

Volume I
No. 7



Monday
30th November, 1959

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

DEWAN RA'AYAT

(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

OFFICIAL REPORT

CONTENTS

BIL^I-THE SUPPLY (1960) BILL— (Second
Reading—Continuation) [Col. 575]

FEDERATION OF MALAYA

DEWAN RA'AYAT

(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

Official Report

First Session of the First Dewan Ra'ayat

Monday, 30th November, 1959

The House met at 10 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' HUSSATN, S.M.N. (Pekan).

the Minister of External Affairs, DATO' DR. ISMAIL BIN DATO' ABDUL RAHMAN, P.M.N. (Johore Timor).

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 and Co-operatives, 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).

ENCHE' ABDUL HAMID KHAN BIN HAJI SAKHAWAT ALI KHAN, J.M.N., J.P., Assistant Minister (Batang Padang).

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).

The Honourable TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI ABDUL RAOF
(Kuala Kangsar).

TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI MOHD. SALLEH, A.M.N.,
P.I.S. (Segamat Utara).

TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN ABDULLAH (Kota Bharu Hilir).

ENCHE' AHMAD BIN ARSHAD, A.M.N. (Muar Utara).

ENCHE' AHMAD BOESTAMAM (Setapak). ENCHE' AHMAD BIN
MOHAMED SHAH (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 SIANO 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 Treng-
ganu 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 HUSSIN 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' KHADUAH BINTI MOHD. SIDK (Dungun).

MR. KHONO KOK YAT (Batu Gajah).

MR. LEE SAN CHOON (Kluang Utara).

MR. LEE SECK FUN (Tanjong Malim).

MR. LEE SIOK YEW (Sepang).

MR. LEONQ KEE NVEAN (Kampar).

MR. LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).

DR. LIM SWEE AUN, J.P. (Larut Selatan).

The Honourable MR. Liu YOONG PENG (Rawang).

MR. T. M AH IMA SINGH (Port Dickson). ENCHE' MOHAMED BIN UJANG (Jelebu-Jempol). ENCHE' MOHAMED ABBAS BIN AHMAD (Hilir Perak). ENCHE' MOHAMED ASRI BIN HAJI MUDA (Pasir Puteh).

ENCHE' MOHAMED DAHARI BIN HAJI MOHD. An (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 SULONG BIN MOHD. Au, 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, O.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 OAK (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).

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).

ENCHE' YAHYA BIN HAJI AHMAD (Bagan Datoh).

MR. YEOH TAT BENG (Bruas).

MR. YONG Woo MING (Sitiawan).

HAJJAH ZAIN BINTI SULAIMAN (Pontian Selatan).

TUAN HAJI ZAKARIA BIN HAJI MOHD. TAIB (Langal).

ENCHE' ZULKIFLEE BIN MUHAMMAD (Bachok).

ABSENT:

The Honourable ENCHE' ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAJI TALIB (Kuantan). Minister without Portfolio.

MR. CHEAH THEAM SWEE (Bukit Bintang).

MR. LIM JOO KONG (Alor Star).

MR. V. MANICKAVASAGAM, J.M.N., P.J.K. (Klang).

ENCHE' MOHAMED ISMAIL BIN MOHD. YUSOF (Jerai).

DATO' TEOH CHZE CHONG, D.P.M.J., J.P. (Segamat Selatan).

IN ATTENDANCE: The Honourable the

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

PRAYERS

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

BILL THE SUPPLY**(1960) BILL, 1959**

Order read for resumption of debate on motion (28th December, 1959).

Question again proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time".

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam (Ipoh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, to-day is the resumption of the debate on His Highness' Speech and the Supply Bill which has been presented to this House. Much has already been said by Members of the Opposition with regard to the taxation policy adopted by this Government for the coming year. Sir, the Speech of His Highness referred in general terms to the policy of the Government and certain important aspects of that policy. But the Speech itself is not intended to be an exhaustive survey of the whole field of Government policy and, therefore, in debating this matter in this House one has to look to the various Heads of Expenditure as set out in the Supply Bill so as to comment and criticise constructively the policies adopted by the Government for the coming year.

Now, what does the Budget show—what do the events subsequent to the presentation of that Budget in this House almost prove? It proves one thing, it shows one thing—that there is complete and utter disregard of current political and social trends in

this country. It shows that the Government is like a ship which is being led by a captain who seems to be blindfolded; he fails to see that the proper course to steer in this country is a course to the left, instead of which—from these Budget proposals—it is clear that the course being steered is one to the extreme right. Mr. Speaker, Sir, when I say that this Government should steer a course to the left I certainly do not mean—and it can never be intended to mean—that this Government should steer a course towards Communism. But what I do intend to say is that this Government in preparing its Budget should adopt a policy, which will establish in this country a socialist form of Government, a socialist form of society, in which all people will share, and share equally and justly, in the fruits of an independent nation.

Now, I said that it is clear that this Government has steered a course to the extreme right, because the proposals themselves show, as has been said by the Opposition, that this taxation is at the poor man's expense to the benefit or to the protection of the capitalists in this country. And it is, I say, the capitalists of this country who are giving the strongest support to the Government party in this land. Why do I say this? Why do I say that the capitalist group in this country is being protected by the Government? I am not going into details as I am not entitled to. But I would mention just two facts: one is the failure to increase taxation on companies and the other—a very significant and a very

important point—is the taxation under the Customs Duties (Amendment) Order which was passed. If you will note carefully, you will find that sodium arsenite will be taxed at \$7 while other weed-killers under item 144, excluding sodium arsenite, will be taxed at \$30. Sir, it is common knowledge that sodium arsenite is used by large companies operating in this country, while the other types of weed-killers are used by the smaller estates. What I do ask is—why is sodium arsenite taxed at only \$7 and the other weed-killers at 530? Is it because the larger estates use sodium arsenite and the smaller estates do not? Sodium arsenite can only be used with proper medical facilities on estates and that is why the smaller estates cannot use sodium arsenite. These two factors clearly indicate what trend this Budget is taking.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, before I go on to debate on His Highness' Speech, may I refer, or may I start by quoting a short paragraph, or a short line, from the Speech from the Throne. It appears on the second page of the English version. It says: "A new era has begun with the full flowering of our Constitution and with the birth of our own parliamentary institutions;". Sir, I am privileged to take part in this new era, to be in this Parliament and to have the opportunity to discuss the Speech of His Highness. There was also an indication that His Highness would want us to behave with propriety and to co-operate with each other for the good of the nation. Events in the last few days in this House have shown that the Opposition has adopted a mild and reasonable stand to criticise, where it is necessary to criticise, to support where support should be given. But I am sorry to say that from the Government back-benchers there has come forward a furore of irresponsible and unjustified attacks on the Opposition. We in the Opposition are ready to take that attack, but we want to make it clear that the Opposition can never be frightened, can never be deterred from putting forward in this House the views of the people whom we represent—and the total of the

Opposition in this House represents 45 per cent of the electorate that went to the polls in this country, and that is a good opposition to have in this country's Parliament. I do hope that the Government side, including the back-benchers, will bear this in mind—that criticism is given where there is need for that criticism, and though you may not agree with the views expressed, there is no need to get hot under the collar.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, on the 28th November, when certain members of the Opposition spoke, one Honourable Member from the Constituency of Taiping, if I am not wrong, said that facts were being twisted. Sir, to-day I will give facts, facts which even an immatured child cannot say that they are twisted, because they are facts based on the Constitution of this country. His Highness on page 2 has set out three main objectives of the Government of this country for the coming year. The first one is "to lead the people of this country towards the sense and reality of true nationhood." That should be the objective, that should be the duty of every politician, of every citizen in this country, but the point is, how are we going to build this nation—how are we going to bring the various races living in this country into one nation, one loyalty, one country, one people? There are, perhaps, several ways, but I think in a democratic country there is only one way. Before I go on to discuss this way, it would be necessary for me, in debating this matter of building a nation, to refer very briefly to the past history of this country. Malaya was for many years, generations perhaps, under foreign domination, under colonial powers. The various races, the three largest races—the Chinese, the Indians and the Malays—worked together, worked happily. They took out the tin from the earth, tapped rubber trees, built roads and built up the country, and they have made this country perhaps one of the richest lands in the world. Then came Merdeka, and for the achievement of Merdeka these three races worked together to become free,

to become independent people—and Merdeka was achieved. With the coming of Merdeka, there came the question of citizenship of this country, and the Constitution contained the citizenship laws, the facts of which cannot be twisted by anybody. If one reads Articles 14 to 22, one will find that a person under the Constitution becomes a citizen of this country, broadly, in three ways: (1) by operation of law, (2) by registration and (3) by naturalisation. There are broadly speaking those three bases: by operation of law, by registration and by naturalisation. Who are the citizens, or who are the people who under the Constitution, Article 14, become citizens by operation of law? They are all persons who on Merdeka Day have become citizens of this country under the Federation of Malaya Agreement and all those persons who are given the status of citizen by operation of law. But are these citizens treated equally? Are all the citizens who have become citizens by operation of law treated in the same way under this Constitution? They are not, and I say that that is a fact which cannot be twisted. Again, if you read Article 43, it becomes very clear—Article 43 says: "Notwithstanding anything in this Article, a person who is a citizen. ..." I am sorry. I missed that Article but I will come back to it. Those who have become citizens by operation of law under the Federal Constitution are not treated equally, because the Constitution contains a provision—I shall find it in a minute—which says that those who become citizens by operation of law under this Constitution, but who became citizens originally by registration before Merdeka Day, cannot hold the post of Prime Minister, cannot hold the post of Menteri Besar, cannot hold the post of Governor of Malacca or Penang. Sir, there at once arises a distinction between citizens who are citizens by operation of law. Then we get citizens by registration under the Constitution. How are they treated?

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid <Seberang Utara>: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker. Is the Honourable and learned Member trying to enlighten the House on citizenship?

Mr. Speaker: I think the Honourable Member is in order. Please proceed.

Mr. D. R. Seenivangan: With your permission. Mr. Speaker, Sir. I think enlightenment is useful. (*Laughter*). The second class of citizens—when I say second class I do not imply anything by that, I mean the other class of citizens by registration under the Constitution of this country—in what position are they placed? Article 43, sub-section (7), says: "Notwithstanding anything in this Article, a person who is a citizen by naturalisation or by registration under Article 17 shall not be appointed Prime Minister." Then there is another Article in the State Constitutions—Article 2 of each State Constitution—which says: "No person who is a citizen by registration or naturalisation shall hold the post of Menteri Besar." Sir, how are we going to build a nation, one indivisible nation, when the fundamental right of equality of citizenship is taken away by this very Constitution? Let anybody tell me whether those facts can ever be twisted. Mr. Speaker, Sir, you cannot build a nation on inequality. You can build a nation free, strong and loyal only when the basic foundation of equality as set out in every democratic country is recognised and preserved for all times. I would ask this Government to take steps to amend the Constitution of the Federation of Malaya to establish once and for all time the principle of equality in this land—for then and then only, can a citizen feel proud in independence, feel truly proud that this country wants him as a citizen. Now, however, when he has sworn loyalty to King and country in return for that fundamental right, that small right, that fundamental important right is taken away from him by the very Constitution of this country. How then can a nation be built? How then can you say that this is a free nation of free men? Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do request, I do ask, this Government to amend the Constitution to establish that equality for all citizens in this country. If you do not

want that equality, if we are not going to get that equality, why then in the first place give us citizenship in this land? The citizenship laws as they stand violate the very spirit and object of the Charter of Human Rights, the basis of which is equality, and His Highness has said that Malaya subscribes to that Charter.

From 1955 the opposite side of this House has had a very strong say in the Government of this land. They have had this strong say, because the people in this country gave them that strong power, and it is their duty to see that justice is done. From 1955 the theme song of the Alliance Party has been unity, build up the nation, think as one, act as one. It is with very great regret that I have to say—I may be wrong, but I think I am right—that their intention, their theme song, is still a song and there has been no progress towards building a united nation. And there can be no progress until equality is established, because that is the basic foundation of a nation. The Government must realise that it cannot build a nation on fear; it cannot build a nation on suspicion; and it cannot build a nation on distrust. Mr. Speaker, Sir, comparing with the obligations a citizen of this country, no matter whether it is by operation of law, no matter whether it is by registration or by naturalisation, what happens? His obligations are equal. If there is a war, if there is a national emergency, every citizen in this country within certain ages will have to bear arms, will have to die for King and country. When it comes to obligations, there is no distinction; when it comes to rights and privileges, there is a distinction. Mr. Speaker, Sir, what I say may annoy, may make some sections of this House feel resentful of what I say, but I ask those sections not to be resentful because those are facts, and facts the sooner that are stated the better for this nation. You may agree, or you may disagree, but please do not get hot under the collar, because they are facts and facts must always be stated because they will stand anywhere.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I ask, if our obligations are equal, why on earth cannot our privileges be the same. We are not

asking for anything more: we are only asking for equality. Some people may say: This man is communal, he is raising communal issues. Mr. Speaker, Sir, logically I am not raising a communal issue—I am trying to play down communalism. Those who ask for equality can never be communal—it is only those who oppose, who fight against, equality who are definitely communalists of this country, and they will go down in the history of this country as having done the greatest disservice to this nation, the greatest disservice to humanity.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, on this question of building a nation, as I say, you can only build a nation if you give the people of the country equal status under the constitution of the land. Time and time again I have heard people say: "Well, there are sections of the community of Malaya who have not proved their loyalty to this country. How dare you ask for equality when you have not even proved your loyalty?" Good. Let us look how far that argument will carry us. In this connection, reference is often made both by the Government side, even in the last few days—in an undertone somebody did make reference to that fact: "When there is trouble, people run away." They were obviously referring to those groups of Chinese youths who went away when, under the colonial rule of this country, there was a call-up known as "the Sutton boys". It must be remembered and appreciated that that was a period when the Malayan people were waging a struggle—a peaceful democratic struggle—to get rid of the colonial Power in this land. Those youths who went away owed no obligation to the colonial Power. They had the right, if they chose, to say: "I am not going to fight for the colonial Power."

Sometimes, it was said: "You yourself ran away when the Japanese came." Mr. Speaker, Sir, I did not run away to India (*Laughter*). I mention this . . .

Mr. Speaker: Is that relevant?

Mr. Seenivasagam: It is, Sir, because it is suggested that I am not trying to build a united nation.

The Minister of the Interior (Dato' Suleiman): Mr. Speaker, on a point of information. I hope the Honourable Member is not speaking in anger.

Mr. Speaker. Please proceed.

Mr. Seenivasagam: I mention it only for one second more—I went to India, it would be hard for me to say no, because the Finance Minister was in India before I reached India, and he was there to welcome me, and if he is a loyal citizen of this country, so am I.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Tan Siew Sin): I didn't know you at all then.

Mr. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, that is why I mentioned that . . .

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: It is below my dignity to know you.

Mr. Seenivasagam: Those who speak of these Chinese youths suggest: "You cannot really suggest that all these people are loyal, because in the past it happened." Mr. Speaker, they conveniently forget that recently there was a national registration for possible call-up. Who ran away? Anybody ran away from this country? No! Because those who were the citizens of this country—the Chinese, Indians, Malays—now realise that this is an independent land, this is their land, and it is their duty to fight for King and country. Why do you mention what is bad? Why do you omit what is good? For this equal duty to this country, we of the Opposition, of the People's Progressive Party of Malaya, demand equal rights from this Government for those people in this land, and we hope they will concede that to us and they will introduce an amendment to the Constitution to establish equality.

Mr. Speaker, His Highness also spoke of foreign affairs. Now, what is the foreign policy of this Government? Is it dynamic? Is it steady? Is it specific? Is it positive? We can only draw inferences from actions and from the behaviour of our representatives in foreign countries, in the United Nations and in other places, and here I think I might have a few words to say.

First of all, let us deal with the question of whether the foreign policy

of Malaya is dictated to by the Anglo-American powers. When I say "dictated to", I do not mean by the Anglo-American powers turning round: "You, you must do this or you must do that." No. It is a fact that Malaya is so heavily indebted to the Anglo-American powers that one might say they are in a position to stranglehold this country at any time they wish. Malaya as a debtor who has already borrowed much and hopes to borrow more is only too ready to pander to the whims and fancies of the Anglo-Americans. No orders are necessary—the slightest hint will suffice. Take the case of Tibet. Malaya did a good thing, we are told, by placing a motion before the United Nations for debate. Take the case of Kenya—what atrocities are being committed in Kenya? What deprivations of the liberty of the subject? What has Malaya done? One word—one word—to protect the citizens of Kenya, to see that the Human Rights Charter is enforced in Kenya? No! Why not? Who is taking the action in Kenya?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, now we come to the Peoples' Republic of China. I am not speaking here on the desirability or otherwise of recognising the Government of China. I want to make that very clear. But I am speaking here on the policy to be adopted towards China in relation to the United Nations. Mr. Speaker, Sir, we know to-day that between India and China disputes have arisen, but that great leader, the Prime Minister of India, still maintains his stand that China should get a seat in the United Nations. Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the United Nations to-day we find nations of every political shade: Communists, capitalists, Fascists, dictatorships, and stooges. Mr. Speaker, we find countries which preach and practise the United Nations Charter. There are also members who preach the principles enshrined in the Charter, but do not practise it.

The Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—I would request the Honourable Member not to use the word "stooges" in connection with foreign affairs, because it might affect some other countries. I know to whom

he is trying to refer by the word "stooges", but I would ask him to limit his language to more parliamentary terms.

Mr. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am not referring to the Federation of Malaya. If it is a request from the Prime Minister, I won't comply, but if it is an order from the Chair, I will comply.

Mr. Speaker: It is an order from the Chair.

Mr. Seenivasagam: Very well. Sir, I withdraw it.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, yet when the question of China's entry into the United Nations comes up, we find that the Anglo-American bloc doing—what? The Anglo-American bloc and the nations which like to toe the Anglo-American line put up their hands in horror, in stark horror at China being admitted to the United Nations. Mr. Speaker, Sir, it should be the policy of the Federation Government to adopt a more realistic attitude in world affairs. It should follow the policy that India has maintained on the question of China's entry into the United Nations. In spite of border incidents, the Prime Minister of India still maintains that same stand. There is no valid reason for this Government of the Federation to oppose the admission of China to the United Nations. By what right, by what authority do we insist? In fact, by what rights does the free world insist that China should follow or respect resolutions passed by the United Nations when we ourselves are not prepared to allow China to sit at the same table in the United Nations? Is there any sense? If you want to condemn somebody, give that person a chance to sit with you and then condemn him. Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is a fundamental principle, the basic principle, the foundation of natural justice, that no-one is to be condemned without being heard. This applies to the individual just as it must apply to nations, and that, I think, is enshrined in the Human Rights Charter, in the Declaration of Human Rights.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, if our representatives in the United Nations can sit at

the same table with Spain, at the same table with France—remember the Algerian problem—if we can sit with them, why can't we sit at the same table with the Peoples' Republic of China. I am not condoning—the People's Progressive Party of Malaya in fact condemns any act of aggression by China. But we are not concerned with what China is doing, whether China is bad: we are concerned only with whether China should sit in the United Nations. China wants to sit in the United Nations—the United Nations works for world peace. What detriment can there be by allowing China to sit in the United Nations? That is the point I am stressing. I am not for one moment suggesting that China should be recognised in this country. That may come at a later stage. What we are talking of is United Nations and China. I hope Honourable Members will clearly keep that in mind: that what I am talking of is United Nations and China.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, on foreign affairs let us look at Indonesia. His Highness has referred to the Treaty of Friendship with Indonesia. I have no objection to treaties of friendship with any country that follows our way of life, follows our pattern of life, follows the democratic principles of liberty, freedom, justice and all those things enshrined in the Charter. Indonesia is our neighbour—close neighbour—and it is only natural that we should seek to establish close and friendly ties with a neighbouring land. At the same time, there is a duty upon us, a duty imposed on every democratic country, a duty to see that this friendship with Indonesia is a friendship of the Malayan people and the Indonesian people. I think there is too much stress being laid on the fact that there are religious ties, on the fact that there are racial ties, with Indonesia. I would suggest that it would do more good for this country, do more good for the world, if we spoke of the Malayan nation rather than the communal aspects of religious or sectarian nationalism, and I do ask this Government in future to see that the friendship ties with other nations are friendship ties with the Malayan nation as a whole. It must be stressed

that the policy of this Government is to foster friendship between the peoples of the Federation and other countries'. There can be no basis for friendship unless that other country acts as we act, works as we work, does as we do. Mr. Speaker, in this connection I can only refer to the present troubles or problems in Indonesia in relation to those who are not citizens or not Indonesians in that country. I do not

The Minister of External Affairs (Date* Dr. batafl): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—is it right for the Honourable Member.....

Mr. Speaker: I don't think that is relevant.

Mr. See*H

: I am speaking on the foreign policy that we should follow in relation to Indonesia. His Highness has referred to that.

Mr. Speaker: You should not touch on the internal policy of Indonesia.

Mr. Seeaiva*agam: No. Sir. I am only speaking on the policy of our country in relation to Indonesia.

Mr. Speaker: On the policy of our country it is all right, but not on the internal poKcy of the Indonesian Government—that I will not admit.

Mr. SesfltraMgMi? Mr. Speaker. Sir. I think we should use our influence, we should use out position as a free aad independent nation to make representations to the Indonesian Government to adopt a more humane policy towards non-nationals who are Mving in Indonesia, to see that they are not hounded here and then and out of that country. Unless we do that, that Treaty of Friendship becomes nothing more than abetment of un democratic practises.....

Data* Dr. Imail: Qa a point of information. Sir, is the Honourable Member advocating that we should interfere in th« internal affairs of a friendly country?

Mr. SeejiiTmfain: Mr. Speaker. I thought that a Treaty of Friendship means being in a position to advise . .

Mr. Ipralar The Honourable Member is suggesting, but we should not

interfere in the internal affairs of other countries. Please proceed.

Mr. Seenrrasafua: Mr. Speaker, I said "advise". You are a friend, you advise your friend to be more reasonable.

Mr. Speaker: Please proceed.

Mr. SeauTtMgMr I never said "interfere in the internal affairs" of another country.

Mr. Speaker, we now come to South Africa. On Saturday, an Honourable Member of the Opposition asked for stern measures against South Africa in relation to her policy with regard to Coloured people. Mr. Speaker, we sit in the United Nations at the same table with South Africa: in the tinted Nations we are a big, happy family of the Commonwealth. Yet it is a known fact—known throughout the world—that South Africa has adopted a policy anti-Asian. Mr. Speaker, South Africa brands as outcasts the natives of that bnd. The irony of it is that the South Africans are the immigrants, yet the white population dare to heap indignities on the sons of the soil. Yet we allow South Africans to come here; we allow them to take our money from this country. We can do without them. We should impose those bans, those restrictions immediately, as an outward sign of protection, of the upholding of Asian dignity in the world. If the South African Government does not want Asians to go there. we do not want South Africans to come here, and we should adopt what I think was adopted in India some time back. A South African was not even allowed to land on Indian soil, even though he was passing through that country. That is a policy, that is the firm hand which an Asian nation like ours, a proud nation in the East* should adopt All actions short of violence, all democratic actions must be advocated on the South African citizen.

Similarly with Australia. We must take action against Australia. There must be an end to official policy: some people may he treated weft, but there is a colour-bar: an Asian cannot

settle in Australia. Are we going to tolerate it? What is the use of being an independent Eastern country? Australia may make exceptions—we are not concerned with the exceptions—we are concerned with the rule.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, His Highness has also referred to the national language of this country and expressed the hope that it will progress from time to time. We, of the Peoples' Progressive Party, have at all times accepted and maintained Malay as the national language of the land; and I assure His Highness, I assure this House, that so far as the Peoples' Progressive Party is concerned, we are taking steps to see that the Malay language is widely used, is widely learnt by non-Malays who are citizens of this country, so that in due course it will be in reality the national language of this country. However, there is a point on which it is necessary for me to comment—that is on the Constitution of this country.

What does the Constitution say? It says that a citizen of this country, no matter whether he knows Malay or not, no matter whether he knows English or not—there are thousands of such citizens—is entitled to stand for election to the Legislative Assemblies of the States or to stand for election to this Parliament. Therefore, Sir, we will get to the position where one day we may have a Member in this House—it may be more than one Member—who cannot speak Malay, who cannot speak English. The Constitution gives him that right—that is another fact which cannot be disputed. That being so, what will be the position of that Member? He might be an Indian, a Chinese or Ceylonese who does not know Malay or English. What is he going to do—sit down like a mummy? If the Constitution gives every citizen that right, why cannot it give him the right to speak in his own language too—to speak in the Chinese language or the Tamil language? I have mentioned these two languages, because these two alone will suffice. And I advocate multi-lingualism. If there is any bar in the

Constitution, I would ask the Government to amend the Constitution to allow multi-lingualism. But in my opinion there is no bar. The Article which says that English may be used is a permissive section and not an exclusive section. The fact that you permit one does not exclude the other. And here, I appeal to Honourable Members, who sit on both sides of the House, not to misunderstand me for one moment. We accept, we acknowledge, we foster the Malay language as the national language of this country. Every political organisation, every individual, does accept it or foster it, but for practical necessity, to keep in line with the Constitution of the country, it is necessary that a man given the right to sit in this House should be given the equal right to speak in the language which he knows. If it was the intention of the framers of the Constitution, if it was the intention of the Government of this country, to bar a person, who does not know Malay or the English language, the Constitution would have said so. But it does not. On that ground, I ask the Government to take a serious view, a strong view. Let us be practical; let us do something which is right. On one side you say, "Come in." On the other you say, "Speak in Malay or English—or do not talk at all." That is the effect of the Constitution.

Sir, again, I come to the question of education, which has been touched on many times. Free education is one of the greatest principles enshrined in the universal Declaration of Human Rights. His Highness has said that we uphold or accept the Declaration of Human Rights—and very shortly it says (Article 26)—everyone has the right to education; education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages: and this is enshrined in the Declaration which Malaya accepts. I call on the Government to give free education, free primary education, to the children of this land, to all children of whatever race they may be.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I realise that finance is a question of importance in

considering free primary education. Time and again the Government Bench has said that there is no such thing as free education and that nothing is free in this world. But the Declaration of Human Rights says that it is free, and I am satisfied. Basing on those words, Sir, money must be found. How can money be found? Yes, you can tax the people and you can bleed the people; but there is an alternative—cut down expenditure. And I appeal to the Government to do so, as the Honourable Minister of Finance has said in his address, there is some pruning to be done on the side of expenditure. What are we going to prune? What can be pruned without creating unnecessary difficulties or trouble to anybody?

Now, there is the fabulous travelling overseas by Members of the Government—we should cut that down. We should cut down foreign embassies; we should cut down the train of staff which exists in foreign embassies. We should close down embassies which are not necessary. It is true that for dignity, for keeping up prestige, it is all very nice to have them—but charity must begin at home. The people of this country must get the benefits of Merdeka before dignity is maintained outside this land. I am not saying that we should close down every embassy in the world. What I am saying is, do not open any more, close down what is not important, and save that money for giving education to the children.

I am glad to note that a Committee will be appointed to study the Education Report and the education policy which has been in force in this country. That is a very good thing, because the people of this country has been asking for that for a very long time. But whether this Committee can do good work or not, whether this Committee will succeed in satisfying the wishes of the citizens of this country, must depend largely on the composition of this Committee. I have this to say: I ask that members from every political organisation in this country be represented on that Committee. I ask that on the Education side—on the Chinese side, on the Indian side, on the Tamil side—there

should be real education experts. The Committee should consist of those persons; and besides the political party representatives, I suggest, that there should be no political interference with that Committee, because then and then only will there be a free Committee to work. The political representatives will be there to put up their views. Let us have a report which, I hope, will solve the education problem. It is a problem which concerns not only one section. I understand that all sections have complaints against the Ordinance. Let the independent Committee produce a report, a unanimous report with the support of education experts of all races in this land. Although we may not like communal matters, sometimes it is necessary, because you cannot solve a problem unless you know the basic fault in any problem. And I ask the Government not to ask for memoranda to be sent, as it will be more useful for the men to be there to say what they mean, so that you can ask them what they really mean.

Sir, I now come back to the old question of the Emergency Regulations Ordinance. We all know that His Highness says—and we hope—that very soon there will be no more Emergency in this country. We are informed that the Emergency is almost at an end—yes, in white areas and I think some States are almost white. Yet, we still have section 24 of the Emergency Regulations in force. Section 24 is the dreaded section under which citizens or non-citizens can be dragged from their house at any time of the day or night and locked up in a police station. What is meant by this? Is the Emergency over or not? What were the Emergency Regulations formulated for? They were formulated to deal with terrorists: now they have come to be known as communist terrorists. But if you read the Emergency Regulations, you will see that they were formulated to deal with terrorists. The Ordinance has been extended to deal with communist terrorists. Good. But the emergency situation is better and the whole country is almost white. Still section 24 is there—for what purpose? Why do

you give the Police powers to frighten people? I say that in this country there are some Police personnel who take pleasure in sort of bullying the people. It is our duty to see that section 24 of the Emergency Regulations is revoked, if not in the whole, at least in part, of the country where there is no more danger. I say this, because as a professional I know what happens. Sir, again the universal Declaration of Human Rights—what does it say? Article 9 says that no person shall be subject to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile. Why this Emergency Regulation in respect of arbitrary arrest? Are we following the Declaration of Human Rights? I know that in case of an emergency in the country we can make emergency laws, but we are told that the Emergency is almost at an end. We can see the end coming with our eyes, and yet there is this arbitrary arrest and detention without trial where a man is deprived of his liberty without trial. I say now with all sincerity that if this House wants, I can produce innocent men in this House who had been detained under the Emergency Regulations—innocent men who today sit in State Legislatures of this country. Is that justice, is that the Merdeka which the people of this country wanted so much to get?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I know that I have had an answer from the Honourable the Minister of Defence that there is a review of the Emergency Regulations going on, but I ask that a Special Committee be appointed to review section 24 to see how far it is necessary for that section to remain on the Statute Book under the Emergency Regulations Ordinance. I think the time has come when section 24 must go. According to the written replies given by the Government side as to how many are detained—35 and 100 over. But yet these Regulations are being used for taking people in. Are we going to give the Police in this country that power? Are we going to maintain a Police State in this land?

Sir, another important point on which I have spoken before and on which I am speaking again is about

people arrested under the Emergency Regulations, people arrested under the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance. What is the Police attitude in this country? I asked for an assurance from the Minister of the Interior and Justice then, and he gave me that assurance—that counsels and relatives will be allowed to see persons arrested as soon as possible. Sir, there are instances where either the counsels or the relatives have not been allowed to see arrested persons for days. Why? The answer given by the Police is, "Investigations are pending." Sir, I know that when investigations are pending, it may be quite in order for the Police to say, "You cannot see him alone." But what is the objection to a Police officer or officers, knowing the language of the person, being present? What is the objection to the relatives of that person, or even his counsel, seeing him? What is the implication, what is the indication which it gives—torture, forced confession? What is the reason, what is the objection? Honourable Members on both sides of the House, can you tell me what is the objection—if you have a Chinese under detention or arrest—to having a Chinese Police officer present, and letting the mother, who is crying, letting the son, daughter and father to see each other? I ask the Minister of Justice, the Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Defence, in the name of humanity, to see that the Police allow people arrested to see their relatives. You can say, "You cannot see him alone", but let him be seen by his relatives in the presence of police officers. Sir, this matter of the Police trying to assume absolute control is becoming more evident every day. Even in minor cases of theft, in minor cases of criminal breach of trust, in minor cases of fighting in public, people are not allowed to bail them due to oversight. Why should a man spend a night in police custody for petty offences, such as fighting on the roadside for which the maximum penalty is a fine of \$100? Can anybody tell me what does it indicate? It indicates that there is not enough control over the Police Department in this country.

I know that the Police have done a good job. I will be the last person to condemn wholesale, but where condemnation is necessary, I will give that condemnation. Sir, this matter is very important as it affects the ordinary man-in-the-street, and I do ask all the Ministers concerned to issue instructions that Police Officers should be reasonable. There is one thing, I must say whatever may be the political repercussions on me. And here I pay neat credit to the expatriate Police Officers of this country, because time and again it is the expatriate officers who assisted parents and children to see the arrested persons which redounds to their credit. Our own Asian officers have no initiative or backbone to act on their own, to think on their own for one moment. It is always the expatriates who come to the rescue.

Mr. Tan Slew Si: On a point of explanation. Sir—we have not had the throwing of ash trays in this Chamber yet.

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: If you want to throw ash trays, I have some. I say that to the credit of the expatriate police officers and I want to say it, because it is true and it is their right to have it.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, foreign troops in Malaya: We have been told that foreign troops are necessary to protect this country. What happened when the Japanese invaded this country? What happened to the foreign troops and who ran first, who left this country, leaving the people of the nation to their own destiny? On whom was the obligation to defend the country? It was on the foreign troops, and yet they went. What will happen in future? Sir, the basing of foreign troops in this land, if there is a war, if there is a conflagration, will positively involve Malaya in that war, although we may as a nation have nothing to do with that war. We will be dragged into the war which perhaps the Malayan people will not want on their hands.

Date* Cam MB Jaafar (KaaU Sdataa): Defence treaties!

Mr. D. R. Seenivangam: That is exactly my point. Sir. This Government must be cautious, must be warned itself, that it represents the people of the nation and that anything that tends to involve the Malayan nation in a war should be done away with.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would now refer to a Ministry which deals with the Information Services and the policy to be adopted by them. Now, information is necessary for the people. I ask the Services to go round everywhere, but I do also ask that the Information Services be not used as a propaganda machinery for any political organisation. They should be used for telling the people what the Government is doing.

Sir, on the question of the freedom of the Press

Dato* Dr. Ismail: On a point of explanation, is the Honourable Member aware that at present we are having parliamentary party government in this country?

Mr. Speaker: I think, it is quite all right. Proceed.

Mr. D. R. Seeaivaiagam: Sir, on the question of the freedom of the Press, an important matter also, it should be the policy of this Government to see that the freedom of the Press is upheld at all times. Any statement which tends to attack or to take away that freedom must be condemned. I refer to a well-known English newspaper—the *Straits Times*—of the 14th October, 1959: I refer to one passage in a report in that paper which has not been denied, which has not been contradicted up to now, which says:

"Syed Ja'afar Albar who was sworn in as Assistant Minister, Prime Minister's Department, to-day said he 'will also keep a close watch on the Press and will urge Government to take strong action against newspapers stirring up communal feelings'."

Again, Sir, I refer to the *Straits Times* of the 21st October, 1959—there is a short passage which says:

"Syed Ja'afar who was giving his first press conference as Assistant Minister, Prime Minister's Department, warned the Press, 'if things are written which do not help to achieve the objective of creating unity amongst the different races, the Government cannot remain silent about it'."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, those statements in themselves might be quite harmless, but those statements and subsequent statements refer in particular to the vernacular press, and the warning was given to the vernacular press, Chinese and Tamil press, to the exclusion of the English and Malay press. Why is it necessary for a high official of this Department to warn the press, do not do this, do that? We have a Public Prosecution Department. If anybody incites communal ill-will, if anybody does anything against the law, it is the Public Prosecution Department which will take action. It is not the duty, it is not the business of this House, or of any Member of this House, to go round warning the press. I do say that it was regrettable that such statements should have been made. They can be misunderstood. They may be absolutely necessary, but they can be misunderstood and have been misunderstood, because one English daily, the *Straits Echo and Times of Malaya*, wrote an editorial on them.

Dato* Dr. Ismail: It can only be misunderstood by you

Mr. Speaker: No interruption, please. Proceed.

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: If you want a reply, speak louder. Some people do not understand what I am saying. I say that we condemn any statement which will tend to take away the freedom of the press. If a communal issue is cited, the press in this country has a right to print that communal issue, so long as it does not incite communal violence, or to cause treason and sedition in this land. There are laws of the country to deal with those questions. I do ask that it should not be the policy for the Assistant Minister concerned to warn the press.

Dato' Onn bin Jaafar: Hear, hear.

Mr. Seeaivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on the question of subversive elements, time and again we have heard "Oh, there is subversion; we must be careful." True! But I ask the Government to beware and not to try to say that anybody who asks for anything, anybody who raises any matter—any issue like the language issue, the education

problem and equal rights, I do ask the Government not to turn round and say that these are subversive elements. I ask the Government not to try to draw a red herring, as was said in this House. Let us not try to brand everybody a subversive element.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, what I have said to-day are facts. What I have said is contained in the Constitution. Let anybody say that these are twisted facts. They are facts, undeniable facts, and no Malayan nation can come into being until the Constitution is put right to establish equality and justice for all persons in this country.

There is one more problem, the problem of immigration, which I am not dealing with, but I say that the Immigration Ordinance as it stands to-day is a piece of legislation which must be accepted by any independent country. Every country must have its immigration control, but how that Immigration Ordinance, how the discretion under the Immigration Ordinance is applied, I hope, will be dealt with by somebody else.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think that is all, except that I wish to finalise my speech by saying: we ask for equality, we ask for multi-racialism, we ask for justice without arbitrary arrests and detention in this country, we ask for a foreign policy which is independent and which will condemn countries like South Africa, Australia and Indonesia. We ask for that on behalf of the people of this country.

Mr. V. David (Bongsar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, before I proceed to speak, I would request Members of the Government bench to be tolerant and to have patience in listening to Members of the Opposition.

Dato* Dr. Ismail: Don't worry.

Mr. V. David: Mr. Speaker. Sir, first of all I would like to deal with the main three aspects which were in the contents of His Highness' Speech. Of these three aspects, the first is vitally necessary for this country, a nation which is trying to foster national unity and attempting to create a national culture which would be acceptable to

all the races in this country. Mr. Speaker, Sir, Malaya with *its* multi-racial cultural backgrounds should now merge into a single culture which would be acceptable and fostered by all the three main races of this country. By this way only could we achieve a united Malayan nation which would earn the respect and dignity of other countries in this world.

Secondly, His Highness' Speech contains the development of the rural areas. When I talk about the development of rural areas, I have now come to know that a Ministry for Rural Development has been established, but I do not know what is the intention of the Government—whether it is genuinely to foster the growth of rural industries or just for the mere sake of creating a political appointment. This is left to be seen. But, in the meantime, I would like to explain the existing conditions in the rural areas.

Malaya has a population of nearly 5 millions, but our rural population is more than 3 millions. According to Ungku Aziz's report, it is stated that in the kampongs most of the fanners earn about \$50 a month, while a few earn about \$500 a month. Mr. Speaker, Sir, when we read this statement we are driven to the conclusion that the present set up in the rural areas is such that it gives adequate privileges for certain groups of people to exploit the farmers. If you are really and genuinely interested to help the farmers, you should accept the principle that land should be for the tillers of the soil and not for those who act as employers and exploit and degrade the livelihood of the farmers. Further, the report says that, very often, farmers do not have modern efficient tools that would make their labour more effective—tools that would get them better results from less effort. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I hope that the Minister who is going to be in charge of Rural Development will bear this in mind. Further, very often a man does not have enough land to keep him fully employed. This is where we find land hunger. Malaya has large acreages of land which have not been

cultivated and still land hunger is there for the very reason that certain amount of land is given to the privileged class, whereby those lands do not get into the reach of the ordinary fanners who work in the farms.

Thirdly, some farmers do not know how to produce the crops that would give them a good income. Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is very encouraging to note that rural development is going to have its own Ministry and the Minister in charge will take initiative to see that all is done for rural development. Until and unless we pay adequate attention towards rural development, Malaya will not have self-sufficiency. For instance, rice is still imported from Siam, Burma and other countries. Malaya has the climatic conditions and the soil which could produce more rice, and it could be made self-sufficient. We should blame ourselves.—the Government in power—for not initiating towards this goal. The report also adds that half of the farm-hind in Malaya is worked by farmers who do not own that land. Sometimes the rent is as high as half the value of the crop. It is really shocking to read this report. From the last election we find that the Alliance Government in power has always been preaching development in the rural areas, but I think a socialist economy can only bring a reformation in the lives of the rural farmers. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the present system of land distribution which gives adequate powers and privileges to certain individuals to monopolise the rural areas would not provide satisfaction to the rank and file of the farmers who are just striving to earn a livelihood. Therefore, I remind the Minister who is going to be in charge of rural development to concentrate on rural development genuinely and not to treat this as a political appointment; and not to lay down policies on paper which are not going to be implemented.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, going back again to that portion of His Highness' Speech where it says that it is the Government's intention to create a Malayan nation, I would like to refer to the existing laws in this country

which are detrimental towards this goal. As previous speakers of the Opposition bench have spoken during the last meeting as well as to-day on the repressive laws, I would like to say something on the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance. Mr. Speaker, Sir, we will not be able to build a united Malayan nation when we have laws such as the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance and the Emergency Regulations. I would like to quote a section of the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance which gives ample and arbitrary powers to the Minister of the Interior to act, and appoint a man to investigate the case of an accused person and to make a decision. It states:

"The Minister may by writing under his hand appoint any person by name or office, and either generally or for any particular case, to be the Inquiry Officer for the purposes of the Ordinance: provided that no police officer shall be appointed to be an Inquiry Officer."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, a man without any legal status can be appointed under this law. An ordinary man, who does not know the law and who may not have any interest to uphold justice can be appointed as an Inquiry Officer and this man has powers under this Ordinance to decide the destiny of a person who will be arrested under the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance. During the last parliamentary elections, Members of the Opposition have been arrested in large numbers. None of them, I know, have been released. Most of them have been placed under restricted residence.....

Mr. Speaker: Is that relevant?

Mr. V. David: When I refer to the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance, Sir, I must quote certain sections of it.

Mr. Speaker: We are now dealing with the Emergency Ordinance. Is it not?

Mr. V. David: The Emergency Regulations and the Prevention of Crimes Ordinances, as has been explained, are detrimental to the democratic and smooth running of this country. The Emergency Regulations, it is often told, are going to be repealed, and certain sections of this

very law have been now applied in the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance and that is the very reason why when you talk about the Emergency Regulations you will have also to speak about certain sections of the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance. Mr. Speaker, Sir, such laws will not create a united Malayan nation. Section 24 of the Emergency Regulations empowers a police officer to make arbitrary arrests and very often these arrests are made not with substantial grounds but through hearsay evidence and mostly through suspicion. When a man is arrested under section 24 of the Emergency Regulations he can be detained for 28 days without trial, and the Minister of Defence can exceed the number of days from time to time. During this period the man arrested will be kept in the lock-up, in the place where he was arrested. Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is a tragedy to the Human Rights Charter of the United Nations to make such arrests without open trial, and there are not one or two cases but hundreds of cases of this nature. Last October there was mass arrests in this country under the Emergency Regulations. In fact, I am of the suspicion that this was intended to create fear in the minds of the electorate who are ardent supporters of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker: I must rule that out. Under the Standing Orders you cannot impute improper motives in debate.

Mr. V. David: My apologies. Sir.

Touching on the education policy, I have nothing much to add. But I would like to comment that there is widespread discontentment over the education policy, not only among the non-Malay speaking group but also among the Malays, especially in Kota Bharu, and there have been frequent strikes in the schools over the education policy. Therefore, we welcome the committee that has been set up, and this committee should necessarily investigate all the relevant aspects of education in this country and place its recommendations which could be

acceptable and enable the smooth running of the schools in this country.

The Honourable Minister of Finance and this Government itself has been advocating free trade. When we talk about free trade we mean that a country which produces any material should be able to sell it freely and buy freely. In this country, we are politically prejudiced towards other countries and sometimes we refuse to import their goods or sell our goods to them. Our principle should be that we should sell our materials to the country which offers a better price.

Mr. Taa Slew Sin: On a point of explanation. Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Are you going to make an explanation?

Mr. T« Slew Sin: Yes, Sir. The Honourable Member does not know what he is talking about. We have not refused to sell any of our commodities to any country. I would like the Honourable Member to quote any instances when we refused to sell anything to any country.

Mr. V. David: Sir. I am glad that the Honourable Finance Minister of this country is a "superman" who knows everything. I am sorry to say that he thinks none of us know anything—that is what he regards.

Mr. Speaker: Have you finished?

Mr. V. David: I have not finished. Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Please proceed.

Mr. V. David: I think he has not understood what I am trying to say. For instance, the Bank of China was closed. I am not talking about the merits or demerits of the Bank of China, but I am concerned why this Bank was closed.

Mr. Speaker: How is that relevant to the debate to-day?

Mr. V. David: When I talk about trade, Sir, I will have to make references on trade.

Mr. Speaker: This is not trade.

Mr. V. David: The economy of this country. Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Please do not proceed on the closure of the Bank; that has nothing to do with this debate.

Mr. V. David: When we talk about free trade. Sir, I think our outlook should be free in all respects and not prejudiced our countries with whom we politically disagree. Great Britain to-day disagrees with so many countries politically but she trades with every country where she gets better prices for her products. Malaya is still a primary producer of raw materials and she needs long-term commodity price stabilisation. Unless Malaya moves towards this direction I am afraid, Sir, in time to come we will be faced with tremendous difficulties. We are completely relying on the export of raw materials such as rubber and tin. A few months back the Malayan economy was hit due to the price of rubber which was not up to our expectations, but now the price has gone up. The market for rubber is now sound, and we have although been depending on foreign markets for our raw materials. As I have said, as a country which believes in free trade, we should not be concerned with the internal political affairs of the respective countries but we should maintain a policy of free trade with any country which is prepared to trade with us with good intentions.

When we talk about stabilised economy, I will also have to touch on the fragmentation of rubber estates in this country. As we have said, time and again, rubber and tin are the life-blood stream of this country and if we fail to give adequate consideration to rubber estates in this country we will not be in an economically strong position. Fragmentation of estates has been taking place during the last couple of years. Mr. Speaker, Sir, there are estates in this country which the absentee land-lords are prepared to sell for a good price and are willing to take the money and invest in other countries where they can make a better profit. They are not concerned with

the economy of this country or the position of the workers in this country; their main object is a better price for their estates. There- are many cases where certain speculators, who come from the Alliance itself, have bought these estates and have split them up to obtain a good price. By this, Sir, large number of workers have been thrown out of employment.

Now, coming to the trade union policy, I would like to touch on several aspects of the government's policy. His Highness* Speech contains a certain section which states clearly:

"My Government's attitude to labour will be unchanged. It will continue to encourage the growth of a strong, free, democratic and responsible trade union movement for both workers and employers as the basis for mutual understanding and co-operation."

Mr. Speaker, the right to organise is not new. It is an accepted principle by the I.L.O. in its previous conferences, where it states:

"It is therefore essential that trade unions should be recognised not only as an essential institution of society but also of the important role in accelerating productivity of the Asian region as a whole. Some of the Asian countries, realising this, have given trade unions representation in the National Economic Councils and National Planning Boards. Even so, it is not adequate. In other countries, the State and the employers are jealous of trade union rights. We particularly draw attention of the countries to the fact that some countries in Asia have suppressed the rights of trade unions. This is a matter of deep concern for those who uphold the principle of free association and the right to organise in free association, upon which economic development is to be founded."

That is a quotation from the I.L.O. The right to organise in this country has to a certain extent been curtailed due to the Trade Union Ordinance which was passed recently. The Trade Union Ordinance has included certain provisions which really curtails the democratic growth of trade unions in this country. I would like to also quote a speech in the Legislative Council by a prominent trade union representative during the Trade Union Ordinance debate in this Council. He said:

"The Malayan Trade Union Congress has given very careful consideration to the provisions of the Trade Union Ordinance, 1959, and while deploring the restrictions on freedom of association embodied in it, accept them with certain reservations in

order to ensure the protection of the workers' interests. We regard certain sections of the Ordinance as 'purely temporary measures, subject to deletion as soon as more stable conditions prevail. Further, as it is, the provision in the law for compulsory registration is certainly contrary to Article 2 of the I.L.O. Convention, which required that workers and employers should be completely free to join organisations of their own choosing; to Article 3 of the I.L.O. Convention, which required that workers' and employers' organisations should be completely free to draw up their own constitutions and to run their affairs as they thought fit and without any intervention from the authorities."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in his speech he has clearly stated that this Ordinance is accepted as only a temporary measure and not as a permanent one. Originally, the Ordinance was framed sometime in 1948, immediately after the commencement of the Emergency Regulations, with an eye to the prevailing Emergency conditions at that juncture. After several years, the authorities did not give any consideration to revising the Ordinance to make it suitable to the conditions prevailing from time to time. I would invite the Honourable the Minister for Labour to appoint a Committee to revise the present Ordinance with a view to the ending of the Emergency Regulations, as has already been said in the Speech of His Highness.

Mr. Speaker, to prove that the Trade Union Ordinance in the past has been a hindrance to trade unions, I would like to quote the membership of the trade unions which have been decreasing from year to year, and the Annual Report of the Registrar of Trade Unions, 1957, states that on 31st December, 1957, the membership of employees* unions was 222,073, which was 10,101 less than the corresponding figure of 31st December, 1956. Again, the Annual Report of the Trade Union Registrar for the year 1958 states that on 31st December, 1958, the membership of employees' unions was 210,688, which was 11,385 less than the corresponding figure on 31st December, 1957. From this we find that trade union membership is decreasing from time to time. I earnestly feel that the new Minister of Labour will give due consideration in revising this Ordinance with a view

to encouraging the growth of free and democratic trade unions.

Negotiating machinery is lacking in this country. We have disputes in various industries in this country taking place due to inadequate negotiating machinery. For instance, the Malayan Railway strike was due to the lack of proper negotiating machinery.

Mr. Speaker: Which part of the Speech are you referring to?

Mr. David: I am referring to trade unions, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: We are now debating the policy.

Mr. David: On the policy itself. I would like to mention that more emphasis should be given for Joint Industrial Councils in industries.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the stoppage of work which took place was in fact due to the lack of proper machinery whereby such machinery could be utilised by both employers and workers for settling their differences from time to time, to iron out differences. Even such machinery is not in some places being fully utilised by the employers. I would like to quote a section of the Report by the M.T.U.C. which states as follows:

"Unions in Malaya experience increasing difficulty in persuading employers to enter into negotiations. Even where sound machinery for collective bargaining exists, negotiations have tended to reach a stalemate. Now is the time, we feel, before the situation deteriorates further. For the I.L.O. to send a Fact-Finding Mission to Malaya to make a study on the application of the International Labour Organisation Convention Nos. 87 and 98. In order to stimulate good management-labour relations, it is suggested that the I.L.O. should intensify its activities in this field. More frequent teams of management and trade union leaders from all the industrial countries would be welcome in Malaya."

Mr. Speaker, to study this aspect of industrial relations, the Malayan Trade Union Congress has requested the Government to ask for an expert from the I.L.O. who could study the prevailing industrial situation in this country and make a report to the Government. I feel that it is extremely necessary for such a report to be submitted to the Government in view of our industrial

expansion. If we would like to have a stable economy in this country, we must also pay adequate attention to industrial peace. If we do not have proper negotiating machinery, I am afraid we will have frequent industrial unrest whereby the economy of this country could be wrecked. Usually, I find, whenever there is an industrial dispute, the Government immediately accuses and alleges the unions without bearing in mind the employers' attitude towards the union. Therefore, it is desirable that an expert be asked to come to Malaya from the I.L.O., who should thoroughly investigate the industrial position of this country.

In the United States, we find there is a National Labour Relations Board and when a dispute arises between the workers union and the industry, at that juncture the National Labour Relations Board is requested by the Government to do conciliation work. During the period of conciliation work, this organisation sends its good offices to finding out the views of management, the views of the unions, and to find out really where the dispute has really arisen, and how it could be settled. We do not have such a Conciliation Board in this country. We have the Labour Department under the Ministry of Labour, and the Industrial Relations Department. These two departments are tied up to a certain extent. I will not dwell on the Labour Department, because its main concern is to enforce laws, but I would like to make certain comments on the Industrial Relations Department. The Industrial Relations Department should be given wide powers to do conciliation work. I find that it has only limited scope in this field. If it is considered really desirable that this Department should do conciliation work, then it must be given ample powers to deal with disputes and also to find out the problems existing between employers and unions.

As regards the Labour Department, which is supposed to enforce the law, I would request that proper training be given to those officers in the department and officers recruited should have adequate qualifications on human relations. They may be academically

qualified for the course, but if they do not have proper experience and knowledge of human relations, I am afraid that they will not be able to do the task efficiently. People who go to the Labour Department are not people well-educated and possessing vast knowledge of trade unions and other matters. They go for the help of the department to ensure that the management plays a fair part. According to the law and in such circumstances, the officer in charge of the Labour Department should be able to grasp what the man really wants and should be able to offer his service to his satisfaction.

On trade unions, Mr. Speaker, His Highness' Speech says "to encourage the growth of strong free and democratic trade union movement for both employers and workers as the basis for mutual understanding and co-operation". Here again, I would like to make reference to splinter unions and yellow unions. I find certain employers nowadays want to sponsor trade unions. They are trying to organise splinter and yellow unions within their factory workers and prevent their workers from joining democratic unions. There are also employers who, as a condition of employment, when a man is recruited for a job, he is asked: "Will you give an assurance that you will not join any trade union?" Such undertaking is illegal and against the law of the country. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would request the Honourable the Minister of Labour to inquire into these aspects and see that no employer acts contrary to the principles of the trade union rights of this country.

Then we come to unemployment. The other day, certain references were made regarding Employment Exchanges. Mr. Speaker, when we talk about Employment Exchange, it has to do with Unemployment Insurance Scheme. Without an unemployment insurance scheme, the employment exchange is useless. We have found through experience that there are people who have registered for employment just over three years ago, and up to now they have not obtained employment. It is of very little use to the people of this country when there is

no unemployment insurance. In other countries, we find that there is an unemployment insurance scheme whereby every worker who loses employment has to register in the employment exchange for the reason that if he does not register he will not be entitled for unemployment insurance, and the unemployment exchange then does its utmost to find employment for the worker who is unemployed, so that he will get employment before his insurance scheme is exhausted. I would recommend that the Government takes action to bring an expert to find ways and means in order to set up an unemployment insurance scheme. If this insurance scheme goes along with the employment exchange, then I think the employment exchange will be of use to the Malayan workers.

The Minister of Health and Social Welfare (Dato' Ong Yoke Lin): Mr. Speaker, on a point of information—I think the Honourable the Minister of Finance announced a few days ago that an I.L.O. expert is already in this country looking into the unemployment insurance scheme. I think the Honourable Member must be aware of it, and any repetition of this subject is a waste of the time of this House.

Mr. David: Mr. Speaker. I am glad that the expert is here. I would prefer that his findings be reported as early as possible, and not wait until the next parliamentary elections.

Dato' Ong Yoke Lin: Sir, he hasn't made his report—he is still investigating.

Mr. Speaker: Please proceed.

Mr. David: When we talk about unemployment, Mr. Speaker, we will have to define unemployment under three categories, that is, technological unemployment, seasonal unemployment and slump unemployment.

When we talk about technological unemployment, we have an experience in one of the pineapple packing industries two years ago. Machinery was brought in without any consultation with the workers, and this machinery replaced a large number of workers. A fear arose in the minds of

the workers that if such machinery was introduced into the industry, they may be forced to lose their jobs or they may become redundant. To eliminate this fear. Mr. Speaker, when we talk about technology and the mechanisation of industry in this country, we must also make provision for adequate opportunities of employment by expanding industry, by creating more public works. We welcome mechanisation, but while welcoming mechanisation, mechanisation should not be a disservice to the workers by placing them under the unemployment list. While workers become redundant in certain industries, there should be additional public works whereby redundant workers could be fitted in. That is what I would like to remind the Labour Ministry, when industries are moving towards the direction of mechanisation, that they should always consult the workers, and they should always give assurance that they won't be replaced or they would not be made unemployed in this country. Technological unemployment is largely due in other parts of the world, but it is just beginning in this country, and I feel within the next five years there will be a lot of technological unemployment in this country due to the mechanisation of industry.

When we talk about seasonal unemployment, this is not very serious but at least in time to come it will become very serious. Seasonal unemployment affects people who live in the rural areas and who are mainly in plantations and in the agricultural field. Fanners especially have a certain period where they work in the farms and after harvest for certain months they do not have any employment. This we regard as seasonal unemployment. Even in the case of fruits—in this country certain fruits are grown at certain period of the year and after these periods those people who have been living by selling those fruits become unemployed. That is what we call seasonal unemployment. As the Minister of Agriculture stated, he is trying to exert every energy to expand agriculture in this country, and in time to come we will have more seasonal

unemployment. When we have seasonal unemployment, the Government should have a certain amount of policy whereby they could find job for these people who are becoming seasonally unemployed.

Slump unemployment—during a boom in rubber, people from the towns rush to the estates for employment, but as soon as the rubber price goes down, they are forced to leave the estates because income from the estates are not sufficient. This we regard as slump unemployment. When we have a stabilised economy in this country, I don't think we will have slump unemployment. At that time we will not be faced with this question. But until we have a stabilised economy, we will have to be faced with slump unemployment.

Since the imposition of tin restrictions, introduced in December, 1957, about 13,300 workers were retrenched in the mines.

His Highness in his Royal Speech has said:

"In the field of Local Government it has been found necessary, in the light of experience, to defer, generally, elections for a period of one year. The pre-1950 situation has progressively revealed over the years since its introduction in 1950 certain unsatisfactory features, particularly the difficulty of maintaining the electoral rolls at a high level of accuracy and the unsettling effect of the annual elections of one-third of the membership of the various Councils. During the period of suspension, it is the intention of my Government to investigate along with the State Governments the desirability of simplifying the Qualifications of Local Authority electors with a view to preparing electoral rolls which can be maintained at a high level of accuracy without excessive annual expenditure on revision."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, while reading the contents of the speech I find that the postponement of local elections is only for the very reason of administrative difficulties because of the prevailing inaccuracy in electoral rolls. But I cannot, for one moment* believe that this is the very reason for postponing the elections. Every year for the last so many years we have been having free elections in all town boards and other places, but suddenly in this year the Government's intention to postpone the elections has convinced me beyond

doubt that there is an ulterior motive behind this.

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: On a point of order. Sir, the Honourable Member is making improper imputations.

Mr. V. David: Thank you. At least the Honourable the Minister of Finance is listening very carefully.

Sir, the postponement of elections, in my opinion, is due to fear in the minds of the Alliance of the Opposition parties . . .

Mr. Speaker: I have ruled that you are not supposed to impute improper motive.

Mr. V. David: I am not, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: You are.

Mr. V. David: Sir, when referring to the Kuala Lumpur Municipal Council, we do not have until now a fully elected Council. The Government itself in its election pledges during the Parliamentary election has assured the people that this Government will encourage fully elected councils in all towns and villages. But here I find that Kuala Lumpur being the capital of the Federation of Malaya, which bears an international importance in this country, has been left out without a fully elected Council. It still follows the old tradition of a nominated system which indicates that it is not fully represented by the people. Sir, the Alliance may have its reasons on the administrative side, but we, in the Opposition, are fully convinced that the Alliance is really fearing the growing consciousness of the town living population. Sir, the people living in towns in the various parts of this country are conscious of their rights and they know from time to time action taken by the Government in power and when they vote they are conscious for what they vote. Therefore, the Alliance move to postpone the elections is a blow on the Opposition parties.

Enche' Abdul Hamid Khan (Bating Padang): Sir, may I know if the Honourable Member is speaking on behalf of members of the Opposition?

Mr. Speaker: Please proceed.

Mr. V. David: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think this question need not be answered.

Mr. Speaker: It does not matter—proceed.

Mr. V. David: Sir, we are fully satisfied that the Alliance is running and seeking refuge by postponing these elections. If they are really brave enough to meet the Opposition parties in the political arena then they should have these elections. It is a sabotage of the democratic system of Local Government.

Mr. Speaker: You have again gone out of order.

Mr. V. David: Thank you, Sir. I think I have dwelled enough on this matter of Local Government elections. I think by this at least the motive has been explained.

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: Sir, I would like the Honourable Member to withdraw his allegations.

Mr. Speaker: Not necessary. Proceed.

Mr. V. David: On housing for workers, I remember that some time back in this country there was an I.L.O. expert, Mr. Ruddock, who came to this country to investigate the present system of housing in this country and to make a report. I am sure the report has been submitted to the Government but I am shocked that the Government has not implemented the recommendations of the United Nations expert.

According to the United Nations expert's Report it states that about 150 million families in the less developed countries are without shelter. The shortage of housing, especially low-cost housing, is one of the many shortcomings in Asia. He says that housing should have a distinct place in the economic development programmes in which there should also be a provision for the necessary development of the building materials and related industries. They should be consulted in the preparation of housing plans and designs.

Mr. Speaker, when referring to housing I do not know whether the Government is paying adequate attention or not, but when you make reference to certain labour lines and quarters under the Malayan Railway, I would say they are most deplorable and I would only refer to them as a Colonial symbol, which is still existing in this country. There are houses without backdoors. A person will have only one means of access and exit. There is no other door to go out of the house. Mr. Speaker, Sir, low-cost housing has been advocated by our Minister of the Interior. There is an organisation, supposed to be the Housing Trust, which has been allocated a certain amount of money for building low-cost houses. In my opinion, I feel that this amount of money is very inadequate. Therefore, in order to enable the Housing Trust to build more low-cost houses, it should borrow money from the Employees Provident Fund. I find that this money has been idling for a considerable period and this money could be utilised for the purpose of building low-cost houses—and if you call it low-cost housing it should be really low-cost housing and not of an exorbitant nature where the ordinary worker with a small income cannot make full use of the advantages provided.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would also like to refer to a certain section of the Report of the expert which says:

"The most regrettable fact to note is the inability of the lower income groups to pay an economic rental for the minimum standard housing. This is perhaps not for the first time but it is a problem which is still unsolved. To-day the housing problem is not only a shortage of accommodation but or rents which people cannot afford to pay."

Sir, in this respect I would like to call upon the Honourable the Minister of Transport to give his immediate consideration to building more railway quarters with modern sanitation and which are really fit for human accommodation.

Now, I will come to medical facilities. Mr. Speaker, Sir, when I talk about medical facilities I really feel ashamed, because this subject has not only been spoken by myself but also by

many in this House. Medical facilities are a deep concern of the Malayan people generally in this country, members from the Government Bench, speaking the other day about Rural Health Centres and Governments immediate action to develop Rural Health Centres. One of the Members from the Government Bench admitted the inadequacy of medical facilities in this country by his speech. When you talk about Rural Health Centres, Sir, these Centres should be established within the reach of the ordinary working people in the kampongs and other places of dwelling. There are Rural Health Centres in this country where you do not have doctors—you merely have a nurse, maybe, and not proper doctors even to visit the Health Centres. If district hospitals and Rural Health Centres are fully equipped and staffed with proper doctors and nurses. I don't think we will have congestion in General Hospitals. Since there are no proper equipment and doctors at the district level and the rural level, we find people flocking into the General Hospitals. Sir, I would ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to give every consideration to improve the health services in rural places as well as at district level.

Dato' Ong Yoke Lin: Sir, on a point of order, this is exactly what the Honourable Member said in his adjournment speech. He is repeating it again.

Mr. Speaker: This is on a point of explanation, not on a point of order.

Mr. V. David: I think the Minister is speaking on the Budget and not on adjournment.

Mr. Speaker: Do not repeat that many times.

Mr. V. David: We have found, through experience, that there are lack of specialists especially in the General Hospital, Kuala Lumpur, where we have one orthopaedic surgeon. In fact, if I am not mistaken, he is the only man for the whole of the Federation of Malaya. When there is an emergency case somewhere in Kajang or at Tanjong Karang, it will take at least half

a day for this man to travel there before he can attend to the case, and in the meantime the patient might pass away. Sir, this is what we are experiencing in hospitals. This orthopaedic surgeon has to serve not only Selangor but also the other States nearby Selangor. We will have to recruit additional specialists to attend to special cases, so that lives will not be endangered due to lack of attention by a specialist.

Sir, when referring to estate hospitals, I would like to add one or two points. To-day estates are not dealing with immigrant labour. They are dealing with citizens of this country who form the backbone of the Malayan economy. I would call upon the Honourable the Minister of Health to be kind enough to pay more attention to estate hospitals and to direct the estate managers and agencies to provide better facilities in the estates.

On 22nd of June, 1959, at the General Hospital, Kuala Lumpur a woman was admitted suffering from acute joint disease. It is rather pitiful to note that the woman has to sit in a wheel-chair for the whole night without having a bed.

Mr. Speaker: Will you confine yourself to the principles and not refer to the details?

Mr. V. David: Thank you, Sir.

Dato' Ong Yoke Lin: I would like to know what was the disease referred to.

Mr. V. David: Acute joint disease. I think it is better for him to consult the Director of Medical Services.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, that is the very reason why I am making adequate emphasis on medical facilities. It should be the responsibility of the elected Government to provide proper and adequate medical facilities to the citizens of this country. If it fails in its duty, then it fails to redeem the pledges which it has made to the electorate during the election campaign.

On foreign policy, Mr. Speaker, Sir, there have been a lot of controversial issues during the last few weeks. In

fact, before touching on them. I would like to quote an extract from the speech of His Highness:

"Its basic policy will always be to uphold the Declaration of Human Rights and the Charter of the United Nations and to develop and maintain close relations with all friendly and sympathetic countries. My Government values particularly its free association with other members of the Commonwealth and the Treaty of Friendship recently concluded with Indonesia."

His Highness has clearly stated "with all friendly and sympathetic countries". Sir, one of the Alliance Members from Prai was commenting that Malaya's motion on Tibet at the United Nations will not destroy the sovereignty of this nation since Tibet is close to Malaya. On this aspect, first of all, I would welcome the Government to introduce a motion on foreign policy in this House at a later stage, so that we can take a stand. As far as I know we are not following any steady foreign policy. The first thing, Mr. Speaker. Sir, we do not want Malaya to be dragged into a cold war. We do not believe, and we are suspicious of all these military pacts—SEATO, NATO, the Baghdad Pact and the Manila Pact—which we feel are all military pacts to the advantage of the imperialist countries which are trying to create military bases in Asia.

Sir, the right direction for the Malayan nation would be to follow the principles of the Bandoeng Conference. When I talk about the Bandoeng Conference, I would like to make it clear that the Bandoeng Conference met in 1955 after serious consideration of the members of the Colombo Plan, fully realising that the Asians and Africans will have to get together in order to preserve political freedom and to achieve economic independence. When you take Africa and Asia, I do not think we have much to differ geographically, historically, economically and politically. Bandoeng has to-day become a symbol of the desire of the peoples of Asia and Africa for peace and international co-operation. After the Bandoeng Conference in April, 1955 the international political climate receded—a welcome change. Tension in the world was lessened. It became quite clear that the people in Asian or

African countries and the world at large do not desire a cold war. Instead they are eager to make friends and to co-operate with the peoples of all other countries towards the achievement of social justice and human welfare.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, when talking about the foreign policy of Malaya, I am really shocked and surprised when the motion on Tibet was moved at the United Nations. A country which is really affected by the Tibetan issue has not sponsored this move. India is directly and particularly affected by the Tibetan issue. But it kept silent. When the voting took place it abstained. Indonesia, which is a member of the Afro-Asian Nations, abstained. Sir, not one of the countries belonging to the Afro-Asian Nations did support this motion.

Date* Dr. Ismail bin Dato' Abdal Rihmni: Sir, I think that is a sweeping statement. I hope the Honourable Member will verify the statement when he said that not one of the Afro-Asian Nations voted.

Mr. V. David: Not major countries. The Afro-Asian Conference represent two-thirds of the world's population. It cannot be called a minority force; it is a majority and an effective force which was organised to preserve economic justice and political freedom and to prevent a cold war. **Mr. Speaker,** Sir, during the debates in the United Nations, we have noted that India did not contribute much in supporting the motion sponsored by Ireland and Malaya. The statement that it was not originally the intention of Malaya to sponsor the motion on Tibet and that it was a dictation from the Anglo-American countries, has been refuted in the past, but I am of the opinion that this was not the idea of Malaya but it was an idea of the American State Department.

Dato* Dr. Ismail; Sir, on a point of order. May I have some evidence of the Honourable Member's statement?

Mr. Speaker: You must not impute improper motives again. Please proceed.

Mr. V. David: Our line of thought, our line of action in international affairs should be in line with the principles of the Bandoeng Conference. We are not very far away from Indonesia; we are on the doorsteps of Indonesia.

Dato* Dr. Ismail: **Mr. Speaker,** Sir, on a point of order. For my own elucidation, will the Honourable Member please recite to me the principles of the Bandoeng Conference.

Mr. V. David: I think I can get him a copy from the library for him to read at home. *(Laughter).* At we have repeatedly said, we do not want Malaya to be dragged into a cold war. In the past—my colleagues here will be able to bear me out—the first victim of the atomic bomb was not a European but an Asian Nation. Hiroshima and Nagasaki were attacked by atomic bombs. It was a tragedy which has gone down in the history of the world which no Asian can forget. It was not dropped in San Francisco or in some other places, but it was dropped in Japan where it affected the lives of hundred and thousands of Asians. The same thing would happen if we are going to join hands with an imperialist nation which is not interested in the economic welfare of our country. It is interested only in a cold war and to monopolise the world through its scientific advancement.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have acted wrongly in the United Nations. We have no right to sponsor a motion in the United Nations, we have no right to impose something on a nation which is not participating in the United Nations. The People's China, the Republic of China, is not a full-fledged member of the United Nations. The move to admit China has been rejected and thrown out on many occasions and what right has the United Nations itself to make a ruling which will affect the People's China. **Mr. Speaker,** Sir, since that country is not a member, according to the objects of the United Nations it has no right to impose something on a non-member country. As the previous speaker stated, India, even though involved directly in the

dispute, did not refuse the admittance of China into the United Nations. It supported wholeheartedly because the principle is involved and it feels that China represents a large percentage of the population of the world. Mr. Speaker, this motion is not a direct concern of Malaya immediately. Malaya should have sponsored a motion where West Irian should be a part of Indonesia.

Dato* Dr. Ismail: I suggest that when his party comes to power, he can do it.

Mr. Speaker: You should not discuss on the policies of other countries. I rule that out.

Mr. David: I am speaking on foreign policy. I am asking why cannot we sponsor a motion of that nature.

Mr. Speaker: You cannot do that.

Mr. David: Thank you, Sir. Africa and Asia have long been subjected to Colonialism and the position of these two continents are similar. Mr. Speaker, Sir, now His Highness' Speech states that we are going to join hands with South-East Asian countries in our economic advancement. It is very encouraging to note, but it should not be an issue which automatically brings America into the picture, and we do not want, America in the back room directing the Asian countries towards their destinies. Sir, in the United Nations our line of action should be straightforward and aligned with the Afro-Asian countries. This will earn us more prestige and dignity in international politics. I am not discussing the merits and demerits of India and China in their dispute. I am not concerned with it, but I am only concerned with Malaya's action in the United Nations, because we as citizens of Malaya are affected by Malaya's action in the United Nations. Mr. Speaker, Sir, we may have a lot of disagreement in this Chamber, we may disagree with each other, because each of us is entitled to have our own opinion, but when we go out of Malaya we represent Malaya and we feel we are Malaysians; and when our Honourable Minister speaks in the United Nations, he is not only speaking for the Alliance

but he is speaking for the Malayan people including the Socialist Front. (*Laughter*). As such, we are quite concerned over Malaya's actions in the United Nations. Therefore, our policy should be neutral in its outlook and should be aligned with the Afro-Asian countries.

Regarding the International Labour Organisation Conference in 1958, when our representatives from here went to the Geneva Conference of the I.L.O., an issue was brought up there regarding Hungary. As far as I know, the objective of the I.L.O. is concerned with the living conditions of the workers in industry; it has no concern about Hungary and its disputes. The motion there was that the Hungarian delegates should not be admitted into the meeting. I am sorry to say that the Malayan delegates abstained from voting on that issue. The Malayan delegates should have objected, because the Conference itself was concerned only over the living conditions of workers.

Mr. Speaker: Is that relevant to this debate?

Mr. David: I am speaking on foreign policy, Sir. If we have a straightforward foreign policy our representatives at the Geneva Conference would have taken a stand.

Mr. Speaker; Please confine to principles only.

Mr. David: Mr. Speaker, Sir, at that juncture the representative of Malaya was unable to take a stand. He had to rush a telegram to Malaya to find out what he should do.

Dato* Dr. Ismail: Mr. Speaker. Sir, on a point of order. Is the Honourable Member up-to-date on the issue of Hungary in the International Labour Organisation? I think he is one year behind time. (*Laughter*).

Mr. David: Mr. Speaker, Sir. I am not concerned over the merits or demerits of the Hungarian issue. I am concerned over the objectives of the International Labour Organisation. I think the I.L.O. is to study the living conditions and to improve the lot of the workers in industry and not to

concern itself over the internal politics of Hungary. On these principles, my views are that the Malayan delegates should have objected to the motion brought up by the imperialist countries.

Date* Ong Yoke Lin: Which one?

Mr. David: For instance, America. *(Laughter).*

Mr. Speaker: No interruptions, please.

Mr. David: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Anglo-American nations were concerned over the dispute in Hungary and they were making an attempt to make use of the Asian countries to support their move. Mr. Speaker, Sir, on such occasions our delegates at international conferences should know what our foreign policy is, so that they can take a clear stand. That is the very reason I was forced to touch on this subject

Again, Mr. Speaker, Sir, our relation with Singapore has been very bad in the last few months, but one thing which I admire is that the Honourable Prime Minister himself has admitted that even though Singapore is separated politically from the Federation, economically Singapore and the Federation of Malaya are one. Mr. Speaker, Sir, even though the Federation of Malaya is separated from Singapore—this is clearly an attempt by the former Administration—such artificial barriers will not last long. In 1945 when our rulers, then the Colonial masters, reoccupied Malaya, Singapore was separated from the mainland and made as a Colony. Neither the people of Singapore nor the people of the Federation of Malaya did give a mandate for this unjust, artificial and high-handed act of our former Colonial masters. This act of the Colonial rulers was an act of unnatural operation, deliberately intended to create these two territories as foreign in nature so that they can create a base in Singapore for their political advancement. Mr. Speaker, Sir, this artificial separation was a forcible restriction of the political rights of the people of Singapore and the Federation of Malaya. If Malacca, Penang and

Province Wellesley, until recently Colonial possessions, can be part of the independent Malaya, why cannot Singapore be? This act of separation of Singapore from the mainland was deliberately created by the foreign rulers so as to provide a base for their further exploitation of the territories in South-East Asia. Let us remember, Sir, that we in the Federation of Malaya and Singapore belong to one and the same family of people, with the same aspirations, the same national language—Malay—within one territory. Singapore is an island, but Penang is also an island. However, Penang is still part of the independent Federation of Malaya and I think Singapore should also be part of it. Malaya has the same economic life, the same social habits, and the same cultural and historical set-up. In short, Mr. Speaker, geographically, economically, politically and historically we the people from the Federation of Malaya and Singapore are the same. The policy of Britain was to divide and rule, to make these two territories as separate territories in order to further their exploitation. Mr. Speaker, Sir, as a first step, the Honourable Prime Minister has said that economically Singapore and Federation are one and I feel that in future he may change his mind or reconsider his views in order to make Singapore as part of our independent nation. When Singapore becomes part of our independent nation it should add to the number of States we have. We are looking forward to see the day when the Honourable the Prime Minister will make his announcement of his future policy on the merger.

Regarding the statement by the Assistant Minister of the Prime Minister's Department, Sir, I have nothing much to comment, but the freedom of the Press is universal and as such this right of the Press should be maintained. If we really respect and honour the Declaration of Human Rights, Sir, then we must respect the Press and the Press should be given its rightful place in our society. Mr. Speaker, Sir, any curtailment on the Press is a

tragedy to the democratic rights of the citizens of this country. The Press is the only source where one's views can be expressed and it is a medium of spreading the news, from the towns to the rural areas and from the rural areas to the towns, thus bringing the people together as one and the same family. Mr. Speaker. Sir, as such, I request an assurance from the Government Bench that no hindrance will be made on the Press.

Dato' Suleiman: On a point of order. For my information, may I ask if the right of the freedom of the Press has been infringed by the Government?

Mr. Speaker: He was referring to the statement by the Assistant Minister. Please proceed.

Mr. David: As the Honourable Mr. Speaker has asked me not to reply, I won't reply. (*Laughter*).

Mr. Speaker: Please proceed.

Mr. David: Thank you, Sir. When we talk about foreign troops in this country, Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is really regrettable to note that we still need foreign troops. We have been talking about independence; we have been talking that we are independent to look after our affairs, but what is the reason that we must have foreign troops? There are thousands of Malaysians who are unemployed to-day, who are prepared to fight and sacrifice themselves for this country. Why cannot these people be taken into the army to take the place of the Australian and other foreign troops in this country? Mr. Speaker, Sir, by having foreign troops in this country, we indirectly have provided a base for SEATO. It may be denied, but I say indirectly it may be a base for SEATO. In time of emergency, when there is a danger for SEATO, the Australian troops will be called from Malaya to defend the countries which are affiliated to SEATO. Mr. Speaker, Sir, therefore I feel it is wrong in principle, and it is a danger to this country to have these troops in our land. There are sufficient number of Malaysians in this country who are willing to sacrifice—if there is really any need to have a military to fight the Emergency, I think they can be

recruited from among Malaysians. There is no need in fact, because the Government itself has declared that the Emergency has come to an end and therefore there is no necessity at all for stationing foreign troops in this country. By allowing foreign troops to be stationed here, Malaya one day or another will be led into the cold war.

I will now touch on certain aspects of the Honourable the Minister of Finance's Budget Speech. Mr. Speaker, the other day the Minister of Finance gave an assurance to this House that he will see the fares of buses are not raised due to the recent increase in taxation. But from a recent Press report, it is stated that if the application was not granted, the company would be forced to increase bus fares because of the new duty on fuel. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am more or less concerned over the increased prices which will be imposed by traders in this country on essential commodities and on transport. I am seeking now an assurance from the Government bench that there won't be any increase in prices of essential commodities and bus fares, and further, if necessary that the Government may implement price controls on essential commodities.

Further, the Honourable Minister himself has stated in his speech that the development projects in this country do not come from the revenue but from loans. Even without taking much of the money from the national income for development purposes, we are facing a deficit. I do not know where my Honourable friend the Minister wants to go for money for development purposes. If we continue to borrow money in this manner, it will be a burden not only on the Ministers, it is going to be a burden on the growing generation of this country. One day or another, the people of this country will have to pay what we borrow to-day. Instead of borrowing money from other countries for national development, it would be more appropriate that we reduce our extravagant expenses and find money within the national income for national development purposes. Regarding overseas trips by Ministers—as an independent nation, definitely we should have

representatives attending conferences. The Honourable the Prime Minister went to Australia, it is extremely necessary when a country invites, he has to go. But I don't see any reason why many other Ministers should follow him on the foreign trips—it should be the Prime Minister, his Private Secretary if necessary, to go to certain countries where he is welcomed, but I find unnecessary Ministers who were not connected at all (*Laughter*). We should have a fixed policy on this, and we should avoid such a state of affairs, because it is going to place an additional economic burden on this country.

Dato' Suleiman: On a point of information, may I ask if any other Ministers go abroad, must they go abroad too separately from the Prime Minister?

Dato* Dr. hmail: On a point of explanation, Mr. Speaker, may I know who are the unnecessary Ministers (*Laughter*).

Mr. David: Mr. Speaker, those who are not necessary for the tour.

Mr. Speaker: Please proceed.

Dato* Suleiman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of information—I did accompany the Prime Minister, but in this case it was really necessary.

Mr. Speaker: You have the right of reply later on.

Mr. David: Mr. Speaker, as head of the country, the Prime Minister will have to go when other countries invite—he cannot say: "I have no money, I can't come." (*Laughter*). That would be too bad, that would not be nice for an independent country like ours. But what I am trying to emphasise is trips where too many Ministers accompany—it is really additional expenses which could be avoided. Mr. Speaker, Sir, when we can avoid extravagant expenses in this country, I think there is no necessity at all to borrow money.

The Honourable the Minister of Finance has said that in the current year the increase in prosperity has given rise to a considerable expansion in the

money supply as measured by the level of currency and bank deposits, which has increased from \$949 million in December, 1958, to \$1.069 million this year and that at the end of September banking deposits had reached a total of \$796 million, over \$10 million more than a year earlier. Then he says:

"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."

Mr. Speaker, the economic position is improving, there is a demand in foreign markets for our goods, and even with this increasing demand we are unable to face a balanced Budget. We are facing a deficit Budget. This clearly indicates we are spending beyond our means. I would request that the Finance Minister see that no prices are increased, that price control if necessary be implemented; that extravagant expenses be avoided in order to save more money for national development instead of borrowing money from other countries.

Finally, I would request that laws enacted by this Parliament from time to time, be in the interests of the vast majority of the people and not just with a narrow outlook of penalising political opponents. Mr. Speaker, we in the House have Members who have been victims of laws enacted in this country and therefore we would urge the Government to give its consideration and its recognition to the views of Opposition parties and take them with tolerance and patience.

Mr. Chin See Via (Swembaa Tiator): Mr. Speaker, Sir. I will confine myself to the crumbs that are left behind in connection with the present issue before us. To begin with, Sir. I would say that the Budget to-day is what I would term as a "cut-pay" Budget. This Budget is really expensive and it is extravagant. In fact, Sir, with the recovery of the tin and rubber industries a reasonable Budget could have been produced without increasing any forms of taxation. In this connection, Sir, I would with your permission

refer to the Gracious Speech of His Highness on page 8 as follows:

"... my Government is determined that its expenditure shall outrun neither the needs of development nor the resources of the country."

In this case, Sir, I am afraid the Budget, with a deficit of \$14 million, is really a very regrettable one and this is due, as you will see from the Honourable the Finance Minister's speech, to the fact that many new departments have been created. The increase in taxation, you will notice, is very largely borne by the people in the lower-income group, and I do not think that it is a very fair one. The question before the House now is whether or not we are going to incur more loans from foreign countries to live in such an extravagant and expensive manner. We are already indebted I believe to the sum of \$900 million-odd. This increase, to my mind, is unnecessary because on the expenditure side we can curtail a lot of expenses, if only there is understanding between the various departments. For instance, Sir, a very simple example is the road-making in this country. Just a small mound on the road costs several thousands of dollars to bring down, and on some roads you can see that no sooner than it has been repaired then it is dug up by another department. If only the Waterworks Department, the Public Works Department, the Telecommunications Department would work in co-ordination, much money could have been saved and the roads would not have been made into a bad state no sooner than it has been put into order. This is one way in which we could save money—there should be co-ordination between the various departments.

On the Budget itself, *Sir*, you must admit that it is no good crying over spilt milk. Let us make the best job out of a bad one. Regarding the policy of the Government, Sir, I think we should neither go right too much or go left too much. I think what we require in this country is a policy which will steer a middle course. By that I mean that capital and labour must work and co-operate together,

because Malaya is a land of agriculture. We are depending so much on rubber and tin, and if we have not the capital we will not be able to produce; and if we have not the labour, money is useless. Therefore, I say it is of utmost importance for the Government to indulge in a policy which is neither too much right nor too much left. It should be a policy that is for capital and for labour to work together.

Rubber and tin in this country, as we all know, are the mainstay of our economic stability, and it is therefore of the utmost importance that in our taxation we should be very careful not to destroy — these two industries by heavy taxation. Very recently we have gone through a Customs Order under which the Government has already increased the cost of weed-killers, fuel oil. Now, weed-killers and fertilisers are for the planting industries and fuel oils for the tin and other industries. With the increase in taxation on these two commodities, it has not only affected the rubber and tin industries, it has affected the transport industry, the fishing industry and other industries to be set up in this country, and I do not think it is a wise move, because by such imposition you are going to bring up the cost of living, which is already high. If the cost of living is high, your cost of production will naturally be high, and therefore we have got to bear in mind that rubber and tin to-day are facing a menace—particularly rubber. Rubber has got to face synthetic, and in order to sell, our natural rubber must be competitive, and we must see that the cost of production is not too high. The cost of production must be high when your wages are high, and wages are high, because our costs of living are high. And living costs are high owing to food and other necessities bring scarce and these costs will go higher because of the recent imposition of tax increases.

It has been suggested *just* now by the previous Honourable Member that there is already a suggestion on the increase of bus fares as a result of the

fuel oil increase. In short, the bus companies will have to take it out from the people in the lower income groups. That is why I say you have got to be very careful in preparing our Budget so that it will not destroy the important industries in our country. Rubber is facing the synthetic menace and tin faces plastic menaces.

On the question of development, I wish to refer to the Gracious Speech of His Highness and which reads from this paragraph:

"The most important pan of the whole programme depends on co-operation between the Federal and State Governments in tackling arrears of land application and strengthening and improving the land administration so that land may be made available and developed at a rate commensurate with the growing demand. The plan is to establish, through the agency of the Federal and State Land Development Authorities, as many areas as possible where smallholdings and estates may be developed intensively around •Bodera villages offering the services and amenities appropriate for a settled, well-organised and prosperous community."*

In this case* Sir, the increasing and growing population in this country is a matter that we should give very, very careful consideration. People require food, and the staple food we need in this country is rice, but only one-third is produced in this country. In other words, we have got to acquire two-thirds from neighbouring countries. Therefore, Sir, the money that we got from tin and rubber and other industries in this country we have got to dish out to get our staple food.

He Miabtor of A*kakan astd •- operatives (Each* AMol Aw bit Ishftk): On a point of information, Sir— we produce 60 per cent of the rice consumed in this country and not one-third.

Mr. Chni See Yin: Thank you. Still, we have got to buy the other one-third from neighbouring countries. We have still to make use of the money we have got from the right hand and dish it out with the left to get the other one-third of rice that is so very necessary. Therefore, Sir, you will see the importance that has not yet been realised,

On the question of development. Sir, the dishing out of land — land that is needed — is of the utmost

importance, and this has caused the price of estate in smallholdings having gone up due to fragmentation — a matter that we will soon deal with at a later part of the debate in this House. State land, forest land and forest reserves in every State are available, but unfortunately under our Constitution every State has got a final say in land distribution. Therefore, it is important that there should be a land policy, whereby sufficient land can be given out to everybody for cultivation — cultivation of not so much rubber. In respect of rubber and tin their individual life may not last for a very long time. An experienced planter has told me that the life of a rubber tree in this country may last up to 15 years; and it has been suggested that there is not much tin yielding land left in this country. Because of scientific advancement, synthetic may take the place of rubber and plastic may take over from tin. Therefore, we have got to go into other industries such as palm oil and the like, and land must be given out to encourage people to cultivate on these lines rather than the cultivation of rubber.

Dr. Lint Swee Aon (Larvt

Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification, may I know how the Honourable Member cultivates tin?

Mr. Chi* See Yin: You dig up tin and cultivate rubber. It is no fault of a person due to a slip of the tongue. I would like to quote a very interesting example— indigo. I think, Sir, you will remember that indigo was a produce from India in the First World War and that as a result of the First World War, Germany could not get indigo and their scientists went into research and found artificial indigo which became not only cheaper but better in quality. After the First World War conditions became very chaotic for India to produce the natural indigo and the plantations had to be shut down. The same thing may happen to this country one day in regard to the cultivation of rubber. Therefore, I say, it is of the utmost importance that this Government should not only look to the present, but it should also prepare for the future generations, in that it should have other industries to take over

from rubber and tin. That is why I say it is important that a policy—land policy is of the utmost importance—should be set up. It is also important for every State to implement a policy that is good for this country. Land development is important in this respect—that for the time being it will provide employment. Besides, it will absorb the young energy which has given so much of a headache to the Government—and this is also due to the education policy which requires a change in order to meet the problems that we are now facing.

Now I will quote you, Sir, the Gracious Speech of His Highness on the question of education. His Highness says:

"My Government intends to set up a special committee to review the education policy adopted in 1956,"

Mr. Speaker, Sir, much has been spoken on this and I think the public will be looking forward very anxiously to the report of this special committee, which I hope will soon be set up by the Government.

On the question of Public Service, Sir, I will again refer you to the Gracious Speech of His Highness which reads:

"The extent to which my Government's policies can be effectively carried put must always depend on the efficiency of its Public Service."

The Public Service in this country has always been good, because its members have been paid sufficiently, and when they are contented and satisfied we can well expect a good and a reasonable service from the Public Service. But I am afraid, Sir, that the recent increase in taxation is going to make things very difficult. Is the Government prepared to give them an increase—that is the point—an increase to provide them with sufficient to meet their requirements?

In Asian countries we, who are earning, will have to support our aged parents, and possibly brothers and sisters who are younger than us. However, it appears now that a person, who is earning a salary of \$170 a month, will have to pay income tax.

In addition, he will have to pay for books, for food and for fares which may be increased. With all these increases, he will become a very very worried person; and with that worried mind how much efficiency can we expect? That is the point we should consider. Therefore, I say, Sir, that in preparing the Budget it is of utmost importance that we should consider the policy of the Government set out in His Gracious Speech.

Senators—Sir, I will again require your patience to a little comment which I propose to make and which has been eloquently dealt with by the Honourable Member for Kuala Trengganu Selatan yesterday. The Gracious Speech of His Highness says:

"A new era has begun with the full flowering of our Constitution and with the birth of our own parliamentary institutions; the Dewan Negara (Senate), representative of the interests of the States and adorned by wisdom and experience drawn from many fields;"

and Article 45 (2) of the Constitution says:

"The members to be appointed by the Yang di-Pertuan Agong shall be persons who in his opinion have rendered distinguished public service or have achieved distinction in the professions, commerce, industry, agriculture, cultural activities or social service or are representative of racial minorities or are capable of representing the interests of aborigines."

Sir, under this very same Constitution, Article 68 mentions the necessity of a money Bill to be sent to the Upper House. That being the case, we require men who are in various fields and various professions to know whether we have done the thing rightly or wrongly. To them have been given the powers to withhold any Bill that we might have, through a little bit of carelessness or rashness, passed. We need men of experience. Sir, it is my submission that among the sixteen who are supposed to have been selected from men whose descriptions are given in Article 45 (2), I am afraid that those men are not qualified. It is regrettable, but it is not too late. I think if new appointments are to be created, or should there be any vacancy in the Upper House, consideration should be given to men from such

professions and occupations—men who have distinguished qualifications such as nominees from the rubber industry, the tin industry, the commerce industry and the smallholders and the transport industries. The transport industries, according to the Estimates, will provide big revenue to the country. I am not speaking as a transport man because I have nothing to do with transport

Sir, the question of tax increases. The increase in taxation has in fact created several headlines in our local papers. I am only asking the Government for an assurance that the railway fares and electricity rates will not be increased because the spokesmen for these two have not said that they will not increase the fares in railways and the rates in electricity. An assurance had been given to this House on the first day, when we debated the tax increases, that the bus companies will not be allowed to increase their fares, and I ask that a similar assurance be given relating to the railway fares and the rates for electricity supply.

Sir, lastly, I appreciate that the Government has considered it important to postpone the Local Government elections. Therefore, I refer you. Sir, to the Gracious Speech of His Highness:

"In the field of Local Government it has been found necessary, in the light of experience, to defer, generally, elections for a period of one year."

All those persons who are in the Council and due for retirement were in fact elected by the people under the Constitution for a specified period. Under the Constitution no provision has been made for their extension and perhaps if it were made, those Gentlemen might not have been elected. In short they were given a mandate to represent the people for a period. Therefore, in any extension they have no mandate from the people to represent them. Sir, therefore, the question of being a man or mouse comes into the debate. If one is man enough he will appreciate that his extended term of office will not give him a mandate to represent the people—though the law permits him to remain there for a

further period of one year—and he will retire and will only return to office again when he is elected. But if he chooses to be a mouse and returns to office, I have nothing further to add.

Mr. Speaker: Saya fikir patut-lah kita tempohkan Dewan ini, masa ada 4 mimt sahaja lagi, Dewan ini di-tempohkan sa-hingga 2.30 pStang ini.

Sitting suspended at 12.55 o'clock p.m.

Sitting resumed at 2.30 o'clock p.m.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair) THE
SUPPLY (1960) BILL

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

Question again proposed.

£ndte* Zulkiflee bin Mnhimaid (Bachok): Yang Berhormat Tudn Yang di-Pcrtua, pada kali ini biar-lah saya mula²-nya mSnyerang Tuan Seenivasa-gam Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya minta ma'af.

Mr. Speaker: Jangan sSbutkan nama-nya.

tiache* Zolkiflee bin Mahammad: Saya minta ma'af. Tidak binar-lah ucapan yang telah di-bSrikan-nya dan pfnat-lah agak-nya dia mSnyiapkan untuk m£mbuat ucapan-nya itu. TStapi, Tuan Yang di-Pfirtua, sayang-nya apa yang di-s£butkan itu tidak-lah b&tul dan bcrlawanan bukan saditit dfngan asas² hidup di-ne'ge'ri ini sSrta dSngan P&rlembagaan n£gfri ini. Tuan Yang di-Pfirtua, perkara di-bahathkan dan di-b£sar-kan di-dalam Dewan kita pada hari ini ia-lah "inequality" satu perkataan di-ulang² yang di-timbolkan sa-olah² menyerang kfidudokan yang tfclah di-chapai oleh bangsa MSlayu di-ne'ge'ri ini yang tidak dapat dingan di-rainta² dari siapa titapi ada-lah satu hak yang di-punyai bangsa MSlayu itu s£ndiri. "You cannot build a nation by inequality", saya snggaja bfirchakap orang Puteh sadikit Tuan Yang di-PSrtua, bukan kerana saya sayangkan chakap orang Puteh te'tapi hanya saya m£ngulang-chakap.

Mr. Speaker: Memang boleh.

kadang² yang baik-nya itu terpaksa dijawab, itu mfrugikan buat kfibajikan dan ke"ma* Moran nJsgen ini.

Jadi, saya harap jangan-lah Parlimen kita yang pfirtama ini m&njadi satu Parlimen main ada sahaja. HSndak Parlimen?.....ada. Sudan kami d&ngar s&fmu, kami akan jawab, yang ta* kami jawab, kami tidak pgduli. Jangan-lah begitu, Tuan Yang di-Pirtua, ini ta* patut. Kita b&firada di-sini ia-lah untuk k&bajikan b&rsama, jadi kalau rasa ta* boleh jawab, ambil note sahaja, simpan, b&fuitkan, chukup-lah (*Ketawa*). Tuan Yang di-PSitu, p&srhatikan-lah bahawa kita fahamkan demokrasi b&stuP "democracy is not a Government of number". Bukan-kah b&sb&rapa banyak K&rajaan bebas itu tidak ada "Government of Discussion". Kita bebas. Jadi, mari-lah kita gunakan Parlimen ini sa-bagai soalan untuk kita bersama. Saya b&srharap d&fingan ta* payah di-jawab oleh pehak K&srajaan bahawa K&srajaan akan b&rsung-goh² m&ngambil fikiran yang di-terima dan munasabah. Chuma kita Wrtgngkar sahaja yang mana "di-tgrima** dan "munasabah." Dalam ini kita b&srghadoh. Saya b&frharap kadang² tolong-lah yang mana munasabah pada fikiran kami chuba² jadikan munasabah bagi fikiran Kirajaan,

Tuan Yang di-P&tua, saya ambil lag! sedikit s&sbab maseh ada ucapan Yang B&rhormat Mgntfiri K&swangan kita yang dalam ucapan-nya itu m&ngatakan berkgnaan dgngan tugas yang di-amanatkan oleh Duli Yang Maha Mulia Timbalan Yang di-PSrtuan Agong bagi mgmimpin ra'ayat n&fng Sri ini supaya m&mbena satu bangsa yang tulin. TSrdahulu daripada itu, Tuan Yang di-P&tua, sudah ada p&srkataan² sa-hinggakan di-tanya bahawa apa-kah K&sbangsaan yang tulin itu? Di-sini di-nyatakan bahawa Kibangsaan yang tulin itu ia-lah K&sbangsaan Melayu—di-p&rtgngkarkan oleh sa-siapa yang hendak mgmp rt&ngkarkan K&fbangsattn M&slay—K&sbangsaan M&filay-lah yang tulin bagi P&grsgkutuan Tanah Melayu.

Tuan Yang di-P&tua, saya sangat t&rtarek hati pada muka 2 yang mana dalam ucapan itu b&rsangkutan d&sgan K&fbangsaan yang tulin ia-itu

chgrian yang pertama-nya. B&srk&saan d&sgan yang lain di-muka 4 b&sr&unyi:

"Yang bold) m&Smbintok p&frasaan b&raatu padu maka K&srajaan beta akan m&ncjalankan s&fgala daya upaya-nya supaya sakalian p&ngduduk dalam P&frsekutuan ini Wrtm'at s&stia dan kaseh sayang kepada nig&ri ini sa-bagai satu bangsa yang t&filah di-satukan oleh b&sb&rapa tujuan yang sarna dtngan tiada m&fnghiraukan p&rbedzaan m&freaka d&fngan masing b&grhak mim&Jilihara *adat risam

Ini elok sangat di-muka d&pan. Tuan Yang di-P&tua, ada-kah kalau kita jalankan sa-macham ini akan sampai kita kepada chita² K&fbangsaan yang satu? Baharu sa-kgap tadi wakil dari Ipoh yang mana pada mula-nya m&snch&ritakan bahasa lain yang b&sr-macham²—multi-lingualism. Apa s&fbab-nya cherita multi-lingualism ini timbul, kerana ini-lah cherita-nya yang masing² b&srhak mendapat 'adat r&fsam di-ngggri ini.

Pada p&sndapat saya, Tuan Yang di-P&tua, saloran yang besar dalam membena satu bangsa ini, yang pe*-tama-nya boleh-lah di-katakan sa-lain daripada k&ss&sdaran politik di-kalangan orang² yang ingin m&snjadikan satu bangsa, sa-lain daripada niat, t&rutama selcali k&sbudayaan yang mgmb&ntok kelu'dupan. Jadi, dalam b&sntok hidup masing² yang b&srhak m&nggmbangkan b&sntok hidup-nya s&sndiri. saya khuatir, Tuan Yang di-P&tua, bahawa chita² h&sndak m&sbangunkan satu bangsa itu tidak akan b&srhasil. Jadi, fikiran saya ini dgngan s&fgala rgndah hati-nya saya sampaikan kepada Kerajaan dan di-harap tolong-lah fikir sedikit supaya jangan pakai tolak sahaja. TS&tapi saya rasa patut kita buat s&karang ini k&srana m&ngujudkan satu b&fntok k&sbudayaan bangsa ini dngan asas² yane kuat bai?i tiap² sa-orang ra'ayat ngggri ini dapat m&mb&ntok diri-nya m&ngnurut yang di-tgrangkan ini. Kita tahu bahawa p&flajaran sahaja tidak chukop untuk m&ngnyatukan manusia. Walau pun p&slajaran s&skolah sama, Tuan Yang di-P&tua, ti&tapi oleh k&grana b&sntok hidup o&srlainan, maka kita pun berlainan. Pendek-nya s&gmua b&f&lainan, pada hal satu s&gkalah. Maka saya rasa bahawa K&srajaan

sudah sa-patut-nya-lah daripada sfikarang ini bSrikhtiar mfengujudkan p£mbentukan satu kebudayaan yang sama di-negSri ini yang mana dgngan s£ndirinya apabila ikhtiar ini di-jalankan maka pgrkSmbangan kSbudayaan² luar yang mSlawan dan mSrosakkan sSrtta membawa t£ntangan kepada kfibudayaan ini mSsti di-tolak kerana me"-rosakkan. Tuan Yang di-Pfirtua, saya rasa kalau di-Pers^kutuan Tanah M6layu maka tak ada-lah kfibudayaan yang mSnjadi pokok pgrkSmbangan bagi bangsa itu sa-lain daripada ke"-budayaan MSlayu.

Ini-lah yang saya minta me'ngke'mukakan, kfrana sfkarang ini ia-lah masa pgmbenaan bangsa yang satu dSngan perkSmbangan kfibudayaan yang di-kawal, yang satu; supaya mSbolehkan bangsa ini tegak mSnjadi satu bangsa yang tulin. Ini, Tuan Yang di-PSrtua, tidak-lah b£rma'ana bahawa kalau dasar ini di-jalankan maka kita akan me'mbe'namkan² kfihidupan dan mgrnbantutkan chara² yang lain daripada itu, t£tapi di-kawal pgrkfimbangan-nya sakira² tidak mSm-bantutkan perkembangan kSbudayaan national.

Tuan Yang di-P6rtua, yang k£dua dan bagitu juga tugas yang bgsar yang kita hadap ini ia-lah tugas bagi memajukan negara. Dalam mSmajukan nSgara ini, Tuan Yang di-PSrtua, banyak-lah salah faham, k£rana masing² menggrtikan b£rmacam². Yang BSrhormat Mngtgr Kewangan kita mdnyatakan bahawa kita mSsti mSngingatkan sedikit ada brake—bagus itu, Tuan Yang di-Pgrtua, t£tapi sgkarang ini dalam memahami bagi m£mbangunkan nggara ini ia-itu bagaimana hSndak kita bangunkan. Sa-tngah mgmahamkan bahawa apabila di-jalankan s£gala ranchangan² yang bfisar² maka bangun-lah n£gara. Sa-tSngah mSngatakan utamakan-lah buroh², orang² kampong dan sa-bagai-nya. SSkarang ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya b£rp3ndapat bahawa dalam soal pgmbangunan nSgara ini hSndak-lah kita sSlami dua perkara. Yang pertama-nya jiwa manusia itu s£ndiri dan yang k£dua-nya kShidupan manusia. SSbab apa, Tuan Yang di-Pfirtua?

Saya tidak pgrnah rat^ndengar ada n£gara yang bangun, l£gak dan kuat sgdag jiwa orang² dalam nggara itu ISmah, lerabek dan orang² yang ada di-dalam-nya lapar. T£tapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sckarang ini jiwa nSgara—jiwa n£gara yang sudah Mgrdeka, alhamdulillah walau macham mana pun kemerdekaan kita, maka b£rshukor kita kepada Tohan; yang m^njadi soalan kepada kita sckarang ini. Kita hendak-lah bSrikhtiar supaya s gala pSmikiran ra'ayat, KSrajaan dan orang ramai sdsuai dgngan jiwa kgmgrdekaan yang ada pada hari ini.

Jadi, ini-lah yang tak b£rapa s£dap \$£dikit kerana kita t£ikat sama ada dalam hutang kepada orang² yang dahulu mgnjah kita, sama ada dalam mgminjam chara hidup orang yang dahulu me'njah kita atau sama ada m'ngikut sunggoh² chara kSraja orang yang dahulu me'njah kita. Juga sama ada mgmperbanyakkan Pegawai² Expatriate yang dahulu mfinjadi pggawai kita. Ini patut-lah di-kurangkan dan kita jadikan-lah ngggr kita ini, ra'ayat-nya daripada pgrsa-orangan sampai kepada orang ramai—sampai kepada KSrajaan dapat chuba b^ndiri dSngan kaki-nya sgndiri di-dalam b£b rapa pdrkara yang patut di-jalankan d^ngan serta-mfirta. Dalam m£mbangunkan satu bangsa bagi mSmp^rbaiki dirinya maka tSntu-lah pSlajaran di-dalam ngge'ri ini m ngadapi b5b£rapa kSSulitan. Sa-tSngah daripada k£ulitan itu ia-lah k^rana ada-nya dan k£mbangan-nya pelajaran² yang b^rlawanan dSngan Pelajaran Kebangsaan. Maksud saya maseh banyak sgkojah² yang hfindak m^njalkan tugas-nya sfndiri, kadang² tidak b r-lawanan dSngan tgrang² dSngan SSkolah KCbangsaan ngggr ini, t£tapi dapat sedikit sa-banyak me'mesongkan atau m£ngkglam-kabutkan p£rjalanan SSkolah Kebangsaan itu. Maka pada pfiraasan saya, Tuan Yang di-P5rtua, jalan² bagi membgtulkan pgrkara ini kita mesti mengambil langkah yang kSras s£dikit ia-itu mSnyalorkan benar² sSkolah² nggfiri ini m£n£rusi S kolah Kgbangsaan yang bahasa-nya bahasa Mglayu. Ini h ndak-lah di-t£tapkan, Tuan Yang di-PSrtua. Saya tfilah mglihat Supply Bill dan Development

Estimate maka kalau boleh-lah saya mnggusek KJrajaan, saya rasa tak chukop rasa-nya untuk mSmbolahkan KCrajaan m&njalankan dasar-nya bagi mSng&mbangkan SSkolah KJSbangsaan yang bahasa pSngghantar-nya bahasa Melayu.

Kita tabu bahawa hanya bfibSrapa tahun lagi negfcri ini akan sampai kapada taraf-nya sa-bagaimana yang di-janjikan oleh pemerintah ia-itu bahawa bahasa Melayu itu di-jadikan bahasa rSsmi yang tunggal di-nfgfcri ini. Oleh kerana sudah di-ator masa-nya dan kalau tidak di-ambil langkah yang tfigas supaya banyak Sfikolah² MSne"-ngah Melayu, Sikolah Mene'ngah yang memakai bahasa KSbangsaan sa-bagai bahasa pinghantar-nya, maka susah-lah. Ini tfrlfbbeh ma'alom tujuan saya ia-lah bagi mengurangkan bilangan Sekolah² Ingggris. Banyak orang b&r-kata bahawa kita h&ndak mfimikirkan quality, ya'ani sifat elok sa-suatu bSnda, dan kalau kita hindakkan pelajaran Sfikolah MSnengah biar-lah sampurna s&kali. Tfctapi, shukor-lah kita kapada Tuhan bahawa kita tidak sa-miskin sa-bagaimana sangkaan sa-tengah² orang dan kita me'rasa bahawa bokh Selcofoh Mfcnfngah ini dapat kita jalankan sunggoh² dan kita mfirmasa peSnting kapada pemakaian bahasa k&bangsaan, di-samping kita ikhtiarkan dari sKkarang ini bagi mNjalkan ranchangan, me*mb&lanjakan wang d&ngan minyidikitkan Sikolah MSnengah Jinis K bangsaan Ingggris. Marah-lah orang, kftrana kami tak tabu bahasa M&layu— ah di-sini-lah harga kira'ayatan yang mesti di-bayar — harga bagi menjadi ra'ayat nfa&ri ini yang mftsti di-bayar oleh meieka yang m&ndapat kera'ayatan; bukan yang nanya tahu menuntut hak dalam niiri am.

Tuan Yang di-Pgtrua, berdasarkan ini-lah maka saya merasa Kengnterian PKlajaran elok-lah mKnengok sa-mula Ranchangan Pelajaran dan Drastic Expansion ya'ani pe'rke'mbangan yang agak keras irrflatniknn bagi mIm-banyakan Sfikolah² Kibangsaan walau pun yang dSmikian itu akan tatngurangkan bilangan SSkolah Jinis KCbangsaan. Bfokinaan pilajaran negfcri kita ini, Ka-bawah Dull Yang Maha Mulia tilah pun bSrtitah

tSntang me'nge'mbangkan pSngfitahuan b5rk6naan dSngan hal² nSgara. Ini sangat munasabah dengan jiwa yang Mgrdeka supaya dapat di-jalankan usaha² bagi mSngimbangkan p&ng4-tahuan bSreSnaan d&ngan hal² nJgara. Ini ada-lah mSsti dan hJndak-lah bStul²—m&sti-lah di-pisahkan bCnar² daripada fahaman politik, supaya dia di-jadikan kSrja nggara hingga sampai-lah tugas-nya ia-itu mengajar-nya. m&ngechap hak² yang patut tfrchapai dan supaya m&ndapat sokongan dari s&fmu ra'ayat dalam nfggeii ini.

Saya peichaya bahawa K^mSnterian yang bSrsangkutan df ngan ini akan bSrsunggoh² m&mf&rhatikan hal ini. Tfritapi kecil juga hati saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kSrana tak di-sfbutkan di-sini bfirmgnaan dCngan bahasa MSlayu walau pun ada di-dalam estimate, titapi rasa saya oleh kftrana bahasa dan kebudayaan ini-lah perkara yang di-ikhtiarkan bSnar² bagi mim-Wntok ra'ayat neggri ini dfiogan mfimbena satu bangsa yang kuat, saya kesal sedikit kapada Titah Uchapan Duli Yang Maha Mulia itu, kftrana tidak mfinyebutkan pSrka ini. Ttapi saya perchaya bahawa Kirajaan akan bfrsunggoh² mSnjalankan k&rja-nya bagi m&ng&mbangkan bahasa KiSbangsaan. MIngfimbangkan bahasa K&bangsaan ini hindak-lah sSlalu di-jalankan dngan niat yang satu dan mat yang t&ap ia-itu hindak-lah mJnggmbangkan bahasa KSbangsaan. jangan chuba di-bandingkan bahasa Meiayu dngan bahasa InggKris. Ini sangat mdrbahaya, Tuan Yang di-PJrtua, s&bab apabila kita mfmbandingkan bahasa Melayu d&ngan bahasa InggJris ada-lah susah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Saya pSrchaya bahawa KKrajaan PgrsSkutuan Tanah Milayu pada masa yang akan datang dengan s&rta radrta bila hindak menulis dan bCrchakap h&ndak-lah mfijnalakan sa-suatu dalam bahasa Milayu. Pakai-lah niat yang satu ia-itu mingfimbangkan bahasa M&layu—orang Puteh boleh pakai. tak p&duli—pakai niat kami, pakai atau tak pakai—bahasa Meiayu. Maka dngan sindiri-nya kerja itu, Tuan Yang di-P4rtua, bejialan-lah d^ngan baik. ttapi rasa saya pada masa ini ada sedikit ISmah-nya sa-hinggakan "Honourable Member"

maseh dalam bahasa InggSris. Saya rasa, Tuan Yang di-Pgtrua, sgpatur-nya "Ahli Yang Bgrhormat" bagi kawasan Bachok. Kalau ada orang yang mg-lawat Dewan Parlimen ini sgjok had mglihat-nya (*Ketawa*). Bila orang lain hgndak maju ka-atas rnaka di-buat-nya bSrsungoh². (*Ketawa*).

Tuan Yang di-Pgtrua, saya amat bgrbgsar hati mSlihat di-hujung muka 4 ini, kgrana Duli Yang Maha Mulia tglah mgmbgri satu amanat kapada kita sgmua di-sini ia-itu:

"Khusus-nya KSrajaao beta bSrharap kapada ahli² Parlimen, dan juga qrang² lain yang bSrpdngaroh dalam NSg²ri ini supaya mfenyokong dan mSmajukan dasar yang panting lagi mustahak ini."

Bgnar, ini-lah kgrja kita bgrsama, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Insha¹ Allah kita akan jalankan tugas kita ini b6r-sama². Chilian yang sa-sudah itu ia-lah bfirsangkutan dgngan Ekonomi Kampong. Nampak-nya ini-lah yang mundor bagi kita dalam pgmbangunan nggara ia-itu Ekonomi Kampong, apabila di-tuliskan di-sini dan di-titahkan oleh Duli Yang Maha Mulia bahawa Kerajaan akan bSrikhtiar mgmajukan Ekonomi Kampong pada kali ini, bukan-lah ma'ana-nya kali yang sudah itu tak pgrnah di-buat. Saya mgrasa hanya dgngan ikhlas sahaja saya sampaikan bahawa yang tglah sudah² itu, kalau l6beh sedikit chSrita ekonomi nggara kita—maka maksud-nya Igbeh wang. Dalam firti-kata yang sa-b6nar-nya—wang. Pfirnah juga, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, wang di-jadikan satu faktor ekonomi dalam nfggri ini. Tdtapi, pada perasaan saya bahawa orang² di-kampong² kita sangat bSrhatat kapada pimpinan bagi atorin, ranchangan dan chara, bfkkrja untuk mSmbbolehkan orang² di-kampong² itu b'rjalan bagi turut mgngSmbangkan Ekonomi NSgara-nya. Sa-tglah itu baik-lah kalau umpama-nya dapat Kgrajaan, Tuan Yang di-P6rtua, mSmbSri sedikit sa-banyak wang dan m&mbawa ahli² pakar yang bukan sahaja dari England, Australia, tetapi Igbeh baik di-bawa umpama-nya daripada Indonesia dan Siam. Tuan Yang di-PSrtua, dalam pfirkara kgmajuan nfgSri yang tflah maju dahulu ia-itu sap²rti di-n6gSri Siam ada-lah di-dapati bahawa orang² itu mfimbe'ri chara² mSnjalankan

hidup-nya mgmajukan kampong sa-umpama ini. Sa-b6nar-nya tidak-lah chukop d'ngan sharahan² dalam kursus RIDA yang kgchil, tftapi hSndak-lah kalau dapat di-ratakan hingga mfm-bohkan orang² kampong itu faham Ekonomi Asasi bagi nSggri kita sfindiri dan bagaimana hSndak me-nggmbangkan hidup-nya; ia-itu apa yang patut di-lSbehkan dan apa yang patut di-kurangkan.

Tuan Yang di-Pgtrua, jadi di-dalam lapangan ekonomi kampong ini hgndak-lah ada pimpinan, yang saya maksudkan ia-lah bahwa lapangan ekonomi orang² kampong pada masa ini mfimpunyai chara ekonomi yang tfirbatas lapangan-nya. Orang yang mSnyiasat hal ini dapat mftmSrhati-kan—tidak lSbeh—gftah, buah²n, padi—²lain daripada itu dia tidak beapa nampak jalan-nya. Jadi, Tuan Yang di-P5rtua, KSmSntSrian yang bgrsangkutan d'ngan hal ini patut-lah bfirikhtiar supaya di-bSri lapangan yang baharu bagi pe'rke'mbangan ekonomi di-kampong, sa-hingga mgm-bohkan tiap² sa-orang ra'ayat daripada nggSri ini menjadi satu anggota atau ekonomi unit yang bSnar² b6r-padan kapada kghendak hidup-nya dalam nfgSri yang tflah raerdeka.

Tuan Yang di-PSrtua, satu lagi uraian di-bawah ini ia-lah b rkfnan dengan kita mgnSntang komunis. Sudah-lah kita tgntang komunis itu, dan jikalau-lah kgjayaan kita chuma di-sini, Tuan Yang di-Pgtrua, saya beYsStuju-lah dgngan bfberapa orang tadi yang telah mSnySbutkan, bila memulakan tftntangan s&karang ini mari-lah KSrajaan P6rs6kutuan Tanah M&layu mfl6tatkan balek kgpSr-chayaan-nya kapada ra'ayat ngggri ini supaya mgngawal nSgSri ini. Saya maksudkan dgngan ra'ayat n^geri ini ia-lah orang² yang tglah mgmboktikan ta'at sgtia-nya kapada ngggri ini bfinar²—kita tidak mahu kapada tSntfira Luar Ngggri—kita tglah mgrdeka, T6tapi kita tidak mahu pula kapada tgntera dalam yang sa-k&rat sahaja kgpgrchayaan-nya kapada ngggri ini. Kita mahu bila orang² memggang s^napang maka diri-nya berjiwa dan bSriman pgnoh mgmpgtrahankan nggeri ini. Jadi, Tuan

Yang di-Pfirtua, hal ini saya harap KSrajaan perhatikan — sfbab apa saya harap KSrajaan p&hatikan bftnar²? — sSbab me'nyele'nggarakan musuh dari luar agak saya l&beh s&ngang daripada mSmbasmikan musuh dari dalam. Kalau musuh dalam parti poliu^k sahaja boleh kita lawan dalam Pilehan Raya, tStapi kalau musuh sudah ada dalam t&nt&ra mSmfigang sSnapang — raaka jahanam-lah ngggri ini. Tuan Yang di-PKrtua, maka soal-nya ia-lah kfta'atan — orang yang mfinjadi ra'ayat negeri ini. Saya tidak mengatakan maseh ada tanda tanya dalam soal ini. tftapt saya mSngatakan hf&ndak-lah Kerajaan pf&hatikapi supaya mgmbolehkan hanya orang² yang sudah bulat ta'at sStia-nya kapada nfcg'eri ini mtmfigang seinapang menipfirtahankan negeri — kalau s&napang — sinapang-lah, kalau kapal tSrbang — kapal terbang-lah.

Tuan Yang di-Pgtrua, paragraph yang sudah itu-lah yang kita bahatkan "Oleh k&rana tiada shak lagi" bahawa dzarurat ini akan dapat ditamatkan, maka, Tuan Yang di-P&tua, bf&S&rtal-lah kami dSngan K&rajaan di-dalam niat, hasrat kami supaya dzarurat ini di-tamatkan dSngan s&rtamSrta, dngan sa-chgpat⁻nya. Tuan Yang di-PSrtua, apabila dzarurat tSlah tamat, maka KJrajaan akan menggunakan wang² yang sudah dapat, walau pun orang itu Wrhutang, wang yang tfclah dapat sJmua-nya itu untuk kfibajikan ra'ayat tfirutama sa-kali dalam pfilajaran, di-hujung paragraph itu; Tuan Yang di-PSrtua, Duli Yang Maha Mulia bfertitah:

"Maka ada-lah tanggungan K&mint&rian Wajaran m&nWri pJ&luang kapada kanak² yang tinggal di-dalam kawasan kampung mCnemskan pilaaran mireka ka-sJSkolah² min&igah dan a&kolahz tinggi sa-bagaimana kanak² yang tinggal dalam bandar."

Ini sangat-lah m&ny&dapkan had kita, chuma saya minta sedikit sahaja, Tuan Yang di-PJ&rtua, dalam mSngistilahkan "sikolah miningah" jangan s&kolah orang Puteh itu di-fahamkan dalam kSpala kita. titapi s&kolah mSn&ngah ia-lah sikolah m&n&ngah yang mfimakai bahasa Milayu sa-bagai bahasa pSngantar-nya. SSbab apa, Tuan Yang di-P&rtua? Bukan marahkan orang Puteh, bukan dia ta' pandai,

bukan bahasa orang Puteh ta* elok, t&tapi kita bukan-nya orang Puteh — kita orang Melayu.

Tuan Yang di-pgtrua, di-bawah ini KSrajaan² n&g&ri hgndak-lah WkSrja-sama dalam soal mfnguruskan permintaan² tanah. Saya rasa bila sSbutkan kSrja-sama terpaksa saya meny&butkan bahawa Kerajaan N6g&ri sudah sa-patut-lah bfikgrja-sama dan saya harap Kirajaan P&rs&kutuan Tanah Melayu, sa-bagaimana yang di-aku oleh Yang B&rhonnat P&irdana M&ntiri, jangan bSzakan KJSrajaan Nigiri dalam soal pembahagian tanah ini, bagaimana yang tSlah di-sibutkan-nya itu sangat-lah baik, beri-lah timbangan yang sama supaya KSrajaan N&g&ri Kilantan, Trtngganu pun dapat habuan yang mSnasabah dalam soal bagi kimajuan tanah. Tuan Yang di-PSrtua, p&rchaya-lah. walau pun saya bukan MinlSri Bisar TrKngganu dan Kelantan. Tuan Yang di-PSrtua, saya p&rchaya hal ini akan di-sambut baik,

Kgmudian fasal hak- manusia yang tSlah Wrbangkit di-sini, kita birshukor, kerana ucapan Duli Yang Maha Mulia ini minunjokkan bahawa kita t&lah mimpunyai fahaman yang masak dalam pohtik International dan fahaman yang bagus dalam moral politik. chuma itu-lah sahaja jangan dt-pileh², bSri-lah timbangan. Saya tidak hendak mSmithal[^]an, s&bab bila banyak mithalan² itu sflalu salah faham. dis&but satu mi thai, orang itu kata mithalan itu begitu ma'ana-nya, orang ini bagini. Jadi saya चाहङ्कन dalam m&nyibutkan dasar ini — sa-sndah kita mJSnyJbutkan bahawa dasar KBrajaan h&ndak mfinjaga hak manusia. piagam Bangsa² Birsatu. maka jangan-lah "pUeh kasch". SSbab. Tuan Yang di-Pfirtua, di-dalam soal International, tgntu-lah banyak t&kanan². saya tidak-lah minyibutkan p&rkara ini — mSngatakan begitu bagini, s&bab orang yang dahulu sudah bKrchakap macham² pf&rkara ini, t&tapi minggatkan oleh kirana tfikanan² yang ada dalam lapangan International dan orang²-nya itu chSrdek² bSlaka, maka kut² — kalau² -lah — kita kSsKdapan kapada tSkanan hingga tfirsengei kita kapada satu pehak. Untuk mSngawal,

Tuan Yang di-PSrtua, saya pferchaya para Mfintiri kita, tSrutama Yang Berhormat MSntfiri Luar NggSri akan bersedia, m6mbantingkan diri-nya bSrsama² sSrta mengawal piagam Bangsa² Bdrsatu dEngan 6rti kata yang sa-bSnar²-nya.

Di-sini tElah di-sSbutkan dalam Uchapan Ka-bawah Dull Yang Maha Mulia bSrckfinaan dengan Indonesia. Ta' sEdap saya me'nde'ngar wakil daripada Ipoh tadi bfrkgnan dengan Indonesia. Sa-b&iar-nya marah-lah saya. Tuan Yang di-Pe²rtua, saya sabalek-nya me'rasa kuatkan lagi dS-ngan Indonesia, kgtatkan lagi bukan sahaja dalam pSrjanjian itu sabaja Tuan Yang di-P6rtua, tetapi dalam bantuan. Bila kita ta' b rduit—sglok poket dan kita teringat orang Puteh. S karang ini tSntu-lah kalau hSndak mgminjam daripada Indonesia tgntu-lah agak-nya ta' hEndak di-bSri-nya. Kalau saya kata Indonesia ta' ada duit tgntu-lah marah pula KSrajaan itu t6tapi Tuan Yang di-PSrtua, p&kara yang kita boleh minta tolong daripada Indonesia, kita hdndak mSngSmbang-kan bahasa Melayu, guru² bahasa MSlayu ini banyak boleh kita dapaL TStapi baharu² ini saya te²rbacha; babaru sSmalam, mfingatakan K^rajaan kita mSnjimpit atau mgngiklan supaya guru² daripada nEg²firi Ingg²ris mgminta be²be²rapa jawatan² guru di-sini. Jadi, guru² ini di-k&he²ndakL raSngajar sSjarah, arithmetic, geography dan sabagai-nya. Tuan Yang di-P2rtua, chuba-lah kita rEnong²kan ka-Indonesia di-dalam bantuan teknik tSrutama soal pfirsikolahan. He! dia apa ada! —jangan. Dia apa tabu!—jangan. Kita ctiuba dahulu Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sehingga boleh-lah nggri ini me'rasa sedikit sa-banyak k^rja-sama daripada KSrajaan-nya yang patut bgnar di-bSrikan k^rja-sama.

KSbajikan kasehatan ada-lah pSrka yang dapat perhatian b rat daripada Titah Duli Yang Maha Mulia dan in-lah dasar bagi K&rajaan kita. Tuan Yang di-Pfirtua, mfimbanyakkan Hospital di-daerah² kampung sangat-lah mustahak umpama-nya Tuan Yang di-P5rtua, di-daerah² yang patut kita banyakkan Hospital sapgri di-Bachok tSmpat saya itu patut di-adakan Hospital. Jadi,

Tuan Yang di-PSrtua, ta'payah kita fi kirk an tatapi boleh saya katakan p&rk&mbangan kSbajikan kasehatan ini Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya rasa-lah jangan Hospital sahaja tStapi hendak-lah b rikhtiar oleh KSmSntSrian yang b^rkdnaan—Tuan MSntSri Yang Berhormat bSrikhtiar supaya mgwujudkan rasa kasehatan di-kalangan ra'ayat dan bantu-lah m reka itu supaya hidup mfinurut asas² kasehatan. Ini Tuan Yang di-Pgtrua, sangat mustahak supaya boleh-lah orang² kampung itu bfrsama² dSngan KSrajaan mSnyS-lamatkan diri m^reka itu daripada musoh-nya yang be'sar ia-itu p^nyakit.

Ini saya hEndak berchakapkan Titah Duli Yang Maha Mulia dan ucapan Yang BSrhormat M6ntEri Kfiwangan ia-itu ia-lah "bfirkSnaan dSngan KSrajaan beta ada-lah bgrazam hfindak m^nchadangkan supaya wang yang di-bSlanjakan tidak lEbeh daripada yang di-k6hEndaki", ya'ani chakap ringkas-nya Yang di-PSrtua, *ekonomi-lah". Chadangan kita ini h2ndak b rdkit supaya n^g^ri kita ini sglamat. Ini satu langkah yang baik. TEringat saya pada waktu daripada Dato' Kramat yang mSngatakan "karong itu bSlubang di-bawah-nya ta* usah-lah di-isi nanti habis". Ah! ini, Tuan Yang di-Pfirtua, saya ini mSnySbutkan sahaja dan Tuan M6ntEri Kfiwangan mungkin bangkit mgngatakan "tidak" dan saya lSbeh suka danger "tidak" daripada "ia". Saya sebutkan "karong bSlobang" ia-itu ada pula ne'g&i kita ini tEngah² ta' bfirduit bfinnUlion² duit kita ini pfirgi k luar nfigeri; kapada sa-buah family ka-sabuah family dan ada surat k ha bar mfingatakan, Tuan Yang di-Pgtrua, 5 million pada sa-bulan duit kita ini di-hantar kd luar nSgSri dEngan hantaran, kiriman² kapada family. Kalau-lah boleh Tuan M6ntEri Kg-wangan mengata "tidak", "tidak" ini s&karang mfinjadi ta' apa. Kalau-lah "ia" Tuan Yang di-Pfirtua, akhir-nya ini kita ambil-lah tali bdlati kita ikat lobang itu jangan mfinjadi bochor (Ketawa). S bab-nya Tuan di-Pfirtua, tidak ada ma'ana sSgala fakir mSskin dalam neg^²n ini kita chgkek t^ngkok-nya sSdangkan kSwangan nggara ini di-bochorkan kapada pgrkiriman wang keiuar nSgeri. Di-dalam men^gakkan

dan menguatkan kftwangan negara kita ini ada chara yang di-buat oleh Kfirajaan yang di-jalankan ia-itu pSnanaman modal asing. Saya sudah katakan tadi, Tuan Yang di-Pfirtua, bahawa nfigSri kita ini memang susah hfindak mInjalankan tftapi di-dalam pinanamao modal asing ini saya rasa sudah sa-patut-nya Kfirajaan mSmbuat sharat² yang kStat. Walau pun boleh jadi ada sharat itu titapi kami ta'tahu, patut-lah ben tabu kalau ada sharat itu. PSnanam² modal yang datang dari negeri asing ini hendak-tah di-sharatkan bahawa tidak be*rlawanan dgngan kep2ntingan modal negara kita ini. Umpama-nya kita hendak 5 million ringgit, patut-kah 5 million ringgit itu tidak di-wujudkan oleh KJSwangan nfigara ini. Dalam erti pgnanaman modal bStul-lah dan kita yaltin bfcnar kapada hidmatan modal dari nSggrl lain itu sSrta sudah kita fikirkan tftapi, Tuan Yang di-Pfirtua, modal asing bagi kSmajuan nSgfiri kita itu baik. Sa-balck-nya saya h&ndak mSngemukakan bahawa b&kaitan dfingan hutangjangan-lah sampai mSngikat kita dan juga modal asing itu jangan-lah sampai mSngikat kfipSntingan modal nSgeri ini sampai ta* boleh mBnguet duit kita. Jaogan-lah ka-hulu dan ka-hilir akhir-nya yang kita halau sudah p6rgi yang baharu pula datang.

Di-bawah daripada itu. Tuan Yang di-P&tua, ada-lah bfrk6naan d&ngan p&rusahaan, biar-lah kita bahathkan satu j&nis bfirkfinaan pCrusahaan ini. Yang B&hormat Tuan MCntfri Kewanangan kita tSlah mSngatakan bahawa harga gttah dan bijeh ini-lah modal kita yang b&sar dan tidak pula Wropa tStap dan tidak boleh-lah kita bCrgan-long kapada kf&dua-nya sahaja.

Jadi Tuan Yang di-PSrtua, oleh kSrana ini ada-lah satu kSnyataan yang tidak boleh di-sangkalkan oleh siapa pun di-Tanah M&layu ini, maka rasa saya sudah liba-lah masa-nya bagi K&rajaan m&mbuka lapangan pj&rusahaan dalam lapangan iktisad. Apa lapangan-nya itu? Kita bfrtharap bSrsama² dan saya raSrasa bahawa nSgJri ini hindak-lah kita kuatkan bfinar² pertanian-nya hingga mSmuas-kan—sa-kurang²-nya Yang Berhormat

Tuan Mintfiri PSrtanian s&ndiri berpuas hati. Di-samping itu biar-lah ranchangan pSrtanian itu di-perbanyakkan piruntokkan-nya dalam n&gBri ini supaya boleh kalau di-tanya orang bahawa apa-kah modal Tanah M&layu dalam kgwangan—Kiwangan Nfigara-nya, maka dingan m^gah-nya kita minygbutkan bahawa satu daripadanya modal kita ia-lah G&tah. Bijih dan yang k&tiga basil pgrtanian. Maka baharu-lah sedap pada masa itu—baharu s&dap tfigak. Tuan Yang di-Pfirtua, mimbuka p&rtanian baharu—lapangan pSrtanian baharu dan dalam pertanian pula hindak-lah di-buat menurut ranchangan, bukan menurut kSadaan simata². Ini hfindak-lah kita ranchangkan dan di-adakan survey yang panjang lebar supaya mimbolehkan kita mfindapat gambaran apa yang sa-b&nar-nya pirtanian yang n&ndak kita majukan itu.

Saya mSny&butkan dalam p&rtanian. Tuan Yang di-P&rtua, tidak-lah pula sava bisingkan Mrk6naan perusahaannya—industry, bukan kerana saya tak bfirmiran kepada-nya, t&tapi ha! industry silalu di-jalankan oleh capitalist dan mSreka ini asal nampak p&ng&luaran sahaja dia pun masuk diSngan tak pavah di-hcboh^kan—m&reka ranchangkan. Titapi pSrtanian di-jalankan oleh orang² kampung yang berke'hendakkan sangat pimpinan dfingan bantuan serta panduan dari KSrajaan s&ndiri.

Tuan Yang di-P&rtua, itu-lah Utah Uchapan Duli Yang Maha Mulia Timbalan Yang di-Pfirtuan Agong yang dapat saya birikan pandangan b&rk&naan dingan pSrka ini dan saya ulang sa-k&ti lagi bahawa jangan-lah ada orang² yang minchuba hendak mengheboh^kan-nya hak mereka itu di-n&geri ini sidangkan mireka itu tahu bahawa di-nigiri ini mSreka t&lah mSndapat hak yang tak akan di-dapat oleh mereka itu di-luar nigiri ini.

Tuan Yang di-PSrtua, banyak sudah saya bSrchakap Wrkinaan dasar tadi—s&karang saya hindak b&rcbakap bSr&k&naan uchapan Yang B&rhormat Tuan Minted itu, tftapi ada o&berapa p&rkara yang maseh b&lum saya chakapkan. Sa-Wlum saya mfinyJbutkan pe>kara-nya yang mana maseh belum

saya chakapkan itu, saya he'ndak mSngulang pgrchakapan itu—sa-kali sahaja ia-itu jangan berhutang banyak sangat ah itu chukup-lah.

Tuan Yang di-PSrtua, kita t6lah mSnaikan chukai barang² dan ini tak usah kita bfrbahath lagi bgrkSnaan chukai ini tak bagus, sfbab bfnda ini sudah di-luluskan. Chuma saya bfrharap kapada KSrajaan PfrsSkutuan Tanah Melayu supaya bSrikhtiar menchSgah sSbarang exploitation—sSbarang yang he'ndak me'rebut p&uang untuk mSninggikan harga barang² kgrana chukai. S5bab ahli² pSrniagaan itu apabila mfireka mfnggunakan kSsSmpatan mfnaikkan harga mereka tidak mSngikut proportion yang munasabah. DSngan mgnaikkan chukai 20 per cent mgreka naikkan barang 80 per cent umpama-nya. Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pe'rtua, b&ida yang sa-macam itu hgndak-lah di-perhatikan oleh Kfirajaan P6rs6kutuan Tanah Mfilayu s&bab kita kasehan kfipada ra'ayat. Bagi orang² yang m njual barang² itu di-naikkan chukai barang—naik harga barang, dia untong dfingan jalan itu sahaja. Tetapi, ra'ayat Persfikutuan Tanah MSlayu, chukai barang naik, harga barang pun naik. Dia kgnna bSli barang yang mahal², ini tak tahan bagi ra'ayat kita.

Yang kfidua daripada itu ada satu pgrkara yang tfilah di-sfbutkan oleh Yang Bdrhormat Tuan M5nt6ri K wangan bfrkfnaan Tax Evasion ya'ani melarikan daripada m&mbayar chukai, dan jni kata-nya akan kita hadapi habis'an. Saya sftuju binar bahawa ini chfiritu bagus, tStapi kfilmarin pun begitu juga b rkfnaan Tax Evasion ini. Saya bSrharp dia di-perhatikan dfingan bgrlipat ganda, biar bfrbelanja banyak sadikit, bukan kfrana naik-nya barang² itu. Kalau kita Tax-kan lagi kita dapat duit. Itu bukan soal, tftapi soal moral yang kita tidak mahu ada orang dalara n gara kita yang mfmpfrmainkan keadaan orang lain hingga dia tak kfna chukai. Ini, Tuan Yang di-P6rtua, saya ada mfindSngar ia-itu ada company, t6tapi saya tak mahu m&nyebutkan company itu kfrana salah di-dalam Majlis im, company itu me*mbuat dua tiga gmpat buku, satu untuk Income Tax, satu untuk shareholders dan satu lagi tak tahu-lah 6ntali apa bfnda arah-nya. Ah

ini Yang B6rhormat MentEri K6wangan hfindak-lah jaga baik²—pfigang orang yang sa-macam itu. Kita mfsti kawal dengao bSrsunggoh² supaya jangan ada sa-orang pun yang dapat m^ngechek di-bawah hidong KSrajaan kita. T2rima kaseh (*Tepok*).

The Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, now that I hope the prosecution has concluded its case, we will begin ours.

Mr. K. Kanun Singh (Damansara): Sir, on a point of information, the Opposition has not concluded its case. I am sorry for interrupting.

The Prime Minister: Sir, we have had a liveK/ debate during the last two days on His Highness' Speech and on the Supply Bill. The debate has produced some very heated arguments and bitter attacks on the Government which in some cases were absolutely unnecessary and uncalled for. Personally, I was sorry that the debate had touched on affairs which we consider as domestic affairs of other countries. However, it is not for me to stop them, but I do hope the countries concerned will understand that in debates in Parliament, speakers are likely to run away with their emotions without intending to say what they had said. Nevertheless, it is an interesting debate. A few points have been brought up for the consideration of the Government, and I on my part, as the Leader of the Government and the leader of my Party, have been pleased to hear from my side of the House some very constructive suggestions from new Members of Parliament. (*Applause*).

I am also particularly glad, for instance, that the Honourable Member for Kuala Trengganu Selatan has made his appearance here in this House after a very long absence (*Laughter*) (*Applause*); and also to note that he has lost none of his eloquence. The only unfortunate part of it was that he was carried away by it and, unfortunately, appeared to have been lost in the midst of confused thinking, if I may put it that way. In the course of debate, the Honourable Member has touched on very many subjects, and it is my duty to reply to some and leave my colleagues to reply to the

others which is of concern to their respective Ministry.

In the course of debate, this Government has been accused of being a totalitarian Government. Government run after the manner of Hitler but I was glad to note that in the course of the debate the Honourable Member toned down and finally referred to this Government as only a guided democracy. That shows there has been a lot of improvement in their thoughts as the debate progressed. In my opinion there is a lot of difference between a totalitarian Government and a guided democracy. In the first place, I understand that in a totalitarian country one is not allowed to speak up, let alone express an opinion.

Date* On MB JMUK Sir, on a point of explanation, I have not used the term "guided democracy".

The Prime Mmitter: I am sorry—I did not mean you. I think this is an example of confused thinking, again (*Laughter*). I did not touch on the Honourable Member's speech alone. I have to touch on others as well, and so I would ask you to just sit and listen carefully, because I do not want to take up the time of this House, as the other Ministers also have to talk.

Dato* OBB MB Jaafar: On a point of explanation, Sir, the Prime Minister is directing his reply to me and not to the Opposition as a whole.

"Mr. Speaker: I think he is directing his reply to the Opposition as a whole.

T*e Prim Minuter: Sir, I refer to the Opposition as a whole.

Dato> OBB Ma Jaafar: Then, why did you pick on me? (*Laughter*),

The Prime Miaiater: Sir, I think the Honourable Member likes to consider himself as "picked," when my remarks was intended for others.

Mr. Speaker: Please proceed.

The Prime Miaister: To my way of thinking, a guided democracy is one which is practised in our neighbouring country, Indonesia, where you are allowed to speak but you must not run down the Government—that is the difference that I know of. I do not

really see how we can be branded as one—whether a totalitarian Government or a guided democracy—after the experience we have had in the last few days, where everybody has the opportunity, the chance, to criticise and brand the Government, and in fact call the Government by every name that is known in parliamentary language. I happen to see also that in the course of debate, there is a lot of interest shown in the affairs of our country by Members of all parties: and I think that in their heart of hearts, they know that we are enjoying a prosperity that is perhaps unequalled, unprecedented in the history of our country. (*Applause*). As evidence of this, Honourable Members will have realised the absolute confidence reposed in this Government by the countries abroad. And as a result of that confidence, we have had all sorts of help from these countries; also we have had all the goodwill and friendship from them. As they have shown such a great interest and goodwill for this country, it is for us, of course, to show how well we appreciate this compliment.

There was one thing which the Opposition brought up, and quite a number of Opposition Members brought it up—the question of the selection of Members of the Senate. Many Members have cast aspersions on this Government as to the method of appointment. Being the sole representative of his Party, the Honourable Member for Kuala Trengganu Selatan naturally does not know or appreciate the requirements of a party in power. In order to implement the policies of this Government, it is in the Government's interest to see that those Members in the Upper House must support the policies of the Government. It is for that reason that this Government has had to make the right choice of Senators—Senators who can support this Government in the Upper House.

Date* OBB bin Jttfar: Sir, on a point of clarification, is it right that 16 Nominated Members should practically be appointed from the same Party, whereas that political Party already had 18 Members from the State Legislatures?

The Prime Minister: It is a question of opinion, Sir. I think that if the Honourable Member were to lead this Government, he would have done worse than I did. (*Laughter*). One thing he must know and that is that it would be awkward for this Government to have Members in the Upper House who would obstruct the policies of this Government. For that reason, I believe, in countries such as England—a country which has practised democracy for so long—every new Party that comes into power would always make sure that the Members in the Upper House would support it. However, in the choice of Members of the Senate, I beg to differ with the terms used by many of the Opposition Members with regard to the type of men. I think that most of the men have done some public service for this country—public service which might not agree with the views of Members of the Opposition Bench. But they have done good work for the Party.

Now, with regard to the question of unemployment of workers, which is another matter which has been brought up in the course of the debate, we are not the only country that is faced with such a problem. I think every country in the world is faced with it today, some in a greater measure and some in a smaller measure. And ours. I am glad to say, is in a smaller measure. Because of that, this Government has had to work on a plan which will ensure that there will be less unemployment as time goes on. Today we are tackling this very serious problem—that after Independence this country is faced with a large number of men who are leaving their kampongs and converging on the capital to seek work. Another problem which we are facing at the present moment is that of our students who have left school and are searching for employment. The only thing we can do in order to tackle this problem is to ask for foreign capital. With foreign capital invested in this country, we are certain that industries will come into being and our youths and unemployed will be able to get some form of help; also with this country getting industrialised, we should be able to get sufficient revenue with which we hope

to carry out extensive work in the rural areas. One of this Government's plans is to improve the amenities in the kampongs, in order to keep people away from the towns. Hence this Development Plan for which this Government intends to spend a lot of money—not a few hundred thousand dollars as was said, I think, by the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat but millions,

The Honourable Member for Setapak also brought up the subject of Malayanisation as one of the best means of reducing expenditure—that is his opinion. The Honourable Member forgets, in the first place, that in order to maintain the efficiency of this Government, we have had to find the right men for the right jobs; and in doing so, we have got sometimes to overlook the cost. The efficiency of this Government and the Administration means a lot to this country. In the course of the British Administration of the last 100 years, the people of this country were never given the opportunity to run this Government and when we achieved independence, we find that one of the most difficult things is to try to get all the men we require to run this country, to run an administration which would ensure to the people of this country justice, peace and happiness. But I can assure the Honourable Member that we are filling the various posts as fast as the availability of officers—qualified Malaysians—makes it possible. Our aim is to Malayanise the service in the shortest possible time consistent with what is best in the interests of the country. We must recognise first and foremost that the Public Service must remain an efficient instrument of administration. The expatriate officers who have remained here have done so at our request. They have done very good work for this country and I for one, as leader of my Government, and my colleagues, the Ministers, have every reason to be grateful for their service. We appreciate it and it is due to their help that we are able to run this country as well as it is being run to-day. The help that they have given us can never be measured in terms of money. For a fuller explanation of the Malayanisation policy. I

would refer the Honourable Member to the Report of the Committee on Malayisation of the Public Service published in October, 1956.

Sir, I would like once more to mention one thing which was commented upon by the Honourable Member from Kuala Trengganu Selatan, and that is the fact that "the Public Service," he said, "must be kept free from political influence." That is the aim and object of this Government. He also spoke of making the appointments "by way of reward for political service rather than on the usual service principles." I take it he was thinking rather of the appointments to senior posts in the diplomatic service. I would like to explain in this connection that the Government's long-term policy is to fill these posts—posts of diplomats and high commissioners in foreign countries—with men trained in the External Service or in the Foreign Service. As it is a new Service, it is not possible to train enough men to send abroad and, therefore, by special arrangements with the Chairman of the Public Services Commission, we are given certain privileges to appoint men who we think will serve this country well abroad. As a result of that agreement, we have sent those men abroad—men who, to my own mind, have done great credit to this country. There are also precedents for this practice in other countries and, at the moment, that is the most satisfactory solution of the particular difficulties with which we are faced.

Some Honourable Members also mentioned the subject of the foreign policy as adopted by the Alliance Government and accused us of not being firm enough with regard to our foreign policy. The Minister of External Affairs, who is here, will reply to all these but my duty at this moment is to touch on what was said this morning with regard to Australia. I would be guilty of ingratitude to that country, if I do not stand up now to say a few words with regard to Australia's "White" policy. In the first place, I am not talking of the "White" policy itself because that is, as I said, entirely a domestic affair which concerns Australia. If they think that their policy would save their country from invasion

by people of Asian origin that is their business. But it is another thing to suggest that we should boycott Australia because of its policy—I think that is wrong. We must appreciate what Australia is doing for the number of students we have there. There are 3,700 students who are being educated in Australia to-day at the expense of the Australian taxpayers and also at the expense of Australian students. I think this is a matter for which we should be grateful to them rather than break up diplomatic relations with them or boycott them.

Further, on our foreign affairs policy I think there is one thing I must mention in connection with the stand our Minister of External Affairs took on Tibet. The Honourable Member for Kuala Trengganu—yes, Kuala Trengganu Selatan—it is difficult to know where he comes from (*Laughter*)—he has accused us of carrying out a policy which is not entirely our own and joining up with small nations such as Ireland, South America and so on. If we had followed Britain or America, he would have accused us of following the big nations and dancing to their tune. Now, when we have joined small nations, he has accused us of being petty. One thing I would like to remind the Honourable gentleman here and that is we too are a small nation. If the small nations cannot be protected from being dominated or trampled underfoot by the big nations, what—I ask him—will be our lot? We condemn Colonialism in any form or guise, and by whichever country—West or East I am, therefore, very surprised that the Honourable Member should have considered the Tibetan affair as of little consequence.

As regards our stand on the Algerian issue, it is a well-known fact that we have been supporting the cause of Algeria; and as fellow-Muslims, we have made our voice well heard in the United Nations.

We have been accused in the course of the debate of being attached to Colonialism, or being soft on policies which our Colonial masters have introduced in this country, or being in sympathy with Colonialism. I say no one

person who has any pride in himself, in his race or in his country welcome Colonialism. But, on the other hand, it does not do us much good to keep on condemning Colonialism. We must try and forget that. There are certain people who cannot forget Colonialism for certain reasons. As a student, I was anti-Colonialism. anti-British and anti-everything because of my patriotism and my desire to free my country and my people. Once we have attained the status of an independent country, it is up to us to forget all that and devote our energies to stabilise our administration, our economy and everything, so that the people in this country can enjoy all the happiness. But unfortunately there are people who—perhaps because in their student days they have suffered slights or insults which they have never been able to forget—have carried their hatred for Colonialism a little bit too far. To these people, I say: Let us forget all that is past; let us devote all our energies into the building of our nation.

We have seen countries adopting anti-colonialism even long after independence. Without going into details, these countries have suffered beyond the gravest assumptions of my own mind, because in their eagerness to remove all vestiges of Colonialism, they refused to accept any form of assistance from any country which once colonised them. At the same time the unfortunate part is that they have not got the means to run their own country, nor the persons experienced enough to help them. We do not want to make the same mistakes because of our concern for the well-being of this country and the well-being of the people here. Some people of course do not appreciate what we do but posterity will tell that what we are doing to-day is in the best interests of our country.

Now, there have been discussions about the presence of Commonwealth troops here and this particular issue was raised many times by different members of this House. Sometime back I said in a radio speech that we have to decide in fact whether we want

bullets or we want food for the people—bullets or food for the people; whether we want uniform for the soldiers, or clothes for the people. I maintained then and I maintain now that we want food and clothing for the people and it is our primary duty to see to the happiness and the well-being of the people of this country rather than to build up the strength of our armed forces. We have got to strengthen our economy rather than build up the size of our armed forces. We have entered into the treaty with the U.K. Government with our eyes wide open. This Government has been accused this morning of being led by a blind-folded Captain, but if that Captain had been blind-folded I am sure the ship would have foundered long ago on some rocks. But to-day as I said, this country enjoys prosperity, happiness and peace on a level higher than we have ever enjoyed at any time in the history of this country. Therefore I cannot be quite blind. Let me re-iterate that I entered into the treaty on behalf of this Government with my eyes wide open. We knew what we wanted and we know what is good for us and for the people of this country. If we are to have armed forces in this country sufficient to maintain peace and security from within and defend ourselves against aggression from without we would have to have more money. Then we would require not 80 million dollars to finance, but one thousand million dollars. Tell me where are we to get that money from? Even when you raise the tax by a few paltry cents there is a hue and cry in this House, a hue and cry in this country, a hue and cry everywhere. Now tell me how are we to raise this one thousand million dollars in order to build up our armed forces to the strength obtainable now under the combined forces of the Malayan army and the Commonwealth. Therefore what we are planning now is to maintain the present strength of our army and at the same time increase the items in our development estimates in order to raise the standard of living in this country to a fair level, and not to bring the ceiling down but to raise

the floor up, to provide for correct spacing between the rich and the poor. Therefore the Commonwealth troops while they are here have been a source of comfort to the people of this country and a source of terror to those who wish to terrorise the people or who wish to overthrow this Government by force of arms. Let us in our hearts be thankful for the good that these troops have done for us and not be unmindful and critical of the benefit we derive from their presence. We are not bound for all time to accept the presence of the Commonwealth troops here at all. There is no limitation placed on the period they should be stationed here. We can do away with them at any time we want. But at this moment I say the time has not come when this treaty with Britain should be abrogated.

Dato* Onn bin Ja'afar: Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification, would the Hon'ble the Prime Minister say whether it was written in the Defence Treaty with regard to the tenure of land that that is limited to a minimum period of 30 years?

The Prime Minister: No, Sir. I think the Minister of Defence can explain that part of the Treaty to you. There is no limit placed on the length of the Treaty—that I can tell you clearly. The only limitation we have here perhaps, speaking subject to correction, is that if we are to terminate the lease at any time we would have to pay the cost of equipment and fittings on the land put up by them.

The other point raised in the course of the debate was on the visits of Ministers abroad. I am happy to hear, from the Honourable Member from Bungsar that he supported the visit of Ministers abroad and there is no need for me to make any lengthy reply to those who are against it. Personally I think it is in the interests of a small country like ours to strengthen the ties of goodwill with countries around us, and we should build ties of friendship with them all. We are not in a position to stand alone. Therefore I feel that whichever

country is good enough to honour this country by extending an invitation to its Prime Minister, I think he should go. I do not think this Government should grumble about the expenditure of a few thousand dollars. We could always raise that money by taxation (*Laughter*), if need arises—and there** no need for it as the amount involved is so small.

Dato* Onn bin Jaafar: On a point of information Mr. Speaker—Will the Honourable the Prime Minister please mention something about the President of the Orchid Society.

The Prime Minister: Oh, yes, I will explain the presence of the President of the Orchid Society in Australia. The point is this: The Malayan orchid growers have spent a lot of time and money on orchids. As a result of that I felt that the money they spent here might be wasted unless we could publicise the type of orchids we have abroad, and one of the things we did just before I went to Australia was to send some orchids from Malaya to Victoria for their flower show. I am happy to report that the Malayan orchids won first prize (*Applause*) and as a result of the visit of the President of the Orchid Society of Malaya there is a possibility that Malayan orchids will be sold very widely in the markets of Australia and also in England and also I can assure Honourable members that in the first place I do not know the President of the Orchid Society at all—he was not my friend until we met on this trip—but I thought if we can earn a good penny from abroad it is for us to try to earn that money for Malaya. That is why I brought him with me.

In the course of the talk this morning there was a suggestion by the Honourable Member from Ipoh-Menglembu. . . .

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: Ipoh.

UK Prime Minister: Ipoh, I am so sorry I beg your pardon. That is another trouble: the Member is one moment from Ipoh-Menglembu, another moment from Ipoh. (*Laughter*).

If I am not mistaken, he said we should not veer to the right in our policy, but should go left. I should

like to assure the Honourable Member that this Government is not a leftist Government: we do not want to go either left or right, but uppermost in our mind is to do good for the country, that is the course which we propose to take.

The Honourable Member spoke about uniting the people of this country and I agree with every word he said, but unfortunately he contradicted himself in the same speech. One moment he suggested there should be unity and at another moment that there should be multi-lingualism, another moment he suggested that the Education policy should be re-examined in order to unite the people of this country. My own personal feeling in this matter is that we should agree on the National language and I think that everybody in this country has already agreed that Malay should be the National language, that English should be used for the time being. . .

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker Sir, on a point of clarification, I did say that I and the Peoples' Progressive Party of Malaya agreed that Malay was the National language.

The Prime Minister: You did? I accept that correction, Sir. Then I say that he did suggest multi-lingualism, and since he has said that he accepted Malay as the National language I infer that he has got himself a little bit confused on this issue.

He also cited the case of the people who ran away from National Service because they did not want to serve under the British Government then. But let me ask just these two questions of the Honourable Member. If they do hate to be under the British Government why did they stay here as long as all that? Secondly, when they ran away, why must they run to China: why not to other countries?

Then again the Honourable Member from Ipoh said this morning that there had been abuse of justice and he quoted the Emergency Regulations to prove his point. The two things must not be confused: the Emergency Regulations were introduced to deal with the enemy of the State, whereas

the law is introduced to deal with law-breakers. It is therefore not being abused at any time. There are remedies available to the people and that is only too well-known to the Honourable Member who is a successful lawyer. He must be successful for we can see from his red car on the road that it is a very expensive one.

There is one accusation directed against the Government which I cannot silently overlook and that is that the Government is trying to curb the freedom of the Press. That is the last thing that this Government would do. If we attempt to do it I am sure the Press of this country would not remain silent (*Applause.*) But what we ask for is something which I am sure the Honourable Member himself would agree, - and that is not to bring up any issue which is likely to cause conflict, to cause trouble between the many races of this country. We have not settled down yet to thinking of Malaya as our home. There are quite a number of people among the various races who, when you suddenly pose a question to them whether they are Malayan would say: "No, no, I am Chinese" or "No, no, I am Indian". That is the point—we have not yet settled down to thinking of Malaya as our home. Therefore it is our duty as responsible citizens of this country to try and prevent anything disastrous such as communal trouble from breaking out in this country. We all. I hope; intend to live here, and intend to allow our own descendants to live here in this country. As far as the Malays are concerned we have got no other home and this is our country.

The other suggestion with which I do not agree at all is that we should close down embassies abroad. I think it is the duty of every country which is independent to set up diplomatic relations with the countries with which it is on the best of friendly terms and with that intention this Government have set up embassies in those countries—not as many as the embassies we have here. But, far from shutting down those embassies, the intention of this Government is to increase them—to increase the number to the proportion which we have

embassies and legations in this country of ours.

Now on the question of classes of citizenship which the Honourable Member mentioned this morning, I personally fed, and I think it is popularly known in this country, that this country has been very very fair to all people here. We have granted citizenship to the people as a special privilege during the first year of Merdeka. As a result of that, my Party has had to face a barrage of attacks from the opposition party during the last election, but we were not afraid because we knew that what we did was correct and it is for those people to appreciate that they cannot get full 100 per cent citizenship unless they themselves are loyal and undivided in their loyalty to this country. But how many of them are? To be truthful, are there 100 per cent of the people loyal to this country?

Mr. D. R. Seeaivmttgun: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification¹—I would be very much obliged if the Honourable the Prime Minister will tell us how a person is to prove his loyalty?

The Prime Minister: By deeds, by actions, by utterances, by even act as a proof that they do not intend to wage war against the Government or to overthrow the Government by force of arms. If they carry on subversive activities against the established Government of this country, that is a disloyal act. We have agreed that the Malayan way of life is acceptable to the Malayan people of this country and we are pledged to carry out the principles of democracy to the best of our ability. But to overthrow a country by force of arms is not democratic and therefore those people who think or whose actions prove that they intend to take such action are disloyal to this country.

Mr. D. R. Seenivasftgun: Mr. Speaker Sir, I am sorry to interrupt, but I want clarification on this. Is it suggested that the Chinese, the Indians and the other non-Malays are trying to overthrow this Government by force of arms?

The Prime Minister: No, Sir, far from it, that is not what I meant; I

meant that there are very many loyal Chinese and loyal Indians in this country—but there are some who are not—and those are not the ones who are disloyal. From the Honourable Member's speech I can gauge his loyalty. It is not for me to deal with it here and now but it is sufficient for me to say that I distrust all people who show any tendency towards a regime, or to be frank, who can recognise a regime or a force or a political party which has caused so much destruction to life and property in this country. The party whose aim is not to end Colonialism but to set up in its place a form of Government that is entirely foreign to our ideal and our conception of democracy. (*Applause*).

D*to* Dr. Ismail: Mr. Speaker, Sir. I rise to intervene in this debate, because several Honourable Members of the House have touched on the foreign policy of this country. In order not to cause confusion, I would like to deal with the points that have been raised according to the order the Honourable Members have raised them and made their observations.

Now, in the first place, I would like to deal with the observations—and in the same language—raised by the Honourable Member for Kuala Trengganu Selatan. I am speaking, of course, figuratively because he used the English language. The Honourable Member for Kuala Trengganu Selatan was disappointed that in the Gracious Speech nothing was said about the foreign policy of the country. By that, Sir, I hope, he means that in the Gracious Speech there was no general statement of foreign policy. I do not think that it is necessary in the Gracious Speech, which was not devoted solely to foreign policy, to elaborate on the general foreign policy of this country. Further, the foreign policy of this Government is contained in our Manifesto. We have been returned to power and we got the mandate from the people on our foreign policy. So, if the Honourable Member is not conversant with our foreign policy in general, may I have the indulgence of this House just to read briefly our general foreign policy. The

cardinal principles of our foreign policy in international relation are:

- (a) To uphold the Charter of the United Nations;
- (b) To help subject nations to freedom and full sovereignty;
- (c) To be on good terms with all friendly countries without sparing any effort in establishing and strengthening the economic and cultural ties with them;
- (d) To maintain close co-operation with all friendly countries;
- (e) To contribute to the fullest possible towards the promotion and maintenance of world peace and prosperity.

Not only do we spell out in detail our general foreign policy, but we even mention our attitudes towards specific international problems as they existed at that time and they are—I am not going to be repetitive and will only read the sub-heads—disarmament, colonialism, Afro-Asian Group, apartheid, Algeria, Middle East, Hungary, Tibet, South-East Asia, Indonesia.

Mr. Lira Kean Siew: Sir, may we know the stand of the Government with greater clarity? Is the Government's stand based upon the principles just read out by the Honourable the Minister or has the Government adopted the stand of the Alliance under the sub-heads? And do we uphold the sub-heads which have been read out?

Mr. Speaker: Will the Honourable Member address the Chair?

Mr. Lim Kean Siew: I am sorry. Sir. I was looking at him and my notes, and might have forgotten to look at the Chair. The Honourable the Minister did read out the sub-heads including that referring to the Afro-Asian group and I am not sure whether he did say he was supporting the proposals under the sub-heads—for the Honourable the Prime Minister yesterday quite emphatically refuted my statement that the Alliance had stated during the Elections that it would support the resolutions of the Bandoeng Conference consisting of the Afro-Asian group. There seems to be

a cardinal contradiction here between the assertion of the Honourable the Prime Minister yesterday and the assertion of the Honourable the Minister of External Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: Please proceed.

Dato* Dr. Ismail: Sir, I said that I would only read the sub-heads because you can see from the sub-heads our attitude. I am really surprised that the Honourable Member should be returned to this House not having known or read our Manifesto. *(Laughter).*

Mr. Lim Kean Siew: Sir, with due apology to the Chair, I did not say that I did not read it. I had read it but might have forgotten some of the less important details. Perhaps it was some other Minister who has not read it.

Dato' Dr. Ismail: That answers what my Honourable colleague, the Minister of Finance, has said—that the Opposition does not know what we are talking about.

Mr. Speaker: Please proceed.

Dato' Dr. Ismail: This is a tragic instance of reading a manifesto without knowing it. Sir, under the umbrella of general foreign policy specific mention was made of the proposed South-East Asia Friendship Treaty Organisation. It will be the practice of this Government that as it encounters specific foreign policy it will inform the House about it.

Now, in the course of debate, the Honourable Member for Kuala Trengganu Selatan made a very slashing attack on our effort in regard to the Tibetan question. I would like to deal with this aspect of our foreign policy very clearly and in detail, because in the course of his speech the Honourable Member did not only attack our foreign policy, but he also queried the effectiveness of the United Nations as an instrument in the maintenance of international peace. I say that because—and I am quoting him: I hope he will correct me if I quote him wrongly—he has said, "The Federation Government should have known before taking the issue to the

United Nations, that no action would be taken on its resolution as has been proved with Korea in the past".

Date* On: On a point of clarification, Sir. I did not say that the United Nations had done nothing in the case of Korea. It was just the opposite. But the United Nations did nothing in the case of Tibet.

Date' Dr. bnail: Well, Sir, I was quoting from the *Malay Mail* and I hope that it will take note of what the Honourable Member has said in this House.

Mr. Speaker: He was misquoted.

Date' Dr. Ismail: When I began my speech, I said that if I quoted the Honourable Member wrongly he would correct me—I am very obliged to him for the clarification. (*Laughter*).

Sir, our defence of Tibet is in keeping with the mandate which we have got from the people—and that is to uphold the United Nations Charter. The argument used by the Honourable Member is that since the country which is most concerned with Tibet has not taken the initiative, why should we? This is a very dangerous argument; because if that argument is accepted, then it naturally follows that we should have no initiative at all on foreign policy. In other words, we must follow what other people do. We have just emerged from the colonial cocoon under which rule we always obey our masters—and I think the Honourable Member experienced that more than I have; so, as the first Minister of External Affairs, I wanted to take the initiative then to put forward the case of Tibet before the United Nations, because it is in keeping with our foreign policy which, I repeat, is independent and entirely our own. (*Applause*).

Now, what are the facts about Tibet? Here is a small country, autonomous country, trampled by a big power, all human rights squashed: does it mean that because the country which is most concerned for some reason or other, or because of international difficulties, did not take up the question of Tibet, that we should follow suit and ignore

the fact that human rights have been trampled in Tibet? I say that I am proud, and I think that the whole country is proud, that this country took the initiative with another small country, Ireland, known for its independent policy on the question of international relations. (*Applause*). It is not true to say that most countries in the Afro-Asian group were not in favour of intervening in the affairs of Tibet. They showed their sympathy by abstaining on the question when it was put to the vote. It was due to then-abstention that we managed to carry two-thirds of the votes in the Assembly for the motion to be adopted. In the United Nations, as you yourself had experienced, having been one of the delegates, . . .

Mr. Speaker: No, do not mention that. (*Laughter*).

Dato' Dr. Ismail: When one abstains on an issue, one shows sympathy. One cannot vote for a particular issue because of other considerations for one's foreign policy. So, the fact that the majority of the Afro-Asian countries abstained on the Tibetan issue showed that they were at least in sympathy with the preservation of human rights in Tibet. At this point, it is relevant for me to answer the question posed by the Honourable Member for Kuala Trengganu Selatan, when I was absent from this House due to conditions beyond my control. He stated—I would like to quote him again and if I am wrong I hope the Honourable Member will correct me—"if my recollection is correct, the Honourable Minister of External Affairs, when he arrived in Singapore, he was stated to have said that he was quite satisfied with the action taken by the United Kingdom, the United States and other countries in this resolution." I suppose he meant the resolution on Tibet. Well, Sir, in the first place, I must try to put the Honourable Member correct with regard to facts. The first point is that I was asked not in Singapore but in Hong Kong. I remember this distinctly, because I came straight from Hong Kong to Kuala Lumpur.

In the second place, the United States did not abstain but voted for the motion. So, the country concerned would be the United Kingdom. I was asked whether I was satisfied with our performance on Tibet. I said, "Yes"; and I was asked whether I was satisfied with the abstention of the United Kingdom and India. I said, and this was not reported in the newspapers, it was not for me as a Foreign Minister to comment on the foreign policy of other countries, but, I said that the fact that they had abstained made it easier for us to get the two-third majority vote in the Assembly for the adoption of the resolution.

Sa-lfipas saya mSnjawab kepada Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Kuala Trengganu Seiatan maka saya b^rpaling pula mgnjawab kepada Ahli Yang Berhormat dari kawasan Besut. Kalau saya tak salah dalam ucapan-nya, dia mSngatakan yang p rtama-nya ia-lah Foreign Policy kita tidak berapa tfgas. Jadi, pSrataan t&gas itu boleh-lah di-tafsirkan dSngan bgbSrapa ma'ana, tetapi pada fikiran saya atau dari pa da party saya ia-itu nSgara kita telah mengangkat KSrajaan PSrikatan menjadi KSrajaan. Foreign Policy kita ini termasuk-lah dalam manifesto dan tentu-lah tegas.

Yang k&lua, Ahli Yang Berhormat tSlah mSmbandingkan bagaimana kita m&ngambil susah payah dalam soal Tibet, t&tapi tidak berapa getting dalam soal Algeria. BfrkSnaan dengan soal Tibet saya tSlah pun memberi jawapan tadi, jadi saya suka h&ndak mSnSrangkan kepada Ahli Yang Berhormat bagi kawasan BSsut ia-itu tenaga dan sSmangat kita mgnolong kepada Algeria itu tidak kurang dan di-katakan lagi Igbeh daripada s&na-ngat bagi menolong orang² Tibet. SSbab yang pSrtama k&napa soal Algeria itu yang mana telah lama di-jadikan dalam United Nations. Yang k&dua ia-lah soal Algeria yang mana pfirkara ini ia-lah soal PSnjajah dan yang kStiga berkSnaan d&ngan orang² Algeria itu ia-lah orang²-nya b&rugama ia-ini satu Uagama d&ngan kita. Jadi, sa-tahun sa-tSngah saya mgnjadi wakil di-dalam

United Nations—Bangsa² B^rsatu dan pada masa saya balek kgmbali saya dapati bahawa kita tidak kSbelakang daripada bangsa² lain dalam mengan-jorkan soal Algeria di-United Nations. Di-sini saya ada.....

Enche* Ahmad Boestaman (Setapak):

Untok kgtSrangan, Tuan Yang di-P^rtua. Di-sini kita mgndatangkan soal Algeria apa-kah maksud ini h&ndak m^nghabiskan KSrajaan SSmentara Algeria? Saya minta p2njSlasan dari Yang Berhormat MSntfiri Luar mg-nyatakan bahawa KSrajaan ini bekerja kSras untok mSmbantu Algeria. Saya ingin b&rtanya ada-kah maksud Kera-jaan ini h&ndak mSngaku KSrajaan S6m5ntara Algeria?

Date* Dr. Ismail: Tuan Speaker, saya sfidia mSnjawab pertanyaan Yang B^rhormat wakil dari SSapak itu. Saya b^rkata bahawa kita tidak k&belakang daripada bangsa² lain dalam memper-juangkan soal Algeria di-United Nations. KSnapa saya bfirchakap dalam United Nations ia-lah kerana saya p^rchaya bahawa soal Algeria ini hanya boleh di-putuskan d&ngan s^mangat United Nations bagi m&nyokong soal Algeria dan nampak-nya sah bagaimana United Nations d&ngan mfinduga bagi me~mbinchan-kan-nya telah mSrungsingkan kepala KSrajaan Franchis sahinggakan General De Gaulle mfimbuat satu siaran h&ndak b runding mSnyfl&saikan soal Algeria dan tSlah m mb ri akuan ia-itu orang Algeria ada hak boleh M&rdeka. Apa-kah yang mSnyusahkan sekarang yang hgndak raSngatakan rundingan itu? Yang m^nyusahkan itu ia-lah dSngan siapa Kgrajaan Franchis patut b runding supaya kSmSrdekaan akan di-s&rahan kepada Algeria. KSrajaan Franchis tidak mSngaku Provisional Government dan juga di-United Nations pula kSbanyakkan-nya ahli² tidak mgngaku Provisional Government itu. Maka kalau tidak mgngikut syarat² yang di-adakan di-dalam International Law yang mana kita telah mgng^shorkan kepada Algeria bahawa pfimbSrontak Algeria yang hendak mSmpSrjuangkan kSmfir-dekaan supaya jangan di-tubuhkan Provisional Government kgrana akan

mSnyusahkan bagi mSnchari pSrda-maian.

Pada satu masa ia-itu bila kita mfimperjuangkan dan m&mbahathkan berkSnaan soal Algeria dalam United Nations, yang pSrtama dalam First Committee, dari kumpulan Afro-Asian yang mana kita ada di-sana ia-itu saya me*mben ke'te'rangian tfrus ttfirang kapada Afro-Asian Group jikalau ini di-masokkan dalam United Nations maka tfintu akan kalah. Bila di-bawa dalam First Committee bagi chadangan itu dan dalam chadangan itu ada be*berapa rangkaian yang satu ia-itu yang mustahak sSkali ia-lah meminta United Nations mSngaku yang Algeria itu ada hak Merdeka. Dan yang kfidua.

Dato* Onn bin Jaafar: On a point of order, Sir. Dapat-kah Yang Bghormat Mgnteri Luar mgngeluarkan ucapan-nya itu mengadap Tuan Pfingurusi?

Mr. Speaker: Tak me*ngapa.

Dato' Dr. IotaU: Saya tidak suka bertengkar dSngan orang tua (*Kfrawa*) dan saya chuma hSndak minjawab kapada Ahli Yang Berhormat bfrke*-naan soal Algeria. Jadi, dSngan tftgas-nya bukan sa-orang yang saya hSndak mgnjawab dfngan tSrus mSnerus.

Dato' Onn Inn Jaafar: Di-dalam Standing Orders ada.

Mr. Speaker: Proceed.

Date* Dr. ImaH: Jadi bila soal ini di-bawa dalam First Committee, bila di*ambU undi bab yang mengatakan orang Algeria ada hak Meideka, telah mfoang Ifibch dua pertiga suara, ttapi bila soal Provisional Government dikemukakan tidak dapat satu pftiga pun undi.

Dato* Onn bin Jaafar: On a point of order. Sir. The Honourable Minister of External Affairs is still directing his remarks to the Honourable Member and not to you. (*Laughter*).

Mr. Speaker: I do not object to that

Date* Onn bin Jaafan Why don't you object to that?

Mr. Speaker: Because when the Honourable Member was asking for

an explanation, he addressed it direct to the Minister.

Dato' Out bin Jaafar: But you objected to the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat. . . .

Mr. Speaker: I do not mind Honourable Members addressing the other Members, including the Ministers, when asking for an explanation.

Dato* Ona bin Jaafar: So that is your ruling?

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

Dato* Onn bin Jaafar: Thank you, Sir.

Dato' Dr. Ismail: Jadi. bila soal Provisional Government ini di-k6muka-kan dapat undi tidak Ifbeh satu pirtiga. Jadi bila chadangan ini di-bawa kapada General Assembly, saya tfilah di-minta oleh wakil Algeria s&ndiri supaya mSmbuat pindaan dijatoh dan di-kechualikan soal Provisional Government ini supaya soal Independent sahaja di-binchangkan, tStapi oleh s&bbab telah lewat, kita kalah satu suara daripada dua oertiga yang di-ke'he'ndaki supaya soal ini diluluskan oleh United Nations. Ini-lah s&bbab-nya soal Provisional Government ini chuma satu soal dalam hJindak mfcmsrdekakan Algeria, tidak-lah Wrma'ana kita tidak mingaku Provisional Government ini kita tidak bersfimpati dngan perjuangan Algeria Mndak Merdeka. India tidak mgngaltu Provisional Government, kita tidak mfengaku sKbab kita suka Mndak minolong Algeria Mirdeka, jikalau kita aku Provisional Government pada satu masa akan datang harus akan mgnyusahkan Algeria hfindakkan kimcrdekaan, itu-lah jawapan saya kapada Tuan Yang Birhormat.

fache* Ahmad Bocftunam: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, satu lagi nntpk p&njelasan, kSnapa Pimftrentah ini mSnolak PJSndaftaran Committee Pembelaan PSrjuangan Algeria di-Malaya.

Dato' Dr. IanaH: Tuan Speaker, saya ta* hendak mSnjawab, kirana soal ini ta* ada kSna-mgnggna.

Mr. Speaker: Ta¹ payah jawab (*Ketowa*).

Dato* Dr. Ismail: Jadi saya mengulang sa-kali lagi dalam soal Algeria ini, kita tidak tsrk&bSlakang dari mana bangsa pun—dari mana nggri pun—baik Afro-Asian atau luar Afro-Asian, m&mpertuakan k&me"rdekan orang Algeria. Dan sSkarang saya pirgi pula kapada Ahli² yang lain, yang pfertamanya ia-lah Yang BSRhonnat wakil danpada Ipoh; jadi saya akan b&r-chakap dalam bahasa Inggris, Tuan. oleh s&bab dia mgmbuat t&goran-nya dalam bahasa Inggris.

Sir, I will now reply to the Honourable Member for Ipoh. His first observation was that our foreign policy is influenced by the Anglo-American bloc, and he gave as one of the reasons our indebtedness to the United States and the United Kingdom in return for their generosity. Sir, if we are going to use that argument, then the country which the Honourable Member has quoted so often, that is India, must truly have no foreign policy of its own, because India is heavily indebted to the United States and the United Kingdom. And the same goes for Indonesia and many other countries in the Afro-Asian bloc.

In the United Nations I had occasions to rebuke the representatives of Hungary for their slanderous remarks on our foreign policy, when they said that our foreign policy was dominated by the United States. I think, however, that Hungary, belonging to the iron curtain countries, has at least some excuse for accusing us of being influenced by the United States, but for an Honourable Member in this House, who knows that our foreign policy has got the mandate of our people, to say that it is influenced by the Anglo-American bloc, is to display the greatest height of ignorance.

Then, the Honourable Member brought up the question of the entry of China into the United Nations. Sir, this question of the entry of Communist China into the United Nations has been debated year in and year out in the United Nations and more eloquent speakers than the Honourable Member have spoken on behalf of Communist China—yet every year it

has been rejected by the United Nations.

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker. Sir, on a point of information. I have never claimed to be an eloquent speaker.

Dato* Dr. Ismail: I never said that you are an eloquent speaker—I used the expression in a comparative sense. I will not dwell. Sir, on the debate of the entry of Communist China into the United Nations but I just would like to give a few reasons why we can never support the entry of China into the United Nations: (i) so long as we do not recognise China; (ii) so long as China is an aggressive nation; and (iii) so long as the resolution of the United Nations accusing China of being an aggressive nation stands in the records of the United Nations. (*Applause*). For a member to belong to such an august body as the United Nations it must first of all subscribe in words and deeds that it will follow the principles and purposes of the United Nations. Then, and then only, will we consider the question of the entry of China into the United Nations.

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification. May it be clarified whether Russia comes under the category of countries that the Honourable Minister has said can be in the United Nations?

Dato* Dr. Ismail: Sir, I do not understand what the Honourable Member means, because I am replying to him on the question of the entry of China into the United Nations. I will exercise my right of reply and will not answer any new points which he brings up.

The Honourable Member also says that on the question of the apartheid policy adopted by the South African Government, we should take more effective steps. I cannot agree more with him—and this, I think, also applies to the Honourable Member for Kuala Trengganu Selatan—but the mere fact is that our unilateral action in this connection will not have any effect at all on the Government of South Africa. The fact remains that this question of South Africa must be dealt with in the United Nations.

Where human rights are being violated, be it in Tibet, or in the Union of South Africa, or in Algeria. . . .

Mr. K. Karam Stagh: Sir, on a point of clarification. Does it apply to the violation of human rights in Kenya, Nayasaland, Congo and other territories where Britain and France are committing atrocities on the people of these territories?

Date* Dr. Ismail: Sir, I think I am exercising my right of reply to the matters that have been brought up so far in this debate. So, I say this question of violation of human rights in South Africa or in Tibet, so long as these items remain in the agenda of the United Nations no nation, big or small, can afford to ignore the moral force of the United Nations. Why do I say that? Let us take the case of China. She has been spending millions of dollars trying to prove to the world that she is a peace-loving nation but by its brutal force of suppression of human rights in Tibet, all those millions have gone into the drain. That is why they are so bitter against us for having brought up the question of Tibet in the United Nations, because that exposes what the Communists stand for, what atrocities they have done—as they have done in this country; and every loyal citizen of this country should support our stand on Tibet (*Applause*).

Mr. V. David: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Sir. When we disagree with the Government Bench it does not mean that we are not loyal.

Mr. Speaker: What order is that?

Mr. V. David: Point of order. Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Please proceed.

Date* Dr. Imuil: As regards the question of the White Australian policy, I think the Honourable the Prime Minister has effectively replied to that.

Now I come to the Honourable Member for Bungsar. I think he opened his speech with a plea for a debate on the foreign policy. I think his speech was a marathon on the debate on foreign policy. He again mentioned why, when countries more concerned

with Tibet than us were keeping quiet, should we put our finger on the question, of Tibet I am not going to labour again on that question. But, Sir, you will agree with me that Honourable Members of this House have privileges and responsibilities, and we take what they say as true—at least we expect them to verify their facts—Now he says, in the course of his speech on this question of Tibet in the United Nations, that no country in the Afro-Asian group voted for the resolution

Mr. V. David: On a point of clarification, Sir. I said major countries.

Mr. Speaker: Major countries—he has already clarified. Please proceed.

Dato* Dr. Ismail: I do not know what he means by that, and if I were to tell my Afro-Asian colleagues that there are minor and major countries in the Afro-Asian group they will probably tell me to get out (*Laughter*), because there is no such thing as major and minor countries in the Afro-Asian group.

Mr. V. David: I was referring to the population of the various countries,

Mr. Speaker: Please proceed.

Dato' Dr. Ismail: The fact remains that in the Afro-Asian group in the United Nations we are all equals.

I think, Sir, he made a very unfounded allegation when he said that the proposed South-East Asia Economic Friendship Treaty was due to the influence of America.

Mr. V. David: Mr. Speaker. Sir. on a point of clarification. I did not say due to the influence of America; I said that it might be that America was at the back of it (*Laughter*).

Dato* Dr. Inuil: Well, Sir, I am glad that he has qualified his statement and now, I think, he is quite clear that America has nothing to do with it; so I am not going to reply to him.

Well, Sir, I think I have replied to most of the observations made on our foreign policy. In conclusion, I would like to state that so long as I remain the Foreign Minister of this Government I will appreciate and I will take any constructive criticism of our

foreign policy, but I will not be made an instrument for implementing the foreign policies of other parties in this House who happen not to be the Government of this country.

Mr. Speaker; Ahli² Yang Berhormat, mengikut Standing Orders 66 (2) pada pukul 4 pStang Wtul atau pun masa yang di-tetapkan oleh Tuan Speaker hSndak-lah Tuan Speaker mSngemukakan soal atau masa'alah ini pada Dewan ini bagi di-dapatkan kSputusan ya'ani keputusan di-atas mfimbachakan kali yang kEdua. Rang Undang² B&anjawan tahun 1960, masa sSkarang sudah lewat daripada 4.30 dan saya tidak lagi hendak mEndngar dari siapa² pun Ahli² Yang Berhormat, mfclainkan saya hSndak mSngemukakan masa'alah ini di-hadapan Dewan ini, saya boleh be nark an satu sahaja, jikalau pehak Minted KeVangan hgndak bSrchakap, kalau tidak, saya fikir ta' payah-lah yang lain bfirchakap lagi kerana masa sudah Ifibeh daripada lewat; kalau ramai lagi yang hEndak be'rchakap, saya mSnempohkan Mfishuarat sa-lama 15 minit.

Majlis ini di-tempohkan sa-lama 15 minit.

Sitting suspended at 4.45 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 5.04 o'clock p.m.

Debate resumed.

Question again proposed.

Mr. Speaker Ahli² Yang Berhormat, oleh sfbab Majlis ini telah mEmbahatkan 2 hari Rang Undang² ini, saya tidak-lah dapat m&mbe'narkan lagi, m&ainkan 2 orang sahaja boleh be'rchakap daripada pehak Kdrajaan, sa-lepas itu saya akan k&emukakan rundingan ini ia-itu BSlanjawan ini dibachakan bagi kali yang kgdua.

The Minister of Defence (Tun Abdul Razak): Tuan Yang di-Pgртуа, sabSlum saya mSnjawab tfigoran² yang tSlah di-datangkan oleh Ahli² Yang Bfirhormat terhadap Titah Uchapan Duli Yang Maha Mulia Timbalan Yang di-Pgртуа Agong juga di-atas dasar Budget yang ada di-hadapan ini. Saya suka bagi pehak Kerajaan b'r-sama² dfingan Duli Yang Maha Mulia Timbalan Yang di-PSrtuan Agong mendatangkan pgrasaan dukachita, oleh s6bab Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seii Paduka Baginda Yang di-P5rtuan

Agong telah jatuh gSring bSbSrapa bulan yang lalu. Dan sekarang kita bSrasa sukachita kErana S'ri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pgртуа Agong semakin hari sa-makin bertambah sggar dan kita bgrdo'a ka-hadzrat Allah-subhanahu-wata'ala mudahan² Sfri Paduka Baginda Yang di-P6rtuan Agong sa-hari d2mi sa-hari s6g6ra-lah sfimboh daripada kSgeringan itu. Saya suka mSngambil pgluang ini bagi pehak K 6 ra j aa n mfinguchapkan sa-tinggi² tahniah² dan tSrima kaseh kepada pggawai² Pejabat Kgsihatan, kepada Director of Medical Services dan juga doktor² Bungsar Hospital Kuala Lumpur dan sEmua kaki-tangan-nya yang tflah bfirsama² mSmbSri pSrtolongao menjaga kgsihatan Sfri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pfртуа, saya suka mfjawab b6bSrapa pgrkara, Wbgrapa pandangan yang tSlah di-datangkan oleh Ahli² Yang Bfirhormat tSrhada pgrkara² dalam Titah Uchapan Duli Yang Maha Mulia Timbalan Yang di-Pertuan Agong ini. Yang pgtrama-nya saya suka m6mb6ri pgnerangan berkfinaan dEngan KSbangsaan P5rsfku-tuan Tanah Melayu yang ada tgrtulis dalam Perlembagaan kita yang ada sfikarang ini. KSbangsaan yang ada di-dalam Perlembagaan ini, tSrang dan nyata-lah ia-lah Kgbangsaan yang mgpunyai taraf dan kfidudokkan yang sama juga dSngan KSbangsaan yang di-dapati di-nSgeri² yang tflah MgrdSka dan bgrdaulat. Dan saya tidak faham-lah apa yang di-k hgndaki, yang di-katakan satu KSbangsaan yang sEjati dan tulin itu, barangkali kalau kita Wrkehendakkan satu KSbangsaan yang sgjati dan tulin bagi PfirsSkutuan Tanah MSlayu ini, itu saya faham. KSbangsaan yang mgpunyai kSdaulat-an yang sa-p5noh²-nya tftlah ada pada tangan kita, akan t&tapi kalau kita hgndak mSndirikan satu bangsa yang sgjati dan tulin, pgrkara itu tgntu-lah mSngambil masa dan bgrgan-tong pada bebgrapa factor² yang sa-tgngah-nya Ahli² Yang BSrhormat tSlah pun menye'butkan. Yang pSrtama-nya dEngan kErjasama di-antara bangsa yang duduk di-Tanah Mfilayu ini dan mgnumpahkan ta*at setia dSngan sa-penoh-nya kepada Tanah MSlayu ini dan bSrgantong juga kapada ta'at sgitia mgreka itu t'rpaksa

tumpukan ta'at sitia-nya yang tidak birbfilah bagi kapada Tanah MJHayu. Yang kJSdua-nya bfrgantong kapada pSlajaran—kapada dasar pilajaran—kapada asas dasar pelajaran yang satu sapfirti yang di-atorkan oleh KSrajaan Perikatan pada masa dahulu, bagitu juga bergantung pada kfmajuan bahasa kBoangsaan yang tunggai dalam Pfir-Ifimbagaan kita ia-itu bahasa Mfclayu di-jaduan bahasa kfibangsaan yang tunggai dalam nfgara kita yang Meraeka ini. Yang ketiga, bSrgantong juga kapada kfcbudayaan, kSsSnian dan kfebudayaan yang satu bagi ne~geri ini. Yang Berfaonnat wakil dari Bachok ada mSmben pandangan. saya suka-chita mfnndngar-nya bSrkJSnian dEngan p&mbentokan kSbudayaan bagi nSgara kita. Kfcrajaan mnenma di-atas dasar-nya, bahawa sa-bagai satu nSgara yang Merdeka, kita mustahak mgmbe'ntok suatu kJSbudayaan bagi nfcgri kita ini. Titapi pada pandangan saya kSbudayaan itu hndak-lah satu kSbudayaan yang hidup ia-itu ta*boieh-lah hSndak di-isikan dEngan satu kfbudayaan sahaja ia-itu kgbudayaan Melayu. Saya yakin dan pferchaya bahawa kftbudayaan M6layu itu minjadi pokok atau ibarat satu rumah mfinjadi tiang sfri bang&a akan ttapi bagi pSikakas yang lain bagi mSndirikan rumah kSbudayaan itu tirpaksa-lah kita mt nirima dan mSnggunakan barang yang di-dapati daripada bangsa¹ lain. nfgSri² lain, bukan di-tKntukan dEngan bangsa² yang hidup dalam Tanah Milayu ini bahkan bangsa² lain di-dunia ini. Kalau kita bferkgh&ndakkan kibudayaan kita itu hidup dan kirnbang, h&ndak-lah kita buka kebudayaan rumah kita itu supaya kita isikan dEngan ptrkakas² yang baharu yang bfrs&suain dengan kfh&ndak kita, bSrs&suain dEngan bangsa kita dan ugama kita.

finche* Othman bia Abdullah: Tuan Yang di-Pgtrua, saya minta pSnirangan apa-kah pandangan dan sikap Kftra-jaan di-atas kfiputusan Kongres Kftbudayaan Melayu yang tflah di-ambil-nya dalam Kongres di-MSlaka sa-bagai pokok kibudayaan ia-lah Wrpuncha kibudayaan Melayu yang tidak Wrlawan dEngan ajaran Islam, apa-kah pandangan Kirajaan?

T<n Abdul Raz<k: Saya sudah tfrangkan tadi Tuan Yang di-Pirtua, di-atas dasar-nya Kfirajaan nigdri ini ia-itu kfbudayaan Mftlayu patut-lah di-jadikan kgbudayaan pokok bagi mfimbena satu kfbudayaan bagi nigara kita yang mfrdeka. SKkarang, Tuan Yang di-Pfirtua, saya suka menfrang-kan sedikit bSrkJSnian dEngan K bang-saan—Nationality atau pun Citizenship bagi Tanah Milayu. Dukachita Yang Krhonnat wakil daripada Kuala Tringganu Silatan tidak ada di*tfmpat-nya pada masa ini. Ahli yang B&rhormat itu mtngatakan bahawa Kftbangsaan yang ada pada kita ia-itu Citizenship yang di-selutkan dalam Pfrfembagaan itu bukan Kfibangsaan yang sa-bdnar. Saya suka tfrangkan di-sini bahawa Kfira'ayatan yang di-punyai oleh warga negara negiri ini ia-lah Kera'ayatan yang mempunyai taraf dan kMudokan yang penoh. sama juga Kera'ayatan yang sama takatan tadi di-mana nSgSri (U-dunia, ini. Sunggoh pun dalam Pfriimbagaan itu kita sfcbutkan Citizen kita tidak pakai perkataan "National" titapi dalam Perlembagaan itu pfrkataan "Citizen" dingan perkataan "National" sama. PKrkataan "Ra'ayat" atau pun perkataan "Warga Negara" ini sSmua sama tidak ada beza. Jadi jika sa-sa-orang itu mfinjadi Citizen nf^firi PSrs&utuan Tanah MSlayu ini ia mfnjadi iuga-lah National Pfrs&utuan Tanah Melayu. Yang boleh menSntukan kfidudukan Citizen atau National sa-buah negtri itu ia-lah Undang³ nfgeri itu atau dalam bahasa InggKris-nya "Municipal Law of that country**", kerana daripada sigi International Law tidak meng-hiraukan sam& ada n^geri itu mSngada-kan berbang² bangsa ra'ayat-nya atau pun mftgunakan apa nama Kera'ayatan.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, what I have been trying to explain to the House is that in the Federation of Malaya the words "national**" and "citizen" are synonymous. It is not true, therefore, to say that the Federal citizenship does not have the status of a nationality. All subjects of the Federation enjoy full political rights and therefore all citizens of the Federation are nationals of the Federation and vice versa. Now the term "national" or "subject of a State"

denotes all persons for the purpose of international intercourse indentified with a given nation — a people organised separte political State and occupying a definite territory. Now, whether a national of a particular State is a citizen of that State depends upon whether he enjoys full political rights under the municipal law of the country. Now, I would like to quote here, Sir, a passage from one famous treatise on international law — „Abraham's Treatise on International Law", and it says:

"Nationality of an individual is his quality of being a subject of a certain State and, therefore, he is a citizen. For all international purposes, all distinctions made by the municipal law between a subject and a citizen and between different kinds of subjects, have neither theoretical, nor practical value. And therefore the terms "subject" and "citizen" are synonymous so far as international law is concerned."

Sir, what I have been trying to prove is that in the Federation these two words, "citizen" and "national" are synonymous; and therefore citizens of the Federation are nationals of the Federation. Therefore, it is not true to say that a citizen of the Federation has not the status of a national of the Federation.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli² Yang Bg'hormat ada juga mfinySbutkan dua tiga pgrkara yang di-katakan tidak di-sebutkan di-dalam Titan Uchapan Duli Yang Maha Mulia Timbalan Yang di-Pertuan Agong, Saya suka-lah menerangkan di-sini dalam ucapan yang panjang itu tgntu-lah pgrkara itu tidak dapat hendak di-sebutkan sgmua sgkali dasar² KSrajaan, sgmua sgkali pekerjaan yang di-jalankan atau pun telah di-jalankan oleh Kgrajaan. Jadi, yang di-sSbutkan dalam ucapan itu ia-lah perkara² yang bSsar, yang penting, yang akan di-jalankan oleh Kerajaan pada tahun hadapan. Bgbgrapa perkara yang lain sungguh pun sangat mustahak tg'tapi tak dapat-lah dimasukkan. Hal itu akan di-tgrangkan oleh Mgntgri² sSndiri apabila mSngS-mukakan pgrbelanjaan dalam Kgmgn-masing².

Saya suka tSrangkan, oleh sSbab saya bertanggung jawab bgrkgnaan dgngan hal kgmajuan luar bandar — kgmajuan

kampong, saya tSrangkan di-sini bahawa pggkgrjaan bagi mgmajukan keadaan hidup di-kampong² itu adalah pggkgrjaan yang akan di-buat bukan oleh satu Mentgri atau satu Ke'me'ntgrian sahaja sapgtri Menteri Kgmajuan Kampong bahkan akan di-jalankan oleh sgmua Kgmngntgrian—akan di-jalankan oleh semua Mgntgri², sgmua pegawai² K5rajaan daripada sSmua pgringkat. Oleh itu ttintu-lah tidak munasabah kalau hSndak di-ambil satu sahaja p^rb lanjaan atau satu item dan satu pe'rbe'lanjaan atau satu K6m6ntSrian sahaja bagi mSnnunjukkan pSkggrjaan yang hgndak di-buat. SapSrti yang di-tgrangkan dalam Titah Uchapan Duli Yang Maha Mulia, Kgrajaan telah mgngambil kftftapan bahawa pekerjaan mgmajukan kgadaan kampong² itu akan di-beri kgutamaan yang tinggi sekali dalam masa 5 tahun akan datang, dan Kerajaan akan mSngadakan satu chara bagi mSnjalkan dasar² Kgrajaan ini ia-itu chara yang baharu yang sama dengan chara bagi me*njalankan sSangan bagi mgnghapuskan pngnganas komunis itu. KSrajaan bgrchadang akan di-adakan Jawatan-Kuasa di-sgmua pgringkat, daripada pSringkat Ibu PSjabat atau Kerajaan Perslkutuan, kapada Kerajaan NSgeri, kapada Jajahan, dan sa-t5rus-nya kapada semua kampong supaya ranchangan kSmajuan dapat di-jalankan dengan sempurna mglalu! satualeran sahaja. Pada masa ini banyak Kemgntenan, banyak Pejabat² dan banyak badan² yang ada mgnjalankan ranchangan² bagi kgmajuan kampong dan pada pgndapat Kgrajaan jika tgnaga² dan pggkgrjaan kita itu tidak sama di-satukan di-bawah satu atoran atau organisation maka tSntu-lah tak akan mgndapat kSjayaan yang mgmbgri puas hati. Oleh kgrana itu kita akan tubuhkan satu Kgmngntgrian baharu ia-itu Kgmngntgrian Luar Bandar dgngan tujuan mgnyatukan tgnaga² semua supaya dapat Kgmajuan Luar Badar itu di-bgri kgutamaan yang sgmpurna dan dapat pggkgrjaan itu di-jalankan dgngan lichin dan sgmpurna daripada atas bingg sampai ka-bawah. Pggkgrjaan mgnjalankan Kgmajuan Luar Bandar itu bukan tanggungan sa-suatu orang bahkan

tanggung jawab sgmua sSkali, pggawai² Kerajaan dan bagitu juga KSrajaan bSrharap Ahli² Yang BSrhorat dan juga ra'ayat jelata sa-terus-nya yang akan mSmben kerja-sama yang pSnoh dalam lapangan yang sangat mustahak. Satu lapangan yang mustahak dalam hal KS:majuan Luar Bandar ini ia-lah hal² tanah. Jadi, hal tanah ini ada-lah di-bawah Keiajaan² Negfiri. tftapi Kerajaan PfrsSkutuan berharap supaya dapat di-adakan satu chara memberi tanah atau mfingeluarkan tanah baharu ia-ini chara yang m&n-bolehkan mSmbri tanah kapada orang² yang sa-benar[^]nya tidak mempunyai tanah dan berkfihe[^]ndakkan tanah.

Ini-lah dasar-nya yang pehak Kerajaan PfrsSkutuan dan Kerajaan² Negeri telah mgnerima ia-itu pada masa yang akan datang kita akan mSmbfiri tanah kapada m&reka² yang tidak mSmpunyai tanah dan yang suka h&ndak mSnjalajikan perusahaan² kSrana Kirajaan b&rpendapat bahawa jalan yang besar selcali bagi mfininggikan taraf hidup ra'ayat jelata di-kampung² ia-lah mustahak di-bSri kapada mfireka itu chukup luas tanah bagi mata p&n-charian-nya yang sempurna—mata p&ncharian yang luas yang boleh m&ndatangkan hasil yang sgmpurna kapada mfireka itu. Pada pandangan K&aajaan, ini-lah lapangan yang mustahak sSkali ia-itu h&ndak-lah kita mSmbfiri tanah yang chukup luas kapada tiap² p&nduduk di-kampung yang b nar² berkfihe[^]ndakkan tanah bagi kSmajuan atau bagi mata pencharian mfireka itu.

Saya harap di-dalam perkara ini, Ahli² Yang B&rhorat s&mu faham d&ngan sa-benar[^]nya dan saya b&rharap juga akan m&ndapat pfrs&tujuan daripada pehak Kerajaan² Nfigfiri supaya Undang² Tanah itu dapat dipinda dan chara meng&luarkan tanah itu dapat di-perbaiki supaya pel&frjaan itu dapat di-jalankan d&ngan sempurna. Pehak K&rajaan t&lah mSlantek sa-orang Pegawai yang di-beri tanggung jawab khas bagi m&nyemak Undang² Tanah dan m&ngadakan satu Undang Tanah National atau National Land Code, ini. D ngan ini, sapfirti mana

ada bfibfirapa orang Ahli Yang Berhorraat dari Party PAS yang t&ilah b&rkata bahawa dapat-kah soal pern-bSrian tanah ini di-atasi dengan s&mpurna. Telah saya katakan tadi bahawa KCrajaan b&rp ndapat pirusahaan tanah ada-lah lapangan yang mustahak sgkali bagi meninggikan taraf hidup p&nduduk² di-kampung².

Tuan Yang di-P&rtua, saya fikir had ini sahaja-lah yang patut saya sebutkan b&r&k&naan d&ngan hal K&:majuan Luar Bandar. Ada bgbfrapa Ahli² Yang Birhorat yang telah m&ndatangkan pandangan Wrkinaan dengan hal ttatera. Ada pula yang mengatakan bahawa kita s&karang mi tidak ad& Tentera Kibangsaan. s&bab tfntera² sikarang ini pfinoh d&ngan Pigawai² Dagang atau P&ggawai² Expatriate. Saya suka terangkan di-sini bahawa Yang Amat B&rhorat Pirdana M&nt&ri telah pun minSrangkan bahawa pada pirmukan ini mustahak-lah kita m&ng&gunakan Pfigawai² British atau P&ggawai² Dagang bagi m&nolong kita minjalan-kan atau pun m&latehkan tentera² kita yang ada pada masa ini. Akan tftapi pikerjaan Malayanisation atau pun pSkerjaan menggantikan PS&gawai² Dagang d&ngan Pigawai² anak negftri itu ada-lah di-jalankan d&ngan sa-berapa chipat yang boleh dan berjalan d&ngan sa-b&rapa yang sempurna.

Saya suka meny&butkan di-sini ia-itu pada tahun hadapan ia-ini pada tahun 1961 dalam Infantry Unit kita akan me'makai simua Pfigawai² kita s&ndiri dan ada-lah barangkali tinggal satu sahaja Pegawai Dagang ia-itu Pegawai Latehan Infantry Unit

Pada 1/1/57 ada 154 Pegawai Tanah Melayu dan 183 Pigawai Dagang dan pada pinghujung tahun ini hanya-lah tinggal 61 orang PK&gawai Dagang dan 213 orang Pegawai Tanah Melayu. Jadi, dalam bahagian ti&knikal terutama sikali dalam bahagian Tentera Laut dan Tintira Udara yang baharu sahaja di-adakan barangkali Malayanisation ini akan mingambil masa yang lama sedikit. Akan tftapi saya suka juga m&nfcrangkan berk&naan d&ngan hal Infantry Unit yang mana tidak berapa lama lagi akan dapat di-adakan Pegawai² daripada Tanah MSlayu s&ndiri. Dan juga baharu² ini

tgah pun di-ishtiharkan bahawa Timbalan Kgtua Agong Tgntgra kita ia-itu sa-orang Brigadier Mglayu dan saya harap sa-lgpas tamat-nya kontSrek Kgtua Agong yang ada sgkarang ini maka akan di-gantikan 15 m pat Kgtua Agong Tgntgra dengan sa-orang Pggawai Tanah Mglayu kita sgndiri.

Enche* Ahmad Boestamam: Untuk pgnjglasan, Tuan Yang di-PSrtua. Dapat-kah Yang Bgrhormat Mgntgri Pgrtahanan kita mgmbgri tahu bahawa bila-kah agak-nya kontgrek Kgtua Agong Tgntgra itu habis?

Ton Abdul Razak: Tuan Yang di-Pgrtua, Kgtua Agong Tgntgra ini dibawa hanya dalam masa dua tahun sahaja. Jadi, saya bgrharap kapada Ahli Yang Bgrhormat tgrutama sgkali wakil dari Sgtaapak faham, oleh sgbab Ahli Yang Bgrhormat itu ada pula mgmbawa satu chadangan atau usul bgrkgnaan dgngan Malayanisation tgrutama berkngnaan dengan tgntera ini bagi di-binchangkan di-Majlis ini. Saya fikir di-atas dasar-nya tidak ada prsglisehan di-antara pehak Kgrajaan dgngan Ahli Yang Bfirhormat ia-itu kita hgndak mgnjalankan Malayanisation dgngan sa-berapa chgpat yang boleh, tgtapi PSgawai Tgntgra ini yang pada masa ini hanya-lah dapat kita latehkan 40 orang tgntgra sahaja — P&gawai TSntfra. Jadi, pada masa ini sahingga kita dapat minambahkan lagi latehan ini hanya-lah kita dapat mE-ngurangkan 40 orang Pfigawai² Dagang sa-tahun dalam tftntfra.

dfingan T^ntera Laut dan TSntSra Udara yang mana dalam T6ntSra Udara kita hanya ada 30 orang Pegawai Tanah Mglayu, t^tapi 27 orang Pggawai maseh dalam latehan lagi. Jadi tiga orang baharu b^kerja sfibab kita baharu sahaja mgndapat kE-mgrdekaan. Saya suka mfimbSri ma*-aloman kapada Ahli² Yang B6rhormat ia-itu sapSrti di-nEg ri India. Ceylon dan Pakistan t&rpaksa mSnggunakan PSgawai² Expatriate ini bgberapa tahun ia-itu tiga grapat tahun sa-lgpas kgmerdekaan. Saya suka mgnygbutkan di-sini dgngan sa-bgrapa sukachita-nya bahawa kita sangat tSrhutang budi kapada Pegawai² Expatriate yaflg tSlah m6nolong kita bagi mgndirikan ^ntgra kita pada masa sa-lgpas M^rdeka. Jadi,

boleh di-katakan pada masa kita mgnchapai kgm^rdekaan pada 31/8/57 itu kita tak ada tgntgra yang sa-bgnar-nya, tetapi daripada hari ini baharu-lah hgndak di-adakan satu tgntgra yang bersSndirian di-sfbbakkan pada masa itu juga kita tidak ada Supply Depot tetapi pada tahun hadapan hgndak di-adakan Supply Depot, itu pun dgngan pgmbgrian daripada pehak Kgrajaan British. Jadi, saya katakan ini-lah chara² yang kita jalankan bgrkneaan² dgngan Malayanisation dalam tgntgra.

Ada juga Ahli² Yang Bgrhormat yang mngatakan bgrkngnaan dgngan kSdudokkan tgntgra Commonwealth di-n6ggri ini, mustahak-lah kita mgmpSrtahankan n^ggri ini oleh warga-nSgara-nya sendiri. Sa-bagai MSnteri Pgrtahanan, saya suka sangat jikalau kita ada mempunyai tgntera yang chukup lngkap, chukup bgsar, Tgntgra Laut, Udara dan juga Tgntgra Darat, akan tgtapi sapgtri yang di-katakan oleh Yang Ainat Bgrhormat Pgrdana Mgntgri, kita tgrpaksa menggunakan wang kapada lapangan yang lain. Saya hanya minta \$83 juta bagi tgntera, dan saya tidak bgrhajat hSndak me minta wang Igbeh lagi daripada itu. kerana saya tahu jikalau saya b^rkghgndakkan wang Igbeh daripada itu, tgrpaksa di-ambil daripada lapangan yang lain, umpama-nya, lapangan Pglajaran, lapangan Kgsehatan atau pun lapangan KSmajuan Kampong. Jadi saya tahu banyak pgmuda² kita nEggri ini suka hgndak bgrkhidmat, Wratus² orang tiap² hari hgndak masuk dalam tgntgra, tgtapi pgrbglanjauan 1 orang tgntgra \$4,000 sa-tahun, dan jikalau kita hgndak mgnambah lagi tgntgra kita dgngan bilangan 10,000 orang sahaja, kita bgrEghgndakkan wang \$40 juta. Sgbab itu bagi sgmgntara ini kita mnggunakan tgntgra luar, s bgb kita tidak kgna foayar satu sen pun dan sgrba-sgrbi-nya pgkgrjaan itu dapat di-buat dgngan pgrchuma sahaja.

Jadi itu-lah sgbab sapgtri yang di-katakan oleh Yang Amat Bgrhormat Pgrdana Mentgri tadi, tgntgra² Commonwealth itu ada di-sini dgngan kg-hgndak kita bagi mgnolong kita pada masa ini, bukan sahaja bagi mglawan pngnganas² bahkan bagi mgmpgrtahan kan ngggri kita ini. Dan saya suka

terangkan di-sini bahawa tftera Commonwealth itu hanya-lah boleh di-gunakan mfingikut Pejianjian PSrtahanan dfengan Kirajaan British ia-itu di-gunakan kerana mempertahankan Tanah MHayu dan negeri² yang berde*katan, saperti Singapura. Brunei, Borneo Utara dan Sarawak, dan ta* boleh di-gunakan hal yang lain ia-itu masok SEATO dan sa-bagai-nya—ta' boleh masok—tentira ini tidak boleh di-gunakan hal yang lain—m&ainkan dJSogan pers&ujuan daripada pehak Kerajaan Ne"geri kita.

Now, Sir, I would like to end my speech with one comment. That is to say, I would like to reply to the speech made by the Honourable Member for Ipoh, Now, the Honourable the Prime Minister has already replied to H number of points made by him earlier, and I wish only to speak on one point.

He mentioned in his speech that according to the provisions of citizenship in our Constitution, there is no equality among citizens of this country, and he mentioned in particular Article 43 (7) which says that only a citizen by operation of law can become Prime Minister of this country. Well, Sir, Honourable Members are aware that in this country we have citizens from different races. We have people who have applied for citizenship by naturalisation, by operation of law from the different races in this country. We are not certain of the loyalty of some of these citizens. Perhaps the Honourable Member may now ask for proof of that I say loyalty is a matter of the mind and heart. That is why it is difficult to prove whether a man is loyal or not to this country. Therefore, in order to safeguard the interests of the country, we nave to have this provision: that is to say, the highest post of this country, the post of Prime Minister, should only be occupied by a citizen by operation of law, that is, by someone of this country who, we know, has definite loyalty to this country. This is not a novel provision

Article 24: one class of citizens by operation of law can become Prime Minister or Mentri Besar, but the other class of citizens by operation of law still cannot be.

Tn Abdul Razak: Well, that is quite true, Sir, because we also require that a citizen by operation of law must be born in this country before he can hold the office of Prime Minister. This, Sir, is not a novel provision, because in the Constitution of the United States of America one of the qualifications for becoming a President is that he must be a natural-born citizen of the United Slates. We have to have this provision, as I said, in order to protect the interests of the country. We do not want the Administration of our country to be influenced by people of alien origin and loyalty. The post of Prime Minister is the highest post in the country, and I think it is only fair that before a person can occupy such a high post, he should be someone who has unquestioned and undivided loyalty to this country. That is why, as I said, we have this provision in our Constitution.

Now, Sir, I should just want to say a few words on the question of the use of foreign troops in this country, because a number of Honourable Members have raised this matter. Although I have spoken in Malay, I should now like to say a few words in English to make it quite clear that, under the Defence Treaty, the Commonwealth troops are stationed here for a definite purpose, that is, for the defence of this country and for the defence of the territories around here—Singapore, Sarawak, Borneo and Brunei—and also, these troops cannot be employed for any other purpose without the approval of this Government. That is clearly stated in the Agreement which I nave in front of me here. There is no question of the Commonwealth troops being used for the purposes of S.E.A.T.O. or any other organisation. I hope, Sir, that is now clear to Honourable Members.

Now, Sir, I do not wish to reply at great length on the Question of the Emergency and the objections raised by a few Honourable Members because I think I have spoken at considerable length two days ago when X replied to

Mr. D. R. SeauTuafun: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification—even a citizen by operation of law is divided into two classes under

the adjournment speech made by the Honourable Member for Setapak. I said then, and I say now, that the Emergency is not yet at an end. We hope very soon the Emergency will come to an end. But until the Government is satisfied that terrorism. Communist terrorism, no longer presents a security threat to this country, the Emergency Regulations must be enforced; and I have repeated then that we have reviewed the Emergency Regulations a long time ago and have revoked a number of the provisions which were considered unnecessary. Therefore, Sir, I do feel strongly that there is no necessity to have a special committee of review, particularly in view of the fact that we hope the Emergency will come to an end very soon. (*Applause*).

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to wind up this debate on behalf of the Government with some gratification—and I use the word "gratification" because of the paucity of criticisms which have been levelled during the debate, and from the fact that the greater part of the debate has been devoted, at least as far as the Opposition speakers are concerned, to His Highness' Speech rather than to the Supply Bill. I assume that this in itself implies that even my taxation proposals have not aroused the ire of the Opposition speakers in the way the newspapers had made it out to be. There are, however, one or two points which have been raised in the course of this debate and to which I intend to reply—I wish to reply to them in the order in which they arose—and I shall try to be as brief as possible.

One Honourable Member went to great lengths, to great pains, to digress on the virtues of nationalisation, or what is known as nationalisation *vis-a-vis* the virtues of free enterprise. This, Sir, is a subject on which one can wax very eloquent and on which it is possible to have more than one point of view. We on this side of the House hold one point of view and probably Opposition speakers on the other side of the House hold another point of view. It is not my intention this afternoon to convince them of our point of view. However, I think it would be useful for one not to look at this matter

from the point of view of the politician, from the point of view of oratory, but rather from what is happening in the world to-day.

I would like to take this House to a country called Germany. After the Second World War, Germany, as we all know, was divided into two parts; those two parts, I suggest, can fairly be compared, because they are one nation, one people, one homogenous race. Yet, what has happened after the War? We all know that West Germany, the non-Communist part of Germany, is to-day a prosperous, thriving, peaceful and happy community. The other part, East Germany, the Communist part of it, is such an unhappy land that we all know that everyday thousands of refugees are trying to cross the border from East Germany to West Germany.

Mr. K. Karam Singh: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification, I would like to know from the Honourable Minister if, in the course of his extensive travels, he has ever been to Eastern Germany; whether he is now speaking from first-hand knowledge, or is he just engaging himself in relaying American propaganda here?

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: I admit, Sir, that I have not been to East Germany, and I hope I will never go there, but I have in my possession certain figures and facts which speak more eloquently than words.

Mr. V. David: Mr. Speaker, Sir, we are not dealing with East Germany or West Germany now.

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: I have got with me here figures which indicate quite clearly the virtues or the merits of free enterprise, according to one's point of view. These are the latest figures.

Mr. Speaker: Is it necessary to quote the figures?

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: I think so, Sir, because these are very major issues.

Mr. V. David: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister whether he is speaking on foreign policy, or replying to the debate on the Budget speech?

Mr. Speaker: He is replying to the debate on the Budget. (*Laughter*). (To Mr. Tan Siew Sin) Is it necessary to quote the figures?

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: Yes, Sir. I will not quote very many figures—just a few. I suggest that this a matter of some importance, because it was stated by the Opposition that if to-day we were to resort to nationalisation all our economic troubles would be over. I entirely disagree with that.

Mr. V. David: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to know who referred to nationalisation, or who is he replying to? (*Interruptions*) (AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Shut up.) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I ask the Honourable Member to withdraw the remark "shut up".

Mr. Speaker: I think there was mention about this question of nationalisation in the debate.

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: Yes. the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat, I think.

Mr. Speaker: and the Minister has a right to reply.

Mr. V. David: Before that, Mr. Speaker, somebody shouted "shut up". Will that be withdrawn, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: I did not hear that. (*Laughter*). Please proceed.

Mr. V. David: Mr. Speaker, Sir, if the Members here do not know how to behave themselves, I think they should be taught.

Mr. Speaker: Sit down, please. I do not like to have these interruptions every now and then. Will Honourable Members behave themselves in this House? I have warned these Members last time and I think one warning is enough. (AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Kick them out, kick them out!) I do not like to kick these people out. (*Laughter*).

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: One of the most reliable criteria on prosperity is, what is known as the *per capita* national income, or gross national product. The *per capita* gross national product for 1958, sometimes known as G.N.P., of East Germany was 3,109 Deutsche-marks and West Germany 3,561—nearly 15 per cent more for West

Germany. Gross fixed investment for 1958: East Germany 12,100 million Deutsche-marks; West Germany 49,000 million. *Per capita* figures were 605 for East Germany and 908 for West Germany—50 per cent more in favour of West Germany. Another figure—I have got figures by the dozens, but I am only quoting a few.

Mr. Speaker: Is it necessary to quote these figures?

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: Yes, Sir. After that, I won't be speaking for long. I think this is an important issue. Cereals (Flour equivalent) (West German figures second referring to consumption in 1957/58)—n8.5 against 93; Potatoes 173.1 against 150.

Mr. K. Karam Singh: Mr. Speaker. Sir, I would like to know, on a point of clarification, who got these figures from Eastern Germany for the Finance Minister?

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: These figures are from Reuters:

Sugar.....	28.7	...	28
Meat and Products ...	48	...	52.6
Fresh Milk	95.1	...	114.8
Oils and Fats inclu ding Butter	...	26.5	...
		252	

Production figures (East German figures first All monthly averages in thousand metric tons for 1958).

Coal	242	...	11,049
Lignite	17,914	...	7,814
Iron ore	126	...	1,053
Meat	49	...	182
Milk	471	...	1,489
Butter	13	...	30
Cheese	3	...	12
Cotton yarn ...	5	...	32
Wool yarn ...	2	...	9
Cement ...	296	...	1,616
Crude steel ...	254	...	1,899

These figures show that in terms of material prosperity, in terms of advancement since the War there is no comparison between East and West Germany and the advantages and odds are greatly in favour of West Germany. Another country nearer home is Japan. I could quote again extensive figures from here to show that Japan has made fantastic progress since the War and that in spite of the fact that Japan in 1945 was probably the most devastated

country in Asia, if not the most devastated country in the world.

All this material progress and prosperity have been achieved by Governments which by no stretch of the imagination can be called left-wing governments.

Another Hon'ble member accused the Government of not allocating a sufficiently generous share of the Development Estimates to rural development. I have got figures to show that even in respect of a few heads like Land Development Authority, D.I.D., fisheries, roads and bridges, water, rubber replanting for smallholders, and RIDA, we have allocated over 45 million dollars out of a total expenditure of 250 million dollars and these items are by no means exhaustive. That Sir, shows that the Government sets very great store, and very rightly so, on this question of rural development. We have been accused—and when I say "We", I mean the Alliance Government—that as a result of our taxation proposals this country is going to be a pretty miserable country to live in. But what are the facts? Malaya to-day is one of the most prosperous countries in South-East Asia by any standards. (*Applause*). I can quote any amount of figures to prove my point but I intend to quote only one, and that is in respect of *per capita* national income in U.S. dollars. These figures are issued by an organisation known as the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. Malaya is highest on the list, US.\$310; second, Japan with US.\$ 190—Malaya being nearly double that of Japan; third the Philippines with US.\$150; fourth Ceylon with US.\$110; fifth Pakistan with US.\$70; sixth India with US.\$60; seventh Burma with US.\$50. These figures indicate, Sir, as nothing else would have done that in spite of everything, in spite of the criticisms which have been levelled against this Government, Malaya was and will continue to be probably the most prosperous country in South-East Asia. (*Applause*). When I was Minister of Commerce and Industry I received everyday begging letters from people all over Asia, begging to be allowed

to come into Malaya under almost any terms, under almost any conditions. (*Applause*). I am sure my Hon'ble friend the Minister of External Affairs will confirm that even to-day, and for a long time more to come, people from all over Asia consider it a privilege to be allowed to enter this wonderful country of ours. (*Applause*). And that applies not only to individuals, it applies to capital from all over the world: capital from Asia, from Western Europe, from Australia and from North America.

Another Hon'ble Member in a speech which was bristling with inaccuracies stated that the Central Bank has no power to issue notes. If I were to deny the accuracy of that statement he would probably say that I do not know what I am talking about. So, I intend to read this short section 20 of the Central Bank Ordinance (No. 61 of 1958) which reads as follows

Mr. Tan Phock Kin (Tanjong): On a point of explanation Mr. Speaker, I said that the power of note issue was never implemented.

Mr. Tan Siew Sin:

"The Bank shall have the sole right of issuing notes and coin throughout the Federation and neither the Government nor the Government of any State, nor any public authority, bank, other institution or person shall issue currency notes, bank notes, or coin or any documents or tokens payable to bearer on demand being documental tokens which, in the opinion of the Bank, are likely to pass as legal tender."

Sir, this question of note issue is a very major issue and is bound up with our credit standing, with our adherence to the Currency Agreement and so on. I have already indicated in my Budget speech that it is the intention of this Government to revise the Currency Agreement in the early part of next year, but even when this is done we must take care that if we ever reduce the backing of our note issue, it must be done in such a way as not to diminish or prejudice the credit standing of the Federation.

Another Hon'ble member in a passing reference to the Hon'ble the Prime Minister's visit to Australia stated that it was improper for the financial provision for this visit to be

sought only after the visit had taken place. This, Sir, is not only proper but is quite usual. In the first place, it is covered by Section 11 (2) of the Financial Procedure Ordinance which I shall not bother to read unless I am challenged, and which gives the Government power to make provision for just such an eventuality. Neither is this provision unique. It is not novel nor unique because it is a provision which is found in the financial procedure of every civilised country in the world. (*Applause*). It is obvious that this provision is necessary because you never can tell when you have to undertake some unforeseen expenditure and obviously this provision will take care of needs of that nature.

Mr. Tn Phock Kin: On a point of explanation Mr. Speaker, is the Hon'ble the Minister of Finance suggesting that this is a matter of such great urgency that it has to be done in this manner?

Mr. Speaker: I do not think it is necessary to reply to that. It is provided in the Financial Procedure Ordinance. I know the provision myself. (*Laughter*).

Mr. Tan Sfew Sin: I should also clarify one point which has been referred to by a number of Hon'ble Members and which I made in my speech on the second reading of the Supply Bill, that is on the question of economy in the Government service. Hon'ble Members will recall that I used the word "personally*¹". In other words I personally think there is room for economy and I will certainly try my best to effect that economy, but I think it is needless to add that that view is not, shall we say, the unanimous view of the Civil Service, and though I have no intention of doing anything but the right thing you must also remember that it is not so easy because if to-day you go about it too quickly or too hurriedly, efficiency may sinter, and that is a thing that we want to avoid.

It has also been suggested, Sir, that this is a capitalist budget in the sense that instead of soaking the rich I have seen fit to soak the poor. Let us remember that the new import duties are estimated to yield between 49 and 50 million dollars but let us take a

round figure of 50 million dollars. 30 million dollars—that is 60%—is expected to come from import duty on diesel and fuel oils. If Hon'ble Members have read the newspapers assiduously they will have noticed that in the past few days I have been deluged with protests and complaints from Chambers of Commerce, Mining Associations, and such like, protesting that this duty will kill their industry, the tin mines and so on. Well, Sir, this shows that industry in fact is taking the major burden of the new tax increases—60%. With regard to sodium arsenite I agree that sodium arsenite is used by rubber estates as weed-killers, but the import duties which have been imposed on weed-killers are those which are not used by rubber small-holders. These weed-killers are things like Shelltox and so on which are used for domestic purposes and which in fact are not at all used by rubber smallholdings. On this matter I can claim to speak with some competence, in view of my slight connection previously with the rubber industry.

Loans—another Member suggested that in view of the enormous loans which we have obtained from the U.K. and from the United States, we are not only indebted to them, we have got to dance to their political tune. Nothing could be further from the truth. To begin with we owe only 29 million from the U.K., which is equivalent to 3% of our public debt. From the United States we have obtained loans amounting in all to 61 million dollars or 6.28% of our public debt. I suggest Sir that these percentages suggest that in fact our loans from these two countries are probably lower in terms of percentages than that of any country in Asia. (*Applause*).

Another Honourable Member suggested that we should give what he calls free primary education. I assume that what he means is really universal primary education. Now let us remember that in 1955, we spent 86.4 million dollars on education. 1955, I would remind Honourable Members, was the year of the Federation's first general election. In 1960, 5 years later, we intend to spend 174.6 million

dollars—just double of what we spent in 1955 (*Applause*). This is by no means an insignificant increase, but in spite of a doubling of expenditure on this one item alone, in 5 years we have only scratched the surface, and if we were to embark on what he calls free primary education, I will have to put up the taxes and this time the newspapers may even refuse to publish the news. (*Laughter*).

Mr. p. R. Seenivasagam: On a point of clarification Mr, Speaker Sir, I hope the Honourable Minister is aware that the Alliance Manifesto contained a promise to introduce free primary education as soon as possible.

Mr. Tan Slew Sin: If you are prepared to pay the taxes I can introduce it to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker, as I said I would like to thank this House generally for, I think, the warm reception it has given to my tax proposals. The fact that so little criticism has been levelled against them, and in fact one Honourable Member has gone so far as to say that he agreed with them generally, goes to show that these proposals are generally fair. Another point which leads me to believe that they are basically fair is the fact that

everybody in this country is protesting against them—rich, poor, big business, small business, commerce, industry—they are all protesting and that I think clearly indicates that the burden has been evenly and fairly spread. (*Applause*). Unfortunately there is a tendency, and I agree it is a very human tendency to say that if you want to tax, please tax the other man but please leave me alone. (*Laughter*). That I agree is a very natural tendency but obviously it is a tendency which cannot be taken into account by any Finance Minister who wishes to survive. (*Laughter*), I would remind Honourable Members, ending on a more sober note, that all this criticism is very well but let us remember that if to-day you criticize, whom shall we tax—unfortunately I am not Moses, neither do I live in biblical times when manna fell from Heaven and being only an ordinary human being I have got no alternative except to introduce these new tax proposals, and I again say that they are fair and that generally speaking they have been well accepted by the country. (*Applause*).

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time.

Adjourned at 6.07 p.m.