

Volume II
No. 29



Saturday
3rd December, 1960

P A R L I A M E N T A R Y D E B A T E S

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

OFFICIAL REPORT

CONTENTS

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 3223]

BILL:

The Supply Bill, 1961 [Col. 3228]

PRINTED AT THE GOVERNMENT PRESS
BY THOR BENG CHONG, ACTING 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

Saturday, 3rd December, 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., D.P.M.B., 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 Internal Security, DATO' DR. ISMAIL BIN DATO' ABDUL RAHMAN, P.M.N. (Johore Timor).
- „ 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).
- „ 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' CHEAH THEAM SWEE, Assistant Minister (Bukit Bintang).
- „ 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).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL SAMAD BIN OSMAN (Sungei Patani).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI ABDUL RAOF (Kuala Kangsar).

The Honourable 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' CHIN SEE YIN (Seremban Timor).
- „ ENCHE' V. DAVID (Bungsar).
- „ DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI HASHIM, P.M.N. (Jitra-Padang Terap).
- „ 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 HASAN ADLI BIN HAJI ARSHAD (Kuala Trengganu Utara).
- „ TUAN HAJI HASSAN BIN HAJI AHMAD (Tumpat).
- „ ENCHE' HASSAN BIN MANSOR (Malacca Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN TO' MUDA HASSAN (Raub).
- „ 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' LEE SAN CHOON (Kluang Utara).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SECK FUN (Tanjong Malim).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SIOK YEW (Sepang).
- „ DR. LIM SWEE AUN, J.P. (Larut Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' LIU YOONG PENG (Rawang).
- „ ENCHE' T. MAHIMA SINGH, J.P. (Port Dickson).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED BIN UJANG (Jelevu-Jempol).
- „ 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).

- The Honourable 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).
 „ TUAN HAJI REDZA BIN HAJI MOHD. SAID (Rembau-Tampin).
 „ ENCHE' SEAH TENG NGIAB (Muar Pantai).
 „ ENCHE' D. R. SEENIVASAGAM (Ipoh).
 „ 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).
 „ ENCHE' TAN PHOCK KIN (Tanjong).
 „ ENCHE' TAN TYE CHEK (Kulim-Bandar Bahru).
 „ TENGKU INDRA PETRA IBNI SULTAN IBRAHIM, J.M.N. (Ulu Kelantan).
 „ DATO' TEOH CHZE CHONG, D.P.M.J., J.P. (Segamat Selatan).
 „ ENCHE' V. VEERAPPEN (Seberang Selatan).
 „ 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 Dato).
 „ ENCHE' YEOH TAT BENG (Bruas).
 „ ENCHE' YONG WOO MING (Sitiawan).
 „ PUAN HAJJAH 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 the Interior, DATO' SULEIMAN BIN DATO' ABDUL RAHMAN, P.M.N. (Muar Selatan).
 „ 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' CHAN YOON ONN (Kampar).

The Honourable ENCHE' GEH CHONG KEAT (Penang Utara).

- .. ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN MOHD. NOORDIN, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Parit).
- .. ENCHE' KANG KOCK SENG (Batu Pahat).
- .. ENCHE' KHONG KOK YAT (Batu Gajah).
- .. ENCHE' LIM JOO KONG (Alor Star).
- .. ENCHE' LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).
- .. ENCHE' QUEK KAI DONG (Seremban Barat).
- .. ENCHE' S. P. SEENIVASAGAM (Menglembu).
- .. ENCHE' TAN KEE GAK (Malacca Bandar).
- .. WAN MUSTAPHA BIN HAJI ALI (Kelantan Hilir).

IN ATTENDANCE:

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

PRAYERS

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

ADJOURNMENT TO A LATER DAY

Motion

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

That, notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 12, at its rising this day this House do stand adjourned to Monday, 5th December, 1960, at 10 a.m.

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

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That, notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 12, at its rising this day this House do stand adjourned to Monday, 5th December, 1960, at 10 a.m.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Expatriate Officers in Government Service

1. Enche' V. David asks the Prime Minister how many expatriate Engineers have been recruited into the P.W.D., since Merdeka and how many of them had more than three years' experience when they joined the P.W.D.

The Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the number of expatriate officers recruited since Merdeka is as follows:

- (a) Total number of civil engineers recruited is 11, of which 9 had more than three years' experience.
- (b) Total number of mechanical engineers recruited is 2, both with experience over three years.

Enche' V. David: Is it a fact that qualified engineers locally recruited will have to undergo a further three years' training?

The Prime Minister: Sir, there is practical experience which is required of the engineers. They are employed, but it is necessary to give the training in order to prepare them for the responsibility which they have to assume.

2. Enche' V. David asks the Prime Minister what is the Government policy regarding re-employment of expatriate officers who have received Malayanisation pay for loss of career in Government or quasi-Government Agencies.

The Prime Minister: It is the present policy of the Government not to re-employ entitled expatriate officers who have retired under the Malayanisation Scheme either in Government Service or in the services of quasi-Government bodies or agencies.

Enche' V. David: Is the Prime Minister aware that expatriates who retired under the Malayanisation Scheme have come back to the R.R.I.?

The Prime Minister: I am quite aware of that, and I can even mention those officers who are re-employed in rubber research. Mr. Turnbull, for instance, a former D.O. of Kuala Lumpur, is at present the Executive Secretary of the Replanting Board Fund "A" for Estates. This is in fact a quasi-Government body. Then Mr. Logan, formerly of the Agricultural Department, is now the Assistant Secretary of the Rubber Research Institute, also a quasi-Government body. He came back to work in Malaya in 1958. And also there is Mr. Adams, who was formerly in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, who is now employed in the International Rubber Study Group, which has nothing to do with our Government. He was chosen out of 12 candidates. Then there is also Mr. Stanley, formerly of the Labour Department, who is now the Executive Secretary of the Malayan Planting Industry Employers' Association. This is also not a Government body.

I can assure the Honourable Member that it is not the policy of the Government to re-employ those people who have benefited under our Malayanisation Compensation Scheme. In some cases, however, allowance has to be made, but the general policy of this Government is not re-employ them, and I may assure Honourable Members that that policy will remain the Government policy.

Reformatory Schools

3. Enche' Ahmad bin Arshad asks the Minister of Health and Social Welfare to state the number of Reformatory schools in the country and the number of inmates of each race.

The Minister of Health and Social Welfare (Dato' Ong Yoke Lin): Mr. Speaker, Sir, there are 6 approved schools in the Federation at present set up under the Juvenile Court Ordinance. We do not normally

describe them as reformatory schools. The total number of persons in these approved schools is 939.

Pasokkan Bersenjata Khas Persekutuan di-Congo

4. Enche' Mohamed Asri bin Haji Muda bertanya kepada Menteri Pertahanan apa bayaran² khas dan kemudahan yang di-beri kepada anggota² Pasokkan Bersenjata Khas Persekutuan.

Tun Abdul Razak: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ahli² tentera Persekutuan di-Congo ada-lah menerima gaji dan elaun yang biasa, sa-lain daripada itu mereka itu di-beri chatuan barang² makanan yang perchuma, di-beri pakaian dan tempat kediaman yang perchuma, dan lagi di-beri elaun sa-banyak \$3.90 pada satu hari ia-itu elaun daripada Badan Bangsa² Bersatu. Mereka itu ada-lah juga di-benarkan menghantar surat² ka-Tanah Melayu dengan tidak di-kenakan apa² bayaran. Kerajaan sekarang sedang menimbang-kan dan sedang berunding dengan pihak Bangsa² Bersatu berkenaan dengan bayaran elaun yang lebih kepada ahli² tentera ini. Jika Kerajaan memikirkan mustahak di-tambah elaun itu maka akan di-beri kepada semua sa-kali ahli² tentera itu.

Enche' Mohamed Asri bin Haji Muda: Tidak-kah ada niat atau chadangan pihak Kerajaan untuk membayar elaun seberang laut kepada mereka² itu.

Tun Abdul Razak: Mereka itu ada-lah menerima chatuan barang² makanan yang perchuma dan saya katakan tadi perkara elaun ini terpaksa-lah Kerajaan berunding dengan pihak Badan Bangsa² Bersatu dan jika Kerajaan fikirkan munasabah maka elaun itu akan di-bayar. Saya suka menegaskan di-sini bahawa Kerajaan sentiasa memerhatikan keadaan tentera² itu dan sentiasa mengambil perhatian apa juga yang mereka kehendakkan.

Enche' Ahmad Boestamam: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, baharu² ini saya membacha surat khabar bahawa elaun yang di-berikan oleh Bangsa² Bersatu kepada askar² kita itu, demikian

sadikit-nya hingga chukup untuk membeli empat lima butir pisang sahaja. Ada-kah ini dalam pengetahuan Menteri Pertahanan?

Tun Abdul Razak: Semua perkara itu ada dalam pengetahuan saya. Sabagaimana saya katakan tadi, mereka itu ada-lah di-beri chatuan barang² makanan yang perchuma jadi harga barang² di-Congo itu tidak akan memberi kesusahan kapada mereka itu. Tetapi Kerajaan akan menimbang-kan berkenaan dengan hendak mem-bayar elaun yang lebih lagi kapada mereka itu.

5. Enche' Mohammad Asri bin Haji Muda bertanya kapada Menteri Per-tahanan apa layanan² khas dan kemudahan yang di-beri oleh Kerajaan kapada isteri² dan orang² tanggungan anggota² Pasokkan Bersenjata Khas Persekutuan yang berkhidmat di-Congo.

Tun Abdul Razak: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sekarang ini isteri² tentera kita ada-lah menerima bayaran elaun kahwin menurut yang telah di-tentukan kapada ahli² tentera itu dan bayaran ini ada-lah di-beri kapada mereka itu oleh pembayaran elaun Arm Forces, dan lagi mereka itu ada-lah di-benarkan dudok di-rumah² yang di-tentukan kapada mereka itu di-sini dan jika mereka itu suka hendak balek ka-tempat masing² mereka itu akan di-benarkan balek dengan di-beri bayaran tambang kereta api. Mereka itu ada-lah di-benarkan menghantar surat² kapada tentera² atau suami²-nya di-Congo dengan bayaran yang biasa; akan tetapi jika surat² yang tidak lebih daripada 2 ounce ada-lah di-benarkan di-hantar dengan kapal terbang dengan tidak kena bayaran yang lebih.

Enche' Mohammad Asri bin Haji Muda: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ini ada sadikit soalan tambahan: bayaran elaun yang di-berikan kapada isteri² dan tanggungan² tentera kita yang pergi ka-Congo itu apa beza-nya dengan bayaran elaun yang di-berikan kapada tentera² kita yang keluar dari-pada kawasan-nya seperti masuk hutan atau sa-bagai-nya.

Tun Abdul Razak: Tidak ada beza-nya bayaran elaun yang di-bayar kapada tentera² yang meninggalkan tempat kediaman-nya masing².

Proposed International Airport

6. Enche' Ng Ann Teck asks the Minister of Transport to state, in view of the importance of the Rubber Research Institute Experimental Station at Sungei Buloh to the Rubber Industry of Malaya, whether the Government would give a precise and categorical statement that the Experimental Station will in no way be affected by the International Airport that is to be built in Sungei Buloh.

The Minister of Transport (Enche' Sardon bin Haji Jubir): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Government has already stated publicly that the Airport will not affect land vital to the Institute and that as little disturbance or encroachment as possible will be occasioned. The Government is fully aware of the importance to the Rubber Industry of the research work that is being carried out by the Rubber Research Institute at their Experimental Station.

7. Enche' Ng Ann Teck asks the Minister of Transport to state, whether it is true that part of the Rubber Research Institute grounds at Sungei Buloh has already been tampered with and that buildings are being constructed for the purposes of the Airport, and if this is so, whether the Government will give an assurance that this intrusion will stop, as it would take about 20 years to recoup losses of experiments that are now being carried out.

Enche' Sardon bin Haji Jubir: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the answer is "no".

BILL

THE SUPPLY BILL, 1961

Second Reading

Order read for resumption of debate on motion, "That the Bill be now read a second time" (30th November, 1960).

Question again proposed.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad (Bachok): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada hari ini kita berhadapan dengan satu perkara yang besar, satu perkara yang menggambarkan perjalanan Kerajaan bagi sa-tahun yang akan datang. Di-hadapan kita Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada satu anggaran belanja yang menunjukkan lebih wang masuk 13 million dan di-hadapan kita juga sa-lain daripada kelebihan 13 million itu ada anggaran belanja pembangunan yang memakan belanja yang banyak. Sungguh pun, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perbahathan bagi anggaran belanja pada hari ini ada-lah mengenai perbahathan perbelanjaan tahunan, tetapi di-dalam membahathkan soal² kewangan negara memisahkan kedua² ini dengan sa-olah² tidak bersangkutan amat-lah payah-nya, hinggakan Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan sendiri telah menyentuh soalan ini dengan banyak-nya, di-dalam ucapan-nya yang panjang sampai 18 muka itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, biar-lah saya memulakan perbahathan saya pada hari ini dengan melihat ucapan yang di-berikan oleh Menteri Kewangan sebab walau pun di-dalam soal ini soal dasar Kerajaan-lah yang menjadi soal besar, tetapi ucapan yang di-kemukakan oleh sa-orang Menteri Kewangan amat-lah besar pula ma'ana-nya biar pun dia tidak dapat menggambarkan semua dasar Kementerian di-dalam perjalanan Kerajaan ini.

Paragraph 4, dari ucapan Menteri ini telah membayangkan satu perkara yang merupakan perubahan di-dalam bentuk Anggaran Belanja yang ada di-hadapan kita ini. Ia-itu menerang dan menetapkan Controlling Officer bagi tiap² kepala pelajaran. Saya tidak-lah hendak hebohkan tentang penetapan Controlling Officer, sebab walau pun Controlling Officer itu ada pada Kerajaan dan ada pada Undang² tetapi yang menarik perhatian saya benar, ia-lah satu apologise yang di-buat oleh Menteri Kewangan ini bagi Kerajaan-nya dan boleh jadi bagi dirinya sendiri di-dalam soal kewangan. Perkara ini tidak-lah baharu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bagi Dewan ini mendengar-nya sebab di-kala kita

membahathkan Report Pemereksa Kira² Negara dahulu, perkataan ini sudah di-keluarkan oleh Menteri Kewangan. Pada maksud dan kenyataan-nya ia-itu bertujuan merengankan tanggungan Menteri dalam soal kewangan dan membebaskan-nya kepada perkhidmatan 'awam yang menjalankan kerja dalam hal ini. Apakah sebab-nya apologise ini di-buat dan apa tujuan-nya, tidak-lah mustahak kita heboh²kan tetapi boleh jadi supaya Dewan ini dapat di-fahamkan agak-nya.

The Minister of Finance (Enche' Tan Siew Sin): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of explanation, I never apologised regarding "Control Officers". Why should I apologise?

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Mohammad: You never apologised, but I interpret it as apologising. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kata-nya apologise atau tidak apologise, Menteri tidak-lah sain Voucher dan sa-bagai-nya kerana ini bukan-lah kerja Menteri dan kapada dunia tergambar-lah sa-suatu-nya itu tidak boleh di-letakkan tempelak ka-atas-nya. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Menteri, walau pun dia bukan Menteri Kewangan, ada-lah juga bertanggung-jawab kapada Dewan ini. Amat-lah lemah daleh Kerajaan dan Menteri²-nya apabila berhadapan di-Dewan ini, yang baik ada-lah kami membuat-nya; kapada yang silap maka Civil Servant-lah di-belakang kami yang salah menjalankan-nya. Ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dapat di-fahamkan oleh siapa² pun dan saya perchaya Civil Servant yang ada di-negeri ini dapat memahami lebih daripada Menteri itu sendiri. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bagi saya Kerajaan ada-lah bertanggung-jawab dengan sa-penoh-nya dalam soal kewangan dan dalam sa-barang kesilapan yang di-lakukan, ada-lah tanggong-jawab Kerajaan. Sebab, walau pun tidak di-sain Voucher dan tidak di-satukan serta di-kawal peruntukan menurut Undang² Civil Servant, Menteri hendak-lah memerhati hal ini dengan halus-nya. Banyak sangat-lah kerja mereka ini akan menjadi jawapan tetapi itu bukan-lah kesilapan saya.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita berada di-dalam masa yang memistikan kita mengadakan Control yang tetap dalam soal kewangan. Di-dalam ucapan-nya, Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan telah mengatakan bahawa dia telah tinggal dan telah berada di-Dewan Undangan dan Dewan Ra'ayat ini sa-lama 12 tahun dan tua-lah umur perkhidmatan-nya kapada Dewan ini. Ini satu sipat yang baik tetapi apabila dia mengatakan, "apabila sampai saya ka-Dewan ini, yang saya dengar hanyalah tuntutan² meminta dan merayu sahaja. Tidak-lah pernah saya dengar bagaimana hendak membanyakkan wang dan apabila saya letakkan chukai kapada siapa², riuh-rendah-lah orang yang terkena chukai itu". Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ini-lah yang terdengar bahawa menjaga kewangan itu-lah yang di-ambil berat oleh Menteri Kewangan di-dalam negeri ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Anggaran hasil yang menjadi asas pada Anggaran Belanja kita ini boleh jadi, menjadi satu chontoh bagi kerja Kerajaan untuk menghasilkan wang.

Dahulu, di-dalam Dewan ini apabila di-chadangkan supaya di-adakan satu peratoran lagi di-dalam membanyakkan hasil dalam negeri ini maka Menteri kita telah menjawab, ta' payah di-buat begitu dan bagini, chukup-lah supaya jangan memberatkan orang lain. Apakah chadangan yang di-kemukakan oleh saya sa-terus-nya di-dalam Dewan ini, kita berhendakkan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-samping menchukai orang² yang di-bawah dengan bermacam², yang \$5,000 di-turunkan kapada \$3,000 dan sekarang ini telah mula pula Kerajaan sedar dan ta' kena pula yang itu, di-betulkan pula dengan pindaan yang baharu di-luluskan. Saya telah mengatakan pada masa itu, kenapa Kerajaan tidak menimbang dan membesarkan chukai bagi pendapatan yang lebih besar yang ada di-dalam negeri ini. Sebab di-dalam pertukaran chukai dan pindaan ini, bagi 55,000 ka-atas tidak di-pinda. Kita berpendapat bahawa chukai bagi pendapatan yang besar, patut-lah ditambah walau pun di-katakan oleh puak itu, ya'ani puak orang yang sudah membayar chukai atas wang

sampai 55,000 sudah banyak membayar chukai, lagi kita hendak lebehkan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kata-nya, "kita ta' chukup wang". Itu-lah sebab-nya kita hendak melebehkan dan ini telah nampak kapada kita satu perubahan sama ada di-sedari atau tidak di-sedari, di-akuī atau tidak di-akuī oleh Menteri Kewangan, apabila harga getah di-kenakan chukai lebih sedikit daripada itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam Dewan ini bukan-lah menjadi asas anggota Dewan Ra'ayat ini semata² hendak melagakan wang Kerajaan, tetapi perkhidmatan yang penting hendak-lah di-pentingkan dan untuk itu sama sahaja Kerajaan memandang bahawa semua orang misti menanggung, tetapi tanggungan itu misti-lah nesbah yang berpatutan. Dalam memperkatakan kemasokan wang tidak sedap dalam tempat ini yang di-chakapkan hendak mengeluarkan wang dan dalam para 27 berhubung dengan ucapan Menteri Kewangan telah juga membuat satu lagi apology di-mana dia tidak mengaku yang ini soal dia: "Lack of staff has, it must be admitted, prevented the maximum results being achieved in this field". Masa mengemukakan pindaan kapada undang² hasil chukai pendapatan ada satu ucapan yang panjang yang di-berikan oleh Menteri itu. Dalam ucapan itu berkata-lah beliau bahawa sekarang ini kita mempunyai Jabatan Pemungut Chukai dalam negeri ini yang anggotanya ta' kurang, dan akan menguatkan kelemahan ini supaya dapat di-penohkan dengan mendapat hasil yang baik dari perjalanan chukai ini. Meminta ma'af kapada ra'ayat sekali lagi "lack of Staff" kapada ra'ayat itu-lah yang mengetawakan kita.

Oleh itu kita hendak melihat Menteri Kewangan kita membetolkan staff dalam Jabatan Income Tax ini supaya mudah²an pada tahun hadapan kita akan dapat hasil yang banyak. Kita kelebehan wang yang di-belanjakan dan telah nyata bagi tahun akan datang dan bagi tahun yang sudah² tidak-lah saperti mana yang kita agak, bahkan kita telah mendapat lebih baik daripada yang kita agak.

Uchapan-nya ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, mengaku bahawa tidak-lah 'adil kerana bagus-nya pentadbiran Menteri Kewangan sahaja bahkan ini ada-lah accidental yang kebetolan harga pasar dalam soal getah itu yang mana kita berharap itu telah naik. Accidental berma'ana kita tidak boleh mempunyai keperchayaan pada tiap² tahun ia-itu akan berlaku seperti yang di-sebutkan oleh Menteri Kewangan ini.

Mengurangkan belanja tentulah akan membawa surplus di-samping banyak-nya wang masuk. Bagi mengeluarkan wang belanja, Kerajaan telah mengadakan satu chara yang berbentok wujud-nya satu Jawatan-Kuasa Jema'ah Menteri yang di-ketuai oleh Menteri Kewangan sendiri yang memikirkan soal tender dan membahathkan bagaimana chara² tender yang menjalankan kerja itu yang baik sekali dan bagaimana chara² bagi mendapatkan bekalan² dalam menghasilkan perkhidmatan dalam negeri ini.

Ada satu tata kerja dalam Kementerian Kewangan yang mana pada fikiran saya patut-lah sangat di-fikirkan oleh Kementerian itu. Dahulu sudah saya kemukakan soal ini dan saya mengulang lagi bagi kali ini dengan tidak-lah merosakan nilai-nya. Apabila Kerajaan hendak beli barang² Crown Agent ada-lah satu saloran yang di-pakai bagi mendapatkan perbekalan barang². Saya telah berkata dan saya lagi sekali mengatakan Kerajaan ini mengikatkan diri-nya kepada Crown Agent dalam mendapatkan supplies atau mendapatkan perbekalan barang². Perbuatan sudah lapok bagi kedudukan dan kemajuan sa-sabuah negeri yang merdeka. Kita telah pun meminta kepada Menteri dahulu supaya hal ini di-fikirkan, tetapi entah siapa yang menjawab-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tidak-lah saya ingat, akan tetapi isi jawapan yang saya terima ia-lah kerana kita dahulu berbuat demikian dan kalau kita ambil dari tempat lain, maka akan kucar-kacir-lah peratoran ini. Sampai bila, Tuan Yang di-Pertua? Hari ini sudah berjalan begitu, walau pun pendek, tetapi tujuan Jawatan-Kuasa dalam para. 31 ini ia-lah hendak mencari

jalan yang baik sekali dari tender system dan mendapatkan bekalan bagi perkhidmatan dalam negeri ini. Kalau itu-lah yang menjadi tujuan yang objective, tujuan yang tersangkut pada sa-suatu maka hendak-lah Kerajaan mendasarkan pembelian atas penyiasatan yang memecahkan rantai Crown Agent dari Kementerian Kewangan khusus-nya.

Di-antara perbelanjaan kita yang banyak ia-lah membayar hutang, membayar bayaran² berkenaan dengan hutang. Beberapa juta ringgit saya pun tak ingat yang di-kenakan di-atas perkara itu—Menteri kita bersungut, bukan senang hati mengeluarkan wang dengan sa-bagitu banyak bagi membayar hutang dan itu telah menjadi satu keyakinan Menteri itu. Saya bersetuju dengan dia bahawa dalam menimbangkan dua anggaran perbelanjaan yang berasingan ia-itu Anggaran Perbelanjaan Biasa dan Anggaran Perbelanjaan Pembangunan. Soal mendapatkan wang yang dahulunya semata² dari pinjaman hendak-lah di-betulkan dan pada fikiran Menteri itu sendiri kita hendakkan supaya kalau dapat bagi kedua²-nya dengan chara daripada hasil negeri ini. Kita membangunkan negeri ini ada-lah baik, bahkan dia telah mengatakan dengan lebeh terang bahawa membelanjakan wang yang di-pinjam bagi maksud yang tidak ekonomi dan tidak productive tidak-lah boleh di-jalankan, sebab tidak sa-imbang dengan bebanan yang kita beban dalam soal kewangan. Saya setuju dan amat baik, tetapi persetujuan ini hendak-lah menimbolkan satu pandangan yang baharu dalam mendapatkan hasil bagi perbelanjaan negeri ini. Jika concept Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan ini di-terima maka kechil-lah ma'ana-nya surplus 13 juta ringgit yang ada pada kita ini.

Walau pun kita merasa amat beruntung dengan satu Anggaran Belanja yang merupakan kelebihan wang masuk, tetapi dengan concept bahawa sa-dapat²-nya Ranchangan Kemajuan Pembangunan yang tidak terang² membawa hasil pengeluaran dan keuntungan ekonomi hendak-lah di-bebankan atas kewangan biasa maka kita merasa

hendak-lah anggaran kelebehan \$13 juta itu di-lipat gandakan, dan bagi melipat gandakan itu, saya fikir patut-lah kita chukai orang² yang lebeh kaya itu lebeh banyak—saya tidak memusohi mereka itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tetapi, soal ini ia-lah soal hendak menchari wang dan soal bersama menanggung beban bagi membangunkan ra'ayat negeri ini. Apabila kita hendak menchari wang, Income tax kita perhatikan. Sekarang ini "Relief from Income Tax" bagi Perusahaan² Pelupor dalam negeri ini ada di-terangkan dalam Paragraph 18. Sudah banyak yang telah dapat, yang telah beruntung dengan Undang² Pengampunan atau kasehan atau perkechualian.

Saya mengharapkan bahawa dari segi kita hendakkan kapada wang bagi pembangunan, hendak-lah "relief" ini di-kaji sa-mula dengan sa-halus²-nya; jangan-lah di-buka amat luas, sa-hing-gakan kita dapati pada satu masa amat banyak perusahaan² dalam negeri ini yang berusaha dan mendapat untong dan mendapat "relief". Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau ta' di-buat begitu, masakan bilangan yang telah banyak itu ia-itu 49 Industries (49 buah Perusahaan) mahu membuat perusahaannya dalam negeri kita ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bagi memulakan sa-suatu itu ada-lah baik-nya dan ada-lah untong-nya, tetapi, bagi melebarkan-nya dengan tidak merasa takut, yang pada suatu masa akan di-lengkar-nya-lah hasil kita dalam negeri kita ini; ini amat-lah merbahaya. Maka menjadi kewajipan yang besar-lah kapada Kerajaan supaya menaruh chemburu dalam hal² yang saperti ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Paragraph 39 daripada ucapan ini ada-lah satu paragraph yang menakutkan saya. Sebab, Dewan ini telah tersenyum dimasa kita mendapat Penyata Enche' Abdul Rahman Talib berkenaan dengan pelajaran. Tersenyum-lah kita melihat perkembangan yang di-gambarkan dan tersenyum-lah kita melihat banyak kebaikan yang akan timbul lebeh daripada Penyata Razak dahulu walau pun ada orang yang mengatakan sa-rupa sahaja. Tetapi paragraph ini dan kenyataan Yang Berhormat Menteri

Kewangan pada ketika itu, yang bernasib-lah ia berchakap kemudian dari-pada saya, yang mengatakan semua-nya ada-lah bergantung kapada keadaan kewangan di-negeri ini, dan kata-nya yang sa-benar, Treasury belum-lah mahu mengikat diri dalam hal ini. Luloh-lah rasa-nya kita mendengar kenyataan ini. Ulangan dalam Paragraph 39 ini menyebabkan lagi lemah kita memikirkannya. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada-lah menjadi kewajipan pada Kerajaan, kalau tidak menjadi kewajipan undang², ada-lah menjadi kewajipan moral kapada Kerajaan, untok melaksanakan apa yang di-gembar-gemborkan-nya itu. Ia tidak boleh, mula-nya bercherita sedap, kemudian berdaleh, sebab ia ada-lah Kerajaan yang sa-patut-nya sudah tahu apa yang hendak di-chakapkan-nya dan bagaimana berat chakap-nya itu di-letakkan di-atas bahu-nya.

Oleh itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, yang kita kehendaki, walau bagaimana pun ingatan dalam Paragraph 39 ini, kita hendak supaya jangan di-perkechilkan perkhidmatan pengajaran dan pelajaran dalam negeri ini. Jika tidak, akan sa-kali lagi berulang-lah sejarah Penyata Razak di-jalankan, tetapi tidak chukup kewangan-nya. Dalil-nya Sekolah Industry tidak dapat di-buat, kerana wang tidak ada. Dalam Paragraph 39 ini-lah juga, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Yang Berhormat Menteri ini gadoh kapada "meminta²" saperti yang saya sebutkan tadi. Di-dalam "meminta" saya dapati chukai lagi sa-kali. Oleh sebab kita hendakkan duit, barang Inggeris, motokar Inggeris hendak-lah di-chukai sama banyak dengan motokar Jarman. Saya tidak menyuroh supaya di-turunkan chukai motokar Jarman dengan tidak tentu fasal, tetapi saya minta supaya chukai motokar Inggeris itu di-naikkan, sebab biar-lah mereka itu sama. Saya tidak tahu apa pertimbangan yang telah membolehkan kedudukan ini berlainan sedangkan kita sudah merdeka. Boleh jadi kita memandang bahawa di-England soal "currency" kita berhubung, tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berhubong atau tidak berhubong, kita ada-lah berhadapan dengan keadaan yang menghendaki wang yang lebeh banyak, sebab saya telah katakan tadi bahawa

“surplus” ini tidak-lah di-pandang “surplus” kapada konsep Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan yang memandang bahawa membelanjakan wang dari luar bagi perkara² ta’ meng-ekonomi dan memperodaktifkan itu tidak patut di-belanjakan dan tidak elok. Maka kalau begitu, kita maseh berhajatkan kapada kewangan yang lebeh banyak.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Review Committee atau Jawatan-kuasa Penyemak Pelajaran dahulu telah menunjukkan belanja yang banyak saperti yang saya katakan dalam Paragraph 40, dan oleh kerana tahun 1961 ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tahun yang mustahak bagi pelaksanaan shor² Jawatan-kuasa itu, saya rasa Paragraph 40 menarek perhatian chara yang istimewa.

Saya tahu bahawa tahun 62-lah pelaksanaan ini akan berjalan dengan sa-benar-nya, tetapi jangan sa-kali lagi si-buta kehilangan tongkat. Dalam Penyata Razak dahulu beberapa perkara yang di-sebutkan, hujjah besar tidak jaya-nya ia-lah kerana tidak chukup persediaan bagi menerima perubahan. Jadi kalau persediaan di-bentangkan dan kalau pelaksanaan itu tahun 62, maka tahun 1961-lah tempat-nya kita mengujudkan persedia²an. Jika tidak lagi sa-kali-lah si-buta kehilangan tongkat. Maka dengan sebab kita berkehendakkan kemajuan pelajaran negeri ini dan dengan sebab Kerajaan sudah pun meng’ilankan niat-nya berbuat demikian, kita bergerak-lah terus supaya prediction pelajaran yang sesuai begitu banyak mengikuti shor Jawatan-kuasa itu kita perhatikan baik² dan di-sesuai-kan-lah wang masuk negeri ini dengan tuntutan pelajaran. Tidak dapat saya ketepikan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, apabila di-kaji soal kewangan negara soal hutang. Oleh kerana hutang negara itu banyak dan oleh kerana ada satu hati dan semangat hendak membuat kemajuan yang chepat yang lebeh dari wang dalam negeri sahaja, oleh kerana itu pandangan yang istimewa hendak-lah di-buat dalam soal perhitongan, sebab Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya setuju pada mencheapatkan kemajuan, tetapi jangan-lah kemajuan itu, oleh kerana hendak chepat perhitongan tidak

di-beri dengan sa-penoh-nya di-dalam melaksanakan-nya.

Mengurangkan hutang negara dalam mengadakan perusahaan² untok-nya hendak-lah di-sesuaikan dengan mem-banyak hasil negara, dan dengan mem-banyakan hasil negara itu tidak dapat tidak kita terpaksa mengurangkan per-belanjaan. Ini sudah di-terangkan oleh Menteri Kewangan sendiri di-dalam ucapan-nya. Meletakkan nasib negeri ini di-dalam kedudukan kewangan-nya kapada kehendak pasar dunia dalam dua hasil yang besar dalam negeri ini, saperti kata Menteri Kewangan itu sendiri, tidak-lah aman. Ini pun Tuan Yang di-Pertua perubahan ini bersetuju dengan chara anitiative yang di-atorkan oleh Menteri itu. Ini akan membolehkan terujud-nya satu perimbangan di-dalam ekonomi kita. Di-masa senang kita adakan tax untok menutup kelemahan kita di-masa susah. Tetapi Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jangan-lah di-biarkan di-dalam kejadian ini kelak bahawa biasa-nya cess yang di-kenakan ka-atas Industry² terutama getah dan bijeh kurang terbeban atas perusahaan² itu.

Jangan-lah di-biarkan bahawa tax yang di-kenakan kapada saudagar² itu di-banyakan dengan beban pembayaran-nya dengan chara tidak langsung-nya ka-atas penjual getah² yang kecil. Sa-umpama-nya katakan-lah yang lebeh dari sa-ringgit kita kenakan tax yang lebeh dan dengan sebab yang demikian maka perusahaan² getah yang besar mempunyai agent² getah dalam perusahaan yang kecil dan ini akan membebaskan sa-balek-nya pada orang² kecil, bukan daripada perusahaan² ini yang menurut Menteri Kewangan sendiri tidak akan merasa berat di-dalam terkena tax itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau tidak-lah kerana kita saperti saya katakan tadi berhadapan dengan ranchangan² pembangunan hendak kita buat dalam negeri ini tentu-lah budget ini amat menyenangkan kita tetapi kita berhadapan dengan belanja yang banyak maka menjadi kewajipan kapada Kerajaan mengikhtiarkan menambahkan satu penambahan hasil sa-bagai mana yang saya sebutkan.

Kedua memerhatikan bahawa kemajuan yang kita buat itu oleh kerana semangat hendak lebeh jangan-lah tergelincir perhitongan daripada berhalus dan berhati² dahulu daripada itu. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada beberapa chontohnya di-zaman penjajahan, ia-itu kemajuan co-operative—Sharikat Kerjasama, bagi menchegeh anchaman Communist. Pesuroh Jaya Tinggi pada masa itu telah memandang bahawa kerja Sharikat Kerjasama ini-lah yang boleh menentang perkembangan Communist dengan chara ekonomi bentok co-operative. Maka pada masa itu berlaku-lah satu forced development atau forced progress—kemajuan yang di-paksa² yang dia mesti maju. Kalau orang hendak berhutang jangan kita hendakkan kepada sharat² sangat, asal ada Sharikat Kerjasama maka dia di-bantu walau apa pun. Maka kalau ini di-ulangkan semula dalam ranchangan kemajuan yang ada sekarang ini umpama-nya asal ranchangan apa sahaja ranchangan kemajuan di-beri dengan tidak mengira baik burok-nya pada ketika itu akan berulang-lah hikayat kemajuan yang di-paksa² dalam Sharikat Kerjasama itu kepada kemajuan pembangunan yang ada di-hadapan kita sekarang ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, memang tidak ada salah-nya kita memajukan dengan chepat naik lift dengan tidak payah naik tangga, tetapi jangan-lah lift yang kita naik itu sampai memuntahkan kita memajukan-nya.

Di-sini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam soal Industry bagi hendak memajukan negeri ini nampak-lah oleh Menteri bahawa perkembangan Industry hendak-lah di-berikan keutamaan. Kita tahu di-zaman saperti ini tidak ada salah-nya di-berikan, tetapi kita tidak boleh melupakan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bahawa di-dalam mengindustrykan negeri ini; saya hendak memperusahakan ta' berapa betul, jadi, saya pinjam mengindustrykan negeri ini, saya berchadang supaya Kerajaan jangan-lah oleh kerana dilebuhkan Industry ini, terganggu pula kemajuan yang di-kampong bukan tentang wang-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sebab jangan ada pula Menteri mengatakan, “kami ta' ambil wang Industry di-bawa ka-kampong, wang

kampong di-bawa ka-Industry”, tidak. Bahkan dalam satu bidang ekonomi sa-buah negara tidak boleh di-pisahkan Industry yang ada di-Kuala Lumpur ini dengan kehidupan orang. Kata-lah kita menggalakkan pertukangan di-kampong atau kita galakkan satu benda perusahaan, kemudian kita adakan Industry betul macham itu juga di-bandar maka dengan sendiri-nya hasrat ra'ayat untok memajukan pengeluaran dan pendapatan diri-nya di-dalam perusahaan-nya yang kechil itu akan hilang. Jadi dasar ini hendak-lah di-perhatikan. Saya tahu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bahawa kemajuan Industry itu akan memberi chukai lebeh banyak tetapi kalau pun kemajuan ra'ayat sa-saorang itu ta' akan lebeh banyak chukai-nya dari segi wang masok; memang kata-nya, rugi-lah kita, tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, hendak-lah kita ingat bahawa chukai daripada Industry itu pun untok di-berikan kepada ra'ayat juga. Jadi, konsep-nya sudah ada dari awal lagi di-kampong, biar-lah dia dapat di-sana, apa yang kita gadohkan. Konsep ini—konsep m e n y a t u k a n bidang ekonomi dengan tidak memisahkan satu dengan lain-nya, dengan tidak mengadakan pertelagahan kepentingan di-antara satu sama lain, penting dipegang kuat dalam meindustrykan negeri ini.

Tidak-lah dapat saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, menolong Menteri Kewangan ini walau pun sedikit untok menghadapi kesulitan yang di-sebutkan di-dalam paragraph 77 itu. Sebab di-situ, ada-lah untok menyatakan bahawa orang bertambah banyak hasil hidup-nya. Ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ta' ada apa-lah yang kita hendak buat bahkan kita hadapi-lah dengan keberanian. Sekarang ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita berhadapan dengan Menteri Kewangan ini, kita telah mengabarkan bahawa amat-lah patut di-betulkan soal Staff. Sebab, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saperti yang kita katakan di-dalam soal Income Tax, sa-lagi sa-saorang anggota menjalankan kerja-nya ini tidak di-selesaikan maka susah lagi-lah

Mr. Speaker: Atas pindaan itu sahaja, sudah-lah. Jangan-lah di-ulangkan perchakapan itu lagi.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Mohammad:

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada satu perkara, di-dalam tanggung-jawab Menteri Kewangan yang menjadi dasar Kerajaan yang pada masa ini, yang patut kita fikirkan ia-lah soal Provident Fund. Provident Fund sudah di-pinda semalam atau dahulu daripada semalam dan pindaan itu hanya mengenai bagaimana meletakkan wang yang terkumpul bagi Provident Fund itu. Maka saya mengharapkan serta meminta supaya di-timbang bagaimana memudahkan pengambilan Provident Fund ini bagi maksud perusahaan kecil di-kampung². Sudah di-jawab oleh Menteri dengan mengatakan bahawa ini ta' boleh sebab akhir-nya tujuan Provident Fund itu akan hapus. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tujuan Provident Fund itu ia-lah membantu maka kalau bantuan itu di-pentingkan kepada satu masa maka pada masa itu-lah patut di-berikan. Dalam dasar kumpulan Provident Fund, Menteri Kewangan sudah menyebutkan bahawa wang Provident Fund ini amat-lah mustahak kepada negara, sebab dengan Kerajaan meminjam daripada wang itu, dapat-lah kita menjalankan rancangan yang besar². Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jangan-lah tujuan hendak menjadikan Provident Fund itu satu bantuan kepada kehidupan ra'ayat yang sudah berkhidmat kepada Kerajaan itu hilang pula. Ini patut-lah kita timbangkan dengan halus.

Habis-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ucapan Menteri Kewangan ini dan pergi-lah saya kepada Anggaran Belanja. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, apabila kita di-berikan Anggaran Perbelanjaan ini, di-berikan pula kepada kita satu kertas lain ia-itu Treasury Memorandum yang di-kembarkan kepada Anggaran Perbelanjaan ini. Ada satu perkataan yang saya hendak bangkitkan cerita-nya di-dalam Majlis ini, Cmd. 57 di-hujung paragraph 2 (a) kata-nya :

" Estimates of expenditure within the Heads numbered with a prefixed letter "C" are not, therefore, included in the Supply (1961) Bill, 1960, and for this reason are not subject to debate in either House of Parliament during the passage of that Bill".

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya gunakan-lah sedikit masa chuba memahami apa-kah maksud benar²-nya, "not subject to debate in either House". Apabila saya chari² Estimates muka 22, 23 ia-itu angka grek bagi Federal Estimates 1961, mula² kita jumpa telah di-letakkan "C", di-situ boleh jadi maksud-nya di-ambil daripada Consolidated Fund dan boleh jadi maksud yang lain tetapi kita pakai yang "C" daripada satu sampai 12 tidak boleh di-debate di-dalam Rumah ini. Dahulu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita sudah-lah juga mendapatkan Estimate, kita sudah-lah juga mempunyai Perlembagaan tetapi tidak pernah timbul cerita ini. Saya chari² sebab-nya, ia-lah ada di-dalam muka ini kepala² perbelanjaan yang bersangkutan dengan Commission yang boleh jadi tidak dibenarkan oleh Perlembagaan untuk di-bahathkan. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, (c) 10 umpama-nya berkenaan dengan Treasury-Charges on Account of Public Debts, kalau itu tak boleh di-bahathkan, maka Menteri Kewangan sendiri sudah membahathkan. Teknik ini agak saya oleh kerana baharu yang maseh belom terang kepada Dewan ini dan walau bagaimana pun soal yang berkenaan dengan 1 dan 12 ini boleh saya bahathkan di-waktu yang lain di-sini juga.

Membahathkan Supply Bill ini adalah satu masa bagi membahathkan dasar umum Kerajaan di-Parlimen. Kepala Parlimen ini sangat menarek perhatian saya. Hal Parlimen sudah pun di-terangkan saperti mana yang dititahkan oleh Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong bahawa dalam Parlimen ini

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, may I rise on a point of explanation? The Honourable Member for Bachok is labouring under a misapprehension. It was not I who directed that sums charged under the Consolidated Fund should not be subject to debate. If the Honourable Member cares to read the Constitution—which he has, I presume, not bothered to do so far—he will find in Article 99 the following words :

"The Yang di-Pertuan Agong shall, in respect of every financial year, cause to be

laid before the House of Representatives a statement of the estimated receipts and expenditure of the Federation for that year, and, unless Parliament in respect of any year otherwise provides, that statement shall be so laid before the commencement of that year."

Now, Article 100 reads as follows:

"The heads of expenditure to be met from the Consolidated Fund but not charged thereon, other than expenditure to be met by such sums as are mentioned in Clause (3) of Article 99, shall be included in a Bill, to be known as a Supply Bill"

The effect of this Article, Sir, is that the Supply Bill under the Constitution is not to include expenditure charged on the Consolidated Fund and the object of the debate today is to debate on the amount proposed to be provided under the Supply Bill. So, it is not the Treasury or the Government that is to be blamed. If the Honourable Member wishes to blame anybody, he should blame the Constitution, and I suggest in future he reads the Constitution carefully before he speaks.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad: Sir, he should read the Constitution, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sebab dia sendiri membuat kenyataan dan dia sendiri berchakap benda yang dikatakan-nya tak boleh di-chakapkan. Dalam soal Parlimen ini pendengaran fikiran daripada pihak yang lain adalah mustahak. Saya nampak Parlimen ini telah berjalan dengan baik. Tentang mendengar fikiran daripada kedua² pihak itu saya tidak ingin menapikan perkara itu. Chuma ada satu chara yang agak saya patut di-fikirkan oleh kita di-sini dan oleh Kerajaan bagi menghasilkan bahawa hendak mendengar fikiran yang lain² itu dengan chara memberi peruntukan kepada usul² dari pihak pembangkang dalam masa yang tertentu. Nasib usul² dari pihak pembangkang ini

Mr. Speaker: Nampak-nya ini sudah terkeluar daripada perbahathan yang di-hadapan Majlis ini. Saya chuma hendak mengingatkan bahawa perbahathan kita dalam Majlis ini hendaklah mengikut Peratoran Tetap 66 (2)—the debate—

" shall be confined to the general principles of Government policy and

administration as indicated by the Bill and Estimates."

Ahli² Yang Berhormat akan berpeluang berchakap apabila Majlis ini dalam Jawatan-Kuasa nanti. Jadi, saya harap perbahathan ini jangan-lah terkeluar daripada Peratoran ini, kerana kita maseh ada lagi peluang hari esok apabila kita membahathkannya dalam Jawatan-Kuasa.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak hendak membahathkan pandangan Tuan Yang di-Pertua itu, tetapi saya berharap esok, sebab ini berlaku—apabila saya membawa dasar Kerajaan sekarang ini di-mana dalam meshuarat Jawatan-Kuasa dahulu saya telah mendapat tegoran daripada Tuan Yang di-Pertua sendiri. Tentang mana yang hendak saya katakan ini ia-lah tentang fikiran dan dasar Menteri itu—tak boleh. Ini service of this head, satu sahaja. Ini kalau boleh, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kepada soal yang bukan membelanjakan wang dasar—kalau tak boleh saya tarek balek.

Mr. Speaker: Dalam Standing Orders ini terang di-nyatakan ia-itu hari ini kita membahathkan general principles of Government policy, tidak policy sesuatu service for which the money is to be provided. Ini di-atas general principle of the policy of the Government. Itu sahaja, kalau lari daripada asas-nya tak boleh!

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua tidak menyebutkan 5 lawan 1 maseh general dasar-nya. Hal ini saya akan bangkitkan lagi sekali dalam Parlimen ini. Sekarang saya hendak berchakap berkenaan dengan Jabatan Perdana Menteri. Bagi sa-sabuah negara Perdana Menteri inilah orang yang menggambarkan dasar negara-nya dan Jabatan Perdana Menteri ini-lah satu jabatan yang penting. Pada masa ini Perdana Menteri kita telah juga menjadi Menteri Luar Negeri. Peranan Perdana Menteri dalam hal ehwal luar negeri ini tidak-lah kurang nampak saya tentang peranan-nya dari menjadi perdana Menteri itu sendiri.

Apabila Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri Persekutuan Tanah Melayu

membuat sa-suatu di-luar Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini, maka atas nama Persekutuan Tanah Melayu-lah ia berlaku. Baharu dua tiga hari yang lalu, Yang Amat Berhormat Perdana Menteri telah mengemukakan satu fikiran yang saya pandang tidak betul fikiran itu apabila ia mengatakan peranan-nya dalam menyelesaikan soal Irian Barat antara Belanda dan Indonesia. Maka di-katakan-nya-lah, ia tidak boleh menyebutkan hal ini sebab hal ini ada-lah hal luar negeri bukan hal Persekutuan Tanah Melayu. Bagi saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-orang Perdana Menteri ada-lah bertanggung jawab lebeh tepat kepada Parlimen ini daripada sa-siapa pun, dan Parlimen ini-lah tempat ia memberikan tanggung jawab-nya atas apa yang di-lakukan. Tidak bertanya-nya Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri didalam menjalankan urusan luar negeri kepada Parlimen, boleh jadi oleh kerana tuntutan hendak mencheapatkan kerja-nya itu memaksa demikian. Tetapi, tidak terfikir-nya Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri tentang kedudukan Indonesia dalam soal ini telah mengkechiwakan

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: On a point of order, Sir.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad: What Order?

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Page 72, Standing Order 66, paragraph 2 of which reads as follows:

"After the motion for the second reading of the Bill has been proposed and seconded, the debate thereon shall be adjourned for not less than two days and, when resumed, shall be confined to the general principles of Government policy and administration as indicated by the Bill and Estimates."

I do not see in what manner the question of West Irian has got to do with the principles of Government policy and administration as indicated by the Bill and Estimates.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I think I rule you out, because the words "as indicated by the Bill and Estimates" are very clear. You can touch on the general policy as indicated by the Bill and Estimates.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau demikian-lah, maka tentu-lah ada hak Parlimen ini membahathkan perkara itu waktu di-dalam Committee.

Mr. Speaker: Dalam Committee, jika ada wang yang hendak di-gunakan—Money to be spent for the service atas policy itu tuan boleh chakap. Dalam Committee, umpamanya, jika hendak meluluskan wang kerana peruntukan Prime Minister termasuklah semua sa-kali service yang hendak di-gunakan, di-situ tuan boleh berchakap, kerana ada wang yang hendak di-gunakan. Tuan boleh berchakap atas policy of the service for which money is asked to be approved by the House. It is very clear.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad: Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, erti-nya bila Prime Minister itu boleh-lah berchakap nanti

Mr. Speaker: Saya kata, for the money. It is very clear

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad: He will receive the salary

Mr. Speaker: I cannot commit myself on what you want to say. Ia kata, "The debate shall be confined to the policy of the service for which"—itu very important—for which money is to be provided.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad: May I ask you a simple question, Sir? Duit yang di-beri \$3,000 kepada yang bernama Perdana Menteri dan \$10.00 kepada sa-orang yang bernama Menteri Hal Ehwal Luar Negeri, boleh-kah saya dalam Committee membahathkan tiap² apa yang di-buat oleh orang yang bernama Menteri itu dalam Committee?

Mr. Speaker: Boleh!

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad: Terima kaseh, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sebab dahulu tidak boleh. Yang sa-benar-nya, ini telah menolong saya dalam perkara yang saya rasa, saya tidak boleh di-sini, tetapi boleh di-sana

Mr. Speaker: Bila tidak boleh di-sini, boleh di-sana.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad: Alham dulillah! Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam soal Perdana Menteri ini dan jabatan-nya, satu lagi perkara yang mustahak kita ambil perhatian ia-lah supaya Jabatan Perdana Menteri ini di-dasarkan kapada jangan lagi memakai pegawai expatriate. Apa macham, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, boleh?

Mr. Speaker: Perkara ini pun dalam Committee juga, dalam Committee nanti ada di-sediakan (provide) item-nya di-situ. Ini ia-lah general principles of the policy of the Government as indicated by the Bill. Oleh itu tuan boleh berchakap sa-berapa banyak—boleh membahathkan atas apa yang telah di chakapkan oleh Menteri Kewangan.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bershukor yang sa-benar-nya kalau pentafsiran saya yang awal itu tidak betul, dan tadi akan membolehkan lebeh banyak bila tiba dalam Committee. Kalau bagitu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-sini telah di-terangkan dalam ucapan Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan ini, peranan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu yang di-jalankan sekarang ini sa-bagai sa-buah negeri yang muda, yang merdeka dan yang mendapat kehormatan daripada luar negeri, dan ini menurut Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan ada-lah di-buktikan oleh banyak-nya conference² yang ada berjalan di-Kuala Lumpur ini dalam tahun yang lalu. Peranan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini termasuk-lah peranan-nya di-Congo yang belanja-nya ada di-sebutkan pula di-sini di-paragraph 7. Di-paragraph 7 Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan telah menyatakan bahawa peranan kita bertambah besar dan bertambah kuat, dan kita berharap, umpama-nya belanja tentera kita di-Congo itu dapat di-bayar oleh United Nations. Memperkatakan peranan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu di-luar negeri, termasuk-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, menurut fahaman saya peranan Perdana Menteri di-dalam soal International. Perdana Menteri kita ini menonjolkan dia menchuba menjadi sa-orang tokoh International dan bagi maksud itu soal Irian Barat, soal

perselisihan Belanda dan Indonesia di-ambil-nya.

Mr. Speaker: Itu sudah lari.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sekarang ini biar-lah saya pergi kapada dasar Kemajuan Luar Bandar yang ada di-dalam Kementerian ini. Dahulu pada satu masa kita telah membuat estimate bagi Kemajuan Luar Bandar. Pada pandangan Kerajaan agak-nya ia-lah Kementerian Luar Bandar bila habis sahaja emergency dharurat, maka Kemajuan Luar Bandar telah menjadi tumpuan pandangan Kerajaan.

Buku Merah telah di-keluarkan dan apabila di-lihat dasar Kemajuan Luar Bandar yang di-pakai oleh Kerajaan pada masa itu dan nyata-lah ia-itu pertama bagi memberi perkhidmatan yang banyak kapada ra'ayat di-dalam artikata alat² hidup mereka dan chara² hidup mereka. Yang kedua, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-lah mengikhtiarkan supaya berhasil di-dalam hidup ra'ayat itu bertambah pendapatan sama ada dengan memberi mereka itu tanah yang lebeh banyak atau pun dengan memberikan perusahaan² yang membolehkan mereka itu menambah hasil kehidupan mereka. Itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, satu perkara yang baik. Tetapi saya memandang bahawa dalam hendak memajukan ra'ayat ini satu daripada kepentingan yang besar-nya, jangan-lah di-ketepikan oleh Kementerian yang bersangkut, ia-lah jiwa ra'ayat bagi memajukan diri-nya sendiri. Kita tahu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ra'ayat negeri ini baharu menchapai kemerdekaan-nya dan dengan baharu menchapai kemerdekaan-nya itu tidak-lah pula banyak pengalaman bagi kemajuan diri-nya dan tidak-lah pula ada pandangan-nya bagi apa yang patut di-dapati dalam sa-buah negara yang merdeka dan berdaulat. Kementerian Luar Bandar ini bukan-lah chukup menjadikan dasar yang besar memupuk jiwa mereka itu dengan memberikan ucapan yang di-bayangkan oleh Menteri Kewangan itu sendiri, bahawa mereka hendak-lah bekerja lebeh banyak. Bekerja lebeh banyak

untuk ra'ayat bagi kemajuan-nya Tuan Yang di-Pertua boleh di-jalankan dengan menghidupkan rasa hendak bekerja itu kepada mereka, tetapi itu tidak-lah dapat di-jaminkan. Perkara yang kedua ia-lah m e n g u j u d k a n initiative mengujudkan perkara² yang akan di-dengari dan melaksanakan apa yang kita suruh. Ini bagi ra'ayat terutama ra'ayat yang belum begitu masak faham-nya di-dalam hidup itu sangat-lah penting.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berpendapat kalau kita kehendaki ra'ayat melaksanakan Industry² atau usaha² kechil tetapi tidak dapat kita kawal musuh²-nya di-dalam kemajuan-nya itu maka dengan sendiri-nya ra'ayat itu akan malas kelak. Oleh sebab yang demikian pada pendapat saya bahawa hendak-lah di-dasarkan Kementerian ini pada menolong ra'ayat memajukan diri di-dalam perkara² yang apabila mereka maju "dengan sendiri-nya" ia itu menambah hasil mereka. Saya katakan "dengan sendiri-nya", sebab kalau dengan sa-chara lambat hasil-nya tentu-lah tidak dapat menjamin kerajinan ra'ayat. Yang penting ia-lah dengan sendiri-nya dan sa-chara langsung ra'ayat boleh melihat hasil-nya. Maka soal menterjemahkan ranchangan² dengan hakikat-nya dan menjadikan ranchangan² kepada wang yang didapati oleh ra'ayat hendak-lah diasaskan bahawa Kemajuan Luar Bandar itu lebih utama daripada Kemajuan Industry dalam negeri ini. Berhadapan dengan kemajuan Industry, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kilang² hendak-lah di-beri kepada ra'ayat di-luar bandar.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, selain daripada itu Kementerian yang patut memikirkan soal ra'ayat itu ia-lah Kementerian Buroh yang ada peruntukan-nya. Kementerian Buroh ini tidak-lah boleh bangun dalam Dewan ini menteri-nya mengatakan tidak ada penganggoran di-dalam negeri ini. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada hakikat-nya, kita dapat melihat penganggoran itu! Saya akan mengulas hal berkenaan menteri itu apabila disebut tentang gaji-nya sendiri. Sebab itu faham baharu Al-hamdu Lillah dan ini-lah sahaja dahulu sebab gaji

menteri itu akan membolehkan saya berchakap apa sahaja.

Sitting suspended at 11.40 a.m.

Sitting resumed at 12.10 p.m.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Debate resumed.

Question again proposed.

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam (Ipoh):

On a point of order. Mr. Speaker, Sir, with great respect may I ask your permission, while I am not attempting to, and I will never attempt to, challenge the ruling of the Chair, may I ask you, Sir, within your own powers, whether you would be prepared to review the ruling which you gave just now as the construction of 66 (2) of the Standing Orders?

Mr. Speaker: I have already given a ruling—Members may speak only on the general principles of the policy and administration as indicated in the Estimates at this stage. If you speak on the general policy, I shall allow that.

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam: You will allow general principles, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: General principles of the policy and administration of the Government as indicated by the Bill.

Enche' Tan Phock Kin (Tanjong):

Mr. Speaker, Sir, when the Honourable the Minister of Finance spoke the other day, we heard a very loud applause from Members of the Government Bench, even from the Ministers themselves, and we had also seen the wide grin on the face of the Honourable the Minister of Finance in acknowledging the applause, as if the result from a deficit to a surplus Budget is something done through the efforts of the Honourable the Minister of Finance or any of the Ministers. However, I know that the Honourable the Minister of Finance is quite aware of the fact that it happened by sheer accident, and I am glad to note that the Honourable the Minister of Finance spoke with a more sober note at the end of his speech, warning as to the consequences that will face this country in the next few years should the rubber price fall below

the present level. However, we notice that the speech of the Honourable Minister is full of very vague statements, of promises of things to be done, of changes to be made, but like the usual accent of the Government, they would not always be implemented to the full. The incident of applause which I mentioned just now is a very good indication of the state of mind which Members of the Government are having. They always feel good because there is a surplus, and because of that state of mind, during the last two years there was a tendency to over-spend, to spend more than we can afford, and even to be extravagant. I am not merely saying this without any facts to prove my case. Even the Honourable the Minister of Finance himself—the Minister who is supposed to be very prudent about money matters, a man who is supposed to be very careful before he approves any expenditure—came to this House and told us one day that, as far as he was concerned, he would insist that, whenever the Honourable the Prime Minister travels, he should travel by chartered plane. But even the Honourable the Prime Minister did not agree with him. The Honourable the Prime Minister merely has agreed to travel on chartered plane for a short distance such as from Bangkok to Kuala Lumpur, and that has been, from my observation, as far as he would go. He would not agree to the suggestion of the Honourable the Minister of Finance, for example, to fly on a chartered plane from Kuala Lumpur to Washington or from Kuala Lumpur to Canberra or from Kuala Lumpur to London. Well, this is an example to show the financial prudence of our Honourable the Minister of Finance. If it had come from somebody else I would not comment at all in this House, but coming as it did from a person like the Honourable the Minister of Finance, to say the least, I think it is a matter to be deplored. So, this is merely one example to illustrate my point.

You can see all along from the actions of the Government in various matters, in supplementary budgets,

throughout the year which show a tendency to increase whenever rubber prices increase. I have pointed this out last year time and again, and it seems to me that the speeches from this side of the House do not seem to make any difference to Government's policy. So we now come to the speech itself.

The speech itself is full of enunciation of principles as to what should be done under certain circumstances, but I am afraid that as far as putting it into practice, it has never been put into practice, or, if it is put into practice, it is put into practice very haphazardly and not implemented very fully, and I will quote examples of this in a moment. So, because of this state of affairs, we have the Government in their very skilful manner—because they have always been very skilful as far as this matter is concerned—of misrepresenting the facts to the House and to the people generally. They started with a statement of achievements during the past year. They seem to think that it is something which they can be very proud of. But what I can see is this, Mr. Speaker, Sir: to me and to, I am sure, many of us here in the Opposition, it is not the achievements that we can feel proud of, and we can put forward issues or actions of what have been done in the past year which cannot be considered as achievements but rather as demonstration of the ineptitude and the incompetence of the Government. Taking one example, I will refer to the Report of the Auditor-General. The Report of the Auditor-General put forward a lot of facts as to the manner in which Government Departments are run, in particular, the Education Department, and what happened? The Honourable the Deputy Prime Minister was so perturbed that he brought a White Paper before this House and asked this House to approve the White Paper, which amounted to saying that this House had no confidence in the Auditor-General. Some Ministers went even as far as to say that the Auditor-General's Report contained misrepresentation and factual errors—That, I

submit, is a very grave charge. So, as usual, the Report went before the Public Accounts Committee which consists of Members of the Alliance as well as of the Opposition. The Committee gathered evidence and issued a report which was tabled before this House. This Committee, including the Alliance Members, stated quite categorically that in their opinion the Report of the Auditor-General contained no factual errors or misrepresentations. So you see, Sir, this is a very serious state of affairs. If the Auditor-General is right—his Report is now being supported by the Members of the Public Accounts Committee including Members of the Alliance, and so you cannot say that it is a biased report or that it is a report coloured by political consideration; it is a very objective report setting out the correct and true position—and if his Report is true, then I say here that we have sufficient proof to show that Government in running the affairs, particularly the affairs in the Education Department, is running them very ineptly and very incompetently. This is beyond doubt, and it is unnecessary for me to elaborate further on this as the facts speak for themselves.

Coming to the other achievements of which the Honourable the Minister so proudly boasts, he talks of the Emergency coming to an end, and here again we have another glaring example of promise but not fulfilment. When the Emergency was lifted and the Public Security Ordinance was passed, this House was given an assurance by the Minister that the Ordinance would not be used indiscriminately against the people of this country, particularly members of the Opposition. But what has happened during the past months? We have seen the further detention of members of the general public; we have seen the detention of members of political organisations in opposition, including those members who are most active. This is a betrayal of the assurance given to this House. This, I submit, is typical of the Alliance Government, typical of their frequent promises, typical of their constant betrayal of such promises.

Then we have another glaring example—an attempt to hoodwink the people of this country. When the Alliance Government introduced the Education Ordinance for fear that sections of the public might oppose it, they came out with the promise of free education; they came out with various promises of providing educational facilities for the people of this country, knowing fully well at that time that they cannot afford to do it, that the financial position of the Federation will not enable them to do so. Yet they deliberately put out this as one of the most radical attempts of the Alliance Government on the question of education—an attempt which very few countries in the world can even boast of doing. But, however, they are quite prepared to do this sort of thing, they are quite prepared to gain support by misrepresentations—so there you are, you have this sort of thing. In this particular speech of the Honourable the Minister of Finance, it is made very clear to us that his Government will not be in a position to do this for some considerable time, or perhaps not at all.

Sir, we must remember that this Government, in endeavouring to do all this, must be motivated by some consideration. We must realise that the Government is essentially a Government of capitalist interests; they are merely concerned with safeguarding the position of this class of people, particularly big capitalists, particularly foreign capitalists. If they have not attempted to mislead the people, I would not have bothered to raise this particular point. But all along in this speech, the Honourable the Minister of Finance seems to create the impression that he is very concerned over the plight of the ordinary people in this country, of the underprivileged, and of his concern to assist them. He stated on page 12 of his speech that “it would be of great help to the Government and to the people of this country in their endeavour to uplift the living standards of that section of the population which is not so fortunately placed.”—it is all very well to speak in such terms, but I would like to ask him what is he proposing to do to

assist these people. It is quite clear that this paragraph is addressed to his own class and not to the people of this country. He is appealing to them to give up a little bit of what they have earned, a little bit of their vast fortunes in order to assist the underprivileged.

However, I must admit here that he is very clever. He has pointed out to us that he has been connected with the rubber industry, but let us look at the record—he has been holding directorships in many rubber companies of very substantial size; and so it is quite clear that our Minister of Finance is very actively connected with the rubber industry and generally with all sorts of capitalistic enterprises. Sir, he has been a Member of the Government for many years and with his radical ideas of helping the underprivileged, surely he could have wielded influence over his Government. But I am afraid nothing had been done.

The rubber industry has been enjoying a high price in the past few years—in the words of the Minister of Finance, it is the highest price we can expect—and yet during the period they were not assisted with that tax that he is now proposing to introduce. We have been collecting anti-inflationary cess during those periods, and that anti-inflationary cess will be returned to the rubber companies when the rubber prices go down to a certain level; and he is merely proposing it now, knowing very well that the rubber price will never reach \$1.00, knowing very well that the price will go down and down. He said so himself—it is not my suggestion—that this is going to be the trend. So, this is an example of his very shrewd business mind; he is a very shrewd man indeed—he was interested in business but he is not now; he is now in the Government and he is concerned with the lot of the people of this country, but he has put forward a tax system that will not raise a single cent for this Government, if his forecast is correct. So this is the state of affairs we have in this country, this is the sort of Government we have in this country, a Government which is definitely interested in the economic future of a

particular class, a Government which is not interested in uplifting the lot of the people in this country—the people in the kampongs, the people in the new villages, and the poor people in the towns. These are glaring examples.

Not being contented with this, he comes down to the question of income tax, and he tells us of a very sound principle, a principle that is accepted by people throughout the world, that there must be differentiation between two types of income—income from personal exertion, and income from property. He says, and quite rightly too, that people who earn income by their own exertion should be given special consideration, as distinct from people who earn their income from property. I cannot agree more with the Honourable Minister on this issue, but what I quarrel with him is this. If we agree that this is a correct principle, then it is only logic that we should implement this principle to the full. We should see to it that people who earn income from personal exertion should not be taxed on the same scale as people who earn income from property, because income from property is unearned and as such should definitely have a higher rate of taxation. So, on this argument alone, we must have two differential rates of taxation—a rate of taxation for those incomes that are obtained through personal exertion, and another rate of taxation for incomes from property. That is the logical conclusion. But, however, our Honourable the Minister of Finance and his Government, because it is a Government representing quite a great many people who earn substantial unearned income, who derive income from property, naturally would not like to see a tax structure that is more equitable, that is fairer. So, it will be seen that he is merely giving us half-measures. He is merely saying that those who earn income from personal exertion will be entitled to an allowance of an extra \$1,000. So, you see, Sir, here again is another example of the very shrewd manner in which certain high sounding principles are being enunciated without being properly implemented.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we on this side of the House have constantly, since we were returned to this Parliament, brought forward many matters which are of very great importance—matters pertaining to the everyday administration, pertaining to tenders and many other matters such as industry and commerce. But I am afraid the proposals put forward by us were never heeded. However, I note here that the Honourable Minister in his speech has put forward certain proposals which can only bear testimony to the fact that he is by no means satisfied with the way in which the Government is being run at the present moment. I refer here, Sir, to paragraph 31, in which it is stated that Government proposes to appoint a Commission of Enquiry to examine the tenders system and the procurement of supplies, and also to investigate P.W.D. standards and costs because, apparently, the Honourable Minister of Finance has now realised that Government is not receiving value for the money given for various works done for various Government enterprises. However, it must be remembered here that when my Honourable colleague the Member for Bungsar raised various points with regard to tenders, such as the reasons as to why tenders should not be given to the lowest tenderer, all sorts of reasons were given by Ministers; and now they want to appoint a Commission to enquire into this. I must say here, Sir, that the question of tenders is a very simple one. It seems to me that as far as the Government is concerned, they have no sense of direction whatsoever. They do not quite know what to do, so much so that they feel they must appoint a Commission of Enquiry. But I must say here, Sir, that giving tenders to the lowest tenderer is a principle which is accepted by all the people as a whole, by all authorities, except when there are very good reasons why it should not be done. And for a Government like ours in the past to indiscriminately give tenders to organisations which have given not the lowest tenders, but tenders which are substantially higher than the lowest, is a question which must be challenged, and we have challenged it many times without much

success; and their reply is "appoint a Commission". I must say here that this is not a matter for a Commission. The point is that if you have a few Members of the Opposition in the Commission, then I am sure the Commission will be able to do some useful work, because it is no use appointing a Commission which consists mostly of Alliance people and which will actually do what the Government says. It will be merely a farce. And on this question of standards and all that, rightly or wrongly, it appears that most Government contracts and tenders were given to firms in which leaders of the Alliance are connected.

Mr. Speaker: If you make serious allegations against anyone, you must be prepared to substantiate your allegations. This is only a warning.

Enche' Tan Phock Kin: I am making allegations against the Government, the Alliance Government, and with regard to substantiating such allegations, Sir, I think it is obvious: everyone in the country knows who owns Printcraft; everyone in the country knows who is connected with Carriers Air-conditioners. So, I sincerely hope that our Government for once should be more receptive to public opinion and that, with the appointment of this Commission, this deplorable practice will stop once and for all, so that the people in this country will never suspect, whether rightly or wrongly, that there have been improper motives.

Now, I come to a very serious aspect of the whole problem, that is, the future which this country is going to face. Had this Government been a more progressive Government, had this Government been a Government that is representing the people of this country, today we would have been in a very good position—a position with very substantial balances, a position in which we can face many years of low rubber prices without much difficulty, without much cuts in development and without worries as to where we are going to raise money. But unfortunately the people of this country voted in a Government which represented only a very small sectional interest but who

were skilful enough by misrepresentations to tell the people that they are the Party for the people. (HONOURABLE MEMBERS: No! No!) Just as I have demonstrated in this speech of the Honourable Minister of Finance, how he was able to fool the Members of the Government in this House itself, so much so that they applauded him so loudly when he mentioned the fact that there has been a relief, it was through the same skill that they were able to get themselves elected. But I say this: that they can only fool the people some of the time, but that they cannot fool all the people all the time. So, you see, Sir, we in the Opposition will take every opportunity to expose this, as we have exposed it today; and before long the people in this country will know all about this Government, so much so that they will be very wary when they go to the polls, and they will be very wary when they are asked to vote the Alliance.

The Alliance has been telling us that their pet theme is that they want to build up a property-owning democracy. They have been here for quite some time, and how did they fare? I have seen some achievements. I must admit. But the achievements are not property-owning for the rank-and-file, not property-owning for the people, but property-owning for a small elite, a small section on the top. I know, and I think the people of this country know, that they have done pretty well since the election. Many of the people in this country have realised—they have seen in the papers and they have noticed them in the various fields of endeavour in commercial and industrial life—that they have made some considerable progress—I am referring to the small section. A lot of them now have come into the banking world, they have sat on the boards of directors of banks, of insurance companies, of industry and of various other enterprises. I congratulate them on their endeavour, but I must ask them to remember that their promise is “a property-owning democracy”. It means for the people: all the people must be able to enjoy a little wealth, and to start that, the logical way of starting will be to start with the people, and

they themselves should be the last to benefit. However, I am sorry to say that the process is the other way round and I do not know when the time will come, if ever at all, when the ordinary people in the street will be able to own property. This, Sir, is another example of what I say—promises, but no fulfilment.

We have also come to notice the very skilful manner in which another principle is being enunciated. That is the principle of industrialisation. We in this country must industrialise or we will perish. So, because of that we must encourage foreign industry and in the process of encouraging foreign industry, or encouraging pioneer industry, we must give them tax deductions and tax holidays, and apart from tax holidays we also allow them exemption from customs duty so that they will be in a position to compete. Here again, Sir, the method, as I have said quite a number of times in this House, is by no means a perfect method. In fact it is a method that is open to abuse, and, as far as the people of this country are concerned, many of them have expressed their great concern over the manner in which pioneer status is being granted, over the monopolistic tendency given to such pioneer industry. We have been told by the Minister that one of the ways in which it has been used by his Government is that it is their practice not to grant pioneer status to more than one firm, and that, to safeguard the position of that particular firm, they have to disallow other applicants of the same industry from starting to produce that particular product because they fear that this particular firm that has been given pioneer status may not be able to sell its product. So, you see, our Government has gone to the extent of using the policy of encouraging pioneer industry to protect a single firm. This, I say, is by no means desirable, because, as far as the firm is concerned, it is enjoying a monopoly. It is enjoying a condition which is abnormal, and in so doing is bound to make profits, and by the same process, such firms can also organise other firms of this sort and it will be seen that as a result of

this you have the growth of quite a number of industries of this nature. If you analyse the share holdings of such new firms, you will find that most of the shareholders are also shareholders of existing firms in this country. So, by a process of understanding, the firm enjoying pioneer status can afford to make huge profits while the other firm, of which the shareholders are almost the same, can even conduct its business at a loss and thereby pay no income tax—and the pioneer firm making huge profits need not pay any tax anyway. So, you see, on the whole the same people are very likely to have an opportunity of escaping in this manner. But what is more important is this. People in firms enjoying pioneer status are very fortunate and they are confined to a small group. Obviously they must be connected with or must have some influence somehow before they can have the opportunity of enjoying such privilege. And here again it is open to abuse. There is nothing to prevent, and I say this quite categorically, the Minister or anybody in his Ministry from favouring one firm to another. The whole decision is very, very arbitrary, and if one says that I prefer this to that, I prefer Dunlop to some other firm, I prefer the Merdeka Film Industry to another film industry, all this can be done, and, rightly or wrongly, the Government may be proceeding along very correct lines without any bias whatsoever. But the fact remains that so long as they have arbitrary powers, the suspicion will always be there that certain firms are being favoured or a certain company is being favoured, and sometimes you may have a firm called the Alliance Engineers which may have nothing to do whatsoever with the Alliance Party or a firm called the Merdeka Film Industry which may have nothing to do at all with the Alliance and yet if they are given pioneer status there are bound to be repercussions, there is bound to be suspicion that there is something fishy, that something improper has happened. But once you remove that arbitrary power, once you do not have that arbitrary power, then nobody can argue along those lines. So, I would like to appeal to the

Government that in view of what I have said they should give very serious consideration to this particular point.

So, we see here that the Government, being so perturbed about the state of affairs they are in, came up with the statement to the effect that our birth rate has increased to a very great extent, and that our increase in birth rate has more or less outstripped our increase in productivity and that, as a result of this, if this trend is not stopped eventually in this country, we will be having a lower standard of living. This, I must say, is a very serious state of affairs, but the important thing is this, and I think it is the responsibility of the Government to tackle this problem vigorously. As I pointed out just now, had this Government adopted a more progressive attitude, this state of affairs may not arise at all. It is because they have left everything to the spirit of *laissez faire* that we have this state of affairs. Apparently the Government realises this and so they now say that they will appoint, they now say that . . .

Mr. Speaker: What paragraph is it?

Enche' Tan Phock Kin: I am looking for the paragraph, Sir. (*Laughter*). They are now telling us that they are going to appoint a Planning Committee, and that the effect is that it is at last considered that the economic secretariat should be enlarged and that there should be more planning. Well, what we say here is that that should have come long, long ago and not now. So, the whole problem, I submit, Sir, is that the Government in the past had been living in a fool's paradise during periods of rubber boom, and thus sufficient money was not being saved. There were no planned economic efforts, everything was left to the free play of private enterprise, and, as a result of that, people go in for what will give them the most profit. Everybody is going for money. So, as far as the business men are concerned, left to themselves they will go and produce whatever commodities that will give them the best return. The Government failed to consider the economic future

of this country. They failed to appreciate that they should produce what is needed in this country. They failed to realise that as a Government they have a responsibility, that they should have more central planning and that they should guide the people of this country as to what they should produce. We have a very sad state of affairs in which our pineapple producers produced more pineapple than required, so much so that most of them are facing financial difficulties; and sometimes we have in rubber an over-production until we find the price toppling down, so much so that smallholders suffer through not being able to sell at a sufficiently high price; and even in tin the same thing has happened time and again.

All this happened during the colonial regime, and at least when the Alliance Government, which claims to be the Government of the people, came to power we did expect them to do something about it. But I am afraid to say that the Alliance Government has all along been following the old colonial pattern of administration. Very little, or no changes were made at all to the administration. They talk of various things, and one of the matters which comes to my mind at this moment is again the question of the note-issue on which the Honourable the Minister seems to think that it should take more time before he has confidence that the Central Bank will be in a position to issue notes. I mean that this is another glaring example that the Government has no confidence in itself. The Minister feels so, and he has told us at this meeting that if we change too abruptly, the people in other parts of the world may lose confidence in the dollar, and it is because of that that the dollar must be tied to sterling and that we must continue with the arrangement for many more years. I asked the Minister at the previous session, when this matter was discussed, at least to tell us when he expected the Central Bank to become a note-issuing authority, but he was unable to do so. And I do not know whether he is able today to inform us, perhaps, of the approximate time.

So, you see, in spite of the fact that we are independent—we say so—we are tied to the colonial pattern both in economic administration and also in other matters pertaining to the Emergency and also pertaining to the armed forces. We on this side of the House have all along been opposing the stationing of foreign troops in this country, but the Government does not seem to worry very much about it and they seem to think that the stationing of foreign troops in our country is consistent with our status of an independent country. It will be seen that, as far as our Government is concerned, we today have gone so far as to be able to send Malayan troops to the Congo, and I see no reason why we should not be in a position to have sufficient troops in our own country without resorting to foreign troops. We must realise, Sir, that there is no more communist insurrection, and the stationing of foreign troops in this country can only mean one thing—that most of these foreigners are merely interested in one aspect: they are not interested in us; they are merely interested in using our country as a frontline for their country; and this particular fact is not a statement from me, it is a statement from the Australian Parliament, in which the Australians themselves say that their justification for sending Australian troops here is not so much to protect us but because they feel that their frontline is in this country, and the only reason for their sending their troops here is that they hope that they will be able to fight the enemy off here in our land. These facts can easily be checked. The Australian Parliament proceedings are published in their Hansard and any Members of the Government who do not believe it can look for themselves, can ask for copies for themselves and can scrutinize for themselves.

So, Sir, it will be seen that this state of affairs is most unsatisfactory and it must be remedied and remedied quickly. It is no use talking about it, talking as to what we are going to do, and telling the people of this country that they must work very hard, because, as far as I can see, the people

of this country are all working—the people that are not working are the people who live on unearned income, and they can afford not to work because they have an unearned income coming to them. So I think the problem facing this country is not so much the question of levying higher taxes but the question of shifting the incidence of tax. The Honourable the Minister of Finance has said that he believes that the taxes should be paid by those who can best afford to pay, and I submit here, Sir, that if that principle is going to be applied, then the incidence of taxation in this country is radically wrong. We are collecting taxes more from people who can ill-afford to pay than from people who can afford to pay. So the higher income groups are let off very lightly while the lower income groups are being taxed more and more. At this Budget meeting

Mr. Speaker: It is now one o'clock p.m. Have you finished?

Enche' Tan Phock Kin: Not yet, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: How many more minutes will you take?

Enche' Tan Phock Kin: I think about ten more minutes, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Ahli² Yang Berhormat, terlebih dahulu sa-belum saya menangogohkan Majlis ini saya suka hendak mengingatkan bahawa mengikut Standing Order 66 (2) perbahathan ini hanya-lah 3 hari sahaja yang di-untukkan bagi membahathkan bacaan kali yang kedua Rang Undang² estimates ini. Jikalau-lah berjalan Majlis ini sa-bagaimana pada pagi ini di-mana kita telah dudok daripada pukul 10 sampai pukul 1 hanya dua orang sahaja dapat berchakap. Saya tak tahu-lah berapa orang boleh membahathkan Rang Unda ng² bagi bacaan kali kedua pada hari ini. Oleh itu saya harap kalau boleh Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang akan berchakap pada petang ini dan juga pada hari Ithnin dan Thalatha supaya dapat m e m e n d e k k a n saberapa boleh ucapan²-nya dengan tujuan dan niat supaya memberi peluang kepada Ahli² yang lain yang hendak memberi

fikiran-nya terhadap Rang Undang² ini, dan kalau boleh juga saya mintalah supaya jangan di-ulang²kan lagi, kerana banyak masa yang terbuang dengan di-ulang²kan beberapa kali segala hujah² yang sudah di-keluarkan dahulu. Itu-lah sahaja ingatan saya.

Sitting suspended at 1.00 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 2.30 p.m.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

THE SUPPLY BILL, 1961

Debate resumed on Question, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Question again proposed.

Enche' Tan Phock Kin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I shall continue my discussion on the Budget Speech of the Honourable Minister of Finance. I am sorry to notice here that, with the resumption of debate, a person like the Minister of Finance, who is responsible for replying to the debate on the Budget, cannot be seen here in this House.

Dr. Lim Swee Aun (Larut Selatan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification, if the Honourable Member will give way. The rest of us, backbenchers, are here to listen to him, Sir.

Enche' Tan Phock Kin: Well, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am replying to the Budget Speech of the Honourable Minister, not speeches of ordinary Members or speeches of other Ministers. The question of responsibility may be collective, but the question of a Budget Speech comes directly under the province of the Minister of Finance. He makes an enunciation of policy and Members of the Opposition are quite at liberty to criticise, and unless he is here, he is in no position to reply. However, I hope he will not feel that he need not reply to Members of the Opposition. I sincerely hope that he believes in the process of parliamentary democracy; I sincerely hope that he believes in government by discussion and government by debate. It is a well-known fact that the Government may have a majority, but that doesn't mean that the Government can do anything

it likes without taking into consideration the views of the minority. I have criticised the Alliance Government on many issues, but I think this is a most serious one—a Minister responsible not being present when a debate is taking place on the very subject for which he is responsible. However, I shall proceed, Sir, and I think this House is quite aware of the seriousness of the thing. I am glad he is present now, but I believe the Speaker told us, very clearly, that it is quarter to three and, as a responsible officer, he should be present in his place promptly.

Mr. Speaker: Please proceed!

Enche' Tan Phock Kin: Well, I was touching on the subject as to what we are faced with today. We have a Budget drawn up by the Minister, and on the question as to the price of rubber, it was fixed at 80 cents. Eighty cents was also put as the price of rubber when estimates were made last year and everybody knows that it was a conservative estimate for last year because the price of rubber was \$1.20—as high as that. So, to put it at 80 cents was very conservative and very sound, and everybody agrees that the Finance Minister should be conservative. This year, with the price of rubber standing at 85 cents—sometimes it went down to 82/83 cents—the rubber price is again put at 80 cents. So, if the principle of being conservative is applied, I must say that it is not being applied this year, and one would expect that principles, if they are going to be applied, should be applied consistently. So, if budgets are to be prepared conservatively, if the principle of conservatism is going to be adopted, then one should be consistently conservative and not being conservative one year if it suits us here and not being conservative another year if it does not suit us or if it is going to put forward a gloomy picture. The fact that the Alliance may not be able to face the situation should the rubber price drop is entirely a different matter. What we are interested in is to have a correct picture, to have a consistent picture, that if rubber price is so much, how much revenue should we have; we do not want a false picture to be drawn

up; and I am afraid that the Honourable Minister of Finance, in placing rubber price at 80 cents per lb. at this particular juncture, is drawing an inaccurate picture of the financial position of this country. I feel, Sir, that in view of the present trend, one of the functions of the Ministry should be to cut down expenditure as much as possible, and least of all be extravagant. I am sorry to note that the Minister made no mention whatsoever on this very particular point. We must appreciate that due to many years of Alliance extravagance, ineptitude and incompetence we are faced with this position today. Though they would not like to talk about the new year, the year after that and the year after that when rubber price might go down, as a Government I feel that we must be prepared for all eventualities. We must not work on the principle that we hope that the rubber price will go up; we should not work on the principle that rubber price is unpredictable and if it should go down we will think about what to do. We have in our experience—at least the Government has—in this country been faced with a similar situation some time ago when rubber prices went down after the Korean war and a lot of development projects were stopped and a lot of money was wasted by the Government on half completed jobs. This state of affairs should have taught us a lesson. We should not be in a similar position again. We must plan our economy in such a way that we should be in a position to face it whatever the consequences. So, instead of coming to this House and telling us with confidence, as they should, that even if rubber prices should go down we can tackle the problem, as far as we are concerned we have a very sorry story from the Honourable Minister of Finance. He says:

“For 1961 it may be said that the outlook is fair though there are one or two ominous, though as yet indistinct, clouds on the horizon, particularly in the United States. At home we are faced with a population which is not only growing too rapidly, it is growing even faster now than it did 10 years ago, and that was fast enough. For the 1947-57 decade the rate of increase was 2.5 per cent per annum. It is 3.3 per cent today, and this country probably has the

dubious distinction of having one of the highest, if not the highest, rates of natural increase anywhere in the world. On the other hand, our rate of economic growth in terms of physical volume of output during the decade was somewhere between 2.5 per cent and 3 per cent annually on the average. This means that population growth is outstripping the growth in production and this trend, if continued, must inevitably entail a lowering of living standards."

This, with the view that rubber price may drop, is, I submit, a very gloomy picture. One is overdoing it when one says that the outlook is fair. I would say that the outlook looks more gloomy than fair. However, what is going to happen the year after, and the year after? I have not seen anything here that puts forward specifically what Government proposes to do. They merely make one statement that they are going to have an Economic Secretariat, going to enlarge, going to plan, but they did not tell us their policy as to what line of action that plan was taking. If we are to believe them, if we are to assume that Government is going to pursue their policy, then I am afraid this country will be plunged into a very serious state. We must realise here that merely telling the people to work is one thing, but to make people work one must offer the workers something, one must make it worthwhile, one must make them feel that this is their country and whatever they do they will reap the bulk of the benefits. If the workers of this country believe that whatever they do, it would be taken away from them by the people who supply the capital, then I am afraid the output per worker will not increase very much. So, here, Sir, is a fundamental question. If Government really believes in increasing the national product it must change its policy radically. It must not think merely in terms of return for capital. It must not merely consider the view points of the capitalists and the big financiers. It must also consider the view point of the working people in this country—be they peasants or be they industrial workers.

On this particular point, I am also surprised to read from the speech of the Honourable the Minister of Finance that land is the solution, and of the difficulties of getting land alienation.

Had the administration of the whole of the States been in the hands of the Opposition Parties, like Trengganu and Kelantan, there may be some reason of expression of such difficulties, but with the State Governments mostly in the hands of the Alliance, I see no reason whatsoever why there should be this expression of difficulty. Surely agreement can be reached very easily, and even in the States of Kelantan and Trengganu, I feel sure that the Pan-Malayan Islamic Party will not put any difficulties in the way of co-operating for the benefit of the people as a whole. So it is rather regrettable to hear this, especially from the Minister. So with the difficulty of land out of the question—that is at least my assumption—then the question is to get the people to work on it. So, on this particular issue I feel that the Government fails to grasp the problem clearly. In their mad belief of individualist enterprise, they fail to appreciate that as far as rural development is concerned and as far as agriculture is concerned—now that the Minister of Agriculture is here—I think it is generally believed that the collective—or if the Minister does not like the word—the co-operative organisation of such industry is the most important and is the most efficient way of getting results. However, the Government, being so biased against collective enterprise in their bid to assist the rural people, feel that land should not be owned collectively, even by a co-operative society, and that it must be owned individually. The net result of this is that it discourages co-operative endeavours, and we see here that the question of co-operation is indeed very important.

Mr. Speaker: I understood from you this morning that you would not take more than 15 minutes.

Enche' Tan Phock Kin: Now it is only five minutes, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: No. You have taken more than fifteen minutes.

Enche' Tan Phock Kin: I am sorry, Sir. This morning I was under the impression that what I had to say would only take ten minutes, but apparently it has taken longer than that.

Mr. Speaker: But I would like to remind you that land is a matter which is in the hands of the States.

Enche' Tan Phock Kin: I appreciate that, Sir. What I am merely talking about is in reply to the speech about increasing our national product, and I feel, Sir, that as far as land utilisation is concerned, the possibility, the prospects, of increasing our national product are better if it was done collectively. And so by restricting land ownership merely to individuals, it is hampering this very efficient process of land utilisation and I feel that Government has committed a big error in this. It does not mean that if land is owned by collective organisation, we are adopting a communist method. I mean the difference is this: the men who cultivate the land must be free to decide whether they want to do it collectively. Once we give them that freedom then there is a world of difference between this particular type of agricultural organisation and the communist methods of doing things. So let us not be biased, let us not be prejudiced. If we are really interested in our country, if we are really interested in increasing our national product, then we should examine the various methods of organisation and adopt whatever methods that are most efficient and not be biased by other considerations.

So, here again, I feel that if we want the people of this country to work, we must give them a stake, we must encourage them whether it be by co-operative effort or otherwise, and, above all, we must make them feel that whatever legislation—be it taxation, be it income tax or customs duties—is introduced, they are designed to assist them, to enable them to have a higher standard of living, to enable them to be more efficient and to develop and everything should be done to assist them; but I am afraid the general tendency here is to consider the viewpoint of the property—owning classes rather than the viewpoint of the working classes, and that I submit, Sir, is the crux of the whole problem. We must plan our future in accordance with our resources, in accordance with

every eventuality; whether the rubber price is going to be 80 cents, 60 cents or 50 cents, we must always be on the alert; should the rubber price go up higher, our taxation system should see to it that we have plenty in reserve during times of boom so that money can be utilised in times of recession. We should not pay merely lip service, as the Alliance Government has been doing for so many years. We must do it in practice. One Honourable Minister laughs, but it is a fact. Take the year 1959, for example: during this year though the rubber price was high, yet our budget resulted in a deficit. Well, I ask him to cast his mind ahead and to think what is going to happen later on when rubber price goes down. This is indeed very serious and it is not a laughing matter.

So, Sir, it is my earnest hope that what I have said at this particular session will be seriously considered by the Minister, though he does not appear to be very interested, going away after listening only for a few minutes. Perhaps, I take it that the Honourable Minister, as he always tries to create the impression, is a very knowledgeable man and need not listen to criticism because in his own words—"the Opposition does not know what it is talking"

Mr. Speaker: It is out of order to impute improper motives against any Member in this House.

Enche' Tan Phock Kin: So I hope, even if the Minister is not present, other Ministers who are present can prevail upon the Cabinet to proceed along more sober lines.

Enche' V. David (Bungsar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, my Honourable colleague has already dwelt on the very vital aspects of the Budget, and he has given a clear picture of our Party's stand.

Sir, when going through the speech of the Honourable the Minister of Finance, I find that the excess of expenditure when compared with the year 1960 is \$69.3 million. By this I believe it will include the various intended visits of the Ministers to foreign countries and it will also include

the creation of a new Ministry called the Ministry of Internal Security.

Sir, we have been repeatedly pointing out that our Government has not been saving enough and that there has been considerable extravagance and that the expenditure should be reduced. But from the speech of the Minister of Finance, we can only come to the conclusion that we have been frequently incurring additional expenditure of various kinds instead of reducing. Sir, by doing so it is not only we alone who are going to be in debts to the other nations, but also the future generation of this country who will be answerable for the debts incurred by the present generation.

Sir, coming to the competition of synthetic rubber in the world market, I would like to say that we have not taken adequate precautions to safeguard our natural rubber industry which is the lifeblood stream of our nation's economy. The question of fragmentation in this country has been treated very lightly in view of the rising grave consequences. When my colleague raised this matter in the form of a motion about a few months back, I remember the Government did give an answer that fragmentation had not risen to be a threat to our economy. According to reliable and statistical information which the Government does not possess (*Laughter*), I have ascertained that there are at least 15,000 to 20,000 workers who have lost their employment in the rubber industry.

The Government has not conducted an adequate survey in this field to ascertain the growing danger to the rubber industry. We cannot stop the synthetic rubber industry from competing in the world market. Our Ministers can frequently travel to the United States and can frequently be given verbal assurances that synthetic rubber will not be in competition, but I understand that synthetic rubber is produced much cheaper than natural rubber. This, in time to come, with scientific research in the advanced countries, will make synthetic rubber a very great competitor of natural rubber

which today is the major commodity sent from Malaya to the outside world.

Sir, fragmentation cannot be stopped by operating a few finance corporations by Ministers. The positive approach would be for adequate legislation to prevent fragmentation. According to the Government's reply, I understand that a Committee, has been set up by the Government to study the question of fragmentation. To my knowledge, Sir, within the recent months the Committee met once or twice and in some cases it met without a quorum and it had to abandon the meeting. So far neither the Ministers, nor the Minister, who is leading the role in the National Land Acquisition Finance Co-operative Society, have been able to tell us what the Committee has done and what it is going to do in order to prevent further fragmentation which will become a threat to Malaya's economy. Sir, I would say that Government by means of a negative approach would not solve the problem of fragmentation. I understand, according to the Minister for Works, Posts and Telecommunications, that his National Land Acquisition Co-operative Society has collected \$150,000 and this would definitely not stop fragmentation.

The Assistant Minister of Labour (Enche' V. Manickavasagam): Sir, on a point of order—Standing Order 66 (2)—how is this National Land Acquisition Co-operative Society relevant to this debate?

Mr. Speaker: I have given my ruling this morning—that in the debate on the Second Reading of the Supply Bill the Opposition side has a wide range of subjects to discuss. He is talking about rubber.

Enche' V. David: I have not gone out of the Standing Orders.

Mr. Speaker: Never mind about that.

Enche' V. David: I was only comparing the rubber industry. In my view the rubber industry is more important than any other industries from the economic point of view. I was referring to my Honourable friend,

Dato' Sambanthan, the Minister for Works, Posts and Telecommunications, who recently in his tour had said that all estate workers if they wanted to preserve their employment in this country should definitely buy shares in the National Land Acquisition Finance Co-operative Society.

The Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives (Enche' Abdul Aziz): He is not a friend of yours, is he? (*Laughter*).

Mr. Speaker: When you want to speak, you must say on what point of order, or on a point of clarification.

Enche' Abdul Aziz: I was thinking aloud. (*Laughter*).

Mr. Speaker: You should not do that. Please proceed!

Enche' V. David: Sir, I do not see how he has been driven to the conclusion that fragmentation of the rubber industry could be stopped by this Co-operative Society. I not only say that this is a negative approach, but I would go a step further and say that this is an attempt by the Honourable Minister to try to deceive the public—in fact, the innocent workers who are employed on estates. The Minister may not have felt the importance of workers losing employment on estates, but there are hundreds of people swarming to the employment exchange from morning till evening

Enche' V. Manickavasagam: On a point of order, Sir, I refer to Standing Order 36 (9) which says that no reference shall be made in any debate to the conduct or character of any Member of Parliament.

Mr. Speaker: Proceed!

Enche' V. David: Thank you, Sir. I definitely know how sensitive and how conscious the Assistant Minister of Labour is when I speak about his colleague from the M.I.C.

Mr. Speaker: Never mind about that. I must warn you, Mr. David, that although you have the right to speak as much as you like on the general principles of the policy of the Government, you must be very careful not to go into detail.

Enche' V. David: Thank you, Sir. I do not understand how a Minister from the ruling Party, from the Cabinet, with a responsible ministerial appointment could involve himself in a finance corporation.

Enche' V. Manickavasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, he is not a shareholder in that Co-operative Society.

Enche' V. David: Sir, I am subject to correction—I did not say that he is a shareholder. I only said that he had involved himself—to what extent he is involved is a matter for the public to judge.

Mr. Speaker: Do not go too far on that.

Enche' V. David: In my opinion, Sir, the Malayan Indian Congress itself being a part of the ruling Party must come to a definite policy regarding fragmentation. My stress on fragmentation is due to the fact that the rubber planting industry should be preserved, not only as an industry but it should be preserved from an economic point of view since the largest number of workers employed today are in the rubber industry.

Sir, the rubber planting industry, if it is to be protected against fragmentation, should have appropriate legislation and the Government, instead of setting up all these advisory boards and committees, would be doing a great service to the economy of this country if it could enact the necessary legislation, such as those adopted in Ceylon and India, to prevent fragmentation.

Sir, coming to the new ministerial appointment of the Minister of Internal Security, I cannot understand that in a country with only 7 million people why there should be two separate appointments—a Minister of Defence and also a Minister of Internal Security.

Enche' Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman (Seberang Tengah): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order—Standing Order 36 (1). It looks to me that the Honourable Member is irrelevant, because we are now debating on the policy of this

Supply Act. It looks as if we are debating on the policy of the Government, because he is talking of Government policy. We are not debating on His Majesty's Speech.

Mr. Speaker: Standing Order 66 (2), if you read carefully, says that the debate shall be confined to the general principles of Government policy and administration. Please proceed!

Enche' V. David: Thank you, Sir. If I am not disturbed by frequent interruptions

Mr. Speaker: Never mind about that. Don't waste your time by commenting on my ruling any more. (*Laughter*).

Enche' V. David: I am afraid of the time factor, Sir. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I find the Budget Speech on page 2 states the following:

"The year has also seen the celebration of the official end of the Emergency which lasted from July, 1948, to July, 1960, and took such a toll in lives and money and caused such widespread misery. We can rejoice that this menace, which drained so much of our resources, has at last been overcome."

According to what I read, Sir, it sounds very nice. If any foreign representative were to read the speech, he would be thinking and imagining that we in Malaya are living in a fairyland. Sir, I cannot say that the people are rejoicing. The people cannot rejoice until and unless the Internal Security Act is removed. Why I say this? I have my reasons. From June 1948 to 1960 the people of this country have met with repeated difficulties when the Emergency Regulations were on, but today we see a permanent legislation, one which has been made a permanent feature in our country, to restrict the citizens of this country in every aspect, that is, hear nothing, say nothing and do nothing. Sir, the first victims of this undemocratic legislation were my pitiful colleagues of the Socialist Front, who have been swept into the lock-ups on the 30th of October, 1960. I was expecting that the Government would present a White Paper to this House, Sir, so that Honourable Members of this House would have an opportunity

of discussing the White Paper. But unfortunately the Government has thought fit not to table such a White Paper, thus not giving an opportunity to Members of this House to debate. However, Sir, why the 20 most active and staunch supporters of the Socialist Front should be locked up?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Subversive!

Enche' V. David: Sir, what is subversive? According to the 20th century Chambers dictionary, it says "either to overthrow or to destroy is subversive". I now say, Sir, that if I myself did not overthrow the Alliance candidate from the political arena, I would not be seated here. So, can that be construed as subversive? Therefore, Sir, the word "subversive" has several wide interpretations.

Mr. Speaker: You have gone beyond the general principles of this debate. You were quite right up to a certain stage, but when you come to that you have gone beyond the general principles. I have to pull you up before you are interrupted by other Members.

Enche' V. David: Sorry, Sir. I did not intend to define the word "subversive." Unfortunately I heard someone utter "subversive" and I was compelled to elaborate on it. But as the ruling has come from the Chair that I am out of order, I will now turn my attention to other matters which are very important from the point of view of the Opposition.

Sir, who were arrested in this action of the Government? The Assistant General Secretary of the Socialist Front of Malaya, Ngoh Pak Ngee. Then comes Mr. Foo Cheong Ho, a Local Council member of Jinjang, who is also a Chairman of that Local Council, and who was elected through constitutional means. He did not sit there through unconstitutional means; he did not force himself in, through a bloodshed revolution. He was elected by the people. Then comes Mr. Peng Yan, who was the Secretary of the Socialist Front in Selangor; and most of the others are all active Party workers.

Mr. Speaker: I do not like to interrupt you, Mr. David, but at one time you were speaking on general principles and now you are speaking on details. You can say that your members have been locked up, that is quite all right; that is on general principles. But if you go to details, I must stop you.

Enche' V. David: I deplore the Government's action and I further charge that the Government has failed in its responsibility to place a White Paper before this House for a full debate. And I further challenge that if the Government is sincere in its action it should then produce all these persons who have been arrested in an open court of law, for which previously the excuse was that since the Emergency was at its peak it was not proper or secure to bring members to give evidence on such charges in court. But now according to the Honourable Minister of Finance the Emergency is ended and I do not see any reason why these members cannot be brought to open court for a fair trial. As I said, Sir, if you believe in a democratic system of Government, if you believe in real parliamentary methods, if you feel that our deliberations should be by democratic means, if you believe that our actions should be through constitutional means, then the Constitution of the country itself should be protected in a constitutional manner, in a dignified manner whereby we can win the admiration of the other countries in Asia and the world.

Now I would like to touch on a very thorny subject. In fact this is a subject which has been brought to this House repeatedly, i.e., the question of Malayanisation. We have heard often from the Government its declared policy on Malayanisation. This morning, Sir, I had a question for the Prime Minister and it was answered that some of the expatriate officers even after they had gone back have come back to quasi-government services to be employed. I would like to refer to a colonial fort in the Federal Capital, that is the Rubber Research Institute. I do not know how many have been acquainted with this Rubber Research

Institute. It is very important from our economic point since if we want to develop the standard or the quality of natural rubber, this Institute is extremely important, and its importance and efficiency depends on the Government's Malayanisation policy. Although the R.R.I. Board has accepted the principle of Malayanisation, the R.R.I. itself has been offering lip service and has not been practical. It will be in order for me to suggest that the Government should take notice of the fact that the Rubber Research Institute is one of the last remaining forts where Malaysians are not given the opportunity to run their affairs for themselves. Sir, there can be no doubt that rubber is the main stay in Malaya's economy. Much has been said about the threat of synthetic to natural rubber. Sir, this apprehension is real, and let us face it boldly. But how? Where do we get the weapon to meet this challenge? The weapon, of course, lies in the hands of the Rubber Research Institute. That is well and good. But to carry on this war against synthetic we need plenty of material resources. Where can we find those resources? Are they really available? If they are not available, then may I ask, why not? The answers to all these questions lie in the hand of the expatriate officers. It is quite well-known, Sir, that the expatriate officers in the Rubber Research Institute are well entrenched. They have ganged up to sabotage Malayanisation and delay the course of history as long as possible. Sir, it is an open secret among local men that the expatriate officers in connivance with some graduates from other foreign countries

Mr. Speaker: I must warn you that you are making a very serious allegation against people who have no opportunity to defend themselves and you must be prepared to substantiate your serious allegations.

Enche' V. David: I would certainly do so, Sir. In this respect I did submit some questions to this House and they were rejected on grounds that it is the normal routine of the Department and the Minister has no jurisdiction over

that. Since then I am forced by circumstances to bring this here, and I have made allegations and will always substantiate them with my grounds.

Mr. Speaker: It is not only that. I think it is not fair to make allegations against people who are not present in this House. They have no chance to defend themselves: it is not fair.

Enche' V. David: This is purely on Malayanisation. I am just quoting examples, Sir. As I said, with the connivance of some graduates from other countries they are deliberately aiding to destroy the Rubber Research Institute knowing fully well Malaya's need for such an Institute. Sir, it has been suggested that degrees in science from the University of Malaya are inferior to those degrees from Britain and India. Sir, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Commerce and Industry to state why there are so few graduates of the University of Malaya in the R.R.I. I do not want an evasive answer from the Minister concerned as I am posing him a serious question. Sir, we must stress the very extreme importance to the R.R.I. and its Malayanisation, because Malayanisation has not taken the least effect in the R.R.I. I am certain after close investigations that a large number of graduates of the University of Malaya did apply for various posts in the R.R.I. in the past few years. So far, I am told, there are only three local graduates employed there. Why is such a situation occurring in the R.R.I.? Cannot the Minister of Commerce and Industry or the entire Cabinet smell anything? Is not there anything fishy in this? Is it the view of the expatriate officers that local degrees are inferior, or is it motivated by a sense of self-preservation? Supposing the degrees of the University of Malaya are inferior, why did the R.R.I. in the first instance send students to the University of Malaya for science courses and after graduation why were they not taken into the Institute? In my humble opinion, Sir, this is just an eye-wash to show to the Government and the public that the R.R.I. is doing something towards Malayanisation, but in actual fact it covers up

their dirty work of not Malayanising the R.R.I.

Besides the Research Section there is an Administrative Section in the R.R.I. which can be Malayanised at this very moment. In my humble opinion, Sir, this is just an eye-wash to show to the Government and the public that the Rubber Research Institute is active towards Malayanisation, but, in actual fact, they have been covering up their dirty work. Besides the Research Section of the Rubber Research Institute, surely the Administrative Section can be Malayanised at this very moment. Instead, we find expatriate officers in the Administrative Section read more newspapers and comics than real paper work they are supposed to do.

Mr. Speaker: You are now going into the details.

Enche' V. David: I am sorry, Sir. I will come back.

Mr. Speaker: You must confine yourself to the general principles of Government policy and administration.

Enche' V. David: Thank you, Sir. We have many young civil servants who can do administrative jobs with greater efficiency.

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order. The estimates for Rubber Research Institute are not covered by the Supply Bill. So I do not think the Honourable Member is in order to deal with the Rubber Research Institute.

Mr. Speaker: I have to enlighten the House on this point. The practice in the United Kingdom seems to be that the debate on the second reading covers a very wide range of subjects, and the Opposition has every opportunity to speak anything on the general principles or policy administration. But I am not quite sure whether this one—the Rubber Research Institute—is part of the Government or not.

Enche' V. David: In fact, I have got only a few things to say about the Rubber Research Institute. There is

quite a bit of scandal about Malayani-
sation in the Rubber Research Institute
through all kinds of intrigue. An
expatriate officer, whom I believe was
from the Ministry of Agriculture, and
who, I understand, after taking no less
than \$60,000 on abolition terms, came
back a few months later to one of the
most senior posts in the Rubber Re-
search Institute. Is it not a fact that
such officers should not be allowed to
return to Malaya to work? I am not the
least interested if they are returned to
Malaya without Government expendi-
ture being involved. But if they come
back and again claim for compensation,
it is the taxpayer who is being
penalised. I am sure the Government
can explain this. I would like the
Government to investigate this affair
and, if necessary, I would call upon
the Government to make a thorough
investigation of expatriate officers
coming back by the backdoor. We
know that the expatriate officers either
think of striking a Football Pool in
England or getting rich from Malaya-
nisation in our country. The irony of it
is that this same officer after sweeping
off \$60,000 is thinking of receiving
compensation from the Rubber Re-
search Institute.

Sir, why no scholarships for overseas
studies for local men are given and
these are awarded instead to expatriate
officers and a few contract officers from
other countries who are their tools?
Surely, if the Rubber Research Institute
is keen of Malayani-ising the Rubber
Research Institute, they should be
sending Malaysians overseas for proper
training. Instead of which we find that
the Rubber Research Institute is send-
ing expatriates and non-Malaysians . . .

Mr. Speaker: I have been told that
the Rubber Research Institute is not a
Government Department. You have no
right to criticise it.

Enche' V. David: Sir, I was only
making a reference, because local
graduates are not being sent to take
over the place of expatriate officers.

Mr. Speaker: You seem to confine
yourself to this question of the Rubber
Research Institute which is not a

Government Department. You have no
right to speak on it.

Enche' V. David: Sir, then I take
the Government Printing Department.
(*Laughter*). I understand that three
gentlemen were trained under the
Colombo Plan and returned to Malaya.
But instead of appointing them for the
necessary posts for which they were
trained, there were new recruitments
of expatriate officers. For example, I
would like to quote the report of the
Union of the Government Printing
Department—it reads:

"Malayanisation in the Department is
taking its course slowly, but a doubt has
been created in the minds of Malayan
officers, because of the recent recruitment of
two expatriate officers from the U.K. be-
tween very short intervals. We were, in fact,
taken by surprise by this recruitment, but
we believe it is a temporary measure until
such time our Malayan officers return from
overseas after their training. However, it
is the view of our Committee and members
that local talents have not been fully tapped."

Sir, as far as the Government Printing
Department is concerned, there were
three Malaysians sent to be trained for a
specialised job, and the three men
after finishing the training, were not
given a job for which they were trained.
Instead of which, new recruitment has
been made in England. Sir, the Govern-
ment is not really implementing speedy
Malayanisation as it has repeatedly
given assurance in this House. The
Government Bench has repeatedly said
that Malaya is proud to be an
independent nation, but these indeed
are mere words thrown before the
wind. Sir, since we are independent we
must run our own affairs and must not
allow somebody to decide our destiny.

Through the course of history we
have seen that foreigners, like the
expatriate officers, cannot run the
country as we would like to run. Sir,
there may be certain improvements in
certain departments regarding Malaya-
nisation, but in several departments it
has still yet to be done. First of all, I
would like to refer to the Labour
Department and the Industrialisation
Department in the Ministry of Labour
and to commend that Malayani-isation
has really taken effect in these Depart-
ments. We really congratulate for that,
but we cannot tolerate at the same

time (*Laughter*) seeing that new recruitments are being made in other Departments. By this, Sir, we always give credit where it is due. (*Laughter*).

Sir, regarding contract officers coming to this country, I understand they come here purely on a contract for a number of years, but after coming here they become permanent, and they usually make themselves permanent by pulling strings. By their becoming permanent it is you and I and the general public in this country that are forced to pay them large sums as compensation. Therefore, I strongly suggest that Government should investigate the growing danger in the Rubber Research Institute. (*Laughter*)

Mr. Speaker: I have already ruled that out. The Rubber Research Institute is not a Government Department.

Enche' V. David: I therefore feel strongly that Malayanisation is extremely necessary especially in the Government Printing Department and so also in other Government Departments.

Coming to the Budget again, I find that there is no adequate provision, nor has it been mentioned in the speech of the Honourable the Minister of Finance, in regard to the Federal Capital and expenditure for the Federal Capital of Kuala Lumpur. I remember that this year a Bill has been passed and accepted that the Kuala Lumpur Municipal Council will be directly under the Federal Government but I do not see any provision for expenditure for the Federal Capital. I understand, Sir, that although the Bill has been passed it has not been possible to implement it because of the fact that the Government is not in a position to choose the best man to be the Commissioner of the Municipal Council—or may be that they have not chosen from their frustrated politicians yet to take up the appointment? However, Sir, my criticism here is, why has the Minister of Finance not made provision in the Budget or mentioned in his speech about the expenditure which may involve the Federation Government for the coming year of 1961.

Sir, I have mentioned earlier that a sum of \$69.3 million is in excess of what we are supposed to spend for the year 1960, but in spite of that there is no adequate provision for medical facilities in this country which have become worse than 1959. When I say this, I am sure the Honourable the Minister of Health will agree with me (*Laughter*), and he will agree with me because there were no drastic charges made in the case of out-patients in 1959 but in 1960 charges are being imposed on out-patients; and I am further informed that when the General Hospital in Kuala Lumpur gives a prescription for medicine, that medicine can be bought cheaper outside than if purchased from the General Hospital itself. Here, I would like to quote an example. In this country a labourer in the P.W.D. only gets \$3.12 and if he takes his family to the hospital, one injection may cost \$8.00 to \$10.00 and in addition to that the pills, mixture, will cost \$3.00—in all the cost may amount to \$12.00 or so. Honourable Members here will not feel the pinch because—unfortunately, I should say—the Government has given them free medical treatment, and when Honourable Members have a headache they can go to the hospital to have a rest, but this is not possible for the ordinary labourers of this country and they will have to pay from their family earnings. Definitely Honourable Members will not have to experience this difficulty. I would propose when the time comes that Honourable Members should be penalised by not being given free medical treatment, and unless they have to pay to the General Hospital they will not know the difficulty.

Sir, in 1959 no charges were paid by the out-door patients, but from somewhere in September or October, 1960, charges have been imposed on out-door patients. My Party and myself strongly deplore the action of the Government in penalising the poor workers of this country and the poor kampong people, who go to the General Hospital for free medical treatment. In our social development, Sir, medical facilities should obtain top priority, but today we find that medical facilities

have been overlooked. I understand that the Honourable the Minister of Health himself did not like the idea of charging the patients but his other Cabinet colleagues imposed these charges.

Dato' Ong Yoke Lin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order, that is absolutely untrue. If the Honourable Member will produce receipts from these poor P.W.D. labourers who have been charged \$8.00 or \$10.00 for an injection, then he might make such charges in this House—but not just by saying it without proof. He should prove it.

Mr. Speaker: It is not a point of order. It is a point of explanation. (To *Enche' David*) You are going into details again. Please confine yourself to the general principles of the policy and administration. If you are in doubt of any fact, better do not disclose it here.

Enche' V. David: Sir, this is the first time that I hear from the Minister of Health that the General Hospital issues receipts for money paid to the outdoor patients. It may be the practice in respect of indoor patients who have been admitted into the Hospital, but definitely not in the case of outdoor patients, Sir. If the Minister can advise his Medical Officers to issue receipts then definitely tomorrow I will bring numerous number of receipts for his inspection and information.

Dato' Ong Yoke Lin: Coupons are issued—for the information of the Honourable Member.

Enche' V. David: By issuing coupons itself is an admission that they pay money.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. David, this morning I said that a Member should not speak too long. I have no right to stop people talking too long, but I would appeal to Honourable Members not to speak too long so that opportunity will be given to other Members to take part in the debate. If it is to go on like this, I think very few Members can speak on the Second Reading of the Supply Bill. For the whole day today we have got only three members talking.

Enche' V. David: Sir, I was trying to save time, but unfortunately there is too much interruptions.

Sir, the most important event of the year, I should say, is the gagging of the Press and depriving the freedom of the Press in this country. (*Laughter*). I would like to quote the instance of FAJAR which is published in Singapore by the University of Malaya Socialist Club and which has been banned from the Federation of Malaya; then the *Saturday Post* was also banned from the Federation of Malaya. Sir, as explained by the Honourable the Minister of the Interior, who is not here at the moment, it is a communist inspired document, but I do not know what he meant by that. As far as I know, it has only said on its front page "Suleiman strikes again." If this is meant as communist inspiration then I do not know what is communism itself. We cannot know what is communism for the very fact that we have not read those books which are not imported into this country.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. David, I do not like to interrupt you all the time, but it seems to me that you have ignored my order. I have already said that you can speak on the general principles of the policy, but you cannot speak on the details in respect of any matter at all.

Enche' V. David: Sir, my reference is to this: "we can rejoice that this menace which drains so much of our resources has at last been overcome." In my view, we cannot rejoice when we have such restrictions in this country.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: But we rejoice!

Enche' V. David: Yes, so as to get further allowances. Sir, as far as the freedom of the press is concerned, I would like to quote certain documents which I have here. "The liberty of the press," says Lord Mansfield, "consists in printing without previous licence, subject to the consequence of law." "The law of England," says Lord Ellenborough, "is a law of liberty, and consistently with this liberty we have

not what is called an *imprimatur*; there is no such preliminary licence necessary: but if a man were to publish a paper, he is exposed to the penal consequences”

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: On a point of order, Sir. May we know what language the Honourable Member is speaking? (*Laughter*).

Enche' V. David: When he spoke, I was thinking that he was speaking in Chinese.

Mr. Speaker: Sit down, Mr. David. I think Honourable Members should know that they must maintain the dignity and prestige of this House. I cannot tolerate Members addressing one another without addressing me. All remarks should be addressed to me. I must maintain the dignity of the House—that is one of the functions for me to do here. But I must tell you, Mr. David, that your subject now is out of order.

Enche' V. David: It is a policy matter. I am speaking on the policy of the Government, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, but there is no provision at all in the Estimates for banning the Press.

Enche' V. David: But according to Parliamentary Practice by Sir Edward Fellowes, Sir, it says: “Thus, whereas the field of debate on the main Consolidated Fund Bill of the year and upon the Appropriation Bill is normally commensurate with the whole range of administrative policy, debate upon a Consolidated Fund Bill introduced for the express purpose of providing funds for some newly undertaken service is limited to that service”.

Mr. Speaker: In view of that I have allowed most of your speech this afternoon. Had it not been for that you would not have been able to speak at all. (*Laughter*).

Enche' V. David: Thank you very much, Sir. As I was quoting just now, “but if a man publish a paper, he is exposed to the penal consequences, if it is illegal.” And further, Sir, it

says: “Neither the government nor any other authority has the right to seize or destroy the stock of a publisher because it consists of books, pamphlets, or papers which in the opinion of the government contain seditious or libellous matter.” So, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the action of the government in banning a legitimate newspaper into this country is improper. We completely disagree with the point of view of the Government, and we also invite the Government to review its former decision.

Enche' Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman: On a point of order, Sir. With due respect to you, Sir, the Honourable Member is actually irrelevant. Standing Order 66 (2) says that the debate shall be confined to the general principles of Government policy and administration as indicated by the Bill and Estimates. But it appears to this House that the Honourable Member is reviewing the whole of Government policy here. It says here, “as indicated by the Bill and the Estimates.” It has nothing to do with the freedom of the press.

Mr. Speaker: As I said just now, in a debate for the second reading of the Bill, it is the practice that a wide range of subjects can be debated in the House—a very, very wide range of subjects. So I would like to advise Mr. David to confine to the general principles and not to pick up one item after another. If you pick up item by item, then I must stop you.

Enche' V. David: If I am deprived to speak on the freedom of the press, then I cannot speak anything on freedom at all. Sir, it is a policy matter, and if we do not enjoy the elementary freedom which is enjoyed in other parts of the world, then I do not think that

Mr. Speaker: Please proceed!

Enche' V. David: Yes, Sir. A few weeks back, we came to understand that the *Nanyang Siang Pau*, a very well-known Chinese newspaper in this country, was delayed at the Airport for censor, and the Government did not give its reason as to why it was

stopped and why its circulation was delayed in this country. But later, through reliable sources, we understood that it published certain articles which were not in the interests of the Malayan Chinese Association. Owing to this, Sir, the paper itself, which should have been circulated at 7 o'clock in the morning, was delayed until 11 o'clock. If this state of affairs were to continue in this country, Sir, the people in this country will be losing the elementary freedom which was even enjoyed during the Colonial period. Therefore, Sir, I strongly feel that the Government should be more liberal in its attitude towards newspapers in this country.

Sir, coming to trade unions, it is encouraging to a certain extent that certain unions, which were splinter unions before, have now formed their organisations as national unions. But according to the Annual Report of the Registrar of Trade Unions, I find that there has been a decline in membership from 1957 to 1959. The Report for the year 1958 says:

"The paid-up membership of all registered trade unions as at 31st December, 1958, showed a decrease of 11,237 over the members as at 31st December, 1957."

Now, Sir, the Report of 1959 says:

"The paid-up membership of all trade unions as at 31st December, 1959, was 175,647, which is 35,981 less than the corresponding figure as at 31st December, 1958. The paid-up membership of employee unions as at 31st December, 1959, was 174,809; this is 35,879 less than the figure on 31st December, 1958."

Sir, when we refer to this, we find that the membership of the trade unions are decreasing from year to year. The total number of workers in this country are about 600,000, and the number of workers organised into unions are about 200,000; that means, only 33 per cent of the workers have been organised into trade unions.

Sir, in my humble opinion I feel that the Government should change its trade union policy. Its declared policy should not be merely on paper; it should be practical. The main obstacle for trade unions to function in this

country is the Trade Union Ordinance itself and the Trade Union Ordinance of 1959 should be revised. Sir, even when that Ordinance was newly debated in this House in April, 1959, the representative of the Malayan Trade Union Congress who was seated here as its representative stated as follows, and I quote him:

"The Malayan Trade Union Congress has given very careful consideration to the provisions of the Trade Union Ordinance, 1959, and, while deploring the restrictions on freedom of association embodied in it, accepted them with certain reservations in order to ensure the protection of the workers' interests. We regard certain sections of the Ordinance as purely temporary measures subject to revision as soon as more stable conditions prevail."

Sir, I am referring to this statement of his because conditions have changed in this country for the revision of the Trade Union Ordinance itself. At that time the Government had stated that in view of the Emergency Regulations the Government had no alternative but to restrict the trade union movement and trade union rights, but now that, according to the statement of the Minister of Finance, we are rejoicing, why not we be a bit liberal towards trade unions in this country? As such, Sir, the Trade Union Ordinance itself is completely outmoded and should be revised to fit in with the new developments, new conditions and new circumstances. So, I humbly submit, Sir, that the Trade Union Ordinance needs complete revision.

Sir, in this country we have not attained the right to organise. The right to organise all over the world is of paramount importance, but in this country we have yet to achieve the right to organise. I will have to quote certain sections of the decisions of the I.L.O. Convention and also certain parts of the Report of the Malayan Trade Union Congress which says:

"Workers of Malaya are perturbed that I.L.O. Convention No. 87, Freedom of association and freedom of the right to organise, and I.L.O. Convention No. 98, Right to organise and collective bargain, have received no consent from so many member states devoted to the democratic concept."

The Director-General of I.L.O. has indicated, and I quote, Sir,

"They have now been widely ratified, the function relating to freedom of association by 32 states, and that relating to collective bargain by 37 states."

Sir, it also says that Asian employers in Malaya, not accustomed to collective bargain, have been and continue to resist management/labour approaches. Sir, I say this because in Malaya we find that the freedom of association has not been granted as it has been granted in Pakistan, in the Philippines and other countries. I call upon the relevant Ministry to look into this and suggest suitable amendments to the revision of the Trade Union Ordinance itself.

Sir, coming to the Minister's speech, if the Government continues to make extravagant expenditure in this manner there would be other problems arising from time to time as the country develops, and as it improves socially there would definitely be claims and demands from the different organised groups in this country. For instance, the Congress of Unions of Employees in the Public and Civil Services have asked a five day week, i.e. a 40-hour week, to be implemented, and if it is implemented the Government would find it necessary to find additional funds to meet the increasing demands in expenditure. But as far as this claim is concerned I fully endorse it for the very fact that it is not an unconventional claim. This claim has been agreed to and adopted in many countries. In the United States they only have a 35-hour week, and in England in the early 1950's I understand that a Royal Commission submitted a Report to the Parliament for a five day week and it was accepted by Parliament in principle. So, I am sure that Malaya cannot ignore this fact and will have to accept this principle sooner or later. For this reason the Government must have adequate funds to meet the demands which will arise from time to time.

Sir, regarding national sick insurance benefit, I understand that Mr. A. E. Godwin of the International Labour Organisation, an expert in

social security, visited Malaya in August, 1959, and has already submitted a report to the Federation Government regarding national sickness insurance. I call upon the Government to give consideration to the Report and publish it as early as possible. Sir, in my previous speeches in this House, I have consistently reminded the House of the growing unemployment threat in this country and the unemployment threat has to be solved by way of offering employment and temporary relief measures during the time of unemployment; the Government should definitely have an unemployment relief scheme which will have to be operated by the Government, and the Government should find ways and means to raise the amount of money required for this unemployment relief scheme.

Sir, when I spoke about the Civil Service I did omit an important thing which appeared in the Press a few days back, that is about the leakage of Government examination papers.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot allow that to be discussed.

Enche' V. David: I am sorry, Sir, if you say that I cannot discuss it.

Mr. Speaker: I rule you out.

Enche' V. David: Thank you, Sir, when I touched on the medical services, I also forgot to bring an important matter to the notice of this House about a member of the medical profession who escaped a warrant of arrest from Madras and who is the Superintendent of the Mental Hospital at Tanjong Rambutan.

Mr. Speaker: Is it a general principle of the policy? It is not, and you cannot touch other than the principles of the general policy. That is very, very important.

Enche' V. David: I will raise this at the appropriate time.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Enche' V. David: Finally, coming to the international situation, Sir, I have been observing, within the last few days, that when our Prime Minister visited

the United States, there had been many contradictory statements appearing in the Press. To my knowledge, Sir, I can boldly say this: our Government in the Federation of Malaya do not possess a concrete foreign policy on which it could work. The foreign policy has been contradictory from time to time. When the Prime Minister reached the shores of the United States, he openly said, "We are towards the West". That indicates that the Federation Government is with the West and is neither with the East nor with the neutral bloc. Sir, this is creating great concern of the Malayan people. We have been always stating that we must be friendly with the neighbouring nations, but I wonder how can we be friendly with our neighbours when our country has indicated that it owes allegiance to the West. Sir, one of the dramatic statements made by the Prime Minister is that the Federation Government should recognise two Chinas. Sir, the Prime Minister would not like to create two Malayas by anybody. Similarly the people of China would not like to see two Chinas. There can be only one China, that is, the Republic of China.

Mr. Speaker: We are not debating on that point now.

Enche' V. David: It is on the policy, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Yet, we are not debating on that issue. You are trying to argue on that point. That is wrong. You can debate on the general principles only.

Enche' V. David: At least am I allowed to state what I feel as far as the Prime Minister's statement is concerned, because it is a matter which involves a lot of money on foreign affairs.

Mr. Speaker: That itself is not the point in issue. You have got to be very careful as to how to put it.

Enche' V. David: Sir, the statement of the Prime Minister has created a great confusion in the minds not only of the general public but also in the mind of the then Minister of External Affairs. It has placed great doubt as to what the Prime Minister was aiming at. How could the Prime Minister advocate

the creation of two states within a population of the same origin? Well, this is a matter, Sir, which must be debated at length, and since on this occasion I am not permitted to debate, I will have to wait for a moment which will be more suitable.

However, touching on the international situation, the Malayan delegates in the United Nations have always been taking an attitude which neither gives us a thought to realise whether they are with the West or whether they are with the neutral blocs. More or less, on many occasions, they have been with the West than the neutral blocs. Sir, I would like to request that the Prime Minister or the Cabinet itself, should allocate one solid day or two days for a complete debate on the foreign policy of Malaya whereby the Malayan Government and the Malayan population would know where we stand. We do not want our delegates to go to the United Nations and abstain from voting or sometimes send a lengthy telegram to Malaya to receive the consent of the Cabinet. It has been very interesting especially, the 15th Assembly of the United Nations, where we have come to know many new world developments which have arisen and which will be a lesson to Malaya, and if Malaya do not adopt itself to the growing trend in international affairs, I am afraid we will be left far behind. The Asian countries today are rapidly moving to be together as one solid neutral bloc. The West today is more or less concerned on nuclear war on which Malaya is not interested. Neither is Malaya interested in disarmament talks in the sense that we are not going to go to war; but it has the moral obligation: any war, any conflict, in the other Asian countries or in the neighbouring countries will place Malaya in a dangerous position especially in view of Malaya accommodating foreign troops in its soil. Therefore, Sir, when we do certain things let us do them sensibly.

Today, Sir, according to the papers, the Indonesian Government or the Indonesian Press has asked the Malayan Government to shut up and mind her own affairs. Sir, I don't like to dwell in detail about the West Irian problem,

but I would like to say that it is a problem for the Indonesians themselves to solve, and President Sukarno has repeatedly said (*Laughter*)

Mr. Speaker: President Soekarno!

Enche' V. David: President Soekarno has said clearly that the Indonesians have a rightful claim over the West Irian and any settlement of that dispute will be on that basis only and nothing else. If we cannot learn from that statement, then it is better that we keep silent.

Mr. Speaker: You have one more minute to go. I must adjourn the House at half past four as laid down under the Standing Orders.

Enche' V. David: Sir, at the last meeting of this House when the issue of sending our troops to the Congo was debated, the Prime Minister and

his Cabinet Members did make charges that we were supporting the Soviet Union and Mr. Khrushchev himself. This allegation is, in fact, a very serious allegation, but facts cannot be hidden. Referring to the situation at the United Nations, when Mr. Khrushchev made charges against the Secretariat of the United Nations and also made a suggestion that the Headquarters be shifted to other parts of the world, we were only making charges against the Soviet representative. But at the same time . . .

Mr. Speaker: Time is up. Have you finished?

Enche' V. David: No, Sir. I will continue on Monday.

Mr. Speaker: The meeting is adjourned till ten a.m. on Monday the 5th December.

Adjourned at 4.30 p.m.