

Volume I
No. 11



Tuesday
14th July, 1964

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

OFFICIAL REPORT

**FIRST SESSION OF THE SECOND PARLIAMENT
OF MALAYSIA**

CONTENTS

BILLS:

The Internal Security (Amendment) Bill [Col. 1429]

The Income Tax Bill [Col. 1489]

**The Criminal Law (Temporary Provisions) (Amendment)
Bill [Col. 1500]**

The Supplementary Supply (1963 and 1964) Bill [Col. 1504]

MALAYSIA

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

Official Report

First Session of the Second Dewan Ra'ayat

Tuesday, 14th July, 1964

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

PRESENT:

- The Honourable Mr Speaker, TUAN SYED ESA BIN ALWEE, J.M.N., S.M.J., P.I.S. (Batu Pahat Dalam).
- „ the Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Defence, Minister of National and Rural Development and Minister of Lands and Mines, TUN HAJI ABDUL RAZAK BIN DATO' HUSSAIN, S.M.N. (Pekan).
- „ the Minister of Home Affairs and Minister of Justice, 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. (Sungei Siput).
- „ the Minister of Transport, DATO' HAJI SARDON BIN HAJI JUBIR, P.M.N. (Pontian Utara).
- „ the Minister of Health, ENCHE' BAHAMAN BIN SAMSUDIN (Kuala Pilah).
- „ the Minister of Education, ENCHE' ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAJI TALIB (Kuantan).
- „ the Minister of Commerce and Industry, DR LIM SWEE AUN, J.P. (Larut Selatan).
- „ the Minister for Welfare Services, TUAN HAJI ABDUL HAMID KHAN BIN HAJI SAKHAWAT ALI KHAN, J.M.N., J.P. (Batang Padang).
- „ the Minister for Local Government and Housing, ENCHE' KHAW KAI-BOH, P.J.K. (Ulu Selangor).
- „ the Minister for Sarawak Affairs, DATO' TEMENGGONG JUGAH ANAK BARIENG, P.M.N., P.D.K. (Sarawak).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Commerce and Industry, TUAN HAJI ABDUL KHALID BIN AWANG OSMAN (Kota Star Utara).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Lands and Mines, ENCHE' MOHD. GHAZALI BIN HAJI JAWI (Ulu Perak).
- „ the Assistant Minister of National and Rural Development and Assistant Minister of Justice, ENCHE' ABDUL-RAHMAN BIN YA'KUB (Sarawak).

- The Honourable the Assistant Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives,
ENCHE' SULAIMAN BIN BULON (Bagan Datoh).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Youth, Culture and Sports,
ENGKU MUHSEIN BIN ABDUL KADIR (Trengganu Tengah).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Education, ENCHE' LEE SIOK YEW,
A.M.N., P.J.K. (Sepang).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL GHANI BIN ISHAK, A.M.N. (Melaka Utara).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL KARIM BIN ABU, A.M.N. (Melaka Selatan).
- „ WAN ABDUL KADIR BIN ISMAIL (Kuala Trengganu Utara).
- „ WAN ABDUL RAHMAN BIN DATU TUANKU BUJANG (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDUL RASHID BIN HAJI JAIS (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAUF BIN A. RAHMAN, K.M.N., P.J.K.
(Krian Laut).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAZAK BIN HAJI HUSSIN (Lipis).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL SAMAD BIN GUL AHMAD MIANJI
(Pasar Mas Hulu).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI MOHD. SALLEH, A.M.N.,
S.M.J., P.I.S. (Segamat Utara).
- „ ENCHE' ABU BAKAR BIN HAMZAH (Bachok).
- „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN ABDULLAH (Kelantan Hilir).
- „ ENCHE' AHMAD BIN ARSHAD, A.M.N. (Muar Utara).
- „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN SAAID (Seberang Utara).
- „ CHE' AJIBAH BINTI ABOL (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' ALI BIN HAJI AHMAD (Pontian Selatan).
- „ O.K.K. DATU ALIUDDIN BIN DATU HARUN, P.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ DR AWANG BIN HASSAN, S.M.J. (Muar Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Muar Dalam).
- „ ENCHE' JONATHAN BANGAU ANAK RENANG (Sarawak).
- „ PENGARAH BANYANG ANAK JANTING (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN CHONG WEN, A.M.N. (Kluang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN SEONG YOON (Setapak).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN SIANG SUN (Bentong).
- „ ENCHE' CHEN WING SUM (Damansara).
- „ ENCHE' CHIA CHIN SHIN (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' FRANCIS CHIA NYUK TONG (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' CHIA THYE POH (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' CHIN FOON (Ulu Kinta).
- „ ENCHE' C.V. DEVAN NAIR (Bungsar).
- „ ENCHE' EDWIN ANAK TANGKUN (Sarawak).
- „ DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI ABDUL MAJID
(Johor Bahru Timor).
- „ DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI HASHIM, P.M.N.
(Jitra-Padang Terap).
- „ ENCHE' S. FAZUL RAHMAN, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' GANING BIN JANGKAT (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' GEH CHONG KEAT, K.M.N. (Penang Utara).

The Honourable DR GOH KENG SWEE (Singapore).

- „ ENCHE' HAMZAH BIN ALANG, A.M.N. (Kapar).
- „ ENCHE' HANAFIAH BIN HUSSAIN, A.M.N. (Jerai).
- „ ENCHE' HARUN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Baling).
- „ WAN HASSAN BIN WAN DAUD (Tumpat).
- „ ENCHE' STANLEY HO NGUN KHIU, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN TO' MUDA HASSAN, A.M.N. (Raub).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN MOHD. NOORDIN, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Parit).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN SULAIMAN (Ulu Kelantan).
- „ TUAN HAJI HUSSAIN RAHIMI BIN HAJI SAMAN
(Kota Bharu Hulu).
- „ ENCHE' IKHWAN ZAINI (Sarawak).
- „ DATO' SYED JA'AFAR BIN HASAN ALBAR, P.M.N.
(Johor Tenggara).
- „ ENCHE' JEK YEUN THONG (Singapore).
- „ PENGHULU JINGGUT ANAK ATTAN (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' KADAM ANAK KIAI (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' KAM WOON WAH, J.P. (Sitiawan).
- „ ENCHE' KHOO PENG LOONG (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' KOW KEE SENG (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' EDMUND LANGGU ANAK SAGA (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' LEE KUAN YEW (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SAN CHOON, K.M.N. (Segamat Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SECK FUN (Tanjong Malim).
- „ ENCHE' AMADEUS MATHEW LEONG, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' LING BENG SIEW (Sarawak).
- „ DR LIM CHONG EU (Tanjong).
- „ ENCHE' LIM HUAN BOON (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' LIM PEE HUNG (Alor Star).
- „ ENCHE' PETER LO SU YIN (Sabah).
- „ DR MAHATHIR BIN MOHAMAD (Kota Star Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' T. MAHIMA SINGH, J.P. (Port Dickson).
- „ ENCHE' JOE MANJAJI (Sabah).
- „ DR HAJI MEGAT KHAS, J.P., P.J.K. (Kuala Kangsar).
- „ ENCHE' MOHD. ARIF SALLEH, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED ASRI BIN HAJI MUDA, P.M.K.
(Pasir Puteh).
- „ ORANG TUA MOHAMMAD DARA BIN LANGPAD (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' MOHD. DAUD BIN ABDUL SAMAD (Besut).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED IDRIS BIN MATSIL, J.M.N., P.J.K., J.P.
(Jelebu-Jempol).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED NOORDIN BIN MASTAN, A.M.N., P.J.K.
(Seberang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' MOHD. TAHIR BIN ABDUL MAJID, S.M.S., P.J.K.
(Kuala Langat).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED YUSOF BIN MAHMUD, A.M.N. (Temerloh).

- The Honourable ENCHE' MOHD. ZAHIR BIN HAJI ISMAIL (Sungei Patani).
- „ WAN MOKHTAR BIN AHMAD (Kemaman).
- „ TUAN HAJI MOKHTAR BIN HAJI ISMAIL (Perlis Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' MUHAMMAD FAKHRUDDIN BIN HAJI ABDULLAH (Pasar Mas Hilir).
- „ TUAN HAJI MUHAMMAD SU'AUT BIN HAJI MUHD. TAHIR (Sarawak).
- „ DATO' HAJI MUSTAPHA BIN HAJI ABDUL JABAR, D.P.M.S., A.M.N., J.P. (Sabak Bernam).
- „ ENCHE' MUSTAPHA BIN AHMAD (Tanah Merah).
- „ ENCHE' NG FAH YAM (Batu Gajah).
- „ DR NG KAM POH, J.P. (Telok Anson).
- „ ENCHE' ONG KEE HUI (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN HAJI OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Hilir Perak).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Perlis Utara).
- „ ABANG OTHMAN BIN HAJI MOASILI (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' QUEK KAI DONG, J.P. (Seremban Timor).
- „ ENCHE' S. RAJARATNAM (Singapore).
- „ TUAN HAJI RAHMAT BIN HAJI DAUD, A.M.N. (Johor Bahru Barat).
- „ ENCHE' RAMLI BIN OMAR (Krian Darat).
- „ TUAN HAJI REDZA BIN HAJI MOHD. SAID, P.J.K., J.P. (Rembau-Tampin).
- „ RAJA ROME BIN RAJA MA'AMOR (Kuala Selangor).
- „ ENCHE' SANDOM ANAK NYUAK (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' SEAH TENG NGIAB, P.I.S. (Muar Pantai).
- „ ENCHE' D.R. SEENIVASAGAM (Ipoh).
- „ ENCHE' S.P. SEENIVASAGAM (Menglembu).
- „ ENCHE' SIM BOON LIANG (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' SIOW LOONG HIN, P.J.K. (Seremban Barat).
- „ ENCHE' SNG CHIN JOO (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' SOH AH TECK (Batu Pahat).
- „ ENCHE' SULEIMAN BIN ALI (Dungun).
- „ PENGIRAN TAHIR PETRA (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' TAJUDIN BIN ALI, P.J.K. (Larut Utara).
- „ ENCHE' TAI KUAN YANG (Kulim Bandar Bharu).
- „ ENCHE' TAMA WENG TINGGANG WAN (Sarawak).
- „ DR TAN CHEE KHOON (Batu).
- „ ENCHE' TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Melaka).
- „ ENCHE' TAN TSAK YU (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' TIAH ENG BEE (Kluang Utara).
- „ ENCHE' TOH THEAM HOCK (Kampar).
- „ PENGHULU FRANCIS UMPAU ANAK EMPAM (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' YEH PAO TZE (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' YEOH TAT BENG (Bruas).
- „ ENCHE' STEPHEN YONG KUET TZE (Sarawak).

The Honourable ENCHE' YONG NYUK LIN (Singapore).

„ TUAN HAJI ZAKARIA BIN HAJI MOHD. TAIB (Langat).

ABSENT:

The Honourable the Prime Minister, Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Youth, Culture and Sports, Y.T.M. TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN PUTRA AL-HAJ, K.O.M. (Kuala Kedah).

„ the Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives, ENCHE' MOHD. KHIR BIN JOHARI (Kedah Tengah).

„ the Minister of Labour, ENCHE' V. MANICKAVASAGAM, J.M.N., P.J.K. (Klang).

„ the Minister of Information and Broadcasting, ENCHE' SENU BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Kubang Pasu Barat).

„ ENCHE' ABDUL RAHIM ISHAK (Singapore).

„ DATO' ABDULLAH BIN ABDULRAHMAN, Dato' Bijaya di-Raja (Kuala Trengganu Selatan).

„ Y.A.M. TUNKU ABDULLAH IBNI AL-MARHUM TUANKU ABDUL RAHMAN, P.P.T. (Rawang).

„ DATU GANIE GILONG, P.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).

„ ENCHE' HANAFI BIN MOHD. YUNUS, A.M.N., J.P. (Kulim Utara).

„ ENCHE' HO SEE BENG (Singapore).

„ ENCHE' IBRAHIM BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Seberang Tengah).

„ ENCHE' ISMAIL BIN IDRIS (Penang Selatan).

„ DATO' KHOO SIAK CHIEW (Sabah).

„ ENCHE' LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).

„ DATO' LIM KIM SAN, D.U.T. (Singapore).

„ DATO' NIK AHMAD KAMIL, D.K., S.P.M.K., S.M.J.K., P.M.N., P.Y.G.P., Dato' Sri Setia Raja ((Kota Bharu Hilir).

„ ENCHE' ONG PANG BOON (Singapore).

„ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN WOK (Singapore).

„ DATO' DONALD ALOYSIUS STEPHENS, P.D.K. (Sabah).

„ ENCHE' TAN CHENG BEE, J.P. (Bagan).

„ ENCHE' TAN TOH HONG (Bukit Bintang).

„ DR TOH CHIN CHYE (Singapore).

„ ENCHE' WEE TOON BOON (Singapore).

PRAYERS

(Mr Speaker *in the Chair*)

BILLS

THE INTERNAL SECURITY (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Order read for resumption of debate on Question: "That the Bill be now read a second time", be amended to, "That the Bill be read a second time on this day six months." (13th July, 1964.)

Mr Speaker: Ahli² Yang Berhormat, saya suka hendak mengingatkan ia-itu ramai sudah Ahli² Yang Berhormat telah mengambil bahagian perbahathan dalam chara Rang Undang² Pindaan Keselamatan Dalam Negeri. Saya perchaya ada lagi Ahli² yang hendak berchakap. Sebab memikirkan ada 9 lagi Rang Undang² yang hendak di-habiskan sa-hingga pada malam esok, terutama sa-kali Rang Undang² Perbekalan Tambahan 1963 dan 1964 yang akan mengambil masa yang panjang, saya terpaksa menutup perbahathan ini lebeh kurang pada jam 11.30 pada pagi ini dan saya minta

Menteri² yang berkenaan menjawab segala pandangan dan pendapat dan tegoran² daripada Ahli² Yang Berhormat. Ahli² yang dapat berchakap pada pagi ini, saya harap-lah beruchap dengan sa-berapa rengkas-nya, supaya dapat memberi peluang kepada Ahli² yang lain berchakap.

Enche' Mohamed Asri bin Haji Muda (Pasir Puteh): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-hadapan kita ini ada satu pindaan untuk meminda Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri, tahun 1960. Saya maseh tidak lupa waktu Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri itu di-bentangkan buat pertama kalinya pada tahun 1960 dahulu, Parti PAS di-dalam memberikan pandangan² dan keritik² yang membina telah memberikan sokongan yang hangat kepada Undang² Keselamatan itu—sokongan yang di-berikan beberapa tahun dahulu itu telah berdasarkan kepada kehendak² bagi mengawal kedaulatan dan kemerdekaan negeri kita ini dan bagi mengawal keamanan dan ketenteraman di-dalam negara kita ini. Kita mengakui bahawa tidak akan wujud keselamatan di-dalam negara kita ini jika gerakan² atau usaha² atau pun kegiatan² yang sengaja hendak meruntuhkan keamanan negeri ini, yang sengaja hendak mengkochar-kachirkan pentadbiran negeri ini, yang sengaja hendak menjatuhkan dan meleborkan kedaulatan dan kemerdekaan negara kita di-chegah. Itu-lah sebab-nya pehak PAS beberapa tahun yang lalu telah memberikan sokongan yang sa-wajar-nya terhadap Rang Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri itu.

Sambil itu parti PAS, dalam ingatan saya, telah memberikan juga pandangan², supaya jangan-lah dengan Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri itu di-salah gunakan dalam melaksanakan kehendak² Undang² tersebut. Sebab kedudukan Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri itu sendiri membuka pintu yang luas, dan memberi kuasa yang sa-penoh-nya kepada pehak Menteri Yang Berhormat bagi melakukan sa-barang langkah dan tindakan untuk menjamin ketenteraman dalam negeri ini. Maka tidak mustahil kalau sa-kira-nya perasaan²

yang terselit, perasaan² atau pun semangat² menyebelah pehak itu bahawa politik pileh kaseh atau pun perasaan ka-partian dan tidak mustahil dengan Undang² yang mempunyai kuasa yang lebar dan luas itu akan dapat di-salah gunakan Undang² ini dengan arahan dan tujuan yang lain. Itu-lah satu peringatan yang telah di-keluarkan oleh pehak PAS dua tiga tahun yang lalu waktu pindaan Internal Security Act di-kemukakan dalam Rumah yang mulia ini.

Akan tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, semenjak Undang² ini di-kuat kuasakan dan pehak Kerajaan mendapat kuasa yang sa-penoh-nya bagi melaksanakan tugas² mengikut asas Undang² itu, kita dapati ada berlaku hal² yang boleh di-katakan atau pun di-maksudkan dengan ta'rif penyalah-gunaan terhadap Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri ini sendiri. Sebab kita tahu pada asas pokok-nya bahawa Undang² Keselamatan ini di-ubah dan di-susun sa-demikian rupa, dengan sa-mata² bagi membina dan menjamin kedudukan keselamatan negara kita daripada anasir² *subversive* atau anasir² yang hendak melakukan tindakan kekerasan terhadap pemerintah dan kekuasaan negara kita. Maka apa yang berlaku itu, mungkin berlaku kerana penyalah-gunaan itu, sangatlah di-kesalkan, mithal-nya mungkin ada orang yang telah di-tahan di-bawah Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri ini, oleh sebab kesalahan yang kecil yang tidak boleh menyampaikan kepada maksud² yang di-kehendaki dengan *subversive* atau pun hendak menggulingkan pemerintahan negeri ini. Umpama-nya sa-orang yang di-tudoh atau di-report oleh gulongan² yang tertentu atas kesalahan kerana hendak memindahkan kedudukan sa-buah surau atau masjid dari tapak yang lama kepada tapak yang baharu, maka timbul-lah gulongan² yang tidak bersetuju dengan perpindahan itu, maka gulongan itu me-reportkan kepada pehak yang tertinggi, dan akhir-nya oleh kerana *sentiment* politik orang itu di-tahan di-bawah Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri. Ini yang telah berlaku dan mungkin berlaku lagi pada masa

akan datang, kalau pehak yang berkenaan itu tidak dapat mengubah sikap-nya tentang chara² mengamalkan Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri ini dengan chara jujur dan sa-chara ikhlas, sa-bagaimana maksud amanah yang di-berikan oleh Rumah yang mulia ini berkenaan dengan Internal Security Act ini.

Kalau hal ini berlanjutan berlaku, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya perchaya bahawa niat baik daripada Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri akan tetap ternoda sa-lama²-nya—niat baik daripada Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri ini tetap di-chabul sa-lama²-nya oleh orang² yang tidak memikirkan akan kemurnian dan kesuchian kehendak² Undang² yang di-buat dalam Rumah yang mulia ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita maseh ingat lagi di-zaman dharurat sa-belum negara kita ini merdeka. Di-zaman dharurat, kalau ada sahaja salah sa-orang atau beberapa orang dalam sa-buah kampong mereport kepada pehak yang berkuasa bahawa si-anu ada mempunyai hubungan dengan kominis dalam hutan, maka sa-belum apa² orang itu di-tangkap dan di-tahan untuk beberapa ketika sa-belum penyiasatan di-jalankan dan kalau penyiasatan itu di-jalankan dengan jujur, maka orang itu di-lepaskan, tetapi tidak-lah—jarang², dan orang itu kadang² di-tahan turus-menerus.

Saya teringat kepada sa-orang kampong yang tua yang telah di-tahan di-bawah Undang² Dharurat pada satu masa yang lalu. Bila kita tanya, “Kenapa Pak Chik kena tahan sampai sa-tahun lebeh?” Maka dia jawab: “Politikkah?”—kata orang Kelantan “politikkah.” Saya kata apa itu erti “politikkah?” “Ta’ tahu-lah”, kata dia, sebab kata-nya: “Saya dahulu masuk champor dengan orang dalam gerakan untuk memerdekakan negeri ini.”—“Oh! bukan masuk champor dengan pengganas?” “Saya pengganas pun saya ta’ tahu”, kata dia. Itu sa-bagai mithalan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Ini pun tidak ubah juga mithalan-nya dengan Undang² Prevention of Crime yang di-lakukan baharu² ini di-dalam negeri Kelantan. Saya tidak tahu dengan kuat-kuasa siapa yang melaku-

kan tindakan menangkap beberapa orang itu, tetapi apa yang saya tahu di-antara yang banyak di-tahan itu sa-bagai mithal-nya kedapatan sa-orang yang berumur sudah 65 tahun yang kerja-nya mendokong chuchu di-rumah dan mengajar Kur’an kepada budak² kechil di-kampong-nya itu. Orang ini tidak ada mengambil bahagian dalam politik; orang ini tidak ada champor dengan soal *gangster*; orang ini tidak ada champor dengan gerakan jenayah, dan rekod dia selama sa-panjang umur-nya, tidak pernah orang ini menchampori gerakan² jenayah, tetapi alhamdu lillah dia telah di-tangkap dan di-tahan di-bawah Undang² Prevention of Crime. Demikian-lah sa-bagai chontoh bahawa Undang² yang kita hormati, yang kita amanahkan itu, kadang² di-dapati di-salah-gunakan.

Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berbalek kepada Rang Undang² atau Bill yang ada di-hadapan kita ini ia-lah satu juzu’ daripada Bill, atau Undang² yang besar—Internal Security Act ia-itu satu Undang² bagi menapis kemasokan penuntut² ka-dalam beberapa buah perguruan tinggi yang tertentu yang di-sebutkan di-dalam muka dua di-dalam Bill yang ada di-hadapan kita ini.

Semangat Undang² yang ada di-hadapan kita ini bersamaan dengan semangat yang termaktub di-dalam hakikat Internal Security Act itu sendiri, ya’ani satu semangat untuk menjamin keselamatan di-dalam negara kita ini sendiri. Semangat itu memang dipuji dan semangat itu memang patut di-hormati oleh sa-siapa sahaja dan di-atas semangat itu juga-lah yang saya sebutkan tadi bahawa pehak PAS memberi persetujuan dengan sapenoh-nya pada tahun 1960 dahulu sa-masa kita hendak meluluskan satu Bill berkenaan dengan Internal Security Act. Akan tetapi, dari segi perlaksanaan, kita boleh kaji dari beberapa sudut. Sudut yang pertama ia-lah perlaksanaan yang di-asaskan kepada niat dan hasrat untuk menjamin bahawa perguruan tinggi itu tidak akan dapat di-jadikan sarang gerakan *subversive* atau sarang gerakan penderhaka terhadap negara kita

ini. Terhadap soal ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada pandangan saya, walau di-tapis sa-berapa ketat dan sa-berapa rapat sa-kali pun, bila mereka itu sudah sampai ka-dalam university, college atau perguruan itu, maka siapa-kah yang akan dapat menjamin bahawa mereka itu akan dapat di-kawal dengan rapi-nya daripada mengambil bahagian yang *active* untuk menyuburkan gerakan² *subversive*. Katakan-lah dalam tahun 1965 atau tahun 1964 ini, kita berkehendakkan atau Nanyang University berkehendakkan sa-ramai 70 orang mahasiswa baharu, maka 70 orang ini di-tapis oleh Director of Education atau pun Chief Education Officer atau siapa sahaja mengikut kehendak daripada Bill yang ada di-hadapan kita ini, di-tapis, hasil daripada penapisan itu kita dapat-lah mengambil 70 orang pemuda untuk menjadi bakal mahasiswa² yang akan belajar di-dalam Nanyang University. Penapisan itu tentu-lah ketat, berdasarkan keturunan keluarga-nya—family-nya itu sendiri, atau berdasarkan kapada latar belakang yang ada dalam keluarga itu, atau latar belakang diri bakal mahasiswa itu sendiri. Baik-lah, sa-sudah di-tapis dan kita dapat berseh. Sa-sudah dia masuk menjadi mahasiswa dalam Nanyang University ini, satu masaalah yang perlu di-kaji, apa-kah mahasiswa² yang telah di-tapis dan di-terima masuk belajar dalam university itu dapat di-jamin benar² yang mereka itu tidak akan menchampioni gerakan *subversive* atau benar² mereka itu tidak menjadikan Nanyang University itu sa-bagai sarang tempat melakukan gerakan *subversive*? Ini satu masaalah yang pokok yang harus di-fikirkan bersama oleh tiap² orang yang ingin melihat keamanan dan keselamatan dalam negeri ini terjamin.

Saya perchaya bahawa pehak Kementerian Keselamatan Dalam Negeri, atau Yang Berhormat Menteri, ta' akan dapat mengirim beratus² Polis Khas jam, mengawal saban masa, saban jam, saban hari, tiap² waktu, memerhatikan gerakan pelajar² itu satu demi satu, sebab kalau itu di-lakukan, maka yang sa-benar-nya memang itu tidak dapat di-lakukan.

Jadi, bagaimana-kah satu ikhtiar yang betul² dapat berkesan bagi menjamin bahawa Nanyang University itu mithal-nya tidak lagi di-masa akan datang menjadi sarang bagi gerakan² *subversive* atau sa-bagai-nya.

Yang sa-benar-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau dapat pehak Kementarian ini, atau Yang Berhormat Menteri, atau Kerajaan sekarang ini, memikirkan satu kaedah yang lain yang boleh menjamin perguruan tinggi itu akan di-bebaskan dari gerakan *subversive* dengan tidak menyentuh kebebasan ilmiah sa-bagaimana yang di-sebutkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Pontian Selatan sa-malam, hanya dengan chara yang demikian sahaja yang boleh menjamin sama ada satu tindakan yang lebeh berkesan yang pernah di-lakukan oleh mana² negeri yang merdeka; kalau kedapatan bahawa benar² perguruan itu menjadi gerakan *subversive*, atau gerakan menderhaka kapada negeri ini, kalau benar² ada bukti, kalau benar² tidak dapat di-kawal dengan jalan kemasokan orang² yang di-tapis saperti ini, maka adakan-lah satu undang² baharu yang boleh di-beri kuasa kapada pehak Kerajaan kita ini untuk mengharamkan perguruan itu sendiri (*Hear! Hear!*) atau pun sa-kurang²-nya membekukan perguruan itu bagi satu tempoh yang tertentu sa-hingga pembersehan dapat di-lakukan di-dalam-nya. Ini lebeh berkesan daripada menapis orang² baharu yang hendak masuk ka-dalam university itu. Ini kajian saya terhadap niat untuk menjaga gerakan *subversive* itu daripada merebak dalam perguruan² tinggi.

Satu lagi, saya kembali kapada masaalah menyalahgunakan dari sudut menapis untuk menjaga jangan *subversive* itu merebak sudah bagus, tetapi dari mana letak kebimbangan kita menyalahgunakan saperti-lah kapada Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri atau pun Prevention of Crime atau sa-bagai-nya. Maka pada wujud-nya, Bill yang di-hadapan kita ini pun kalau tidak di-perhatikan betul², memang ada tempat boleh di-lakukan salahguna kalau ketidakjujoran itu akan bersarang dalam orang² yang melakukan tindakan itu, sebab Bill ini

terkena kepada University of Malaya, University of Singapore, Nanyang University, Singapore Polytechnic dan Ngee Ann College—saya tidak tahu-lah Nanyang Universiti atau Ngee Ann College. Yang saya berchakap ini bagi pehak orang² Melayu yang sa-bahagian besar orang kita bila menyambong pelajaran ka-University dalam negeri ini tidak lain University Malaya atau pun University Singapura.

Penyalahgunaan ini boleh di-lakukan kalau orang² yang memegang amanah bagi melakukan penapisan itu bersarang dalam jiwa-nya satu perasaan yang di-namakan *sentiment* atau pun *prejudice* terhadap pemi-lehan orang² ini. Yang kita hendak tapis ia-lah supaya jangan masok anasir² komunis dan anasir² jahat dalam sekolah² itu, tetapi mungkin terjadi bila di-lakukan penapisan anak² daripada keluarga yang kebetulan keluarga itu menjadi anggota parti yang tidak parti pemerintah tetapi menjadi anggota parti yang sentiasa memberi keritik dan tegoran kepada pemerintah dalam dewan² sama ada Dewan Negeri atau Dewan Ra'ayat, maka lantas mungkin boleh jadi orang itu tidak mendapat nasib yang baik untuk memasuki university di-atas alasan untuk menjaga keselamatan. Perkara ini pehak Menteri tentu akan jawab, "Saya akan tetap memberi jaminan." Dan jaminan demi jaminan tetap kita terima dalam Dewan Yang Mulia ini, seperti-lah jaminan Yang Berhormat Menteri waktu Internal Security Act itu dahulu di-luluskan, dan oleh kerana lemak manis-nya itu-lah, maka pehak PAS ini bershukor kepada Tuhan dengan lapang dada menyokong Rang Undang² itu pada masa itu. Jadi apa-kah jaminan yang akan di-beri oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri, dan sa-belum saya hadir dalam Dewan ini pada hari samalam sudah ada Yang Berhormat Menteri memberi jaminan bahawa tidak akan di-lakukan penyalahgunaan di-dalam Bill ini, dan tentu-lah sakali lagi Menteri akan memberi jaminan seperti itu.

Yang sa-benar-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jaminan kita kehendaki. Tetapi sudah banyak jaminan kita dengar

dan kita terima. Tetapi apa yang berlaku tetap juga dia berlaku. Jadi apa-kah dengan Bill ini jaminan itu akan terongkai dengan sendiri-nya oleh perbuatan² yang tidak bertanggung-jawab? Itu terserah-lah kepada pehak yang berkuasa. Terserah-lah kepada Yang Berhormat itu sendiri. Tetapi apa yang saya hendak nyatakan kepada Majlis ini untuk pandangan: Ahli² Yang Berhormat ia itu-lah bahawa jaminan demi jaminan itu sentiasa di-langgar oleh pehak yang bertanggung-jawab itu sendiri dengan Internal Security Act itu sendiri, apa lagi dengan Bill ini belum kita tahu, tetapi mungkin akan berlaku dalam hal seperti itu.

Jadi, untuk merengskakan penjelasan ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya dapat-lah menyatakan di-sini bahawa semangat untuk mengawal keselamatan dan kedaulatan tanah ayer kita itu ada-lah satu semangat yang terpuji, dan pehak PAS sentiasa menyokong-nya semangat seperti yang demikian. Tetapi apa yang menjadi dukachita kepada pehak kami ia-lah soal jaminan tetap menjadi jaminan, tetapi perlanggaran-nya tetap berjalan juga seperti biasa berlaku. Jadi apa yang kami minta supaya apa yang telah berlaku dalam perkara menyalahgunakan atau pun tidak menyalahgunakan tetapi seperti menyalahgunakan dapat di-perbetulkan oleh pehak Yang Berhormat Menteri di-masa akan datang supaya hal yang demikian tidak berlaku. Sebab sudah sampai masa-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, segala penyelewengan dari kehendak asas² undang² itu di-perbetulkan dan di-jaga betul² supaya tidak berlaku oleh kerana memandang bahawa sa'at negara kita sekarang ini di-dalam keadaan bahaya dan terancham dari sa-genap sudut dan sa-genap segi. Sudah sampai masa-nya, bukan sahaja pehak parti² pembangkang, tetapi pehak parti pemerintah sendiri menginsafi bahawa sudah sampai masa-nya kita melupakan segala perselisihan yang kecil² dan sudah sampai masa-nya soal penyalahgunaan sa-barang undang² itu di-ketepikan, dan kita hadapi soal² besar, soal negara kita ini dengan semangat waja, dengan semangat laki²

dan semangat jantan dalam perjuangan dan kita melupakan semua perselisihan parti dan perselisihan politik bagi menghadapi perkara yang besar.

Saya perchaya Undang² Keselamatan ini ada-lah satu juzu' daripada usaha dan ikhtiar negara kita untuk menghadap perkara besar. Penyerangan dari luar satu perkara yang tertentu yang sedang di-hadapi oleh anggota pertahanan, tetapi pengkhianat dari dalam satu perkara khusus yang mesti di-hadapi oleh kita bersama, bukan sahaja oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri, tetapi oleh tiap² ra'ayat dalam negeri ini yang insaf dan sedar bahawa keselamatan dan kedaulatan tanah ayer ini mesti di-kawal oleh tiap² jiwa-raga yang ada dalam tanah ayer kita ini.

Dr Mahathir bin Mohamad (Kota Star Selatan): Mr Speaker, Sir, we in Malaysia move with gentleness and caution. We tackle problems as they present themselves. We are never drastic and therein lies our weakness and the weakness of the Alliance Government in the face of the Communist threat. In this Chamber we have time and again passed Bills directed at containing Communism, and each time we do so the supporters of Communism are given opportunities to castigate the Government, to call it undeserving names and to try and convince not merely this House but the whole country that those Bills should be resisted. We have passed them nevertheless and they have proved their usefulness.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I am in full support of the Bill presented by the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs, but I feel that its provisions are inadequate. In our firm belief in democratic principles, we purposely tie our hands, we fear to take drastic steps and, in so doing, we impose undue responsibilities on our officers—in this case, on the Chief Education Officers. Yet, it must be clear to all that all these problems arose with the founding of the Nanyang University. This institution was meant to be an outlet for the Chinese educated students seeking higher education but denied this by

lack of facilities—but ever since its inception there can be little doubt that the Communist movement in Malaysia has been given a fillip. Where once we had the problem of Chinese Middle Schools, whose students were indoctrinated by teachers from China, we now have provided for the hard core of those students a centre for them to come together and collectively propagate the cause of Communism and the techniques of Communist subversion. That the University had never been able to serve the original purpose of its founders can be seen from the ridiculously low standards maintained.

Mr Speaker, Sir, all the security problems of Singapore are related in some way or other with the Nanyang University. We have heard the Honourable Minister for Home Affairs, the Prime Minister of Singapore and even the Barisan Sosialis Member, speak of these problems. We have heard of the invocation of the Internal Security Act to contain Communism in this University. We have heard of the never-ending student unrest in this institution. Indeed, this whole Bill has been necessitated by the Nanyang University. Sir, I have no doubt that in its small way the Bill before us will contribute towards purging the communist influence in the Nanyang University. I therefore support the Bill, but I do not believe that this will be the last of such Bills.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we, in our reverence for democracy and our desire to please everyone, have hesitated to take the bull by the horns. In supporting the Bill, I must comment that we are avoiding the real issue, and that issue is the existence of the Nanyang University itself. We have seen that this institution is not an institution of higher learning. It is, in fact, merely a centre of communist influence, a base of subversion, and to a lesser extent a bastion of Chinese chauvinism in this country. I feel that it is time we ask ourselves whether we should not solve this problem posed by the Nanyang University by re-examining its justification as a separate entity. Knowing its past, it is not too difficult to decide. I would, therefore, suggest that we

seriously consider as a final measure the merging of the Nanyang University with the University of Singapore, so that the influence of the communist indoctrinated students will be diluted in a larger and a more sophisticated student body. It will also subject the students to a more effective supervision by a staff more dedicated to academic progress and by the Government itself. It is a step which will need courage on the part of both the Central Government and the Government of Singapore. But in striking at the roots of the problem, we will be rid once and for all of the necessity to legislate Bills which will only provide a partial solution.

Sir, the Prime Minister of Singapore has spoken on Singapore's philosophy of "an eye for an eye" and "a tooth for a tooth". By this I believe, Sir, he implies that the Singapore Government is ruthless. Let us, therefore, hope that Singapore not only supports these half measures which the Central Government makes for the benefit of Singapore but initiate the process of the merger of the two Universities despite the resistance of Chinese chauvinists within its ranks and the communists outside. Let us not witness again the spectacle of the Prime Minister of Singapore wanting to have his cake and eat it as well. Let us all be less gentle and cautious in our dealings with communists at the Nanyang University.

May I conclude, Mr Speaker, Sir, by drawing a parallel with medical practice, as everyone in this House seems so fond of doing, by saying that when the indications are irrefutable, amputations, however painful, must be undertaken. The indications here are irrefutable and let us, therefore, amputate.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam (Menglembu): Mr Speaker, Sir, it is most unfortunate that at this time, when we are facing a common enemy, the Alliance Government should have thought it fit to introduce this obnoxious Bill which is likely to cause frustration and disappointment among the students and the youths of this country—the students and the youths

who are going to be called upon, if the occasion arises, to give their lives in defence of this country.

If this Bill had indicated in what manner the guilty were going to suffer, then we would have supported the Bill wholeheartedly, because we are together with the Government in our desire to stamp out subversion—communist inspired subversion, in particular—in this country. But we feel that it is our duty to the youths of this country and the future generations of this country to condemn this Bill as an undemocratic piece of legislation, and I think even the Government will admit that, on the face of it, it is a most undemocratic form of legislation and one which finds no precedent in any part of the world, whether communist, fascist or otherwise.

One significant feature in this Bill is that there are absolutely no safeguards for a student who hopes to become a man of some standing in this country, for a citizen of this country who hopes to develop his intellectual powers, so that he may make a decent living and contribute something to this land which belongs to him. Who is going to decide the future of a young man, who has been through the school for ten years, perhaps, as to whether he is going to have higher education or not? On the face of it, he is none other than a man called the Chief Education Officer, comparatively a junior officer in the Federal establishment. On the face of it, he is the man who is going to decide whether Mr So-and-so is going to be a lawyer, or going to be a doctor or not—that is on the face of it. But, in fact, the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs has told us yesterday that it will be the Special Branch who is going to decide the fate of the youth of the country. This is what it is reported to have been said by the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs:

" The Chief Education Officer or the Director of Education would then forward the application to the Security Authorities who will screen the student concerned"—reminiscent of the Gestapo—"against records kept by the Security

Authorities in respect of persons of security interest. If the student concerned is not on security record, the Chief Education Officer or Director of Education will be accordingly informed by the Security Authorities and the student will be issued with a certificate of suitability If the student concerned is on adverse record with the Security Authorities, then he will be refused a certificate by the Chief Education Officer”

In other words, the C.E.O. only sits there with a rubber stamp awaiting a reply from the Special Branch to say “yes” or “no”. If he gets a reply, he puts the rubber stamp and that is the end of it. He is nothing but a machine. It is not the C.E.O., who makes the decision. It is the Special Branch. And on what materials does it make a decision? On secret reports received, on information supplied by the enemies of the student? What assurance is there that the Legal Department, or the Attorney-General’s Department, or anybody is going to vet the security reports? Absolutely nothing, and the Honourable Minister can only given an assurance that if a student cares to appeal to him, then he will—at his mercy—give the benefit of doubt to the unfortunate student. Has the time come when the youths of the country have to go on their knees to get an education?

This Government spends millions of dollars on the Information Department and Information Officers. What has happened to the Information Department? Why not scrap the whole of the Information Department? They have confessed that they are unable to counter communist propaganda—a complete and shameless admission of defeat. Millions of words have been printed and sent all over the country with no effect at all. Millions of dollars were wasted on paper and envelopes, and now the Government has come to this House saying that it can do nothing except to prevent people getting an education—people whom the Police suspects of being a security risk.

Now, this is what the Honourable Minister said yesterday, “Let me make it quite clear that a certificate will be refused only in the case of a student with a very bad security record.” In other words, is the Minister suggesting that today there are students with

very bad security records? May I ask him this: if there are students with very bad security records, why are they not detained? Is it because there will be insufficient grounds to detain them?

Throughout the debate, I think, the emphasis has been on Chinese students, and I do not think anybody can refute that—Chinese students and Nanyang University. Now, I ask the Honourable Minister to clarify this: is this piece of legislation directed only at Chinese students and the Nanyang University, and what form of subversion is it being directed against? Here we see that the ground for refusing admission is, “. . . . reasonable grounds for believing that the applicant, if admitted to the institution in question, would be likely to promote, or otherwise participate in action prejudicial to the interest of the security of the Federation or any part thereof”.

I, therefore, ask the Honourable Minister, if this piece of legislation is going through, then let it go through and be enforced properly. People who act against the security of the nation are not only Chinese students. People who act against the security of the Federation is every person, young or old, who is a racist. Let us have the assurance that—whether he is a Malay, Chinese or Indian—racism is also a form of subversion. If an Indian preaches racism which is likely to create discord, then apply this to him. If a Malay of the type like the Member for Johor Tenggara applies for admission to a University, then let him be refused on the ground that if he goes to a University he is going to be a subversive element in that University.

Mr Speaker, Sir, it has been admitted. I think, by the Honourable Prime Minister of Singapore that even the Police makes mistakes. Where then is the safeguard? Initially, it will be adverse records. The reply is “No admission”. He goes to the Honourable Minister. How is the Minister going to decide whether there is reasonable ground or not? Is there anything here which requires the Minister to hold any enquiry? Is he going to give the House an assurance that upon an appeal being made, the student or his

representative, is going to have an audience with him? Is he going to prove that the Police reports are false? He has given no such assurance—it is at his mercy. Student organisations and Universities have got their own disciplinary boards. If a student is found—after all he is daily under the surveillance of his master, of the Students' Hostel wardens, and so on—to be an undesirable element in the University, it is a very simple thing to get rid of him—expel him. If the professors of Nanyang University fail in that duty, sack them. Why blame the student for it? Those who supervise the students and who fail in their duty, they are the people who should be penalised, and not a young man who has spent ten years of his parents' money in secondary school—he is not the man to suffer. What a prospect it is for the youth of this country that every student hereafter who applies for admission to any University is going to have his name in a Police dossier or file like the gestapo system of Germany or the communist police system in Russia. And even there I do not think the Honourable Minister will find any legislation which says that the Chief Education Officer can bar a student from getting into a profession and earning his living.

As I have made it clear earlier, Mr Speaker, Sir, we would have been glad to support this legislation, if it had any semblance of democracy in it. But to me, it appears to be nothing but subversion of the Constitution of this country by the Alliance Government, and a subversion of the fundamental rights of the youth of this country to an education. It is, therefore, our duty to oppose this Bill in its present form, and I would like to support the suggestion that it be referred to a Select Committee, so that it may be possible to consider views which have been expressed not only by Members of this House but also members of the public and organisations from all over Malaya. If a proper opportunity is given for these views to be considered, and if it is found that there is no alternative, then I would consider it our duty to support the Bill, but

certainly not as it is in its present form, rushed through without giving anybody a chance to express their views.

Enche' Tan Tsak Yu (Sarawak):

Mr Speaker, Sir, in support of this Bill under debate I would like to say a few words. In normal practice the control of admission to institutions of higher education is not essential, but under specific circumstances and in the national interest such control is not only desirable but of absolute necessity if you want institutions to be purely academic and free from subversive elements. As Honourable Members are aware, a number of our secondary schools as well as institutions of higher learning have been infiltrated by subversive elements, and such institutions can never function properly until these subversive elements are weeded out. Therefore, any step taken towards this direction should be supported by all loyal Malaysians, especially during the present period of emergency. If it were in normal times, my sympathy would be with those who oppose this Bill. But in view of the stepping up of the Indonesian aggression, the hostilities in the Borneo States might spread to other Malaysian territories. In face of a very powerful and aggressive neighbour, the threat to our survival is real: therefore, we should mobilize all our available resources and resist the aggression. In order to do so, it is very necessary to tighten up our internal security measures and remove any threat from within, so that we can be united, and direct all our efforts to defend the country. At a time of national crisis every loyal citizen is expected to make sacrifices for the country. National interest should be placed above all other considerations. Sir, I support this Bill.

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam (Ipoh):

Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of order, the Honourable Member's speech is irrelevant. He is speaking on this Bill making reference to Indonesian aggression against Malaysia. I think that is entirely irrelevant—Standing Order 36 (1). This has nothing to do with Indonesian aggression against Malaysia.

Enche' Tan Tsak Yu: I was giving the reason why I support the Bill—especially in view of Indonesian aggression, the specific circumstance under which I support the Bill.

Mr Speaker: You can support the Bill but it has no connection whatsoever with Indonesia. Proceed. Have you finished?

Enche' Tan Tsak Yu: Yes, I have finished.

Enche' Abdul Ghani bin Ishak (Melaka Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam menyokong undang² yang telah di-kemukakan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Keselamatan Dalam Negeri ini, saya ada-lah mengalu²kan untuk di-laksanakan dalam masa yang sengkat pada masa yang akan datang ini. Pada pengalaman sa-bagai negara muda, kita pun telah tahu bahawa teknik² dan tektik² yang di-jalankan oleh kominis sa-telah di-pukul hanchor oleh pemerintah kita pada masa yang lalu, mereka telah berundur kepada tempat² yang munasabah untuk menjadi sarang dan bergerak pada masa² yang akan datang.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-bagaimana kita sama² ma'alum, negara kita ini ia-lah negara muda dan akan menyalorkan atau pun akan membentok satu bangsa pada masa yang akan datang yang tidak berbelah bagi fahaman, pendapat, pengorbanan dan lain² kepada negara Malaysia ini. Saya rasa memang kena-lah pada masa-nya sa-telah kita menubuhkan Malaysia, maka penyusunan² untuk melengkapkan negara kita itu, berdiri pada masa akan datang di-perbuat daripada sekarang.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bagaimana yang di-gambarkan daripada kenyataan² yang berikut sa-hingga pada hari ini chontoh yang di-tunjokkan oleh perkembangan² yang di-timbulkan oleh Nanyang University mithal-nya. Ini menunjukkan kepada kita bahawa perkara ini sama-lah erti-nya akan membenarkan bahawa pembentukan kebangsaan kita pada masa akan datang mungkin lambat terchipta. Sa-bagaimana yang di-ucapkan oleh Ahli² yang telah lalu, juga saya suka mem-

bawa perhatian kepada Dewan ini, perkara ini—penyusunan sa-mula telah pun di-mulakan kepada Nanyang University ini dan kita harap akan dapat kita tengok pada masa akan datang bahawa penyusunan ini benar² menuju kepada hakikat, atau pun kemahuan daripada ra'ayat Malaysia ini. Tetapi, kalau kita pandang sa-kali imbas pun terang dan nyata bahawa nama Nanyang University ini pun, saya rasa tidak ada sangkut-paut-nya dengan Malaysia, dan kalau mithal-nya kita mengarahkan anak² kita pada masa akan datang yang hendak menyambong pelajaran-nya, hendak mendapatkan pelajaran sampai tingkatan university, kalau mithal-nya sa-tengah² ra'ayat kita yang telah lalu, atau pun ibu bapa yang kurang mengerti, atau pun yang kurang dalam ilmu pengajiannya, bila ternampak soal nama ini pun, tentu-lah barangkali sa-bahagian orang sahaja yang suka masuk, atau pun mengarahkan anak²-nya masuk kepada University Nanyang itu. Jadi, saya rasa, tentu-lah hilang tujuan bagi kita sekarang ini mengadakan ra'ayat pada masa akan datang yang tidak lagi boleh mengatakan yang ini China, yang ini India, atau Melayu ia-itu mereka berbangga dengan satu perkataan: "Kami ra'ayat Malaysia". Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita dalam soal ini, saya rasa bagi pehak kita sekarang ini untuk menghadapi benchana² kominis sama ada dengan kekerasan, atau pun dengan *subversive*, rasa kita tenaga² yang ada sekarang ini telah pun cukup, tetapi apa yang saya suka menyokong Undang² ini ia-lah untuk menyekat, atau pun untuk mendidek, atau menyalorkan generasi (keturunan) kita pada masa akan datang supaya dia tidak dapat membuat kerja² yang tidak memberi faedah kepada negara, kepada bangsa kita itu.

Saya faham daripada sekolah², *subversive* ini apabila kita selideki satu demi satu, semua kita dapat yang mereka ini menjalankan kerja ia-lah untuk faedah orang lain. Umpama-nya, sekarang ini, *subversive* kominis, adakah dia bekerja untuk negara kita? Tentu-lah jawab-nya tidak. Mereka bekerja untuk orang lain, atau pun untuk faedah negara lain. Jadi, dalam

fahaman kita sekarang ini, kita mahu-lah, walau apa pun perkumpulan, walau apa pun lapangan pendidekan, walau bagaimana tinggi pun tempat pelajaran yang akan di-adakan dalam Malaysia ini, kita harap pada masa akan datang, tidak-lah ada manusia, adek² kita, atau anak² kita yang akan datang ini membuat kerja yang merendahkan harga diri dia, ia-itu menyombongkan kerja² busok yang ditunjukkan oleh orang lain untuk menjahanamkan saudara-mara-nya dalam negara dia sendiri. Jadi, dengan sebab itu, saya rasa untuk menerima masuk anak² ka-sekolah yang di-maksudkan dalam Rang Undang² ini, saya ada-lah menyokong dengan kuat-nya.

Enche' Mohd. Zahir bin Haji Ismail (Sungei Patani): Mr Speaker, Sir, since the publication of this Bill, there have been criticisms against it from members of the public. In this House yesterday and this morning, we heard only a few criticisms. After hearing all these criticisms, is the Government justified in its actions if it were to postpone the debate on the Bill to another date? Do the criticisms disclose any wisdom and truth, and will those hideous and monstrous events occur, as they alleged, if the Bill is passed? Mr Speaker, Sir, to consider these questions, we have to consider not only the criticisms but also the motives with which the criticisms were made. We have also to consider those members of the public who do not criticise, those who choose to remain silent but hoping, nevertheless, that the Government will push the Bill through, and those parents who wish to send their children to the university without fear that their children will be misled to participate in subversive activities that are detrimental to the interests of our nation. These silent people, Mr Speaker, Sir, who support the Bill, since the Government in introducing the Bill do not, of course, have to resort to calling of meetings, adopting resolutions and sending of telegrams to the Minister or to Members of the Opposition. Mr Speaker, Sir, we have to consider these people too.

The criticisms we have heard so far can be classified into three groups.

Firstly, those who seek publicity for their own ends with a view to winning the support of the electorates in their own constituencies, in the case of Honourable Members of this House.

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise on a point of order. Standing Order 36 (6) says "No member shall impute improper motives to any other member." Mr Speaker, Sir, my submission is that to impute that an Honourable Member of this House does not believe in what he says but says it only for the purpose of getting votes from his electorates is an improper motive, and I ask you, Mr Speaker, Sir, to rule that the Honourable Member speaking now should withdraw that allegation as it offends Standing Order 36 (6).

Mr Speaker: According to Standing Order 36 (6), it says "No member shall impute improper motives to any other member." It is better not to say it that way.

Enche' Mohd. Zahir bin Haji Ismail: Sir, it is a matter of opinion. I think I am entitled to pass my own opinion.

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam: Sir, I rise on another point of order. The Honourable Member cannot argue with the Chair. (*Laughter*).

Mr Speaker (To Enche' Mohd. Zahir bin Haji Ismail): Yes, you must not argue with me.

Enche' Mohd. Zahir bin Haji Ismail: I will proceed, Mr Speaker. In the case of those people outside, some of them hope of winning leadership and recognition in their own fields. These people criticise the Bill without due regard to the real purpose and object of the Bill, which is to preserve the very principle of democracy which we have chosen for ourselves and which we have pledged to maintain. This type of criticism should of course be ignored.

Secondly, there are those who criticise in good faith, those who honestly think that our democracy by passing this Bill will be at stake; those who think that freedom to academic learning is being threatened. We have

to pay all due attention to this type of criticism. The Government has to dispel their fears and doubts. I hope these people have heard the solemn assurance given by the Minister of Home Affairs, and I hope they have also heard the statements of the Honourable Members who spoke yesterday supporting this Bill—that this Bill does not seek to destroy our system of democracy and that it does not intend to destroy the freedom to higher academic learning. On the contrary, it has been proved that the Bill seeks to preserve those very things which they fear they would be losing. Mr Speaker, Sir, I hope these people have by now been convinced with the assurance and the explanations given.

Mr Speaker, Sir, now we come to the third group of people who criticise the Bill. This group is the most difficult and dangerous one. These are the people that we have to be careful of. These are the Communist-front people who are now employing and misusing our freedom of speech with the sole purpose of destroying our system of democracy and with the hope of bringing our Government into disrepute and contempt of the electorates. Once they succeed in discrediting the Government, they hope to win the next elections and once they form the Government, they will then without doubt destroy our present system of democracy. Then it will be too late for all of us. These people without any qualms whatsoever accuse the Government of being dictatorial and trying to set up a totalitarian State; they accuse the Government of violating the Constitution, and the United Nations' Charter on Human Rights, with terrorising the people, and also that the Government is bent to set up a gestapo government. They will hurl abuse and such other things as you have heard yesterday. Mr Speaker Sir, this is the pattern of their attack in order to destroy our system of democracy. These are their tactics; we can see these tactics in the past records. They will continue to use these tactics in the future. They will seize every opportunity to attack any Bill in future from this angle. Mr

Speaker, Sir, we have to be careful. We cannot afford to lose. We have to win, and we shall win.

Reviewing these criticisms against the Bill and considering the attitude of those who prefer to remain silent, I do not feel that there is any justification whatsoever that we should postpone the passing of this Bill. In my view, in matters of this nature our decisions and acts should be realistic, clear-cut and precise. If we want our system of democracy to continue and if we want our future generations to inherit our system of democracy . . .

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: On a point of order, the Honourable Member is reading a written speech, and I suggest, to save time, he should circulate the speech and sit down (*Laughter*).

Mr Speaker: Please proceed.

Enche' Mohd. Zahir bin Haji Ismail: If we want to safeguard our type of democracy, our system of democracy, we should be bold and unhesitating to take any action to frustrate any attempts or moves that will eventually destroy that very foundation of democracy that has been entrusted to us by the people of this country into our care. Mr Speaker, Sir, the issue boils down to a matter as simple as that. If we realise that there are students seeking admission into our universities with a view to destroying our accepted system of democracy, well, we have to stop them from doing so. If the Government were to fail to do so, then the Government will be condemned for failing in its duty. We have heard the Peoples' Progressive Party member already accusing the Government saying that the Government has failed in its duty to prevent subversion in this country. And yet, if the Government seeks to do so by introducing this Bill, they say the Government is violating the principles of democracy. It is a very funny way of reasoning indeed. It must be realised that there are other requirements before a person can go into a university. For instance, one must have the necessary academic qualifications and one must have the necessary money to pay the fees, if one cannot obtain a

scholarship. If a student is refused entry into a university on the ground that he lacks the necessary academic qualifications or if he cannot pay his university fees, or if there is no room for him in the university, can we in these circumstances say in all fairness that there is no democracy in our country? In some institutions in England, particularly the Inns of Court, students are required to furnish the university authorities with certificates of good character. If this certificate of good character is refused by the person from whom it is asked, can we say that there is no academic freedom in that country? Similarly, Sir, in this matter that is before us, the Government is justified in seeking to impose an additional requirement for entry into a university, i.e., a certificate of suitability. I too do not like the Bill. No one would be supporting it and the Government would not be introducing it had it not been that it is necessary, and the unfortunate part of it is that it appears that there is no alternative.

Mr Speaker: How long will you take to finish your speech?

Enche' Mohd. Zahir bin Haji Ismail: Sir, I am concluding now. In the circumstances, let us all give our support to this Bill without further creating a storm in a tea cup.

Dr Tan Chee Khoo: rises.

Mr Speaker: Please sit down. I know you have got the right to speak, but you promised me yesterday that you were not going to take part again in the debate on this Bill.

Wan Abdul Kadir bin Ismail (Kuala Trengganu Utara): Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya bangun menyokong penoh akan Rang Undang² yang ada dihadapan kita pada hari ini. Ada sa-tengah² Ahli Yang Berhormat pada hari sa-malam mengatakan bahawa Rang Undang² ini ada-lah tidak mustahak di-kemukakan kerana kuasa² yang ada di-tangan Menteri Hal-ehwal Dalam Negeri di-bawah Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri sudah cukup untuk menchegeh anasir² subversive, kalau tidak salah saya Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Tanjong ada me-nyatakan ini pada hari sa-malam. Saya

rasa kuasa² yang ada di-bawah Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri tidak cukup untuk menghadapi perkara ini, kerana kalau kita hanya hendak menangkap penuntut² yang menjalankan *subversive* dalam University, mereka sudah berada di-dalam University dan sudah di-beri peluang untuk menanam beneh² itu dalam University. Soal Bill ini ada-lah untuk menahan dan menchegeh, untuk menyaring dan menapis, student² itu sa-belum mereka itu masuk dalam University lagi. Dan dengan tidak sengaja Bill ini ada-lah, sa-benarnya sa-kali, hendak menjaga kesuchian University²—di-tempat² pengajian tinggi itu sendiri, kerana dengan di-saring dan di-tapis penuntut²—mahasiswa² yang hendak masuk ka-situ, maka tidak ada langkah di-bawah Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri yang perlu di-jalankan terhadap penuntut² dalam University. Bill ini, sa-benar-nya sa-kali, ada-lah hendak menyelamatkan University dan hendak menyelamatkan kebebasan academic—kebebasan ilmiah University itu sendiri. Kerana kalau kita biarkan beneh² *subversive* daripada anasir² kominis itu, maka jangan-lah kita mimpi akan ada demokrasi, jangan mimpi akan ada kebebasan ilmiah sa-bagai di-chita²-kan oleh kita pada masa ini. Dan pandang sahaja-lah apa yang telah berlaku di-Russia, apa yang telah berlaku di-negeri² kominis, di-mana tidak ada langsung sa-barang kebebasan ilmiah, sa-barang demokrasi dan sa-bagai-nya. Ada suara² di-dalam dan di-luar Dewan ini daripada berbagai² kalangan yang menentang Rang Undang² ini, ada di-antara-nya dari badan² mahasiswa University itu sendiri; tetapi sa-benar-nya suara² ini tidak sedar akan musoh-nya sendiri. Kapada mereka ini semua dengan segala badan² di-luar dan di-dalam Dewan ini yang menentang Rang Undang² ini biar-lah saya bawa satu cerita, satu cerita yang saya pernah baca dalam buku kanak².

Mr Speaker: Cerita itu biar-lah pendek sahaja, kerana masa kita ini pendek sangat.

Wan Abdul Kadir bin Ismail: Cerita landak, serigala dan itek

(Ketawa). Sa-kali persetua tiga binatang—tiga makhlok; serigala, landak dan itek. Serigala ada-lah sa-tiap hari hendak menangkap itek dan di-kejar-nya ka-sana ka-sini, tetapi tidak dapat. Habis-lah helah-nya maseh tidak dapat. Sampai tepi sungai, itek pun bernang dalam sungai maka tidak dapat-lah hendak di-tangkap-nya. Maka akhir-nya serigala pun berjumpa dengan landak kata-nya bagini:

“Aku hendak berpakat dengan engkau, aku hendak pergi tepi sungai itu duduk—aku hendak buat mati, kemudian kau chakapkan sama itek; katakan serigala yang kejar engkau itu sudah mati, tidak perchaya pergi-lah tengok tepi sungai itu”. Landak ini pun pergi berchakap sama itek, “hai itek, serigala yang kejar engkau itu sudah mati, tidak perchaya pergi-lah tengok tepi sungai itu”. Pergi-lah itek merayap² dekat tepi sungai, di-tengok-nya betul-lah serigala itu ada terkapar di-tepi sungai itu. Itek tengok kehairanan; dia kata, “aku ingat”, kata itek, “aku nampak serigala yang mati ini mulut-nya tidak tutup, ini mulut-nya terbuka. Biasa-nya serigala yang mati tertutup mulut-nya”. Dia dengar ulasan dari itek, dia terus tutup mulut-nya. Itek pun sedar bahawa serigala ini pura², dia pun lari-lah, maka tidak dapat-lah serigala ini menangkap itek.”

Ini-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, orang yang menentang Rang Undang² ini, saperti serigala ini-lah, yang hendak memakan teman-nya, dia chuma buat² mati kalau kita tidak sedar—kalau kita dapat kepada-nya, habis-lah kita. Sebab itu-lah saya sukachita bahawa gabungan penuntut² Melayu dalam University menyokong kuat Rang Undang² ini, kerana mereka sedar akan kewajiban mereka itu sendiri. Perlu-nya juga Rang Undang² ini di-tambah lagi dengan ada-nya konfrantasi yang sedang berjalan sekarang. Baharu² ini kita maseh ingat bagaimana beberapa badan dalam University Nanyang, University Malaya, Polytechnic telah mengeluarkan kenyataan terang² menyokong konfrantasi Indonesia, menyokong chita² kominis yang berjalan di-dunia sa-belah sini. Ini-lah perkara² yang hendak kita hindarkan dengan ada-nya Rang Undang² ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya merasa Rang Undang² ini pun bagi menghadapi anasir² *subversive* ini tidak chukup, dan saya merasa kalau-lah timbul satu² suasana sa-lepas di-jalankan Rang Undang² ini, maka tidak chukup juga lagi bagi menghadapi

keadaan *subversive* dalam University² ini, saya suka menhadangkan kepada Menteri yang berkenaan, jika sampai masa-nya kelak ambil-lah tindakan di-bawah Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri dan tutupkan-lah saja akan segala tempat² pengajian tinggi yang menjadi sarang *subversive* itu, Nanyang atau tidak Nanyang. Kerana Rang Undang² ini ada-lah satu langkah yang lembut. Tetapi kalau langkah lembut ini tidak dapat menghadapi keadaan itu, maka saya shorkan supaya pehak Kerajaan menimbangkan—menjalankan kuasa di-bawah Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri bagi menutup segala tempat² pengajian tinggi yang menjadi sarang anasir² pengkhianat kepada perkembangan negara kita ini.

Ada juga pada hari sa-malam tuduhan² di-kemukakan dalam Dewan ini terhadap UMNO sa-bagai sa-buah parti perkauman, ini di-suarakan oleh Ahli dari Ipoh. Apa yang di-buat oleh UMNO di-Singapura, kata-nya, ia-lah langkah perkauman. Pada hal Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh itu sendiri bapak perkauman dalam negara kita ini (*Tepok*). Dia-lah orang yang lama telah menyuarakan soal ra'ayat berkelas², ia menimbulkan istilah ra'ayat kelas satu, ra'ayat kelas dua. Ini-lah orang-nya yang harus di-perhatikan oleh Kementerian Keselamatan Dalam Negeri, kalau tidak di-perhatikan sudah tentu timbul bahaya perkauman (*Tepok*). Sa-benar-nya peranan UMNO dalam perkara yang berlaku di-Singapura sekarang ini ada-lah peranan untuk menchari jalan damai bagi menyelesaikan krisis yang ada di-Singapura sekarang ini, kerana kalau-lah Kerajaan Petir di-Singapura itu tidak dapat menyelesaikan ketidakpuasan hati orang² Melayu di-sana maka dengan sendiri-nya Kerajaan Petir Singapura akan menjadi alat kepada konfrantasi Indonesia dengan tidak di-sedari-nya atau di-sedari-nya.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Menglembu telah ada juga mengatakan apa-kah guna-nya kita adakan Bill ini, apa yang di-buat oleh Pejabat Pencerangan? Kapada Pejabat Penerangan hendak di-serahkan-nya keseluruhan beban. Saya sa-orang yang pernah bekerja dalam

Pejabat Penerangan, saya tahu pejabat itu telah menjalankan kerja yang sangat tinggi, yang sangat banyak dan sangat baik, tetapi bagi hendak menyatakan tidak payah-nya kita adakan Bill ini memada-lah dengan Pejabat Penerangan itu menjalankan kerja itu memang tidak chukup. Saya tidak tahu-lah kalau Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Menglembu itu sendiri bersempati kuat dengan golongan *subversive* kominis yang berjalan dalam negeri kita pada masa ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Pasir Puteh menyuarakan rasa takut kalau² Kerajaan menyalahgunakan kehendak Undang² itu, sungguh pun dia menyokong, pada hal PAS dahulu sokong kuat Rang Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri. Apa-kah dia ingat sa-sudah sokong Undang² itu Kerajaan akan pejamkan saja mata kapada dia, walau pun dia buat salah, biar-lah sahaja Socialist Front yang kena, tidak boleh-lah bagitu! Kita Kerajaan yang bertanggung-jawab menjalankan tugas, tidak boleh pandang bulu dan warna. Barangkali Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Pasir Puteh itu tidak sedar di-bawah Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri ini telah di-tangkap Ahli² UMNO sendiri. Kita tidak memilih bulu, kalau PAS betul² menyokong Undang² ini, maka dia boleh main kasar, dan boleh main foul dan dia boleh buat sa-barang apa yang dia suka, kalau bagitu, tidak usah-lah menjadi ahli politik dalam negeri ini. Jadi sahaja ahli pergerakan yang menjalankan kerja² itu, tidak payah masuk PAS. Kerana sabentar tadi Ahli dari Pasir Puteh itu berkata, Kerajaan telah menangkap orang² PAS di-bawah Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri, ia-itu orang² yang melakukan jenayah di-Kelantan, dan orang² samseng, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Saya tahu banyak sangat orang samseng dalam PAS ini, digunakan-nya mereka di-dalam Pilehan Raya, dan di-luar Pilehan Raya. Jangan-lah hendak-nya berselindung di-bawah sokongan mereka kapada Undang² ini untuk mengatakan tidak payah buat apa² terhadap mereka, walau pun mereka melindungi ahli² samseng di-Kelantan untuk menjalankan pemerintahan mereka.

Enche' Mohd. Asri bin Haji Muda: Minta penjelasan Tuan Yang di-Pertua,

Mr Speaker: Dia minta penjelasan. hendak beri atau tidak?

Wan Abdul Kadir bin Ismail: Tidak boleh. Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Menglembu sa-olah² hendak memberi faham kapada Dewan ini, bahawa Kerajaan mengambil tindakan ini untuk hendak menekan penuntut² China sa-mata². Ini-lah kedudukan-nya bagaimana Ahli² daripada P.P.P. dua beradek menjadi juara perkauman, chuba juga di-tanam di'ayah dalam Dewan ini bahawa Kerajaan bersikap anti China, supaya rasa perkauman orang² China itu makin naik. Pada hal dengan mengkaji segala clause dalam Rang Undang² ini, tidak ada satu pun yang menyatakan "penuntut² China" saja, sa-barang penuntut yang hendak masuk university yang memang menjadi *subversive*, memang akan terkena di-jalankan Rang Undang² ini terhadap-nya. Tidak payah mengingatkan Kerajaan, kerana Undang² ini terang sa-kali menjelaskan perlaksanaan-nya kapada semua kaum.

Mr Speaker: Sudah habis?

Wan Abdul Kadir: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada suatu point lagi yang saya hendak memberi penerangan kapada keraguan² yang di-timbulkan oleh Ahli² yang berchakap tadi, bahawa certificate of suitability, kalau sudah di-tahan daripada sa-orang penuntut, mungkin tidak akan memberi peluang lagi. Bila saya memandang kapada keseluruhan Bill ini, saya rasa sa-orang penuntut *subversive* yang pada tahun itu di-tahan daripada masuk ka-University, tetapi kalau dia bertaubat, dan sudah baik tidak lagi *subversive*, saya tidak fikir bahawa Undang² ini dapat menahan dia masuk sa-mula di-dalam University, dan saya rasa tidak ada apa² sebab bagi keraguan itu di-timbulkan, kerana jelas kita dapat memahami implication yang ada di-belakang Bill ini, terima kaseh.

The Assistant Minister of National and Rural Development and Assistant Minister of Justice (Enche' Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub): Mr Speaker, Sir,

this morning the Honourable Member for Menglembu in his speech on the Bill to amend the Internal Security Act alleged that the Information Department had done nothing at all to counter subversion in this country. He even wonders whether or not it should be scrapped at all. Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, I wonder whether the Honourable Member really wants in his heart of heart the Information Department to be scrapped.

Honourable Members of this House, including of course the Honourable Member for Menglembu, know fully well the positive and constructive role played by the Departments of Information, Radio and Television in helping to build national unity amongst the people of Malaysia as a whole. We know fully well, the Honourable Member for Menglembu also knows fully well, that the Department of Information has been a vanguard in the fight against subversion even from the early days of the Emergency. He may not know that, because he might not have been here then. The Department has done valuable work in promoting on a broad basis the civic consciousness amongst the people of Malaysia. But what we must bear in mind, what we must not forget, is this the role of the Information Department is that of a friendly persuader, not punitive, or preventive, agent to action directly against subversive elements. This latter task, Mr Speaker, Sir, is left to other Departments, as we all know, such as the Police and the like. I think the Honourable Member for Menglembu is not aware of the role of the Information Services, which have a vital role to play in building our national unity and Malaysian consciousness. Thank you, Sir.

The Minister of Home Affairs and Minister of Justice (Dato' Dr Ismail bin Dato' Haji Abdul Rahman): Mr Speaker, Sir, Members of the House who oppose the Bill, and also those outside the House who communicated their opposition to Members of this House, gave as one of their reasons that this Bill is a violation of fundamental rights. Those who are

outside the House are very proper in their choice of words. They are very responsible. Here is one of the telegrams which I received. It says that the implication will result in the complete denial of fundamental and inalienable rights of the citizens of this country. Another one is from the M.T.U.C.—I assume it is “Malayan Trades Union Congress”; it says, “The Internal Security Act, threat to fundamental liberties and freedom of educational pursuits”. Here is yet another one: “Infringement of basic rights of individual to higher education”—to use the proper terms. But Members of this House from whom we should expect better, what do they use? The most surprising of all, of course, is from the Member for Tanjong. The Member for Tanjong is trying to express to this House how much he knows of the Constitution, and he has used words like “obnoxious” referring to the Constitution.

Yet another Member, or rather several other Members have used words which are less responsible than those outside the House. Now, Sir, in whatever words this opposition has been couched, the reason given is very fundamental, and if I cannot answer this accusation that this Bill is a denial of fundamental rights, then I will be the first to withdraw this Bill.

Sir, let us go back to the time when this country—it was the Federation of Malaya then—gained its independence. Before we gained our independence, this country was under, or was in, a state of emergency, and militant communism tried to overthrow the legally constituted Government—even though it was a colonial Government it was legally constituted. We negotiated for our independence in London under that cloud of emergency. We asked for an Independence Commission, the members of whom, as Honourable Members know, were famous jurists: for example, the Chairman, Lord Reid—I think everybody agrees that he is a famous judge, Justice Hamid from Pakistan, William McKell, Governor of South Victoria, rather

former Governor-General of Australia—my apology to the Australian Government. Now, Sir, we asked for an Independence Commission to draft for us a Constitution for an independent country, and that Constitution had become the Federal Constitution of Malaysia. Members of this House, when debating on the Amendment to the Constitution, referred to this book as “sacred”—that is the word used by the Member for Tanjong. So, Sir, I can quote it as if I can quote the Bible or the Koran. What does the Constitution say on fundamental rights? Let me recite Article 10, Sir. Article 10 (1) says—

“Subject to Clauses (2) and (3)—

- (a) every citizen has the right to freedom of speech and expression;
- (b) all citizens have the right to assembly peaceably and without arms;
- (c) all citizens have the right to form associations.”

That is Article 10 (1). Now Article 10 (2)—“Parliament may by law impose—

- (a) on the rights conferred by paragraph (a) of Clause (1), such restrictions as it deems necessary or expedient in the interest of the security of the Federation or any part thereof, friendly relations with other countries, public order or morality and restrictions designed to protect the privileges of Parliament or of any Legislative Assembly or to provide against contempt of court, defamation, or incitement to any offence;
- (b) on the right conferred by paragraph (b) of Clause (1), such restrictions as it deems necessary or expedient in the interest of the security of the Federation or any part thereof or public order;
- (c) on the right conferred by paragraph (c) of Clause (1), such restrictions as it deems necessary or expedient in the interest of the security of the Federation or any part thereof, public order or morality.”

Article 10 (3)—“Restrictions on the right to form associations conferred by paragraph (c) of Clause (1) may also be imposed by any law relating to labour or education.”

That is what this sacred book says. Now, Members of the Opposition, who say that this book is sacred, are you still going to say that this Constitution is a denial of democracy? You are the ones who affirm that this

book is sacred and that all that we believe in, in democracy, is contained in this book. Why should the authors of the Constitution—the Independence Commission—provide those safeguards to our fundamental freedom? Because this nation, this country, gained its independence in the midst of a state of emergency. We had twelve years of it. How many brave sons of the country died in order that we may be free? Let me read a paragraph from the Malayan Constitutional Reports. Let me read what it says—

“Neither the existence of fundamental rights nor the division of powers between the Federation and the States ought to be permitted to imperil the safety of the State or the preservation of a democratic way of life. The Federation must have adequate power in the last resort to protect these essential national interests.”

Those are not my words. Those are the words of the people, who come from their respective countries which practise democracy. And yet Members of this House, who should know better, should use the words, as the Member for Tanjong says, “that this Bill is obnoxious under the Constitution.” Sir, while listening to the debate in the House, I was conversing with my colleague the Minister of Finance, and I said that in the future, not in the very near future, we should make it as a qualification for citizenship of this country that a person who wants to be a citizen must study this Federal Constitution, and that one cannot become a citizen unless he knows the Constitution, so that he knows what are the fundamental rights enshrined in the Constitution—and not talk glibly, when the Government tries to pass a legislation to protect the freedom of this country as a violation of fundamental rights. I may yet consider introducing and passing that Bill in this House, so that every ignorant person must know the “Bible” of this country. Now, I challenge the Member for Batu, Sir, to go to court to challenge this Bill as he said he would. Let him go to court to see whether this Bill is constitutional or not. It is no use talking about the fundamental rights in other countries. You have just got to go back to our own history. On the occasion when I

was given the honour of receiving the Honorary Doctor of Laws from the University of Malaya, I said, Sir, that the problem in this country now is the problem of building a united nation. I said then that at the moment we are not yet a nation. There is inter-racial harmony and education is our main instrument for forging a united Malaysian nation and our university is part of that instrument. To accuse me of destroying our universities is a slander, I think a slander on the part of the members of the Opposition. They tried to paint a picture, Sir, that as if this Bill is trying to prevent all law-abiding citizens, those who have no aim to subvert, from going into the universities, whereas they know very well that this Bill is to deny those who try to subvert our universities. They are very clever painters; they painted a picture of the plight of a boy denied the opportunity of going to university, denied the opportunity to become a lawyer or a doctor. But I am glad that members who support this Bill painted the real picture, the real picture of what will happen to our universities if we do not have this Bill. Sir, I would be failing in my duty if, after what happened at the Nanyang University, I don't ask the House to approve this Bill. This Bill is a preventive cure.

I think at this stage I might as well answer the Member for Menglembu, because he always tries to bring this communal question of Chinese education. He said that this Bill is aimed at the Chinese. Sir, if this Bill is aimed at the Chinese, I would only mention the Nanyang University there and not the other universities. I do not know how much further truth can be perverted in this House by the Honourable Member from Menglembu in the name of racialism. The other reason given for opposing this Bill was this: that I have the power to close the universities and to arrest the students. Why should I need this power to prevent these students from going into the universities? Sir, it is not very pleasant; I admit, Sir, that I did not *like* to take the action that was taken in the Nanyang University. The situa-

tion in Nanyang University could have been prevented, first of all, as the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew, the Prime Minister of Singapore has said, if the Nanyang authorities had done their duty; secondly, if we had this Bill. This is not a question of denying a few students. This is a question of denying those few active dedicated Communists from going in, because when they go inside the university they are like termites. Sir, I have to describe to you the *modus operandi* in the Nanyang University. I will describe to you how powerless were the opposition to the Communists, those students who believed in democracy and who talked of fundamental freedom, they were defenceless against these Communists. And how much heartache and suffering would have been prevented if this Bill had been passed long ago. Many of those students who are now detained would be free, because they would not be subverted by the Communists, and that is the reason why I want this power. You call it arbitrary. That I agree.

At this stage I would like to reply to the constructive speech of the Member for Bungsar, because, Sir, he voiced the fears of the people if this Bill were implemented. They are the genuine cases. I will try to answer them. But to say that I have no power to pass this legislation and that it is unconstitutional—that I completely deny. I say to the Opposition, at least those members of the Opposition who opposed this Bill, that they are not behaving in a democratic way. The Honourable Member for Batu, he had a colleague once in this House. He is no longer here now. He challenged me on the Internal Security Act. He said "Let us go to the country on the issue of the Internal Security Act." Everywhere I went I campaigned on the necessity for the Internal Security Act and we are returned with a two-third majority (*Applause*). So let us hear no more from the Opposition about our right to pass this Bill, or to amend the Internal Security Act. We have a mandate from the people. But what we would like to hear from the other side of the

House is that whether we are going to abuse this power or not. That I am prepared to discuss with the members of the Opposition, not the right of the Government to pass this Bill. It is no use asking me whether I can quote a similar legislation in other countries. The very fact is that this country is unique. It is unique. In this country we have the Malays and the Chinese who are numerically equal. Where have you got that? Tell me, in which country have you got this problem? And yet that very problem is our strength if we are wise and not exploit racialism in this country. Mr Speaker, Sir, it is no use asking me whether there is a similar legislation to this, and it is no use for the Member for Batu telling me that there is no legislation like this in the Communist countries, because the Communists do not need it. If the Member for Batu were in Russia and were to call me, a Minister of the Government, a Gestapo chief, tomorrow he will be here no more.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon (Batu): Sir, I did not call the Minister a Gestapo chief. Yesterday I was very restrained in my language. I was merely quoting newspaper reports. The Honourable Minister has misheard me. I was very restrained in my language and it is far, far from me to call the Honourable Minister of Justice a Gestapo chief.

Dato' Dr Ismail: My apology to the Honourable Member. I must have mistaken him for other members of the Opposition who opposed this Bill.

Now, Sir, let us see whether there are enough safeguards in this Bill. It has been quoted to me by the Honourable Members for Ipoh and Menglembu that under the Internal Security Act there is a provision for an Advisory Committee to advise the Minister as to whether a person should or should not be detained. Sir, those two Honourable brothers, when we discussed the Internal Security Bill in this House, opposed the Advisory Committee saying that it was a farce, a mockery of the law, a mockery of justice. Yet, I am glad today that the two Honourable brothers now regard

that the Advisory Committee is playing a useful part.

Sir, we now come to the question as to why we do not provide for an Advisory Committee in this Bill. First, of all, let me explain that the persons who are supposed to issue the certificate of suitability are the Chief Education Officers or the Director of Education or the Chief Education Adviser. Now, Sir, when a student applies for a certificate of suitability, as I explained in my opening speech, his name will be sent to the Special Branch. The Special Branch will look up the records to find out whether the applicant has a bad security record or not, and then the security officer will inform the Chief Education Officer whether he is suitable or otherwise. In other words, the security officer advises the Education Officer. Of course, normally and in practice, the Education Officer will abide by the advice of the security officer. But there is nothing to prevent him, if he finds that that security record is not good enough to deny the certificate of suitability to a student, to give that student the certificate. Sir, why do we deal with the Education Officer? We think that the Chief Education Officer or the Director of Education has the interest of education at heart—in other words, if he is bias, he is bias in favour of the students because of his interest in education. If the Director of Education issues a certificate against the advice of the Security Officer, there is nothing I can do and that student gets the certificate. But, on the other hand, if the Education Officer denies a student the certificate and if the student is not a security risk, the student appeals to the Minister. So, if the Education Officer wants to abuse the power, he abuses it in favour of the student rather than in favour of the security officer. That is why we think it is unnecessary to have a committee of enquiry. There is another practical reason, that is the lack of time. If we were to send every application to an Advisory Board, then the vetting, if I may use the word, will not be completed in time for the students to enter the University.

Sir, so much was made of me as the person to deal with the appeals. Sir, I purposely put myself as the target, because I am a Minister responsible to this House, I can be criticised in this House and I can be criticised by the Press, since the ultimate safeguards to the Internal Security Act, or to this amendment to that Act, are this House, the free Press of this country and the public opinion of the country—those are the real safeguards. If this Bill were in the hands of the real Gestapo, then you can say that it can be abused without any safeguard at all—not when it is enacted by Parliament, not when it is introduced in a democratic country like ours.

Now, I would like to refer to the Honourable Member for Bungsar who has made a very clear, eloquent, speech on this one, expressing the real fears of the parents, genuine fears, as he said, in regard to the implementation of the Bill. He has said that there is fear of educational future of their children by the parents. Well, Sir, we all have these fears so long as subversion is rampant in this country. It is because of the fear that our children, when they go to university, are not subverted, we want to isolate the communist germs from infecting them. The second fear is that it must not be directed against patriotic citizens because they go against the pleasure of the authority. Now, Sir, this was the same fear aired to me by the representatives of the Students Council of the University of Malaya. I told them, Sir, that in a democratic country, we can legislate for good government, but we cannot legislate for bad government because if the government is bad, the answer lies with the people as once in every five years in this country we go to the people to get our mandate from them; but once you have elected that government, there is no guarantee whether it can do good or bad, but you can criticise the government, you can make life intolerable for that government under democracy. Our record on this is clear, and we have never tried to intimidate other students or mem-

bers of the Opposition who differ from us either in ideology or view. I have told the students of the University of Malaya that I am not concerned whether they are rightists or leftists, and that what I am concerned is that no communist should subvert them. They told me, "We are grown up, we are citizens, we can protect ourselves." But those in the Nanyang University, Sir, were grown up, they were not fools, they were clever students, and yet they were powerless against the method used by the communists. In saying that, I am not passing any disparaging remarks on the students in the University of Malaya or other Universities. I have a great admiration for them. It is right that they should protest on this Bill, but I think they are wrong when they say that it impinges on their fundamental rights.

Sir, if they express fears that this Bill will be abused, then I will do all I can, as I have done, to allay their fears. But to ask the Government to withdraw this Bill, that I refuse on behalf of the Government, because we have a duty to the country to govern, to protect this country from being subverted, especially at this time when the communist forces of Malaya join with Indonesia trying to destroy our freedom, our democracy.

One Honourable Member yesterday said that the *Straits Times* also opposes the Bill—I think he is a Member from the *Barisan Sosialis*. I am not surprised, because he always quoted things wrongly—unless he is quoting from the Communist publications. (*Laughter*). Sir, the *Straits Times* said here: "Some critics complained during yesterday's debate that the Bill would work against academic freedom, but so did the absence of control over enrolment." By what kind of logic, may I ask the Member representing the *Barisan Sosialis*, when he said that the *Straits Times* supported him? I have no brief but I am certain that the *Straits Times* is not toeing the Communist line. I am not so certain that the *Barisan Sosialis* is not. In fact, here the indication is that they are.

Sir, the other fear is that those enforcing this law will not be, to use the words of the Honourable Member, of a high standard. Sir, I can only inform this House how we govern this country. It is no use telling the Members of the Opposition opposite me, because they have had no experience of governing (*Laughter*)—probably the P.A.P., of course, have some experience. But I am telling the House our experience in running the Government. We regard ourselves as policy makers.

With regard to Civil servants being instruments to implement our policies, we encourage Civil servants to give their views fearlessly irrespective whether these views coincide with the Ministers or not. But we retain the ultimate control. I am proud of our Civil Service. There are defects, I know—I am the first to admit that. But as a body, as a Service, I am proud of that Civil Service.

To say that I act under the direction of the Special Branch is the greatest slander in this House, especially when it can never be proved. Sir, if the Members of the Opposition think that they can govern this country—not that they ever will—without the Civil Service, then they will govern it exactly as Soekarno had governed Indonesia. (*Applause*). The very essence of the Bill, Sir, is that I am leaving it to these Education Officers who have the interest of education at heart. Of course, if you have no trust in the Civil Service, then, you say it is fantastic. But I have great trust in the impartiality of those Officers, especially the Chief Education Officers, or the Director of Education, that they will look after the interest of education and that, if this Act is going to be abused, it will be abused in favour of the students rather than of the Security Branch.

Now, Sir, I come to the Amendment to this Bill. Now, the Member for Batu wants this Bill to be postponed for six months. In the first place, Sir, if he is acting, as he says, on behalf of those who had made representation to him, he is not doing what they wanted him to do. These

people wanted him to withdraw the Bill—he wanted to postpone it!

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification. “Debating it six months hence”, in effect, is to give us a chance to withdraw it. My original amendment to the Clerk was that the Government should reject this Bill. I was advised by the Clerk that under Standing Order 53 (4) that was not possible; hence I have to comply with the Standing Order. The Honourable Minister should have referred to the Clerk of the House.

Dato’ Dr Ismail: On a point of clarification. I may have been accused of being a gestapo chief, but I do not go that far to eavesdropping the conversation between the Honourable Member and the Clerk. I am very glad for the clarification. We reject this Amendment for the reason that I have explained. I also would like to take this opportunity, since it was brought into the debate on the question of referring the Bill to a Select Committee, to reject that suggestion not because I have so many Members who will outvote those Members who try to propose this Bill to go to a Select Committee, not because I want to use the majority in this House, but because the Members of the Opposition have not given me reasons why they want this Bill to go to a Select Committee. All that I heard were abusive arguments against the Bill. They reject the Bill in principle. There is nothing good that they did say about the Bill. If I were to go to a Select Committee, it is just like the Prime Minister going to Soekarno, (*Laughter*) and the end result will be that the Select Committee’s report will come to this House and I would still be confronted by those Members who opposed this Bill.

Enche’ D. R. Seenivasagam: On a point of clarification. Does the Honourable Minister mean that the Prime Minister made a fool of himself by going to Soekarno? (*Laughter*).

Dato’ Dr Ismail: What I am telling you is that I said, “I am not a fool”, (*Laughter*) but by his logic, by a strange twist of his mind, he has concluded that I have been saying

that the Prime Minister is a fool. Now, Sir, I do not want to lengthen the debate, but what I am saying is that—I am doing this with my eyes open and the Prime Minister went to Tokyo with his eyes open too but for different reasons, because he wanted to have a talk with Soekarno to size him up—I have sized you up in this House. There is no point in my trying to size up Honourable Members in the Select Committee, as I know what they are going to do to me (*Laughter*). I anticipate, Sir, they will still confront me when they come to this House, and hence I say there is no point of going to Select Committee.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: On a point of clarification. Is the Minister of Home Affairs aware that, as far as I know, only two lawyers in this House—two legal luminaries in this House—have asked for reference to Select Committee: one is the Honourable Member for Ipoh, very eminent in his own field, and the other is the Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore, perhaps, equally if not more eminent than the Honourable Member for Ipoh (*Laughter*)—that is no slur on the reputation of the Honourable Member for Ipoh. Unfortunately, Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not know, during the adjournment hour, what strong medicine the Honourable the Minister of Home Affairs, who is a doctor of medicine himself, applied on the Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore that he should, in the terms of the communist cliché, publicly recant what he said. Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not wish to prolong the debate, but if you will bear with me a little longer, I would like to say that I do not know what “truth” drug was injected into the Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore, what strong native “ubat kuat” (*Laughter*)—not in the sense that the Malays understand it—was applied to him, or what powerful, strong medicine, as the Red Indians understand it, was applied to the Honourable the Prime Minister, in order to make him to recant publicly. On this side of the House, as far as I know, only two legal luminaries asked for this reference to Select Committee.

Dato' Dr Ismail: Well, Sir, I am indebted to the Honourable Member for the correction, but I think he can excuse me, because the variety of the Opposition Members are so wide that it is very difficult for me to particularise. That is my first answer. The second answer is that there is no mistake. I have talked to the Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore and have told him that these people are laying a trap for me, and I do not want him to help these people to trap me (*Laughter*). That is all there is to it (*Laughter*) I am always direct, and I always tell the Members of the Opposition the real truth. There is no magic potion (*Laughter*). In any case I am antiquated in medicine, and I don't mind to make good in hunting communists.

Now, the last point, Sir, and here again, in order to save time. I would like to comment on the proposal of the Member for Tanjong to amend this Bill—I think he has circulated an amendment to Honourable Members, so I will not weary the House by trying to read the amendment. But if Honourable Members will please refer to this amendment slip, I will just try to explain why I oppose this amendment.

Sir, for practical purposes it is not practical for the Minister of Education himself to issue the certificate of suitability. He has to delegate it to the very officers mentioned in the Bill. Secondly, in my opinion, it is contrary to ministerial responsibilities, because the Minister responsible for internal security, whether Honourable Members like it or not, is myself, and this Bill as its title implies is an Amendment to the Internal Security Act. Thirdly, Sir, the certificates sought are not in respect of academic qualification, in which case it would admittedly be, and could have been, within the functions of the Minister of Education, but this Bill is rather an exercise on security. Now, Sir, the reason, as I have said, for these certificates to be issued by the Chief Education Officer, or other corresponding officer mentioned in the Bill, is that he is an independent civil servant, who will be

free to decide the matter uninfluenced by political considerations; and further, his close association with the educational administration of students best befits him to impart a deep sense of responsibility in the issue of such certificates and to assess the value and weight of any matters brought to his attention touching on such issues. Now, I also oppose the consequential amendment, that is the amendment to make the Prime Minister responsible for appeal, because, Sir, matters of security interests under the Act are within the portfolio of the Minister for Home Affairs, and that is myself. Now, the Prime Minister, when allocating portfolios to Ministers, make the Ministers wholly responsible for them. If a Minister's decision could be reversed by the Prime Minister on appeal, then I contend that the principle of the responsibility of a Minister in respect of matters in his portfolio would be breached. In Cabinet practice, if I may say so, if a Minister responsible for a portfolio makes a decision and if his decision is unacceptable to the Prime Minister and the Cabinet, his only recourse is to resign. Of course, in practice, in order to avoid this extreme rupture in the Cabinet, the Minister responsible always consults the Prime Minister, or his colleagues, on matters in respect of which a decision has to be taken. Further, in regard to our Prime Minister, who is well-known for his generosity, as testified by the Member for Tanjong, and approachability to members of the public, it has been the practice—it is almost a tradition now—that all appeals to a Minister are accompanied by copies sent to the Prime Minister (*Laughter*). So, in the case of the present Prime Minister, the proposal by the Honourable Member is redundant.

Further, Sir, an appeal to me as Minister of Home Affairs is not as sinister as some Honourable Members or members of public would think. In this case, as I have said in my speech when introducing the Bill, or in the course of replying to the debate, I would not come into the picture at all when the question of the issue or otherwise of certificates are taking

place. In other words, at this stage it is all in the hands of professionals in the Ministry and in the Education Department, who are all public servants. When an appeal comes to me, I shall be able to consider it purely from the security angle with an open mind—although you may dispute it—in the light of the security assessment made by the experts. As the Minister of Internal Security I would be in a position to disagree with the views of the Special Branch on any application, where further enquiries satisfy me that the security interest has been assessed upon wrong principles, or over valuation, or inadequate data—and in the last resort I am responsible to this House. So I reject that amendment.

Sir, I think I have covered all the main points brought up by the Honourable Members who oppose this Bill. It only remains for me to thank those Members who have supported this Bill. They have, if I may say so, painted a true picture of the intention of this Bill. And also, I would like to thank Members of the People's Action Party for supporting this Bill—although they do not belong to the Government, they support the Bill because they believe in it. They have expressed their fears, as the Member for Bungsar has done, and I have tried as far as I can to allay those fears.

So, Sir, before I conclude, I once again deny that this Bill is a violation of the fundamental rights as enshrined in our sacred book, the Federal Constitution of Malaysia. (*Applause*).

Question, as amended, put, and negatived.

Original question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time.

Dr Lim Chong Eu (Tanjong):

Mr Speaker, Sir, under Standing Order 54, I would wish, in spite of the anticipatory remarks made by the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs, to move a motion that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee. Sir, I shall quote the Standing Order so that all members might appreciate that it is not an attempt on my part to try to delay the passage of this Bill. It says that this

motion being proposed, the question thereon shall be put forthwith and shall be decided without amendment or debate. However, Sir, I hope you would give me some opportunity to give the reasons whereby I have chosen to move this motion.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I have thought over very carefully the very eloquent remarks made by the Prime Minister of Singapore. But he was later persuaded by the Minister of Home Affairs that we on this side of the Opposition might possibly be laying a trap for him and subsequently he retracted his decision to move this motion. However, I assure the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs that there is no trap tended and there is no intention of later confronting him in a Soekarno-like manner even if this Bill were referred to a Select Committee. The Honourable Minister of Home Affairs in his, I must say, very reassuring speech just now, however, did mention that he considered that no adequate reasons were given as to why this Bill should be referred to a Select Committee. Sir, there is no need for me to reiterate all the points that were brought up in full consciousness and honesty and with wisdom by the Honourable Prime Minister of Singapore yesterday. Those reasons he brought up, I think, are cogent reasons. The other factor was that right at the beginning of the reply made by the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs he quoted me with very great pertinence and said that I used the word obnoxious, and he took great offence at the word obnoxious, when the other people used the word infringement. Sir, we have been using medical terms and obnoxious, I presume, might hit rather antiquated ideas of medicine. But, however, I would like to reassure the Minister of Home Affairs that when I said that this Bill has got constitutional overtones, I referred to the fact that it could be obnoxious to those parts of the constitution referring to the fundamental rights and liberties of the individual. The Minister of Home Affairs very carefully jumped to Article 10, leaving out Articles 5 to 8.

The Minister of Finance (Enche' Tan Siew Sin): Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise

on a point of order under Standing Order 54, which reads as follows—

“When a Bill has been read a second time it shall stand committed to a Committee of the whole House unless the House on motion commits it to a Select Committee. Such motion shall not require notice, must be made immediately (as has been done) after the Bill is read a second time, and may be proposed by any member;”

Well, this is the important clause—

“the question thereon shall be put forthwith and shall be decided without amendment or debate.”

Although I do not find the speech of the Honourable Member unattractive, I think he is out of bounds in trying to inflict another debate on us.

Mr Speaker: I think he is trying to explain a bit why it should be referred to a Select Committee.

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: The voting should be taken forthwith and not subject to a debate.

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Mr Speaker, Sir, I merely ask for the opportunity to lay down a few reasons as to why I move this motion, so that we would not be tarred with the same brush airily

Dato' Dr Ismail: I am not trying to interrupt, Sir, but I think the Honourable Member has expressed his intention to put this Bill into Select Committee. In the course of the debate they were given ample opportunities to give their reasons and because I happened to reply very adequately, now they are trying to create a *volte face* and give another reason why they want to have a Select Committee. I really suggest, Mr Speaker, Sir, that we abide by the Standing Rules and Orders of this House.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: May I say that the Government in allowing the Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore to speak a second time yesterday had already violated the Standing Orders. Properly speaking, Mr Speaker, Sir, my amendment should have been debated and thrown out and then the Government's Bill debated as a substantive motion. That should be the proper procedure. But we have not followed the proper procedure and I

think the Honourable Member from Tanjong should be allowed a little time despite Standing Order 54.

Dato' Dr Ismail: I shall try and make that point quite clear, Sir. It was agreed by the Honourable Member that he wanted to have a full debate on the amendment, so that there was no necessity to debate the whole thing again when the Bill is read a second time. Now we are reverting to the Standing Rules and Orders, because that understanding is completed. So, now the Honourable Member is asking again to relax these Standing Rules and Orders without very good reasons. Yesterday there was a very good reason why we should adopt that procedure agreed to by the House; otherwise we would be debating this thing all over again. But now I think we should revert back to the Standing Rules and Orders.

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr Speaker, Sir, this point of order, I think, is of great importance to this House because, if this Bill has been read a second time without following the Standing Orders and Rules, perhaps, then this Bill can be challenged in a Court of Law as to whether it was constitutionally passed within this House. As far as I can see, Sir—I am not asking for any opportunity to speak, because I do not intend to speak anymore on this Bill except in Committee stage—there was no debate open to Members of this House on the original motion moved by the Honourable Minister. I would submit that it is wrong to read it a second time without opportunity being given to Members to debate the original motion.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, Sir, this seems to demolish a matter of procedure which may well arise again in future. If there is an amendment, the amendment must be disposed of and then the main Bill is debated. I would like to assure the House and you, Mr Speaker, Sir, that I do not intend to speak again, but I think it will be wrong to overlook that procedure.

Mr Speaker: First and foremost, I

Dato' Dr Ismail: Sir, when the relaxation to the Standing Orders were agreed to by the House

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: The Standing Orders were not suspended by the House by any motion.

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, if I may interject again, the Bill has been read a second time, the vote has been taken and the Bill has passed its second reading. So, there is no question of a debate on the second reading, because the Bill has passed the second reading.

With regard to the explanation of the Prime Minister of Singapore, this, I think, is covered by Standing Order 25, but I will not bother the House by reading it, and I suggest that the Honourable Members concerned read these Standing Orders before they talk and not waste the time of this House.

Question that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee put, and negatived.

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee of the whole House.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr Speaker in the Chair)

Clauses 1 and 2—

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: Mr Chairman, Sir, I wish to reiterate our opposition to the inclusion of Clause 2 in the Bill.

We have heard the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs giving his reasons. But to me, none of them are valid answers to any of the objections which have been raised by speakers on this side of the House, particularly myself—I rather speak for myself because, as the Honourable Minister for Home Affairs has said, it will be very risky for any one Member to claim to speak on behalf of the Opposition.

In attempting to refute my argument, the Honourable Minister for Home Affairs accused me of perverting the truth when he did, in fact—I would not be so uncharitable as to say that he perverted the truth—say

something which did not occur. He tried to discredit my argument by saying that I was raising a communal issue and that I said that this Bill was directed against the Chinese. I did not say anything of that sort. I said that, from what I have heard in this House, it would appear that it was directed against the Chinese, because reference was made almost entirely to the Nanyang University and so on—that is an entirely different thing from saying that it was directed against Chinese.

Another reason why I opposed the inclusion of this clause in the Bill is that, as I have said, it is obnoxious; and whether the Honourable Minister for Home Affairs likes it or not, it is obnoxious. I said that there are no safeguards, and the Honourable Minister said, "These two brothers are the ones who condemned the Enquiry Board under the Internal Security Act." Of course, we did so and we do even now; and it is not that kind of a force which we are seeking for in the matter of enquiries relating to students. We repeat that we look upon with ridicule at the existing state of enquiries under the Internal Security Act.

Referring to our objections in relation to the Constitution, the Honourable Minister, perhaps, did not understand what we meant. Of course, the Constitution gives power to the Government to do almost anything. But the question is, should the Government do it and is it reasonable for the Government to do it? Our argument is that it is a violation of the spirit of the Constitution, not the letter of the Constitution and, indeed, the Constitution even goes so far as to say that we cannot challenge in Court the validity of any law passed in this House. So, there is no question of arguing that within the letter of the Constitution, you cannot pass this law—you certainly can. But, as men who profess democracy, you should not attempt to pass this law which is against the spirit of the Constitution. That is our argument.

Finally, in refuting our right to speak in this House, the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs said, "Look

at the result of the Elections—two-third majority. We have a right, and I hope that in future the Opposition will keep quiet"—that was in effect what he intended to convey. But does the Honourable Minister know that by some cunning device—they kept this thing away from the electorate during the Elections? They had not the guts to make this an issue in the Elections, and the Elections were fought almost entirely on the confrontation issue. And now we have the Minister for Home Affairs having the audacity to stand in this House and say that we have no right to speak on an issue which was not even laid before the public during the Elections.

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise again to reiterate my stand on Clause 2 of this Bill and to say that the replies given by the Honourable Minister for Home Affairs do not pull wool over our eyes although they may do so over the eyes of the back-benchers—and they are certainly not going to pull wool over the eyes of the public.

What is the answer given to the objection which I raised? Firstly, I said that these students are not even given what the detainees are given, i.e., the right of appeal before a committee of enquiry. In that statement I said that although the committee of enquiry is an unsatisfactory method, these students are denied even that unsatisfactory method. But that has been twisted and turned—perhaps, to mislead his own back-benchers—by the Minister saying that we approved these committees. We certainly do not, and I say only half-way we will approve of these committees as a satisfactory machinery for the review of anything.

Then, again, we have opposed Clause 2. The answer given as to why a suitable Board or a suitable appeal machinery, cannot be set up was a most ridiculous, a most fantastic answer this House could ever expect from the Ministerial Bench. The answer was, "If we refer all of these applications to the Boards, where is the time?" Who on earth said, "Refer the applications to Boards"? We said

"appeals to Boards" or "appeals to proper machinery", not the "applications". Do you think that people are so stupid that they cannot understand what was asked and that the replies which you have given are not in reply to what was asked? We are asking for a machinery for appeals, not a machinery for the original orders, one way or the other, to be made. I hope the Honourable Minister can explain why he cannot tell us why another satisfactory machinery for appeals cannot be put up, and not the question of whether or not these applications should be referred to Boards—nobody asked for it in this House.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we have condemned Clause 2 and we will continue to condemn it. It is obnoxious to the Constitution and, as the Constitution says, it cannot be challenged in Court. But let it be remembered that the undertaking which I gave was not to speak a second time. That was the only undertaking which I gave. I did not hear any motion to suspend the Standing Orders of this House. If a law is passed through this House unconstitutionally, in violation of Standing Orders, that law will be *ultra vires*. So, I ask the Government side to consider whether, in respect of Clause 2 inserted here, in the manner in which the second reading went through, it is constitutionally going through this House. I ask you to consider that seriously.

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew (Singapore):

Mr Speaker, Sir, I shall let the Honourable Member for Batu into the secret of the potent medicine which was administered. I found it hard to believe the Minister of Home Affairs when he expounded to me that the purpose to which such a Select Committee would be postured would be something quite different from what was intended by us. I conceded to him that that may well be the purpose, but in the course of this morning Members on my right have proved to me that he was right, that in fact really they are against the Bill *in toto*—they are not just against Clause 2 as drafted because it is insufficiently precise in its definition and because no proper

safeguards or attenuative provisos have been added. Perhaps he is right in saying that if those who are against this Bill in principle *in toto*, as distinct from those who would like to sieve those doubts and reservations, if both together agree to a Select Committee it might confuse the public.

Sir, I would like to suggest to the Honourable Member for Tanjong, after hearing his few remarks made in connection with this motion to refer this Bill to a Select Committee, that perhaps now is the time when he could make a useful contribution. As I understand the two brothers—one is the Honourable Member for Ipoh and the other is the Honourable Member for Menglembu—the one from Menglembu is opposed to the Bill *in toto*, opposed to Clause 2 of the Bill *in toto*, whereas the one from Ipoh, as I understood him yesterday, was prepared to accept with regret the necessity for Clause 2 and would like to see it narrowed down, improved by appeal provisos and so on. I hope he will correct me if I am wrong because he has more than one opportunity to speak in Committee.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: On a point of clarification, what I said was that if there were a Select Committee and we were satisfied after hearing all views that there was no other way to prevent this subversion, then we would be prepared to support the Bill in its present form. Otherwise we would not.

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew: I beg to differ. Before the Bill can be referred to a Select Committee it must be read a second time. As I understand parliamentary practice, when one agrees to the second reading of a Bill, one agrees to its contents in principle. So, before it goes to a Select Committee one must agree with the Bill in principle. If one disagrees with the Bill *in toto*, then one denies it a second reading. Therefore, the question does not arise. But perhaps in a round about way this might be the easier way to separate the sheep from the goats. The point I want to make, Mr Speaker, Sir, is that the Minister for Home Affairs may well find it to his advantage at a subsequent date, after

he has scored his point to bring on his own, such amending legislation to give this Bill sufficient safeguards to allay honest, genuine anxiety. There are certain words and phrases in the Bill which could have been more happily phrased. In fact, as the Minister, knew, we would have introduced such a Bill, a similar Bill, in Singapore, had this been, as we intended it to be, in the Education Act. However, it was his decision that this was a matter of security and not of education. Hence the matter was out of our hands. I do not believe it is possible at this juncture in Committee, particularly when the Attorney-General is not a Member of this Chamber, to go on altering phrases and provisions in the Bill. Suffice it be for me to say this—that the Attorney-General, with whom I had casual discussions yesterday, is quite receptive to proposals, after the Bill has been in operation for some time, to make such amendments as may make its phrasing more precise.

I would myself, Mr Speaker, Sir, if I were playing this in a scrum and I were centre forward, I would let them confront us in the scrum rather than in the House, because some times there is an advantage in really having a double exposure. But, perhaps, that is too lengthy and laborious a process and judging also from the few Members of the Barisan Sosialis who have attended this session, perhaps, they are also finding it laborious and this is an easier way to get through. Even if one gave them all the democratic freedom guaranteed in the United Nations, they would still be unhappy, because what they want to achieve is a State run after their own hearts—a Soviet Republic of Malaya. Whichever form of democratic right and freedom one offers them, it is valuable to them only in-so-far as it can be exploited to destroy the stupidity of the bourgeois democratic system. But here the bourgeois democratic system has decided, as it has the right to decide in self-defence, that this particular freedom or licence to run about and spawn, talent scouting recruiting, training, hardening a group of

cadres in the University, shall be denied them. It is as simple as that. That is the principle to which we agree and that is what Clause 2 seeks to do. Whether Clause 2 will do what it seeks to do is another matter which depends on the efficiency and efficacy of the organs of administration.

I suggest that, in the light of one year's working of this Bill, we might after proper discussion and consideration of the side effects which all such Bills will have, bring in an agreed (that is what I hope), amendment to improve its presentation. But on this we are 100 per cent with the Minister—that we have the right, and we must have the right, to say, “No, you will not go on doing that in the schools”. And one of the ways in which we hope to stop them is by preventing a conglomeration of hardened, professional revolutionaries in the guise of perennial students foregathering in the seats of higher learning. One does not make a threat, even two do not make a threat. In fact, one of the points which this Bill does not do is to say that a person who has been denied a certificate cannot get admission into a university abroad. The unpublished policy in Singapore, one of the ways in which we try to meet the problem of borderline cases, is to send that student on a Colombo Plan scholarship abroad. One man lost in McGill University, one would-be Chin Peng in McGill, in the affluence of Canadian society, will come back at the end of four years with his horizon widened. But 100 would-be Chin Pengs vying with each other to outdo each other in revolutionary fervour, conglomerated in ten acres of university campus, can do immeasurable damage to hundreds of other students not similarly alive to these dangers. So, I say with the reservations I have made as to the aptness of the expression in Clause 2, that we support the intention in Clause 2 and I hope that the Minister will implement it effectively.

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Mr Speaker, Sir, although I was denied the chance to give the reasons why I wanted to move a motion for referring the Bill to

Select Committee, I would like to say that it is quite clear—it must be clear to the House—that once the Bill has been read a second time, the principles of the Bill have been agreed to; and as a matter of fact if we look through Standing Order 55, it will be seen that it is clearly defined that the function of a Select Committee is not to debate the principles but only the details of the Bill. Sir, it is in the details of the Bill that I find myself apprehensive over the interpretation of Clause 2. Earlier on in the debate, particularly with regard to the term “certificate of suitability”, I had raised two points for the Minister of Home Affairs to consider—two points which I felt would contribute greatly to the successful implementation of the aims and principles of the Bill.

Sir, if a student were to be denied a certificate of suitability, would it mean, in the first instance, that he would also be denied the opportunity for employment, as nothing is mentioned in this Bill. Secondly, Sir, if a student were denied a certificate of suitability in the first instance, under what conditions, could he on a subsequent application, be given such a certificate?

Sir, we have been assured by the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs in respect of the procedure and the processes, whereby a certificate of suitability would be assessed and given. Sir, it would be, I think, a very great assurance not only to this House but also to all the other bodies and persons, who have been generally concerned over the implications of the Bill outside this House, if the assurance as to the intention of Government, which the Minister for Home Affairs earlier elaborated, had been incorporated into this section of the Bill.

Sir, there was another reason why I felt that reference to a Select Committee will make the implementation of the Bill more successful and the purposes of the Bill more successful. Sir, I feel that the question of security should not only be the responsibility of the Government or the Minister responsible of the portfolio concerned,

but that the security of the nation should also be the responsibility of all the citizens of this country, and the lead provided by the passage of this Bill should be properly interpreted and properly explained to the various bodies, who have raised doubts over the constitutional aspects of the Bill, which will certainly involve the various bodies representing the teachers, parents and the workers in this country. Sir, that, however, deals only with what I had intended to say earlier on and which I was prevented from saying at the proper time.

Now, Sir, I would refer immediately to the amendments which I had earlier proposed. As a matter of fact, during the course of the debate, I realised that even the very amendments, which I made two or three days earlier in an attempt to provide some constructive proposals as to how the Bill could be somewhat tempered to meet the anxieties outside this House, I realised that even these proposed amendments that I had circulated were inadequate and probably not correct in the context of the speeches made by the Minister of Home Affairs. However, Sir, the Minister of Home Affairs anticipated my amendments and referred to the amendments that I had proposed in these terms. First, on my suggestion that the issue of a certificate of suitability should be referred to the Minister charged with the responsibility for Education—this according to him was not practical, because the Bill is an exercise of security, which did not involve the Ministry of Education. Also, according to him, it was contrary to ministerial responsibility. However, Sir, the Honourable the Minister of Home Affairs did admit that the Chief Education Adviser and the Chief Education Officer, Director of Education, or Chief Education Adviser, as the case may be, would be acting under the Ministry of Education—and to some extent he also agreed that this Bill, although essentially an exercise in security, also involved the question of education.

Now, Sir, if you look at this Bill, the provision of Clause 41 (c) (1), you

will notice that in 41 (c) (1) the Bill itself admits that the Minister charged with the responsibility for education is also the authority which the Government accepts as the proper authority whereby certain students should make their application for certificates. Therefore, if a student or any person not ordinarily resident in Malaysia were to apply for a certificate of suitability, he can apply to the Minister charged with the responsibility for education. Sir, under those circumstances, I do not see where it is irrelevant that the Minister charged with the responsibility for education can similarly be employed for the enactment of Clause 41 (c) and subsection (2). Sir, let us accept it as a fact that the student who are the products of the efforts of the Minister and the Ministry of Education, who eventually apply for certificates of suitability for entry into higher education, and who subsequently are refused these certificates of suitability on security grounds must represent to some extent the failure of our education system to impart a proper national-and-civic consciousness to our students. Therefore, Sir, to some extent I feel that, if we have the intention to fight for the heart and minds of these students, if we refer the question of certificates of suitability to the Minister of Education, and in the event of his refusal of such certificates, the Minister of Education may provide an answer, or may provide a solution, as to how he can re-train, re-educate and rehabilitate these students, who have been considered unsuitable. I mean that some solution may arise so that in practice we will still be able to salvage all the students, who have been lost earlier. We understand that if certificates of suitability were to be sent in to the Minister charged with the responsibility for education, in fact, the civil servants who are associated with that Ministry will be responsible for the direct enquiries concerning this suitability.

Sir, with regard to the other proposed amendments which I made of referring the question to the Honourable the Prime Minister, the very replies made

in anticipation by the Minister of Home Affairs create two points. First, he says that the appeal is to be considered by the Minister of Home Affairs. I was under the impression that the word "Minister" under Sub-clause (4) referred to the Minister for Internal Security, but the Minister of Home Affairs referred, in particular, to the fact that the appeals would be considered by him in his capacity as Minister of Home Affairs. It so happens that he is at the present moment the incumbent holding both portfolios, but I think he reiterated twice that it is the Minister of Home Affairs, who would consider these appeals—I stand to be corrected.

Mr Speaker: Have you finished yet?

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Just one last word. Sir, the Minister of Home Affairs also stated that it is a well-known fact that every appeal goes in with a copy to the Honourable the Prime Minister. Sir, the amendments that I proposed only seek to try and bring out what the Alliance has always reiterated—that they like to do things clearly and openly; and if in fact the appeals have always been sent to the Honourable the Prime Minister, and the Honourable the Prime Minister is consulted in all these various matters on appeal, why then do we not face facts and just put it down "refer appeals to the Honourable the Prime Minister". These are my points.

Mr Speaker: The sitting is suspended to 4 o'clock this afternoon.

Sitting suspended at 1.00 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 4 p.m.

(Mr Speaker in the Chair)

THE INTERNAL SECURITY (AMENDMENT) BILL

Committee

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee of the whole House.

Bill considered on Committee.

Mr Chairman: The debate on the Internal Security (Amendment) Bill in Committee will resume.

Dato' Dr Ismail: Mr Chairman, Sir, the Member for Tanjong asked whether the Government has considered the prospects of a student who has been refused a Certificate of Suitability ever being given employment, and whether the Government intends to give the student who has been refused a Certificate of Suitability a second chance. I think this is a fair question and I feel I must answer it as definitely as possible.

Sir, no stigma need to be attached to the fact that a student has failed to obtain a Certificate of Suitability unless he himself publicises the fact. The provision in this Bill does not preclude him from applying again and if the authorities consider that he has ceased to be a bad security risk, his case will be reconsidered.

Question put, and agreed to.

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

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

THE INCOME TAX 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 amend the laws relating to income tax in Malaysia" be read a second time.

Honourable Members who were members of this House then may recall that in the 1964 Budget speech mention was made that certain amendments to the Income Tax Ordinances in Malaysia would be made. The purpose of the present Bill is to give effect to the changes proposed in that Budget speech.

Before I proceed with the explanation of the clauses in the Bill, I would like to inform the House that at the moment, pending production of a single Malaysian Income Tax Ordinance, each of the four groups of Malaysia retains as a Federal law its former Income Tax Ordinance, which has been suitably modified in consequence of Malaysia. Honourable Members have already seen the Modification of Laws (Income Tax) Order,

1964 which has already been laid before this House pursuant to subsection 9 of section 74 of the Malaysia Act.

The Bill itself contains only two clauses: clause 1 gives the short title of the Act, whilst clause 2 recites the four Ordinances which the Bill seeks to amend. Owing to the present diversity in our income tax laws, the Bill has four Schedules. Each Schedule contains the changes proposed for a particular territory, e.g., the First Schedule contains the States of Malaya proposals, the Second Schedule the Sabah proposals and so on. Some of the changes are common to all territories and some affect no more than one.

I now propose to examine the changes contained in the First Schedule which sets out the amendments to the States of Malaya Income Tax Ordinance and to indicate which of those changes appear in the other three Schedules. Thereafter, I shall deal with the remaining changes which appear only in the Second, Third or Fourth Schedules. If my exposition is necessarily somewhat discursive I beg the forbearance of the House.

Under Section 2 of the States of Malaya Income Tax Ordinance the Comptroller-General of Inland Revenue is, by implication, given power to approve any pension or provident fund or society. Subject to certain limitations, contributions to a fund so approved are available for income tax relief.

Paragraph 1 of the First Schedule seeks to confer on the Comptroller-General an express power of approval and in addition to empower the Comptroller-General to withdraw any approval given prior to Malaysia Day. Honourable Members will wish to be satisfied that there are valid reasons for seeking this power to withdraw from a fund an approval which had earlier been given to it.

I am advised that under the rules of many funds approved in the past it is possible either for the fund to be wound up and all benefits distributed

to members, or for an employee, after perhaps only a few years' membership of the fund, to withdraw his accrued benefits on leaving his employment even though he is nowhere near normal retiring age.

This is contrary to Government policy. The purpose of a provident fund is to make provision for the employee in old age or when, through ill health, he is unable to continue his working life, and in the last resort, to ensure that his dependants, should he die before reaching normal retiring age, are not left in want. As these purposes are wholly admirable, income tax relief is given on contributions made to approved funds by both employers and employees. Honourable Members will, I am sure, readily agree that it is undesirable that employees, while still young and in unimpaired health, should be able to obtain and dissipate provident fund benefits built up from contributions on which income tax relief has been given. The inevitable consequences of such licence must be, not merely that the income tax incentive to make such provision has been given at public expense and to no purpose, but also that many such employees will in old age needlessly be a charge on the Government.

A new set of conditions for approval for provident funds has, therefore, been drawn up which are virtually identical with those contained in section 13 of the Employees Provident Fund Ordinance which governs withdrawals from the E.P.F. These new conditions will ensure that, broadly speaking, benefits become payable only when members reach normal retiring age or die earlier, when they cease to be employable through chronic ill health, or when they leave Malaysia with no intention of returning thereto. In addition, trustees of certain funds will be asked to observe a policy of investing an increasing percentage of their funds within Malaysia.

If the rules of any fund, approved in the States of Malaya or Singapore prior to Malaysia Day, and in Sabah prior to 1st January, 1964, conflict

with the conditions I have just indicated, it will be invited to amend its rules accordingly.

It is, I am glad to say, already clear that most trustees of provident funds welcome these new conditions and there is every indication that, in those cases in which it may be necessary, they will freely co-operate in amending their rules to conform with the new policy.

Provision, however, must be made for the exceptional case of trustees who may refuse to amend old rules approved in the past which offend the present policy. If persuasion fails the Comptroller-General must have power to withdraw that earlier approval.

I wish to assure the House that this power will be used neither oppressively nor retrospectively. Although an approval given in the past can be withdrawn, even so, the income tax relief already given on the basis of that past approval will not be disturbed. The power can only be used to deny income tax relief in respect of contributions paid by employers employees and *after* the date on which the approval is withdrawn.

Powers to confer approvals and to withdraw old approvals are sought for Sabah and Singapore in paragraph 2 of the Second Schedule and paragraph 1 of the Fourth Schedule respectively. Such powers already exist in the Sarawak Ordinance.

Paragraph 2 of the First Schedule is merely a tidying-up operation to substitute "Dewan Ra'ayat" for "Legislative Council".

Paragraph 3 seeks to remove a doubt created by the use of the word "person" in section 2 of the Income Tax Act 1963, which from 1963 gave exemption in respect of the annual value of one residence in the States of Malaya occupied by its owner. The substitution now proposed of the word "individual" for the much wider term "person" fulfils the obvious intention of the Legislature.

It will be seen from paragraph 1 (2) of the Second Schedule and paragraph 2 (2) of the Fourth Schedule

respectively, that a similar residence exemption is now proposed for Sabah and for Singapore. No comparable exemption is required for Sarawak since owner-occupied residences are not charged to tax under the Sarawak Ordinance.

Honourable Members will recall that during my Budget speech in December, 1963, I said that the desirability of fixing a ceiling to this exemption was being studied. That study has now been completed and we have decided that no such ceiling should be imposed.

For the purpose of the study, it was assumed that the exemption was to be restricted to a maximum sum of \$3,000 and that, if the net annual value exceeded that sum, then the excess was to be charged to tax. On that basis, it was estimated that the numbers of persons who would be affected and the additional tax yield in a year would be as follow:

In Sabah 65 persons would pay further tax totalling \$6,500—an average of \$100 each.

In Singapore 40 persons would pay further tax totalling \$12,000—an average of \$300 each.

In the States of Malaya 90 persons would pay further tax totalling \$37,000—an average of \$411 each.

Of the States of Malaya total of \$37,000, Kuala Lumpur residents would contribute \$36,600. This fact highlights the effect of the recent revaluation of properties in Kuala Lumpur where values are now relatively much higher than anywhere else in Malaysia. If the exemption were to be subject to a ceiling, the consequences of this differential in the basis of valuation would clearly be to saddle Kuala Lumpur owners with a tax liability which, had their residences been elsewhere in Malaysia, would either have been non-existent or very much smaller.

It is the stated aim of Government to encourage as many of our people as possible to become owners of their own homes. This process demands not merely such positive encouragement

as Government can reasonably give, but wherever possible, the removal of disincentives. In this context, the concept of taxing the owner upon a notional income from his home although it yields him no rent, seems sufficiently artificial to warrant sweeping it completely away to the extent of one such residence per individual; and any ceiling to the exemption would not merely, in a limited form and for a small number of taxpayers preserve and perpetuate the inherent artificiality of that concept, it would also as between those taxpayers themselves, create inequalities.

That there would be inequalities is clear from the figure I have quoted. Were a ceiling of \$3,000 imposed, Kuala Lumpur with its high level of valuation would account for 99 per cent of the further tax to be expected from the States of Malaya and 66 per cent of the further yield from Malaysia as a whole.

For these reasons—to say nothing of the administrative work involved in determining year by year whether particular net annual values fall above or below the ceiling—we have rejected any whittling away of the broad principle that a man should not be charged income tax on the house owned by him in which he chooses to live.

Paragraph 4 of the First Schedule proposes for the States of Malaya the change in the conditions for granting personal reliefs to non-residents which I outlined in my Budget speech. Similar changes are proposed for Sabah (Paragraph 3 of the Second Schedule) and for Singapore (Paragraph 3 of the Fourth Schedule). No such change is required in Sarawak because, under the different system of taxation in that State, there are no express provisions for the grant of personal reliefs to non-residents.

An individual, neither resident in the States of Malaya nor in Singapore, but having income arising in one of these territories, is liable to tax at a rate which, under the proposals of this Bill, is a uniform 40 per cent. The same is true of an individual not

resident in Sabah who derives income from that territory.

As the law now stands, however, such non-resident individuals, in whatever country of the world they reside, can claim a substantial reduction of their Malaysian tax bills if they are British subjects—which for this purpose effectively means citizens of any country in the Commonwealth—or British protected persons. Malaysia is thus committed to repaying tax to the citizens of any Commonwealth country whether or not that country grants reciprocal relief to Malaysian citizens. We have decided that this one-sided arrangement should be terminated.

With effect from years of assessment beginning in 1965, non-resident relief in the States of Malaya, Sabah and Singapore will be accorded only to an individual who is either a Malaysian citizen, a resident of another part of Malaysia, or the recipient of a pension derived from one of these States. The timing of this change represents a departure from the proposals in my Budget speech. I had then indicated that the new form of relief would be operative for 1964 and subsequent years. We have now decided to defer the change for one year. This will afford countries whose residents will not, after the change, qualify for non-resident relief, an opportunity to negotiate Double Taxation Agreements with Malaysia in the context of which it may be possible for the relief to be granted to their residents on the basis of reciprocity for Malaysian residents.

In my Budget speech I referred to the special claim which pensioners have on our consideration and I said that, because of the services they had rendered to Malaysia, pensioners deserved some relief from the 40 per cent non-resident rate of tax which would otherwise be deductible from their pensions. I then indicated that this special treatment would, broadly speaking, be accorded only to pensioners of Government or quasi Government bodies and to such other pensioners as I might, by Order, extend the relief. On reconsideration, we have decided that all pensioners—

regardless of whether they are pensioners of the Central Government, State Government, local authority, or of industry—should be accorded relief and the Bill so proposes.

Honourable Members will see from sub-sections (1) and (2) of the proposed new Section 36 contained in paragraph 4 of the First Schedule (and similarly in paragraph 3 of the Second and Fourth Schedules) that the quality of the relief differs according to the circumstances of the claimant. If he claims because he is a citizen of Malaysia resident abroad, because he is resident in another part of Malaysia, or, because he is a resident of another country with which we have reciprocal provisions for non-resident relief in a Double Taxation Agreement, the relief will extend to *all* income—not excluding a pension—which may be derived from the territory to which he makes his claim. If, however, he possesses none of those three qualifications and his title to claim rests solely on the fact that he is a non-resident pensioner, then the relief will extend to his Malaysian pension only and not to any other Malaysian income he may possess, for example, dividends.

I should perhaps say a word on two minor amendments effected by the new Section 36 in paragraph 4 of the First Schedule, which amendments have their counterparts in the Second and Fourth Schedules. These amendments are designed to remove two anomalies which are present in the existing schemes of calculating non-resident relief. For the purposes of this relief, the non-resident's liability is first computed on the hypotheses that he is resident in the territory to which he makes his claim, and that he is chargeable to tax in that territory on his entire world income. These hypotheses, unless restricted in the way now proposed, confer on the non-resident two reliefs proper to Malaysian residents to which the non-resident can have no equitable title. These two reliefs which will from 1965 be denied to non-residents are as follows:

Firstly: increased child allowance for a child educated abroad. For a non-resident, this relief is anomalous and

unnecessary since in the nature of things his child will be so educated without involving the extra expenditure which a resident of Malaysia incurs on the overseas education of his child; and

Secondly: relief of foreign taxes on income which is never in fact assessed to tax in Malaysia.

Paragraph 5 of the First Schedule seeks to increase the non-resident rate of tax in the States of Malaya from 30% to 40% and thus bring it into line with the existing non-resident rate in Sabah and Singapore.

Paragraph 5 also increases from 30% to 40% the executors' and trustees' rate in the States of Malaya while paragraph 5 of the Second Schedule effects a similar increase in Sabah. In consequence of these latter changes the executors' and trustees' rates will be identical in the States of Malaya, Sabah and Singapore.

To the extent that income is distributed to the beneficiary of a deceased person's estate, or that the beneficiary of a trust is entitled to a share of trust income, provisions exist to enable such income to be charged at the rates of tax at which the beneficiary is personally liable. There will be no change in those provisions and accordingly the beneficiaries I have described will be unaffected by the increase in the executors' and trustees' rate.

The amendment proposed in paragraph 6 of the First Schedule is designed to ensure in the States of Malaya, that, should a Double Taxation Agreement come to an end without being renewed, the alternative form of double taxation relief provided by Section 43 or 44, as appropriate, is revived. Comparable amendments are proposed for Sabah, Sarawak and Singapore by paragraph 4 of the Second Schedule, paragraph 2 of the Third Schedule and paragraph 4 of the Fourth Schedule, respectively.

Under the existing law in Sabah and Singapore this House may by resolution amend the scale rates of tax. Paragraph 7 of the First Schedule and paragraph 3 of the Third Schedule give

the House a like permissive power in regard to the States of Malaya and Sarawak scale rates respectively.

I now turn to the remaining paragraphs of the other Schedules to which I have not so far referred.

Under the Sabah and Sarawak Income Tax Ordinances, the profits arising to a non-resident from the operation of ships or aircraft are exempted if the country from which he carries on business grants an equivalent exemption to British shipping or air transport profits. A somewhat similar exemption is provided in respect of such profits under the Singapore Income Tax Ordinance.

This unilateral giving up of Malaysian tax will now cease. It is proposed (through paragraph 1 of the Second Schedule, paragraph 1 of the Third Schedule and paragraph 2 of the Fourth Schedule to the Bill) to cancel these exemptions. In future, such profits will be relieved from tax only under reciprocal provisions in Double Taxation Agreements entered into by Malaysia. The comparable exemption earlier enjoyed under the States of Malaya Income Tax Ordinance has already been repealed by section 6 of the Income Tax Act, 1962.

Paragraph 2 (a) of the Third Schedule proposes that in Section 60 of the Sarawak Inland Revenue Ordinance there should be substituted the words "tax under this Ordinance" for the words "income tax". It has just been brought to my notice that the proposed change has been included in a major redrafting of Section 60 (1) to which the Modification of Laws (Income Tax) Order 1964 has already given effect. I shall in the Committee Stage be moving an amendment in respect of paragraph 2 of the Third Schedule of the Bill. The necessary amendment slip has, I believe, been circulated to Honourable Members.

I offer the House my apologies for this unfortunate oversight which Honourable Members may, I hope, think pardonable in the context of the major modification of our income tax law which has just taken place.

At the end of each Schedule to the Bill there is a paragraph which sets out the years of assessment for which certain of the changes proposed in that Schedule are to have effect. I shall briefly recapitulate these changes.

All other changes take effect only from the date this Act passes into law.

The increases in the non-residents' and in the executors' and trustees' rate of tax take effect in the States of Malaya for the year of assessment 1964 and subsequent years.

In Sabah the executors' and trustees' rate is increased for the year of assessment commencing 1st July, 1964 and subsequent years.

The existing exemption of the shipping and air transport profits of non-residents is repealed in Sarawak and in Singapore with effect from 1st January, 1964. In Sabah, the like exemption is repealed in the case of companies with effect from 1st January, 1964, and in any other case with effect from 1st July, 1964.

The exemption of one residence owned and occupied by an individual has effect in Sabah for the year of assessment commencing 1st July, 1964, and subsequent years and in Singapore, for years of assessment commencing 1st January, 1964, and subsequent years.

In the States of Malaya, the substitution of "individual" for "person" in the context of the existing exemption has effect from 1st January, 1964.

As I have earlier indicated, the new provisions for the grant of personal reliefs to non-resident individuals have effect in the States of Malaya and in Singapore for years of assessment commencing 1st January, 1965, and subsequent years and in Sabah, for years of assessment commencing 1st July, 1965, and subsequent years.

Sir, I beg to move.

Dato' Dr Ismail: 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.

First Schedule ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Second Schedule ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Third Schedule—

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Mr Chairman, Sir, I wish to amend the Third Schedule in the manner in which I have indicated in my speech in the Second Reading, that is to delete paragraph 2 and substitute the following—

"2. In section 60, at the end of sub-section (2) there shall be added the words 'but the said section shall come into operation again for any subsequent year of assessment with respect to which no such arrangements are in force'."

Question put, and agreed to.

Third Schedule, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Fourth Schedule ordered to stand part of the Bill.

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

THE CRIMINAL LAW (TEMPORARY PROVISIONS) (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1964

Second Reading

Dato' Dr Ismail: Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "An Act to amend the Criminal Law (Temporary Provisions) Ordinance, 1955, of Singapore" be read a second time.

Sir, the Criminal Law (Temporary Provisions) Ordinance, 1955, (No. 26 of 1955), of Singapore (as amended by Ordinance No. 36 of 1958 and No. 56 of 1959) will expire on 20th October, 1964. This Bill seeks to extend its life for a period of another five years. This Ordinance contains several parts dealing with various subjects, viz.:

Part I—Preliminary.

Part II—Miscellaneous Offences relating to Public Safety.

Part IV—Restriction of Display of National Emblems.

Part V—Illegal Strikes and Lock-outs in Essential Services.

Part VI—General-Dispersal of Assemblies, etc.

Part VII—Detention.

Part III has already been deleted.

As will be seen from the subjects contained in this Ordinance, the provisions therein are primarily intended for the maintenance of public safety, peace and good order, prevention of strikes and lock-outs in essential services, and detention and supervision of persons associated with activities of a criminal nature. From experience since its introduction, this Ordinance has been especially effective in the maintenance of public peace and order and in curbing the activities of persons associated with secret societies who constitute a danger to the public.

Since the introduction of the Criminal Law (Temporary Provisions) (Amendment) Ordinance 25/58 on the 15th of August, 1958, the number of secret society incidents have diminished from 402 in 1959 to 144 in 1963. Breakdown figures are as follows:

	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963
Secret Society incidents ...	402	239	211	207	144

This vast improvement is a clear reflection on the effectiveness of the ordinance. As on 28-6-64 the total number of persons in detention under Section 47 (a) of the Ordinance was 729 and the number of persons on Police Supervision under Section 47 (b) was 1,236.

The situation as regards secret societies in the State of Singapore is under control, but a constant vigil has to be kept in order to maintain this situation. Without the Criminal Law (Temporary Provisions) Ordinance, the power of control would be considerably weakened if not lost.

Under Article 111 of the Supplementary Agreement relating to Malaysia (done at Kuala Lumpur on the 11th day of September, 1963), the power to make and confirm orders under the Criminal Law (Temporary Provisions) Ordinance, 1955, will as from Malaysia Day be delegated to the present

Government of Singapore, and the Government of the Federation will take such steps as may be appropriate and available to them to secure the enactment by Parliament of an act to extend the operation of the Criminal Law (Temporary Provisions) Ordinance, so long as such delegation continues.

In view of the above, the Singapore Government has requested that the life of the principal Ordinance which will lapse on the 20th October, 1964, be extended for another five years.

Sir, I beg to move.

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

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, we on this side of the House have deferred so much with those on the other side of the House that I think it must be a relief both to them and to us that I rise on this occasion to support this Bill (*Applause*). No right thinking person will quarrel with this Bill and no right thinking person, whether on that side of the House or this side of the House, will quarrel with the Government when it seeks powers to control the nefarious activities of the secret societies. But, Mr Speaker, I do not know why this law is only for Singapore, because I do not think that the Singapore secret societies are bigger or more numerous than those in the Federation. I do hope that the Minister of Home Affairs will realise that in our own backyard of Malaya there is a need for constant vigilance and this vigilance must not be relaxed.

One has only to read the newspapers to read of letters of extortion, bullets being sent to all and sundry, my profession being the special target for such bullets, whether rightly or wrongly, and I do hope that the Minister concerned will take into consideration that these people do exist. They come and go; the Causeway is no barrier to them. Today they are in Kuala Lumpur, tomorrow they are in Singapore, and *vice versa*. Mr Speaker, Sir, I think the Singapore Government has tried an experiment; I do not know whether aptly or inaptly it has called it Pulau Senang, and that turned out to be a fiasco. But I do hope that the Government will not give up

their attempts in trying to find a more sensible way of dealing with this problem rather than having to legislate in this way.

Mr Speaker, as this House must know, the root cause of a person falling into bad ways lies not in his inherent wickedness or otherwise, but it lies in the social and economic factors that surround him. This I commend not only to the Minister of Home Affairs, but I do know that the Singapore Government must be aware of this thing. If a child cannot go to school because he is handicapped—but happily he has now six years of free primary school education and another three years of secondary education. But even if after he has finished nine years of schooling and he comes out, he finds a cruel world facing him, then what is he to do?

Mr Speaker, Sir, when I was in my dispensary this afternoon, a Malay came to the dispensary. He said, "I went to see the Menteri Besar, I went to see this man, I went to see that man, I went to the Employment Exchange. I can't get a job. Doctor, can you give me a job?" I said, "Look here, for God's sake, I am not the Government, neither am I the Minister of Labour. I can't offer you a job. What I can do is that to direct you to the Labour Exchange and I hope they will help you to find a job." As I have said before, I fully support this Bill, but the root cause lies in the socio-economic conditions that face the youth of our country. I notice that the Minister of Youth, Culture and Sports is here. If the youths of this country are not catered for by the various activities like ping-pong, swimming or basketball, and if after leaving school or being thrown out of school they cannot get a useful job, then they are but easy targets not only for what the Government benches would think the Communist agents but also for secret societies. They find these frustrated youths of our country easy targets and they are easily recruited into the 08 Gang or the *Ang Bin Hoay* or the *Wah Kiew* and such like and they go on to swell their numbers and go on multiplying.

I do hope that the Government of Malaysia will think a little more on this and go into the root cause of this, which they know, and try and find some other way by which we can prevent the youth of our country falling into evil ways.

Dato' Dr Ismail: Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to thank the Member for Batu for his support of this Bill. I am very sorry to hear that he was placed in the dilemma of having to find a job for the boy who saw him at his dispensary. For one moment I thought that he was giving the boy the job of another Political Secretary, in which case we on this side of the House can expect more questions and more observations from the Honourable Member (*Laughter*).

I share his observation that we must do something constructive for the people he mentioned. In fact, the Government is thinking on the same lines, as to how to combine constructive measures with the repressive measures that are being enforced now. My Ministry is looking into the matter and, if it is practicable, I will consult my colleagues and probably the Honourable Member will support me if I bring such a Bill or motion to this House.

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 SUPPLEMENTARY SUPPLY (1963 AND 1964) BILL

Second Reading

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that "a Bill intituled an

Act to apply sums out of the Consolidated Fund for additional expenditure for the service of the years 1963 and 1964 and to appropriate such sums for certain purposes" be read a second time.

As has been the practice in previous years, Sir, this Bill seeks authority for expenditure in regard to two separate sets of Supplementary Estimates, one for the year 1963 and the other for 1964. This practice, as I have said before, simplifies the procedure for considering two sets of Supplementary Estimates during the same meeting of the House.

Clause 2 of the Bill provides authority for additional expenditure of \$10,111,730 for the service of the year 1963 and this is itemised in the First Schedule of the Bill and also in the Supply Expenditure section of the Fifth Supplementary Estimates, 1963, which are tabled as Command Paper No. 16 of 1964. Of this amount, a sum of \$4,700,687 was advanced from the Contingencies Fund and this has now to be recouped. As Hon'ble Members will observe, out of the total of \$15,388,606 included in the Fifth Supplementary Estimates, 1963, a sum of \$5,276,876 is required to meet the cost of financing "charged" expenditure services which are not of course mentioned in the Supplementary Supply Bill. The two big items of "charged" expenditure are the assignment to States of export duty on iron ore (\$4,133,677), and the interest on the £5 million sterling loan raised in London in 1963. The increase in the assignment to States of export duty on iron ore which is required under the Assignment of Revenue (Export Duty on Iron Ore) Act, 1962, is to cover the period up to and including 30th September, 1963, for which period receipts from export duty on iron ore have proved to be higher than estimated. As regards the additional expenditure to meet the interest due on the £5 million sterling loan, the amount appropriated to this Sub-head in the 1963 Estimates did not take this loan into account as it was only raised in July, 1963. In the Supply section of the supplement, the two big items are

under Head S. 40—Royal Malaysia Police (\$7,862,129) and Head S. 62—Postal Services (\$643,914). The supplement for Head S. 40—Royal Malaysia Police, is mainly required to meet Personal Emoluments as a result of the upward revision of salaries of the Police rank and file effective from 1st March, 1963, and the establishment costs of the Headquarters of the Inspector-General of Police, Malaysia. The additional expenditure under Head S. 62—Postal Services is to cover the payment of arrears of salaries resulting from the salary revision of the uniformed staff of the Postal Department effective from 1st August, 1963, and the increased cost of conveyance of mail arising from heavier mail traffic. The increase in mail traffic will increase revenue correspondingly.

The original Estimates of Expenditure approved by Parliament for 1963 amounted to \$1,088 million. Taking both the "supply" and "charged" expenditure together, the total estimated expenditure, including the four previous supplements and the present supplement which the House is now requested to approve, would amount to \$1,408,714,624. This does not mean, however, that the total additional amount of \$320.9 million was fully spent in that year. As the 1963 accounts can now be closed with the approval of this supplement, the total actual expenditure for 1963, including all the Supplementary Estimates, is estimated to be in the region of \$1,276 million. Actual total expenditure will, therefore, exceed the sum of \$1,088 million originally approved by Parliament by \$188 million.

Clause 3 of the Bill seeks authority to incur additional expenditure of \$39,230,398 in respect of the year 1964 as itemised in the Second Schedule of the Bill and also in the First Supplementary Estimates, 1964, which are laid before the House as Command Paper No. 18 of 1964. Of the sum required as additional expenditure, an amount of \$21,477,857 has been advanced from the Contingencies Fund and this has now to be recouped. As Hon'ble Members will observe, of the total sum of \$39,230,398 included in

the First Supplementary Estimates, 1964, a sum of \$1,762,550 is required to meet the cost of financing "charged" expenditure services which are not mentioned in the Supply Bill. The two big items of "charged" expenditure are encashment of Treasury Notes issued to the International Monetary Fund and interest on the 1963 \$40.5 million loan raised locally.

As regards the additional expenditure under Supply, by far the biggest items of expenditure are in respect of:

Defence	...	...	\$ 6.7 million
Contribution to Statutory Funds	...	...	3.5 million
Internal Security and Royal Malaysia Police	...	...	14.1 million

As the reasons for requesting additional monies have been given in some detail in the Treasury Memoranda on the two sets of Estimates which are tabled as Command Papers No. 17 and 19 of 1964 respectively, it is unnecessary for me to elaborate further on them now. The Ministers concerned will explain their own items in greater detail during the Committee Stage.

Sir, I beg to move.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Dr Lim Swee Aun): Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Minister of Finance, in moving the second reading of the Supplementary Supply Bill, has tried to justify the need for the additional expenditure and also has said that when we talk on the respective Ministries themselves, the respective Ministers, in Committee I presume, will reply to us.

Mr Speaker, Sir, contrary to what the Minister has said, I find that most of the expenditure is unnecessary and in any case the urgency was not there for sums to be advanced out of the Contingencies Fund. Furthermore, the type of expenditure incurred and spent could not be said to be unforeseen expenditure. Therefore, this is an extraordinary method of seeking approval for expenditure already met. Mr

Speaker, Sir, in talking about the Development (Supplementary) Estimates, I have already commented on the fact that very often the Government spends first and then comes to us for approval. I reiterate again that this is putting the cart before the horse. This has become quite a practice of the Minister of Finance.

Sir, the total requested for formal approval, taking the two Schedules together, is approximately \$55 million. But this does not include the amount of approximately \$10 million which was spent by way of virement. This House is, therefore, asked as a mere formality to approve a total of \$65 million.

Of this amount, slightly more than \$40 million is a direct result of the establishment of Malaysia, and is in addition to the amounts originally approved in the four previous Supplementary Supply Bills for 1963 and those amounts approved in the main Supply Bills in 1963 and 1964. What the total amount spent as a direct result of Malaysia, God only knows. But quite a substantial amount of this could have been avoided if there had been a little less haste, a little less fear, a little less bravado and a little more self-reliance on the part of the Alliance Government.

However, now that the Alliance has committed us to Malaysia, we presumably will be asked by the Minister of Finance to tighten our belts—he has given no indication of it yet—and may we pray that we may avoid the holocaust that may well descend on us.

Mr Speaker, Sir, under Head S. 14, Ministry of Defence, sub-head 108, page 12 (1964 Estimates), the sum of \$3,910,000 was spent on temporary accommodation for the Malaysian troops. I wonder whether the number of Malaysian soldiers is so numerous that such a vast amount is required for just temporary quarters. Are our soldiers housed in holiday resorts in Sabah and Sarawak, or are they supposed to be fighting a war in the unchartered jungles of Sabah and Sarawak? If they are actually fighting in Borneo, then I think such an amount is unnecessary for temporary quarters.

Then, again, under item 27 of the same page for \$1,786,725 is for equipping two battalions of Malaysian Rangers. This, we are told, is to be raised and maintained by the British Army. If this is so, then why do we have to equip them? The explanation given in the Explanatory Note is that the British Army is not in a position to supply equipment which are not standard to the British Army. If that is so, why were not our soldiers provided with standard equipment? Is the British Army short of such equipment that we have to equip our soldiers with sub-standard equipment?

Here, Mr Speaker, Sir, while we are talking of defence, may I refer to the speech of the Acting Prime Minister on Monday last, when he appealed to the House and the country to rally round the Government. We appreciate the sober analysis of the crisis, and we wish to assure him of our support for the latest measures taken. But we would urge him to pay greater attention to the proposed Afro-Asian Conciliation Commission which we had earlier suggested when we were debating the King's Speech—it was I who suggested it. This idea of solving the dispute should be pursued with determination as we feel that that is the only way of solving it. But we, the Socialist Front, would like to remind Indonesia that we would not sit back and let her hold this country to ransom and blackmail. As a country that has brought about independence before us, she should have enough statesmanship to find a peaceful settlement to this dispute.

We also warned the Alliance Government of the consequences of Maphilindo and the Macapagal Plan, because it is racialistic in concept and would stir up racialistic feeling and split the country along a racialistic line just when we need everyone in this country to rally round the Government.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we hope that the Government would remember that the defence of the country has to be shared equally by all people, and all the people of this country must be treated equally. Only in this way can a common feeling and a common

outlook be fostered and established. I say this with conviction, because there is no alternative for the Malays, Chinese and Indians in this country but to dedicate themselves to the forging of a united State of Malaysia founded on equality, tolerance and brotherhood. Let us march together with charity to all and malice to none.

Now, I come to more mundane matters contained in the Bill before us. On page 9 of the 1963 Estimates, a sum of, I think, \$35,620 was spent for the setting up of a National Language Operations Room. This sounds as if the Director of the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka is going to war against the non-Malays for not learning the national language. Does this mean that the Director has abandoned the velvet love for the mailed fist, or is the Director of the Dewan Bahasa still trying in his own way to foster the growth and the use of the national language.

Mr Speaker, Sir, may I ask what has come out of that room to this date? Has a greater love for the national language been encouraged and fostered? Has public desires and enthusiasm for the learning of the national language been aroused? I do not think so. On the contrary, fears have been aroused; force, instead of persuasion, has been used; opposition has been more vocal. Even the faithful and obedient *Straits Times* has been castigated. The English press as a whole has also been castigated. This is not what we want from the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, or for that matter from the Director of the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka. But is the Director aware that if his dreams were to come true in Malaysia, then there will be not one nation but many. Therefore, I should like to urge the Director to spend more time in his Operation Room instead of planning for war? He should plan for the acceptance of the national language as the common language of the diverse people of Malaysia as a whole, as the number of tongues used in our country has increased manifold with the establishment of Malaysia. All this does not mean, Mr Speaker, Sir, that

the Socialist Front is against the study and propagation of the national language.

At the first meeting of this House, it was only the Socialist Front that drew the attention of this House to the absence of any reference to the present *Bulan Bahasa Kebangsaan* in the Royal Address. We expressed regret at such an omission and said that if the Alliance Government did not take the lead in such matters, how could this House expect the ra'ayat especially the non-Malays, to study the national language?

We also drew the attention of this House to the fact that last year one Assistant Minister was invited to a prize-giving of a school, and after the Headmaster and the Chairman of that school had spoken in *Bahasa Kebangsaan* first and then in English, the Minister concerned was invited to speak before he gave away the prizes. He, when he stood up, spoke only in *Bahasa Inggeris*. Mr Speaker, Sir, may I commend this, as I have commended before, to the Government benches: let them put their own house in order first before they ask the ra'ayat outside this House to study the National Language.

The Alliance Government's long-term plans for the study of the national language are quite satisfactory. Here, the fact that it is a compulsory subject in all Examinations at M.S.S.E.E.—now abolished—L.C.E. and the F.M.C. will ensure that the rising generation will have an adequate knowledge of the language. But the Alliance Government has failed in its short-term plans for the present generation and winning over the intellectuals. I dare not call myself an intellectual, but I dare say that the professional people have not been won over as a whole and the fault lies with the Alliance Government, Mr Speaker, Sir.

As you know, the professional people as a group are fairly busy people and by the very nature of their work they find it difficult to take regular lessons in the national language. What has the *Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka*, or the Government,

produced for these people? The *Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka* has yet to produce a grammar book for the average student. It has published a *Kursus Bahasa Kebangsaan* in three volumes but they are meant for Government servants. At the various exhibitions held by the *Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka*, I have searched in vain for a dictionary published by the *Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka*—and this also applies to books like “Antonyms and Synonyms”, “*Peri Bahasa*” and “*Sim-pulan Bahasa*”, etc.

Next, there have been several excellent radio courses in the national language that I have tried times without number to get a retaping of such courses, but I have been unsuccessful. Now, one of the best ways for a busy professional, intelligent man to learn any language is to learn it from a taperecorder with the lessons provided for in book form. I am at a loss why this valuable method of teaching any language has not been adopted and encouraged. As I stated before, I have tried times without number to get such recordings: every time I tried, there is, what you call “patent rights” and the like. If we are to encourage the use of the national language to these professional people, surely this is the method: a taperecorder with the lessons in book form should be provided for the person who is, perhaps, far too busy to take lesson from a *guru* or to listen at a regular time over the radio.

May I sound a word of warning to the parents of Malay students in the English Medium Schools. In a primary school where I am the Chairman of the Board of Managers in 1962, 67 boys failed the M.S.S.E.E. solely because they failed in the National Language, and of these more than half were Malay students. This is one aspect of the study of the national language that I would commend to the Government and to the attention of the Director of the *Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka*. May I also urge him to organise a seminar on the study of the national language composed solely of non-Malays. Such a seminar will be most helpful to

bring to the attention of the Government and the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka the problems of the non-Malays in their attempts to study the national language. After all, I take it that every Bulan Bahasa Kebangsaan is meant solely for the benefit of the non-Malays, but in this I am afraid, despite all the processions, despite all the money spent, the Dewan Bahasa and the Government have merely scratched the surface of the problem and have failed in their attempt to get the ra'ayat to learn and accept the national language. May I also urge the Director of the Dewan Bahasa to devote more time to finding ways and means of assisting people to learn the national language rather than chanting slogans and threatening people.

Mr Speaker, Sir, here I notice with gladness and with pleasure that there has been a change of heart on the part of the Director of the Dewan Bahasa. A few days ago there was tarring of all the signs around Kuala Lumpur and I am glad that the Director of the Dewan Bahasa has come out in an outright condemnation, calling such acts as acts of vandalism which should be condemned. If such acts are being perpetrated by whoever they may be, then it will probably have exactly the reverse effect that it is intended; it may well antagonise the non-Malays, particularly those educated in the English language. Here again, I repeat, I am glad that perhaps there is a change of heart on the part of Director of the Dewan Bahasa when he came out with an outright condemnation of such acts of vandalism.

Mr Speaker, Sir, lest I be attacked by people on the opposite side, I want to reiterate once again before I leave this question of the national language that we in the Socialist Front are fully behind the Government in its attempts to propagate the learning and the use of the national language.

A casual perusal will show how wasteful some of the expenditure is. In addition, there is a great number of items of expenditure which have been incurred unnecessarily and unwisely. On page 10 of the 1964

estimates it asks for an additional sum of \$945,495 for the New York Trade Fair. The cost of the Malaysian Stand was originally estimated at \$1 million, today we are told that it would cost \$2½ million more. The Minister of Commerce was quoted to have said on Wednesday, 30th June, 1964, by the *Malay Mail* that "as far as we are concerned, the expenditure has constituted a problem." As such was it wise to participate in the Fair? Why should not we pull out, especially when a recent Malaysian visitor, who has now returned to Malaysia and who had visited our Malaysian stall, said that our stall at the Fair was a disgrace? What is the benefit we are going to get when it is so disgraceful that no one is attracted to that stall? The Director of the Malaysian Pavilion at the Fair is quoted in the same paper as saying that "Our only purpose is to present the story of Malaysia as a great new nation to the visitor". What a stupid way of doing it. At any rate, it is like a common expression "Style mahu, rugi ta' apa".

Another stupid expenditure was the payment of \$197,677 for publishing a special Sunday Supplement on Malaysia in the *New York Times*—item 36, page 16 of the 1964 estimates. I wonder how much the Alliance paid to buy publicity in the local press. But these two attempts to sell Malaysia were dismal failures and therefore completely unnecessary. A better job could have been done by producing films and commentaries, both for public screening at theatres and television. Here at least the viewers have no need to be attracted to see them. They are almost compelled like us when we go to the cinema and are forced to see the advertisements and propaganda.

There are also some silly items like Chinese New Year and Hari Raya Puasa celebrations expenses. These cost the taxpayer a mere \$60,000. I do not know—I notice the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications is not here—why nothing was spent for Deepavali? Perhaps there are no Indians in this country, or perhaps the Minister concerned met

such expenses out of his own pocket. But why was such an expenditure incurred in the first place?

Then there is the contingency of \$2,572 for a Shakespeare Centre to be built in Good Old England. I did not realise that the Alliance could be so sentimental about Shakespeare. I wonder what the Director of Dewan Bahasa has to say about it. Perhaps it must have slipped him. If not he would have suggested a Hang Tuah Centre on top of Mount Ophir.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I hope I have rightly castigated the Alliance Government for their wanton waste and misuse of public funds. Now may I, Mr Speaker, Sir, show how they have been niggardly where they should loosen their purse strings. One instance is the expenditure on the Auditor-General's Department. Mr Speaker, Sir, this Department is woefully understaffed with the result that it cannot do its job properly; and it is performing a vital piece of work. Perhaps the Auditor-General's castigation of both the Federal and State Governments has resulted in the Department not getting enough funds for the recruitment of suitably qualified officers. Year in and year out, with an almost regular monotony, the irregularities and misuse of public funds are revealed by the Auditor-General. Mr Speaker, Sir, one such classic example occurred recently in the Jinjang New Village. I am reliably informed that the Auditor-General's Department made a surprise check on the funds of the Jinjang New Village Council on 1st July, 1964. The surprise check revealed that several post-dated cheques of the New Village Councillors have been found in exchange for the cash collected by the Jinjang New Village Council. Large sums were involved. I am reliably informed also that the exchange of post-dated cheques with the cash collected by the Jinjang New Village Council is a regular practice with some of the New Village Councillors. When the time for the payment of the cheque is due they merely pull back their post-dated cheque and introduce yet another cheque. In this way they are able to

corruptly use the Jinjang New Village money *ad infinitum* until the day that they are caught *inflagrante delicto* as happened on 1st July, 1964. This is not the first time that such an exchange of post-dated cheques has occurred under the present regime in the Jinjang New Village Council. I am informed that such a corrupt practice has been unravelled once before but the M.C.A. Councillors cannot be reformed and they have brazenly committed the same offence again. In this case some of the post-dated cheques have been banked. A few days ago we heard the Honourable Member for Ipoh say that if a cheque is wrongfully banked even for one hour it constitutes a criminal breach of trust. I regret that the Minister of Justice is not here. But I notice that the Assistant Minister of Justice is here and I do commend this to his attention and I do hope that he will ask for a report on this matter by the Auditor-General concerned and that he will take appropriate action if a *prima facie* case has been established. I wonder what the Minister of Finance has to say about such a practice and whether as President of the M.C.A. this is the sort of new image of the M.C.A. that he is trying to create in this country.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the other matter I wish to refer to is where the Alliance is niggardly with the expenditure on the prevention of cholera. I refer to item (43) on page 18—Anti-Cholera in Kedah. In spite of the spending of \$110,000, a fresh outbreak of cholera has been reported in Kedah. This House should know why the Ministry of Health has not asked for more funds to prevent once and for all any further outbreaks in Malaya of this deadly disease called cholera. Why has the Government not taken all the preventive action recommended by the Khaw Kai-Boh Committee of Enquiry in December, 1963? What is the Ministry of Health doing about this dangerous infectious disease which can spread like wild fire through our country and kill large numbers of our people?

Mr Speaker, Sir, it is now more than six months since the Ministry of Health received the Khaw Kai-Boh report. The report contains many important recommendations to prevent the recurrence of cholera epidemics in Malaya. On the 10th January, 1964, the then Minister of Health tabled in this House a printed statement accepting and supporting all the recommendations of the Khaw Kai-Boh Committee. What action has been taken by the Ministry to protect our people from this deadly disease, cholera?

Mr Speaker, Sir, I submit that the Ministry of Health has done nothing to implement all the recommendations of the Khaw Kai-Boh Committee. This supplementary budget shows clearly that *no preventive action has been taken*. The Ministry of Health waited for cholera to break out in Kedah before taking any action. This was exactly what the Ministry of Health did in May, 1963 when cholera broke out in Malacca. The Ministry did little or nothing to prevent the spread of cholera to South Malaya in 1963. All the action that should have been taken in Malacca was taken after cholera had spread outside Malacca. There was no vaccine to protect the people against the disease. Very little was done in the early days of the outbreak to help the panic stricken people of Malacca and South Malaya. The Ministry of Health was helpless, unprepared, inefficiently organised and, to say the least, incompetent. Mr Speaker, Sir, I say this to show that the Ministry of Health has not shown the concern that it should show, to prevent suffering and loss of life of our people of Malaya, and now Malaysia. Since cholera is now endemic in Malaysia, I appeal to all Honourable Members of this House to give some time to discover what is wrong with our Ministry of Health.

Mr Speaker, Sir, exactly one year after the outbreak of cholera in Malacca in May, 1963 we have a more serious outbreak in Kelantan, Trengganu and Pahang. Three months have gone by since cholera started on the East Coast in May, 1964. I

believe that more than 600 people have been admitted to the hospitals or have been seen by doctors. I believe that the death toll is now 75 known cases on the East Coast. This is six times more than the cholera deaths that occurred in the 1963 outbreak in Malacca.

Most of these people are poor Malays who do not have clean water to drink, who do not have a latrine in their homes, whose food and water has been easily contaminated by the dangerous cholera germs let loose in Malaya by the inefficiency of the then Minister of Health. Since the outbreak of cholera in May, 1963, the Minister of Health has had more than one year, in fact about 14 months, to ask Parliament for more funds to completely eradicate cholera from Malaya. What we have before this House is a small request for supplementary funds for action taken in Kedah after cholera had broken out there. Why was no preventive action taken in the State of Kedah earlier? Why is the Ministry of Health not asking today for funds to prevent once and for all the outbreak of cholera not only in Kedah but also on the East Coast and also in Sabah and Sarawak? It is not that the Ministry of Health does not know what should be done to eradicate cholera once and for all from Kedah, and set the minds of the people of Kedah at ease. The former Minister knows what should be done. Then why has he not asked for more funds? What has the Ministry of Health, seven months after the recommendation of the Khaw Kai-Boh Commission, done nothing to implement all the recommendations of that Report?

Sir, it is therefore not surprising that cholera has struck again in Kedah? The Ministry of Health waited for about two months after the outbreak of cholera on the East Coast of Malaya before deciding to send its Controller of Communicable Diseases together with other specialists to take charge of the anti-cholera work there. And when will they send a special team to Kedah? The former Minister of Health should have shown more concern for the lives of our people.

He should have known that cholera will easily spread into the kampongs of Malaya and kill many people there. As such, he should have implemented immediately all the recommendations of the Khaw Kai-Boh Report. If this was done immediately, then we should not see such a high death toll not only in Kedah but also on the East Coast.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Ministry of Health is today administered by laymen who do not understand the health problems of the people and who are reluctant to take prompt action on the advice of the doctors in the Ministry. Besides, there is a terrible shortage of doctors with the Diploma in Public Health. I am told that when Dr Bell of Trengganu leaves, there will be no qualified health officers in Trengganu and Pahang. The Ministry of Health should immediately offer study leave awards to our young doctors to take up the D.P.H. Mr Speaker, Sir, the public health officer, unlike his counterpart in the clinical field, cannot charge any fees for cases seen or for work he has performed in the course of his duty. Hence, the reluctance of the young doctors to do the D.P.H. course. So, I call on the present Minister to restore the inducement allowance to the public health officers, so that more of them will take this course and, what is more important, remain in the Government Service after that.

If I have spoken at length on cholera, Mr Speaker, Sir, it is because it is endemic, as I have stated before, in all the States of Malaysia, and only vigorous action and constant vigilance by the Ministry of Health can avert another major outbreak and greater toll of the lives not only in the East Coast but also throughout Malaysia.

Enche' Ling Beng Siew (Sarawak): Mr Speaker, Sir, may I refer to Head S. 16 in the First Schedule and Head S. 15 of the Second Schedule to the same Bill? I would like to touch on our education policy in respect of Sarawak.

Honourable Members of this House are no doubt aware that Sarawak entered Malaysia on the basis of the

I.G.C. Report and the London Agreement of which I was a signatory. In that Agreement which was endorsed by the Council Negeri in Sarawak as well as the then Malayan Parliament, the provisions were made to the effect that the present policy in Borneo States regarding the use of English should continue until the Governments of Sabah and Sarawak otherwise agree. It is the common desire in Sarawak that this policy should remain undisturbed for some years to come. I sincerely hope that this policy will not stand in the way of educational expansion in either Sarawak or Sabah. English has been adopted as the medium of instruction in Sarawak secondary schools under the State education policy. Although private secondary schools are allowed to choose their own medium of instructions, we feel at this stage of development in Sarawak that English medium gives our students a better opportunity to catch up with Malaya and Singapore in the learning of technology and other sciences. This shows no disrespect for the national language that we have accepted. In fact, we are most anxious to have trainers for the national language to come and train our teachers in Sarawak to teach the language, so that we can introduce it in all schools as a compulsory subject as soon as possible. I hope the Central Government will assist us in this matter.

Mr Speaker, Sir, in promoting the national language, it is important that we must be practical and avoid making it into a communal or political issue which could become dangerous.

Sir, I beg to support the motion.

Enche' Ong Kee Hui (Sarawak): Mr Speaker, Sir, as a representative, or as a Member from Sarawak, I am naturally more interested and more concerned with the supplementary provisions in the Estimates in so far as it concerns Sarawak, not that I am not interested in what my Honourable friend, the Member for Batu, has said under other Heads. As a Member from Sarawak, I am naturally more interested in the provisions for Sarawak, and in

this respect I think that other representatives from Sarawak share with me the view that we welcome whatever the Honourable Minister of Finance, out of his generosity, is prepared to give us. Looking through the Heads, however, I think most Members feel a sense of disappointment that the big item, which we have been looking for some time, which is the provision for free primary education in Sarawak, has not yet appeared. I would, therefore, like, Mr Speaker, Sir, to deal with the financing of education in Sarawak in general terms, and also to say something more on the point which has been raised by my Honourable friend opposite, who is also a Member from Sarawak.

The subject of education, Sir, so far as it concerns Sarawak, has been raised before by representatives in this House on several occasions, in debates, at question time, and on the adjournment. It has been, in Sarawak, the subject of discussion in Local Councils, Division Councils, and in Council Negri, and outside. Amongst the people this is a matter of great interest and concern. I feel therefore that it is our duty as representatives of Sarawak in this House to make the Federal Government and Members of this House aware of the sense of disappointment and frustration which the people in Sarawak are feeling over this matter.

Mr Speaker, Sir, when the Inter-Governmental Agreement, to which my Honourable friend opposite has referred, in connection with the formation of Malaysia, was negotiated, the Sarawak representatives agreed to education being made a federal responsibility on the advice of the colonial officials, because it was thought that the State would be able to make greater progress in education, if it is able to get assistance from the Federal Authority to replace or to augment the assistance it was then receiving from the United Kingdom. At the same time, in order to meet the aspiration of the people of Sarawak, to use a popular phrase, to "catch up" on the more advanced communities in other parts of Malaysia by being able to go abroad for study in the medium of the English language, it

was agreed in the Inter-Governmental Agreement that English shall remain the official language for ten years after Malaysia Day, or until such time as the State Government may decide. This, Sir, is one of the safeguards which the people of Sarawak asked for and was given to them under the Malaysia Agreement.

It is on the basis of this Agreement that the present education system is orientated. In reply to questions asked by the Opposition and a Sarawak Alliance Member at this meeting of the House, the Honourable Minister of Education stated, if I am not mistaken, that free primary education and the comprehensive school system, which is to be implemented in the peninsular States of Malaysia, would be introduced or extended to Sarawak if the State conformed with the national system of education. Unfortunately, the Honourable Minister did not explain in what respects the Sarawak system of education differs from the national system. In the absence of any such explanation, we can only presume, probably quite wrongly, that the Honourable Minister was referring to the continued use of English as the medium of instruction in our schools.

The people of Sarawak, Sir, have expected that on the formation of Malaysia—that is after the 16th of September, 1963—they will enjoy the same facilities as the peninsular States in the field of education. The people of Sarawak have high expectations that the formation of Malaysia, and they had been told so, means further accelerated progress and development both socially and economically. Their disappointment and disillusionment can, therefore, be imagined when months later they find that whereas the children in the peninsular States and in Singapore pay no fees in the primary schools but children in such schools in Sarawak still have to pay fees. This state of affairs, in the minds of many people in Sarawak, appears to be a discrimination against them, as having surrendered this important subject to the Federal Authority, they had expected greater benefits of progress than they would be able to enjoy if they had retained

control of it themselves. Not only do they not get equal treatment, but it would appear that the gap that now exists between them and the people of the rest of the Federation will become wider, when the comprehensive system of education is introduced into the peninsular States in that not only will children in these States enjoy free primary education but will also have an additional three years of free secondary education as well.

Mr Speaker, Sir, perhaps, not all Honourable Members of this House are aware of the fact that in Sarawak from the days of colonial rule until today, primary education has been delegated by the State Government to Local Councils. Local Councils get a grant to cover the difference between the school fees which they collect from pupils and the cost of teachers' salaries plus some other incidental expenses. Local Councils, in addition, may get capital grants in varying sums amounting from 40% to 50% of the total cost. Most Local Councils in Sarawak, Sir, take their responsibility in education very seriously. Each year more primary schools are being opened not only in the towns but also in rural areas to cope with the increasing school population. This expansion of primary education has imposed an increasing strain on the finance of the Local Councils. More and more money has to be found to meet both the increasing recurrent and capital cost of running these schools. Their difficulties are further aggravated in certain cases by the fact that in some of the poorer rural areas some parents are unable to pay the school fees and the Local Councils are therefore unable to recover these fees, although they are allowed to waive up to ten per cent of the total of the school fees which are due to the Government. Under such circumstances, the Local Councils, being unable to recover these fees either from the parents or from the State Government, have to meet the deficits from their own revenue. As the revenue of Local Councils, apart from what grants are forthcoming from the Government, is derived from rates, this means that rates have to be raised to cover the deficits, and thus the burden on the poor section of the community is

thereby increased. It is for this reason, Sir, that the people of Sarawak are so concerned over the subject of free primary education. We realise that, when we say "free primary education", there is nothing really free in this world. We pay for it in some other ways. The Finance Minister, or the State Financial Secretary, will manage to squeeze it from somewhere else, and in the end we do pay, but it does mean that it is paid by those who are best and better able to pay for these things.

Mr Speaker, Sir, my Honourable friend on the opposite side has referred to the question of the use of the English language in our schools. There is a general desire on the part of the people in Sarawak to learn the national language. The difficulties are practical ones. They have to do with the difficulties of getting teachers for these schools. In fact at this meeting my Honourable friend, who is not here, had approached the Honourable Minister of Education to find out how best we could tackle the problem in those schools with which he is connected.

The point I wish to make in conclusion is that this is a subject which we hope both the Honourable Minister of Finance and the Honourable Minister of Education will look into urgently, because if a decision on this matter is deferred far too long, I am afraid disillusionment will set in, and the people of Sarawak will begin to ask themselves, "where then are the benefits which we are told we will get from our association in Malaysia?" With that note I would urge in all seriousness that the whole question of the financing of education in Sarawak should be looked into. I am sure that any differences which may arise can be reconciled. The important thing is not to defer a decision but to take the bull by the horns, and for goodness' sake decide.

Enche' Aziz bin Ishak (Muar Dalam):
Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka bersama² mengambil bahagian pada membahathkan peruntukan tambahan perbelanjaan yang di-bentangkan di-dalam Dewan ini. Atas membahathkan perkara yang bersangkutan dengan soal kebangsaan,

sangat patut di-ambil perhatian oleh pihak Kerajaan peruntukan tambahan yang di-bentangkan di-hadapan kita pada hari ini pada pendapat saya ada-lah sangat perlu dan mustahak sa-kali, kerana di-samping penambahan peruntukan yang di-kehendaki pada hari ini, kerana negara kita ini sedang terancam oleh angkara dasar konfrontasi Soekarno terhadap negara kita, dan dengan ada-nya itu saya fikir tentu-lah sa-banyak sedikit sudah berkait sa-hingga terpaksa memerlukan wang tambahan sesuai dengan dasar Kerajaan kita untuk mempertahankan kedaulatan negara kita ini. Dengan ada-nya dasar konfrontasi dari Soekarno, kita terpaksa memerlukan wang untuk menghantar rombongan Perdana Menteri dan Menteri² kita yang lain keluar negeri dengan berbagai² urusan, dan juga dengan ada-nya dasar ini, kita perlu menyediakan peruntukan bagi memperketatkan lagi pertahanan negara, memperhebatkan kawalan polis supaya anasir² yang hendak menhuba merosakkan, atau pun meruntuhkan kedaulatan negara kita ini, semua dapat di-hanchorkan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ra'ayat yang telah memberi sa-penoh kepercayaan kepada Kerajaan negeri kita ini, kechuali Parti² Pembangkang yang pro-kominis, saya fikir sangat-lah menyokong penoh atas segala tindakan yang di-buat oleh Tunku Perdana Menteri kita dengan dasar-nya suka berunding, atau menchari jalan perdamaian, tetapi malang-nya, Soekarno dan kunchu²-nya memang sengaja hendak menunjukkan sifat angkoh dan sombong-nya di-mata dunia di-mana saya fikir segala sifat yang di-tunjokkan ka-mata dunia itu akan menjatuhkan dia terjerumus bersendir. Dengan ada-nya keadaan sa-rupa ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-samping Kerajaan berkehendakkan peruntukan bagi membangunkan dan kemajuan negara, saya dan rakan² saya di-dalam Dewan ini mungkin tidak teragak² lagi akan memperkenankan, jika Kementerian yang berkehendakkan sa-banyak mana wang yang di-perlukan untuk pertahanan negara kita ini, kerana, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita tidak mahu membiarkan

musoh² dari luar dan dari dalam ini melarat sa-hingga naik ka-mata.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam masa dasar konfrontasi ini berjalan, sa-bagaimana yang kita telah tahu sa-hingga sekarang ini sa-banyak 149 orang agent² dan pengkhianat² telah ditangkap yang masuk ka-dalam negeri kita ini dengan bertujuan hendak meruntuhkan negara kita ini. Kita dapat tahu juga bahawa maseh ada agent² pengkhianat daripada orang² yang dudok dalam negeri kita ini yang telah menjadi tali barut pihak Soekarno yang menjalankan segala ikhtiar untuk memperak-perandakan keadaan negeri kita ini dengan meletupkan bom² di-sana sini, dan kita dapat tahu juga gerakan agent² Soekarno yang dudok dalam negeri kita ini dari sa-hari ka-sahari telah menumpang perahu² nelayan² pergi ka-pulau² yang berdekatan untuk berlateh bagi menghanchorkan negara kita ini, dan banyak lagi perkara² yang di-lakukan oleh agent² Soekarno yang bermaksud bagi memudahkan Soekarno dan kunchu²-nya mena'aloki negeri kita ini.

Saya sangat-lah berasa dukachita, kerana kita dapat tahu kebanyakan agent² Soekarno dan pengkhianat² negeri kita ini telah mendapat sokongan moral dari sa-tengah² Parti Pembangkang yang ada dalam negeri kita ini. Dengan ada-nya keadaan yang sa-rupa ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya meminta kepada Kerajaan, jangan-lah teragak² dan berlengah² lagi bagi menjalankan sa-chepat mungkin akan langkah² bagi mengawal dan menjaga supaya perkara yang kita tidak ingini itu akan dapat berjalan terus-menerus sa-hingga keadaan ini nanti tidak dapat di-kawal lagi.

Pada pendapat saya, lebeh baik kita hanchorkan gerakan² itu lebeh awal² yang berlaku baharu sedikit², tetapi kita akan susah hendak menghanchorkan manakala keadaan itu berlaku sa-chara besar²an.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, walau pun Kerajaan pada hari ini telah mengistiharkan hendak menghidupkan sa-mula Pasokan Kawalan Kampong dan juga sementara hendak menanti pemuda² kampong hendak berlateh senjata, maka saya suka hendak menarek

perhatian Kerajaan, oleh sebab memandangkan sa-makin hebat gerakan Soekarno hendak menghanchorkan Malaysia ini, saya berpendapat sangatlah perlu dan mustahak Kerajaan bertindak dengan serta-merta bagi menegarah dan menubuhkan Pasokan Sukarela Pengawal Kampong sa-bagaimana yang telah di-buat di-dalam masa dharurat dahulu.

Ketua² Kampong yang baharu hendak-lah di-pertanggung-jawabkan bagi mengawal kampong²-nya sendiri. Satu peratoran mengawal kampong dan pantai hendak-lah di-susun dan di-ator supaya kerja pengawalan itu dapat di-jalankan dengan terator dan baik supaya anasir² dari luar dan dalam tidak dapat berluas²a lagi. Pada pendapat saya apa yang sedang di-jalankan oleh Kerajaan pada hari ini hanya menggunakan Pasokan Polis di-Raja Persekutuan kita untuk menjaga dan mengawal pantai dan mana² tempat dari kemasokan anasir² dan perkembangan pengkhianat² ini. Ini, pada pendapat saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tidak-lah menchukupi untuk menampung kegiatan dan kemasokan pengkhianat² terhadap negara kita ini dengan hanya menggunakan Pasokan Kawalan dari Polis ini sahaja. Mereka mesti-lah di-perbantu dengan Pasokan Kawalan Sukarela Kampong yang di-ator oleh Kerajaan sendiri. Saya penoh percaya ra'ayat negeri kita ini tentu-lah menyambut dengan tangan yang terbuka, jika mereka di-kehendaki serta di-ator untuk menjaga keselamatan negara-nya ini. Di-samping kita mengadakan kawalan kampong dengan serta-merta, maka saya fikir Pasokan Wataniah patut di-besarkan lagi dan hendak-lah di-tubuhkan sa-berapa banyak di-semua kampong dan saya minta kapada Menteri Kewangan dapat menguntokkan wang sesuai dengan keadaan yang saya katakan tadi.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, hukuman yang sa-berat²-nya hendak-lah di-kenakan kapada barang siapa yang di-dapati berkaitan dengan menyokong confrontasi Soekarno dan chuba hendak mengkhianat kapada negara kita ini, asalkan mereka itu di-dapati bersalah berkaitan dengan kegiatan Soekarno yang hendak menghanchor-leborkan

negara kita ini, walau pun kita terpaksa mengharamkan Parti² Pembangkang yang kita tahu benar² banyak ahli² dan tokoh²-nya menyokong pehak yang menentang negeri kita ini. Saya fikir ada lebeh baik kita hanchorkan mereka lebeh dahulu sa-belum mereka menghanchorkan kita.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untuk memberitahu dunia luar atas kedudukan yang sa-benar-nya keadaan negeri kita ini berthabit dengan dasar confrontasi Soekarno, Kerajaan hendak-lah menguatkan dan melipat-gandakan usaha memberi penerangan dengan berbagai² chara sama ada dengan jalan menyebarkan risalah² dan lain² melalui Kedutaan² kita di-luar negeri. Satu chontoh, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya telah di-beritahu oleh beberapa orang rakan saya yang baharu balek dari menunaikan fardzu haji ka-Mekah baharu² ini mengatakan pehak Soekarno telah mempergunakan banyak kesempatan untuk mempengaruhi orang² haji di-Mekah dengan menghantar beberapa banyak agent² bagi mempengaruhi bakal² haji ini dengan menggunakan sa-berapa banyak kakitangan untuk menghasut orang² haji dengan chara berbual² sa-bagaimana yang di-buat oleh General Jatikosumo di-Malaya kita ini dahulu. Mereka juga telah memperhebatkan penyebaran risalah² untuk mempengaruhi surat² khabar dengan memuatkan gambar² Soekarno yang besar² serta memperhebatkan siaran Radio Indonesia di-kalangan orang² haji di-sana, tetapi malang-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, apa yang saya telah di-beritahu ia-itu pehak Kerajaan kita tidak sadikit pun, atau sangat sejoj keadaan-nya—tidak-lah dapat mengatasi apa² perkara yang saya katakan tadi. Saya berharap bagi pehak Kerajaan akan dapat mengambil perhatian yang berat atas perkara ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, oleh sebab memandangkan keadaan negeri kita ini sedang terancham, maka saya berseru kapada seluroh pehak dalam negara kita ini, terutama sa-kali parti² Pembangkang mari-lah tunjukkan ta'at setia kapada negara kita ini sendiri sama² dengan ra'ayat yang banyak yang sukakan negara ini aman dan

ma'amor, tetapi jika keadaan negara kita ini tidak dapat di-kawal lagi dan nanti akan memaksa Kerajaan menjalankan sa-barang tindakan yang sawajar-nya, maka orang² yang tidak ta'at setia dan parti² yang berdegil yang mementingkan kehanchoran dari kebaikan pada satu hari mereka yang khianat kepada negara akan di-hanchor-leborkan bagaimana Kerajaan menghanchor-leborkan kegiatan kominis yang bermaharajalela 12 tahun dahulu. Ra'ayat yang setia kepada Kerajaan akan tetap berdiri di-belakang Kerajaan demi kepentingan negara-nya sama ada kita akan hanchor atau berdiri dengan tegak-nya.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, satu perkara yang besar yang saya hendak sentoh di-dalam perbahathan pada hari ini ia-lah berkenaan dengan peruntukan yang diberi kepada Kementerian Perdagangan dan Perusahaan, yang mana di-dalam-nya ada berkait dengan memberi kursus kepada konterektor Melayu dan lain²-nya. Di-dalam Kementerian Perdagangan dan Perusahaan ini bagaimana yang kita tahu sa-orang Menteri Muda yang telah di-khaskan bagi bertugas dan menggalakkan orang² Melayu menyertai di-dalam lapangan perniagaan yang sa-lama ini orang² Melayu kita sudah lama ketinggalan dalam lapangan ini. Maka sa-sudah Kerajaan Perikatan memerintah baharu-lah ada usaha² untuk mempersetandingkan orang² Melayu dalam segi perniagaan itu. Saya sangat besar hati dan mengucapkan tahniah atas usaha yang di-buat oleh pehak Menteri Muda Perdagangan dan Perusahaan itu dari masa ka-masa. Kita pernah mendengar dari masa ka-masa Yang Berhormat Menteri Muda itu telah mengisytiharkan berbagai projek seperti hendak mengadakan ranchangan membuka sharikat peronchit² Melayu di-daerah² sa-terus-nya di-negeri² dan hendak mengadakan sharikat impot dan expot Melayu peringkat nasional dan lain² lagi, bukan itu sahaja projek² yang di-bentangkan malahan beberapa banyak lagi kita dengar dari masa ka-masa yang di-bentangkan oleh Menteri yang berkenaan itu.

Pada pendapat saya tiap² satu projek yang telah di-bentangkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri ini saya penoh per-

chaya orang² Melayu di-seluruh negara kita ini menyambut dengan tangan yang terbuka dengan harapan sa-moga apa yang di-ranchangkan-nya itu dapat berjaya sa-terus-nya. Tetapi apa yang saya harapkan kepada Kementerian ini, ia-itu jangan-lah perkara yang saya sebutkan itu bak kata pepatah Melayu "indah khabar dari rupa". Projek tinggal projek sahaja. Saya berpendapat, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jika dapat Menteri yang berkenaan mengatakan dalam Dewan ini ia-itu sahingga pada hari ini sa-takat mana-kah hasil atau kemajuan yang di-chapai oleh Kementerian ini dalam usaha menolong dan membantu orang² Melayu dari segi perniagaan ini supaya dengan keterangan yang akan di-beri oleh Menteri yang berkenaan maka dapat-lah kita semua bersama² bertanggung-jawab, jika perlu memberi pandangan untuk bersama² menjayakan usaha yang besar itu?

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya sangat menyokong atas satu pandangan yang di-tulis oleh sa-buah renchana di-dalam *Berita Minggu* beberapa minggu yang lalu yang telah menchadangkan supaya Kementerian ini membentok sa-buah bilek gerakan seperti Bilek Gerakan Kebangsaan yang terdapat di-Kementerian Pembangunan Luar Bandar atau pun sa-rupa dengan Bilek Gerakan Bahasa Kebangsaan yang mana bilek gerakan itu akan menumpukan dengan sa-penoh-nya dalam usaha penyertaan orang² Melayu dalam lapangan perniagaan dan perusahaan. Buku panduan yang merupakan berbagai panduan dan projek hendak-lah di-adakan dengan di-susun rapi perkara² dalam hal ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, memang kita telah nampak dengan terang-nya bahawa usaha yang di-tugaskan kepada Kementerian ini amat-lah berat sa-kali, kerana dalam usaha perniagaan dan perusahaan itu orang² kita Melayu sa-memang-nya telah tenggelam ka-bawah sa-kali. Jika terdapat orang kita hendak bangkit dalam usaha ini berbagai chara tekanan yang di-lakukan supaya usaha itu tidak berjaya sa-terus-nya. Oleh yang demikian untuk melaksanakan itu satu sahaja jalan yang kita harapkan usaha

Kementerian itu dapat menjayakan-nya ia-itu galakan dan dorongan dari Kerajaan sahaja yang boleh memandu orang Melayu kita supaya dapat di-persetandingkan dengan bangsa² lain di-negeri kita ini. Orang Melayu kita bukan-nya tidak ada kebolehan dalam lapangan ini, tetapi tidak tahan dengan berbagai tekanan yang menyebabkan usaha itu jatuh dan lemah. Saya fikir jika Kerajaan sendiri dapat memberi galakan dengan memberi keutamaan dalam apa sahaja peluang yang di-tawarkan oleh Kerajaan saksadar apa sahaja perkara yang terdaya oleh orang² Melayu kita, maka saya penoh perchaya sedikit demi sedikit dapat-lah orang² Melayu kita bangkit dalam usaha lapangan ini.

Ini apa yang saya tahu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-hingga penempahan tiket² kapal terbang pun tidak dapat di-beri peluang kapada sharikat orang² Melayu kita, pada hal perkara yang sa-rupa ini satu perkara yang mudah bagi Kerajaan menggalakkan-nya.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, banyak lagi lapangan dan jurusan dari segi kebangkitan bangsa Melayu di-dalam perniagaan dan perusahaan yang sentiasa di-hempit dan di-tekan yang patut Kerajaan fikirkan, umpama soal pasaran dalam dan di-luar negeri. Soal² kehabisan dan tidak chukup modal, soal kurang latehan dari segi perniagaan dan soal tidak dapat tempat perniagaan di-bandar² dan di-kam-pong², maka ini saya pulangkan kapada Kementerian ini untuk membuat kajian yang sa-wajar-nya atas perkara yang besar ini.

Mr Speaker: The meeting is suspended for fifteen minutes.

Sitting suspended at 6.15 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 6.30 p.m.

(Mr Speaker in the Chair)

Mr Speaker: The debate on the Supplementary Supply Bill will resume.

The Deputy Prime Minister (Tun Haji Abdul Razak): Mr Speaker, Sir, I only wish to reply to some of the points raised by the Honourable Member for Batu who is, unfortu-

nately, not in the House now. The Honourable Member has warned this House about Maphilindo. I would like to assure the House that Maphilindo was originally a regional association initiated by President Macapagal of the Philippines. It was a regional association between the Philippines, Malaya and Indonesia, and it was intended that its membership should be extended to other countries in South-East Asia. This regional association was intended to promote understanding and co-operation among nations. However, Sir, as the House is aware, the future of Maphilindo is very uncertain at the moment, because one of its members has chosen to carry out acts of aggression against another member—and it can almost be said that Maphilindo was strangled at its birth.

Now, Sir, the Honourable Member for Batu raised two points on defence under Head 14. Under Head 14 there is expenditure amounting to almost \$6 million approximately. The sum of about \$2.5 million is required for the purchase of equipment for the Malaysia Rangers. We have raised two battalions of Malaysia Rangers for Sabah and Sarawak, and under the arrangement with the British Government, the raising and the equipping of these two battalions is financed by the British Government. However, Sir, as regards equipment, whatever equipment which we require and can obtain from Britain, we have to purchase them ourselves and pay for the equipment first, and the money will be recouped by Britain. As the House is aware, we do not use British equipment entirely, and we do use equipment from other countries too, because we normally choose the best equipment for our Armed Forces.

Now, as regards the expenditure of \$3.9 million for temporary accommodation in the Borneo territories, we have several battalions of our Armed Forces now operating in the Borneo territories. The Borneo territories cover a very wide area—the border itself is about 1,800 miles and our troops are scattered along the border. It is necessary for these troops to have accommodation, and temporary accommodation here means non-permanent accommodation,

in the sense that we have to build semi-permanent accommodation for our troops. Obviously, it is not possible to construct permanent accommodation which will take a long time, and it is not possible for these troops to be housed in tents and also for equipment to be kept in tents, as they would be more expensive to maintain. We do not know how long this confrontation will last, and we have to continue to defend these areas. Therefore, it is necessary to have this temporary accommodation—and that is why we require the sum of nearly \$4 million.

Sir, the Honourable Member also spoke about the small amount of contribution that we decided to make in commemoration of Shakespeare. Sir, this is a matter of international academic interest. Now, Honourable Members of the Opposition, particularly the Member for Batu, have spoken at length about academic freedom, academic interest and so on, and this is one of the things that we do, as it is a matter of international academic interest, because Shakespeare is of international repute and hence, as a gesture on our part, we decided to make this very small contribution. Sir, I think that is all in respect of the matters to which I wish to reply: the other matters will be replied to by my colleagues, the other Ministers.

Dr Lim Swee Aun: Mr Speaker, Sir, knowing that the Honourable Member for Batu comes from an honourable profession I, therefore, am not surprised at his anaphylatic reaction to advertising. It is desirable and indeed very correct for the medical profession not to advertise because it is offering a service, but in other fields, where goods have to be sold, advertisement is a necessity. We, as a nation, as a whole, have been earning foreign exchange through the export of our primary commodities. In the past our main exports were centred around rubber and tin and as these two were essential raw commodities, very little advertisement was necessary because we enjoyed a sellers market. But through the advances of science and research, we are now faced with competition from substitute synthetics, and in the case of

tin, the stockpile releases from certain Governments. Hence there is a need for advertising so as to try to increase our export earnings. Besides rubber and tin, we also export primary commodities like palm oil, timber and spices. We have yet not gone very far in the field of export of manufactured goods.

Now, in advertising our products, there are several avenues that we can choose. First, through advertising in the press; secondly, through trade missions; and thirdly, through trade fairs. Any advertising to be effective must be done where the market is available. It is true that one of the ways of advertising is through making documentary films and making commentaries, but if we limit ourselves to this avenue of exhibiting these films in our country, because it would be very difficult to get these films exhibited in other countries, then the market to which these films would be shown would be relatively small. And what is more important is that our primary goods which are exported must be advertised in the consuming areas. That is why, Sir, it was necessary to spend some money in advertising our primary commodities in the New York newspapers, because in America we have the largest consumers of our primary commodities and this paper has one of the widest circulations in that country and also in the world.

Following on the needs of advertising, trade missions are another important means of advertising and the Honourable Member for Batu must have realised that several foreign trade missions have come to this country with a view to increasing their trade. In fact, there have been foreign trade fairs even in the form of floating trade fairs and static trade fairs which have exhibited in our own towns. Even today, the Burmese Trade Mission called on me in an attempt to improve trade.

Trade fairs are another method of advertising with the hope of increasing our export earnings. When we were invited to take part in the New York World Trade Fair a Committee of officials drawn from all the Ministries of the Government was set up together with representatives from the Chambers

of Commerce and the Industries. This Working Committee was given the responsibility of designing the building and also arranging for the types of exhibits that should go into our stall. Bearing in mind that the amount of money that we have is limited, it was decided that we should not spend too lavishly on this New York Trade Fair, but sufficient to get across to the people what we want to show, and that is mainly the primary produce that we have been selling and also to show to the world the structure of our Government, the peoples of this country, our cultures and the progress and development made in this country. On that score, Sir, when I came to this House during the last Budget meeting, a model of our stall at the New York Trade Fair was displayed for the benefit of Members. At that time nobody made any criticisms, everybody said that it was just the thing which would "sell" Malaysia.

Sir, since then, as our main theme was to show to the people who visit the Trade Fair from all over the world—the visitors are estimated to be 70 million people—what we exported, the tin, rubber, timber, oil palm and pineapple industries pooled their resources together and employed professional exhibitors in New York to design and display their exhibits. On the other hand, the other exhibits, which went to explain to the people who visited our stall the structure of our Government, our peoples, our cultures, were handled by another Sub-Committee and again professional advice was sought in New York on the presentation of these exhibits. Sir, I was, therefore, very surprised that the Honourable Member for Batu, having had a professional training and having had a scientific background should stand up in this House and just say that the stall is a disgrace. Sir, I would like to know from the Honourable Member for Batu

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: That is not what I said. I said that it was stated by a recent visitor to the stall. I have not been to New York, so I cannot comment on it. In the words of a recent

Malaysian visitor to the stall, it was a disgrace. I quoted this; I did not say it myself. So I hope the Honourable Minister will not put words into my mouth.

Dr Lim Swee Aun: I thank the Honourable Member for his explanation. But, all the same, I would have hoped that the Honourable Member would have given reasons as to why he thought, or why he supported, or, at least, why he parroted that statement that our stall is a disgrace. Being a man of scientific training, one could have hoped from him a constructive criticism rather than a wild statement that it is a disgrace. In the light of what I have said, in the light that we intended to limit our expenditure, and in the light of our theme, from the reports that I have had officially, our stall has come up to expectations and we have got our money's worth. It is estimated that we will spend slightly more than \$2.5 million Malayan dollars. Naturally, one cannot expect such a small expenditure to produce a show as good as or similar to in lavishness as that of the Indonesian stall, which happens to be closeby, and on which I understand from the Press, 20 million U.S. dollars have been spent. That should be borne in mind when criticisms are made with regard to our stall.

If the Honourable Member would like to see, I have here a collection of photographs taken of our stall, which I have received, which display the view of our stall, what the interior looks like, and detailed pictures of our exhibits. (*Photographs are held up to show the Honourable Members*) Exhibits other than the progress and development in this series, this one on the cultures of the country, this series on the rubber industry from its production to its end uses, and then you have pictures of our exhibition on tin from its production leading to its end uses and the other alloys of tin, and also the exhibits of our smaller industries like our pewterware, our bateks and sarongs, our silverware from Kelantan, and of course a section on tourism.

Sir, compared to the expenditure made by other countries in this World

Fair, ours is relatively cheap and a sum of \$2½ million, as we expect it to be, is more than reasonable. This is not a sudden expenditure as claimed by the Honourable Member for Batu, but when I came to this House during the last Budget session, because we were then unable to estimate what the actual expenditure would be, a token vote of \$10 was put in at the Budget and I had informed the House then that when I had more accurate figures I would come again for more money under Supplementary Supply Bill, and that is why I have come here again for \$954,495.

Enche' Jonathan Bangau anak Renang (Sarawak): Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise to endorse what the Honourable Members from Sarawak have said regarding the education policy in Sarawak. Admittedly, this is a highly controversial subject all over the world, especially in a nation of multi races. In Sarawak, Mr Speaker, Sir, during the first few years we had quite a tough time in deciding the education policy for Sarawak. I personally feel that it would be inadvisable to go back to it again now after Malaysia.

Under the education policy in Sarawak we have chosen English to be the media of instruction in the secondary schools and it was agreed that this will continue to be used for a period of 10 years or until such time as the Council Negri otherwise decides. This education policy is provided with the agreement of the Inter-Governmental Committee and it has the support of the great majority of the people in Sarawak. However, we have resolutely decided that Malay should be the national language, which is also stated in the I.G.C. Report passed by the Council Negri. I hope the Honourable Members of this House will give us time to consider a way as to how we can fit in the secondary schools curriculum a number of periods for the national language. By so doing it will allow us time to recruit qualified Malay teachers.

Moreover, I wish to point out to this House that in the implementation of the education policy in the course of

the years Sarawak is facing some difficulties in, on the one hand, training the existing teachers in other languages, so that they can take part in teaching English in the secondary or primary schools and, on the other hand, in transferring the surplus teachers of the other languages to the other primary schools in order that they will not lose their jobs.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I hope the Honourable Members will share our feelings and appreciate our task in carrying out the education policy. As education in Sarawak is a Federal matter, it is very important that the Federal Government is aware of the fact that conditions in Sarawak are such that the wishes of the people in Sarawak should be given consideration. Likewise, the Federal Government, when considering the media of instruction for Sarawak, should not upset the education policy already decided by the people previously.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I wish further to add that the Federal Government should give every consideration to the academic standards in the schools, which should be raised in accordance with the times, particularly for those who are going for overseas studies. The academic standard should be equal to that of the overseas countries, if not better. However, the reason for my bringing up this matter to this House is that I wish to clarify the doubts recently aroused among the people in Sarawak. Thank you.

The Minister of Health (Enche' Bahaman bin Samsudin): Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to reply to the Honourable Member for Batu in regard to the question of cholera, which was raised by him just now. Sir, all possible precautionary and preventive measures have been taken by my Ministry to prevent the spread of cholera. In each State, there is a State Epidemic Control Committee and in the District affected, the District Epidemic Control Committee meets regularly to discuss measures to control the disease. Mass inoculation is undertaken in affected areas by several teams, which make investigations and help people to build wells, latrines, etc. The Information

Department and other Departments concerned and the local leaders help in publicising the dangers of the disease by pamphlets, and talks direct or through the radio to the public. The State Governments help in providing money and facilities. Officers of my Ministry and I have visited some of the areas affected and attended to whatever requirements that were immediately needed for the control of the epidemic. Because of the measures taken, the number of deaths from cholera and also the number of cholera cases or suspected cases have decreased.

Mr Speaker, Sir, with regard to the Khaw Kai-Boh Enquiry Committee's Report, mentioned by the Honourable Member, many of the recommendations have been implemented while others are in the process of being implemented. I am glad that the Honourable Member has admitted that the disease is now endemic and naturally we cannot expect that the disease can be eradicated overnight.

Sir, I am glad also that the Honourable Member has suggested that I get more funds for the purpose. In actual fact, I am at present making an estimate of funds I would require to eradicate cholera as a long-term measure. I hope the Minister of Finance, after listening to the Honourable Member, would provide the money that I require.

The Honourable Member has also mentioned about the shortage of doctors. That is a well known fact; and we are trying our best to get doctors from outside the country.

He has also mentioned about a certain Doctor, Dr Bell, in Trengganu. I understand that Dr Bell's service is being extended.

The question of restoring inducement allowance to health officers is still under active consideration by the Government. As the Honourable Member is aware, I have taken over this Ministry of Health only recently, and I cannot effect changes and get results overnight. I am still studying the problems, and I can assure him

that all his suggestions, whatever they are, are always welcome.

The Assistant Minister of Commerce and Industry (Tuan Haji Abdul Khalid bin Awang Osman): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mengambil peluang ini mengucapkan berbilang terima kasih kepada Yang Berhormat dari Muar Dalam di-atas segala tegoran² yang telah di-bentangkan di-dalam Dewan yang mulia ini. Dalam perkara hendak menolongkan orang² Melayu supaya mengambil bahagian di-dalam lapangan perniagaan dan perusahaan, Kerajaan Perikatan cukup sedar di-atas kewajipan-nya. Dalam perkara ini Kementerian Perdagangan dan Perusahaan, bagi pihak Kerajaan, telah menjalankan berbagai² usaha dan banyak lagi usaha² sedang di-susun untuk di-jalankan pada masa akan datang. Tetapi perniagaan dan perusahaan ia-lah satu perkara yang hasil-nya tidak dapat di-lihat atau pun di-chapaikan di-dalam masa yang singkat seperti membuat jambatan atau jalan raya. Kalau kita hendak membuat satu jalan raya dengan satu rancangan hendak menyiapkan-nya dalam masa satu tahun saya percaya dengan mudah jalan itu dapat di-siapkan di-dalam masa yang di-jangkakan. Tetapi perniagaan dan perusahaan tidak begitu. Saya harap saudara saya dari Muar Dalam supaya bersabar dalam perkara ini dan saya berharap dengan sa-tinggi² harapan segala usaha tulus ikhlas itu akan membawa hasil yang baik kepada orang² Melayu kita khas-nya dan ra'ayat Persekutuan am-nya.

Berkenaan dengan pejabat² Kerajaan tidak menggunakan sharikat orang² Melayu khas-nya Sharikat Federal Travel Agency manakala menghantar-kan pegawai² Kerajaan ka-luar negeri. sukachita saya menegaskan bahawa banyak jabatan² Kerajaan dan Kementerian² sedang menggunakan sharikat² orang Melayu khas-nya Federal Travel Agency ia-itu satu sharikat Melayu untuk menghantar pegawai² dan kaki²-tangan Kerajaan ka-luar negeri untuk menghadziri persidangan². Sunggoh pun begitu banyak orang² Melayu maseh lagi tidak puas hati bagaimana

yang di-suarakan dalam *Utusan Melayu* khas-nya di-dalam Ruangan Bajang dan dalam perkara ini saya suka mengatakan tindakan sedang di-ambil dan mudah²an pada masa yang akan datang ramai lagi Kementerian² dan Jabatan² akan menguruskan soal menghantar pegawai² dan kaki²-tangan ka-luar negeri melalui sharikat yang tersebut itu, terima kaseh.

Enche' Siow Loong Hin (Seremban Barat): Mr Speaker, Sir, it has always been the case, whenever the Government presents the Estimates, that there will be people who say that sometimes the Estimates fall short of what is required, while some will say that the Estimates go beyond what is required. One cannot satisfy both sides—those who want more and those who want less. However, the Government has always been asked that it should be responsible for public good and that it should be responsible for public services. But, sometimes, the people who so ask, have not asked themselves what the public themselves should do for their own comrades, for the people.

In this connection, Sir, I would like to refer to the remarks made by the Honourable Member for Batu, in particular, on the question of cholera infection and secondly on the question of the shortage of doctors. As to the question of cholera infection, I think it is quite clear that, when cholera occurred some time last year, because of the shortage of vaccine, there had been a great deal of exploitation by the general practitioners and that this situation was relieved only when the Government was able to bring in sufficient vaccine to bring down the price of vaccination for the general public and for their benefit.

It is a known fact, Mr Speaker, Sir, that in the field of general medical practice medical practitioners are in a privileged position practising an honourable profession, which beyond doubt is noble for what it is intended for—for the power of healing is given to a few. This power of healing should do a tremendous amount of good for the whole of the people and it should not be abused in any way. With this

reference, I would say that possibly the Government should consider taking steps, which would seem to some people rather radical, to a specific control of prices and drugs dispensed by general practitioners. We have, as you know, at times regulated prices for commodities which we consider is necessary to public welfare, especially to those who are in need of them—by the control of prices of these commodities it can come within the reach of all and sundry.

But in this field of medicine there has apparently been a completely free enterprise. We believe in free enterprise, but when is not free in the sense as it should be when it is misapplied, then the Government should do something in order to regulate it. Medicines are being purchased by general practitioners at a tremendous discount on the wholesale price—discounts ranging from 25 to 30 per cent—yet when these medicines are being dispensed to the people, they are being charged at prices which would seem relatively small in terms of \$1, \$2 or \$3, but in fact are relatively high in terms of percentage, because profits made may range as far as 200 per cent to 300 per cent on medicines dispensed. Just to elaborate a very simple illustration: a drug called “Penadol”, which is now utilised for headaches and for children who are suffering from fever, costs relatively cheap—it costs about 2 cents to 3 cents each pill—but then they are being sold by general practitioners at something like 10 cents, or averaging 8 cents to 10 cents each. One can just work out what is the percentage of profit made on these pills. Drugs like “Chemicitin”—general practitioners will understand what they are being used for—costing about 12 cents to 15 cents each are being sold at 30 cents and at times 50 cents per pill! An ampute of injection of 10 c.c. costing 10 cents—1 c.c. costing about 1 cent is being charged at an average of \$1 to \$2 per injection.

Mr Speaker, Sir, in comparison with other business or trade, one can see the tremendous amount of profit that can be made from this profession. This state of affairs prevailed because it is a

privileged profession. I would like to call it a trade or a business. However it is called a profession, but sometimes, I think, it is no longer a profession but it has become a business—big business. Such a privileged position, Mr Speaker, Sir, should not be abused—abused because the general practitioners are in a position to make money beyond any public control. We do not grudge people making money. I think making money is a very good and healthy thing to do, if one can make money. But then society is guided by certain morals and ethics, especially when one has got to deal with the poor, the sick, the needy, and the workers in general. These are the people who will have to pay for such services and they ill-afford it. If one were to look at the statistical roll of patients attending clinics, be it governmental or otherwise, one can see that practically 90 per cent of the patients are poor people, people who are earning something like \$2 to \$3 a day. If that is so, and if members of their family are sick, if two or three of them should get sick at the same time, they would not be able to meet the medical bill.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I have friends in the medical profession, inside and outside this House. Some of them will probably disagree with me completely; some of them may say that I am very radical in my thoughts. But I think each one has got to answer these questions according to their own conscience—whether it is just, it is fair, for them to levy such high fees for curing the sick, for after all when they entered the medical profession their first code of ethics was to heal the sick, not to make money out of the sick. I know that some doctors . . .

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of order. Is the Honourable Member trying to persuade the Minister of Finance to introduce a National Health Service so that everybody is treated free? Then, I think, the medical profession cannot be held answerable for these charges.

Enche' Siow Loon Hin: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am very glad for the intervention of the Honourable Member for Batu,

because he mentioned earlier that there was a shortage of doctors in the General Hospital. I have been hearing him speaking about the Government Medical Services, saying that the Government has not done this, the Government has not done that, and that the Government has not done enough for the people. I was wondering why he himself has not served in the Government Service, if he thinks he should serve the public and not come into private practice and make money. (*Laughter*). I am sure if the Honourable Member for Batu thinks so noble of his profession, he should then give free service in his clinic to people, but I was told that he does so for reasons other than for professional reasons. (*An Honourable Member: Hear, hear*). As I said earlier, what has been said would affect some of my friends in the Government benches who are medical practitioners as well as some of those in the Opposition benches who are also medical practitioners. I think those of my friends in the Government benches will understand why I brought this up. It is not because I wanted to attack the medical profession as a whole, but I wanted to adjust their conscience to what they have been doing so far.

People have said that doctors are leaving the Government Service, and the excuse they gave was that the terms of service in the Government are unsatisfactory—poor salaries and inadequate facilities—but why don't they say that doctors prefer general practice as it is more lucrative and that is one of the inducing factors for them to leave the Government Service? That is the actual fact. I know of doctors who made an average income of something like \$800 to \$1,000 a day! An average doctor in general practice, who may not be so renown, will earn an average income of something like \$200 to \$300 a day. Mr Speaker, Sir, if one were to work this out in multiple progression, one can see how much income these people are making. As I said earlier I have no grudge to them making money. But surely if they could only sacrifice a part of their income by lowering down their fees they would

still be rich people; such people—some of these medical practitioners today—have a fancy of calling themselves Socialist! (*Laughter*).

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member is imputing improper motives to members of my profession down here. I do not think he should (*Laughter*).

Enche' Siow Loong Hin: Mr Speaker, Sir, I think probably the Government will have got to think of some ways in which we could regulate fair prices for medicine dispensed because we know that these drugs and medicine are being manufactured at a very cheap rate.

The next point, I would like to touch on is on the estimates of the Ministry of Social Welfare, which has made a provision of \$2 million by way of grants to voluntary welfare bodies to enable them to carry out social welfare work. I would say this is very commendable on the part of the Government to provide \$2 million and the voluntary welfare bodies are thankful to the Government for that. But I think this amount of money falls far short of the requirement of these voluntary welfare bodies if they are to carry out effective work in the various fields of social welfare in which they are engaged. There are two examples which I would like to bring out here today.

Mr Speaker, Sir, as was mentioned a few days earlier by the Ministry of Social Welfare, two voluntary organisations, namely the Central Welfare Council and the M.A.P.T.B., have been given grants totalling about \$1,300,000. It would seem a huge sum of money that is being given to two voluntary welfare organisations, but if one bears in mind the work which these two organisations are doing, the number of people they are assisting, then one would be able to understand why I request the Government to consider increasing the grant to voluntary welfare organisations. The M.A.P.T.B. is giving monthly relief to about 10,000 cases involving about 30,000 or more dependants. The annual grant of about

\$699,000 which the M.A.P.T.B. received enabled the Association to give an average relief of about \$10 per case, which sum is hardly adequate for TB families to live on. The Central Welfare Council, deals with the aged, the underprivileged, the destitutes, school aid for poor children, artificial aids, disasters caused by storms and fires, crop failures, etc. and is the other welfare organisation receiving grants from the Government.

They are assisting over 40,000 people a year, giving an average relief of \$7 to \$10 per case which is hardly adequate. The Council also maintains about 60 voluntary old folks homes throughout the country. The Welfare Council is undertaking, I understand, with the assistance of the Social Welfare Department, a survey on the requirements of school aid for poor children. In January of 1965 the Council will face, as it faces every year, hundreds of applications for school books from poor children from kampongs, from development schemes, and so forth. I hope by then the Minister of Social Welfare would be able to get more money to try and alleviate a situation which requires to be alleviated.

There is also the problem of grants being made not in time for these organisations to operate; there has been some considerable delay. We understand these delays are unavoidable because of the changeover from one source to another for dispensing grants, but we hope that the Minister concerned and the people concerned in the Ministry would expedite these grants to these organisations so that they could carry out their work without having to fall in arrears, sometimes as long as six months, thereby causing great difficulties to the recipients of relief.

It is also gratifying, Mr Speaker, Sir, to note in these estimates—and of course it has been said by our Prime Minister that a new Minister of Culture and Sports is being set up—that the Government is now taking a definite and positive interest in the young people of this country. We have in the past touched only on the fringe of the

problems of youth without getting into the inner core of the problem itself. Our concept of youth and of what youth should be and should do, in my opinion, has not been very clear. This question of a definite youth policy by the Government would be very welcome by the young people, because then the young people will know exactly where they are going. In my opinion, so far, only lip service has been given to youths. It is often said that the youths of today are the leaders of tomorrow. But, then, one does not look into the mechanics of how we can make them leaders of tomorrow. Probably they can be leaders of tomorrow of their own initiatives. But is that sufficient? During the last two days we have heard a lot of discussion on the Security Bill; the necessity of the Bill because of the dangers facing young people; the need to take definite steps to prepare them to combat subversion; and to allow them to take their rightful place with the democratic forces of this country to fight against communism. In my opinion, no area of social policy seems to be more in need of and more open to constructive and co-ordinated action than questions relating to youth.

Mr Speaker, Sir, youth organisations that have been existing in this country, a majority of them, were nurtured by the colonial powers, and a number of them have risen postwar out of the needs and aspirations of the young people themselves. It is very unfortunate, but it is true, that those nurtured by the colonial powers, having patronage in one form or another, are better off than those created postwar by the people themselves. Therefore, I hope, the new Ministry will take note of the differences that exist today between, shall I say, the "privileged" organisations and those "less privileged" organisations. They should be able at this stage to work out a dynamic and progressive policy, and, in order to do so, we must not be afraid of any radical change—a change from the past to the present and to the future. Unless we are able to generate this change within ourselves and this change be brought about by the young people,

we will not be able to succeed in bringing about a change in the pattern of society in the years to come. For the young people today, one of the deeply rankling features of society is what they consider and regard as its "unfairness"—unfairness in opportunity, unfairness in the economic and social field. At the same time, also, they are in search of status, and for satisfaction from working life as well as community life. These are the problems, these are the inherent problems of youth—to find a place in society, to be acceptable to society. In the whole evolution, one has got to bear in mind that the problems of the youth are not the problems of youth alone; they are the problems of our community, of our society. If we had an ordered, matured society, youth problems in the form we know them today would not exist. Hence, it is not enough for us to say that we will tackle these problems, it is essential for us to find the root causes and come to grips with the basic social problems of modern society. In this task young people of today can help the older ones to move and help to move towards a community which can truly command the sympathy and the support of all people.

The young people expect a great deal of the Government and I think the Government will not fall short of their expectations. Just as much as the Government will expect a great deal of the youth (if the Government produces a policy which is dynamic and progressive), I think youth will not fall short of the expectations the Government has of them.

Dato' Dr Ismail: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for Batu, when he made observations concerning the Ministry of Justice, deplored the fact that I was not in the House to listen to him. But I am always in communication with the Honourable Member for Batu, especially with his latest effort of giving co-operation to the Government. His observation that there were alleged irregularities in the Jinjang Town Council would naturally be dealt with by the Government if

he could supply more particulars. As the Minister of Justice, of course I cannot adopt the Gestapo-like method of trying to arrest the members of the Jinjang Town Council merely on the general allegations made by the Honourable Member for Batu. I would be grateful if he will be more specific, and better still, if he will come and see me as Minister of Justice in my office in the Ministry of Justice.

Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Muar Dalam di-dalam ucapan-nya telah memberi tegoran dan chadangan bagaimana kita boleh memperbaiki dan mengatasi konferantasi yang di-datangkan oleh Indonesia kepada negeri ini. Saya mengucapkan ribuan terima kaseh kepada Ahli Yang Berhormat itu dan segala tegoran dan chadangan-nya itu akan saya kaji dengan halus-nya, dan mana yang boleh akan di-gunakan oleh Kerajaan.

The Minister of Education (Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Yang Berhormat dari Batu di-dalam ucapan-nya yang panjang lebar telah menyentuh berkenaan dengan Kementerian Pelajaran berhubung dengan Bilek Gerakan Bahasa Kebangsaan yang di-adakan di-Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka. Dalam ucapan-nya nampak-nya dia tidak-lah menitik-beratkan sangat berkenaan Bilek Gerakan itu, tetapi telah menggunakan peluang untuk menentang dan menchachi Pengarah Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, yang malang-nya, tidak ada dalam Dewan ini, dan tidak ada peluang menjawab. Jadi, saya terpaksa-lah menjawab kerana Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka ini duduk-nya di-bawah Kementerian Pelajaran.

Yang pertama sa-kali, di-dalam ucapan yang panjang lebar itu dia berchakap berhubung dengan Bahasa Kebangsaan dengan asas dan konsep yang salah. Dia menyangka bahawa Bahasa Kebangsaan ini ia-lah hak Kerajaan Perikatan dan menyangka juga bahawa Bahasa Kebangsaan ini ada-lah hak Pengarah Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, dan dengan sebab konsep dia itu sudah salah, maka dia telah bertanya apa-kah Kerajaan Perikatan telah buat berkenaan dengan mengem-

bankan lagi Bahasa Kebangsaan dan menyatakan Pengarah ini belum membuat itu dan ini. Jadi konsep-nya saya katakan konsep yang salah kerana Bahasa Kebangsaan ini bukan-nya hak kepunyaan Pengarah Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka dan bukan-nya juga hak kepunyaan Kerajaan Perikatan, tetapi ada-lah hak kepunyaan tiap² sa-orang warga-negara yang mengaku ta'at setia kepada negara Malaysia ini. Kerana ini ada di-chatitkan di-dalam Perlembagaan yang di-katakan "sacred book". Jadi sa-patut-nya bahawa kewajipan untuk mengembangkan lagi kegunaan bahasa ini ada-lah kewajipan, bukan kewajipan Pengarah Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka sa-orang sahaja atau pun kewajipan Kerajaan Perikatan sahaja, tetapi ada-lah kewajipan semua warga-negara, termasuk Yang Berhormat dari Batu itu dan juga Parti Socialist Front, jika dia bertapak di-bumi Malaysia ini. Dalam ucapan-nya dia mengatakan bahawa Dewan Bahasa ini tidak berjaya dalam usaha-nya, alasan yang di-beri bahawa orang² intellect belum lagi dapat di-tarek untuk menchintai Bahasa Kebangsaan.

Saya katakan tadi bahawa ini bukan-nya kewajipan Pengarah Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka. Sa-patut-nya ahli² intellect itu-lah juga yang bukan-nya patut kita tarek tetapi dia datang ka-hadapan bersama² berusaha menjalankan ikhtiar untuk memajukan lagi bahasa kebangsaan kita. Yang saya tahu Kerajaan telah berbuat sa-berapa boleh melalui Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka untuk membolehkan lagi semangat sayang, chinta kepada bahasa kebangsaan kita. Tetapi yang saya tahu di-perlindungan oleh kelas² hendak mengembangkan bahasa kebangsaan oleh party Socialist Front, menggunakan kelas² seperti yang di-dirikan oleh-nya untuk barangkali menjalankan gerakan² subversive yang bertujuan untuk memesongkan ta'at setia ra'ayat negeri ini kepada Peking atau Moscow. Dan ini-lah contribution yang di-bagi oleh Socialist Front dalam melaksanakan dasar bahasa kebangsaan. Dan tidak hairan-lah kalau wakil-nya yang tunggal dalam Dewan ini telah bangkit menyerang dengan hebat-nya Pengarah Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Perkara yang kedua, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya hendak jelaskan ia-lah berhubung dengan ucapan yang dibuat oleh dua orang wakil daripada Sarawak berkenaan dengan dasar dan system pelajaran negeri itu. Dia ada menyebutkan berkenaan dengan Penyata Inter-Governmental Committee, saya pun juga faham akan kehendak dalam kandungan penyata itu. Saya tahu bahawa sa-lama 10 tahun akan datang mulai daripada tahun 1963, tarikh di-adakan Malaysia, dasar dan system pelajaran di-Sarawak itu berjalan-lah terus bagaimana yang ada hari ini sa-hingga kepada satu masa Kerajaan negeri itu hendak mengubahnya. Dan yang saya pelekkan pada masa system dan dasar pelajaran yang berjalan di-Sarawak pada hari ini dimajukan dua tahun dahulu di-negeri itu, parti SUPP ini membangkang keras dasar pelajaran itu. Tetapi hari ini entah macham mana pula dia datang ka-mari beria² benar supaya dasar pelajaran yang akan datang—dua tahun itu di-lanjutkan lagi berjalan di-Sarawak. Ini ada-lah pendirian yang menghairankan saya. Tetapi sebab kita tahu akan kedudukan party ini, dia tidak ada mempunyai pendirian yang tegas kita sipatkan ini perkara biasa sahaja-lah.

Saya boleh memberi akuan yang saya sangat bertimbang rasa dengan kehendak² pendudok di-Sarawak khususnya supaya free education ini di-jalankan di-sana dan oleh kerana system mengadakan sekolah rendah dengan bayaran ini ada-lah system yang di-jalankan oleh Kerajaan negeri yang tidak boleh di-pinda kechuali dengan persetujuan Kerajaan Negeri, jadi perkara ini terpaksa di-rundingkan lebeh dahulu dengan Kerajaan Negeri. Jadi sa-belum kita dapat kata sapaikat di-antara Kerajaan Persekutuan dengan Kerajaan Negeri, maka perkara ini tidak dapat-lah di-jalankan pada masa sekarang ini. Tetapi saya bolehlah memberi akuan dan jaminan bahawa kita akan melanjutkan lagi perbincangan dengan Kerajaan Negeri Sarawak berhubung dengan perkara ini. Sekian-lah.

The Minister for Welfare Services (Tuan Haji Abdul Hamid Khan bin Haji Sakhawat Ali Khan): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka-lah menjawab dan memberi sedikit penerangan berkenaan dengan perkara² yang di-bangkitkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Seremban Barat. Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Seremban Barat itu telah menarek perhatian Rumah ini ia-itu sa-banyak dua juta ringgit yang di-untokkan di-dalam bantuan ini patut-lah kalau boleh di-tambahkan lagi oleh kerana pada pendapat beliau ini ia-itu wang sa-banyak ini tidak menchukupi. Pada pendapat saya dan apa yang saya tahu dari Kementerian saya pada masa ini wang sa-banyak dua juta ringgit ini bagi peruntukan kebajikan ada-lah menchukupi dan sa-kira-nya perlu sudah tentu-lah saya akan minta lagi kepada Kerajaan.

Bagaimana pun tiap² peruntukan ada-lah di-beri oleh Welfare Council kepada badan² suka rela dan badan² suka rela ini hendak-lah menunjukkan bahawa sa-nya kerja² yang di-jalankan oleh mereka itu ada-lah kerja² yang memang di-kehendaki daripada segi bantuan kepada masharakat dan juga bantuan² yang memang di-perlukan oleh orang yang memang memerlukan bantuan, bukan hanya untuk memberi bantuan sahaja.

Ahli Yang Berhormat itu juga telah membangkitkan berkenaan dengan perkara buku²—bantuan buku² bagi sa-tengah² murid yang belajar di-sekolah² yang tidak mampu membeli buku sendiri. Dalam masaalah buku² bagi murid² sekolah ini, kita sedia ma'alum ia-itu di-dalam sekolah² kebangsaan buku memang ada di-beri ia-itu buku² asas, pada murid² yang di-dalam sekolah jenis kebangsaan yang tidak mampu untuk membeli buku.

Memang Jabatan Kebajikan Masharakat ada memberi buku² yang berpatutan, sa-telah mengkaji keadaan satu² keluarga itu, dan sa-jauh mana yang saya tahu boleh di-katakan semua permohonan yang di-buat kepada Jabatan Kebajikan Masharakat, telah di-ambil perhatian, dan juga telah di-beri bantuan. Tentang kelambatan yang di-katakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat itu kepada sa-tengah² pihak

mendapat bantuan ini, boleh jadi timbul-nya oleh kerana tiap² satu penuntut itu untuk mendapat bantuan, mesti-lah di-siasat dan di-kaji keadaan kesulitan dan sa-bagai-nya. Ini sudah tentu-lah akan mengambil masa, dan bagaimana pun sa-kira-nya perkara itu di-siasat di-pandang perlu di-beri bantuan maka bantuan akan di-beri.

Saya menguchapkan terima kaseh kapada Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang telah menchadangkan supaya Kementerian saya dapat lebih daripada 2 juta ringgit daripada sahabat saya Menteri Kewangan. Dan sudah tentu-lah saya tahu Menteri Kewangan ini hati-nya murah, dan bila berkehendakkan apa² dari permintaan saya ini yang berpatutan, tentu-lah dia akan menimbangkan. Sekian-lah.

Enche' Abdul-Rahman Ya'kub: Mr Chairman, Sir, the Honourable Member for Batu has commented on Head S. 16, sub-head 58, and attacked the expenditure as a waste of funds. Under that sub-head, Sir, a provision of \$197,676 is required to meet expenditure in connection with the production of external publications on Malaysia in the Special *Sunday* Supplement to *New York Times*. Sir, we know why the Honourable Member for Batu attacks that expenditure and says it is a waste of time. It is because he does not want Malaysia to be advertised in any country at all. He does not want people outside Malaysia to know that Malaysia is not a colonial plot. That is the reason. He has chosen, Sir, to spare that money, because he knows that in New York representatives of nations from all over the world will go there and this paper, the *Sunday New York Times*, has a circulation of more than 1.7 million and it is likely to reach not only the American people but also the representatives of other nations.

Other Members who have spoken earlier on said that we must intensify our external publicity. The Socialist Front Member says, "No, do not spend money on this sort of thing." I must say such an expenditure is very necessary, especially in special circumstances when we have confrontation by Soekarno; if we lack in that we may

not be able to carry public opinion with us. Thank you.

Enche' Abu Bakar bin Hamzah (Bachok): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam membahathkan perkara ini tidak usahlah kita hendak menentukan satu² keadilan dalam pembahagian ini, kerana Menteri² Yang Berhormat itu tidak menjelaskan dasar dalam membuat tambahan ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya maksudkan ia-lah ia-itu dalam kita membuat tambah perbelanjaan ini, jika kita tentukan dasar-nya dahulu boleh dapat kita menimbangkan kepala² yang di-beri itu sesuai dengan dasar. Saya katakan bagitu ia-lah kerana saya dapati penerangan² dari back benchers, saya perchaya itu pun boleh jadi tidak di-terima oleh Menteri² kita ini ia-itu kebanyakan-nya di-terangkan kerana konfrontasi Indonesia. Kalau-lah di-tambah perbelanjaan pula kerana konfrontasi, jadi segala²-nya kerana konfrontasi. Jadi, tidak-lah kita ini mendasarkan tambahan kita ini di-atas satu² hujah yang benar² berlaku dalam negara kita ini, masaalah yang saya buktikan melihat muka 9 di-dalam Kepala 13 ini, ia-itu Ministry of Commerce, perkara nombor 28, Kursus Teknik bagi Contractor Melayu \$23,000. Kursus apa ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, \$23,000 bagi sa-buah negara berbanding dengan New York World Fair. Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, nyata-lah di-dalam membuat tambahan ini, Kerajaan tidak mempunyai dasar yang tegas, maka kapada Ministry of Defence kita dapati pula tambahan² itu banyak perkara yang ketinggalan, masaalah peluru, sedikit sangat belanja-nya. Kita hendak perang sangat, mengikut statement konfrontasi hendak perang sangat-lah. Jadi tidak chukup itu terlampau sedikit. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dan saya dukachita di-dalam tambahan ini tidak dimasukkan satu peruntukan ia-itu membolehkan Ahli² Yang Berhormat ini pergi training dua tiga bulan, supaya kita ini tidak-lah menyuroh ashkar² kita berperang dan apabila orang² itu balek kita menangis kapada orang² itu. Jadi, sa-patut-nya di-tambahkan lebih banyak lagi supaya membolehkan Ahli² Yang Berhormat, malah isteri² mereka itu juga supaya

mereka itu dapat berjuang mempertahankan negeri ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, satu perkara yang menarek sa-kali ia-lah dengan Kementerian Pelajaran. Tidak nampak di-sini belanja yang di-minta, sa-olah² sudah chukup-kah agak-nya Menteri itu di-dalam perbelanjaan, pada hal perkara yang besar dalam membena sa-buah bangsa itu ia-lah berkenaan dengan kesihatan, pelajaran dan juga ekonomi. Jadi, tidak ada di-sebut di-sini, barangkali dia rasa sudah chukup dalam perkara² ini dan dalam perkara² lain akan di-tunjokkan agak-nya, kerana saya perchaya Menteri Kewangan itu murah hati, maka di-tanggohkan-lah perkara² itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Saya kalau saya kata walau apa sa-kali pun dalam Majlis ini tidak akan menang dengan Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang banyak itu. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam politik kita ini, saya minta-lah Menteri² yang berkenaan terutama sa-kali Menteri Kewangan, supaya menerangkan dasar-nya kepada penambahan ini, supaya di-dalam peringkat Jawatan-kuasa itu dapat kita bahathkan perkara² itu lebeh detail dan saya minta Menteri yang berkenaan menerangkan dasar penambahan bagi supplementary ini. Sekian-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

The Assistant Minister of Youth, Culture and Sports (Engku Muhsein bin Abdul Kadir): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menguchapkan berbanyak² terima kaseh kepada Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Seremban Barat yang telah memberi pandangan dalam perkara gerakan² belia. Oleh kerana Kementerian ini satu Kementerian yang baharu, tentu-lah tidak dapat dalam tempoh yang sa-bagini singkat di-lihat hasil²-nya dan tentu-lah tidak pula satu penegasan yang tegas dapat di-beri dalam chara² melaksanakan kerja² untuk belia. Walau bagaimana pun dengan ada-nya Perdana Menteri sendiri memegang sa-bagai Menteri dalam hal ini ada-lah menunjukkan bagitu besar-nya sa-kali perhatian dan keinsafan Kerajaan pada urusan belia ini dan suka-lah saya menegaskan apa juga pandangan yang telah di-berikan oleh Yang Berhormat dari Seremban Barat itu, terutama sa-kali pandangan-

nya dalam perkara ini supaya satu langkah yang tegas dan juga perpaduan yang rapat di-antara Persatuan² Belia di-seluruh tanah ayer ini hendak-lah di-buat, ada-lah menjadi sa-bagai satu langkah yang di-harap akan dapat di-laksanakan dalam tempoh yang tidak berapa lama lagi.

Berkenaan dengan pandangan-nya akan peri ada-nya dua jenis Persatuan Belia sekarang ini yang menurut kata-nya satu jenis yang di-anjorkan oleh sa-tengah² gulungan colonial pada masa² yang lampau dan sa-paroh daripada-nya pula di-anjorkan atas keinsafan belia² sendiri maka perkara ini, saya ta' tahu-lah sa-takat mana kebenaran-nya, tetapi ini-lah yang saya suka menjelaskan bahawa sa-panjang yang mengenai Kementerian ini, kita ada-lah memberi kerjasama: kita ada-lah berjuang dan bergerak samata² demi kepentingan belia dan juga chara² gerakan yang sesuai untuk tanah ayer kita ini, dan tidak sa-kali² menyokong mana² juga gerakan² yang terbawa², atau pun berbau dengan chara² colonial.

Kementerian ini berharap dan sedar, memandangkan kepada jumlah orang² muda dan orang² yang berumur 25 tahun ka-bawah berjumlah lebeh dari 60 peratus daripada ra'ayat Malaysia, maka ada-lah satu tanggong-jawab yang besar bagi kita meranchangkan satu langkah yang lebeh tegas, yang lebeh sunggoh² lagi dalam melaksanakan kerja² untuk kepentingan belia ini. Langkah yang pertama yang kita harapkan akan dapat mengadakan sa-bagaimana pandangan yang di-beri oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat tadi ia-lah hendak mendapatkan kebanyakan belia² kita, terutama yang belasan tahun supaya mereka itu tidak terbawa² oleh anasir², atau oleh keadaan² yang burok yang boleh membawa mereka itu kepada keadaan kenakalan, atau kepada keadaan kejahatan, juga kepada keadaan² yang lebeh terok lagi saperti pembawaan yang membawa kepada kominis. Maka chara yang kita harapkan ia-lah langkah yang pertama untuk mendapatkan mereka itu berkumpul sa-sama mereka dengan kita mengadakan dalam masa tidak berapa lama lagi, jikalau di-setujui

oleh pehak Perbendaharaan, pusat atau pun tempat² orang ramai bagi belia² di-daerah² yang ramai penduduk-nya di-mana pusat² itu akan dapat di-adakan alatan² dan juga lain² chara yang boleh memberi pertolongan dan juga latehan kepada belia² tadi; di-samping mengadakan latehan² yang lebeh kemas dan lebeh panjang lagi kepada pemimpin² muda—belia² itu.

Jadi, itu-lah sahaja yang boleh saya tegaskan kepada Ahli² Yang Berhormat itu dan saya harap-lah dengan sokongan daripada semua jurusan Kementerian ini akan dapat memberi khidmat-nya kepada gulongan yang sangat besar peratus-nya di-tanah ayer kita ini.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid (Seberang Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka menarek perhatian Peratoran Tetap 40 (1). Saya fikir peluang telah

banyak terbuka kepada Ahli² Yang Berhormat dan kita ada lapan lagi Bill² yang hendak di-bahathkan, maka molek-lah, kalau dengan kebenaran Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mencha-dangkan ia-itu masaalah ini di-putuskan sekarang.

Mr Speaker: Ada-lah masaalah-nya ia-itu masaalah ini di-putuskan sekarang.

Mr Speaker: (*To Enche' Tan Siew Sin*) Do you want to reply?

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Under the Standing Orders I have got no right of reply. I am quite happy, Sir. (*Laughter*).

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time.

Mr Speaker: The sitting is adjourned till 10 a.m. tomorrow.

House adjourned at 8 p.m.