

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

Official Report

First Session of the First Dewan Ra'ayat

Friday, 27th November, 1959

The House met at 9.30 o'clock a.m.

PRESENT:

- The Honourable Mr. Speaker, DATO' HAJI MOHAMED NOAH BIN OMAR,
D.P.M.J., P.I.S., J.P.
- .. the Prime Minister, Y.T.M. TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN PUTRA
AL-HAJ, K.O.M. (Kuala Kedah).
- .. the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Defence, TUN
ABDUL RAZAK BIN DATO' HUSSAIN, S.M.N. (Pekan).
- .. the Minister of Finance, MR. TAN SIEW SIN, J.P. (Malacca
Tengah).
- .. the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications,
DATO' V. T. SAMBANTHAN, P.M.N. (Sungei Siput).
- .. the Minister of the Interior, DATO' SULEIMAN BIN DATO'
ABDUL RAHMAN, P.M.N. (Muar Selatan).
- .. the Minister of Agriculture, ENCHE' ABDUL AZIZ BIN
ISHAK (Kuala Langat).
- .. the Minister of Transport, ENCHE' SARDON BIN HAJI JUBIR
(Pontian Utara).
- .. the Minister of Health and Social Welfare, DATO' ONG
YOKE LIN, P.M.N. (Ulu Selangor).
- .. the Minister of Education and Minister of Commerce and
Industry, ENCHE' MOHAMED KHIR BIN JOHARI (Kedah
Tengah).
- .. the Minister of Labour, ENCHE' BAHAMAN BIN SAMSUDIN
(Kuala Pilah).
- .. TUAN SYED JA'AFAR BIN HASAN ALBAR, J.M.N., Assistant
Minister (Johore Tenggara).
- .. TUAN HAJI ABDUL KHALID BIN AWANG OSMAN, Assistant
Minister (Kota Star Utara).
- .. ENCHE' ABDUL GHANI BIN ISHAK, A.M.N. (Malacca Utara).
- .. ENCHE' ABDUL RAUF BIN A. RAHMAN (Krian Laut).
- .. ENCHE' ABDUL SAMAD BIN OSMAN (Sungei Patani).
- .. TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI ABDUL RAOF (Kuala
Kangsar).
- .. TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI MOHD. SALLEH, A.M.N.,
P.I.S. (Segamat Utara).

- The Honourable TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN ABDULLAH (Kota Bharu Hilir).
- .. ENCHE' AHMAD BIN ARSHAD, A.M.N. (Muar Utara).
- .. ENCHE' AHMAD BOESTAMAN (Setapak).
- .. ENCHE' AHMAD BIN MOHAMED SHAH (Johore Bahru Barat).
- .. TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN SAAID (Seberang Utara).
- .. ENCHE' AHMAD BIN HAJI YUSOF (Krian Darat).
- .. TUAN HAJI AZAHARI BIN HAJI IBRAHIM (Kubang Pasu Barat).
- .. ENCHE' AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Muar Dalam).
- .. DR. BURHANUDDIN BIN MOHD. NOOR (Besut).
- .. MR. CHAN CHONG WEN (Kluang Selatan).
- .. MR. CHAN SIANG SUN (Bentong).
- .. MR. CHAN SWEE HO (Ulu Kinta).
- .. MR. CHIN SEE YIN (Seremban Timor).
- .. MR. V. DAVID (Bungsar).
- .. DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI HASHIM, P.M.N. (Jitra-Padang Terap).
- .. MR. GEH CHONG KEAT (Penang Utara).
- .. ENCHE' HAMZAH BIN ALANG, A.M.N. (Kapar).
- .. ENCHE' HANAFI BIN MOHD. YUNUS, A.M.N. (Kulim Utara).
- .. ENCHE' HARUN BIN ABDULLAH (Baling).
- .. ENCHE' HARUN BIN PILUS (Trengganu Tengah).
- .. TUAN HAJI HASAN ADLI BIN HAJI ARSHAD (Kuala Trengganu Utara).
- .. TUAN HAJI HASSAN BIN HAJI AHMAD (Tumpat).
- .. ENCHE' HASSAN BIN MANSOR (Malacca Selatan).
- .. ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN TO' MUDA HASSAN (Raub).
- .. ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN MOHD. NOORDIN, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Parit).
- .. TUAN HAJI HUSSAIN RAHIMI BIN HAJI SAMAN (Kota Bharu Hulu).
- .. ENCHE' IBRAHIM BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Seberang Tengah).
- .. ENCHE' ISMAIL BIN IDRIS (Penang Selatan).
- .. MR. KANG KOCK SENG (Batu Pahat).
- .. MR. K. KARAM SINGH (Damansara).
- .. CHE' KHADIJAH BINTI MOHD. SIDIK (Dungun).
- .. MR. KHONG KOK YAT (Batu Gajah).
- .. MR. LEE SAN CHOON (Kluang Utara).
- .. MR. LEE SECK FUN (Tanjong Malim).
- .. MR. LEE SIOK YEW (Sepang).
- .. MR. LEONG KEE NYEAN (Kampar).
- .. MR. LIM JOO KONG (Alor Star).
- .. MR. LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato' Kramat).
- .. DR. LIM SWEE AUN, J.P. (Larut Selatan).
- .. MR. LIU YOONG PENG (Rawang).
- .. MR. T. MAHIMA SINGH (Port Dickson).

- The Honourable ENCHE' MOHAMED BIN UJANG (Jelebu-Jempol).
- .. ENCHE' MOHAMED ABAS BIN AHMAD (Hilir Perak).
- .. ENCHE' MOHAMED ASRI BIN HAJI MUDA (Pasir Puteh).
- .. ENCHE' MOHAMED DAHARI BIN HAJI MOHD. ALI (Kuala Selangor).
- .. ENCHE' MOHAMED NOR BIN MOHD. DAHAN (Ulu Perak).
- .. DATO' MOHAMED HANIFAH BIN HAJI ABDUL GHANI, P.J.K. (Pasir Mas Hulu).
- .. ENCHE' MOHAMED ISMAIL BIN MOHD. YUSOF (Jerai).
- .. ENCHE' MOHAMED SULONG BIN MOHD. ALI, J.M.N. (Lipis).
- .. ENCHE' MOHAMED YUSOF BIN MAHMUD, A.M.N. (Temerloh).
- .. TUAN HAJI MOKHTAR BIN HAJI ISMAIL (Perlis Selatan).
- .. NIK MAN BIN NIK MOHAMED (Pasir Mas Hilir).
- .. MR. NG ANN TECK (Batu).
- .. DATO' ONN BIN JAAFAR, D.K., D.P.M.J. (Kuala Trengganu Selatan).
- .. ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Tanah Merah).
- .. ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Perlis Utara).
- .. MR. QUEK KAI DONG (Seremban Barat).
- .. TUAN HAJI REDZA BIN HAJI MOHD. SAID (Rembau-Tampin).
- .. MR. SEAH TENG NGIAB (Muar Pantai).
- .. MR. D. R. SEENIVASAGAM (Ipoh).
- .. MR. S. P. SEENIVASAGAM (Menglembu).
- .. TUAN SYED ESA BIN ALWEE, S.M.J., P.I.S. (Batu Pahat Dalam).
- .. TUAN SYED HASHIM BIN SYED AJAM, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Sabak Bernam).
- .. ENCHE' TAJUDIN BIN ALI (Larut Utara).
- .. MR. TAN CHENG BEE, J.P. (Bagan).
- .. MR. TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Malacca).
- .. MR. TAN PHOCK KIN (Tanjong).
- .. MR. TAN TYE CHEK (Kulim-Bandar Bahru).
- .. TENGKU INDRA PETRA IBNI SULTAN IBRAHIM, J.M.N. (Ulu Kelantan).
- .. DATO' TEOH CHZE CHONG, D.P.M.J., J.P. (Segamat Selatan).
- .. MR. V. VEERAPPEN (Seberang Selatan).
- .. WAN MUSTAPHA BIN HAJI ALI (Kelantan Hilir).
- .. WAN SULAIMAN BIN WAN TAM (Kota Star Selatan).
- .. WAN YAHYA BIN HAJI WAN MOHAMED (Kemaman).
- .. MR. WOO SAIK HONG (Telok Anson).
- .. MR. YEOH TAT BENG (Bruas).
- .. MR. YONG WOO MING (Sitiawan).
- .. HAJJAH ZAIN BINTI SULAIMAN (Pontian Selatan).
- .. TUAN HAJI ZAKARIA BIN HAJI MOHD. TAIB (Langat).
- .. ENCHE' ZULKIFLEE BIN MUHAMMAD (Bachok).

ABSENT:

- The Honourable the Minister of External Affairs, DATO' DR. ISMAIL BIN DATO' ABDUL RAHMAN, P.M.N. (Johore Timor).
- .. ENCHE' ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAJI TALIB (Minister without Portfolio) (Kuantan).
- .. ENCHE' ABDUL HAMID KHAN BIN HAJI SAKHAWAT ALI KHAN, J.M.N., J.P., Assistant Minister (Batang Padang).
- .. MR. CHEAH THEAM SWEE, Assistant Minister (Bukit Bintang).
- .. MR. V. MANICKAVASAGAM, Assistant Minister (Klang).
- .. ENCHE' MOHAMED ISMAIL BIN MOHAMED YUSOF, Assistant Minister (Jerai).
- .. ENCHE' YAHYA BIN HAJI AHMAD (Bagan Datoh).

IN ATTENDANCE:

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

PRAYERS

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

EXEMPTED BUSINESS

(Motion)

The Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 12, the House shall not adjourn this day until after the completion of all Government business on the Order Paper.

The Deputy Prime Minister (Tun Abdul Razak): Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That, notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 12, the House shall not adjourn this day until after the completion of all Government business on the Order Paper.

BILLS

**THE SUPPLEMENTARY SUPPLY
(1959) (No. 4) BILL**

Second Reading

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Tan Siew Sin): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to apply a sum out of the Consolidated Fund for additional expenditure for the service of the year 1959, to appropriate such a sum for certain purposes and to provide for the replacement of amounts advanced from the Contingencies Fund" be read a second time.

Yesterday this House approved the Supplementary Estimates of \$12,024,288 in the fourth Supplementary Estimates of Expenditure for the current year which have been tabled as Cmd. Paper No. 24 of 1959. As I indicated when I moved that those Estimates be approved, the purpose of this Bill is to appropriate that sum of \$12,024,288 from the Consolidated Fund for the services specified in those Estimates.

I do not consider that this Bill involves any question of policy on which I need speak or that it is necessary for me to add anything to what was already said yesterday.

Sir, I beg to move.

Tun Abdul Razak: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time.

Question, that the Bill be now read a third time, put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read the third time and passed.

**HOUSING TRUST (AMENDMENT)
BILL**

Second Reading

The Minister of the Interior (Dato' Suleiman bin Dato' Abdul Rahman): Tuan Speaker, saya bangun mēmbawa usul supaya Rang Undang² mēmindia Undang² Housing Trust tahun 1950 dibachakan kali yang kēdua.

Dalam bulan July tahun ini sa-orang Timbalan Pengerusi telah di-lantek sa-bagai menjalankan kerja dalam Housing Trust, mengikut kehendak dalam Bab 5 Undang² Housing Trust.

Tujuan mengadakan Timbalan Pengerusi ini ia-lah supaya dapat Timbalan Pengerusi ini menjalankan perkara pentadbiran hari² yang tidak dapat dijalankan oleh Pengerusi-nya. Tujuan ini-lah Rang Undang² ini di-bawa ka-hadapan Dewan ini.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to amend the Housing Trust Ordinance, 1950" be read a second time.

In July this year, a Deputy Chairman was appointed to the Housing Trust in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of the Ordinance. The purpose of this appointment was to relieve the Chairman, who is at present myself, from the day-to-day routine administrative matters in housing affairs. In order to achieve this object, however, it is necessary to amend the Housing Trust itself. This Bill before the House gives effect to its implementation.

Sir, I beg to move.

Tuan Syed Ja'afar bin Hasan Albar (Johore Tenggara): Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

Clauses 1 and 2 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported without amendment: read the third time and passed.

THE TREASURY DEPOSIT RECEIPTS (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to amend the Treasury Deposit Receipts Ordinance, 1952" be read a second time. The purpose and effect of the Bill are set

out clearly in the explanatory statement attached thereto.

At present the Government may borrow for periods up to twelve months by the issue of Treasury Bills and for periods of 3, 4 and 5 years by the issue of Treasury Deposit Receipts. The Government does not have power to issue two-year securities other than two-year registered stock under the provisions of the Loan (Local) Ordinance, 1959, which up to the present time has been used for the issue of longer term loans, as any monies raised under the provisions of that Ordinance are paid into the Development Fund. It is important that the market for Government Securities should be widened and this will be facilitated by increasing the range of such securities, and the amendments now proposed to the Treasury Deposit Receipts Ordinance will contribute towards the achievement of this objective as two-year deposits will meet at least part of the requirements of the State Governments and statutory bodies in particular, for short-term Government Securities. Similarly, it is hoped that the reduction of the minimum deposit to \$50,000 will make Deposit Receipts more attractive to private investors.

Treasury Deposit Receipts are not normally marketable prior to their maturity dates, but the Federation Government will give sympathetic consideration to any request for early repayment by holders and will in normal circumstances be prepared to make repayment although no definite prior commitment to do this in any particular case can be accepted.

Sir, I beg to move.

Tun Abdul Razak: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported without amendment: read the third time and passed.

THE PINEAPPLE INDUSTRY (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari): Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to amend the Pineapple Industry Ordinance, 1957" be read a second time.

Sir, one effect of the increasingly keen competition in the international market for canned pineapples, which became evident since 1958, has been the development of a number of problems in the pineapple industry in Malaya, particularly in the marketing of the fruit to the canneries during the peaks of the fruit season. Honourable Members will no doubt recall the sad experience we had late in December last year, when the sudden closure of one of the canneries in Singapore disrupted the normal marketing of smallgrowers' fruit, causing hardship to certain smallgrowers who had to be financially assisted by the Government. Since then, although the international market is reported to have shown a steady improvement (at least so far as the Federation is concerned) there have been several developments which make it extremely difficult to assess what the market situation is likely to be in the next few months. In the face of such uncertainties and the possibility that difficulties may arise again in the industry, the Government considers it desirable that the purposes for which the Pineapple Industry Cess Fund may be legally used under the Pineapple Industry Ordinance, 1957, should be extended to include the provision of assistance to any section or sections of the industry which may justify such assistance. Hence the proposed amendment at clause 2 of the Bill.

The other amendment at clause 3 seeks to authorise the Minister responsible to make orders for the imposition, collection, variation or cancellation of a cess or cesses on the exportation of canned pineapple, after consultation with the Malayan Pineapple Industry Board. In this connection, I would like to emphasise that

the principle of giving such authority to the Minister is not new and has been incorporated, for instance, in the Malayan Rubber Fund (Research and Development) Ordinance.

I should also like to add that the Government of Singapore, which administers a parallel legislation in that territory, has agreed to support the introduction of the proposed amendments in Singapore.

Sir, I beg to move.

The Minister of Agriculture and Cooperatives (Enche' Abdul Aziz): Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad (Bachok): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam Cheraian 3 Bill ini ada menunjokkan Amendment yang hendak di-gantikan "after consultation with" dengan yang ada "on the recommendation of". Jadi, saya suka-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau Yang Berhormat Menteri dapat memberikan sedikit keterangan ia-itu apa-kah sa-benar-nya yang di-tujukan dengan perbezaan dalam perbahathan ini. Ada-kah dahulu usaha ini umpamanya di-dapati oleh Kementerian atau Menteri Yang Berhormat bahawa melakukan sa-suatu "on the recommendation of" menyebabkan berapa kepayahan besar atau sa-bagai-nya hingga terpaksa di-tukarkan perkataan "after consultation with" itu?

Mr. V. David (Bungsar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think the assistance to the pineapple industry by the Government should have come a long time ago. The pineapple industry in fact has been facing repeated crises during the last few years due to competition in the international markets.

Mr. Speaker, there is another thing that I would like to emphasise here. As far as I know, most of the pineapple growers in this country are looking forward to the report of the Commission which sat to enquire into the position of the pineapple industry somewhere in the middle of 1959. Approving this Bill and at the same time publishing that report would provide more scope for the pineapple industry in this country to make its progress.

As we know, to-day rubber is the main product of this country, and it is always risky to completely rely on one product and if we have another agricultural product like pineapple which could compete in the international market it would be to the advantage of the Malayan economy. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the pineapple industry has a wide scope in this country due to the Malayan climate which is suitable for this product and I would request the Honourable Minister to give all support and all encouragement to this industry which employs a large number of workers of this country; and at the same time it should be encouraged to produce finished products—on the agricultural side the industry employs large numbers of workers; and also, in the manufacturing side, such as canning and so on. Therefore, if encouragement is sufficiently given to this industry, in time to come we can lead in the international market and at the same time thousands of unemployed workers in this country can be given employment. Mr. Speaker, Sir, finally I request the Honourable Minister to publish the report on the findings of the enquiry as early as possible, because most of the employers and workers are looking forward to the report to make adjustments and improvements in the industry. Thank you.

Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari: Tuan Speaker, bagi menjawab soalan yang telah di-bangkitkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bachok, saya suka menjawab bahawa yang sa-benar-nya ada berlaku sedikit kesusahan tentang perkara² bersangkutan dengan Nanas di-sini, maka dengan sebab itu-lah kita berkehendakkan Bill ini di-pinda.

In reply to the Honourable Member from Bungsar I would like to say here and now that the Government. . . .

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya minta sedikit lagi penerangan berkenaan dengan kalimah: "after consultation with", ada-kah itu timbul kerana dengan "on the recommendation of" menyebabkan beberapa kepayahan?

Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari: Ya, sa-bagaimana yang di-sebutkan "after consultation with" berma'ana kita terlebih dahulu hendak-lah berunding dengan pihak Lembaga Nanas, kemudian daripada itu baharu-lah Menteri yang berkenaan membuat keputusan "on the recommendation of". Ini boleh jadi, baik atau ta' baik belum-lah di-tentukan lagi, tetapi "after consultation with", saya ingat lebih sesuai lagi daripada apa yang telah terkandung dahulu.

In reply to the Honourable Member from Bungsar, I can assure him, and also the House, that the Government fully realises the importance of the pineapple industry to the economy of this country, and I can assure him that we fully support what he said just now in regard to the encouragement that the Government should give to the pineapple industry. In return, I would ask for the co-operation of the unions connected with the industry.

With regard to the point he raised about the report of the Commission of Enquiry, the Commission has already completed its work and the report is now being considered by the Government. It will be published, as soon as it has been fully considered, for the information of the public.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*).

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported without amendment: read the third time and passed.

THE EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to amend the Employees Provident Fund Ordinance, 1951," be read a second time. The purpose of this Bill

is fully set out in the explanatory statement attached thereto, but it may be desirable for me to enlarge on the reasons which have led the Government to introduce this Bill.

Honourable Members of this House will, I am sure, agree that the rapid economic and social development of our country is one of the primary responsibilities of the Government. The rate and extent of such development will be determined largely by the volume of money provided by our own people that is devoted to this purpose. At the present time, during the formative period of the Fund the largest single source of money derived from the people themselves that is available in the Federation is the contributions that are made to the Employees Provident Fund. It is therefore in the national interest that these funds should not be lost for this purpose which would be the case if the assets of the Fund were invested outside the Federation. I do not wish to imply by this that there has been any disregard of this need by those who have been responsible for the investment of the funds accumulated to date. The identity of interest between the contributors to the Fund and the people of the Federation generally has been fully recognised by the Employees Provident Fund Board and reflected in its investment policy, as the major part of the Fund has been invested in Federation Government loans raised for development purposes. I can assure Honourable Members, therefore, that the introduction of this Bill in no way indicates a lack of mutual trust and confidence between the Government and the Board of the Fund.

The actual investment of the large sums received by way of contributions and interest on capital rests with the Board and I consider it desirable that it should continue to do so. Nevertheless, the responsibility is a heavy one and it is desirable that Parliament should define more precisely by legislation the broad lines of investment policy to be followed. The Government is satisfied that it is in the long-term interests of all contributors that the assets of the Fund should be used to

promote economic and social development in the Federation. Nevertheless, in the short-term, more favourable opportunities may arise for investment in foreign countries than are available in the Federation. For instance during the 1957 credit squeeze in the United Kingdom interest rates were higher in the United Kingdom than in the Federation. This possible conflict between national and short-term interests might possibly render the Board open to criticism that it is neglecting the interests of depositors, should it fail to take advantage of favourable opportunities for investment which may arise in overseas countries. The Bill before you to-day, by giving statutory recognition to the over-riding claims of investment within the Federation, will resolve this difficulty.

Honourable Members will note that the Bill provides for not less than 70 per cent of the monies invested or re-invested in any one year to be invested in Federation Government securities. Some of you may consider that this unduly restricts the Board's field of investment. The Government has given most careful consideration to this point and, after full consultation with the Board, has reached the conclusion that it is right and proper that the bulk of the assets of the Employees Provident Fund should be invested in Government securities as the money so invested is utilised to finance a development programme approved by the people's elected representatives in this House. I am satisfied that the right of the Board to invest 30 per cent of the assets of the Fund in other than Government securities will allow the Board adequate flexibility in the determination of their investment policy. It may indeed happen that the Board will have some difficulty in finding an outlet even for this 30 per cent within the range permitted for trustee investment.

I also wish to assure Honourable Members that should the Federation Government at any time not be willing to issue securities which would meet the essential requirements of the Fund, I am prepared to allow the Board to invest more than 30 per cent in non-Government securities in the Federation as may be necessary in the

circumstances and will also be prepared to allow investment outside the Federation should the Board be able to show that such investment was essential in the interests of depositors.

Sir, I beg to move.

The Minister of Labour (Enche' Bahaman bin Samsudin): I beg to second the motion.

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam (Ipoh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Employees Provident Fund was originally formulated and passed to be of some assistance to the employee in his old age, principally. The E.P.F. has, in fact, by its very nature worked not to the benefit of the employees, but in a large number of cases to the detriment of them in this country. I say that consciously and I hope that the Ministry concerned will in due course present to this House an amendment to the Employees Provident Fund to give effect to the following suggestions, which I say the Government party itself did promise in 1955.

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: On a point of order, Sir, I wonder whether the Honourable Member is speaking on this Bill; I think he is referring to another matter.

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: I am speaking on the E.P.F. Ordinance.

Mr. Speaker: We are dealing with the amendment to sub-section (2) of section 4 of the Bill.

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: The amendment deals with how money belonging to the E.P.F. should be dealt with, and I submit that I am entitled to say how the money should be disposed of.

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: You are talking of withdrawals.

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: Yes, when you put in money you withdraw it, and when you withdraw money you dispose of that money. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the monies which are going to the E.P.F. are contributed by employers and employees; and on the principle of how that money should be disposed of, I have a few suggestions to make. I am not making suggestions which are new because in 1955 those suggestions were made by the Government party to the people in their manifesto: that steps

would be taken to amend the E.P.F. in relation to how money should be disposed of, and in cases of urgent necessities, how money could be withdrawn by contributors. That was promised in 1955, but throughout this time in the Legislative Assembly, questions have been asked of the Government to allow employees in cases of dire necessity to withdraw money and answers given by the Government Bench that there would be no amendment. Money belonging to the Employees Provident Fund, I see, can only be disposed of to the employee now in three ways:

- (i) when he is over 55 years of age;
- (ii) when he is certified medically unfit for the rest of his life to work; and
- (iii) when he is declared no longer an employee (I presume to be a capitalist).

But there are cases where an employee cannot work temporarily through illness or for the fact that he cannot get a job, and he has a wife and children and they are on the verge of starvation, and yet money from the E.P.F. cannot be refunded back to the employee. What is the use, the man is on the verge of starvation and still the E.P.F. says: "Wait until you are 55." By 55 that man may be dead. I hope that the Ministry concerned will in due course amend the E.P.F. Ordinance, as promised by the Government party in 1955, to give effect that in case of urgent necessity workers can withdraw their money so as to live and exist; and that is the way I suggest should be done.

Mr. V. David: Mr. Speaker, Sir, we feel that there is really a genuine necessity to revise the complete Employees Provident Fund Ordinance. The Ordinance itself was enacted sometime in 1951 after repeated demand from the workers of all sections that they should have a certain amount of contribution to safeguard their interests in times of necessity. But now the contribution made by the workers are becoming not to their interest. For instance, a female employee can only withdraw the contributions when she reaches the age of

55. In Asia, I don't think a woman lives, on the average, more than 55 or 60 years. I think when she reaches 55 she neither can see and neither sometimes she can hear, and at this juncture the money doesn't go to the employee but becomes an asset to the Government itself. So what I would feel is that the age limit should be relaxed with the view of the Asian living, and it should be reduced to a certain extent where the employee concerned will have the opportunity of enjoying the contributions. The workers themselves have been contributing to these funds.

The Ordinance which was enacted in 1951 was enacted in a very hasty manner because at that time the conditions in the country were quite different. We were still a part of British territory, and the treatment embodied in that Ordinance was colonial in nature. I think that it should now be redrafted to suit Malayan needs with a view and with a spirit that Malaya is an independent nation. Therefore, the Minister concerned will take these into consideration and do everything possible for the benefit of the workers who make the contributions to safeguard their interests in the latter part of their lives.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka membéri sadikit penjelasan ia-itu dengan ada-nya Undang² Employees Provident Fund ini, kita telah mendengar beberapa sungutan di-sini yang telah disampaikan orang² kampung yang dahulu-nya békérja sa-bagai pékérja Kerajaan atau békérja di-bandar. Pada masa ini mereka terpaksa balek kampong. Saya tidak-lah mengatakan orang² yang hendakkan itu berkéhendak mênjadi kapitalis sa-sudah dia mênjadi buroh di-bandar tetapi terpaksa mereka itu menghadapi hidup baharu di-kampong. Dan oleh kerana kétat sangat, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Undang² berkénaan Provident Fund—hanya mempunyai tiga jalan yang disebutkan oleh rakan saya tadi, maka oleh kerana kétat-nya itu terasa-lah kapada mereka ini bahawa Undang² Provident Fund ini tidak mênolong

mereka itu pada masa mereka itu berkéhendakkan sangat². Saya harap bahawa Yang Béhormat Méntéri Kéwangan dapat mênimbangkan jalan² yang sa-kira-nya mêmbolehkan orang² yang benar² berkéhendakkan kapada bantuan daripada wang Provident Fund itu sendiri sa-belum sampai dia-nya bérumur 55 tahun supaya mêmbolehkan dia bérdiri di-atas kaki-nya di-dalam kéhidupan baharu-nya.

Mr. Chin See Yin (Seremban Timor): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am in full agreement with the submission made by the Honourable Member of Ipoh Constituency. Sir, it is of the utmost importance that those employees who have contributed towards that fund in their time of need should be given assistance. I think, we all will agree that the employees in this country are the mainstay of and have provided the financial aspect of the country. So long as the workers have money, the traders will find it easier to carry on with their business. This is a sort of a circle—it goes round and round. When a worker has money, he has money to make purchases, and the shopkeepers will have money to buy goods, and when the shopkeepers have money to make purchases for their shops, the Government will find revenue. Therefore, in this way we will have more money. Not only it will benefit the workers, it will benefit the Government as well. Therefore it is of the utmost importance that the provision should be revised. The legislation of this law was made under pressure made by the workers' unions or the workers' representatives. As a result of this, contributions were made not only by the employees but by the employers as well. But unfortunately the law was made in such a way that only when you are 55 that you can draw this money.

There are many cases in welfare homes where you find inmates who through no fault of their own are unable to get some sort of relief from the Provident Fund because, they were told, they would not be able to withdraw their money as they had not come to the age of 55 or they have

not been pronounced absolutely unfit for employment. Therefore, it is of great necessity that the Government should consider to revise this law.

Mr. K. Karam Singh (Damansara): Mr. Speaker, Sir, as at present the Employees Provident Fund is meant to provide security for the workers of this country in times of need and in time of old age and when they are unable to work, but the working of the Employees Provident Fund Ordinance is entirely inadequate. It has failed to give the workers a sense of security. On the other hand, it has only added to their frustration because when they are hungry, when they are unemployed, when they are in difficulties, they have their money in the Fund but are unable to use it. It is like having water everywhere, but not a drop to drink. I would like this House to remember that the security, social and otherwise, of the workers is not guaranteed by this Ordinance alone. We must make provision for the workers when they are old. Not only do Government servants require pensions, but all workers and every peasant in this country require support of one kind or other from the Government in their old age.

Mr. Speaker, when we say that this Ordinance is inadequate to provide the security that any working man requires, we mean he may have collected a little money and when he draws it out and uses it, after that what security? Once that money is used, he is left again to the mercy of the trade cycle or the boom and depression of industry.

I would request the Government Bench not to be complacent. The difficulties of the working class are great, and the security provided for by this Employees Provident Fund is not sufficient, and we would request, as other Honourable Members have requested, that the Ordinance be thoroughly revised to provide full security for all working people of this country.

Enche' Othman bin Abdullah (Tanah Merah): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berkénaan dengan tujuan asal daripada

Provident Fund ini ia-lah untuk mēmbērikan satu kēhidupan baharu kepada mēreka² yang bēkerja di-waktu tua kēlak dan sa-tēlah dia tidak bērdaya lagi dalam kēhidupan-nya, tētapi didalam Undang² atau Pēratoran kepada pēkerja² yang akan dapat kēmbali wang-nya itu ia-lah sa-tēlah di-hadkan apabila sampai umur-nya 55 tahun.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ini tidak pula di-jamin bahawa dia boleh bēkerja sampai umur-nya 55 tahun. Ini bērti bahawa sa-bēlum dia mēndapat wang-nya itu maka dia tērpaksa mēndērita. Saya mēndapat pēngalaman dalam soal ini yang mana ada bēbērapa orang manusia, kawan² yang tēlah bērhēnti dari pēkerjaan-nya sa-bēlum dia mēndapat atau sampai umur-nya 55 tahun, mithal-nya dia mēnjadi sa-orang anggota Polis Tambahan yang hanya bēkerja dalam masa 4-5 tahun atau sa-lama 8 tahun, kēmudian dia bērhēnti dari pēkerjaan-nya itu oleh kērana kontrek-nya tēlah sēlēsai. Jadi, apakala dia hēndak mēmulakan pēnghidupan baharu-nya, maka dia tēlah gēlisah, oleh kērana itu dia pērnah datang bērjumpa dēngan kawan² yang lain, mithal-nya mēminta pērtolongan hidup, tētapi dia kēchiwa akhir-nya pērgi-lah ia mēnchuba mēndapatkan wang daripada Provident Fund itu. Ikhtiar tēlah di-jalankan, dan apa-kah yang timbul daripada dalam pērkara ini—sa-hingga ada yang bērani mēngatakan bahawa diri-nya bukan ra'ayat nēgēri ini dan oleh kērana itu dia hēndak kēluar dari nēgēri ini dēngan ta' bērmaksud kēmbali ka-Tanah Mēlayu ini. Maka di-buat-nya-lah surat² sumpah pēisu mēngatakan bahawa dia bukan ra'ayat nēgēri ini dēngan tujuan dan maksud sēmata² hēndak mēndapatkan wang. Dia ta' tahan lapar mēnunggukan umur-nya sampai 55 tahun, jadi apa yang tēlah tērjadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dia tērpaksa mēlanggar Undang² dan akhir-nya tērpaksa-lah mēnērima binchana pēlanggaran ini.

Jadi, nampak-lah daripada kēadaan dan maksud Provident Fund ini elok-lah Pēmērentah atau Kērajaan nēgēri kita mēmikirkan dēngan sa-jauh-nya bahawa bagaimana-kah supaya mēreka itu tidak tērlibat dēngan sēbab²

kemiskinan-nya bagi melanggar Peratoran Undang² negeri ini. Dan banyak lagi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perkara² yang saperti ini berlaku dan kalau sa-kira-nya Kerajaan atau Pemerintah kita memikirkan ini satu perkara yang besar dan mustahak supaya di-perbaiki lagi, maka ada harapan bahawa mereka itu tidak akan melanggar Undang² negeri ini sa-hingga berani mengatakan bahawa dia bukan ra'ayat negeri ini. Sekian-lah sahaja, terima kaseh.

Mr. Speaker: Ahli² Yang Berhormat, nampak-nya perkara ini telah di-ulang²kan beberapa kali dengan point itu juga.

Enche' Othman bin Abdullah (Perlis Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka hendak berchakap sedikit dalam soal Provident Fund ini. Nampak-nya, Ahli Yang Berhormat dari pehak pembangkang telah menitek-beratkan soal kesusahan bagi orang yang menyimpan Provident Fund. Saya suka menarek perhatian di-sini bahawa umur 55 tahun itu memang menasabah di-beri kepada tiap² orang yang bekerja bagi pekerjaan-nya itu, kerana pada masa muda tenaga maseh kuat. Oleh itu, sa-harus-nya jangan-lah mengharapkan Provident Fund itu sahaja sa-mata² dalam menempoh perjuangan hidup, tetapi gunakan tenaga dan gunakan-lah kekuatan dengan kemudaan bagi pekerjaan untuk penghidupannya sendiri. Kita harus faham erti Provident Fund itu yang akan memberi pertolongan besar bagi kita pada masa hadapan.

Soal Provident Fund pula ia-itu sampai umur 55 tahun itu lupakan sahaja, tetapi nanti-lah di-masa tua apabila tenaga tidak ada lagi. Maka dengan ini di-harap para pembangkang tadi memikirkan demi keselamatan tiap² orang yang bekerja dan menyimpan Provident Fund pada hari ini bukan sahaja akan menjaga waktu muda atau waktu bekerja, tetapi Kerajaan akan menolong daripada muda hingga ka-tua. Terima kaseh.

Che' Khadijah binti Mohamed Sidik (Dungun): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menguatkan, ia-itu akan seruan rakan² saya tadi, meminta kepada Kerajaan,

supaya melonggarkan Undang² Provident Fund. Sa-bagai menjawab ucapan saudara Yang Berhormat yang baharu berchakap tadi, yang menyatakan, bahawa kita harus memikirkan keselamatan manusia; maka saudara²—itu benar, kerana untuk memikirkan keselamatan manusia-lah, maka kami dari pehak pembangkang, membangkang atau merayu kepada Kerajaan, supaya melonggarkan Undang² Provident Fund itu, kerana banyak daripada saudara² dari pehak pemuda² kita yang maseh berumur 35 atau 36 tahun yang telah di-berhentikan daripada pekerjaan-nya, mithal-nya, Special Constable, atau Polis Khas dan sa-bagai-nya, Apakala mereka balek ka-kampong dengan mempunyai anak isteri, maka bila sampai di-kampong dengan tidak ada mempunyai wang, tegas-nya untuk bekerja berchuchok tanam, bagi memulai penghidupan baharu, maka mereka berusaha meminta mengeluarkan wang Provident Fund-nya yang ada itu.

Beberapa orang telah datang meminta pertolongan kepada saya, sa-hingga kerana desakan penghidupan kadang² mereka terpaksa mahu melanggar Undang² yang telah ditetapkan. Mithal-nya, jika ta' ada Certificate dari Doktor, maka ta' boleh di-keluarkan Provident Fund itu, maka mereka terpaksa-lah berhubung kepada Doktor, meminta Certificate dari Doktor dengan menyatakan: Tolonglah Doktor, beri saya Certificate, saya sakit ta' boleh bekerja, dengan maksud supaya dapat di-keluarkan Provident Fund itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-telah menyatakan tidak ada alasan untuk mendapat modal bagi penghidupan baharu, tetapi sa-bagaimana yang di-katakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat tadi, hendak-lah di-kembangkan tenaga pemuda—mereka mesti di-suroh bekerja. Ya, jika sa-orang diri, tidak mempunyai tanggungan boleh, tetapi bila mereka ada mempunyai anak dan isteri, apa-kah yang harus di-makan oleh anak dan isteri-nya? Tentu tetap mereka akan menjadi mangsa. Dengan ini, bagaimana pula kalau tidak ada mempunyai modal, boleh memulai penghidupan baharu?

Oleh sebab itu, saya minta kepada Yang Berhormat Menteri yang berkenaan dalam soal ini, supaya memikirkan sa-dalam²-nya, demi keselamatan orang ramai supaya di-longgarkan Undang² itu.

Enche' Mohamed Sulong bin Mohd. Ali (Lipis): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sungoh pun perbahathan ini tergelinchir sedikit daripada dasar-nya, semua telah berchakap berkenaan hal undang². Saya suka menchampori sedikit berkenaan dengan Provident Fund ini, ada-lah Provident Fund ini bukan-lah satu perkara yang dikehendaki oleh Kerajaan negeri ini tetapi ia-lah dengan desakan ahli² kerja terutama sa-kali pekerja yang bergaji murah, kerana hendak mendapat keselamatan hidupnya dalam masa bekerja atau pun dalam masa tua-nya. Jadi, pada hari ini jikalau hendak mengikut kehendak² pekerja² yang sudah berhenti, yang susah, barangkali kita bukan sahaja hendak pinda Undang² Provident Fund ini tetapi sa-patut-nya kita patut hapuskan. Jikalau memikirkan orang yang meminta, ia-itu daripada orang yang sudah keluar daripada kerja, supaya Kerajaan memikirkan dengan panjang, saya fikir yang berhenti, tidak berapa peratus yang berkehendakkan pertolongan sa-chepat mungkin dibandingkan dengan orang² yang ada dalam pekerjaan yang maseh berkehendakkan kepada Provident Fund ini.

Saya sendiri ada beberapa kali di-datangi oleh orang kita juga minta dikeluarkan Provident Fund, tetapi saya memikirkan, umpama-nya bagaimana Yang Berhormat sa-belah sana tadi berchakap berkenaan S.C. Sa-benar-nya banyak pertolongan daripada Kerajaan, S.C. mendapat pertolongan yang istimewa, dapat wang \$1,500, tanah free, itu pun ta' chukup—hendak juga Provident Fund. Maka kehendak umpama ini jika di-layan, jadi ta' ada fa'edah kita mengadakan Provident Fund.

Jadi pada menyokong Kerajaan, saya memikirkan permintaan² sa-demikian yang boleh kita mēmbagi pertolongan daripada lain chawangan atau pun lain perusahaan dan ranchangan, tidak-lah patut kita mengeluarkan Provident Fund yang sedikit itu, kerana orang

yang bekerja 7, 8 tahun ada-lah lebih kurang \$1,000—banyak-nya dalam Provident Fund. Jika di-beri dengan tidak di-kontrol sebab hak dia sendiri, barangkali sampai sa-bulan dia minta lagi, tolong di-sana sini. Ini perkara, jikalau hendak menjaga keselamatan ra'ayat negeri ini, kita mesti fikirkan dengan panjang perkara yang sudah di-buat. Sekarang saya memikirkan kita hendak-lah fikirkan dengan halus-nya berkenaan dengan hal ini, kerana di-hadapan kita pada hari ini banyak ranchangan² yang akan mēmberi fa'edah kepada semua gulongan ra'ayat.

Mr. Speaker: Sa-benar-nya Dewan ini belum lagi mēmbahatkan pindaan berkenaan dengan perkara hendak mēnerima wang daripada 55 tahun.

Enche' Mohamed Sulong: Saya faham.

Mr. Speaker: Jangan menjadikan satu perbahathan dalam perkara ini.

Enche' Mohamed Sulong bin Mohd. Ali: Itu-lah saya sudah katakan perkara ini tergelinchir sedikit dari mula-nya tadi tetapi saya hendak mēnjelaskan fasal-nya terkeluar, saya tahu ini tergelinchir. . . .

Enche' Othman Abdullah (Tanah Merah): Tuan Yang di-Pertua

Enche' Mohamed Sulong bin Mohd. Ali: Oleh sebab itu saya mēmendekkan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-itu saya harap kita tidak-lah boleh mērengan²kan ma'ana-nya melonggar²kan barang yang kita fikirkan baik, demikian, Tuan Speaker.

Tuan Syed Ja'afar bin Hasan Albar (Johor Tenggara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, nampak-nya Ahli² Yang Berhormat di-sabelah sana chuba hendak mēnunjokkan atau mēnjadi champion bagi puak gulongan² pekerja. Tetapi sa-kira-nya Ahli² Yang Berhormat itu mēnilek pandang kepada tujuan asal daripada mengadakan Provident Fund, ia-itu hendak mēnjamin hidup sa-sa-orang pekerja itu sa-lēpas umur-nya mēningkat 55 tahun dan lain² lagi, neschaya Ahli² Yang Berhormat itu tidak akan meminta supaya peratoran² berkenaan hendak mengeluarkan wang Provident Fund itu di-sebutkan dalam

Dewan ini. Kira-nya Dewan ini mēngikut atau pun mēlayan dan mēm-persētujukan kehēndak dan angan² daripada Ahli² Yang Bērhormat di-sabēlah sana supaya di-longgarkan dan di-buka Undang² Provident Fund ini dan barang siapa sahaja bērhēnti daripada kērja-nya dan mēnuntut Provident Fund itu, maka di-sērahkan balek kapada-nya, maka akhir-nya tujuan asal Provident Fund itu akan rosak binasa dan akan mēnērbitkan kēlamkabut di-dalam kēhidupan orang itu sēndiri. Umpama-nya sa-orang itu bila bēkērja sa-tahun, kēmudian ia bērhēnti sa-bulan dua, maka katakan-lah dalam ia tidak bēkērja itu ia mēnuntut balek wang Provident Fund-nya, dan di-bērikan pula wang simpanan-nya itu. Dēngan yang dēmikian ini maka rosak-lah tujuan asal Provident Fund ia-itu hēndak mēnjaminkan kēhidupan sa-orang itu sa-tēlah ia tidak dapat bēkērja ia-itu sa-tēlah umur-nya 55 tahun atau pun tēlah di-sabitkan oleh doktor yang dia tidak dapat bēkērja lagi kērana satu² kēuzuran, maka dēngan itu batal-lah sa-kali maksud Provident Fund itu. Jadi untuk mēminda atau mēlonggarkan sharat² mēngēmbali balek atau mēlepaskan balek wang² Provident Fund kapada pēkērja² itu akan mērosakkan tujuan Provident Fund.

Dari sēbab itu, tuan², saya tidak nampak di-mana hikmat, muslihat-nya bagi pēkērja² itu, jika di-sērahkan balek wang² Provident Fund itu kapada mēreka bila sahaja mēreka bērhēnti daripada kērja. Tambahan pula, bērapa-lah lama-nya Provident Fund itu, akan tahan, Tuan Yang di-Pērtua, kalau sa-orang itu sa-tahun bēkērja dan sa-bulan dua bērhēnti kērja, dan bērapa-lah lama-nya wang kumpulan-nya itu dapat mēnyara, mēnjamin kēhidupan-nya kalau dia ta' mēndapat balek kērja-nya dalam masa yang lēbeh lanjut. Jadi itu-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pērtua, saya nampak bahawa Ahli² Yang Bērhormat di-sabēlah sana itu chuba hēndak mēnjadi champion bagi pēkērja² dēngan tidak mēmandang pērkara ini dari sēgala sēgi-nya.

Enche' Othman Abdullah (Tanah Merah): Tuan Yang di-Pērtua, saya

nampak buat pērkara ini tēlah di-datangkan suatu bahathan. Tuan Yang di-Pērtua, kami dari pēmbangkang bukan-lah manusia² hanya datang mēmbangkang di-dalam Majlis ini tētapi apa yang kami kēmukakan di-sini ada-lah pandangan kami yang patut Kērajaan mēmikirkan sa-mula.

Mr. Speaker: Ya.

Enche' Othman Abdullah: Kērajaan mēsti mēmikirkan, bukan kami mēmbangkang-nya, ini hēndak-lah Yang Bērhormat Mēntēri Muda kita itu mēmahamkan apa yang kita bahathkan, di-sini kami bukan mēmbangkang. Tuan Yang di-Pērtua, tētapi mēngē-mukakan fikiran² yang patut di-ambil oleh Pēmērentah bagi mēnimbangkan sa-mula. Kami tidak mēmbangkang dan kami tidak mahu mēnjadi jagoh.

Mr. Speaker: Sudah-lah.

Enche' Othman Abdullah: Sēbab itu saya minta pērkara ini

Mr. Speaker: Dalam pērkara ini saya mēmutusan ta' patut di-bahathkan atas pērkara bērkēnaan dēngan umur tadi. Saya mēmbēnarkan pehak dari Mr. Seenivasagam yang pērtama tadi dēngan sēbab dia bērpēgang kapada bagaimana hēndak mēngēluarkan wang itu, maka dari sēbab itu bērbangkit-lah pērbahathan pēkērja² ini. Dari masa ini, saya nūnta-lah kalau Ahli² Yang Bērhormat ini mē-numpukan atas dasar Rang Undang² yang ada di-hadapan Majlis ini sahaja, tēntang pērmohonan daripada pehak² pēkērja supaya pehak Kēmēntērian mēmikirkan bagaimana hēndak mēminda undang² ini, saya sa-memang²-nya-lah luluskan, tētapi saya minta tidak boleh mēnjadikan pērbahathan dalam Dewan ini. Saya jēmput Mēntēri itu kira-nya hēndak mēnjawab.

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir. I think that there is probably a certain amount of misunderstanding in connection with the purposes of the Employees' Provident Fund, but before I deal with that I should like to answer an Honourable Member, who suggested that in the 1955 election we did promise to amend the Ordinance.

We promised then that we would consider the matter and, in fact, the matter has since been considered by the Board of the Fund.

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification, the Manifesto states, "we will consider and make provision for withdrawal in case of dire necessity". If you look it up, you will find it.

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: In any case, this matter has been considered by the Board of the Fund, and in this connection I should add that the Fund or rather the Board consists of 18 representatives—6 are nominated by the employees themselves, 6 by the employers and 6 by the Government. It will, therefore be seen that this Board is a representative Board in which the claims and interests of the employees will always receive due consideration. I should add that the Board has turned down the request that withdrawal should be permitted in cases of unemployment, whether temporary or otherwise.

Sir, I can appreciate the anxiety of many Honourable Members about unemployment. In this connection, if I may be permitted to digress a little, I recall an incident about two months ago when I was attending a meeting of Commonwealth Finance Ministers in London. Someone then observed that out of 10 Commonwealth Finance Ministers who attended in 1957, only four were left as six had become casualties. Speaking, therefore, as a Minister of Finance, I, myself, would welcome an unemployment insurance scheme, in view of the high casualty rate in my profession. (*Laughter*). I suggest, Sir, that if the object is unemployment, the answer is not a provident fund but an unemployment insurance scheme: and in this connection I am informed by my Honourable colleague, the Minister of Labour, that there is at the moment in this country an I.L.O. expert who is looking into this question.

I also appreciate the anxiety of some Honourable Members about sickness. I agree that if you are sick you cannot

work, and that although you cannot work, you still have to eat—that I think is self-evident; but again, the answer is not a provident fund but a national health insurance scheme.

The object of the Fund, if I may say so, is to provide for old age. It is intended as a security against old age, and the whole object of the scheme would be defeated if the Government were to allow withdrawals in cases of unemployment, whether such unemployment is temporary or otherwise. It is as simple as that. We should, I suggest, look on this matter as adults, and we should not behave like children who put some money into a box for some specific purpose, but who the moment they want a new toy say, "Let us raid the box for buying a new toy." This question is a serious matter. If, to-day, the Fund were to permit withdrawals before an employee in question has reached a certain age—in this case we have fixed the age at 55—the time may come when he reaches that age but finds that he will have nothing to look forward to.

One Honourable Member has made the point that the weakness of the Fund is that it permits withdrawal in one lump sum. I agree that there is validity in that criticism, and I myself have been thinking about it for some time. It may be that the final answer is not to allow an employee to withdraw in one lump sum—and that means eventually we may have to turn this Fund into an old age pension scheme. I should hasten to add that I am making no promises, because an old age pension scheme is a vast undertaking and it will cost a lot of money—and I do not know whether at the moment the Fund is in a position to convert into an old age pension scheme. However I have got the matter in mind. In fact, I wrote a minute about it a few days ago, and if it is possible we are prepared to consider it. But before we do so, it will be essential to have an expert actuarial survey made to find out whether it is financially and economically practicable; and if it is so, I suggest that that is the ideal solution, that is to turn it

eventually into an old age pension scheme, so that this Fund will really fulfil the object for which it was originally set up, that is to provide for an employee at the time when he needs help most—when he is old.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

Clauses 1 and 2 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported without amendment: read the third time and passed.

THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR OFFICERS (OATHS AND FEES) BILL

Second Reading

Tun Abdul Razak: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to provide for the administration of oaths and the levy of fees by diplomatic and consular officers" be read a second time. This is straightforward and a simple Bill, Sir. It is customary for the convenience of citizens abroad to give diplomatic and consular representatives power to administer oaths, to take affidavits and to do any notarial act abroad. It is also customary to fix fees arising from the performance of such functions. Now, this Bill is simply to make provision for this. As can be seen in clause 3, provision is made here for powers to be exercised by the diplomatic and consular representatives of the Federation abroad and also under sub-clause (4) of that clause, provision is made for the purpose of taking oath provided under the Constitution, provided that it be taken by someone who is a citizen of the country. And clause 4 of the Bill provides for the levying of fees for this purpose.

Sir, I beg to move.

Dato' Suleiman: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

Clauses 1 to 9 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported without amendment: read the third time and passed.

THE LOANS (EXPORT CREDITS GUARANTEE DEPARTMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to provide for the raising of loans from the Export Credits Guarantee Department of the Board of Trade of the United Kingdom by the Federation of Malaya" be read a second time.

The purpose of the Bill is clearly set out in the explanatory statement attached to it. The general pattern of the Bill follows that of the Loans (International Bank for Reconstruction and Development) Ordinance, 1959, which respectively authorised the borrowing of monies from the International Bank and the Development Loan Fund. I should, however, like to describe briefly the use which the Government proposes to make of the powers conferred by the Bill.

As Honourable Members are aware agreement in principle has been reached between the Governments of the Federation and the United Kingdom on the grant of a loan to the Federation, equivalent to just over \$19 million. This loan will be used to finance overseas expenditure on certain telecommunications projects which are set out under Head 144—Telecommunications, Sub-heads 28, 30, 32, 36, 37, 42, 45, 46, 47, 48, 51, 55-62 and 64 of the Development Estimates, 1960. In addition \$1.2 million will be spent on the conversion of the Taiping Exchange from manual to automatic working, and this project will appear in the 1961 Development Estimates.

The total cost of these projects is just over \$28 million and the Federation Government has undertaken to provide funds to meet the local expenditure involved, i.e., round about \$9 million.

The terms and conditions of the loan have not been finally decided, but it has been agreed that the loan shall be made available to the Federation through the agency of the Export Credit Guarantees Department of the United Kingdom and shall be fully repaid by 31st December, 1969. The loan will be drawn as and when required to pay for equipment purchases and the rate of interest will be calculated separately for each drawing. The rate applicable to each drawing will depend on the rate at which the U.K. Government is itself borrowing at the time when the drawing is made for periods similar to the period of this loan plus a small charge of $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent per annum to cover the working expenses of the Export Credit Guarantees Department. Such rates are likely to be appreciably lower than those at which the Federation itself could borrow in the United Kingdom for a comparable period.

The loan will be used for the purchase of British equipment and this is considered to be in the best interests of the Federation. The equipment and planning of the whole telephone and telegraph network in the Federation is based largely on the practice of the British Post Office. In this way Malaya is able to take full advantage of the vast research, development and experience of the British Post Office Engineering Organisation and the proposed purchase of British equipment which will ensure continuing standardisation of equipment enables the maximum economies to be effected in the training of staff and in the holding of spare parts and lastly facilitates planning and development of the whole network.

The terms of the loan are similar to those which apply to all other loans granted by the United Kingdom to other independent members of the Commonwealth under the provisions of the Export Credit Guarantees Act of the United Kingdom.

The provision of this loan by the United Kingdom will enable the development of the Telecommunications Department to be accelerated and thus help in meeting the ever-increasing public demand for the facilities provided by the Department both in the rural and urban areas, and I should like to take this opportunity of expressing the Government's appreciation of the U.K.'s generosity in granting this loan to the Federation.

Sir, I beg to move.

The Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications (Dato' V. T. Sambanthan): I beg to second the motion.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-hadapan kita ini ada-lah satu Bill untuk membolehkan Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu berhutang sa-banyak yang ditetapkan. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dasar berhutang ini memang-lah dasar yang boleh di-katakan tidak boleh di-elakkan oleh manusia apabila kesusahan, tetapi patut-lah soal² yang saperti ini kita kaji dengan lebih halus dan satu dasar yang tetap bagi mengurangkan hutang bagi Persekutuan Tanah Melayu di-lakukan. Mengikut ucapan Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan dalam menyatakan bahawa perkara yang dibuat dengan wang hutang ini ada-lah bagi membeli alat Telecom yang datang dari negeri Inggeris juga. Ini tidak-lah dapat di-hairankan, sebab kalau kita berhutang daripada orang Inggeris maka terpaksa-lah kita membeli barang² Inggeris supaya menguntungkan orang Inggeris juga.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perkara yang sa-macham ini tentu-lah dapat di-chari helah² saperti perkataan² yang mengatakan ini akan menyenangkan beberapa soal; ia-itu soal mengendalikan hal² jentera dan soal alat² simpanan, soal menyatukan chara² Telecom di-negeri ini, tetapi saya berharap-lah kalau dapat hutang² yang di-lakukan oleh Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini dikurangkan dan dengan yang demikian dapat-lah kita menjalankan negeri kita ini dengan ta' banyak terpaksa berbuat bagitu dan berbuat bagini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tentu-lah Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan akan bangun dan mengatakan bagaimana-kah kita

hendak menjalankan segala rancangan pembangunan kalau kita tidak berhutang? Bagaimana hendak menimbulkan wang—memang betul, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tetapi dalam membuat rancangan itu hendaklah di-fikir halus² apa-kah rancangan yang lebih² hendak di-gunakan—rancangan Telecom, rancangan berkenaan dengan alat Telephone, rancangan chara Microwave yang hendak di-buat ini semua-nya bagus belaka. Tetapi, hendaklah kita fikir bahawa ada-kah ini satu perkara yang mustahak dari seluruh ra'ayat—seluruh Tanah Melayu. Bagi saya tidak-lah hendak membahatkan satu persatu-nya, tetapi saya nampak bahawa keadaan berhutang ini telah pun mengikat Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu. Apa-lah salah-nya kalau kita chuba berhutang daripada satu pihak dan membeli alat² dari pihak yang lain. Memang-lah boleh di-jawab orang itu ta' hendak memberi hutang dengan membeli alat² orang yang lain. Maka ini-lah saya katakan bahawa hutang yang di-lakukan oleh Kerajaan Persekutuan ini ada-lah mengikat Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu.

The Minister of Transport (Enche' Sardon bin Haji Jubir): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli Yang Berhormat yang baharu sa-bentar berchakap tadi telah mengatakan kalau hendak berhutang biar-lah di-pereksa sama ada hutang itu menguntongkan atau pun tidak, bukan hendak membuat Microwave atau menambahkan perusahaan². Saya berharap Yang Berhormat akan menyasiat hasil dari Pejabat Talikom ini yang telah pun bertambah dari sa-tahun ka-sa-tahun yang menguntongkan negeri ini dan menambah segala² kemajuan pertama sa-kali negeri² yang di-Pantai Timor. Sa-waktu saya menjadi Menteri Kerja Raya, Pos dan Talikom rancangan² memang-lah telah membawa perhubungan² ka-hulu² sa-bagaimana Talipon Merdeka yang mana banyak lagi sedang tertunggu². Dengan sebab ada-nya rancangan ini dan dengan sebab ada-nya hutang ini hasil negeri ini yang patut kita gunakan ia-lah memberi layanan kepada ra'ayat yang jauh² itu supaya dapat kita selamatkan Microwave yang baharu di-buka itu memakan belanja

lebih kurang \$13 juta, itu akan membanyakkan hasil² daripada talipon. Ini ia-lah melëkaskan perhubungan ka-sa-luruh dunia kerana kita berharap harga getah dan bijeh ini dengan kedua²-nya lekas di-ketahui. Di-situ-lah dapat harga yang baik dan di-situ-lah membaikkan ekonomi negeri kita. Oleh itu saya menyatakan Kerajaan Perikatan pada waktu berunding berkenaan hutang, apa juga hendak di-timbangkan semua-nya di-halusi daripada segala segi yang akan menguntongkan negeri, menguntongkan ra'ayat dan membaikkan segala² perhubungan bukan sahaja di-dalam negeri ini bahkan sa-luruh dunia. Saya sa-bagai Menteri Kerja Raya, Pos dan Talikom baharu² ini telah menghadhiri persidangan Talipon Sa-dunia di-Geneva dan telah membawa nama baik Persekutuan Tanah Melayu. Mereka telah hairan kemajuan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini chukup maju di-dalam lapangan Talikom dan chukup menguntongkan (*Tëpok*). Saya berharap pihak parti pembangkang ber-banyak terima kaseh kepada Pejabat Talikom dan kepada Kerajaan yang tidak pernah di-gunakan orang di-zaman dahulu; masa dahulu orang² ta' dapat bertalipon dengan ring tetapi hari ini mereka boleh bertalipon daripada Talipon Merdeka. Tolong-lah sedikit memberi kerja sama mudahan² hasil yang dapat dari Talikom dapat di-gandakan, terima kaseh.

Dato' V. T. Sambanthan: Sir, some points were raised with regard to the equipment, and why British equipment has been bought. It was bought precisely because it falls into line with the equipment we already have, and it facilitates the working of the Department.

Secondly, a point was raised by the Honourable Member asking why we are spending so much money in terms of economics. I would like to inform him that after this new network comes in, we would be getting a revenue of \$6.65 million every year, and this should pay for itself in a very short time.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid (Sëberang Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Bill ini ada-lah pada fahaman saya,

bukan-lah kita hendak hutang duit. Pada fahaman saya, ia-lah di-beli alat² itu daripada pihak Kerajaan British dan mereka hargakan alat² itu dan dijadikan hutang kepada negara Persetujuan Tanah Melayu. Yang Berhormat wakil Bachok tadi mengatakan dengan ada-nya alat² Telecommunication itu bagus, tetapi kata-nya ta' mustahak. Pada fikiran saya sangat² mustahak diadakan, oleh kerana pada dahulu-nya waktu belum kita ada Telephone Merdeka di-béberapa kampung, orang² terharu hendak tahukan harga getah berapa, harga kelapa berapa dan lain² barang². Dan juga pada waktu kemalangan, seperti di-patok ular, macham tempat yang jauh², jika ta' di-bawa ka-Hospital di-inject ubat harus nyawa-nya hilang. Pihak kaum ibu yang mengandung pula, manakala bidan di-tempat itu tidak dapat menyelamatkan dengan chara dia pelajari, terpaksa di-bawa ka-Hospital, kalau ta' di-béri tahu kepada Pejabat itu (Hospital) dengan cepat dan pertolongan itu terlambat datang harus nyawa orang itu pun tidak akan selamat. Jadi, sekarang ini saya fikir sangat mustahak di-adakan untuk membéri fa'edah semua penduduk² di-luar bandar. Sakian-lah terima kaseh.

Dato' Mohamed Hanifah bin Haji Abdul Ghani (Pasir Mas Hulu): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kami sedar bahawa sanya talipon telah bertambah banyak dalam negara kita sa-bagaimana yang telah di-nyatakan oleh Menteri yang berkenaan. Tetapi berapa kerat-kah orang² kampung yang memerlukan menggunakan talipon ini, yang sangat mementingkan talipon ini ia-lah saudagar² dan Kerajaan. Pandangan yang di-bérikan oleh Wakil Bachok tadi, ada-lah berhubung dengan pinjaman wang yang harus mengikat negeri ini. Begitu juga seperti pinjaman wang daripada United Kingdom dengan mengambil pinjaman wang ini, maka Kerajaan kita terpaksa membeli pula alat² daripada United Kingdom itu. Maka itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pihak kami menaruh kebimbangan, supaya jangan-lah dengan meminjam² wang boleh mengikat negeri kita, sakian-lah sahaja.

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not think there is very much for

me to say because many of the points raised by Honourable Members have already been dealt with by my colleagues.

As has been pointed out, it has been considered desirable to buy British equipment for the very simple reason that at the moment we have British equipment in this country and, obviously, it would be extremely expensive to change over to new equipment. It is as simple as that.

One Honourable Member made the point that we should not borrow. I am sure he also disagreed with the increase of taxes. I merely would like to know how we could find money to pay for this equipment.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad (Bachok): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ta' ada yang mengatakan, we should not borrow.

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: It is admitted that this is a revenue-earning project. In fact I am told that, although it is very difficult to assess exactly the return, the average return would be about 10 per cent on the amount invested, and the interest we will have to pay, although it has not yet been decided, would certainly be far less than 10 per cent. So, by any standards, I think we can say that this is not only a revenue-earning project but it is a revenue-earning project which is well worthwhile.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported without amendment: read the third time and passed.

THE PETROLEUM (AMENDMENT) BILL

-Second Reading

Enche' Mohamed Khir bin Johari: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a

Bill intituled "an Act to amend the Petroleum Ordinance, 1949" be read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill as stated in the objects and reasons, is to provide for the appointment of a Chief Inspector for the purpose of directing and supervising the duties to be carried out by inspectors appointed under the Petroleum Ordinance, 1949.

The local authority (Municipality, Town Board or District Officer) is the "licensing authority" for the storage of petroleum under the Ordinance. A large number of officers belonging to local authorities and State Governments have been gazetted as inspectors to enable them for licensing purposes, to inspect and control petrol storage tanks throughout the Federation.

A defect of the present Ordinance, however, is that an inspector is automatically given powers to board vessels, inspect and test petroleum and examine tanks as well as the powers needed to control actual storage within the Federation. Inspections and testings of tankers and bulk petrol storage containers involve hazardous duties and require properly qualified professional or technical officers: it would be potentially dangerous for unqualified inspectors to undertake such duties and to date, the duties of unqualified inspectors have been limited by administrative action to the less dangerous functions of control under the Ordinance. It is however clear that co-ordination of the duties and responsibilities of the various Inspectors under the various parts of the Ordinance is essential as a matter of public safety.

The bill provides for the appointment of a Chief Inspector (who will be the Director of Chemistry), and gives him powers to exercise general supervision over all Inspectors appointed under the Ordinance, and to issue such directions to them as may be necessary for the proper enforcement of the law, and to ensure public safety in the handling of petroleum.

Many State Officers are at present gazetted as Inspectors and therefore all State Governments have been consulted

regarding this proposal. No objections have been raised.

Sir, I beg to move.

Enche' Sardon bin Haji Jubir: I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported without amendment: read the third time and passed.

THE COMMON GAMING HOUSES (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to amend the Common Gaming Houses Ordinance, 1953", be read a second time.

In prosecutions under the Common Gaming Houses Ordinance, 1953, and the Betting Ordinance, 1953, expert evidence is frequently required to be given on illegal gaming. The important function of giving expert evidence in such gaming cases has largely been performed by detective-sergeants. This arrangement has not proved entirely satisfactory. There is an insufficient number of such detective experts in the force. Their usefulness for this purpose is, besides, limited to the type of games that they have become expert in.

A book entitled "Gambling Games in Malaya" by Mr. Dobree has recently been published. Mr. Dobree is an authority on gambling in this country, having served in the Federation of Malaya Police from 1928 to 1955, when he retired as Assistant Commissioner, Secret Societies Department, Police Headquarters. In view of the difficulties attending the giving of expert evidence in the matter of illegal gaming, it is the object of the present measure not

only to permit the Court to refer to Mr. Dobree's book but also to refer to such other books or articles on gaming as the Court may consider authoritative on the subject. There is precedent for this measure in section 25 of the Societies Ordinance, 1949, under which the Court is permitted to refer to works on secret societies.

Sir, I beg to move.

Tun Abdul Razak: Sir: I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

Clauses 1 and 2 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported without amendment: read the third time and passed.

THE OATHS AND AFFIRMATIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

The Minister of External Affairs (Dato' Dr. Ismail): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "An Act to amend the Oaths and Affirmations Ordinance, 1949," be read a second time.

This, Sir, is a short and simple Bill, and, as I have said just now in moving the second reading of the Diplomatic and Consular Officers (Oaths and Fees) Bill, it is customary in most countries for the law to provide for the recognition of oaths and affidavits taken in other countries. No such provision is contained in the present law of the Federation. The object of the present Bill is to give recognition to oaths and affidavits taken in other countries. It is noted, however, that the draft Bill provides that no oaths for the purpose of the Constitution shall be taken outside the Federation except before a diplomatic or consular officer of the Federation who is himself a citizen of this country.

Sir, I beg to move.

Dato' Suleiman: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

Clauses 1 and 2 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported without amendment: read the third time and passed.

THE BETTING (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "An Act to amend the Betting Ordinance, 1953" be read a second time.

This Bill proposes to amend the Betting Ordinance in the same way as the Common Gaming Houses (Amendment) Bill has amended the Common Gaming Houses Ordinance and for the same reasons as I gave when moving the second reading of that Bill. I therefore see no point in amplifying on what I said then.

Sir, I beg to move.

Tun Abdul Razak: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

Clauses 1 and 2 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported without amendment: read the third time and passed.

THE NATIONAL REGISTRATION BILL

Second Reading

Dato' Suleiman: Tuan Speaker, saya bangun mēmbawa usul ia-itu Rang

Undang² bagi mendaftar penduduk² dalam Tanah Melayu, kerana mengeluar-kan Kad Pengenalan dan perkara² yang berkaitan telah di-bachakan bagi kali yang kedua. Ahli² Yang Bèrhormat dalam Dewan ini terlebeh ma'alom sa-bagaimana yang saya katakan pada hari sa-malam bahawa Kad Pengenalan baharu akan di-keluarkan pada tahun hadapan. Kad Pengenalan yang ada ini di-keluarkan di-bawah Undang² Dharurat dalam tahun 1948, maka telah di-fikirkan bahawa jikalau hendak di-keluarkan Kad Pengenalan baharu ini patut-lah di-keluarkan di-bawah Undang² Yang Tetap sa-lain daripada Undang² Dharurat.

Rang Undang² ini pendek, ia-itu ada-lah Rang Undang² yang membèri kuasa bagi menjalakan tujuan² sa-bagaimana yang saya katakan tadi dan ada di-bawah-nya section di-mana juga boleh di-buat Peratoran²-nya. Ada satu dua perkara yang saya suka membèri ketèrangan saperti yang di-tèrangkan di-dalam Bab 3 ia-itu sa-orang pegawai akan di-lantek menjadi Ketua Pegawai Pendaftaran. Di-sini patut-lah saya terangkan bahawa Ketua Pegawai Pendaftaran Tuan McDonald yang telah bèkerja—bèrkhidmat sa-lama 22 tahun yang tidak bèrapa lama lagi akan bèrsara. Pada masa ini sa-orang Pegawai Melayu, Enche' Ibrahim Ali akan menjadi Ketua Pejabat ini. Jadi, di-chadangkan ada satu pendaftaran ia-itu tiap² orang penduduk di-dalam nègeri ini sa-lain daripada yang di-kèchualikan hendak-lah mendaftar diri-nya bagi mengambil Kad² Pengenalan.

Sa-bagaimana yang saya katakan tadi bahawa Rang Undang² ini ia-lah Rang Undang² yang membèri kuasa dalam Bab 6 dan satu kuasa akan dibèri kepada Mèntèri yang bèrkènaan ia-itu dalam perkara diri saya sendiri bagi membuat Peratoran² supaya mēndapatkan bagaimana tujuan² Rang Undang² ini. Kad Pengenalan baharu ini bukan-lah pula di-gunakan saperti kèrtas² yang dahulu. Ada satu kèrtas yang baharu yang di-buat dari Amerika oleh Todd Co., Rochester, U.S.A. Kad ini akan di-gunakan dan harga hendak mengeluar-kan sèmuanya ia-lah lebeh \$3,280,000. Dan di-chadangkan bahawa ra'ayat akan mēmbayar sa-banyak

50 sen bagi satu Kad Pengenalan dan orang yang bukan ra'ayat akan mēmbayar sa-banyak \$5.00. Dèngan jalan ini kita bèrharap dapat-lah balek pèrbèlajaan-nya sa-bagaimana yang saya katakan tadi akan di-bèlanjakan.

Ada èmpat warna kad yang akan di-keluarkan. Sa-bagai ra'ayat nègeri ini warna biru. Yang bukan ra'ayat warna merah dan pelawat² yang duduk sèmentara bukan pelawat² yang duduk dalam nègeri ini yang mēndapat kebènar-an duduk dalam nègeri ini di-keluarkan satu kad yang bèrwarna hijau. Satu lagi kad yang bèrwarna coklat akan di-keluarkan kapada orang² yang telah mēndaftarkan dalam pendaftaran Prevention of Crimes Ordinance. Pelawat² yang mēndapat kebènar-an masok di-dalam nègeri ta' lebeh dari satu bulan tidak-lah di-kèhendaki mēngambil Kad Pengenalan baharu ini. Banyak sudah kèrja² bèrkènaan dèngan hendak mēnjalakan ini dan yang sèdang di-jalakan dan bagaimana hendak mēnjalakan lebeh² lagi nampak-lah di-dalam Bab 6 Peratoran yang akan di-jalakan.

Kad Pengenalan ini banyak gunanya dan boleh di-katakan satu daripada kègunaan yang mēsti di-adakan dan kad² yang ada ini tidak-lah nampak-nya boleh di-gunakan lagi, oleh kerana sudah banyak kènyataan di-dalam-nya yang tidak bètul dan ta' tēntu. Ini-lah dia tujuan Rang Undang² ini.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to provide for the registration of persons in the Federation, for the issue of identity cards and for purposes connected therewith," be read a second time.

As the House will be aware it is proposed next year to introduce a new system of identity cards. The present issue was made under the provisions of the Emergency (Registration Areas) Regulations, 1948, but it is considered that with regard to the new issue, permanent legislation should be enacted and the purpose of the Bill before the House is to give effect to this intention. The measure itself is a short one and as will be seen is an enabling measure. There are however one or two points in the Bill on which I should like to touch. It will be seen from Clause 3 that the Commissioner of

National Registration is to be appointed and it is of course intended that this Officer should be the Chief Registration Officer. At this point I should like perhaps to remark that Mr. E. M. McDonald, the present Chief Registration Officer is shortly retiring after some 32 years loyal service to this country in many different fields and his successor is to be a Malay Officer of the M.C.S. Enche' Ibrahim bin Ali. It is proposed that a register should be maintained of all persons in the Federation who are required to be registered—and indeed every person in this country, unless especially exempted, will be required so to register.

As I remarked just now this measure is an enabling one, and section 6 will confer the necessary powers on me to make Regulations for carrying out the intentions of this legislation. The new issue of identity cards will be laminated and are being supplied by the Todd Co. of Rochester, U.S.A. The cost of the issue will be of the order of \$3,280,000 but it is proposed that a charge of 50 cents should be made for the issue of these cards to citizens, whilst non-citizens will be required to pay \$5; thus it is hoped that the cost of the issue will be more than recouped in due course.

To facilitate identification the cards will be of different colours; blue for citizens, red for non-citizens, and temporary passes will be in green. Persons registered under the Prevention of Crime Ordinance will be issued with a brown card in place of their existing cards which are stamped with a large black cross. Persons who visit this country for a period of less than a month will not be required to take out an identity card. There are a considerable number of administrative arrangements to be made in connection with this new issue, and section 6 of the Bill will give some idea of the scope of the undertaking, and the various matters on which Regulations will be required. I should add that administrative arrangements will be made to ensure that proper precautions are taken to prevent non-citizens acquiring identity cards as citizens.

The identity card system has many uses and has become accepted in the

fabric of our national life. The present issue however is unsatisfactory, and clearly the time has come for us to examine the matter afresh, and produce a new and up-to-date form of registration. The object of the Bill before the House is designed to achieve these ends.

Sir, I beg to move.

Enche' Sardon: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon menyokong dan memberi peluang bagi di-bahath.

Mr. Lim Kean Siew (Dato Kramat): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish to speak in opposition to this Bill, but before doing so, in view of the fact that the many speakers who have spoken have not done so under S.O. 53 (4), I would like your ruling on this. Standing Order 53 (4) says:

"On the second reading of a Bill, an amendment may be proposed to the question, 'That the Bill be now read a second time', to leave out the word 'now' and add, at the end of the question, 'on this day six months', or an amendment may be moved to leave out all the words after the word 'That' in order to add words stating the object and motive on which the opposition to the Bill is based, but such words must be strictly relevant to the principle of the Bill and not deal with its details. If the House agrees to an amendment in either of such forms, the second reading of the Bill shall be considered to have been negatived."

Sir, in opposition to the Bill, I intend to move an amendment under S.O. 53 and my amendment is, "That this Bill be rejected in view of the fact that it is contrary to the intent and purpose of the present national registration regulations, and is an attempt to extend the national registration beyond the period to which national registration under the Emergency Regulations Ordinance, 1948, would apply." I believe that prior to this stage this morning most of the Honourable Members who have spoken have assumed that the Bill was a motion. So, I think, Sir, it would be correct for me to move an amendment under this Standing Order.

Mr. Speaker: Now, the Bill is before the House for debate and you have the liberty to oppose the Bill now.

Mr. Lim Kean Siew: I oppose it by this amendment.

Mr. Speaker: If you have an amendment, you must give me notice of the amendment in writing. You can oppose

the Bill and you can give your reasons for opposing it.

Mr. Lim Kean Siew: As it may please you, Sir. According to the explanatory statement of this Bill, it is stated that:

"At present identity cards are issued under the provisions of the Emergency (Registration Areas) Regulations, 1948. It is considered that these regulations should be revoked, and replaced by a more comprehensive and permanent system of national registration, involving the creation of a central registry and index: and it is the object of the above measure to provide the machinery for such a system."

Sir, this Bill is against the spirit of our Constitution. It seeks to make permanent what was in fact a temporary measure under the Emergency. Under our Constitution the Emergency Regulations Ordinance is extended under Article 163 (1)—this comes in Part XIII under the Temporary and Transitional Provisions chapter. Article 163 (1) says:

"The Emergency Regulations Ordinance, 1948, and all subsidiary legislation made thereunder shall, if not sooner ended by a Proclamation under Clause (2), cease to have effect on the expiration of one year beginning with Merdeka Day or, if continued under this Article, on the expiration of a period of one year from the date on which it would have ceased to have effect but for the continuation or last continuation."

and under Clause (4) of the same Article, it is stated:

"While the said Ordinance continues in force any subsidiary legislation which could have been made thereunder immediately before Merdeka Day may be validly made thereunder notwithstanding that it is inconsistent with any provision of this Constitution, and Parliament may, notwithstanding anything in this Constitution, by law amend or repeal any provision thereof."

The national registration at the moment is a subsidiary legislative measure under this Emergency Regulations Ordinance and ought to end with it. Therefore, it is very clear that, since it is the intention that this National Registration Bill should replace the present Regulations, it is intended to make this registration permanent and outside and beyond the period of the Emergency and the Emergency Regulations. Sir, I submit that this is against the spirit of our Constitution. It has been said very often that we are trying to develop a

democratic system, but I would like to submit that it can be said that though we say, "We are free", we are now in chains.

The purpose of the identity card system was to combat terrorist activities under the Emergency Regulations. If we approve of this legislation, we would be going over and beyond the Emergency period. Since the purpose of the identity card system was to fight the terrorists effectively during the period of the Emergency, what then is the purpose of the extension of the identity card system into a period of non-emergency? If we say that it is to combat the Emergency, then it is useless. If we say that this is not to combat the Emergency then, Sir, what is the purpose of extending the period of the Emergency under our Constitution in order to have certain regulations promulgated and continued?

Sir, the Minister of Justice in presenting this Bill

Dato' Suleiman: The Minister of the Interior.

Mr. Lim Kean Siew: I am sorry—the Minister of the Interior, and not of Justice. (*Laughter*). In presenting this Bill, he gave a lot of reasons but, Sir, he missed giving the purpose and intent of the legislation. It is the intent and purpose of the legislation with which we are always concerned. We are not only concerned with whether the card is blue, pink, green or red in colour. We want to know why does he intend to have this Ordinance, but instead we have been told that we are going to buy paper that is known as laminated paper. Whether laminated paper is better than ordinary paper, whether it is better than parchment paper or not, we do not know nor do we care very much. However, on this point, since identity card is a document, I presume that parchment paper would be more appropriate.

The danger of this National Registration Ordinance is this. Firstly, it will make registration permanent. Now, do we want this to be permanent? In considering this, I would ask another question, "Do you want us to divide into classes, into sections?" We

would have blue, red, green and chocolate cards—blue for citizens, red for non-citizens, green for visitors and chocolate for persons who are registered under the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance. Soon, we might also have different shades of blue—light blue, dark blue and not so dark blue: dark blue for Ministers, not so dark blue for non-Ministers and light blue for opposition members, (*Laughter*) and so on. We begin to divide and segregate ourselves into classes of citizens. Already we have two—those with chocolate and those with blue cards.

Now, Sir, people who have been registered under the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance may change in character. Sometimes it may be due to administrative oversight; sometimes we may have young children who are 15, 16 years or 17 years of age who go against authority, not because they are criminal by nature or by some psychological distortion, but because they might have been antagonistic to authority as represented by the father, and in their fight against authority sometimes they might psychologically be fighting against the authority of the father whom they dislike and oppose; and very often we find that these people after they have settled down say at the age of 25 or 26, change for the better. Now, Sir, if you are going to give them chocolate identity cards, every time they produce their identity cards, they feel a sense of guilt—thus if a person has to produce his card ten times a day he would feel guilty ten times a day. After, say, a period of five years it is very difficult to remove that guilty complex in a person. Consider also the effect on a son of a father who carries a chocolate card and we know that a lot of people who are so-called 'subversives' or so-called anti-social people, who are not really anti-social at all, but people who feel that they should at that time of their lives rebel against what they believe to be unjust authority. You might ask, "How do we deal with these people?" exactly. When we want to register a person, do we have a trained psychiatrist to deal with that person's personality first, do we have the person examined, his home background examined? Do we examine the falsity

of the reports or otherwise? Some of my friends have been accused of being so-and-so inclined, and then after they have met people, after they have been introduced to their accusers, the accusers have often changed their opinion making such ridiculous statements as: "Oh, he is not a bad chap after all, we did not know him before." But once you give that person a chocolate identity card, he has got to go before that very man, who put the colour on his card, to remove that colour and to give him a blue card. Now, we all know that once a person has decided on a course of action, very often it is very difficult for him to admit that he has been wrong and that he wishes to redeem himself by admitting his mistake. This also applies especially to authorities. So, we must understand that permanency as regards colour of identity cards is something we must avoid.

The purpose of the present national identity cards is to make sure that certain people are not found in certain areas and, perhaps, to arrest and detain certain persons under the Emergency Regulations: but because of the fact that every person has to carry an identity card that purpose is to a large extent defeated.

Sir, according to the Honourable the Minister of the Interior, the present identity card system is rather chaotic and it should be revised. I agree that it is chaotic, and if you make it permanent, it will be permanently chaotic. (*Laughter*). The point we must remember is this—if the present identity card system is chaotic, there is no reason why it cannot be corrected under present Regulations.

Dato' Suleiman: I thought you object to the present Regulations.

Mr. Lim Kean Siew: No, I do not object to the present Regulations. That is irrelevant in this discussion. I say that this is an attempt to make the present Regulations, which is temporary under the Emergency Regulations, into a permanent legislation which is divorced from the present Emergency, and therefore divorced from the purpose on which the present system is based. If we wish to correct the

present system—there is no reason why it should be made permanent—it can still be corrected under the present Regulations. Therefore, one of the reasons given for this by the Minister of the Interior is illogical. In fact, I would go so far as to say that it is not so much a reason but an excuse.

Now, if we say that this registration will do good, because it has been found necessary under the Emergency Regulations, then we must also say, once the Emergency is ended, that its goodness or otherwise need no longer be a matter of discussion.

The other point that we must remember is this: that when we register people, we are in fact proceeding along lines as has been done in armies, for criminals, by fascists and among police personnel. In other words, we still have to understand this—would this measure not in the end be a rather dictatorial and fascist method of democracy? If it had been the purpose that the registration of people should be permanent the Constitution would have stated so quite clearly, but as you see under Section 163, it states that the Emergency Regulations shall cease one year after Merdeka day. Therefore, the first intent of our Constitution is to end the Emergency as early as possible. Secondly, if you wish to continue it, you may extend it from time to time under sub-section (3). From year to year the Emergency Regulations Ordinance has been extended—from 1958 to 1959 and from 1959 to 1960, in other words, twice. It also states quite clearly that:

“While the said Ordinance continues in force any subsidiary legislation which could have been made thereunder immediately before Merdeka Day may be validly made thereunder notwithstanding that it is inconsistent with any provision of this Constitution”

The national registration system as it stands to-day is made under the Emergency Regulations. From this Constitutional statement it would appear, therefore, that this Bill is in that sense contrary to the Constitution or the spirit or the intent of our Constitution which, under Part II, Sections 5 to 11, deals with the liberty and the freedom of the people. Under

Section 9, there is prohibition of banishment and the freedom of movement. So, when you give a person a chocolate card you limit his freedom; when you give him a blue card you give him more freedom, and when you give him a red card he may probably be under police surveillance all the time. I do know that when a person is registered, every time he finds a job he finds difficulty in maintaining his job because according to the relevant Ordinance, when a person is registered the police may demand for his identity card and for that purpose the police can go anywhere and very often they go to these people and ask for their identity cards in order to check their movements and therefore embarrassing them. That Ordinance, we must remember, has very little to do with the Emergency—that is registration of criminals. But once you introduce this National Registration Ordinance, this Ordinance would apply also in those cases and therefore we must carefully consider it; and I hope that when we come to this point Members of this House will vote according to what their belief in democratic principles rather than on party lines, because during election time, everywhere I went I heard the same phrases uttered by all sides of the House—that we believe in democracy, that we are upholding the principles of democracy and justice, the liberty of the person, and the freedom of the individual. Well, this is a chance for us to prove it. (*Laughter*).

Dato' Suleiman: I would ask members of all parties to come in to vote to show either they can understand the spirit of our Constitution or that they would rather accept party discipline.

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, in Hitler's Germany. Hitler made the Jews put on the star of David whenever they went out of the town and the Jews were identified by the star of David. In Malaya, it appears that the people in this country, or those who are living here, are to be identified, as were the Jews by the star of David, by different coloured identity cards: blue, in my presumption, is for loyal citizens; red for those

hundreds of Chinese, Indians and some Malays, who are not citizens, or citizens who have close connection with China, or India, or perhaps Kerala State, which has a Communist government; green for visitors is no danger at all, because they will be here for a very short time; and chocolate—of course, that is meant for criminals. Well, why should an independent country have an identity card system as a permanent feature in its laws. The system of registration and the issue of identity cards have been carried out in a number of countries, but when the emergency or the situation which is dangerous or explosive is over this registration of identity cards no longer exists in countries where democracy is practised or democracy in the form it is believed in—no guided democracy as some people say we have in this country. Now, the Emergency Regulations brought into existence the identity card system and it has served a useful purpose. We are told that the Emergency is coming to an end very, very quickly.

Now, when the Emergency Regulations were framed, they were framed as an emergency measure and the law in regard to identity cards was included there. Therefore, it was clear that the intention of the Colonial Government, which was blamed for what happened in the past, was that this system should be temporary, or for so long as the Emergency lasted. Why should a government elected by the people, a government which represents the majority of these people, now say that it wants to make the law permanent? What is the necessity? I may be ignorant of world affairs—I am not so widely travelled as some Honourable Members on the Government side—but all I would like to know is—in which country is there a permanent feature of registration by the issue of identity cards? It is true that it may last for many years, but the time comes when it is no longer a feature in the laws; and for that reason there is no permanent legislation, there is only temporary legislation. What is the need to make the thousands of

citizens and the thousands of non-citizens, who will one day become citizens of this country, and there is a large number of them, to spend more money in getting a new identity card when the national registration cards issued under this can last for one year, two years or 4 years? What is the position of those who get red identity cards? He gets it in January and he becomes a citizen in March: who is to pay for the alteration of his card? Does the Government pay for it? No, the poor individual has to pay for it and for that he pays \$5 and after 3 months when he becomes a citizen he has to pay 50 cents to the same person who issued him with a red card in the first instance to change it from red to blue, so that he will become a loyal citizen of the Federation.

Mr. Speaker: Are you going to be long?

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: Yes, Sir. I am going to be a bit long.

Mr. Speaker: In that case, to-day being Friday, I have to adjourn the House until 2.30 p.m.

Sitting suspended at 12 noon.

Sitting resumed at 2.30 p.m. o'clock.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

THE NATIONAL REGISTRATION BILL

Resumption of debate on Question, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Question again proposed.

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, as I was saying before the adjournment, this move by the Government to make the need for identity cards a permanent feature is undemocratic and brings to mind the dictatorial methods adopted in, as I said, Hitlerite Germany. But there are more important points at issue to-day here. A non-citizen will receive a red identity card for which he will have to pay a sum of \$5. It must be remembered that there are thousands upon thousands of people who are non-citizens to-day but who will in the

very near future—a month, two months perhaps—become citizens of this country, and that state of affairs will proceed month after month, and even after they receive their red identity card in a very short time they may have to get blue identity cards. The expense will of course have to be borne, I presume, by the man who is to change his identity card. In the first place, why should a non-citizen have to pay \$5 and a citizen pay only 50 cents? Is it proposed by this Government that non-citizens who have resided here for years and years should be penalised? Is it the intention of the Government to force or to suggest that if you are not a citizen you are going to be penalised in one way or another? What is the purpose of giving a different coloured card to a non-citizen of this country? I do not know why the colour red is chosen, whether it is significant or not is another matter—why not another colour? Is there a sinister motive behind the choice of this colour? Is there a motive to keep in readiness information at all times within the knowledge of the Government of the persons who are non-citizens of this country? So that the Government, if it so wishes, if it so turns out, may intimidate, try to frighten non-citizens of this country from not opening their mouths for a single moment in respect of any matters which the Government does and which they consider should not be done?

But more important than all that—what will be the effect of this identity card as proposed by the Government have on the ordinary citizen or non-citizen of this country who lives here. We know that to-day—I say this knowing very well, very sincerely, that it is true—there are certain Police officers—and when I say “officers” I do not mean only officers of the highest rank, I mean every Police officer in the Police Force—there are some of them who for one reason or another, whenever the opportunity arises, bully and try to disturb members of the public by asking them to produce and show their identity

card—not once, not twice, but maybe ten times. We know that there have been people of this country, both citizens and non-citizens, who are, from day to day, pulled up to the Police Stations for no reasons whatever—because out of the hundreds of persons pulled in in and around the State of Perak, from the written replies given by the Minister in charge to the question: “How many people were arrested under the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance in the State of Perak—35”. Mr. Speaker, Sir, we who move about with the people know that in one day you may have to visit the Police station more than 35 times, and you get the answer that you are detained under the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance—and yet the answer is: 35 persons arrested under the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance.

With regard to the chocolate identity card—people who are registered under the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance—there is perhaps justification for a different coloured card. But for the non-citizen there is no justification whatever, because non-citizens are entitled to have the same freedom in this country as anybody else has. We from the Opposition Bench have time and again asked for the revocation of the Emergency Regulations, and when we ask for the revocation of the Emergency Regulations, we do not mean revoke the Regulations by name but reimposing them in another form. When we say revoke the Emergency Regulations, we mean: take them away for good. Let us not have that kind of law in this country any longer. It has become more and more significant, more and more clear, that from time to time the Government is trying on the one hand saying: “We are revoking the Emergency Regulations—or certain parts of it” but next day we find them being re-enacted as a permanent part of the law of this land under a new law. I do not think any of us are foolish. I do not think any of us can be misled. It has been said: “You do not like the Emergency Regulations, therefore we revoke this part relating

to identity cards". That is no answer, by having that part revoked when it is re-enacted in a more fearful, in a more deadly form, in the form of this Bill which is now before us.

In the Honourable Minister's supporting remarks for this Bill, one significant statement was made: that some of the identity cards or a large number of them were not in proper order, that the details there are not true. I shudder to think that the Legal Department, or the Department of Public Prosecutions, or the Attorney-General's Department, is incapable of dealing with this matter. If the Minister knows that there are untrue particulars on identity cards, then, surely, that must have come to his knowledge by proper sources, by investigation, and I think this House is entitled to know why no action has been taken if that is within the knowledge of the Government. The Government seems to be so resourceful, they are so powerful that they can deal with crime, any crime, yet in a matter which is within their knowledge no action has been taken because if action has been taken then I am sure the Honourable Minister would not have found it necessary to say that particulars on identity cards are now not true.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, as I said, before I conclude, the Emergency Regulations were meant to be a temporary measure to meet with a particular situation. We have been informed time and time again that the situation is now so much improved that in due course the Emergency Regulations will cease to exist. Let them exist if necessary as Government thinks, but let them go away as soon as possible. But once they go away, let us not get them back under disguise, under a more fearful, a more dreadful feature. The people of this country are under many restrictions, and even among citizens themselves, some citizens are under certain restrictions. There is no equality. The basic foundation is not there—equal citizens in an equal country. Now you want to go and place restrictions on those who are loyal citizens of this

country. You want to make a distinction between human beings living in this land. You hold a red identity card, therefore I look upon you with suspicion. You hold a blue identity card, I look upon you as a citizen. You hold another type of card—you are a criminal, branded for the rest of your life without conviction in a Court of law. Is that the justice, is that the Merdeka which the Alliance Party have fought for and has been put back into power in this country for another term of five years?

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid (Seberang Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli² Yang Berhormat sakalian, saya telah mendengar penerangan² dari pehak pembangkang yang telah mengemukakan beberapa buah fikiran tetapi pada pendapat saya chadangan itu sangat-lah baik-nya dan tiap² warga negara Perssekutuan Tanah Melayu yang mengaku ta'at setia yang tidak berbelaah bagi mesti-lah sokong chadangan ini. Oleh kerana pada pendapat saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, adalah Undang² Pendaftaran Kad Pengenalan ini tidak kita harus bandingkan dengan Undang² Dharurat. Mengikut kenyataan orang wakil yang sudah berchakap berkenaan dengan dharurat, sebab saya katakan begitu Undang² Dharurat telah di-istiharkan pada tahun 1948 kalau tidak silap saya. Berkenaan dengan Pendaftaran Kad Pengenalan ini telah di-jalankan pada tahun 1951. Bukan-kah Undang² Pendaftaran ini di-adakan oleh kerana hendak menyenangkan pehak yang mengawal keamanan negeri ini bagi menjalankan tugas-nya masing²? Yang sa-benar-nya walau ada atau tidak ada Kad Pengenalan ini, Undang² Dharurat itu akan di-kenakan kepada siapa² juga yang melanggar Undang² itu, ini ada-lah fahaman saya.

Kedua, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, negara kita yang sedang di-agong²kan baharu sahaja mulai merdeka dan hakikat yang sa-benar-nya di-adakan Undang² ini ia-lah oleh kerana hendak menentukan siapa-kah warith-nya yang berhak bagi negara Perssekutuan Tanah Melayu ini. Sebab itu di-adakan Kad Pengenalan kepada orang yang berhak kepada negara Perssekutuan Tanah

Melayu ini; dan yang ada hak meněrina keistimewaan. Sa-bagaimana yang di-katakan oleh Yang Běrhormat wakil daripada Ipoh, ra'ayat něgěri ini di-kėnakan 50 sen dan orang yang bukan ra'ayat něgěri ini di-kėnakan \$5. Sa-bagai sa-orang warga něgara ia-nya městi-lah ada keistimewaan dan dia bėrhak di-kėnakan kurang bayaran.

Tuan Yang di-Pěrtua, kita patut-lah insaf apa-kah sėbab-nya di-adakan Undang² Dharurat dan apa-kah sėbab-nya di-adakan Kad Pěngėnalan? Undang² Dharurat itu di-adakan oleh kėrana kita mēngikut Piagam Bangsa² Běrsatu ia-itu "freedom from fear"—mēngawal kėbebasan daripada takut, itu-lah sėbab-nya yang di-adakan Undang² Dharurat. Untuk hėndak mēnjalkan kėwajipan bagi pehak yang mēngawal Undang² itu maka di-adakan Pěndaftaran Kad Pěngėnalan. Pada tahun 1948 sampai tahun 1951, Tuan Yang di-Pěrtua, tiap² orang yang dudok di-dalam něgara Pěrsėkutuan Tanah Mėlayu ini walau pehak pėngėnalan, walau pehak orang 'awam sėmua-nya di-dalam kėtakutan. Yang puak pėngėnalan ini takutkan kapada puak orang yang mēmpertahankan kėamanan daripada di-tembak atau di-bunoh. Yang orang 'awam pula takut hėndak tidor di-waktu malam, sėntiasa bėrjaga² sėrta siapkan sėnjata takut bahaya akan tiba. Alhamdulillah, kita bėrada di-dalam kėamanan dėngan chara Kad Pěngėnalan, yang mana kita pada hari ini patut bėrtafkor dan bėrutang budi kapada sa-orang ahli pėrjuangan yang tėrkorban jiwa-nya yang sangat kita kėnangkan jasa-nya kalau tidak silap saya dia-lah yang mula² sa-kali mēngėluarkan fikiran untuk mēngadakan Kad Pěngėnalan. Bėliau ada-lah sa-orang daripada tėmpat kita dari Pulau Pinang ia-itu Dr. Ong Chong Keng. Patut kita bėrshukor kapada Allah sėbab dia-lah yang mula² sa-kali mēngėluarkan fikiran mēngadakan Kad Pěngėnalan ini.

Tadi saya dėngar Yang Běrhormat wakil daripada Ipoh mēnėgaskan bahawa dėngan ada-nya Kad Pěngėnalan ini, konon-nya akan mēnyėkat kėbebasan bagi sėgala warga něgara Pěrsėkutuan Tanah Mėlayu. Mēngikut Artikal No. 5 yang mēnyėbutkan "No person shall be deprived of his

life or personal liberty save in accordance with law". dan No. 9 mēngatakan "No citizen shall be banished or excluded from the Federation". Jadi, dia ingat istilah kėbebasan bėrma'ana tėrus bebas boleh buat apa². Yang Běrhormat itu ta' tahu, tiap² apa yang ada dalam něgěri, dan apa yang ada kėnyataan² dalam dunia ini městi-lah ada sėmpadan atau pėrėnggan-nya. Sa-hingga langit itu pun di-jadikan mithalan kata orang Puteh "The sky is the limit". Langit itu pun di-jadikan sėmpadan dan bėbebasan kita ini pun městi-lah ada sėmpadan.

Oleh sėbab itu saya mēnėgaskan kalau sudah ada Undang² "No citizen" (ta' ada satu warga něgara yang boleh di-buang něgěri) kalau ta' ada Kad Pěngėnalan yang mēnėntukan dia itu ada-lah warga něgara, maka harus warga něgara itu akan di-buang něgěri, sėbab tidak ada kėtėntuan. Dėngan ada-nya Kad Pěngėnalan yang sa-macham itu maka boleh-lah di-tėntukan bahawa orang itu ada hak-nya dan orang ini ta' ada hak-nya. Dan bėrhubong dėngan apa yang saya katakan tadi bahawa kėbebasan itu ada pėrėnggan-nya mēngikut Article 149 (1) "If an Act of Parliament recites that action has been taken or threatened by any substantial body of persons whether inside or outside the Federation, to cause, or to cause a substantial number of citizens to fear, organised violence against persons or property, any provision of that law designed to stop or prevent that action is valid notwithstanding that it is inconsistent with any of the provision of Article 5, 9, or 10, or would apart from this Article be outside the legislative power of Parliament; and Article 79 shall not apply to a Bill for such an Act or any amendment to such a Bill."

Dato' Onn bin Jaafar: On a point of information, Sir, will the Honourable Member quote the Article?

Mr. Speaker: You will have a chance to talk afterwards.

Dato' Onn bin Jaafar: I am only just asking if he will quote the number of the Article.

Mr. Speaker: What number is the Article?

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid: No. 149. Yang Bèrhormat wakil dari Ipoh telah mengatakan ia-itu Kèrajaan Pèrikatan bèrsikap Dictatorial. Kita ta' boleh bandingkan dèngan sikap Hitler; sangat jauh beza-nya. Sikap Hitler, ia-lah bèrfahaman sa-bagai "Lust for power" atau dahaga kapada kuasa. Kita bukan dahaga kapada kuasa bahkan kita hëndak mènjaga kèamanan dan hak bagi ra'ayat nègèri ini (*Tèpok*). Kata-nya lagi "Di-mana pun ta' ada Kad Pèngènan". Saya tahu bahawa waktu saya bèrada di-Mèkah, Saudi Arabia. di-sana pun ada Kad Pèngènan

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification, I never said there was no identity card system anywhere. I said there was no permanent identity card system anywhere.

Mr. Speaker: Tidak ada sa-lama²-nya.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid: Saya ta' sèntoh kata Yang Bèrhormat wakil dari Ipoh itu di-atas soal Kad Pèngènan. Saya chuma sambongkan pèrchakapan yang lain (*Kètawa*). Jadi, kalau ada orang yang mengatakan di-lain tèmpat ta' ada Kad Pèngènan sa-lama²-nya maka di-Saudi Arabia ada Kad Pèngènan sa-macham itu. Dèngan ada-nya Kad Pèngènan sapèrti itu maka mudah-lah bagi orang² kita ia-itu warga nègara kita yang pèrgi ka-sana. Dalam sa-tahun sampai lima ènam ribu orang pèrgi ka-Saudi Arabia. Banyak orang² atau pènuntut² yang mëndapat scholarship atau biasiswa pèrgi ka-luar nègèri. Kalau ta' ada Kad Pèngènan bagaimana kita hëndak mènèntukan yang mana bèrhak mëndapat biasiswa? Sa-kira-nya mèreka yang bukan warga nègara yang pèrgi ka-Saudi Arabia itu waktu mènunaikan fardzu Haji-nya dan juga yang bèrharapkan bantuan daripada wakil Duta kita di-sana, dèngan ini tèntu sa-kali wakil Duta kita ta' tahu yang dia itu warga nègara nègèri ini. Jadi, dèngan jalan itu

banyak orang² yang bukan kena pada tèmpat-nya mèminta pèrtolongan.

Oleh yang dèmikian saya suka mènègaskan ia-itu Yang Bèrhormat wakil dari Dato' Kramat mèrayu kapada pehak Kèrajaan mènggunakan fikiran-nya sèndiri—undi ikut fahaman sèndiri. Sèkarang saya sa-balek-nya suka hëndak mèrayu kapada Yang Bèrhormat wakil dari Dato' Kramat sa-muga fikir sa-mula; kalau sa-bènar-nya mèngaku warga nègara nègèri ini dan yang ta'at sètia dèngan tidak bèrbèlah bagi, maka patut sangat disokong chadangan ini (*Tèpok*).

Mr. V. David: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the previous Honourable Member has really given a different meaning to the Emergency Regulations which was enacted in 1948. His first argument was that these Regulations were enacted in order to protect the people from threat. The first thing I would like to know is, whether it is the Government's original intention to protect the people from threat, or is it merely to prevent the people from demanding Merdeka for Malaya. I will give examples and illustrations to show that the Regulations were misused and abused. For instance, the Honourable Member for Setapak, Enche' Ahmad Boestamam, was arrested under the Emergency Regulations—he is not a Communist; and the Honourable Dr. Burhanuddin was arrested—he is not a Communist either.

Tuan Syed Ja'afar bin Hasan Albar: Tuan Yang di-Pèrtua, saya ta' ingat Dr. Burhanuddin ada di-tahan.

Mr. V. David: All these people were arrested under the Emergency Regulations because it was stated that they were a threat to the country. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I can confirm that the original intention of the British Government in enacting these Regulations in this country was to prevent the people rising on their feet to demand for independence. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the British Government realised that they could not sabotage the Malayan people's aspiration in demanding for self-government and finally knowing this aspect very well, they granted independence to this country. Sir, the

United Nations Charter clearly sets out the fundamental human rights. The Constitution of Malaya is a sacred document to us and we believe in it. It is a sacred document which is for the guidance of the Malayan people and all the parliamentarians in this country. But our acts are contradictory and contravening the provisions of this sacred document. The previous speaker quoted Article 5 of the Constitution—“No person shall be deprived of his life or personal liberty save in accordance with the law”. However, I do not think that this Bill is in the spirit of the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have been talking about aggression in other parts of the world. But here, under our roof, we are having laws which are aggressive in nature and oppressive in structure. Sir, the previous speaker said that these identity cards are documents for use whenever people visit overseas so that they could be identified by our Ambassadors in the various countries. But the Honourable Member failed to realise that without a Malayan Passport he cannot leave Malaya, and that the Malayan Passport is a document for our Ambassadors to recognise that we are from Malaya.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would request and plead to the Government and the Honourable Minister not to be guided by their expatriate Private Secretaries. Let them be guided by their own conscience and think what is right for this country.

When you talk about the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance, it is the most dictatorial law which I have ever seen—a law which is similar to the law which has been used by the Britishers in Guiana to oppress the people who are aspiring for national freedom. Sir, the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance vests powers on individual persons who the Minister appoints. He can appoint anybody to investigate a case. Any man can be bound over under the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance without being given substantial reasons and produced before a Court of law.

Mr. Speaker: That Ordinance is not before the House to-day and the Honourable Member should confine

himself to the National Registration Bill.

Mr. V. David: I am sorry. There are certain relevant points in connection with the Bill, because the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance is the part where we have a chocolate identity card. This law is of such a nature that it deprives one of the rights of a citizen. When you talk about chocolate it looks very delicious, but when a man is given a chocolate identity card, and if he carries it, I can assure this House that he cannot forever obtain a job, for the very simple reason that when the man happens to show his card, with an “X” mark to the employer, he will call his watchman to drive him to the gates.

Sir, are we trying to create frustrated youngsters who are vengeful, because they are discredited in this country by all men; or are we going to reform youths to be good future citizens and who will make a better Malaya? I am afraid we are now on the path of negative approach—not positive; and this identity card, chocolate in colour, will never never produce good citizens. There have been in the past, as my previous colleague has said, youngsters having gone out of the way for some time; but a man is bound to change and when he changes it is the responsibility of the Government to give him all the guidance, and to reform him and make him a new man in society. If the Government is going to enact such laws as to make him permanently not acceptable to the society, I am afraid we are only driving him in despair.

Sir, the Honourable Minister when moving the Bill stated that revenue could be collected by the issuing of identity cards

Dato' Suleiman: Sir, on a point of order, I object. I did not say to get revenue. What I said was to recoup the cost of the cards.

Mr. V. David: It is all the same, Mr. Speaker, so long as it is collected from the people. You can call it recoupment or income because there will be lot of money coming in—I am not disputing on that fact. But my principle here is that the identity card, chocolate in colour, will and can never

reform any citizen of this country. I remember a High Court Judge from the United States once said "We cannot buy the minds of the people through bullets and guns, but we must find a solution whereby we can reform them." To-day I find that we are now strictly following guns and bullets method and driving the people to despair.

A man who is given a chocolate identity card is not kept in his local town. Usually he is under restricted residence where the Honourable the Minister of the Interior says: "My friend, you cannot stay here; you will have to live 30 or 40 miles away." The C.I.D. picks him up and takes him and leaves him somewhere in Banting or Rawang. And the poor man will not have a single dollar in his pocket; he will be stranded in the street. This is not law, it is a mockery of the law. If the Honourable Minister has any sense of responsibility towards society, he must consider that the other people in this country are human beings. I know personally things like this has happened. People have been left in quite strange places where they are unknown and do not have any relatives—they are left stranded on the streets without jobs.

Dato' Suleiman: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is my Bill: I do not know whether the Honourable Member is speaking on the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance or not.

Mr. V. David: Sir, I have to say this because it is mentioned here—chocolate cards and Prevention of Crimes Ordinance—and they automatically come together.

Mr. Speaker: You must confine yourself to the principle of the Bill.

Mr. V. David: Well, I will confine to that. Sir, certain speakers have already spoken in this House about the Emergency Regulations. Now, certain parts are being taken from the Emergency Regulations to be made into the permanent laws of this country to deprive them of their fundamental rights as the people of this country. Sir, if we are going to lead a nation,

if we are going to lead a Government, which is to be recognised at the international level—and if you want international reputation—I feel that laws of this nature are below our integrity and dignity. Sir, I would plead and appeal to the Honourable the Minister of the Interior to reconsider this Bill—to reconsider the issue of chocolate identity card. You are now driving the people to frustration. Hundreds of them have been sent out of this country, or out of the States; and various men from one State have been sent to another State, without ample reasons being given as to why they have been sent there: these people are collared at midnight and sent out.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would request the Honourable Minister to use his discretion and also to judge with his own conscience and not allow himself to be led by expatriate officers. If you want a democratic nation—a democratic country—to function within the framework of our Constitution, which my colleagues and I regard as a sacred document, I would once again plead that he might reconsider this carefully and see that chocolate identity cards are not issued to people.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, turning again to National Registration of Identity Cards. In 1948 when the Emergency Regulations were enacted, it was said that the legislation was only as a temporary measure. To-day, according to the statement by the Honourable the Defence Minister and Deputy Prime Minister, it has been clearly stated that the Emergency is coming to an end. Therefore I do not know why we are going to have this new identity card system. Sir, since the Emergency is coming to an end, why are we now trying to bring in some new legislation which is going to be a permanent feature in this country? Before the war I know, from my school days, that we only go to the Municipality to get licences for our dogs and that my forefathers or fathers have not taken a licence for themselves. But to-day the moment a child reaches the age of 12 years, he has to run to the Identity Cards Office

to take an identity card to identify himself—even though he is born and bred in this country, he would have to identify himself that he is from the Malayan territory. Sir, this state of affairs should not continue and should cease forthwith. I would appeal not to let this become a permanent feature. The Emergency Regulations were enacted as a temporary measure, so let that be regarded as temporary; and let us now explore the possibilities of bringing the Emergency to an end as early as possible and thus do away with the identity card system. Thank you.

Tuan Haji Abdullah bin Haji Abdul Raof (Kuala Kangsar): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun menyokong di atas Bill ini oleh sebab memandang bahwa Bill ini ada-lah mustahak. Pada pendapat saya bukan-lah soal berkaitan dengan wang patut di-jadikan kesulitan dalam menimbangan Bill ini, tetapi perkara Kad Pengenalan ini patut-lah kita timbangkan atau pun kita fikirkan ia-itu ada-kah National Registration dan Kad Pengenalan ini satu perkara yang berguna atau pun tidak? Pada pendapat saya bahwa Kad Pengenalan ini jikalau kita pandangan dari segi kegunaan-nya berkenaan dengan dharurat sahaja yang mana boleh di-katakan hampir tamat, maka saya rasa Kad Pengenalan ini tiada-lah mustahak lagi. Akan tetapi jikalau kita pandangan perkara² yang berlaku di-negeri ini ia-itu perkara² saumpama orang² negeri asing yang chuba masuk ka-negeri ini dengan jalan haram, maka dengan sebab itu-lah saya rasa Bill ini di-kemukakan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Dalam. Kita tahu bahwa berhampiran dengan kita ini ada bermacam² bangsa yang mahu dan suka datang ka-negeri ini kerana negeri ini ada-lah satu negeri yang ma'amor dengan mendapat kehidupan yang senang. Oleh sebab mereka terasa susah dalam negeri mereka maka mereka chuba datang ka-negeri ini dengan bermacam² helah walau pun dengan jalan yang tiada di-benar oleh undang².

Saya bawa satu pendapat untuk pengetahuan tuan² di-Majlis ini ia-itu

di-Dindings satu District di-dalam negeri Perak di-mana dalam masa Perentahan Jepun dan juga pada masa tamat perang saya ada bekerja di-satu tempat yang di-namakan Pasir Panjang. Di-sana banyak Orang² Indonesia datang ka-negeri ini dengan jalan sampan. Jadi, ini-lah sebab-nya jikalau kita tiada mengadakan undang² ini, maka saya perchaya bahwa banyak orang² dari negeri asing akan masuk dengan jalan sa-macam itu dan berbagai² jalan lagi. Dengan sebab itu saya rasa bahwa Bill ini sangat-lah mustahak kerana kita bukan sahaja hendak menggunakan Kad Pengenalan itu berkenaan dengan dharurat bahkan hendak menjaga dan menahan kemasokan orang² asing ka-negeri ini dengan sa-chara haram. Di-atas soal warna Kad Pengenalan, ini bukan-lah satu perkara yang rumit oleh sebab perkara itu boleh di-pinda jika didapati tiada sesuai. Sekian-lah sahaja, terima kaseh.

Dato' Onn bin Jaafar (Kuala Trengganu Selatan): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, wakil Seberang Utara telah menyebutkan berkenaan fasal 149 dalam Undang² ini. Pada pendapat saya sendiri bahawa fasal 149 itu tidak ada kena-mengena dengan perkara yang dibahaskan, oleh kerana fasal 149 itu berkata: "Sa-kira-nya ada sa-suatu Undang² Parlimen yang mengatakan ia-itu langkah yang telah di-jalankan atau pun yang hendak di-jalankan oleh sa-suatu puak yang ramai, maka sa-barang Undang² yang di-luluskan bagi menahan langkah itu sa-kali pun melawan dengan kehendak² dalam Undang² Perlembagaan ini boleh di-jalankan."

Perkara yang di-bahaskan pada petang ini ia-lah berkenaan dengan hendak mengadakan suatu Peratoran, satu chara bagaimana yang akan dapat di-pertimbangkan lagi kerja² berkenaan dengan Kad Pengenalan itu. Wakil Seberang Utara tadi telah berkata ia-itu Undang² Dzarurat telah dimula² pada tahun 1948 dan Kad Pengenalan telah di-adakan pada tahun 1951-1952. Sa-bagai satu alasan yang mana pada pendapat dia bahawa Kad Pengenalan itu tidak ada kena-mengena

dengan Undang² Dzarurat. Di-sini saya sangat² tidak bersetuju dengan pendapatannya itu, oleh kerana Kad Pengenalan itu telah di-jalankan dengan sebab adanya Dzarurat. Kalau sa-kira-nya Kad Pengenalan itu di-jalankan sa-belum berbangkit Dzarurat, maka boleh-lah di-katakan tidak ada kena-mengena perkara yang kita bahaskan pada petang ini. Yang sa-benar-nya bukan perkara sama ada patut atau tidak di-adakan Kad Pengenalan itu, tetapi oleh kerana perkara mengadakan Kad Pengenalan itu ada-lah bersangkutan dengan perkara Undang² Dzarurat. Maka di-sini saya suka hendak menyebutkan fasal 163 dalam Undang² Perlombongan ini yang berbunyi demikian:

"The Emergency Regulations Ordinance, 1948, and all subsidiary legislation made thereunder shall, if not sooner ended by a Proclamation under Clause (2), cease to have effect on the expiration of one year beginning with Merdeka Day or, if continued under this Article, on the expiration of a period of one year from the date on which it would have ceased to have effect but for the continuation or last continuation."

Now, under Clause (3) of the same Article, it says—

"The said Ordinance and subsidiary legislation may be continued from time to time by a resolution of each House of Parliament."

Well, the points arising from these are—Was a proclamation made one year after the date of Merdeka continuing the Emergency Regulations? I presume it was. This must have been made some time in 1958. Again, was a proclamation made in 1959? For that I am not so sure. But whatever the position is, with the institution of this Parliament, I say that the provisions of Clause (3) of Article 163 now applies. Therefore, it is logical that before introducing this Bill, the Honourable Minister concerned or the Government—I do not mind which (*Laughter*)—should have moved a resolution in this Parliament to continue the Emergency Regulations. If such a resolution is not brought in, then, in my view, the Emergency Regulations do not exist.

Tun Abdul Razak: On a point of explanation, Sir, a resolution has

already been brought into this House on the 24th June this year to extend the Emergency Regulations for a period of one year from the 31st August, 1959, to 31st August, 1960.

Dato' Onn bin Jaafar: Thank you for the information. But, as I say, Parliament has now been convened and I feel that the correct procedure would have been to bring in a resolution in this Parliament.

Identity cards were issued under the Emergency Regulations. Identity cards were made purely as a temporary measure; it was not intended at any time within my knowledge that it should be a permanent feature of the law of this country. The intention of this Bill is to make it so. We have the words of the Bill which says in the Explanatory Statement—

"... It is considered that these regulations should be revoked, and replaced by a more comprehensive and permanent system of national registration . . ."

The fact that identity cards are to become a permanent feature of registration is in conflict and at variance with the original intention that it should be a purely temporary measure. I therefore move, in accordance with Standing Order 53 (4), that the second reading of this Bill be postponed till the same day 12 months hence or the nearest date thereto.

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

Mr. Speaker: May I have the wording of the amendment?

Dato' Suleiman: I am sure we require notice of that, Sir.

Dato' Onn bin Jaafar: No.

Mr. Speaker: Honourable Members, I have received an amendment to the motion for the second reading of the Bill, namely, the National Registration Bill, which is before the House to-day, and I shall read the amendment. The amendment has been proposed and seconded. It reads—

"That the second reading of this Bill be postponed to the same day 12 months hence or the nearest date thereto."

This is not quite clear.

Dato' Suleiman: Sir, although I am the mover of the motion, I have not been given a copy of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: I have already read the wording of the amendment. I suggest to the Honourable mover of the amendment that it would be better to substitute the words "on this day twelve months" for the word "now".

Dato' Onn bin Jaafar: But I was trying to obviate the possibility that Parliament does not meet this day 12 months.

Mr. Speaker: I think it would be better to use the words "on this day twelve months."

Dato' Suleiman: Sir, I do not know whether the Honourable Member is moving the amendment or you are moving it. (*Laughter*).

Mr. Speaker: I am only trying to help the Honourable Member, because the wording of the amendment is not very clear and therefore I have suggested to the Honourable Member to make it clearer, and he has agreed to it. In fact, if you read Standing Order 53 (4) the wording there is clearer.

Dato' Suleiman: Thank you, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Now, Honourable Members, the motion before the House. That the Bill be now read a second time, is amended to read "That this Bill may be read on this day twelve months hence." The amendment has been proposed and seconded; it is now open for debate.

Mr. Chin See Yin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will confine myself to this amendment only.

Mr. Speaker: Yes. (*Laughter*).

Mr. Chin See Yin: Thank you, Sir, as you have heard just now from the various speakers in this House, the matter now before us is the result of the Emergency that prevails in this country. And at that time I think we all agreed that when these regulations came into force the former Government had given an assurance that it would only be a temporary measure.

That being the case, we must admit that according to the information given to us by the Honourable Minister of Defence, the Emergency will soon come to an end. We are yet to see the end of the Emergency, but we hope to see it very soon.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, under the Emergency Regulations, provision was made for the issue of identity cards. These cards will be valid, under their assurance, for such time as the Emergency is on, and under the regulations it was also necessary to have it extended from time to time. Sir, the reason why I strongly support this proposed amended motion is because we have to give time for the Emergency to come to an end. On the other hand, Sir, it would be expensive if we were to rush the Bill through. It will cause everybody to spend money and we all agree that this country is an agricultural country where 90% of the population have to work for a living, and they have already been contributing so much in various taxation. Now if this National Registration Bill is passed through and put into operation, it would mean that we will have to spend \$4½ million to implement it. Mr. Speaker, Sir, \$4½ million is a lot of money, and I think this money can be used for more useful purposes. We have heard from the Honourable Ministers holding various responsibilities the amount of progress that we can achieve if we have sufficient money. Sir, it is for this reason that I stand up to support this amendment. On the other hand, I need not repeat what has been said by the Honourable Members in this House regarding the liberty of the human beings.

Mr. Speaker: Will you confine your speech to the proposed amendment?

Mr. Chin See Yin: Yes Sir, I will confine to it. As I said, Sir, if we all will sit up and think for a moment, we will agree that this costs so much money; and the proposal made by the Honourable Member for Kuala Trengganu Selatan, is for a deferment of this Bill, which is, I think, a very good thing.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, may I refer, with your permission, to the speech by His Highness the Timbalan Yang di-Pertuan Agong

Mr. Speaker: Is it in connection with this?

Mr. Chin See Yin: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: With the amendment?

Mr. Chin See Yin: Yes Sir. It reads: "Whatever is good for the people should have the support of all parties irrespective of where the idea has originated," and it goes on further to say, "but on the majority party in any Parliament lies the special responsibility of listening with receptive minds to constructive criticism of their policies"

Dato' Suleiman: On a point of order, I have not objected.

Mr. Speaker: Do not read too long.

Mr. Chin See Yin: No Sir. ". . . . ever ready to accept sincere contributions to the common weal." I am referring to this, Sir, because when you put this proposed resolution to vote, I am asking the Government party to be considerate so that we all will work for a common cause, in the interests of the people and for the betterment of the country. Let us vote with our conscience.

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the proposed amendment, and I would ask the Government to accept this amendment, when it is put to the vote for this reason—that it will not cause hardship or damage to the Government side by deferring this matter for the period asked for. I think, as an Honourable Member has said, the Government must be ready to accept constructive criticisms. This amendment cannot be destructive—if anything at all, it will be a useful suggestion. In any event, it can only be a constructive and not a destructive suggestion.

Tuan Haji Ahmad Saaid (Sēberang Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada-lah perkara masa'alah di-hadapan Majlis

ini sama ada kita hendak binchangkan di-atas usul National Registration atau hendak tanggohkan. Saya hairan. kalau-lah hendak mengemukakan chadangan hendak di-tanggohkan. waktu mula² tadi patut di-bawa chadangan hendak di-tanggohkan, sekarang sudah jalan sa-tengah, hampir sampai ka-pangkal—di-kemukakan chadangan tanggohan. Jadi sekarang terpulang kepada Majlis ini menimbang dan menjalankan, sakian, Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun membēri sokongan, berdasarkan bahawa apa yang hendak di-buat oleh Kerajaan ia-lah hendak mengemukakan atoran Pendaftaran Kēbangsaan seluruh Persekutuan Tanah Melayu. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, oleh kerana terbit atoran pendaftaran ini dahulu daripada ada-nya keadaan dharurat negeri ini, maka sudah-lah pada tempat-nya perkara saperti ini kita lihat kepada keadaan negeri. Maka Yang Bērhormat Timbalan Perdana Menteri telah menyatakan kepada kita ada harapan bahawa dharurat akan di-tamatkan pada tahun 1960. mudahan², Tuan Yang di-Pertua, apabila sampai pada tahun 1960, kita dapati ta' payah lagi kita ini menggunakan pendaftaran, kalau dengan maksud hendak menjaga subversive.

Soal pendaftaran ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tidak-lah berbangkit tentang asas ada-nya. Tetapi tentang menanggohkan dasar-nya, melihat kepada keadaan, saya rasa patut-lah di-fikirkan oleh Kerajaan. Ada satu soalan yang telah di-bangkitkan oleh Yang Bērhormat Menteri yang bersangkutan tadi ia-itu keadaan pendaftaran sekarang ini tidak memuaskan. Saya perchaya dengan pendirian Kerajaan yang ada sekarang ini akan dapat-lah dalam masa penanggohan ini Kerajaan mengemukakan pendaftaran negeri ini dan mengētatkan beberapa screw yang longgar pada machine ini supaya membolehkan pendaftaran ini menjadi satu alat bagi mengawal ketēntēraman ra'ayat negeri ini.

Enche' Abdul Ghani (Melaka Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun berchakap pada kali ini ia-lah menentang usul yang di-bawa untuk menanggohkan perbincangan berkenaan dengan Bill tadi. Saya memandang perkara yang di-chakapkan oleh pehak pembangkang atas alasan menanggohkan sementara sa-hingga tahun akan datang mital-nya, itu ada-lah saya rasa ta' ada perkara yang besar dikeluarkan untuk alasan bagi pehak saya hendak menyokong atas chadangan itu. Kerana saya dapat tahu pehak kami—Perikatan atau pun Kerajaan, bila kami hendak mengemukakan satu² perkara ada-lah kami telah timbangkan, perkara ini perkara yang menasabah hendak di-jalankan terutama sa-kali bagi menyegerakan tamat-nya dharurat. Tuan² pembangkang tadi ingin sangat supaya lekas di-tamatkan atau pun dapat kita sampai kepada sa'at yang kita janjikan, jadi sama² menikmati bahwa negara kita tidak dharurat.

Jadi saya rasa kita telah bincangkan perkara ini saya agak macham sudah masak, kemudian perkara ini hendak di-tanggohkan, ini penanggohan adalah penchuri masa untuk mengamanakan negara, terima kaseh.

Dato' Suleiman: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I feel that I should be given the opportunity to say whether I am in favour of the amending motion or not. Sir, I say that I oppose the motion, because . . .

Mr. V. David: Mr. Speaker, Sir, there are many more speakers and before the Honourable Minister replies

Mr. Speaker: (To Dato' Suleiman) You can speak. I must warn the Honourable Mover of the amendment that he has no right of reply under the new Standing Orders. This is an amendment moved by somebody—not by the Minister.

Dato' Suleiman: May I remind the Honourable Member that I was the Mover of the original motion; so, it is up to me to say whether I accept the amending motion or not. If I accept it, then there will be no debate. As I have

said just now, I oppose the motion, because I feel that so far there has been no good ground given as to why this Bill should be delayed for one year. On the other hand, Honourable Members who have spoken—before this amending motion was brought—did not suggest that this Bill was completely of no help to the masses.

Sir, the Honourable Mover of this amendment, to my mind, has not given—I say so with due respect—any good ground or reason as to why this Bill should be delayed. If I were to reply afterwards, on the criticisms that have been made on the original motion, I would be able to disclose the reasons as to why it is rather urgent that we should have this Bill through.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua dan Ahli² Yang Berhormat, saya berchakap di-sini ia-lah bagi pehak Kerajaan. Kita menolak usul yang di-bawa tadi bagi di-tanggohkan. Rang Undang² yang saya bawa pada pagi tadi maseh di-bahatkan, kerana pada fahaman saya Ahli Yang Berhormat yang membawa usul yang hendak menanggohkan ini belum-lah lagi ada dan tidak-lah akan menambahkan sebab² yang munasabah. Fasal apa Undang² ini patut di-tanggohkan dan jika sa-kira-nya pula saya menjawab sekarang di-atas usul yang saya bawa tadi di-hadapan Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang telah berchakap maka saya akan memberi keterangan sebab²-nya yang Rang Undang² ini mesti di-luluskan dengan sa-bberapa segera, kerana ini ada-lah satu Undang² yang mustahak pada hari ini. Undang² ini tidak ada kena-mengena ia-itu Identity Card dengan Emergency Regulation, sungguh pun barangkali asal-nya datang dari Emergency Regulation dengan Identity Card ini. Sebab²-nya saya boleh terangkan pada masa sekarang kalau sa-kira-nya usul pindaan yang ada ini di-tolak.

Enche' Ahmad Boestamam (Setapak): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-benar-nya kami dari pehak Socialist Front bermaksud untuk menolak semua sa-kali National Registration Ordinance ini sebab itu-lah beberapa orang dari pehak kami tadi telah menyatakan bingkangan terhadap Undang² itu. Kemudian timbul satu usul baharu,

usul yang meminta supaya Undang² ini di-tanggohkan perbinchangan-nya untuk sa-lama 12 bulan. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Yang Berhormat Menteri Dalam Negeri tadi mengatakan bahawa pehak yang menchadangkan usul ini tidak ada mengemukakan sebab² yang tegas, yang konkrit kenapa dia mahu tanggohkan. Saya mengambil kesempatan untuk memberi tiga sebab kenapa penanggohan harus di-lakukan.

Yang pertama, mengikut apa yang di-nyatakan di-sini belanja membuat Kad² baharu \$3,287,660. Kalau sa-kiranya di-tanggohkan 12 bulan wang itu dapat kita simpan, kita gunakan untuk belanja lain.

Kedua, Menteri Dalam Negeri telah mengatakan Kad baharu ini akan dibuat di-Amerika. Kalau di-tanggohkan perbinchangan ini sa-lama 12 bulan erti-nya Undang² ini tidak akan berjalan sa-lama 12 bulan, dan Amerika tidak dapat duit tiga million itu.

Ketiga, ada empat macham Kad Pengenalan. Bagi ra'ayat negeri ini dikenakan bayaran 50 sen dan bagi yang bukan ra'ayat negeri ini dikenakan bayaran \$5. Jadi, jumlah-nya yang akan di-terima sa-banyak \$4½ juta.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau kita kaji Anggaran Belanjawan kita ini meskipun kita naikkan chukai pendapatan. Kita maseh kekurangan \$14 juta lebih dan dengan tidak menjalankan Undang² ini sa-lama 12 bulan itu maka \$4½ million untuk membayar Kad² itu dapat kita gunakan untuk kemajuan Tanah Ayer.

Itu-lah tiga sebab kenapa saya menyokong chadangan dari Yang Berhormat wakil Kuala Trengganu Selatan itu, terima kaseh.

Mr. Speaker: Jika tidak ada Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang lain hendak berchakap, saya hendak mengemukakan chadangan ini untuk pindaan. Pindaan-nya ia-lah kalimah "second" itu di-buang. "Now" di-gantikan dengan kalimah "on this day 12 months hence". Bermana jika pindaan ini di-persetujuan, Bill ini akan di-tanggohkan sa-lama 12 bulan. Ini saya terpaksa terangkan kepada Ahli² Yang Berhormat. Sekarang saya hendak kemukakan pindaan ini, pindaan ini hendak di-buang kalimah "second" dan kalimah "now" di-gantikan dengan kalimah "12 bulan yang akan datang".

Dato' Onn bin Jaafar: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada-kah saya berhak berchakap?

Mr. Speaker: Pehak yang membawa pindaan ini tidak ada hak berchakap.

Question put, That the word "now" be left out of the Question.

Mr. V. David: Mr. Speaker, Sir, could we have a division?

Tuan Haji Abdul Khalid: Sir, I do not think that there is justification for a division from the voices.

Mr. Speaker: The decision rests with the Speaker. Nobody can challenge the decision of the Speaker. Will Honourable Members desiring a division stand?

(More than 15 Members stand).

The House divided : Ayes, 29; Noes, 64; Abstentions, Nil.

AYES

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdul-lah

Enche' Ahmad Boestamam

Dr. Burhanuddin bin Mohd. Noor

Mr. Chan Swee Ho

Mr. Chin See Yin

Mr. V. David

Enche' Harun bin Pilus

Tuan Haji Hasan Adli bin Haji Arshad

Tuan Haji Hassan bin Haji Ahmad

Tuan Haji Hussin Rahimi bin Haji Saman

Mr. K. Karam Singh

Che' Khadijah binti Mohd. Sidik

Mr. Lim Kean Siew

Mr. Liu Yoong Peng

Enche' Mohamed Asri bin Haji Muda

Dato' Mohamed Hanifah bin Haji Abdul Ghani

Nik Man bin Nik Mohamed

Mr. Ng Ann Teck

Dato' Onn bin Jaafar

Enche' Othman bin Abdullah

Mr. Quek Kai Dong

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam

Mr. S. P. Seenivasagam

Mr. Tan Kee Gak

Mr. Tan Phock Kin

Mr. V. Veerappen

Wan Mustapha bin Haji Ali

Mr. Yeoh Tat Beng

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad

NOES

Tun Abdul Razak bin Dato' Hussain	Tuan Haji Azabari bin Haji Ibrahim	Enche' Mohamed Abbas bin Ahmad
Mr. Tan Siew Sin	Enche' Aziz bin Ishak	Enche' Mohamed Dahari bin Haji Mohamed Ali
Dato' V. T. Sambanthan	Mr. Chan Chong Wen	Enche' Mohamed Nor bin Mohd. Dahan
Dato' Suleiman bin Dato' Abdul Rahman	Mr. Chan Siang Sun	Enche' Mohamed Sulang bin Mohd. Ali
Enche' Abdul Aziz bin Ishak	Datin Fatimah binti Haji Hashim	Enche' Mohamed Yusof bin Mahmud
Enche' Sardon bin Haji Jubir	Mr. Geb Chong Keat	Tuan Haji Mokhtar bin Haji Ismail
Dato' Ong Yoke Lin	Enche' Hamzah bin Alang	Enche' Othman bin Abdullah
Enche' Mohamed Khir bin Johari	Enche' Hanafi bin Mohamed Yunus	Tuan Haji Redza bin Haji Mohd. Said
Enche' Babaman bin Samsudin	Enche' Harun bin Abdullah	Mr. Seah Teng Ngiah
Tuan Syed Ja'afar bin Hasan Albar	Enche' Hassan bin Mansor	Tuan Syed Esu bin Alwee
Tuan Haji Abdul Khalid bin Awang Osman	Enche' Hussein bin Tob Muda Hassan	Enche' Tajudin bin Ali
Enche' Abdul Ghani bin Ishak	Enche' Hussein bin Mohd. Noordin	Mr. Tan Cheng Bee
Enche' Abdul Rauf bin A. Rahman	Enche' Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman	Mr. Tan Tye Chek
Enche' Abdul Samad bin Osman	Enche' Ismail bin Idris	Tengku Indra Petra ibni Sultan Ibrahim
Tuan Haji Abdullah bin Haji Abdul Rauf	Mr. Kang Kock Seng	Dato' Teoh Chze Chong
Tuan Haji Abdullah bin Haji Mohamed Salleh	Mr. Lee San Choon	Wan Sulaiman bin Wan Tam
Enche' Ahmad bin Arsbad	Mr. Lee Seck Fun	Wan Yahya bin Haji Wan Mohamed
Enche' Ahmad bin Mohamed Shah	Mr. Lee Siok Yew	Mr. Woo Saik Hong
Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid	Mr. Leong Kee Nyeon	Mr. Yong Woo Ming
Enche' Ahmad bin Haji Yusof	Mr. Lim Joo Kong	Hajjah Zain binti Sulaiman
	Dr. Lim Swee Ann	Tuan Haji Zakaria bin Haji Mohd. Taib
	Mr. T. Mahima Singh	
	Enche' Mohamed bin Ujang	

ABSTENTION

Nil

Amendment accordingly negatived.

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. S. P. Seenivasagam (Menglembu):

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose the Bill before this House. For some time past we have had suspicions that the Emergency Regulations were going to be done away with, but at the same time—we have had no illusion about it—we knew that the idea was to do away with the name and to re-enact the substance. And this Bill before the House today is the first step in that direction.

Sir, I wonder whether the Honourable Minister responsible for introducing this Bill has considered the possible effects of it. We as free citizens of this country have a right to live in this country without having to carry around with us a badge. It is true that we do not have it around our necks, but we have to carry it in our pockets. We are free citizens and we are entitled to live in this country without having to carry

any badge—that is our birthright, a right conferred on us by the Constitution.

Dato' Suleiman: What about the P.P.P. badge?

Mr. S. P. Seenivasagam: I will have the P.P.P. badge or any badge as I please. That is my privilege as a citizen of this country. The Honourable Minister should not interrupt me, Sir.

During the Emergency we were prepared to put up with inconvenience for the sake of security, for the sake of easier detection of so-called undesirables—and perhaps they were really undesirables. Any way, we had to put up with a lot of things connected with the Emergency. Now, the Emergency we are assured is almost over from the towns right up to the border. We find that what was originally intended to be a temporary measure is going to be a part of the permanent law of this country—and we knew that all along.

The citizens and inhabitants of this land in whose interests our deliberations are held, they are going to be divided up into three sections. The new system of identity cards is going to split up the inhabitants of the country into three sections—(i) non-citizens, who are red; (ii) citizens, who are blue; and (iii) unconvicted persons, who are chocolate. I believe that it is one of the principles of our Constitution, that there should be no discrimination between citizens.

In my view, a man not convicted in a Court of Law is no more a criminal than any other man, that is, those who are not convicted are not criminals in the eyes of the law. Why then should the law discriminate? This Bill is attempting to discriminate between citizens. Just because some police officer has decided certain things a man is branded under the Public Security Ordinance, and by the proposal of this Bill he is to be issued with a chocolate identity card. What are the consequences of that?

Sir, one of the fundamental principles in the administration of justice in this country is that a presiding officer should not know the character of a man he is trying in ordinary criminal cases. Now, would those responsible for the Bill consider what the effects of the issue of a chocolate identity card would be? A man is produced in Court; he produces his identity card; he is charged with a certain offence that has nothing to do with security; he comes up for trial and it is known that, here is a man with a chocolate identity card. Does not that prejudice his trial? Does not that bring to the notice of the Judge that the man is regarded as a criminal—because he carries a chocolate identity card? Those are factors which those responsible for this Bill did not consider. If they are responsible enough, perhaps they will consider it and do away with the issue of chocolate identity cards. Sir, I would urge upon those responsible for dividing up the inhabitants of this country into three sections to consider what happened in other countries, consider the evils which ensued in those countries—and we do not have to look far back,

because we have examples of what happened in Germany.

The citizens of Germany were divided into two main sections—the Jews and the Aryans. The Jews were issued with yellow identity cards and they had to carry them on their clothes—a yellow six-pointed star of David as a badge intended by the Nazis to be a badge of shame. How did they turn out in the end? That badge was regarded as the badge of martyrdom. I urge upon those responsible for introducing the Bill to consider what would be the effects of issuing indiscriminately on suspicion a large mass of chocolate identity cards. I invite them to consider the possibility that these chocolate identity cards if issued at random may cease to be a badge of shame and the holders of chocolate identity cards might be regarded as the martyrs of this country.

Enche' Mohamed Yusof bin Mahmud (Tēmērlōh): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bērasa hairan, kita ada, di-tēngah² kita ini, ra'ayat yang ta'at sētia-nya kapada nēgēri ini, chuba mēmpertahankan hak² atau pun kēmewahan² yang di-nikmati oleh orang yang bukan daripada ra'ayat Pērsēkutuan Tanah Mēlayu dēngan lain kata mēnjadi champion for the Alliance. Saya muskil bērkēnaan dēngan hal ini, satu puak daripada pēmbangkang chuba mēmbebaskan atau pun mēmbēnarkan orang² luar, orang yang bukan ra'ayat Pērsēkutuan Tanah Mēlayu dudok dalam nēgēri ini bērsama² dēngan kita dēngan tidak ada pērbezaan. Saya rasa dalam hal ini satu² ra'ayat yang ta'at sētia bagi nēgēri ini ta' patut dan ta' mungkin buat sa-dēmikian. Bagitu juga daripada pehak pēmbangkang yang mēngatakan freedom of movement, freedom of speech, tētapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bebas kita, bebas satu Kērajaan yang demokrasi, bebas dalam pērundangan, bukan-lah boleh bebas kēhēndak hati kita, maka ini satu point patut pehak pēmbangkang ingat.

Tiap² satu buah nēgēri yang mērdeka, maka ada undang²-nya, untok kēbaikan nēgēri-nya. Kalau nēgēri itu tidak ada undang², bebas sēgala²-nya, maka saya rasa bukan-lah satu nēgēri yang bērtamaddun dan satu nēgēri yang kēmanusiaan. Dalam hal ini, saya suka-lah

mēnarek perhatian kapada puak pembangkang yang baharu keluar ini mengambil perhatian dari ucapan² saya dalam mema'anakan kebebasan. Saya umpamakan, kita boleh bebas bertelanjang di-khalayak orang ramai dan bebas segala²-nya, kalau mengikut tafsiran daripada pehak pembangkang itu tadi. Maka bebas kita ia-lah dengan Perlēmbagaan, bebas dalam undang², dan ini undang² ia-lah satu undang² menjaga nēgēri kita. Kita tahu nēgēri kita sa-lama ini, dalam masa penjajah, maka orang² asing telah di-bukakan pintu masok sa-luas²-nya kapada mereka ka-nēgēri kita ini. Maka dengan hal ini, maka saya sa-bagai ra'ayat jelata nēgēri ini tidak berkēhendakkan mereka² itu tadi bebas dalam nēgēri kita, bebas mēndapat nikmat, dapat mēngeluarkan harta kekayaan nēgēri ini untuk nēgēri masing² di-luar Tanah Mēlayu. Maka saya rasa ini-lah satu chara-nya yang dapat kita memērhentikan mereka² itu. Yang lagi satu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sēmēnjak kita mērdeka dan sēmēnjak kita telah mēngadakan Undang² Kera'ayatan, banyak orang² asing yang patut boleh jadi ra'ayat nēgēri ini, tētapi tidak suka mengambil kera'ayatan nēgēri ini. Maka di-sini-lah tanda² yang patut kita adakan pada mereka² itu, jika mereka² ini di-biarkan bērsuka hati tidak mēngambil kera'ayatan Pērsēkutuan Tanah Mēlayu, apa akan jadi kapada nēgēri kita? Kita tidak dapat tēnaga-nya. Umpama-nya, pada masa yang sudah kita hēndak mēnchari tēnaga manusia, maka mereka² ini pun mēngambil pēluang mēngatakan mereka bukan ra'ayat Pērsēkutuan Tanah Mēlayu, bahkan keluar daripada nēgēri ini, tētapi mereka² ini mēndapat nikmat segala kekayaan nēgēri ini dengan tidak payah hēndak mēnumpukan atau mēmbēri tēnaga-nya kapada nēgēri ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, maka usul ini saya fikir mustahak di-jalankan dengan sērtamērta, tērima kaseh.

Enche' Hamzah bin Alang (Kapar): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sēmēnjak pagi tadi kita mēndēngar bērhubong dengan pērbahathan Identity Card ini sa-hingga pētang ini pun ta' habis lagi, pada hal bila kita mēshuarat dalam rumah Yang Bērhormat ini, kita telah bērdo'a, bērunding, bērpakat pērkara yang baik.

Dalam Bill ini banyak puak pehak pembangkang telah mēnyatakan pēndapat-nya tēntang ta' baik-nya, yang baik-nya tidak ada. Jadi saya bērpēndapat, kita harus mēmbandingkan tēntang kēadaan pēnduduk² di-Pērsēkutuan Tanah Mēlayu hari ini, di-Pērsēkutuan Tanah Mēlayu sa-bagaimana yang kita tahu pēnduduk²-nya tērdiri dari sēmuā bangsa. Jadi kita tidak-lah boleh mēnyamakan Pērsēkutuan Tanah Mēlayu ini sa-bagai nēgēri² asing yang banyak pēnduduk bangsa itu sēndiri dalam-nya. Bukan pula erti-nya kita bēnchikan kapada pēnduduk² bangsa asing yang datang ka-tanah ayer kita ini, malah kita juga sayang dengan bangsa² asing itu yang datang ka-tanah ayer kita ini, maka itu-lah sēbab-nya kita bēri kad, tanda mēngēnalkan pada orang² yang datang ka-tanah ayer kita, kērana kasehkan orang itu (*Tēpok*).

Dari jumlah pēnduduk Tanah Mēlayu ini, sa-tēngah daripada pēnduduk²-nya, saya ta' suka-lah mēnyebutkan siapa², tētapi sa-tēngah pēnduduk itu ada yang mēnangis dan ada yang mēnjērit, kērana tērhimpit yang macham² datang-nya, ada yang sa-tēngah-nya gēlak-kētawa. Tētapi dengan ada-nya Bill ini, kalau ada 4 macham, bukan-lah erti-nya, kalau orang itu warna kad-nya merah, orang-nya pun merah—tidak—atau kalau dia choklat pun chuma kad-nya, ini ia-lah untuk mēnyēnangkan dan untuk mēnyēlēnggarakan satu pēratoran pēnduduk² Pērsēkutuan Tanah Mēlayu ini yang banyak tērdiri daripada bangsa² asing yang ada dalam Tanah Mēlayu ini.

Sa-bagaimana yang saya tahu, di-kampung saya ia-itu di-kawasan saya sēkarang ini, sēmēnjak keluar-nya bērita hēndak mēngadakan kad Pēngēnalan yang baharu, orang kampung chukup suka. bila lagi masa-nya Kērajaan hēndak mēngeluarkan-nya (*Tēpok*). Dan sēkarang di-tēmpat saya, orang sudah sēdia mēngambil gambar masing², ada yang 3 kēping 80 sen—sudah sēdia (*Kētawa*). Itu-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mēnyokong Bill ini dengan sa-pēnoh-nya, tērima kaseh.

Enche' Abdul Rauf bin Abdul Rahman (Krian Laut): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bērdiri di-dalam Majlis ini ia-lah untuk mēnyokong chadangan

daripada Yang Bèrhormat Mèntèri Dalam yang tèlah mèmbeŋtangkan National Registration ini. Saya tidak hèndak bèrchakap panjang bahawa saya bèrasa hairan dan pelek mèmikirkan sa-tèngah daripada Ahli² Yang Bèrhormat di-sabèlah sana mèmbeŋkang dan mèmpeŋtahkan supaya Undang² National Registration Bill ini jangan diluluskan oleh Majlis ini. Kita sèmu tahu baik² ia-itu tiap² sa-orang yang ada mèmpunyai Kad Pèngènanan ia-itu orang² yang tèlah di-aku² oleh Pèmèrentah nègèri ini bebas dudok dalam Tanah Mèlayu ini. Tètapi sa-tèngah dari sa-tèngah-nya pula peluang² yang di-bèri oleh Kèrajaan kapada orang² ini tidak pula di-sèmpurnakan-nya atau di-tunaikan kèwajipan² mènunjokkan ta'at sètia dalam nègèri ini bahkan ada pula yang kèluar dari hutan dan masok ka-dalam hutan. Sèlalu kita tèrbacha dalam Surat² Khabar sakian² orang mati kèna tembak. Dèngan ada mèmponyai Kad Pèngènanan bèrsèrta dengan nama-nya sakali, jadi dèngan ada-nya Undang² itu dapat di-bezakan. Kapada pènduduk² yang tèlah ada Kad Pèngènanan ta' dapat tidak di-situ tètuluah kita tahu ada-kah orang itu orang baik atau pun orang yang tidak baik. Kita bèrharap tiap² sa-orang pènduduk di-Tanah Mèlayu sama ada orang Mèlayu, orang China dan orang India kita bèrkèhendakkan biar-lah dudok dalam aman dalam nègèri ini. Dan bagi pehak Kèrajaan sèdang mèmikirkan-nya. Pada fikiran saya dèngan sa-luas²-nya bèrkènaan mængadakan Kad yang bèrchorak 3 warna itu ia-lah untok fa'edah bagi nègèri kita ini, untok fa'edah pènduduk² nègèri ini. Bagitu juga saya sa-bagaimana yang tèlah di-tèrangkan sa-orang daripada sahabat saya tadi bèrkènaan dèngan bèrsàngkutan Kad Pèngènanan bukan sahaja kapada orang Mèlayu tètapi juga kapada orang China dan orang India. Di-dalam kawasan saya juga orang sudah bèrsèdia mængambil gambar 3 kèping. Tiga kèping untok gambar Kad Pèngènanan baharu. Bèrèrti orang ini ada-lah orang yang ta'at sètia kapada Tanah Mèlayu yang tidak bèrbèlah bagi (Tèpok). Jadi di-sini saya bèrpèndapat kapada pehak pèmbeŋkang itu kalau ta' bèrsètju daripada Ahli² Yang Bèrhormat di-sèbèlah sana, saya takut²

bèrangkali ada udang di-sabalek batu, sakian sahaja yang boleh saya bèri pandangan. Saya uchapkan tèrima kaseh.

Ènche' Mohamed bin Ujang (Jèlèbu-Jèmpol): Tuan Yang di-Pèrtua, pagi ini kita tèlah mèndèngar bèbèrapa hujah daripada Ahli Yang Bèrhormat dari Dato' Kramat mènèrangkan dari sègi Undang² yang Bill ini tidak sèsuai dèngan spirit constitution kita yang ada sèkarang ini. Pada fikiran saya Tuan Yang di-Pèrtua, kalau-lah tidak sèsuai constitution itu, dan kita bèrsètju chadangan itu baik, tambahan pula saya fikir chadangan itu baik, Ahli² Yang Bèrhormat di-sini tètuluah bèrsètju mængambil kètètapan mèminda constitution itu bagi kèbaikan kita jika mustahak.

Tuan Yang di-Pèrtua, wakil dari Ipoh tadi tèlah bèrchakap panjang lebar mulai daripada pagi sampai pula ka-tèngah hari ini mèmpeŋtahkan pehak sa-bèlah sana tètapi apa yang sangat muskilkan sa-kali ia-lah wakil dari Ipoh itu chuba hèndak mèmpeŋtahkan sa-saorang yang tidak ada ta'at sètia kapada nègèri ini. Tuan Yang di-Pèrtua, saya fikir pèrkara ini ia-lah satu pèrkara yang tidak di-ingini orang² yang mængaku ta'at sètia kapada nègèri ini dan pehak di-sana harus mènèntang-nya dèngan sa-bèrapa boleh. Tuan Yang di-Pèrtua, saya tèringat-lah pada masa dahulu kètèrangan² dalam surat² khabar mængatakan dalam Majlis Federal ini dahulu ada orang chuba hèndak mèmpeŋtahkan gangster dan sa-bagai-nya. Maka pada mèshuarat pada hari ini

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order. I would ask the Honourable Speaker to ask the Honourable Member to withdraw his remark that somebody is championing the cause of the gangsters. If not, I would like to know who is.

Mr. Speaker: I did not hear that.

Ènche' Mohamed bin Ujang: Tuan Yang di-Pèrtua, saya tèlah tèrbacha dalam surat khabar pada masa dahulu ada pula dalam Majlis ini

Mr. Speaker: Tolong tinggalkan-lah perkara itu.

Enche' Mohamed bin Ujang: Ada orang dalam Majlis ini dahulu telah mempertahankan orang yang tidak sa-benar²-nya mengaku Kerajaan di-sini. Maka pada petang ini saya telah menyaksikan pula ada sa-tengah pehak hendak mempertahankan hak yang saya fikir tidak sa-kali² boleh dipertahankan kerana mereka itu bukan ta'at setia kepada negeri ini. Pada fikiran saya Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ta'at setia itu ia-itu kemegahan yang kita telah bagi kepada mereka itu.

Berkenaan dengan Kad Pengenalan bermacam warna tadi Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya fikir ini-lah satu jalan yang baik kerana kalau-lah Kad Pengenalan berupa ini untuk orang yang kurang baik dan warna ini untuk orang yang chukup baik, orang yang tidak baik itu akan berikhtiar dengan sa-boleh²-nya meminta Kad yang lebih baik itu. Saya rasa dengan mengadakan Kad Pengenalan bermacam² warna itu tidak menjadikan mengechap sa-saorang itu sampai bila² menjadi jahat tetapi boleh menjadi satu semangat dan berkehendak menjadi sa-orang yang berguna kepada negeri ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak lagi hendak berchakap panjang melainkan berkenaannya seruan dari Ahli Bukit Kramat tadi ia-itu kita mesti-lah tidak mengikut party whip dan mengikut fikiran² yang bebas. Jadi, sa-sudah saya fikirkan sa-benar²-nya dan sa-halus²-nya saya terpaksa menentang pehak² yang di-sabalah sana, terima kaseh.

Dato' Onn bin Jaafar: Tuan Peng-
rusi, saya menumpang bertanya si-
pakah Ahli Yang Berhormat Bukit
Kramat itu?

Mr. Speaker: Dato' Kramat. Dia kata
Bukit. (*Ketawa*).

Enche' Tajudin bin Ali (Larut Utara):
Dato' Yang di-Pertua, Dato', saya
bangun menyokong Bill yang telah di-
kemukakan oleh Kerajaan. Dato' Yang
di-Pertua, Semenanjong kita ini kecil
dan mempunyai satu Kerajaan yang
tegap dan kuat. Di-keliling negeri kita
pula, ada bermacam² negeri yang
mempunyai berlainan ideology. Kita

hendak mempertahankan keamanan
kita dengan mengadakan Kad Peng-
nalan bagi orang² yang ta'at setia dan
patoh kepada negeri ini. Maka sebab
ini-lah kita takut orang² luar masuk
ka-negeri ini. Dengan ada-nya Kad
Pengenalan dapat-lah kita bezakan.
Kalau di-tanya saya sendiri, saya
tentu berkata bahawa itu patut kita
baharui—Kad Pengenalan tiap² lima
tahun, kerana kalau di-perhatikan
tiap² orang kita di-sini ada mempunyai
Kad Pengenalan. Dan ada sa-tengah-
nya pula ta' dapat di-bacha kerana
kotor dan burok. Jadi, patut-lah
sangat bagi 4-5 tahun kita baharui
sa-kali. Kerajaan kita sangat² baik
dengan bangsa² asing. Chuba kita
tengok Singapura, negeri jiran kita,
boleh keluar masuk—ta' ada negeri
di-dalam dunia ini yang lebih baik
daripada Tanah Melayu ini dengan di-
diami oleh berbagai² bangsa kulit
puteh, hitam, kuning, maka semua-nya
itu boleh keluar masuk, tetapi orang
yang dudok di-negeri ini ta' tahu
menikmati yang Kerajaan ini baik—
lebih daripada baik.

Dato' Yang di-Pertua, ada-lah Kad²
baru itu bermacam² chorak yang di-
sebutkan oleh Yang Berhormat wakil
dari Ipoh. Ini bukan-lah berma'ana
yang puteh di-beri kepada orang
Melayu, merah kepada orang India—
tidak begitu, bahkan semua bangsa
sa-rupa juga. Ahli Yang Berhormat
itu baik dengan saya, tetapi saya ta'
setuju sedikit dengan-nya, kerana kita
di-sini mesti-lah berdiri sa-bagai satu
bangsa, Malayan.

Berkenaan dengan Polis pula, saya
fikir kalau di-tanya fikiran saya sendiri,
saya mesti beri kuasa istimewa kepada
Polis. Sebab kalau orang jahat patut-
lah terus kita hantar ka-dalam jail.
Kita ta' mahu yang Kerajaan kita
terlalu bertimbang rasa sa-hinggakan
ta' ada Kerajaan yang lebih baik di-
seluruh dunia ini. Polis telah pun men-
chuba menjalankan pentadbiran-nya
yang 'adil tetapi ta' sunyi daripada tu-
dohan—yang itu ta' baik dan ini ta'
baik, tetapi saya rasa Polis itu men-
dapat latehan yang terator dan ada
yang sa-tengah-nya pula mendapat
latehan di-luar negeri. Dengan yang

démikian mēreka sangat² bērtanggong-jawab. Kalau kita pērhatikan nēgēri yang bērjiran, maka tēntu kita dapati bahawa kalau salah sadikit sahaja—3 bulan tērus di-hantar masok jail.

Dato' Yang di-Pērtua, dua tahun yang lēpas saya tēlah pun bēruchap di-dalam Majlis Mēshuarat nēgēri Perak mēnyatakan bahawa orang² yang ta' baik mahu pun Wakil Ra'ayat atau orang² awam patut kita simpan di-sabua pulau, tētapi Kērajaan kita tērlalu bērtimbang rasa ta' sētuju dēngan pēndapat saya itu. Sa-baleknya Kērajaan adakan Kad Pēngēnalan yang bērwarna². Yang warna coklat di-bēri kapada orang² yang kurang baik kēlakuan-nya. Sunggoh pun di-kalangan kita banyak juga orang² yang dēmikian Kērajaan maseh mēmbēri pēluang kapada mēreka itu bērchampor gaul dēngan baik-nya dalam nēgēri kita ini. Dēngan yang dēmikian, maka dapat-lah kita dēngan pimpinan Yang Tēramat Mulia Tēngku, kita boleh mēmbēntok satu bangsa yang bērchorak Malayan yang sa-bēnar²-nya.

Tuan Syed Ja'afar bin Hasan Albar: Tuan Yang di-Pērtua, ada bēbērapa fikiran dan ucapan daripada Ahli² Party Pēmbangkang tadi yang mana saya bērasa pērlu mēnēgor-nya dan tidak boleh di-biarkan bērlalu bagitu sahaja. Wakil dari Ipoh dalam ucapan-nya daripada hari sa-malam lagi mēmbawa-lah ka-hari ini tēlah mēngulang² mēnyēbut pērkataan Demokrasi Tērpimpin atau Guided Democracy. Kita di-dalam nēgēri ini tidak kēnal Guided Democracy dan kalau di-dalam nēgēri ini ada Guided Democracy, maka Ahli Yang Bērhormat dari Ipoh itu tidak ada di-dalam Dewan ini.

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification. I sit here by the voice of the people and you cannot send me out of here.

The Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order. That is democracy—not guided democracy—and by that you are here (*Applause*).

Tuan Syed Ja'afar bin Hasan Albar: Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pērtua, lagi satu

pērkara yang di-ongkit²kan, di-mithal²kan, di-chontoh²kan ia-lah kēadaan dan Pēmērentahan nēgēri ini dēngan mēngambil pērbandingan daripada Kērajaan Kuku Bēsi Hitler. Pērbandingan ini ada-lah satu pērbandingan yang tidak bērasas dan kalau Pēmērentahan nēgēri ini bēnar² bērchorak Pēmērentahan Hitler, barangkali yang mula² hēndak mērasa pēnangan-nya ia-lah Ahli Yang Bērhormat dari Ipoh dan Mēnglēmbu—nasib mēreka bērtuah kērana mēreka mēndapat Kērajaan Pērikatan yang chukup bērtimbang rasa.

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise on a point of order, because the Honourable Member made a personal remark relating to me although my name was not mentioned.

Mr. Speaker: That was out of your speech.

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: It also applies to the Minister of Finance.

Tuan Syed Ja'afar bin Hasan Albar: Tuan Yang di-Pērtua, lagi satu pērkara yang sangat mēnghairankan saya ia-lah ada di-antara Ahli² Socialist Front, juga People's Progressive Party yang bērasa tērlampau bērat bērkēnaan dēngan Undang² Dharurat. Saya hairan sunggoh kērana Ahli Yang Bērhormat itu mēnyēbutkan sambil mēngongkit² motive Kērajaan British yang mēngadakan Undang² Dharurat itu. Konon-nya, untok mēnyēkat orang ramai di-dalam nēgēri ini daripada mēmpērjuangkan kēmērdekaan.

Saya bērdiri di-sini, Tuan Yang di-Pērtua, tidak bērhajat hēndak mēmbela dan mēmpērtahankan Kērajaan Pēnjajah yang kita tēlah hambat kēluar daripada nēgēri ini, tētapi sa-pērkara yang patut saya sēbutkan di-dalam Dewan ini dēngan tēgas ia-itu walau bagaimana pun motive dari Kērajaan British bērkēnaan dēngan Undang² Dharurat itu namun kita tēlah mēncapai kēmērdekaan dan kēdaulatan. Ini-lah yang mēnjadi soal. Tujuan Undang² Dharurat, Tuan Yang di-Pērtua, bukan untok hēndak mēnyēkat—bukan untok hēndak mēnyēmpitkan pērjalanan orang yang sētia dan siuman di-dalam nēgēri ini, tētapi Undang² Dharurat ada-lah di-tujukan

kapada anasir², element² yang chuba hëndak mēruntohan dan mērosakkan Kērajaan dan kēsēlamatan nēgēri ini.

Saya hairan bēnar kēnapa ada diantara Ahli² Pēmbangkang yang bērasa bērat bērkēnaan dēngan Undang² Dharurat ini, dēngan ada-nya

Enche' Ahmad Boestamam: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya minta penjēlasan.

Mr. Speaker: Hēndak di-sēbutkan di-bawah mana? Boleh minta kētērahan itu sahaja.

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: If he can't produce the point of order

Mr. Speaker: I know. Boleh mēnēgor dua sahaja. On a point of clarification dan on a point of order.

Enche' Ahmad Boestamam: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ta' mēnyēbut pērkataan order, kēraana itu bukan bahasa saya.

Mr. Speaker: Di-bawah mana?

Enche' Ahmad Boestamam: Di-bawah Pēratoran 36, soal yang kita binchangkan ia-lah soal National Registration. Yang Bērhormat Mēntēri Muda Pēnērahan kita tēlah mēmbabitkan soal Dharurat—Dharurat. Kēnapa? Tētapi itu ta' bērsangkut dēngan National Registration dan National Registration sēkarang ini hēndak di-buat di-luar daripada Undang² Dharurat. Jadi, kēnapa di-bangkitkan.

Mr. Speaker: Saya bēnarkan ini oleh sēbab Undang² Dharurat itu tēlah bērbangkit tērlēbeh dahulu oleh pehak yang bērchapak tadi (*Tēpok*). Itu saya bēnarkan, jikalau dia sēndiri bērchapak salah dēngan tidak mēngikut Pēratoran, saya sēndiri mēnahan-nya (*Tēpok*).

Tuan Syed Ja'afar bin Hasan Albar: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tērpaksa mēnyēbutkan bērkēnaan dēngan Undang² Dzarurat dan kalau Ahli Yang Bērhormat daripada Sētapak mēnganggap pērchakapan saya ini tērkēluar, maka mēreka-lah yang sa-bēnar-nya kēluar, dan saya hanya ikut dari bēlakang sahaja. Bērkēnaan dēngan Undang² Dzarurat yang di-bēratkan sangat, di-sungutkan sangat, di-tangis dan di-

ratapkan sangat oleh Ahli² Yang Bērhormat daripada People's Progressive Party, Socialist Front tadi tēlah pun mēnyēlamatkan nyawa bērmillion² manusia yang ada dalam nēgēri ini dan sunggoh pun Undang² Dzarurat ini ada, tētapi banyak kawasan hitam dalam nēgēri ini yang tēlah mēnjadi puteh. Apa gērahan-nya Ahli² Yang Bērhormat itu bimbangkan sangat bērkēnaan dēngan Undang² Dzarurat ini, kalau kawasan² hitam dalam nēgēri ini samakin banyak, umpama-nya dahulu ada satu kampong sahaja yang hitam dan sēkarang 100 kampong tēlah jadi hitam, barangkali kita bērsimpati, bērtimbang rasa juga kapada pēndapat yang di-bawa oleh Ahli² Yang Bērhormat dari sa-bēlah pēmbangkang sana.

Tujuan mēngadakan Bill ini dan kad² yang baharu ini ia-lah untok mēmēlihara dan untok mēmbezakan ra'ayat², pēnduduk² yang ada dalam nēgēri. Kēraana bagaimana yang kita sēndiri sēmula kētahu, banyak tēlah bērlaku agak-nya kēpalsuan dalam Identity Card, dan juga maseh ada orang yang mēnchuri masok ka-Tanah Mēlayu daripada nēgēri² yang bērjiran, oleh kēraana pantai Tanah Mēlayu ini dan pērayeran-nya tērlampau panjang. ta' dapat-lah hēndak di-adakan satu kawalan yang chukup rapi mēnahan orang² luar daripada masok ka-Tanah Mēlayu ini dēngan jalan haram. Ini-lah orang² yang kita hēndak chari dan ini-lah orang² yang kita hēndak tapis dan sēkat gērahan mēreka supaya tidak mēmbahayakan kēamanan dan kēsēlamatan nēgēri ini (*Tēpok*).

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli Yang Bērhormat daripada Bungsar mēngatakan, apakala mēngulas bērkēnaan dēngan warna² kad tadi, ia mēminta supaya tidak akan mēmbabitkan ra'ayat yang baik dan sētia. Yang sa-bēnar-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tujuan mēngadakan kad bērwarna², ini ia-lah untok mēmileh antah daripada bēras. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tompang bērasa dukachita, kēraana nampak-nya ahli² daripada Pērsatuan Islam sa-Tanah Mēlayu atau pun PAS, ada gaya² hēndak mēmbangkang dan

sudah pun ada suara-nya tadi hendak meminta supaya perkara ini ditangguhkan bila di-usulkan satu pindaan kapada usul yang ada di-hadapan kita ini. Saya berasa kēsāl dan dukachita

Wan Mustapha bin Haji Ali: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would refer to Standing Order 35, which states that all observations should be addressed to the Chair—not to this side.

Mr. Speaker: That is a very small point.

Tuan Syed Ja'afar bin Hasan Albar: Boleh saya pandang tetapi saya hendak menerima kaseh (*Kētava*) yang saya berasa hairan dan kēsāl ialah kerana sa-lama ini saya telah mendengar, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bahawa ugama Islam yang konon-nya di-wakili oleh Persatuan Islam ini atau pun yang mengaku pembela ugama itu mengatakan bahawa ugama Islam bertentangan dengan Komunizem. Jadi, sa-kira-nya benar apa yang PAS katakan itu

Mr. V. David: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about Communism but about this Bill.

Mr. Speaker: He is not touching on Communism.

Mr. David: He is referring back—he is making unwarranted references to the past.

Mr. Speaker: No, he is talking about the P.M.I.P.'s objectives.

Mr. David: There is nothing in the Bill about Communism.

Dato' Suleiman: Mr. Speaker, if you give a ruling to that point—I must point out that I myself said that I did not bring forward this Bill under the Emergency Regulations, and I repeated it just now, but the Members on the other side keep on talking about the Emergency Regulations. Now, surely, we can bring up other things which other parties bring forward.

Mr. David: On a point of information, we only said that certain aspects of the Emergency Regulations are being brought into this Bill.

Mr. Speaker: Proceed.

Tuan Syed Ja'afar bin Hasan Albar: Tuan Yang di-Pertua

Mr. Speaker: Jangan sebutkan fasal komunizem.

Tuan Syed Ja'afar bin Hasan Albar: . . . yang menjadi tujuan Undang²—Rang Undang² ini ia-lah hendak memelihara negeri ini daripada gerakan² subversive. Jadi, apabila sa-buah parti yang mengaku diri-nya Parti Islam dia tidak menyokong Undang² atau Rang Undang² yang hendak menghambat atau hendak menghapus gerakan² subversive dalam negeri ini, maka ini satu perkara yang saya ta' dapat erti dan ta' dapat fahamkan. Sa-patut-nya Rang Undang² ini di-sokong kuat bukan sahaja oleh Government bench tetapi sa-patut-nya daripada rakan² Yang Berhormat di-hadapan saya ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, terima kaseh.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad (Bachok): Tuan Yang di-Pertua

Mr. Speaker: Saya nampak yang sana.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad: Terima kaseh.

Mr. Speaker: Lain kali kalau hendak bangun, tengok-lah saya dulu.

Mr. K. Karam Singh: Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the Honourable the Assistant Minister who spoke with such fire is not present in this Chamber at the moment

Tuan Haji Abdul Khalid: He is hearing in the Lobby.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Mr. Karam Singh: Mr. Speaker, we presume he has retreated to a safe place out of the range of fire.

Tuan Haji Abdul Khalid: Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification, he has gone to have a drink.

Mr. Karam Singh: Mr. Speaker, that Assistant Minister said he drove out colonialism from Malaya.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: No, no!

Mr. Karam Singh: He said he is against colonialism, but to-day, Mr. Speaker, I charge the entire Alliance Government with being fully in love with colonialism. Mr. Speaker, the two

most repressive, the two most destructive instruments of colonialism: the Emergency Regulations and the British Army, are still retained by the Alliance. (HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear.) Malaya will not be free

The Prime Minister: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: as I understand it, the debate is on the second reading of the National Registration Bill. It has nothing to do with the British Army or colonialism. The matter before the House would not have taken so much time for discussion if Members had confined themselves to discussing this Bill.

Enche' Ahmad Boestamam: On a point of order juga Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya rasa Menteri Muda itu tidak sangkut-menyangkut dengan dasar PAS atau tujuan PAS tetapi dipanjangkan berkenaan itu juga. Kalau hendak di-bangkit menyentoh kasanya, menyentoh ka-mari

Mr. Speaker: I must give a ruling on that. Saya boleh beri dia-nya perintah. Saya kata Ahli² Yang Berhormat ini boleh membahathkan principle—dasar² Rang Undang² yang ada di-hadapan Majlis ini. Apa juga dasar berkait dengan Rang Undang² ini saya boleh bənarkan tiap² Ahli bərchakap dalam hal itu tetapi dia tidak boleh kəluar daripada dasar-nya. Tetapi jikalau pada sa-sorang Ahli sudah menyebutkan satu² perkara atau dasar-nya dan bagi pehak Ahli yang lain boleh menjawab pula atas perkara itu. Bagitu-lah biasa-nya di-jalankan di-mana² Parli-men dalam dunia ini.

Enche' Ahmad Boestamam: Ada-kah tidak soal yang di-sentoh oleh saudara dari Damansara tadi menyentoh apa yang di-chakapkan oleh Menteri Muda tadi?

Mr. Speaker: Dia menyebutkan tentang "colonialism" perkara ini yang di-sentoh tadi, itu yang di-tahan oleh pehak di-sabəlah sini.

Mr. Speaker: Will you confine yourself to the principles only?

Mr. Karam Singh: The Honourable Assistant Minister made certain slanders

Dato' Suleiman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, may I ask that the Honourable Member confine his speech to the Bill instead of answering one another.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member must speak on the principle of the Bill, but he can answer on any matter or point raised by any other Member.

Enche' Ahmad Boestamam: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya minta Tuan Yang di-Pertua sėkarang mėmpaskan satu ruling, kalau Majlis ini mėmbėnarkan jawab-mėnjawab, ya! mari kita jawab-mėnjawab. Kalau Majlis ini hendak mėmbinchangekan Bill ini, mari kita mėmbinchangekan-nya.

Mr. Speaker: Tiap² Bill bėrjalan di-Parli-men ini ada-lah dalam jagaan Tuan Yang di-Pertua ia-itu saya sėndiri. Saya tidak boleh mėmbėnarkan Ahli² ini mėnudoh sa-sorang yang lain dan mėnjawab atau pun mėng-ganggu pėrjalanan pėrbahathan di-atas satu² pėrkara tėrhadap Majlis ini. Saya tidak boleh bėnarkan bagitu, jikalau bėrlaku bagitu saya sėndiri ada bėr-kuasa boleh mėnahan dan sa-hingga sampai ada kuasa boleh mėngėluarkan sa-sorang daripada Majlis ini. Ada-lah yang kita bahathkan di-hadapan Majlis ini ia-itu satu Rang Undang² National Registration yang di-bahath-kan pada dasar-nya sahaja. Jadi saya minta-lah Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang bėrchakap dalam mėngambil bahagian dalam pėrbahathan ini supaya mėnum-pukan pėrbahathan-nya kepada dasar-nya supaya tidak lari atau tėrkėluar daripada dasar itu. Jikalau Ahli² Yang Berhormat maseh hendak bėrchakap luar daripada dasar-nya saya akan mėnahan dia dan jika susah juga lagi mahu mėngikut, saya akan pėrhatikan pėrbahathan ini sėmėntara.

Mr. Karam Singh, will you confine yourself to the principles of the Bill. Do not go beyond that—we are now discussing the principles of the Bill.

Mr. Karam Singh: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to this House and to the entire country that in introducing this Bill the Government is following the inglorious example

of the Union of South Africa, which it only recently condemned. (Honourable Members: No, no!). In the Union of South Africa you have identity cards for people. Mr. Speaker, in Kenya the British have imposed identity cards, and the people are struggling to free themselves from that inglorious imposition on them.

These identity cards are outmoded. They are not in keeping with the spirit of independence. In this respect the past colonial practice is being followed, continued, perpetuated by the Alliance. There are Honourable Ministers on the Government Bench who preach to-day a doctrine regarding subversion. But, Sir, I charge to-day these preachers of this same doctrine that they themselves are committing subversion of the ordinary law of this land. They are smuggling provisions of the Emergency Regulations piecemeal into separate permanent legislation. This is an attempt that is taking place here, that is subverting the ordinary law of the land, and such being the case, the House must reject this Bill.

Sir, it is regrettable that reference has been made to America as the source of these identity cards. We hope that the American F.B.I. is not having

Dato' Suleiman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: does the Honourable Member want me to lie and say that I don't know where they came from?

Mr. Speaker: It is all right, I think you can say that. You are quite in order. You are relevant.

Mr. Karam Singh: Thank you, Sir.

Sir, we do not know—the American F.B.I. may have a hand in this. (*Laughter*). This may be inspired by the strange doctrine of the late Mr. McCarthy in America. How do we know that this is not an indigenous idea, Sir. (*Laughter*).

Enche' Mohamed Asri bin Haji Muda (Pasir Puteh): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak-lah hendak bërchakap banyak dalam përkara ini, dan jangan-lah ada di-antara Ahli² yang

hadhir di-Majlis ini mënyangka yang saya hendak mëmbangkang dan hendak mënjawab përtanyaan salah seorang Yang Bërhormat Mëntëri Muda tadi. Sa-bënar-nya sa-panjang përbahathan ini bërjalan, kami dari pehak Party PAS bëlum lagi mënayakan pada Yang Bërhormat Mëntëri apa yang di-katakan sokongan pindaan, tëtëpi ia-lah sa-kadar përbahathan bagi kali yang këdua bërhubung dëngan Bill ini.

Maka sëkarang, Tuan Yang di-Përtua, saya bërdiri di-sini untuk mënampaikan sadikit pëndirian kami tërhadap Bill ini. Pada dasar-nya bahawa Pëndaftaran Këbangsaan itu ada-lah baik, dan ini kami tëläh mënimbangan dëngan chërmat; di-samping itu kami mëmandang apa yang tëläh bërjalan sëkarang ini, dëngan ada-nya Kad² chara yang biasa ini ada-lah mënëpati bagi këmendak² mëngadakan Pëndaftaran Këbangsaan itu. Kalau sa-kira-nya kita mëngikut chara² pëndaftaran daripada Bill yang di-këmukakan di-Dewan ini pada hari ini rasa-nya ada-lah mënysahkan kapada ra'ayat.

Kami mëmandang dari sudut ra'ayat nëgëri ini yang mana hendak mënukar satu Kad Pëngënalán yang lama kapada yang baharu itu mëstilah ia mënysiapkan gambar dëngan mënysediakan wang sa-banyak 50 sen. Walau pun ada sahabat saya Ahli Yang Bërhormat yang bërchakap dahulu yang mana orang² di-kawasan dia tëläh bër sedia tërlebeh dahulu mëmbuat gambar sa-bëlum Bill ini di-këmukakan tëtëpi orang² di-kawasan saya khas-nya bëlum-lah bër sedia lagi bagi mëmbuat gambar²-nya itu (*Këtawa*). Tuan Yang di-Përtua, dalam pëngalaman saya, yang saya përhatakan sa-lama ini bahawa sa-saorang yang këmilangan satu Kad Pëngënalán, maka chukup-lah sulit hendak di-buat Kad Pëngënalán yang baharu, kërana përtama-nya duit ta' ada. Èntah-lah kalau orang² di-Pantai Barat barangkali banyak duit, tëtëpi saya përchaya orang² di-Pantai Timor itu ta' ada. Jadi, apa yang kami hendak tërangkan bahawa sa-takat yang bërjalan dëngan

Kad Pengenalan ini ya'ani yang berjalan sekarang ini, kami rasa tidak-lah mustahak bagi pindaan baharu.

Sa-përkarra lagi bërhubung dengen soal warna warni rasa-nya terringat juga saya hëndak bërchakap di-Majlis ini ia-itu saya bukan-lah hëndak bërchakap atas warna merah, biru dan hijau. Tètapi yang mènarek pèrhatian saya ia-lah warna coklat. Orang² yang nanti mëndapat warna coklat itu, rasa saya pëlueang hidup-nya adalah tèrlalu tipis pada masa yang akan datang. Pèrtama sa-kali yang mèsti di-kaji ia-lah di-atas pèrtimbangan dan dasar mana-kah yang tiap² sa-orang itu dapat di-hukum, sa-hingga dia itu mèsti di-bèri kad coklat.

Kèdua, apabila sa-saorang itu tël原因 hëndak mëndapat kad coklat bagaimana-kah proses bagi mèmbolehkan dia mngubah kad coklat-nya kapada kad yang biasa-nya, mithal-nya warna merah atau biru. Jadi, sa-lama itu-lah jika dia tètapi mèmegang kad coklat yang ada di-tangan-nya, maka buat sa-lama itu pula pëlueang bagi mènchari pèkèrjaan hidup agak tèrkandas. Maka ini-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pèrtua, saya mngatakan bahawa kalau-lah pehak kami yang mènnyatakan pada pètang ini mèmbangkang Bill ini atau mènèntang Bill ini bukan-lah kèrana tujuan-nya ta' baik, tètapi maksud atau tujuan pèlaksanaan-nya itu tël原因 pun sèsuai dengen yang ada pada hari ini. Itu-lah sahaja pènèrangan saya, tèrima kaseh.

Dato' Suleiman: Tuan Speaker, saya mèm bawa Rang Undang² ini bagi bacaan kali yang kèdua. Sa-tël原因 saya katakan pada pagi tadi ada-lah tujuan yang sa-bagus²-nya—tujuan bagi hëndak mènolong ra'ayat jèlata—ra'ayat di-kampong² yang susah kalau hëndak pèrgi ka-bandar, maka mèstilah ada mèmpunyai Kad Pengenalan. Pada hari ini banyak Kad Pengenalan yang ada salah kènnyata'an dan oleh kèrana tël原因 tèrbiar atau dengen lain² sèbab maka yang sènanng sa-kali ia-lah 'alamat-nya, tèmpat kèdìaman yang ta' di-tukar, umur yang ta' di-tukar dan sèrba sèrbi-nya. Banyak kènnyataan²-nya itu—kènnyataan yang ada

di-situ, barangkali Ahli² Yang Bèrhormat sèndiri tahu bahawa pada masa saya mènjadi Hakim dahulu tël原因 pun ada banyak orang² yang di-bawa ka-hadapan Magistrate—di-tudoh dan di-hukum. Dan yang susah pada hari ini ia-lah hëndak mèm bètulkan bahawa banyak Kad Pengenalan Pèrsèkutuan ini ada di-punyaì oleh orang² yang dudok di-Hongkong, Indonesia, Singapura, India, Ceylon dan lain² lagi. Kèsusahan yang bèsar sa-kali bagi Kad Pengenalan ini, ia-lah kèrana mëndapat citizenship—kèra'ayatan dan boleh pula mëndapat passport. Barangkali kalau saya tèrangkan di-sini kapada Ahli² Yang Bèrhormat bahawa ada orang yang ta' ada passport yang bèrani mèm bayar sampai \$10,000 kèrana bèrkèhèndakkan passport dan passport itu boleh di-dapati dengen jalan ini.

Kad Pengenalan dan kèra'ayatan ini-lah yang mustahak bènar hëndak di-adakan bagi Undang² baharu. Pada masa saya pèrgi ka-Hongkong, saya tahu bahawa banyak orang² di-sana ada yang mèm punyai Kad Pengenalan Pèrsèkutuan. Di-Singapura pada hari ini, nègèri Colonial Territory yang mana banyak orang² di-Singapura ada mèm punyai kad ini. Jadi, dengen sèbab itu-lah kita hëndak mngadakan Kad Pengenalan baharu. Saya fikir jawapan ini tèn tu-lah mngènai sèmu sèkali kapada Ahli² Yang Bèrhormat yang bërchakap tadi. Ini ia-lah pèngètahuan yang ada di-Kèmèntèrian yang saya tahu. tètapi kalau hëndak di-bawa ka-Mahkamah—di-tudoh bukan-nya sènanng. Sa-lain daripada itu biar saya tèrangkan kapada Ahli Yang Bèrhormat dari Pasir Puteh dahulu yang mana kata-nya dia bèsètujui dengen tujuan Rang Undang² ini. Saya mngucapkan bèrbanyak tèrima kaseh, tètapi bagi mènanggoahkan pèrkara ini ada-kah Ahli Yang Bèrhormat dari Pasir Puteh itu sèdar bahawa jikalau di-tanggoahkan sa-tahun maka bèrapa banyak lagi kèra'ayatan boleh di-dapati dengen jalan ini yang kita ta' dapat hëndak mèm pèrtahankan Kad Pengenalan yang ada pada hari ini.

Pengētahuan yang di-bēri ini barangkali saya fikir tēntu-lah Ahli Yang Bērhormat dari Pasir Putih tidak tahu—ini terlēbeh ma'alom. Dan bērkēnaan dēngan Ahli² Yang Bērhormat yang lain yang bērchakap dalam bahasa Inggris tadi biar saya tērangkan dalam bahasa Inggris.

Turning to the Honourable Member from Dato Kramat, I would refer him to Article 74 of the Malayan Constitution, which says:

"(1) Without prejudice to any power to make laws conferred on it by any other Article, Parliament may make laws with respect to any of the matters enumerated in the Federal List or the Concurrent List (that is to say, the First or Third List set out in the Ninth Schedule)."

In that Ninth Schedule, First List, one of the subjects is: National Registration.

I have no intention of underrating the intelligence or the vast knowledge which Honourable Members in this House possess. That is why I began my introduction of this Bill with a very innocuous statement, a very simple statement, hoping fully well that Honourable Members would surely know that the object of these identity cards is to help the people from the rural areas.

Of course the Honourable Member from Ipoh quoted Hitler's views and so on, but I will give him the benefit of the doubt and assume that he merely wants to use his rhetoric. In any case, I gather that he objected to the colour red. Mr. Speaker, only this afternoon, coming up here, did I realise that my Honourable friend's car is red. I hope that he did not think that I suggested red because I already knew the colour of his car. I did not mean the red colour for him—it is a very nice car (*Laughter*).

With regard to the other objection put up by the Honourable Member from Ipoh, I need not reply because, as I say, though the origin of the cards might have been from the Emergency Regulations, since then it has been found from experience that these cards are of great help to the people. And if what the Honourable Member from Ipoh says is true—that the Police keep

on calling people to the Police Station—then these cards will help them immeasurably. The trouble is that, as I have found from my experience as a legal practitioner, I have to depend on these identity cards a great deal, and there are also many departments which require them.

Sir, the Honourable Member from Bungsar was carried away by his rhetoric. As a Minister, I can assure him that I am proud to have expatriate Secretaries serving under me. They are very loyal. But they have never influenced me. On the other hand, they have done their work loyally to the Government of this country, and I can assure the House that I would be the last Minister to be influenced by anybody, let alone Secretaries. Here again, the Honourable Member unfortunately hasn't got a car, but I gather his objection is only to the chocolate colour. Now, I used the word "chocolate" in Malay, but the colour actually is brown. I have been asking everybody, but there is no word in Malay for brown so it is "chocolate" (*Laughter*).

Sir, the Member for Bungsar has attributed sinister motives to me in bringing this Bill, and yet he keeps on appealing to me. I don't know what to do actually (*Laughter*). Sir, I would prefer to give him the benefit of the doubt—that he does'nt mean I have got sinister motives, but that I personally look sinister.

With regard to the remarks of the Honourable Member from Menglembu, it is not the intention of this Bill to divide people into three sections but to make the administrative work easier—all these different colours. Sir, under a law passed by Parliament, an Order can be made after an inquiry for a cross to be put on a person's identity card. Now, if at the present time a white card carries a cross, does it matter very much that it is changed to a card of a brown colour? The only thing I can say here is that I hope that the Member from Menglembu will bear kindly towards the "chocolate" colour.

On one thing I am afraid I must disagree with the Honourable Member from Menglembu, and that is when he

says that these chocolate cards, when produced in court, may influence the decisions of the judges. I have great faith in the impartiality of the judges. I hope that by that criticism the Honourable Member does not imply that judges are of so low a calibre that they can be prejudiced so easily by this

Mr. S. P. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, on a point of explanation, what I meant is that it is contrary to the law of evidence for a judge to know of the character of an accused person.

Dato' Suleiman: Thank you. But, Sir, as I say, that also cannot be helped under the conditions as existing in this country. I still feel that the judges in this country will not take that into account when making their decisions.

I now come, Sir, to the Honourable Member from Damansara. He has gone very far indeed—to South Africa (*Laughter*). But I understand that in Singapore they have a permanent registration system, and I also understand that they have issued permanent identity cards in Singapore. Now, when I say that, I don't mean here that we love colonialism, nor do we want to follow colonialism. What I mean is that we have found from experience that there are great uses for these cards to the people in rural areas. But if I may be so bold as to make this remark in this very anti-colonialistic House, sometimes there may be good things that are handed over to us by colonialism. Why should we then throw these good things away? My whole idea is this: Even if there is colonialism in this country, if the spirit of the people is free, then we can fight it; but even if we have driven away colonialism, if the spirit of the people in this country is faint in the way of colonialism, then that independence is empty.

Sir, it is with that spirit that I move this Bill, and I am sorry to hear from the various parties in opposition that they attribute all the very worst motives that can be thought of to this Bill. I can assure them that there are very many good reasons for it, and even if colonialism were one of the reasons, I submit that it is not the main reason.

Mr. Lim Kean Siew: On a point of information—I did not want to interrupt the Minister just now, but there is a fundamental misinterpretation of the law in his speech, and I thought I might point out the mistake. I don't think Members of this House should walk away from this Chamber with a misinterpretation of the law.

Mr. Speaker: You should have stood up just now when he made that utterance. Since he has already completed his speech, I can see no reason why I should allow you any more opportunity.

Mr. Lim Kean Siew: Under Standing Orders, Sir, on a point of information a speaker need not give way, and anyone wishing to make the point must wait until the speaker has finished. Only on a point of order can we interrupt a speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Even on a point of information or explanation, a speaker can give way.

Original question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(*Mr. Speaker in the Chair*)

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported without amendment: read the third time and passed.

THE INCOME TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to amend the Income Tax Ordinance, 1947" be read a second time.

This Bill stems from the Government's decision, which is basic to the Budget which I presented two days ago, to expand the revenue. At least I will not weary the House by recapitulating the reasons for that decision,

nor will I waste its time—in all conscience, Honourable Members are hearing more than enough of my voice in this meeting—by shedding crocodile tears over the unpleasant tasks which are the lot of a Minister of Finance at this session.

The enactment of this Bill will mean that a single person will begin to pay income tax when his income exceeds \$2,000 a year; a married person without children when it exceeds \$3,000; a married person with, for example, 2 children, when it exceeds \$4,250; and a married person with 5 or more children when it exceeds \$5,350. There are at present some 45,000 taxpayers and it is anticipated that as a result of this Bill the figure will be increased by not less than 50 per cent. The amounts of tax payable will be determined by the Schedule in Clause 3 of the Bill. The rates in that Schedule run from 6% to 45% as compared with 5% to 40% in the corresponding present Schedule. I do not wish to burden Honourable Members with too many figures, but let me take a few examples to illustrate what the Government's proposals involve for taxpayers—in this connection, Sir, I hope I will be permitted to refer more frequently to my notes because of the number of figures involved. A person with an income of \$3,000 a year is not at present taxed. He will remain untaxed if he is married or married with children. If he is single, he will pay \$60 a year or at the rate of \$5 a month out of his monthly income of \$250. An income of \$4,000 will attract tax of \$120 a year if the taxpayer is single, \$70 more than at present; a tax of \$60 if the taxpayer is married without children, whereas no tax is payable at present; and no tax if the recipient is married with children. A taxpayer with an income of \$6,000 a year will pay \$39 a year, or just over \$3 a month, if he has 5 children, as compared with nothing at present. He will pay \$190, or \$140 more than at present, if he is married without children; and \$270—per year, of course—or \$95 more than at present, if he is single. On an income of \$9,000

a year a single man will pay \$550, \$115 more than at present; a married man without children \$450, \$195 more than at present; a married man with 5 children \$242, or \$158 more than at present. It will therefore be noted from the figures I have given that the burden should be an acceptable one and that it cannot honestly be said that it is unfairly distributed or that it will cause hardship. Honourable Members will recall that in the course of my Budget Speech, I referred to the necessity to combat evasion. I wish to make it clear that this was not meant to reflect on either the competence or the integrity of the Department of Inland Revenue as a whole. One of the handicaps under which it has been labouring for some time is shortage of experienced staff. Renewed efforts will be made to overcome this difficulty, but, in the meantime, I would like to take this opportunity in this House to acknowledge the excellent work which the Department has always done and I have no doubt will continue to do in the future. (*Applause*).

Sir, I beg to move.

Tun Abdul Razak: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Mr. Liu Yoong Peng: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Bill is the confirmation of the belief of the ra'ayat that this Government is the guardian of the rich. This taxation is imposing a heavier burden on the poor, as in the past \$3,000 a year was the lowest bracket. Now it is proposed that it should be reduced to \$2,000, and in this way we can see that the Government, in attempting to have a more balanced budget, is trying to squeeze the poorer section of the population more than it is attempting to get the revenue from the richer classes of the population, for we can see that the highest figure in the rate of taxation is 45 per cent. This is a very mild figure compared, for instance, to that imposed in Great Britain. If the Government needs more revenue, why not put up the percentage on the higher income bracket instead of having to squeeze the poor so much more. Thank you.

Mr. Yeoh Tat Beng (Bruas): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose this Income Tax Bill which amends the Income Tax Ordinance of 1947, and in doing so, I do not oppose simply for the sake of opposing, but I strongly feel that my learned friend the Honourable Minister of Finance in his zest to find funds for our development schemes has resorted to the measure of introducing the Customs Duties (Amendment) (No. 6) Order, 1959, and also the introduction of this Bill now to tax directly. We have been merciless to impose duty under the Customs Ordinance yesterday and by that very measure we have indirectly taxed the consumer because, as you know, businessmen will pass the tax to the buyers. Added to this misery, a bachelor with an income of \$170 per month, or a daily wage of slightly less than \$6, or a married man without children with an income of over \$250 per month or a daily rate of \$8.33, will come within the tax net of this amended Act. Under such circumstances I would request Honourable Members of this House to ponder whether it is possible for a bachelor, who has to support his aged parents or sometimes his brothers or sisters, to live on \$6 per day, and a married man with \$8.33 per day, to support a wife and in some cases he has to support his in-laws and his aged parents. Now, here we have no relief for house keeping allowance. The only allowance that we have here is \$3,000 and the children's allowance. I therefore ask Honourable Members of this House to think carefully whether it is possible for our fellow citizens to live on so small an income. I therefore hope that the Honourable Finance Minister will not permit the allowances to be cut. However, the purpose of this Ordinance is to raise income to meet our expenditure. I may be questioned from where are we going to finance our development schemes? Well, we must have our development schemes; we must have our projects. First of all, I would support wholeheartedly the Honourable Minister's vigorous action against tax dodgers, let

us also scrutinise our expenditure as vigorous as in hauling in tax evaders and budget our revenue in a more realistic manner, i.e., by increasing the Rubber revenue under the First Schedule by \$22 million. By increasing another \$22 million, the estimate for 1960 would be \$119,500,000 as against the 1959 estimate of \$181,500,000, i.e., our estimate basing on my new figure would be \$62 million less than in 1959. And this estimate, I consider, is not excessive in view of paragraph 8 of the Honourable Finance Minister's speech on the 25th November, which reads:

"The expansionary phase of the trade cycle in the economies of the industrialised countries should continue at least until the latter part of 1960 and the prospects for a continuing firm demand for rubber and tin are good. The economic outlook for the Federation in 1960 is therefore favourable."

Therefore, I think what I suggest is not very inaccurate. However, if I am accused of endorsing the Honourable Finance Minister's optimism, my alternative suggestion would be that we finance our development schemes from new loans because, strictly speaking, the burden of capital projects should be spread over a number of years and then recouped from the Consolidated Fund by annual loan charges—because our projects are for the good of posterity and they should share the burden. The Honourable Finance Minister also said under paragraph 60 that the Federation of Malaya funded debt is only 15% per capita national income per annum basing on the period 1952/1954. I have every reason to believe that Government would give my alternative suggestion due consideration.

Mr. Tan Phock Kin (Tanjong): Mr. Speaker, Sir, my opposition to this particular Bill is motivated by my feeling that this Bill is inequitable. Everybody realises that direct taxation by income tax is one of the most equitable forms of taxation, but it is based on the assumption that the basis of taxation is on a progressive scale so that you take money from those who can best afford to pay. The proposal submitted by the Honourable Minister of Finance is, in my view, a departure from this

generally accepted principle. He has, as we notice here, by reducing allowances for single and married people, included quite a lot of people who are earning barely sufficient to make ends meet into his net, as he calls it. I believe it is the policy of this Government to increase the standard of living of the people. We are trying to do what we can to help the rural people, so that the people can earn more money, but I am afraid this particular Bill is going to take away from the rural people with one hand what Government is trying to give with the other. Any person, whether he lives in the town or in the rural district, will have to pay tax—there is no differentiation as far as this Bill is concerned. So, a poor farmer who may be earning barely enough now—for example, he may be earning \$2,400 a year, which is about \$200 a month—under the present Ordinance he need not pay. But with the introduction of this Bill, he will have to pay tax, however small the amount may be. One must realise that \$10 or \$20 to a person with an income of \$200 a month is valued very much more than to a person who earns \$500. So the idea of progressive taxation is that one must, first of all, exempt people who earn barely enough; and it is my submission that the \$3,000 level under the present Ordinance for a bachelor and \$5,000 for a married couple is just sufficient for a person to live, and any amendment in that direction is a retrograde step which is turning our taxation into a retrogressive tax. When I turn round to have a look at the rates, it amuses me to find that the Honourable Finance Minister sees it fit to stop at 45 per cent. It is contrary to his idea of trying to get more money. If he is trying to get more money, why does he stop at 45 per cent for people whose earnings exceed \$55,000? He should carry on and tax the people in accordance with their income, because the more money a person earns the more he can afford to pay. A person earning \$200,000 can afford to pay as much as 75 per cent, not 45 per cent. So, I submit, Sir, that the amendment to the Income Tax Ordinance is contrary to any sense of equity. Let us have a look at this particular Bill and try to

analyse the policy of the Government. What is Government trying to do with this particular Bill on income tax? Whom are they trying to help, and from whom are they trying to get money?

From our analysis of this amendment, we find that Government is trying to grab as much money from the poor people—people earning \$200, \$300 and \$400

Mr. Speaker: There have been so many repetitions on that point.

Mr. Tan Phock Kin: I am trying to draw

Mr. Speaker: Don't do too much.

Mr. Tan Phock Kin: on this by mentioning that they are the working classes of Malaya—the working classes, whether they work in the rural areas or in the towns. And who are the people who are going to benefit from this? I submit, Sir, that they are very few, and I think there may be some good reason why the Government is endeavouring to carry out this policy of assisting the upper strata of Malayan society. Perhaps it is an election promise—I don't know—Hon'ble members will recollect that on the days prior to election, there were reports in the newspapers that various people are contributing huge sums to the Alliance—and surely this must be the group of people whom the Alliance are trying to help—people who are earning above the \$55,000 bracket and who are able to contribute figures such as that to the political fund of the Alliance Party.

So, in view of the inequity of the whole Bill, Sir, I would like to move, under Standing Order 53 (4) that the words after the word “that” be deleted and the following words substituted:

“In view of the inequitable nature of this Bill in that it spreads the incidence and increases the rates of taxation in a manner which is inconsistent with the accepted principle of relating taxation to one's ability to pay, this Bill be rejected.”

Mr. V. David: Mr. Speaker, I second the motion. I reserve the right to speak at a later stage, but if there are no speakers I will speak now.

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I naturally ask the House to reject this amendment. A lot of play has been made of the allegation that this Bill causes undue hardship to the poor while discriminating unduly in favour of the rich and the well-to-do. Nothing, I suggest, could be further from the truth. I agree that the principal aim of the Government in bringing forward these proposals is to widen the net, so to speak, and the reasons are very simple, as an examination of a few figures will indicate. I have with me here a report of the Department of Inland Revenue giving details of assessments up to 31st December, 1958, and I believe it is the latest report available. For the period under review, the total amount of tax collected was \$142 million, leaving out the odd little thousands. Out of this \$142 million, 75 per cent approximately was paid by limited liability companies numbering 1,241, whereas the remaining 25 per cent were paid by 35,000 individuals. That, surely, does not suggest that the individual taxpayer in this country is excessively taxed.

Another point we might remember is this. There are in this country only 45,000 taxpayers, but there are 75,000 car owners. I suggest that if you are sufficiently well-off to own a car, it is surely not too much to expect you to contribute your due to the country's revenue—and it is not a very large due either at that level. In the highly industrialised countries of the West, income tax is in fact a major source of revenue, and one Honourable Member conceded that it is, by and large, an equitable form of taxation because it is based on the principle of ability to pay. Now, in the highly industrialised countries of the West, nearly everybody has to pay tax, and in fact the floor, shall we say, is much lower than the floor which would be applicable should the present proposals be approved by this House. That is the only way in which income tax can be made to yield any appreciable amount of revenue.

The other complaint is that the well-to-do or the rich have not been "soaked" enough, shall we say. Now, in the United Kingdom, which is probably one of the highest taxed countries

in the world, the company rate is only 38-3/4 per cent. In this country it is 40% -1¼% more. And if the United Kingdom charges only 38½%, I suggest that 40% is surely not too low, especially when you consider that Malaya is not a highly industrialised country. Most of our revenue, as Honourable Members know, not only from income tax but most of our general revenue comes from the two main industries of rubber and tin. Now, let us look at the taxation paid by the rubber industry.

Now, a good deal of the rubber acreage in this country is in the form of limited liability companies, so by and large you can say that the rubber companies pay not only this tax of 40%, but something else. But what is that "something else"? That is export duty, and if you add export duty to Income tax, you will find, by and large, that rubber estates organised as companies pay something like 60% of their gross proceeds to Government in the form of income tax and export duty, in addition to import duties which they may have to pay on their supplies, and as a result of the motion passed yesterday, they will have to pay in future import duties on fertilisers, on sodium arsenite, and things like that. In fact, if anything, the rubber industry has a just claim for saying that it is overtaxed in the context of Malayan circumstances.

The same thing also applies to the tin industry. The tin industry, if organised as limited liability companies, pays 40% in addition to the export duty, and the two together come to more than 50% of the gross proceeds. That, Sir, I suggest is something, even when compared to the United Kingdom, which is regarded as one of the most highly industrialised countries in the world.

There is another point we should bear in mind, and that is the question of our foreign investment. As Honourable Members are aware, we have for the last two years been encouraging foreign capital to invest in this country, and, if I may humbly suggest, our

success has been little short of spectacular. Malaya to-day has a reputation which is unequalled anywhere in Asia—probably anywhere in the underdeveloped sections of the world (*Applause*), and that is due to our far-sighted and liberal policy in playing fair by foreign capital. But if we were to penalise foreign capital unduly and they have to operate as limited liability companies in order to get “pioneer industry” status, we will find that things will be quite different. Honourable Members on the other side will probably challenge my statement. I can give them one example. A few days ago, they will have noted that two world-famous oil companies . . .

Mr. Tan Phock Kin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I think the Honourable Member is irrelevant. We are discussing my amendment.

Mr. Speaker: It is quite relevant. Please proceed.

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: A few days ago, two companies of world-wide repute announced their intention to build oil refineries in this country—this country of six million people and 50,000 square miles. That, I think, is a unique tribute to the standing which this country has throughout the world (*Applause*).

Let us remember one thing: we are trying to build not only a united but a prosperous Malaya, but that prosperity can only be achieved by a certain amount of sacrifice. I agree that this is painful. I agree these proposals will involve some sacrifice on the part of the small man. But I suggest that if we accept the sacrifice in the spirit in which the Government has put these proposals forward, the time may come one day when all of us who are citizens of Malaya will say: “I am proud to be a citizen of Malaya”. (*Applause*).

Mr. V. David: Mr. Speaker, I am not debating on the Bill itself, but I am debating on the amendment, so that I will have the opportunity to speak on the Bill later.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable the Finance Minister made several

observations and defended himself in opposing the amendment proposed by my colleague. He has said that the present Bill will not bring any undue hardship to the poor people. May I call the attention of this House to the fact that the present rates imposed by the Finance Minister will definitely bring tremendous hardship on the ordinary working man of this country, if we take into consideration the average income of the working man in this country. It is merely about \$200—not \$250—per month, and out of this—the man who works in an office with \$250 a month—has so many commitments. The first thing is his house; second his clothing, and food. To take housing—the Honourable the Minister of the Interior will bear with me how low cost houses which have been built cost \$39 to \$48 per house, and a man who earns \$250 having to pay about \$48 for a house, will have to run a family with the remaining money.

Dato' Suleiman: On a point of information, Sir—on low-cost housing in Penang the rent is \$15; in Johore about \$18. Not necessarily \$48.

Mr. V. David: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am referring to the Suleiman Court, Kuala Lumpur.

The Honourable the Minister of Finance has said that there are nearly 75,000 car owners to be found in Malaya. Even at \$250 per month a man can own a car, as he can get a loan from the Government which is repayable by monthly deduction from his salary, and the question of owning a car should not be the reason for he having to be imposed with a heavy tax.

The Minister of Finance has also referred to the number of people paying income tax, saying that there are only 45,000 persons who are paying income tax in this country. And as my colleague previously admitted, the only source of income is direct taxation, but when we say direct taxation we mean that it should not punch the ordinary workers below the belt—such punches should be directed on people like the Dunlop Company,

Shaw Brothers and the Cathay Organisation, but these people, I find, have been relieved to a large extent as per the proposed scheme by the Finance Minister. I do not think that they will be affected very much. The only people who are going to be affected are the working-class.

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: Sir, on a point of clarification. The Honourable Member has distorted facts. As I have tried to show, it is the big people who are paying more income tax in this country.

Mr. V. David: Sir, I cannot believe that, because there are companies in this country which are running away without having to pay tax. In the Minister's speech in connection with the Budget, he was referring to evasion of income tax. I say that evasion is not by the small men, the ordinary men, who cannot employ clerks, accountants, etc., to dodge paying income tax. Only big people are in a position to employ accountants

Mr. Speaker: We are not concerned with the evasion of income tax. We are concerned with the increased rate of taxation.

Mr. V. David: Sir, the Minister of Finance also referred to the United Kingdom. United Kingdom is an industrialised country, and when you take United Kingdom as an example, you must also consider the earnings of the ordinary worker in the United Kingdom.

You cannot compare the United Kingdom or America with the Federation of Malaya. In America there is a minimum wage—there a man is provided by law with a minimum wage which is sufficient for him and his family to lead a normally decent life in society, which we do not find in this country. So we cannot compare England or America with Malaya in respect of the wage structure.

Usually, I hear from the Government Bench about sacrifice. Every time I hear of the Government calling for sacrifices to be made, I wonder how much the Ministers are sacrificing

and how many rich people are sacrificing in this country. Sir, when you make a call on the ordinary man earning \$250 a month to make a sacrifice, why cannot we call upon the richer people, who can bear the burden, to make more sacrifices? I think that there is a lot of people in this country who are in a better position to make sacrifices than the ordinary working people.

Now, in regard to foreign capital, we appreciate that Malaya should be industrialised. But when we invite foreign capital, we should see that the foreign capital is not detrimental to the interests of local capital. I read a few days back in the newspapers that a Japanese shoe factory is going to be established in Malaya. By allowing that shoe factory from Japan to be set up here, it is going to affect the local shoe industry. There are hundreds of shoe factories in this country which are going to be affected by this. So the principle is that while we appreciate foreign investment in this country, we must not tolerate investments which are detrimental to local capital. I say, Sir, that by allowing foreign investments from other countries, which will affect local industries, I do not think that Malaya will prosper economically.

Mr. Speaker: That is not quite relevant.

Mr. V. David: I am only making observations. Mr. Speaker, Sir, yesterday we were hearing speeches—and so many things were mentioned—about local industries and local products. But here the emphasis is on foreign investment in this country which is really driving me to conclude that the Ministers are conflicting and inconsistent in their policies.

Sir, when we talk about prosperity in Malaya, to obtain prosperity we will have to go a long way to reach that goal. And it should not be our aim and object to penalise the ordinary working class of this country. There are people in a better position whom we can penalise and they will not be over-burdened.

To-day in Malaya there are so many concerns in respect of which the ceiling of the tax could be raised. Now, I find here that the ceiling is only 45%—that can be raised to 80% or even 90%. It is quite all right, because I feel that those people who are drawing more than what is prescribed here can bear the burden—they will have to forgo luxurious items not the essentials, as in the case of a man drawing \$250 a month to comply with this has to forgo some essential requirements of life—food, and clothes. I repeat that those who are going to draw more than \$60,000 a year, there is no essentiality involved—merely luxuries, and I think luxuries can be penalised.

I wonder, Sir, why the Honourable the Minister of Finance has been so sympathetic with that group of people—may be it is for the reason that financial aid could be obtained from time to time for elections? I will not say anything further on this.

Mr. Speaker: You cannot. It is not relevant.

Mr. V. David: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would request that the Honourable Minister reconsider this Bill in view of the observations I have made. I strongly deplore this Bill as I feel that it is aimed to penalise the ordinary working class of this country, who are already finding it difficult to make both ends meet.

Therefore, in conclusion, Sir, I request once again this House to give serious consideration to this amendment. If this amendment is accepted, then there will be relief for the ordinary wage earner of this country.

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, from the day this proposal was mentioned in this House and this Bill was published, it has been said that this is a Bill which soaks the poor to protect the rich. After hearing the Honourable the Minister of Finance, I have no doubt whatsoever that it was conceived in that manner and presented to this House with that very objective. I say that because in

a certain speech very significant things were said.

Reference was made to 75,000 car owners but only 45,000 taxpayers in this country. Reference was also made to companies established here; and justifying the failure to increase the tax on companies in this country, the Honourable Minister has said that the companies have to pay export tax, import tax, they have to pay this and that. What about car owners? Don't they pay road tax; don't they pay driving licence fees; don't they have to pay tax on tyres for their cars and petrol for their cars? It is significant that the Honourable Minister should have given the reasons at great length—at great pains too—as to why company tax should not be raised—he has gone to great pains to justify the failure to raise company tax. In the case of the 75,000 car owners, they pay taxes too and they have to pay income tax.

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: Sir, on a point of information, I was referring to direct taxation. Export duty is direct taxation; import duty is indirect taxation which everybody pays.

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: Direct or indirect taxation, it comes out of the pocket. I thought it strange, very strange, that in one case an attempt to justify it was made, while in another case a blank statement was made.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the suspicions or fears of the people, if you read the responsible newspapers this morning, that it is the case of taxing the poor and protecting the rich, is confirmed by the speech of the Honourable the Minister of Finance. He has said that the people must make sacrifices for a united and prosperous nation. Whom are we calling on to make the sacrifice—the rich man? He is not sacrificing anything more than what he has been doing in the past—if at all very little. As has been suggested by previous speakers, taxation on the rich could have gone up, company tax could have gone up. Why broaden the base? What we complain of—even if we have not much to complain of on

the increase in the percentage of the tax—is that we have a justifiable case to complain about in respect of the broadening of the base. What is the need to broaden the base? What is the need to squeeze every ounce from the poor men in this country today? Is that the way a Government should carry on? Is that the form, the manner, in which the country can progress to prosperity? Is that the way a poor Government servant should be allowed to live in this country? Is that the way a small trader should be allowed to live, making it almost impossible for him to live from hand to mouth? Had anyone thought of the effects, even on the Government servants of this country? Would you not throw wide open the door to corruption in this land? Will people not try to pick up or make a few dollars, so that they can live without paying tax on that corrupt money? How do you expect them to live without being corrupted, if you are trying to take away their meagre subsistence? For that reason, I support the proposed amendment wholeheartedly.

Mr. Lim Kean Siew: Mr. Speaker, Sir, there has been a lot of eloquence over very few principles. Therefore, I shall not dwell too much on these things such as soaking the poor to protect the rich and so on. However, I want to bring out two points.

There is a lot of talk about broadening the base. There are two ways of broadening the base: one is to reach down and down, lower and lower to the lower income groups; and the other is to bring the lower income group up and up to the higher income group, so that more people will earn more money and therefore will pay more tax. In this Bill it is broadening the base by making more and more poor people to pay more tax—not that of bringing more and more people into the higher income group to pay more tax. Therefore that argument is not logical.

Another point is that, according to the Honourable the Minister of Finance, in the United Kingdom

companies pay more tax; but in the U.K. we also know that some people pay 19s. 6d. in the pound, which is over 90 per cent of their income. Therefore, this ceiling of 45 per cent is not really very high. It is only half of that in the United Kingdom.

Dr. Lim Swee Aun (Larut Selatan): Sir, on a point of clarification, may we know in the United Kingdom 19s. 6d. is paid at what level of income?

Mr. Lim Kean Siew: According to U.K. money I believe it is £5,000 a month, that is £60,000 a year—according to our money, it is \$45,000 a month—but our rate of income is less. (*Interruption*). It is the question of the principle of the limit. And, of course, if I am to be interrupted on rates of income, then I have to say that the workers in England earn 10 times as much as the workers in Malaya. A driver of a motor vehicle may earn £12 a week which is over a hundred dollars a week, or \$500 a month, compared with the \$40-60 a month which a Malay fisherman earns in Beserah, according to Ungku Aziz's statistics.

Now, let us proceed to another point. It has been ruled by the Speaker that it is relevant to talk of tax free pioneer industries in Malaya. We were given two examples by the Honourable the Minister of Finance of two oil refineries coming here to set up tax free industries. However, we must not forget two other points relating to this. There is at present in Malaya no means of stopping or preventing profit from being taken away from Malaya. Therefore, you can set up a big company here, make profit, send it out to India—any person can make a lot of profit and send it out to India—and from India apply to Malaya for a tax free pioneer industry. Then the Government will say “If you are bringing money from abroad to Malaya, we will give you 5 years of tax free period.” So the profit one makes here, and which is sent out to India, is sent back again to Malaya to make more profit which in turn will again be sent back to India in order to be sent back again to Malaya to open a further new pioneer industry.

Profit exported is profit loss. Profit invested is turned into capital. Therefore when we talk of these people who have faith in Malaya and are investing in Malaya—in fact according to the Honourable the Minister of Finance, we are the most stable Government in South-east Asia

Enche' Tajudin bin Haji Ali: Sir, on a point of clarification. What I want to say is this: most of the companies that are applying for pioneer industry status, before we grant that status to them, we always make them to conform to our rules and regulations by which 50 per cent of the shares must be held by local people, not entirely by aliens.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: No.

Mr. Speaker: That is entirely irrelevant. Proceed.

Mr. Lim Kean Siew: Therefore, when we say that we are a stable country and people are investing in Malaya because they have confidence in us, it may not be true and might in fact mean something else—that it is not that people have confidence in us but that people feel that they can make more money here, but pay less tax and that they can send profits earned abroad. Therefore, as all business people want to make profit, wherever they can make more money they will invest in that particular country. So the Honourable the Minister of Finance, perhaps, would like to clarify that point. I would like to say, Sir, that this Bill is really inequitable because there is a big leakage of profit from one source of revenue that is not being touched. I say this: if you want to fill your rice bag, you must first make certain that there are no holes in the bag. Because if you put in your rice and there are holes in the bag, the rice will run out of the bag, so that your bag will be forever empty and the Minister of Finance will have to continue to increase the income tax.

Question, That the words proposed to be left out be left out of the Question, put, and negatived.

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. Chin See Yin: Sir, the Honourable the Finance Minister has reduced the personal allowances of a married

man from \$5,000 to \$3,000 and he has also reduced the children's allowance of \$200 for each child by limiting the number to five only which means I presume that the remaining four have got to be cast away somewhere. Now in doing so the Honourable the Finance Minister has brought into this group of tax payers a larger field than 45,000—as he has said that there will be an increase of 50 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, you will appreciate, when comparing the present rate with the proposed new rate, you will find that a person having an income of \$4,500, which carries a taxation of 5 per cent, will have to pay only \$75; but now with this reduction in allowances from \$5,000 to \$3,000 he will have to pay at the new rate \$150. An increase from \$75 in the old rate to \$150 in the new rate is really an increase of 100 per cent. Again, Sir, you will see that where a person who has an income of \$7,000—now he is allowed to deduct \$5,000 and he will have to pay \$75+30 that is \$105 under the old rate—at the new rate he will have to pay something like \$290. Thus, Sir, you will see that this increase has brought in a large group of taxpayers, who are from the lower income group. Sir, it can be seen that from this new taxation, we are going to get in 1960—according to the Minister's estimate—an additional sum of something like \$14 million. And from this \$14 million, Sir, if you work it out on the old rate and the new rate, you will find that about \$11.2 million will be tax from the lower income group. This taxation, as it is such an increase from the lower income group, will have to be given consideration, particularly in view of the fact that we have passed the Customs Bill yesterday, from which we will get an estimated revenue of \$29 million from duty on diesel oil. Incidentally, this duty on diesel oil for the time being will affect the bus companies, the Railway, the C.E.B., the mining industry and the fishing industry; how long can they bear this burden? Eventually, I am sure they will have to find a way to get it from

the lower income group. Therefore, Sir, you will see the danger that this is going to create, because under this new group of taxation you are going to take it out from the lower income group and they in turn will be forced to ask their employers to pay them more. Sir, to get this additional revenue, which will be from the lower income group mainly, you will appreciate what the Honourable Minister of Finance has said—the Government will have got to use more men; and it will cost more money. I suggest that it would be easier if he were to take this extra money, so necessarily required for future development and for progress, from the higher income group; and how to get that, my Honourable friend from Bruas has given a suggestion which, I think, is more appropriate than what we are proposing just now.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah (Kota Bharu Hilir): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya membangkangkan chadangan ia-itu hendak menurun atau mengurangkan daripada \$3,000 kepada \$2,000 sa-bagaimana rakan² saya yang lain telah menerangkan bahawa yang kena berat di-dalam income tax ini ia-lah orang di-lapisan yang di-bawah, orang yang chuma mendapat income atau pendapatan yang sedikit dalam kawasan \$2,000. Tetapi saya sokong direct taxation, kerana di-dalam direct taxation ini tax payer ta' boleh melarikan diri ya'ani ta' boleh ditanggohkan kepada consumer, ini saya menyokong. Tetapi yang saya bangkang income tax ini ia-lah kerana orang yang di-dalam lower income group ini-lah orang yang susah, mereka mempunyai standard of living yang sangat rendah, sa-kira-nya kita chukai dan kurangkan daripada \$3,000 ini menjadi \$2,000 maka di-sana perkara ini akan merosakkan atau memburokkan standard of living atau taraf kehidupan mereka. Oleh yang demikian, di-England sa-bagaimana yang telah di-terangkan oleh saudara kita tadi mengatakan bahawa di-England sana orang yang di-dalam higher income group ada-lah taxation-nya sampai 75 peratus, wal-hal kita di-sini

chuma 45 peratus sahaja; ini ia-lah berma'ana bahawa Bill ini hendak menolong orang yang kaya, tetapi kebimbangan atau burden of taxation ini jatuh berat-nya lebih lagi kepada orang yang mendapat pendapatan yang rendah (lower income group).

Kalau sa-kira-nya Kerajaan hendak menchari wang supaya dapat dijalankan project² dan development² sekim yang banyak, maka ini-lah masa-nya bagi Kerajaan untuk melébehkan chukai yang 45 peratus tadi sampai 50, 60 atau 70 peratus. Kerana orang yang di-dalam higher income group ini mereka itu hidup dalam kesenangan yang sangat, kushing mereka itu pun di-beri makanan yang orang kampung kita tidak dapat makan-nya.

Maka di-sini mengikut democracy, maka hendak-lah incident of taxation itu mesti jatuh lebih sedikit atau lebih ringan kepada orang yang susah menanggung-nya (miskin), tetapi sekarang ini apabila kita kurangkan daripada \$3,000 hingga sampai \$2,000, maka di-sana sampai-lah had atau limit yang di-namakan taxable capacity dan sudah melébehi taxable capacity bagi orang yang di-dalam lower income group.

Oleh yang demikian itu-lah sebab-nya saya membangkang untuk mengurangkan pendapatan yang \$3,000 itu menjadi \$2,000 dan saya chadangkan supaya income tax yang 45 peratus itu di-angkat sa-hingga menjadi 75 peratus.

Mr. Kang Kok Seng (Batu Pahat): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to support the Income Tax (Amendment) Bill strongly, because we who live in this country enjoy a stable Government because of taxation. When we come to other arguments or other views we talk of democracy, we talk of protection of human rights under the United Nations Charter, etc. but when we come to taxation, Sir, we try to differentiate between the business people and the average man. In my opinion, Sir, I think we who ask for everything to be provided, should also try and contribute back in a small way. I know that my few words here this evening will be

disadvantageous to me in my political career, but what I am here today is not to express the feelings of the rich but also the feelings of the poor. I am the representative of the people in Batu Pahat; therefore, I speak on behalf of the rich and the poor. Our Opposition Members here champion, or they profess to champion, for the benefit of the poor, but they forget that it is the business people in this country who put up most of the capital for investment in estates and various other businesses. They contribute the greater part of the revenue, and I think it is only fair that we should accept them as human beings. Besides the business people take risks in carrying out their business activities.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*).

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported without amendment: read the third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Speaker: As it is now past 4.30 p.m., I shall call upon the Prime Minister to move the adjournment.

The Prime Minister: I beg to move that the House do now adjourn.

Tun Abdul Razak: I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT SPEECH

FRENCH ATOMIC TESTS IN THE SAHARA

Mr. Speaker: Honourable Members, I shall now call upon Mr. Karam Singh to make his adjournment speech.

Mr. K. Karam Singh: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the subject on which I wish to speak at this adjournment to-day is the proposed holding of atomic tests by the French Government on African territory.

Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying for us to note that after I have sent in this topic as an adjournment speech, our country has voted against the holding of these proposed tests in the Sahara desert. But, Mr. Speaker, we must go further and add not only our vote but also our voice; we must join world opinion to condemn the holding of atomic tests on another people's continent. The effect of these atomic tests in the Sahara would be to poison the African continent, perhaps to deform the unborn generations that will rise in a free and independent Africa. We would ask the French colonial powers, at this parting of ways of colonialism in Africa, not to deal any parting blows to the people of Africa. Within the next few years the people of Africa will take their rightful places in the United Nations, and to-day, Sir, we have the great example of Mr. Sekou Toure of Guinea adding the voice of Africa in the councils of the world.

Mr. Speaker, we must arouse the public opinion of our country to the danger of holding these proposed tests so that to-morrow our own public opinion may react against war-like tests being held anywhere. By doing this, we would be strengthening the cause of world peace and the public opinion that would have been informed against these nuclear tests would remain as a lasting pillar of world peace.

Mr. Speaker, whatever may be the ideological conflict in this world, there is one issue that is above ideologies and that is the issue of peace; and it would be a great contribution of Malaya to the world if she can consciously and consistently propagate, where she is able, against the holding of these proposed tests. Thank you, Sir.

Tun Abdul Razak: Mr. Speaker, Sir, as the Honourable Member himself has admitted that Government has already played its part in the United Nations by voting against the holding of these

atomic tests, perhaps there is no need for me to reply. But I should like to explain that on the 12th of November, 1959, the first meeting of the United Nations General Assembly adopted a 22-power resolution calling upon France to refrain from carrying out the proposed nuclear tests in the Sahara and the Federation of Malaya was one of the Co-sponsors of the resolution. Subsequent to that, another resolution

was placed before the General Assembly and our country voted in favour of the resolution. So, Sir, we have definitely played our part in endeavouring to stop these tests. (*Applause*).

Mr. Speaker: Honourable Members, the House is adjourned to 10.00 a.m. to-morrow, 28th November, 1959.

Adjourned at 6.26 p.m.