

Volume III
No. 20



Friday
20th October, 1961

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

OFFICIAL REPORT

CONTENTS

ADJOURNMENT *SINE DIE* (MOTION) [Col. 2027]
HOURS OF SITTING OF THE HOUSE (EXEMPTED BUSINESS)
(MOTION) [Col. 2028]

BILLS—

The Education Bill [Col. 2029]
The University of Malaya Bill [Col. 2127]
The Consolidated Fund (Expenditure on Account) Bill [Col. 2145]
The Parliament (Members' Remuneration) (Amendment) Bill
[Col. 2149]
The Corporation Duty Ordinance (Repeal) Bill [Col. 2160]
The Local Councils (Amendment) Bill [Col. 2161]
The Life Assurance Bill [Col. 2162]
The Local Government Elections (Amendment) (No. 2) Bill
[Col. 2169]
The Rubber Export Duty (Penang) Bill [Col. 2170]

MOTIONS—

The Customs Duties Order, 1961 (Statute Paper No. 41 of 1961)
[Col. 2181]
The Customs Duties (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1961 (Statute
Paper No. 42 of 1961) [Col. 2184]
The Income Tax Ordinance, 1947—Amendment to First Schedule.
(The Federation of Family Planning Associations and affiliated
State Family Planning Associations) [Col. 2187]
The Income Tax Ordinance, 1947—Amendment to First Schedule.
(The Football Association of Malaya) [Col. 2189]

FEDERATION OF MALAYA

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

Official Report

Vol. III

Third Session of the First Dewan Ra'ayat

No. 20

Friday, 20th October, 1961

The House met at half-past Nine 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 and Minister of External Affairs,
Y.T.M. TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN PUTRA AL-HAJ, K.O.M.
(Kuala Kedah).
- „ the Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Defence and Minister
of Rural Development, TUN HAJI ABDUL RAZAK BIN
DATO' HUSSAIN, S.M.N. (Pekan).
- „ the Minister of Internal Security and Minister of the Interior,
DATO' DR. ISMAIL BIN DATO' HAJI ABDUL RAHMAN,
P.M.N. (Johor Timor).
- „ the Minister of Finance, ENCHE' TAN SIEW SIN, J.P. (Melaka
Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications,
DATO' V. T. SAMBANTHAN, P.M.N. (Sungai Siput).
- „ the Minister of Transport, DATO' SARDON BIN HAJI JUBIR,
P.M.N. (Pontian Utara).
- „ the Minister of Health and Social Welfare, DATO' ONG YOKE
LIN, P.M.N. (Ulu Selangor).
- „ the Minister of Commerce and Industry, ENCHE' MOHAMED
KHIR BIN JOHARI (Kedah Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Labour, ENCHE' BAHAMAN BIN SAMSUDIN
(Kuala Pilah).
- „ the Minister of Education, ENCHE' ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAJI
TALIB (Kuantan).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Education, ENCHE' ABDUL HAMID
KHAN BIN HAJI SAKHAWAT ALI KHAN, J.M.N., J.P.
(Batang Padang).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Rural Development, TUAN HAJI
ABDUL KHALID BIN AWANG OSMAN (Kota Star Utara).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Commerce and Industry, ENCHE'
CHEAH THEAM SWEE (Bukit Bintang).
- „ the Assistant Minister of the Interior, ENCHE' MOHAMED
ISMAIL BIN MOHAMED YUSOF (Jerai).

- The Honourable ENCHE' ABDUL GHANI BIN ISHAK, A.M.N. (Melaka Utara).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAUF BIN A. RAHMAN (Krian Laut).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL SAMAD BIN OSMAN (Sungai Patani).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI ABDUL RAOF (Kuala Kangsar).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI MOHD. SALLEH, A.M.N., P.I.S. (Segamat Utara).
- „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN ABDULLAH (Kota Bharu Hilir).
- „ ENCHE' AHMAD BIN ARSHAD, A.M.N. (Muar Utara).
- „ ENCHE' AHMAD BIN MOHAMED SHAH, S.M.J. (Johor 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, A.M.N. (Kluang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN SIANG SUN (Bentong).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN SWEE HO (Ulu Kinta).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN YOON ONN (Kampar).
- „ ENCHE' CHIN SEE YIN (Seremban Timor).
- „ ENCHE' V. DAVID (Bungsar).
- „ DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI HASHIM, P.M.N. (Jitra-Padang Terap).
- „ ENCHE' GEH CHONG KEAT (Penang Utara).
- „ ENCHE' HAMZAH BIN ALANG, A.M.N. (Kapar).
- „ ENCHE' HANAFI BIN MOHD. YUNUS, A.M.N. (Kulim Utara).
- „ ENCHE' HARUN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Baling).
- „ ENCHE' HARUN BIN PILUS (Trengganu Tengah).
- „ TUAN HAJI HASAN ADLI BIN HAJI ARSHAD (Kuala Trengganu Utara).
- „ TUAN HAJI HASSAN BIN HAJI AHMAD (Tumpat).
- „ ENCHE' HASSAN BIN MANSOR (Melaka Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN TO' MUDA HASSAN (Raub).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN MOHD. NOORDIN, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Parit).
- „ TUAN HAJI HUSSAIN RAHIMI BIN HAJI SAMAN (Kota Bharu Hulu).
- „ ENCHE' ISMAIL BIN IDRIS (Penang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' KANG KOCK SENG (Batu Pahat).
- „ 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, A.M.N. (Sepang).
- „ ENCHE' LIM JOO KONG (Alor Star).
- „ ENCHE' LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).
- „ ENCHE' LIU YOONG PENG (Rawang).
- „ ENCHE' T. MAHIMA SINGH, J.P. (Port Dickson).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED BIN UJANG (Jelebu-Jempol).

- The Honourable ENCHE' MOHAMED ABAS BIN AHMAD (Hilir Perak).
- .. ENCHE' MOHAMED ASRI BIN HAJI MUDA (Pasir Puteh).
- .. ENCHE' MOHAMED DAHARI BIN HAJI MOHD. ALI (Kuala Selangor).
- .. ENCHE' MOHAMED NOR BIN MOHD. DAHAN (Ulu Perak).
- .. DATO' MOHAMED HANIFAH BIN HAJI ABDUL GHANI, P.J.K. (Pasir Mas Hulu).
- .. ENCHE' MOHAMED 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).
- .. ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Tanah Merah).
- .. ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Perlis Utara).
- .. ENCHE' QUEK KAI DONG, J.P. (Seremban Barat).
- .. TUAN HAJI REDZA BIN HAJI MOHD. SAID (Rembau-Tampin).
- .. ENCHE' SEAH TENG NGIAB (Muar Pantai).
- .. ENCHE' D. R. SEENIVASAGAM (Ipoh).
- .. ENCHE' S. P. SEENIVASAGAM (Menglembu).
- .. TUAN SYED ESA BIN ALWEE, J.M.N., S.M.J., P.I.S. (Batu Pahat Dalam).
- .. TUAN SYED HASHIM BIN SYED AJAM, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Sabak Bernam).
- .. TUAN SYED JA'AFAR BIN HASAN ALBAR, J.M.N. (Johor Tenggara).
- .. 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 BESAR INDERA RAJA IBNI AL-MARHUM SULTAN IBRAHIM, D.K., P.M.N. (Ulu Kelantan).
- .. ENCHE' TOO JOON HING (Telok Anson).
- .. ENCHE' V. VEERAPPEN (Seberang Selatan).
- .. WAN SULAIMAN BIN WAN TAM, P.J.K. (Kota Star Selatan).
- .. WAN YAHYA BIN HAJI WAN MOHAMED (Kemaman).
- .. ENCHE' YAHYA BIN HAJI AHMAD (Bagan Datoh).
- .. 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).

ABSENT:

- The Honourable DATO' SULEIMAN BIN DATO' HAJI ABDUL RAHMAN, P.M.N. (Minister without Portfolio) (Muar Selatan) (*On leave*).
- .. the Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives, ENCHE' ABDUL AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Kuala Langat).
- .. the Assistant Minister of Labour, ENCHE' V. MANICKAVASAGAM, J.M.N., P.J.K. (Klang).

- The Honourable ENCHE' AHMAD BOESTAMAN (Setapak).
 .. ENCHE' IBRAHIM BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Seberang Tengah).
 .. ENCHE' KHONG KOK YAT (Batu Gajah).
 .. DR. LIM SWEE AUN, J.P. (Larut Selatan).
 .. DATO' ONN BIN JA'AFAR, D.K., D.P.M.J. (Kuala Trengganu Selatan).
 .. ENCHE' TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Melaka).
 .. DATO' TEOH CHZE CHONG, D.P.M.J., J.P. (Segamat Selatan).
 .. WAN MUSTAPHA BIN HAJI ALI (Kelantan Hilir).
 .. ENCHE' ZULKIFLEE BIN MUHAMMAD (Bachok).

IN ATTENDANCE:

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

PRAYERS

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

Mr. Speaker: Honourable Members, last night when I put the question to the House to adjourn I noticed some hesitancy or disinclination on the part of Members to disperse. I repeated the question at that time due to the fact that Honourable Members were naturally indisposed to adjourn the sitting of the House because of the great amount of business still unfinished. However, I have since been informed that probably the confusion has arisen because the question was put by me in an erroneous form, and I am sorry for that. I should add that the procedure followed by me is laid down in S.O. 17 (4). In any event, all Honourable Members will, I think, have ample opportunity to prove their diligence to-day.

ADJOURNMENT *SINE DIE*

(MOTION)

The Deputy Prime Minister (Tun Haji Abdul Razak bin Dato' Hussain):

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move,

That at its rising this day the House do stand adjourned *sine die*.

The Minister of Transport (Dato' Sardon bin Haji Jubir): Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That at its rising this day the House do stand adjourned *sine die*.

HOURS OF SITTING OF THE HOUSE (EXEMPTED BUSINESS)

(MOTION)

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: Sir, I beg to move,

That the resolution of the House adopted on the 16th October, 1961, relative to the times of present sittings of the meeting of the House shall not apply to this day's sitting, and that the House shall not adjourn until all Government business on the Order Paper for this day has been disposed of.

Sir, to-day is the last sitting of the present meeting of the House, and as it will be apparent from the Order Paper that there is still much Government business which must be dealt with by the House before it is adjourned *sine die*, it is therefore imperative under the circumstances that the House sit throughout the whole of this afternoon and to-night also, if necessary, in order that all Government business shall be disposed before the House adjourns. Now, to enable us to do this, I move the above motion under Standing Order 12 (1).

Dato' Sardon bin Haji Jubir: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That the resolution of the House adopted on the 16th October, 1961, relative to the times of present sittings of the meeting of the House shall not apply to this day's sitting, and that the House shall not adjourn until all Government business on the Order Paper for this day has been disposed of.

Mr. Speaker: Honourable Members, I propose to sit this morning till 12 noon, and then suspend the sitting till half-past-two and resume at half-past-two continuing till half-past-six in the evening; and if the Government business is still not finished then, I propose to continue from 8.30 p.m. to-night till the whole of the Government business is disposed of.

BILLS

THE EDUCATION BILL

Second Reading

Order read for resumption of debate on Question, "That the Bill be now read a second time". (19th October, 1961).

Question again proposed.

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam (Ipoh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, in view of the shortage of time, if I may say so, and to keep the proceedings as short as possible and also to do justice in this debate, I undertake not to try to reply to the observations made by other Members—and I hope that the back benchers of the Government will adopt this course and make their observations to enable a reply. That will shorten the debate on this matter.

Sir, yesterday I was speaking on Clause 77 (e) and I made the comment that the words "convicted by a court" had been left out; the Clause goes on to say "and sentenced to a term of imprisonment". Therefore, the deletion of those words by themselves may not mean anything, because only a court of competent jurisdiction can sentence anybody to a term of imprisonment. But I do complain on a matter of principle in relation to Clause 77 (e) in that it is so vague, so dangerously vague, that the Minister or the Registrar of Teachers

could do anything in any case where a man has been sentenced to a term of imprisonment—and that too without consultation, as he is not required by law to consult anybody before exercising that discretion. I fully realise that there may be difficulties in giving very specific and clear definitions in a matter of this nature, but we certainly would require some amplification and clarification from the Honourable the Minister of Education as to what is meant by para. (e), "has been convicted, in the Federation or elsewhere, of an offence and sentenced to a term of imprisonment". A man driving a motor car without insurance cover can be sentenced to imprisonment: is it the intention of this Government to deprive such a person, or refuse to register such a person as a teacher in this country? A man committing some minor traffic offence may be sentenced to a term of imprisonment: is it the intention of the Government to deprive such a person of his right to be a teacher, or is it the intention of the Government to confine this section to moral criminals and not statutory criminals? We must seek clarification on this point because it is important; where power is arbitrary, that power might be misused, and we would require a very clear guarantee, if I may use the word, that this power will not be misused. What has the Minister in his mind, or what instructions would he give to the Registrar on this particular Clause?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I now move to the next important Clause—Clause 99 (2)—dealing with the inspectorate of schools. Under this proposed Bill, an inspectorate of schools or local inspectorate will be set up. The purpose of that inspectorate would be to visit schools, keep an eye on them, and make regular reports to the Minister of Education. Clause 99 is a section which purports to give power to the Chief Inspector to send a report to the Minister on every school or educational institution inspected pursuant to the provisions of Clause 96. What is to be done with this report? What is the purpose of such a report? Obviously,

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the purpose of a report on a school is for the Minister to see whether there are any grounds for acting under other provisions contained in this Bill relating to the registration of schools. In other words, if an adverse report is sent, then the Minister may consider whether the registration of such a school should not properly be cancelled or for further restrictions or conditions placed upon the registration of such a school. It is surprising indeed that Clause 99 (2) makes such a report a confidential document, and as such it will not be supplied to anybody, unless the Minister in his discretion thinks that it should be made available to any person in this country. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would say that that is a most unfair and most dangerous Clause, because a report which is adverse, say, on a private school—which has also to be registered as a school in this country—may result in the cancellation of the registration of that school. Sir, I would like to pose this question: is it not fair and just that by law that report, or the substance of the report, should as a matter of right be made available to the Managers or Governors, or the responsible persons of that school? If you do not have such a statutory provision, then again there is room for misuse and abuse of Clause 99 of the Education Bill. Therefore, I would ask the Minister to seriously consider at the appropriate stage proposing some amendment to make it mandatory that at least the substance of an adverse report on which action is contemplated should be made available to the particular person against whom action is to be taken; and that safeguard should be by statutory law, and should not be at the discretion of even the Minister of Education; otherwise it opens the door, although the action taken by the Minister may be proper, to very great criticisms because nobody would know why such action is taken; if somebody knows why action is taken then the criticisms would be kept to its lowest limits.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we find throughout the Education Bill, in various parts of

it in respect of the registration of schools, registration of teachers and similar other matters, that wherever an applicant is refused registration, or the registration is cancelled, for example, of a teacher, he is given the right to appeal. But the right to appeal to whom? To the Minister of Education. Sir, the Minister of Education does not deal with that appeal himself under the proposed Bill. He has to appoint a committee of three persons to deal with such an appeal. Now, it is not necessary for me to say that that procedure, adopted in this country, is a most unsatisfactory procedure. It is most unsatisfactory in the case of other Ordinances such as the Prevention of Crimes, Citizenship and, now, Education. It is unsatisfactory, because the persons who sit on these committees are by and large persons with political inclinations; that cannot, perhaps, be helped because everybody to some extent is a politician in one way or another, but I find that the tendency is for members of these boards or committees to consist in the major portion of active politicians—that is the way in which the greatest danger lies. Mr. Speaker, Sir, that difficulty should have been foreseen by the Minister of Education, when this Bill was presented to this House, because on more than one occasion complaints have been made by members of the Opposition sitting on this side of the House that such a procedure has been most unsatisfactory, most disliked by the public of this country. Now, the proper course would have been to give a person the right of appeal to a judicial tribunal—and why that was not done, I cannot understand; or, if it was to be a Commissioner of Enquiry, it could have been one man, a judicial officer—and in all these cases of enquiries, the President of Enquiry should also always be a judicial officer, but the decisions or recommendation are to be majority recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, those are facts which by themselves may not convey very much, but read in conjunction with the intention of this Bill it conveys a great deal. It conveys the

fact that a teacher in a school will be a person in constant fear that he may lose his registration certificate, in constant fear that he may be victimised for political views, that he may be victimised if he dares to venture to criticise any policy of this Government—and I do not think it is a good thing for education if teachers are put in constant fear or in constant anxiety and we must do something to remove the basis for that anxiety, which obviously exists under this proposed Bill. As I said yesterday, primary education was not going to be free and that it was proposed to get more revenue for educational purposes by the imposition of an education rate. I would like to put a number of questions to the Honourable Minister and I hope these will be answered in the course of this debate. Does the Honourable Minister realise that in different local authorities there are different modes of assessing properties, that in different local authorities different valuations are placed on properties? Does the Honourable Minister realise that there is no valuation of properties in rural and kampong areas as we know it? Now, how is the Honourable Minister going to lay down a fair basis for this proposed rate? Is it proposed to place a valuation on rural areas and make the rural folk bear an equal burden for the education of the children of this country? Or is it proposed that the townfolk should bear the burden for education not only of the townfolk but also of the rural areas of this country? That becomes a most important question because, if persons are asked to bear the burden of education, that burden must be fairly and squarely distributed; if it is not done, then it is prejudicial, unfair and unjust that only sections should bear the additional burden of education all round.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, throughout the time when the Rahman Talib Report was published up to date, one of the strongest points made by the Alliance was that primary schools were of such a build-up under the proposed policy

that Chinese and Tamil could be learnt in primary classes by everybody and there was no hindrance to them. Now, is that a true picture of the educational policy? I say it is not a true picture, and it can be proved by looking at the provisions in the proposed Bill dealing with primary schools. Under the Bill, the intention of the Government is important, and in every Bill which becomes law, its construction must be in accordance with the intention of the legislature. Now, what is the intention of the Rahman Talib Report and what is the intention of this Bill which has come before this House? Is it the intention of this Government, and indeed of this Bill, when it becomes law, to protect and preserve the study of languages other than Malay in primary schools? If it is so, then there would have been no difficulty in making that intention clear in this Bill. But, let us look and see what the Bill says. We must refer to Clauses 19, 20 and 21—there we will get a clear picture.

“Statutory Education System.
Chapter I—Stages of Education:

- (a) Primary education
- (b) Secondary education
- (c) Education in institutions of a higher nature.”

Now, primary education is divided into two types—National Primary Schools and National-type Primary Schools. In National Primary Schools, the medium of instruction is Malay, a compulsory medium of instruction. In National-type Primary Schools, what does it say? You look at the definition and you will find:

“A National-type Primary School means a fully assisted primary school:

- (a) providing a six-year course of primary education.....;
- (b) using the English, Chinese or Tamil language as the main medium of instruction;
- (c) in which the National language is a compulsory subject of instruction;

- (d) in which the English language is, if not the main medium of instruction, a compulsory subject of instruction;
- (e) in which facilities for the teaching of the Chinese or Tamil language, if not the main medium of instruction, shall, if it is reasonable and practicable so to do, be made available if the parents of 15 children of the school so request."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, if it had stopped at Clauses 19 and 20, perhaps there would be sufficient ground to say, "Yes, they have a right to learn Chinese and Tamil, or even, if they want, to have them as the media of instruction in primary assisted schools". But the intention of the Government, the sinister, the cunning intention of the Government, is clear when we come to Clause 21. Clause 21 is an over-riding clause which I say is the killing clause—the killing clause of other languages to be taught in the schools. It is a clause which makes the Minister of Education almighty and it reads like this:

"(1) The Minister, may, subject to the provisions of this Act, establish national primary schools and national-type primary schools and shall, subject to such provisions, maintain all such schools.

(2) Where at any time the Minister is satisfied that a national-type primary school may suitably be converted into a national primary school he may by order direct that the school shall become a national primary school."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Minister of Education is almighty under Clause 21 and can, with a stroke of his pen, convert any National-type Primary School into a National Primary School. Now, what is the intention, what is the purpose of Clause 21, taken in conjunction, to declare the policy of the Alliance Government that Malay shall be the only language of this country? The purpose of Clause 21 is to kill slowly, steadily, systematically the existence of even primary schools where the medium of instruction is not the National language. If that is not

the intention, I hope the Honourable Minister can tell us the purpose of Clause 21 in the Education Bill. Mr. Speaker, Sir, therefore I say that the propaganda carried out over Radio Malaya, carried on the public platform of the Alliance organisation in this country, carried out in this leaflet "Digest of Education Policy of the Federation of Malaya" is false as the propaganda could not be substantiated by the law which the Alliance proposes to introduce in this country. It is significant in this pamphlet the Government has thought it fit or necessary to use the Tamil language, the Malay language, the English language and the Chinese language to describe the word "school", and yet when the people ask that these languages have their proper place, the Government is not prepared to do.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I now come to the question of the education policy itself as shown in this Bill. Now, this policy is of the utmost importance, and what happens in this House in the next few hours will lay down the basis for the future of this nation. From the time of the Razak Education Report until the Rahman Talib Report came out, and up to this date, opinions from diverse sections, from diverse organisations, have been expressed on what should be the proper education policy for the children of this nation. Despite unjust accusations, threats by the Government, shouts of disloyalty, shouts of communism, they struggle to convince by democratic means the elected Government of this country, elected by the people of this country; and having a mandate from the people of this country, they continue unabated, without fear, to try to convince the Government that this policy is not acceptable to the people of this country as a whole—now, I emphasise *to the people of this country as a whole*. However, it is quite clear that whatever representations have been made, that whatever we may say from this side of this House, the mind of the Alliance Government has been made up that nothing is going to change at this stage. Therefore, I am not going to

suggest a reference back—although I support very strongly the suggestions made by the Honourable Member for Telok Anson—because I think it is a waste of time. If the Government had any intention of doing so, they would have done so before this meeting.

Now, during the course of the debate on merger, the Honourable the Minister of the Interior and Internal Security said that “so long as the Alliance is in power, Malay shall be the only language in this country” or words which convey that meaning. Well, I am glad that it has been put specifically, clearly, to the people of this country, as indeed it has been done many times. An observation has been made that those who are asking for multi-lingualism and other rights, which we think we should have, are wasting their time and talking nonsense and that we could not do it. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish to assure the Honourable the Minister of the Interior that time will show whether we can win this struggle or that we cannot win this struggle. But I assure the Honourable Minister that this struggle will be a peaceful, democratic, struggle in accordance with the Constitution of this country, in accordance with the laws of this land. I also assure the Minister that we have the energy, we have the strength, we have the staying power, we have the resources to carry on the struggle for years, for generations; if not in our generation, in the generations to come this will become a reality in this land, because as a reality, it will be a democracy, and until that is attained, I assure the Minister that the citizens will carry on that struggle whether the Minister likes it or not.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Razak Education Policy brought forth a lot of comments. The People’s Progressive Party of Malaya have never accepted the Razak Policy as a suitable foundation for an Education Ordinance of this country. We did not accept it for various reasons, the most important being that it was vague to the extent of being able to be misconstrued by those charged with the responsibility of putting into effect the Razak Policy.

However, it is quite clear that the Razak Policy foresaw one very important matter and it put down in writing in Article 70 of the Report. Reading Article 71 of the Report dealing with the question of languages in secondary schools—it has been read before—it says:—

“In these Secondary Schools we recommend that the study of the Malay national language and of the English language shall be compulsory. The reason for the study of Malay is the intention, referred to in our terms of reference, to make Malay the national language of the country. The reason for teaching English is that we desire that no secondary school pupil shall be at a disadvantage in the matter either of employment or of higher education in Malaya or overseas as long as it is necessary to use the English language for these purposes.”

Further, paragraph 72 says:—

“We consider that there should be some flexibility in our secondary school system as suggested in paragraph 70 above. For example, we can see no reason for altering the practice in Chinese secondary schools of using *Kuo Yu* as a general medium provided that these Chinese schools fall into line with the conditions mentioned in the previous two paragraphs. We see no educational objection”—I emphasise ‘we see no educational objection’—to the learning of three languages in secondary schools or to the use of more than one language in the same school as the medium of instruction.”

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Razak Report had in mind the intention to make Malay the National language. The Razak Report had in mind the necessity for building up a united Malayan people, and yet the Razak Report says that it can see no reason for altering the practice of using Chinese or Mandarin and Tamil in secondary schools of a vernacular nature in this country. If that Report had those things in mind and it proposed that there was no reason to change that system, then I ask, if the same objects are in the minds of this House to-day, were in the minds of the Rahman Talib Committee of Review, why then is it necessary to change what was recommended in the Razak Report when conditions are,

perhaps, the same, when the intentions and the purposes of the Government are the same—to make Malay as the national language, to build a united nation of Malayan people, to carry on the educational system in this country. If the Razak Report said that it can be done, I wonder why the Rahman Talib Report says it cannot—because that is what it comes to. The Honourable Minister in moving the Bill suggested that there was no fundamental change between the Razak Report and the present Report, and the Bill which we are now considering. But is that not a fundamental change? Is it not a fundamental change so far as Chinese and Tamil as mediums of instruction in schools are concerned? Surely that is a fundamental change from the Razak Report. Then I ask, why try to mislead the people by saying that there is no fundamental change when there is such a glaring fundamental change?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, schools in this country have existed for many years, some built by Government, some built by different communities of this land. Yesterday, in the course of an address to this House by a Member of the PMIP, reference was made to the name of Dr. Sun Yat Sen. I think we all know the history of Dr. Sun Yat Sen—a hero, a philosopher, an educationalist, a national figure. I think in almost every other house in Malaya you will find the portrait of Dr. Sun Yat Sen. I completely disagree that such a figure of such significance to the people of a particular race should have been mentioned in this House and that it should have been suggested in this House that those portraits should not exist in such establishments. The test of loyalty is not by looking at a picture. If you are going to do that, you will find Dr. Soekarno's picture in many houses in this country. I say that is a most regrettable case of reckless statements made in this House; and from whatever section of China people come, whatever their beliefs are, I understand that Dr. Sun Yat Sen was a nationally respectable person in that community.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have here a leaflet with a cartoon captioned, "Unaided Private Chinese Secondary Schools"—Chapter 9, Page 15—which shows a person struggling under the burdens of, "Reduction in Teachers' Salaries," "Heavier Burden for School Directors," "Public to make increased contributions" and "Increase in School Fees." Then you have "National-type Secondary School," "Full Government Aid," showing a man sitting very happily on a very comfortable chair. The Honourable Minister has said, and Members of this House have also said, that many of the Chinese Secondary Schools are now accepting Government aid; and the Honourable Member from Seberang Utara suggested that it was true that this policy was acceptable to those schools. He asked why the Honourable Member for Telok Anson was trying to say that the people are not accepting the policy. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the people of this country accept internal security, not because they like it but because they have to obey. Certain schools have to seek grants from Government not because they like them but because if they do not get those grants, they cannot survive. I ask, how many large schools in this country have accepted aid? We read in yesterday's paper that the schools in Kajang, I think, refused to accept it. There are dozens of schools who will not accept aid, and who will never accept it, because they are not prepared to go under a policy which they have not accepted. But this cartoon is of very great significance. If you look at the cartoon of a man under those burdens, you will see that it shows he is struggling, it shows that he has still strength left in him; it shows that with so much burdens he is trying to rise again; and when the ultimate cartoon is drawn, that man will rise, because his energy, his determination, is greater than all the money the Government can offer him. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Minister put it very nicely when he said in this pamphlet and in the course of his address, that the Government in carrying out its policy to preserve and sustain the other languages in this

country. I wonder why the Honourable Minister and Members of this House, I would say, deliberately left out the words "use of such languages". Article 152 is very clear, and Article 152 of the Constitution was drawn up, I take it, after very great consideration. Article 152 (b) reads as follows:—

"Nothing in this clause shall prejudice the right of the Federal Government or of any State Government to preserve and sustain the use and study of the language of any other community in the Federation."

May I ask whether the Government is not going to preserve and sustain the use of these languages? Is that why it says that for promotion you can learn, but if you go to secondary schools, you cannot learn them, because you do not want these communities to use these languages? What is the explanation? Why is that on every document on Education only the Government leaves out that important qualification, "the use of these languages"? Why does it want to preserve and sustain? You preserve and sustain something for some purpose, and it is no use to preserve and sustain unless you know for what purpose. If it is for use, then say so. If you intend to carry out the provisions of our Constitution, you cannot sustain its use by stopping at primary level: and even at the primary level, as I said, Clause 21 makes it clear that you do not intend to preserve and sustain this education even at that level.

Now, I come to the question of intention, and intention is very important because if the intention of the Government is good, then any law, whether it is not properly framed or insufficient, can be properly carried out; but if the intention of Government is bad or contrary to what the people want, then whatever law you may make can be destroyed. Now, the intention of the Government has been declared several times—we want only Malay. Therefore, the intention is there. Clause 21 of this Bill gives power to carry out that intention. Further, if you look at the Bill in relation to the registration of schools, what do you

find? You will find, even in what I call frivolous sections, that the Minister may by order direct the name of a school to be changed. What are you anticipating? Are you anticipating that somebody is going to put up the school and call it "Mao Tse Tung School", and so you want the school's name changed? Are you going to ask them to put up names which mean nothing to them? What is the intention of this Clause? Is it not intended to interfere in schools, undue interference with the freedom of the people to name schools according to the wishes of those who built those schools? (*Interruption*) Yes, you want to know something? Mr. Speaker, Sir, I thought somebody was asking something.

Mr. Speaker: Please proceed.

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam: If you want to allow people to carry on with education in accordance with the Constitution, then don't try to interfere by legislation. If they do something wrong, contrary to the legislation, you have enough laws to deal with it.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it has been a matter of very, very great regret that from the time the Rahman Talib Report was published in this country the Government side has carried out a campaign in mounting tension saying: "You are disloyal, you are a communist, you are a trouble maker, you are a communalist", and one of the last but most important statement by the Prime Minister of this country is that "I will take action against these people." And here we come to Mr. Lim Lian Geok—I am not saying one word about the case in court, but I am saying about a notice served on him in relation to his teacher's certificate which has nothing to do with his citizenship. Mr. Speaker, Sir, Mr. Lim Lian Geok is one of the greatest critics of the education policy. He is entitled to criticise. If he has committed an offence, that is being dealt with by legal and judicial methods—we leave that alone. He was a teacher, a teacher for years in this country. For years from 1954, he was a supporter of the

Alliance Organisation and, if you would look at newspaper cuttings, he had consistently until 1959 told the people: "Support the MCA. I hope they will do something for us on this education problem." Everything was all right; Lim Lian Geok was a hero in the eyes of the MCA. In 1959 Mr. Lim said, "Do not support the MCA. They are not going to help Chinese education" and Lim Lian Geok became a devil. In 1961 Lim Lian Geok is such a devil that his certificate to be a teacher in this country is to be revoked, and in fact from what I hear, it has been revoked because he did not bother to appeal. What are the implications? What are the outstanding features of that case—You can say what you like so long as you vote MCA; you cannot say the same thing if you do not vote MCA—then he becomes a devil. That is the danger of arbitrary provisions; that is the danger of the misuse of arbitrary provisions. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the people of this country are loyal citizens of this country. They will follow this education law, because I know that it will become law when the Bill is passed to-day and approved by the Yang di-Pertuan Agong. The people will obey, but they will continue to campaign against it, as they are entitled to do. The fact that the people obey must never be taken to mean that they accept it. I say that the majority of people in this country do not accept it. You may say, "Who is the majority?" My answer is this: this is a multi-racial nation—you take all people together—you have three million over Malay brothers, three million over Chinese brothers, then you have the Indians, the Eurasians, and a few Europeans who are citizens of this country. Now, I don't know how many per cent. of our Malay brothers accept this policy; perhaps 100%, but that can never be. But I say this: that the large majority of three million Chinese do not accept it and large sections of the Indians do not accept it. Putting them together you will find that a very large proportion of the people of this country, who have rights in this country, do not

accept this policy because this policy is out to kill their languages and their cultures. You may say: "If you like your language and culture so much, go back to India, go back to Ceylon, go back to China." But I say to this House, "We are not going back to India, Ceylon or China; we are staying here and we intend to stay here for all times and we intend to fight this policy by democratic means now and for ever until we get what we want."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, when the education policy was debated in this House I made a statement and stated that that was a death sentence on these two languages. When a death sentence is passed, it has to be executed and this Bill is the ultimate execution. The executioner is, unfortunately, the Honourable Minister of Education, who has introduced this Bill to this House. To-day it will be executed, but the children remain and unless we execute all the children of this nation who are against the policy—and I use the word "children" to mean the generations to come—you cannot completely execute it; it will always remain. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Prime Minister has said that communalism in this country is one of the biggest evils which he has to fight. Let us not try to cheat ourselves. Malaya is a multi-racial nation; communal problems will always be present; and one of the greatest problems of a communal nature, no doubt, is an education policy.

I condemn this Bill, because obviously I have to. We fundamentally disagree. Once we disagree on the fundamental principle as to whether there shall be multilingualism in this country or not, then obviously this policy is no good. To those who agree that there shall be only one official language in this country, this policy is 100% suitable—to those who do not agree to that, this is 100% rubbish—and we disagree with that and I say many strong, influential bodies disagree with this policy including the MCA members from Johore—the president of that branch. What explanation is there for

that? The next day the Honourable Minister says: "Come, my friend, I will explain to you the policy. You will be satisfied after his explanation." I submit that he may feign that he is satisfied, but in his heart he will not be satisfied, because in his heart he knows he is still a Chinese who has the right under the Constitution to preserve his own language, and although members sitting on the opposite bench who are members of the MCA may not be able to say it to-day. I know that in their own hearts—although they may laugh now—they know in their own hearts that what I am saying is what they want. (*Laughter*) Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is significant that the PMIP members in the course of the debate on Greater Malaysia told us that the Member for Johore Tenggara had said that when the time comes they will kick out the MCA and MIC. Perhaps that is true. Perhaps the MCA and MIC are aware of that and, being aware of that, perhaps they are biding their time. Mr. Speaker, beyond that I do not wish to go, except to say once more that the PPP condemns this in the strongest possible terms and we associate ourselves with all constitutional struggles to get a policy acceptable to all races in this country. We associate ourselves with the gallant struggles put up by persons like Mr. Lim Lian Geok, for example, who will go down in the history of this country as a person who fought for language and culture for generations to come.

Enche' Ahmad bin Arshad (Muar Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ada-lah mengalu² dan menyokong atas Rang Undang² Pelajaran yang telah di-kemukakan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran dan saya gemar menarek perhatian di-antara ucapan² Yang Berhormat itu mudah²an mendatangkan kebajikan kita bersama. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, waktu beliau beruchap mengemukakan usul ini ia-itu saya menarek perhatian dalam perkara Pelajaran Ugama Islam di-sekolah² yang mendapat bantuan. Saya mengharapakan dengan peratoran yang di-perkemaskan itu akan memberikan

pengharapan baik bagi ibu bapa Islam di-dalam negeri ini yang mana anak² mereka mendapat Pelajaran Ugama Islam yang sempurna. Hal ini saya mengharapakan mendapat satu sukatan pelajaran yang sama di-kenakan di-tempat² di-seluruh Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini. Sebab saya mengatakannya bagitu, dalam masa yang akhir ini saya telah menerima pengaduan² daripada ibu bapa Islam dengan mengatakannya bahawa Sekolah Kebangsaan yang telah mengajar pelajaran ugama tetapi dalam masa dua bulan anak² mereka itu chuma di-ajar manguchap dua kalimah shahadat sahaja, ini patut kita fikirkan bersama mengapa sebab di-ajar bagitu.

Sa-lain daripada itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, rasa mustahak-lah saya di-sini memberi penjelasan dalam Dewan ini kerana dalam ucapan Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran dalam perkara sumbangan pendapatan untuk pelajaran yang mana telah menyebutkan di-antara kawasan yang tidak pernah memungut chukai pelajaran ia-itu di-Kelantan dan di-Johore. Saya, bila bandingkan dengan Kelantan dan Johore itu, oleh sebab Negeri Kelantan itu di-perintah oleh Kerajaan PAS, jadi di-sini bukan erti-nya Negeri Johore itu mengekor Kerajaan PAS Negeri Kelantan. Saya gemar menarek perhatian bahawa Negeri Johore sedang memperkemaskan peratoran dalam pungutan chukai pelajaran ini dan menimbangakan dengan sa-masak²-nya dalam pungutan itu. Kerana hendak mengenakan chukai pada ra'ayat satu keadaan yang belum di-kenakan pada zaman penjajahan dahulu. Peratoran yang di-buat itu supaya tidak memberatkan kepada ra'ayat dengan di-bagi peringkat-nya sebab pungutan chukai itu akan melalui chukai² kebun, jadi dengan itu timbangan dengan beberapa peringkat pada pekebun² kecil yang sangat kecil mungkin di-kechualikan dan pekebun² kecil penengahan akan di-kenakan bayaran rendah dan peladag² yang besar akan di-kenakan bayaran² yang tinggi. Kerana peratoran ini dapat di-jalankan bagi Negeri Johore dengan tujuan sa-bagaimana kata perbilangannya

Melayu: “menarek sapu tangan di-kaut duri, kawat ta’ bergegar, sapu tangan ta’ chair”. Erti-nya, chukai atau kutipan dengan penoh sempurna dan ra’ayat tidak berasa serta memberi sa-penoh² keriaan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, oleh sebab chukai pelajaran mulai chukai tanah, gemar saya menarek perhatian kepada Kerajaan supaya tidak-lah kalau boleh di-ubah-lah tulisan chukai pelajaran itu dengan chukai sumbangan Pelajaran. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bagi pehak Kerajaan di-Johore dalam masa yang lalu dapat mengeluarkan wang pelajaran itu untuk tambahan kewangan yang di-berikan kepada Kerajaan pusat. Walau bagaimana pun saya memberi pengakuan bahawa Negeri Johore akan memungut chukai sumbangan terhadap perbelanjaan pelajaran pada masa akan datang menurut jiran²-nya sa-bagaimana negeri² yang lain.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada akhirnya saya berchakap bahawa Rang Undang² Pelajaran yang hendak di-luluskan ini ada-lah lanjutan daripada Penyata Pelajaran Razak yang dapat di-sempurnakan dengan tegas—dan kongkrit. Oleh itu tidak-lah benar akan penolakan yang telah di-buat oleh Ahli² Yang Berhormat daripada Front Socialist dan Ahli² Yang Berhormat daripada parti Progressive Ra’ayat dan juga Ahli² Yang Berhormat Telok Anson dan Seremban Timor. Kerana semua ra’ayat dalam negeri ini menyambut baik termasuk juga orang China dan orang India dengan pelaksanaan bahawa Sekolah Rendah pada tahun akan datang tidak di-kenakan bayaran. Sa-telah mendapat kenyataan bahawa 34 buah Sekolah Menengah China telah menerima bantuan sa-paroh dan 48,000 murid² China ada di-Sekolah Menengah yang menerima bantuan penoh. Saya menyesali atas permintaan Yang Berhormat daripada Telok Anson, meminta supaya kita menendang jadual yang ada di-hadapan kita ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, oleh sebab perkataan “menendang” itu, saya gemar menarek mithalan kesan-nya rupa menendang sa-bagai-

mana Yang Berhormat itu di-tendang oleh MCA.

Mr. Speaker: Itu tidak boleh di-chakapkan, kerana itu sudah jadi personal, salah dalam peratoran Majlis ini.

Enche’ Ahmad bin Arshad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau salah saya tarek balek. Jadi, dengan itu saya memikirkan Ahli Yang Berhormat itu tidak-lah boleh mengagong²kan diri-nya mewakili orang China sa-bilangan ramai.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ter-peranjat manakala dapat sokongan daripada parti Islam sa-Tanah Melayu dan saya berasa berbesar hati sakiranya datang perkara sokongan ini daripada jiwa yang ikhlas. Tetapi, sudah-kah parti Islam sa-Tanah Melayu ini memikirkan dengan masak² bahawa pada tahun akan datang akan memberi fa’edah kepada penuntut² China dan India. Saya keberatan-lah menerima-nya sa-kira dengan sokongan itu bertujuan menebuskan keperchayaan orang² Melayu yang telah di-buat kesilapan oleh Persatuan Islam sa-Tanah Melayu waktu menentang chadangan Melayu Raya.

Mr. Speaker: Itu tidak ada kena mengena dengan fasal ini. Saya banyak kali beritahu kepada tuan supaya jaga² sadikit berchakap.

Enche’ Ahmad bin Arshad: Walau bagaimana pun saya mengharapkan sokongan di-berikan-nya itu tidak ada latar belakang, sekian, terima kaseh.

Enche’ Othman bin Abdullah (Tanah Merah): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, walau bagaimana ikhlas-nya kami menyokong pun akan di-tudoh-lah kami tidak ikhlas, ini terserah-lah kepada orang yang suka apa yang dia hendak berchakap. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kami bagi Persatuan Islam sa-Tanah Melayu yang berpendirian di-dalam soal pelajaran ini ada-lah berdiri tegas. Sa-bagaimana sahabat² saya kelmarin telah menyebutkan bahawa di-dalam mendaulatkan bahasa kebangsaan kita di-tanah ayer kita, memberikan kedudukan yang sawajar-nya kepada bahasa kebangsaan

di-dalam negeri ini, kami tidak bakhil memberikan sokongan, baik di-dalam atau di-luar Parlimen ini. Keikhlasan ini akan dapat kita perhatikan sendiri di-dalam tugas² kita di-dalam kerja² kita bagi menchiptakan apa yang kita hajatkan di-dalam negeri ini ia-itu pada tahun 1967 insaallah hanya satu bahasa yang tunggal sahaja ia-itu bahasa kebangsaan seperti mana semua ra'ayat yang chintakan keamanan dan chintakan tanah ayer ini mempunyai maksud yang sama.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, agak naik bulu roma saya, bila saya mendengar chabaran yang di-kemukakan dalam Dewan ini sa-chara langsung atau tidak langsung oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh dengan memberikan suatu gambaran apa-kah akan berlaku kalau sa-kira-nya Dasar Pelajaran ini dan Rang Undang² ini di-terima, dia kata-nya bagi pehak orang² yang tidak menyetujui ada-nya Rang Undang² ini di-perundang²kan. Memandang bahawa bentuk Tanah Melayu ini ada-lah lebeh banyak lagi—majority-nya lebeh banyak lagi orang yang bukan Melayu daripada orang Melayu. Dan oleh kerana itu kata-nya akan sampai-lah saat dan waktu-nya manakala chita² daripada parti Progressive Ra'ayat ini menjalankan tugas-nya di-bidang politik sa-chara Perlembagaan. Menurut kata-nya juga orang² dari pehak MCA berdiri di-belakang-nya walau pun mulut-nya menentang tetapi hati-nya benar berkata. Terserah-lah kepada Dewan ini ia-itu kepada Ahli² Yang Berhormat daripada MCA manapikan perkara itu. Terserah-lah kepada Ahli² MIC manapikan dan menentang apa yang di-sebutkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh supaya kami tidak ragu² atas keta'at-setian tuan² dalam mendaulatkan bahasa Melayu sa-bagai bahasa kebangsaan Tanah Melayu ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, banyak hal yang di-kemukakan oleh Ahli dari Ipoh yang sa-patut-nya biar di-jawab oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran sendiri, tetapi oleh kerana telah di-chuit dan di-usek kepada kami yang ia ta' hairan kata-nya PAS menyokong perkara ini dan kami ta' hairan pula yang ia menentang perkara ini. Ia

menentang bahasa kebangsaan di-jadikan bahasa yang tunggal dalam negeri ini. Kami ta' hairan, sebab sa-memang dasar-nya hendak mendaulatkan bahasa China, bahasa India yang dengan sendiri-nya telah menchabol kedaulatan bahasa kami. Itu dasar-nya dan kita tidak hairan dan kami tidak hairan Persatuan Islam menegaskan yang kami menyokong Kerajaan dalam mendaulatkan bahasa kebangsaan di-dalam dan di-luar Dewan ini pada bila dan bila² masa pun. (*Hear! Hear!*) Ini kita tidak bakhil sama sa-kali. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, biar-lah masa dan ketika itu akan menentukan apa yang akan berlaku kalau sa-kira-nya ada orang menapikan perpisahan kita sama kita dalam soal pelajaran ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, banyak orang berkata kami ta'at kepada negeri ini dan tanda ta'at kami ia-lah ta' kan balek ka-negeri asal kami. Kami akan perjuangkan ideology politik yang ada pada kami, tetapi apa-kah ma'ana-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-saorang yang berkata ta'at setia kepada negeri ini tidak mahu mendaulatkan bahasa kebangsaan negeri ini, tetapi mahu menjadikan bahasa-nya di-bawa pula ka-dalam negeri ini. Mana letak-nya ta'at setia mereka itu? Pada pendapat saya kalau hendak di-daulatkan bahasa China dan India oleh kerana banyak jumlah mereka di-negeri ini, maka saya rasa lebeh baik-lah mereka itu pulang ka-negeri China di-mana ada beratus million bangsa China yang mendaulatkan bahasa China, dan dengan hormat-nya balek-lah ka-India di-mana ada 400,000 million orang India yang mendaulatkan bahasa India, atau negeri Ceylon di-mana mereka mendaulatkan bahasa-nya sendiri. Kalau mereka tidak mahu balek, saya mengharapakan dengan segala hormat-nya supaya Menteri Keselamatan Dalam Negeri memberi pass free kepada-nya. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, itu-lah pendapat saya dalam soal ini dan amat berat saya, juga bagi Parti Islam menerima apa yang di-sebutkan multi-lingualism dalam negeri ini dalam perbahathan kita berkenaan dengan perchantuman itu yang Tuan Yang di-Pertua memberitahu saya bahawa soal pelajaran ini

boleh di-chakapkan dalam masa membathahkan Rang Undang² ini. Maka saya sendiri menarek perhatian Kerajaan apa-kah akan jadi soal pelajaran kalau undang² kita yang kita akan perundang²kan itu kalau sa-kira-nya yang satu pehak berlainan bentok dan satu lagi berlainan choraknya, walau bagaimana pun mari-lah kita berdo'a kepada Tuhan kerana kita tahu hanya Tuhan sahaja-lah yang berkuasa dalam perkara ini. Maka kita mengharapkan hak pertuanan bangsa kita ini dapat di-chiptakan dan saya mengharapkan kepada Ahli² Yang Berhormat dari MCA dan MIC tidak akan menyertai Ahli dari Ipoh atau Ahli dari PPP dalam perjuangan-nya itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka menarek perhatian Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran Fasal 36—Teaching of the Islamic religion. Sa-bagaimana Ahli Yang Berhormat yang baharu berchakap sa-bentar tadi sa-belum saya berdiri telah pun berchakap berkenaan dengan soal ugama, maka bagi saya sendiri soal guru ugama atau pun pelajaran ugama di-sekolah² kebangsaan atau jenis kebangsaan itu mustahak-lah bagi Kementerian Pelajaran menjalankan-nya dengan sa-berapa daya upaya dengan sa-chepat mungkin yang boleh. Sebab saya mengatakan bagitu kerana ini hanya-lah sahaja satu mata pelajaran ia-itu pelajaran ugama yang boleh menentang perkembangan fahaman Communist dalam negeri ini. Fahaman Communist akan berkembang dengan subur-nya manakala dalam hati sa-saorang penuntut itu tidak tertanam semangat ka-ugama-nya, oleh kerana Communist ada-lah musuh kami dan kami ada-lah menentang Communist maka dalam Rang Undang² ini telah pun di-matrikan bahawa di-mana ada 15 orang murid Islam dalam sa-buah sekolah itu akan di-hantar sa-orang guru ugama. Saya mengharapkan guru yang akan mengajar yang hendak di-hantar itu biar-lah dapat kerjasama dengan Kerajaan Negeri dan dengan Kerajaan Persekutuan dalam melaksanakan guru² ugama dari sekolah itu dapat dilaksanakan dengan segera, kerana

walau pun Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Muar Utara mengatakan bahawa yang di-ajar di-sekolah itu hanya khalimah *shahadat* sahaja. Ta'kan-lah budak darjah satu hendak mentafsirkan Kor'an dan pelajaran mantek—mana otak murid itu hendak mentafsirkan hadith. Tentu-lah mula² belajar *alif ba ta* sa-lepas itu *ashadu allah ila hailallah*—layak-lah bagi kanak² itu, dan itu-lah asas Islam, kalau asas itu di-tanam ka-dalam jiwa dan di-masokkan ka-dalam jiwa-nya kalimah *shahadat* tahu mengenalkan Allah Taala, tanda² perbedzaan antara pokok kelapa dengan pokok jejawi maka baharu-lah mereka tahu sedikit demi sedikit akan ajaran Islam. Saya sedeh sedikit kerana tidak di-ajarkan pelajaran ugama Islam jangan di-katakan mengajar ugama Islam, kadang² tidak di-ajar asas² ugama di-sekolah itu, barangkali guru di-sekolah kebangsaan itu tidak mempelajari tentang hal itu. Maka oleh kerana dasar kita ini semua ada-lah menentang faham Komunis maka hanya satu perkataan sahaja kata saya yang boleh menentang Komunis sa-lain daripada kekuatan senjata maka kekuatan batin ada-lah mustahak dan perlu. Kalau sa-kira-nya kita mahu menengok keamanan dalam negeri ini dan tidak mahu berkembang-nya pengajaran Komunis itu maka hendak-lah kita utamakan perlaksanaan pengajaran ugama di-sekolah² itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, satu penentangan telah di-kemukakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh tadi tentang apa yang di-sebutkan oleh sahabat saya dari Kuala Trengganu Utara ia-itu mengeshorkan kepada Kerajaan supaya Kerajaan mengamati kepada sekolah² yang bukan sekolah kebangsaan tentang lagu, tentang gerak dan sa-umpama-nya di-mana ia menyebutkan sa-malam, mithal-nya ada orang mendewa²kan Dr. Sun Yat Sen dalam sekolah² itu. Ini telah di-tentang oleh Ahli dari Ipoh itu yang kata-nya ta'patut di-bawa ka-dalam Dewan ini, kerana Dr. Sun Yat Sen itu sa-orang pemimpin besar dalam dunia ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak mengerti pemimpin besar dalam dunia ini,

tetapi dengan mendewa²kan Dr. Sun Yat Sen atau Chiang Kai Sek atau Mao Tze Tung atau siapa juga, orang itu yang tidak ta'at setia kepada negeri ini, tidak ta'at kepada Tanah Melayu tidak-lah layak mendapat sanjungan dan pujaan kerana yang demikian itu tidak layak bagi negeri ini.

Oleh kerana kita tahu bahawa dengan memasokkan segangat mereka ini ka-dalam sekolah² akan mengingatkan mereka itu kepada tanah tumpah darah-nya yang asal, yang mana ta'at setia-nya kepada negara ini akan sumbang dan tidak penoh. Oleh hal yang demikian, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menarek perhatian Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran supaya sekolah² kebangsaan, sekolah² jenis kebangsaan, baik rendah, menengah, tinggi atau lanjut memerhatikan tiap² suara yang di-lagukan dalam sekolah² ini. Sebab, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, lagu mempunyai satu irama yang boleh menaikkan semangat, dan dengan semangat itu akan mengembalikan ingatan mereka kepada keadaan asal-nya. Kalau Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran tidak dapat menyekat soal ini, maka akan menjadi sia²-lah tujuan kita yang hendak menjadikan ta'at setia dalam negeri ini yang tidak berbelah-bagi.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, walau pun Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran telah menerangkan bahawa telah banyak sekolah² China di-masokkan ka-dalam pentadbiran Kementerian Pelajaran ia-itu 34 buah sekolah telah di-beri bantuan, dan ada lagi hendak di-beri sa-tengah bantuan dan bantuan penoh. Saya rasa di-zaman penjajah dahulu sekolah² ini tidak mendapat satu sen pun bantuan daripada penjajah. Nampak-nya bermurah hati—terlalu bermurah hati—Kerajaan Perikatan memberi sokongan kepada mereka ini, daripada ta' di-beri kepada di-beri. Itu pun mereka maseh tidak puas hati. Mana-lah manusia yang hendak puas hati dalam dunia ini. Sudah di-beri betis hendakkan peha, beri peha hendakkan kepala, dan beri kepala hendak mata; beri sadikit mereka hendakkan banyak. Tidak ada satu pun nafsu manusia yang boleh puas dengan pemberian. Oleh itu kita

tidak hairan kalau sa-kira-nya ada orang² yang menyuarakan: kami tidak puas hati, benda ini ta' guna, benda ini condemn, sebab mereka memang tidak puas hati. Tetapi, dalam sikap yang saperti ini, kami pun PAS tidak puas hati, sebab terlalu banyak Perikatan memberi—kami pun tidak puas hati—yang sa-patut-nya di-beri bagaimana chara hendak meninggikan bahasa kebangsaan. Meski pun bagitu, mereka itu patut-lah di-beri bantuan. Sungguh pun kami tidak puas hati, tetapi dasar pelajaran dan undang² ini hendak menegakkan bahasa kebangsaan ada-lah mendapat sokongan yang sa-penoh-nya daripada kami. (*Tepok*).

Enche' Lee San Choon (Kluang

Utara): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support this Bill. So far, has any Opposition Member presented any concrete proposal to solve this problem? Let us take their points one by one. First, the Honourable Member for Seberang Selatan—I presume he speaks for the Socialist Front—gave us a long talk on this matter; but could he let the House know, let every one of us know, what is the stand of the Socialist Front? When the Government wanted to encourage the use of Bahasa Kebangsaan, they told the Chinese to object; when we tried to encourage the use of other languages, they told the House that the Government had not done enough for Bahasa Kebangsaan. So, I would like to know what is their stand. I issued a challenge in the 1959 elections and that challenge still stands.

Coming to the Honourable Member for Telok Anson—and the Honourable Member for Seremban, I believe—I wish to refer to him point by point. He seems to say that the spirit in the Razak Report is lost in this Rahman Talib Report. He also seems to tell us that the important thing is the medium of examination which is not the medium of instruction; and perhaps he also implied that there will be less time devoted for the study of Chinese. Is that a fact, is that true? Let us examine it in detail. Before that, let us note that for over half a century Chinese institutions for the learning of

Chinese have been established in this country. When the early Chinese established their institutions, established their schools, there were then the China's Chinese who were citizens of China. They established their schools with the intention that their children will one day learn more about Chinese and go back to China. They never dreamt of becoming citizens of this country when they established the schools. The then British Government were quite happy about it—of course, because the Chinese paid for their own education and the Government did not have to pay. Furthermore, with the "divide and rule" policy, they were more happy to keep the Malays, Chinese and Indians apart. For more than half a century, Chinese school students, hundreds and thousands of them, received no recognition for their education and Chinese education was not considered as part of the Government educational system. There we have the dissatisfaction; there frustration grows. It has grown for more than half a century. We know, everyone of us know, that Chinese are very sensitive about the Chinese education problem, and there are a lot of grievances on this problem, but I should like to remind the Honourable Member for Telok Anson that this blame should not be put to the Alliance Government of which he was one before. During the colonial days, any rule or regulation that was passed, was considered unfavourable for the Chinese. So much so, this has become general feeling among the Chinese and this sort of feeling carries on until to-day. However, is the Alliance Government trying to kill Chinese education or trying to stop the learning of the Chinese language? Sir, I say "no". I say "no", because with this Report we have free education, although this money has got to come from somewhere. This means a lot to the masses, although it may mean nothing to the Honourable Member for Ipoh. For a man, say, a rickshaw-puller or a labourer, who has five or six children, \$10 or \$15 means a lot to him. How does it help in the learning of Chinese language? Sir, it certainly popularizes

the learning of the language. He has told that hitherto people have to stop their children from going to school after three or four years. This will not be the case under the present Alliance Government. Under this education policy people will be able to afford to send their children to Chinese schools to learn the Chinese language. Furthermore, Sir, for secondary education, at the moment, students pay something like \$20 per month as school fees and some pay \$18 or \$16 in partially-assisted schools or in independent schools. So only those with means can afford to send their children to a secondary school, not the man in the street whom the Government is looking after, whom the Government is much concerned. With the introduction of the National-type secondary school or fully-assisted secondary school, people will be able to send their children to those schools where Chinese language and Chinese literature will be taught. Well, the argument is that in the new fully assisted secondary schools you will only learn Chinese language and therefore you curtail the number of hours and you kill the Chinese education. Is that true? For the information of the Honourable Member for Telok Anson, I would say let us face the situation. In Chinese secondary schools to-day, we have Chinese language, we have Chinese literature, we have Algebra, we have Arithmetic, we have Biology, we have Chemistry, we have Physics, we have drawings and so on. Besides Chinese and Chinese literature, all other subjects such as the Science and Maths subjects, most of the textbooks, if not all, are translated from English to Chinese. What is wrong with $A+A = A+A$, $A \text{ chia } A = A \text{ chia } A$? Is that killing Chinese culture? That is not Chinese education in any case. So what are they doing? They know very well that dissatisfaction and frustration have accumulated for over half a century, because their children have no future. They have got to look after the security of their children. They know frustration is there. People like the Honourable Member for Ipoh and the Honourable

Member for Telok Anson are trying to exploit the situation.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam (Menglembu): Sir, on a point of order—S.O. 36 (5). No Member shall impute improper motives to any other Member; and the allegation that we are trying to exploit is an improper imputation.

Mr. Speaker: (To *Enche' Lee San Choon*) You should not use the word "exploit".

Enche' Lee San Choon: Anyway, they make use of the situation for their political ends.

Mr. Speaker: I must draw your attention that you must be very careful in your words. If you use words which are unparliamentary, I will ask you to withdraw them.

Enche' Lee San Choon: I submit to your decision, Sir. Our Honourable Member from Telok Anson was our Assistant Minister of Education before. I wonder whether he has thought of this: every year, not only to-day, since after the war, there are 500, 800, 1,000, 1,500, and to-day a few thousand, students come out from Chinese secondary schools. Every year there is a large number of such students come out of schools but they cannot have a chance like those receiving English education, national education, to get Government jobs, to go to Universities. They cannot do so because their qualifications are not recognised—I wonder the ex-Assistant Minister has thought of it. No. Perhaps, that is the reason why he was chucked out of the Ministry. (*Laughter*).

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! I have warned you before that you must be very careful in choosing your words. The words "chucked out" cannot be used. They are unparliamentary.

Enche' Too Joon Hing (Telok Anson): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like the speaker to withdraw his words.

Mr. Speaker: (To *Enche' Lee San Choon*) Please withdraw.

Enche' Lee San Choon: I use the word "dismissed", Sir.

Mr. Speaker: I asked you to withdraw.

Enche' Lee San Choon: I withdraw.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: Sir, on a point of order. It is obvious from the demeanour of Members of the House that they are ridiculing the Chair by laughing at the orders given by you, Sir, from the Chair.

Mr. Speaker: They were not laughing at my order. Please proceed.

Enche' Lee San Choon: Sir, as I was telling you, every year there are thousands of Chinese school students come out of Chinese schools learning only Chinese, and their qualifications are not recognised. They come into the society frustrated. They want to be useful citizens of the society but they are not wanted. Now, the Government has come out with a solution whereby the Government want to use the Malay language as the National language and at the same time encourage and sustain the use of the other languages—also at the same time as a solution to solve the Chinese school students problem. After the implementation of this Report, the Chinese school students will no more be afraid of their future, and I think in this way more and more parents will be willing to send their children to learn their mother tongue and at the same time to learn the Malay language.

Sir, another fact is that less and less parents send their children to Chinese schools. Have those who oppose this Bill thought why? Have they told us why? The reason is that they have nowhere to go. The Government has come out with a solution. They said no. Why did they say so? They said so because they want to see this situation to continue to exist so that they can continue to make use of it, otherwise all the Opposition "mati-lah".

Mr. Speaker: If you repeat, I shall ask you to discontinue your speech. Please proceed.

Enche' Lee San Choon: The most important thing, as I see it in this Report, is this: Chinese education in Malaya had never been recognised as part of the education system in the country. Before we got independence, even immediately after we got independence, Chinese schools were given grant in aid somewhat less than a million. They were not satisfied and the Minister will verify me. Up to now more than 100 million dollars of grant-in-aid for Chinese schools and we have still not solved the problem. To-day, Chinese education has been recognised and classified as part of the education system and it is recognised as the main language besides the official language. Thus, it plants the root of Chinese education in this country. How can you say the Government has any intention to stop the use of Chinese then. The Honourable Member from Telok Anson suggested that partial aid to secondary schools should be continued. I wonder why. I would ask him why. Would that solve the situation? Would that solve the problem? If he can tell me that will solve the main problem, then I would think of supporting him.

Enche' Too Joon Hing: I only said that in independent schools the learning and teaching of Malay should be provided with assistance according to the provisions laid down in the Razak Report under paragraphs 17 and 18.

Enche' Lee San Choon: All the same. I also do not know the stand of the Honourable Member from Telok Anson. What is his stand? What does he want the Government to do? Does he merely want to object to everything so that he can remain in power all the time or what is it? I would be grateful to hear from him what is his stand. At least the Honourable Member from Ipoh had declared the stand of the PPP. They want to fight for Chinese as one of the official languages, although I do not agree. I would change my mind if PPP can win an election in Trengganu or Kelantan.

The Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications (Dato' V. T.

Sambanthan): Mr. Speaker, I hear it said that the world is on the brink of disaster. We read that the 50 megaton bomb may go off at any time, and humanity does not know what is going to happen to itself if this process continues: I say this merely as a prelude, because I feel we have got to stand on our own feet and keep our feet on the ground. Humanity, as such, is at its twilight to-day. Whether to-morrow is the morning or the beginning of a long night, nobody really knows. The next five months may show it. In the meanwhile, however, humanity here, must go on as ever.

We debate the Education Bill, but at this moment at least, how many of us are willing to concede that in all things ethics and morals have a place; that everyone, has a duty to a nation and not only to the people of his own party; that if we, in this small country, want to go forward building upon that unity which history by strange circumstances has bestowed upon us, then we have got to depend, to a large extent, upon the factors which civilisation has bestowed upon us: that is, an essential belief in spiritual values, in moral values, in ethical values. Seeking to divide people on the basis of language, simply because certain parties attain their political ends, is not helping the country; is not helping anybody. I would wish to stress that, because to-day more than ever, we have got to think carefully about the future.

Some time ago, the representative of the PPP, the Honourable Member for Ipoh, said that the Indians are opposed to the education policy. I do not know where he got this information. I have gone to many places. I have seen people in the estates, in the urban areas—Malayans of Indian stock, and I have asked them, and they have generally expressed satisfaction at the fact that if they live in an urban area, they can utilise the opportunity of sending their children to Tamil schools, English schools, Malay or Chinese schools. In fact, I know some Indian parents who send, if they have four children, one to an English school, one to a Malay school and a couple to a Tamil school.

I have seen it happen in many parts of the country, and when you look back, you realise the vast improvements that has been brought about during the past five years of Alliance rule to Indian schools. These improvements have been basic and definite.

I shall delve a bit deeper into the past in an effort at analysing and showing what really is our position to-day. In the past, we had Indian schools—Tamil schools, generally—Indian schools in estates run by estate managements, indifferent mostly, obtaining a grant from the Government. In the towns, we had schools run by committees in independent buildings, and also being run with a certain grant from the Government. But after the Razak Plan came in, however, there was a change. We found that estate schools, as such, existed with 16, 17, 18, 25 children to a school and that the teacher had to teach from Std. 1 to Std. 6 which was the highest in an Indian school. He had to teach all these classes in the same room. I felt as early as 1954, long before I came into politics, that these schools ought better to be described as single teacher, multi-standard monstrosities. And so they were! So the Razak Education Plan decided, that these schools had to be grouped; and so, during the past four years they have been systemically grouped where the distance permitted these schools to be grouped, and we have now that process wherein schools of 10, 15 or 25 children have been grouped together, and we now have schools of 100 or 80 or more children with 5 or 6 teachers, each teacher being able to take a class. At the same time, these children are being taught English and Malay. We have geared these schools to the general pattern in such a manner that children in estate schools can write the Std. 6 examination and, if they pass, go on to a secondary school. The fact that they have been taught English and Malay for so many years in these estate schools makes it easy for them to go into Remove Classes and onward to secondary schools. Now, this is an opportunity which extends throughout

the length and breadth of this country and goes to the remotest estate school. Does the Indian community object to it? I do not think it would. It does not. Every parent realises the good that it brings. I have known estate workers' children who have benefitted as a result of this and who have gone on into secondary schools. They will go in increasing number. To-day, perhaps off and on, it may be economic circumstances which prevent their going, but, as opportunity grows, as more and more children go into Std. 6 and write this examination, more and more of them will go into Remove Classes and onwards to secondary schools, and then, let us see what happens. If at a secondary school, they want to study the Tamil language, 15 children have to ask for it and they get a teacher. After the school certificate class, if they want to go into a university, they have a first-class Chair in Indian Studies in the University of Malaya, and we have one of the world's well-known exponents of the Tamil language in Revd. Thaninayagam, the Head of the Department of Indian Studies.

Now, is that the example of a country or of a Government trying to kill a language? I ask you, Sir, and I ask this House, is that an example of anybody trying to kill a language? Let everyone think for himself and let the world at large ask this question. They know what the answer is. This Government pays lots of money day in and day out, year in and year out, in an effort at preserving and promoting the growth of the language. Malaya had NO, I say NO, Chair in Indian Studies before the Alliance came into power. (*Applause*). To-day, we have it and it is growing apace. We have more and more lecturers. Only the other day another lecturer arrived—I forgot his name—who is an expert in Sanskrit and will help in research. We will have fundamental research in the language, and as we know the association of Malay with Tamil and Sanskrit, that study of the Indian Group in the University of Malaya is going to help a lot in the growth of the culture that

we have in this country. Why then does the PPP say—I know the Honourable Member from Ipoh is a learned gentleman, why does he say that the Tamil language is going to be killed? Why does he say the Indian language is going to be killed? Why does he say the Indians are against this language policy?

I did not mention the other section to which Indian parents have found the doors open. I refer, to those workers—the ordinary poor man, who in the past could never dream of sending his child to an English school, simply because places in English schools were limited and simply because English educated parents send their children earlier for admission to English schools, and obtain all the places. So, the P.W.D. worker or the Town Board worker sent his child, invariably because he had no other place, into an Indian school. That was the lot of the poor man. But to-day, during the past few years, we have thrown the doors open and we say: “Send your child to any school you want.” And they have sent their children in increasing numbers to English schools in the urban areas—English or Malay schools, or Tamil schools if they wanted to send them there. Is that then an unpopular issue? The right a parent exercises to send his child to any school, to a school of his choice in four languages? Does that happen in many parts of the world, I ask—in four languages—any school to which any parent can send his children? Throughout the world how many countries do you have, where such a thing exists? And yet you say the Government is trying to kill the culture of the Indians and the Chinese. Personally, my rationale does not permit me to believe this fantastic charge.

Let us come now to Chinese schools. I would like to follow up what my Honourable friend from Kluang Utara mentioned about Chinese schools—to go back to the history. I am afraid that a large measure of blame for the present distressing circumstances must begin with the British. In the past, the Chinese

clamoured as much as the Indians for English education, but they were not provided. English schools were simply not there and so the Chinese felt that rather than let their children become illiterate they owed it a duty to themselves and to their children that they should start schools; and since English teachers were not in plentiful supply and since in any case, they could get teachers at lower salaries from China, they got them and they ran their schools. I say, Sir, of the Chinese merchants and the other persons with the interest of the public at heart who have been pouring money throughout the last many decades in the building of Chinese schools, that they have done very great duty to society. If they did not build those schools, then we would have had a large population of Chinese completely illiterate. But, they took out of their own pockets the money, they built these schools, they got the teachers, they provided the money for the teachers, and they sent their children to schools. In every town you find Chinese schools. I say, Malayan society owes a debt of gratitude to those men who built these schools those days and who ran them. My own father—he is deceased—I remember those days, was so happy about the manner in which the Chinese built the schools, about their self-reliance, that he himself would give large donations to Chinese schools whenever they came for money. He felt they ought to be helped in their efforts. But they did their job. They did their job, because they wanted to keep their children literate. Now, they did it because there was no other way out. They still continue paying for their schools. But to-day a new chapter has been turned. At long last, the Government of this country have come forward to say “We will bear the burden of your schools. We will pay everything for your schools and we will run them and we will see that we shall teach your language in your schools. But we will see that other languages are also taught so that the children from your schools can go to any high post, so that a Chinese school student is not left at a blind alley; the gateways of the world are open to him;

the universities are open to him." That, the Government at last says—and we say it now: "We pay you all the money, we run your schools, we build your buildings, we will look after the whole thing"—is that wrong? Yet why are some schools not coming into it? Some schools are not coming into it because the old suspicion still exists: "Can we trust the Government? Will they be fair? Will they run these schools which we have sedulously fostered for so many years? Will they run them properly?" That is the distrust that they have, but gradually, slowly but surely they will find that children from the fully-supported schools go out into the world better educated with better opportunities and that they can go to any University throughout the world for further studies. Let us recognise it—English is the gateway to the world to-day and that English is being taught here. For our purpose, the National language is being taught. To those who say that cultures will be smashed up, Chinese is being taught and soon the University of Malaya will also have a Chinese Chair—I suppose that that is another nail in the coffin of the Chinese language, if the PPP would have it. But, Mr. Speaker, Sir, there can be no nail in the Chinese language, because a language which has been virulent for the past 5,000 years cannot be killed by anybody however much we may try; and it is not for the Member for Ipoh or for the Member for Menglembu or for any Party to come up and say, "I will save the Chinese language." Nobody need save it. It cannot be killed. (*Applause*). And yet, why do these Gentlemen go like this? We got down to the basis of it. It is not the education policy to-day that is bothering the Member for Ipoh. It is not at all the education policy but it is this—and he came out with the truth to-day—he said, "Whatever you do, we want 100% multi-lingualism; that alone will satisfy the PPP." There you have the fact. They are afraid that the Alliance Government in seeking to pay the full amount to Chinese schools have solved the education situation. To-day we do not stand by and say,

"Look, you must run the school as we say, but we will not pay you the money." To-day we say, "We will pay the money, we will do everything, we will look after your children, it is our duty to do it and we will obtain taxes and do it." But, knowing that the sands are running out, knowing that he is on shifting sands, he says, "No, no. We want multi-lingualism, one hundred per cent multi-lingualism," which means that every language in this country—there are so many languages here—should be spoken, an impossibility; and yet why do they ask for it? Mr. Speaker, the *New Statesman* for which all of us have high respect—for which I have high respect, because I think Mr. Kingsley Martin has run a very good paper; it is called a left wing paper and some say it is left of left but still, a good paper—came out with an article some time ago in which it said, in regard to the political parties in Malaya, that the PMIP takes on a highly racial role, that is, religion and so on, and dismisses the PPP with just one sentence, "The PPP plays on communal issues." Just that. That, I think, Mr. Speaker, Sir, is ample testimony to the basis, the platform, of the attitude of that Party—Play On Communal Issues. I do not say it. The *New Statesman* says so. (*Laughter*).

We come to another angle of this killing of cultures. Radio Malaya—so many hours are spent every day in the speaking of the Chinese language. Again, I fail to see this killing of Chinese culture. Is it the killing of Chinese culture when so many hours are devoted to Chinese in Radio Malaya. Further, so many hours of Indian languages are spoken over Radio Malaya. There again, Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have another example of how this Government of ours is trying to play fair and may God help it, because in the coming years, in the coming months, we will have to have more and more of goodwill and understanding among the people.

Speaking of Chinese schools, let us look around. What is happening in Thailand? What happens in Indonesia? Let us look around, and you know the

answer. I would have been happier. I would have called the Honourable Member for Ipoh thoroughly honest, if he had got up and said, "I congratulate the Malayan Government, the Alliance Government, for having been so liberal to the languages and cultures of the other races". Compared with Indonesia, you know what is the answer. Compared with Thailand, you know what is the answer. Why then, this quarrelling; why then, this playing upon issues to-day? This playing upon issues to-day, is the biggest single factor which is in a way an impediment to the remaining schools coming into the scheme. They are afraid of political pressure, they are afraid that this platform oratory by so many Opposition Parties playing upon communal issues will have an effect on the Committee members. They are afraid; they will think, "Are we right to get into the Government scheme? Firstly, it is run by the Government; secondly, if everybody in the Opposition parties are attacking it, can we go into it?" Therefore, they fight shy. That, Mr. Speaker, Sir, is the sum and substance of the whole thing. If only members of political parties will realise that the future is in our hands to-day; that the future which we want to build is in our hands, but if we think that building it is going according to the famous dictum of Julius Caesar—*divide et impera*—then it is different. *Divide et impera* means divide and rule. In the past, we of this country have said that we fight the imperialists and that we fight the colonialists because they divide and rule. Yes, the British divided India, they had the Hindus and Muslims at each other's throats. They did that and nobody can deny it. But what is happening around the world to-day? We who fought for freedom in those days did say, "We must unite to achieve the freedom." But what are we doing to-day? If we look around, we will find that in most countries, the very politicians who to-day are the men who claim to bring about the millennium of the people, say to themselves, "Look, there are so many races, so many languages and so many religions. Why should we not divide

them? Divide them, and on the basis of division, we can rule; we can get more votes." It is not only in Malaya, it is throughout these recently freed nations. It is a political analysis which anybody can question if they want to. Let them study it for themselves and they will find that it is a pattern, a frightening pattern, throughout the Eastern world. My request to my Honourable friends who like to play up these religious issues is, "Please desist, because you are playing with fire." Examples there are in plenty, be it in Ceylon, be it in India, anywhere else—plenty, a hundred fold—and don't say that you are going to save Chinese cultures. Chinese cultures does not need anybody to save it. It is there for five thousand years and it will live for fifty thousand years and many more, Mr. Speaker. (*Applause*).

So let us be humble. Let us recognise that there is a limit to the possibilities of any one man. Let us realise that in the ultimate analysis we, who are human beings, who have been endowed with a certain basis by civilisation, have only one duty that we can willingly and freely render to society, and that duty is, to hold aloft certain spiritual, moral, ethical, values and we want our country to grow into a great country and we want there to be unity. Do we want people to be high-thinking or on the other hand do we want them to tear at each other's throats like wild animals, and that is what this country or any country would become if it goes into war on language, war on culture. So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to appeal most sincerely in the name of our civilisation, "Please let us build up the future." Thank you. (*Applause*).

Che' Khadijah binti Mohd. Sidek (Dungun): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong kepada dasar pelajaran ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kerana dasar ini bersamaan dengan dasar Persatuan kami. Kalau kira-nya tadi ada salah sa-orang dari Ahli Yang Berhormat merasa was² atau mempunyai shak wasangka kenapa Persatuan kami pada hari ini menyokong dasar pelajaran ini, maka di-sini saya suka memberi

keterangan-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Kami menyokong dasar pelajaran ini ia-lah bersesuaian dengan dasar atau idiologi Parti kami; kami berjuang dengan sungguh²-nya ia-itu dasar pelajaran yang akan menegakkan bahasa Melayu sa-bagai bahasa Kebangsaan yang tunggal dalam negeri ini. Kerana Parti kami mempunyai dasar² yang pertama, satu negara yang berbahasa satu, bahasa Melayu dan berbangsa satu ia-itu bangsa Melayu. Oleh kerana bahasa Melayu akan menjadi bahasa rasmi yang tunggal dalam negeri ini ia-itu bersesuaian dengan dasar atau idiologi yang kami anuti dan kerana itu-lah maka kami memberikan sokongan dalam dasar ini.

Saya berharap Yang Berhormat daripada Muar Utara faham dengan sesungguhnya²-nya kenapa kami memberi sokongan itu. Jadi bukan-lah kerana ada tipu helah politik terselit di-dalam-nya, kami tidak mahu bermain di-balek belakang, kami mahu tegas², berterang² terhadap bangsa kami dalam menegakkan bangsa kami dalam negeri ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya hendak memberi jawapan sedikit kepada Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Ipoh, kerana beliau itu sa-bagaimana sudah di-tentang oleh beberapa Ahli Yang Berhormat dalam Dewan ini, tentang beliau itu hendak menegakkan multilingualism dalam negeri ini, maka beliau itu juga sudah agak marah terhadap Parti Islam sa-Tanah Melayu kerana memberi sokongan dalam dasar pelajaran ini sa-hingga beliau mengatakan Parti Islam sekarang ini sudah tidak di-perchayai lagi oleh ra'ayat Kelantan dan Trengganu. Sungguh pun Yang Berhormat daripada Ipoh berkata demikian, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tetap Kerajaan Kelantan dan Trengganu di-bawah pentadbiran Kerajaan Parti Islam sa-Tanah Melayu. Maka di-sini, saya menegaskan lagi kami dari PAS sa-lagi Kerajaan pada hari ini mempunyai pemerintahan yang tetap, tegap menegakkan bahasa Melayu menjadi bahasa Kebangsaan yang tunggal dalam negeri ini, kami tetap akan berdiri di-belakang Kerajaan menghadapi segala rintangan atau halangan sa-siapa sahaja yang hendak menegak-

kan bahasa² asing sa-bagai bahasa rasmi dalam negeri ini hatta apa yang akan terjadi. (Hear! Hear!).

Mr. Speaker: Perlahan sedikit.

Che' Khadijah binti Mohd. Sidek: Naik semangat, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. (Ketawa). Sa-betul-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada pendapat saya menilek kapada ucapan² yang di-berikan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran dan menilek kapada isi² Undang² ini, saya merasa sa-benar-nya pemberian yang telah di-berikan oleh Menteri Pelajaran terhadap saudara² bangsa asing sudah berlebeh² daripada patut. Kerana kalau di-bandingkan Sekolah² China yang ada dalam negeri ini ada-lah Sekolah Private dahulu yang sekarang dengan sukachita Kerajaan telah memberi bantuan sa-hingga yang dahulu-nya murid² dalam Sekolah Menengah atau Sekolah Tinggi dahulu tidak di-recognisekan ia-itu penamatan pelajaran-nya oleh Kerajaan maka pada hari ini kerana sekolah itu telah di-jadikan Sekolah Kebangsaan di-sokong oleh Kerajaan maka murid²-nya akan menerima kebahagiaan, mereka boleh di-anggap sama dengan murid² berkelulusan Sekolah Menengah yang lain dan akan mendapat kerja² dalam negeri ini. Tetapi kalau kita lihat, mana ada satu Sekolah Private atau Sekolah Menengah yang di-punyai oleh orang Melayu dalam negeri ini. Sa-kira-nya kita bandingkan dengan itu sangat-lah tidak adil Kerajaan terhadap kami kerana sangat bermurah hati memberikan segala²-nya kapada bangsa China, tetapi ini pun saudara² dari bangsa China sa-tengah-nya maseh merasa lagi tidak adil, maseh merasa lagi belum memuaskan akan pemberian-nya.

Mr. Speaker: Saya hendak ingatkan lagi, di-bawah peratoran 10, ada-lah salah berkata perkataan yang harus menaikkan perasaan bersakit² hati, atau bermusoh²an di-antara satu dengan satu kaum dalam Persekutuan ini. Jaga² sedikit.

Che' Khadijah binti Mohd. Sidek: Terima kasih, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, maksud saya untuk memberikan per-

bandingan, dan tidak ada niat untuk menaikkan semangat untuk bersakit² hati di-antara satu kaum dengan satu kaum.

Jadi, saya merasa, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ta' patut-lah rasa-nya ada lagi orang yang tidak puas hati terhadap dasar pelajaran ini. Di-sini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, walau pun kami memberikan sokongan tetapi untuk lebeh baik lagi di-beri tambahan mana² yang kurang dalam Undang² ini, kami memberikan pandangan² atau mengharapkan kepada pehak Menteri Pelajaran ia-itu di-fasal:

23. It shall be the duty of the Minister to secure the provision of education in secondary schools of the following descriptions:

- (a) sekolah² pelajaran lanjutan or, in English, continuation schools;
- (b) sekolah² lanjutan kampong or, in English, rural extension schools;
- (c) national secondary schools;
- (d) national-type secondary schools;
- (e) secondary trade schools;
- (f) secondary technical schools;
- (g) secondary schools of such other descriptions as the Minister may from time to time direct.

Di-sini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berharap supaya di-adakan lagi dibawah (f)-(g) ini hendak-lah dituliskan "secondary domestic science school." Sebab²-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sekarang sekolah² kebangsaan itu ada di-dirikan khas untuk anak² perempuan sahaja di-kampong² dan di-dalam-nya itu di-ajar pelajaran domestic science—jahit-menjahit, masak-memasak dan lain²-nya. Jika sakira-nya anak² perempuan lepas daripada sekolah kebangsaan itu bila mereka itu; jika sa-kira-nya di-satu negeri ada satu secondary domestic science school, maka daripada sekolah² itu nanti akan di-pilih dan di-masokkan ka-dalam secondary school ini.

Dan juga di-fasal 25 (a), (b) dan (c) ini, saya juga meminta supaya di-masokkan pelajaran domestic—dari-pada secondary school di-masokkan nanti ka-dalam domestic college.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya merasa sangat dukachita kenapa rakan² saya ia-itu wakil dari Jitra dan wakil dari Pontian Selatan tidak mengambil perhatian dalam perkara wanita ini kerana mereka itu dudok dalam pehak Kerajaan.

Mr. Speaker: Itu tidak kena mengena dengan perkara di-hadapan kita ini.

Che' Khadijah binti Mohd. Sidek: Bukan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, hendaklah ada pandangan² atau permintaan daripada wanita dari pehak sana.....

Mr. Speaker: Puan tidak boleh masokkan perkara itu.

Che' Khadijah binti Mohd. Sidek: Jadi, saya minta kepada Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran supaya dapat menambahkan sekolah² atau college di-dalam Rang Undang² Pelajaran ini kerana ini sangat penting bagi kemajuan anak² perempuan dalam negeri ini. Sebab rasa saya, anak² perempuan tidak kurang jumlah-nya daripada anak² lelaki bersekolah di-dalam negeri kita ini.

Mr. Speaker: Meshuarat di-tanggohkan sa-hingga 2.30 petang.

Sitting suspended at 12.00 noon.

Sitting resumed at 2.30 p.m.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

THE EDUCATION BILL

Debate resumed.

Question again proposed.

The Deputy Prime Minister (Tun Haji Abdul Razak): Mr. Speaker, Sir, it always gives me great pleasure and a great stimulus to return to this battlefield of education where for some years I had the honour of being the Minister. At that time it was a real battlefield, because there were firings from all sides—from Chinese schools, from Malay schools, from English schools, from Tamil schools, and indeed from all schools. With the adoption of the 1956 Report and its implementation the fury of the battle

had been reduced and now we have only firing from one side, that is from Chinese education and from those who champion the cause of Chinese education.

Now, Sir, it has been alleged in this House as well as outside that the Report of the Review Committee is different in principle as well as in policy from the Report of the Committee in 1956. I would like, Sir, as one of those responsible for the 1956 Report, as the Chairman of that Committee, to state before this House quite clearly that there is no difference in principle and policy between the Rahman Talib Report and the 1956 Report. There are a few differences, but they are not in the matter of principle or policy. These relate to the raising of school leaving age, the suspension of Local Education Authorities, and the establishment of free primary education. But these are non-controversial matters and I do not wish to dwell on them. I only wish to say, Sir, that I am surprised—I am indeed surprised—that the Honourable Member for Ipoh should have said that the announcement by the Government to give free primary education is a humbug or a sham. These are strong words, Sir, and I am surprised that they should come from the Honourable Member after the Government had made that announcement, an announcement with no conditions whatsoever. The announcement said that the Government would from the beginning of 1962 give free primary education to all students, to all types of schools—to standard type schools as well as standard schools.

Sir, I will now endeavour to explain very briefly why I consider the allegation made that these two Reports are different in fundamental policy is not true. Firstly, Sir, the Review Committee was precluded by the terms of reference laid down by the Cabinet from recommending any fundamental changes. The duty of the Review Committee was merely to review the existing policy and, in particular, the implementation so far carried out and the implementation to be carried out

in the future. That Review Committee was never asked, and it was not entitled, to produce any new policy or new system, or any fundamental change in the policy or the system. What in fact that Committee did was to affirm and clarify the fundamental principles contained in my Report of 1956. Although I was not a member of the 1960 Committee, its Chairman, my Honourable colleague the Minister of Education, did me the courtesy of providing me with all the minutes and papers of this Committee and throughout the deliberations he consulted me on my views with the object of ensuring that the two Reports were in line on fundamental matters. Now, Sir, the Report of my Committee tried to recommend a national system of education which would work towards making the national language the main medium of instruction throughout the system, while at the same time preserve and sustain the languages and cultures of the other races. That is the fundamental policy, and it is clear from both Reports that the principle on which Government has been working is that—while the Government is endeavouring to make Malay the national language, the Government intends to preserve and sustain—if you like you can put the word “use”—preserve, sustain and use all the languages and cultures of the other races. Now in both Reports it is stressed—particularly in my Report of 1956 it was stressed—that this national policy should, as far as possible, be acceptable to the people as a whole. I am convinced that both the 1956 Report as well as the Review Committee's Report are acceptable to the people as a whole. Now when we say acceptable to the people as a whole, obviously it cannot mean a policy which is 100% acceptable to every section, or every interest of this country. There are such divergent views in this field of education that it would be beyond human ingenuity to satisfy every element in this controversial field. Therefore, an acceptable policy can only mean a policy which satisfies, within the context of national unity and within the context of non-chauvinist

aspirations, all our major cultural groups; and these aspirations should be reconciled with the paramount need of creating a truly national system based on the national language. Sir, in paragraph 12 of my Report it is clearly stated that the ultimate objective of the education policy in this country must be to bring the children of all races together under a national system of education in which the national language is the medium of instruction. Now, Sir, the Honourable Member for Telok Anson, who was one of the principal signatories of that Report—stated that this was not the recommendation of the Committee, but was only a task which the Committee could not carry out. Sir, that is quite untrue. As anyone can see from the Report, this was one of the principal tasks agreed to by the Committee and, therefore, by being one of its principal tasks, it must be one of its main recommendations. Otherwise, the Committee would not have discharged its task satisfactorily. My Committee also stated quite clearly in that paragraph that this policy or this goal cannot be rushed but must be carried out gradually as the ultimate object of the policy.

Now, Sir, it has also been alleged that there is a difference in the National Type Secondary School as recommended in my Report from that envisaged in the Rahman Talib Report. Here, again, this allegation, to my mind, is quite untrue. In my Report it is stated that at the secondary level the National Type Secondary Schools can have more than one medium of instruction. They can have flexibility in respect of the medium of instruction, but these schools must work towards common final examinations; and the common final examinations—the Federation of Malaya Certificate of Education and the Lower Certificate of Education—are stated clearly in the appendices to the Report, and the languages of these examinations are Malay and English—English for the time being. There is no mistake about that at all. Indeed, I have made it quite clear on many occasions in this

House that whilst the Government would agree that certain subjects, particularly language and literature, could be taught and should be taught in that language, the examination must be in one of the official languages; and I am surprised, Sir, at the Honourable Member for Telok Anson, who was present in this Council, or the previous Council, when I made that announcement on two or three occasions when I was the Minister of Education. This is a vital issue, because if any other language is used for public examinations, it will mean that the Government will accept that language as one of the official languages of this country. That the Government has made it quite clear that it was not prepared to accept, because the Constitution states that Malay is the only national and official language of the country, and that for a period of ten years English can be used. That, Sir, is quite clear and there should be no mistake. Also at that time, I did make an announcement that I would be prepared as a temporary measure to allow promotion examinations in secondary schools to be carried out for purposes of promotion only. These promotion examinations are intended solely for promotion and are not to be recognised as public examinations. However, this offer was not accepted, because the Chinese schools at that time wanted examinations at the Lower Certificate of Education level as well as the Federation of Malaya Certificate of Education level to be in Chinese. That, as I have said, is contrary to the Constitution, and that the Government would not be prepared to accept.

Now, Sir, there is also another allegation made that this Rahman Talib Report has not been fair in that it decided to take away the partial grant-in-aid to Chinese schools. In my Report for 1956 there was mention of only two types of schools. There were only Government schools and private schools and there were no partially aided schools. But when drafting the 1957 Ordinance, I did agree—and I considered it fair—that there should be a transitional period for these schools

to transform into Government schools. That is why there was provision in that Ordinance which gave the Minister the power if he deemed it desirable to allow partially aided schools to continue—but that was only a transitory provision; and after a period of five years quite naturally it was considered that this was long enough for the transition period, and the Rahman Talib Report rightly recommended that grants-in-aid should be discontinued from next year.

From these explanations, I am sure that it is now quite clear that there are no differences in the policies or principles between these two Reports. Only those critics of the Government try to make it out, or try to show these differences which really do not exist. I need not state, as it has been stated by many Honourable Members, in particular by my Honourable friend and colleague, the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, that this policy on education has been fair and just to all.

Now, the Government for the first time has decided to give free primary education to all children: all schools, all types of schools, with various media of instructions will receive free primary education. Is this the action of a Government that tries or attempts to destroy Chinese culture or Chinese language?

Sir, the Honourable Member for Telok Anson has alleged that the Alliance Government does not carry out its manifesto. I say that the Alliance Government has more than carried out its manifesto. Now, under the policy of 1956 as well as the present policy, the Alliance Government has not only allowed for the expansion of the so-called vernacular schools, but it has now also agreed to give free education to all the vernacular school children. Also the Alliance Government has not only allowed the Government grant-in-aid to exist, but the Alliance Government has agreed to take over all the schools to provide education to all children at all levels at Government

expense. Does it not mean that this Government has more than carried out its manifesto, the pledge, it made to the people both in 1955 and 1959? Indeed, I think the Government has been extremely fair and just. If I may put it differently, Sir, it seems to me that the Government has never offered, or there has never been a case, in which so fair a price has been offered by an anxious bridegroom to a reluctant bride (*Applause*), and I do not know why some of the Chinese secondary schools need any persuasion at all to accept the assistance from Government which is in their own interest, in the interest of the children and in the interest of the teachers and the parents themselves.

Therefore, Sir, it is obvious to me that we on this side of the House, the Government, in implementing the national education policy has been fair to all concerned; and in the implementation the Government has tried as far as possible to make the transformation as smooth as possible. I am glad indeed to note that the Honourable Minister of Education has announced that in order to meet the problem of unqualified children he would give them a transition period in which they could be accommodated in private schools in the afternoon so that they could continue their education. Sir, in every possible way, the Government has tried to be fair to give every possible opportunity to children of all races to have fair and equal treatment in education.

Now, Sir, under our policy, the Alliance Government has endeavoured to put all schools on an equal status: Chinese schools, Tamil schools, will, if they accept the Government's policy, be put on the same footing and same status as the Malay and Government English schools. If this is not a fair policy, I do not know what is a fair policy. Therefore, Sir, to my mind, all these allegations made against this Government's educational policy have been completely unfounded, and I ask the House to reject all the allegations and accept this Report in the interest

of our country and in the interest of our children and in the interest of our national unity. (*Applause*).

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam (Mengelembu): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am glad we have heard the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister declared that never has he heard of a higher or fairer price being offered to a reluctant bride. I am glad he said that, because at least he concedes that the bride in this case is reluctant. Now, what would a gentleman do if a bride does not want him? He would not attempt to force his attention on her (*Laughter*), and my complaint is that the Government in this case is forcing unwelcome attention on the bride-to-be. The Honourable the Deputy Prime Minister said that there was no change in the present policy embodied in the Rahman Talib Report, and he also said that the Committee, in fact, had no jurisdiction to effect any change of policy. If that be so, then I would submit that the Rahman Talib Review Committee has acted *ultra vires*, has gone beyond its jurisdiction and has submitted a report which, I repeat, is at variance fundamentally with the requirement of the Razak policy.

The Honourable Deputy Prime Minister has given no satisfactory explanation of the change in regard to the medium of instruction in National-type Secondary Schools. The only suggestion he has put forward is that, Chinese not being an official language, it would be improper to allow examinations to be held in Chinese, but he has forgotten that the Constitution permits the Government to sustain the use of other languages. If the Government were really anxious to accede to the wishes of the Chinese educationists in this country, the Constitution has provided for it. The simple fact is that the Government is determined to stop Chinese education at primary level, and I don't think that any amount of words would conceal that fact. The Honourable Deputy Prime Minister has also said that it is wrong for us to criticise the offer of free education, but the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister has not answered the question posed

when that criticism was made. Is it not a fact that although you make it appear that you are going to give free education, you have in fact already decided that that education is going to be paid for, to be paid for by education rates levied by local authorities? On that point the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister remained silent.

There is one more observation which I would like to make on the speech made by the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister. He says that the Government has agreed to take over all the schools teaching all these languages. I think "agreed" is not the word—to an agreement there must be two parties. Here it is a decision, a directive, that the Government is going to take over whether people like it or not. Therefore, it is entirely encouraging to see that the Government has agreed to do something. It is a unitary action undertaken by the Government without request being made by anybody.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have before us to-day a Bill described as an Education Act. But to us of the People's Progressive Party and to the very large sections of people whom we have the privilege to represent in this House, this is not an Education Act but it is an Act of treachery perpetrated upon the people of this country. It is an Act designed to destroy everything that is cherished by the people and of which they are proud. Mr. Speaker, Sir, however, it is a consoling thought that the history of the world reminds us that no Government which imposes its will upon an unwilling people survives for long, and it is a consoling thought that history will repeat itself in Malaya and, sooner or later, by democratic and constitutional processes, this Government will be replaced by another more amenable to the wishes of the people.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Bill purports to introduce a national type of education. The Constitution does not provide for a national type of education. We have a lot of national things in the Constitu-

tion: for example, we have got national development, we have got national emblem, national finance, national language, national policy, national parks and so on; but when we come to education, what does the Constitution say? It does not say "national education". It just says "education"—it appears in the Ninth Schedule as item 13 where it simply says "Education" and no more. Therefore, it was clear that the framers of the Constitution knew that owing to the diverse population of this country, owing to the difference in the population of this country, it would not have been possible to evolve a national type of education. Otherwise why was the word "national" dropped when the Constitution was framed and why is it now that this Government, which professes to respect the Constitution, is attempting to introduce into this country a type of education not provided for in the Constitution? Mr. Speaker, Sir, what we are protesting against is the flagrant violation of this Constitution, the determined effort of the Government to ram down the throats of the people of this country something for which they have expressed deep hatred. More than that, it is not my intention to say to-day.

Details have already been gone into by previous speakers, and I do not think it is necessary for me to refer to Clauses in the Bill. However, it is necessary for me to refer to certain observations made by speakers who have preceded me. Firstly, I would like to refer to certain very objectionable remarks made by certain speakers from the PMIP. Since we came into this House and the PMIP came into this House, fortunately we have avoided a direct clash. However, that was not to be for long and, perhaps, now the time has come when both Parties have to make their stands crystal clear. The PMIP's attitude to logic is abuse—their reply is abuse, their reply is threat. They cannot answer logic with reason and their answer is, "If you don't like us, if you don't like our policy, get out, go back to your country." That is all they can

think of. Now, the Honourable Member for Tanah Merah, I think, was generous enough to speak to the Government to get free passages for those of us who would like to go back to India, China or Ceylon. But for the information of the PMIP and others, who may think as they do, let me make this clear: we are citizens of this country whether you like it or not, and however loud you may shout, however loud you may thump the table, we are going to be in this country whether you like it or not—and that is a fact which the PMIP has got to accept not only in the course of this Education debate but also in the course of their dealings with other races throughout this country in any sphere of activity.

It may well be that the PMIP feels uncomfortable to remain in this country where we also remain. If they do not wish to remain in this country, there is one alternative—accept that advice which you gave us and we will be only too glad to provide *tonkangs* to take you back to Sumatra, or any other place where you originated from. But, Mr. Speaker, Sir, all this is unnecessary if a spirit of tolerance could be cultivated. After all we are all human beings, and it is not possible for one man to have his way and push another man out of a country where he was born, where he has lived and where he has been bred. Why not we acknowledge that fact and do not talk about pushing each other out of the country?

Now, the Honourable Member for Dungun made certain observations, but I think she enjoys a certain advantage in that she is a lady and I do not want to be rude to ladies. Therefore, I do not intend to make any comments on what she said.

Before I leave the PMIP, Mr. Speaker, Sir, there was one regrettable reference made by one speaker, again I think it was the Honourable Member from Tanah Merah, who quite unnecessarily referred to an honoured man, a man honoured in history, by the name of Dr. Sun Yat Sen. He

suggested that, the man not being born in this country, no prominence should be given to his portrait. I think that is a wrong attitude to take. I have heard no objections being made against portraits of leaders of other countries. Let us take Shakespeare, for example. The PMIP has not said that the portraits of Shakespeare must be burnt or that they must be withdrawn from schools because he was a European and not a Malayan. I do not see why they are so hostile to this honoured man from a great country. It is true that he was not born here, but it matters not where he was born—the fact remains that he was a scholar and philosopher and a man universally respected, and I think it would be a privilege for any school, be it Chinese, Tamil or Malay, to be adorned with a portrait of such a great man.

Enche' Othman bin Abdullah (Tanah Merah): Untuk penjelasan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua—Kami tidak menyebutkan tentang gambar tetapi mendewa²kan Dr. Sun Yet Sen serta pemimpin²-nya yang kami pandang tidak sesuai bagi negeri ini. Bukan tentang gambar²-nya tetapi lagu² yang di-nyanyikan di-sekolah² itu yang merupakan lagu² membangunkan semangat luar dari negeri ini.

Mr. Speaker: Lebeh kurang ma'ana-nya.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: Perhaps I don't understand the Malay in which it was delivered, but if he means.....

Enche' Othman bin Abdullah (Tanah Merah): Belajar-lah.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: You go and learn English first before you tell me to learn Malay.

I am glad the Honourable Member offered an explanation and said that what he meant was that he has no objection to the pictures being there so long as they are not idolised—that I agree with him. We should not idolise anybody.

I now leave the PMIP. We were given a speech by the Honourable Member for Kluang Utara. Now, the

Honourable Member struck a very pathetic figure and by his demeanour and by his speech, it seems to me—perhaps I was wrong—that he did not speak with conviction, but he spoke because he had to speak, and I am saying that not without basis because it is my information and reliable.....

Enche' Mohamed bin Ujang (Jejebu-Jempol): On a point of order, Sir, I think he is imputing improper motives.

Mr. Speaker: I think that is all right.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: It is my information, and information which I think is correct, that a directive was sent out only this morning to our Honourable Members of the MCA that they were required to speak—and the Chairman of the MCA has honoured us with his presence here this morning until a few minutes ago.

Sir, the Honourable Member for Kluang Utara struggled to put up some sort of a case—and he even went to the extent of cracking some half-baked jokes which were really in bad taste, but which nobody took real exception to—appreciating the situation he found himself in. Now, can this Honourable Member from Kluang Utara really have such a short memory? Has he forgotten that it was in 1957 that he was the Chairman of a sub-committee for the Pan-Malayan Chinese Youth Conference and at that conference this very Member took the leading part in demanding that Chinese be recognised as an official language of this country and he pressed for a vote and the vote was in his favour? How could he forget it? And to-day he is ridiculing us for asking for the same thing which he asked for in 1957—and we are supposed to be communalists. The only thing that has changed now is that to-day he is an Honourable Member of this House, and I say, and I believe, that he probably still sticks to his views of 1957, but due to his obligation to the Party which returned him to this House, he has no option but to toe the party line. The Honourable Member was unable to answer one single

point that was made out in this debate against the policy. He did not even attempt to do so. He concluded by creating a third category of languages in this country—so far we have had an official language and we have had a national language. For the first time the Honourable Member from Kluang Utara had brought in a third classification “main language”. He said that Chinese is a main language and he is satisfied because it is a main language. But who provided this classification and who recognises Chinese as a main language? Nobody knows except the Member for Kluang Utara.

Now, I do not know why for some reason or other he ended up his speech by telling us that he would be more inclined to listen to us if we could win an election in the East Coast. I really do not know why he wants us to go and win an election in the East Coast to make him listen to us. I do not understand it. Perhaps my intelligence is much below his, but I think that a more manly and more courageous thing for him to say was that he would go to Perak and he would win back the seats which the MCA had lost to the PPP. Then, we would congratulate him, and we await with anxiety the day he would come to Perak. What is the use of asking us to go to the East Coast to win a seat so that he can respect our views? (*Laughter*).

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I consider it necessary to refer to certain observations made by the Honourable the Minister of Works and Telecommunications. First of all, I would like to say to the Honourable Minister that we of the PPP are not in need of any lectures or advice on political philosophy or political morals from the Honourable Minister. He took a lot of pains, I know, to give us a lecture, but I assure him we do not need it. We personally would rather give up politics than to accept his philosophy and his view of political morals and remain in the position in which he finds himself to-day in the Alliance organisation.

The Honourable Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications made

this proclamation. He said that everyone has a duty to the nation and not only to his own party. That is true, but the tragedy of it is that if the Honourable Minister for Works, Posts and Telecommunications himself were to realise that first, he would not to-day be in the Alliance. He would be out of the Alliance working for the nation.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, again I have some amount of sympathy for the Honourable Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, because I remember the days when the PPP was a member of the Alliance, and the Alliance which existed in Perak at that time was the UMNO, MCA and PPP alliance. At that time the MIC had been in the Alliance and then had walked out of the Alliance, and then they applied to come in again.

Enche' Mohamed bin Ujang: I think that has nothing to do with the Bill before us. I am speaking under Order 36 (1).

Mr. Speaker: I think he is quite relevant because it was mentioned by the Minister for Works, Posts and Telecommunications. Please proceed.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: At that time I was one of those who were appointed by the Alliance to interview the Honourable the Minister for Works, Posts and Telecommunications and to decide whether the MIC should come in. One of the questions put to the Honourable Minister by me at that time was “Would you abide by the majority decision?”, and he said, “Yes”. And he is keeping his word. The Alliance majority had decided for this policy; therefore as an honourable partner of the Alliance he is keeping his word—and I do not blame him—and he has to say that it is good whether he likes it or not. I agree with the Minister it is wrong to divide a nation on a language issue without justification, but the point the Honourable Minister has missed is this—that we are not dividing the nation. We are calling for unity, for a unity of all men of goodwill, of all men joined together, so that together we can evolve an education policy which will be

acceptable to all races and not only to one race to the enmity of the other races. The Honourable Minister asked, "Which other country in the world provides for education of four languages". The Honourable Member has become so Malayanised that he has forgotten that India has a score of languages, a score of languages receiving official aid from the Government of India, promoted, preserved and used. Surely he cannot have forgotten that. And also we have our good neighbour Singapore where all four languages are preserved and provided for.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Minister wants us to tell him where we got the information that Indians are not satisfied with this policy. The answer is simple. We have spoken to more Indians than the Honourable Minister has spoken in recent months; we have addressed more public meetings consisting of Indian audiences than the Honourable Minister has addressed in recent months; we have campaigned in more elections than the Honourable Minister has campaigned in recent months; and from all these the conclusion is inescapable that the Indians join with their Chinese brothers in expressing their resentment to the present policy. The Honourable Minister also wants to know how is it that we know that the policy is not acceptable to the Chinese. The answer to that is also simple. We of the PPP have the proud privilege to represent in this House the most densely populated Chinese areas in the whole of the Federation of Malaya, and if that is not a mandate, then I wonder what is. Furthermore, the Honourable Prime Minister himself in his speech on merger, conceded, and conceded very generously, that the education policy of the Federation of Malaya would not be acceptable to the people of Singapore because 70 per cent of them are Chinese. Now we have it on the highest authority that it is not acceptable to Singapore because 70% of her population are Chinese. The Federation is only about $\frac{3}{4}$ mile away from Singapore and I think it is fair

to assume that the Chinese in the Federation and the Chinese in Singapore think about the same way.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I don't understand why some speakers keep on saying that we accuse the Alliance of having killed Chinese education. We never gave them that compliment. There is nobody who can kill Chinese education. What we have said is that this is an attempt to kill it and it has been explained by the Member for Ipoh this morning that the Alliance will not succeed in killing it. Please don't misunderstand it. We never said that you have succeeded in killing it. You will never succeed in killing it, but you are attempting. That is all we say.

The Honourable Minister also appears to be confused regarding our demand for multi-lingualism. He asks how many languages do we want in this country. Now, if the Honourable Minister acquires his information from local sources instead of relying on Kingsley Martin, the *New Statesman*, he would have known that the PPP has only asked for recognition of Chinese and Tamil in addition to the official languages. We have not asked for a score of languages.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, now I want to refer to his observations regarding the PPP and our alleged communal policy. I do not think it is ever proper to say that a community which asks for legitimate demands is being communal. So long as we ask for the legitimate demands of a particular community, we are asking for certain rights, we are not being communal. We have no hatred against anybody else. We are not trying to take away anything which belongs to any other community. We are not asking that Malay education should be subservient to Chinese education. Certainly not. We will do all we can to promote Malay education. In return, we only ask, "Give us the same privilege. Allow us to develop our language and our culture in the way we think best."

Now as to Kingsley Martin or the *New Statesman*, frankly I am not

ashamed to admit that I do not read the *New Statesman*. I do not think I have lost anything by not reading it, and I do not propose to read it. I think there are much more useful papers to read. However, it is obvious that the Honourable Minister for Works, Posts and Telecommunications has not been able to rid himself completely of the effects of the colonial rule in this country, because he appears to have a great respect for the opinions expressed overseas—the opinions expressed by Europeans in newspapers published in English. During the colonial time, of course, we respected those views. But now we do not care. In fact, the PPP does not care two hoots whether Kingsley Martin or the *New Statesman* thinks that we are communal or not communal. To us the only opinion that matters is the opinion of the people of this country, and in this House we speak with authority, because as I have said we are representatives of the most densely populated Chinese areas in the entire Federation of Malaya.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Minister appealed for unity. Now, we also want unity. But the difference is this: the unity which we strive for is unity with pride and dignity. We are not interested in unity which brings with it shame and slavery and these two things appear to be the goal of the Honourable Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew (Dato' Kramat): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I had not intended to waste any more time of this House than is necessary, and I had not intended to speak. But during the course of the debate, while I was outside happily enjoying my tea, I heard a lot of statements which I thought amounted to quite, plain, vulgar and ignorant abuse, and so I feel I ought to say something, although I like to make it as short as I can, to clarify certain points.

First of all, we must know that in this kind of debate, it is very easy to use emotional slogans—for example, I can say, "I stand for Chinese rights"

or "I stand for Malays and if the Chinese do not want them, they can go back to China"—and I will get the appropriate applause. But we all know that if one party says that it stands for the rights of one racial section of the people, the other party is bound to say that it stands for the rights of other sections of the people. However, the truth lies somewhere in between. Malaya consists of many people. Hence the educational policy of this Bill says that there shall be a national system of education which will satisfy the needs of the nation; and to promote its cultural, social, economic and political development. Here the Bill envisages the nation as one, and therefore we must approach the problem as if the nation was one, as one people who have originated from different places. No one has a right to say, "We own Malaya, because we were here first." No one can say, "You are an immigrant people but we are not"—because who knows who are the immigrant people? Let anyone in this House stand up and say, "I am an aborigine of this country. I first originated in this country, I came from the pre-historic man, and I first lived somewhere in a cave in Malaya." We are all, to a larger or lesser extent, immigrant people, and we must understand that as people who have come to make this place our home, we want our rights as much as we want other people to have their rights.

Now, I will not go into the provisions of this Bill and shall deal only with the policy, because my friend from Seberang Selatan has ably presented our arguments—attack for attack and counter-attack, rhetoric for rhetoric, debate for points of debate. My Honourable friends from Ipoh and Menglembu have also made their points, and as for abuse our friends from the PMIP have succeeded very well in meeting the abuse from the Government benches. I wish to make it very clear that I have the mandate and I am speaking here as the General Secretary of the Socialist Front. Why do I say that—because two ignorant people from the other side of the House

have stated that we have no policy and that we have a weak stand—I am glad that though we may have a very weak stand at least we are not the blushing bride.

Now, we must understand that there has always been a policy of the Socialist Front. But we have at least—I come from Penang and I can say it from my own personal knowledge—tried never to make this issue a racial issue, never to make this issue which might incite violence. So at least I think we are more qualified to talk on this issue than anybody else. It is unfortunate that we have in this Bill the two types of schools, the National schools and National-type schools. National schools, of course are schools where Malay shall be the main medium of instruction and National-type schools are those wherein English shall be the main medium of instruction. I am surprised that the PMIP have said that they now agree to English as main medium of instruction, which shows a change in their policy. As for attacks by the Alliance, briefly, my Honourable friend from Seberang Utara, I understand, spoke in *Bahasa Kebangsaan* and unfortunately he spoke unparliamentary language without realising it; so here we have an instance of a Malay who though speaking in *Bahasa Kebangsaan* is not himself well versed in it; and I suggest that he should go back to the National school set up in this Bill. As for the Member for Kluang Utara—or as I would call him the “tiger” from Kluang Utara, because he did roar very loudly and now he has gone to sleep in the afternoon as is the habit of all animals in the jungle (*Laughter*)—he says that we have no policy since the Socialist Front (the Labour Party and Parti Rakyat) have quarrels. You know, coming from him such statements are very surprising; what policy has the MCA got? Absolutely none. It is, as my Honourable friend from Damansara has suggested to me, like a woman going to a fashion parade naked, without clothes, and saying, “How beautiful I look.” The point is this that unless

you have something, you should not attack other people. We know the problems in the MCA.....

Mr. Speaker: You must be very careful in choosing your words!

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: We must be careful.

Mr. Speaker: I must draw your attention to that—you must be careful in choosing your words in this House, even for the purpose of illustration. I don't like it.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Yes. But I thought the Ministerial Bench had been talking about our weakness and they had been going on for two or three days without any word from the Chair. However, now the MCA has come here also to attack us on our policy when we know that they have never had any clear policy of their own for a long time. As the Honourable the Deputy Prime Minister has said, “they are the blushing bride”—I can quote his words, of course, without being unparliamentary.

Mr. Speaker: He did not say that. He said “reluctant bride.”

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: “Reluctant”. I thought it was “blushing.” I suppose there is some difference there. Now, Sir, since there have been so many attacks from other parties and misunderstandings, I would like to inform especially the Honourable Member for Kluang Utara that the policy statement of the Socialist Front was published in 1959 prior to the Rahman Talib Report, and says in respect of our policy that—

“The proper function of Education is

(a) to bring about a unity and a Malayan personality.”—

So you see even from the opening sentence, we had in 1959 talked about a Malayan personality, not a Malay personality or a Chinese personality in Malaya.—

“(b) to increase the power of understanding and communication between the people.”

So you see, again in 1959 we had talked about the power of understanding and communication between the people—by that we mean integration of the Malayan people; and for communication between the various peoples. We, of course, accept that language itself does not bring about loyalty or disloyalty. Language is a medium or a means of communicating our thoughts. If that were true that language could bring about loyalty, then why did President Soekarno fight the Dutch? He spoke Dutch. What about Nehru? Nehru was educated in English. What about our Honourable Member from Telok Anson? He spoke in Malay just now? Does that mean to say that he is more loyal than the MCA members who cannot speak Malay? Do not confuse language as a medium or means of education or instrument of communication for things which will bring loyalty or disloyalty.

“(c) to make people more useful in society and to produce more efficient people to satisfy the needs of our nation in its various fields of endeavour.” and finally,

“(d) to make them aware of the struggle for emancipation from oppression.”

Now, let us refer to the statement on policy of the Government. It states that the Government will attempt “to bring about national system of education”—yes, that is as we of the Socialist Front had suggested in 1959—“which will satisfy the needs of the nation and which will promote cultural, social, economic and political development.” From what I have read it is clear that we do not differ in principle. The quarrel is with regard to the implementation and the programme. We must distinguish between policy, programme, report and the Act, which is causing so much confusion. Policy states mainly in a few words what the aim is; programme breaks up the policy into details and stages; report, of course, means the study of the situation and the presentation of proposals; and these proposals finally become a Bill and then an Act. If the

Honourable Member for Kluang Utara cannot distinguish between policy and programme, then I would suggest that he go to the other type of school—that which is called in the Bill the *Sekolah Menengah Jenis Kebangsaan*—and there he can learn English, because the main medium of instruction there is English. In our Party programme we propose that we must bring about mass education and bring literacy to the Malays and to the non-Malays in the kampongs and elsewhere, and we say next that Malay shall be taught in all schools to the same standard and that the preference given to English in schools shall be terminated. We also say that we want a unified educational system to allow the graduates of all our schools to compete with one another on the basis of equality and a cultural and national unity; and of course, we must establish more vocational, trade and agricultural schools and must produce a more balanced ratio of skilled and unskilled workers to fulfil the needs of the nation in its various fields of endeavour. We also say, of course, that we must introduce free and compulsory primary education immediately. Now, what is wrong with our policy? Why keep on saying that our Party members are contradicting one another? It is true that when the presentation of a suggested programme was made by one of our own parties to another party, it was rejected—but it was on the question of structure of implementation, not on the question of policy.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we must understand here that what I have reminded the House previously has been proved correct. We did not vote for the Rahman Talib Report because at that time we wanted to see how the Government would carry out or implement that Report; we abstained because we wanted to make sure, and we did suggest at that time, whether or not the Report would in fact give a bias to the English language at the expense of all other languages. At that time our Honourable Member for Johore Tenggara was the Assistant Minister of Information and Broadcasting and he

did say, "Yes, that is correct." Well, I am glad that it has been proved correct by this Bill. Why? It is because our National schools are now divided into two types—the National school and the National-type school. The National school says Malay shall be the main medium of instruction and English shall be a compulsory subject of instruction. Note that English is to be a compulsory subject of instruction, not merely a compulsory school subject. I think my friends from the PMIP have not realised that in giving their support to this Bill.

The other type is National-type school. The National-type school is a school which is similar in all aspects to the National school except that the position is reversed as regards language. Here the National-type school shall be using the English (not Chinese or Tamil language) as the main medium of instruction, in which the national language is a compulsory subject of instruction." Now consider this very carefully. When the Chinese schools convert themselves to National schools, they will become National-type schools—I understand that 31 of them have so converted themselves—the main medium of instruction will be English.

Therefore the Malay school boy who goes to a National school will speak Malay, and the Chinese school boy who goes to the English school will speak English. That is the contradiction. Where then is the unity? When a student goes to a National-type school he becomes mainly educated in English (many of my friends, I know, who have been learning Malay and when they see this Bill would say, "Good, we do not have to learn Malay any more, we can all speak English.") Now, if that is the intention of the Government, let them say so. I am not quarrelling with it. But let them say so and let them define their stand.

Now, let us refer to Section 21. Under Section 21 of the Bill the Minister can convert any National-type primary school into a National primary school. In other words, where a

primary school is concerned, the Minister can at any time say, "Stop learning English, Chinese or Tamil as the main medium of instruction. Go and take Malay as the main medium of instruction." But why is this power not given to the Minister to convert a National-type secondary school into a National secondary school? If you say that the Minister cannot convert a National-type secondary school into a National secondary school, then why give the power to the Minister to convert the National-type primary school into a National primary school? That is the first point. The second point is this: is it true to say that all people in Malaya as a whole want to learn only one language? If you tell all the Chinese to learn Malay only, will they be happy? If you tell Malays to learn Chinese only, will they be happy? If you tell the Malays, "Don't learn English, don't learn Chinese, just learn Malay and there are not eno

Universities for you people", will they be happy? So, I would propose that one should think of a kind of bi-lingual educational structure in our educational system. When I say "bi-lingual structure", I mean this that we must compete with people from other countries. Therefore, it is no use asking people to learn only one language. We must examine the problem from other points of view. It is to the advantage of anybody if he is conversant in more than one language—do you not agree with that? Mr. Speaker, Sir, if you tell a boy from the kampong, "You go to a secondary school, you learn Malay and you learn English at the same time so that you can go to Australia, you can go to England, you can go anywhere if you can't find a place in Malayan Universities," will not he be pleased? If your answer is "Yes", then of course, National-type secondary schools are necessary. But if you say, "No", then why have National-type secondary schools? Just have only National secondary schools where one other language at least such as English can be taught as a compulsory subject—English or Chinese or Tamil. If you say, "No, no, we must have schools

with at least two major languages of instruction," then you agree that we should have National-type secondary schools. If that is so, then I only ask this: Why only use English as the main medium of instruction? Why leave out other languages? Why make English language a privilege? Of course, I have my personal opinion on this and we believe that it is, in fact, not necessary to divide schools into National schools and National-type schools. We can have only National schools with the provision made for Malay as a medium of instruction and for Chinese, English or Tamil as the secondary medium of instruction plus one other optional language. This means that if a boy goes to school and wants to learn Chinese language only as a language, he may go to the National Type (English) School, which means that he will learn English as a secondary medium of instruction with Chinese as an optional language subject.

But if I want to send my son to learn Chinese as a secondary medium of instruction, I can then send my son to a National (Chinese) school, which teaches Malay as the main medium of instruction and Chinese as a secondary language of instruction with an optional third subject English, so that my son who goes to a secondary (Chinese) school would know Malay, Chinese and would have learnt English as a language. If I want to send yet another son of mine to a National (English) school, he goes to an English school and he learns Malay as a main medium of instruction with English as a secondary medium of instruction, and then he can learn Chinese as an optional subject. If I say that I do not want my son to learn Chinese, then he does not need to learn that optional subject in the National (English) school since the language is only optional. If I say that I do not want my son to learn English, then he does not need to do that in a National (Chinese) school since in that school English would only be an optional subject. So the point that we have to consider is that if you are going to have National-type secondary school

which uses English as a main medium of instruction, then we cannot logically refuse a request that if you insist on having English language as a medium of instruction, you must also have Chinese or Tamil-type schools. But the Honourable the Minister of Education might say, I am talking rubbish. If I am, may I then refer to National-type Primary school in this Bill? The definition of National-type Primary School is this: "A National-type Primary School shall be using English, Chinese or Tamil languages as the main medium of instruction." Why is that clause there? Why not remove it? The answer is because it cannot be removed. Mr. Speaker, Sir, we must here understand that where we give way at one point, it means that that point is necessary and if it is necessary, we cannot logically say it is not necessary. Mr. Speaker, Sir, if you ask me what is more important, more languages in secondary schools or more languages in primary schools, I would say more languages in secondary schools. From secondary schools, our boys go to universities and, therefore, they must be fully equipped.

We are a nation of less than 7 million people. Everyone of us must be as fully educated as possible. There is nothing wrong in knowing more than one language. Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is our suggestion that if this Bill stands as it is, the definition of the National-type Secondary School must be the same as the definition for National-type Primary School. We must certainly have a bi-lingual structure—certainly all the other languages must be guaranteed and not merely that facilities for the teaching of the other languages shall be made available if required. My friend from Seberang Selatan will be dealing with this point in detail, I hope, when it comes to Committee Stage. But having dealt with this, I would like to remind the Government that although the policy says the educational system must satisfy the needs of the nation, this ordinance has made no provision at all for the division of our educational schools into agricultural and technical

schools for the kampongs, for the rural areas, and schools, secondary schools and technical schools, for the people in the town areas. Now a proper educational system must consider the whole structure of the economy of the country which, I am sure, the Honourable the Minister of Finance could quite ably do. He should say, well 91%, for example, of our Malay population—Muslim population—are, in fact, farmers in the rural areas, how are we going to educate them to do typewriting and what is the purpose of educating them to do typewriting for example? They must.....

The Minister of Education (Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib): On a point of information. In order to save the breath of the Honourable Member, may I draw his attention to Clause 25 of the Bill.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Clause 25 is referred to and you can see how very vague it is. I thank my Honourable friend the Minister of Education for reminding me of Clause 25.

"The Minister may, subject to the provisions of this Act, establish and maintain educational institutions of the following descriptions:—

- (a) Special schools—What for? What type of special schools and how many?
- (b) Technical colleges—Yes, where and in what language? Using English as the medium of instruction or using Malay as the main medium of instruction?
- (c) Institutions of higher education and educational research—Well I would not ask that question in public. (*Laughter*).
- (d) Centres of further education....."

Mr. Speaker: What is happening now?

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Pardon, Sir?

Mr. Speaker: What is happening now?

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: He asked me where, Sir? So I said I need not ask that question.

Mr. Speaker: You should not answer that question.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Very well, Sir. It is very rude to answer that question.

"(e) teacher training institutions, and

- (f) other educational institutions, the establishment or maintenance whereof is not otherwise provided for in this Act."

Now, that is true and it is what exactly I am arguing about. It is not stated what percentage and what proportion and how the schools are going to be distributed. This is very important. To satisfy the needs of the nation, we must classify our school children into various categories as agricultural workers, industrial workers, boys going to universities, boys in the towns, boys living in the kampongs.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the reason is this: because under our provisions for finance which my friend from Tanjong will be dealing with, the local authorities should be able to impose rates for educational purposes and the maintaining of all schools. Mr. Speaker, Sir, you know what it means? It means that Penang, Kuala Lumpur, Ipoh with more money, with more houses, will be able to get more money for education. When they get more money for education, they can set up more schools and, therefore, people from Kelantan, Trengganu, impoverished States under the PMIP—so I understand—Kedah, Perlis, Ulu Langat, and the various outlying areas, where they have no schools, will be rushing to the towns to get education. When they rush to the towns and they are educated under town conditions, what do they become? They become people who like to stay in towns, who like to go to cinemas, who like to take ice-cream, who like to drink coffee, and they do not like to go back to the kampongs. That is the whole point. It sounds as if when we have education set up through local authority rates, that we are going to bring about fair distribution in education. But "No", such distribution brings a bias to the towns, and it will keep drawing the people from the kampongs. We must maintain a balance between the two, and we can only do that if we have

a central fund and control with distribution of training centres controlled by national and not local and sectional demands. So that is why when we say we stand for socialism and nationalisation, we are actually not talking rubbish as some people think. Now, supposing we nationalise iron-ore, don't you think we would have sufficient education funds at once? What is the difficulty in iron mining? The companies send big cranes, they dig big holes in the ground, they put the iron-ore in their lorries, and the lorries are driven very fast and knock people from their bicycles, go to the ships, load the iron-ore into Japanese ships which take the ore to Japan, and we buy bicycles produced in Japan to be knocked down by our iron-ore trucks again. Now, let us assume that for a ton of iron-ore the miner gets \$20 profit; we in Malaya produce over 5 million tons per year—but I shall say 5 million tons per year for argument—and for five million tons a year at a profit of \$20 per ton, we would get a profit of \$100 million a year. Therefore, with the nationalisation of such industries, like iron, we can, by allowing the Government to use the same managers—because the towkays also use the same managers—dig big holes in the ground, load our iron-ore into trucks and get \$100 million a year for education immediately. If we have this finance, it means that the money that we make from these iron-ore producing States can be brought to other States like Kelantan and Perlis, where they have no iron-ore and they have no money, and build schools there to educate the people in those States. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am sorry that I cannot keep the attention of some Members of the opposite side, because obviously such addresses as this not being abusive they find it difficult to concentrate upon. It is quite correct, as our Honourable Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications has said, that we must maintain calm and that we must not bring about racial discord and violence. Yes! But we must remember this: we cannot hope to maintain calm when there is suppression. The whole essence of

democracy is that where people can say what they like and speak what they like, they do not feel suppressed and they are quite happy when they have spoken. And I hope that the Honourable Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, as you call him, Mr. Speaker (*Laughter*), does not term racial harmony with suppression.

The Minister of Finance (Enche' Tan Siew Sin): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have listened for nearly two days to this very interesting debate and, as far as I can make out, the gist of the Opposition charges against the Government's education policy, in so far as it affects Chinese education, ranges, on the one extreme, to charges that it has been guilty of killing or attempting to kill the Chinese language and culture, and on the other, that it is not giving a fair deal to Chinese education. The Honourable Member for Ipoh, I think, made one very pertinent point in the course of his speech when he stated that in this sort of thing it was probably wisest to look at the broad intentions of the Government, and I think in this very complicated issue we could do no better than follow his very sound advice. I am tempted to make this remark, because a number of Opposition speakers tried to pick holes in the Government's education policy—as represented by the present Education Bill—by picking out a number of clauses which they considered objectionable.

Now, as Honourable Members are aware, the Government must in framing any kind of legislation, whether it be educational, financial or any other piece of legislation, give itself sufficient powers to act, and those powers must not only provide for normal circumstances they must also provide for exceptional, or rather special circumstances; and if one were to assume that the Government would make arbitrary use of such powers—and such powers can often be extremely wide—I agree that the powers given on such occasions can look very fearsome to an outsider. For example, a lot of play was made about a particular clause—I

think it was Clause 21—which could be construed as an attempt to give the Government power on an occasion in the future to kill Chinese education even at the primary school level. But I am told that this power in fact was taken from the previous Ordinance and I don't think that this can be taken as an indication of the Government's policy because, as I have tried to point out to Honourable Members, powers of this kind are found not only in this piece of legislation but in other pieces of legislation as well. I would take a small instance. If Honourable Members would care to look at Section 10 of the Customs Ordinance, they will find that it gives me, in theory at least, as Minister of Finance, powers which can be regarded as almost dictatorial. That section states, for example, that I can—

“.....from time to time, by order published in the *Gazette*, fix the customs duties to be levied on any goods imported into or exported from the Federation.”

In theory, therefore, I could raise a particular duty, export duty or import duty, ten times without even reference to the Cabinet. But as everybody knows, in practice, that cannot happen, because any Finance Minister who is so crazy to do so will probably not last very long.

I, therefore, come again to this question of Government's broad intentions, and in this respect I think all Honourable Members will agree with me that we should judge the Government not by its words, not by the utterances of its spokesmen, not even sometimes perhaps, if I may say so, by the assurances of the Minister responsible for the subject in question, if Honourable Members want to be really suspicious, but by its deeds or by its record; and I think in this respect the record of the Alliance Government since it came into power in 1955 does not bear out the charge that it has in any way tried to diminish the importance of Chinese education in this country. In fact, if you look at the record, I think we can justifiably claim that we have advanced the cause of

Chinese education in this country as it has never been advanced by any Government previous to 1955. I do not wish to burden this House with more figures than are necessary, but I perhaps may be permitted to quote a few examples of what the Government has done in regard to Chinese education.

In 1947 there were just over 5,000 Chinese school teachers in this country; in 1961 there are over 14,000—that means the number is nearly three times greater than it was 14 years ago. In 1947 again we had just about 190,000 pupils in Chinese schools; in 1961 the number has risen to 436,000, or nearly two-and-a-half times greater. In 1954 there were 1,216 Chinese schools; in 1961, seven short years later, the number had increased to 1,406—roughly an increase of 190 new schools. In terms of expenditure—although Honourable Members know I am rather particular about costs—in 1956 the Government spent just over \$23 million; in 1961 the Government will spend nearly \$40 million on Chinese education and this will be very nearly twice of what was spent only five short years ago.

Now, let us look at the picture for 1962 or what is to be presented to this House, when I move the adoption of the Budget at a subsequent date. In 1962, as far as we in the Treasury can make out, the Government will spend roughly \$40,000,000 more on education than it did this year—and that is an increase of about 22 per cent in one year. Honourable Members will, therefore, agree that this is a very substantial increase. Let us see what proportion of this increase will be allotted to the cause of Chinese education. I will not give details but very roughly the amount allotted to Chinese education out of this \$40,000,000 will be anything from \$13,000,000—it will certainly be not less than \$13,000,000 and it will not be more than \$18,000,000 depending on the number of secondary schools which convert on or before 1st January, 1962. It will, therefore, be seen that the additional amount which will be

allocated to Chinese education out of this vast increase on education expenditure will be very nearly 50 per cent; and I do not think that you can charge a Government, which is prepared to give 50 per cent of a huge increase to Chinese education, for trying to kill the Chinese language and culture. Let us remember that in 1962 it will be possible for anybody in this country to study Chinese free.

The Honourable Member for Ipoh has tried to belittle the significant achievement of the Government in this respect. He says that this free education is not really free. Now, I would like to ask him, where does he expect the money to come from? Does he expect the money to come from heaven in the same way that Moses two thousand years ago got *manna* from heaven? Does he expect me like Aladdin to discover a wonderful lamp which I can rub on and which can produce a genie, who can do my wishes and find me enough money, enough gold, with which to finance free primary education? Does he think that I am in communication with God so that I can find the money? Obviously, the money must come from the public, and I do not think that anybody has tried to deceive the public. He, himself, has stated, and I have always warned, that nothing in this world is free—for instance, in certain countries one even has to pay for the air one breathes. Obviously, public services must be paid for by the public. It is only the form of payment that matters, and we have tried in this respect to ensure that payment comes from those who can best afford such payment. So long as we do that, you cannot say that free primary education, which we will introduce in 1962, will be really not free—and this I consider is a very considerable achievement.

As I have stated, this has never happened before, and I think if we look at it in the context of Chinese education, it is quite unique. Let us look at the countries surrounding us in Southeast Asia. In many of these countries you get huge Chinese colonies who in the aggregate form a very

considerable proportion of the total population. Even outside Southeast Asia, even in North America, in temperate countries, you get large Chinese populations. I think I am correct in saying that nowhere outside China and Formosa has any Government been prepared to give a Chinese free primary education in the language and culture of his ancestors. Malaya is the only country which has done so, and I think that that in itself gives the lie to the charge that we are trying to kill Chinese education.

I have the impression—I am not an expert on Chinese education—that the real quarrel with the Government is its refusal to allow the students of Chinese schools to take examinations in Chinese which could lead to, for example, entry into the Public Service; although my Honourable friend and colleague the Deputy Prime Minister has stated that he is prepared to allow an examination to be taken in Chinese for promotion purposes but it will not lead to a certificate qualifying for entry into the Public Service, and the reason is quite simple—to do so would be tantamount to an implied admission that Chinese is one of the official languages of this country. Honourable Members are aware that in order to make Chinese one of the official languages in this country, it would be necessary to change the Constitution. I do not for the time being wish to debate the merit or demerit of this proposal, but in order to change the Constitution, as Honourable Members are fully aware, one would require a two-thirds majority, and I think it is quite indisputable that in the present context of Malayan politics such a majority will not readily be forthcoming, to put it at its mildest. So, it is a matter of practical politics, and if any Honourable Member seriously suggests that this can be done, I think he should have his head thoroughly examined—and that, in fact, is really the main theme of the Honourable Member for Ipoh. He, in fact, admitted in the closing stages of his speech that what he really wanted was multi-lingualism, i.e., to get Chinese

recognised as one of the official languages of this country—I think what he is really asking for is not within the realm of practical politics.

Sir, I would like Honourable Members, for example, to bear one little point in mind—again, in connection with the charge that Government is not aware of the importance of Chinese culture. Those of us who like myself have been privileged to attend State banquets and functions held at the Istana Negara have, for example, noticed that every time there is some sort of entertainment provided after a meal is over, or in the course of a meal, we get cultural exhibitions given by, for example, Radio Malaya; and in every one of these exhibitions there are always a few items which are performed by Chinese artists and in the Chinese language and depicting some aspects of Chinese culture. I do not think that this has ever happened before, and I do not think it ever happened during the time when the British were in control of this country. If to-day the Alliance Government was not aware of the importance of Chinese culture, I do not think such a thing would be allowed to happen.

The Honourable Member for Dato' Kramat suggested that it was very useful to know more than one language and, in fact, the more languages we know the better—I entirely agree with him—and in this connection thought that there was nothing wrong in a multiplicity of languages being used in national-type secondary schools. I do not quarrel with him so far, but I think we must remember one practical difficulty. The world in which we live, I think, has got a lot of knowledge we have to imbibe, and one of the wisest men in this world, who lived about two thousand years ago said, when he was complimented on his wisdom, that he agreed that he was the wisest man in this world, because he was the first man to realise that he knew practically nothing.

Sir, knowledge is such a vast field that even if we were to live to a few hundred years, we still would not be

able to imbibe all that had been learnt in the past, and the study of a multiplicity of languages, although useful in its own way, will not enable us to progress to the point where we will be able to imbibe more than just enough if we are to reach the goals which probably have not been attained hitherto in this country.

I think I have said enough to show that the Government on its own record has done everything it can to encourage not only the use but also the study of both the Chinese language and culture, and I would ask the House, before I sit down, to consider this record very carefully and then come to its own conclusion. A lot of rhetoric have been used these last few days, many clichés have been spoken, and I suspect that an attempt has been made to rouse communal feeling and excite communal passions for the sake of political advantage; but education is a very serious subject and the people who are affected are the children, not the politicians. Unfortunately, education in this country has got almost as many experts as there are school-children, and in this respect let us be calm and cool and consider what the Government has done; and I think, if you look at it in that light, the Government's record can bear close examination.

Sitting suspended at 4.12 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 4.40 p.m.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

THE EDUCATION BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Question again proposed.

Enche' Tan Phock Kin (Tanjong): Mr. Speaker, Sir, since the debate started on this Bill, I have been waiting patiently to listen to the Honourable the Minister of Finance. When he spoke just now, I was very happy because I thought that my patience was to be rewarded, and I had hoped to hear from him his elaboration on the finan-

cial implications of the Bill. The Honourable Members for Ipoh and Menglembu have raised certain points with regard to the financial implications of the Bill—and so have my Honourable friend the Member for Dato' Kramat.

However, when the Honourable the Minister of Finance spoke just now, he failed to give a reply to the various queries that were raised. Instead, he spoke more like a Minister for Chinese Affairs rather than as the Minister of Finance, because in the course of his speech he took great trouble to justify the stand of the Alliance on the question of Chinese education. Coming as it does from a Minister of a Party which professes to be non-communal, it is most amazing to me. Why should a Minister of the Government be so concerned with political support from one community, if it professes to be non-communal in its outlook? It would, perhaps, be more justifiable if the Minister had spoken on the question of equality with regard to the various schools.

However, Sir, I am here concerned with the financial implications of the Bill. The Minister has told us two things with regard to finance. First of all, he has told us that nothing is going to be free, everything must be paid for by the public. I cannot agree more with him on that statement. Secondly, he has told us that money will be obtained from those who can best afford to pay. That is also another statement with which I agree entirely with him. But I must say here, Sir, that he has made no attempt to justify that statement. Anybody can make a statement that one is fair without giving any evidence as to why one believes that one is fair. Similarly, the Honourable the Minister of Finance has told us that money will be raised from those who can best afford to pay, but he has not given any instance—no example—as to how this particular provision in the Bill will provide for that safeguard because, as we can see from the Bill with regard to finance, the money will be raised by Local Education Authorities from education

rates. In other words, each local authority will be asked to raise a rate: for example, in the city of George Town, perhaps, the City Council will be asked to raise an education rate of 3, 4, 5, or even 10 per cent. Similarly, in the case of the other Town Councils and the various other Councils, who will be asked to do likewise.

Therefore, Sir, let us examine the position of assessment, this process of fund raising, to see whether it is in accordance with the principle enunciated by the Honourable the Minister of Finance—it is true that money will be raised from those who can best afford to pay. I am sure the Minister of Finance realises that as far as fund raising is concerned this is the most equitable principle. He has enunciated it correctly, but let us see whether in practice it will work out that way.

Sir, at the present moment, we are aware that in this country we have what we call the Rent Control Ordinance; and in the Rent Control Ordinance it is provided that such assessment rates be raised by any local authority and that the burden of the extra rates is not to be paid by the landlord; in other words, although people who own houses need not pay for the increased rates, education rates, the burden can be passed on to the tenants. So the tenants in turn can pass the burden of additional education rates to the sub-tenants. Now, let us examine the financial position of these people. Are they the people, who can best afford to pay an extra dollar, or an extra five dollars for education? This is the crux of the problem, and I feel that the Honourable the Minister of Finance in his usual style is endeavouring to mislead this House by saying that funds in this manner will be raised from those who can best afford to pay. But I submit that, under these circumstances, money in the form of education rates will be raised from those who can ill afford to pay—the cubicle dwellers and the slum dwellers. If the rates on the houses were increased, the landlords will pass the burden to the chief tenants, and the

chief tenants will pass it on to the sub-tenants—and the majority of the people in this country who will be called upon to pay the additional rates for education will be this category of people. I feel sure that the Honourable the Minister of Finance is deliberately evading the whole issue by refusing to elaborate on this particular point, in spite of the fact that it is expected that in any Bill that comes before this House, if there is any financial provision in the Bill, the Minister of Finance should speak not at a late stage of the debate but at the commencement of the debate and tell this House exactly how he hopes to raise money and in what way the method adopted by him is equitable, so that Members on the Opposition will have the opportunity to argue the case with him. However, here, we have a responsible Minister who apparently failed to do his homework and is in no position to elaborate the position to Members of this House. It is my earnest hope that, in future, I need not stand up again and remind the Minister of his duty. Suffice it for me to say that as far as the provision, as I understand it from the Bill, is concerned, to my mind it is most inequitable.

Further, my Honourable friend the Member for Dato' Kramat has also brought up another aspect of the Bill: if we are to raise education rates in the manner envisaged in this Bill, there will be the problem of various areas which have no local authority, and under these circumstances the Minister will have to provide other means of raising money. I remember reading the debate in 1957, when the matter was discussed, that a lot of anxiety was felt by people who owned land, and they argued that if a flat rate of assessment was going to be put on land irrespective of what sort of land, then again there might be people living in rural areas who might own one or two acres feeling the pinch of having to pay such rates. So, I submit that both from the urban and from the rural point of view, as far as we can see, this system of raising education rates is most inequitable.

However, as far as the Alliance Government is concerned, as far as the speakers on the Alliance benches are concerned, it is not unusual to hear arguments of a conflicting nature. I say so because on this particular question, when looking through the debates for the year 1957, I cannot help notice a statement made by none other than the present Assistant Minister—this was on the Education Ordinance; and this statement from the present Assistant Minister of Education appears to me to be in direct conflict with the statement of the Honourable the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications: it was only just now we heard the Honourable the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications who spoke at great length on the usefulness of English and justifying the stand of the Government on supporting English schools in the present Bill. In 1957 the Honourable the Assistant Minister of Education had this to say:

“It is not the medium of instruction that matters. What matters is the contents.....”—

and here I think he agrees entirely with my Honourable colleague the Member for Seberang Selatan—

“what is taught to the people of this country. It is not that the products of English schools only could be Ministers and so on; I also see people who have been through schools using other languages as media of instructions. What about people in Indonesia, people in Burma and people of other countries, even China?”

This, I submit, is the most remarkable statement, because it seems to me that if he still holds this view, then the present Bill contradicts a great deal what the Honourable the Assistant Minister believes in. If he really believes in what he said in 1957, I am at a loss to see how he can support this particular Bill in its entirety, and it is my earnest hope that he will explain to us his present change in his view point in regard to this particular point.

The Minister of Education (Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya telah mengikuti

perbahathan ini atas Rang Undang² Pelajaran dengan sa-penoh minat dan telah mengikuti segala pandangan dan tegoran serta kechaman yang telah di-lafadzkan oleh Ahli² Yang Berhormat, terutama-nya daripada pehak pembangkang. Tetapi, sungguh pun banyak telah di-chakapkan, pada hemat saya kechaman itu berpusu² kapada dua atau tiga perkara.

Perkara yang pertama ia-lah datang-nya daripada Pati Progressive Ra'ayat dan juga sa-tengah-nya daripada Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada puak bebas yang mengatakan bahawa dasar² yang terkandung di-dalam Rang Undang² ini ada-lah perkara² yang berbedza daripada dasar² yang terkandung di-dalam Undang² Pelajaran 1957, dan Penyata Razak tahun 1956. Tentangan daripada golongan ini tidak-lah menghairankan saya kerana pada masa Penyata Jawatan-Kuasa Penyemak Dasar Pelajaran yang di-bentangkan, mereka juga telah menentang Penyata itu.

Yang kedua-nya bangkangan itu berpusu kapada dasar ini di-tudoh-nya sa-bagai satu dasar yang tidak hendak mendewa²kan bahasa Inggeris. Itu datang-nya daripada puak pembangkang daripada kumpulan Socialist Front. Yang ketiga-nya, tegoran yang di-datangkan oleh Parti Islam sa-Tanah Melayu, saya dengan sukachita-nya menyambut sokongan-nya dengan dasar ini dapat di-perketatkan lagi dengan kuat-nya sa-bagaimana yang di-kehendaki oleh parti-nya. Perkara yang pertama, ada-kah dasar yang terkandung di-dalam Rang Undang² ini berbedza atau pun lain daripada dasar yang asal. Yang Berhormat Timbalan Perdana Menteri, yang menjadi Pengerusi Jawatan-Kuasa yang membuat Penyata tahun 1956 itu, dan juga saya sa-bagai sa-orang ahli dalam Jawatan-Kuasa itu berpendapat bahawa tidak ada perbedzaan. Pada pendapat saya itu dan juga pendapat Yang Berhormat Timbalan Perdana Menteri telah di-terangkan dalam ucapan-nya tadi. Yang pertama sa-kali yang mengatakan berbedza ia-lah berkenaan dengan memberhentikan bantuan sa-paroh kapada Sekolah² Menengah

China. Ahli Yang Berhormat wakil daripada Telok Anson, barang kali oleh sebab dia telah berpindah dari sini ka-sabelah sana sudah lupa akan apa yang telah di-sain-nya. Saya suka-lah menarek perhatian-nya kapada para. 39, dalam Penyata tahun 1956, yang mengatakan bahawa chuma hendak di-adakan dua sahaja jenis Sekolah Menengah, ia-itu Sekolah Menengah yang mendapat bantuan penoh dari Kerajaan, dan Sekolah Menengah yang tidak mendapat bantuan penoh. Jadi, yang sa-benar-nya apa yang di-sebutkan dalam Penyata saya dalam para. 187, itu, ia-itu memberhentikan bantuan sa-paroh itu ada-lah perlaksanaan daripada satu dasar yang telah di-setujui oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat itu sendiri pada tahun 1956. Kemudian di-timbulkan pula perkara yang bersangkutan paut dengan penafsiran berkenaan dengan National-type Secondary School. Saya rasa tidak payah-lah saya ulangi lagi apa yang telah di-terangkan oleh Yang Berhormat Timbalan Perdana Menteri itu. Hanya, saya suka-lah hendak menjelaskan ia-itu saya tidak-lah bertanggong-jawab atas penafsiran yang salah yang ada di-dalam ingatan wakil Telok Anson itu. Dan juga saya tidak-lah hendak mengambil atau pun mengikut tafsiran yang ada di-dalam ingatan-nya pada masa sekarang, tetapi tafsiran pada tahun 1956 dahulu itu.

Bangkangan yang kedua sa-bagaimana yang saya katakan tadi ia-lah berpusu kapada Rang Undang² ini mendewa²kan bahasa Inggeris dan tidak memberi galakan dengan perkembangan bahasa Melayu atau bahasa Kebangsaan yang sa-luas²-nya.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, hujjah yang mengatakan bahawa dasar ini hendak mendewa²kan bahasa Inggeris bukanlah satu perkara yang baharu. Dan hujjah ini di-sebutkan di-dalam Dewan ini atau pun di-tarikan oleh Ahli² Yang Berhormat daripada Socialist Front dalam Dewan ini atau pun di-atas pentas ini dengan ada-nya satu orchestra yang ahli² orchestra ini sendiri memainkan peranan-nya di-sebalek tirai yang tidak kelihatan mata orang ramai.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: *Hear! Hear!*

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Tetapi saya chukup faham dan walau bagaimana pun saya boleh-lah mengakui bahawa usaha² untuk mengembangkan lagi pelajaran melalui bahasa kebangsaan dan banyak lagi sekolah² menggunakan bahasa kebangsaan. Sa-bagaimana saya sebutkan dalam ucapan saya perkara itu sedang di-selenggarakan dengan bersungguh². Kita masukkan pelajaran bahasa Inggeris sa-bagai satu mata pelajaran yang mesti di-pelajari kerana kita tahu dan faham bahawa bahasa itu ada-lah berguna dan kita ada-lah memberi peluang yang sama dengan semua kanak² dalam negeri ini mahu pun dia dudok di-bandar atau pun di-kampung peluang mereka dapat melanjutkan pelajaran-nya dan meluaskan pengetahuan mereka.

Tetapi pada hari ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada satu manifesto education yang di-sebutkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Seberang Selatan, jikalau dia mengecham hendakkan penggunaan pelajaran dalam bahasa Inggeris, saya suka-lah kalau dia memberi pendapat-nya kepada umum apa-kah yang di-maksudkan supaya di-dalam dasar ini, "the guarantee of freedom to parents to send their children to whatever language school they choose", saya agak tentu-lah termasuk juga sekolah² Inggeris. Dan daripada apa yang telah di-tulis oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat itu sendiri berkenaan dengan dasar parti-nya, saya tidak hairan-lah apabila di-perhatikan yang apabila Yang Berhormat itu berchakap bahawa dia sendiri pun berasa yang apa dia chakapkan bukan datang daripada hati-nya sendiri. (*Ketawa*).

Perkara yang ketiga, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-lah pandangan yang di-berikan oleh rakan kita daripada pehak pembangkang—PAS yang jauh perbedzaan-nya dengan pendapat gulongan² yang saya sebutkan tadi. Jadi, memang banyak yang saya dengar hujjah² atau keterangan² yang telah di-berikan oleh Ahli² Yang Ber-

hormat puak pembangkang daripada tiga gulongan, ini mungkin kuat keyakinan saya mengatakan bahawa dasar ini ada-lah dasar yang sa-baik²-nya—dasar penengahan. Dan saya rasa dengan sebab itu-lah ini boleh-lah di-katakan dasar yang boleh di-terima oleh sa-bilangan ramai penduduk² dalam negeri ini. Ini telah di-buktikan dengan banyak-nya bilangan Sekolah² Menengah China yang akan dapat bantuan sa-paroh yang telah mengambil keputusan hendak masuk jadi Sekolah Jenis Kebangsaan yang sa-benar²-nya.

Semalam wakil dari Ipoh ada menyebutkan sa-buah sekolah di-Kajang yang telah menetapkan tidak mahu masokka-dalam system kebangsaan ini. Tetapi dia barangkali pada hari semalam juga dia tidak terbaca pada muka yang lain dalam surat khabar itu juga yang mengatakan bahawa tiga buah Sekolah Menengah yang mendapat bantuan sa-paroh, 3 buah sekolah yang besar di-Pulau Pinang yang mengandongi murid² sa-ramai 2,500 orang telah menetapkan hendak menjadi sekolah yang mendapat bantuan penuh. (*Tepok*). Tiap² hari saya dapati bahawa banyak sekolah² ini akan berubah chorak berma'ana bahawa mereka menerima dasar yang di-bentang dalam Rang Undang² ini.

Sa-telah menjawab perkara² yang besar yang telah di-bangkitkan dalam perbahathan daripada masa Rang Undang² ini di-bahathkan saya sukalah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, menyentoh sedikit perkara² yang khas yang telah di-terbitkan oleh Ahli² Yang Berhormat dalam Dewan ini. Perkara yang pertama sa-kali yang telah di-bangkitkan oleh tiga orang Ahli Yang Berhormat kalau tidak salah saya daripada Ipoh dan juga dari Telok Anson ada-lah berkenaan dengan Fasal 21 (1) di-dalam Rang Undang² ini dan 21 (2). Mereka hendak tahu apa-kah mustahak, apa-kah tujuan di-adakan fasal² ini. Tujuan di-adakan fasal ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada-lah untuk melaksanakan satu dasar yang telah di-persetujui di-dalam Penyataan Pelajaran Razak yang saya sebutkan tadi dan telah di-persetujukan oleh wakil

Telok Anson pada tahun 1956 seperti yang terkandung dalam paragraph 56 Penyata Pelajaran Razak itu. Tujuan dan maksud-nya hanya-lah tertentu kepada Sekolah² Rendah yang bangunannya di-punyai oleh Kerajaan, tidak Sekolah² Rendah yang bangunannya bukan kepunyaan Kerajaan. Ini saya telah jelaskan dalam ucapan saya bagi membentangkan Rang Undang² ini.

Satu lagi perkara yang telah disebutkan oleh beberapa orang wakil dari pehak Parti Islam ia-lah berkenaan dengan hal² pendaftaran sekolah² ra'ayat. Saya suka hendak menjelaskan bahawa hal mendaftarkan sekolah² ra'ayat ini hanya-lah timbul masalah-nya di-negeri Kelantan dan tidak timbul di-negeri² lain, sebabnya timbul masalah ini di-Kelantan ia-lah oleh kerana di-sana banyak sekolah² ra'ayat yang di-dirikan dan oleh sebab banyak sekolah² ini di-dirikan maka mustahak-lah di-siasat dengan chermat-nya sama ada sekolah itu patut di-daftarkan atau tidak. Saya katakan mesti di-siasat dengan chermat-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kerana di-dapati ada sekolah ini di-dirikan di-tempat² yang sangat berhampiran dengan sekolah kebangsaan yang tersedia ada dan dengan sebab itu maka kerana ibu bapa kanak² berkehendakkan anak²-nya pergi sekolah sa-habis dekat dengan rumahnya maka mereka pun menarek anak²-nya daripada sekolah kebangsaan dan di-masokkan ka-dalam sekolah ra'ayat yang dekat sekolah dengan rumah mereka. Maka kita tahu keadaan pelajaran yang di-ajar oleh guru²-nya yang hanya lulus darjah tiga atau darjah empat di-sekolah ra'ayat itu dengan perkakas yang ada di-sekolah² itu tidak-lah boleh menolong kanak² itu mendapat kejayaan dan kemajuan dalam hal pelajaran.

Jadi masalah-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-lah sama ada dasar kita hendak memberi sekolah dengan jalan menggalakkan banyak-nya di-dirikan sekolah² ra'ayat supaya dekat dengan kanak² atau pun hendak memberi pelajaran kepada kanak² itu. Saya ada pengalaman sedikit sa-banyak dalam soal pelajaran ini dan telah di-

tetapkan dasar Kementerian saya ia-itu hendak-lah kita menjalankan satu dasar hendak memberi pelajaran, bukan hendak mengadakan sekolah sahaja. Jadi dengan sebab itu-lah kerana hendak menjalankan dasar ini maka pada masa sekarang pegawai² Kementerian saya sedang menyiasat berkenaan dengan pendaftaran sekolah² ra'ayat dalam negeri Kelantan, tetapi saya beri akuan dan jaminan bahawa di-mana yang di-fikirkan sekolah ra'ayat lebeh patut di-daftarkan mana yang ada sekarang ini patut di-daftarkan, kita akan daftarkan tidak berapa lama lagi.

Satu lagi tegoran yang di-bangkitkan oleh parti saya dalam Fasal 36 (2) berkenaan dengan masa yang ditentukan berkenaan dengan pelajaran agama Islam. Masa yang di-tetapkan di-sini ia-lah sa-kurang²-nya dua jam, dan rasa saya telah di-minta supaya masa itu di-ubah, tetapi oleh kerana memang ada dalam undang² ini "at least two hours—sa-kurang²-nya dua jam" atau hendak di-tambah pula. Tetapi sa-belum kita membuat keputusan mu'tamad, kita mesti menyiasat supaya pelajaran yang lain tidak akan terganggu yang boleh melebihi masa dalam sa-suatu mata pelajaran itu.

Satu lagi perkara yang telah di-bangkitkan dalam perbahathan ini ia-lah fasal pendaftaran guru². Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-bagaimana yang telah saya katakan dalam ucapan saya pada memajukan Rang Undang² ini, maka fasal² di-dalam undang² pendaftaran guru² yang ada dalam Rang Undang² ini ada-lah sama tidak sedikit pun berubah daripada fasal² yang terkandung dalam undang² yang ada pada hari ini. Jadi kalau wakil daripada Telok Anson umpama-nya berasa churiga berkenaan dengan section 89 atau daripada fasal dalam Rang Undang² ini maka saya suka menyatakan bahawa fasal ini ada terkandung dalam undang² yang berjalan sekarang yang telah di-luluskan sa-masa Ahli Yang Berhormat itu menjadi Menteri Muda Pelajaran dahulu. Satu perkara yang selalu disebutkan di-dalam.....

Enche' Too Joon Hing: On a point of clarification.

Mr. Speaker: (*Kapada Enche' Abdul Rahman*) Ini ada interruption clarification—hendak beri jalan tidak?

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Tidak, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. (*Ketawa*). Satu lagi perkara yang selalu di-sebutkan dalam perbahathan ini ia-lah shor² yang terkandung dalam Rang Undang² ini dan dalam penyata dahulu ia-itu dalam article 152 dalam Perlembagaan. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bukan-lah sa-orang lawyer, tetapi saya telah mendapat nasihat pesti daripada Peguam Agong bahawa hal ini tidak-lah sa-kali menyalahi article 152 dalam Perlembagaan itu, dan jika ia menyedari undang² ini salah, Peguam Agong yang mula² sa-kali menasihatkan bahawa Rang Undang² ini di-majukan sekarang dalam Majlis ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, rasa saya memadai-dengan apa yang telah saya jelaskan menjawab sa-tengah daripada kechaman² yang di-majukan dalam perbahathan ini dan sa-bagaimana yang saya katakan tadi apabila makin lama makin kita mendengar perbahathan atas perkara ini, makin-lah saya yakin bahawa Kerajaan adalah mengambil jalan tengah untuk mengadakan satu dasar pelajaran yang boleh di-terima oleh sa-golongan besar penduduk² dalam negeri ini. (*Tepok*).

Question put, and agreed to.

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

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(*Mr. Speaker in the Chair*)

Clause 1 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 2—

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Sir, I beg to move an amendment to Clause 2 as per amendment

slip circulated to Honourable Members: that is in line 2 of paragraph (b) of the definition of "capital grant" to leave out the words "but excluding minor works".

Amendment put, and agreed to.

Clause 2, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 3 to 20 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 21—

Enche' Too Joon Hing: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to suggest that Clause 21, sub-clause (2), be deleted. As I have explained in the course of my speech yesterday, this Clause is entirely in similarity with the one that is contained in the 1952 Education Ordinance. We find here that the Minister has the power to convert—by order direct—National-type Primary Schools into National Primary Schools. In Section 18 of the Education Ordinance, the authority concerned is given power to replace these primary schools by national type secondary schools; and this policy we had—I mean when I was in the Alliance—opposed and we declared that this policy was unacceptable to the people as a whole. The introduction of this national system into vernacular schools is not acceptable to the people as a whole. Therefore, Sir, in bringing this Clause back I cannot see how we can accept this when we have once already rejected it. Sir, I beg to move that this Clause 21 (2) be deleted.

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam (Ipoh): Sir, I beg to support the motion for the deletion with another reason in addition to what has been said. Just now, in the general debate, we had the pleasure of hearing the Honourable the Minister of Finance speaking on this very important Clause. What he said was most surprising, and it shows how negligent the Government side has been in reading through their own Bill. The Honourable Minister suggested that Clause 21 was taken from the Ordinance of 1957, but if you look at the Table at the back, Clause 21 is

branded as a new Clause; and if a Minister of this Government can be so misleading in regard to Clause 21, then surely it is very strong ground for taking away Clause 21, because the Minister does not know that it is a new Clause, or he has doubts about it—something is wrong somewhere; in fact, if anybody does not know that this Clause is new he must either get a very good optician to examine his eyes, or, perhaps, not only get his head examined but spend a few days in Tanjong Rambutan within the district of Ulu Kinta which is held by the Peoples' Progressive Party—and we welcome such persons into that institution.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Sir, I think the Government has never said that this is not a new Clause. We have said clearly that this is a new Clause and as I have said just now, this is a Clause to implement the accepted policy laid down in paragraph 56 of the Razak Report of which the mover of this amendment was a signatory.

Amendment put, and negatived.

Enche' V. Veerappen: Sir, as the deletion is not agreed to, could I propose a suggestion for the consideration of the Minister? Here it gives power to the Minister—"by order direct that the school shall become a national primary school." Would the Minister agree that there should be a provision for the Minister to consult the Board of Managers? If not the Board of Managers of a school would become just puppets. Would the Minister consider that?

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Cannot we have the courtesy of a reply to a polite question?

Enche' Abdul Rahman: I think there is no need for me to reply. I do not need to consult anybody.

Clause 21 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 22 to 74 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 75—

Enche' Abdul Rahman: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move an amendment to Clause 75 as per amendment slip circulated to Honourable Members: that is in line 2 of paragraph (b) to leave out the figure "61" and add the figure "89".

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Sir, I am afraid that we do not know what amendment slip the Honourable the Minister of Education is referring to. We cannot find it.

Mr. Speaker: This slip has been circulated to all Honourable Members. The amendment is to delete the figure "61" and insert the figure "89" instead.

Amendment put, and agreed to.

Clause 75, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 76 to 99 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 100 to 110—

Enche' Tan Phock Kin (Tanjong): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wonder whether the Honourable the Minister of Finance will kindly clarify the points raised by me and by the Honourable Member for Dato' Kramat in the course of the debate, and also to justify his statement that funds raised in the manner prescribed in the Ordinance is in accordance with the principle of collecting from those who can best afford to pay.

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I can assure him that the money required for implementing this Bill will be forthcoming. As to the time of revelation, I am afraid the time is not quite appropriate, but I think if the Honourable Member has the patience to wait until the Budget Meeting, I shall then reveal my statement to him with very great pleasure.

Enche' Tan Phock Kin: Sir, I am indeed surprised to hear that reply from the Honourable the Minister of

Finance, because at this meeting, in the course of the debate, he specifically told this House that funds raised for education will be raised in accordance with the principle of collecting them from only those who can afford to pay, and I am merely asking the Minister to justify this. In the course of the debate, he had on no occasion justified that particular statement. On the other hand, I have pointed out that as far as provision in the Bill is concerned, it will not be in accordance with the principle enunciated by him, and in the light of that, I would like the Honourable Minister to categorically state the position clearly to this House because, if this House is not convinced that money to be raised in accordance with this financial provision, is strictly in accordance with this principle enunciated by the Minister, then obviously we are going to oppose this particular provision. And I think it is most irresponsible for a Minister to come to this House without being able to clarify. If he does not know, at least he should have the courtesy to tell us that he doesn't know the exact implication of this particular provision. I shall be very grateful if the Minister will kindly elaborate on this point.

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have already answered that. If the Honourable Member refuses to understand simple English, I cannot help him.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am afraid I am one of those people who cannot understand him, and I am a member of the Bar of the Federation of Malaya! Perhaps, the Honourable Minister of Finance could be kind enough as to let us know what he actually means by the following—

“.....the Minister may require State authorities or rating authorities or both to make such contributions in that year, recoverable as a debt due to the Federal Government, as may be specified in the requirement.”

Does that mean.....

Mr. Speaker: Which section is that?

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Section 105 (1). Sir, It says—

“Towards meeting the expenses of the provision of education under this Act incurred in any year to which this section applies, the Minister may require State authorities or rating authorities or both to make such contributions in that year, recoverable as a debt due to the Federal Government, as may be specified in the requirement.”

I ask, “recoverable” as to what sort of a debt and to what purpose. Is it within the State authorities' precincts or outside the State authorities' precincts; or is it in the Local authorities' precincts, or outside the Local authorities' precincts; or is it within the State precincts?

Mr. Speaker: The Minister in charge of the Bill would like to clarify?

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Sir, the method of raising this contribution is in the hands of Local, State or rating authorities. The contribution will go to the Federal revenue.

Enche' Tan Phock Kin: Since the Honourable the Minister of Education is prepared to venture into the rim of finance, may I ask him to be kind enough to answer the queries raised by me and by my Honourable colleague from Dato' Kramat in the course of the debate this afternoon?

Mr. Speaker: Under what section you are talking?

Enche' Tan Phock Kin: Section 105 (1), Sir.

Mr. Speaker: On what point you want clarification?

Enche' Tan Phock Kin: In the course of this debate, on this point of financing.....

Mr. Speaker: What is the point to be clarified?

Enche' Tan Phock Kin: I want Section 105 (1) to be clarified. Section 105 (1) is not specific. It makes a general statement to the effect that “the Minister may require State authorities or rating authorities or both to make such contributions in that year, recoverable as a debt due to the Federal Government, as may be specified in the requirement.” In the course of the

debate, it was pointed out to this House that the methods will be put in a more equitable manner, so that money will be raised from those who can best afford to pay. So, I am merely asking the Minister to clarify in what manner he proposes to raise this money: is it by education rate and, if so, is it going to be a fixed percentage on houses?

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: If I may enlighten the Honourable Member, obviously this clause 105 only gives the power to the Minister to require State authorities or rating authorities or both to make the contributions. This Ordinance only gives the power as to the method of raising this money, which will have to be made under separate regulations or by another law. It has not been decided yet as to how this should be done. This clause only gives the Minister the power to require State or rating authorities to make contributions.

Enche' Tan Phock Kin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the light of the explanation, it appears to me somewhat odd that if the manner of raising the revenue has yet to be decided, on what authority can the Minister tell us that it is going to be raised in an equitable manner? If he has not yet decided, it is obvious that nobody knows how the money is going to be raised.

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to ask for clarification which has already been asked by Members of the Socialist Front, and to which no satisfactory answer has been forthcoming from either the Minister of Education, Minister of Finance, or the Deputy Prime Minister. Under those circumstances, a number of points in Section 105 are important. When a clause for revenue is put in, surely the Government must have considered that matter and must come to certain, at least, preliminary decisions as to what should be done. You don't just put in a clause as a shot in the dark. You put it in after considering it, after having formulated at least a preliminary point as to what you are going to do with such a clause.

Therefore, the point is this: is it the intention of the Minister in any area in the Federation to ask both States and Local Authorities to contribute? Is it? Do they want double taxation from the State Authorities as well as from the Local Authorities? If that is the intention, we must know. What is the rate that you want to raise? If no answer is forthcoming, then I move for the deletion, with Mr. Speaker's permission, of clause 105 (1).

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: I said the rates have not been decided. What is required is only the power for the Minister to do this. Once this is passed, then the matter will be gone into carefully. And as the Minister of Finance has explained, it is the Government's policy that the rates will be charged to those who are in the best position to pay. That is only a statement of general policy. That is all the Bill requires and if at any time Government decides to require the various local authorities to pay, at that time the Government will state what rates and what other things are involved.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: From what the Deputy Prime Minister has said, I understand he is asking this House for a blank cheque to be signed and for the amount to be filled in afterwards.

Mr. Speaker: The question is the deletion of Section 105 (1) and the substitution therefor the other subsection 2 to become 1.

Amendment put, and negatived.

Clauses 100 to 110 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 111 to 129 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 130 to 140—

Enche' V. Veerappen (Seberang Selatan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, as I said in my speech yesterday, I ask with special regard to clause 136 that the Minister should consider the changing of the word "appointed", but I do not

think that he has given consideration to it. Mr. Speaker, Sir, this clause definitely means that as from 1st January, 1962, all grants in aid to partially assisted schools will stop—that is the meaning of the word “appointed”. But, Mr. Speaker, Sir, as the Deputy Prime Minister has said before that this transitional period is 10 years—we have only passed five years and as several members of the Alliance also have expressed apprehension over this and have asked for assurances—I would like to move, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that we delete the word “appointed” and substitute therefor the word “prescribed”. Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is not much difference we can say, but “appointed” date definitely means the 1st of January, 1962, but “prescribed” date will give that privilege and the power and the honour to our Minister to fix a certain date be it 1967, be it 1963 or be it 1980. We give him that honour and I hope he will accept it in that sense.

Enche' Abdul Rahman: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am sorry I cannot accept that amendment because the Government has already decided the appointed date of 1st January, 1962.

Mr. Speaker: The question is the deletion of the word “appointed” in line 3 of clause 136 and substitute therefor the word “prescribed”.

Amendment put, and negatived.

Clauses 130 to 140 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Preamble ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported with amendment: read the third time and passed.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA BILL

Second Reading

The Minister of Education (Enche' Abdul Rahman): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled “an Act to provide for the establishment and incorporation of the University of Malaya and for matters connected therewith” be read a second time.

The object of the Bill is to give the Kuala Lumpur Division of the University of Malaya the status of an autonomous, separate national University for the Federation, to be known as the University of Malaya.

Sir, this intention to set up a separate national University in Kuala Lumpur has been generally known for some time and has been fully accepted by the other two parties concerned, namely, the present University of Malaya and the Government of Singapore. The accepted plan is to establish, instead of the two present semi-autonomous Divisions of the University of Malaya, two fully-fledged separate and autonomous Universities.

The Division in Kuala Lumpur is to become the University of Malaya under this Bill. The Division in Singapore will also become a separate University under Singapore legislation.

The new Constitution of the University is contained in the Schedule to this Bill. Substantially this Constitution represents a return to the 1949 Constitution of the University of Malaya—the Constitution which was enacted when the University was first founded in Singapore.

This new Constitution will replace the Constitution approved by the Federal Legislative Council on the 28th of October 1958 when my Honourable Friend, Enche' Mohd. Khir Johari successfully moved the University of Malaya (Amendment) Bill, 1958. That Constitution, while following the 1949 Constitution as much as possible, had to make changes to provide for the two Divisions and for central machinery to hold the Divisions together.

The present central apparatus of the University will no longer be necessary. However, the Bill does provide in Clause 65 for a Joint Winding up Committee to wind up the affairs of the present University. I do not think it would be proper to legislate for any further central machinery in this Bill but I would like to express the hope that the two Universities will find it

good to establish by agreement between themselves permanent liaison arrangements (in which I hope the Governments would be suitably included) by which they may keep in the closest touch and help each other to develop.

In his speech at the University Convocation last June, when the University conferred upon him a richly-deserved Honorary Degree, my Honourable Friend, the Deputy Prime Minister said that the change in the status of the University should not be regarded merely as "split" as it is so often inelegantly called. He made it clear that this was not a parting of ways and was not a change arising merely from the present political division between the Federation and Singapore. He said that it was a logical outcome of the increasing demand for University education both in Singapore and in the Federation. This is now of such dimensions that the creation of the two separate brother Universities has become necessary in the best interests of all.

I believe that this view is accepted by both Divisions of the present University and by the Government of Singapore. I have been in close touch with my opposite number in Singapore over the terms of this Bill and we have agreed that the two new Constitutions should, as far as possible, be similar and that the transitional provisions, in particular—which are in Part VII of the Schedule—should be completely in tune. I am grateful to him for his help and co-operation in this respect and I hope that our joint efforts will establish two first class Universities, brothers in learning and in achievement.

This new Constitution was discussed at a Joint Committee of Government and University representatives in Kuala Lumpur. This Committee reached complete accord and the draft Constitution was subsequently submitted to a joint meeting of the Kuala Lumpur Division Council and Senate for discussion. A full, indeed a verbatim, report of that discussion was sub-

mitted to me and carefully considered by me and I submitted the draft Bill for the agreement of my Cabinet colleagues. Apart from minor drafting alterations, the only change which the Government has made in the draft agreed with the University is the addition of the proviso to Clause 47 of the Schedule. This proviso is necessary. It seeks to safeguard the admission of Government scholars to the University provided they satisfy the entrance requirements which are laid down by the University.

Sir, in all material respects both the Bill and the Schedule, as I have said, follow previous legislation which has been well tested by experience. The Constitution confers upon the University the right of managing its own affairs and a degree of autonomy which is proper to its status and dignity as a University.

The Government, Sir, is determined that our own University here in Kuala Lumpur shall be, by the highest standards, a first class teaching and research institution which will stand comparison with the best in the world. A very fine start has already been made in the Pantai Valley and great credit is due to all those who have built up the Kuala Lumpur Division during the last three or four years. There are already faculties of Arts, Science and Engineering. There are flourishing Departments of Agriculture, Economics, Malay and Indian Studies. Departments of Chinese and Islamic Studies are being created. Already there is a wide range of achievement in that beautiful campus. A Faculty of Medicine is to be established, beginning I hope in 1963.

The objective of the Government, and of the University authorities, is to build up a truly national University as the apex of our educational system. It is intended, and this principle is fully accepted by the University, to introduce gradually the use of the National Language into certain University courses so that eventually a bi-lingual University will develop, crowning the education system of the

Persekutuan Tanah Melayu. In such a capacity the University of Malaya can always rely upon the full support of Federation Government, financially and otherwise, and the Government will be no less jealous than the University itself of the academic standards of our University, their maintenance and their improvement.

Sir, under Clause 53 of the Schedule the Chancellor of the New University of Malaya will be appointed by the Yang di-Pertuan Agong after consultation with the present Chancellor. I am sure that the House will agree that the time has come for the appointment of a Malayan Chancellor.

The present Chancellor, the Right Hon'ble Mr. Malcolm Macdonald has himself been of this view for some time, and over three years ago, he offered to stand aside so that a Malayan Chancellor could be appointed in his place. As my Hon'ble Friend, my predecessor as Minister of Education, said, when he introduced the 1958 University Bill, this gracious offer of his again showed his deep understanding of the wishes of the people of this country and the sincerity with which he approaches our problems and our aspirations. He has been Chancellor of the old University of Malaya ever since it was founded in 1949 and the services he has rendered to that University are well-known. They have been greatly valued by the University and appreciated by the Governments and I wish, Sir, to pay a tribute to our distinguished outgoing Chancellor for his incomparable services to our University.

I hope, Sir, that this Bill will find favour in all quarters of the House. It is in the highest degree undesirable that our University should become a subject for political controversy. The autonomy which this Constitution confers upon the University is intended to maintain its position outside party politics and to enable the University to develop into a citadel of learning and research which will earn the respect, not only of Malaysians, but also of the whole world. I believe that

there is a real chance of this under the terms of this Bill which I commend for the approval of the House and which I now have the honour to move.

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

Dr. Burhanuddin bin Mohd. Noor (Besut): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ada-lah menyokong pada dasar-nya Rang Undang² ini, kerana telah disusun dengan elok untuk menegakkan University Persekutuan Tanah Melayu. Oleh kerana kesuntokan masa, jadi saya tujukan perchakapan saya kepada maksud sahaja. Pada muka 22 manakala saya perhatikan wakil² yang hendak mengambil bahagian dalam University ini, saya dapati Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka tidak ada wakilnya. Tetapi di-sini ada Council of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, dan sa-tahu saya council ini di-Singapura, sudah-kah ia-nya di-daftarkan di-Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini? Dan kenapa-kah Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka tidak di-masokkan, sedangkan ia-nya itu ada-lah menjadi pokok yang pertama untuk memperkembangkan bahasa dan per-pustakaan negeri ini yang sangat rapat hubongannya dengan University?

Memandangkan kepada keadaan itu-lah saya berharap dasar (policy) University ini hendak-lah sunggoh² berchorak kebangsaan—berteraskan kebangsaan dan kebudayaan negeri ini—yang sa-suai dengan perkembangan timor, dan jangan-lah sampai terbawa² lagi dengan chara kebaratan. Dengan jalan ini kita bersama² mengetahui bahawa University itu-lah sa-bagai dapor yang akan menchorakkan satu keadaan makanan budi dan akhlak satu² negeri dan begitu juga satu achuan bagi satu bangsa dan kebudayaan hingga ka-punchak pelajaran tinggi. Dengan kerana itu-lah saya harap University ini akan dapat membentok kebangsaan dan kebudayaan yang berteraskan kebangsaan dan kebudayaan negeri ini.

Enche' V. Veerappen: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is unfortunate that such an

important Bill should come at the end of a very heavy session which is also a very exciting one. However, we of the Socialist Front welcome this intention to set up the University, and I am glad to note that the Minister has mentioned in passing that it will be an autonomous University. I hope that he would not give the word "autonomous" his own definition, as he so often likes to do. I have consulted the Oxford Dictionary which I have here, and it is stated that "autonomous" means "the right of self-government; personal freedom; freedom of the will; a self-governing community." In other words, the University should be a self-governing community. In the words of the Director of Education in this country when the first University of Malaya Bill was introduced he said, "There should be no interference by any Government in the affairs of the University. It should be an independent corporation, not controlled by Government." But is it so? It may be to a certain extent, but I do not think that it is entirely so, as I will show later on.

The Carr-Saunders Commission said that to give a little representation of the Government in the University Council was already a considerable limitation of autonomy—that is to have any Government representation at all. Now, if that is so, then I do not know how the Government itself can interfere with the activities of such an intellectual body.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, recently I was told that a group of students wanted to form an organisation—the University Socialist Club—but it is regrettable that the Minister should have thought it fit to intervene and even brought this matter up to the Cabinet. If this is not interference, then what is it? If our Government cannot trust the highest body of intellectuals to manage their own affairs through their own organs, then I think we have really sunk very low. Sir, I hope that the Government will not try to interfere in the affairs of the University. It is not satisfactory. It has in this Bill before us, in the Schedule, tried to increase its representation by some means or

other. If it is not good to have even a few, then why should the Government try to increase its representation, as you will see in the Schedule, page 11. When we come to the Committee Stage of the Bill, I would like to propose certain amendments and I hope that the Minister will accept them in the true spirit.

Sir, another matter which I would like to mention—perhaps it might have escaped notice—is that there is no provision to prevent persons, who have certain pecuniary interests or vested interests, from being appointed to the University Council and other organs. Mr. Speaker, Sir, you know very well that our University is expanding, and it is really not desirable that certain directors of companies should have a say in the Council of the University, as definitely you would agree that they have vested interests. Thank you.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, we of the Peoples' Progressive Party welcome this Bill, which seeks to establish a University which will be autonomous. Of course, just because this Bill says that it is going to be autonomous, it does not mean that it will be necessarily free from governmental interference—governmental interference can be carried out in so many ways. It will be appreciated that with the coming into being of this University, there will commence the building of a generation whose outlook will be conditioned by what happens in that University, and I do hope that the Government will maintain its intention, if indeed that is its intention, of allowing this University to build up a generation without regard to political ideology professed by the Government in power. There must be no attempt whatsoever on the part of Government to make any move for the regimentation of the minds of University students in this country. There must be no attempt at brain-washing of University students, so that they may grow up to profess the political beliefs held by any Government which may for the time being be in power. Now, how can a Government do these things, if it can

control the publications of the University, if it can control the formation of groups within the University, if it can control the students by preventing their travels to gain knowledge and experience? There are a dozen ways in which Government can interfere with the University, if it wants to.

Now, let us for example take what is a recognised practice in universities in other parts of the world. Students who have some common interest join together to form a club; if they are socialists, they may wish to form a University Socialists' Club. Naturally, they must be permitted to do so. Similarly, you will have a University Liberals Club, or University Alliance Club, or University Progressives' Club. It is up to them to decide how they wish to progress in their political ideology. If the Government would keep faith with the declared intention, as declared to-day, then we feel that there is a bright future for this country and its future generation of University students and graduates.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I also rise to welcome this Bill, and in doing so I would like to pass a few remarks, some of which have been touched on by my Honourable friend the Member for Menglembu and my Honourable friend the Member for Seberang Selatan in regard to the basic principle that if universities want to flourish there must be complete independence.

Sir, throughout the history of the struggle of mankind, as I am sure the Honourable the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications will say, the greatest thinkers of this world have come from the universities.

Dato' V. T. Sambanthan: Not necessarily.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: In our Education Bill, which we discussed this morning, it is stated that the system of education should also promote political development. So, since we are going to promote political development in our secondary schools, we must have political development in

our University, whether we like it or not. Let it not be said one day that for the sake of democracy in Malaya we have killed the freedom of speech in our University.

The other matter which I would like to touch upon, Mr. Speaker, Sir, is that I am glad to hear that there have been such nice buildings put up in the Pantai Valley, but let us not hope that we will similarly follow the University of Singapore, because I, unfortunately, had the experience of having been educated in the University of Singapore, when it was the Raffles College and the history of that College, and the history of the University, seems to be this: firstly, they produce people who ultimately become clowns on the television; secondly, they produce people from foreign countries who come here to become lecturers and do their Ph. D.—their doctorate degrees—while they are teaching here. I know of one person, who is a Professor in English, who later on did a doctorate degree at the expense of the students' essays, who ultimately obtained his doctorate, left the country and became a lecturer in a provincial university of England, and ultimately after many many years of struggle became a lecturer in one of the better known English universities.

I happen to know that in England there is a radio doctor; let us hope that there will be no radio lawyers from the professional rank of the University. I think, for the sake of the future, let us remind the people who are going to run our University that we must not produce also people who would not do research but who would produce tracts from time to time or little pamphlets in the name of research. Further, we hope that the University, since a university must produce research books, will encourage students to produce theses which can be published, and not hidden away in the shelves of our libraries for the reference of our would-be professors, who need to look to student work for sources of materials in order to obtain their doctorates. Let us hope that no foreign lecturers would come to Malaya

to do their Ph. D. in our University like some professors have done in Singapore.

It is, I think, also true that we must now try to impose our will upon the students, and we must make sure, on the other hand, that there will be no public performances by our teaching staff in the University no damaging rivalry. I understand, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that already in Singapore there is a shortage of staff. Why? It is because of monopoly and rivalry—there are people who will prevent other people from doing research and not co-operate with other people in order that they themselves might make a name for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do really hope that we will be able to produce a first class University in Malaya. I do really hope that we will produce a University with the traditions of the best Universities in England, France, Germany and so on. And, finally, I do hope that we will be able to produce a liberal education through this University.

The Assistant Minister of Education (Enche' Abdul Hamid Khan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think Honourable Members have expressed their views on this Bill and their support for it. There is only one point which I would like to reply to—that is the point raised by the Honourable Member for Besut. The suggestion from the Honourable Member for Besut will be taken care of under Clause 13 (m).

Various Honourable Members have raised the question of the University being autonomous and the various aspects of autonomy. This, Mr. Speaker, Sir, will of course be taken care of and the views expressed passed on to the University authorities.

Question put, and agreed to.

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

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

Clauses 1 to 12 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Schedule—

Section 13:

Enche' V. Veerappen: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to refer to Section 13 (k), page 11, which says, "such representatives of the Guild of Graduates as may be prescribed by Statute"—that is to the Court. I would like to suggest for the Minister's consideration the stipulation of a number, and that is "10" representatives of the Guild of Graduates—would the Minister care to consider it.

Mr. Speaker: What is your amendment?

Enche' V. Veerappen: Sir, to amend the word "such" by substituting for it the word "ten" and to delete or leave out all the words after "Graduates"; then section 13 (k) will read, "ten representatives of the Guild of Graduates;"

Enche' Abdul Rahman: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am sorry, I cannot accept that.

Enche' Tan Phock Kin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have heard the Honourable the Minister of Education telling us that he cannot accept the amendment. In the course of speaking just now, my colleague the Honourable Member from Seberang Selatan has pointed out his reasons, and it appears to me that in the old Ordinance a specific number "10" was prescribed as representatives from the Guild of Graduates; and since the Minister cannot agree to "10", may we know the reasons as to why he disagrees with the proposal? Is it his intention to reduce representation from the Guild of Graduates and is he aware of a resolution adopted at a meeting of the Guild of Graduates demanding for representation?

Enche' Abdul Rahman: Sir, I think it is better to leave it as it is because this is flexible.

Enche' Tan Phock Kin: Then, can the Honourable Minister assure us that

as far as the Guild of Graduates is concerned, they will have the same proportion of representation as in the old Ordinance?

Enche' Abdul Rahman: The representation will be prescribed by Statute to be prepared by the University of Malaya.

Amendment put, and negatived.

Enche' Abdul Rahman: Sir, may I take up the Government amendment? I beg to move an amendment to Section 13 of the Schedule as per slip circulated to Honourable Members—that is to add the following new paragraph immediately after paragraph (f) of this section—

“(g) Eleven persons one appointed by each Ruler or Governor of a State”.

and to re-number the present paragraphs (g) to (n) of this section as paragraphs (h) to (o).

Amendment put, and agreed to.

Section 13, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Section 15—

Enche' Abdul Rahman: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to propose another amendment under Section 15 of the Schedule as per slip circulated to Honourable Members—that is to add immediately after paragraph (f) of the first part of this section the following paragraph—

“(g) Two representatives of the Conference of Rulers”.

and to re-number present paragraphs (g) to (j) as (h) to (k).

Enche' V. Veerappen: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like here to propose an amendment to Section 15 (j)—that is the number of persons to be elected by the Guild of Graduates be increased from 4 to 5.

Mr. Speaker: Do you accept that?

Enche' Abdul Rahman: Yes, Sir, I accept that amendment.

Amendments put, and agreed to.

Section 15, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Enche' Abdul Rahman: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that this Bill be reported back to the House.

Question put, and agreed to.

House resumed.

Enche' Abdul Rahman: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think I have left out an amendment to the Schedule.

Mr. Speaker: You must move now that this Bill be reverted back to the Committee. That is the only thing you can do now. If that is agreed by this House—it must be agreed by the House—then I can make this House go back to Committee, not otherwise. Otherwise you will have to do it at the next meeting.

Enche' Abdul Rahman: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that the Bill be re-committed back to the Committee of the whole House.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification. Perhaps the Honourable Member would like an adjournment and then bring this matter up at half-past-eight, because I do not think he knows under which Order he would have to move such re-committal. I do not think there is such an Order as suggested by him.

Mr. Speaker: Honourable Members I must look up the Standing Orders on this point as to how to revert this House back to Committee. I think I better suspend this sitting now until 8.30 to-night.

Sitting suspended at 6.30 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 8.30 p.m.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

THE UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA BILL RE-COMMITTAL

The Minister of Education (Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move,

That the University of Malaya Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the whole House in respect of sub-section 1 (d) of Section 15 and in respect of Section 58 of the Schedule under S.O. 59.

The Assistant Minister of Education (Enche' Abdul Hamid Khan): Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Enche' V. Veerappen: I would also like to include an amendment.

Mr. Speaker: When it comes to Committee?

Enche' V. Veerappen: Yes, Sir. I would like to move an amendment in respect of sub-section (3) of Section 15. That is to add.....

Mr. Speaker: This motion is for the re-committal of the Bill to Committee only, and since you have moved this, I can add that also.

Question put, and agreed to.

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee of the whole House in respect of Sections 15 and 58 of the Schedule to the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

Schedule: Section 15—

Enche' Abdul Rahman: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to propose an amendment to Section 15, sub-paragraph (1) (d)—that is to delete the words “by the Deans of Faculties” in line 1.

Amendment put, and agreed to.

Enche' V. Veerappen: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move an amendment to Section 15, sub-paragraph (3)—that is to add the following words after the word “Council” in line 4, “and no person having a pecuniary or vested interest in the University shall be elected or appointed to the Council”.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is a very important principle involved in this. We have reason to believe that there have been cases where even people with vested interests have become, or have been appointed, Chairman of the University Council; and, therefore, I think this should not be repeated and I hope the Honourable Minister will accept this amendment.

Enche' Tan Phock Kin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to speak in support of the proposal put forward by my Honourable friend the Member for Seberang Selatan. I think Honourable Members of this House are aware that there is a trend nowadays for leading public figures, for leading political figures, to be put on Boards of Directors of various companies; and very often when we appoint people to the University Council, or when we appoint people to various Boards, it is not uncommon that we appoint public figures—and even more conspicuous we appoint political figures: by political figures I mean people who are associated with the governing parties. So, in the light of this, it very often happens that certain Boards have such people.

Now, let us take, for example, the University. In the next few years, it will be having many construction works costing millions of dollars, and it is thus undesirable that anybody, who is appointed to the University Council, should be associated with contracting companies, companies which will be submitting tenders to the University—and such tenders will be considered by the University Council after consideration by the Tenders Board. It will be very embarrassing for anybody, who is serving on the Board of Directors of such a company, to also serve in the University Council, because there he will be asked to decide as to whether his own firm, or the company in which he is a director, should be given the contract. I feel, it is embarrassing to the person concerned and to the University to have people in such category serving in the Council—and I think that there should be a general provision in this Bill which should set it out very clearly; we do not want a case in which, if it is not set out clearly, very often it may so happen that a person, who may have pecuniary interest, will accept position. If we have a provision of this sort, people will be in a position to know that if they are appointed and if they want to serve on the Council, then they cannot continue as directors of com-

mercial organisations, which may have a pecuniary or vested interest in the University—and it is up to them to tell the Minister concerned, “Thank you very much, I am afraid I cannot serve, because my company will have some pecuniary interest in the University.” Sir, this is a constructive suggestion put forward by my Honourable friend the Member for Seberang Selatan and I hope it will be accepted.

The Minister of Internal Security and Minister of the Interior (Dato’ Dr. Ismail): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the amendment moved by an Honourable Member of the Socialist Front may be clear to the Socialist Front but not to the rest of the House, because the definition or meaning of “pecuniary or vested interest” may be, from the point of view of the Socialist Front, clear to its members, but not to other Members of the House. Now, Sir, if I contribute a sum of \$100 to the University, am I debarred from serving on the Council, just because I have a pecuniary or vested interest there? What is meant by vested interest? A person who donated money may have a vested interest. This is clearly an amendment which has come from the Socialist Front because they look at the matter from one particular angle. I think this House must look at it from a very broad angle. It may be that in future one of the members of the Socialist Front may donate a large sum of money to the University—it may be that the Member who speaks on the question of finance may be donating that. Will the University be deprived of this because of this cynical approach to the question of the University. This is surely an amendment which, let alone being accepted by the House, should not even be considered.

Enche’ Lim Kean Siew: Mr. Speaker, Sir, is the Honourable the Minister of the Interior challenging us to give names? If this will help him to understand things more clearly, we are prepared to give names of people who have pecuniary interests who have been members of the Board. We all

know that Members of the Ministerial Bench, for example, cannot become directors of a company. This amendment which is suggested by my Honourable friend is a harmless thing, and I see no reason why we should come to a slanging match.

Enche’ Tan Siew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Government would agree entirely with the Honourable Members of the Socialist Front in that if you have a pecuniary interest in a particular contract, you should not take part in the proceedings thereof—we cannot agree more with Honourable Members of the Socialist Front on that. In fact, I have a shrewd idea whom the Honourable Member of the Socialist Front is referring to and, I think, he will agree with me that the person is not a member of the Alliance. In fact, as Head of the Treasury, I had occasion to look into this very incident, where a Member of the University Council voted on a contract in which a firm of which he was a director was interested. I think the Honourable Member for Seberang Selatan and I at least see eye to eye on this issue, but that is not really the point. In that particular case, there was a remedy open to us and it eventually happened that that particular person was told not to vote on that contract. I, therefore, suggest that the remedy is quite simple. The rules lay down that if you are interested in a contract, or if the firm of which you are a director is interested in the contract, you are not supposed to vote on it—and, in fact, we did manage to stop the member from voting on that particular contract. Therefore, I think, this amendment is quite unnecessary. As my Honourable friend the Minister of Internal Security has pointed out, how do you define vested interest, what exactly is vested interest, I do not know what it means.

Enche’ V. Veerappen: Mr. Speaker, Sir, in view of the assurance given by the Minister of Finance and in view of the admission, so to say, I would like to withdraw the amendment. *(Applause)*.

Section 15, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Section 58—

Enche' Abdul Rahman: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move an amendment to Section 58 of the Schedule as per amendment slip circulated to Honourable Members—that is to leave out the whole section and add a new section as follows:

“58 (1) Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 13, the first Court of the University shall consist of—

- (a) the Chancellor;
- (b) the Pro-Chancellors;
- (c) the Vice-Chancellor; and
- (d) such other members of the Court of the University set up under the University of Malaya Ordinance, 1959, as are resident in the Federation.

(2) Such Court shall continue in existence until such time, not being later than six months from Foundation Day, as a Court is constituted in accordance with Section 13.”

Amendment put, and agreed to.

Section 58, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Bill reported with amendment; read the third time and passed.

THE CONSOLIDATED FUND (EXPENDITURE ON ACCOUNT) BILL

Second Reading

The Minister of Finance (Enche' Tan Siew Sin): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled “an Act to apply a sum out of the Consolidated Fund to the service of the year ending on the thirty-first day of December, 1962” be read a second time.

As it is uncertain whether it would be practicable to pass the Supply Bill authorising expenditure for the year ending 31st December, 1962 before the end of 1961 owing to the possibility that the dates for the next sitting of this House might be altered, it is necessary to make provision for Government expenditure from 1st January, 1962, until such date as the Supply Bill for 1962 is passed by Parliament.

The Bill now before the House provides for the issue from the Consolidated Fund of a sum of \$121 million which is calculated to provide for the service of the Government for about two months, as it is anticipated that the Supply Act will have become law not later than the end of February, 1962.

This procedure, is similar to that adopted last year except that the present Bill includes a schedule setting out how the sum of \$121 million shall be applied between the various Heads of Expenditure.

Sir, I beg to move.

Dato' V. T. Sambanthan: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Enche' Tan Phock Kin (Tanjong): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to seek clarification from the Honourable the Minister of Finance. According to the Explanatory Statement given in the Bill, it reads as follows—

“To provide for the possibility that Parliament may not have passed the Supply Bill for 1962 by the end of 1961, it is necessary to make provision for expenditure in 1962 for the period from the 1st of January, 1962 until the date the Supply Bill for that year becomes law. This Bill, pursuant to Article 102 (a) seeks to authorise the issue of the sum of one hundred and twenty-one million dollars from the Consolidated Fund for such purpose.”

Let us now look at Article 102, and Article 102 has this to say—

“Parliament shall have power in respect of any financial year—

- (a) before the passing of the Supply Bill, to authorise by law expenditure for part of the year;
- (b) to authorise by law expenditure for the whole or part of the year otherwise than in accordance with Articles 99 to 101, if owing to the magnitude or indefinite character of any service or to circumstances of unusual urgency it appears to Parliament to be desirable to do so.”

It appears to me that this year it is the view of the Honourable Minister that the Supply Bill cannot be passed in the month of November. So it is logical for us here, at least, to know

the reason as to why the Supply Bill cannot be presented to this House in the usual time, because as he is aware Articles 99 to 101 of our Constitution make specific provision with regard to the Supply Bill. As we are no doubt aware, if we are asked to approve something, at least we must be told the reasons as to why it is necessary, and I am afraid the Honourable the Minister of Finance has always been very reluctant to give us the reasons for this action. I would therefore very much appreciate it, if the Minister can take the trouble to elaborate his reasons for doing so.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think it was at the beginning of last year that I raised the question of the alteration of dates of meetings of Parliament and, I think, the Honourable Prime Minister gave us an assurance that dates will be set well in advance and would be adhered to except for special reasons. The reason I gave was that we and many people keep dates free for meetings of Parliament—and, to give an example, in the case of those Members of Parliament, who happen to be Members of the Bar, they are placed in a difficult position, because when they know that there is a Parliament meeting, say, for example, the Budget Meeting in December lasting three weeks, three weeks are reserved—and the courts oblige them by fixing important cases on other days. Now, if these dates are going to be altered, they are going to have a very unpleasant time in the courts. The judges are not inclined to delay criminal work—similarly in the magistrate courts—and they will be put in a very difficult position indeed. Therefore, I dare say that other people in other professions would also find themselves inconvenienced. Therefore, I would ask the Minister concerned to state the reasons clearly—and unless it is really necessary, the original dates should be adhered to.

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I cannot agree more with the Honourable Member from Menglembu

that it is very inconvenient to alter dates which have been fixed sometime in advance. He speaks about inconvenience to judges and lawyers. I can assure him that an alteration of dates would be most inconvenient to the Treasury, Sir, and to me in particular, and if we do decide eventually to change dates, we do so not because we want to irritate the Honourable Member from Menglembu but because we have got no alternative. It is as simple as all that.

Now, I tried to make it clear in my speech that there was a possibility that we might not be able to pass a Supply Bill before the end of this year because Honourable Members must remember that under the Standing Orders, we have to allow very nearly, taking all things together, three weeks for the Supply Bill to go through this Lower House. It must then go to the Senate and, as Honourable Members are aware, the Standing Order gives the Senate power to delay such a Bill for a month and the Government, therefore, has to take precautions to ensure that if, for example, the Senate should take it into its head to delay the Bill by, say, a month, it will not be possible for us to pay for the services of the Government during the first few months of 1962. This is nothing new as I tried to point out in my speech. We did the same thing last year but we managed, happily, both from the point of view of Honourable Members of the Opposition and from my own particular point of view, to pass the Supply Bill before the end of last year and so everything went well. But we must take precautions to ensure that if there is some unforeseen delay, the Government Service will not in any way suffer.

Question put, and agreed to.

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

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

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

Schedule ordered to stand part of the Bill.

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

THE PARLIAMENT (MEMBERS' REMUNERATION) (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

The Deputy Prime Minister (Tun Haji Abdul Razak): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that the Bill intituled "an Act to amend the Parliament Members' Remuneration Act, 1961" be read a second time.

Sir, it is with great pleasure indeed that I move this very short and very simple Bill. As Honourable Members are aware, at present the remuneration of a Member of this House is \$500 a month and this remuneration was fixed following the remuneration of Members of the former Legislative Council, but with the change in the character of this House after the election of 1959—now all Honourable Members are elected to this House—it is felt that there is a need to review the rates of allowances. Honourable Members of this House, having been elected by the people, have responsibilities to their constituencies and they have not only to be in constant touch with the happenings in their constituencies, with the views of their constituents, but they have also to make visits to other parts of the country. And in recent months representations have been made to the Prime Minister not only by members of the Government party but by others that the present rate of allowance is inadequate for Members of this House to undertake their responsibilities. The Government has given this matter very careful consideration and has come to the conclusion that there is justification for an increase. Therefore, it is proposed that the rate of allowance for Members of this House should be increased from \$500 to \$750.

I do not anticipate, Sir, that there will be any opposition to this Bill, but if there is any Honourable Member who feels that he does not need this increase of allowance, I am quite prepared, and I think my Honourable colleague, the Minister of Finance, will agree, that payment of this increase to the Honourable Member can be suspended.

Therefore, Sir, I accordingly beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: I beg to second the motion.

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was shocked to hear that Members of parties other than from the Alliance had made representations to the Honourable Prime Minister for this increase. I think in fairness to the parties that are sitting on this side of the House, the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister should make it clear whether any political parties sitting here have made that request, or whether any individuals sitting here have ever made that request, because I state here and now, without any fear, that no member of the PPP sitting here, as far as I know, had made any request to the Honourable Prime Minister; and if that clarification is given, in fairness to us, I would indeed appreciate that very very much from the Honourable the Deputy Prime Minister. But if any members of the PPP have made a request to the Honourable Minister, I should like to know it as well.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, on this question of remuneration for Members, I fully realise that it is a matter of importance not only to the Members concerned but also to the electorates who voted us here. I was waiting to hear of the reasons for this increase. I have heard the reasons, but I think more reasons are necessary—for example the Honourable Mover has said that a Member has to be in touch with his constituents, and for the usual services an elected member gives to his electorate. That is very right and very

proper, but has any reasonable investigation been made as to whether Members up to now have been carrying out their duties to justify this increase—because, Sir, from what we hear, as far as the Alliance members are concerned, they do not do their duty to their electorates? There are constant grumbling and murmuring from the electorates in constituencies where they were fortunate or unfortunate enough to elect Alliance representatives—they say, “They never come and see us. We cannot get in touch with them. We cannot see their faces when we want to”. And if that is a fact, then of course the reason given there is not substantiated. I should like clarification on that issue. Has any check being made on Honourable Members? As far as the Opposition is concerned, of course, I would like to say that I think we have done our duty. It is a matter of opinion there.

A suggestion was put forward that if there is any Member who does not like this increase, the Treasury will be glad to keep it. I completely disagree (*Laughter*), but if the Treasury would give me an undertaking to remit my increase of \$250 to a Chinese school that does not want to be converted into a National-type School, I would give that authority here and now—on that undertaking being given to me—to forward it monthly to a school which I know.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: It is very embarrassing that in support of the Government's Bill, the Government should mention others than themselves, because we all know that more than a dozen times at least we have made proposals which were reasonable but which have been rejected by the Government. I know this is very embarrassing; some of us here have no money; some of us have money and we do not need this money. We are called Honourable Members, and, of course, in the history of the parliament, it has always been that people served in an honourable capacity—in other words, this is not an office for profit.

It is very interesting, however, to notice that the monthly allowance of \$500 to the members of the Dewan Negara has not been increased and that the remuneration for members of this House has been increased by \$250. Now we all realise that if a person has to do work he needs to spend money; we all realise that many of us here have bought cars to travel in their constituencies and they have still to pay hire purchase rentals for those cars—and I still remember one member in this House asking for a motor car loan to buy a motor car. We realise all those difficulties. Of course, if I say that I personally object to it; then people will say that I don't need it, “Lim Kean Siew has got plenty of money (*Laughter*);” and if I say on behalf of my Party that I do not object to it, then people will say I want the money. I really do not know what to say. I must say that the Honourable the Deputy Prime Minister ought at least to say why we need this \$250. What is the basis for this \$250? Now if we say \$500 is for remuneration and the sum \$250 is for out of pocket allowance, for which accounts have to be submitted, then at least the people in this country will be quite happy that their money is not misused. Shall I put it this way—there are some people who can afford it and there are some people who cannot afford it; there are some people who have great difficulties of travel and there are some people who have no difficulties of travel, like the Honourable the Prime Minister, who can get the V.I.P. Cessna; there are some people who travel and some people who do not travel; and there are some people who take the money and put it in their pockets and do not use it at all. Are we going to allow those type of people to profit at public expense? On the other hand, we know that there are certain wards with areas which are so large that it is quite a problem to travel from one point of that constituency to another point of the same constituency, and I personally know of people who have come to me to borrow money—because they find it difficult to travel within their con-

stituencies. Mr. Speaker, Sir, this question of monthly allowance makes it a bit difficult and may cause misunderstanding, but if the thing had been worded remuneration for expenses or travel expenses for visiting constituency, then perhaps the argument might be different, and like the Member for Ipoh I also seek for clarification.

Enche' Othman bin Abdullah (Tanah Merah): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bila Yang Berhormat Timbalan Perdana Menteri mengemukakan Rang Undang² ini maka tersebut-lah bahawa anggota daripada Perikatan menyokong usul ini. Saya bagi pehak Persatuan Islam ingin juga mendapat tahu kalau sakira-nya daripada kami dengan sa-chara bertulis menuntut-nya, walau bagaimana pun tidak-lah rezki yang menggolek ini kami tolak. (*Ketawa*). Saperti mana juga kawan saya bagi pehak Perikatan maka saperti ini tidak kami tolak, chuma satu sahaja yang saya hendak berchakap, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-itu kenapa-kah—minta penjelasan sahaja—Ahli² Dewan Negara tidak di-naikkan sa-umpama anggota Dewan Ra'ayat ini juga.

Kedua, saya mengharapka ta' usah-lah dengan kenaikan anggota Dewan Ra'ayat ini menjadi anak tangga kepada kenaikan Ahli² dan Menteri² kita.

Enche' Mohamed Yusof bin Mahmud: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ta' hendak berchakap di-atas Bill ini, tetapi saya hendak berchakap terhadap Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh. Dia kata ahli² Perikatan ta' pernah pergi melawat ka-kawasan². Saya pun hairan. Saya ta' pernah tengok dia pergi ka-kawasan saya. Jadi bagaimana-kah satu perkataan yang di-gunakan-nya itu pada hal ia-nya belom pernah datang ka-kawasan saya.

Dato' Dr. Ismail: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am not at all surprised at the observations made by members on the Opposition bench. I had occasion to move a motion in this House for the sake of keeping the dignity of this House, and one would have thought—I would have thought—that it would have unanimous support from the

House, because it was purely a non-party affair. Now we agree that we are in the House representing the various parties, but there are issues which affect us all not as separate members of political parties but as parliamentarians. We may differ in our political views, but surely when we belong to one House we can agree at least on certain things that we think would help members of the House and that would enhance the reputation of the House. Now, Sir, I can only infer the observations made by the members of the Opposition bench that, by the Deputy Prime Minister mentioning that representations came not only from members of the Alliance Party but from members of the Opposition bench, therefore we may have concocted this idea and hence they want clarification from the Deputy Prime Minister who the individual members are who made this representation. I said I can only infer; I am not attributing to them. But I feel, Sir, that the Government in this case has weighed the question very carefully.

Now it was mentioned by the Deputy Prime Minister that the allowance of \$500 was initiated by the former Legislative Council when all the members were not elected; they were nominated. They did not have the responsibilities which elected members have now and also in those days the sittings of the House were also arranged in such a way that they will conform to some of the activities of the members present. But in this House of Parliament the call of the House has top priority over any member's private business or private activities. And further in this House, at least the Government feels that irrespective of our financial position we should be in a position to be equal in discharging our duties as parliamentarians. Some of us—and it is admitted that even members of the Alliance Party—some of them probably do less work than others, but surely the criteria is, what is expected of a Member of Parliament? That is a criterion that has weighed heavily with the Government when we considered the question of raising

Members' allowances. Now we feel that the value of money also has changed—that is the first. Secondly, we feel that members of the House, elected members, they come from various walks of life: some can afford it, some cannot, but they all would like to perform their duties not only to their constituencies but in the interest of the country. I feel sure that even in the Alliance Party we have men of properties but there are others who cannot afford. But surely they should not be penalised from doing their parliamentary work just because they are not so well off as some of us. I feel very hurt to hear all this, because we tried to make this purely a non-party affair. We feel that it is to the advantage of all and it is in the interest of all that we moved this Bill, not because we feel that we want to give it to the members of the Alliance Party who are the majority in the House. We sincerely feel that the members of the House, if we want them to perform their parliamentary duties fully with integrity, surely should not be out of pocket, and not only that but they should be able to perform their duties truly well. So I think the Government has nothing to hide in moving this Bill to the House. Thank you, Sir.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to make a brief contribution to this debate. I think that it is wrong in principle to make an increase at this stage however much it may be needed, because when a Member stands for election he knows exactly what he is in for—when he stood for election he knew that Members of Parliament were likely to be paid \$500 a month; and knowing that he must have felt that that would be sufficient to enable him to carry out his duties and obligations as a Member of Parliament. It is morally a contract entered into with the electorate. Indeed, when he was campaigning for votes, not one Member of Parliament told his electorate, "You elect me and you have got to pay me to do work for you." It was morally understood that Members who were elected would receive what their predecessors were

receiving, and I feel that it would be wrong in principle now to ask the electorate, the people who elected him, to pay more than what it bargained for. I think there is a great danger of politics becoming a profession in this country and we should not encourage that. I have nothing further to add and I leave it to the conscience of this House. So far as I am concerned, I make the same offer as the Honourable Member for Ipoh, in case the Government wants to make sure that I do not use the \$250 extra for myself.

Dato' V. T. Sambanthan: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on the matter of principles. The Honourable Member for Menglembu mentioned "principle" just now; but what is this principle? The principle is the exercise of democracy in this country. We have elected Members and some of them had been in jobs which had given greater remuneration than \$500 a month. I know it for a fact that some Members are in real difficulties, simply because they made sacrifice of their professions. They gave up their jobs saying, "I will become a Member of the Dewan Ra'ayat; I will try and serve the people." These men do not all belong to the Alliance; some belong to the Opposition. Now, Sir, do we want to penalise them for that? To-day, the Members of this House are the men who will have to see to the successful working of democracy. On them, there is a very heavy load; and we have got to help maintain the integrity of these Members. Telling them simply that, because one is rich, telling them that, because some can afford to own \$20,000 or \$40,000 cars, and placing that as a criterion and then saying that nobody should have more than \$500 a month, I think, is being quite blind to the principle.

Sir, if we want Members of this House to perform their functions properly, if we think that democracy has come to stay in this country, let us not make it the rich man's game. It will be a rich man's game, if we pay too little—it will be a game for rich men, rich lawyers, rich planters, rich estate owners, as they alone can

go into politics—and that I think is bad. We must see that ordinary men, who are Members of Parliament can look after their families happily. I was rather surprised when the Honourable Member for Dato' Kramat asked what it was all about. He knows what it is all about. I hope people are honest enough to come here and not play politics. Let us be frank. Everyone of us has known the poverty of some of the Members. We want to raise the amount because we feel that they ought to be given necessary help. The Honourable Member for Dato' Kramat knows it as much as I do. But why come to the House, and, simply for some political reasons say, "We do not want it." I think that it is wrong. We have got to be honest, Mr. Speaker, Sir, and I say we must give that extra \$250. Thank you.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid (Seberang Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun ingin memberi penjelasan sedikit berkenaan dengan kenaikan sugu hati tetap Ahli Dewan Ra'ayat. Soal ini ia-lah soal wang, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tentu-lah ada di-antara orang yang mulut-nya sahaja kata tidak mahu tetapi hati-nya tentu kata mahu. Sa-bagaimana yang telah di-terangkan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, terbit-nya kenaikan ini ia-lah memandang di-atas keadaan sa-tengah Ahli Dewan Ra'ayat ini sangat susah kerana tanggung jawab-nya berat, mereka kena mengeluarkan wang untok jamu²an, menderma kepada badan² kebajikan dan pertubohan² dan menderma kepada parti. Saya telah melawat Tokyo dan ingin membuat perbandingan ia-itu bagi Majlis Cosmopolitan mendapat elaun \$1,000 sa-bulan dan wakil Diet mendapat \$1,200 sa-bulan tiap² sa-orang. Tiap² wakil itu ada satu bilek khas dan mempunyai sa-orang kerani atau sa-bagai setia-usaha yang gaji mereka di-bayar oleh Kerajaan.

Jadi kenaikan yang saperti ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sangat-lah sesuai kalau di-bandingkan dengan negeri² yang maju. Sa-lain daripada itu elaun yang di-naikkan ini bukan kita dapat semua, kerana kita kena

bayar Income Tax sa-kurang²-nya \$250.00.

The Minister of Health and Social Welfare (Dato' Ong Yoke Lin): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for Menglembu has mentioned the matter of principle. This sort of increase in allowances for Members of Parliament is not new at all. In other Legislatures in the Commonwealth, there have been cases of allowances having been increased during their term of office. Sir, I regret very much that some Members of the Opposition are playing politics regarding this issue. I can tell the House that this matter is no secret and has not been so for a long time. It has been talked about and discussed—and I would not like to break confidences; but if you ask many Members of the Opposition to search their own hearts and say whether they gave us the impression that this Bill would be supported, you would know the answer. In point of fact, the Government Bench.....

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification—I hope that it will be remembered that we on this side sought only for clarification, but if the Ministerial bench want to carry on with the debate.....

Dato' Ong Yoke Lin: Sir, we did this in all good faith. As my Honourable colleague has just said, we will not allow this only to be a rich man's game. If that is not the feeling of certain Members of the Opposition, I think, we on the Government bench are quite prepared to withdraw this Bill.

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I had not thought that this Bill would be a controversial one as shown in many of the observations by Honourable Members from the Opposition in reply to my Honourable colleagues on this side of the bench.

Sir, as I have said, before bringing up the proposal, the Honourable the Prime Minister has given this matter very careful consideration after representations have been made to him not only by Members of the Alliance but

also by others. It is not for me here to say who are the others. It is a matter for them to speak up in this House, but I can say on behalf of the Government categorically that this is a non-party matter; and if Members of the Opposition do not want this Bill the Government is prepared to withdraw it. This is not intended for the Alliance Party only but for all Members of this House—the increase of the allowance is intended for every Member who serves in the Dewan Ra'ayat. If Members of the Opposition feel that there is no need for this increase, the Government is prepared to withdraw the Bill. (*Applause*).

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not know whether there is a Standing Order to meet this. In view of the statement made, may I ask for a recess of ten minutes?

Mr. Speaker: I have not yet a proposal whether the Government is going to withdraw this Bill. What I have heard is only, "the Government is prepared to withdraw the Bill."

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am prepared to have a recess. We think we should have a recess in order to let the Opposition make their stand clear. If they do not want this Bill, the Government is prepared to withdraw it.

Sitting suspended at 9.35 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 10.00 p.m.

THE PARLIAMENT (MEMBERS' REMUNERATION) BILL WITHDRAWAL

Mr. Speaker: There is no motion before the House under Standing Order 62 for the withdrawal of the Bill.

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: Sir, as I have made it clear, the Government position is this: if there is support from all sides of the House, then only Government is prepared to proceed with the Bill; if there is no unanimous support for this Bill, I have no alternative, Sir, but to ask your permission under Standing Order 62 to withdraw the Bill.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Sir, on a point of clarification, how is the Government going to know whether there is full support for the Bill in the House or not, unless it is put to the vote?

For further clarification, somebody asked for the adjournment of the House, but I do not know why.

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: Sir, obviously, there appears to be no unanimous support for this Bill. I therefore move, under Standing Order 62, that this Bill be withdrawn.

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Sir, I beg to second the motion. (*Applause*).

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly withdrawn.

THE CORPORATIONS DUTY ORDINANCE (REPEAL) BILL

Second Reading

The Minister of Finance (Enche' Tan Siew Sin): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to repeal the Corporations Duty Ordinance of the Straits Settlements" be read a second time.

Sir, the Corporations Duty Ordinance, Cap. 229 of the Laws of the former Straits Settlements, levies annually in respect of movable and immovable property which belongs to or is vested in any body corporate or incorporate, a duty at the rate of 3 per cent of the income or profits after allowing for certain permissible deductions in the management of such property. This Ordinance is applicable only to the States of Penang and Malacca and not to the rest of the Federation.

The administration of this Ordinance before the war is somewhat shrouded in obscurity but from information which it has been possible to collect, it would appear that the duty collected under the Ordinance was not substantial. In the case of Malacca, the amount collected was stated to be not more than \$100 per annum. No duty has been collected under this Ordinance

since the war, presumably because this type of duty is now covered by the Income Tax Ordinance, 1947. The effectiveness of the Ordinance has therefore been allowed to lapse and since it is now redundant, it is considered that it should be repealed. The States of Malacca and Penang have been consulted and both Governments are agreeable to the proposal.

Sir, I beg to move.

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

Question put, and agreed to.

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

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

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

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

THE LOCAL COUNCILS (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

The Assistant Minister of the Interior (Enche' Mohamed Ismail bin Mohamed Yusof): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to amend the Local Councils Ordinance, 1952" be read a second time.

Sir, the object of this measure is clearly stated in the Explanatory Statement at the end of the Bill before the House. Honourable Members will recall that at the April sitting of the House, it passed the Local Government Elections (Amendment) Act, 1961, which enables the Election Commission to assume responsibility for the supervision and conduct of elections to Local Councils. The Election Commission has been making all the necessary arrangements for the conduct of elections to Local Councils and has notified me that it will be in a position to hold such elections in a few months'

time—at the most nine months' time. There is, therefore, no point in holding further Local Councils elections until then.

The object of this measure is to suspend the holding of any further elections under the Local Councils Ordinance, 1952, and to extend the term of office of existing members until such date as elections are held under the Local Government Elections Act, 1960.

I would like to inform the House that the terms of this Bill have been discussed in the National Council for Local Government and have been agreed to by the Local Councils.

Sir, I beg to move.

The Assistant Minister of Rural Development (Tuan Haji Abdul Khalid bin Awang Osman): Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

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

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

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

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

THE LIFE ASSURANCE BILL

Second Reading

The Minister of Finance (Enche' Tan Siew Sin): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to make further provision with respect to policies of assurance upon human life and the carrying on of life assurance business" be read a second time.

Honourable Members will recall that in April this year, when introducing the Life Assurance (Amendment) Act, No. 20 of 1961, I informed the House that the Government intended to introduce comprehensive legislation to

ensure the growth of a sound assurance business in the country, and also to provide the maximum of protection to policy-holders. The introduction of this legislation had, however, to be deferred as we had not then been successful in recruiting an Insurance Commissioner. I am glad to say that with the co-operation of the Australian Government, the Government has now succeeded in securing the services of an Insurance Commissioner who has already arrived in the country, and is now working on our new insurance legislation, and I would like to take this opportunity to express our grateful appreciation of the invaluable assistance rendered to us in this respect by that Government. That assistance has certainly been most timely. It is, therefore, hoped that this legislation will be enacted in the not too distant future.

I also informed the House then that the Amendment Act of 1961 introduced earlier in the year was an interim measure. Its purpose was to ensure that assurance companies had a capital of \$1 million before starting business and, therefore, had a sound financial foundation. In this respect the amendment was successful, but it was not directed at ensuring that the companies' business methods were sound. Further legislation, again of an interim character, is now necessary to ensure that sound methods are adopted.

During recent months great concern has been expressed that the activities of some so-called "assurance companies". These companies through advertising in the vernacular press and intensive canvassing have persuaded tens of thousands of uninformed people to take out policies with them. On present indications, many of these people can expect to find ultimately that their policies are valueless. Hence it is urgent and imperative that the public be protected against the nefarious practices of these companies.

These mushroom companies have issued policies at rates of premia that are grossly inadequate. It is fairly certain that in the future they will be

unable to meet claims under these policies unless appropriate action is taken, and probably even if it is taken. The Bill, therefore, provides that no company can issue policies and continue to carry on a life assurance business unless its rates of premia have been approved by an actuary.

The life assurance business is a technical one. The formulation of rates of premia is a highly specialised branch of mathematics. The qualified people who make the necessary calculations, as Honourable Members know, are called actuaries and they receive years of professional training. We can only be sure that premia are adequate if they are certified as such by an actuary. If the premia are inadequate, the ultimate failure of the life assurance company concerned, followed by defaults on claims and hence losses to its policy-holders, is almost a mathematical certainty.

The Bill also gives relief to the owners of existing policies. If, and only if, the rates of premia can be proved by an actuary to be inadequate, any waiting period provided by the policy will be void and a return of premia can be obtained if it is applied for within six months of the date of commencement of the legislation.

Apart from the fact that existing companies cannot in future issue policies with inadequate premia, a new company will be similarly bound. Further, a new company will not be able to commence unless the Minister of Finance is satisfied that it will conduct its business in accordance with sound insurance principles.

It is appropriate that I should inform Honourable Members of some of the unsound practices of these mushroom companies. They ask no questions whatsoever about the state of health of the person whose life is to be assured. They charge the same rates of premia irrespective of age. They impose no maximum age limit, and most of the lives assured are old—sixty years or more. The premia would be most inadequate even if they were

assuring younger and healthy lives. The position is that people are being encouraged at a comparatively small outlay to assure people in the sole expectation of their early death. The policies being issued by these companies are frequently, or perhaps even generally, not for the laudable purpose of family protection. Many people are being encouraged to assure other people, including beggars, without their knowledge and consent, if the person effecting the policy thinks that the life assured will survive the waiting period, usually nine months and not much longer.

This is nothing more than gambling, and gambling with the most serious and dangerous implications. It is the kind of gambling which could possibly lead to the murder of completely innocent people in order that profits might be made by one party or the other. Insurance plays a vital and essential role in modern society and is based on the principle that when many people pay a small sum into a common pool, it will be fairly cheap and simple to insure themselves against disaster or loss occurring to a few. As such, it is a social boon of immeasurable value. On the other hand, life assurance as practised by the people against whom this Bill is aimed, is a grave social menace because the object of both the company and the policy-holder could be to hasten the deaths of those who are assured—in the one case, the death should take place nine months of a policy being taken out, and in the other, shortly after. I think, therefore, that every Honourable Member in this House will agree with me that the sooner this evil is wiped out from our midst, the better it will be for all concerned.

The policies being issued by these companies do not contain reasonable non-forfeiture provisions. A typical policy condition is that, however long a policy may have been in force, it shall be void if a premium is outstanding for two months. Further, there is no arrangement whatsoever for paid-up policies and surrender values,

both of which are standard features of life assurance policies the world over.

The facts I have put before Honourable Members call for this urgent legislation. I should say, however, that life assurance business in the Federation is generally conducted along sound lines and renders an invaluable service to the community. Well managed companies will not be affected adversely by this legislation, and the institution of life assurance itself should be strengthened.

Before I conclude, Sir, I would like to remind Honourable Members that an amendment slip has been circulated to Honourable Members, which I hope they have received, proposing an amendment to Clause 4 (3) of the Bill. The object of this amendment is to provide an additional penalty for life assurance companies or so-called life assurance companies for starting business before the consent of the Minister has been obtained in the form of a certificate. It is felt that because of the menace which exists now, it would have a deterrent effect if the penalty were so framed that any company which commences business before it is entitled to do so would have to pay a further penalty of \$1,000 a day.

Sir, I beg to move.

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

Enche' V. Veerappen: Mr. Speaker, Sir, we welcome this Bill, and I fully agree with the views expressed by the Minister of Finance. The fact that thousands of people have fallen easy prey to these companies of doubtful intentions goes to show the great deficiencies in our social security; and, as you see on the Order Paper, Sir, there is a motion which I hope to bring forward for the introduction of a Social Security Insurance Scheme in this country—and I hope the Government would be accepting it—and thus we would be able to provide, at least, for the great desire of the people to have security in their old age.

Enche' Kang Kock Seng (Batu Pahat): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support this Bill before the House. Sir, this is a measure which the public has been waiting for since the mushroom old age insurance companies started, some of which are disguised under enterprising names.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the ratio of premiums paid for such old age policies is inadequate. The ultimate result would be that when such companies close down, their policy-holders would be the losers. Sir, some of these policy-holders are saving every cent to pay for their policies, while others are opportunists gambling on the death of poor human-beings. It is estimated that over \$1 million is paid as premiums on these policies, and, as a result, business in the country particularly among the small traders, retailers, shop-keepers suffer. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the time has now come for the Government to remedy the situation. This exploitation of the lower income group of the population must be stopped.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I know that Section 6 of the Bill has no provision for consequences in the event of companies failing to repay the premiums if such repayment is elected by the policy-holders. Sir, there may be strong reasons for this omission, and I, therefore, leave it to the Minister concerned. Sir, I believe that such a provision is necessary and I hope, where possible, our Minister concerned would take the necessary steps. Thank you very much, Sir.

Question put, and agreed to.

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

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 4—

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move the following amendment specified in the amendment slip which has already been circulated to Honourable Members, for the purpose of which has already been explained.

Clause 4 (3)—

In line 3 after the word "dollars" add the following words—

"with a further one thousand dollars for each day on which he contravenes that sub-section."

Amendment put, and agreed to.

Clause 4, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 5 and 6—

Enche' Tan Phock Kin: I have great interest in the query raised by a Government back-bencher with regard to Section 6 that no penalty is provided, and since the Minister of Finance makes no attempt to answer, may I take this opportunity in drawing his attention to the question. Perhaps he would be able to enlighten this House as to the reason why this provision is not provided.

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the reason why I did not reply to the point made by the Honourable Member for Batu Pahat was not because I wished to ignore him, though I realise that it is a matter of some importance. The Government is aware that this is a possible loophole, and we have been giving further thought to it and if we find that this legislation requires further amendments they will be proposed in due course. But it is not so easy, as Honourable Members will appreciate, to wangle money out of people of this nature. Although you might be able to win against them legally, you might not be able to get the substance or secure the result of your victory; but the Government is very much alive to this danger and will certainly bear this in mind.

Clauses 5 and 6 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported with amendment: read the third time and passed.

**THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT
ELECTIONS (AMENDMENT)
(No. 2) BILL**

Second Reading

The Assistant Minister of the Interior (Enche' Mohamed Ismail): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to amend the Local Government Elections Act, 1960," he read a second time.

This Bill is very short and straightforward and the object is clearly stated in the explanatory statement at the end of the Bill before the House. The Election Commission recently drew attention to a certain weakness in the Local Government Elections Act, 1960, which, I regret to say, was not noticed when opportunity was taken to move certain amendments to this same Act in this House in April. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Act provides that whenever there is a casual vacancy among the elected Councillors of a local authority it shall, subject to the provisions of this section, be filled within sixty days from the date on which it occurs and an election shall be held or an appointment made accordingly. The Commission pointed out that as the law stands, the possibility exists that it may not be informed by the Council in time to arrange for the holding of an election within sixty days of the occurrence of the vacancy, in which event the vacancy could not be filled. It is considered that this weakness in the law must be corrected at once; hence the Bill before the House.

I wish to point out to this House that the terms of this Bill have been discussed in the National Council for Local Government and have been agreed to by the Council.

Sir, I beg to move.

Tuan Haji Abdul Khalid: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

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

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

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

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

**THE RUBBER EXPORT DUTY
(PENANG) BILL**

Second Reading

The Minister of Finance (Enche' Tan Siew Sin): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to provide for the payment of export duty on rubber exported from Penang, and matters connected therewith" be read a second time.

The Bill now before the House is not only short but a straight forward one. Its provisions will enable export duty to be levied on rubber produced in and exported from Penang Island as from 1st January, 1962. Consequently, as from that date export duty will replace the present excise duty on estate rubber and the annual tree tax on smallholder rubber which are payable under Sections 3 (1) and 4 (1) respectively of the Rubber Excise (Penang) Ordinance, 1949.

The annual tax, Sir, has become a source of increasing embarrassment and irritation to the rubber smallholders on the Island for a variety of reasons. In the first place, their rubber trees are generally old and therefore low-yielding. This is not all; they become less and less productive as time goes on. Secondly, the annual tax is fixed at so much, i.e., so many cents per tappable rubber tree and is payable on an arbitrarily determined average number of trees to the acre. In view of this, the tax is payable irrespective of whether the rubber is being tapped or not.

Thirdly, the quantum of tax is based on the average price ruling during the year two years prior to the year in which it is applicable. For example, the tax for 1961 would be based on the average ruling price for the year 1959, for the simple reason that this levy would have to be determined some time in 1960, and hence it would not be possible to base it on the year previous to that in which it would be applicable. The effect of this system could be that a smallholder would have to pay a higher rate of duty than his counterparts on the mainland because his levy payable in a lean year, would be based on a price level prevailing during a boom year, and *vice versa*. This incidence is further aggravated by the fact that this tax is payable in one lump sum, unlike export duty which is deducted from the proceeds of rubber as it is sold, though I should also add that it is usual to allow such payments to be made in instalments. Be that as it may, it will be seen that this is a rigid formula which has all the disadvantages inevitably associated with rigidity.

No formula, however cleverly devised, can possibly take into full account the wide variations in yield occurring as between one holding and another, particularly between those which are planted solely with high-yielding material on the one hand and those containing derelict rubber on the other. In the circumstances, all that can be done is to devise a formula which would yield in tax an amount approximately equivalent to that obtainable from a holding of average yield. Such a formula must necessarily bear hardly on those which are below average while discriminating in favour of those which are above it.

On the other hand, the imposition of export duty will not only lighten the burden to which I have referred, by paying export duty and contributing to the replanting cess the smallholders on Penang Island will be entitled to participate in the various replanting schemes which have been specially designed to assist their brethren on the mainland to replant their obsolescent

holdings. At present only a limited acreage is being replanted on Penang Island, if at all. It is in their interest, therefore, that they should start replanting their holdings before it is too late.

I am aware that the rubber trade on the Island does not welcome this proposed arrangement, and perhaps this is putting it rather mildly. They oppose it on the ground that any changes of this nature would disrupt its entrepot trade. While I agree that importers of rubber who do so with the intention of re-exporting it, would be subject to a certain measure of Customs control, the Government is prepared to do everything possible to ensure that such control is limited to the minimum necessary to ensure the effective implementation of this Order, and I am satisfied, after giving the matter considerable thought, that the entrepot trade in rubber will not suffer as a result of this new system.

Out of about 32,000 tons imported into Penang Island every year—in this connection, I have taken the average for the last three completed years—7,500 tons are remilled and turned into crepe and sheet rubber. In other words, the real entrepot trade amounts to only 24,500 tons a year. On the other hand, a total of approximately 22,000 tons is imported in the Principal Customs Area every year and the importers of such rubber have apparently found it profitable to turn such rubber into crepe in spite of an import duty of \$20 a ton. I, therefore, see no reason why this section of the trade should suffer at all, because provision will be made in the appropriate Customs Regulations and Customs Duties Order to exempt rubber imported into Penang Island if such rubber is to be subsequently re-exported.

In view of what I have said, I now commend this Bill to the House. Sir, I beg to move.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Enche' Mohamed Khir bin Johari): Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Enche' Ismail bin Idris (Penang Selatan): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun menyokong Rang Undang² ini, sebab saya menyokong-nya ia-lah sa-belum Rang Undang² ini di-bacha, maka tuan² punya kebun² kecil telah membayar chukai mengikut banyaknya pokok dalam satu ekar tanah itu. Chukai yang di-kenakan dalam tahun 1961 ia-lah 20 sen tiap² satu pokok yang boleh di-turis. Ada kala-nya sa-hingga 15 hari pada satu bulan pokok getah itu tidak dapat di-turis oleh sebab hujan. Jadi sangat susah bagi tuan² yang mempunyai kebun² kecil untuk membayar chukai yang di-kenakan pada tiap² satu pokok 20 sen pada tiap² tahun. Dengan yang demikian maka beberapa kesulitan telah berbangkit di-sebabkan chukai pokok tidak dapat di-bayar pada tiap² tahun.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perlu-lah saya beritahu dalam Dewan ini ia-itu lebeh dari 50 peratus kebun getah yang ada di-dalam kawasan Pulau Pinang di-punyai oleh tuan² punya kebun kecil yang kurang dari 5 ekar. Dan juga dengan keadaan pokok itu ada-lah sangat tua dan keluaran getah atau susu getah-nya sangat sedikit. Jadi susah mereka itu hendak menyimpan wang atau hendak mengumpul wang untuk membayar mengikut undang² yang telah di-kenakan kepada mereka itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, chukai mesti di-bayar oleh sebab di-dapati kesusahan mereka itu maka terpaksa-lah Kerajaan mengambil satu langkah atau tindakan bagi mendapatkan chukai itu. Dengan hal yang demikian, ahli² dari pekebun² kecil telah bermeshuarat dan telah pun membuat satu permohonan kepada Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan di-dalam satu perjumpaan di-antara wakil² dengan Yang Berhormat itu, maka persetujuan telah diambil sa-bagaimana maksud dalam undang² ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam pada itu suka saya hendak meminta sedikit penjelasan atau keterangan dari Yang Berhormat Menteri, apakala Rang Undang² ini di-kuat-kuasakan nanti maka ada-kah

pada fikiran Yang Berhormat ia-itu dengan sebab-nya Rang Undang² ini di-kuat-kuasakan maka ini akan menjadi sa-bagai satu step, atau satu tangga untuk menjadikan Pulau Pinang Principal Customs Area, dengan yang demikian hilang-lah hak Pulau Pinang sa-bagai sa-buah pelabohan Free Port Status. Saya sa-bagai wakil pekebun² kecil Pulau Pinang ada-lah menguchapkan berbanyak² terima kasih kepada Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan yang telah mengemukakan Rang Undang² ini dengan semata² untuk merengankan sedikit dari bebanan dan kesusahan tuan² punya kebun kecil bagi membayar chukai pendapatan itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untuk melaksanakan chara² ini, pada fikiran saya patut-lah di-adakan satu atoran supaya penjualan getah nanti dapat-lah mereka ketahu² berapa banyak-kah hasil chukai di-kenakan yang di-kehendaki oleh pengeluaran getah itu supaya dapat-lah mereka tahu berapa banyak chukai yang akan di-kenakan pada tiap² satu tahun mengikut banyaknya keluaran getah. Sa-takat ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, maka saya sa-kali lagi menguchapkan terima kasih dan menyokong penoh di-atas Rang Undang² ini.

Enche' Geh Chong Keat (Penang Utara): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support this Bill, and I am sure that the residents of Penang Island appreciate the assurance given by the Honourable the Minister of Finance, that this Rubber Export Duty (Penang) Bill is not the beginning of the thin end of the wedge. We understand and appreciate very much that the Minister of Finance is doing his best to meet the request of these smallholders in the rural areas of Penang Island, in order to solve and to lighten the rubber tax problem and at the same time protecting the interests of rubber traders. However, I must also present to this House a certain degree of anxiety felt over the trade affecting the century-old entrepot status of the Island in that it is feared that this may result gradually in turning Penang Island into

a fishing village instead of a prosperous free port enjoying entrepot facilities.

Sir, I am pleased to hear that the Honourable the Minister of Finance has agreed that importers of rubber, who do so with the intention of re-exporting them would be subject to a certain measure of Customs control and the Government is prepared to do everything possible, to ensure that such control is limited to the minimum necessary, to ensure the effective implementation of this Order. Penang traders should be pleased to hear that their entrepot trade in rubber will not be affected by the subsequent procedures, now that there will be export duties imposed on the rubber produced and exported from Penang Island.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, as we know, the more procedures that are being imposed, the more forms the traders will be asked to fill up, and that will increase overhead expenses of the traders. These formalities will increase the pressure of work of Government officers concerned and may result in taxing their patience and temper. All these problems may perhaps cause the traders to divert their rubber shipments to Singapore or elsewhere. I hope the Honourable Minister, as he has agreed in his speech, will enforce this simple, efficient and effective procedure so that the least possible inconvenience is given to rubber traders concerned.

Penang has to depend quite largely on entrepot trade, on the import and export of rubber; and as the rubber produced from the Island is going to be subjected to duty, a satisfactory method, whereby the dry rubber content may be arrived at, must be introduced so that the new method of levying tax may be successful.

Another point which I would like to bring to the notice of the Honourable the Minister of Finance is that, I understand that the rubber imported into the Mainland for processing is subject to the payment of import duty, although there is no imposition of export duty where the same lot or equivalent amount of rubber

is being re-exported. I was going to ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance, because I had my doubts when going through this new Bill, as to how would the passing of this Bill effect the rubber imported into Penang Island for processing. Would the import duty be imposed on this rubber, if imported into the Island for processing and which would in turn be re-exported? I had a sense of anxiety. I was worried that if rubber imported into Penang Island from Indonesia, Burma and other territories, were being subjected to import and export duties, that would then be the death knell of the entrepot trade of Penang Island. However, he was very kind enough to come out with an assurance that he would make the necessary and apt Customs regulations and Customs Duties Order to exempt rubber imported into Penang Island if such rubber is to be subsequently re-exported.

However, Sir, at this juncture, I would like to point out one small but important problem confronting the smallholders of Penang Island. Presently they are required to pay duty on all approved high-yielding materials from the Mainland for the purpose of carrying out the replanting programme, whereas planters on the Mainland are not required to pay duty on such planting materials as seeds, budded stumps, budwood, etc. I request for the possible immediate lifting of such duty in order to assist the planters to carry out their planting programme for 1961 and subsequent years effectively and also to comply with the advice of the Honourable the Minister of Finance that they should replant their holdings before it is too late.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, as I have said earlier, the smallholders in the Penang Island rural areas appreciate this co-operative gesture of the Minister of Finance, but it is inevitable that I must also present the anxiety and fear of the residents of Penang Island, as part of my constituency includes a portion of the City of George Town. The fear involves the repercussive

effect of this Bill on the free port status of Penang Island—and rubber is one of the main commodities of the entrepot trade of Penang Island. The fear has also been expressed by my Honourable colleague, the Member for Penang Selatan that this may also be the beginning of the Principal Customs Area. However, it is encouraging that the Honourable the Minister of Finance has shown that he has no intention of working in that angle. For the time being, I feel we are quite safe; if I am to judge by the speech in the introducing of this Bill. In this field I must specifically point out, that it does not imply that the population of Penang Island want or claim the best of two worlds. We only wish that the Minister of Finance will understand that we are only struggling to retain whatever little we have that is vital to Penang Island and the Mainland—the entrepot status on which it was founded and had thrived upon since the 18th century. Thank you.

Enche' Tan Phock Kin (Tanjong): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am rather amused to hear the speeches from two Alliance back-benchers on the subject of the free port status of Penang. They have expressed their anxiety and have pleaded to the Minister not to get rid of the free port status of Penang. I must remind them that they were returned to this House on a platform, which made no mention whatsoever that Penang might lose its free port status should the Alliance be returned to power. I will say that if the Honourable Minister of Finance has the audacity to deprive Penang of its free port status, it is a breach of an election pledge, because during the elections no mention was made whatsoever. If it is the intention of the Alliance Government to get rid of the free port status of Penang, then I feel that they should make that an election issue—before they do that they have no business whatsoever to talk or even to mention about it. I say so because I feel that in a democracy like ours, the opinions and views of the people are of utmost importance and, unless you can get a mandate, it will be wrong for our

two Honourable Members to have any anxiety over this problem; and I personally feel that it is their duty to prevail upon their Minister, should be decide to act contrary to the pledges of the Alliance Government.

Sir, I for one welcome this Bill because I realise that the problem of smallholders in Penang has been a real one. Though this Bill is a bit belated to be implemented as from 1st January, 1962, though we have heard of the hardships faced by the smallholders, I feel that something more should be done for them. I have heard the two Honourable Members of the two rural constituencies in Penang speaking on behalf of the smallholders.

Enche' Geh Chong Keat: Sir, on a point of clarification, I have said that my constituency includes part of the City of George Town, Penang Island, and not rural areas of Penang.

Enche' Tan Phock Kin: Well, I shall put it this way, one representative of a rural constituency and another representative of a partially rural and partially urban constituency. (*Laughter*). I personally feel that since everyone of us have agreed, including the Honourable Minister of Finance, that the smallholders in Penang Island have faced a great deal of hardships—and a lot of them, according to our Honourable Member from Penang Selatan, are very poor people; and I know of cases in which they have even to pawn the jewellery of their families, in order to pay for this duty on rubber trees—I feel that since we are all agreed that they deserve to be exempted, and since we have already collected duty from them for many years, perhaps, the Minister will consider giving them some sort of a subsidy; in what form the subsidy will take, I leave it entirely to the discretion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. I feel, Sir, that if that is possible, the Government will be showing, in a very concrete manner, how they appreciate the plight of these people and how they are going, in a very constructive manner, to assist them. It is no good

paying lip-service by saying that you realise their plight without doing anything constructive. It is my hope that the Honourable Minister of Finance will give serious consideration to my suggestion.

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to say that I am very grateful to the Honourable Members who have spoken in support of this Bill, and I would try to clarify the issues they raised, if not to set some of their fears at rest.

With regard to the question of export duty on planting material exported to the Island, I might inform the House that the Ministry of Commerce and Industry has a scheme for planting up, I think, about three seed gardens which would be able to supply planting material to smallholders at greatly reduced prices, and I have no doubt that when the scheme is brought to completion, the benefits of that scheme would be easily available to the smallholders of Penang Island.

I do not think, however, that it would be possible to exempt planting material from export duty in the ordinary way because, as I have said on previous occasions, Penang Island cannot have of both ways. If Penang feels that it should be entitled to the benefits of the Principal Customs Area, the solution, I think, is obvious. I can categorically assure the Honourable Member who asked me if the import duty of \$20 a ton would be payable on rubber imported into Penang, that the answer is in the negative—I am glad to say it. With regard to the dry rubber content of wet rubber imported into Penang, we have in the Principal Customs Area a system whereby such D.R.C. is determined and, as far as I know, no complaints have been raised about our system. I think it is quite fair and, Honourable Members will find when it is working, that there should be no unjust manipulation of figures or percentages of rubber imported.

I believe again the Ministry of Commerce and Industry or the Depart-

ment of Information Services are aware that smallholders are sometimes defrauded of their legitimate price in the sense that they do not get the full price for their produce, and I think we can consider whether it is possible to extend a system, which I believe is in force now, whereby smallholders are warned in advance of the price they should receive from the rubber dealers.

The last item concerns the future of the free port status of Penang. As some of the Honourable Members who have spoken are aware, I, in fact, only got this idea of introducing export duty on Penang rubber when I went to Penang at the request of the Honourable Members concerned to look into the plight of smallholders there and I felt that this was the fairest way out. So, I do not think that it can be said that this proposal has any connection with the free port status of Penang, which is an entirely different matter. I do not, however, share the pessimistic views of one of the Honourable Members that Penang will one day, either in the near or distant future, be relegated to the status of a fishing village. I have far too much faith in the resourcefulness of the inhabitants of Penang Island and, not only that, I also have a soft spot for the charm of the Island and I would be the last person to try to relegate it to the status of a fishing village either now or in the distant future.

Question put, and agreed to.

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

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

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

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

MOTIONS

THE CUSTOMS DUTIES ORDER,
1961

(Statute Paper No. 41 of 1961)

Minister of Finance (Enche' Tan Siew Sin): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move the motion standing in my name, viz.—

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of sub-section (2) of Section 10 of the Customs Ordinance, 1952, the Customs Duties Order, 1961, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 41 of 1961 be confirmed.

Sir, this Order under the Customs Ordinance has been made and it is presented to the House, as the Ordinance requires, for confirmation. In the ordinary course of events it is stipulated for obvious reasons, that Customs Duties Orders come into force as soon as they are published. This Order, however, has been made for purely technical reasons on which I will touch later, and it will not come into force until 1st January, 1962. It does not alter the rate of duty payable on any article on 22nd August, 1961, that is to say, on the date on which I made the Order.

Honourable Members may, however, be aware that the rate of duty on sodium arsenite was raised to 95 cents per gallon and \$9.50 per cwt. on 1st September, 1961 by virtue of the Customs Duties (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1961. A motion to confirm that change stands in my name in the Order Paper and will be taken at a later stage in the proceedings of this session.

In consequence of that change, it will be necessary for me in due course to make and present to the House for confirmation, a further Order, amending the Customs Duties Order, 1961 by substituting for the figures \$7.00 and 70 cents appearing in Codes 514.404 and 514.405 respectively on page 28 of Statute Paper No. 41, the figures \$9.50 and 95 cents respectively, which are the rates of duty actually in force at present.

Honourable Members will recollect that the Customs Duties Order, 1959, which was confirmed by the House on 26th November, 1959 introduced into this country a form of tariff directly related to the Malayan Trade Classification which is itself based on the Standard International Trade Classification sponsored by the United Nations Organisation. The importance of the Classification may be judged from the fact that in 1960 countries accounting for about 80% of world trade were compiling trade-by-commodity data in accordance with it. A number of countries including some Commonwealth countries use it, as we do, as the basis of their customs tariff.

The customs tariff in many countries, however, is based on a system sponsored by the Customs Co-operation Council and known as the Brussels Nomenclature for the Classification of Goods in Customs Tariffs and the existence of two classifications, one for trade statistics and another for customs, caused a good deal of difficulty and, indeed, confusion.

To obviate this a group of experts worked out a revised classification combining the original Standard International Trade Classification with the Brussels Trade Nomenclature. That revised classification is the Standard International Trade Classification, Revised, 1960 on which the Order which I am now asking the House to confirm, is based. It combines the merits of the former Standard International Trade Classification with the advantages of the Brussels Customs Tariff Nomenclature. Indeed, it is a very precise and detailed document and since the Customs, in construing it, will adopt the principles laid down in the Brussels Nomenclature, we have a tariff in which the classification of goods will follow even clearer and more precise rules than those hitherto followed.

Perhaps Honourable Members would be interested by a simple illustration of the way in which the Classification works. Let us consider an ordinary

rotan suitcase. Suitcases are travel goods and travel goods fall, normally, into Division 83, Group 831 on page 83 of the Statute Paper, but, if you will read the note to that Group, you will see that articles of basketwork are stated to be excluded from it. There can be no mistake or doubt. We must look elsewhere and will, in fact, find travel goods of basketwork specially provided for on page 98 under code 899.221. Lest you should think that it would have taken you a long time to find either travel goods generally or basketwork travel goods in particular if I had not given you the references, I should like to add that an edition of the Tariff with an alphabetical index containing about ten thousand items will be on sale to the public well before the Order comes into force.

Honourable Members who are familiar with the Customs Duties Order, 1959, will notice that the layout of this Order differs from it in one obvious particular. In the 1959 Order the rates of import duty and export duty were shown in a single Schedule, straight across the page. In the Order now before the House, the First Schedule shows import duties only. Export duties, now considerably fewer than they were when the 1959 Order was made, have been relegated to a separate schedule, the Second Schedule, which with its Appendices, occupies only the last four pages of the Statute Paper.

The form of the new Order has, so far as it concerns the classification of goods (but not, of course, the Tariff) been worked out in agreement with the Government of Singapore, so that the Federation and Singapore will continue, as in the past, to use identical forms of trade classification and the production of Pan-Malayan trade figures will continue as before.

Honourable Members will probably share my hope that no further re-cast of the form of our trade classification and tariff should be required for many more years. That is, I am informed, a hope most devoutly shared by the officers on whom has fallen the

laborious and difficult task of preparing the new Order.

Sir, I beg to move.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Enche' Mohamed Khir bin Johari): Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of sub-section (2) of Section 10 of the Customs Ordinance, 1952, the Customs Duties Order, 1961, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 42 of 1961 be confirmed.

THE CUSTOMS DUTIES (AMENDMENT) (No. 2) ORDER, 1961

(Statute Paper No. 42 of 1961)

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move the motion standing in my name. The Amendment Order before Honourable Members to-day is presented to the House for confirmation as required by the Customs Ordinance, 1952.

This Order effects increases in the rate of import duty on sodium arsenite from \$7.00 to \$9.50 per cwt. in the case of sodium arsenite in powder form, and from 70 cents to 95 cents per gallon in the case of sodium arsenite in liquid form. These increases took effect from 1st September, 1961.

I should perhaps explain that these increases in duty were not imposed on revenue grounds; indeed no part of the proceeds of the extra levy will go to swell the coffers of the Treasury.

Considerations other than revenue have dictated these increases which, in this case at least, I am informed, will not be grudged by the users of sodium arsenite on whom the burden of the increased duties will fall. These other considerations concern Ministeries other than my own and I am, therefore, asking my colleague the Honourable the Minister of Commerce and Industry

to inform the House of the reasons for this Order.

Sir, I beg to move,

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of Section 10 of the Customs Ordinance, 1952, the Customs Duties (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1961, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 42 of 1961 be confirmed.

Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari:

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to second the motion. As explained by my colleague the Honourable Minister of Finance, the purpose of this Order is to increase the import duty on sodium arsenite, by \$2.50 per cwt. on powder and 25 cents per gallon on liquid sodium arsenite, and the additional levy is to be credited to a Fund to be applied for the purpose of paying compensation to owners of livestock whose animals can be shown to the satisfaction of the Government to have died of sodium arsenite poisoning. The Government is aware that in the past many livestock owners in the rural areas had incurred heavy losses as a result of their animals being killed, directly or otherwise, through eating grass contaminated with sodium arsenite used for killing weeds on rubber holdings. It is sometimes not entirely the fault of the livestock owner that his cattle should go into contact with sodium arsenite, but the onus of proof is on the owner that he did exercise due care to prevent his animal from wandering into areas poisoned with sodium arsenite before he gets some measure of compensation.

The Government considers that livestock owners, who are usually peasant farmers and smallholders, should not be made to suffer financial hardship as a result of the loss of their animals and it is with this objective in view that the Government has decided to establish a Livestock Compensation Fund, out of which compensation will be paid as expeditiously as possible to livestock owners who can show to the satisfaction of the Government that their animals died as a result of sodium arsenite poisoning. The Fund will be

administered by a Committee consisting of Government officials and representatives of the rubber industry. This Committee, which will shortly be set up, will work out the details of the compensation scheme.

I would like to add that this scheme is only a temporary measure, pending the availability of a suitable and economic substitute for sodium arsenite as a weed killer. It is proposed, therefore, to put this scheme into effect for an initial period of six months in the first instance, and if found to be satisfactory, it will be extended for a further period of a year, subject to revision every six months.

This scheme has the full support of the rubber industry which is the single largest user of sodium arsenite. The Rubber Producers Council, which is the organ which speaks on behalf of the rubber industry in this country, has given an assurance to the Government that will co-operate fully with the Government to make this scheme a success.

Enche' Ahmad bin Arshad (Muar Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ada-lah mengalu²kan dan menyokong atas chadangan yang telah di-bawa oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan tadi. Di-tempat saya ada-lah satu kawasan yang banyak menjadi mangsa berhubung dengan rachun rumput sodium arsenite ini. Walau macham mana pun dengan keadaan saperti mana yang telah di-terangkan oleh Yang Berhormat berhubung dengan perkara itu di-masa yang akan datang, saya sangat-lah berbesar hati, oleh sebab saya memandangkan yang rachun ubat ini bukan sahaja boleh membunuh lalang, tetapi juga boleh di-jadikan baja atas tanam²an. Jadi pada masa sekarang ini mustahak-lah bagi pekebun² menghendaki pertolongan ini terutama sa-kali fahaman orang² kampong di-kebun² baharu.....

Mr. Speaker: Ini ada-lah masalah berkenaan dengan pembayaran ganti rugi binatang² yang mati memakan

rachun rumpit. Tidak-lah ia berchakap berkenaan dengan rachun itu menjadi baja. Itu tidak termasuk.

Enche' Ahmad bin Arshad: Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, walau bagaimana pun saya sangat menghargakan atas peratoran yang hendak di-jalankan ini.

Enche' Mohamed Yusof bin Mahmud (Temerloh): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong atas usul yang di-bawa ini. Saya dengar orang² yang kerbau-nya mati kerana termakan rachun akan di-beri sagu hati. Saya juga berpendapat bahawa boleh wang ini digunakan supaya tempat yang digunakan rachun itu di-pagar supaya kerbau² atau lembu² itu, tidak dapat masuk ka-dalam kebun² yang menggunakan rachun² ini. Saya sayang kepada binatang² itu kerana sangat besar guna-nya kepada peladang². Tidak ada ma'ana duit kepada peladang, kerana kerbau itu besar guna-nya. Saya harap dapat di-timbangkan bukan sahaja di-beri wang kepada kerbau² yang mati tetapi tempat yang di-gunakan itu patut di-beri bantuan wang untok di-pagar supaya ta' dapat kerbau itu masuk.

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I welcome the assurances of support which have been given to this motion from the Honourable Members who have spoken in favour of it. My Honourable friend, the Member for Temerloh, has made a suggestion which my Honourable friend and colleague, the Minister of Commerce and Industry, has taken note of.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of section 10 of the Customs Ordinance, 1952, the Customs Duties (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1961, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 42 of 1961 be confirmed.

THE INCOME TAX ORDINANCE, 1947

AMENDMENT TO FIRST SCHEDULE

(The Federation of Family Planning Associations and affiliated State Family Planning Associations)

The Minister of Finance (Enche' Tan Siew Sin): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move the motion standing in my name, which reads—

That this House in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 102 (1) of the Income Tax Ordinance, 1947, resolves that there be added to the First Schedule of the Income Tax Ordinance, 1947, the following new item:

“The Federation of Family Planning Associations and affiliated State Family Planning Associations”.

Sir, Section 13 (1) (e) of the Income Tax Ordinance provides that the income of any institution, authority, person, or fund specified in the First Schedule to the Ordinance shall be exempt from income tax. There is also provision under Section 102 (1) of the Ordinance for changes in the Schedule to be authorised by a resolution of this House.

The motion now before the House is that the Federation of Family Planning Associations and affiliated State Family Planning Associations be added to the First Schedule and thereby granted exemption from the payment of income tax.

This Association, as Honourable Members will probably know, is a voluntary organisation which seeks to help the people of this country to plan and regulate the size of the families by providing a free service. The work of the Association will help to mitigate the evils of ill-health and overcrowding consequent upon the arrival of the children who cannot properly be cared for and to ensure healthy children who will be an asset to the nation.

It is, therefore, considered that the grant of exemption from income tax will be a good gesture on the part of

the Government towards helping the Association to achieve this aim.

Sir, I beg to move.

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

Question put, and agreed to.
Resolved,

That this House in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 102 (1) of the Income Tax Ordinance, 1947, hereby resolves that there be added to the First Schedule of the Income Tax Ordinance, 1947, the following new item:

“The Federation of Family Planning Associations and affiliated State Family Planning Associations”.

THE INCOME TAX ORDINANCE, 1947

AMENDMENT TO FIRST SCHEDULE

(The Football Association of Malaya)

The Minister of Finance (Enche' Tan Siew Sin): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move—

That this House in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 102 (1) of the Income Tax Ordinance, 1947, resolves that there be added to the First Schedule of the Income Tax Ordinance, 1947, the following new item with effect from 1st January, 1961—

“The Football Association of Malaya”.

The resolution before the House is similar in purpose to that on the Federation of Family Planning Associations which was passed a little while ago. It seeks to add another association, this time the Football Association of Malaya, to the First Schedule of the Income Tax Ordinance so that it may be exempted from income tax under the provisions of section 13 (1) (e) of the Ordinance.

The Association is a national institution which controls football in the Federation of Malaya. Any profits

made by the Association are ploughed back and used for the general purpose of improving the standard of the game and for providing better facilities to encourage interest in the sport. A six-storey building is at present being erected by the Association from its own resources and will be used as a hostel and club house, among other things, and will provide training facilities and accommodation both for home and visiting teams.

Since Merdeka, the Association has each year held a Merdeka Football Festival in which national teams from neighbouring countries participate. It has also held Asian Youth Tournaments. By inviting teams from other countries to play here and by sending out Malayan teams to other countries in reciprocation, the Association is fostering a great deal of international goodwill. Further, these international and other tournaments sponsored by the Association have contributed significantly to the building up of a Malayan consciousness among Malaysians of all races.

There are, therefore, cogent reasons for encouraging the work of the Association and with this end in view it is considered that the Association should be assisted by exempting it from the payment of income tax under the provisions of section 13 of the Ordinance.

Sir, I beg to move.

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

Questions put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 102 (1) of the Income Tax Ordinance, 1947, resolves that there be added to the First Schedule of the Income Tax Ordinance, 1947, the following new item with effect from 1st January, 1961—

“The Football Association of Malaya”.

Adjourned at 11.30 p.m.