

TRANSCRIPT OF THE QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION AT A
PUBLIC FORUM ORGANISED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF
SINGAPORE STUDENTS' UNION
ON MONDAY THE 27TH AUGUST, 1962.

QUESTION BY JOSEPH LYNUS:

After careful scrutiny we have been convinced that the change from nationality to citizenship has just been a change in nomenclature. You, Mr. Lee, earlier maintained that there was no difference between the meaning of these terms. Since you now use the term "citizenship" as opposed to "nationality", we see an inconsistency in your terms. Please explain yourself.

Prime Minister: I am sorry that Mr. Lynus believes that I have been inconsistent. I have always maintained that the State Advocate-General of Singapore was absolutely right when he said there was in law no distinction between the concept of a common nationality or a common citizenship. However, apart from what the law was, we had to take into consideration the political propaganda on the ground. And I

say this, quite simply, my enemies took a dangerous line when they had insisted that citizenship was different from nationality and they wanted citizenship. Well, you remember Mr. Marshall, he is a man not unlearned in the law, he came before this very same gathering two months ago, and he said this: "We do not quarrel about proportional representation. "We do not quarrel about with their insistence that Singapore politicians should vote or stand for election in the Federation. So we say, 'we accept it Tengku, but let us have a common citizenship and let us have a common constitutional disability that no Federation citizen can stand or vote in Singapore. We can't stand or vote in the Federation. Let us have a clause to say that after merger.'" You remember when I wound up, I said this to Mr. Marshall: "Mr. Marshall has now publicly -- and I'm glad for this forum if for no other reason than this -- that he has publicly now on his own said he is prepared to accept all these things provided we ensure in the constitution that there will be no discrimination. Then Mr. Marshall interjected, 'and common citizenship', and I said "no discrimination, common citizenship and no changeable voting." And I went on to say, "I have said on National Day

National Archives of Singapore

and this is not a thing said lightly and in jest, that it is the duty of the government to see that these things are written into the constitution before Malaysia takes effect. “And I may yet have the pleasure of playing this tape recording of what Mr. Marshall said at some future occasion in order to get him to endorse what we have done”. Well, we took Mr. Marshall’s words to heart, the Cobbold Commission came out with their report giving a common citizenship to Borneo which obviously opens the door to us to do likewise. And I asked Mr. Marshall this, on the 25th of August, Radio Singapore. “In other words, you support Alternative ‘A’, the Singapore flag, you do.” He said: “I accept.” “You will support them.” “I shall gratefully support them.” (this is page two of the transcript). You see, I went on to say, “if you will support it in the Assembly it follows you will support it in the Referendum.” “No”, he said, You know, it’s a little bit difficult, he likes spring chicken if it is served in the Assembly, you tell him in a Referendum, “Would you like spring chicken, roast duck or roast pork,” he says, “No, I won’t have any.” And I think in answer to Mr. Lynus, I can do no better than to read Mr. Marshall, and he is quite an

National Archives of Singapore

authority, we quote him from time to time, and he said this on Page 8 of the transcript, and if it comes from a man no less learned in the law than Mr. Marshall how much more it must be in the case of other people, he said this about Mr. Ong Eng Guan. (Mr. Ong Eng Guan being a much more subtle politician he kept up the line of the Barisan Sosialis, he is quite a wily fellow, I mean, he knows what's coming, Barisan star falls, U.P.P. circles capture Barisan supporters, that's what he is thinking. Well, good luck to him.) However, Mr. Marshall said: "I am sorry that Mr. Ong Eng Guan is getting lost in the thicket of legal technicalities distinguishing nationality from citizenship. But I do say that there is no question of two classes of Malaysian citizenship here at all. There is one Malaysian citizenship and there will be in addition in respect of the various territories, as I understand it, some classification whereby those territories can in respect of their own people limit the special privileges existing in those territories and there is no more than that. And that is why the Worker's Party accepts these changes in that context. Quite frankly I have studied it very carefully." Can I just finish Mr. Marshall. I am merely doing Mr. Marshall a

National Archives of Singapore

favour, rather than be an authority myself I thought better Mr. Marshall as an authority. "Quite frankly I have studied it very carefully and I am deeply, and perhaps more deeply suspicious of the P.A.P. than most. And I can tell you insofar as these changes in the citizenship proposals are concerned, I see no catch." Well, Mr. Marshall is happy. Now he is half and half. You know, on the one hand, he is all for White Paper. On the other hand, you know, there is this little bit of a veer to keep in line with the United front line just in case the ground is altogether lost. However, if it must be so in the case of Mr. Marshall, how much more must it be in the case of the thousands and thousands of non-legally trained men and women who have been pumped this vicious propaganda of second-class citizenship by Mr. Woodhull's underground and above ground friends.

National Archives of Singapore

Mr. Marshall:

Mr. Lynus forgets that one of the aspects of the changed citizenship provisions is that Federation citizenship has been abolished. And I say this, I may be wrong in my understanding of these provisions, but we of the Worker's Party challenge any other political party which denies it, to

submit the issue to any constitutional lawyer of standing of their choice and if that constitutional lawyer says that there is no radical constitutional change we will stand up publicly and admit our error if they would do the same. Because I say to you this, dislike the P.A.P. as I do for the dishonesty and grievous harm they have done to our people, we face the truth and the truth we genuinely believe is that there is a radical constitutional change whereby two distinct status of citizenship is now merged into one constitutional citizenship. There is no more a Federal citizenship and the name Singapore citizen, I hope, will ultimately disappear since it is a psychological bone of contention, and I offer as a suggestion that for the peoples of Singapore, the Federation, Borneo, Brunei and that for the Sarawak, the term that is used should be the term "Singapore voter", "Federation voter, "Borneo, Brunei and Sarawak voters." Those are the terms which are necessary to use for the purposes of distinguishing where you vote and what are your own personal rights in that particular territory. But am honestly convinced that the changes which have been made are not changes of nomenclature, they are vital constitutional changes. And I

National Archives of Singapore

repeat -- I here challenge any political party that says otherwise to submit this matter to any constitutional authority of international standing of their choice and if we, the Worker's Party, lose we are prepared to pay for the opinion too.

Mr. Woodhull:

I think Mr. Lee has not answered Mr. Lynus' question. The point is this. Mr. Lynus says that these new proposals do not affect the real position. They are just a change in nomenclature. 'Yes' or 'no' -- Mr. Lee hasn't answered. And I say 'yes'. I have a photostat copy of the correspondence between our illustrious Prime Minister and the Prime Minister of the Federation. And it states here, Paragraph 3 -- "some persons find it difficult to understand that there is no difference in calling Singapore citizens 'nationals' or 'citizens' of the new Federation of Malaysia. We have, therefore, agreed, it says, "that since this question of nomenclature has loomed large in the minds of some sections of the people, paragraph 14 of the White Paper should be so amended that citizens of Singapore would be 'citizens' of Malaysia instead of "nationals' of Malaysia."

And then you have attached to it the interpretation of the Advocate-General of Singapore and the Attorney-General of the Federation that there will only be two citizenships -- citizens of Malaysia and citizens of Singapore. The position is the same. Mr. Lee himself has asked the Prime Minister of the Federation to change the name so as to satisfy some people who do not like the word 'national' to substitute 'citizen' for it. That's all. Why doesn't Mr. Lee admit it.

Mr. Marshall:

Mr. Woodhull complains that Mr. Lee Kuan Yew has not answered Mr. Lynus' question. Ladies and gentlemen, may I complain gently that Mr. Woodhull has not answered by challenge. He says, I do not understand and I confess to you I am no expert in constitutional law and I am prepared as a honest politician to accept. Will he, who says he is an honest politician, accept the opinion of any lawyer, he has the choice, of international standing as a constitutional lawyer. It's a very simple question. He has read to you the exchange of letters. I am not here to explain to you -- many of you are intelligent enough to recognise that these letters are worded with an eye to their respective electorates. Perhaps you can

understand what I mean. But if we look behind the words to the realities of the constitutional change. I repeat my challenge either this week or any other week before Malaysia, will Mr. Woodhull accept that challenge?

Mr. Woodhull: (Happy to accept it).

Mr. Marshall: This is it. To put to a lawyer of international repute, a constitutional lawyer: Do these changes make any vital constitutional difference to Command Paper 33? That is the question.

Mr. Woodhull: The simple answer to Mr. Marshall is that I do accept the challenge.

National Archives of Singapore

Mr. Marshall: Name your man.

Mr. Woodhull: Anyway, the question that was asked was: Did these changes make any difference to Proposal 'A'? That was the question whether there were any changes or not and Mr. Lee's own letter to the Tengku just asks for a change of

name. This is something Mr. Marshall should understand.

Unfortunately, it's the second time that Mr. Lee has set a trap for Mr. Marshall. The first time was when they went for the constitutional talks in London when Mr. Marshall pressed for independence for Singapore, Mr. Lee just watched him making all his strenuous efforts, getting himself involved and Mr. Lee just smiled, the whole thing collapsed and poor Mr. Marshall had to resign. And this time, Mr. Lee being more a politician than a lawyer, watches Mr. Marshall perform, get himself involved, then he meets Mr. Marshall, Mr. Marshall finds his foot in the trap. Mr. Lee, of course, is very good in what the Malays call 'pasang kaki'.

Prime Minister:

Well, I'm sorry, ladies and gentlemen, if you believe

that I have "pasanged" Mr. Marshall as my 'kaki'. Let me say this -- nothing is more disastrous, in my view, than to

have a 'kaki' that is not quite steady. And I never got into

any common Council of Joint Action with Mr. Marshall. It's

Mr. Woodhull and his friends who got into a Council of Joint

Action. To put it crudely, Mr. Woodhull's 'kaki' that he

'pasanged' tripped him up.

Question from Mr. Lim Chew Hock:

I understand your present stand on the citizenship question is the same as that of the Government. But nevertheless, you still ask the people to cast blank votes in the Referendum poll to show disgust at the mode and manner by which the Government is carrying out the Referendum. Am I fair in suggesting that in effect you are asking the people to place party politics above and beyond the interests of the people in their consideration when casting their votes.

Mr. Marshall:

Thank you, Sir, for permitting me to speak on this. I have prepared a script for it, but unfortunately thanks to the Prime Minister's insistence I wasn't allowed the extra ten minutes, I want to read to you what the Prime Minister in his "Battle for Merger" for power, as he calls it, which I call "12 lessons in how I stabbed my colleagues and double-crossed my friends; page 80 this was drawn to my attention of the English edition, he says: "A Referendum means the people decide 'yes' or 'no' to merger proposals. But Dr. Lee Siew

Choh for the Barisan Sosialis, who have claimed they want the people to decide on merger instead of wanting the people to say 'yes' or 'no' to merger wants general elections. Now, here he tells you what it means on the previous page, he says, "we have said and everyone knows, that these terms and conditions will be presented to you people for your acceptances or rejection." Now he has lied there. We have no right to accept or reject or say 'yes' or 'no'. Proposal 'B', according to Mr. Dingle Foot, Queen's Counsel and Member of Parliament, whose opinion, I sought means nothing at all I have the statement of the case and the opinion here if you wish to see it. Proposal 'C', according to the Prime Minister to the United Nations on the 26th of July, Page 32 of the transcript, "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 crystalised in a 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 question until Alternative 'C' has

National Archives of Singapore

been published and clarified.” That’s the second lie. It also means nothing because there is no White Paper. Now, in the Federation, we have got ‘Bapa Malaysia,’ in Singapore we’ve got ‘Bapa Clause 29’, that abortion. On top of it, he has used the emotive Singapore flag as a symbol for proposal “A” although he has promised in the Assembly there will be no emotive symbols. He has also permitted himself no publication of the number of blank votes. The entire thing is so immoral, and you say it is party politics. You are asked to participate in a thoroughly dishonest, publicly dishonest manoeuvre and you say it is party politics. The law compels us to go there, to the ballot box, and we will go. The law compels us to take that ballot paper, that filthy thing, we will take it. But it doesn’t compel us to mark it, and we will not mark it. And you call it party politics. At least, I hope you have some principles. It is not through the principles of his honesty, through Machiavellian treachery that we are going to achieve a decent country.

Prime Minister: You know there is a saying in court, “when you are in a jam. bluster,” And the jam is simply this. Mr. Marshall

said on the 19th of August knowing full well what the Referendum was, what the proposals were, what the symbols were, he said it in the Sunday Times, he was going to get his party to reconsider the question of blank votes. In other words, on Saturday night, 18th of August, barely a week ago, Mr. Marshall was in a reasonably happy frame of mind. He wanted not only, having had a nice dialogue with me, ever so polite and ever so pleasant over the radio, I asked him whether he would state his stand, Ah, he'll give it unequivocally, a matter of days, must allow him time to speak to his party. And he said in the Sunday Times, interview given on the 18th, that he wanted to get his party to reconsider blank votes. If it's so immoral, if it's so wicked if it's so dishonest to partake of this Referendum, why did it cross his mind on the 18th of August that he was going to get his party to reverse the decision. I suggest he was unable to get the party to reverse, that the party is, as he has admitted, captured by others, that he doesn't want to break with his party because it means he will be left with nothing. Now, let me answer the substance of the allegation. 'Yes' or 'No' to merger, and I would have put that question, 'Yes' or 'No' to

National Archives of Singapore

merger. And they asked in the Assembly, 'don't put that question yes or no to merger, because we all agree on merger. Dr. Lee Siew Choh said that. It is as simple as that. Nobody disagrees on merger. Dr. Lee Siew Choh said, 'it's only what kind of merger'. Therefore, I say, I will put it to the people. What we have proposed, what Barisan Sosialis have asked for, merger like Penang and Malacca, what Mr. Marshall -- and I quoted him with great effectiveness. Every now and again, he becomes a great authority on my side, and I quoted him. And you know, he got excited over the wireless and called me a liar and so on. I didn't have the particular text then, but I've got it here with me now, the Hansard of the 23rd November, Column 375 -- he said: "merger, complete, unconditional." That's No. 2. And if Mr. Dingle Foot doesn't know what it is, tell Mr. Dingle Foot to come here and I'll tell him all about it. I've got an S.A.G. who has drafted out 18 paragraphs to show the difference between 'A', 'B' and 'C'. I said to the United Nations, "surely we won't put it until 'C' is known." Sixty-thousand words have been published in the Cobbold Report and all the unanimous recommendations of the Cobbold Report have been accepted

National Archives of Singapore

by the Federation and British Governments, and the 18 paragraphs are spelt out from the unanimous recommendations of the Cobbold Report and 'C' is known. And anyway, nobody wants 'C', they voted against 'C' in the Assembly. This is plain and simple passing of the buck. Everybody wants merger except Barisan. That's honest. Mr. Ong Eng Guan wants merger, but he wants me to carry the buck, heap abuse, heap trouble on me, then ride, Barisan goes, he gathers the multitude, banners to Kuala Lumpur. Well, we are not that suckers. I mean, we are not in this game for the benefit of a gang of adventurers. (Mr. Marshall: No, it is for your benefit.) No, it is for the benefit of the people of Singapore. Let me put it simply, if I wanted to play for my benefit, if I wanted (a member of the crowd shouts 'Malam Malaysia') -- and there is nothing wrong with Malam Malaysia either and I didn't do the twist, nor did I do the Cha-Cha, nor did I have anything to do with soap and contraceptives as Mr. Woodhull has suggested. Let me put it simply to you like this, if we wanted to play party politics, all we need do is to opt out. You see, we have got a guaranteed and an insured position. (Mr. Marshall: "Please do it".) Ah,

Ah, they want us to do that. There are 26 votes, or there were, in the Assembly. They could outvote us, we want no coalition, and if they outvote us, we lay down our responsibility, but as long as we are in power, we discharge it to the best of our ability, according to our conscience and what's in the interests of the people.

Mr. Marshall:

The Prime Minister tells you that if Dingle Foot doesn't know what proposal 'B' means, he will tell him. This is what the Prime Minister said to United Nations -- at Page 31 -- "It is not for me and I do not claim the right to make a judicial interpretation of these documents", that's to say in accordance with the Constitutional documents of the Federation of Malaya. He said my party has been captured.

Just by whom? By the Communists? But I thought he said they don't want merger. We have come out honestly and frankly stating that we recognise that the merger proposals as they now stand are right. But the Barisan Sosialis -- they are against it. Whom have we been captured by? Now, let me make my stand quite clear. We have told the Prime Minister, postpone this humbug referendum, postpone it till after the

Malaysian Constitution is before the people so that they can see it spelled out, so we can explain it to them, so that we, and the Worker's Party, undertake publicly to work for that proposal with all sincerity and to urge the people to support it if we have a referendum that gives us a chance to say "Yes" or "No". Because though the Worker's Party accepts it, we are not the people of Singapore, nor is he. He is just one and one empty balloon of gas. Give the people of Singapore the chance and take their decision. If a doctor says to you, "you must amputate your leg, otherwise you will be in more serious danger", it is your right to say "No". He has no right to cut it off or to put forward this shameless, public humbug to get you to do it.

Mr. Lee:

I am not going to reply to abuse, but I want to make a few simple points. First, Mr. Marshall says who has his party been captured by? I say if he would read the Straits Times of April and May he will see Mr. K.M. Byrne right there, in writing say that Mr. Marshall admitted his party has been captured by the Communists. Mr. Marshall subsequently corrected it and said it's been captured by Barisan Sosialis. He says Mr. Byrne is a liar. I said sue Mr. Byrne and the

Straits Times, because it is damaging. Never mind. That's point number one. Point number two, let's postpone this Referendum. You heard this plea. It's always a passionate, powerful plea for decency and understanding and humanity and (Mr. Marshall: And you can't understand). If I, for one moment, believed that the postponement was for the sake of decency and humanity I would be the first to respond. Here is a party which says, "postpone", says the spokesman "because we want time to explain to the people" and instead of immediately explaining to the people why 'A' is good, they said "cast blank vote, down with every merger vote." And I ask him: Does he honestly believe -- he asked Mr. Rajaratnam twice for time to persuade important people in Barisan Sosialis who were beginning to see his point of view.

Mr. Marshall is asking for reconvening of the Assembly and we wanted to know what for? And he said in order to clarify the stand, now he is quite prepared to vote for the White Paper and he wanted time to convince the Barisan chaps, and he said some of them are beginning to see his point of view. The very day he said that Lim Chin Siong went to Jurong and promptly denounced him. I don't know whether Mr. Lim

Chin Siong wrote the English text, I've got a feeling Mr. Woodhull's style was somewhat there. You know, "people who ran away when the going got hot." I don't think Mr. Marshall ran away. I thought he did the right thing but Mr. Woodhull thought he ran away and these are men who have not the slightest intention of being convinced either by humanity or decency. Their movement to capture Singapore, Malaya, and the Borneo territories for the Communist cause will be blocked by merger and Malaysia, they are going to fight it to the death. You give them another six months, they will tell more lies, cause more trouble. They are at the moment at the lowest ebb, no more ideas, no more material, debunked, deflated and all they can think of its postponement. Well, 1st of September, we'll see.

National Archives of Singapore

Mr. Woodhull: The Barisan Sosialis are supposed to have captured the Worker's Party. I suppose they have captured the P.A.P. now. (Prime Minister: you tried that last year, you know but you failed). We tried that last year, he says. But before we came out of prison, Mr. Lee had amended the Constitution of the P.A.P. He appointed the cadres, the cadres appointed

him. It's a perfect arrangement. Mr. Rajaratnam, the mental heavyweight of the P.A.P. -- he tried to justify this system. I mean, he quoted the Roman Catholic Church -- the Pope appoints the Cardinals, the Cardinals appoint the Pope. Papa Lee, Harry the Pope. Now, I mean, I've nothing against Mr. Rajaratnam, in fact, he is dreadfully honest fellow. Not only he is confused, he looks confused. But now it's being said that we tried to capture the Worker's Party and Mr. Lee specialises in this, one insinuation after another insinuation. The Communists, he says, are at their low ebb, they had it, merger, Malaysia, this is the only solution. This is his familiar theme. Now, I say, that Mr. Lee knows that his time is up and he has to push through this Malaysia whether he likes it or not. Look at the arguments that he has been given.

He says that Dr. Lee says, "don't say yes, no to merger." Of course, we proposed in the Legislative Assembly that we want a complete merger, with Singapore citizens becoming the citizens of the Federation of Malaya, with Singapore sending proportional representatives and he rejected it. This is the very man who now says, "Oh, the Barisan does not want merger." This is twist, yes. We also proposed that you

put your proposals through in the Legislative Assembly, alright, put it to the people, 'yes' or 'no' and he dared not put it to the people, yes or no. Instead he gets Mr. Lim Yew Hock to propose Proposal 'C', then Mr. Lim Yew Hock attacks the blank vote and he says, "alright, vote proposal 'A' now." This is Harry Lee. Everybody has agreed on merger, we want a complete merger. He doesn't get it. What are his excuses, just watch him, first he says it's legally not possible. Then it's proved that it's legally possible. Section two and sub-section 22 of the Federal Constitution makes it possible for such a merger. So he shifts this ground, he says now, we have 15 seats in the Legislature, we have Labour and Education, so we need only 15 because we have autonomy. I mean, if that is the basis of the 15 seats, then we say, take labour, take education but give us a common citizenship and 25 representatives or 24 on proportional basis. We asked Mr. Lee, no answer. He refuses to budge on this. And so he rigs up this Referendum Law and tries to justify it. I will say this for Mr. Marshall, at least his legal training has made him ashamed of this Referendum Law. But Mr. Lee is a sort of lawyer who brings his profession into issue and disrepute.

And this is his basis. If he says that he has the support of the people, Mr. Lim Yew Hock says he has the support of the people, alright, the Barisan say we have the support of the people, you may dismiss it, this is politicians' talk. But let us test our positions. Let us test our ground by going back to the people. Does he dare do it? He hasn't got the courage to do it. All he can do is give his excuses. "We want a Referendum only to determine the mode and manner of merger." Then he shifts his ground further. He says, "15 seats, therefore Labour and Education we shall have autonomy." I mean, his law is crooked, his economics is crazy, his politics is just crackers and Mr. Lee is personally cuckoo.

Mr. Lee:

I have just been given one minute to answer Mr. Woodhull and my answer is quite simple. Mr. Woodhull is a Federation citizen, he carries a Federation passport. I even allowed him to complain against me, at the United Nations although he isn't a subject of Singapore. I raised no objections whatsoever. And I say to Mr. Woodhull, quite simply this: He's not afraid to go to prison, he's a brave

man, good. Go back to Batu Pahat, fight the Tengku, get into Parliament, give us 25 seats. That's your battle.

Mr. Woodhull:

If all Federal citizens were like me, Mr. Lee would not be here. This is the same man who organised the P.A.P. with me. Now, I am quite happy to go back to Batu Pahat. But Mr. Lee has tried to take the people for a ride and one of these days he will find out that they will take him for a very short run and dump him into the Rochore Canal. (Prime Minister: When are you going back to K.L.?)

Question by Chandran Mohan:

Mr. Lee, you explained before that blank votes in the Referendum would mean a vote for the Government as is contained in the Referendum Bill. But lately you have been saying that by casting blank votes, the electorate in Singapore would be indirectly voting for Alternative 'B' as the majority. Please explain.

Prime Minister:

I have never said that the blank vote is voting for the Government. That is what the Opposition have viciously always said. Clause 29 says a blank vote or an unmarked vote will go in accordance with what the Legislative Assembly decides -- not what the Government says is 'A' or 'B' but what the Legislative Assembly and, as I pointed out to Mr. Woodhull, we didn't even command a majority last time when they moved a motion of 'no confidence' in us. They, the Opposition together, could have out-voted us. That's the first point we must have clear. Barisan is now going down on the ground: "Ah, well, since you like White Paper just cast a blank vote, it will be for the White Paper, which is another lie. A blank vote is a lost vote. It will have to go according to the decision of the Assembly. But if the Assembly is faced with a situation where there are more votes for 'B' than 'A', I think it will have to be a very brave Assembly to say that blanks go to 'A' and not to 'B'. It's as simple as that. I ask them -- Mr. Marshall is a lawyer and he is being praised by Mr. Woodhull, he only praises Mr. Marshall when it suits him. When Mr. Marshall talks about citizenship with authority, Mr. Woodhull doesn't like it.

National Archives of Singapore

Never mind. But that is what Clause 29 says. And I say it's as simple as this: Three people go to vote. I would have voted for 'A' -- let's say Harry Lee votes for 'A'. Sandra Woodhull or Sidney Woodhull -- I thought I saw his name change from Sandra to Sidney now. Never mind. But let's say he also wants to vote (assuming that he has got the right of voting, but he hasn't -- never mind). For the purposes of the argument, let's assume he also wanted to vote for 'A', but Mr. Marshall wanted to vote for 'B' because Mr. Marshall thinks complete merger is the right thing. I mean if he lived up to what he said in Hansard, then he'll vote for 'B', you see. So there will be two 'A's against one 'B'. But let us suppose that I go and listen to Barisan's line "never mind, you want 'A' cast a blank vote." So I cast a blank. Mr.

Woodhull gets a directive to cast a blank vote. He casts a blank. There are two blanks against one 'B'. And the Legislative Assembly will have to decide what those two blanks go to, and I say if there are more 'B's than 'A's the matter is wide open.

Mr. Marshall:

The euphemism of Clause 29 is that the blank vote will go according to the decision of the Legislative Assembly.

That's correct. The Legislative Assembly by 33 votes to 18 Opposition walking out, voted in favour of Proposal 'A', that is to say, in favour of Command White Paper 33 of 1961.

The country will not know how many people have genuinely voted for 'A' and how many blank votes are added to the total because they also refused to permit an amendment of their provision, and now as the law stands the Superintendent of Election has got to add all the 'A' votes with the blank votes. And this talk about 'B' is another PAP lie. Those are the facts that the Assembly has voted in favour of Command White Paper 33 of 1961. That is on the record. Clause 29 says blank votes will go in accordance with the decision of

the Legislative Assembly which is already on the record. The Referendum Ordinance says that the blank vote shall not be declared separately. The Assembly will not know. You will not know. He will know for the purposes of his party. He and Mr. Ong Pang Boon and Mr. Goh Keng Swee and the rest of them. They will know, but no citizen of Singapore outside that filthy PAP Party will know how many blank

votes there are. They will be joined to the 'A' vote and will be given a total of 99.9%. So, let's have no humbug about 'B'.

Mr. Woodhull:

The point I want to make is very much the same as Mr. Marshall. The Legislative Assembly has already decided for Proposal 'A' -- this has been passed. Section 29 of the Referendum Ordinance states quite clearly that all blank and uncertain votes will be deemed to be votes in accordance with the decision of the Legislative Assembly, which is Proposal 'A'. Now, how does Proposal if you vote blank it will count for Proposal 'B', Mr. Lee has got to explain. Let Mr. Lee explain if the blank and uncertain votes will be counted separately. If he says they will be counted separately and made known to the public, then I say 'jolly good'.

Prime Minister:

You see this is the problem that arises when the Opposition construes the Ordinance for their own propaganda purposes. Section 29 (I haven't got the Ordinance, neither has Mr. Marshall, nor has Mr. Woodhull), but I have just had

the advantage of a session this morning with the Chinese Chamber of Commerce and I went through Section 29 with them, blank and uncertain votes will go in accordance with the decision of the Assembly. The Assembly made the decision on the White Paper but the Assembly never made a decision on the three alternatives. In fact, part of the Opposition that supported the White Paper proposed 'C'. Tun Lim Yew Hock and his S.P.A. proposed 'C'. In other words, there has been no pronouncement on the three alternatives put in the referendum, and blank votes will go in accordance with the decision of the Assembly. And I say this in all seriousness -- Barisan is trying to get the maximum number of blank votes by shooting the line that blank vote means 'A'. And I am saying quite frankly that, according to the law, that is incorrect, untrue, mischievous. And if, as a consequence of what I have explained just now, there are more 'B's than 'A's the Legislative Assembly will be in a difficulty to decide the blanks go to 'A' and not go to 'B'.

Mr. Marshall:

Clause 29 speaks of a decision taken, or to be taken, by the Legislative Assembly. Decision has been taken but the

Prime Minister has not promised that it will be reconsidered again. But even if it is reconsidered again, the PAP command 25 people in the Assembly and the SPA has come out in favour of 'A'. So when, if (a big 'if') he seeks the approval of the Assembly again for the blank votes, whose number we will not be permitted to know, it will still be 'A'. I nail down that lie.

Mr. Woodhull:

I think what Mr. Lee has been saying is most interesting. We are going to have a Referendum on September the first. There will be voting, counting of the ballot on the same night. How are the blank votes going to be counted? It states in the Referendum Ordinance that the blank and uncertain votes shall be included and counted with the decision in accordance with the Legislative Assembly which has already decided on Proposal 'A'. How are the votes to be counted? Will Mr. Lee tell us if the blank votes will be counted separately -- the blank and uncertain votes -- and made known to the public. This is the crucial question. If he can answer that, if he says 'yes', then I say 'three cheers to Harry Lee'.

Prime Minister: I give you the simple answer that if there are more 'B's than 'A's, the blank votes will go back to the Assembly and I say 'three cheers to Sandra Woodhull'.

National Archives of Singapore

Question by Mr. Manjit Singh:

The livelihood of the people of Singapore depends on its trade with the Federation. If Singapore were to demand for complete independence, and first chance going it alone, is it possible if not probable that the Federation would sever trade relations with Singapore? This was made quite clear by the attempt made by the Federation to improve Port Swettenham in order to cope up with the Federation's trade. But today, Singapore has been offered merger under certain conditions, and although the opposition parties are condemning it vehemently, at least it means what the people of Singapore will retain as their livelihood. So, wouldn't you agree that, at least, half a loaf is better than no bread for it means that the people of Singapore will still have something to eat and there is always the hope of improving the existing conditions?

Mr. Woodhull:

Before the PAP came into office they produced such a thing called "The Tasks Ahead." That was before the serious decline in mental powers resulted in the battle for merger.

But in the "Tasks Ahead" they made it quite clear that the Federation needs us as much as we need the Federation, and it is to the interests of both territories to have a common market. But, what has happened to the Common Market? The merger proposals make no mention of the common market. At the same time Harry Lee talks glibly about having a market of 10-million people, but is there this market of 10-million people? Just see the position. In the Federation they're running into difficulties to finance the five-year plan. In Singapore, since the P.A.P. came into office in 1959, the financial statement of account says there are 70-million dollars in Sterling securities. The 1960 statement of account shows that there are 164-million dollars spent on Sterling securities -- almost double the amount in hundred years, in money gone out of Singapore to build homes in Sussex, Wessex, Middlesex, some sex that Harry likes. And this is the position. There has been no talk, no mention of a common market.

National Archives of Singapore

Is the position changed at all? And do we have to bring about merger on these terms when nothing has been clarified? And this is the question that needs to be answered, and this is something that the P.A.P. has never answered.

Mr. Marshall:

The threat to cut the Causeway is the threat of a man to cut his own throat. Not only the head dies, but also the body dies. The Federation knows it. That's sheer humbug. Port Swettenham today in spite of all their efforts hasn't been able to stop the growth of the port of Singapore which carries more trade than it has ever carried before. It's the greatest port in all Asia. Let us not be fooled by this.

We of the Worker's Party have told you that we agree with the person who asked the question that the present proposals are workable. We have stood up for independence as an alternative to complete merger. We now accept that there is merger, there is a common citizenship in spite of certain unfair aspects and shabby treatment of Singapore. But if the people of Singapore should want independence, we are convinced, that that independence would be but a step

towards a merger of equals, and we can stand completely alone as a viable entity. We have said this for a long time. That has been our platform and we believe it, that through independence there will be mutual respect by recognition on both sides of the need of one for the other, and then we can have a merger compatible with the self-respect of the people of Singapore who will no longer have the impediment -- the clot -- in the Constitution of a P.A.P. party in office.

Mr. Lee Kuan Yew: Well, Mr. Marshall has answered on my behalf about the merger business. Now, he admits it is genuine merger, miraculously achieved now. And so it is going to be. And as for common market, Mr. Marshall knows, Mr. Woodhull can't be all that ignorant, that there is a United Nations team now right here looking into this question of a common market.

National Archives of Singapore

If there is an unconditional common market, let's face the facts, all the development will be in Singapore. It's got the best harbour, it's got the best land and sea communications and railway connections. From Singapore you can attack the whole of the South East Asian markets. Your imports are cheap, your exports are cheap. The Federation wants to ensure that there are certain industries which are closely connected with their raw materials like iron, tin, rubber, palm oil, those industries should be scheduled in the Federation, otherwise they will all gravitate to Singapore, and the common market is there as an accepted principle of both governments. The question is how do we devise a plan whereby not all the development takes place in Singapore, whereby some development, mainly connected with the raw materials of the Federation, can only develop in the Federation. The whole purpose of this getting together is in order to build a more prosperous society. And if there is no common market, we just go in for the purpose of just merging with the Federation without a common market, then I say what are we all talking about? The Tunku accepts this, the Federation Finance Minister has agreed this with our

National Archives of Singapore

Finance Minister, the United Nations team, I think, is already on its way out, if not already here, and with merger and Malaysia, the final crux is this: if things are worse after merger and Malaysia, we will have to take the rap for it, and we are convinced things will be better after merger and Malaysia. That is why we are prepared, as Mr. Marshall says, he sticks his neck out, but we are prepared to put our lives at stake on this.

28th August, 1962.

National Archives of Singapore