

Volume II
No. 20



Thursday
11th August, 1960

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

OFFICIAL REPORT

CONTENTS

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 2207]

MOTION—

Report of the Education Review Committee [Col. 2214]

PRINTED AT THE GOVERNMENT PRESS
BY B. T. FUDGE, GOVERNMENT PRINTER
FEDERATION OF MALAYA

1961

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

Official Report

Second Session of the First Dewan Ra'ayat

Thursday, 11th August, 1960

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

PRESENT:

- The Honourable Mr. Speaker, DATO' HAJI MOHAMED NOAH BIN OMAR, S.P.M.J., P.I.S., J.P.
- „ the Prime Minister, Y.T.M. TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN PUTRA AL-HAJ, K.O.M. (Kuala Kedah).
- „ the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Defence, TUN ABDUL RAZAK BIN DATO' HUSSAIN, S.M.N. (Pekan).
- „ the Minister of Finance, ENCHE' 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 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 Commerce and Industry, ENCHE' MOHAMED KHIR BIN JOHARI (Kedah Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Labour, ENCHE' BAHAMAN BIN SAMSUDIN (Kuala Pilah).
- „ the Minister of Education, ENCHE' ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAJI TALIB (Kuantan).
- „ 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' V. MANICKAVASAGAM, J.M.N., P.J.K., Assistant Minister (Klang).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED ISMAIL BIN MOHAMED YUSOF, Assistant Minister (Jerai).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL GHANI BIN ISHAK, A.M.N. (Malacca Utara).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAUF BIN A. RAHMAN (Krian Laut).

- The Honourable ENCHE' ABDUL SAMAD BIN OSMAN (Sungei Patani).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI ABDUL RAOF (Kuala Kangsar).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI MOHD. SALLEH, A.M.N., P.I.S. (Segamat Utara).
- „ 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, S.M.J. (Johore Bharu Barat).
- „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN SAAID (Seberang Utara).
- „ ENCHE' AHMAD BIN HAJI YUSOF, P.J.K. (Krian Darat).
- „ TUAN HAJI AZAHARI BIN HAJI IBRAHIM (Kubang Pasu Barat).
- „ ENCHE' AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Muar Dalam).
- „ DR. BURHANUDDIN BIN MOHD. NOOR (Besut).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN CHONG WEN (Kluang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN SIANG SUN (Bentong).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN SWEE HO (Ulu Kinta).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN YOON ONN (Kampar).
- „ ENCHE' CHIN SEE YIN (Seremban Timor).
- „ ENCHE' V. DAVID (Bungsar).
- „ DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI HASHIM, P.M.N. (Jitra-Padang Terap).
- „ ENCHE' 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, A.M.N. (Baling).
- „ ENCHE' HARUN BIN PILUS (Trengganu Tengah).
- „ TUAN HAJI HASSAN BIN HAJI AHMAD (Tumpat).
- „ ENCHE' HASSAN BIN MANSOR (Malacca Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN TO' MUDA HASSAN (Raub).
- „ TUAN HAJI HUSSAIN RAHIMI BIN HAJI SAMAN (Kota Bharu Hulu).
- „ ENCHE' IBRAHIM BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Seberang Tengah).
- „ ENCHE' ISMAIL BIN IDRIS (Penang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' K. KARAM SINGH (Damansara).
- „ CHE' KHADIJAH BINTI MOHD. SIDEK (Dungun).
- „ ENCHE' KHONG KOK YAT (Batu Gajah).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SECK FUN (Tanjong Malim).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SIOK YEW (Sepang).
- „ ENCHE' LIM JOO KONG (Alor Star).
- „ ENCHE' LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).
- „ DR. LIM SWEE AUN, J.P. (Larut Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' LIU YOONG PENG (Rawang).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED BIN UJANG (Jelebu-Jempol).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED ABBAS BIN AHMAD (Hilir Perak).

- The Honourable ENCHE' MOHAMED ASRI BIN HAJI MUDA (Pasir Puteh).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED DAHARI BIN HAJI MOHD. ALI (Kuala Selangor).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED NOR BIN MOHD. DAHAN (Ulu Perak).
- „ DATO' MOHAMED HANIFAH BIN HAJI ABDUL GHANI, P.J.K. (Pasir Mas Hulu).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED SULONG BIN MOHD. ALI, J.M.N. (Lipis).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED YUSOF BIN MAHMUD, A.M.N. (Temerloh).
- „ TUAN HAJI MOKHTAR BIN HAJI ISMAIL (Perlis Selatan).
- „ NIK MAN BIN NIK MOHAMED (Pasir Mas Hilir).
- „ ENCHE' NG ANN TECK (Batu).
- „ DATO' ONN BIN JA'AFAR, D.K., D.P.M.J. (Kuala Trengganu Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Tanah Merah).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Perlis Utara).
- „ ENCHE' QUEK KAI DONG (Seremban Barat).
- „ TUAN HAJI REDZA BIN HAJI MOHD. SAID (Rembau-Tampin).
- „ ENCHE' SEAH TENG NGIAB (Muar Pantai).
- „ ENCHE' D. R. SEENIVASAGAM (Ipoh).
- „ ENCHE' 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, P.J.K. (Larut Utara).
- „ ENCHE' TAN CHENG BEE, J.P. (Bagan).
- „ TAN PHOCK KIN (Tanjong).
- „ TAN TYE CHEK (Kulim-Bandar Bahru).
- „ DATO' TEOH CHZE CHONG, D.P.M.J., J.P. (Segamat Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' V. VEERAPPEN (Seberang Selatan).
- „ WAN MUSTAPHA BIN HAJI ALI (Kelantan Hilir).
- „ WAN SULAIMAN BIN WAN TAM, P.J.K. (Kota Star Selatan).
- „ WAN YAHYA BIN HAJI WAN MOHAMED (Kemaman).
- „ ENCHE' WOO SAIK HONG, P.J.K., J.P. (Telok Anson).
- „ ENCHE' YAHYA BIN HAJI AHMAD (Bagan Datoh).
- „ ENCHE' YEOH TAT BENG (Bruas).
- „ ENCHE' YONG WOO MING (Sitiawan).
- „ PUAN HAJAH ZAIN BINTI SULAIMAN, J.M.N., P.I.S. (Pontian Selatan).
- „ TUAN HAJI ZAKARIA BIN HAJI MOHD. TAIB (Langat).
- „ ENCHE' ZULKIFLEE BIN MUHAMMAD (Bachok).

ABSENT:

- The Honourable the Minister of External Affairs, DATO' DR. ISMAIL BIN DATO' ABDUL RAHMAN, P.M.N. (Johore Timor).
- „ the Minister of the Interior, DATO' SULEIMAN BIN DATO' ABDUL RAHMAN, P.M.N. (Muar Selatan).

The Honourable ENCHE' CHEAH THEAM SWEE, Assistant Minister (Bukit Bintang).

- „ TUAN HAJI HASSAN ADLI BIN HAJI ARSHAD (Kuala Trengganu Utara).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN MOHD. NOORDIN, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Parit).
- „ ENCHE' KANG KOCK SENG (Batu Pahat).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SAN CHOON (Kluang Utara).
- „ ENCHE' T. MAHIMA SINGH, J.P. (Port Dickson).
- „ ENCHE' TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Malacca).
- „ TENGKU INDRA PETRA IBNI SULTAN IBRAHIM, J.M.N. (Ulu Kelantan).

IN ATTENDANCE:

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

PRAYERS

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

EARLIER RESUMPTION

(Motion)

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

That this House at its rising this day shall resume at 9.30 a.m. tomorrow morning instead of at 10.00 a.m. as provided under Standing Order 12.

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

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House at its rising this day shall resume at 9.30 a.m. tomorrow morning instead of at 10.00 a.m. as provided under Standing Order 12.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Sandiwara Radio Malaya

1. Enche' Othman bin Abdullah (Tanah Merah) minta Kapada Perdana Menteri menerangkan jika beliau sedar ia-itu sandiwara yang bertajok "Ketuhanan" yang di-sambongkan oleh Radio Malaya dari Radio Singapura sedikit masa yang lalu itu menghena Quran dan Uagama Islam, dan jika demikian, apa-kah langkah yang diambil oleh Kerajaan untuk menjamin supaya sandiwara seperti itu tidak di-sambongkan lagi di-masa hadapan, dan

jika tidak, terangkan sebab²-nya maka tidak di-buat demikian.

The Prime Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mengaku yang saya tidak mendengar sandiwara itu, tetapi saya tahu bahawa siaran itu telah menyebabkan pertelingkahan di-dalam surat² khabar Melayu. Saya bersetuju perkara yang boleh membawa pertelingkahan dalam ugama Islam itu tidak patut di-benar di-siarkan oleh Radio Malaya dan pada masa akan datang tidak akan di-siarkan. Saya memberi akuan di-sini bahawa segala sandiwara yang dikeluarkan daripada Singapura pada masa akan datang akan di-rekod, di-pereksa dan di-semak perkara itu terlebih dahulu sa-belum di-benar di-keluarkan oleh Radio Malaya.

Enche' Othman bin Abdullah (Tanah Merah): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soalan tambahan. Ada-kah Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri mengaku bahawa sandiwara "Ketuhanan" itu sa-bagai sandiwara yang merendah dan meng-henakan Islam?

The Prime Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dari mula-nya tadi saya mengatakan ia-itu saya tidak mendengar sandiwara itu, tetapi jika ada menjatohkan taraf ketuhanan, itu tidak patut di-benarkan.

Dato' Onn bin Ja'afar: Ada-kah pengakuan Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri itu akan meliputi cherita² sa-umpama ketuhanan itu kapada ugama² lain?

The Prime Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ini perkara lain daripada perkara yang saya jawab sekarang ini, kalau ia hendak bawa soalan ini pada masa hadapan, Inshaallah, saya akan jawab (*Ketawa*).

Clinics for Tanah Merah District

2. Enche' Othman bin Abdullah (Tanah Merah) asks the Minister of Health and Social Welfare if he is aware that the clinic with one Hospital Assistant in the District of Tanah Merah is inadequate to meet the needs of the people in that area, and whether the Ministry is planning to build a new clinic at Ayer Lanas; if so when it will be built and, if not, to state the reasons.

The Minister of Health and Social Welfare (Dato' Ong Yoke Lin): Mr. Speaker, Sir, besides a Government dispensary staffed by one Hospital Assistant, there is also a health sub-centre in the District of Tanah Merah which was opened on 26th March this year: this sub-centre is at present staffed by one Assistant Nurse, one Midwife and an attendant. A new midwifery clinic was opened at Ayer Lanas in July last year and a Traveling Dispensary visits there regularly.

Enche' Othman bin Abdullah (Tanah Merah): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada-kah Kementerian ini berchadang supaya kelinik yang di-buka di-Ayer Lanas itu di-tetapkan pembukaan-nya pada tiap² masa, dengan tidak di-datangkan pegawai-nya dari Tanah Merah?

Dato' Ong Yoke Lin: It depends on the trend of the population. At present there is one midwifery clinic. In view of the present staffing position of the Ministry it is adequate for the time being.

Lesen² kereta sewa di-Trengganu

3. Enche' Othman bin Abdullah minta kepada Menteri Pengangkutan menerangkan sama ada beliau akan menimbangkan supaya di-tambah peruntukan lesen² kereta sewa di-Negeri Trengganu (untuk di-tempatkan di-Tanah Merah dan Machang) agar dapat memenohi kehendak² orang ramai terhadap kenderaan demikian, maka dengan demikian dapat-lah

di-hapuskan tuduhan² Mahkamah di-lemparkan kepada kereta sewa yang tidak berlesen di-dalam kawasan ini.

The Minister of Transport (Enche' Sardon): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tambahan² bilangan kereta² sewa di-dalam sa-buah negeri itu ia-lah dengan pengakuan atau recommendation daripada Lembaga Penasehat Kereta Sewa tiap² sa-buah negeri itu. Apabila sudah ada recommendation atau pun pengakuan di-hantarkan kepada Kementerian Pengangkutan dan biasa-nya saya bersetujui-lah. Dan di-tempat yang ditanya oleh Yang Berhormat itu di-Tanah Merah, kalau di-Tanah Merah bandar itu ada peruntukan hanya 2 buah kereta sewa dan telah pun ada 2 buah di-situ. Di-bandar Machang itu di-untukan 8 buah dan sudah pun ada 8 buah kereta sewa di-situ. Jadi kerana tidak ada kekosongan lagi tentu-lah tidak dapat di-tambahkan lagi kereta sewa tetapi kalau Kerajaan negeri ada memberi pengakuan-nya di-hantarkan kepada Kerajaan Federal kita akan timbangkan perkara itu.

Enche' Othman bin Abdullah: Saya telah di-beri tahu bahawa banyak permintaan² kerana menambah kereta² sewa di-dalam jajahan Tanah Merah dan jajahan Machang dan apa yang berlaku sekarang, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-lah penangkapan² beramai² kepada mereka itu sedangkan mereka tidak dapat ka-izinan untuk mendapat lesen manarek penumpang² dengan chara taxi yang biasa-nya. Ada-kah Kementerian ini berchadang supaya permintaan² itu dapat di-berikan timbangan kepada mereka² yang mempunyai kereta yang di-tangkap sekarang ini.

Enche' Sardon: Terima kaseh. Oleh kerana Yang Berhormat bertanyakan lebih panjang lagi perkara kereta sewa di-dalam jajahan Tanah Merah dan Machang, saya suka memberi penerangan sekarang. Peruntukan ketetapan kereta sewa di-jajahan Tanah Merah ada 25 dan di-jajahan Machang ada 34. Sekarang di-jajahan Tanah Merah ada 5 lagi kosong dan di-jajahan Machang ada sa-buah lagi kosong. Dan perkara ini telah di-ishtiharkan kepada orang ramai supaya memasokkan permohonan-nya. Tentang memberi pengakuan

orang² yang kena tangkap fasal membawa kereta private taxi atau pun digelar Communist taxi di-Kelantan itu, itu saya tidak dapat memberi pengakuan kerana Lembaga Pelisen Tempatan yang akan memeriksa dan menimbangkan dalam perkara itu.

Jawatan-Kuasa "Apartheid"

4. Enche' Ahmad Boestamam minta kepada Perdana Menteri menerangkan sudah-kah Perdana Menteri menimbangkan chadangan menubuhkan sabuah Jawatan-Kuasa semua parti untuk menentang dasar apartheid sa-bagaimana yang telah di-janjikan-nya dalam persidangan Dewan Ra'ayat yang lepas dan jika sudah apa-kah hasil pertimbangan itu.

The Prime Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, apa yang telah saya jalankan berkenaan dengan tindakan terhadap perkara apartheid di-atas dasar-nya itu ia-lah sa-bagaimana telah di-setujukan oleh Dewan Ra'ayat ini ia-itu menulis surat kepada Perdana² Menteri negeri² lain dan ketua² negara negeri yang tersebut itu. Dan jikalau nampak-nya dikehendaki ambil apa² tindakan tambahan, saya tetap akan bermufakat dengan parti² lain.

Enche' Ahmad Boestamam: Soalan tambahan, ada-kah Perdana Menteri mengatakan bahawa Jawatan-Kuasa semua parti yang di-chadangkan itu maseh belum di-timbangkan.

The Prime Minister: Bagi menjawab-nya, belum di-timbangkan lagi.

Chabaran kepada PAS

5. Enche' Ahmad Boestamam minta kepada Perdana Menteri menerangkan baharu² ini sa-orang tokoh Perikatan di-Perak telah menchabar PAS supaya menarek keluar Kelantan dan Trengganu berpisah daripada Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu. Apa-kah keadaan sa-bagaimana yang di-chabarkan ini di-galakkan oleh Kerajaan Pusat.

The Prime Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak tahu sama ada perkara chabaran ini betul atau tidak dan sudah tentu bagi pehak Kerajaan Persekutuan kita tidak ambil champor di-atas perkara² yang kita dapati sa-bagai satu perkara yang cherewet atau

tidak menasabah pada akal fikiran ia-itu hendak menolak negeri Kelantan, Trengganu itu kepada Persekutuan.

Dato' Onn bin Jaafar: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menumpang bertanya kepada Perdana Menteri ada-kah sa-barang sharat di-dalam Undang² Perlembagaan yang membolehkan sa-suatu negeri itu menarek diri-nya daripada Persekutuan.

The Prime Minister: Yang saya tahu tidak ada. Kulau hendak di-tarek pun, kita tidak bagi (*Ketawa*).

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad: Soalan tambahan. Oleh kerana chabaran ini sudah di-berikan ada-kah Perdana Menteri berniat hendak menasehatkan ahli² Perikatan itu supaya berhati² pada masa akan datang.

The Prime Minister: Kalau saya tahu ada berbangkit hal sa-macam ini, saya akan nasehatkan.

Undang² mentaksir harta Menteri²

6. Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad minta kepada Perdana Menteri menerangkan ada-kah Kerajaan hendak mengemukakan Undang² mentaksirkan harta Menteri supaya dapat di-perhatikan perkembangan harta² Menteri² dan Menteri² Penolong. Jika ada bila undang² itu akan di-kemukakan. Jika tidak apa-kah sebab-nya.

The Prime Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Undang² yang saperti itu tidak mustahak di-buat kerana pada masa ini sudah pun ada peratoran:

The Code of Conduct by the Ministers

The Rules of Conduct by the Ministers

The Rules of Obligation by the Ministers

The Rules of Prudence by the Ministers

Jikalau sa-saorang itu tidak ada Rules of Conduct atau pun yang saya katakan tadi, ini terikat-lah kepada segala² Menteri dan Menteri Muda. Dalam pada itu pun jika tuan² ada keterangan ia-itu Menteri² atau Menteri Muda ada buat perkara yang tidak baik sa-bagai makan suap dan sa-bagai-nya,

saya nasehatkan tuan² tentu-lah tahu tanggungan tuan² ia-itu bagi-lah report hal itu. Jadi, kalau keluar soalan yang sa-macam kita dengar ini ada-lah membawa salah faham dan mengelirukan orang ramai terhadap kejujuran Menteri² dan Menteri² Muda.

Officials of Defunct N.U.F.G.W.—Release from Detention

7. Enche' V. David asks the Minister of Defence what action the Government is taking regarding the release of four former N.U.F.G.W. officials, Messrs. Ng Tze Chooh, Wong Loke Kuan, Ng Chin Leong and Tan San Sui, who are now under detention.

Tun Abdul Razak: The answer is "None".

Enche' V. David: It is really surprising to note that the answer is "None". May I know whether the Honourable the Deputy Prime Minister will confirm that the Review Commission decided to release the four detainees in 1959, but later withdrew its decision as a result of Government pressure?

Tun Abdul Razak: There was no such pressure. The power to release a detainee was at that time in the hands of the Review Commission—this had nothing to do with Government.

Enche' V. David: Is the Government taking any further step under the Security Act to release the four persons?

Tun Abdul Razak: As I have said, the Government is not taking any action on this. Under the law, a detained person has the right to make representations to the Advisory Board and the Advisory Board will consider such representations within three months from the 1st August, 1960. The law is quite clear on the subject.

Mr. R. G. Balan—Removal of Restrictions

8. Enche' V. David asks the Minister of Defence why the Government is not willing to withdraw conditions imposed on Mr. R. G. Balan since he is now considered not to be a security risk to the nation.

Tun Abdul Razak: Mr. Speaker, Sir, Mr. R. G. Balan is not considered such a security risk that he should be subject to further detention. However, there are sufficient grounds for a Restrictive Order with conditions in accordance with section 8 (1) (b) of the Internal Security Act. This Restrictive Order will be reviewed within six months by the Advisory Board under section 13 (1) of the Act. I hope, Sir, that the Honourable Member will realise that his concern about Mr. Balan is not appreciated by Mr. Balan himself. *(Applause).*

Enche' V. David: Mr. Speaker, Sir, did Mr. Balan tell the Deputy Prime Minister that he is not happy about my taking up this matter?

MOTION

REPORT OF THE EDUCATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

Order read for resumption of debate on Question.

"That this House approves in principle the policy recommended in the Report of the Education Review Committee, 1960 (Command Paper No. 26 of 1960). *(10th August, 1960).*

Question again proposed.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad (Bachok): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada pagi ini saya sampai-lah kepada Chapter XVI yang bersangkutannya dengan pengajaran agama Islam dalam sekolah². Dalam para 291 penyata ini menyebutkan—

"It is our view that the present situation as regards the implementations of Section 49 is not satisfactory,"

Section 49 is not satisfactory. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dukachita-lah kita, kerana perlaksanaan Section 49 dalam Education Ordinance ini berkenaan dengan pelajaran Islam di-sekolah telah tidak memuaskan Jawatan-Kuasa ini. Semalam telah saya sebutkan sebab² yang membawa kepada kechiwa-nya kanak² itu. Pada hari ini kita dapat dalam para 285 mengatakan bahawa Jawatan-Kuasa ini telah memandang satu penyelesaian yang hendak di-buat dengan menerangkan—

" a fair and reasonable interpretation of the requirements of this section would be that religious instruction in schools

to Muslim pupils should be given by teachers provided by the State Governments and that the cost of such instruction should be shared by arrangement between the State and the Federal authorities."

kalimah-nya menjadikan soalan dalam para ini ia-lah—

" shared by arrangement between the State and the Federal authorities."

saya bersama² mentafsirkan bahawa dalam Perlembagaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ada-lah nyata pemecahan kuasa dalam soal pengajian agama ini. Dan dalam masa Penyata Razak yang lalu itu "*arrangement*"—penyelidekan dalam menyelesaikan fahaman oleh Kerajaan Negeri. Sekarang ini apa yang di-susun oleh Jawatan-Kuasa ini ia-lah mengadakan lagi "*arrangement*" di-antara Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu dengan Kerajaan Negeri.

Sa-benar-nya dalam membuat satu shor tentu-lah kita memikirkan hingga ka-mana shor itu dapat di-jalankan. Apabila di-sebutkan "*arrangement*" di-sini bahawa dalam para 294 telah dinyatakan perbelanjaan bagi menjalankan pengajaran Islam di-sekolah² sudah di-anggarkan sa-banyak \$14.00 setahun bagi tiap² murid mengikut taksiran itu.

Dalam para 295 di-nyatakan bahawa pada asas-nya \$7 tanggungan di-antara Kerajaan Persekutuan dengan Kerajaan Negeri. Apa yang menjadi soal dalam perkara ini atau menjadi soalan apakah di-agakan oleh Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu dan terutama Jawatan-Kuasa ini bahawa Kerajaan Negeri dapat menyambut baik chadangan ini. Sunggoh pun Kerajaan Negeri dapat bertanggung-jawab terhadap pengajian agama ini ada-lah hasrat penyata ini bahawa tiap² 15 orang murid dalam sa-buah sekolah mesti-lah di-beri pengajaran Agama Islam dan hasil yang demikian saya rasa satu kaedah yang tetap hendak-lah di-buat sa-belom perkara ini di-panjangkan. Perkara² yang di-binchangkan dan di-rundingkan ia-itu walau bagaimana pun Kerajaan Persekutuan dengan dasar ini hendak-lah tegas bahawa dengan jalan apa sekali pun Kerajaan Persekutuan akan menjalankan dasar memberi pengajaran agama dengan

tidak berlengah lagi dengan sebab wang yang \$7 yang akan menjadi tolak dan terek di-antara Kerajaan Persekutuan dengan Kerajaan Negeri. Maksud saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita tak boleh berlambat, sebab saya nampak bahawa kerugian yang telah berlaku tentang perkara tolak dan terek di-antara Kerajaan Negeri dengan Kerajaan Persekutuan amat besar.

Saya pernah menjadi pemereksa dalam pengajian agama dalam negeri ini di-mana saya dapati sekolah² yang mempunyai guru agama yang di-gajikan mendapat markah selalu-nya 80 peratus ka-atas dari murid² yang mengambil agama Islam sa-bagai mata pelajaran peperiksaan-nya, tetapi malang-nya sekolah² yang kita sangkakan tidak mempunyai guru agama itu mendapat markah rendah² hingga saya dapati ada mereka yang memandang tuhan itu ada-lah sa-orang muda. Ini berlaku dalam sa-buah negeri yang agama Islam ada-lah agama resmi. Maka saya berharap supaya di-beri pertimbangan yang sangat berat dalam melakukan *arrangement* di-antara Kerajaan Negeri dengan Kerajaan Persekutuan patut-lah tegas sakira-nya Kerajaan Negeri lambatkan perjalanan di-negeri itu maka akan mendapat sa-tengah-lah dalam pelajaran agama di-sekolah.

Saya tidak-lah memikirkan patut kita memikul bebanan itu semua-nya sekali, sebab tidak guna beralah sangat dengan Kerajaan Negeri yang patut memikul sama sementara pelajaran agama menjadi kewajipan bagi Kerajaan Negeri.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam para 297 timbul pula soal guru² yang hendak mengajar perkara itu. Telah saya tengok ka-atas dan saya tengok samula ka-sana ka-mari, saya dapati bahawa penyata ini tidak tegas dalam perkara ini. Apa yang di-katakan-nya—

"We therefore consider that the additional teachers required for religious instruction in all assisted secondary schools should possess qualifications and be employed at rates approved by the Ministry of Education, that the cost should be met by the Federal Government, and that the Ministry should make arrangements for teacher training."

apabila Kerajaan hendak mengadakan guru² lain 3,000 orang, 2,000 orang setahun dan sa-bagai-nya di-tulis-lah

dalam penyata ini "*complete*" bagitu dan bagini ranchangan tahunan keluar masok bermacam². Tetapi, apabila sampai kapada pengajaran ugama, maka saya dapati "*vote*" tidak terang sa-lain daripada mengatakan memakai *arrangement* yang mana saya fikir tidak dapat di-ubah kalimah dalam para 291 melainkan kita bertemu apa yang hendak di-buat pada masa hadapan.

Pada fikiran saya "*teacher training*" bagi pengajaran ugama ini hendak-lah di-buat dengan chepat dan di-ranchangkan. Kita mengetahui bahawa Kerajaan Negeri mempunyai guru² pada masa ini, mempunyai latehan pengajaran guru² ugama di-negeri ini dan saya menhadangkan supaya *approve*-kanlah guru² yang keluar dari-nya dengan mengikut tingkatan yang munasabah. Sebab apa saya berkata demikian? Dalam menitek beratkan atau menetapkan ka-ahlian dan kelayakan guru² dan sa-bagai ada satu langkah untuk menyampaikan perkara ini, ia-itu patut-lah Kerajaan Persekutuan menyebutkan bahawa satu usaha untuk melateh guru² akan di-lakukan di-College Islam Malaya umpama-nya. Kita berbelanja bagi kebajikan negeri ini dengan banyak dan satu daripada belanja yang di-beri oleh Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ia-lah terhadap College Islam Malaya. Jadi, sudah pada tempat-nya bahawa Kerajaan menggunakan College Islam sa-bagai melateh guru² sama ada di-beri kursus atau mengadakan satu "*stream*" dalam College Islam bagi melengkapkan orang yang berkebolehan untuk menjadi guru² ugama di-sekolah² yang akan dapat akuan dengan sa-benar-nya bagi menolong perkembangan pengajaran Islam di-sekolah² Kerajaan yang di-wajibkan oleh peratoran ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Chapter XVII The National Language itu saya tinggalkan sebab perkara itu sudah saya chakapkan. Berkenaan dengan Chapter XVIII The Inspectorate ia-itu Nazir. Pada asas-nya kita telah mendengar cherita Nazir ini ia-itu kelemahan²-nya yang sudah, tetapi dalam Paragraph 312 Penyata ini telah menyebutkan satu ubat yang hendak di-buat ia-itu mengadakan:

"... a local Inspectorate of Schools at State level ..."

Saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tentu-lah tidak hendak menghalang sa-barang kerja² yang akan membolehkan Kerajaan mengator perjalanan, pemereksaan Nazir yang bebas dalam negeri ini, tetapi saya berharap, oleh kerana ada-nya "Local Inspectorate" ini janganlah sampai berlaku "*overlapping*" berlaku-nya satu kerja yang lebeh kurang sama di-antara "Federal Inspectorate" yang ada di-Paragraph 310 dengan yang di-buat pada Paragraph 312. Sebab, sa-barang "*overlapping*" yang berlaku dalam pentadbiran akan mengurbankan belanja yang banyak dan akan menchelarukan fikiran guru² yang akan di-lawati oleh Inspectorate² ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, patut-lah kita menyambut baik ada-nya hemat dan ada-nya pertimbangan Penyata ini.

Di-dalam Paragraph 363, perkembangan kebudayaan dalam negeri ini. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perkembangan ini hendak-lah di-dasarkan benar² kapada satu perkembangan yang sehat, yang tidak di-buat² dan di-paksakan² kapada orang² yang belajar dalam negeri ini. Saya sebutkan demikian ia-lah kerana sa-barang kebudayaan yang di-tekan² ka-atas ra'ayat itu tidak akan kekal, dan akan menyebabkan "*reaction*" yang tidak baik daripada ra'ayat itu sendiri. Jadi, "School of Arts" yang hendak di-buat dengan bertujuan hendak mengembangkan kebudayaan itu hendak-lah benar² mengikut saloran kehidupan yang diterima oleh ra'ayat. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dengan ada-nya sa-buah "School of Arts" ini makin menguatkan hujah saya dengan mengatakan sa-buah sekolah saperti Kolej Islam mestilah di-beri pertimbangan yang kuat, yang lebeh banyak. Sebab, "Schools of Arts" yang akan di-belanjakan oleh Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini tentu-lah akan memakan belanja yang banyak, maka ini hendak-lah disamakan tanggung-jawab-nya bahkan di-lebuhkan layanan-nya kapada pengajaran Islam yang menjadi asas bagi kehidupan moral dalam negeri ini. Pengajaran Akhlak (Moral Education) yang di-sebutkan dalam Paragraph 363 ini ada-lah satu chara yang amat baik yang saya sendiri fikir Jawatan-Kuasa ini amat berwaspada dan amat baik

dalam pertimbangan-nya. Tetapi yang menjadi susah-nya ia-lah apabila murid² yang bukan Islam tidak dapat menurut peratoran² yang di-buat seperti yang tersebut dalam Paragraph 366, tidak dapat pengajar ugama-nya sa-chara yang di-sebutkan oleh peratoran itu ia-itu dengan sendiri-nya menjadi tanggung-jawab-nya sendiri dan dengan sukarela dengan tidak memakan waktu yang munasabah digunakan bagi pelajaran yang lain. Kalau itu tidak dapat di-jalankan, maka akan rugi pula orang² lain yang ada hidup dalam negeri ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mengatakan bahawa "Moral Education" kepada orang² yang bukan Islam ini jangan-lah di-biarkan, bukan-lah berma'ana saya lebih sangat kepada orang² lain, tetapi dalam kehidupan sa-sabuah negeri, mesti-lah ada satu pandangan sosial, sebab bagaimana baik sa-kali pun satu pehak kita ajar tetapi satu pehak lagi di-biarkan moral-nya maka akan runtohlah kehidupan moral dalam negeri ini dan kita tidak ingin melihat ra'ayat dalam Persekutuan Tanah Melayu tidak mendapat perhatian dalam segi ini. Walau pun ada dalam Peratoran 366 ini bahawa Pelajaran Moral ini boleh di-jalankan dengan sukarela saya berharap supaya Kerajaan memerhatikan benar² langkah sukarela itu berlaku dan menggalakkan dengan apa chara sama ada di-masokkan sa-bagai satu mata pelajaran dalam pengajaran² umum sa-hingga tiap² sa-orang dalam negeri ini mendapat pengajaran moral yang mustahak bagi kehidupan-nya dalam sa-buah negeri yang berkebudayaan dan berakhlak.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ini-lah pandangan² saya yang saya kemukakan kepada Majlis ini dengan harapan supaya itu di-timbangkan oleh Kementerian yang bersangkutan, sebab, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kelulusan yang akan di-beri kepada Penyata ini ada-lah satu kelulusan yang akan membolehkan Kerajaan membuat satu undang² yang di-landaskan di-atas dasar Penyata ini.

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam (Ipoh):

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise this morning to speak on the Report of the Education Review Committee and the recommendations they have made and I will be asking Honourable Members of this

House to reject this Report for a number of reasons. But before I do so, Mr. Speaker, Sir, it will be necessary, with your permission, to take our minds back a few years before, because in considering any education policy for this country it will be necessary to look at the background leading up to the necessity for this review of the Razak Education Policy which was formulated and set out in 1956.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, when the Alliance Party asked the people of this country in 1955 to give them a mandate to bring Merdeka to this land, the people of this country of all communities gave them almost a 100 per cent mandate to bring Merdeka to this land. But even at that time when that mandate was given, there was already in the minds of the people the question of education for their children and the policy which the Government should set out which would meet the requirements of a multi-racial nation, such as ours is. Mr. Speaker, Sir, we will all recall that during the Constitutional Talk at about that time, organisations were concerned, and very concerned, on the education of the children of this land and as a result of that concern and memoranda submitted to the Reid Commission, certain provisions were inserted in the Constitution of this country for certain purposes and I would, with your permission, Sir, refer to Article 152 of the Constitution of this country—it is of considerable importance in discussing the present recommendations of this Committee. Article 152 says:

"The national language shall be the Malay language and shall be in such script as Parliament may by law provide:

Provided that—

- (a) no person shall be prohibited or prevented from using (otherwise than for official purposes), or from teaching or learning, any other language; and
- (b) nothing in this clause shall prejudice the right of the Federal Government or of any State Government to preserve and sustain the use and study of the language of any other community in the Federation."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the word I emphasise there is "use"—"to preserve and sustain the use and study of the language of

any other community in the Federation". I emphasise the word "use" because throughout the history of education and education reports in this country from time to time the word "use" of the languages of other communities has been omitted from each and every education report including the Razak Education Report. It is of considerable importance—a small word but of very great significance.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, then came the Razak Education Report of 1956—and that Report was formulated on certain basic foundations which the framers of that Report said they had to bear in mind at all times—and I would refer to page 2, paragraph 9, which says:

"Furthermore, throughout our deliberations we bore in mind the fact that our primary task under our terms of reference was to recommend an educational policy *acceptable to the people of the Federation as a whole*. Technical and theoretical considerations have, in some instances, had to be subordinated to this paramount objective."

I would also refer to paragraph 10 which says:

"We have also, as required by our terms of reference, taken as a guiding principle the intention to make Malay the national language of the country whilst preserving and sustaining the growth of the languages and cultures of non-Malay peoples living in the country."

There again the words "preserve" and "sustain" are used. But the word "use" has not been considered by the Razak Education Report; neither has it been considered by the Review Committee, because throughout the Report one will see the words "sustain" and "preserve" but the word "use" has never been considered by either of these Committees.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, when a clause is inserted in a Constitution, it is inserted for a specific purpose and the framers of our Constitution realised that in this country, like all multi-racial nations there are people of different racial origins, and protection must be given to them by writing in that protection in the Constitution of the country. At a later stage I will analyse very briefly—not at very great length—some of the recommendations of the Report, but here and now I say that this Report of the Review Committee has not borne in mind that the languages of the other races in this country have to be

preserved so that they can be used in accordance with the Constitution of the country, and for that reason I say the Committee failed miserably to follow the intention and the spirit of the Constitution of this country.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, after the Razak Education Report was put into operation in 1957, there were what has been described as "immature schoolboys' riots" in some parts of this country. But as it turned out, those immature schoolboys' riots were followed up by legitimate, peaceful demands by a large body of interested educationists in this country headed by a very simple man known as Mr. Lim Lian Geok, who has been asking for many, many occasions, protection, preservation, growth and use of each race's culture and language. Therefore, what turned out to be an "immature schoolboys' riot"—in fact not one, but more than one—was followed up by demands in a lawful manner by responsible educational organisations.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am saying "Chinese language and Chinese culture" because I have with very great regret heard the Honourable Minister of Education speak yesterday when he said: "Let no one be afraid that Chinese culture will be destroyed". I take it, therefore, that in the opinion of the Government there is no such thing known as Tamil culture in this country, because no reference has been made by the Government to this; and if that is the intention, then surely the lot of the Tamils in this country is in a very desperate position. But since the Government has adopted that attitude, perhaps I will confine myself to that, but what I say refers to all the other races' cultures in this country. And it is a matter of very great concern that nowhere in the Honourable Minister's speech has he referred to Tamil culture which, obviously, the Razak Report itself recognised as part of this country.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Razak Report was drawn up with the intention of building a united nation—that was the declared objective of the Razak Report. The Razak Report also acknowledged—and carried out to a degree, but not to its full—that Chinese, or *Kuo Yu* as it is called, and Tamil could be taught side

by side with Malay, the National Language, in schools and that such teaching was not inconsistent with the building of a nation of the future. What has this Committee now recommended? This Committee, in fact, says that the teaching of the other languages of this country side by side with Malay, the National Language of this country, is inconsistent with the building of a united nation. Therefore, you find at once a complete turnover from the Razak Education Policy's intentions. You will get that in the Razak Education Report, page 12, paragraph 72. After speaking of building a nation, it goes on to say:

"We consider that there should be some flexibility in our secondary school system as suggested in paragraph 70 above. For example, we can see no reason for altering the practice in Chinese secondary schools of using Kuo Yu as a general medium provided that these Chinese schools fall into line with the conditions mentioned in the previous two paragraphs. We see no educational objection to the learning of three languages in the same school as the medium of instruction."

And yet the fundamental outlook of the Razak Education Policy was "to build a nation of the future". To build a nation of the future, the Razak Education Report Policy stated that they saw no educational drawback in teaching those two other languages side by side with the National Language of this country, provided a common syllabus was followed by these schools. Mr. Speaker, Sir, what the new Committee says is: it is inconsistent with the building of a united nation if we are going to allow this, even though there may be a common syllabus. Therefore, what does the Committee say? It says: "All right, we will follow the Constitution, Article 152, but only to this extent. If you want to go ahead and teach your own language, go ahead and do so, but we won't give you one cent aid and we won't hold any examinations for the children who learn in these schools. Go ahead; sit down at your desks and read your books in Chinese; and that is the end of your life so far as the Government is concerned." That is the sum total of the attitude of the Education Review Committee with regard to these schools.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, to build a nation in Malaya, you can only build that nation

on a Malayan culture. You cannot build a nation of the future by creating in any manner distrust, desperation or disappointment or taking away of something which is dear to the heart of each man and each woman. There is no Malayan culture today. A Malayan culture must be born; it must grow out of the cultures, the languages, of the various peoples who live in this country, who have lived in this country and who want to live in this country as loyal citizens of this country and in return for which in accordance with the Constitution of this country, they ask for their protection under Article 152 of the Constitution. It is not sufficient for the Government to say: "We are sustaining your culture by letting you learn your language," because the Constitution says that it is not enough for the Federal Government to preserve, but it also should sustain the use of that language in this country.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in regard to primary schools, the Government now says, or the Report says: "We recommend free primary education". That is, of course, a good step and nobody can complain about it; neither do I. But let us analyse it a bit further. Who gets free primary education—National Schools, National-type Schools? They get free primary education? Then, in the primary section you have another type of schools which will not conform sufficiently to get full aid and they become independent primary schools, the majority of which will be in New Villages in other parts of the country. They will be partially-aided—only partially-aided—and that also, at the discretion of the Minister of Education. The children who attend those schools do not get free primary education; they have to pay for it. That, of course, may be a small point on which I do not make much about, but the principle of free primary education to schools is there.

There has been a lot of talk that the school-leaving age has been increased to 15 and everybody is very happy. If it has, in fact, been raised to 15 everybody should be glad; and I myself should be glad. I agree that there is something to be happy about, because the Education Report recommends

certain steps by which young persons up to the age of 15 can be in some sort of school. But let us not be misled, or let us not fail to appreciate, that primary education still ends at the age of 13. At the age of 13, primary education for the student finishes. But what the Report says is, "We will set up another school known as Trade School or post-primary school; if you like, you can come there". That is all the difference. It does not mean that the student who goes to a primary school will be there till 15. He still ends at 13. Then he goes to a post-primary school and in that post-primary school there is no free education. There is only free education in the post-primary school in the National schools. If you learn the National language you get free post-primary education, otherwise you have to pay for it. It is a matter of regret that that arrangement should not also be free for these very young citizens of this country. Therefore, that distinction must be borne in mind when we consider this Report. Now what happens to persons from primary schools? The recommendation is that 30 per cent should go into secondary school and the rest of the 70 per cent would either have to go anywhere they like or they have what is known as the rural secondary school—post-primary school. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the reason given by the Review Committee for recommending this is that not all students are intelligent, that not all students can benefit by going to secondary school. It is true that different people develop their intelligence at different ages, but I say that, at the age of 13 to judge a person and say he is not fit for any higher education, academic education, is a sin. It is the duty of the Government, and it should have been the duty of this Committee, to recommend that all who qualify by examination from primary school should find their place in secondary schools in this country. It is impossible to say at the age of 13 whether any student is so dull, or so stupid, that he should not have a chance to reach the highest education which this country can offer to him. It may be said that after he goes to the post-primary school he can get a transfer to a secondary school if he

shows intelligence, but the Report itself says that this will be in the rarest circumstances. What are we going to have then? We are going to have a body of young persons who will end their education at the primary stage with no real prospects for future, or we will have 70 per cent doing manual labour in this country, because that is the ultimate result of the 70 per cent who are not going to be allowed to enter secondary schools.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, when we come to secondary schools, one thing is very clear. The Chinese secondary schools are being discriminated against for no apparent reason except on political grounds. Sir, Chinese secondary schools now teach Malay, now teach English, as compulsory subjects. The Razak Education Report felt that the teaching of Malay and English as compulsory subjects was sufficient to build the nation of the future, and the Razak Report said that their recommendations in their opinion, could last for ten years in this country. This is set out almost at the beginning of paragraph 8 which says:

"After preliminary examination of our terms of reference and of the problems before us, we unanimously agreed that our task was the practical one of planning for the immediate future, which might be defined as the next ten years."

Therefore, whatever was recommended in the Razak Education policy was recommended with the intention that it could continue for a period of ten years. Now we have this new Committee saying, "Take away all the grants to Chinese schools which do not become fully assisted and do not comply with every regulation of the Government". I say that it is a breach of faith, it is a breach of promise, it is a violation of the Constitution of this country itself, because that is one method by which the Government is going to kill, by which the Committee has passed sentence of death on the Chinese schools. What is the intention, what is the motive, what is the reason, if in 1956 the same Government thought that it could build a nation by making these languages compulsory? What has changed their minds now? I make these observations in sincerity, I make them because of the pledge we

gave to the people who elected us into this House. That is our platform on which we have stood and it is the platform on which we are standing for all time. There will be many in this House who disagree with this, but I do not blame them, as each man has his own view, but let us consider each point carefully. What does the Report say? It says that you can teach English in this country, almost equally important, side by side with Malay. However, when the Chinese schools say, "Give us some money to preserve our culture", the Government is going to say, "No". Is that not hypocrisy in its worst form? I am the first one to say that English will play an important part in this country not only for ten years but for the next 20, 30, 40 years; and I am glad that this Committee appreciates that fact. I am glad that the Honourable the Assistant Minister of Broadcasting, two days ago, emphasised the importance of English in this country. That is a correct policy, a policy which the People's Progressive Party of Malaya has advocated from time immemorial.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, after this Report came out, what do we find? It is an all-party Report of the Alliance organisation represented by various races that form this country, and the Committee is a small one comprising of the Honourable Minister of Education, the Honourable Tun Leong Yew Koh, the Honourable Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari, the Honourable Dato' Wong Pow Nee, the Honourable the Assistant Minister of Education, the Honourable Enche' V. Manickavasagam—and you also have a number of others in the Committee. What do we find after the unanimous Report is sent out? We find a hurried delegation by the Malayan Chinese Association to see the Minister of Education—for what purpose? I say this: the country will note that this Report was a sentence of death passed on Chinese schools. The delegation of the Malayan Chinese Association goes to the Honourable the Minister saying, "Before you execute the sentence of death, please inform us"—that is all that happened. What is the purpose of the delegation? They signed this; and

then they go and say, "Before you hang the man, let us know about it". I cannot understand it. Is it to play up with the public? Does the Malayan Chinese Association support this Report in principle? If it does, then what is there to consult about it before implementing it? I cannot understand it, and perhaps somebody will explain it to us in this House.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, if we approve this in principle, then the Honourable the Minister of Education is going to be guided by this House. He will have to implement the principles contained in this Report. It is true that there are the details of finance, the details of teachers—what is available, what is not available; those are the details which, of course, cannot be done away with if they are not there; but the main principles will have to be implemented, and I cannot understand what purpose there is in consultation over any principles of this affair.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, so far when Chinese schools have been using Chinese as the medium of instruction in their schools, there have been examinations held in that language so that the students could get certificates when they pass out of school, so that they can show something for the education they have received. What does this Report say? It says that it is inconsistent with the building of a nation. Although the Government has the machinery now to hold these middle school examinations, it says, "We are not going to hold these examinations for you; you can learn, you will not get any aid from us; you learn your culture as much as you want and then go into the world and do what you can about it". Why? Does Article 152 of the Constitution foresee such a situation? If you are going to let a man learn his language, and you have the machinery to hold the examination for him, why can't you hold it? Why do you want to deprive him of it? If you want to pass a sentence of death, at least pass it openly and say that you do not want them in this country, and that they had better close their

schools. Let us not try to bluff ourselves, let us not try to bluff anybody. Reports coming in clearly indicate that this is not a report acceptable to the people of this country as a whole. It can never be, because it strikes at the very thing which the Constitution deliberately wants to protect.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the people of this country of various races love this country very much. Despite tests of loyalty which have been suggested from some quarters, I say that those tests of loyalty are not necessary, because the loyalty of the citizens of this country cannot be questioned. It has often been said that those who ask for Chinese education rights, those who say that this Government is not fair, are disloyal to this country. That is not the attitude to adopt. In fact, when this Report was published, what was the first thing we heard from the Minister of Education and others? We heard them say, "Let those who read this Report read it as loyal citizens of this country"—it is suggested that the loyal citizens of this country will accept it and that disloyal persons will criticise it? You started with a warning, but there are people who are not afraid of such warnings—either inside this House or outside this House, politicians and non-politicians. There are many who will exercise their legitimate rights.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I say that there are only two recommendations which have some merit that is, free education, and the raising of school-leaving age. I am not touching on the practical application such as my Honourable friend, the Member for Seberang Selatan, has done with regard to teachers and other technical matters; but I wish to say this: the Review Committee was set up under circumstances which were very clear and which were very strong. Before the Parliamentary Elections, a crisis started in the M.C.A. and the Alliance organisation, a crisis which led to men like Mr. Too Joon Hing and others leaving the M.C.A. They are still alive in this country and one day they will tell us about the crisis which took place. There was pressure applied on the partners of the Alliance to include a review of the Education policy,

because the Razak policy was not implemented as it should have been implemented. It was causing unnecessary hardship; it was destroying Chinese culture. After great pressure, the manifesto of the Alliance included a clause saying that the education policy would be reviewed.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the purpose of the Review Committee was to see how Article 152 of our Constitution could be brought into practical operation. It was not a review to destroy Article 152; neither was it a review intended to desecrate and take away the Chinese culture in this country. What has happened is exactly the opposite of what the M.C.A. leaders preached during the parliamentary elections, when they said, "See, we are good; we agree to set up a Committee to review the policy; don't worry; we will protect you." That was the theme song during the parliamentary elections, but what we have got is just the opposite. The people of this country of various races have asked for bread, but what do they get? They do not get even a stone.

Mr. Speaker: I do not like to interrupt you, but I would like to remind you of Standing Order 36 (10) which says:

"It shall be out of order to use—

... (c) words which are likely to promote feelings of ill-will or hostility between different communities in the Federation."

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam: I assure you, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that I will not use words which are likely to promote feelings of ill-will or hostility.

Mr. Speaker: The word "ill-will" is very wide.

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I say that this matter of education policy is a matter of the language of each race and, as such, it is necessary for me to say why the Chinese want Chinese as a language to be preserved, why Malays want Malay as the National Language; and that, I say, won't create ill-will.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, throughout the history of Chinese education in this country, from the colonial days right up to now, they have constantly been asking for more grants-in-aid. During the colonial days they got something.

They have asked for more. The Alliance Government came into power, independence came, and with the introduction of the Razak Report, instead of their demands being met fairly, suddenly they get a somersault, and they do not get even what they got during the colonial days. That is the position of the new Report.

To sum up this new Report, I say that it is a betrayal of what the Constitution itself has set down for the protection of Chinese and Tamil cultures in this country and for the use of the Chinese language and the Tamil language in this country. I say that it is a Report which intentionally, by design, and by purpose, in one way or another, at every stage, from primary to secondary education, has found ways and means to block, to stop, to destroy, to take away, what little protection there has been under Article 152 of the Constitution for these two major races in this country. I have said at the commencement that we ask for the rejection of this Report; and I say that any Honourable Member of this House who holds Article 152 of the Constitution sacred, any Honourable Member of this House who holds that 70 per cent of the children at the age of 13 should not be let on to the streets of the country or sent to manual schools, will see that they should have a place in the secondary schools in this country if they pass their normal examination. I say that for any Honourable Member of this House who holds sacred in his heart that the right of each race is not only to preserve his culture, because that preservation of culture is done by the community itself. Article 152 of the Constitution does not say one word of culture; it says of language, and we must not get mixed up ourselves.

The culture of the race is preserved by the family, by the places of worship, by their heritage and by their background. That does not require very much assistance from either the Government or this Report. That is protected by the various individuals themselves, and the heritage of these people can never be destroyed in this land. But what we must protect in accordance with the Constitution is the

use of that language, and I am surprised that throughout this Report, the word "culture" has been used instead of the word "language". As the Honourable the Minister of Education, in moving this Report, ended up by saying in the middle of his speech:

"The Committee, Sir, examined this policy and its implementation so far with the greatest care, and the results are set out in Chapters II and III of this Report. My Committee came to the conclusion in the short time that has elapsed since 1956, the Razak policy has been implemented as faithfully and as successfully as finances and circumstances allowed, and that no fundamental changes in that policy are required."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, that is entirely inconsistent with the Report itself, because the Report of the new Committee is fundamentally different: so fundamentally different because, as I said, it destroyed what the Razak Report at least allowed to breathe. Then, the Honourable Minister said:

"Let no one say that these recommendations in any way threaten Chinese culture. Let it be remembered that the Government is now for the first time in history offering free primary education in Chinese."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, is it suggested that Chinese culture is protected by allowing free primary education for those people? Is it suggested that the culture of a race, of a community, is preserved in the primary schools? Is it suggested that the culture and the language—more important than all, that the language—of a race is preserved in the primary school? If that is so, then there is something fundamentally wrong, because the language of a race cannot be preserved in the primary school. It can only be preserved at the higher levels of education.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is a sad day for me to stand up here and speak about these matters which are very touchy, which are very controversial, which will make many people hot under the collar. But what has to be said has to be said. What has to be faced has to be faced. What the country and the world should know should be told, so that the country and the world shall know. Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is not only for the voters who voted for me that I speak here. It is also for all the voters, all the electors who supported all Members of the People's Progressive Party

of Malaya to sit here, and also for all those hundreds of thousands of voters who voted against the Alliance organisation in one way or another—and that is a very substantial body of persons—of course I exclude my Honourable friends from the Socialist Front because they will speak for themselves—but I speak for those who voted anti-Alliance or other organisations or for independents who did not come into this House. (*Interruption*). Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have been associated with the Malayan Party, who stands on exactly the same platform as the People's Progressive Party of Malaya stands on in this issue, and all that I say today goes equally for the Malayan Party of this country. Mr. Speaker, it is of course very significant that opinions on the education policy of a country will vary, and on certain other important issues as well. Sir, this policy as set out here can never be acceptable to the People's Progressive Party of Malaya and the Malayan Party for one good reason: that is, we believe in multilingualism. We believe that the official languages of this country should include Chinese and Tamil. That is the background, that is our policy, and once we believe in that policy, this recommendation obviously can never be acceptable to us. Therefore I say this, that it can never be acceptable to about three million Chinese living in this country. It can never be acceptable to leaders like Mr. Lim Lian Geok, who speak with authority on education in this country.

Enche' Sardon: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mula² tadi tak patut bangun berchakap, tetapi oleh kerana mendengar daripada Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bachok berkenaan dengan Bab 49 berkenaan pelajaran ugama di-ajar di-sekolah² rendah, dan begitu juga Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh yang menyebutkan tak payah-lah di-uji ta'at setia sa-saorang dalam Tanah Melayu ini dalam soal dasar pelajaran negeri ini, dan begitu juga dalam ucapan²-nya yang bernyala² dan bersemangat menyatakan kalau bagini dasar Kerajaan, maka Kerajaan bunoh Sekolah² China itu. Perkataan yang di-gunakan itu—*"to kill the Chinese Schools,"* ini satu perkataan yang sesiapa juga mendengar

akan berasa panas dan hangat. Kita dalam Rumah yang berhormat ini hendak mengambil fikiran serta mengambil pandangan dari segala segi dan pandangan orang ramai, dan Yang Berhormat Tuan Yang di-Pertua sendiri telah pun tadi mengingatkan Yang Berhormat Ahli daripada Ipoh jangan keluar batasan, saya tidak akan memulakan lagi perkara² ini; chuma saya hendak terangkan sahaja. Dalam soal dasar pelajaran Tanah Melayu ini yang mana sangat² penting yang kita mempunyai satu bahasa, bahasa Melayu ia-itu bahasa Kebangsaan dan Kerajaan Perikatan tidak zalim, tidak menahan yang lain² bangsa tidak boleh belajar atau tidak boleh berchakap bahasa-nya, dan kita memberi peluang dalam tempoh 10 tahun sa-lewat²-nya. Oleh kerana itu, pada hari ini dasar pelajaran Kerajaan Perikatan yang telah dapat persetujuan orang ramai yang memilih parti perikatan tidak sabagaimana yang di-katakan oleh wakil Ipoh tadi (*mandate-nya sendiri*). Pilihan raya yang pertama telah mendapat 100 peratus kuasa daripada pehak orang ramai yang di-berikan kapada kita, bukan sahaja untuk kemerdekaan, tetapi mahu menjalankan pemerintahan yang 'adil dalam negeri ini serta mengekalkan keamanan dan kema'moran dengan jalan menyatu padukan satu fikiran, satu bangsa dalam negeri ini supaya negeri ini aman damai dan ma'mor. Tetapi, di-sebalek-nya saya berasa dukachita, kalau-lah PPP—kita tidak menapikan wakil daripada gulungan dari Ipoh sahaja barangkali yang mendapat sokongan sebahagian kecil daripada orang² China, tetapi hendak mengatakan bahawa kami PPP tentulah mendapat sokongan dari 3 million China dalam negeri ini dan hendak mempengaruhi Kerajaan. Pengakuan-nya yang kosong, pengakuan yang tidak benar; kalau pun ada daripada sa-gulungan China yang kecil di-negeri ini. Ini ada-lah menghasut sokongan dari satu pehak China supaya jangan menyokong Kerajaan dan memanaskan pehak orang² Melayu.

Saya berharap baik apa parti juga sekali pun bahawa dasar pelajaran—education policy, dalam soal yang hendak mengatakan sa-suatu . . .

Mr. Speaker: Nanti sekejap! Saya ada mendengar tadi yang dia berchakap tidak mengatakan parti dia menyokong orang China 3 million.

Enche' Sardon: Tidak—ia mengatakan 3 million China fahaman dia—ma'na-nya tahu

Mr. Speaker: Tidak—dia kata China yang 3 million itu menyokong parti dan fahaman-nya; itu saya mengingatkan!

Enche' Sardon: Terima kaseh, tetapi Yang Berhormat itu mengatakan, saya perchaya bahawa China yang 3 million itu bersetuju tidak boleh bahasa Melayu di-jadikan bahasa yang tunggal, kerana Party PPP memahami yang dia mahu semua bahasa dalam Tanah Melayu ini menjadi bahasa resmi.

Mr. Speaker: Itu boleh.

Enche' Sardon: Terima kaseh. Jadi, kalau begitu-lah dasar PPP walau sampai hari kiamat pun pehak Party PPP dan penyokong-nya tidak sesuai dengan fahaman orang ramai pertama sekali orang² Melayu di-Tanah Melayu ini. Di-sini, saya tidak akan panjangkan perchakapan saya, tetapi saya minta Yang Berhormat walau daripada apa parti, apa bangsa juga, apa ugama, mari-lah kita bersama² memberi pandangan dan fikiran yang boleh sesuai kepada orang ramai untuk membolehkan dan memberi keuntungan kepada ra'ayat negeri ini daripada berbagai bangsa dan ugama.

Saya minta daripada semua parti, dan di-sini saya ucapkan "*shabbas*" kepada Parti PAS Malaya. Yang Berhormat wakil Besut telah bangkit walau pun ada penerangan² yang lanjut dan ada juga soal titek bengik, tetapi dasar yang di-soalkan itu di-sokong, di-persetujui supaya di-lekas-kas dasar itu supaya yang lain dapat mengikut-nya. Ini saya sangat²-lah memberi pandangan dan mengucapkan tahniah, dan juga pehak daripada Bachok yang mengambil masa satu dua jam berchakap, tetapi saya suka juga menyentuh berkenaan dengan pelajaran ugama di-sekolah² Kebangsaan. Yang Berhormat itu membaca hanya-lah para 291, tetapi para 292 yang berikut tidak di-bachakan dan tidak di-fahamkan. Dalam muka 48 mengatakan apa-lah hendak di-lama²kan

berkenaan dengan soal² murid² Islam yang di-ajar—bahasa ugama memakan belanja \$14 ia-itu di-bahagi dua—Federal \$7 dan Kerajaan Negeri \$7—jalankan sahaja-lah. Tetapi, ini bukan fasal lekas hendak di-jalankan, malah kita pada hari ini mempunyai Perlembagaan, Perlembagaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu yang kita telah pun mengesahkan dan mengakui bahawa soal ugama itu ia-lah di-serahkan kepada tiap² negeri yang mana Duli² Yang Maha Mulia Raja² Melayu menjadi Ketua-nya yang bertanggung jawab dalam soal ugama, dan soal adat resam Melayu. Dan dalam persidangan Raja² Melayu juga berkuasa atau memutuskan atas soal dasar besar mengenai pelajaran ugama di-dalam Negeri² Melayu itu.

Jika Kerajaan Persekutuan hendak lekas menjalankan sa-suatu soal itu dengan tidak berunding dengan negeri masing² dan mereka bekerjasama dengan Persekutuan, tentu-lah lebeh lama lagi hendak di-jalankan. Di-sini, para 292 yang mana Jawatan-Kuasa ini telah menimbangkan dengan suatu perkara itu sehalus² dan teliti-nya ia-itu tidak ada lain selain dari bekerjasama dan berunding sama² menanggung separoh perbelanjaan pada penuntut Islam tiap² sa-orang yang memakan belanja \$14.00.

Saya berharap dan berseru kepada pehak Parti PAS yang mana negeri Kelantan dan Trengganu negeri yang di-perintah oleh Parti PAS supaya dapat memberikan sokongan penoh menguntokan wang itu supaya guru² ugama lekas dapat di-laksanakan dan mereka itu dapat mengajar ugama kepada murid² Islam di-sekolah² Kebangsaan.

Saya tidak akan memanjangkan chakap lagi, hanya-lah saya minta Ahli² Yang Berhormat sekalian dalam perbahathan soal dasar pelajaran ini agar dapat menimbangkan dengan sehalus²-nya dan tidak-lah hanya membawakan fahaman daripada satu puak parti atau fahaman, tetapi hendak-lah di-pandang dari segi *national interest*, dan saya berseru sekali lagi supaya soal *loyalty* mesti kita mahu betul² menghadapi-nya. Jika

sa-saorang itu hanya bibir-nya berchakap ta'at setia kepada negeri dihati-nya tidak demikian, maka tidaklah ada guna-nya pengakuan itu dan apa juga kata² sa-orang yang semacam itu tidak-lah boleh di-pakai baik dari segi kepentingan bangsa dan negara, keamanan dan kema'moran. (*Tepok*).

Enche' Liu Yoong Peng (Rawang):

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose this Report because I see in this Report the story of a tragedy of the peoples in this land. The people of Malaya devoted their heart to fight for the building up of a nation in this country and in doing so we have already got our independence. But now having got the independence, we find that, take the government political party for example, the composition of which is the M.C.A., the U.M.N.O. and the M.I.C., from this composition it is clear that originally peoples of three distinct racial groups were co-operating together to work for a common cause. Now we find that the M.C.A. has already lost the backing of those people who helped that party to fight for and win the independence, the reason being that the U.M.N.O. section has betrayed . . .

Mr. Speaker: I rule you out of order under Standing Order 36. Will you sit down when I talk? Will you look up your S.O. 36 (10) (c), it says: "It shall be out of order to use words which are likely to promote feelings of ill-will or hostility between different communities in the Federation." I warn you that next time you must not use words which are likely to promote feelings of ill-will or hostility. You must be very, very careful. Proceed!

Enche' Liu Yoong Peng: Yes, Mr. Speaker. It is not my intention to promote ill-will. I am merely trying to explain a fact which is in existence in Malaya, but I would be careful not to give even any presumption of ill-will.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Enche' Liu Yoong Peng: So, we know that the Government today in its education policy has, instead of regarding the Chinese and Tamil languages as closer to the Malay language, chosen closer association with the English language. We can see clearly from this

Education Report that it is an act of cultural subversion on the part of an element that is quite foreign to the peoples in this country. I say this because of what I understand from the Report itself as well as from the speech made by the Minister of Education yesterday, when he repeatedly emphasised the importance of national education in this country. He said that he was conscious of the importance of national education in this country and then he said that the national language is one of the main objectives in our country. Despite these words, we find that in effect it is not the National Language which this Report is trying to emphasise in the immediate future. I fail to understand why 1962 is given as the time limit in which the partially aided Chinese secondary schools should have to determine whether they are going to go into the national stream or not, because quite clearly by that date the Government is not in a position to provide sufficient qualified teachers and textbooks and thereby to give these schools an opportunity to conduct their instruction in the National language. In other words, it only means that these partially aided Chinese secondary schools are to choose either to remain as Chinese schools or to become English schools. That is why I say, Sir, that loyal citizens of this country fail to understand why the Government shows such a favour towards a language which is quite foreign to this country—people who fought so hard for the Merdeka of this country see now that the Government is in fact favouring those people whom they had fought hard to get the independence from.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish to illustrate my point further by saying that the Government in this Educational Report is trying to put the cart before the horse, and in doing so it has got a donkey in between. This donkey, I submit, Sir, is the English language and the cart, of course, is the national schools and the horse the National language. But because the horse is not sufficiently trained, it has to seek the assistance of the donkey to pull the cart. So, in this way, this Education Report is not satisfactory and does not meet the needs of the citizens in this country.

Therefore, I say, Sir, I am suspicious of a strange situation arising in this country, which has been well illustrated by the Assistant Minister for Broadcasting some time back when he referred to what happened in Radio Malaya. In fact, he said that expatriate officers in Radio Malaya have been deliberately trying to utilise the facilities in Radio Malaya.

Mr. Speaker: How is that relevant to the motion before the House?

Enche' Liu Yoong Peng: I will explain, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: I don't see any relevancy at all.

Enche' Liu Yoong Peng: The relevancy is that cultural subversion is going on in this country.

Mr. Speaker: That is not the motion before the House. The motion before the House is: "That this House approves in principle the policy recommended in the Report of the Education Review Committee, 1960." That is the motion before the House.

Enche' Liu Yoong Peng: I fully realise the motion before the House, Sir. What I wish to say is that this Report is done by people who actually have the intention of making the importance of the English language continue in this country. We understand, Sir, that in preparing this Report, the Government had to rely extensively on the assistance of the Secretaries in the Ministry of Education—in fact it was done entirely by them after the committee meetings together with their stenographers. Therefore, Sir, I should think that in the drafting of this Report the expatriate officers involved had an excellent chance of putting their view across in such a way that we now find that the English language is given undue prominence contrary even to the wishes of the Education Minister himself who wants to see the promotion of the National language. If this Report goes through, I would submit that in the future the chances of the National language to be used solely would be lessened, because of the undue emphasis on education in the English language.

Enche' Mohamed Dahari bin Haji Mohd. Ali (Kuala Selangor): Dato' Yang di-Pertua, pada Kerajaan Perikatan Penyata yang ada di-hadapan kita sekarang ini boleh di-umpamakan saperti peri bahasa kita, "sakali mengurak pura, dua tiga kali hutang lang sai". Dato' Yang di-Pertua, ini adalah kerana dalam Penyata ini Kerajaan Perikatan akan menunaikan janji-nya berkenaan dengan pelajaran dalam masa pilihan raya yang sudah. Saperti sama² kita ketahui menifesto Perikatan dalam pilihan raya yang sudah, Kerajaan ini akan berusaha ka-arrah menaikkan had umur murid² berhenti sekolah kapada 15 tahun dan membanyakkan lagi Sekolah² Menengah, sekolah² vocational dan mengadakan kemudahan² yang lebeh luas untuk mempelajari bahasa² dalam semua jenis sekolah dalam negeri ini. Perikatan juga berjanji, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, bahawa sa-rentak dengan itu ia tidak akan membantut perkembangan kebudayaan dan bahasa segala rupa bangsa yang tinggal dalam negeri ini. Dato' Yang di-Pertua, semua-nya ini ada-lah mendapat jaminan daripada Penyata yang ada di-hadapan kita ini.

Shor yang paling penting pada pendapat Jawatan-Kuasa ini ada-lah menaikkan umur anak² sekolah pada 15 tahun dan Fasal 103 daripada Penyata ini kalau saya tidak silap menyatakan bahawa perkara ini-lah yang mesti di-segerakan terlebih dahulu daripada shor² yang lain. Dari segi orang² Melayu, tegoran² yang telah dibuat dalam Rumah Yang Berhormat ini tidak-lah sa-bagitu hebat saperti tegoran² yang di-buat oleh sa-bahagian kaum tepelajar kita yang terapong² di-awangan², kaum tepelajar itu menudoh Penyata ini tidak ada memberi kemudahan bagi anak² kita di-kampong² mendapat pelajaran Sekolah Menengah.

Fasal 48 Penyata ini berkata bahawa keutamaan harus-lah di-berikan pada tahun² hadapan untuk menambah lagi Sekolah Lanjutan Kampong. Dan Fasal 206 ada menyatakan Sekolah Lanjutan Kampong yang akan membuka peluang kapada anak² kita di-kampong masok pepereksaan Sijil Rendah Pelajaran harus-lah di-tambah jumlah-nya lima kali ganda daripada jumlah yang ada sekarang. Murid² yang keluar daripada

sekolah ini akan di-beri juga peluang masok ka-Sekolah Technical Institute.

Fasal 89 (a), mengatakan satu jenis Sekolah Menengah yang baharu yang di-beri nama Sekolah Pelajaran Lanjutan hendak-lah di-adakan bagi menampung 70% daripada anak² kita yang tidak dapat masok Sekolah Menengah saloran akademik. Perubahan ini, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, ada-lah dalam bidang usaha menaikkan had umur murid² berhenti sekolah kepada 15 tahun. Jadi, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, kalau di-fikirkan daripada jumlah 4,684 sekolah yang mendapat bantuan Kerajaan 2,338 adalah Sekolah Kebangsaan dan sa-bahagian besar daripada Sekolah Kebangsaan itu ada-lah terletak di-kampung² maka murid² sekolah itu akan ditampung oleh Sekolah Lanjutan Pelajaran itu. Tudohan² kaum tepelajar yang terapong di-awang² ini tidak berasas bahkan tidak bertanggung jawab semua sa-kali kerana hendak mengabui mata ra'ayat dengan usaha baik Kerajaan Perikatan.

Dato' Yang di-Pertua, dewa² ini menyatakan bahawa anak² di-kampung perlukan Sekolah Menengah yang menggunakan bahasa Kebangsaan yang dapat menyalorkan sa-bahagian daripada mereka itu kepada peringkat University. Pada pendapat saya kenyataan orang² kayangan ini, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, ada-lah berlawanan dengan hujah² yang di-berikan oleh mereka itu. Sakira-nya orang² kayangan ini hendak melihat sa-bahagian daripada anak² kampung kita masok ka-peringkat University maka tidak dapat tiada anak² yang ber-geliga otak-nya itu terpaksa masok ka-dalam Remove Class yang bahasa pengantar-nya bahasa Inggeris kerana University dalam negeri ini dan University di-seberang laut ada-lah mengambil anak² yang berpengetahuan, yang kelayakan-nya ada-lah seperti kelulusan yang boleh kita dapati daripada Sekolah Menengah Kebangsaan jenis Inggeris. Hatta University di-Indonesia sa-buah University rasmi, bukan partikulier kata orang di-sana, menghendaki anak² kita yang masok ka-dalam-nya hendak-lah lulus kepada peringkat pelajaran yang sa-rupa seperti peringkat pelajaran yang di-dapati dalam Sekolah² Menengah Kebangsaan

jenis Inggeris. Jadi kita tidak dapat lari daripada kenyataan, Dato' Yang di-Pertua. Kerajaan Perikatan telah mengadakan kemudahan pelajaran yang seperti itu sekarang yang dapat pada sekolah Tuanku Abdul Rahman.

Dato' Yang di-Pertua, tuduhan itu di-buat dalam satu Akhbar Kebangsaan Melayu yang di-terbitkan di-Persekutuan Tanah Melayu. Akhbar itu juga memuatkan satu tuduhan oleh satu pertubohan yang kalau saya ta' silap bernama "KUBU". Dalam tuduhan-nya, mengikut orang² yang hampir dengan Pertubohan itu pertubohan tersebut tidak mempunyai ahli sampai 50 orang atau kurang satu chawangan U.M.N.O. tuduhan mengatakan bahawa Penyata ini mengabaikan perkembangan Bahasa Kebangsaan, tidak tegas dalam membuat shor² berkenaan dengan melaksanakan Bahasa Kebangsaan. Saya tidak-lah tahu apa-kah Pertubohan itu membuat tuduhan tersebut berdasarkan kenyataan chabutan² daripada Penyata ini yang mula² tersiar dalam Akhbar Kebangsaan Melayu yang di-terbitkan di-Persekutuan Tanah Melayu itu. Sayang, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, Akhbar Kebangsaan Melayu yang di-terbitkan di-Persekutuan Tanah Melayu itu tadi menyiarkan sedikit lengkap Penyata tersebut pada hari kelmarin. Saya ta' tahu-lah kerana tidak lengkap-nya di-terbitkan pada hari mula² di-siarkan maka Pertubohan "KUBU" ini membuat satu tuduhan yang saya rasa adalah satu tuduhan yang melulu.

Lagi satu perkara, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, saya chuma hendak membayangkan beberapa shor yang ada dalam Penyata ini yang bertujuan hendak mengembangkan Bahasa Kebangsaan dalam negeri ini. Pertama ialah mewajibkan bahawa bahasa Melayu di-ajar di-semua sekolah jenis kebangsaan mulai darjah I. Kedua, mengadakan saloran² kebangsaan di-sekolah yang dahulu-nya Sekolah Inggeris mulai tahun 1961.

Pelajaran perchuma kepada semua kanak² yang belajar dalam Sekolah Kebangsaan dari peringkat rendah hingga ka-peringkat menengah. Dalam jangka panjang bahasa penghantar dalam semua Sekolah Pelajaran Lanjutan akan di-adakan dalam bahasa

Kebangsaan. Pepereksaan resmi dalam bahasa Melayu dan bahasa Inggeris.

Guru² yang bukan Melayu akan diberi kursus bahasa Kebangsaan sahingga mereka dapat mengajar dalam bahasa Kebangsaan peringkat darjah III sa-kurang²-nya. Scheme of Services Kerajaan akan di-pinda, akan di-sesuaikan dengan perkembangan bahasa Kebangsaan. Apa-kah ini shor² yang bukan belom tegas lagi?

Sekarang soal-nya, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, ada-kah Penyata Pelajaran ini dapat di-terima oleh ra'ayat. Dalam penyata ini menyatakan bahawa kita tidak dapat memuaskan hati semua orang. Ukoran apa-kah penyata ini boleh di-terima oleh ra'ayat seluruh-nya ada-lah bergantung kepada apakah penyata ini 'adil atau tidak.

Tuduhan telah di-buat dalam Rumah ini, chuma sa-buah parti sahaja yang menyeru supaya penyata ini di-tolak sama sekali. Yang Berhormat ahli dari Besut yang mempunyai anggapan sa-olah² saperti tuduhan pertubohan "KUBU". Ini saya tak tahu-lah ada-kah beliau itu sa-orang pertubohan anggota itu ada-lah menerima penyata ini pada dasar-nya.

Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Seberang Selatan dan Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Seremban Timor tidak menyatakan bahawa penyata ini tidak 'adil. Saya tidak-lah tahu pendirian Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Rawang, apa-kah ia sesuai "toe-the-line" dasar parti-nya ada-lah terserah kepada parti-nya memikirkan, tetapi Ahli Yang Berhormat itu bukan juru chakap parti-nya. Saya mengambil ingatan kepada Ahli Yang Berhormat Seberang Selatan yang mula² berchakap tadi ada-lah berchakap bagi parti-nya. Jadi chuma sa-buah parti sahaja yang menolak penyata ini ia-itu Party PPP yang diketuai oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh. Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh mengemukakan alasan² berdasarkan kepada Perlembagaan (Constitution). Alasan² perlembagaan ini boleh di-bahathkan berlarut² masa-nya. Ahli Yang Berhormat itu ada-lah menolak sama sekali, erti-nya dia menolak faktor yang saya katakan tadi ia-itu faktor hendak menaikkan umur anak²

sekolah ini pergi ka-sekolah hingga ka-peringkat umur 15 tahun dan juga menolak pelajaran perchuma, ter-masok-lah anak² China yang dia menjadi jagoh-nya.

Dato' Yang di-Pertua, tak usah-lah kita usek tentang fikiran yang kita dapat daripada Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh itu. Soal-nya ia-lah bila masa membuat tegoran terhadap penyata ini, Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Seberang Selatan bertanya kepada kita apa-kah kita akan mengadakan pelajaran se-chara kita orang Malaya, atau sechara orang Inggeris apakala beliau membuat tegoran ka-atas pelajaran Sekolah China. Saya suka bertanya bahawa apa-kah kita juga dan apa-kah beliau itu berpendapat dengan parti pembangkang yang lain ia-itu Party PPP yang mana hendak menggalakkan dan maseh juga menghendakan chara fikiran Malaya, chara berfikiran Inggeris, Tamil dan China dalam masharakat kita yang ada sekarang.

Saya tak tahu-lah apa-kah hujah Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Seberang Selatan itu ada kait-mengait untuk mengekalkan undi China dalam parti-nya supaya takut lari undi² itu kepada Parti PPP, tetapi

Mr. Speaker: Saya hendak mengingatkan lagi bahawa dalam Standing Order ini ada menyebutkan sa-saorang itu tidak boleh memberi chakapan-nya yang boleh memberi salah sangka kepada orang² lain—itu tak boleh—"improper motives" bahasa orang puteh-nya, dan "it is not in order". Tolong jaga sedikit!

Enche' Mohamed Dahari bin Haji Mohd. Ali: Baik, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, terima kaseh. Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Seberang Selatan yang membuat tegoran-nya terhadap susah-nya sa-saorang murid itu menukarkan bahasa perantaran-nya ia-itu daripada bahasa China ka-bahasa Melayu dan Inggeris. Ini-lah yang telah di-lakukan oleh murid² sekolah Melayu yang masok ka-sekolah Inggeris dari semanjak sa-below perang dahulu ter-masok Ketua Ahli Parti Socialist Front ia-itu Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Setapak.

Enche' V. Veerappen: I did not mention about the change of language . . .

Mr. Speaker: When you stand up, you must mention the point of order, quoting the number of the Standing Order. You cannot simply stand up and say anything.

Enche' V. Veerappen: On a point of explanation, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Are you giving way?

Enche' Mohamed Dahari: I do not wish to give way.

Mr. Speaker: He doesn't give way. Please proceed!

Enche' Mohamed Dahari bin Haji Mohd. Ali: Ada tegoran terhadap menaikan bayaran Sekolah Menengah. Menurut penyata ini, menurut ibu bapa yang tak mampu. Saya fikir ibu bapa yang tak mampu hendak-lah memasokkan anak-nya ka-sekolah saloran kebangsaan, kerana dalam sekolah saloran kebangsaan itu dia bukan sahaja mendapat pelajaran perchuma sekolah rendah, tetapi pelajaran perchuma hingga ka-peringkat menengah.

Enche' Tajudin bin Ali (Larut Utara): Tuan Speaker, Tuan, "Bahasa Jiwa Bangsa" saya bangun menyokong dengan kuat-nya usul yang di-majukan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran. Tuan Speaker, Tuan, kalau kita ada bangsa, mesti ada bahasa dan begitu-lah kedudukan negara yang bebas dan merdeka ini. Di-sekeliling negeri kita ini, kita perhatikan banyak negeri yang telah mendapat taraf kemerdekaan telah timbul bermacam² rusohan, soal pokok-nya ia-lah bahasa. Malaya ini telah menjadi mangsa Kerajaan Kolonializam, kalau-lah ditanya fikiran saya, Tuan Speaker, masa pemerintah kolonial dahulu, kalau Kerajaan masa itu benar² hendak menyatu-padukan segala bangsa ia-itu orang² Melayu, China, Tamil dan lain² ka-araf satu rupa bangsa ia-itu Inggeris, saya rasa sa-lepas merdeka ini, orang² Melayu tentu-lah tidak sakali² keberatan menerima Inggeris sabagai rupa bangsa Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini. Tetapi kita sakalian faham ada-lah bahasa yang di-tutorkan dan yang di-fahami oleh bangsa² di-Tanah Melayu pada masa ini ia-lah bahasa

Melayu. Itu-lah sebab-nya kita hendak membentok satu bahasa, satu bangsa dengan menggalakkan sedikit demi sedikit bangsa² asing itu mempelajari bahasa Melayu; perkara ini sangat rumit.

Oleh sebab rakan saya telah berchakap dengan panjang lebar di-atas perkara ini, saya chuma hendak menyentoh sedikit sahaja ia-itu Ahli² Yang Berhormat daripada pembangkang, terutama rakan saya daripada P.P.P. yang telah berapi² berchakap di-atas perkara ini. Tuan Speaker, Tuan, kalau-lah perchakapan itu di-majukan di-Indonesia dan di-negeri Siam, saya rasa tidak sempat siang pun, hukuman-nya akan sampai (*Ketawa*). Tuan Speaker, oleh sebab di-Tanah Melayu ini ia-lah di-tadbirkan oleh Kerajaan Perikatan yang chara pemerentahan-nya mengikut dasar demokrasi yang sa-benar-nya, kami mahu tegoran² yang terator untuk membena negara kita ini. Saya geli hati apabila Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh mengatakan perkara ini akan menjadi satu masa'alah yang besar pada masa yang akan datang, kebanyakan tegoran Ahli Yang Berhormat itu berkenaan dengan pelajaran di-sekolah² China. Saya hairan, kerana rakan saya itu ia-lah sa-orang India, kalau ia hendak memajukan perkara ini tentu-lah ia memajukan di-atas hal orang India, tetapi ia bertalu² berchakap fasal orang² China, dan ia menyalahkan orang² India yang tidak mengemukakan perkara ini dengan sa-jelas²-nya kepada Jawatan-Kuasa yang di-lantek itu. Saya takut perchakapan, hujah yang di-binchangkan-nya itu "Ada udang di-sa-balek batu".

Kalau ada orang yang hendak berchakap fasal orang China, tentu-lah orang² yang saperti Yang Berhormat Dato' Dr. Cheah Toon Lok, Tun Tan Cheng Lock atau pun rakan saya yang di-sabelah saya ini Yang Berhormat Dr. Lim Swee Aun, tetapi orang India pula yang berchakap fasal bahasa China, ini 'ajaib, saya serahkan perkara ini untuk pengetahuan Tuan Speaker dan rakan² saya sakalian. Tuan Speaker, Tuan, kemudahan² telah di-susun dan di-ator dengan baik-nya oleh Jawatan-Kuasa yang di-lantek

mengkaji Dasar Pelajaran ini ada-lah menyatakan dengan terang-nya ia-itu bahasa lain itu boleh di-pelajari dalam Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini.

Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Seberang Selatan menyatakan soal pelajaran ini ia-lah satu masa'alah yang berapi, saya rasa perkara ini tidak berapa benar, kalau dia tidak mengapi²kan, perkara api ini tidak akan timbul, kalau ada, mereka-lah yang mengapi²kan-nya. Saya suka hendak menyentoh ucapan Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bachok ia-itu berkenaan "Automatic Promotion" di-muka 27. Pada pendapat saya yang sengkati ini, "Automatic Promotion" ini memang baik, kerana chara²-nya baik, tetapi ada-kah atoran² yang telah di-beri oleh Kementerian itu di-jalakan dengan baik atau tidak, terpulang-lah kepada sekolah itu masing², kerana saya dapati ada sekolah² itu bukan sahaja mengadakan peperiksaan pada penghujung tiap² tahun bahkan tiap² minggu; ini terserah-lah kepada guru² sekolah itu masing². Ahli Yang Berhormat itu juga menyebutkan berkenaan dengan "Technical Schools" di-Paragraph 253 ia-itu budak² yang lulus dalam geography dan history patut-lah di-galakkan masuk di-Sekolah Teknikal, tiap² sekolah yang hendak mempelajari sa-suatu itu, terserah-lah kepada "curriculum"-nya sendiri, umpama-nya hendak masuk Sekolah Teknikal, kelulusan mathematics dan science sangat-lah perlu kalau tidak budak² yang masuk sekolah itu akan kechiwa.

Tuan Speaker, Tuan, sa-bagaimana yang saya sebutkan pada mula-nya tadi ia-itu saya tidak hendak berchakap panjang. Saya mengambil peluang ini mengucapkan sa-tinggi² tahniah kepada Ahli² Jawatan-Kuasa Menyemak Dasar Pelajaran ini yang telah menyusun dan mengatorkan serta memberi puas hati kepada sa-bahagian daripada penduduk Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini. Di-sini saya ada membawa surat khabar yang menyatakan pihak orang China pun berpendapat "Review Committee" ini memberi puas hati pada umum-nya. Jadi, Tuan Speaker, penduduk² negeri ini yang berchadang hendak melihat satu rupa bangsa, satu rupa bahasa,

segala perchakapan dan tegoran itu hendak-lah daripada hati ka-hati, jangan sa-kali hendak-nya membuat tegoran dengan tidak bertanggung-jawab langsung.

Che' Khadijah binti Mohd. Sidik (Dungun): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-sini saya menyatakan persetujuan pada asas-nya kepada Report ini tetapi; ada tetapi-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-sudah saya menilik dan memerhatikan isi daripada Report ini, saya merasa sangat dukachita sa-kali kerana kami merasa bahawa kami pihak perempuan atau anak² perempuan di-anak tirikan oleh Kementerian Pelajaran di-dalam Report-nya ini. Kerana tidak ada terchatet atau tertulis ia-itu sekolah yang sangat penting bagi anak² perempuan kita ia-itu Sekolah ke-Rumah-Tangga. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya sangat merasa hairan sa-kali kenapa maka pihak Kementerian Pelajaran tidak sedikit pun mengambil berat terhadap anak² perempuan di-dalam tanah ayer kita ini. Sudah beberapa kali dalam Dewan ini pada masa yang silam, saya menyuarakan soal itu dan pada satu masa telah di-beri jawapan dengan chara gelak ketawa, saya merasa saya sangat di-rendahkan oleh Menteri Pelajaran dahulu yang ia-nya sekarang telah menjadi Menteri Perdagangan dan Perusahaan. Beliau memberi jawapan kepada saya, itu-lah kata-nya, "segala Yang Berhormat² di-dalam Dewan ini akan berserta dengan saya ia-itu kita tidak boleh melupakan wanita, kalau kita melupakan wanita, kita akan mati". Tetapi penjawapan itu tidak berdasarkan penjawapan kepada tuntutan saya supaya beliau mengambil perhatian yang berat kepada sekolah² anak perempuan dalam negeri ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya rasa Sekolah Rumah Tangga ini sangat penting kerana di-sini anak² kita yang berkelulusan School Certificate terpaksa dia mengambil Diploma Rumah Tangga di-luar negeri hanya di-antara mereka yang pergi di-Australia, ada di-antara mereka pergi ka-England sana untuk mengambil Diploma itu. Kenapakah tidak boleh di-adakan sekolah yang demikian rupa ini khas-nya untuk anak² perempuan di-kampung² dan juga di-dalam bandar² di-dalam negeri kita ini. Chuma saya terbacha semua

sekolah² yang ada di-dalam Report ini hanya-lah di-untokan kepada anak² lelaki sahaja. Memang ada Sekolah Rendah yang berchampur dengan anak² perempuan tetapi Sekolah Rumah Tangga ini ada-lah satu didekan jiwa untuk anak² kita yang anak² perempuan kita lepas dari Sekolah Rendah kebanyakan tidak berpuluh ribu malah beratus ribu yang terlantar dalam kampung², Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kema-mahu di-alirkan. Mereka tidak mengetahui soal rumah tangga. Ini-lah menyebabkan banyak tersasar hidupnya perempuan² muda di-dalam negeri kita ini, terpaksa kadang² melachorkan diri untuk kehidupan anak²-nya yang kechil² itu. Juga terpaksa mereka merendahkan diri-nya kerana mereka tidak mempunyai 'ilmu pengetahuan yang chukup di-dalam soal ke-rumah-tanggaaan. Jadi, soal ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau kita sendiri mengatakan peri bahasa, "pemuda itu harapan bangsa" maka untuk pemuda sahaja-lah yang di-banyakkan soal pendidekan ini tetapi kerana tiang itu di-sangka tiang sahaja tidak perlu di-banyakkan memberi pendidekan yang sa-luas²-nya kepada anak² perempuan kita di-dalam negeri ini. Saya merasa sangat dukachita sa-kali dan saya merasa hairan tidak-kah Kerajaan kita sedar bahawa terdiri-nya Kerajaan Perikatan ini adalah oleh kerana tenaga kaum wanita sa-bahagian besar dalam pilihan raya tahun 1955, 70 peratus wanita-nya berduyun² keluar mengundi untuk menegakkan Kerajaan kita. Sa-patut-nya-lah Kerajaan kita juga mengambil berat tentang hal² kewajipan anak² perempuan di-dalam negeri ini.

Sa-lain daripada itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-bagaimana yang telah di-uchapkan oleh rakan saya Yang Berhormat dari Jitra soal gaji guru² perempuan. Ia-itu juga guru² perempuan menuntut supaya gaji-nya di-samakan dengan pehak guru² lelaki tetapi nampak-nya tidak mendapat sambutan. Ini juga alasan barangkali saya fikir kerana dari pehak kaum bapa merasa wanita itu lemah, merasa bahawa wanita itu tidak mempunyai tenaga yang chukup sebab itu-lah gaji-nya di-kechilkan dari pehak kaum bapa tetapi

Mr. Speaker: Saya hendak mengatakan, Jawatan-Kuasa yang di-angkat ini ada dia punya "terms of reference". Dalam "terms of reference" itu tidak ada di-sebutkan fasal gaji, tentu-lah Jawatan-Kuasa ini tidak boleh membuat dia punya Report fasal gaji. Jikalau Ahli Yang Berhormat baccha "terms of reference" Jawatan-Kuasa itu ia-itu pada chapter yang pertama, di-situ terang sa-kali tidak ada di-sebutkan fasal Jawatan-Kuasa membentok fasal ini. Jadi, saya fikir tidak payah di-chakapkan lagi fasal gaji.

Che' Khadijah binti Mohd. Sidik: Kalau begitu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berpaling saya kepada soal mewajibkan pelajaran bahasa Inggeris di-sekolah². Kalau salah sa-orang rakan saya Yang Berhormat mengatakan tadi bahawa "Bahasa Jiwa Bangsa". Memang saya merasa bangga kepada "Bahasa Jiwa Bangsa" ia-itu bahasa Melayu—bahasa Kebangsaan kita yang akan menjadi jiwa dan teras tiap² jiwa ra'ayat di-dalam negara kita ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Tetapi kalau sa-kira-nya bahasa Inggeris juga di-jadikan jiwa di-wajibkan bersama² dengan bahasa Kebangsaan ini di-dalam sekolah² Melayu maka saya rasa, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bahasa Inggeris ini-lah nanti yang akan menjadi jiwa bangsa anak² kita kerana menaikkan bahasa asing dan bahasa Inggeris ini akan lebeh kuat kapada anak² kita. Kita melihat di-sini sahaja, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam Dewan ini kalau sa-kira-nya dari pehak Yang Berhormat² Menteri kita betul² mempunyai jiwa chintakan "Bahasa Jiwa Bangsa" maka tidak ada daripada Menteri² Yang Berhormat itu ia-itu yang terdiri daripada saudara² Yang Berhormat bangsa Melayu yang faseh dalam bahasa Melayu tidak mahu berbahasa Inggeris dalam Parlimen ini kerana kalau betul² mahu menjadi satu Bahasa Jiwa Bangsa maka sa-patut-nya Yang Berhormat itu mengeluarkan segala² penerangan dalam bahasa Melayu supaya terpaksa dari rakan² Yang Berhormat yang tidak mengerti bahasa Melayu itu memahamkan kerana mereka tiap² sa-orang mempunyai earphone di-sini.

Mr. Speaker: Saya hendak mengingatkan, bahasa kedua² itu boleh dipakai dalam Parlimen ini. Dia boleh suka apa juga bahasa yang dia hendak chakap.

Che' Khadijah binti Mohd. Sidik: Terima kaseh, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Di-sekolah², saya rasa kalau sa-kira-nya bahasa Inggeris ini di-wajibkan maka anak² kita yang mahir dengan bahasa itu akan berchakap dengan bahasa Inggeris sahaja nanti. Dengan yang demikian bahasa Melayu itu akan menjadi bahasa yang kedua. Oleh sebab itu pada pendapatan saya bahasa Inggeris itu perlu di-wajibkan sa-bagai mata pelajaran tetapi tidak di-wajibkan sama dengan bahasa Kebangsaan ia-itu bahasa yang utama di-dalam negeri ini.

Dan berpaling saya kapada para 274 dalam soal guru². Di-sini di-katakan bahawa guru² keluaran dari Lower Certificate of Education mereka mendapat latehan, kerana selama 2 tahun sa-sudah itu mereka di-beri mengajar ka-sekolah rendah dari darjah I sampai darjah III, sedangkan dalam sekolah itu guru² Melayu yang keluaran dari Maktab Perempuan Melaka mithal-nya, mereka mempunyai pengalaman yang lebeh luas dalam bahasa Melayu, dan mereka sudah berpuluh² tahun mengajar dan mereka mengatakan ia-itu guru² yang baharu keluaran latehan ditaroh di-sini. Mereka ada yang dapat mengajar darjah I hingga darjah III sahaja sedangkan mereka yang lain itu gaji-nya lebeh besar daripada Kepala Sekolah keluaran daripada Maktab Melaka.

Jadi di-sini saya merasa itu sangat merendahkan kapada guru² Melayu yang telah mempunyai pengalaman² mengajar di-sekolah² itu, sedangkan guru² yang baharu itu baharu sahaja dan tidak mempunyai pengalaman yang luas, tetapi mereka mendapat gaji yang lebeh tinggi. Saya suka mengambil pandangan di-sini supaya dapat Kementerian kita memikirkan supaya kedudukan guru² yang keluar daripada Maktab Melaka itu agar mereka di-beri keutamaan juga yang lebeh baik daripada guru² yang baharu keluar daripada College Pulau Pinang itu.

Enche' Geh Chong Keat (Penang Utara): Mr. Speaker, Sir, when the Alliance faced the electorate last year, the following were some of the promises made by the Party to the people on the question of Education—and I quote from the Manifesto:

"To review the present Education Policy in the light of experience gained since its implementation, bearing in mind the declared objective of making Malay the National Language, while at the same time, encouraging and sustaining the growth of the languages and cultures of the other races.

To continue to give top priority to education in general.

To work towards a minimum school-leaving age of 15.

To continue re-orientating education to a national outlook."

These were the promises. The people endorsed this programme by giving their mandate to the Alliance to form the present Government with such an over-whelming majority in this House.

As it has always done, the Alliance Government has kept its promise to the electorate. Proof of this can be found in the Report of the Education Review Committee which is now before this House as Command Paper No. 26 of 1960, which is before us for our consideration.

I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to members of the Education Review Committee under the able leadership of my Honourable friend, the Minister of Education, for their excellent work which is consonant with the promise of the Alliance to give top priority to Education in this country. (*Applause*).

This is the time, Mr. Speaker, Sir, for all true Malaysians to show their undivided loyalty to this country. This is the moment for all true Malaysians to prove their sincerity. (AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear, hear.) This is, indeed, the occasion for all patriotic Malaysians, of whatever racial origin, who genuinely believe in a united Malayan nation, to take their stand courageously in favour of what is fair, just and right for this country. (AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear, hear).

I fully endorse the views of the Committee in connection with "the requirements of an education policy acceptable to the people as a whole". It can only

be a policy which is fair to all concerned, in particular to the pupils, our future citizens. It is not possible, within the framework of a policy which is truly national, to satisfy completely all the individual demands of each cultural and language group in the country.

There are, as we all know, extremists among the various groups. There are extremist Malays who would give no place at all to any other language but would insist on having Malay as the only language to be taught and used in this country. There are also some Chinese, who are equally extremist in their views, who would insist in making demands which would, in effect, repudiate our common desire and determination to make Malay the sole National Language of this country, as enshrined in the Constitution of the Persekutuan Tanah Melayu. (*Applause*).

In this connection I would like to raise one of the few points of criticism that I have against the Report of the Education Review Committee. It is in connection with the use of the word "*Kuo-Ye*" with reference to the Chinese language. "*Kuo-Ye*" is, of course, the Chinese word for "National Language". In China it is natural for the Chinese language—to be more specific, Mandarin—to be referred to as "*Kuo-Ye*", the National Language; and some of our Honourable Members pronounced it as "*Kuo-Yu*". It is wrong; it is "*Kuo-Ye*". As a matter of fact this term is no longer used in Malaya, even by the Chinese. Whenever the Chinese Press in this country write about "*Kuo-Ye*", they mean our National Language—the Malay Language. They now refer to the Chinese language as "*Wah-Ye*", which means "Chinese Language". This is symbolic of the general acceptance, among the vast majority of Chinese who are loyal Malaysians, of Malay as the National Language of this country.

We should support the acceptance of the Education Review Committee's Report in principle because the recommendations of this Committee are within the framework of the Constitutional guarantees as provided in Article 152 of the Constitution of the

Persekutuan Tanah Melayu in connection with the preservation and sustaining of the use and study of the language and culture of the other races.

There has been some agitation to delay consideration and approval of the recommendations of the Education Review Committee. In so far as the objective of our national education policy as recommended by the Committee is to bring together the children of all races under a national education system in order to strengthen our national unity, I submit that to advocate any delay in considering this Report is to advocate a delay in the task of national reconstruction, the noble task of achieving true and lasting unity among the peoples of this country. (*Applause*).

The agitators against the recommendations of the Committee's Report are obviously a small minority, and I hope that the vast majority of Chinese in this country will realise that the Malay extremists who agitate against the recommendations of the Committee are a small minority, in as much as the majority of Malays in this country must appreciate that the agitators among the Chinese form only a small minority, who do not necessarily represent the views of the whole Chinese community in this country. (*Applause*).

The recommendations of the Education Review Committee generally follow the promises regarding education contained in the Alliance Election Manifesto last year. By giving their unequivocal mandate to the Alliance by such a clear majority, I am convinced that the people of this country fully support the recommendations of the Education Review Committee.

I see in the recommendations of the Committee the foundations for a truly national education policy which would lead to the establishment of free and compulsory primary education for all our children. It is proposed that universal free primary education be introduced from 1962. This means that every child will have at least six years of schooling without having to pay any fees. Besides, those proceeding to Post-Primary schools where the medium of

instruction is in the National Language, will be able to continue their education without having to pay any fees.

This is something which will benefit hundreds of thousands of children of all races in this country. Chinese children will get as much benefit as Malay children and even in the secondary schools where the medium of instruction will be English, provision has been made for up to 10 per cent of the places in these schools to be free to those who cannot afford to pay fees.

In the past, Chinese parents have sent their children to English language schools because they realised that this was the right thing to do, if they wanted to give opportunities and brighter prospects to their children to progress in the then colonial world of Malaya where English was the most important and the official language. Now, in an independent Malaya, where we have adopted Malay as the National Language of this country, I am sure that far-sighted Chinese parents in this country will want their children to be educated through the medium of our National Language. It is with pride that I, as a Malayan of Chinese descent, can point to the fact that many Chinese pupils who have attended classes where the medium of instruction is in the National Language have done well and have topped their classes. They have done as well as those who have in the past attended schools where the medium of instruction was in English. It is not uncommon now to see Chinese pupils winning prizes for examinations in the National Language in schools all over the country.

One of the merits of the recommendations of this Committee is the practical attitude with regard to the teaching of the English language. We are proud of our National Language, and we should endeavour to do everything possible to promote it but I am convinced that the status, dignity and prestige of our National Language will in no way be affected by adopting such a practical attitude as is recommended by the Committee with regard to the teaching of English, which has become an international language to our children.

Another recommendation which I am sure will be supported by the vast majority of the people of this country is the proposal to extend the minimum school-leaving age to 15. This should be a great contribution to the social well-being of this country and it is a step which will be of great benefit to Chinese children. At present, as we all know, only a very small proportion of Chinese children, who study in Chinese language schools, get a chance to proceed beyond the primary stage. If the policy recommended by the Committee is adopted, it would now mean that children from Chinese schools can get free post-primary education for three years if they choose to join a school where the medium of instruction is in the National Language, and provision is also made for them to be given an intensive course in the National Language in the first year in these post-primary schools so as to be able to get the maximum benefit from the three years they spend in these continuation schools.

Perhaps those who are engaged in the present agitation, may be concerned about the future not only of the Chinese language and culture but also of their own economic and political future. The leaders of the Malayan Chinese Association have been able to discuss this matter with my Honourable friend the Minister of Education and we should be satisfied with the assurances that have been given by my Honourable friend the Minister of Education to the effect that, in the implementation of these recommendations, all concerned would be consulted.

It is my personal conviction that, with the existing Constitutional guarantees, there is no real danger of the language and culture of the various racial groups in Malaya being suppressed. On the contrary, with the freedom we are now enjoying under our democratic Constitution, and because of the love and devotion which the Chinese citizens of this country have for the language, custom and traditions of their forefathers, I would even venture to say that in time to come we Malaysians of Chinese descent

in this country would have more successfully preserved this language, custom and traditions of our forefathers than the Chinese on the mainland of China who are now under Communist domination. (*Applause*).

For the first time in the history of this country, our children who prefer to go to Chinese primary schools will be able to study for six full years without having to pay any fees. Not some of the children, as in the colonial days of the past, but all children will be given free places to study through the medium of the Chinese language in these fully-aided primary Chinese schools. I ask, where else is this done in the whole of South East Asia? More money will be spent by the Government on these schools than before. Freedom is also given to establish our own independent Chinese schools. How can this be interpreted as an attempt to stifle Chinese language or culture? Chinese language and literature will be taught even in the secondary schools.

If one examines the Report of the Education Review Committee from the point of view of a Malayan, even as a Malayan of Chinese descent who wants to preserve and promote the progress of the language and culture of his forefathers, one is impelled to support the acceptance of the Report in principle.

The national education policy as outlined in this Report ushers in a new and bright era for our children of all races, based on the vital principle of equality of opportunity for all. As this is the guiding principle which is evidently the cornerstone of this national education system aimed at forging a truly united Malayan nation, it is hardly necessary for me to emphasise the importance of treating children of all races on the basis of equality within the framework of this national education policy. But there may be some people who entertain unfounded fears that in the implementation of this policy there may be recourse to discriminatory practices in favour of one racial group. There may be even a fear that a certain percentage of the places in the secondary

schools would be reserved for children of a particular race.

In my own mind, these fears are unfounded. I am convinced that within the national education scheme as envisaged by this Report, all children of all racial groups would be treated on a basis of equality. They would gain admission to the limited places in the secondary schools purely on their merits and their ability to benefit from such education, and not on the basis of their racial origin or the social status of their parents. I am sure my Honourable friend the Minister of Education will have no hesitation in giving such an assurance.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, since the Alliance came into power, there has been complete harmony among the people. This is a great achievement. This harmony is a model for the whole world and could only have been achieved by a just government sympathetic to the aspirations of the many races living in this country.

Mr. Speaker: How is that relevant to this debate on this motion?

Enche' Geh Chong Keat: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is concerning the policy set forth by the Alliance Government on its education policy. As I said, since the Alliance came into power there has been complete harmony among the people. This is a great achievement. This harmony is a model for the whole world and could only have been achieved by a just government sympathetic to the aspirations of the many races living in this country. This just and sympathetic attitude of the Alliance Government is reflected in the national education policy envisaged in the Report that is before the House. The Report also represents yet another step towards the fulfilment of promises made to the people by the Alliance in its election manifesto.

In its manifesto for the 1955 Federal Election, the Alliance pledged to achieve independence for our country within four years. This pledge was fulfilled within two years and we achieved our independence three years ago. In its manifesto for the Parliamentary Election last year, the Alliance

promised to bring peace to the country and end the Emergency. We witnessed the fulfilment of this pledge and the ending of the Emergency only a few days ago. It is not surprising that the same parties, who were rejected by the electorate and who refused to take part in the rejoicings over the ending of the Emergency, are opposed to this Report which represents another fulfilment of the promise which the Alliance has made to the people.

Mr. Speaker: I must warn you that this is irrelevant. I have

Enche' Geh Chong Keat: Thank you, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: I have not finished yet. It is in the Standing Orders that when the Speaker speaks, the Honourable Member speaking must sit down. I would refer you to Standing Order 36 (1) which says:

"A member shall confine his observations to the subject under discussion and may not introduce matter irrelevant thereto."

Proceed!

Enche' Geh Chong Keat: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Sir. However, I am confident that the Alliance has the full support of the people in its endeavour to fulfil its promises.

Enche' Harun bin Abdullah (Baling): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ada-lah menyokong di-atas Penyata Jawatan-Kuasa Menyemak Pelajaran tahun 1956. Hasil daripada penyata yang terdapat ini ada-lah daripada tolak ansor dan saling mengerti di-antara penduduk² yang berbagai² bangsa dalam Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini yang mereka itu sendiri sadar di-atas kedudukan-nya sa-bagai sa-o-r-a-ng ra'ayat yang ta'at setia kepada negeri ini. Walau pun dalam beberapa tahun yang lalu telah ada sedikit sa-banyak yang tiada puas hati di-antara kalangan² yang tertentu mengenai sekolah menengah dan juga had² umur, maka dengan terlaksana-nya Dasar Pelajaran yang telah di-susun oleh Jawatan-Kuasa Penyemak itu, maka pada masa ini segala kerunsingan atau kebimbangan pehak² yang tertentu itu akan lenyap dengan sendiri-nya.

Dalam Penyata Menyemak Dasar Pelajaran tahun 1956 itu, saya suka menarek perhatian sedikit ia-itu berkenaan dengan pelajaran agama juga, pehak negeri Kedah, saya rasa tidak bagitu sangat merumitkan di-atas chara² melaksanakan Dasar Pelajaran Agama ini. Walau pun ada ternyata dalam penyata ini mengatakan masalah yang susah yang akan terdapat untuk mendapat guru² bagi mengajar pelajaran agama itu, tetapi pehak di-Kedah telah ada guru² yang mengajar agama di-sebelah petang. Dan pada hari ini guru² itu telah di-beri kursus oleh Jabatan Agama Negeri Kedah. Jadi, kalau sa-kira-nya bila² masa juga yang di-kehendaki oleh Kerajaan Persekutuan, saya rasa tidak menjadi kerumitan apa² bagi pehak di-sana, lebeh² lagi tentang peruntukan wang yang akan di-beri oleh Kerajaan Persekutuan \$7.00 pada tiap² kepala itu. Jadi, ada-lah menjadi satu sambutan yang baik kepada guru² yang mengajar agama di-sana dengan sebab berpeluang mengajar mengikut dasar pindaan baru ini.

Dan lagi ada suatu perkara yang menguntongkan dengan ada-nya perubahan² baru itu, ia-itu semua kanak² yang belajar sekolah rendah ada-lah berpeluang mendapat belajar sedikit sa-banyak perkara² agama, walau pun pelajaran yang mereka itu dapat se-chara rendah sahaja tetapi ada-lah memadai kepada peringkat yang pertama atau peringkat permulaan bagi kanak² itu mendapat pelajaran agama kadar fardzu 'ain.

Pada masa dahulu di-sekolah² rendah itu ada juga di-beri peluang belajar agama di-sabelah petang, tetapi ada sa-bahagian besar ibu bapa kanak² tiada menghantar anak² mereka di-sekolah yang tersebut ha-nya di-beri pelajaran biasa di-sabelah pagi sahaja. Jadi, dengan ada-nya perubahan dasar ini dengan sechara tiada langsung maka kanak² itu tiada boleh melarikan diri daripada menerima pelajaran agama maka ada-lah amat menguntongkan kepada kanak² itu.

Dalam masaalah hendak melaksanakan pelajaran agama ini, walau pun saya kata tiada ada apa² kesulitan tetapi harus-lah juga ada kelemahan²-nya ia-itu mengenai guru pelawat.

Guru Pelawat yang ada sekarang ini ha-nya di-untokkan kapada pelajaran darjah biasa sahaja, tidak ada pula disebutkan Guru Pelawat yang akan mengawasi pelajaran ugama, tetapi walau bagaimana pun saya rasa Jawatan-Kuasa itu telah pun ada perundingan dengan pihak Jawatan-Kuasa Ugama Negeri masing². Dan perkara itu saya percaya akan dapat di-jalankan dengan sa-berapa chepat-nya.

Dan lagi satu perkara yang saya tertarik hati sangat dalam Pindaan Penyata Pelajaran ini ia-itu ada suatu perkara berkenaan dengan pelajaran perdagangan dan menaip dalam Bab 361-362 dan ada di-beri peluang kapada kanak² berkenaan dengan pelajaran menyimpan kira² perniagaan. Jadi, saya rasa perubahan ini tiada ada dalam Dasar Pelajaran yang lalu dan ini ada-lah sangat menguntungkan.

Sa-kian-lah sahaja, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untok penutup-nya saya dengan sukachita-nya menyokong dengan sa-penoh-nya Penyata Jawatan-Kuasa Menyemak Dasar Pelajaran tahun 1956 itu.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew (Dato Kramat): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I notice there is a great reluctance on the Ministerial Bench to speak on this subject, and I understand that they are waiting for us to speak first, so we shall oblige them. Sir, I am afraid to speak after that great eloquent speech by the Member for Penang Utara. It fills me with apprehension, especially since he has now taken upon himself the privilege which I thought had been left to the Ministers—that is the ability to read his speech so well.

Of course, as you quite rightly pointed out, many parts of his speech were irrelevant, but that is perhaps to be expected, especially as I suspect his speech was not written by himself.

Mr. Speaker: You are not to impute improper motives.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: No, Sir, I am not implying improper motives, I imply improper application of ability.

Mr. Speaker: That is improper motive!

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Of course, there was another statement—a very

remarkable statement—also by the same Member, that he speaks for the Party that got into power by a vast majority, but I am sure he was speaking for the Party and not for himself, since he got in with only a majority of 700 votes.

Enche' Geh Chong Keat: Mr. Speaker, Sir, for his information, it is more than 700 votes!

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: About 900 votes, I presume. His delivery of that written speech did sound a bit hollow, because although he kept praising the Alliance in the Government, he kept reminding the Minister of Education of his promise to the Malayan Chinese Association. There was, we understand a special meeting of the Alliance on this Report. Of course, we are not aware of what happened behind the closed doors at that meeting, but no doubt the Minister of Education had to give a lot of assurance in order to bring this Report into Parliament and in order that it might, like the sailing ship of the Alliance, have a smooth sailing through this House (*Applause*).

I must however say, since we are asked to approve this Report in principle, that in principle this whole document is a hoax. This Report—I cannot impute improper motives to any particular person, but I suppose I might impute improper motives to a section, to a group—this Report is full of hypocrisy, is full of false statements. And we might then ask ourselves: "What is the truth?". The truth is as expressed by that "great" Honourable Member from Tanjong Utara, and it is that he was speaking as a Malayan Chinese

Enche' Geh Chong Keat: Correction, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am not the Member from Tanjong Utara, and I am surprised that a man from Penang did not know that!

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: I am sorry, Sir—from Penang Utara. Penang, of course, is an English word.

When he said "I, as a Malayan Chinese of Chinese descent," he had said that without ending with the other part—"who is educated in English"—and this is the whole crux of the

matter. He spoke as a Malayan Chinese of English education and he therefore stressed the supreme importance of English. His expression of the view of an English educated person. The stress in fact is on English and not on Malay as the Honourable mover of the motion tries to put it. And this was emphasised by none other than the equally great Assistant Minister of Information when he said, and I quote the headlines of a certain newspaper:

"Albar says 'English a must in schools' and he says that 'I myself lack an English education'"

a very honourable admission—

" . . . we do not love English . . . "

also a very honourable admission—

" . . . but the importance of the language must be acknowledged. If we need it for progress, we need English to learn to read and follow developments in technology and medicine."

The Honourable Assistant Minister of Information went on to state according to the paper that he was confident that Malay could be used—*could be used*—as a medium of instruction in the University today, but of course he did not say it will be used—merely that it could be used, but that it is not being used.

"English will give our students the wide scope of knowledge open to them in that language. This is not that we do not believe in Malay. We use English to obtain knowledge that it can offer us."

And that, in fact, is the tenor of this Report, although it is couched in very long phrases, although it is very carefully laid out, so that it might confuse a lot of people who cannot read properly; although it is hundreds of paragraphs long, one simple fact emerges from it, and this is the insincerity of this Report. Though it talks of the importance of Malay, it really intends to maintain English as the main language of this country. They keep saying: "We are going to have Malay". They keep saying: "We are going to develop our National Language". But this Report in fact says: "We will maintain English as the primary language and Malay in time to come as a language which will be second to English, though Malay will

be used it certainly will only occupy an inferior position."

Now, I might of course be asked why I say this Report is a hoax. First of all let us refer to this diagram of the Report itself the intended education system of Malaya, and we see that according to this diagram—at page 79—that no less than 70 per cent of our students from primary schools will go to post-primary schools. But it is not true that 70 per cent will go to post-primary schools. It appears from this Report that 70 per cent will go to post-primary schools, but since we do not know the number of post-primary schools that will be set up, since we do not know the amount required for the students to go through these schools, since we do not know the standard required for admission into these schools, this 70 per cent claim in the Report—is nothing but a hoax.

Now, it has of course been said that the support of this House ought to be given to this Report. Well, I ask this question: Ought the support of this House be given to the intent of this Report, or to the words of this Report? If it is to the words of this Report, of course it appears good. But if it is going to be the intent, then surely we have a right to question the sincerity of the Government in this Report. The intent, I say, does not correspond with the words. Because the intent supports English of course the first question that will naturally come to our mind is why should the Government not encourage Malay and why should it encourage English? The answer is very clear. In order to educate a person in any language, we must first of all have the textbooks in that language. Since we do not have enough textbooks in Malay, our students will have to read textbooks or books from outside Malaya, and if we really desire to educate the people in Malay in this country, what books are they to read? The answer is: books from Indonesia. Therefore the next question is: does the Government in fact want links with Indonesia? Since most of our Malay books will have to come from Indonesia. If they do not want this is an important question links with Indonesia, that is their privilege; but

for a lot of parents whose children are learning Malay, it will be a great disappointment to hear that there shall be no link with Indonesia. Now today, if they have read the papers carefully, they will find that

Mr. Speaker: Order, Order! The time is up. The meeting is suspended to half-past two this afternoon.

Sitting suspended at 1.00 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 2.30 p.m.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

REPORT OF THE EDUCATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

Debate resumed.

Question again proposed.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Mr. Speaker, Sir, as I was saying this morning, Malay education would require Malay textbooks and because we are either unable to produce the textbooks or because we are unwilling to do so, pupils who want to be educated in Malay will have to take textbooks in Malay from Indonesia. Therefore, the question of whether we are going to encourage education in Malay or not is linked with what is our attitude towards Indonesia. Indonesia and Malaya belong to the same cultural group. There have been attempts to bring about a common language between Indonesia and Malaya, and what has the Government done. The Government has postponed this issue. After coming under the inspiration of the Malay Language Congress, the Government at the end of last year set up a language committee to act as a link with Indonesia in order to decide on a national spelling and on a common language which, I believe, was to have been called Melindo. Our representatives, including Professor Zainal Abidin and Enche' Asraf of the Oxford University Press, flew to Indonesia. They came back and it was decided to set up a sub-committee on spelling and the Government was supposed to have elected this committee under the chairmanship, I believe, of Syed Nasir of the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka. Instead of which

our great chairman flew off to America, from whence he has since returned, but up to now no attempts have been made on the question of the unity of spelling. This, I think, does to some extent reflect on the sincerity or otherwise of the Government towards the development of our national language.

Of course, when you educate boys and girls in the Malay language they need secondary schools and after secondary schools they will want to go to universities. If they are educated in Malay in Malaya, which university could they go to? Is there a university in Malaya, is there a university in Singapore, which gives university education in Malay? I believe not. One of our interpreters now at the moment interpreting comes from the University of Malaya, from where she graduated not in Malay but only in Malay studies. But how many of them have done so? How many Malay scholars have been encouraged to study the Malay language? I think we can safely say there are not more than 30 up-to-date. So, it is natural that if we educate our children in the Malay secondary schools they have to go and finish their education probably in Indonesia, because Indonesia has universities using Malay as the medium of instruction.

Indonesia has pressed forward with Malay education. We know that in Indonesia a lecturer wishing to give lecture in a Indonesian university has to pass his Malay language examination and lecture in Malay within two years of his contract date. If that can be done in Indonesia, why cannot it be done here? Because, firstly, we have not got the teaching staff; secondly, we have not got the textbooks; thirdly, the Government has no real desire to set up this course; and fourthly, there is great fear that if the university that will be set up cannot absorb all these Malay educated boys, they will want to go to Indonesia, and, as I have said, the Government is hostile to Indonesia. They might say that is not so, but I disagree, because although we have been independent since 1957, and although our Honourable the Prime Minister has been talking of cultural

ties with South-East Asia, we keep on going to Philippines and by-passing Indonesia. Our government members go to Thailand, to Indochina, to Burma and they ask for cultural and economic unity, but the biggest Malay speaking area—Indonesia—with more than 90 million people is ignored. Why? Is it because Indonesia is a republic and we are not, or is it because Indonesia stands against feudalism and against capitalism whereas we encourage and foster them in Malaya? Of course the answer is obvious.

Education, as we have said in our policy statement, should be something to bring about unity between the various races in Malaya, to create a Malayan personality, to increase understanding and communication between the people, to make the people able to employ themselves more usefully in our society, to produce more efficient people to satisfy the needs of our nation in various fields of endeavour and, finally, to make them aware of their struggle for emancipation from their oppressors. And it is this last clause which I believe is lacking in our Education Report—to make the people aware that for years they have been suppressed and subjugated by people who have been living off the sweat of their brows and who have been keeping them in a semi-feudalistic state in order that they may produce more padi to give more wealth to the landlords. Education in itself can mean nothing if we are not sure of its aim, and this Education Report is not sure of its aim. Let us ask ourselves when we are going to support this Report—what has happened to the Razak Report? What has in fact happened to all the attempts to set up a national consciousness and a system which will fulfil the needs of the people. Today, as we have heard in this House, we are still broken up into pieces, each one trying to say: we want to build up a Malayan nation, but in fact we are different peoples. That is why the Honourable Member from Penang Utara's speech was not so wonderful after all, because he was conscious that he is a Chinese; he is conscious that he came from China. But he is not conscious

Enche' Geh Chong Keat: On a point of clarification, Sir, I never said that I came from China, but my forefathers, like his, came from China. (*Laughter*).

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: I withdraw that. I will quote his words: "I am a Malayan Chinese of Chinese descent." He was very proud of it and he made it a point. So, although the Razak Report came out in 1956, we still have people like him in this country.

I would like now to come to a more serious matter and it is on the question of our textbooks and our teachers. There can never be any success in any educational programme if we do not have textbooks and teachers. To set up an education programme without teachers and textbooks is like setting up an army and giving them beautiful uniforms and giving them pieces of wood for guns. How can they fight? They may have stripes on their shoulders, they may have a lot of medals, they may have a lot of brass, but if they have no guns, they cannot fight. It is the same with our Education Report. In language it is verbose, in declaration it is fine, but in intent and in content it is very much like a bundle of rubber that easily can be turned into any shape by any pressure and it will keep bouncing off the wall without causing any impression on the wall.

First of all we come to the textbooks. Now, under the inspiration, I suppose, of the Razak Report they set up the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka. What has happened to that wonderful Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka? I am told the other day that it has become a gathering of Syeds. I am not sure. (*Laughter*).

Mr. Speaker: I must warn you that you must not use insulting language.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: No, Sir, I was not intending to be insulting, but I was going to say further that there are these people, 70 of them in all, and they have existed for a number of years. But what have they produced? I believe a publication from Great Britain claimed that it has turned into a sponsor of essay competitions. I would have said that it is beginning to gather its inspiration from the addresses to the Women's Institute and

to Women's Corner, other than the Brains Trust where one of their officers—I believe the research officer, has been making himself heard very often. Well, what has he produced? I have here an example of the so-called books that he produces—"Malay as the National Language" by Syed Hussein bin Ali, Research Officer, Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, printed in 1959. In English it consists of 12 pages and the rest of it in Jawi. You don't need a research officer to write this kind of pamphlet. The Report is very proud of the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, because in section 279 it talks of the co-ordination of the programmes of the several Malay research agencies, but in what way is this pamphlet a research? Apart from this, what has the Dewan Bahasa done? I don't like to indulge in personalities, but I would like to ask the qualification of the officers there, for it has the sacred task of building up a new set of textbooks in the Malay language. Is the chairman qualified to hold a research post? Of course, there are rumours as to how he got to hold that post. Perhaps, the Ministerial bench can tell us since he was a member of the central executive of the U.M.N.O. before he became the chairman of that body. (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Proceed!

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Of course, we have also the research officer, whose name I shall not mention, but who perhaps is quite wellknown here and who is supposed to organise research. I myself have very anxiously waited for something to come out of what is supposed to be a qualified man in this sort of work and, as far as I am aware, apart from a few pamphlets such as this, nothing has come out and I understand that person is leaving the Dewan for some other country.

If the Government is sincere, is really intent, to see to it that we have proper textbooks, surely the first thing to do is to review the whole of the Dewan Bahasa set-up and see if we cannot find somebody more suitable. If we want to be kind to some of those people who are not qualified, we can be kind and give them jobs in some

other institution that is not so important. In the Dewan they number altogether over 70 and, as I have said, the only thing that comes out regularly that is on any standard at all is the monthly journal, which I am sure many of you have looked at. However, as for as the Textbook Section is concerned, I am afraid that all we hear from that place is gossip, gossip, gossip—people going round the whole of Kuala Lumpur spending their time in gossiping, talking about other people, and running other people down but doing no real work.

We have, I believe, the former Head of Malay Studies at the moment in charge of this Dewan, where he is one of the more fit persons to have organised this Research Section. But I understand, I may be wrong, that he is going to be put in the Arabic Section that is going to be set up. Why an Arabic Section in the Dewan Bahasa at this stage, I do not know. Our attempt now, especially in the Dewan Bahasa, ought to be concentrated on the production of textbooks not only for primary schools but also for secondary schools. It is said, of course, that nepotism exists in the Dewan, and that is one of the reasons why its work has been hampered—I do not know, but I think it is worth finding out, because there may be fire if there is smoke. I understand that a lot of people, who are unqualified, are able to find jobs there. If, as I have said, we want to be kind to this type of people, it is better for us to open a motor car agency for example and put them there as clerks.

Mr. Speaker: You have been repeating too much on that point. Will you confine yourself to the point in issue?

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: The point in issue, Sir, is whether the Government is sincere in attempting to set up or trying to set up a Language and Literature Agency for the production of textbooks for our secondary schools. As it happens, bowing to your ruling, I do not wish to touch on it, because it is a very hurtful thing; we know that a lot of people are sensitive about such remarks and the fact is that we do not have enough textbooks and

very little is being done to set the matter right.

The next thing about education is the question of teachers. Have we got enough teachers, or are we setting up enough teachers' institutions? According to the review, it appears as if we would be able to obtain about 30,000 teachers in about 1975; but my question is this: how many of those 30,000 will be fit to teach the National language? According to the Report, under the chapter on Teacher Training, we have quite a number of paragraphs dealing with the training of teachers, and let us look at them briefly. In section 257, on page 43, there is talk of three residential Teacher Training Colleges and twelve Day Training Centres turning out General Purpose Teachers for primary schools at an approximate maximum rate of 2,000 per annum. Is it not correct that at the moment most of these people are turned out as English language teachers with knowledge of Malay? Are they Malay language teachers with a knowledge of the English language? No. So, of these two thousand, the majority of them will know Malay, but their main medium of conversation, communication, would be in English. Then we have, in addition, approximately 1,000 non-standard teachers who are being trained by correspondence for Malay medium primary schools.

Now you will notice that, although we talk of 2,000 per annum at the first paragraph, in the second paragraph it is stated that there are 1,000 non-standard teachers being trained: 1,000 in three years, in five years, in ten years or is it per annum? On this point the Report is silent. So we presume that the rate is not 1,000 per year. All these little points disclose the lack of real intent to press on with the education of our National language.

According to sub-paragraph (c), page 44, there are Teacher Training Colleges at Penang and Brinsford Lodge in England, and our students have to fly by aeroplane there—chartered; they are taken back also sometimes in chartered planes. There on English soil they are supposed to learn Malay, but, again, the medium

of instruction and the main language is English. Then at sub-paragraph (d), there is talk of the Language Institute and the Kirkby College that turn out 270 Specialist Teachers of Languages for primary schools and for the lower forms of secondary schools. Now the Language Institute is the Institute in Pantai Valley and we have all seen it. We see it on our way to Klang and back. It is a beautiful building, one of the most magnificent buildings in Malaya, and as I have said, the contents in its car parking space is more valuable than the contents that you will find in its library. That Institute is supposed to be our foremost language institute and it is supposed to train and bring out teachers. Linking it with Kirkby, it would appear that we get about 270 teachers; but not all the 270 are trained in the same way, because Kirkby is in Great Britain and the Language Institute is in Malaya. The Language Institute takes in approximately 180 students a year—60 from Chinese schools, 60 from English schools and 60 from Malay schools. However, I would like to ask this question: after their training what happens to them? The answer is that they are sent out to primary schools and lower secondary schools. I understand that even the best of them are not kept back to train other teachers; the best of them are not kept back to learn the language to become more proficient; they are sent out to non-Malay schools; and I also understand at the moment that the best Malay teachers are in our best English schools. Therefore, it is very clear, even from this, that the emphasis is on English as the language of primary importance, and the Malay language is of secondary importance. I must make it clear that I am not speaking against the English language, but I am advocating the development of the Malay language. I am not saying that English ought not to be taught in schools; I am not saying that English should only be taught to the minimum degree in schools. What I am saying is that, if we proceed according to this Report, in the end English will become the National language and Malay will only become the secondary language.

I realise, of course, that we have not got Universities where our boys can go for training in Malay in Malaya; I realise also that the majority of the people cannot afford to go to Universities; I realise further that the majority of us, who want education in a University, will have to go either to an English University, or an Australian University. I realise also the utility and the need of the English language as a language of the world of commerce. I realise all those things, but I cannot accept that English should usurp the function and the place of our National language.

Lastly, I come to sub-paragraph (e) which reads:

"Teachers for the upper forms of secondary schools and lecturers for training colleges are recruited from University graduates with a diploma in education: the supply at present is very inadequate and the present shortage in assisted schools is about 1,000, only 48 being actually in service."

That is an appalling admission of this Report. In fact, we have not got the facilities—we have not got the facilities for training and we have not got the teachers with which to train these boys.

Now, I have to touch on the more controversial subject—the question of the so-called vernacular schools. Some people have argued that you cannot destroy Chinese culture; some people have argued that you cannot have Chinese culture; and some people have argued that if you want to have a culture in Malaya, it must be a Malayan culture and that Malayan culture exists; and some people argue that there is no Malayan culture, as my Honourable friend the Member for Ipoh—of course, he is entitled to his view, but as you know, I have a different opinion. I believe that culture is as you find it. In other words, we live in Southeast Asia within a Malaysian context. We have a culture that is polyglot, that is mixed. I cannot say that all of us here have our pure cultures. Many of us, when we refer to culture, think of the time of *Hang Tuah*, but how many of us have that kind of culture today? It is all mixed, because cultures are living things and intertwine with each other. I cannot say that all my manners and

behaviour are purely Chinese; I cannot say that I am a Malayan of Chinese descent and that therefore I am a Chinese, because to be a Chinese today in every respect is not to be a Confucianist, but to be a Marxist. Also there are many Chinese in Formosa—and are we going to follow the Formosan Chinese? There are old Chinese traditions which are carried on in Malacca and to a lesser extent in China, which do not exist any more today. We all know, for example, that French Canada has a lot of French people who conform to what they believe is French custom; but when the French go to French Canada, they say that these people are old-fashioned, that they live in the sixteenth century and they do not live in the twentieth century.

Now, I think, the whole point in our educational policy is how to merge our education together, how to bring everything together, how to make sure that out of all these a new national consciousness is going to be created, how a new person educated in our future schools is going to be turned out, how the culture will evolve influence in Malaya in the future.

When we talk of education, we do not mean the education of ourselves, because many of us are perhaps not quite fit and cannot be redeemed. (*Laughter*). I mean that the various expressions in this House this morning have made that very clear—you can do what you like, but these people consider that they are Chinese of Chinese descent. We are considering people of the future—our children and our grandchildren. What kind of product are we going to have that will be fit to be used in Malaya? Here we will have to disagree unfortunately with the Report, because although in expression it is good, although it is quite true that the Razak Report did ask for a deadline for Malayisation, or shall we say Malayisation, for national-type schools by a certain date, in fact this cannot be achieved, because we do not have these school teachers. It is appalling to find boys in Chinese schools learning Malay from a Malay teacher who himself is not educated in his own mother tongue, and it is also very appalling

to find them instead of saying "saya" and "apa", saying "sayë" and "apë"; and using all those local accents that vary all the way from Kelantan down to Johore. It is also appalling when you know that they cannot pronounce the letter "r" so that "rambutan" sometimes becomes "lambutan". That is due to the appalling lack of educational and training facilities in our schools today.

Let us put the problem in another way. In spite of the Razak Report, in spite of this Education Report, the problem will come in future when, if you ask these people to sit for an examination either in Malay or English, they will take their examination in English, because we have more teachers and more teaching facilities in English than in Malay. Therefore, if you insist on this Report, what we are trying to do will be to encourage the continuation of the English language at the expense of all other languages. This Report is not, as many people seem to think, an encouragement of our National language. By this Report the student is given this choice in schools: "In three years you have to take your examination and you have to do it in the official languages—it is either Malay or English;"—but the teacher, in all fairness, should add these words—"But I must tell you, if you do your language in Malay, you will have no secondary school to go to, you will have no University to go to, and probably if you go to Indonesia you will not be welcome back to Malaya; but if you do it in English, we have our Malayan Universities, both the Kuala Lumpur Division and the Singapore Division, or you can go to"—like the Honourable the Minister of the Interior said yesterday—"the Cambridge University, mix up with boys with bowler-hats and so on; or you may"—like the Minister's children—"perhaps go to an Australian school to educate yourself; but if you do Malay, you will not go to a University; you will not be able to become a Doctor. So take your choice." And how would the student choose? I would say English at any time. Therefore, to insist on carrying out the policy of this Report would mean in

the end that we are insisting on the English language.

Now, would it not be more sensible if we approach the problem in this way? We have three streams—a Malay stream, an English stream and a Chinese stream—and in the primary schools a Tamil stream. I would tell you that the Tamil stream is not really a very great problem in the sense that in 1957 the figures for Tamil schools showed that of 48,546 students studying, only 1,059 reached Standard VI, consisting of 464 11-year-olds and 575 12-year-olds; and there is no, that is in 1957, higher education in Tamil. Perhaps you would like to know the source of this quotation. It comes from our Policy Statement which has taken the facts from the Annual Report 1957. We have our educational policy which is in the policy statement of the Socialist Front. (*Laughter*). Sometimes when I read the Education Report and our policy statement, I cannot help feeling a sneakish pride that in many instances, like equal pay for all teachers, the Government has in fact been inspired by our policy statement.

Would it not, as I was saying, be better if we have a Malay stream, and allow the Malay stream to have another language. In other words, let us not put the Malay boys at a disadvantage: they shall do their Malay in the Malay schools, but they shall learn a second language, and they can choose if they want their second language as English; they can do so, if they want their second language to be Chinese, choose Chinese as well. And all English schools and all Chinese schools and other schools shall have the same standard of Malay. In other words, boys in English schools can and will be made to study Malay; boys in Chinese and other schools too can and will be made to study Malay; but we may insist that the language examination in Malay in all schools shall be official and shall be of the same standard, so that in time to come we can start off with official examinations in the Malay language only, provided we have sufficient textbooks and teachers. Then, when the Dewan Bahasa decides to sit up and do some

work, we may produce Malayan History textbooks in Malay, in which case Malayan History of all the schools in Malaya shall be examined in the Malay language. Then we can come to geography, and so on, subject by subject in part and finally perhaps in the whole, until all students in Malaya no matter from what schools they come shall know two languages: the language which is our National Language, and another language of their choice. Surely, that is not so difficult of implementation. It is no use insisting that the boys should do their official examinations either in English or Malay when we know very well there are no textbooks in Malay, and they cannot study in Malay. We know very well what indeed will happen if everybody in Malaya shall be compelled to study English, with English as the medium of instruction: to produce little Malayan Lord Fauntleroy's! If we are anxious to maintain our identity as an Asian country within an Asian context, then we must make English only as a secondary language, not as a main language, so that our boys can go, if they like, to English universities and graduate.

Mr. Speaker: You must keep from repeating too many times!

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: I am sorry, Sir. Perhaps sometimes repetition is necessary, especially when we are coming to such a controversial subject, and where our approach is so different.

Mr. Speaker: You are not trying to argue with me, are you?

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: No, Sir.

Of course I understand some people say that the Socialist Front is unable to have a programme, or that, surely, the Educational Review Committee Report is the same as our policy statement. Well, in intent it is not so. But I can do no better in the criticism of this Report than to read out certain paragraphs or to cite certain paragraphs of our own Policy Statement. We ask, for example, for more vocational, trade and agricultural schools in order to produce a more balanced ratio of skilled and unskilled workers to fulfil the needs of the nation in its various

fields of endeavour. We ask that because we say that a blind educational programme which is not related to the needs of our national development would only bring about a surplus and wastage of manpower. Comparative figures in 1957 show an alarming paucity of trade and vocational schools in comparison with other schools. Thus, we say—and this is not in the Report—that there were only 731 students in our technical and trade schools in comparison with 428,368 Malay, 391,667 Chinese and 48,546 Indians in other schools, and we find that this becomes even worse when we realise that the majority of the Malay boys in Malay schools are only given the minimum amount of education. This Education Review Report say that these students can go to the Pelajaran Lanjutan; and it says, that the boys will be taught handicrafts and the girls will be taught housecrafts—that is in paragraph 94. In other words, we are going to have, if the Report is correct, 70% of the people coming out of the schools stitching baskets, making little shoes, making little toys, making little guns, for 30% of the boys and girls that go to secondary schools. But there is no planned programme of proper technical and trade schools which we say is necessary. What is going to happen to the boys from the post-primary schools or the Pelajaran Lanjutan? What is going to happen to them? Why does not the Government come straight out—as we have said in our Policy Statement—and say that we have to give all these boys technical education and education in trades according to the needs of the country. For example, if you are going to have so many rubber factories and shoe factories requiring so many hundreds of thousands of students for shoe-making, then all these boys should learn shoe-making—such a proportion shall learn as will be necessary for the requirements of that trade. Of course people will say—as usual, because, perhaps, we do not repeat ourselves often enough—that we are contradictory and contradict each other when in fact we do not. We ask that there shall be a universal educational system to

allow the graduates of all our schools to compete with one another on the basis of cultural and national unity. In other words, we want our boys, no matter from Chinese schools or not to compete with boys and graduates from English schools, and in order to do that, we must make certain that in their National Language they shall be fully trained.

Then, of course, there are two other points which I would like to mention. There is nothing in this Report dealing with Mass Education. Consequently, many people are under the impression that if a person is a Malay in a kampong and can speak Malay, therefore he is educated. But that is far from the truth. We must have a Mass Education programme all round Malaya to bring literacy to the kampongs, because many people in the kampongs, although they can speak Malay, cannot read or write, and are therefore illiterate. We must also have a Mass Education programme for the non-Malays to educate them in Malay so that they will be able to communicate with one another. Where is there in this Report any attempt to deal with this point?

It is also stated in our Socialist Front programme that Malay secondary schools using Malay as the medium shall be set up immediately—under trees if necessary—because we do not think that there is a shortage of funds, and that if there is a shortage of institutions, if there is a shortage of buildings, that the boys must suffer and wait and grow beards until the Government finds money to build schools. It is of course realised that the Education Report at this point is stressing the need to have English at the cost of the other languages known in Asia. I am not talking of the Chinese language or the Indian language, but I am dealing with this problem from the Malaysian point of view.

We say this: that there must be education in the National Language in all our schools to the same standard, but not English at the sacrifice of Chinese, not English at the sacrifice of Malay, not English at the sacrifice of the Indian language.

Last but not least—perhaps the P.M.I.P. will agree with me in this—there are many schools in Malaya which educate pupils in Arabic, and I think the Assistant Minister for Information will confirm this. Now, if we say that these Arabic school students will have to study English to pass their examinations, what is going to happen to these schools and to their pupils. We know well that they suffer enough through the shortage of teachers and educational facilities. They go to little *pondoks* where they learn their Arabic and Koran, but they do not know English and to insist that they conform to the national standards would mean that they will have to study English. If the Government thinks that these schools should close, then say so—close the schools, but do not kill them indirectly in this way.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would now like to ask the Honourable Members of this House not only to read the words of this Report, not only to try to understand its very complex grammar, not only to look through and study its syntax, but to ask themselves what in effect will happen if they approve this Report and if this Report is carried out. We have emerged from a colonial era and many people are right—and justly right—in insisting on a common National Language, but we must also remember that if we do not conform to their wishes we are only continuing a structure which we have fought so hard to get rid of. We must also remember that standing up and praising the Government, as the Honourable Member from Penang Utara did—because he cannot do otherwise—in the hope of extracting a promise in public, as he tried to do when he said “we all know that the Honourable Minister of Education has promised that he will do X, and Y, and that we are sure that he will keep his promise,” is in fact taking too sycophantic and weak-kneed a stand.

Dr. Lim Swee Aun (Larut Selatan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Education Review Committee is to be congratulated on the amount of hard work and ingenuity it has put in in preparing this Report. The Alliance Government also deserves

commendation for having kept faith with the people with the promise to preserve and sustain the four main languages and cultures of Malaya. The Committee is of the considered opinion that the 1956 Education Report is in the main suited for the present needs of this country. The Honourable Minister of Education in his radio broadcast very aptly described this Report as a valuable document that is going to affect the lives and pockets of everyone of us. On pages 64 and 65 a summary of the estimated recurrent cost of implementing the recommendations of the Education Review Committee and the capital cost year by year is given. Now, if we add the net estimated recurrent cost with the capital cost for the corresponding year, in 1962, education will cost us \$338 million; in 1967, \$598 million; in 1972, \$498 million; in 1977, \$625 million; and in 1982, \$817 million. For education in 1960 this House has approved \$175 million, which means that the cost of education will, roughly, be doubled in 1962, four times in 1967 and about five times in 1982. The total amount of income this Government expects to get in 1960 is only \$875 million. Therefore, this estimated cost should be a sobering thought to all of us. Education is not the only service that requires expansion. We have heard in this House on many occasions that the Cinderella service—the Medical Service—is in great need of priority, and if both these services expand at the rate that they should, that means we should find more and more money. No wonder the Honourable Minister of Education was very cautious when he said that the Government accepted the principles of this Report but stipulated that putting all the recommendations into effect would depend on how much money this Parliament was prepared to vote for education from year to year. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not think that it is a question of how much money this Parliament is willing to vote for education, but rather, can we find that money?

The two outstanding recommendations, both to start in 1962, in their order of priority are the raising of

school leaving age to 15 years and universal free primary education. These two recommendations have been debated in full in this House; everybody supports them, and so do I.

As far as universal free primary education is concerned, I am rather perturbed to read paragraph 123, which states:

"We would like to emphasize that our recommendation embraces all these proposals taken together and that we would not advocate universal free primary education except in conjunction with the rates of fees and exemptions which we have proposed in fully-assisted post-primary and in fully-assisted secondary schools."

In other words, it means that before Government can implement universal free primary education it must find enough money: (a) to pay for the actual cost of primary education of all schools, plus (b) the amount of money required for the exemption of fees in certain fully-assisted post-primary and secondary schools. In the light of the high cost of education, and bearing in mind that 70 per cent of all children finishing primary school education will go to the post-primary schools, these exemptions in fees will be very considerable and would far exceed the money earned through the increase of fees in secondary schools. I am not against free primary education. In fact, I support the ideal that all education, primary and secondary, should be free if we can afford to pay for it. Therefore, when this recommendation has this second part attached to it, Government can find itself in an awkward position, in that though it has enough money to pay for free primary education, it may not be able to implement this recommendation because it has not got enough money to pay for the exemptions required. In that case a major step forward in this education policy would not be put into effect.

Even if we have the money, without qualified teachers the education policy cannot be fully implemented. We have heard that again and again in this House, but I would like to point out certain parts of this Report. In paragraph 130 it says: "... the shortage of suitably qualified teachers will not be completely surmounted even in

twenty years". That is what this Committee has discovered through its research. Now, as long ago as 1956 it has been stated in the Education Report that

"The ultimate objective of educational policy in this country must be to bring together the children of all races under a national educational system in which the national language is the main medium of instruction, though we recognise that progress towards this goal cannot be rushed and must be gradual".

I am happy to note that no political party, even in the Opposition, has categorically stated that they do not support this ultimate policy. Every Federal citizen should support it. This Committee in reviewing what has happened in working towards this ultimate objective has, in paragraph 28, stated that the first priority is to send as many trained teachers as possible to the Malay primary schools which are not staffed with trained teachers so as to bring up their standard to become National type schools, and to this end two out of every three primary teachers trained under the new training arrangements are now being posted to these schools. In paragraph 29 the Committee noted that there is a heavy demand for trained teachers of the National Language in non-Malay schools in which Malay is a compulsory subject. In paragraph 30, it goes on further to say, "that priority is rightly being accorded, and taking into account the limitations of the rate at which teachers can be adequately trained, we note that it has not yet been possible to provide appropriately trained teachers to start converting former Government primary schools into Standard, or National, schools." And in paragraph 130, it says: "There are in fact, as yet, no standard or standard-type primary schools in the true sense of the 1956 Report". With these facts unearthed by the Review Committee, they have rightly recommended that partially assisted primary schools must continue to receive financial assistance so that they will not make an unsatisfactory state of affairs worse.

Perhaps the most controversial recommendation in this Report is that

all partially assisted secondary schools must by the end of 1961 conform to the statutory requirements so that they become National or National type secondary schools, or become independent. As I have said, so far in the debate no Honourable Member of the Opposition has categorically stated that he does not support that the ultimate objective of the educational policy in this country must be to bring together the children of all races under a national educational system. Sir, this recommendation means that by the end of 1961 these 41 partially assisted schools in the secondary level must be staffed by trained teachers either in the English or the Malay medium so as to be able to prepare their students to take the public examinations in English or Malay, and that is one of the causes as listed by the Committee why they are not conforming. Now the all important question is whether or not it is possible for the Ministry of Education to find adequate teachers to take over these 41 schools, because this Committee has recommended that they must. The Ministry of Education must post qualified trained teachers to these schools so as to facilitate this conversion. I should, therefore, be very happy if the Minister of Education would tell us whether by 1961 it is possible. However, I would like to draw the attention of this House to the big problems which he has to face. In paragraph 257, sub-paragraph (c), on the present teacher training arrangements, it is stated that only 300 General Purpose Teachers for the lower forms of secondary schools are produced a year, and sub-paragraph (d) states that only about 270 Specialist Teachers of Languages for primary schools and for the lower forms of secondary schools are produced a year. Where university graduates are concerned there is hardly a trickle. In fact the position is so bad that there are only 480 of them in service, but there is a shortage of 1,000. These figures mean that there will be only 300 qualified teachers every year for General Purposes and 270 specialist teachers for both primary and secondary schools. Now, assuming that half of these go to primary schools, it

means that 135 of these specialist teachers will go to secondary schools. So, adding the two together we have 435 qualified teachers who will be available at the end of 1961 to be transferred to secondary schools.

Now, if we look at page 82, Appendix 4, Table 19, Teachers for Secondary Academic Schools, it says that in 1962 the estimated shortage of teachers is 2,320—in spite of all these 435 teachers that are graduate teachers that come out from these Colleges, 2,320 will be still short for all the Government secondary schools. Now, every year in spite of these teachers coming out, they are being posted to existing secondary schools which are already conforming schools, and these conforming schools are still short. Therefore, I hope the Honourable the Minister of Education would enlighten me as to how and from where he is going to find these teachers to man these 41 partially-assisted secondary schools, if they all decide to conform. On the other hand, the Boards of Governors of these 41 schools may not conform because of reasons beyond their control. The school children in these schools, when they have passed the secondary entrance examination and being pupils of partially-assisted secondary schools, have a right to demand for admission into the national-type or national secondary schools, in which case Government should be in a position to absorb these children from these partially-assisted schools which do not wish to conform or who cannot conform. Therefore, in implementing this recommendation, the future 45,000 school children, that is 20% of the 220,000 school children in secondary schools, will be jeopardised, unless the Honourable the Minister of Education has plans ready so that by 1961 these teachers can be found and the studies of these students will not be affected.

Throughout the Report, there is an underlying reminder that there is a shortage of teachers; and though the Committee has thought of many ways on how to improve the rate of production of teachers, I am rather surprised that this Committee has not thought it

fit to recommend equal pay to women teachers, who have worked so hard in the classroom as well as in the production of trained teachers.

One recommendation, that graduates from Universities should be recruited direct into the teaching profession immediately after they have obtained their degrees, the Diploma in Education being an obligatory qualification to be obtained during full-pay study leave to be granted thereafter, should attract many graduates into the teaching profession. But with the present trend in secondary schools to divide classes into Arts stream and Science stream in Forms IV and V and also the formation of Form VI, specialist teachers are becoming fewer and fewer and the need for them is becoming bigger and bigger. The reason, as I see it, is that these Honours graduates, being Education Officers, start off as specialist teachers in their classes, but because of the system of promotion they have to leave the classes to become Headmasters, Chief Education Officers and what-have-you, wasting their talents behind desks writing minutes, instead of being suitably and usefully employed in the classroom teaching students. I therefore hope that, though this is a detail and not a principle, in the unified scheme of teachers, a specialist scheme should be included where Honours graduates, who are specialists, can remain specialists and be active teaching specialists throughout their whole professional career, similar to the specialists in the Medical Service. As specialists are such rare specimen, we must try to conserve them. There is this trend in all secondary schools of standing to divide the Form IVs into Arts and Science streams. In the Science stream Chemistry, Physics, Biology and Mathematics are taught as specialist subjects, and they must be taught by specialists otherwise they would not attain the right standard.

Now, in any town, taking Taiping for example, where there are four major secondary schools—King Edward and St. George's—two boys'—and two girls' schools, the practice is for these schools to divide the Fourth Form into Arts and Science. This will

mean that each school must find specialists for each type, thus making it necessary for a small town like Taiping to have four specialists for Biology, four specialists for Physics, four specialists for Chemistry, four specialists for Mathematics, four specialists for History, four specialists for Geography, and four for the other subjects. Now, for each school to justify the formation of one class, there must be at least 40 students, and invariably it is the practice in a two-stream school to divide the 80 boys into two groups of 40; the first 40 to do Science and the second 40 to do Arts. Invariably there are misfits, because it does not mean that the boys at the top of the class must do Science and those at the bottom of the class must do English or Art subjects. Because of the necessity to have minimum numbers in the classes, there are a lot of misfits in these Science and Arts streams; and besides, the multiplication of teachers makes it harder to find suitable specialist teachers who, as the Report says, are very hard to get. I would, therefore, suggest to the Minister to explore the possibility of starting co-education schools at the Form IV level. At present these schools only exist at the Form VI level. I suggest that this Form VI level should be brought down to Form IV level, so that in small towns boys and girls, who wish to do Science or Arts, can go to a central place, where all doing Arts will go to one particular school and all doing Science will go to another particular school. By this method there will be no misfits and there will be a saving in specialist teachers.

Among other matters considered by the Committee, age limits in schools were dealt with. On page 87 are the rules recommended for age limits in primary schools. I feel that these rules are rather rigid and inflexible. Of course, the Committee has very good reasons why they should be so, but I am thinking of the case of the child who is intelligent but who, through no fault of his, is held back owing to illness. Take, for example, the child in a kampong, who is held back by chronic malaria or amoebic dysentery,

or the child in a town who is held up on account of tuberculosis or even a major fracture sustained from a motor accident. This can happen at the most awkward times, and before the child is fit to go back to his school he has probably lost six months in a year. Sir, I would like to know from the Honourable the Minister whether these rules do give exemptions for such type of students.

I am also happy with paragraph 358 where the Committee has made a stand in the education of English when they state, "We regard it as important that there shall be no lowering of standards in the learning and teaching of English" . . . "This high standard must be maintained at the same time as the knowledge of English is being extended throughout the entire school population." I am glad that all Opposition Parties so far have accepted that we should have English in our schools.

I am also happy to note that the Honourable Member for Bachok has been very generous in supporting that moral education should be taught in school hours, even to non-Muslim students, and it would indeed be very useful if the Honourable the Minister of Education would include the teaching of moral education in the standard syllabuses of secondary schools.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, except for these comments which are mostly financial, and also whether or not you can find the teachers, I fully support the motion. (*Applause*).

Enche' Ahmad bin Arshad (Muar Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya adalah menyokong dan mengalu²kan Penyata Jawatan-Kuasa Menyemak Dasar Pelajaran tahun 1956 ia-lah dengan tujuan membentok satu system pelajaran kebangsaan yang mana kita ra'ayat negeri ini hendak mewujudkan satu bahasa yang tunggal. Sementara itu, saya menguchapkan tahniah berhubung dengan dasar pelajaran Penyata Razak yang dapat menyelamatkan pelajaran negeri ini daripada dasar pelajaran yang di-beri oleh penjajah yang mana menjadi ra'ayat negeri ini sa-bagai

alat-nya. Sejak 3 tahun Penyata Razak dapat di-jalankan yang mana telah membuat beberapa perubahan yang besar dari apa segi pelajaran sama ada bangunan-nya dan lain² lagi. Dan penuntut² daripada lanjutan Penyata Pelajaran Razak ini mereka akan bertanggung-jawab kepada negara-nya pada masa hadapan.

Menurut apa kechaman yang telah di-berikan oleh Yang Berhormat Ahli dari Bachok pada hari semalam dan juga pada pagi ini atas kegagalan dalam beberapa segi perhubungan dengan Penyata Razak ini. Gemar saya memberikan satu kesimpulan bagi kemajuan Penyata Razak ini ia-itu Penyata Razak ada lebeh baik dan banyak menafa'at-nya daripada Kerajaan PAS yang telah memerintah di-pantai timur sejak sa-tahun yang lalu yang tidak memberi apa² janji kepada ra'ayat negeri itu.

Mr. Speaker: Saya suka hendak mengingatkan bahawa dalam Standing Order ini ada menyebutkan tak boleh berchakap atas saksi terhadap sa-suatu puak dan jangan-lah berchakap perkara yang boleh memberi jangka yang tak baik. Itu hendak-lah jaga sedikit.

Proceed!

Enche' Ahmad bin Arshad: Terima kasih, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Daripada beberapa perkara dalam Penyata Razak itu patut di-perbaiki dari semasa ka-semasa, maka baharu² ini telah dapat di-bentangkan kepada ra'ayat negeri ini sa-bagaimana penyata yang ada di-hadapan kita. Saya juga mengucapkan tahniah kepada Ahli² Jawatan-Kuasa yang baharu terdiri daripada 3 parti ia-itu UMNO, MCA dan MIC yang mewakili sa-bahagian besar daripada ra'ayat negeri ini, dan saya menguchapkan terima kasih kepada pehak MCA yang dapat mententeramkan perasaan ra'ayat China yang menjadi warga negara Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini—pada-nya menggemarkan menerima penyata yang baharu di-bentangkan pada ra'ayat negeri ini.

Sementara itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, gemar saya menarik perhatian secharam dalam penyata yang ada di-hadapan kita ini untuk bersama² kita

mengambil perhatian, terutama sekali kepada pehak Kementerian Pelajaran. Berchakap pada tentang bantuan Sekolah Menengah pelajaran perchuma untok murid² masok Sekolah Menengah yang hanya dapat di-untokkan 10 peratus sahaja, saya mengharapkan sepatut-nya di-perbesarkan lagi peratus-nya itu, kerana dengan keluasan yang sa-umpama itu yang menyebabkan ramai daripada anak² keluarga yang miskin khas-nya orang² Melayu yang tidak dapat meneruskan pelajaran-nya natijah-nya kelak akan mengurangkan anak² kita bangsa Melayu menjadi penuntut di-University.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berchakap dalam pelajaran agama, saya juga berbesar hati dengan dapat dalam penyata itu kerana di-masa hadapan akan memberi pelajaran agama kepada anak² Islam yang pada masa dahulu kalau di-sekolah Inggeris mereka tidak dapat menerima pelajaran agama itu. Saya juga telah dapat membacha dalam akhbar² ia-itu banyak daripada penuntut itu mereka tak suka mendengar bachean Kor'an dan tidak menghormati orang² tua. Mudah²an pelajaran agama ini di-berikan kepada Sekolah Jenis Umum ia-itu Jenis Kebangsaan (Inggeris) yang akan dapat mengatasi hal² itu.

Sementara itu dalam penyata ini menerangkan ia-itu akan memberikan pelajaran agama hanya 2 jam sahaja dalam sa-minggu. Saya berpendapat bahawa dengan 2 jam itu ada-lah pelajaran agama di-berikan dengan chara sambilan sahaja. Saya kkuatir dengan pelajaran yang bagitu singkat tidak akan memberikan kesan kepada jiwa anak² kepada didekan agama Islam. Saya mengharapkan bagi pehak Jawatan-Kuasa ini di-satu masa kelak akan dapat menerima masa-nya itu hingga 3 jam dalam sa-minggu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka juga mengharapkan bahawa pelajaran agama itu dapat di-jalankan dengan tidak mengganggu perkembangan pelajaran agama di-sekolah² Kerajaan di-sebelah petang sa-bagaimana yang telah di-jalankan saperti di-negeri Trengganu, Pahang, Selangor, Kedah dan Negeri Johor. Sekolah² agama ini menggunakan Sekolah Melayu pada

masa dahulu-nya dan sekarang di-katakan Sekolah Kebangsaan. Saya memberi ingatan hendak-nya jangan-lah di-berikan satu pemerintah pada masa yang akan datang ia-itu Sekolah² Agama Kerajaan itu tidak boleh membina bangunan sekolah itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berchakap berkenaan dengan Pelajaran Akhlak dalam Penyata ini. Saya gemar menarik perhatian ia-itu dalam Penyata ini menyebutkan guru² hendak-lah menggalakkan dasar perangai yang baik sama ada dalam sekolah mahu pun di-luar sekolah. Saya berpendapat ada-lah lebih baik Penyata ini dapat menentukan satu ragaman pakaian yang sempurna yang patut di-pakai oleh guru² itu sama ada laki² mahu pun perempuan. Jadi kurang-lah molek akhlak guru² itu sa-kira-nya guru² perempuan yang mengajar di-sekolah² itu dengan memakai kain batek ikat balero, memakai baju jarang atau memakai baju bandong yang sempit lagi ketat, dan bagi guru² laki² pula tentu-lah tidak molek pergi mengajar dengan memakai seluar yankee. Kalau dapat guru² perempuan yang akan datang ini hendak-lah di-adakan satu ragaman pakaian yang sesuai bagi mereka itu sa-bagai pendidik, sa-kurang²-nya kalau dapat seperti pakaian dua orang Ahli Yang Berhormat di-sabelah saya ini dan di-saberang sana itu (*Tepok*). Sebab-nya saya menyebut berkenaan dengan pakaian itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-lah ada hubungan-nya dengan akhlak, kerana pakaian guru² itu akan menjalar ka-dalam jiwa murid² seperti kata bidalan Melayu, "Seperti ketam menyuroh anak-nya berjalan betul" erti-nya pakaian yang sa-umpama ini merosakkan kebudayaan dan kesopanan orang Melayu yang akan terjadi di-masharakat orang Melayu di-sebabkan chegu²-nya memakai seperti itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka berchakap sedikit lagi berkenaan dengan Sekolah Kesenian. Hal ini akan di-timbangkan oleh Jawatan-Kuasa Penyata ini. Saya berpendapat hendak-lah menimbangkan kebudayaan Malayan yang sempurna dan sa-benar-nya, maka patut-lah di-adakan sekolah kesenian yang bertanggung-jawab berkenaan dengan kesenian tempatan

saperti lukisan dan lain². Saya suka menarik perhatian supaya sekolah yang tersebut itu di-masokkan satu mata pelajaran ia-itu pelajaran panchak silat supaya menghidup dan mengekalkan kesenian orang Melayu.

Sa-takat ini-lah sahaja pendapat saya di-atas Penyata ini.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam (Menglembu): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I feel proud to be able to stand here today and to be able conscientiously to oppose this Report which is before this House and to call for the rejection of the policies embodied in it. There was an Honourable Member of the House this morning who appeared to doubt the right of an Indian—as he called the Honourable Member for Ipoh, or, if he were to be more correct, a Ceylonese—to speak for the rights of Chinese education in this country. The answer to that is very simple: We are a non-communal party, the Chinese people of this country do not look at the colour of the man who represents them; the Chinese people of at least five constituencies in Perak voted for the People's Progressive Party knowing full well that the Members for Ipoh and for Menglembu were both not of the same race. They placed their faith in us, and we shall not and will never betray those who trusted us.

I think the Honourable Member for Larut Utara made that remark. He, more than anybody else, should be well aware of the fact that the People's Progressive Party has got a very, very substantial measure of support from those whom we purport to represent in this House. He is a resident of the Batu Gajah constituency, he knows full well, or must have known full well, that this Party and its policies were not acceptable to the people of Batu Gajah Constituency, and he, though a resident of the Batu Gajah Constituency, sought election from another Constituency, whereas our Party now represent the Batu Gajah Constituency in this House—and I am sure he knows why that is so.

There is one matter I would first like to invite the attention of this

House too and that is the composition of the members of this Committee, and if my Honourable friend had looked at the composition of the members of this Committee, he would be the last person to say that one who is not a Chinese should not speak for Chinese education, because the composition of the members of this Committee shows that of a total of nine, there were only three Chinese. I am not complaining of that—it could even have been composed entirely of Malays, there would have been no harm in it. The Alliance say: “We are non-communal!” Why then bring up this talk: “You are an Indian, why should you bring up the question of Chinese education?” That is the last thing one expects of a Member of the Alliance, and one hopes that it will not be said again.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is not my purpose to examine this Report in detail. It is true that in this Report there are one or two things which are acceptable to all reasonable people: free education, raising of age limit and so on. But, then, what we are asked by this motion before the House today is to accept the policy laid down in this Report: accept the policy as a whole—and that is what we are not prepared to do. Bits here, and bits there: yes, but, say, take it as a whole, we say: No, we can't do it, because it is like giving a person an apple with poison in it and saying: “Part of it is poisoned, the other part is good, but you must either take the whole apple, or else reject the whole apple.” Naturally, although part of it is good, since to take the good we must also take the part of the Report which is poisoned, we have no alternative but to reject the whole.

Mr. Speaker, from the time this Committee was formed, we of the People's Progressive Party have had no doubts as to what the outcome would be, because a glance at the composition of this Committee would show that many of them had already expressed their views on the matter on which they were going to consider; many of them were personally concerned with the administration of

education in this country, and it is those who have prevailed—approved a policy—those who were deeply concerned in implementing it, they were the persons who were appointed by the Government to review the policy, and it has required very little powers of deduction to come to the conclusion that they were going to approve the whole Report and to do something on the same lines. There had been outcry for a considerable time in this country from certain sections of the community who declared that they were not satisfied with the policy as laid down in the Razak Report, and we had already heard Honourable Members who sat on this Committee reject those claims long before they were ever appointed on the Committee—they had already made statements rejecting those objections. And, of course, once they were formally in the Committee, we all knew what sort of Report they were going to draw up. If the Government was really interested in ascertaining what would be a fair policy for this country, what they would have done is to appoint an independent Commission to look into the whole thing—not persons who have already said what they thought about it. The result, then, Mr. Speaker, is that this policy—if it could be called a policy at all—is nothing but a document influenced by political considerations; that is the main stream running through the whole Report—political considerations; and one cannot help but sympathise with those who were sitting on this Committee. What were they to do, composed as they were? If they were to be more liberal towards the Chinese educational claims, they would lose their support in the Malay area; if they were to adopt the more extremist view of certain Malay groups, then they would lose the popularity of the Chinese group. They were, no doubt, in a fix. That does not mean that their product is acceptable to us. This Report is a Report of political expediency, and whether it represents the conscientious beliefs of those who sat on the Committee or not, we are

unable to say. But the ultimate result is that this Report is totally and wholly unacceptable to the Communities whose views we are now expressing in this House.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, there has been much talk in this House about loyalties in connection with the adoption of this Report. That, again, is drawing a red herring across the whole subject. You can't frighten the people from expressing their views by telling them: "Well, if you are loyal, you have got to accept this Report". That is not the way you get people to express their views freely and honestly. If you frighten a man and you say to him: "Here is something which a loyal citizen must accept," then, of course, if he vacillates, if he thinks, and if he has a little bit of brain in his head, he will say to himself: "Well, the Government said I am going to be disloyal if I criticised this Report. I had better keep my mouth shut." But fortunately for the people of this country there are Members in this House who are prepared to express their views, and to bring the views of the people to this House, and that is what we of the People's Progressive Party are going to do here. Loyalty to this country we have in abundance—each and every one of us is absolutely loyal to this country. But there is one thing we want to make clear: that we are loyal to this country as a whole; and that we are loyal to the interests of the people who are citizens of this country. But loyalty to the country as a whole does not mean that we are going to be treacherous to any single community in this country.

Mr. Speaker: How is that relevant to the motion before the House?

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: With respect, Mr. Speaker, the question of loyalty was raised by the other side, and it was suggested that those who do not support the Report are not loyal.

Mr. Speaker: You should not speak very long on that.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: I am just trying to explain as clearly as I could, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: I have been very lenient to you. You should not speak very long on that—a short explanation I do not mind. That is not the point at issue.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: If I am out of order, Sir, I would be glad to withdraw it, if that is pointed out. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is our stand: that whereas we are loyal to the country as a whole, we are not treacherous to any single community in this country.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is our view that this Report has inflicted a wound, a gaping wound, on the hopes and aspirations of large sections of the people who live in this country, and this is a wound which cannot be healed and which will not be forgotten by those on whom it has been inflicted. The only way it can be remedied is by a radical revision of the present Education Policy in this country. We oppose this Report and its so-called policy, because we believe that those who are truly loyal to this country and who desire to build up a united Malaya, a strong and united Malaya, feel that we must evolve a policy acceptable to the major communities residing in this country, and not one which has been condemned for the past few years and which is now put in another garb—in the form of a Review Committee Report.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, what we speak in this House we would rather not have spoken if there was any way out. I assure this House and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that what we speak in this House we feel compelled to do, because we come here with a mandate from those who elected us and we consider that we would be guilty of a crime if we did not draw the attention of this House to the dangers which the adoption of the policy in this Report would involve; and we consider it is our sacred duty, in the name of those whom we represent, to lodge a solemn protest in this House and to warn the Government against following the evil course set out in this Report. Mr. Speaker, it is thus with a clear conscience—not with any evil intent to create any ill-will, as some may

suggest, but with a clear conscience—that we are impelled to declare openly that in our view it is the policy of this Report to bring about the ultimate destruction of the Chinese and Indian languages in this country.

The Assistant Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Tuan Syed Ja'afar bin Hasan Albar): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Dewan ini telah mendengar ucapan² yang panjang daripada sa-tengah puak² pembangkang berkenaan dengan Penyata Jawatan-Kuasa Menyemak Dasar Pelajaran dan saya dapati tidak ada satu parti pun dalam Dewan ini yang lebeh bingung dan tak tentu arah keadaan-nya daripada Ahli² Yang Berhormat dari Socialist Front, dan kebingongan Ahli² Socialist Front itu telah pun di-saksikan oleh Dewan ini. Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Ipoh telah berchakap panjang berkenaan dengan penyata ini, dan memang tidak hairan kita mendengar-kan hujah²-nya berkenaan dengan kebudayaan dan bahasa² yang ada dalam negeri ini. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soal yang di-hadapan kita ini ia-lah, ada-kah kita hendak mengekalkan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini berjalan terus dengan keadaan kaum² dan keturunan² yang ada dalam negeri ini dudok berpetak², dudok berasingan dan masing² mendapat latehan-nya dudok mengikut bahasa dan kebudayaan-nya sendiri dengan tidak di-chuba mengalehkan kaum² dan keturunan² itu kepada satu keadaan dalam mana akan terbit dan timbol serta terbentuk satu bangsa yang ta'at setia-nya tidak berbelah bagi melainkan kepada Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini.

Saya berpendapat, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-itu kalau kita hendak melayankan dan mengikut fikiran² sa-bagaimana yang di-chadangkan, atau pun di-galang gantikan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Party PPP itu, maka tidak akan tertuboh dalam negeri ini satu bangsa yang benar² ta'at setia-nya yang tidak berpaling kepada mana² negeri melainkan kepada Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini, dan ini-lah tujuan yang besar daripada Penyata Jawatan-Kuasa Menyemak itu.

Kita chukop sedar kesusahan² dan kesukaran² yang ada di-hadapan Kera-jaan dan pemimpin² yang ingin hendak menengok kaum² dalam negeri ini supaya dapat di-satukan dengan baik-nya, tetapi dalam pada kita menyedari kesusahan² itu satu perhubungan yang berani mesti-lah di-laksanakan dengan sechara beransor² sahingga-lah satu bangsa yang tulin itu dapat terdiri.

Pehak² atau gulongan² yang hendak mengekalkan chara dan system pela-jaran membiarkan masing² kaum mengikut arah dan aliran-nya sendiri itu, akan membawa negeri ini kepada keadaan sa-bagaimana dalam masa penjajahan dahulu, yang memang menggalakkan supaya anak negeri ini hidup berasingan dan berpechah² serta membawa diri masing² supaya senang di-perahkan oleh penjajah itu. Tetapi, kita dalam negeri yang merdeka ini berkehendakan supaya segala tenaga dan segala kekuatan sa-orang ra'ayat negeri ini bukan di-perahkan bagi kepentingan lain negeri di-luar Persekutuan, tetapi mesti-lah di-perah bagi kepentingan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini. Kalau Ahli² Yang Berhormat daripada PPP dapat memikirkan sa-bagaimana kita memi-irkan hal ini tentu-lah mereka akan bersetuju dengan sekuat²-nya dan dengan sepenoh²-nya kepada penyata ini. Jangan-lah kerana kita memi-irkan undi dalam pilihan raya maka kita hendak mengurbankan nasib negeri ini dalam masa² yang akan datang. Jangan-lah kita hendak memi-irkan hal ini dengan dorongan hendak menang dalam pilihan raya masa hadapan semata².

Kita hendak-lah kenangkan apa-kah nasib Tanah Melayu ini, yang pendudok-nya dari berbagai² keturunan, daripada berbagai² bangsa, berbagai² ugama dalam masa beratus² kahada-pan. Jadi itu-lah saya mengajak dan menyeru Ahli² Party PPP supaya menimbangkan perkara ini dengan berat dan dengan perasaan ikhlas. Saya yakin dan perchaya, kalau Ahli² Yang Berhormat daripada PPP hendak teruskan juga chara mereka memper-dayakan diri sendiri dan chuba hendak memperdayakan orang ramai, maka mereka pada satu hari akan berasa

kesal, tetapi "*Kesal dahulu untong, kesal kemudian tidak berguna*". Sa-belom terlambat saya meminta pehak PPP memikirkan kepentingan negeri ini, muslihat negeri ini dan ra'ayat seluroh-nya dan bukan kepentingan kerusi atau pun parti.

Penyata yang di-hadapan kita ini telah di-bentok dan di-buat serta digubal dengan berdasarkan dan berasaskan kepada satu tujuan yang mulia, bukan bagi kepentingan parti, tetapi bagi faedah dan semata² untuk kepentingan negeri dan kepentingan ra'ayat negeri ini. Di-samping itu, kalau Ahli² Yang Berhormat dalam Dewan ini khas-nya sa-tengah daripada puak pembangkang dapat berfikir sechara ini, barangkali senang kita hendak menyelesaikan perkara² kaum, perkara² bahasa yang ada dalam negeri ini.

Saya berasa dukachita mendengar Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh yang menudoh bahawa kita hendak men-chuba dengan penyata ini hendak "*membunuh*" sa-suatu bahasa atau pun kebudayaan. Barangkali tidak ada dalam dunia ini satu bahasa yang berasal daripada luar dan kebudayaan yang berasal daripada luar mendapat layanan sa-bagaimana yang ada dalam Tanah Melayu ini. Jadi untuk menudoh penyata ini hendak "*membunuh*" bahasa atau pun kebudayaan lain² kaum dan lain² keturunan ini; ini satu tuduhan yang sangat melampau dan satu tuduhan yang saya nampak tidak akan mendatangkan kebaikan kepada diri sa-saorang itu, bahkan semata² akan menyebabkan "*kachau bilau*" yang dahshat dalam negeri ini, yang akan terlibat dalam-nya manusia² yang tidak berdosa. Oleh sebab itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sekali lagi saya tegaskan dan menyeru kepada Ahli² Yang Berhormat dari PPP itu supaya

dalam soal yang sa-bagini rumit, hendak-lah mereka mengeluarkan fikiran² dan pendapat² dengan chukop chermat untuk kebaikan negeri ini dan keselamatan ra'ayat negeri ini. Dan juga dalam ucapan Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh yang mana beliau telah mengatakan bahawa ada chara "*discrimination*" atau "*bedza membedza*" yang di-buat terhadap penyata ini dalam Sekolah² China, pada hal tujuan penyata ini sa-bagaimana yang telah berulang² kali diterangkan bukan hendak "*membunuh*" atau "*membedza*"²kan, tetapi semata² untuk memberi peluang kepada kebudayaan dan bahasa negeri ini tumbuh dalam negeri ini, hidup dalam negeri ini dan berkembang biak, dan dalam pada itu hidup juga *culture* dan kebudayaan yang berasal daripada luar, dan dengan perubahan masa maka dengan perlahan² akan dapat-lah di-bentok "*satu kebudayaan*" yang besar bagi Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini.

Baharu sebentar tadi Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh telah menyebutkan berkenaan dengan diri saya ini yang sangat² mementingkan bahasa Inggeris dalam system pelajaran kita yang akan datang. Saya di-sini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, hendak menegaskan sa-bagaimana yang telah di-tegaskan dalam penyata yang di-hadapan Dewan ini bahawa bahasa Inggeris itu di-pandang mustahak buat sementara waktu. Kita melengkapkan, meluaskan dan membesarkan bahasa Kebangsaan kita sahingga masa dan ketika itu tiba, maka kita maseh perlu pada penggunaan bahasa Inggeris. Di-sini, walau pun saya

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! Time is up.

Adjourned at 4.30 p.m.