

**CHRISTIAN FEDERATION OF MALAYSIA  
PERSEKUTUAN KRISTIAN MALAYSIA**

(PPM-003-10-14011986)

*Address : 26 Jalan Universiti, 46200 Petaling Jaya, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia*

*Telephone / Fax : + 60 3 7957 1457*

*Email: [cfmsia@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:cfmsia@yahoo.co.uk)*

3rd March 2017

**CFM FACT SHEET ON THE PROPOSED BILL TO AMEND ACT 355  
AND WHY IT SHOULD BE OPPOSED**

It is a fact that Islamic law or the Syariah has had an impact on the lives of non-Muslim Malaysians. There are many examples over the decades, including enactments – both State laws and in the Syariah - that forbid the use of certain words or even of greetings such as “Peace be with you” or “Assalaamualeykkum”. There are frequent uproars over what is deemed “halal” which even some Muslims find debatable, and which are divisive as well as disruptive.

The most serious or most talked about recently would be what is generally referred to as “Hudud Law”. Although non-Muslims keep being reassured that they will not be affected, this is untrue.

This CFM Fact Sheet on the Proposed Amendments to Act 355 is to provide details about these Hudud Enactments and especially the latest Bill to amend Act 355 which will likely be voted on in the next session of Parliament. Non-Muslim Malaysians need to be aware of the implications of this Bill and ask one’s relevant Member of Parliament to vote against the Bill.

It is important to note that UMNO, the ruling party in the current government coalition has joined forces with PAS to present this Bill in Parliament, and UMNO leaders have openly expressed their support for this Bill. The implications of the government of all Malaysians supporting such a Bill are considerable.

An amendment such as those proposed to Act 355 have grave consequences and would affect the fundamental principles of justice, freedoms and rights of all Malaysians, As such, they must be thoroughly and responsibly discussed openly and honestly. This has not happened.

The amendments proposed by Dato’ Seri Hadi Bin Awang’s private member’s bill should no longer be solely in the domain of Muslims alone or a compulsive duty by Muslims as asserted by the PAS President, even to the extent of claiming this small element of the Syariah as “Divine Law” which it is not.

The proposed amendments should only be initiated by the Government after a thorough study of its impact and gravity on Malaysians of all walks of life. Any intended increase of the punishments prescribed should be in accordance to sound principles of laws and our Constitution.

The Christian Federation of Malaysia calls upon members of the Malaysian Parliament, both in the Dewan Rakyat and Dewan Negara, not to approve either version of the proposed amendments to Act 355.

We call upon all Malaysians to contact their Member of Parliament the addresses of the Members of Parliament service centres can be found on the Parliament website <http://www.parlimen.gov.my/ahli-dewan.html?uweb=dr&> to ensure that their Member of Parliament attends the sitting of the Dewan Rakyat that votes on this matter, and to ensure that s/he does not vote in favour of the amendments.

Yours Sincerely,



Rev. Dr. Eu Hong Seng,  
Chairman and the Executive Committee,  
The Christian Federation of Malaysia.

**CHRISTIAN FEDERATION OF MALAYSIA  
PERSEKUTUAN KRISTIAN MALAYSIA**

(PPM-003-10-14011986)

*Address : 26 Jalan Universiti, 46200 Petaling Jaya, Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia*

*Telephone / Fax : + 60 3 7957 1457*

*Email: [cfmsia@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:cfmsia@yahoo.co.uk)*

3<sup>rd</sup> March 2017

**CFM FACT SHEET ON THE PROPOSED BILL TO AMEND ACT 355  
AND WHY IT SHOULD BE OPPOSED**

**Introduction**

1. The Syariah Court (Criminal Jurisdiction) Act 1965 (“Act 355”) was first passed by Parliament in March 1965. Act 355 did 2 things. Firstly, it authorised a Syariah court set up by a state to mete out punishments not exceeding 6 months in jail or a fine not exceeding RM1,000 or both for offences against the precepts of Islam that had been created by state law (known as “enactments”). Secondly, it validated all the punishments that had been meted out by Syariah courts prior to the coming into force of Act 355. This was because the Syariah courts had been operating since Merdeka (independence for Malaya on 31 August 1957) without any authority to mete out punishments.
2. Act 355 has been amended twice before. In 1984, the limits of the punishments were increased to a term not exceeding 3 years in jail, a fine not exceeding RM5,000 or not more than 6 strokes of the cane. In 1989, the jurisdiction of Act 355 was extended to Sabah and Sarawak.
3. PAS President Dato’ Seri Hadi Bin Awang’s private member’s bill to amend Act 355 was first listed in Parliament’s Order Paper on 7 April 2015, but was not debated. It appeared again in June 2015, but again it was not debated. Finally in May 2016 the Government made way for the bill to be debated. However, Dato’ Seri Hadi Bin Awang requested for the debate to be deferred to October 2016, and this was granted. In October 2016, Dato’ Seri Hadi Bin Awang again asked for the debate to be deferred, this time to March 2017. Again this was granted.
4. In the meantime, the nature of the proposed amendments by Dato’ Seri Hadi Bin Awang changed. His initial proposals were to give the Syariah courts:
  - 4.1 jurisdiction over all persons professing the religion of Islam and in respect of offences against the matters listed in paragraph 1 of the State List of the Ninth Schedule to the Federal Constitution; and
  - 4.2 to mete out any punishment permissible under Syariah law in relation to these offences except for the death penalty.
5. **It must be made clear that these proposed amendments did not mention the word “hudud”. However these were far-reaching provisions which would permit the introduction of hudud law and hudud-prescribed punishments in Malaysia.**

This was not part of the framework anticipated in the Federal Constitution at the time of Merdeka. The history of the negotiations for Merdeka, and the drafting of the Federal Constitution by the Reid Commission, clearly show that we were all to be governed by secular laws, except in the limited area of personal law for those professing the religion of Islam. The same principles applied when Sabah and Sarawak joined Malaya to create Malaysia. So if these proposals remain, Parliament should reject them.

### **The revised proposed amendments**

6. When the proposed amendments were re-tabled in Parliament on 24 November 2016, they were significantly amended.
7. The current proposed amendments deal only with the increase in the existing punishments. It is proposed that the current maximum sentences of imprisonment for a period not exceeding 3 years, a fine not exceeding RM 5,000, or not more than 6 strokes of the cane, or a combination thereof, be increased to imprisonment for a period not exceeding 30 years, a fine not exceeding RM100,000, or not more than 100 strokes of the cane, or a combination thereof.
8. **It is clear that while the proposed amendments to Act 355 again do not mention the word “hudud”, the fact is that the increase in the maximum punishments will allow for hudud-compliant punishments to be meted out.** The proposed increase in the maximum penalties under the proposed amendments to Act 355 will allow several hudud punishments to be implemented directly, and for other hudud and non-hudud punishments to be indirectly achieved.
9. Using the Syariah Criminal Code (II) (1993) 2015 of Kelantan, which has already been passed in Kelantan (but not in force), as a reference point for hudud offences, the hudud-prescribed punishment for a “ghairu mohsan” (someone who has not previously had sexual intercourse or, if married, has yet to consummate the marriage) who commits the hudud offence of adultery or sodomy would now be possible, i.e. 100 lashes, since the maximum number of lashes would now be increased to 100.
10. Again under the Syariah Criminal Code (II) (1993) 2015 of Kelantan, the hudud-prescribed punishment for the hudud offence of “qazaf” (false accusation of adultery or sodomy), 80 lashes, would also now be possible.
11. Further, under the Syariah Criminal Code (II) (1993) 2015 of Kelantan, the hudud-prescribed punishment for the hudud offence of “syurb” (consumption of alcohol or intoxicating drink), between 40 to 80 lashes, would also now be possible.
12. One of the hudud-prescribed punishments for the hudud offence of apostasy (“irtidad”) under the Syariah Criminal Code (II) (1993) 2015 of Kelantan, in addition to a jail term and then the death penalty, is the confiscation of the apostate’s property. A fine of RM100,000, the new maximum fine, may for some people be equivalent to the loss of their entire property.
13. Additionally, a jail sentence of the maximum 30 years is greater than many of the punishments under the Penal Code. Under the Penal Code, a jail sentence of up to 30 years is imposed on those convicted of terrorist-related offences, for culpable homicide

not amounting to murder, for kidnapping and for hostage-taking. In countries where the death penalty is no longer applied, a sentence of 30 years in jail is seen as the equivalent of a death sentence. If implemented, the hudud-prescribed punishment for the hudud offence of apostasy would now be possible in principle.

### **Pressure to apply the same law to non-Muslims**

14. Even during the debate on the introduction of Act 355, in March 1965, some of the members of Parliament had called for the provisions to be applied also to non-Muslims. The oft-used rationale is where two or more people are involved in an activity, but only the Muslims are prosecuted, and that this would be unjust. So the pressure is to make the same offences apply to everyone. Overall, the proposed amendments to Act 355 will lead to increased calls for the harmonisation of Syariah law with secular criminal law, and for the extension of Syariah law to non-Muslims. These calls were made right from the very beginning in 1965, even when the limits of Syariah court punishments were low. With these current proposals to make them very high, the pressure will no doubt increase.
15. The argument against the question of applying the law equally is NOT to make Syariah law apply equally to both Muslims and non-Muslims. Instead, we have to look at Article 8 of the Federal Constitution and ask whether there ought to be inequality in criminal law at all. Article 8 (5) (a) of the Federal Constitution only allows for the non-invalidation or non-prohibition of “any provision regulating personal law”. “Personal law” should not include “criminal law”.
16. Any assurance given to the states of Sabah and Sarawak that Muslim authorities in Sabah and Sarawak need not adopt the increased punishments is illusory. It does not take away from the fact that Muslims from Sabah and Sarawak will NOT be spared punishment under increased penalties, since they would come within the jurisdiction of the Syariah law in another state in which they travel and/or live (e.g. in Selangor, when they fly through KLIA or KLIA2).

### **Summary**

17. The original proposal would clearly permit the introduction of hudud law and hudud-prescribed punishments in Malaysia and are unconstitutional. Parliament should reject them.
18. Under the revised proposals, the increase in the limits of punishments will allow some hudud-prescribed punishments to be meted out. Apart from increasing caning to 100 lashes, a jail term of 30 years is equivalent to the death penalty. Fines of up to RM100,000 could be similar to confiscation of property.
19. The maximum limits of a jail sentence and caning punishments under the proposed amendments exceed most punishments that currently exist under the Penal Code. When the focus was on the “inequality” that non-Muslims could not be prosecuted in the Syariah court (even in 1965), there were already calls for the law to apply equally to both Muslims and non-Muslims. Now that some of the punishments will exceed some of those under the Penal Code, there will be even greater calls in this regard.

20. Any increase in the limits of punishments under Syariah law perpetuates a dual criminal legal system which violates the protection of equality before the law and equal protection of the law under Article 8 of the Federal Constitution.
21. An amendment such as those proposed to Act 355 have such grave consequences affecting the fundamental principles of justice, freedoms and rights of all Malaysians. As such, they must be thoroughly and responsibly discussed openly and honestly. This has not happened.
22. The amendments proposed by Dato' Seri Hadi Bin Awang's private member's bill should no longer be solely in the domain of Muslims alone or a compulsive duty by Muslims as asserted by the PAS President, even to the extent of claiming this small element of the Syariah as "Divine Law" which it is not.
23. The proposed amendments should only be initiated by the Government after a thorough study of its impact and gravity on Malaysians of all walks of life. Any intended increase of the punishments prescribed should be in accordance with sound principles of laws and our Constitution.

### **Recommendation**

24. The Christian Federation of Malaysia calls upon members of the Malaysian Parliament, both in the Dewan Rakyat and Dewan Negara, not to approve either version of the proposed amendments to Act 355.
25. We call upon all Malaysians to contact their Member of Parliament the addresses of their service centres can be found on the Parliament website <http://www.parlimen.gov.my/ahli-dewan.html?uweb=dr&> to ensure that their Member of Parliament attends the sitting of the Dewan Rakyat that votes on this matter, and to ensure that s/he does not vote in favour of the amendments.

**Issued by the Executive Committee of the Christian Federation of Malaysia  
3<sup>rd</sup> March 2017**



# Majlis Perundingan Malaysia Agama Buddha, Kristian, Hindu, Sikh dan Tao

Malaysian Consultative Council of Buddhism  
Christianity, Hinduism, Sikhism and Taoism

123 ,Jalan Berhala, Brickfields, 50470 Kuala Lumpur. Tel: 03-2273 9304 Fax : 03- 2273 9307 Email : mccbchst@yahoo.com Website:http://harmonymalaysia.wordpress.com

## **MCCBCHST - AN OPEN LETTER TO MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT TO VOTE AGAINST HADI'S HUDUD BILL**

The **Malaysian Consultative Council of Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism, Sikhism and Taoism (MCCBCHST)** is gravely concerned with Hadi's Private Member's Bill which will be coming up for debate soon in our Federal Parliament. As the Bill will have far-reaching consequences for the Nation, the MCCBCHST feels duty bound to issue this open letter to Members of Parliament to do their duty as required by their oath of office to protect our Federal Constitution.

### **I. Is HADI's Private Member's Bill a Bill empowering HUDUD offences?**

The answer is a clear 'YES'. Here it is why.

The **AIM** of HADI's Private Member's Bill is to seek Parliament's approval to enhance the jurisdiction of the SYARIAH COURTS. Presently, the Syariah Courts can only impose punishments up to 3 years imprisonment, fine up to RM5,000.00 and whipping up to 6 lashes (commonly known as 3-5-6 limits). This is provided for by the Syariah Court (Criminal Jurisdiction) Act 1965 (Act 355).

HADI's Bill seeks to amend the 1965 Act (Act 355) as follows:-

- (i) menggantikan Seksyen 2 dengan Seksyen berikut:

*"2. Mahkamah Syariah akan mempunyai kuasa ke atas seseorang penganut agama Islam dan di dalam hal-hal kesalahan di bawah perkara-perkara yang disenaraikan di dalam Butiran 1 Senarai Negeri di bawah Jadual Kesembilan Undang-Undang Persekutuan",*

*dan*

- (ii) memasukkan selepas Seksyen 2 dengan Seksyen berikut:

**2A.** *"Dalam menjalankan undang-undang jenayah di bawah Seksyen 2 Mahkamah Syariah berhak menjatuhkan hukuman yang dibenarkan oleh Undang-Undang Syariah berkaitan hal-hal kesalahan yang disenaraikan di bawah Seksyen yang disebutkan diatas, selain dari hukuman mati".*

The proposed new Section 2A is very wide and states that Syariah Courts can impose punishments which are allowed by Syariah Law in relation to punishments which are listed under the above Section, other than the death penalty.

Now, let us look at the Syariah Law Enactment passed by the State Legislature of Kelantan, known as the "Kelantan Syariah Criminal Code II (1993) 2015". The offences included in this Kelantan Enactment are:

- (i) HUDUD (fixed punishments). The offences included are theft, robbery, adultery, false accusation of adultery, sodomy, intoxication, heresy (these are II Hudud Offences).**
- (ii) Qisas (retaliatory) – punishments for homicide and causing bodily injuries (these are "qisas offences").**
- (iii) Ta'zir (discretionary) punishments imposed when hudud or qisas punishments cannot be meted out.**

Thus if Hadi's Bill is passed by Parliament it would allow the Kelantan Syariah Criminal Code II (1993) 2015 to be implemented and to impose HUDUD punishments of theft, robbery, adultery, sodomy, etc.

Thus, the proposed Hadi's Private Member's Bill is clearly a HUDUD BILL as it seeks to empower States to be able to introduce amendments empowering Syariah Courts to impose HUDUD Punishments.

## **II. MCCBCHST since its formation has always supported:**

- (i) The Federal Constitution**
- (ii) Rukunegara**
- (iii) Islam as the religion of the Federation**
- (iv) Loyalty to King and Country**
- (v) Rule of Law**

## **III. Is HADI's proposed Bill constitutional.**

The MCCBCHST is of the view, that it is clearly unconstitutional. These are the reasons why it is so.

### **(1) The Historical documents and evidence point to Malaysia being a Secular State.**

- (i) The ALLIANCE MEMORANDUM submitted jointly by UMNO, MCA, MIC to the Lord Reid Commission in 1956 specifically stated that they wanted a secular state, although the religion of the State was to be Islam, and we quote:**



***“The Religion of Malaya shall be Islam. The observance of this principle shall not impose any disability on non-Muslim nationals professing and practising their own religion, and shall not imply that the State is not a secular state”.***

- (ii) Lord Reid Commission Report recommended that although Islam was to be the State religion, it did not imply that the State is not a secular State (Para 169 of Reid Report).***
- (iii) The White Paper issued by the British Government in June 1957 reconfirmed that the inclusion of the declaration that Islam is the religion of the Federation, “will in no way affect the present position of the Federation as a secular state” (Paragraph 57 of the White Paper).***
- (iv) Letter dated 31<sup>st</sup> May, 1957 written by the colonial Secretary (Lennox-Boyd) to Lord Reid:***
  - “... changed their tune about Islam and the Government presented a united front in favour of making Islam a state religion even though Malaya is to be a secular state”.***
- (v) The Cobbold Commission Report 1963 again reiterated the secular nature of the new Federation comprising Malaya, Sabah, Sarawak and Singapore.***
- (vi) The 20 points consensus Agreement for Sabah and the 18 points consensus Agreement for Sarawak. The 1<sup>st</sup> point of agreement was that there would be no State religion for Sabah and Sarawak.***
- (viii) Tunku Abdul Rahman who was deeply involved in the drafting of the constitution and attainment of Independence for Malaya on 31<sup>st</sup> August, 1957 had clearly stated on a number of occasions that Malaysia was a secular state and not an Islamic state, including:-***
  - During debate in the Federal Legislative Council in 1958 “..... I would like to make it clear that this country is not an Islamic state as it is generally understood, we merely provide that Islam is the official religion of the State”.***
  - Our First Prime Minister and founding father Tunku Abdul Rahman stated clearly that Malaysia was set up as a secular state with Islam as the official religion” (The Star (9/2/1983) under the heading “Don’t make Malaysia an Islamic State”)***
- (ix) There appears to be no Historical document to contradict the fact that Malaysia was intended to be a secular state.***

- (2) The Hadi’s Bill seeks to empower the States to be able to impose HUDUD sentences. This proposed HUDUD offences are already offences under the Federal Penal Code. The Federal List which comes under Parliament and States cannot legislate on it. The HUDUD offences thus seek to encroach into the Federal List and seek to create a dual legal system, which is not allowed by the constitution, as it will undermine the basic structure of the constitution.**

Article 160 (2) of the Federal Constitution defines “Law” as :-

“Law includes written law, the common law in so far as it is in operation in the Federation or any part thereof, and any custom or usage having the force of law in the Federation or any part thereof”.

Thus, Syariah Law (of which HUDUD offences is part), is not even included in the definition of “Law under our Federal Constitution.

Thus, the introduction of Hudud offences, will affect the very fabric of the Federal Constitution, as basically we are governed by secular laws.

### **(3) Religion of the Federation**

**Article 3(1) explained:**

**It provides:**

“Islam is the religion of the Federation, but other religions may be practised in peace and harmony in any part of the Federation.

The Supreme Court in the case of Che Omar Bin Che Soh v. PP (1988) 2 MLJ. 55 after going through the History of the Formation of Malaysia held that the Federation is governed by secular Laws.

**Prof. Shad Faruqi in his book “Document of Destiny” at page 123 stated:**

***“The word ‘secular’ does not appear anywhere in the constitution. However, there is historical evidence in the Reid Commission papers that the country was meant to be secular and the intention in making Islam the official religion of the Federal was primarily for ceremonial purposes.”***

Article 3(4) explained:

It provides:

**“Nothing in this Article derogates from any other provision of this constitution”.**

This Article 3 (4) is the controlling Section of Article 3 and is very often overlooked in discussions.

***The effect of Article 3(4) is that “no right or prohibition, no law or institution is extinguished or abolished as a result of Article 3’s adoption of Islam as the religion of the Federation”.*** (Shad Faruqi. “Document of Destiny”, p. 126).

**This further means that Article 3 cannot be used to affect or abridge any other provision of the constitution.**

**(4) Islamic Law is confined to what is provided for in the State List II (9<sup>th</sup> Schedule), with the limitations imposed therein.**

The present limitations are imposed by Act 355 commonly known as 3-5-6 limit.

In fact words "Islamic law" or "Syariah Courts" were not found or included in Schedule 9 List II in the 1957 Federal Constitution. This meant that Syariah Law or HUDUD offences were never in contemplation of the framers of the constitution.

The Schedule 9 List II was amended in August, 1976 to rename "Muslim Courts" as "Syariah Courts" and "Muslim Law as "Islamic Law".

**(5) Article 4 (1) provides that :**

"This constitution is the Supreme Law of the Federation....."

This means all other laws are inferior and they must conform to the constitution, failing which they will be declared unconstitutional.

Thus, Syariah Laws and other laws are subject to this constitution.

It also means that this constitution is supreme and not Parliament. Therefore any Law passed by Parliament that contravenes our Federal Constitution, can be declared null and void by our Courts.

In the Indian Supreme Court case of ***Kesavananda Bharati v. the State of Kerala***, the Court held that in any Country where the constitution is supreme, there must be an implied restriction of the power of Parliament to change the basic structure of the Constitution. This case has been accepted by our Malaysian Courts and the basic structure doctrine being endorsed.

**(6) Higher status of secular authorities.**

*"If by a theocratic State is meant a State in which the temporal ruler is subjected To the final direction of the theological head and in which the law of God is the Supreme Law of the land, then clearly Malaysia is nowhere near theocratic, Islamic state. Syariah authorities are appointed by State Government and can be dismissed by them. Temporal authorities are higer than religious authorities". (Shad Faruqi, "Document of Destiny", p. 126.)*

**IV. Would HADI's Bill infringe Non-Muslim Rights?**

**Our YAB Prime Minister is reported to have said....**

**"I would like to clarify that the amendment (bill) is not hudud law ..... It also involves the Syariah Courts and only involves Muslims. It has nothing to do with Non-Muslims"..... [Malaysiakini – 28/5/2016 extract from article by Wong Chin Huat]**

**The YAB Prime Minister is entitled to his opinion, but we beg to differ.**

**The following personalities are also not convinced and believe that Hadi's Bill will lead to HUDUD:**

- a. 4 Cabinet Ministers had threatened to resign if Hadi's Bill is passed
- b. Sarawak Government had made its stand clear that it rejects Hadi's Bill
- c. "Hadi's Bill will lead to hudud, G25 refutes Najib (M.Kini 06/07/2016)
- d. Ex-IGP warns of PAS' tactic to slowly push for hudud law (The Star 02/06/2016)
- e. 284 Malay NGO'S: Hadi's Bill is unconstitutional (The Star 26/07/2016)
- f. DON: Muslim's Not obliged to support Hudud. (The Star 02/06/2016)
- g. Two sets of criminal laws not for modern countries says top Islamic scholar (Malaysian Insider 25/05/2015)
- h. Refrain from calling for Islamic state, Perlis Mufti tell Muslims (M.Kini 04/02/2016)
- i. "No need to discuss something that will not happen. It's stupid for anyone to even be discussing Hudud" – Datuk Seri Nazri Aziz.

These are the reasons why, Hadi's Bill, if passed will have serious consequences to the Nation and to the Non-Muslim position:

- (i) *The Kelantan Syariah Enactment Bill passed in 1995 as amended had by Section 56(2) of the Enactment given option to Non-Muslims to come under its Jurisdiction.*

This option is clear violation of the Constitution, which has declared in List II Schedule 9 that Syariah Courts have jurisdiction only on Muslims.

- (ii) *A paper prepared by the Jakim Syariah Civil Technical Committee dated May 8, 2014 had proposed Hudud to be implemented in 2 stages, the first involving amendments to Federal and State Laws.*

In the second stage it will include education and promotion of the Hudud implementation and would then apply to Non-Muslims [See MalaysiaToday, "Hudud should apply to all Malaysians - Jakim paper suggests dated 6/9/2014].

Hadi's Bill, thus appears to be the first stage.

- (iii) Hadi's Bill is indeed empowerment of Hudud offences.

The Aim of the Bill is to empower States like Kelantan to be able to impose Hudud punishments. Thus it is clearly a Hudud offences Bill.

- (iv) Innocent packaging of Hadi's Bill

The authorities and those supporting Hadi's Bill now refer to it as "Act 355". By this they appear to be hoping to Lull people into believing that they are just enhancing powers of Syariah Courts, e.g. from 6 to 100 lashes and no Hudud offences are involved.

(v) **Hudud offences would undermine the Non-Muslim rights as follows:**

(a) Under an Islamic theocracy, God's law is supreme. This position would undermine the fundamental rights guaranteed to citizens.

(b) A Non-Muslim cannot be a witness under Syariah Law. In most Hudud offences the victim must produce four (4) male Muslim persons of good character to give evidence on his or her behalf.

Thus the Non-Muslim victim must rely on the Muslim witnesses although there may be scores of Non-Muslim witnesses available.

(c) In our multi-cultural country people of different faiths live side by side. When crime is committed involving Muslims and Non-Muslims which Court would have jurisdiction?

(d) In rape cases, the burden is on the rape victim (women) to produce 4 adult male Muslim witnesses which in most cases would be impossible.

The experience of other Hudud countries show that such perpetrators go free while the victim can be punished for "zina".

(e) The Kelantan Syariah Criminal Enactment 1993 (2015) seems to recognise the fact that crime may be committed against Non-Muslims by Muslims or vice versa when it provides in Section 56 (2) that a Non-Muslim can elect to come under the Syariah Enactment. This "choice" given by the Enactment is unconstitutional as jurisdiction is given by law.

[NOTE: We understand that this section 56 (2) may be removed now. But there is nothing to stop them from introducing again on the pretext to allow Non-Muslim victims to obtain justice in Syariah Courts].

**(vi) Members of Parliament Oath of office.**

The Members of Parliament upon being elected have to swear an oath to protect the Federal Constitution.

It has been shown above that the 1957 Constitution was a product of consensus reached between the communities. All documents, as shown above, re-iterate Malaysia as a secular State.

It has been shown above that Hadi's Bill has the potential to affect the basic fibre and structure of the Federal Constitution. It will also create a dual legal system.

## Sabah & Sarawak Position

When Sabah and Sarawak together with Singapore and Malaya formed Malaysia, Sabah and Sarawak were guaranteed the 20 and 18 points in the Agreement.

The 1<sup>st</sup> point of the Agreement stated that there shall be no State religion for Sabah and Sarawak.

Thus, the Hudud introduction will undermine Sabah and Sarawak's rights for joining Malaysia.

Oath of Office.

Therefore, the Members of Parliament must attend Parliament sittings diligently and be guided by their oath of office into rejecting the Hudud Bill.

One Minister had stated that she would not support the Hudud Bill and will also not attend Parliament.

Non-attendance is not an option. It will be a serious mistake not to attend Parliament sitting. For if the Hudud offences Bill is passed, it will affect all. One's non-attendance will not be a defence. All must attend and help to defeat Hadi's Private Member's Bill.

**MCCBCHST** call upon all Members of Parliament to attend Parliament and help defend the Constitution by vigorously opposing Hadi's Bill and voting against it. This is what the Nation expects of You.

**Dated: 14 October 2016**

Ven. Dato' Seri Jit Heng  
President

Datuk R.S. Mohan Shan  
Deputy President

Bishop Sebastian Francis  
Vice-President

Sardar Jagir Singh  
Vice-President

Daozhang Tan Hoe Chieow  
Vice-President

Mr. Prematilaka Serisena  
Hon. Secretary-General