

**Volume I
No. 36**



**Tuesday
15th December, 1964**

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

**DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)**

OFFICIAL REPORT

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

CONTENTS

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 4573]

THE SUPPLY BILL, 1965:

Schedule—

Heads S. 18, S. 19 and S. 20 [Col. 4576]

Head S. 21 [Col. 4660]

ADJOURNMENT (Motion) [Col. 4700]

ADJOURNMENT SPEECH:

**Acts of brutality by certain members of the Police Force
[Col. 4700]**

MALAYSIA
DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

Official Report

First Session of the Second Dewan Ra'ayat

Tuesday, 15th December, 1964

The House met at Ten o'clock

PRESENT:

- The Honourable Mr Speaker, DATO' CHIK MOHAMED YUSUF BIN SHEIKH ABDUL RAHMAN, S.P.M.P., J.P., Dato' Bendahara, Perak.
- „ the Prime Minister, Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Culture, Youth and Sports, Y.T.M. TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN PUTRA AL-HAJ, K.O.M. (Kuala Kedah).
- „ the Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Defence, Minister of National and Rural Development, 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. (Sungai Siput).
- „ the Minister of Transport, DATO' HAJI SARDON BIN HAJI JUBIR, P.M.N. (Pontian Utara).
- „ the Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives and Minister of Education, ENCHE' MOHAMED KHIR JOHARI (Kedah Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Health, ENCHE' BAHAMAN BIN SAMSUDIN (Kuala Pilah).
- „ 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 Sarawak Affairs, DATO' TEMENGGONG JUGAH ANAK BARIENG, P.M.N., P.J.K. (Sarawak).
- „ the Minister of Information and Broadcasting, ENCHE' SENU BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Kubang Pasu Barat).
- „ the Minister of Lands and Mines, TUAN HAJI MOHAMED GHAZALI BIN HAJI JAWI (Ulu Perak).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Commerce and Industry, TUAN HAJI ABDUL KHALID BIN AWANG OSMAN (Kota Star Utara).

- The Honourable the Assistant Minister of National and Rural Development and Assistant Minister of Justice,
ENCHE' ABDUL-RAHMAN BIN YA'KUB (Sarawak).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives,
ENCHE' SULAIMAN BIN BULON (Bagan Datoh).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Culture, Youth and Sports,
ENGKU MUHSEIN BIN ABDUL KADIR, J.M.N., S.M.T., P.J.K.
(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, P.P.T. (Kuala Trengganu
Utara).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAHIM ISHAK (Singapore).
- „ 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
(Pasir Mas Hulu).
- „ Y.A.M. TUNKU ABDULLAH IBNI AL-MARHUM TUANKU ABDUL
RAHMAN, P.P.T. (Rawang).
- „ 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, J.P. (Seberang Utara).
- „ CHE' AJIBAH BINTI ABOL (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' ALI BIN HAJI AHMAD (Pontian Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Muar Dalam).
- „ ENCHE' JONATHAN BANGAU ANAK RENANG, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ PENGARAH BANYANG ANAK JANTING, P.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN SIANG SUN (Bentong).
- „ ENCHE' CHIA CHIN SHIN, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ 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' GEH CHONG KEAT, K.M.N. (Penang Utara).
- „ DR GOH KENG SWEE (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' HAMZAH BIN ALANG, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Kapar).
- „ ENCHE' HANAFI BIN MOHD. YUNUS, A.M.N., J.P.
(Kulim Utara).
- „ ENCHE' HANAFIAH BIN HUSSAIN, A.M.N. (Jerai).
- „ ENCHE' HARUN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Baling).
- „ WAN HASSAN BIN WAN DAUD (Tumpat).

- The Honourable 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).
- „ ENCHE' IBRAHIM BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Seberang Tengah).
- „ ENCHE' ISMAIL BIN IDRIS (Penang Selatan).
- „ DATO' SYED JA'AFAR BIN HASAN ALBAR, P.M.N.
(Johor Tenggara).
- „ PENGHULU JINGGUT ANAK ATTAN, Q.M.C., A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' KADAM ANAK KIAI (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' KAM WOON WAH, J.P. (Sitiawan).
- „ ENCHE' EDMUND LANGGU ANAK SAGA (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SAN CHOON, K.M.N. (Segamat Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SECK FUN (Tanjong Malim).
- „ ENCHE' LIM HUAN BOON (Singapore).
- „ DATO' LIM KIM SAN, D.U.T., J.M.K., D.J.M.K. (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' LIM PEE HUNG, P.J.K. (Alor Star).
- „ DR MAHATHIR BIN MOHAMAD (Kota Star Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' T. MAHIMA SINGH, J.P. (Port Dickson).
- „ DATO' DR HAJI MEGAT KHAS, D.P.M.P., J.P., P.J.K.
(Kuala Kangsar).
- „ ENCHE' MOHD. DAUD BIN ABDUL SAMAD (Besut).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED IDRIS BIN MATSIL, J.M.N., P.J.K., J.P.
(Jelebu-Jempol).
- „ ENCHE' MOHD. TAHIR BIN ABDUL MAJID, S.M.S., P.J.K.
(Kuala Langat).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED YUSOF BIN MAHMUD, A.M.N. (Temerloh).
- „ ENCHE' MOHD. ZAHIR BIN HAJI ISMAIL, J.M.N. (Sungai Patani).
- „ WAN MOKHTAR BIN AHMAD (Kemaman).
- „ TUAN HAJI MOKHTAR BIN HAJI ISMAIL (Perlis Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' MUHAMMAD FAKHRUDDIN BIN HAJI ABDULLAH
(Pasir Mas Hilir).
- „ TUAN HAJI MUHAMMAD SU'AUT BIN HAJI MUHD. TAHIR,
A.B.S. (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).
- „ DATO' NIK AHMAD KAMIL, D.K., S.P.M.K., S.J.M.K., P.M.N.,
P.Y.G.P., Dato' Sri Setia Raja (Kota Bharu Hilir).
- „ ENCHE' NG FAH YAM (Batu Gajah).
- „ DR NG KAM POH, J.P. (Telok Anson).
- „ ENCHE' ONG KEE HUI (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' ONG PANG BOON (Singapore).
- „ TUAN HAJI OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Hilir Perak).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Perlis Utara).

- The Honourable ABANG OTHMAN BIN HAJI MOASIL, P.B.S. (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, P.J.K., J.P. (Kuala Selangor).
- „ ENCHE' SANDOM ANAK NYUAK (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' SEAH TENG NGIAB, P.I.S. (Muar Pantai).
- „ ENCHE' S. P. SEENIVASAGAM (Menglembu).
- „ ENCHE' SIOW LOONG HIN, P.J.K. (Seremban Barat).
- „ ENCHE' SNAWI BIN ISMAIL, P.J.K. (Seberang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' SNG CHIN JOO (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' SOH AH TECK (Batu Pahat).
- „ ENCHE' SULEIMAN BIN ALI (Dungun).
- „ ENCHE' TAJUDIN BIN ALI, P.J.K. (Larut Utara).
- „ ENCHE' TAI KUAN YANG (Kulim-Bandar Bharu).
- „ DR TAN CHEE KHOON (Batu).
- „ ENCHE' TAN CHENG BEE, J.P. (Bagan).
- „ ENCHE' TAN TOH HONG (Bukit Bintang).
- „ ENCHE' TAN TSAK YU (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' TIAH ENG BEE (Kluang Utara).
- „ PENGHULU FRANCIS UMPAU ANAK EMPAM (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' YEOH TAT BENG (Bruas).
- „ ENCHE' YONG NYUK LIN (Singapore).
- „ TUAN HAJI ZAKARIA BIN HAJI MOHD. TAIB, P.J.K. (Langat).

ABSENT:

- The Honourable the Minister for Local Government and Housing,
ENCHE' KHAW KAI-BOH, P.J.K. (Ulu Selangor).
- „ the Minister of Labour, ENCHE' V. MANICKAVASAGAM,
J.M.N., P.J.K. (Klang).
- „ the Minister without Portfolio, ENCHE' PETER LO SU YIN
(Sabah).
- „ WAN ABDUL RAHMAN BIN DATU TUANKU BUJANG (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAJI TALIB, P.J.K. (Kuantan).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDUL RASHID BIN HAJI JAIS (Sabah).
- „ DATO' ABDULLAH BIN ABDULRAHMAN, Dato' Bijaya di-Raja
(Kuala Trengganu Selatan).
- „ O. K. K. DATU ALIUDDIN BIN DATU HARUN, P.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ DR AWANG BIN HASSAN, S.M.J. (Muar Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' E. W. BARKER (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN CHONG WEN, A.M.N. (Kluang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN SEONG YOON (Setapak).

- The Honourable ENCHE' CHEN WING SUM (Damansara).
- „ ENCHE' FRANCIS CHIA NYUK TONG (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' CHIA THYE POH (Singapore).
- „ TUAN SYED ESA BIN ALWEE, J.M.N., S.M.J., P.I.S.
(Batu Pahat Dalam).
- „ ENCHE' S. FAZUL RAHMAN, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ DATO' GANIE GILONG, P.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' GANING BIN JANGKAT (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' STANLEY HO NYUN KHIU, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' JEK YEUN THONG (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' KHOO PENG LOONG (Sarawak).
- „ DATO' KHOO SIAK CHIEW, P.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' KOW KEE SENG (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' LEE KUAN YEW (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' AMADEUS MATHEW LEONG, A.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).
- „ DATO' LING BENG SIEW, P.N.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ DR LIM CHONG EU (Tanjong).
- „ ENCHE' LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).
- „ ENCHE' JOSEPH DAVID MANJAJI (Sabah).
- „ 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' OTHMAN BIN WOK (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' D. R. SEENIVASAGAM (Ipoh).
- „ ENCHE' SIM BOON LIANG (Sarawak).
- „ DATO' DONALD ALOYSIUS STEPHENS, P.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ PENGIRAN TAHIR PETRA (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' TAMA WENG TINGGANG WAN (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Melaka).
- „ DR TOH CHIN CHYE (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' TOH THEAM HOCK (Kampar).
- „ ENCHE' WEE TOON BOON (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' YEH PAO TZE (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' STEPHEN YONG KUET TZE (Sarawak).

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TARIFF ADVISORY BOARD— APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS

1. Dr Tan Chee Khoon asks the Minister of Finance to state whether any businessmen have been appointed to the Tariff Advisory Board, if so, what steps has the Minister taken to prevent such members from influencing the

decisions of the Board in a manner favourable to their business.

The Minister of Finance (Enche' Tan Siew Sin): Mr Speaker, Sir, the term "businessmen" is ambiguous and misleading. While it is true that a number of the part-time members of the Tariff Advisory Board are persons who are engaged in commerce, section 8 (7) of the Tariff Advisory Board Act, 1963, provides that no part-time member can participate in any proceedings of a

Committee or a Sub-Committee of the Board on any matter in which he has a direct or indirect pecuniary interest, unless he has declared such interest to the Committee or Sub-committee, as the case may be. Furthermore, the Board is required to hold a public inquiry into any matter that is referred to the Board for consideration. It is considered that such a public inquiry would disclose any sectional interest of any of the part-time members. The selection of the part-time members to sit on any Committee of the Board will be made by the Chairman who will take into account the business connections of any member when making his choice.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: I am glad for this clarification by the Honourable Minister of Finance.

TRAWLER FISHING—SARAWAK

2. Abang Othman bin Haji Moasili bertanya kepada Menteri Pertanian dan Sharikat Kerjasama² ada-kah Kerajaan dapat memberi jaminan ia-itu Pukat Harimau akan di-gunakan di-Sarawak.

The Assistant Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives (Enche' Sulaiman bin Bulon): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada-lah menjadi dasar bagi Kementerian Pertanian dan Sharikat Kerjasama hendak melipat gandakan pengeluaran ikan² di-dalam negeri ini supaya dapat menchukupi kehendak² rakyat dalam Malaysia akan makanan yang mengandongi zat² protein. Dimana sahaja di-dalam dunia ini, pukat harimau telah di-akuī sa-bagai alat menangkap ikan yang bermutu tetapi di-Malaysia ini merupakan satu perkara baharu. Oleh kerana yang demikian ada-lah masaalah² yang tertentu mengenai nelayan kita yang menangkap ikan di-kawasan² pantai, maka penggunaan pukat harimau di-dalam perayeran kita maseh di-timbangan dengan rapi, dan ada-lah di-jangka yang keputusan mengenai perkara ini akan boleh di-buat di-dalam masa yang tidak berapa lama lagi.

THE SUPPLY BILL, 1965

Order read for resumed consideration in Committee of Supply (Tenth Allotted Day).

House immediately resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(Mr Speaker in the Chair)

SCHEDULE

Heads S. 18, S. 19 and S. 20—

Resumption of debate on Question:

That the sums of \$48,628,746 for Head S. 18, \$239,358,359 for Head S. 19 and \$32,326,246 for Head S. 20 stand part of the Schedule.

Mr Chairman: Saya suka hendak mengingatkan kepada Ahli² Yang Berhormat masa kita hanya untuk perkara ini ada-lah suntok sedikit kerana pada pukul 12.00 nanti kita akan memberi peluang kepada Menteri² untuk menjawab. Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang hendak berchakap banyak datang memberi tahu saya yang mereka hendak berchakap. Chuma saya minta jika dapat Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang hendak berchakap itu tepatkan perkara² itu, pendek² sahaja maka baharu-lah boleh saya benarkan. Itu-lah sahaja saya beri tahu kepada Ahli² Yang Berhormat. Waktu kita berhenti sa-malam Ahli Yang Berhormat itu belum habis lagi.

Enche' Lee Seck Fun (Tanjong Malim): Mr Chairman, Sir, I now proceed to page 211 of Head S. 18—Teacher Training (Headquarters). Over 20,000 young Malaysians have applied to become teachers and we require only 4,500. To see that every student who has completed his six-year primary education and automatically promoted will be given a place to begin with his secondary education, we have selected teams from the Ministry in every State to recruit these approximately 4,500 teachers to carry on their work since November, and I presume they have not completed to date. I sincerely hope that care should be taken to select not only the hardworking and intelligent ones but that they must also be loyal. We have one or two teachers in our country giving us trouble now by twisting the Rahman Talib policy and misguiding the innocent children and parents. However, I am sure they cannot get very far due to the wide publicity, in theory and practice, of the Alliance education policy, and their

anti-campaign is dying a natural death. It must be borne in the mind of the Honourable Minister concerned that of the 4,500 who are going to be selected there may be a few who will twist the Rahman Talib education policy. Under such circumstances, I would suggest that every teacher must know the Rahman Talib education policy fully well before he or she can be qualified to be a teacher or can be given increment.

Mr Chairman, Sir, I now take Head S. 18, page 241—Perak Education Office. I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the Chief Education Officer, his officers and staff for their magnificent work and their development planning prepared for the State of Perak. The planning is so in detail and good, and I hope the Honourable Minister of Education and the Honourable Minister of Finance will consider the development programme of Perak with top priority. It is of utmost importance that the Catholic High School Tanjong Malim gets approximately \$200,000 next year for the construction of an administrative block, extension of the science laboratory, woodwork room, a domestic science room and metal-work room. As over eighty students sat for the Lower School Certificate Examination this year, under the guidance of a good set of teachers, I am sure at least 80 per cent will pass. With the assistance of the present Acting Minister of Education, his predecessor and the towkays of Tanjong Malim Sub-district and areas around, I am proud I have got the Catholic High School (National-type secondary, Chinese medium) started in 1961—approximately 1½ years since I was elected to the First Malayan Parliament. This is now a model school, and every right-thinking Malaysian of Chinese origin in my constituency appreciates the Alliance policy in the Rahman Talib Report. The students of Tanjong Malim Catholic High School speak and write Chinese, English and Malay very well. I would remind the Malays to study hard, as the previous years' F.M.C. results showed that many non-Malays got Grade I F.M.C. certificates. If the Malays do not work hard, I am afraid

that in time to come more Malaysians of non-Malay origin will teach the national language to the Malays. I sincerely hope that this will not happen (*Laughter*).

Mr Chairman, Sir, I now refer to page 249, item XI—Centralised Hostels. Such hostels are very good; and, especially, in areas where the Malays are thickly populated, they are essential. Most Malay parents are poor. There is no such hostel in my Tanjong Malim constituency, and I appeal to the Minister that a centralised hostel must be constructed in Tanjong Malim or Sungkai.

Now, I wish to touch on page 260, sub-head 105, Publication of Malaysian Literature in Chinese and Tamil languages. I note that under this sub-head only a token vote of \$10 is shown, and I presume the Honourable Minister concerned has a vast programme in view. I would like to see that this publication is widely distributed to all parts of Malaysia, in both urban and rural areas as well. Malaysian literature on educational policy should be given more publicity. If this is done, then the Honourable Member from Singapore, whom I understand was the Minister of Education for Singapore, would not have compared our education policy with their education policy and its implementation in this House yesterday afternoon. However, my friend, the Honourable Acting Minister of Education, will be taking some time to tell him, before the House adjourns this morning, our education policy and then I am sure he will certainly agree that our education policy is better than the Singapore education policy. (AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear, Hear).

Mr Chairman, Sir, I now wish to dwell on page 260, subhead 106—Furniture, Fittings and Equipment. The Maktab Perguruan Sultan Idris, Tanjong Malim, is the oldest Malay Teachers' Training College in Malaysia and it is sad to note that not enough fund is allocated yearly to make it as grand as the Language Institute, Kuala Lumpur, and other new Teachers' Training Colleges in Malaysia. I presume and hope that more

funds will be allocated to this Maktab Perguruan Sultan Idris, Tanjong Malim for the coming year 1965.

Mr Chairman, Sir, I am now touching on page 263, item 1, Grants to Primary Schools and item 12, Aid to Non-Government Muslim Religious Schools. The below schools and Sekolah² Ugama Ra'ayat Rendah need grants and aids very urgently and need the attention of the officers concerned:

- (1) Sekolah Kebangsaan Kampong Kuala Slim, Slim River;
- (2) Sekolah Kebangsaan Kampong Perlok, Sungkai;
- (3) Sekolah Kebangsaan Kampong Poh, Bidor;
- (4) Sekolah Kebangsaan Bidor Town;
- (5) New National-type Tamil School (Primary), Trolak;
- (6) Methodist English School (Primary), Tanjong Malim;
- (7) Methodist English School (Secondary), Tanjong Malim;
- (8) National-type Primary Chinese School, Slim Village;
- (9) National-type Primary Chinese School, Slim River;
- (10) Catholic High School, Tanjong Malim;
- (11) Sekolah Ugama Ra'ayat Kampong Balun, Slim River;
- (12) Sekolah Ugama Ra'ayat, Slim Village;
- (13) Sekolah Ugama Kampong Rasau, Slim Village;
- (14) Sekolah Ugama Ra'ayat Kampong Guntong, Sungkai;
- (15) Sekolah Ugama Ra'ayat, Kampong Beiro, Tanjong Malim; and
- (16) A new building for Sekolah Menengah Ugama at Slim River. (To cater for students from the streams of Sekolah² Ugama Rendah (Non-Government) from Tanjong Malim to Bidor).

Mr Chairman, Sir, I would suggest to the Honourable Minister concerned to print pamphlets in Chinese and Tamil to explain to the parents of Malaysian students of non-Malay origin that if they send their children

to the National-type primary schools of either Chinese or Indian medium, Chinese and Tamil and other languages cannot be killed. If they do not do so, as most parents now send their children to National-type primary schools of English medium, then it is they themselves who are not interested in their own vernacular language and as time goes on the Chinese, Tamil and other languages will run down due to the fault of the non-Malay parents themselves and not the Rahman Talib Education Report.

The teachers of National-type Chinese and Tamil media must also work hard to teach their students and produce good results as schools of other media. If the teachers and Malaysians of non-Malay origin work together, then our future young Malaysians of non-Malay origin will be able to speak, read and write the national language, Chinese, Tamil and the English languages as long as the Alliance Party under the leadership of our Prime Minister, Yang Teramat Mulia Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra Al-Haj and the Deputy Prime Minister, Tun Haji Abdul Razak bin Dato Hussein, governs Malaysia.

Before I conclude, Mr Chairman, Sir, the Honourable Member from Singapore, who was also the ex-Minister of Education in Singapore, yesterday afternoon in this House asked the Central Government's stand with regard to higher Chinese education and drew the attention to Malaysia's consular relations with Taiwan and asked whether it is preferable to send our students to Taiwan or to the Nanyang University on Malaysian soil. He also asked the Malaysian Chinese Association to state its view on this issue. As a member of the General Central Committee, M.C.A. Headquarters, Kuala Lumpur, and also a delegate of Malaysia to the last 18th General Assembly of the United Nations in New York (*Laughter*), I have spoken to almost all the international diplomats and politicians from 113 countries all over the world (*Laughter*) and have urged me to answer the question put forward. The answer is a straightforward one from my own point of

view, and from the view of any right-thinking Malaysian, and it is that if the control of the Nanyang University is to be handed over by the Peoples' Action Party Government to the Alliance Central Government and allow the Central Government to take full control of it, then it is preferable to send our students to the Nanyang University than to the Taiwan University and not otherwise. Thank you, Sir (*Applause*).

Wan Abdul Kadir bin Ismail (Kuala Trengganu Utara): Tuan Pengerusi, saya suka mengambil bahagian sedikit di-dalam perbahathan Kementerian Pelajaran ini, dan saya ada-lah menyokong penoh peruntukan yang di-minta, kerana ini ada-lah satu perkara yang sangat wajib bagi pembangunan nasional kita. Bila kita memandang kepada pelajaran dan rangka pelajaran nasional yang ada sekarang ini, Tuan Pengerusi, kita tidak lupa kepada jasa satu orang yang pada hari ini tidak ada di-dalam Dewan ini. Beliau ia-lah Enche' Abdul Rahman Talib yang telah memberikan sumbangan yang besar di-dalam pembentokan kepada rangka sistem pelajaran nasional kita yang ada pada hari ini (*Tepok*). Sa-orang yang telah memberi jasa-nya dan derma-nya kepada pembangunan pelajaran kita, kepada pembangunan nasional kita dan walau di-mana pun kita berada, kita tidak akan lupa jasa sa-orang yang bernama Abdul Rahman Talib itu yang akan abadi dengan Penyata Rahman Talib-nya di-dalam pelajaran, dan saya rasa perasaan ini bukan sahaja di-rasa oleh kita orang² Melayu, tetapi juga oleh segala warga negara Malaysia yang terdiri dari segala keturunan yang ta'at setia—saya tegaskan sa-kali lagi yang ta'at setia kepada negara ini (*Tepok*).

Tuan Pengerusi, saya hendak beredar sedikit pada muka 224—Asrama Penuntut Malaysia, Kahirah, dan saya hendak menyampaikan rasa penghargaan saya kepada satu jawatan yang akan di-adakan pada tahun hadapan, sa-orang Pegawai Perhubungan Penuntut yang menjaga berkenaan dengan asrama di-Kahirah itu, dan ini dinyatakan bagaimana sedar-nya Kera-

jaan kita kepada kepentingan penuntut² kita di-Masir yang telah bertambah ramai—ada 300 orang ramai-nya pada masa ini dan dengan yang demikian maka dapat-lah Kerajaan menampung keperluan mereka itu di-sana, chuma saya nampak peruntukan tambahan bagi Pegawai Perhubungan Penuntut itu terlalu rendah gaji-nya, barangkali sama dengan taraf gaji kerani. Kalau ini di-beri \$3,500 sa-tahun, saya ingat tidak berpadan dan tidak berpatutan. Maka patut-lah di-naikkan gaji-nya sahingga sama dengan kedudukan-nya sesuai dengan kedudukan dan status-nya sa-bagai Pegawai Perhubungan Penuntut dengan pehak pelajaran di-U.A.R. sana.

Di-samping itu, Tuan Pengerusi, sampai sekarang ini, sampai satu perkara yang berhubung dengan ini, sampai sekarang saya tidak tahu di-mana sangkut-nya penilaian ijazah² dari Masir ini—belum lagi selesai. Dari tahun 1957 soal ini di-kemukakan dari masa kita mula merdeka dan sampai hari ini perkara itu maseh senyap.

Saya tahu penuntut² yang balek dari Masir maseh lagi menunggu² dengan sabar hendak melihat sa-takat manakah langkah yang akan di-jalankan oleh Kerajaan bagi menilai ijazah² dari Masir ini, tetapi jangan-lah kita biarkan mereka itu menunggu terlalu lama, kerana walau pun Tuhan beserta dengan orang yang sabar, tetapi kalau menunggu terlalu lama, kalau lama, sejok akhir-nya—ta' ada berkain dia itu akan lari ka-mana². Dan kita perlu kepada tenaga mereka itu, Tuan Pengerusi, dalam pembangunan negara kita pada masa ini.

Sa-lain daripada itu saya hendak memberi pandangan sedikit, Tuan Pengerusi, tentang usaha hendak meningkatkan kemajuan pelajar² Melayu di-sekolah² menengah. Ini banyak diperkatakan dan saya berasa hendak bersetuju dengan pendapat sa-tengah daripada Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang mengatakan ada penekanan sa-chara halus kepada penuntut² Melayu di-sekolah menengah, terutama di-sekolah² menengah jenis kebangsaan Inggeris yang guru besar-nya bukan daripada orang Melayu sendiri.

Saya beri satu contoh, Tuan Pengerusi, di-sabua sekolah menengah Inggeris yang terbesar di-pantai timur, di-Trengganu ada di-lakukan tindakan² yang kasar, yang tidak patut, kepada murid² Melayu kita untuk hendak menaikkan taraf kemajuan penuntut² Melayu di-tanah Malaysia ini. Tempat yang perlu kita tumpukan perhatian di-tempat di-mana orang² Melayu ramai—di-pantai timur.

Di-sini, satu contoh, Tuan Pengerusi, di-sekolah ini murid² Melayu di-pechat dengan sembarangan, sungoh pun Jemaah Pengurus Sekolah itu membuat keputusan bahawa mesti-lah murid ini di-ambil balek. Guru Besar ini telah menentang keputusan Jemaah Pengurus itu, tidak mahu mengambil balek murid² ini. Ini ada berlaku dan sampai sekarang, saya hairan kenapa-kah satu tindakan tidak di-ambil kepada guru besar yang menghalang aliran pembangunan pelajaran kita seperti ini, Tuan Pengerusi, bahkan pernah satu masa baharu² ini sa-waktu Perayaan Malaysia di-adakan, guru besar ini melarang murid²-nya mengambil bahagian dalam Perayaan Menyambut Hari Malaysia. Sampai satakat itu dan lebeh menyedehkan, Tuan Pengerusi, dalam perkara kemajuan murid² Melayu ini, guru besar ini telah meletakkan murid² Melayu hanya dalam aliran arts sahaja dan tidak diberi peluang sedikit pun untuk menempatkan murid² Melayu ini dalam aliran sains.

Bagi kita yang hendak berusaha untuk mencari perimbangan kedudukan dalam pelajaran ini, perkara yang seperti ini ada-lah merupakan satu sejarah yang mesti di-hapuskan.

Saya merasa bahawa perisytiharan daripada Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran bahawa tahun hadapan ada sa-kumpulan murid² yang mengambil pengajaran dengan bahasa Melayu akan masuk ka-universiti, ia-itu di-Sekolah Alam Shah ada sa-ramai 35 orang. Ini satu langkah yang berperistiwa yang penoh bersejarah. Maka bagi menggalakkan aliran ini, Tuan Pengerusi, saya suka-lah menhadangkan supaya di-banyakkan lagi Form VI itu di-Sekolah Alam Shah.

Sekarang ini, saya tahu barangkali Upper Six ada satu kelas, Lower Six ada satu kelas yang bahasa penghantar-nya bahasa Melayu di-Sekolah Alam Shah, maka apa-lah salah-nya di-usahakan sa-berapa banyak supaya di-tambah kelas² itu di-Sekolah Alam Shah dan di-sekolah² menengah kebangsaan lain yang menjalankan pengajaran-nya dalam bahasa Melayu.

Untuk mengukuhkan standard dan mutu murid² Sekolah Alam Shah yang mengambil pelajaran-nya daripada bawah dengan bahasa Melayu-nya ini, Tuan Pengerusi, saya suka-lah hendak menyatakan di-sini ada satu majallah dan beberapa orang murid di-Sekolah Alam Shah, ia-itu Upper Six ini—Form VI ini telah menulis beberapa articles dalam soal ekonomi di-dalam majallah itu—essay-nya—dan menurut penilaian daripada maha² guru daripada universiti, mutu tulisan murid² ini dalam soal ekonomi ada-lah sama taraf-nya dengan mutu penuntut² Tahun Satu, dan Tahun Dua di-universiti. Maka tidak ada sebab untuk mengatakan orang yang mengambil mata pelajaran dalam bahasa Melayu itu tidak tinggi pelajaran-nya—ini bergantung kepada murid², bergantung kepada usaha mereka itu sendiri, dan dengan adanya kemajuan yang ada sekarang ini, saya merasa kita patut-lah berusaha menambahkan dan membesarkan lagi Form² VI yang ada di-Sekolah Alam Shah itu.

Di-samping itu ada satu perkara, Tuan Pengerusi, ada sa-tengah² persatuan pelajar yang sedar perlu-nya mereka memberi sumbangan memajukan pelajaran anak² Melayu mengadakan kelas sendiri untuk penuntut² Melayu; kelas sa-belah petang bahagian kira², sains dan lain². Satu persatuan dalam perkara ini yang saya tahu ia-lah GPMS (Gabongan Penuntut² Melayu Semenanjung) di-seluruh Malaya. Persatuan ini ada 25 kelas untuk pelajar² Melayu memajukan pelajaran di-luar masa sekolah. Saya hanya hendak menhadangkan supaya pehak Kerajaan memberi pandangan sa-belah mata kepada persatuan² bagini dan beri-lah bantuan. Di-Selangor ini ia-itu di-Klang satu chawangan GPMS ia-itu Persatuan Pelajar² Melayu

Selangor telah membuka kelas-nya di-Klang dapat bantuan. Kalau bantuan sa-bagai ini di-beri kepada segala kelas² yang lain itu ia itu memberi dorongan yang baharu kepada kemajuan pelajar anak² Melayu dalam pelajaran.

Pada hari sa-malam, Tuan Pengerusi, saya ada mendengar orang yang tidak berapa setuju dengan Aneka Jurusan ini seperti saudara saya Yang Berhormat dari Bachok, dia berkata ada macham chara kominis-lah, macham² yang bukan². Saya merasa segala perkataan Yang Berhormat dari Bachok ini ia-lah merupakan satu ulasan yang tidak siuman. Tiada siapa yang sedar akan keperluan pelajaran yang mahu menentang sistem pelajaran Aneka Jurusan ini, kerana ia ada-lah merupakan suatu sistem yang memberi saloran bukan pada satu jurusan ekedemik tetapi dua tiga jurusan lain untuk memenohi keperluan² pembangunan kebangsaan kita. Ini satu perkara yang kita tidak mimpi boleh dapat. Siapa yang menentang Aneka Jurusan, maka mereka ada-lah bererti suka kepada satu sistem yang berbau colonial, dan saya tidak fikir kita mahu. Maka saya merasa tidak pada tempat-nya-lah kita hendak mengatakan yang sistem Aneka Jurusan ini tidak berfaedah.

Tuan Pengerusi, pada hari sa-malam sa-orang Yang Berhormat dari Singapura—Tuan Yong Nyuk Lin—ada berchakap tidak berapa panjang, tetapi panjang juga, di-dalam perchakapannya itu sa-olah² beliau hendak menjadi juara pelajaran bagi Sabah dan Sarawak. Saya hanya bertanya² dalam hati sendiri ada-kah beliau melakukan ini sa-olah² dia hendak menutup kegagalan-nya sendiri sa-bagai Menteri Pelajaran Singapura, kerana beliau ada-lah dahulu-nya Menteri Pelajaran, di-pechat, di-tandang, di-hantar kepada Kementerian Kesihatan—ta' tahu-lah dia akan berjaya atau tidak berjaya dia jadi Menteri Kesihatan, kerana kebiasaan di-Singapura orang yang gagal di-Kementerian Kesihatan di-hantar pula untuk menjadi Ketua Badan Perlanchongan—entah tahun hadapan, tahun sa-kali lagi kita lihat sahabat kita ini akan menjadi Ketua Badan Perlanchongan Singapura pun kita tidak tahu.

Soal Sarawak dan Sabah tentang pelajaran memang ada beberapa keraguan dari Sarawak dan Sabah yang kita faham dalam perkara pelajaran, dan sebab itu-lah dalam Perjanjian dengan Sarawak dan Sabah masa mewujudkan Malaysia, kuasa melaksanakan pelajaran itu di-beri kepada Kerajaan Negeri sa-lama 10 tahun. Saya harap Ahli S.U.P.P. dari Sarawak daripada berpekek² di-sini tentang hal pelajaran di-Sarawak lebih baik-lah beliau itu berpekek² di-Sarawak dahulu supaya di-kikis segala anasir² colonial yang maseh mengkongkong pelajar di-Sarawak (*Tepok*), di-sana dahulu di-bersehhkan baharu berpekek ka-mari, kemudian kita akan kembali-lah kepada pertemuan jalan dan kembali-lah kita pada masa itu kepada keperibadian kita sendiri.

Kapada P.A.P. Singapura saya hanya berkata bagini-lah: jangan chuba² hendak menjalankan jarum penjajah hendak memecah-belahkan antara parti² dalam Perikatan ini, antara UMNO dengan M.C.A. dengan mengemukakan soal pelajaran, soal bahasa dan soal Nanyang Universiti—ta' usah-lah di-chuba. Saya tahu P.A.P. chuba begitu hendak memecah-belahkan itu, dia hendak datang ka-sini bertenggek menggantikan tempat M.C.A. (*Tepok*). Ini tujuan P.A.P. Kita tahu kita tidak benarkan itu, kerana kita tahu P.A.P. bertalam dua muka sa-lama²-nya.

Saya ingin bertanya kapada P.A.P. Singapura sampai bila-kah Singapura akan merupakan sa-buah Afrika Selatan dalam Malaysia dengan menjalankan dasar multi-lingualism? Adakah Singapura kelak akan masuk juga ka-dalam lengkongan dasar pelajaran kebangsaan kita, kerana ini-lah sa-benar-nya jaminan bagi Malaysia ini bersatu, atau Singapura dan P.A.P. Singapura akan terus menjalankan dasar Apartheid-nya dalam pelajaran seperti sekarang terus-menerus? Kalau Singapura terus-menerus menjalankan dasar Apartheid pelajaran-nya, maka tanda Singapura tidak ikhlas kapada Malaysia, tanda Singapura hendak berusaha mengapatitkan (Apartheid) dasar pelajaran seluroh Malaysia dan tanda sa-benar-nya P.A.P. ia-lah subversive disloyal opposition.

Dia memang menyokong, Tuan Pengerusi, dasar Apartheid Afrika Selatan, dia tidak mahu boycott Afrika Selatan dan sekarang dia hendak menjalankan pula dasar Apartheid pelajaran-nya terus-menerus.

Suatu perkara, Tuan Pengerusi, bersangkutan dengan universiti. P.A.P. Singapura sekarang ini sudah chuba² hendak menyeludup universiti. Pada satu masa dalam tahun ini N.U.F.S. (National Union of Federation Students) telah mengadakan sidang-nya di Serdang, sa-buah pertubuhan penuntut² kebanyakan-nya bukan Melayu, yang berpusat dan berpijak di-Tanah Melayu, untuk membuka sidang National Union of Federation Students ini tidak menjemput Yang Teramat Mulia Perdana Menteri, tidak menjemput Timbalan Perdana Menteri, tidak menjemput Menteri Pelajaran, tetapi menjemput Lee Kuan Yew, Perdana Menteri Singapura. Ini-lah chara yang sudah chuba di-jalankan oleh P.A.P. untuk menyeludup universiti² kita, Tuan Pengerusi. Sa-patut-nya sa-bagai menghormati negeri ini negeri Selangor, kalau tidak mahu panggil pun Menteri Pelajaran, panggil-lah Menteri Besar Selangor, tetapi tidak, menyeberang Selat Tebrau memanggil Perdana Menteri Singapura.

Enche' Ali bin Haji Ahmad (Pontian Selatan): *Subversive.*

Wan Abdul Kadir bin Ismail: Tuan Pengerusi, tiap² kali Perdana Menteri Singapura ka-mari atau kunchu²-nya ada-lah mereka memberi cheramah di-universiti. Suatu masa satu gerakan dilakukan oleh perjuangan bahasa di-Kuala Lumpur mengchat segala papan yang berbahasa Inggeris termasuk universiti, sa-lepas itu datang-lah Perdana Menteri Singapura memberi cheramah di-universiti. di-dalam cheramah-nya itu sa-olah² menghasut supaya penuntut² yang bukan Melayu menjalankan tindakan balas, dan betul berlaku sa-lepas itu beberapa hari segala tulisan bahasa kebangsaan di-universiti itu telah di-chonteng. Ini sudah berlaku. Ini bagaimana keadaan-nya, Tuan Pengerusi, P.A.P. sudah menjalar hendak menyeludup di-universiti kita, dan saya harap Kemen-

terian Pelajaran akan mengambil pengawasan yang baik atas usaha² yang subversive sa-bagai ini. National Union of Federation Students ini, Tuan Pengerusi, di-chuba hendak di-jadikan kuda tonggangan dan batu lonchatan oleh P.A.P. bagi menyeludup di-universiti kita ini. Bila kita pandang kapada Perlembagaan-nya kita nampak bagaimana sikap-nya yang sa-benar. Dalam Perlembagaan National Union of Federation Students ini bahasa rasmi bagi union itu ia-lah bahasa Inggeris sahaja, tidak sebut sedikit pun bahasa kebangsaan sa-olah² badan itu bukan berpijak dan hidup di-bumi Malaysia yang mengaku bahasa Melayu sa-bagai bahasa kebangsaan—(AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Haramkan dia).

Tuan Pengerusi, tentang soal bahasa yang bukan bahasa kebangsaan saya suka hendak menghilangkan sedikit keraguan atas salah faham yang timbul kapada orang² yang menentang bahasa China atau bahasa Tamil menjadi bahasa rasmi bukan mereka menentang kerana mereka bermusoh dengan bahasa itu atau kerana mereka benchikan bahasa itu—tidak dan jauh sa-kali! Bahasa China satu bahasa yang tua dalam dunia ini yang tinggi persuratan-nya (literature) dan banyak perkara² yang perlu kita kaji dan kita pelajari tentang literature-nya dan sa-bagai-nya, tetapi tempat memakai-nya ia-lah di-negeri-nya, di-tempat dia berpijak dalam negeri-nya. Kita di-sini Malaysia hendak bentok satu negara yang baharu timbul, kita hendak satu alat yang menjadi penchantuman, suatu alat perpaduan dan alat perpaduan yang paling *effective* (berkesan) ia-lah bahasa kebangsaan. Kalau di-hanchor kan alat perpaduan ini di-mana kita hendak mencapai perpaduan. Kalau dapat di-perdua atau di-pertiga alat perpaduan ini akan terhempas-lah perpaduan kebangsaan kita. Itu timbul-nya dorongan bahawa kita suka dan kita berjuang supaya bahasa kebangsaan menjadi bahasa rasmi yang tunggal bagi negara kita.

Tuan Pengerusi, bila kita buka tentang Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka tentulah semua orang bersetuju bahawa kita menghargai akan jasa dan usaha

Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka dalam meninggikan penggunaan bahasa kebangsaan dalam segala segi. Saya rasa kita ini tahun 1967 tidak lama lagi, kalau tahun ini di-beri dua million sa-tengah barangkali tahun hadapan tidak chukup dua million sa-tengah kerana kita dekat sangat dua tahun lagi hendak mencapai tahun 1967. Pada masa akan datang hanya kita lipat gandakan peruntukan bagi Dewan Bahasa supaya lebeh chepat jalan-nya kita menuju kepada pelaksanaan bahasa kebangsaan. Saya minta-lah sambil mengambil sempena ini meminta bahawa bulan bahasa kebangsaan kita akan mengadakan sa-mula pada tahun hadapan, pada tahun hadapan satu perkara yang perlu di-jalankan kerana menyambut bulan bahasa kebangsaan ia-lah berusaha dan berikhtiar supaya *sub-title* film² itu di-adakan sama dalam bahasa kebangsaan. Ini dijadikan satu perkara yang penting untuk menaruhkan dalam masa bulan bahasa kebangsaan. Saya ingat pada tahun 1960 mula² kita melancharkan minggu bahasa kebangsaan perkara ini telah timbul tetapi belum dapat di-jalankan—belum berjaya tetapi pada tahun hadapan (1965) usaha yang betul² besar harus kita lakukan dengan segala daya yang ada pada kita supaya pada masa kita menyambut bulan bahasa kebangsaan tahun 1965 maka kita melihat film² di-segala panggong di-Kuala Lumpur ini dan di-luar Kuala Lumpur kita akan melihat bersama ia-lah *sub-title* dalam bahasa kebangsaan. Bukan kita tidak hendak dalam bahasa lain—boleh tetapi ada *sub-title* dalam bahasa kebangsaan yang menjadi bahasa kebangsaan bagi negara kita ini. Muka 263 sub-head 10

Mr Chairman: Saya suka hendak mengingatkan Yang Berhormat, saya tidak dengar dalam muka berapa?

Wan Abdul Kadir bin Ismail: Muka 263, sub-head 10—Pemberian untuk Pengajaran Ugama di-Sekolah Rendah dan Sekolah Menengah yang di-bantu sa-banyak \$4,000,000. Saya hanya satu sahaja hendak minta penjelasan, kerana saya tahu pada tahun lepas peruntukan kita bagi memberi bantuan kepada Pengajaran Ugama sa-banyak

\$5,000,000 tetapi tahun ini hanya \$4,000,000—kurang satu million, dimana-kah kurang-nya dan tentu-lah ada kesan-nya dengan kekurangan ini. Jadi saya berharap oleh kerana masa kita ini kena menghadapi konfrantasi di-kurangkan, tetapi perkara ini kalau boleh hendak di-kurangkan biar-lah perkara yang lain bukan pengajian ugama ini, kerana ini satu perkara yang besar yang mustahak kita sematkan kepada murid² ini belajar ugama untuk menentang segala diayah² *subversive* yang datang bermacam² pada masa ini. Dan saya nampak bahawa bantuan sekolah ugama Islam ada bertambah, ini satu langkah yang baik, chuma saya minta bantuan pengajian ugama ini jangan-lah di-kurangkan daripada yang telah di-untokkan pada tahun yang lepas.

Tuan Pengerusi, muka 264—College Islam. Sa-malam telah ada Ahli Yang Berhormat berchakap tentang College Islam. Saya hanya meminta satu perkara tentang College Islam ini, chadangan yang mula dahulu College Islam ini di-tubuhkan dan akan di-usahakan untuk menjadi sa-bahagian daripada University sa-hingga ijazah-nya ia-lah ijazah University. Ini chita² yang mula² dan pada masa itu Yang Berhormat Tun Abdul Razak menjadi Menteri Pelajaran tetapi entah macam mana, entah pengaruh dari mana, entah siapa yang memberi fikiran di-situ, entah orang yang bukan anak negeri di-sini telah menyelewengkan tujuan asal itu sa-hingga terjadi-lah College Islam macham ada sekarang dan di-adakan pengajian Islam di-University, di-ambil peruntukan-nya daripada peruntukan College Islam sa-olah² dia sa-bahagian daripada College Islam bukan sa-bahagian daripada University. Ini perkara yang menjadi kusut—menjadi satu benda yang duplicated, satu perkara yang tidak di-ingini sama sakali. Kenapa-kah tidak kita kembali kepada tujuan kita yang asal. Usaha menjadikan College Islam itu sa-taraf dengan pengajian University dan diakui kelulusan-nya sa-bagai kelulusan University dengan pemeriksa² daripada University. Kerana kedudukan sekarang ini Jabatan Pengajian Islam sa-olah² bukan-lah satu daripada bahagian

University. Ia sa-bahagian daripada College Islam, chuma taraf-nya di-akuī oleh University di-belanjāi daripada wang yang di-bayar untuk University. Ini satu perkara yang tidak di-ingini sama sa-kali. Tinggal-lah College Islam di-Klang dan sekarang akan di-buat pula di-Petaling Jaya dengan keadaan yang sangat tidak menyenangkan hati, taraf-nya di-akuī oleh Kerajaan sa-bagai taraf sekolah menengah, sudah jauh lari-nya daripada tujuan kita yang asal, Tuan Pengerusi. Dalam Jabatan Pengajian Islam ini pula, pemilehan Pensharah² di-Jabatan Pengajian Islam di-University ini selalu sangat di-pentingkan daripada orang² anak negeri luar daripada Malaysia—daripada luar Malaysia, pada hal yang meminta masok menjadi Pensharah di-situ banyak daripada anak² negeri kita sendiri yang mempunyai kelulusan yang tinggi daripada luar negeri yang di-akuī tentang pengajian Islam, mereka tidak di-terima. Ada-kah mereka tidak di-terima kerana mereka itu anak negeri, di-pileh orang daripada lain negeri sa-hingga ada orang yang di-pileh pada satu masa orang yang Mazhab Shi'a yang tidak di-akuī oleh Mazhab kita di-sini. Ada pernah orang yang menjadi Pensharah di-sini yang bermazhab Shi'a yang menentang ahli sunnah wal-jama'ah kerana mementingkan orang daripada luar negeri, sedangkan orang² dalam negeri banyak anak² orang kita sendiri yang kelulusan daripada Masir dan lain² yang ada kelulusan chukup boleh mengajar. Kalau mereka kurang dalam bahasa Inggeris tetapi dalam bahasa Melayu mereka boleh memberi pengajaran dan bukan mesti, kerana telah banyak sa-kali mata pelajaran di-university di-ajar dalam bahasa kebangsaan, mereka boleh mengajar dalam bahasa kebangsaan. Oleh sebab yang demikian, Tuan Pengerusi, taraf pengajian Islam di-University itu tidak sa-berapa. Dan menurut yang saya tahu pengetahuan pengajian Islam-nya—penuntut² pengajian Islam ini kalau di-bandingkan dengan penuntut² pengetahuan pengajian Islam, penuntut² College Islam jauh lebih baik daripada penuntut² di-University. Jadi ini harus di-perbaiki dan ini harus di-betulkan, harus di-persesuaikan dengan keadaan yang sa-benar.

Satu perkara yang akhir-nya, Tuan Pengerusi, ia-lah saya suka menyatakan di-sini ia-itu untuk kita hendak membaiki pengajian ugama Islam dan Yang Berhormat Menteri telah mengatakan dengan tegas hendak membaiki taraf pengajian ugama Islam. Saya minta dan saya merayu-lah supaya diadakan Maktab Latehan Guru Ugama, tidak chukup dengan ada-nya latehan sekarang di-buat dalam masa chuti penggal. Di-beri latehan dua minggu untuk guru² ugama lepas itu nanti di-beri latehan lima, enam bulan lagi tetapi perkara ini tidak systematic bagini tidak akan mendatangkan kesan yang baik, bagi kita melihat mereka dalam sa-buah Maktab yang khusus sa-hingga kita dapat menerbitkan guru² mengajar betul²—guru² yang bermutu dan betul terlatah kerana dapat menjamin hasil yang baik bagi pengajaran ugama Islam. Jadi, sekian sahaja-lah, Tuan Pengerusi dan saya menyokong peruntukan ini. Terima kaseh.

Enche' Ong Pang Boon (Singapore):

Mr Chairman, Sir, first, let me dwell with the last remark made by the Honourable Member for Tanjong Malim. The Nanyang University is not a State University: it does not belong to the State of Singapore. Nanyang University was sponsored by some merchants and educationists who are interested in Chinese education. It has its own Board of Management, and the power of giving away the control of the University therefore does not lie with the Singapore Government and, for his information, I might say that 60 per cent of the students of the Nanyang University come from Malaya—a fact which he should always remember.

Mr Chairman, Sir, it is very much regretted that the autonomy in education in Singapore and its policy giving equal treatment to the four-language streams of education have come under heavy criticism in this House; and some Honourable Members, including the Government backbenchers, have even demanded the abolition of our State autonomy in education. It is necessary in view of the concern and anxiety that such statements have generated in Singapore that, I think, it will not be

out of place for me to explain why we think our policy of according equal treatment to four-language streams of education in Singapore is the correct approach in the peculiar condition obtaining in Singapore and why we insist on autonomy in education as one of the conditions for merger.

Mr Chairman, Sir, the Razak Report of which the education policy in Malaya was based states that, I quote: "The ultimate objective of educational policy in this country must be to bring together the children of all races under a national system in which the National language is the main medium of instruction though we recognise that progress towards this goal cannot be rushed and must be gradual."

Now, while few will disagree with this statement, a cursory glance of the daily newspapers recently will show that

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid (Seberang Utara): Mr Chairman, Sir, on a point of order. Standing Order 67B (6) (ii) states:

"If no notice has been given of any amendments, or when all amendments have been disposed of, a debate may take place on the motion mentioned in paragraph (5), or on that motion as amended, as the case may be; debate on the motion shall be confined to the service concerned."

The Honourable Member is now speaking on the policy.

Mr Chairman: That is not a point of order, please.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon (Batu): If the P.A.P. has come under a withering attack, it should have the opportunity to reply. I am no friend of the P.A.P. (*Laughter*).

Mr Chairman: Please proceed.

Enche' Ong Pang Boon: Thank you, Mr Chairman, Sir. I was saying why few will disagree with the statement and that a cursory glance of the daily newspapers, of course, will show that a large section of the people in Malaya was concerned in the manner of its implementation. This goes to show that education if not handled with tact, understanding and patience can be a disturbing factor to unity instead of becoming an instrument to forge a united people with a common national

consciousness. Today national consciousness and a common loyalty to Malaysia is our goal in education. At the moment Malaysian nationalism and Malaysian national unity demand a wider, more tolerant and statesmen-like approach to our educational problem.

While we in Singapore have on our own initiative, and with the full support of the people accepted Malay as our national language, our approach in Singapore is somewhat different. Our education policy in Singapore is based on three main principles outlined in 1959 when we came into power:

(1) The acceptance of the 1956 Report of the All-Party Committee (including the UMNO) of the Singapore Legislative Assembly on education which provides:

(a) equal treatment for the four-language streams of education in Malay, Chinese, Tamil and English;

(b) the introduction of bilingual education in primary schools and tri-lingual education in secondary school; and

(c) the use of Malayan-centred textbooks and syllabus.

(2) The acceptance of Malay as the national language of the State. This provides encouragement to non-Malays to learn the language, a goal which is also pursued here in Malaya, and at the same time the revitalisation of Malay education itself.

(3) Emphasis in science and mathematics to meet the requirements of an industrialised society and in the study of the languages of the State.

Mr Chairman, Sir, this All-Party Committee was called into being because of the long years of successful communist exploitation of Chinese culture and education in Singapore. In the turbulent years in the early fiftys, because of the disparity of treatment in Chinese education, the communists

successfully exploited this sensitive, emotional issue, because the colonial Government and the subsequent Lim Yew Hock regime had both failed to appreciate and understand this basic problem. The communist exploitation of this issue was so successful that communists and Chinese education more or less became synonymous. Any action against the communists was often construed as an attempt to destroy Chinese language, culture and education. The Lim Yew Hock regime came into an ignominious end, not because he fought the communists, but because they failed to understand the deep emotional attachment of the Chinese to their language, education and culture, and failed to remove the dissatisfaction and frustration arising out of the disparity of treatment between the Chinese and the English schools. Thus by our giving equal treatment to the four-language streams of education, we have removed the long-standing distrust and suspicion of the Chinese and deprived the communists of fertile grounds for exploiting the education issue to the detriment of the democratic cause. The continuance of this policy does not mean that we are adopting an educational policy which runs counter to that of the Peninsular, but rather we are travelling by different roads and, therefore, it will take different periods of time to reach the common national objective in education, as enunciated in the Razak Report.

Mr Chairman, Sir, language, education and culture are emotional issues which are best resolved by persuasion than by compulsion. This is particularly important in a multi-racial and multi-cultural society like Singapore and Malaya where each of the three main communities has its own distinct language and culture. To compel a large section of the population to study only in a particular language and to abandon its own culture is impractical and can only create antagonism and disaffection. It is for this reason that we sought autonomy in education, so that our educational policy, which is based on a realistic appraisal of the multi-racial character of the population in Singapore

and of the susceptibility to their respective languages and cultures, can continue.

Failure to appreciate the emotional attachment that the Indians and the Chinese had for their own language and culture, fostered and strengthened by over a hundred years of colonial education system and latterly inspired by the resurgence of India and China in the modern world, can only lead to disaster. Language and culture which have a history of thousands of years cannot be discarded overnight. However, what can be done is to gradually persuade the people of various communities to study and use the national language in schools where the language media is other than the national language. This in fact is what is being done in Singapore in the English, Tamil and Chinese schools where the national language is taught. We believe, at this early stage of the political development in Malaysia, this phase is necessary. It is our view that if the people wish their children to be educated in any of the four languages in Singapore, they should be allowed to do so. There is nothing wrong in this. However, in addition, they should also learn and master the national language. In fact, the parents and school authorities have been only too willing to co-operate and the Government finds itself hard pressed to supply the necessary number of qualified national language teachers.

However, what is more important at this early stage of political development in Malaysia is the inculcation of a Malaysian consciousness and the sense of belonging to one nation in schools rather than the insistence of one particular language medium. It is the ideological content in education that is more important at this stage than the language medium itself.

We believe that in Singapore before we can achieve the ultimate national objective in education, it is necessary to go through a phase of adjustment during which equal treatment to the four language streams of education will be accorded but at the same time the national language will be encouraged. We believe that the various language schools which have hitherto developed

into separate water-tight compartments should be brought closer together by breaking down these racial and linguistic barriers that separate them. To do so we must first accord equal treatment to the four language streams of education in Singapore so that the long standing distrust and suspicions of every Government intention will be removed. Once this is done, then measures can be introduced to bring about inter-mingling of students, a common content syllabus and the inculcation of national consciousness and Malaysian identity. This is the course of action being followed in Singapore. The common content syllabus . . .

Enche' Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman (Seberang Tengah): On a point of order, Standing Order 36 (1). I think the Honourable Member is irrelevant, Sir, because we are discussing the education policy of Malaysia, which does not include Singapore, for the education policy of Singapore is autonomous.

Mr Chairman: Isn't Singapore part of Malaysia?

Enche' Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman: We are not interested in this House to hear the education policy of Singapore. (*Laughter*).

Enche' Ong Pang Boon: I am trying to reply to some of the attacks that have been made on the education policy in Singapore. In any case, Mr Chairman, Sir, I won't take long. Mr Chairman, Sir, the common content syllabus and the inter-mingling of students from different races in our integrated schools where students of two or more streams of education are studying under one roof and using the common facilities in the classroom and in the playing field have contributed in a large measure towards breaking down the racial and linguistic barriers. Although this may take two generations or more to achieve the national objective in education, but it will in a positive manner bring peace and harmony to the country. As against this, the alternative is too terrible to contemplate.

It is because we understand the sensitivity of the people on matters of

language, education and culture and the realisation that the present approach to language and education in Malaya will not be wholly and immediately acceptable to the people of Singapore that we have sought autonomy in education on merger.

This state of autonomy is embodied in the merger and the Malaysia Agreement and enshrined in our Constitution. These are solemn documents not to be taken lightly. Over 70 per cent of the electorate in Singapore had voted for autonomy in education on merger in a Referendum. We shall see that their will, their decisions, are honoured and that no change is made without their consent.

Malaysia was brought about by the mutual consent of the people in a spirit of give and take. Any tampering with the terms and conditions of the Malaysia Agreement and the Constitution at such an early stage of Malaysia will only shake the very foundation of its existence. As it is, the insistence that the Sarawak and Sabah Governments should change their education policies contrary to the spirit of the Malaysia Agreement if they want to qualify for free primary education has been disquieting to the people in these two States. I hope these talks of abolition of state autonomy in education by some Government backbenchers do not reflect the sentiments and intentions of the Central Government. Indeed, the less such wild talks the better for unity and solidarity of the people in Malaysia.

The question of language and medium in education has little to do with the question of loyalty. There are people in this country who speak Malay and educated in the Malay language school and yet carry out anti-national and anti-Malaysia activities both in Singapore and Malaya and some such persons even allow themselves to be used as agents for Indonesian aggression. There are, on the other hand, many people who were not educated in the Malay language and who speak little or no Malay and yet are loyal to Malaysia and prepared to lay down their lives in the defence of its territorial integrity and sovereignty. Is the farmer who speaks no Malay but who

led an Indonesian lieutenant to his capture at the Jurong Police Station less loyal than, for instance, Ahmad Boestamam or Musa Ahmad the Chairman of the Communist Party of Malaya, both of whom were educated in Malay and speak *pakar* Malay? Mr Speaker, Sir, the sooner the question of language and education is treated as an educational problem and divorced from the question of loyalty and race the better for all in Malaysia at this stage of our historical development. So much for Singapore's policy in education.

Now, coming to Malaya, the . . .

Enche' Abdul Razak bin Haji Hussin (Lipis): (Malay) Standing Order 36 (1).

Enche' Ong Pang Boon: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am coming to the Comprehensive School system.

Mr Chairman: Carry on.

Enche' Ong Pang Boon: Mr Chairman, Sir, the Acting Minister of Education has claimed that a tremendous progress has been made in the provision of educational facilities for the people. Indeed, one of the main reasons for introducing the inequitable and ill-considered tax policy is claimed to be the raising of additional revenue for the expansion of education. Yet, the facts seem to indicate that the actual achievements are far less than the claims and that the Government has still a long way to go in the provision of what may be regarded as reasonable opportunities for the education of the masses.

It is generally accepted that education is one of the most important means of raising the economic status of the people and an equalising factor between the "haves" and "have-nots". This means that the Government must do all it can to see that education opportunities are offered to all and not just confined to a small elite specially endowed with money, power or position.

From the figures given by the ex-Minister of Education to this House on 2nd December, it was noted that over the last two years more than 20,000 children of the correct age each year had not been admitted to schools.

The figures must be higher in previous years. Whereas in Singapore, we had been able, since 1960, to offer every child of school going age a place in school. The comparative figures of secondary school enrolment are even more startling. The percentage of total number of secondary school students to that of total number of primary school students in Malaya in 1963 was 13.5% whereas in Singapore it was 26% approximately. In the case of Malay stream, the percentage of total number of secondary pupils to that of total number of pupils in Malay primary schools in Malaya was 4% compared with 23% in Singapore. A comparison of the number of pre-University students between Malaya and Singapore is even more startling. There are in 1964 almost two and a half times more pre-University students in Singapore than in Malaya.

This indicates inadequate provision of educational facilities and a great deal of wastage in Malaya. The lack of properly trained teachers, the inadequacy of teaching facilities and schools and automatic promotion have been reflected in the high percentage of elimination rate in the Secondary School Entrance Examination, which is as high as 70%, and another 40% in the Lower School Certificate Examination. The result was that only about 15% to 20% of students admitted to schools had the opportunity to study up to Form V and sit for the Cambridge School Certificate or the F.M.C. Examination. In Singapore, all who pass the Primary School Leaving Examination, which is about 60%, will have the opportunity to study and sit for the Cambridge School Certificate or the F.M.C. Examination. That, I hope, will answer the Member for Tanjong Malim who claims that education in Singapore is far inferior to that of Malaya.

Mr Chairman, Sir, this high percentage of wastage in Malaya is not going to be eliminated by the introduction of the comprehensive system. It only means that the elimination process will be deferred for three years to take place at L.C.E. level and the rate of elimination will be raised from

the present 40% to somewhere in the region of 75% to 80%, because practically all the financial provision in the next year's Budget has been to provide educational facilities at the lower secondary level to meet the large increase of Form I students following the abolition of the Secondary School Entrance Examination. Besides, all the factors contributing to a high percentage of wastage such as automatic promotion and lack of trained teachers will even be more serious.

In principle, the comprehensive system as announced has its merits and is a progressive step in education especially in raising the school leaving age to 15, although in Singapore it has been 16 since 1960. However, the manner and circumstances of its introduction, as my colleague has pointed out yesterday, reveal all the evidence of a hastily conceived and inadequately thought out scheme prematurely launched as an election stunt to gain votes in the last General Elections. It is a foregone conclusion that the declared aims of the comprehensive system will not be realised in the next three to five years.

For one thing, the comprehensive system requires an additional 4,000 classrooms, or nearly 200 schools, to cope with the expected increase of 100,000 Form I students next year as stated by the Acting Minister of Education.

Mr Chairman: I would like to remind the Honourable Member that he should confine himself to the policy of the service as provided in the Estimates and not go beyond that.

Enche' Ong Pang Boon: Sir, I am talking of the inadequate provision in the Estimates.

Mr Chairman: But you are generalising!

Enche' Ong Pang Boon: However, it is well known that all the proposed new comprehensive schools are still on paper. Despite the running of an extra session in the afternoon and loan of classrooms from independent schools, it is not unlikely that a large number of Primary VI pupils will not be able

to find places in Form I in 1965. Parents will find their children out of school without having passed a simple examination to indicate the level of performance attained by them.

The Acting Minister of Education assured the House yesterday that the Ministry will see to it that the standards are maintained. This, I submit, is humanly impossible. When the abolition of the present system of schools was announced in March, the Alliance Government claimed that 3,000 additional teachers were required and they were to be given emergency training of six months, and that this training will be supplemented by two additional spells of training of six months each. Yesterday, we heard the Acting Minister of Education announce that more than 4,500 teachers will be required to cope with the expected increase in the next year's Form I enrolment. Furthermore, the teachers are to receive even less training than in the original plan. They are practically asked to teach without any training. Whatever training the teachers are to receive will be given at week ends and during school vacations. What is more surprising is that though large numbers of teachers are required, there is hardly any increase in the number of teacher trainers. The strength of the present teacher training establishment, both in the primary and secondary sections, as provided for in the Budget, remains the same for Division I and Division II officers. A falling off in standards appears inevitable.

Furthermore, the students will not be offered the announced wide range of subjects which, in theory, the students can elect to study, because of the lack of teachers with the necessary skills and the facilities to teach such subjects and because no new schools equipped with such facilities are being built as yet. In any case, I understand that even the syllabus for these elective subjects have not yet been finalised. There is, indeed, a very real danger that those students with talents may not have the opportunity to flower.

The Member for Pontian Selatan yesterday criticised the planning officials in the Education Ministry for

inadequate and bad planning in the implementation of the comprehensive system. This, I think, is rather unfair as the decision on comprehensive system was taken by the Ministers and they must have known that it was physically and humanly impossible to implement the system next year. But then, the General Elections had to be held and won, and all regard for adequate preparation and planning would have to go overboard.

Mr Chairman, Sir, education is far too serious a matter to be experimented upon. Now that the folly has been committed, it is hoped that all measures to rectify the shortcomings will be expedited so that what appears to be an improved system does not become an object of ridicule.

Dr Tan Chee Khoo: Mr Chairman, Sir, I wish first of all to touch on the two sensitive subjects that have been touched upon again and again in this House, that of language and education. At the beginning of this session, the Member for Tanjong made a plea that these two sensitive subjects should be separated, so that the emotion that goes with both of them can be calmed down.

Mr Chairman, Sir, the national language should not be treated as one where one shouts slogans about it and be highly emotional about it. The national language is accepted by each and every citizen as an official language and given time it is true to say that in the years to come each and every citizen of this country will be able to read and write the national language. That is no problem, because it is a compulsory subject in all media of instruction and it is a compulsory examination in all examinations. Consequently, the rising generation will have an adequate knowledge of the national language. As for the other people who are not literate in the national language, those like me for example, they are learning the national language and, no doubt, will continue to learn the national language. But there are a number of people who are illiterate and no amount of slogan shouting can make them study the national language. But, as has been pointed out before, the

farmer who led the Indonesian lieutenant to the Jurong Police Station does not know the national language and knows only Mandarin, but does that make him one iota less loyal than the highly educated person in the national language—the graduate of the Malay Studies Department in the University of Malaya or the University of Singapore? I maintain that it is not so. So, Mr Chairman, Sir, I will make a plea that let us look at this subject of the national language with calmness, tolerance and patience.

It is a wellknown fact that in physics for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction. Now, to those people who shout slogans about the national language, there may well have an opposite reaction, in that, it may well frighten the illiterate farmer who may well be thinking of learning the national language, but because of these slogans he may well say, “Well, what am I do do? They say ‘Meninggikan, Menggunakan, Mengutamakan Bahasa Kebangsaan’. My God, how am I to go about about it?” So may I make a plea that we should treat this subject with patience and tolerance and in time no doubt everyone will know the national language and will use the national language.

As for education, there is really no necessity to get emotional about it, because education is a highly technical subject. There is a course in education leading to a Diploma of Education in the University of Malaya and in the University of Malaya education itself is going to be a subject for an Honours or Pas Degree, which shows that education should not be an emotional subject but should be regarded as a technical one and let us leave it to the professional people to judge how best the educational system in this country will benefit the rising generations.

Mr Chairman, Sir, the Comprehensive system of education has been criticised both by the Alliance backbenchers and by us on this side of the House. I have time and again brought to the attention of this House the totally inadequate facilities that are being provided for the Comprehensive

system of education and the member from Singapore has just now talked at length about it. I do not wish to reiterate what he said, except to say that I see no evidence as yet of the complete assurance that the Government gives that every student now in Standard VI will be given a place in Form I next year. I sincerely hope that they will get a place. With charity in heart, I will say that I must congratulate the Alliance Government for the introduction of this system of education, although I think it is an election gimmick, and I am prepared to see that in time to come they will succeed. I still sincerely hope that this Comprehensive system of education will succeed, but from the allocations before this House it does not seem that any serious attempts are being made to implement this scheme. The provision made is totally inadequate and it is only for three years. The bottle neck, as has been pointed out just now, comes three years hence, and what are you going to do? Three years hence all those pupils in Standard VI will be knocking at the doors of L.C.E. and they will all want to go to Form IV. Perhaps then there will be the massacre of the innocents and then everybody will wonder "After 15 years I can't get a certificate. What am I to do?" At least under the present system after six years of study they get a certificate. That is a matter, Mr Chairman, Sir, which I wish to commend to the Acting Minister of Education.

I wish to dwell again on the topic of the teaching of Chinese and Tamil in English schools. None other than the member from Tanjong Malim has brought to the attention of this House of the inadequate provision for Chinese primary schools and I do hope that the Acting Minister of Education will look into this matter of inadequate Chinese primary schools. I have been told by many parents that they cannot get their sons or daughters to study Chinese and Tamil in the English medium schools. That is so particularly in Kuala Lumpur. This is a matter which not only I say so but none other than the Malayan Indian Congress says so.

I quote from the *Malayan Times* of the 14th December, 1964—

"Touching on education, the delegates regretted the attitude of schools in not giving proper attention to the teaching of mother tongue in the English medium schools. The Government was urged to investigate this matter, and was further urged to observe the teaching of mother tongue within the period of the timetable."

So, Mr Chairman, you see that I am not the only one to complain; a partner of the Alliance, as reported in the *Malayan Times*, has stated that the time given to the teaching of Chinese and Tamil is inadequate and I do hope that the Acting Minister of Education will look into this matter.

Mr Chairman, Sir, I now wish to touch on the Department of Chinese Studies in the University of Malaya. The Alliance Government proudly proclaims that the Chinese student today can go right up from the primary school to the University of Malaya's Department of Chinese Studies. Mr Chairman, Sir, I maintain that is a falsehood and that must be nailed. First of all, education in the Chinese medium is stopped at Standard VI. Thereafter this education is continued admittedly in the Chinese schools, but the medium of examinations is in the official languages, i.e., either in the national language or in the English language. Consequently the Chinese students in the Chinese schools lose touch with Mandarin and as such if they were given inadequate instruction, as was pointed out by the Malayan Indian Congress, then how on earth are they to progress beyond Form VI, when from Forms IV and V and thereafter in the Upper Secondary and the H.S.C. there is no instruction either in the Tamil or Mandarin languages? Consequently, how can these students prepare for courses in the Department of Chinese Studies? This is a matter which I wish to bring to the attention of the Honourable Acting Minister of Education. If the Alliance Government proudly proclaims that Chinese students can go from Standard I right up to the University, then it must implement that promise, it must provide adequate instruction in the students' mother tongue, both in the lower secondary and in the upper secondary

and in Form VI as well, so as to prepare these students for education in Department of Chinese Studies in the University of Malaya.

Mr Chairman, Sir, Nanyang University has been bandied about a great deal in this House both yesterday and today. It has been pointed out by the Honourable Member for Tanjong Malim that if the Nanyang University was handed over to the Central Government then the Nanyang University would be recognised. Mr Chairman, Sir, perhaps the Member for Tanjong Malim is not aware of the fact that education is a State matter in Singapore. In any case, between the University of Singapore and in the University of Malaya there is a reciprocal agreement between the two Governments, i.e., if there are students from Singapore studying engineering or agriculture here then the Singapore Government has to reimburse the Central Government for the number of students studying here and vice versa. If students from Malaya take up courses in dentistry or medicine in Singapore then the Central Government has to reimburse the Singapore Government for the students studying in the University of Singapore.

Mr Chairman, Sir, the recognition of Nanyang University degrees, I maintain, should have nothing to do with politics. Recognition of Nanyang University degrees should be on whether or not the standards are adequate. That should be the criterion; whether degrees are from Al-Azhar, from Timbuctoo, from Taiwan or from Decca, it really does not matter. If the Government is satisfied that the academic standards are adequate then, I maintain, recognition should be given by the Central Government.

Now, Mr Chairman, Sir, as was just now pointed out by the Honourable Member from Singapore, 60 per cent of the students in the Nanyang University are from the Federation. I maintain that if the standards in the Nanyang University are adequate and if by suitability certificates bad elements are all eliminated from the University, then probably the time has come for the Central Government to

think (1) whether it should assist its students studying in the Nanyang University, and (2) whether it should recognise the degrees of the Nanyang University. This has nothing to do with politics, and I hope the Central Government will look on it objectively and not to get emotional as some of the Government backbenchers tend to be when the Nanyang University issue is mentioned.

Incidentally, Mr Chairman, Sir, there are many protagonists of the Nanyang University from the Malayan Chinese Association who are making loud noises outside this House. We are today debating on the subject of education, and why are these protagonists, amongst them is the Honourable Member for Bandar Melaka, why is he, not here today to have their say? I do not know whether he is here today, but he was not here yesterday. Such is . . .

Enche' Geh Chong Keat (Penang Utara): On a point of clarification—for the benefit of the Honourable Member for Batu I wish to inform him that there are many speakers from the M.C.A. who are going to speak after him, provided we have the time to speak.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Yes, I will be very brief and allow other Honourable Members to speak, Mr Chairman, Sir.

Enche' Tan Toh Hong (Bukit Bintang): Mr Chairman, Sir, on a point of clarification—on this matter of recognition of Nanyang University, the Honourable Member for Teluk Anson has already spoken very clearly and loudly on this topic in this very House.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Then I wish to withdraw that little bit regarding the M.C.A., except to say that one protagonist of the Nanyang University has spoken loud and bold on this subject outside this House.

Mr Chairman, Sir, I now wish to touch on the proposed University College in Penang. Here, again, the Alliance Government has made all sorts of promises and the Penang State Government unfortunately has been led up the garden path. I notice that in a newspaper report they are now a

little more sober and realistic that they may not have the University College until 1970 as reported in the Press. I am glad that they are now more realistic and, perhaps, they suspected that the Central Government was all the time leading them up the garden path. I say that the Central Government is leading them up the garden path, Mr Chairman, Sir, is because if the University College were to be established in Penang then it must have the active collaboration and assistance from the University of Malaya. But, Mr Chairman, Sir, I do know for a fact that up to the end of 1963 this matter of a University College in Penang has never been discussed in the University Council of the University of Malaya, and I understand also that it is not being discussed during the current year. Consequently, how on earth can you have a University College in Penang if you do not have the active assistance from the University of Malaya? I do hope that the Central Government will be a little more sincere in its promise to establish a University College in Penang.

Now, Mr Chairman, Sir, I wish to dwell on the subject of free primary education in the Bornean States. This is a matter that has again been discussed at great length in this House. I only wish to say that I have stated time and again in this House why the people of the Bornean States have not the privilege to enjoy this free education despite whatever obstacles that may be in the way by virtue of constitutional arrangement. I do wish to commend to this House the fact that Professor Tregoning of the Department of History in the University of Singapore has, I think in the *Sarawak Times* of last year, put forward a thesis that there should be a University College in the Bornean States. This is a long-term wise proposal which I commend to the Acting Minister of Education, and I do hope that as a start he should look into the feasibility of setting up more Sixth Form classes in the Bornean States.

Mr Chairman, Sir, I wish now to close my speech by bringing to the attention of the Acting Minister of

Education this question of hunger strike at the Ministry today. Today's "*Straits Times*" carries a picture of a teacher squatting outside the Ministry of Education. This is a matter, Mr Chairman, Sir, I hope the Acting Minister of Education will look into. I quote from the "*Straits Times*" of the 14th December, 1964:

"The President of the 500-strong All-Malaya Association of Past Students of the Tamil Teachers Preparatory Examination, Mr S. B. Linggam, will go on a hunger strike in front of the Ministry of Education tomorrow morning. The hunger strike is in protest against the Ministry's decision not to give teachers training."

About 200 teachers had received the preparatory examination to undergo professional training but are not allowed to qualify as teachers. The training scheme for Tamil language teachers was taught in 1964. Mr Chairman, Sir, incidentally Mr Linggam is now squatting in front of the Ministry of Education as shown in today's issue of the "*Straits Times*". I do hope the Honourable Minister of Education will be kind enough to look into the matter and save him from the hunger pangs that he has to endure as a result of this governmental policy. Thank you, Sir.

Enche' Abdul Samad bin Gul Ahmad Mianji (Pasir Mas Hulu): Tuan Pengerusi, saya suka mengambil bahagian dalam Belanjawan Pelajaran ini dengan hanya menyentuh beberapa perkara yang penting. Yang pertama sa-kali, Tuan Pengerusi, masallah buku² text. Dalam buku² text sejarah dalam sekolah² Inggeris maseh terdapat sejarah² yang mencheritakan penderhakaan pahlawan² Melayu dahulu. Mithal-nya ada buku sejarah yang mencheritakan Mat Kilau dan Datok Bahaman ia-lah sa-orang penderhaka, pada hal sa-patut-nya kita mensifatkan orang² ini sa-bagai pejuang bangsa, pejuang kemerdekaan, bukan lagi penderhaka, bagitu juga di-dalam sa-buah buku sejarah yang di-ajar di-sekolah² Inggeris ini, sa-orang pahlawan Melayu yang bernama Putong di-Perak yang telah membunuh sa-orang Resident bangsa British yang mendapat sokongan daripada Raja Perak ketika itu, dan di-dalam buku ini di-cheritakan bahawa orang Melayu

yang bernama Putong ini ada-lah penderhaka.

Tuan Pengerusi, saya harap-lah pehak Kementerian ini menyelideki buku² sejarah yang di-ajar di-dalam sekolah² di-Tanah Melayu ini, supaya jangan ada lagi murid² kita semenjak tahu sejarah Tanah Melayu ini, mengatakan bahawa orang² itu penderhaka. Kita mahu keturunan di-masa yang akan datang ini kenal siapa juga pejuang² kemerdekaan dahulu lebih awal daripada kita.

Berkenaan dengan yang kedua, Tuan Pengerusi, ia-itu saya tidak tahu sama ada Yang Berhormat Pemangku Menteri Pelajaran ini tahu bahawa Universiti Malaya sekarang ini sudah ada satu kumpulan, ia-itu kumpulan anti-bahasa kebangsaan, dan timbulnya kumpulan ini sa-telah lawatan yang di-buat oleh Lee Kuan Yew manusia yang bernama Lee Kuan Yew—dan kerja² pehak anti-bahasa kebangsaan ini ia-lah menchunting semua sa-kali nama² dalam bahasa kebangsaan di-sakitar Universiti Malaya ini. Ini-lah benda yang saya mahu sampaikan ka-pengetahuan pehak Yang Berhormat Pemangku Menteri Pelajaran. Sudah banyak di-chakapkan oleh saudara² yang lain dalam masalah bahasa kebangsaan ini, dan saya menguchapkan banyak terima kaseh pada Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Pontian Selatan, yang dengan terang² telah mencheritakan dengan jelas-nya kesalahan² di-lakukan, tetapi pehak Ahli Yang Berhormat itu tidak mencheritakan Kementerian yang bersalah, tetapi mencheritakan pegawai². Saya tentang itu tidak setuju, kerana yang menjalankan kerja ini betul pegawai², tetapi mendapat arahan daripada pehak Kementerian, dan tidak patut-lah yang pegawai² itu mesti di-salahkan.

Masaalah bahasa kebangsaan ini, Tuan Pengerusi, ia-lah satu masalah yang penting. Ini di-aku² oleh segala pehak. Penting dari segi membangunkan masharakat satu bangsa di-Malaysia ini. Chita² membangunkan satu masharakat, atau satu bangsa ini tidak akan berjaya, bahkan menjadi chita² khayal, kalau-lah bahasa kebangsaan ini tidak betul² di-pelajari dan di-amalkan oleh segala pehak.

Kita maseh dengar banyak pehak² yang menuntut supaya bahasa² lain di-jadikan bahasa rasmi yang kedua, atau yang ketiga, dan tuntutan² ini tidak mendapat apa² bantahan daripada pehak Kerajaan, hatta sa-orang wakil Perikatan sendiri, ia-itu Yang Berhormat daripada Bandar Melaka maseh dengan terang² menuntut bahasa China di-jadikan bahasa rasmi yang kedua di-Malaysia ini.

Saya mahu tahu, fasal apa dalam Dewan Ra'ayat ini, Yang Berhormat itu tidak berchakap menuntut bahasa itu di-jadikan bahasa rasmi, tetapi di-luar di-dalam satu perjumpaan yang di-adakan di-Negri Sembilan, Gabungan Dewan² Perniagaan China, Kesatuan Guru² China di-seluruh Malaya telah mengadakan memorandum dan pada hari itu saya sudah keluarkan masaalah ini di-Dewan Ra'ayat, tetapi Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran yang lepas telah menafikan benda ini. Ini-lah, Tuan Pengerusi, jawapan yang di-berikan oleh Yang Amat Berhormat Perdana Menteri dalam jawapan polisi speech baharu² ini ada-lah amat mendukachitakan sa-kali, ia-itu kata Yang Amat Berhormat Perdana Menteri ini sampai tahun 1967, kalau ta' dapat sa-ratus peratus pun, sembilan puluh peratus kita jadikan juga. Ini satu jawapan yang amat mendukachitakan seluruh pendukong² bahasa kebangsaan di-seluruh negara kita ini. Kita tidak mahu apabila sampai masa bahasa Melayu di-jadikan bahasa kebangsaan maka percentage-nya itu kurang. Kita mahu sa-ratus peratus, tidak ada tolak ansor lagi. Sebab itu dalam meshuarat Dewan ini juga pada hari yang lepas, saya telah menchadangkan apa guna kita mengatangkan Nanyang Universiti ini tidak bersifat kebangsaan. Apa guna kita menyalahkan Nanyang Universiti, kalau sudah tahu Nanyang Universiti ini tidak bersifat kebangsaan, menyalahkan Perlembagaan Malaysia ini—haramkan Universiti Nanyang itu lebih baik daripada membiarkan Nanyang Universiti itu hidup. Tidak ada guna-nya kita bertemppek Nanyang Universiti itu tidak betul, tidak betul, tidak betul, tetapi kita membiarkan benda yang tidak betul ini hidup, dan

beratus² tahun murid² akan keluar daripada Nanyang Universiti ini. Saya ulangi cadangan saya, Tuan Pengerusi, pada Yang Berhormat Pemangku Menteri Pelajaran, tutup Nanyang Universiti dan benda yang kedua berhentikan bantuan² yang di-beri oleh Kerajaan kepada sekolah² yang tidak menggunakan bahasa kebangsaan.

Dua tahun lagi akan menjelang-lah bahasa Melayu menjadi bahasa kebangsaan di-seluruh Tanah Melayu. Mengapa Kerajaan maseh memberi bantuan kepada sekolah² yang tidak mengamalkan dasar pelajaran kita, dan tidak mahu menjalankan bahasa kebangsaan sa-bagai bahasa rasmi. Kita memberi bantuan itu berma'ana kita membiakkan kembang-nya bahasa² lain daripada bahasa kebangsaan. Ini ada-lah satu benda yang bertentangan dengan chita² menjadikan bahasa kebangsaan

Enche' Tan Toh Hong: On a point of clarification, Sir, If the Honourable Member so really

Enche' Abdul Samad bin Gul Ahmad Mianji: Tuan Pengerusi, ta' ada masa lagi saya hendak memberi peluang kepada Ahli Yang Berhormat itu. Benda yang patut di-perhatikan oleh saudara² atau pun orang² lain di-dalam Malaysia ini, ia-itu yang tinggal pada orang Melayu hanya-lah satu, ia-itu bahasa kebangsaan. Ini-lah yang maseh ada, kalau bahasa kebangsaan ini pun mahu di-chabul, saya tidak tahu apa benda yang akan berlaku di-negara kita ini.

Tuan Pengerusi, saya beraleh kepada Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka. Ada saudara² saperti Yang Berhormat daripada Kuala Kangsar menchadangkan supaya di-beri hadiah kepada orang² yang belajar bahasa kebangsaan, di-beri hadiah dan di-naikkan pangkat. Saya tidak setuju, Tuan Pengerusi, kerana tidak pernah di-buat orang di-dalam dunia ini, tiap² warga negara yang dudok di-negara Malaysia ini mengakui tundok kepada Perlembagaan Malaysia. Dan dalam Perlembagaan Malaysia menyatakan bahasa Melayu akan di-jadikan bahasa rasmi, Kalau orang² itu tahu ta'at, tahu ta'at kepada Perlembagaan Malaysia ini, sudah

sampai masa-nya dan telah di-beri peluang oleh Kerajaan lapan tahun lama-nya untuk mempelajari bahasa kebangsaan, dan mengapa hendak suroh tundok kepada undang² Perlembagaan Malaysia itu hendak di-beri upah dan hadiah. Ini satu benda yang ta' pernah di-buat walau di-mana pun. Saya menchadangkan Tuan Pengerusi, apabila buat satu² benda mesti ada force, mesti ada law—undang² tidak boleh bila sampai masa Bulan Bahasa Kebangsaan itu gunakan-lah, gunakan-lah, gunakan-lah, jadi kita ini minta tolong orang itu supaya menggunakan Undang² ini. Kita minta tolong orang itu supaya tundok kepada Perlembagaan ini. Ini tidak betul. Orang itu sudah sanggup menjadi ra'ayat, dia mesti tundok kepada kemahuan Perlembagaan.

Saya menchadangkan, Tuan Pengerusi, supaya Kementerian ini mengadakan undang² dalam Bulan Bahasa Kebangsaan yang di-ishtiharkan oleh Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka; siapa sahaja yang berchakap lain daripada bahasa Melayu boleh di-tangkap dan di-hukum dalam mahkamah. Baharu-lah ada—pehak Menteri suka sahaja. Tetapi ini-lah benda yang patut di-buat. Ada orang yang mengatakan "Go to hell with National Language". Ya, maseh ada orang yang berchakap sa-macham itu. Saya, Tuan Pengerusi, pernah bekerja sa-bagai Telephone Operator dalam Minggu Perpaduan, dalam Minggu Bulan Bahasa ini, saya minta supaya orang² besar ini menggunakan bahasa kebangsaan hari ini. Dia kata, "Go to hell with National Language." Apa saya hendak buat, hendak report pada siapa? Sa-hingga Pengarah Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka pun telah berkata, "Saya sudah puas dah, saya dah pening kepala!" Sampai bagitu sa-kali orang² yang anti bahasa kebangsaan ini. Saya menchadangkan dan saya minta Menteri itu jawab, boleh atau tidak boleh mengadakan satu undang²—memaksa orang² ini supaya menggunakan bahasa kebangsaan saperti Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Seberang Selatan berchakap mengenai Thailand. Di-negeri Thai tidak boleh dan tidak dibenarkan sama sa-kali orang lain

membuka sekolah, melainkan mesti tundok dan mesti belajar bahasa Siam. Hendak letakkan nama lain di-sign board rumah itu pun kalau hendak gunakan bahasa asing mesti minta kebenaran daripada Kerajaan dan kena bayar tax. Ta' ada manusia dalam dunia ini mengatakan Kerajaan Siam dzalim—ta' ada—kerana itu negeri-nya, dia boleh buat apa dia suka. Bagitu juga Malaysia dalam Undang² Malaysia ini mengatakan—Perlembagaan menyatakan bahasa Melayu menjadi bahasa rasmi, mesti tundok kepada itu dan tidak ada lagi bertolak ansor.

Soal lain, Tuan Pengerusi, Malaysia Hall, London. Saya telah menerima rayuan² daripada anak² Melayu yang menuntut di-England dan tinggal di-Malaysia Hall, anak² Melayu ini di-anaktirikan, sa-bagaimana Ahli² Yang Berhormat telah mengatakan bahawa anak² Melayu dalam sekolah² Melayu di-Malaysia di-anaktirikan, tetapi di-Malaysia Hall, London juga anak² Melayu di-anaktirikan sa-bagai orang yang datang menumpang bukan sa-bagai tuan hak. Mithal-nya, Tuan Pengerusi, periok masak daging, itu-lah periok masak babi, itu-lah periok masak daging² lain. Ini tidak dapat di-nafikan oleh pehak Yang Berhormat Menteri, kalau mahu menafikan saya akan bawa surat daripada orang yang menghantar surat itu, dan orang itu sudah pun kembali ka-tanah ayer bekerja sa-bagai loyar—baharu kembali. Saya harap benda macham ini tidak akan berlaku lagi.

Sa-lain daripada itu masalah scholarship yang di-beri di-negeri ini kebanyakan-nya orang² yang besar dan orang² kaya yang dapat, orang miskin tiada berpeluang. Saya harap pehak Yang Berhormat Pemangku Menteri Pelajaran menyelideki benar² benda ini. Beri scholarship Kerajaan ini kepada orang yang betul² mustahak, kepada orang yang betul² patut dan layak mendapat-nya, jangan-lah ada memilih kaseh dalam pemberian scholarship ini.

Akhir-nya, Tuan Pengerusi, buku² yang di-keluarkan oleh Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka yang menjual buku² itu kepada semua sekolah² dengan tidak memberi peluang kepada penjual² buku yang ada berselerak di-tanah ayer kita

ini. Apa yang saya harapkan, Tuan Pengerusi, biar-lah sa-kurang²-nya di-beri konterek penjualan buku² yang di-keluarkan oleh Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka ini kepada sa-buah kedai Melayu, bukan tidak ada di-bandar Kuala Lumpur ini sa-buah kedai Melayu yang besar menjual buku², tiap² buku yang di-keluarkan oleh Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka patut di-beri kepada kedai² buku Melayu dan kedai² ini supply kepada semua² sekolah dalam Malaysia ini.

Saya sa-kali lagi ucapkan terima kaseh kepada Yang Berhormat dari Pontian Selatan kerana membongkar cherita² Kementerian ini. Kalau Ahli PAS berchakap sudah tentu kena godam kuat, tetapi kalau Yang Berhormat dari Pontian Selatan berchakap sendiri, maka saya anugerahkan gelaran Dato' Paduka Maha Raja Shah Alam di-Rimba (*Ketawa*) kepada Yang Berhormat dari Pontian Selatan. Terima kaseh.

Mr Chairman: Saya suka hendak memberitahu kepada Ahli² Yang Berhormat oleh kerana perbahathan ini banyak belum habis lagi dan jika boleh, kita habiskan sa-belum pukul 1.00 dan supaya banyak Ahli² Yang Berhormat dapat berchakap tolong-lah pendek²kan ucapan itu.

Enche' Siow Loong Hin (Seremban Barat): Mr Chairman, Sir, apparently there seems to be quite some confusion, everybody wanting to speak. However, I would like to thank you very much for granting me this opportunity.

I have listened with great interest just now to the Honourable Member from the P.M.I.P. Apparently, he is asking the Government to use undemocratic methods in forcing people to study the National Language, and that is something which is very foreign to the Alliance Government. Possibly, when the P.M.I.P. come into power, they will probably be able to do a thing like that. But, as far as the Alliance Government is concerned, being a democratic Government, we would like to follow the democratic ways of encouraging people to study the National Language. I think everyone is agreeable that there must be a

National Language for this country, and everyone is attempting to study the National Language as quickly as possible.

The Honourable Member from Singapore yesterday had challenged, in this House, the M.C.A. to state openly its policy on Nanyang University and Chinese education. This morning we have heard another Honourable Member from Singapore, who says that language, education and culture are very sensitive and emotional issues, and that the communists exploited these sensitive issues on Chinese education before in Singapore and hence the trouble had started years ago when there were riotings by students in Singapore. I wonder whether the Honourable Members from Singapore who have touched on this issue, challenging the M.C.A. to state openly here, are not again re-opening up these sensitive issues, or are they trying to play the P.A.P.'s politicking game in this House? I think everyone is fully aware of the P.A.P.'s tactics in utilising this House for its Party's politicking; and I think the Honourable Members from Singapore are also fully aware that the M.C.A.'s policy, as far as education is concerned, is the Alliance policy, and we have stated categorically many a time what the Alliance policy is, and the public is fully aware of it.

The Alliance policy on the Nanyang University has been openly stated, that it will give a square deal to the Nanyang University, provided it conforms to our education system, maintains an academic standard equivalent to other Universities, and is completely devoid of all subversive elements in the student bodies. I am sure the P.A.P. Members are fully aware of this policy.

When the Nanyang University had its bag of troubles, what did the Members of the P.A.P. Government in Singapore do? They did nothing. (AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear, hear!) They called on the Alliance Government to do the dirty work for them. The basic cause of Nanyang's troubles had been the P.A.P. They had been helping indirectly to cause dissensions

among the student bodies to rise against a legitimate Government in power, at that time the Government of Tun Lim Yew Hock. Later, when they found that they could not control the situation any further, they passed the buck to the Alliance Government. I must say here that they practically went on their knees to Dato' Dr Ismail, our Minister of the Interior at that time, and begged him to help them to deal with these subversive elements in the Nanyang University.

May we also know as to whether the Government of Singapore has recognised Nanyang University as yet, despite the fact that education is a State autonomy in Singapore? What is their policy? Is their policy just the employment of a few Nanyang University students under the employ of the Singapore Government, or is their policy towards Nanyang much further and deeper than that? As to Chinese education, the Alliance Government has stated many times that it encourages the study of the languages of the various races in this country; it is not our policy to do away with the languages and cultures of other races. This is written in our Constitution.

The Honourable Member there has the audacity to stand up in this House unashamedly to claim credit for the free primary education policy in Singapore which, from his own mouth, he stated was handed down by the colonial masters. This is not an innovation of the P.A.P. Government of Singapore. Where was the P.A.P. then when the colonial masters were controlling Singapore?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Sleeping!

Enche' Siow Loong Hin: They now take credit for something which was done by somebody else. In fact, this morning we heard a very glowing report of the education policy in Singapore. We are not going to cross swords with them on this matter. If they think their policy is good, we think ours is just as good, if not better. But what actually confuses the minds of the people in this House, as well as the people outside, is the way the

P.A.P. members are trying to play politics by trying to gather around the *haves* and the *have-nots* and divide them into two separate groups. I suppose they have now placed Sabah and Sarawak among the *have-nots* and Singapore as the *haves*. If one recollects, some time ago, when the Sabah Government was trying to obtain a loan of \$30 million from Singapore, they were placing obstacles and impossible conditions amounting to demanding "a pound of flesh" from Sabah before the \$30 million could be given to them. Where is their disparity of *haves* and *have-nots*?

Mr Chairman, Sir, we have been hearing a great deal about this question of the comprehensive system as an election gimmick. I wonder whether the speeches made in this House are not a political gimmick to mislead the people inside and outside as well as the administrators. They have now resorted to championing the administrators and the civil servants of this Government and put the blame on the political leaders of this Government. There are many types of chauvinism, and I think this is chauvinism of one of the highest degrees. They are trying to divide, split and, if possible, disintegrate the whole society in this country. One may wonder whether the P.A.P. has a hand in the present trouble in Sabah (*Laughter*).

Mr Chairman, Sir, they talk about Chinese education, they talk about multi-lingualism. As a matter of fact, according to the 1963 statistics the enrolment of Chinese primary schools in Standard I in Singapore amounts to only one-third of the total Chinese pupil population in Singapore as compared with that enrolled in Standard I English primary schools, and over these years, more than 100 Chinese school teachers and headmasters have been sacked by the P.A.P. That is their education policy. They have always considered themselves the self-styled champions of the Chinese language and education and have done a great deal for the Chinese language and education, and yet they have come down here and say that this is a very sensitive issue, the communists have been exploiting it

and therefore they have had trouble. Are they not exploiting this issue directly here with the M.C.A. in trying to split the M.C.A. and the UMNO and split the Alliance? I am quite sure we are not as blind as not to be able to see through their game.

However, Mr Chairman, Sir, I would like to speak on this question of the comprehensive school system that we will be putting into operation by next month. There has been a great deal of debate on the comprehensive system both inside and outside the House. I would like to state here that everyone is in full agreement with the Government's policy on education; but what has been causing great concern is not the policy as such but the actual implementation of this policy. I would like to elaborate on this for the information and guidance of the Minister.

On 15th July, 1961, the Ministry of Education issued an official statement stating that 1/3rd of the time in converted Chinese secondary schools can be spent on the study of the Chinese language, literature and culture. This time is broken up as follows: a minimum of 180 minutes per week for Chinese language, a minimum of 135 minutes per week for Chinese literature and a further period of 360 minutes per week at the discretion of the head teacher can be devoted to the study of Chinese. This makes up a total of 675 minutes per week, out of a total of 1,620 minutes per week. Now, the comprehensive system syllabus allows only 120 minutes to the study of the pupil's own language, including literature, or the study of Islamic religious knowledge. This means that 555 minutes have been taken off, resulting in only 1/15th of the time as compared to 1/3rd of the time as stated in the policy statement. This syllabus can be construed as not conforming to the policy set forth in the Ministry's statement of 15th July, 1961. According to this statement of 15th July, 1961, even assuming that the head teacher will devote some part of the 360 minutes at his discretion to other subjects, this still means that in the first three years in the fully assisted Chinese secondary schools about 1/3rd of the time can be devoted to the study

of Chinese language, literature and culture. In the fourth and fifth years, the head teacher has wider discretion as to the time spent on other subjects, but the result is the same—that up to 1/3rd of the time can be spent on the study of Chinese. The above timetable requirements are established by law under the Schools (Courses of Studies) Regulations, 1956 (L.N. 451/56) and are stated in *Gazette* Notification 1815 published in the Federal Government *Gazette* of 14th May, 1959. The syllabuses, also authorised under the same Regulations, provide 315 minutes for Chinese in the first three years and 360 minutes in Forms IV and V. But these periods can be increased up to 1/3rd of the total school time. This was widely published. This policy statement was issued to refute the criticism that only 180 minutes per week is given to teaching Chinese in conforming Chinese secondary schools. Now, in the comprehensive system with the reduction to 120 minutes, the time given is far short of the original time agreed to.

Mr Chairman, Sir, the purpose of the comprehensive system, as we all know, is the eventual integration of all school children. This would in the long run, however, affect the teachers' employment, especially the teachers in Chinese. I am sure the Government is fully aware of this problem and would find ways and means to safeguard the livelihood of these teachers as promised by the Rahman Talib Report. The comprehensive system is an improvement on the secondary school system and the fulfilment of the Rahman Talib Report to giving 9 years education to all children. Such an improvement cannot be construed as a change in policy. Since the policy is unchanged, it is important that those engaged in the implementation and administration should not tamper with the basic policy set forth by this House. It must be remembered that this House is elected by the people and any policy approved by this House is the policy of the people. The administrators should follow this policy to the very letter in its implementation.

As I said earlier, Mr Chairman, Sir, the main cause for concern is that this

policy is not being implemented accordingly. Mr Chairman, Sir, I would urge the Minister to go into this question of the syllabus of the comprehensive system and see that this policy is not deviated from its original aims.

Mr Chairman, Sir, I would not like to go much further, except to say a few concluding remarks regarding this question of the Budget that we have been discussing since the last few days.

Mr Lee Kuan Yew's speech on last Saturday to the P.A.P. Central Executive Committee and branches at the Victoria Theatre, Singapore, as reported in the *Straits Times*, shows that behind the pretence of preventing the Barisan's poison from reaching home, the real and main purpose of Mr Lee Kuan Yew and company is to launch an extensive and massive pan-Malayan campaign and to utilise all their available cadres and supporters. This is revealed in the following paragraphs of the statement he made in that newspaper. He said:

"It is important to explain to the people and build up a climate of public opinion that will make it difficult for the Central Government to go through with retrogressive tax legislation."

I am quoting from the *Straits Times* of 14th December, 1964. This, in my opinion, is a complete defiance of the Central Government. He, again, repeatedly stressed the introduction of the controversial payroll and turnover taxes as unnecessary, iniquitous and having a retrogressive effect on the economy.

"With support throughout Malaysia", he said, "a new climate of public opinion may be built whereby the Finance Minister may find he has got to adjust policies to face realities."

This is rebellion!

Next he said that, "beginning next week, the P.A.P. cadres would go out on an explanatory role and make clear our stand and explain to the people the taxes."

This morning's newspaper was very clear. It says here under the heading

MINISTER SPEAKS AT "ILLEGAL" RALLY:—

"All the three"—Mr Hoh See Beng, N.T.U.C. Chairman, Enche' Hashim Idris,

the Vice-Chairman, and the Honourable Enche' C. V. Devan Nair, the Secretary-General—"said that the Internal Security Act was being interpreted as a law to protect the Malaysian Finance Minister, Mr Tan Siew Sin, from honest, constructive criticisms."

I wonder, Mr Chairman, Sir, whether one can find in the Internal Security Act where it is stated that it should protect the Minister of Finance from criticisms from the public. I think this is a very unfair allegation to make, because when the Police went to intervene it should not be interpreted as the implementation of the Internal Security Act to protect the Minister of Finance.

Again, you will find statements saying that P.A.P. cadres and Assemblymen in groups of two or more move around, attending dinners, or calling on trade unionists and association leaders, etc., inciting them to send memoranda, stage mass rallies and so on whereby the P.A.P. will escalate the discontent of the people, because of the way the P.A.P. had described these new taxes "as unnecessary, iniquitous and having a retrogressive effect on the economy".

At the Hokkien Hoay Kuan dinner on the 6th December, 1964, this was stated by Mr Lee Kuan Yew:

"As usual, the P.A.P. goes back to the ideology of the inevitable class war between the 'haves' and the 'have-nots' in Malaysia."

This was very loyally stated, again, in today's newspaper by the Honourable Enche' Jek Yuen Thong:

"But any taxation policy must be realistic; it must take into account the fact that the majority in any country are the 'have-nots' and a minority are the 'haves'."

Mr Lee Kuan Yew said that the Malaysian Budget was basically weighted in favour of the "haves" and against the "have-nots".

"It is morally wrong to take from the 'have-nots' and give to the 'haves', particularly in Singapore. This is utter madness", he said.

If this is not class warfare, if this is not inciting class warfare, I wonder what is.

Further he said:

"And one thing we know to be wrong is to give in to intimidation. We give sincere, honest criticisms and in return we are shown the mailed fist. I think it is wrong that we be intimidated and cowed."

I wonder when the Central Government ever did intimidate the Singapore Government. I wonder when the Central Government ever did show its mailed fist to the Singapore Government. Where these words come from, I do not know. This can possibly be an indication that the P.A.P. will secretly support the Barisan's strategy of defiance of the Government's policy of law and order. Mr Lee Kuan Yew has hinted here that where the people think that the taxes are wrong they must not give in to intimidation, which means that the masses will be urged to fight—constitutionally or by violent means.

However, there is a sane person among the group. The Honourable Dr Goh Keng Swee was more careful. He only said:

"I hope public opinion will be strong and unanimous to persuade the Central Government to consider the new measures."

I think that is a very logical step to take and not to say about intimidation and mailed fist.

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair (Bungsar): On a point of information, Sir. As there was reference to Dr Goh Keng Swee, may I inform the Honourable Member and this House that this attempt by the M.C.A. to woo Dr Goh Keng Swee is completely pathetic and fallacious, because I know him very well and much better than the Honourable Member.

Enche' Siow Loong Hing: Sir, I would like to thank the Honourable Member very much for his information. As a matter of fact, we are not wooing anybody from the P.A.P. We are only just trying to make a discerning line between the good and the bad among them. (*Laughter*).

Mr Chairman, Sir, we in the Alliance, the Central Government, know that when we promulgate any policy, particularly a tax budget of this nature, we are always at a disadvantage—at a very great disadvantage. It is like a political fight in which the Opposition have the people on their side—usually they show to the people that they are on the side of the people—and the Alliance are on the defensive, and if we were to hit

back, we hit at the people; if we do not hit back, we keep on receiving the blows of the Opposition, particularly the P.A.P. and their stooges. Therefore, something must be done to separate the people from the P.A.P., so that if the Central Government were to give blows to the P.A.P., they will not be felt by the people. If the P.A.P. can be shown to the people that they are not sincerely loyal to Malaysia and that they are not sincerely wanting to stop Soekarno's aggression, that they are not really for the welfare and security of the people but rather they are putting party interests before national interests

Mr Chairman: May I point out to the Honourable Member that he is taking part in the debate on the Supply Bill and not speaking at an election rally. (*Laughter*).

Enche' Siow Loong Hing: Mr Chairman, Sir, that is why at the beginning I said, "In conclusion, I would like to say a few words" (*Laughter*) and having had your permission, may I conclude my speech by saying just a few lines more.

The P.A.P. are putting party interests before national interests and they are a security risk. There must be some truths after all in what people believe as to what took place between Enche' Lee Kuan Yew and the "Plen". Then the peoples' minds will be taken from the tax issue to the more important issues of national integrity, solidarity, security, peace and harmony.

Now, I would not like to ask them questions, but I would just like to remind the House of this, Mr Chairman, Sir. If you all have read a little bit of the Second World War and what happened in England, you can remember that during World War II while Mr Churchill was fighting to save Britain from Hitler, the British Communist Party was conspiring to take advantage of the World War situation to stage a civil war in Britain in order to capture power. This was Lenin's strategy which enabled him to capture the government while the Russian troops were heavily engaged in fighting the Germans during World War I. A

third example was Mao Tse Tung's strategy to capture control of the government while Chiang Kai-Shek was heavily engaged in fighting the Japanese. This is the strategy which the P.A.P. is now employing in Malaysia today. (HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Shame! Shame!). While the Central Government is heavily engaged in fighting Soekarno, the P.A.P. is exploiting the tax issue for party power-struggle.

Mr Chairman, Sir, we must also remember, just as the Communists and the pro-Communists must keep on their anti-American struggles and campaigns in order to destroy the symbol of democracy, so the P.A.P. and the Barisan Sosialis must keep on their massive campaigns against the M.C.A., especially against the M.C.A. President, who is the Finance Minister, and also against the Chinese leaders who represent the freedom-loving Chinese in Malaysia, because the M.C.A. is the only democratic political Chinese party that can provide leadership to all the Chinese in South-East Asia. Therefore, the Communists and their fellow travelers must kill the M.C.A. I hope my brothers from the UMNO will realise this point. This is the only answer why the Communists and the pro-Communists are determined to destroy the M.C.A. and, with it, the President. Thank you, Sir. (*Applause*).

Che' Ajibah binti Abol: Berhubung dengan perbelanjaan atas Kepala S. 20, Sukatan Pelajaran untuk negeri² Borneo, saya suka menerangkan dengan tegas ia-itu saya tidak bersetuju dengan sentimen yang di-keluarkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Sarawak, Enche' Ong Kee Hui. Petang sa-malam Ahli Yang Berhormat itu telah menudoh, di-antara lain, ia-itu nampak-nya Kerajaan Pusat tidak mempunyai pengertian simpati dan perasaan terhadap orang² Sarawak. Peruntukan sa-banyak \$17 juta lebeh untuk pelajaran di-Sarawak bagi tahun 1965 yang akan datang membuktikan dengan terang dan jelas-nya bahawa tuduhan Ahli Yang Berhormat itu tidak berasas sama sa-kali.

Tuan Pengerusi, saya menyokong penoh seruan Yang Berhormat Menteri

Pelajaran supaya Kerajaan Sarawak mengkaji sa-mula dengan teliti system pelajaran yang sedang di-jalankan di-Sarawak pada masa ini. System ini, Tuan Pengerusi, di-adakan di-Sarawak semenjak, kalau ta' silap, ia-lah dalam tahun 1961. Dan di-bawah system ini anak² bumiputra di-Sarawak, terutama sa-kali yang dudok di-luar bandar, tidak mendapat nikmat pelajaran yang wajib di-berikan oleh Kerajaan kepada ra'ayat. Daripada keputusan pe-periksaan, nyata sa-kali kepada seluruh ra'ayat Sarawak bahawa system pelajaran di-Sarawak ada-lah menguntongkan suatu gulongan sahaja ia-itu kaum China yang telah maju pelajaran dalam Sarawak. System yang ada di-Sarawak pada masa ini hendak di-jalankan dalam tahun 1961 dahulu, parti SUPP-lah menerusi pemimpinnya, Ahli² Yang Berhormat, Enche' Ong Chee Ho, dan Enche' Stephen Yong, yang telah menentang keras system tersebut dengan alasan, bahawa system itu bukan berchorak national yang bertujuan hendak menghapuskan kemuliaan dan kesusasteraan kaum China. Sekarang sa-telah Malaysia yang di-tentang-nya itu telah di-tubuhkan, Ahli Yang Berhormat itu meminta Kerajaan Pusat supaya membelanjakan wang berjuta² ringgit pula untuk Kementerian Pelajaran di-Sarawak dan menerusi system yang tersebut juga, yang di-tentangkan oleh beliau dan parti-nya dahulu. Ada-kah Ahli Yang Berhormat itu terfikir pada masa ini bahawa system di-Sarawak itu bertujuan hendak menyamakan, hendak menyemaikan perasaan bersatu padu, satu bangsa dalam Malaysia, atau adakah Ahli Yang Berhormat itu sekarang berfaham bahawa system yang ada di-Sarawak pada masa ini, tidak lagi bertujuan untuk menghapuskan kemuliaan kesusasteraan kaum China.

Tuan Pengerusi, saya yakin ia-itu sa-bahagian besar daripada ra'ayat Sarawak mahu supaya system pelajaran Aneka Jurusan, yang akan di-mula di-Malaya ini pada tahun hadapan kelak di-sambungkan di-Sarawak. Tetapi telah banyak di-dengar oleh kita propaganda² yang telah di-taborkan di-Sarawak oleh gulongan² yang anti atau menentang Malaysia, dan pegawai²

British yang ada di-Sarawak yang berkata, kalau system pelajaran di-Malaya di-gunakan di-Sarawak, maka hilanglah bahasa Inggeris. Dan dengan hilang-nya bahasa Inggeris di-Sarawak kelak, kata-nya oleh kerana murid² itu hanya mempelajari bahasa kebangsaan sahaja, maka sudah tentu tidak-lah anak negeri Sarawak itu dapat men-chapai kemajuan dalam pelajaran. Oleh itu saya berharap Kerajaan Pusat mesti mengambil tindakan yang sasuai untuk memberikan penerangan yang sa-jelas²-nya kepada ra'ayat Sarawak berkenaan dengan system pelajaran yang di-amalkan di-Malaya ini.

Tuan Pengerusi, akhir-nya saya berchadang supaya Kerajaan Pusat menghantarkan sa-orang pegawai dari Kementerian Pelajaran ka-negeri² Borneo, supaya wang yang berjuta² ringgit yang di-belanjakan tiap² tahun itu, dapat di-nekmati oleh pehak² yang mundur atau suku² bangsa yang mundur di-Sarawak saperti Melayu, Melanau, Iban, Kedayan dan lain² lagi dari bumiputra. Tuan Pengerusi, pada masa ini sakalian pegawai² tinggi dalam Jabatan Pelajaran di-Sarawak ada-lah pegawai² expatriate sahaja. Sakian.

Enche' Geh Chong Keat: Mr Chairman, Sir, I would like to speak on Head 18, sub-head 17 and Head 19, sub-head 30, University of Malaya, and higher education.

Sir, we accept that by 1967 Malay shall be the official language. Our country has also accepted the education policy as laid down by the Razak and the Talib Reports wherein the teaching in the mother tongue is accepted, and as a result of this the Alliance Government thereby created the four streams in the primary education, viz., Malay, English, Chinese and Tamil. Up to 12, pertaining to the rights in respect of education, the Government cannot prevent the teaching of the different languages in the educational institutions or schools. In the light of this, both in the Constitution, the Razak and the Talib Education Policy Reports, we hope that our Government will honour the continuance of these four streams in the primary education after 1967. It is also

in the education policy to permit one-fourth of the time in the secondary schools, i.e., the time in Government-assisted schools may be used at the discretion of the principals to teach Chinese to the Chinese students and similarly Tamil to the Tamil students. We all know, of course, that the Education Advisers have a say indirectly, as they control the Chief Education Officers and the principals of schools.

Sir, I trust that the Acting Honourable Minister of Education will state in this House that it is not the intention of the Alliance Government to change its education policy after 1967, because the public, and the citizens and the fathers of students would like to know it, as it is of national interest to all of us. As much as the Malays want higher education, Sir, the other non-Malays also have a right to such amenities; and I must congratulate the former Minister of Education for creating the Alam Shah Pre-University School which prepare Malay students, using Malay medium, for entry into the University of Malaya. These Malay students need not have to pass the Form Six, i.e., the Higher School Certificate. I must point out that I fully support that Malay students must have a fair share in higher education. But, Sir, there is also the problem of the non-Malay students who find great difficulty in obtaining admission to the University of Malaya and the University of Singapore. I trust that the Honourable Acting Minister of Education will not treat these non-Malay students as "step children", for they too have their aspirations and, if the Acting Minister of Education will not help them as he has helped the Malay students, I am afraid, Sir, that there will be frustration and discontentment which may lead to disharmony and further misunderstanding, which will destroy the very basis or foundation to integrate them into one class of citizens under one nation.

I have no doubt, Sir, that the Acting Minister of Education, like all other Ministers of the Alliance Government, is non-communal in his approach, in drawing up the policies and in the implementation of them. Since the

former Minister of Education has created the Alam Shah Pre-university School for the Malay students, surely the present Acting Minister should not find any difficulty in establishing another pre-university school for the non-Malay students, who do not receive their secondary education in the English medium. Sir, we realise that both the University of Malaya and the University of Singapore have limited facilities and limited enrolment and so they cannot cope with the rapid expanding needs of our nation. Our nation's wealth, our nation's power to expand industrially and technically and our nation's source of progress are in our human resources. May I ask this House, what better resource can there be than an intelligent educated society, and what better education can there be than a university education?

I would like to point out to this House that thousands of our students go abroad for higher education simply because our Universities do not have the capacity for them. Not only do the non-Malay students go abroad, but also Malay students do so, and some even go to Cairo. May I add, at this juncture, that we still do not have a university like the University of Cairo and a large number of our young men have to proceed to a foreign country to obtain such Islamic academic qualifications. So, I would like to urge the Government to establish and organise a University in the near future for Islamic students.

Sir, our country must either have some more Universities or it must expand the capacity and facilities of the present ones. In all countries of the world, other than communist countries, there are both Government and private universities. We in Malaysia must not hesitate to encourage the private sector to establish universities if our Government has not the funds to do so, and the existing private University should be recognised if its standards conform to the international standards.

Sir, the Government should be highly commended for its foresight in establishing the University of Malaya

and its expansion, besides the University of Singapore. Malaysia now proudly boast of her two seats of learning, which are second to none in South-East Asia. Besides these two Universities, we have also a third seat of learning which was established through the efforts of educationists and philanthropists—I am referring to the Nanyang University. It is indeed unfortunate that this University, which does not have the benefit of the support of the Government, should have been disrupted due to infiltration by fractional and political elements. Sir, I would appeal to the Honourable Members in this House not to brand anyone, who speak in support of the Nanyang University as a chauvinist or as a disloyal citizen. The Honourable Prime Minister and the Minister of Home Affairs, while previously expressing their views as regards the Nanyang University, have stated that as long as they function constitutionally and progress to reorganise in such a way that the administration and the functioning of the University conform to the standard as required by the Government, the Government will reconsider the recognition of this University. Sir, it is also my humble opinion that it should be the policy of the Government to encourage more institutions for higher studies. The Nanyang University had been the subject of recent controversy. It is regrettable that some section of the public should make it appear that the Nanyang University has met with disapproval of the Government because it caters for only one section of the people. The problem, as I see it, Sir, appears to be that some people feel that the Nanyang University is communal and that its standard is insufficiently high enough to receive the attention and blessings of our Government. It is my opinion that the Government should support all seats of learning and render every assistance to bring them to a standard that we can be proud of. The Nanyang University is an accomplished fact—it is already in existence. If this University is not keeping up its standard, or if it falls short of our expectations, then it is up to us to help it to put things right.

This University was established to meet the educational needs of our country. Before the establishment of the Nanyang University, Malayan Chinese students—and even some of the Malay students—had no alternative but to proceed abroad to take up Chinese studies. These people had no choice but to look to foreign Universities for further studies, such as the Taiwan University. It was felt that this would not be conducive to the moulding of our nation. Sir, a spokesman of the Ministry of Home Affairs also expressed the view in the *Straits Times*, “Why should our Malayan students proceed to a foreign country to acquire foreign culture; why don’t they go to the Nanyang University?” That was the view of a spokesman of the Ministry of Home Affairs. Sir, the facts that have been brought up in this House have shown that it is really a necessity that Malaya must have a third seat and, if possible, a fourth seat in education in Malaya. Sir, I would not like to prolong this debate to approve sub-heads 18, 19 and the others under the Head “Education”. However, I wish to point out that it is really a compliment to receive praise from the Member for Batu, who is the leader of the Socialist Front in this House. His very words of praise have really brought credit to the Alliance Government, and I appreciate him in turn for his courage to voice his party’s feelings and I hope he really means this praise of his.

Mr Chairman, Sir, we in this House must also take heed of the proposal brought by a member of the P.M.I.P. that the Government must use force on our citizens in order to make them study the national language. Sir, the world knows that Malaya is a free country and adheres strictly to the democratic principles of the free world. A statement such as this from a member of the P.M.I.P. really creates great concern. This is really food for thought for the general public on what would happen if the P.M.I.P. really came to power. I really abhor to think of that and it is a real blessing to us and we have got to thank God that the P.M.I.P. is not in power, and we must see to it that the P.M.I.P. must never

come to power in this Malaysia of ours. Thank you.

Enche' Tan Toh Hong: Mr Chairman Sir, in any enlightened country education is an instrument of progress. Unfortunately, in this country education has been made a political issue. It has been exploited by self-seeking career men, Communists and communalists. As the Honourable Member from Seremban Barat has said, people from the P.A.P. and the P.M.I.P. have exploited education, twisted facts, used half truths, quarter truths and whatever fraction of truths (*Laughter*) for their own self-pursuit of political gains. Mr Chairman, Sir, I do not propose to be caught in their trap. I shall speak on education and education should be spoken of as a science and as a technical topic.

Mr Chairman, Sir, it is a problem that has to be studied objectively, calmly and scientifically. I wonder how many of our much publicised speakers on this subject have ever done any research on this important subject. Have they studied the various educational principles and theories and made comparison with the various types of institutions of those countries whose education is regarded as progressive?

Sir, I gather from modern educationalists that a country's education policy should be aimed at two very important objectives. They are, firstly, how best our younger generation will grow up to be useful citizens? Secondly, how these youths can be equipped with the best possible capability to work and live happily in their respective environments, so that they may grow up to be useful to their society, their families and themselves.

In the Malaysian context, where plural society does exist, this means that the long-term principal aim should be how to inculcate in our younger generations a spirit of national identity and unity. At the same time our education should also cater for a more immediate need—the need to give our youth skills and ability to get

employment and also to be useful to a developing society. By this, I mean that they should not turn out to be people of a special class, discarded and divorced by the common people of the community in which they live.

This long-term objective and the short-term need seem to be irreconcilable. They only seem to be. In fact they are not, and they need not be. This has been proved by events here for the last nine years, by history and by civilisation. Take America, the greatest melting-pot of all kinds of races in the world. She has shown us the way and the direction, as the Honourable Member from Kota Bharu Hilir has told us the other day. Hawaii, composed of citizens of Polynesian origins, of Japanese, Chinese, German, French, English, Americans, etc., shows that so long as the educational and cultural process is moving towards national loyalty, unity and identity, it does not really matter what the short-term fluctuations are. In fact, in Hawaii, a Japanese American is as loyal as a Bostonian American, even though this man is likely to be more "Japanese" than the Japanese in Japan.

In Malaysia, the long-term economic and social forces will act and interact to generate forces of national identity and cohesion—the only prerequisites being understanding and tolerance.

Sir, the critical question on education is: as an instrument of science how best it can equip our younger generation? My humble observation is that first and foremost our education system should be orientated towards increasing the level of academic and technical proficiency.

If we want our nation to continue to expand and to grow, then our schools and our colleges must produce more scientists, more professionals, managers, technicians, mechanics, electricians, and skilled workers. There is no other alternative, because the momentum at which our industries and our economy will grow depends primarily on human skills and techniques.

Equally important, the essence of education is to develop the power of

the mind. The mind should be a thing that works, that seeks. It must be cultivated to scan a wide horizon as well as to analyse in depth. In this connection, the more cultures one learns, the more languages, the more sciences, the better it is for our youths in the long run. Knowledge is both strength and growth.

By all means, encourage the study and use of national language—no one in his proper senses can dispute that. But please, let us not hear from people like the Honourable Member for Pasir Mas Hulu, “Ban this culture, ban that language, ban the Nanyang University”. What for? (*Laughter*). Sir, in fact, we are lucky that we have here already various kinds of cultures that we have inherited, like the kind of culture of the Honourable P.M.I.P. Member who is now wearing the European suit and tie. If he considers himself a nationalist he should take them off now! (*Laughter*).

Mr Chairman: I must remind the Honourable Member to please confine to the relevant subject.

Enche' Tan Toh Hong: I will, Mr Chairman, Sir. Sir, we have already the various kinds of languages and cultures that we have inherited through the process of evolution, and we can turn these into a more fertile Malaysian culture.

To glorify our geographical position as the cross-roads of Asia, and as the centre of South-East Asia, we must develop further and make this country the centre of learning in all the main cultures of Asia.

I would like to envisage the day when Asians and South-East Asians come here to Malaysia to further their studies on their respective languages and cultures—Asians like the Thais, Japanese, Burmese, Vietnamese, Laotians, Chinese, Filipinos, Indians, even Indonesians when there is no more confrontation.

Afterall, in London they have the famous School of Oriental and African Studies, which we also contributed some money; in Hawaii, the East-West Centre, in California, the schools of Russian and Chinese Studies. In Japan,

students are actively encouraged to study French, English, Russian, Spanish, Chinese, etc. Even in Communist China, the students there are made to study American, English, Russian and so forth.

Sir, I submit that education should be made the instrumentality of brighter future, so that our younger generations will become a fountain of progress and happiness. On an international context, we must train and educate our youth with the ability to stand up proudly in face of keener and keener competition, between man and man, in this world of nuclear age. (HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear! hear!).

Sir, in conclusion, may I quote a philosophical reflection of John Stuart Mill:

“Great economic and social forces flow like a tide over half-conscious people. The wise are those who foresee the coming event and seek to shape their institutions and mould the thinking of the people in accordance with the most constructive change. The unwise are those who add nothing constructive to the process, either because of ignorance on the one hand or ignorant opposition on the other.”

Enche' Jonathan Bangau anak Renang (Sarawak): Mr Chairman, Sir, I would like to touch on Supply Head S. 20 page 266, Education in the Borneo States. I fully endorse the views expressed by Honourable Members yesterday on the question of free primary education in Sarawak and Sabah. I would, however, like to add to what Honourable Members have already said in that there has been no provision in the 1965 Estimates for free primary education in Sarawak, and one would have thought that the Central Government would have budgeted at least a token sum so that the expenditure for this purpose can be supplemented at any time.

Mr Chairman, Sir, so many promises on education and development have been made by the responsible Ministers of the former Malayan Government to the people of Sarawak before Malaysia was formed. Now, I am sorry to say that the majority of the people of Sarawak, especially the Ibans, are disillusioned, particularly in the field of

education. I sincerely hope that the Acting Honourable Minister of Education will re-consider the question of free primary education for the people of Sarawak.

In conclusion, Sir, as I have heard the Honourable lady Member from Sarawak, if I understand her correctly, has alleged that the existing system of education is only to benefit the Chinese in Sarawak, I wish to clarify that her allegation is not true. In our present system of education, the mother tongue is used as a medium of instruction in the primary schools and in the secondary schools the medium of instruction is English. This applies to all schools in Sarawak which receive Government aid, irrespective of whether they are Chinese schools, Mission schools or Native schools—it does not favour any one race in that State. Thank you, Sir.

Enche' Ahmad bin Arshad (Muar Utara): Tuan Pengerusi, saya mengambil kesempatan berchakap di-dalam Kementerian ini, chuma saya hendak berchakap dalam muka 263, S. 19, Pechahan Kepala I—Pemberian kepada Sekolah Rendah.

Saya nampak bahawa dengan pemberian yang sa-umpama ini ada-lah menunjukkan yang Kerajaan kita sekarang tidak-lah berjalan untuk membenamkan kebudayaan warga negara di-dalam negeri ini sa-bagai-mana yang di-sangsikan oleh sa-tengah² ra'ayat di-dalam hal ini, ia-itu Kerajaan memberi peruntukan kepada sekolah rendah ini, sama ada Sekolah Melayu, Sekolah Tamil dan Sekolah China, tetapi di-dalam masaalah ini, Tuan Pengerusi, saya hendak sentoh sa-telah Kerajaan memberi peruntukan yang sa-macam ini. Perkara yang saya nampak keterlaluan, saya mengharap-kan kepada Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran ini supaya mengambil perhatian, sebab keadaan ini saya nampak tidak sesuai dengan sa-buah sekolah yang di-bantu oleh Kerajaan, tetapi guru², Jema'ah Pengurus Sekolah telah mengadakan satu perhimpunan, ia-itu hendak menjadikan bahasa China itu sa-bagai satu bahasa kebangsaan dalam negeri ini.

Jadi, saya nampak, Tuan Pengerusi, memang tidak sesuai-lah, kerana sekolah ini sekolah yang kita bantu, tetapi guru² yang kita gajikan itu mengambil satu langkah yang bertentangan dengan Perlembagaan kita. Perkara yang sa-macam ini akan memecahkan perpaduan negeri ini dan menanamkan satu perasaan kapada ra'ayat yang orang² China yang menjadi warga negara ini, yang di-harap-nya guru dan Jema'ah Pengurus Sekolah itu gulungan cherdek pandai bagi mereka.

Lagi satu sebab, Tuan Pengerusi, oleh sebab masa ini ada perhubungan dengan bantuan kapada sekolah² menengah—sekolah menengah yang saya suka hendak sebutkan ini ia-lah Sekolah Menengah Inggeris dan juga Sekolah Menengah China yang bahasa penghantar-nya bahasa Inggeris. Dalam sekolah menengah ini ada membiayai berhubung dengan Perpustakaan. Perpustakaan ini menjadi satu sungutan kapada penuntut² di-situ dengan mengadakan bahawa perpustakaan itu hanya di-muatkan dengan buku² bahasa Inggeris, buku² bahasa China—buku² bahasa Melayu sangat-lah kurang. Jadi, saya berharap dengan ini supaya dapat di-masa akan datang untuk menyempurnakan kehendak penuntut² di-situ dengan di-beri buku² yang di-keluarkan daripada Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka dan buku² bahasa kebangsaan keluaran daripada Indonesia untuk di-masokkan dalam perpustakaan di-sekolah² menengah. Ini ada-lah menjadi satu hasrat, menjadi satu perkembangan kapada penuntut² itu untuk mempelajari bahasa kebangsaan.

Akhir-nya, Tuan Pengerusi, berhubung dengan bantuan pada sekolah² ugama. Saya sangat ingin hendak berchakap di-dalam masaalah ini tadi yang menyebabkan saya berdiri—saya harap Kementerian ini dapat mengkaji sa-mula berhubung dengan bantuan kapada sekolah² ugama ra'ayat, sebab usaha ra'ayat dalam negeri ini mendirikan sekolah², mendirikan pondok², mengumpulkan ra'ayat negeri ini, memberikan pelajaran di-dalam didekan Islam, saya nampak pada sa'at sekarang, chuma di-beri kapada sekolah², atau pondok² yang ada menjalankan dasar yang di-kehendaki oleh

Kementerian ini. Apa yang saya harapkan, oleh sebab usaha ra'ayat yang memberikan pelajaran kepada ra'ayat negeri ini di-dalam segi ugama, kita minta ugama ini supaya berkembang, malahan pula pelajaran ugama di-pondok² itu tidak menyalahi dasar Jabatan Ugama di-tiap² Negeri. Kita mesti-lah kena timbangkan tentang sekolah pelajaran ugama di-pondok² itu juga kita sayugia beri bantuan kepada mereka, sebab kita nampak, kalau kita hendakkan ugama Islam ini supaya berkembang—sekolah ugama, pengajaran ugama di-pondok² itu hendak-lah di-beri bantuan, sebab ra'ayat bila di-buat-nya sekolah itu kadang² mereka tidak dapat menyuarakan segala kepayahan-nya, kemudian bila dia hantar ka-Pejabat Kesihatan, dia kata sekolah ini tidak dapat memberi kesihatan kepada penuntut². Jadi, ra'ayat tidak dapat hendak menyuarakan perkara yang sa-umpama itu. Pada segi pengajaran ugama, saya harap dapat di-pertimbangkan.

Ada satu perkara lagi dalam segi sekolah ugama ra'ayat ini yang sangat di-amalkan oleh ra'ayat negeri ini berhubung dengan mengaji Qur'an. Mengaji Qur'an ini di-sabuh rumah, Tuan Pengerusi, sampai dua tiga puluh orang murid belajar di-tempat itu. Ini saya nampak, kalau Qur'an itu kita jadikan satu pertandingan Qur'an, Kerajaan mengeluarkan wang, kerana ujian ini, tetapi sekarang ra'ayat di-kampong² belajar Qur'an, anak² di-kampong², kalau kita pergi ka-kampong², Tuan Pengerusi, kalau lepas waktu maghrib, nyaring-lah suara anak² kita dengan bunyi Qur'an. Kalau pukul lapan sa-tengah kita nampak-lah obor anak² kita balek dengan membawa suloh daripada getah, daripada pelepah nyior—api daripada daun nyior untuk balek sa-lepas daripada mengaji Qur'an. Apa yang saya mengharap, kalau boleh Kementerian ini, tambahan pula dia hendak menambahkan pegawai di-tempat itu supaya di-ambil tahu di-mana rumah² yang ada mengaji Qur'an dengan begitu ramai—guru atau ta' guru itu tolong-lah beri hadiah sedikit. Ini dari segi perkembangan ugama di-dalam negeri

ini. Sekian-lah, Tuan Pengerusi, terima kasih.

Sitting suspended at 1.00 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 4.30 p.m.

(Mr Speaker in the Chair)

THE SUPPLY BILL, 1965

The House immediately resolved itself into Committee of Supply. Resumption of debate on Question:

That the sum of \$320,313,351 for Heads S. 18, S. 19 and S. 20 stand part of the Schedule.

Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari: Mr Chairman, Sir, I must, first of all, thank the Honourable Members who have contributed objectively to the debate on the Education budget and I can assure them that their views will be given due consideration. On the other hand, a number of Honourable Members made certain criticisms against the Government's education policy and I feel it my duty to deal with these critics first before going on to deal with the various points that have been expressed throughout the debate.

I shall now first deal with the Honourable Member from Sarawak, Mr Ong Kee Hui. He again made a plea for the extension of free primary education to the Borneo States. In this he was supported, quite logically, by another Honourable Member from Sarawak, Mr Jonathan Bangau. He also seemed to have the support of the P.A.P. for the extension of the privilege to the Borneo States.

The Honourable Mr Ong, in the course of his speech, quoted the Malaysia Day Speech of the Yang di-Pertuan Agong in which, according to the Honourable Member, it was announced that free primary education would be extended to the Borneo States. For the benefit of this House, and with your permission, Sir, I would like to quote the relevant part of the Royal Address which was quoted by the Honourable Member. I quote—

"You all know that our Government will be implementing a new system of education, known as the Comprehensive School System, to take effect from next year. Under this

system all children will have the opportunity to study for a period of nine years and during this period, their individual aptitudes and abilities will be properly assessed and developed with the special aim of enabling every one of our future citizens to be able to play his or her proper and rightful role in the economic and social spheres of our country."

At this juncture, I would like to explain that His Majesty was then addressing the whole nation including the people in Singapore who, as we all know, on Malaysia Day retained autonomy in education. The S.U.P.P., to which Party the Honourable Mr Ong belongs, chose to capitalise on this speech and at a meeting of the Council Negeri of Sarawak on 1st October, 1964, the Honourable Mr Stephen Yong, also of the S.U.P.P., moved the following motion, i.e.

"That this House records its appreciation of His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong's Malaysia Day Message announcing the introduction of the Comprehensive School System which will give free education to all children for nine years throughout Malaysia as from 1965 and urges the Federal Government to implement the same in accordance with the terms embodied in the Inter-Government Agreement on the formation of Malaysia."

When the motion was debated, the Sarawak State Government gave the following reply to the Honourable Member. I quote—

"The policy mentioned in His Majesty's Speech was national policy. Under the existing Constitutional arrangements even though education is a Federal subject, it is well known that Singapore is autonomous in education whilst in the case of Sabah and Sarawak there would be Federal State Government consultation and agreement before there could be changes to the existing State policy and system of education. The Central Government had the intention of doing this in the near future and once this consultation has been finalised and agreement reached then it should be possible to implement the national education programme to cover the Borneo States when the question of the Comprehensive School System would, *inter alia*, be considered."

Sir, it would be seen from this therefore that for the Honourable Mr Ong and his supporters to accuse the Central Government of lack of understanding and sympathy and feeling for the people of the Borneo States has no basis whatsoever. The Honourable Mr Ong, supported by the P.A.P., mentioned the fact that the annual cost of the exten-

sion of free primary education to Sarawak would only be around \$3 million. Sir, \$3 million is a very small sum compared with over \$300 million for which I am asking this House right now. But I should like to make it clear once and for all that the decision to postpone the introduction of free primary education in Sarawak is not a question of dollars and cents. It is a question of principle. If Sarawak, or for this matter Sabah, wishes to enjoy a Federal educational privilege, then she must be ready to reconsider the present Inter-Government Committee's provision and conform to the national educational policy. When I say that Sarawak must conform to the national educational policy, I do not mean that the medium of instruction in all the schools in Sarawak must overnight be changed to the National Language. In my reply to the Adjournment speech made by the Honourable Mr Edwin anak Tangkun I made it very clear that Malay as a main medium of instruction is only one of the many aspects of the national educational policy. For anyone to suggest that the medium of instruction is the main issue is entirely wrong and misleading.

If I remember correctly, when the former colonial Government in Sarawak proposed the introduction of the present system of education in Sarawak in 1961, the S.U.P.P., of which the Honourable Mr Ong was and is still the Chairman, opposed this system on the ground that it was not national in outlook and was intended to destroy Chinese culture. In other words, it was colonial in character and therefore could not be supported by the S.U.P.P.

It would appear from the Honourable Mr Ong's speech as well as from the speeches of the Honourable Members of the P.A.P. that they would like this colonial system of education to be perpetuated in the State of Sarawak and, to make matters worse, they are suggesting that the Central Government should be a party to this by contributing funds from the Federal Treasury for the perpetuation of this colonial system of education.

Sir, we are now one nation, and we would like to see our children educated

under a system that will ensure their future as Malaysians in this country. For this reason, the Federal Government has proposed that talks be held as soon as possible between the Federal Government and the State Government of Sarawak in order to resolve this issue. No amount of talks in the newspapers, or no amount of gossiping can do any good to any party. However, I can give a categorical assurance both to my Honourable friends from Sarawak and also to this House that once this question is resolved, we shall do everything we can to help not only in the extension of primary education in Sarawak but also in the extension of the comprehensive education in Sarawak. It is my intention to go over to Sarawak at the earliest convenient time in order to thrash out the whole matter with the Sarawak Government. The welfare and happiness of the people of Sarawak is not only the concern of the P.A.P. but also ours. The only difference is that we are sincere and we have no political axe to grind. My next advice to the P.A.P. is to stop shedding crocodile tears for the people of Sabah and Sarawak. (*Applause*).

Sir, a lot of discussions took place on the question of comprehensive education. It has been alleged by the Honourable Member of the P.A.P. from Singapore that comprehensive education has been introduced without proper thought and planning and that this comprehensive education is not something new and what is worse is that this comprehensive education that we are giving to the children of this country is an election stunt.

Sir, in the past the P.A.P. used to boast that theirs was an efficient Government and capable of doing things in a lightning flash way. Sir, now we are trying to do something quick, something worthwhile, something that we believe in for the good of the children of this country but, instead of getting bouquets, we get bombardments from them.

Sir, in my opening speech, I never for once made any claim that this comprehensive education that we are giving to the children of this country is something new. It has been practised in

many countries for decades, but I say it is new to Malaysia. It is a programme that will really give equal opportunity to all our children—giving them the opportunity to develop to the fullest degree their potentialities and then to develop this by giving the type of education that will best meet these requirements. For Malaysia, it is a total reorganisation of our secondary education, away from the system that we had inherited from the colonial past. For these reasons, it is new, and I would say it is historical to us; and we mean to do our best to make this a success. As I said in my opening speech, we expect to come across a lot of difficulties and also some teething troubles, but let us not be deterred by these. Comprehensive education has worked out well in so many other countries, and there is no reason whatsoever why in Malaysia we could not make this a success.

Sir, the Honourable Member from the P.A.P. also belittled the free education that the Alliance Government has been giving to the children of this country. They say that they have started this years ago. I think it is quite illogical for anyone to compare a little island with a peninsula with over seven million people. (*Applause*). It is just like comparing our country with India, which is a sub-continent. So, what Singapore can do, we have tried to do, and the Honourable Member himself should be in a better position to appreciate the difficulties that we here have got to face, the amount of forests that we have got to wade through, the amount of difficulties in meeting the people and in persuading the people, the mentality of the people in this country as compared with more sophisticated type in Singapore, and all these troubles that we have to contend with in trying to make certain educational reforms in this country.

Sir, then the Honourable Member also talked about higher education in the Chinese medium. This is not something new. The Honourable Member from Seremban Barat has very ably replied to this, and I do not intend to go over it once again. The P.A.P. tried this tactic in

the last General Elections and as a result of this, a number of their candidates lost their deposits. (*Laughter*). My advice to my friends—when I say “friends”, I mean them—in the P.A.P. is to stop this communal politics as it is just like playing with fire and it does not pay in the long run.

On the subject of Nanyang University, my Honourable friend from Teluk Anson and also my Honourable friend from Seremban Barat have replied quite at length, and I do not propose to repeat it again.

Then I go on next to the Honourable Mr Ong Pang Boon from Singapore too who said that our system as proposed is inadequate and wasteful as compared to Singapore's. The same reasoning goes as I said just now: it is not fair to compare a closely-knit territory such as Singapore with the extensiveness of the area as in our country here in the Malay Peninsula. Then the Honourable Member also touched on the question of the provision for increase in teacher training. I would say that it is true that we have not made any provision for increase in teacher training, but, for a beginning, what we are trying to do is to make use of experienced teachers to be part-time, week-end and also vacation courses lecturers; and for the information of this House, we have already started these courses. It is still going on here in Kuala Lumpur.

The Honourable Mr Ong Pang Boon also said that we have not yet built schools to provide the facilities for the starting of comprehensive education. For his information, I would say that the schools are now being built and they should be ready very soon, but in the meantime, as stated in my opening speech, there might be certain difficulties and inconveniences caused to the students. But these inconveniences will be short-lived. We hope we will be able to solve this teething trouble within the next one or two months. He also stated that we have not finalised the syllabuses for the comprehensive education. For his information, the syllabuses have been finalised and if the Honourable Member is interested, I can show him a copy of the syllabuses.

The same Honourable Member also referred to the Comprehensive education system as merely delaying selection to after the ninth year and stated that because of this there will be wastage. He further commented that there is no provision to provide education beyond this point. For the information of the Honourable Member, 1965 will be the first year of implementation and this will be completed by the end of 1967. In January, 1968 there will be schools—upper secondary vocational and academic—to provide for education for the livelihood of our children. Financial provision for this will be set aside at the appropriate time and there will be sufficient time to plan for this. In terms of percentage, 100% of all those joining Standard I will have a chance to go to Form III. After the Comprehensive lower secondary education, 25% to 30% will go to academic and the others will have a chance to go for vocational training.

Now I go to the Honourable Member from Batu—since he is here. He wants an assurance that all Standard VI pupils will be given a chance to go to Form I. I can assure that the Ministry will provide Form I places to all Standard VI pupils when the Comprehensive education system starts in January next year. The facilities, as I said just now, might in some cases be a little inconvenient to the pupils, but this will only be temporary and I hope with the co-operation of the parents this will be soon overcome. He also touched on the question of teaching Tamil and Chinese in the national-type schools. I am told that the Ministry is in the course of tightening up and streamlining the procedure so as to make the implementation of this policy more effective.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: On a point of clarification, do I have an assurance from the Minister that every child whose parents wish the child to learn his mother tongue, as I quoted this morning, will be given a chance to do so? Do I have a definite assurance from the Acting Minister on that?

Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari: I have already stated that the Ministry will be tightening up the machinery

and everything possible will be done to provide facilities for the teaching of these languages to the students where required. Then the Honourable Member also touched on the question of admission into the Department of Chinese Studies in the University of Malaya. He says it has been closed to Chinese students who receive education in Chinese only at the primary level. The fact that the Chinese language and literature is a medium only at the primary level and is a subject in the secondary and sixth form levels does not prevent students from joining the Department of Chinese Studies in the University of Malaya. The Honourable Member himself is aware that the admission requirement into the Department is a Higher School Certificate with Chinese at principal level as a "must". Such a Higher School Certificate could be taken by all Chinese students under our national secondary school system, which has only two media of instruction but with sufficient periods set aside for the learning of Chinese.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: On a point of clarification, if I understand the Minister correctly, then instruction in Chinese language and Chinese literature is also provided for at Form VI level—Lower VI and Upper VI. Is that the statement made by the Minister? Is that the condition prevailing at this moment?

Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari: Well, provision is made also for the teaching of Chinese at higher levels than the School Certificate level.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: My information is that it is not—that is why I am asking the Minister.

Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari: I think the Honourable Member's information must be wrong. Then the Honourable Member for Batu also talked on the proposed University College in Penang. He asked why has not the University authorities been consulted on this matter. Now, the proposal for establishing a University College at Penang is still in the planning stage. No firm proposals have yet been

received from the Penang State Government. These proposals, when received, will be considered by the Ministry in conjunction with the Higher Education Planning Committee. Only when it is decided what the status of this College will be will the University authorities be consulted.

On the question of the hunger strike just right in front of the Ministry of Education, I issued a statement on this matter and I do not wish to repeat that statement in the House on the whole issue; and also something is being done to persuade this man to try to eat something. (*Laughter*).

Now, I go on to another Honourable Member from Sarawak, Enche' Jonathan Bangau. I do not propose to repeat what I have already said in reply to the Honourable Member from Sarawak, Enche' Ong Kee Hui.

The Honourable Member for Seremban Barat brought up the question of the time for the teaching of Chinese language in the secondary schools, particularly in the proposed comprehensive schools. I can assure the Honourable Member that I will look into this matter and everything possible will be done in order to accommodate as far as possible the wishes as expressed by the Honourable Member. In this connection, I would also like to refer to an assurance which was sought by the Honourable Member that in implementing this comprehensive education the policy will not be changed in regard to the teaching of the Chinese and Tamil languages in the comprehensive education, as indicated by my predecessor when he introduced the amendment to the Education Act recently. The introduction of the comprehensive education affects only the programme changes and not policy changes. Amongst the policy, as you all know, is that of preserving and sustaining the languages and cultures of the other peoples other than the Malays. This the Government will adhere, and sufficient teaching time will be set aside for the instruction of Chinese and Tamil languages accordingly.

The Honourable Member for Penang Utara brought up the question of higher educational facilities in this country. He says that they are inadequate. I, myself, personally admit that they are inadequate and everything possible should be done to provide more facilities for higher education in this country, and it is for this reason that the Government thought it necessary to set up a Higher Planning Committee with the Minister of Education as the Chairman and with several other Ministers as members, in order to plan as a long-term measure what sort of higher education we should have for this country. I think Honourable Members will agree with me that in the planning of higher education in this country, we should be careful to see that everything that is done should be national in character and also should be of an acceptable academic standard. We cannot afford to be lenient in our policy towards the establishment of private institutions which are of sub-standard types.

The Honourable Member for Tanjong Malim brought up the question of teacher training. I can give him an assurance that care is always taken in selecting proper persons to be trained as teachers. Normally on the Selection Board, for the purpose of interviewing teachers, we have unofficals who sit along with officials to interview the applicants.

Now, with regard to another question brought up by the Honourable Member for Penang Utara, I would like to inform him that the ultimate objective, as laid down in the Razak Report on our national education policy, as we all know, is to have a system in which the National language is the main medium of instruction as recommended in paragraph 12 of the Razak Report and as further enunciated in the preamble to the Education Act of 1961. Now, in implementing this policy, regard will be given to the wishes of the parents and their intention of preserving and sustaining the languages and cultures of the major sections of our population, namely, the Chinese and the Indians, consonant with the primary objective just mentioned by me.

That, in short, is for the policy adopted by the Government now and it is not the intention of the Government to depart from this Policy.

Sekarang saya suka mengambil peluang bagi menjawab beberapa hujah yang telah di-sebutkan oleh Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang lain, dengan ringkas-nya terutama sa-kali saya suka menjawab Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Kuala Lipis yang telah menyebutkan berkenaan dengan University Malaya—ada juga Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang lain pula telah menyebutkan soal itu. Saya suka memberi pengakuan bahawa Kementerian ini sedang berusaha bagi menjadikan universiti kita itu bilingual dengan sa-beberapa chepat yang boleh dan untuk pengetahuan Ahli² Yang Berhormat juga bahawa jawatan Vice-Chancellor yang ada sekarang ini akan tamat dalam pertengahan tahun yang akan datang, dan kita berharap akan dapat di-isikan tempat itu dengan sa-orang anak tempatan dan pada masa itu, saya perchaya segala rancangan kita bagi menjayakan apa yang di-sebutkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat itu dapat di-jalankan dengan lebeh tegas lagi.

Ahli Yang Berhormat itu juga telah menyebutkan berkenaan dengan guru pelawat. Sa-bagaimana kita ma'alum, mengikut shor Jawatan-kuasa Penye-mak Pelajaran Tahun 1960 jawatan guru² pelawat akan di-hapuskan memandang kepada keadaan² tempat. Ini akan di-buat dan pegawai² yang menjadi guru² pelawat sekarang ini akan di-masokkan ka-dalam perkhid-matan, sama ada di-dalam perkhid-matan² Kerajaan, atau pun jawatan² di-sekolah di-mana mereka itu akan di-beri tugas² yang baharu mengikut keadaan yang ada di-tempat itu.

Ahli Yang Berhormat itu juga telah menyebutkan berkenaan dengan Sekolah Agama Ra'ayat, kata-nya patut-lah kita mengadakan pelawat² rahsia supaya terelak daripada perkara siasah masok ka-dalam sekolah² agama. Ini saya suka memberitahu kepada Ahli² Yang Berhormat bahawa memang ada satu syarat, ia-itu apabila kita memberi bantuan kepada Sekolah² Agama, jika

sa-kira-nya di-dapati ada perkara² politik berlaku di-Sekolah Ugama itu, maka pehak Kementerian berhak menarek balek bantuan yang di-beri kepada sekolah tersebut.

Saya suka menjawab Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Pontian Selatan, dan juga Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Singapura sa-kali. Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Pontian Selatan telah menyebutkan bahawa beliau telah mengkeritik beberapa orang pegawai di-dalam Kementerian dan dia mengatakan bahawa mereka itu menjalankan sa-tengah² dasar Kerajaan dengan tidak betul. Maka dengan sebab itu, ranchangan Sekolah Pelajaran Lanjutan telah gagal. Saya suka memberitahu kepada Ahli Yang Berhormat itu bahawa kegagalan Sekolah Pelajaran Lanjutan bukan-lah di-sebabkan oleh salah perlaksanaannya, tetapi ranchangan ini tidak mendapat sambutan daripada ibu bapa. Daripada 117,000 kanak² yang di-beri peluang masuk ka-sekolah itu pada tahun 1962 hanya 21,000 kanak² sahaja yang telah menerima tawaran itu. Pada tahun 1963 pula daripada 104,000 yang di-tawarkan, hanya 14,000 sahaja yang telah menerima. Ibu bapa memandang rendah kepada Sekolah Pelajaran Lanjutan ini bagi anak²-nya, dengan sebab ada di-antara kanak² yang belajar di-situ yang tidak lulus di-dalam peperiksaan masuk ka-sekolah menengah. Ranchangan yang demikian rupa itu ia-lah hasil daripada shor Jawatankuasa Penyemak Pelajaran 1960 yang terdiri daripada Ahli² Parlimen. Daripada mula ranchangan itu, seperti mana yang kita ketahui, ada-lah di-tolak oleh orang ramai.

Perkara yang lain² yang telah disebutkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat itu, saya ambil ingatan, tetapi satu perkara yang saya sebutkan di-sini, tidak 'adil bagi mana² juga Ahli Parlimen menuduh, meletakkan satu kesalahan itu ka-atas mana² pegawai. Kerana sa-bagai Menteri maka Kerajaan, pada umum-nya, bertanggungjawab di-atas apa juga yang di-buat oleh pegawai² Kerajaan. Jika di-dapati ada kesalahan di-mana pehak, di-mana² pehak pegawai Kerajaan berlaku tidak 'adil di-dalam mereka itu menjalankan kerja, saya pinta Ahli²

Yang Berhormat membawa perkara ini kepada perhatian saya sendiri, kalau saya duduk dalam Kementerian ini atau kepada Menteri yang berkenaan supaya dapat di-ambil tindakan yang tegas terhadap pegawai yang berkenaan.

Kemudian saya suka menjawab kepada Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Seberang Utara. Ia telah mengeshorkan supaya kita meneruskan juga peperiksaan darjah enam untuk menjadikan satu panduan bagi pilihan untuk pelajaran akademik di-dalam Sekolah² Menengah. Peperiksaan demikian tidak dapat di-teruskan kerana ini akan bertentangan dengan asas pelajaran Aneka Jurusan yang bertujuan untuk memberi pelajaran 'am yang boleh membentuk bakat dan kebolehan murid² itu. Pemilihan kepada akademik dan bukan akademik hanya ia-lah sa-sudah pelajaran Aneka Jurusan. Jadi-nya memilih murid² sa-chara peperiksaan berakademik sa-bagaimana yang di-shorkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat itu akan bertentangan dengan tujuan pelajaran Aneka Jurusan yang di-sokong oleh kebanyakan daripada Ahli² Yang Berhormat sakalian.

Kemudian berkenaan dengan pelajaran tulisan Jawi. Maka pelajaran untuk tulisan Jawi hari ini ada-lah diusahakan dan saya boleh memberi pengakuan kepada Yang Berhormat itu, usaha bagi mengembangkan tulisan Jawi itu akan di-jalankan dari satu masa ka-satu masa.

Kemudian Ahli Yang Berhormat itu juga bertanya ada-kah remove class atau pun kelas peralehan, darjah peralehan, itu akan di-laksanakan selepas kita adakan pelaksanaan Aneka Jurusan ini. Ini akan di-teruskan kerana apabila kanak² itu keluar daripada Sekolah Rendah, menukarkan bahasa penghantar-nya, maka terpaksa-lah kita mengadakan darjah latehan untuk memberi kesempatan bagi kanak² itu belajar bahasa yang akan menjadi bahasa penghantar di-dalam Sekolah Aneka Jurusan itu.

Kemudian saya suka pada 'am-nya menjawab pada sa-takat ini berkenaan dengan buku² teks. Ada banyak Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang telah berchakap atas perkara ini. Saya suka memberi

tahu kepada Ahli² Yang Berhormat bahawa pihak Kementerian dalam bulan September yang lalu telah pun menghantarkan surat keliling kepada semua Ketua Pelajaran Negeri² untuk mengambil tindakan dalam soal buku teks ini dan perkara ini sedang pun di-jalankan.

Kemudian ada juga keretik berkenaan dengan kelambatan buku² itu sampai. Kadang² mengikut Ahli daripada Pontian Selatan sampai bulan sebelas baharu sampai buku itu. Yang sa-benar-nya buku² ini kelambatan-nya bukan dengan sebab daripada Kementerian Pelajaran. Jadi kita sudah ada arrangement dengan pihak Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka apabila sedia sahaja buku, di-hantar kepada sekolah. Jadi kadang² buku baharu siap dalam bulan enam, bulan enam juga di-hantar ka-sekolah. Kalau siap dalam bulan sepuluh, bulan sepuluh di-hantar. Jadi ini satu perkara yang tidak boleh di-elakkan kerana ini pekerjaan yang dibuat oleh Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, tetapi perkara ini kita akan kemaskan lagi supaya segala kemushkilan yang di-sebutkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat itu dapat kita atasi pada masa yang akan datang.

Kemudian Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Pontian Selatan telah menyebut berkenaan dengan pelajaran² dan Sekolah² Ugama, terutama sa-kali Sekolah² Ugama Ra'ayat. Kata-nya di-mana banyak berlaku kekechewaan di-kalangan anak² kita. Saya menyokong di-atas hal ini kerana saya sendiri ada-lah daripada dahulu pun sampai sekarang, sunggoh pun saya tukar Kementerian, memang saya sunggoh² berasa mushkil kerana keadaan ini maseh berjalan lagi. Sa-benar-nya pihak Kementerian tidak ada kuasa penoh dalam hal Sekolah² Ugama Ra'ayat. Jika sa-kira-nya kita tidak mendapat kerjasama yang penoh daripada Kerajaan Negeri, tidak mungkin yang kita dapat menjalankan perubahan² bagitu jitu, bagitu giat, di-dalam soal memperbaiki lagi keadaan Sekolah² Ugama. Memang saya tahu beribu² kanak² kita yang dudok dalam Sekolah tidak tahu di-mana hendak pergi apabila mereka ini tamat latehan. Jadi bagi pihak diri saya, saya bagi

pengakuan bahawa perkara ini akan mendapat timbangan yang berat daripada pihak Kementerian dan kita akan chuba dengan sa-bberapa daya upaya yang boleh untuk mendapatkan kerjasama daripada Kerajaan² Negeri untuk membaiki keadaan Sekolah Ugama ini.

Kemudian Ahli Yang Berhormat Che' Ajibah, daripada Sarawak, telah meminta pihak Kementerian menem-patkan pegawai² daripada Kementerian², Pegawai² Pelajaran daripada Kementerian, pergi ka-Sarawak. Sa-bberapa boleh juga kita chuba-lah, tinggal lagi saya sendiri tidak boleh meletakkan sa-orang pegawai pun di-dalam negeri Sarawak melainkan pegawai itu di-pinta oleh Kerajaan Sarawak. Jadi sunggoh pun pelajaran itu menjadi satu Federal subject, tetapi mengikut keadaan perjanjian yang dibuat dahulu, kita tidak boleh buat bagitu. Jadi kalau Sarawak meminta baharu boleh, kalau tidak, hantar juga, di-hantar balek, malu sahaja perkara ini.

Kemudian Yang Berhormat daripada Kuala Trengganu Utara telah meminta supaya pensharah² daripada Jabatan Islamic Study dalam Universiti kita yang sa-patut-nya mengikut National, apa pun tidak tahu, yang sa-benar-nya kita chuba-lah hendak dapat macham itu, kadang² tidak boleh dapat. Kalau boleh dapat memang-lah Lembaga Pemilihan itu akan memberi ke-utamaan kepada chalun² yang mempunyai kelayakan yang sa-umpama itu.

Kemudian Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Pasir Mas Ulu telah mengatakan bahawa buku² tawarikh ada yang isi-nya tidak sesuai dengan segi national. Perkara ini sedang di-usahakan dan apabila kita dapat mengadakan buku² yang lebeh sesuai lagi, maka buku² yang sa-macham itu akan di-tarek balek daripada sekolah². Kemudian dia mengeshorkan lagi sa-kali berkenaan dengan bahasa kebangsaan. Dia telah mengeshorkan patut kita mengadakan Undang² bagi memaksa orang menggunakan bahasa kebangsaan terutama sa-kali dalam masa Bulan Bahasa. Jadi saya tidak tahu-lah kalau tidak tentu, kalau ada Undang² pun dia tidak mahu pakai, boleh buat macham mana. Macham

sekarang ini pun ada Undang², Undang² Khalwat, tetapi orang hendak khalwat juga. (*Ketawa*). Jangan kata orang biasa, orang² PAS pun khalwat juga. (*Ketawa*). Itu Undang² Tuhan pun ada, Undang² kita di-sini pun ada, itu pun di-buat kerja itu juga (*Ketawa*). Jadi jangan Ahli Yang Berhormat itu ingat kita sudah buat Undang² itu tentu berjaya. Jalan yang baik sa-kali ia-lah jalan kita buat sekarang ini, dengan kita adakan Bulan Bahasa, ia-itu jalan psychology. Yang macham itu lebeh baik lagi daripada kita gunakan Undang². Ini Undang², lepas itu kita hendak gunakan kuasa military pula.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tadi tuan Menteri ada berkata khalwat di-antara PAS. Boleh-kah saya bertanya ada-kah khalwat dalam anggota UMNO? (*Ketawa*).

Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari: Mungkin ada, tetapi belum kena tangkap lagi. (*Ketawa*).

Yang Berhormat itu juga, kalau saya tidak salah, telah menchadangkan berkenaan dengan buku² Dewan Bahasa ia-itu Dewan Bahasa patut mengadakan ejen untuk menjual buku² ini. Dalam waktu kita membahathkan Anggaran Perbelanjaan Kementerian Pertanian dan Sharikat Bekerjasama banyak Ahli² Yang Berhormat, terutama sa-kali daripada bangku PAS telah bangun mesti kita chari jalan untuk menghapuskan orang-tengah. Sekarang ini Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada PAS chadangkan kita patut adakan orang-tengah (*Ketawa*).

Enche' Abdul Samad bin Gul Ahmad Mianji: Saya maksudkan bukan beri kapada orang-tengah, saya maksudkan beri kapada penjual² buku yang ada di-bandar Kuala Lumpur ini; beri dia peluang supaya dia boleh hidup.

Enche' Mohamd Khir Johari: Dalam ekonomi itu di-panggil orang-tengah-lah (*Ketawa*). Jadi, sekarang ini Dewan Bahasa buat terus. Apa ke-untungan yang di-dapati daripada penjualan buku itu di-dapati balek kapada Kerajaan dan kita belanjakan wang itu untuk kebaikan bagi membangunkan Bahasa Kebangsaan.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah (Kelantan Hilir): Ada-lah di-maksudkan orang-tengah ia-lah orang yang menghisap darah yang mana ada di-kampung ada-lah harga

Mr Chairman: Hendak bertanya-kah? (*Ketawa*).

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah: Untuk penjelasan. Ada pun ejen² buku apabila di-lantek oleh Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka harga-nya tetap dan tidak ada tipu daya di-situ. Kita bangkitkan soal orang-tengah (middlemen) di-kampung² ada yang menipu dan harga-nya tidak tetap, orang-tengah mengikut hawa nafsu membeli benda itu dan mengikut timbangan-nya, maka dari segi ini PAS menchadangkan supaya middlemen itu di-hapuskan.

Enche' Mohamed Khir bin Johari: Saya kata middleman itu tidak kira apa bangsa. Pada asas-nya kita sa-boleh²-nya memang tidak mahu ada middleman walau apa bangsa sa-kali pun. Kalau kita boleh buat sendiri, kita jalankan sendiri saperti mana yang di-buat oleh Dewan Bahasa, dan saya suka memberitahu Ahli Yang Berhormat itu ia-itu saya tidak berchadang hendak menukar polisi itu (*Tepok*).

Berkenaan dengan Malaysia Hall, London, ada juga Ahli Yang Berhormat itu menyebutkan berkenaan dengan masakan² dan sa-bagai-nya. Perkara itu saya akan siasat dan apa tindakan yang sa-patut-nya akan di-ambil untuk mengatasi perkara ini.

Bagitu juga Yang Berhormat dari Seberang Utara telah menyebutkan berkenaan dengan tidak chukup tempat di-Dewan Malaysia, London, dan patut di-besarkan. Perkara ini akan di-timbangkan juga oleh pehak Kerajaan.

Saya suka menguchapkan banyak terima kaseh kapada Yang Berhormat dari Kota Star Selatan yang telah mengshorkan berkenaan dengan la-tehan doktor, kata-nya, patut-lah kita menengok balek kapada chara² kita melateh doktor pada tahun 1906 dahulu. Saya memberi pengakuan kapada Ahli Yang Berhormat itu bahawa shor-nya itu akan di-sampaikan kapada Jawatan-kuasa Pelajaran Tinggi untuk mendapatkan timbangan.

Yang Berhormat dari Pasir Mas Hilir telah menyebutkan berkenaan dengan Form (VI) bahagian sains di-negeri Kelantan kata-nya dia telah menyuarakan ketiadaan langsung Kementerian bagi mengadakan pelajaran sains peringkat Form (VI) di-Kelantan dan juga beliau telah mengemukakan beberapa chadangan patut di-timbang-kan oleh pihak Kementerian. Saya suka memberi pengakuan bahawa shor-nya itu akan di-timbangkan.

Berkenaan dengan pepereksaan. Ada Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang telah menyebut berkenaan dengan kertas pepereksaan. Ada yang mengatakan kita patut-lah tidak ada lagi menggunakan nama dalam kertas² pepereksaan. Perkara yang sa-macam ini tidak dapat di-lakukan kerana mengikut Perjanjian kita dengan pihak Cambridge, maka perkara itu akan diteruskan sa-hingga pada satu masa yang akan datang kelak. Ahli Yang Berhormat itu juga telah menyebutkan berkenaan dengan berlaku kejadian yang tidak di-ingini apabila sampai masa pepereksaan, tetapi Yang Berhormat dari Lipis telah menjawab hal ini, kata-nya sa-kali sahaja terjadi bukan-lah selalu. Jadi, saya terima kasih-lah kepada Yang Berhormat dari Lipis yang telah menjawab atas perkara itu. Saya ingat lain perkara yang di-sebutkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat itu berkenaan dengan biasiswa patut di-adakan banyak lagi untuk anak² Melayu supaya dapat peluang. Itu saya akan ambil ingatan dan sa-berapa daya yang boleh akan di-jalankan.

Sa-perkara lagi perkara yang saya hendak menjawab ia-lah kepada Yang Berhormat dari Perlis Selatan yang telah menhadangkan supaya kita mengadakan maktab arts atau crafts dan juga maktab fine arts. Jadi saya suka memberitahu kepada-nya bahawa chadangan mengadakan school of fine arts sedang di-timbangan oleh pihak Kerajaan dan apabila sudah dapat keputusan nanti pihak Kementerian akan mengeshorkan berapa banyak wang yang patut di-untukkan bagi membena sekolah ini.

Ahli Yang Berhormat itu juga telah menyebutkan satu perkara ia-itu telah

berlaku di-Australia semenjak berlaku pergaduhan antara orang Melayu dengan orang China di-Singapura sudah berlaku salah faham antara penuntut² di-Australia ia-itu penuntut² Melayu dengan penuntut² yang bukan Melayu. Perkara itu saya dukachita mendengar-nya dan saya akan selideki atas hal itu dan apa² juga tindakan yang sesuai akan di-ambil. Berkenaan dengan chadangan-nya supaya di-adakan guru ugama di-Malaysia Hall, London, itu akan di-timbangkan.

Yang Berhormat dari Jelebu-Jempol telah menhadangkan supaya mana² penuntut yang sudah dapat biasiswa Kerajaan sa-kira-nya dia hendak lepas daripada Agreement yang sudah ditandatangani dengan Kerajaan patut-lah kita chari jalan supaya menyekat mereka itu lari daripada jawatan-nya dengan kita mengadakan denda yang berlipatganda supaya mereka itu tidak dapat keluar daripada jawatan itu. Perkara itu akan di-ambil ingatan dan sa-tengah-nya pun sudah di-jalankan.

Ahkir-nya sa-kali, saya suka hendak menjawab pandangan Yang Berhormat dari Bachok, kerana dalam semua sa-kali Ahli² Yang Berhormat dia-lah yang tidak bersetuju sangat kepada dasar comprehensive education atau aneka jurusan—nampak-nya dia-lah sa-orang yang kuat benar tidak bersetuju. Saya suka-lah menjawab khas kepada-nya. Yang Berhormat itu mengatakan sistem aneka jurusan ini ia-lah sistem kominis. Saya suka memberitahu kepada Ahli Yang Berhormat itu sistem ini bukan sahaja di-jalankan oleh negeri² kominis tetapi juga oleh beberapa buah negeri yang democratic.

Enche' Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Saya tidak berkata bahawa comprehensive education ini hak kominis, tetapi saya berkata berasal daripada kominis, sampai kepada Amerika dan di-buat oleh Britain, oleh Kerajaan Buroh, tetapi masa Kerajaan Buroh itu dia failed (kechewa). Jadi, sebab itu saya memberi pandangan supaya kita jangan kechewa sa-bagaimana kechewa-nya Kerajaan Buroh itu.

Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari: Kerajaan Buroh ini Kerajaan lain, ini Kerajaan Perikatan (*Ketawa*). Ini saya

kata kalau Kerajaan Kominis buat ini sa-kali pun, kita tidak langsung teragak² kita hendak tiru, apa yang baik dari negeri kominis kita tiru daripada negeri kominis, apa yang tidak baik kita tinggalkan. Jadi kita tidak boleh fanatic kapada mana² negeri. Kita bukan fanatic kapada England—U.K. buat ini kita patut turut U.K. Kita pilih mana yang baik kita ambil yang baik, mana yang jahat kita buang ka-tepi. Itu-lah dasar yang di-jalankan oleh Kerajaan Perikatan.

Lagi satu kata-nya, dasar yang kita jalankan—dasar aneka jurusan ini akan membawa kapada feudalism. Saya kata kapada Ahli Yang Berhormat itu, saya nasehatkan betul² dengan ikhlas kapada Ahli Yang Berhormat, kalau sa-benarnya dia itu anti sangat kapada feudal saya nasehatkan, tolong nasehatkanlah pondok² ugama yang ada di-Kelantan ia-itu yang menyokong PAS. Saya kata, bagi nasehat mereka itu chuba ubahkan—tukarkan pondok itu menjadi sekolah yang sa-benar²-nya memberi pelajaran yang dinamik kapada anak² kita. Jangan kita bawa macham ini; dia larat kata feudalism. Ini satu chara yang sa-benar² progressive, yang demokratik, yang dapat memandukan apa sahaja mengikut kehendak budak itu sendiri, macham mana kita katakan itu feudalism?

Enche' Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Tuan Pengerusi, oleh kerana Menteri Yang Berhormat kita itu terlampau interested dalam perkara ini, saya suka-lah memperkatakan bahawa yang saya maksudkan itu bukan-lah masalaah pondok² di-Kelantan, tetapi saya berchakap di-atas policy bagi negeri ini. Ada pun tentang hendak menambah di-situ, saya menyebutkan dengan ikhlas di-sini, saya amat-lah interested di-dalam Ministry of Education ini dan saya telah bekerjasama walau pun saya daripada pehak Pembangkang dan telah menolong menyusun L.C.E. dan F.M.C. dengan Islamic Studies dan 20 buah buku karangan saya dan telah mendapat kata sambutan daripada Menteri Pelajaran yang dahulu. Jadi, bukan-lah bererti saya membangkang sa-mata² menudoh system itu feudal. Bukan sa-mata² untuk membangkang.

Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari: Itu-lah saya katakan tadi, dia tidak boleh katakan feudal. Guna perkataan feudal itu pun sudah salah, fasal ini anti feudal (*Ketawa*), bukan saya marah apa² (*Ketawa*). Jadi, kalau kita hendak tunggu saperti mana yang di-shorkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dan daripada PAS juga, apa akan jadi kapada anak² kita, tiap² tahun beratus ribu keluar tidak dapat pelajaran langsung. Kita takut hendak buat salah, kalau kita takut hendak buat salah, saya katakan ta' usah-lah jadi jantan dan Kerajaan Perikatan (*Ketawa*) ini adalah Kerajaan jantan, dia berani buat salah dan dia berani pikul bebanan (*Tepok*). Itu-lah sahaja, terima kaseh.

Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$320,313,351 for Heads S. 18, S. 19, S. 20 ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Sitting suspended at 5.50 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 6.10 p.m.

Head S. 21—

Dr Tan Chee Khoon (Batu): Mr Chairman, Sir, I have given notice of an amendment under Standing Order 67 (7) on Head S. 21. May I move the amendment now?

Mr Chairman: Yes.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Chairman, Sir, in proposing this cut of a token sum of \$1 from the salary of the Menteri Luar Negeri, Head 21, Sub-head 1, item (1), I am conscious of the fact that my move may be misinterpreted by some members who would think that it is intended to ridicule or belittle the Prime Minister who is also the Minister for External Affairs. Far from it, I have the greatest respect and regard for our Prime Minister and I was indeed surprised to note, as I have said before when we debated Head S. 7—Prime Minister, that his salary as Prime Minister is only \$4,000 per mensem which is only \$1,000 more than that drawn by his colleagues in the Cabinet. This is hardly commensurate with the dignity, responsibilities and burdens of his high office. Accordingly, Mr Chairman, Sir, as members of this House know, it

was I who proposed that when confrontation ends and when the finances of the country are in a better condition, we should think of increasing the salary of the Prime Minister. I hope this action of mine in proposing this cut will not give rise to the thought in anyone that it is intended to ridicule or belittle the Prime Minister.

Mr Chairman, Sir, however, my decision to propose this cut is in accordance with the usual parliamentary practice to focus attention on the foreign policy of the Government, so that we can have a full-scale debate on it and to save the Government from embarrassment. However, as time is short, it is not my intention today to initiate such a debate. It is only my intention to focus the attention of this House on this important matter.

It is indeed incredible that in all the nine years that the Alliance Party has been in power that there has been no debate on foreign affairs. One would have thought that any government for its own good would now and then have full-scale debates on such important matters as foreign policy, defence, economic policy, etc. However, the Alliance Government is always afraid of any critical appraisal of its policies. Not only does the Alliance Government not initiate debates on these matters that I have mentioned, but, on the contrary, it blocks any efforts on the part of the Opposition to bring up such matters for discussion. Most of the members of the House will recall that it took the late Dato' Onn more than a year to bring his motion on *Tanah Melayu* to be debated in the last Parliament. Members of this House will also notice that the three motions standing in my name have been on the Order Paper since July this year and, as I have mentioned before in my speech on the second reading of the Budget, I am not sanguine enough to hope that my motion will be debated for another year to come if the attitude of the Government still persists. However, Mr Chairman, Sir, we have had an assurance from the Prime Minister that time will be given to Opposition members to discuss the matters that they bring before this House. This is,

of course, a result of the tyranny of the majority of the Alliance Party and by now the country must realise that this massive majority that the Alliance Party enjoys does nobody any good—not even the Alliance Party itself.

To get around this, I have decided on this amendment in the hope, albeit a slim one, that by focussing attention on foreign affairs the Alliance Government on its own accord will publish a White Paper on its foreign policy so that we can have a full-scale debate on it and the people of this country also will have a chance to know and discuss what is the foreign policy of this country.

Mr Chairman, Sir, I decided to focus attention on our foreign policy, or more correctly the Alliance foreign policy, because I believe that more than anything else it is the source of our difficulties at this moment. All too long it has been very vague, confused and contradictory. Sometimes the foreign policy is said to be a neutral policy and sometimes it is claimed to be definitely pro-West. None other than the Prime Minister once said, while speaking to a group of students, that he was proud to be pro-West and regretted that some nations thought it not fashionable to be pro-West whilst receiving aid from the West. I fail to understand the logic of the argument. It follows the simple saying that he who pays the piper must be permitted to call the tune. This attitude clearly belied the protestations of our Government. It shows to what extent we are subservient or to what extent we are prepared to allow ourselves to be dictated to by other foreign powers who give aid to us. Above all, it shows unmistakably that we are not neutral. Mr Chairman, Sir, this is further confirmed by the Defence Treaty with Britain which permit the continuation of military bases and stationing of troops and, above all, it permits the use of these bases and troops for the defence of any part of South East Asia. The relevant part of the agreement reads as follows—Mr Chairman, Sir, this is the agreement concluded between the Federation of Malaya, the United Kingdom of

Great Britain and Northern Ireland, North Borneo, Sarawak and Singapore. I quote—

“The Government of Malaysia will afford to the Government of the United Kingdom the right to continue to maintain the bases and other facilities at present occupied by their service authorities within the state of Singapore and will permit the Government of the United Kingdom to make such use of these bases and facilities as that Government may consider necessary for the purpose of assisting in the defence of Malaysia and for Commonwealth defence and for the preservation of peace in South East Asia.”

Mr Chairman, Sir, the last few words are the damaging ones—“and for the preservation of peace in South East Asia.” You will note, Mr Chairman, that these bases and facilities are not only for the defence of Malaysia and the Commonwealth but also for the preservation of peace in South East Asia.

Mr Chairman, Sir, the pace in any country can be disturbed by the folly of its own Government and it does not necessarily need any outside aggressor. As such, the foreign forces here could be used without the sanction of this country to prop up an inefficient and corrupt Government. It can also be used to suppress the legitimate aspirations of subject peoples to free themselves from their colonial yoke. As such we have become indirectly at least tools of imperialistic governments to perpetuate colonial rule directly or indirectly in this part of the world. It is the acceptance of this role by Malaysia that has brought us to distrust and disfavour among Afro-Asian nations, almost all of which have cast away their colonial yokes and have declared themselves to free other countries from that same yoke. Therefore, our action is against their declared policy and is there any wonder that we are not looked upon with favour in the Afro-Asian group?

Furthermore, the Afro-Asian nations have accepted non-alignment and co-existence as the twin pillars for peace in a world torn by the struggle of two conflicting ideologies and in a world in which force more than anything else has settled scores between nations. The Afro-Asian nations though weak in

military strength hope by their normal and numerical superiority to be a stabilising factor for peace in the world. That they have succeeded no one can deny. As such, it is preposterous for a country like ours not only to ignore them but to ridicule and condemn them. The Prime Minister while making a statement on the Sino-Indian border dispute said that it is impossible for us to co-exist with Communist China. The *Malayan Times*, which appears to be nothing but a weak and feeble organ of the M.I.C., calls them sympathetic to the Communist bloc. Such remarks are directed at the very principle of the Afro-Asian group and, as such, can we get their sympathy?

Besides that, we have until now ignored the Afro-Asian group and cared for the big powers in the West, which incidentally are all white. We have not taken the trouble to establish embassies in Africa except in Cairo. The budget that is before us does not make any provision for establishing more embassies in Africa. We fill the existing embassies with discredited politicians. Cairo is an excellent example. There we sent a man whose primary qualification was said to be that he prayed seven times a day, but in reality he was sent away because his actions have given rise to suspicions. If only men like him are to project our country

The Prime Minister: Mr Chairman, on a point of clarification. The man who was sent to Cairo has never prayed in his life—that is our worry (*Laughter*). I think the man the Honourable Member is referring to is the one in Saudi Arabia. There is no provision for praying seven times a day in the Muslim law (*Laughter*).

Dr Tan Chee Khoo: Mr Chairman, I was referring to our first Ambassador to Cairo—not the present one. In the Dewan Ra'ayat it was stated that his qualification was that he prayed seven times a day.

The Prime Minister: I don't know where he got that—it is not in Islamic law.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: I do not wish to tangle with the Honourable Prime Minister on this question of Islamic law. I admit I am very ignorant about it, although I think there is nothing wrong in praying seven times a day (*Laughter*). I wish I can myself pray seven times a day.

Mr Chairman, Sir, only men like him are to project our country in foreign capitals, then is there any wonder that we have failed miserably in our foreign affairs? That man whom we sent to Cairo must have been a failure. I wonder if he had any contact with the Afro-Asian secretariat there. If he, who was so close to the secretariat, was not able to put forth our case to the Afro-Asian nations, then either our policy must be unacceptable or he was incompetent. This, then, shows that the present policy of appointing ambassadors and consular heads is wrong. The tendency to give these important appointments for political favours done or because of incompetence locally, is bound to have serious repercussions if it is persisted in. It is because of this failure that the Mission to Africa under the Prime Minister of Singapore was necessary and now the Deputy Prime Minister had to make a long trip. We should think seriously before appointing ambassadors and we should only send the right people, be they Indians, be they Chinese, be they Malays, be they Kadazans or Bajaus. For the good of the country, Malaysians of whatever race should be selected on ability and merit alone to represent our country abroad. These people should have clear-cut directives to follow a policy of non-alignment and co-existence, and it is time that the Government makes a clear-cut stand on this so that we would be invited to the next Afro-Asian Conference in Algiers. The Deputy Prime Minister has just returned from a visit to some of the North African countries to represent to them the Malaysian case. But whether the Afro-Asian countries accept us as one of them will depend on our declarations and actions. As such, it is imperative that the Prime Minister should at this crucial stage make a clear-cut and unequivocal declaration of non-align-

ment and co-existence and the position of the Anglo Malaysian Defence Treaty, which has to be revised at least to delete the reference to the use of these bases for the preservation of peace in South East Asia.

The junketting across the African continent led by the Prime Minister of Singapore was proclaimed to be a success. Mr Chairman, Sir, we were not invited to the Afro-Asian Conference held recently at Cairo. The Honourable Deputy Prime Minister has proudly proclaimed the success of his mission to North Africa. I hope it is really so and that we would set up diplomatic missions with some of those countries and that all these will lead us to being invited to the next Afro-Asian Conference to be held in Algiers next year.

Mr Chairman, Sir, I am glad that there is a perceptible change of heart on the part of the Alliance Government that we are now going all out to woo African countries and that we have at long last realised that we must go along with the mainspring of Afro-Asia. We must also show by word and deed that we are Asians, first and foremost, and that we are prepared and willing to work with other small nations for the preservation of peace and that we accept the concept of a peaceful co-existence as the only road to avoid a global war.

Mr Chairman, Sir, I now move that item 1 of subhead 1 of Head S. 21 be reduced by \$1 as per provision of Standing Order 66 (7).

Enche' Ali bin Haji Ahmad (Pontian Selatan): Tuan Pengerusi, mula² tatkala saya mendapati usul yang dikemukakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu itu, saya bersedia-lah menchatit point² untuk di-bahathkan, tetapi apabila saya mendengar sedikit demi sedikit, maka nyata-lah tiada apa yang hendak di-bahathkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat itu, hanya mengulangi balek apa yang pernah di-perkatakan sedikit di-sana, sedikit di-sini dahulu. Jadi, oleh kerana beliau sendiri tidak ada apa banyak yang di-perkatakan, dan walau pun saya telah bersedia untuk berbath pada hari ini, tetapi ta' banyak-lah yang saya perkatakan.

oleh kerana beliau sendiri tidak mengemukakan hujah² yang chukup kuat untuk membawa usul ini. Jadi, usul ini di-kemukakan sa-mata² sa-bagai satu daleh untuk membahathkan policy luar negeri. itu pun saya merasa disappointed, kerana tidak ada apa sangat yang di-bahathkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu itu.

Jadi, pertama sa-kali Ahli Yang Berhormat itu mengatakan bahawa beliau menghargai Yang Teramat Mulia Tunku Perdana Menteri dan daripada situ beliau menganjorkan supaya gaji Yang Teramat Mulia di-naikkan sa-bagai Perdana Menteri dan di-samping itu beliau menganjorkan, atau mengemukakan usul supaya peruntokan token untuk Menteri Luar Negeri di-turunkan sa-banyak \$1. Jadi, saya ta' nampak lojik, atau mantek Ahli Yang Berhormat itu. Pertama sa-kali jawatan Perdana Menteri itu dan jawatan Menteri Luar di-pegang oleh sa-orang yang sama juga. Jadi, kalau kita memandang tinggi kepada satu peranan, dan memandang rendah kepada peranan yang lain, pada hal pekerjaan itu di-jalankan oleh sa-orang, maka saya ta' nampak lojik-nya di-dalam perkara ini, dan sa-bagaimana yang di-katakan-nya tadi, kalau saya ta' salah faham bahawa usul ini di-kemukakan hanya-lah untuk di-jadikan sa-bagai satu helah untuk membahathkan soal policy luar negeri, tetapi kalau hendak membahathkan policy luar negeri dengan mengemukakan perkara menurunkan \$1, saya rasa banyak masa lain dan peluang lain untuk membahathkan policy luar negeri, bukan-lah dengan chara hendak menurunkan \$1. Jadi, saya ta' nampak lojik-nya di-dalam perkara ini.

Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu itu juga berkata, atau pun menganggap salah bahawa di-dalam Perjanjian Pertahanan antara Malaysia dengan United Kingdom, ia-itu mempertahankan *preservation of peace in South-East Asia*—mempertahankan keamanan di-Tenggara Asia. Jadi, ini di-anggap-nya sa-bagai satu yang salah, tetapi pertama sa-kali yang elok saya menarek perhatian Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu dan juga Socialist Front. Negara² Kominis juga ada Pakatan Warsaw,

tetapi ta' pernah Ahli Yang Berhormat itu menchela Pakatan Warsaw. Kenapa Pakatan ini di-chela, tetapi Pakatan Warsaw itu tidak di-chela? Ini lojik Parti Socialist Front dan Ahli Yang Berhormat itu menggunakan *double standard in international politics*. Pakatan negara kita di-chela, tetapi bila pact negara China Communist tidak di-chela. Jadi, kita tahu bahawa Socialist Front merupakan barisan hadapan kominis di-negara kita ini. (HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear! hear!) Kalau sa-kira-nya Socialist Front betul² berdiri *neutral*, kita tidak kira siapa yang buat itu, kita chela—itu satu.

Yang kedua-nya, Ahli Yang Berhormat itu menganjorkan kita mengikut dasar neutralist, dasar Afro-Asia Baik dan bagus bunyi-nya, tetapi apabila China Communist menyerang India, Socialist Front tidak bangun menchela pencherobohan China Communist itu. Mengapa-kah apabila Inggeris, Peranchis dan Israel menyerang Republic Arab Bersatu, Socialist Front tegas keras menentang pencherobohan itu, tetapi apabila pencherobohan itu dilakukan oleh negara kominis, kenapakah Socialist Front tidak tegas, tidak lantang menentang negara kominis? *Double standard* yang di-gunakan oleh Parti Socialist Front, erti-nya *double standard* bukan-lah *double standard* yang menguntongkan negara kita, yang menguntongkan negara Malaysia yang kita kasehi, tetapi *double standard* yang menguntongkan negara² kominis, dan menguntongkan gerakan kominis sa-dunia. Ini policy Socialist Front, dan oleh kerana kita mengutok sa-tiap pencherobohan dan kutokan kita itu tidak menguntongkan negara kominis, maka oleh sebab itu-lah Parti Socialist Front tidak merasa puas hati dengan policy luar negeri kita. Policy luar negeri Kerajaan Perikatan ia-lah kita menggunakan satu standard, kalau pencherobohan yang di-lakukan oleh Peranchis, oleh United Kingdom dan Israel terhadap Republic Arab Bersatu, kita chela. Maka demikian juga pencherobohan kominis terhadap India—terang dan jelas policy kita. Ada-kah ini policy yang Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu itu tidak puas hati, ada-kah Ahli Yang Berhormat

dari Batu itu menganjorkan kita menggunakan *double standard* di-dalam *international politics* dan lebih buruk lagi *double standard* yang hendak dipergunakan, yang hendak di-anjorkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu ia-lah *double standard* yang menguntongkan kominis?

Jadi, soal pertahanan kita dengan United Kingdom itu ia-lah untuk pertahanan dan untuk keamanan negeri kita, dan juga oleh kerana negara kita ini dudok-nya di-dalam Tenggara Asia, maka sudah tentu-lah kita mempunyai tanggung-jawab yang besar terhadap keamanan di-Tenggara Asia. Nama perjanjian ini sudah jelas—Perjanjian Pertahanan bukan Perjanjian Menyerang. Jadi, ta' perlu di-katakan apa² yang tidak puas hati, sebab perjanjian ini untuk pertahanan—pertahanan terhadap sa-barang pencherobohan. Jadi, apa yang hendak di-susahkan lagi, dengan nama-nya itu sudah merupakan Perjanjian Pertahanan dan bukan-lah perjanjian untuk menyerang negara² lain, kata-nya dengan perjanjian di-antara negeri Nazi Germany dengan Fascist Italy yang dahulu-nya lain. Ini perjanjian yang merupakan sa-mata² Perjanjian Pertahanan; baik, kalau kita tidak hendak mengadakan Perjanjian Pertahanan dengan United Kingdom, ada-kah Ahli Yang Berhormat itu sanggup kita mengorbankan begitu banyak daripada wang kita untuk tentera dan melupakan soal² pembangunan ra'ayat? Kalau ini-lah yang di-tujukan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat itu, maka implication, chara jauh-nya, ada-lah begini: Kita belanja habis²an wang negara untuk tentera; pembangunan negara, kebajikan ra'ayat, tolak ka-tepi, dan akibat-nya ra'ayat tidak akan merasa faedah daripada kemerdekaan, ra'ayat akan gelisah, ra'ayat akan bangkit, ra'ayat akan menentang pemerintah, ra'ayat akan menjatuhkan democracy—democracy jatuh yang selalu-nya beruntung ia-lah kominis. Ada-kah ini matalamat perjuangan Socialist Front di-dalam menentang Perjanjian Pertahanan di-dalam jangka jauh-nya? Erti-nya menentang Perjanjian Pertahanan di-dalam jangka jauh-nya menguntongkan perjuangan dunia kominis—world communism. Ada-kah ini yang di-tujukan

oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Batu?

Satu lagi, kita tahu bahawa di-Malaysia ini hanya ada 10 juta ra'ayat dan kita tahu di-sekeliling kita, Indonesia mempunyai tentera kira² sa-tengah juta. Kalau lah takdir-nya, kita diserang oleh Indonesia, siapa-kah yang akan sempat menyelamatkan kita, jika tidak ada Perjanjian Pertahanan? Lihat-lah kepada apa yang terjadi kepada Tibet. Tibet telah di-langgar oleh Komunis China; tidak ada negara yang sempat menyelamatkan daripada serangan Komunis China. Ada-kah nasib yang sa-umpama ini yang di-kehendaki oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Batu itu? Malaysia di-langgar dan di-ta'aloki dalam masa yang cepat, kemudian tidak ada negara yang sempat membantu-nya. Ini-lah dia yang kita hadapi dan saya takut ini-lah dia yang di-kehendaki oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Batu itu. Sebab polisi Socialist Front tidak berubah menentang Malaysia. Jadi tidak dapat menentang Malaysia dengan sa-chara terang², tetapi ini-lah chara-nya, pertama sa-kali membawakan perkara ini supaya kita berbath dan kemudian dengan harapan supaya Perjanjian Pertahanan ini di-hapuskan dan dengan harapan kita terpaksa mengikut nasib yang di-alami oleh Tibet dan sa-bagai suatu chara persediaan—preparation of the ground for the spread of the Communist movement for the Communist powers in South-East Asia.

Sekarang dalam perchatoran politik dunia, Vietnam Selatan menghadapi kekachauan dengan kominis. Jadi di-harapkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Batu itu juga, hapuskan Perjanjian Pertahanan ini dengan harapan kita akan lemah berhadapan tenaga² kominis. Jadi ini-lah yang saya nampak daripada sa-balek pemikiran Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Batu itu. Jadi Ahli Yang Berhormat itu tadi menganjorkan kita hendak-lah menganut fahaman co-existence. Saya rasa tidak ada mempersoalkan ini dan polisi co-existence ada-lah yang sa-baik²-nya bagi negara kita terutama sa-kali bagi negara² kecil. Tetapi dalam menganjorkan polisi co-existence ini, ada-kah Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Batu

itu menyetujui pencherobohan, atau penyerangan oleh sa-sabuah negara terhadap negara yang lain? Pertama Indonesia menyerang kita. Co-existence apa-kah ini?

Yang kedua, Kominis China menyerang India, ada-kah ini co-existence yang di-maksudkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Batu? Kalau Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Batu itu sa-benar² menganut fahaman co-existence, maka sudah sampai-lah ketika-nya ia-itu memberikan kenyataan atau statement di-mana juga, bahawa beliau menentang pencherobohan oleh sa-siapa juga. Sila berikan statement tentang pencherobohan oleh Kominis China terhadap India yang sekarang maseh lagi menguasai kawasan² India. Seru-lah supaya Kominis China berundur balek ka-kawasan-nya yang lama. Saya belum pernah mendengar lagi statement daripada Socialist Front tentang hal ini. Juga pada satu masa dahulu apabila Kominis Russia melanggar, menghantarkan kereta² kebal dan tentera² ka-Hungary, Socialist Front tidak berbunyi sadikit pun menchela tindakan Russia menghentam, melenyek ra'ayat Hungary yang bangkit mahukan kebebasan. Tidak timbul sa-barang statement yang menentang, yang menchela perbuatan negeri kominis.

Kemudian satu daripada-nya lagi ia-lah Ahli Yang Berhormat itu mengecham atau mengkeritik perlantekan Duta² atas dasar lantekan politik ya'ani Duta² ini di-lantek daripada orang² Parti Perikatan. Saya tidak nampak apa salah-nya sa-tengah² jawatan Duta itu di-pegang oleh orang² parti. Sebab kalau kita hendak fikirkan baik², orang² parti-lah lebeh memahami dasar dan mind ya'ani pemikiran parti yang memerintah. Sebab orang² ini yang telah sa-hidup, yang merasai pahit maung-nya perjuangan parti dan orang² itu faham benar² akan jiwa, akan pemikiran parti. Jadi pada saya, perlantekan Duta² daripada orang² Parti ini ada-lah merupakan satu lantekan yang penting di-dalam usaha hendak memberikan penerangan, polisi, atau dasar² Kerajaan yang di-kuasai oleh Parti Perikatan. Ada-kah dengan mengemukakan per-

soalan ini bererti jika Socialist Front berkuasa bahawa Socialist Front tidak akan melantek Duta² atas dasar political appointment? Jangan-lah di-pergunakan double standard lagi. Bila Kerajaan Perikatan membuat bagini, maka di-kecham—nanti bila Socialist Front membuat ini, oh! betul semua. Jadi sa-panjang Duta² yang di-lantek atas dasar political appointment ini, saya dapati di-satengah² tempat yang saya sudah pergi amat berjaya, dan di-sini perlu juga saya menyatakan, Duta Besar kita di-Bonn ada-lah merupakan Duta Besar yang telah dapat menjalankan tugas²-nya dengan berjaya. Sa-bagai chontoh-nya saya tunjukkan, di-dalam sambutan Ulang Tahun Malaysia yang baharu lepas, seluruh Duta Afro-Asia hadir di-majlis upacara kita. Ada-kah ini tidak merupakan satu kejayaan oleh sa-orang Duta yang di-lantek atas dasar political appointment? Sa-lain daripada itu patut saya peringatkan ia-itu di-Bonn, kalau ada apa² upacara Kedutaan², Menteri² Kerajaan Jerman Barat jarang sa-kali hadir, payah hendak hadir, berbeza keadaan-nya dengan negeri kita. Di-upacara² Kedutaan, Menteri² kita umum-nya hadir dan selalu-nya ramai yang hadir tetapi di-Bonn jarang benar, tidak sa-orang pun Menteri² Jerman Barat yang hadir dalam sa-barang upacara Kedutaan². Tetapi yang istimewa-nya telah pun berlaku pada hari ulang tahun Malaysia yang baharu lalu, ia-lah hadir-nya sa-orang Menteri Jerman yang kanan yang mewakili Chancellor. Ada-kah ini merupakan satu kegagalan dalam menjalankan tugas oleh Duta Besar yang di-lantek atas dasar political appointment? Jadi, bagi saya yang penting sa-kali ia-lah "effectiveness" sa-saorang Duta Besar itu, tidak kira sama ada ia di-lantek atas dasar political appointment atau pun atas dasar "profession" ia-itu pegawai daripada Kementerian Luar Negeri, tetapi yang di-persoalkan oleh Yang Berhormat dari Batu itu ia-lah perlantekan atas dasar political appointment. Jadi, keritik yang sa-benar-nya Yang Berhormat dari Batu itu bukan-lah merupakan keritik yang sehat, atau yang baik

untuk memperbaiki lagi keadaan daripada yang ada ini, tetapi sa-mata² hendak membahathkan dasar luar negeri, tetapi bila saya dengar betul² tidak ada apa yang telah di-bahathkannya, kechuali beberapa point sahaja—itu pun point yang kechil², jadi saya tidak nampak “justification” Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu itu hendak memotong \$1.00 peruntukan bagi Menteri Luar Negeri ini. Sa-kian-lah sahaja.

Wan Abdul Kadir bin Ismail (Kuala Trengganu Utara): Tuan Pengerusi, saya bangun membangkang usul yang di-kemukakan oleh Yang Berhormat dari Batu dan usul ini sa-betul²-nya menunjukkan memang benar Ahli dari Batu itu berkepala batu (*Ketawa*). Inilah dia, Tuan Pengerusi, usul yang di-alu²-kan oleh Indonesia, yang di-nanti²-kan oleh Sukarno dan Aidit, ini-lah perkara yang di-nanti dari Kuala Lumpur itu datang dan usul ini datang rupa-nya daripada Yang Berhormat dari Batu, dan saya perchaya dengan di-sedari, atau tidak di-sedari, beliau telah menjadi ejen Indonesia dalam Dewan ini (*Tepok*).

Apa yang hendak di-salahkan dasar luar negeri Malaysia? Dasar luar negeri Malaysia dasar luar yang bebas yang telah di-terangkan berulang² kali—dasar luar negeri yang bebas, dan maseh lagi Yang Berhormat dari Batu itu hendak supaya dasar ini di-ubah.

Tentang Perjanjian Pertahanan, saya sekarang minta Ahli dari Batu tolong tunjukkan apa yang dia akan buat dengan menghapuskan Perjanjian Pertahanan yang ada sekarang ini? Kita berhadapan dengan sa-tengah juta askar Sukarno. Apa Ahli dari Batu akan buat? Siapa hendak di-panggil bagi menentang kekuatan itu? Tentu tidak lain saya perchaya bahawa Ahli dari Batu mahu kita tundok dan menyembah dan masuk ka-dalam perut Sukarno dan Aidit. Ini-kah dia sa-benar-nya tujuan yang di-maksudkan oleh Ahli dari Batu yang berkepala batu itu.

Perjanjian Pertahanan kita dengan Britain ada-lah satu langkah sementara, telah berkali² di-terangkan oleh pehak Kerajaan, satu langkah sementara yang boleh kita hapuskan dan kita batalkan

bila masa yang kita suka, bukan sa-macam mana perjanjian Filipina dengan Amerika yang 25 tahun baharu boleh batal, tetapi perjanjian kita bila kita mahu batalkan dia, kita boleh batalkan, untuk menjaga dan memelihara muslihat dan kepentingan kita—kepentingan sa-bagai crisis yang kita hadapi sekarang ini.

Barangkali ada ahli² Kepala Lembu atau Socialist Front akan berkata baik-lah kalau untuk menghadapi Indonesia sekarang ini barangkali mustahak, tetapi dahulu sa-belum konferantasi berlaku kenapa maseh ada. Saya suka bertanya, kenapa dahulu Indonesia tidak konferantasikan kita—kenapa, padahal Pengkalan ini sudah ada terlebih dahulu? Barangkali pada masa itu Indonesia belum ada ejen² yang aktif sa-bagai Ahli dari Batu pada masa itu.

Tuan Pengerusi, apa-kah dia dasar non-alignment ini? Menurut istilah yang telah di-setujukan dalam Persidangan Non-Alignment baharu² ini di-Cairo ia-lah sa-suatu negeri yang tidak masok pakatan tentera boleh di-terima menjadi anggota persidangan itu, dan menurut tafsiran itu kita memang boleh masok, kerana kita bukan masok pakatan tentera, antara kita dengan Britain hanya suatu “bilateral agreement”—perjanjian antara kedua buah negeri sahaja dan ini bukan sahaja di-aku² oleh negeri kita, tetapi di-aku² oleh Piagam Bangsa² Bersatu, Piagam Bandung dan segala Piagam² dalam dunia ini untuk menjaga muslihat kita.

Kita memang patut hadir dalam Persidangan Non-Alignment kelmarin, tetapi kita telah di-tahan, di-tegah dan di-chegah oleh Sukarno dan Indonesia yang memang sakit hati kapada kita. Negara² Afrika dan Asia yang berpengaruh, termasuk Republik Arab Bersatu, dan negeri² lain yang kita sangat berterima kaseh kapada mereka itu yang kuat menyokong kita, tetapi apa boleh buat Sukarno yang jahat maksud-nya itu telah berjaya menahan kita masok persidangan itu, tetapi kita tetap bersama dengan segala keputusan² yang telah di-putuskan oleh Persidangan itu sa-bagaimana yang dinyatakan oleh Yang Teramat Mulia Perdana Menteri dalam hubungan

kawat-nya kepada Pengerusi Persidangan itu. Jadi terang sahaja bahawa dasar kita tidak ada apa salah-nya, hanya rasa dendam Ahli dari Batu itu, hanya rasa hendak berkhidmat kepada Jakarta, Ahli dari Batu itu mengemukakan usul ini kepada Dewan ini.

Tentang Duta kita di-Cairo, saya sendiri hairan bahawa segala kelayakan yang ada pada Duta kita di-Cairo itu yang dapat di-perolehi oleh Ahli dari Batu itu ia-lah dia hanya pandai sembahyang lima waktu. Kalau itu sahaja yang dia dapat repot sia²-lah dia menghantar dua wakil-nya baharu² ini ka-Cairo—wakil daripada Socialist Front, tetapi sayang-nya Ahli dari Batu tadi oleh kerana jahil-nya dia tentang perkara ini, dia kata sembahyang tujuh waktu, sa-benar-nya lima waktu (five) bukan tujuh. Menurut pengalaman saya sendiri saya sampai di-Cairo pada bulan Mach dan Ogos saya dapati Duta kita di-Cairo sa-orang yang sangat popular di-sana. Ada pernah berlaku, Tuan Pengerusi, resepsi² yang di-adakan oleh Indonesia di-Cairo tidak ada Menteri U.A.R. menjengok, saya dapat tahu, tetapi sa-barang resepsi kita adakan tidak kurang 3-4 Menteri² U.A.R. datang ka-tempat kita dan kedudukan Duta kita di-sana mendapat sambutan yang baik dan hubungan-nya dengan segala kalangan Afro-Asia di-Cairo sangat baik sekali. Dan tentu sahaja kalau kita mengalu²kan kejayaan lawatan Timbalan Perdana Menteri baharu² ini ka-Afrika Utara ia-lah telah di-buka jalan-nya dengan jaya oleh Duta kita di-Cairo bersama² dengan Timbalan Perdana Menteri melawat ka-serata negeri di-Algeria, Tunisia dan Morocco, maka tidak ada jalan bagi Yang Berhormat dari Batu itu untuk menyatakan bahawa Duta kita tidak ada membuat pekerjaan. Saya harap lain kali lebih baik Ahli dari Batu itu hantar lagi wakil-nya ka-Cairo tolong tinjau benar atau tidak. Terima kaseh.

Enche' Ong Pang Boon (Singapore): Mr Chairman, the P.A.P. has always emphasised the political importance of the Afro-Asian countries in international politics. It has always held the view that Malaysia should draw closer into the Afro-Asian Bloc and should

take a more active interest in the activities of the Afro-Asian countries. Afro-Asian support for us, whether expressed in moral terms or in more votes in the United Nations, is vital for our survival. For this reason, Soekarno has always tried to win Afro-Asian opinion on his side and to isolate us from the newly emerged countries in Africa and Asia. To lose the support of Afro-Asian countries in our legitimate claim as an independent sovereign State is tantamount to their acceptance of the view of Indonesia that we are a neo-colonialist territory. For this reason, the active and persistent efforts on the part of the Central Government to get Malaysia accepted as a participant in the next Afro-Asian Conference in Algiers deserve the full support of the House.

It will be recalled that early this year the Prime Minister of Singapore led a truth mission to explain to the non-aligned Africans that Malaysia is not a neo-colonial puppet of the British, but a State as independent as any of them. The Singapore Prime Minister's tour was a success and did much to wipe out the false impression of Malaysia created by the Indonesians who employ their diplomatic machinery to the full to turn Afro-Asian nations against Malaysia. It was most unfortunate that the truth mission was not followed immediately by moves to set up closer diplomatic ties with the countries visited. The Deputy Prime Minister, Malaysia, has also made a successful mission recently to the North African States of the United Arab Republic, Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia. He has stated that Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia have agreed to establish diplomatic relations with Malaysia and that it is the intention of the Central Government to maintain contacts with these countries and send missions there. It is hoped that no delay will occur in fulfilling these aims.

In fact, diplomatic ties should be established not only in North Africa but also in the East and West African States considering the number of votes African States have in the United Nations and their influence amongst the countries. Indeed, it will be money well

spent, whereas it is money wasted on setting up diplomatic missions in such corrupt and discredited States like South Korea, South Vietnam and Formosa.

However, it is hoped that the Government will realise that it is in the national interest that the men dispatched to consolidate the diplomatic victory in Africa should be men selected for their ability and integrity and not for reasons of political patronage. The possibilities for good and bad international relations depend on the quality of the diplomatic corps. On the basis of reports of the policies of rival and friendly governments received through diplomatic channel, the Government has to make vital decisions that affect not only the destiny of the nation but also its relations with other countries. Skilled diplomatic representatives will confirm friendship, make peace, settle past disputes and remove the cause for future disagreements. Not the least, they preserve the support of friends and win that of neutrals against the aggrandizement of hostile neighbours. For these reasons, it is hoped that the Government will not show the same lack of judgment in its choice of diplomatic representatives as it had occasionally done in the past—for example, the despatch of a discredited politician from Singapore to Australia. Furthermore, diplomats however skillful and intelligent cannot exploit the possibilities and limits of diplomacy to the advantage of the country unless the men ultimately responsible for the foreign policy of the country are themselves capable of seeing the potentialities of diplomacy and pursue the appropriate policy.

In this connection, it is to be regretted that the Government has thought it fit to allow the K.M.T. to establish a Consulate in Kuala Lumpur. The Prime Minister has explained that it is necessary to have such a Consulate because of the growing trade between Malaysia and Formosa and the increasing flow of people between the two countries. He also claims that the establishment of Formosan Consulate does not amount to the recognition of Formosa on the part of Malaysia. Yet, it cannot be denied that the acceptance of a Consu-

late of the K.M.T. does imply a certain degree of recognition of the existence of another China besides Communist China, a situation the rest of the Afro-Asian world is unwilling to accept.

Enche' Wan Abdul Kadir: On a point of order—Standing Order 35 (6) "A member shall not read his speech". The member is reading his speech now.

Mr Chairman: Will you try not to look too much at your notes (*Laughter*).

Enche' Ong Pang Boon: Yes, Mr Chairman, I shall do so. But I think this is the Budget session, it is the Opposition's time and I hope the member will allow the Opposition ample time to finish their speeches.

Mr Chairman, Sir, the existence of a K.M.T. Consulate in Malaysia is not going to improve the internal state of politics. Perhaps the Government has forgotten that the K.M.T. has a notorious record of stirring up Chinese patriotism among the overseas Chinese through commercial and social organisations. Together with the Malayan Communist Party, it has left behind in Malaya a legacy of Chinese chauvinism. We are a nation in the making and we have taken great pains to persuade the Chinese immigrants to break their ties with China, the Indians to break their connections in India and the Malays of Indonesian origin to sever relations with Indonesia so that all will make Malaysia their object of loyalty. The presence of Nationalist Chinese influence in Malaysia will stir up old memories and dying loyalties. Perhaps one of the conditions for accepting a K.M.T. Consulate is that it should stay out of politics. Even if it does, its presence will carry weight in the psychology of some of the chauvinist elements of the Chinese population. The K.M.T. should not be allowed to be an alternative to the M.C.P. even in the most remote manner. What is ultimately at stake is the development of Malaysian consciousness and identity.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah (Kelantan Hilir): Tuan Pengerusi, saya mengambil bahagian sedikit di-dalam perbahathan ini. Tuan Pengerusi, adalah dasar—polisi luar negeri bagi Kerajaan Perikatan semenjak Tanah Melayu

telah mencapai kemerdekaan ada-lah satu dasar—polisi yang berdampingan tegoh dengan Kerajaan Inggeris, ini ada-lah satu perkara yang tidak dapat di-nafikan. Hebat-nya perdampingan dasar—polisi kita dengan Kerajaan Inggeris telah menimbulkan beberapa perkara, satu daripada-nya ia-lah treaty—perjanjian di-antara Kerajaan kita dengan Kerajaan Inggeris di-dalam masaalah pertahanan.

Betul perkara perjanjian yang telah di-adakan oleh Kerajaan kita dengan Kerajaan Inggeris ia-lah kita pandang dari segi mustahak-nya pertahanan negeri kita, kerana kita lemah dan sa-terus-nya, tetapi di-sisi negeri² yang baharu mencapai kemerdekaan me-reka seperti India, Arab dan lain² negeri lagi, walau pun mereka itu telah mencapai kemerdekaan, dan walau pun kedudukan mereka itu di-dalam perkara² pertahanan ada-lah kedudukan yang lemah, tetapi oleh sebab di-pandang mereka itu hanya tentera bangsa asing di-tanah ayer mereka yang di-pandang sa-bagai satu kemerdekaan yang tidak penoh, bahkan ada tentera asing di-dalam tanah ayer mereka itu, mereka itu pandang sa-bagai satu kelemahan mereka di-dalam foreign policy mereka

Enche' Ahmad bin Arshad: Untuk penjelasan.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah: Saudara akan dapat berchakap.

Enche' Ahmad bin Arshad: Sadikit sahaja saya hendak tanya.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah: Tidak. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ini perkara perjanjian yang telah di-adakan oleh Kerajaan kita dengan Kerajaan Inggeris di-dalam masaalah pertahanan dan mengekalkan kubu pertahanan dengan Inggeris dan membenarkan tentera² Inggeris dudok di-dalam tanah ayer kita yang telah menjadi duri di-dalam daging Kerajaan kita. Ini perkara yang selalu di-tanya² oleh bangsa² asing kepada kita, walau pun seperti mana yang telah saya terangkan tadi ada-lah perjanjian pertahanan ini ada-lah perkara mustahak untuk pertahanan dan keselamatan negara kita, tetapi di-jawab oleh mereka itu boleh

kita adakan satu perjanjian, sa-kira-nya boleh kita adakan satu perjanjian dengan Kerajaan Inggeris, atau Kerajaan mana juga, sa-kira-nya negeri kita di-langgar, baharu-lah pada ketika itu, boleh Inggeris datang menolong kita. Ini satu soal yang mustahak di-kaji.

Soal yang kedua ada-lah satu perkara yang jelas dan chukup terang bahawa-nya Kerajaan kita tidak mengambil langkah yang berat untuk mengadakan perhubungan yang rapat dan rapi dengan negara² Afro-Asia. Ini perkara tidak-lah dapat di-nafikan oleh Kerajaan, tetapi sa-telah confrontasi—masaalah confrontasi timbul, maka baharu-lah Kerajaan kita terburu² hendak mengadakan perhubungan dengan Kerajaan Afro-Asia, wal hal Kerajaan Indonesia telah mendapat peluang yang ke-emasan untuk menerangkan dengan sa-berapa jelas-nya kepada negara² Afro-Asia ini bahawa-nya Malaysia bukan satu bangsa yang merdeka, kerana mereka itu membenarkan tentera² Inggeris di-dalam tanah ayer mereka dan sa-terus-nya. Jadi, Kerajaan Indonesia telah mendapat peluang lebeh dahulu untuk menanamkan rachun itu kepada penganjor² negara Afro-Asia di-sana.

Perkara yang ketiga, Tuan Pengerusi, ia-lah satu perkara yang mustahak bagi Kerajaan kita, walau pun dengan sengaja atau tidak, telah menjalankan perkara ini dan perkara ini telah menimbulkan satu soal pula yang besar di-sisi orang² Arab di-Timor Tengah sana ia-itu akuan kita kepada Kerajaan Israel. Masaalah akuan Kerajaan kita terhadap negara Israel ini telah menimbulkan perbahathan yang besar di-kalangan orang² Arab, bagaimana-kah Kerajaan Malaysia yang berdasarkan, atau pun yang menjadikan agama Islam sa-bagai agama rasmi, telah mengakui dan mengiktirafkan

Enche' Senu bin Abdul Rahman: Untuk penjelasan, kita tidak pernah mengakui Israel.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah: Sa-bagaimana yang saya tahu, Tuan Pengerusi, Kerajaan kita akui Israel, tetapi tidak di-adakan perhubungan.

Soal Perjanjian Pertahanan, suka-lah saya panjangkan perbahathan saya

untuk memberi penjelasan kepada Rumah yang mulia ini. Orang² Afro-Asia memandang kedudukan tentera² bangsa asing di-dalam satu² negeri ialah satu perkara yang tidak baik. Maka sebab itu-lah Kerajaan Arab—U.A.R., atau pun Kerajaan Masir dengan giatnya menjalankan tenaga-nya untuk menghapuskan Perjanjian Pertahanan di-antara Kerajaan Libya dengan Kerajaan Washington, atau Kerajaan Amerika, kerana Kerajaan Libya membenarkan Kerajaan Amerika mengadakan tempat pertahanan kapal terbang di-negeri Libya sana, kerana apa, pandangan di-sisi orang² Arab bahawasa-nya kedudukan tentera² Amerika di-Libya ia-lah satu perkara yang memburokkan kehormatan kemerdekaan mereka, demikian juga tentera² Inggeris di-Aden. Ini juga dipandang oleh orang² Arab dan Afro-Asia sa-bagai satu penghinaan kepada orang² Arab di-sana, maka sebab itu-lah timbul pemberontakan di-Yaman sana, dan sekarang tenaga² di-jalankan untuk menghapuskan tentera² Inggeris yang ada di-Aden sana, dan ini timbul-lah penjelasan yang telah saya kemukakan, dapat-lah kita ketahui ada-lah perkara kedudukan tentera² bangsa asing di-dalam tanah ayer kita maseh lagi berjalan terus dan maseh juga sakira-nya kita tidak ambil langkah yang chukup giat untuk memperbaiki perhubungan baik kita dengan Afro-Asia, maka sa-lama itu-lah soal Malaysia tidak dapat di-sambut oleh orang² Afro-Asia.

Baharu² ini kita terbacha di-dalam akhbar *Utusan Melayu* ia-itu reporter *Utusan Melayu* telah mengambil peluang apabila di-adakan seminar dalam ranchangan T.V. untuk bertemu dengan rombongan² (delegates) yang datang daripada Africa sana. Maka reporter ini telah bertanya kepada mereka itu, apa-kah pendirian dan pendapat mereka itu di-dalam soal confrontasi di-antara Indonesia dengan Malaysia. Kebanyakan daripada delegate² itu berkata yang mereka itu tidak dapat mengambil bahagian, sama ada menyokong Indonesia atau pun menyokong Malaysia, bahkan mereka itu berharap supaya kedua² Kerajaan ini—lebeh² lagi Kerajaan Malaysia—tenaga²,

langkah² untuk di-adakan perdamaian supaya dapat-lah soal confrontasi ini di-selesaikan dengan damai. Oleh sebab yang demikian, Tuan Pengerusi, saya minta-lah kepada Kerajaan untuk mengkaji sa-mula dasar luar, policy Kerajaan kita, muga² apabila di-kaji sa-mula, dapat-lah di-perbaiki yang mana policy yang nampak lapok, atau yang nampak burok akan kedudukan kita supaya dapat di-ubah dengan policy yang dapat menchantumkan, atau memperbaiki kedudukan kita dengan Afro-Asia.

Enche' Abu Bakar bin Hamzah (Bachok): Tuan Pengerusi, pada mulanya saya sangka usul yang di-bawa oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Batu ini merupakan satu usul yang sunggoh² hendak memotong gaji Menteri yang berkenaan itu. Tetapi di-dalam mengemukakan atau mengusulkan, beliau berkata bahawa ini ada-lah sa-mata² untuk membolehkan Dewan ini membahathkan dasar luar negeri. Jadi, Tuan Pengerusi, di-dalam beliau itu mengemukakan usul-nya di-sebut-lah beberapa perkara yang mendorong beliau berbuat demikian ia-itu pendirian atau sikap Kerajaan Malaysia dalam erti kata "co-existence" dan begitu juga berkenaan dengan mencari persefahaman dengan negeri² Afro-Asia dan begitu juga dengan Pengkalan Tentera yang ada di-sini dan keadaan Kedutaan dan Duta² kita di-luar negeri dan dikaitkan pula dengan kekechewaan kita di-dalam Mu'tamar Afro-Asia negara² berkechualahi baharu² ini di-Cairo dan Mu'tamar yang akan datang pada bulan Mach di-Algeria.

Tuan Pengerusi, saya berpendapat berlainan, ia-itu saya tidak mahu dikurangkan sa-ringgit, tetapi saya minta tambah lima million kali ganda lagi ia-itu saya minta tambah lima million lagi memandang kepada Malaysia ini telah merasakan satu negeri lebeh besar dan policy luar negeri-nya bertambah hebat dan kerja² yang di-jalankan oleh Kementerian yang ada sekarang ini terlalu banyak, tetapi malang-nya dilakukan oleh Menteri tetapi tidak ada orang-nya. Sebab itu-lah saya minta lima million kali ganda daripada sa-ringgit itu.

Tuan Pengerusi, sa-bagaimana yang telah saya katakan di-dalam Kementerian Pertahanan, saya katakan juga di-dalam Kementerian Luar Negeri, ia-itu Perdana Menteri kita ini, pertamanya yang ta' dapat kita nafikan umur dia pun sudah lebeh, dan dia telah banyak kali sudah menjadi Perdana Menteri, dan banyak-lah beban² yang di-tanggung-nya yang sekarang ini tiga portfolio yang di-pegang-nya, kalau ta' salah saya, ia-itu Perdana Menteri, Menteri Luar Negeri dan Menteri Kebudayaan dan Sukan. Kalau dahulu di-dalam negeri Federation of Malaya boleh buat empat pun dia pegang. Tetapi sekarang ini sudah bertambah wilayah² kita dan maseh hendak retain lagi championship itu sekarang ini. Jadi ini-lah yang menyebabkan policy² luar negeri itu tidak di-perbesarkan peranggotaan-nya sa-hingga apa yang di-buat oleh Kerajaan ini tidak dapat di-fahamkan oleh orang ramai, bukan salah di-mana, sebab sudah-lah token \$10 di-minta kurangkan lagi \$9. Jadi langsong kita tidak tahu policy luar negeri ini. Sebab itu saya meminta tambahan lebeh lagi.

Tuan Pengerusi, kalau-lah kita hendak katakan salah satu sebab daripada mengapa usul ini di-bawa ia-lah Pengkalan Tentera British ada di-sini dengan mentafsirkan bahawa itu untuk pertahanan, dan untuk sa-suatu yang lain, tetapi kita hairan di-dalam Kongres Negara² Berkechuali di-Cairo baharu² ini yang di-hadhiri oleh 29 atau 30 buah negara—saya lupa itu, tetap terdapat di-dalam-nya negeri Turkey, kalau ta' salah saya negeri Iraq, negeri Philippine, Thai. Pada hal negeri² ini mempunyai pakatan² senjata yang lebeh kurang taraf-nya sama dengan pakatan di-negara kita dengan mengadakan pengkalan-nya itu. Negeri Turkey, mithal-nya, dengan pakatan NATO, negeri Iraq dengan Baghdad Pact-nya dan negeri Philippine/Thai dengan SEATO-nya. Jadi bagaimana-kah negara² ini boleh turut sama di-dalam Persidangan itu, sedang kita ditara'rifkan yang negeri kita ini ada mempunyai hubungan penjajahan di-sini dengan sa-mata² di-adakan Pengkalan Tentera di-sini. Di-sini-lah yang saya katakan duit mesti di-tambah lagi

supaya di-perbanyakkan lagi pegawai² supaya memberi penerangan sa-hingga bukan sahaja negara² luar boleh faham, tetapi orang² Perikatan sendiri pun boleh tumpang mengerti dalam policy yang terpendam ini.

Tuan Pengerusi, kalau-lah kita hendak katakan kedutaan kita tidak saimbang dengan taraf Malaysia yang luas ini—ini pun saya mengaku², tetapi kedutaan² atau pun mission kita di-luar negeri di-buat sa-sudah negara itu terbentok. Jadi sa-sudah Malaysia ini terbentok, baharu-lah di-buat perhubbungan² kedutaan itu. Jadi pada masa ini saya perchaya dengan di-minta duit yang saya katakan banyak tambahan lagi itu dapat-lah di-adakan lagi kedutaan² di-negeri² yang lain termasuk juga negeri² yang kita tidak pernah sebut, mithal-nya di-Khabul, Afghanistan mithal-nya, negeri² yang terpendam di-sabelah India sana.

Tuan Pengerusi, ada pun berkenaan dengan Duta² kita di-luar negeri, saya tidak pernah melawat Kedutaan² di-luar negeri sa-bagaimana sahabat² saya daripada Kuala Trengganu Utara, saya ta' dapat peluang, kerana dia Parti Perikatan, dia tentu-lah dapat peluang, saya Parti Pembangkang tentu-lah orang ta' bagi. Jadi, Tuan Pengerusi, Kedutaan² kita ini yang saya tahu, hendak kata layak ta' layak pun, tetapi kita ada satu orang Ustaz daripada Kedah nama-nya Ustaz Othman yang menjadi Duta di-Mekah, dan saya rasa kalau dia itu di-bawa balek sanggup-kah Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Batu menjadi Duta di-Mekah pula (*Ketawa*). Jadi, Tuan Pengerusi, yang saya kata bagitu, sebab kalau kita bawa balek Duta kita yang bernama Tuan Yang Terutama Ustaz Othman itu, saya takut pula na' di-rebut oleh orang lain yang bernama Ustaz Othman, yang calibre-nya lebeh rendah lagi—itu yang saya takutkan benda itu sebab itu saya mengemukakan ada-kah dia bersedia hendak pergi jadi Duta di-sana, jika tidak, jangan di-tarek²kan benda itu. Jadi, Tuan Pengerusi, ada pun kekechewaan kita di-dalam Persidangan Negeri² Yang Berkechuali baharu² ini, Ahli Yang Berhormat itu tidak juga berani menegaskan, jadi di-dalam dia

mengemukakan masa membawa motion—hujah² itu, kami di-pehak Pembangkang ini, kalau hujah² itu sehat, kami na' sokong, tetapi dia membawa mula-nya dengan berani, tetapi di-dalam menggulong-nya terlampau lembut dan kami pehak Pembangkang pun rasa malu (*Ketawa*) dia hendak menghentam mula-nya, kemudian dia kata ini sa-bagai satu helah hendak membahathkan policy sa-mata². Jadi kami pun berse-dia persiapan itu entah di-mana saya letakkan, sudah ta' jadi ucapan itu berlainan daripada ini. Jadi, saya rasa ini pun dia mengechewakan bagi pehak Pembangkang sendiri. Patut-nya dia lebeh berani daripada itu supaya kita tengok, kalau dia kalah mithal-nya, dua orang memang patut-lah kalah, sebab dia sedikit.

Jadi Tuan Pengerusi, dalam keke-chewaan ini dahulu pernah saya kata-kan, saya tidak juga salahkan Kerajaan atas perkara ini, tetapi manusia mana yang ta' buat salah. Kita hantar rom-bongan pergi ka-luar negeri na' chuba menchari "mutual understanding" dengan negeri² Arab, kita hantar pergi Perdana Menteri Singapura, kalau kita hantar Setia-usaha Agong UMNO itu baharu kena (*Ketawa*). Jadi, tersilap kita menghantar itu, jadi bukan-kah kerja-nya itu di-jalankan dengan betul. Mithal-nya kita katakan bagini, kalau mithal-nya kita katakan kita mempun-ya² sa-ekor harimau yang baik, yang sudah di-lateh tahu membawa barang daripada satu rumah ka-satu rumah, dan boleh menjadi "messenger", dan kita teringat-lah, jiran kita yang sa-belah rumah, yang anak-nya sakit, dan kita na' hantar \$10, kita malas na' pergi, kita ikat-lah duit \$100 di-leher harimau ini dan harimau itu pun tahu menyam-paikan duit itu. Dia membawa rahmat pergi, tetapi tuan rumah itu tengok harimau datang duit itu dia ta' nam-pak dia nampak harimau itu. Jadi ini-lah yang kita silap mengirim-nya tadi, dan saya rasa ini sa-bagai satu perkara yang patut di-ingat oleh Kerajaan dan saya mencheritakan ini. Tuan Pengerusi, ia-lah kerana saya berniat hendak memberi tegoran² yang memben-akan, tetapi saya nampak ada Menteri² yang pandang pada saya (*Ketawa*). Saya

susah hati ada satu orang sahaja dalam Dewan ini, Tuan Pengerusi. (*Ketawa*).

Jadi, Tuan Pengerusi, ada pun yang maseh lagi kita tertunggu²—saya ini membahathkan di-atas duit \$5 juta ini, kalau tidak ada duit ini saya tidak ber-chakap, Tuan Pengerusi, sebab asas saya bukan hendak potong \$1 tetapi hendak tambah \$5 juta lagi. Jadi, Tuan Pengerusi, ada satu perkara lagi agak-nya yang susah-nya, sebab Yang Berhormat dari Batu tidak mahu menerangkan, ia-itu mithal-nya dalam dia minta supaya di-adakan Kertas Puteh berkenaan dengan dasar luar negeri kita ini dia tidak pula menyebutkan di-mana silap-nya Kerajaan ini, dia sa-mata² mengatakan silap sa-chara umum sahaja. Jadi, hendak betul pun tidak boleh juga, macham orang yang sakit, dia cheritakan sakit-nya, tetapi dia minta ubat yang tertentu, jadi sebab itu-lah susah, dan saya rasa dia sa-bagai sa-orang doktor tahu dia tidak boleh mengubat, melainkan di-pereksa dahulu. Mithal-nya, dia kata mengapa-kah di-dalam Kementerian Luar Negeri kita ini terdapat orang² yang berjawatan pentadbir atau politik—saya tidak ingat—tetapi dia berani mengeluarkan statement² yang boleh menimbulkan suatu silap faham di-kalangan perhu-bongan kita dengan negeri² yang lain. Mithal-nya, berkenaan dengan pengebo-man (bomb) Amerika kapada Vietnam Utara. Ada spokesman kita di-sini mengatakan memang itu kita harapkan, itu-lah polisi yang kita suka. Ini sa-patut-nya Menteri dahulu membuat perkara yang sa-macham itu sa-belum daripada spokesman itu, dan akhir-nya saya dapat tahu bahawa perkara itu sudah-lah terpaksa di-betulkan dan kita ini menyokong pengeboman itu sudah bererti melupakan beberapa usaha kita hendak menchari mutual understanding dengan negara² Afro-Asian atau pun negari² luar yang kita sebutkan tadi. Jadi, Tuan Pengerusi, ini sa-bagai satu chara yang kita melakukan intervention atau masuk champor dalam satu per-kara yang merugikan kita daripada menguntongkan. Saya rasa kalau Yang Berhormat itu berani mengemukakan bagitu, saya rasa baharu-lah debate ini menjadi hangat dan boleh menghasil-kan sa-suatu yang memben-akan.

Tuan Pengerusi, satu lagi masalaah ia-lah saya tidak dengar daripada Ahli Yang Berhormat itu menegor tentang dasar negeri ini membuat perhubungan dengan Taiwan (Formosa), kalau tidak salah saya, tetapi dia menegor hubungan kita dengan negeri² yang lain, yang dia takut kalau² kita ini tidak dapat sokongan daripada Afro-Asian. Perhubungan kita dengan Taiwan dia tidak tegor, pada hal Taiwan ini kita tahu sama dengan Israel. sebab Taiwan ini di-biaya² oleh Amerika dan Israel juga di-biaya² oleh Amerika. Agak-nya Taiwan itu sedikit sa-banyak ada hubongan dengan beliau, jadi dia diam sahaja. Jadi kami pehak Pembangkang hendak menyokong sudah serba salah. Tuan Pengerusi, ter-pulang-lah kapada Kerajaan sendiri menjawab-nya apa-kah hubungan itu walau pun berapa consul yang hendak membuat urusan² perdagangan atau pun perniagaan itu boleh melukakan atau menyekat kita daripada mendapat habuan yang baik daripada negeri² Afro-Asia.

Tuan Pengerusi, ada lagi satu perkara ia-itu saya perchaya Kerajaan kita sedang membuat usaha² yang hendak menjamin bahawa kita boleh hadir dengan rasmi dalam Persidangan Afro-Asian di-Algeria atau pun di-Cairo. Pada hari ini saya dapat tahu conclusion ia-itu orang² kita ini hadir di-jemput oleh negeri Masir dudok di-situ, bukan sa-bagai ahli yang mengambil bahagian dan tidak juga sa-bagai pemerhati. Saya tidak mahu negeri kita ini turut sa-bagai "pa' yet", kita mahu mendapat satu habuan ia-itu turut debate di-dalam persidangan itu. Kalau kita kechewa pada masa itu, saya harap dalam Persidangan Afro-Asian di-Algeria jangan kechewa juga.

Tuan Pengerusi, untok menjamin boleh-nya kita hadir dalam Persidangan Afro-Asian di-Algeria itu, saya rasa ada satu soal yang mesti di-jawab oleh Kerajaan, ia-itu negeri Algeria sendiri tidak i'tiraf Israel dan Kerajaan kita tidak i'tirafkan Israel. Saya tidak mahu bahathkan ini, sebab Kerajaan kata sa-bagai satu method of debate, saya menerima apa yang Kerajaan kata itu.

Yang kedua-nya, Tuan Pengerusi, pendirian negeri Algeria sendiri dia menyokong gerakan Nasionalis di-Congo. Di-Congo itu ada dua kuasa yang bertentangan antara Regime Tshombe dengan kuasa Nasionalis. Jadi, di-mana-kah Kerajaan Malaysia sekarang ini menyokong Tshombe-kah atau pehak Nasionalis? Ini akan menjadi perbezaan di-antara Malaysia kita dengan Algeria, dan bagaimana pula pendirian kita terhadap negeri Arab Selatan, Mozambique dan Angola yang bergaduh dengan Portuguese sekarang ini dan juga terhadap satu perkara yang kita tidak tahu yang sa-patut-nya dahulu kita bawa masuk ka-dalam Malaysia ia-itu Irian Timor yang di-bawah Amanah Australia sekarang ini. Ini sudah ada pergerakan kalau kita hendak meluaskan, tetapi kita tidak pernah kemukakan perkara² ini kapada ra'ayat jelata, sebab itu-lah timbul-nya ada yang hendak membawa usul potong \$1, ada yang susah hati—saya pun berkawan baik juga dengan Ahli² Perikatan—entah mereka rahsiakan, saya ta' tahu-lah, mereka pun tidak tahu hal ini semua. Mereka semua serahkan kapada Perdana Menteri. Kalau kita hendak mati besok pun serahkan kapada Tunku. Lama² bila Tunku kata: "Hai orang² Perikatan nampak-kah ini gajah aku masuk di-dalam kendi?" "Ya kami nampak." "Mana kamu tahu kamu nampak?" "Kami nampak ekor dia keluar dari lobang itu." Mereka tambah dan sokong lagi perkara² yang mustahil gajah masuk lobang kendi dan mereka tambah ekor gajah keluar dari lobang itu, mereka tambah lagi benda yang tidak betul itu.

Oleh sebab itu, Tuan Pengerusi, saya shorkan di-dalam kita hendak meng-hadhiri Persidangan Afro-Asian itu kalau usaha² kita itu berjaya saya rasa kita jangan tinggalkan wakil² wanita kita di-sini walau pun wakil wanita daripada PAS ini tidak ada, tetapi sa-bagai saya sa-orang Pembangkang dalam Dewan ini dalam masaalah luar negeri dan masaalah nasional saya suka memberi fikiran saya kalau dapat di-terima, kerana di-dalam Persidangan Afro-Asian itu bukan-lah membahathkan berkenaan dengan politik sa-mata², tetapi ada juga membahathkan culture,

masaalah² wanita dan lain², dan saya suka juga kalau Menteri Muda Kebudayaan hadhir sama dan saya tidak lupa juga sahabat saya dua orang yang mempunyai degree dalam bahasa Arab seperti Yang Berhormat dari Kuala Trengganu Utara patut di-bawa bersama, tetapi jangan-lah bawa ustaz² yang boleh berchakap “ana, ente” yang pernah lari daripada PAS masuk Perikataan (*Ketawa*). Sekian-lah sahaja.

Mr Chairman: Saya suka hendak mengingatkan kita maseh membahathkan pindaan, penchadang akan menjawab, Yang Teramat Mulia Perdana Menteri barangkali suka hendak menjawab, jadi kalau begitu bila masa-nya kita hendak habis. Saya hendak beri peluang kepada penchadang menjawab. (TO DR TAN CHEE KHOON) Do you wish to reply?

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Yes.

Mr Chairman: How long will you take?

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: I do not know maybe about five minutes.

Dato' Nik Ahmad Kamil (Kota Bharu Hilir): Mr Chairman, Sir, is it your intention to cut short this debate and not give any more backbenchers of the Government a chance to contribute or participate in the debate on this very important subject matter?

Mr Chairman: No, I am merely stating that this is an amendment to the debate and Honourable Members will have a chance to vote when it is put to the House instead of repeating what has been said over and over again.

Tuan Haji Othman bin Abdullah (Hilir Perak): Saya rasa, Tuan Pengerusi patut memberi peluang kepada saya untuk menjawab tuduhan yang personal terutama sa-kali kepada Kerajaan kami dan juga ada menyentoh nama saya. Jadi, Tuan Pengerusi, kalau Tuan Pengerusi daripada pagi tidak membenarkan saya bangun berchakap habis-lah (*Ketawa*). Benarkan-lah saya berchakap, Tuan Pengerusi.

Mr Chairman: Boleh saya benarkan, kalau Ahli Yang Berhormat boleh memendekkan sadikit. Tetapi kalau

merewang² sahaja bila hendak habis, itu sahaja. Bukan-nya masa ini saya punya, tetapi Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang punya.

Tuan Haji Othman bin Abdullah: Tuan Pengerusi, saya minta sa-belum saya berchakap beberapa perkara yang sudah kita dengar di-sini penerangan² yang tidak betul yang mustahak di-betulkan dan saya rasa sa-belum penchadang pindaan ini menggulung ucapan-nya patut juga Menteri² kami di-beri peluang untuk memberikan penjelasan supaya perkara ini tidak berulang lagi di-dalam membahathkan dalam Committee. Kalau Tuan Pengerusi tidak membenarkan, kami akan menyediakan itu semua di-dalam Committee, Tuan Pengerusi, nanti susah juga.

Mr Chairman: Saya benarkan.

Tuan Haji Othman bin Abdullah: Terima kaseh. Tuan Pengerusi, saya membangkang usul ini. Bangkangan saya di-atas pindaan ini sa-bagaimana alasan² yang telah di-beri oleh sahabat² saya dari Pontian Selatan, daripada Kuala Trengganu Utara yang telah menyatakan bangkangan-nya yang keras terhadap usul pindaan yang di-kemukakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Batu. Yang menyusahkan fikiran saya di-dalam perbahathan ini ia-itu perkara yang di-bahathkan ini ia-lah perkara yang berulang² dan sudah di-chakapkan tetapi di-ulang² juga. Biasanya kalau mengikut kaedah orang belajar 2×2 jawab-nya 4, lain kita ta' usah tanya lagi. Jadi manakala orang bertanya 2×2 jawab-nya 4, besok dia bertanya lagi orang itu nama-nya jahil. Besok di-tanya lagi nama-nya Murakkab. Di-tanya lagi Bahlol nama-nya. Jadi perkara itu sudah berkali² di-chakapkan. Dasar luar negeri kita bukan-lah satu dasar yang menyebelah ka-mana² block, yang sedang bertentangan dalam negeri ini. Kita mempunyai dasar bersendirinya mengikut atoran dan fikiran kita. Apa yang saya tidak mengerti pendirian orang PAS muzab zabir—pendirian munafik yang telah di-terangkan-nya di-dalam Dewan ini. Sa-orang Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Bachok dia hendak menyokong-kah, tidak-kah dia tidak tahu

kapada Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Batu, tetapi Ahli Yang Berhormat yang sa-orang lagi itu berchakap mula², dia menentang kita, ma'ana-nya dia menyokong Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu, macham ular dua kepala. Jadi orang PAS ini nampak-nya yang dia menyuruh orang jangan munafik dalam Dewan ini dia-lah bapak munafik dalam Dewan ini!

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah: Tuan Pengerusi, Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Hilir Perak munafik yang dahulu bersumpah dan berjanji hendak memperjuangkan ugama sekarang dia munafik.

AHLI² YANG BERTHORMAT: Dudok! dudok!

Mr Chairman: Saya hendak menterangkan sedikit. Saya ada chukup kuasa sa-bagai Pengerusi, saya boleh menghantar orang keluar. Saya minta-lah jaga tatatertib waktu hendak berbath.

Tuan Haji Othman bin Abdullah: Tuan Pengerusi, manakala orang menyerang kami, kami diam, sebab kami tahu bahawa sabar itu elok tetapi bila kami menyerang balek rupa-nya orang PAS yang memegang Islam ini tidak sabar fasal itu dia kalah.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah: Dia tidak faham ayat Qur'an, Tuan Pengerusi.

Tuan Haji Othman bin Abdullah: Tuan Pengerusi, orang yang beradab ia-lah orang yang mendengar nasehat. Ada pun orang yang tidak mahu mendengar nasehat orang itu nama-nya kurang ajar (*Ketawa*).

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah: Tuan Pengerusi, saya minta dia tarek balek.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Dudok! dudok!

Mr Chairman: Saya minta perchakan itu di-tarek balek.

Tuan Haji Othman bin Abdullah: Tuan Pengerusi, sa-belum saya menarek balek saya tidak menunjukan kapada dia.

Mr Chairman: Kalau tidak menuju kapada dia, ta' apa-lah.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah: Saya minta

Mr Chairman: Itu terpulang kapada saya. Tolong tarek balek perkataan yang salah pada Undang² Standing Orders itu.

Tuan Haji Othman bin Abdullah: Tuan Pengerusi, sa-belum saya tarek balek, saya tidak menunjukan kapada sa-orang Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada PAS. Bagaimana saya hendak tarek balek? Dia menyebut nama saya patut dia menarek balek tetapi saya tidak mahu, saya sa-bagai orang jantan dalam Dewan ini kita berbath, kalau dia sa-orang jantan lagi di-luar kita boleh berjumpa (*Ketawa*).

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah: Tuan Pengerusi, apa yang saya faham, Yang Berhormat itu melarikan diri daripada

Mr Chairman: Nanti, nanti.

Enche' Ali bin Haji Ahmad: Standing Orders 37. No member shall interrupt another member.

Dato' Nik Ahmad Kamil: Rasa saya kita ini ada Standing Orders, apabila Tuan Pengerusi itu berchakap, Ahli dalam Dewan ini kena dudok. Ini rasa-nya dua tiga baris sahaja, budak sekolah pun pandai bacha.

Mr Chairman: Itu semua kita sudah tahu tetapi kita bantah juga. Jadi bila macham itu kita sudah jatoh mertabat kita—jatoh mertabat budak². Saya minta kapada Ahli² Yang Berhormat simpan-lah mertabat itu dan boleh berbath.

Tuan Haji Othman bin Abdullah: Itu-lah saya katakan

Mr Chairman: Saya sekarang buat ruling. Perkataan yang di-katakan tadi itu ya'ani perkataan kurang ajar itu di-tarek balek.

Tuan Haji Othman bin Abdullah: Baik-lah. Saya menudoh kapada Ahli Yang Berhormat itu kurang ajar saya tarek balek (*Ketawa*). Tuan Pengerusi, kalau Ahli² Yang Berhormat daripada PAS mengemukakan beberapa chontoh², maka saya pun ingin juga hendak menimbulkan beberapa chontoh². Chontoh²-nya satu daripada-nya kalau Tuan

Pengerusi mempunyai hak menentukan peratoran dalam Dewan ini orang itu tidak mahu ikut, yang pertama sekali, Tuan Pengerusi boleh halau orang itu keluar daripada Dewan ini, kalau dia tidak mahu, itu nama-nya kurang ajar, Tuan Pengerusi.

Mr Chairman: Saya tidak suka orang bertengkar macham ini.

Tuan Haji Othman bin Abdullah: Jadi, saya ini tidak boleh berchakap dia buat kachau sahaja. Masaalah yang saya kemukakan ini, saya tidak mengerti apa-kah lojik di-antara orang² PAS dalam menyokong usul yang di-kemukakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Batu, yang satu menyokong yang satu lagi menentang.

Enche' Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Siapa yang menyokong?

Tuan Haji Othman bin Abdullah: Dengar dahulu saya berchakap. Apa yang saya faham, Tuan Pengerusi, Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Kelantan Hilir telah menyokong usul yang di-kemukakan atas pindaan yang di-buat oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Batu.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah: Tuan Pengerusi, saya berdiri berchakap dalam Dewan ini saya tidak menyokong tetapi dia tidak faham.

Tuan Haji Othman bin Abdullah: Tuan Pengerusi, itu erti-nya orang kurang ajar. Sa-patut-nya dia mesti minta kebenaran dahulu.

Mr Chairman: Saya hendak memberi tahu kepada Ahli Yang Berhormat, kalau hendak menjawab, kemudian nanti boleh di-jawab. Jangan tengah² dia berchakap di-sampok, kalau dia tidak benarkan berchakap, jangan-lah berchakap.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah: Tuan Pengerusi, saya bangun kerana dia melangkah dan melawan serta melanggar Undang² Standing Order yang ta' boleh di-gunakan di-dalam Rumah ini—chakapan yang kotor, un-parliamentary.

Mr Chairman: Ini dia sudah tarek balek tadi!

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah: Ini yang dia ulangi² lagi, Tuan Pengerusi.

Mr Chairman: (kapada Tuan Haji Othman) Jangan di-ulang² lagi.

Tuan Haji Othman bin Abdullah: Yang saya ta' faham, Tuan Pengerusi, Ahli dari Kelantan Hilir berkata kata-nya orang ta' hendak menyokong kita ini sebab dasar luar negeri, kerana tentera² bangsa² asing ada di-dalam negeri ini, ada tentera² Commonwealth, ada tentera² British di-dalam negeri ini, dan dia meyakinkan bahawa sebab itu-lah, maka dasar luar negeri kita ini, yang saperti ini yang menyebabkan negara² Afro-Asia tidak mahu menyokong kita—dengan erti kata yang lain bahawa Ahli Yang Berhormat itu menyokong dasar yang di-buat oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu, itu mantek-nya dia menyokong, dan dia sendiri mengatakan bahawa sa-barang negara di-mana ada tentera² asing di-dalam negeri itu menunjukkan bahawa negara itu tidak penoh merdeka dan ini menjadi amalan yang sa-lama²-nya oleh orang² PAS mengatakan bahawa kemerdekaan kita ini tidak penoh—sa-tengah masak, sa-tengah matang—itu bahasa dia dahulu, sa-tengah masak, tidak sempurna kemerdekaan ini. Bukan-kah ini berma'ana bahawa paduka Yang Berhormat itu menyokong Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu—bukan-kah itu ma'ana-nya, mantek-nya, tetapi Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bachok lain fikiran-nya. Dia kata dia hendak menyokong parti, tetapi oleh kerana pandangan Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu

Mr Chairman: Saya suka hendak mengingatkan kepada Ahli Yang Berhormat, Ahli Yang Berhormat ta' ada hak hendak menyebut, hendak mengulas satu persatu ucapan Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang lain. Beri keterangan di-atas maudzu' yang ada di-hadapan ini sahaja dan sambil lalu boleh di-refer atas perchakapan² itu sahaja.

Tuan Haji Othman bin Abdullah: Tuan Pengerusi, saya hendak menjelaskan betapa keraguan saya dalam masaalah ini, sebab Dewan ini telah di-kelirukan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat

yang pandai berchakap, tetapi chakap-nya tidak betul. Apa mithal-nya chakapan-nya itu betul bahawa Duta Malaysia di-Saudi Arabia sa-orang yang bernama Ustaz Othman—benar-kah ini? Benar-kah ini, Tuan Pengerusi, bahawa Duta Malaysia di-Saudi Arabia yang sekarang ini bernama Ustaz Othman dari Kedah, benar-kah? Ada-kah bohong orang PAS ini, hendak kita tahan di-dalam Dewan ini, dan patut-lah Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bachok menarek balek perchakapan-nya bahawa Duta kita di-Saudi Arabia bukan Ustaz Othman bin Yusof datang dari Kedah, tetapi sa-orang bekas Duta dari Indonesia yang bernama Dato' Kamaruddin. Alang-kah jahil-nya Ahli Yang Berhormat itu tentang sa-orang Duta sahaja di-dalam negeri ini—Malaysia ini terhadap negara² lain. Ada-kah layak orang yang saperti ini champor di-dalam masaalah Duta kita ini—layak atau tidak layak, nama pun tidak tahu!

Kemudian berkokok-lah Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bachok mengatakan Philipina hadir di-dalam Persidangan Negara² Berkechuali di-Kahirah; Turkey pun hadir—saya tidak tahu, benar-kah pandangan-nya ini, benar-kah negara² yang masuk dalam blok ini, walau pun negara itu negara Asia ada hadir di-dalam negara² bebas yang bersidang di-Kahirah, tetapi berselindung—satu pembawaan faham yang salah yang di-terangkan di-dalam-nya, di-dalam Dewan ini yang kita tidak boleh telan bagitu sahaja. Oleh Indonesia, Tuan Pengerusi, telah melibatkan nasib negara Malaysia ini saperti negara² Asia, atau Afrika yang dudok di-sabuah blok² negara yang sekarang ini sedang berchichir. Dimasokkan-nya nama kita ini dalam list mereka itu, erti-nya Malaysia ini juga ia-lah negara di-mana dia dudok di-dalam sa-buah blok dunia. Kita menyatakan tidak, oleh kerana kita menyatakan tidak, kita terpaksa menghantar beberapa orang pegawai kita ka-Kahirah untuk menyatakan masaalah ini dengan terang, walau pun kita tidak di-terima masuk sa-bagai anggota penoh di-dalam persidangan negara² berkechuali di-Kahirah, tetapi kita mempunyai peluang² yang besar untuk menyatakan kepada seluruh

negara² yang berkechuali tentang kedudukan kita yang sa-benar-nya, dan kerja kita itu berjaya. Kejayaan daripada Kedutaan kita di-tambah dengan pegawai² kita yang berpengalaman di-tanah ayer kita ka-Kahirah, kemudian di-susul dengan perjalanan Timbalan Perdana Menteri kita. Kabus-nya sekarang ini yang menyelubongi negara kita, kian lama, kian terang, dengan harapan bahawa negara² di-dunia ini terutama-nya negara Afro-Asia akan dapat memahami kedudukan kita yang sa-benar-nya, memahami dasar kita yang sa-benar-nya terhadap penjajahan dan terhadap sa-barang bentok pencherobohan di-dalam dunia ini. Tetapi, Tuan Pengerusi, apa yang telah di-lakukan oleh dua ekor lembu yang di-hantar ka-Kahirah oleh Socialist Front? Mereka ini tidak kelihatan langsung dan apa yang saya dengar, mereka ini masuk ka-Night Club, keluar Night Club; kemudian mengkerohkan suasana negara sendiri dan menaborkan garam-nya—negara-nya sendiri, tumpah darah-nya sendiri, tempat dia belajar, menuntut dan tempat dia besar—yang di-tujukan-nya kepada negara lain, di-chakapkan-nya kepada Indonesia bahawa kita neo-colonialist. Dua ekor lembu yang diseret dari Moscow, dua ekor lembu yang taring-nya, yang leher-nya di-seret dari Peking untuk chuba hendak menandok negara kita yang merdeka dan berdaulat ini, dan wakil-nya ada sa-orang di-sini—Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu.

Tuan Pengerusi, masaalah ini hendak-lah di-faham. Berulang² kita menyatakan bahawa kita tidak mengi'tiraf negara Israel—mana lagi mulut yang hendak kita sebutkan, sepuluh kali kita tidak mengi'tiraf negara Israel, tetapi orang² PAS maseh berkepala batu. Ada mata ta' di-gunakan, ada telinga ta' di-gunakan, ada hati ta' di-gunakan; kalau dalam Qur'an ia mengatakan. Ula ika kal an 'am—Mereka ini macham binatang. Ini kata dalam Qur'an. Kalau hendak marah, marah Qur'an. Kalau hendak suroh tarek balek, kikis dalam Qur'an. Ada kepala ta' berfikir, ada mata ta' menengok, ada telinga ta' mendengar, macham ini macham binatang. Kita beberapa kali sudah kita katakan, kita

tidak mengi'tiraf negara Israel. Kita menentang penjajahan. Kita mengutok sa-barang pencherobohan, walau dilakukan oleh sa-siapa pun juga dalam dunia ini, tetapi sharakallah hul 'azim—ia ulang balek; ia ulang alek, sahaja hendak melambatkan debate ini, Tuan Pengerusi, Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu sengaja mengemukakan masaalah ini, tetapi kalau kami kata, saya tadi berasa sabar terima segala tuduhan daripada pehak Kerajaan, maka terima-lah pula kami punya peluru.

Tuan Pengerusi, bagi kita, saya ta' hendak berchakap panjang—chukup-lah itu. Bagi saya, Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bachok mengecilkan fikiran kami—Ahli² Perikatan ini adalah satu hal yang keterlaluan yang kami tidak dapat memberi ma'af, walau pun di-dalam Dewan ini ia mengatakan apa yang di-sebut oleh Tunku, itu-lah yang kami sebut; ma'ana-nya ini kami jahil—tukang ikut, pak enggeh sahaja!

Tuan Pengerusi, pandangan rendah daripada Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bachok terhadap Ahli² Dewan Ra'ayat dari Perikatan ini, satu pandangan yang sempit yang tidak pandai mengukor diri-nya sendiri. Kami tidak memandangi Tunku sa-bagai Tuhan. Kami tidak memandangi Tunku sa-bagai Nabi, tetapi kami memandangi Tunku sa-bagai pemimpin. Chuba lihat orang PAS dalam masaalah debate ini tidak mempunyai pemimpin. Satu kata ini, satu kata itu. Orang yang tidak mempunyai pemimpin akan hanyut-lah dia di-tengah² gelombang yang bagini hebat. Kami mempunyai kepala sendiri. Kami mempunyai pandangan sendiri dalam masaalah ini, dan kami berani kerana kami tahu, kami benar.

Tuan Pengerusi, membodohkan ahli² UMNO ini dengan mengatakan sa-kali lagi, hai ta' patut-lah Tunku itu semua dia hendak ambil, beri-lah dengan orang lain rezki itu. Dia sudah tua, walau pun Yang Teramat Mulia Tunku sa-orang yang tua, tetapi 10 orang PAS boleh di-telan-nya sa-kali gus. (*Tepok*). Sudah lama kita mendengar bahawa chara orang² PAS ini terhadap orang² Perikatan demikian, tetapi satu perkara yang saya tidak

faham, apa-kah pandangan dia dalam masaalah ini—pendirian dia yang concrete! Saya dahulu sa-orang ahli PAS, Tuan Pengerusi, yang dia kata tadi saya lari daripada sana. Betul saya lari, kerana pendirian yang goyang, yang munafik saperti ini, siapa yang ta' lari? Siapa yang ta' mahu lari dengan pendirian yang saperti ini? Besok Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bachok pun hendak lari! (*Ketawa*) tetapi kami siang² telah berkata: Kami tidak akan terima. Orang² yang sudah menjadi second hand dalam PAS mula' tahun 1965 tidak akan kami terima. Perchaya-lah—ta' ada harapan!

Saya tahu, Tuan Pengerusi, saya tahu pendirian dan dasar luar negeri orang² PAS ini—saya tahu. Saya orang besarnya dahulu! Saya tahu rahsia-nya itu dalam saku saya semua. Ka-mana-kah arah tujuan mereka itu . . .

Mr Chairman: Saya suka hendak mengingatkan kepada Ahli Yang Berhormat—ini rasa-nya macham political rally. Jadi, kita mesti-lah patoh kepada perkara yang kita hadapi ini supaya barangkali dapat Ahli² yang lain yang ada hendak berchakap, barangkali hingga pukul lapan akan ditutupkan perbahathan ini.

Tuan Haji Othman bin Abdullah: Saya hampir hendak habis, Tuan Pengerusi, lima minit sahaja lagi saya hendak habis. Dalam masa lima minit saya habiskan chakapan saya ini. Yang saya kata tadi masaalah ini yang saya ragukan ini di-mana-kah orang² PAS ini berdiri? Itu yang saya ragukan sangat, dan manakala saya terangkan perasaan ini, saya tahu pendirian dia. Saya tahu, saya tahu fahaman dia, saya tahu. Terima-lah bedilan pula!

Tuan Pengerusi, saya di-dalam masaalah ini pun ta' perlu saya hendak ulang²kan dan Ahli² Yang Berhormat dari sahabat² saya pun akan berchakap dalam perkara ini, dan kami tidak akan puas, Tuan Pengerusi, sa-lama Tuan Pengerusi tidak benarkan kami—kami bukan orang bodoh semua, kami boleh berchakap. Benarkan-lah kami berchakap, kami basoh semua orang² ini, sampai batu² itu kami hendak basoh.

Pada akhir-nya, Tuan Pengerusi, ta' ada benda baharu. Benda baharu yang

original yang di-bawa oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu itu ta' ada—ta' ada benda. Benda itu benda yang sudah lapok, yang ta' laku di-Sunday Market pun ta' laku modal dia ini, maseh di-bawa lagi ka-dalam Dewan ini; dan oleh kerana itu-lah Ahli Yang Berhormat sahabat saya dari Pontian Selatan sudah bomb dia, Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Kuala Trengganu Utara tadi telah buldozer dengan dia, dan saya hanya untuk menyapu berseh mana yang tinggal² (*Ketawa*). Sekian, Tuan Pengerusi.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Chairman, Sir, may I have a very brief reply because tomorrow morning I will have to be at the Selangor Legislative Assembly and I will not be present. I will take no more than five minutes.

Mr Chairman: I do not think you can give a reply satisfactorily in five minutes.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: I will not take very long, Sir. I am not that long-winded; I am not that vindictive.

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Mr Chairman, Sir, there are a few of us who would like to take part in this debate, too. I think we should continue tomorrow morning.

Mr Chairman: Yes, I think we adjourn till tomorrow.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Chairman, Sir, then I regret, as I have said, I will not be here tomorrow morning.

Mr Chairman: It is for you to be here or not; it is not for me. You started this and it is for you to be here. It does not matter to me.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: I just wish to inform the House that I will not be here tomorrow morning as I have to be present at the Selangor Legislative Assembly.

Mr Chairman: The time of the House is not in my entire control; it is in your hands.

House resumes.

Mr Speaker: Honourable Members, I have to report that the Committee of Supply on the Supply Bill, 1965, has progressed up to Head S. 20 of the Schedule to the Bill.

ADJOURNMENT

Dato' Dr Ismail: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn.

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

ADJOURNMENT SPEECH

ACTS OF BRUTALITY BY CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE POLICE FORCE

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, after much amount of heat that has been generated in the last two hours. I hope this further speech of mine regarding reforms in Police investigations will not generate further heat from the Minister of Home Affairs.

Mr Speaker, Sir, at the October session of this House, it was my very pleasant duty to bring to the notice of this House the exemplary conduct of a member of the Police Force, namely Felix Manuel. Today I have the unpleasant duty of speaking on the subject of Police brutality. Cases of deaths of persons in Police custody, the peculiar way such deaths are supposed to have taken place and the lack of evidence from Police officers and men who could be the only witnesses, have compelled me to bring to the notice of this House the urgent need for reforms in the method of investigations, interrogations and examinations carried out by the Police.

Although only a few cases have been heard ended in deaths and have been the subject of inquests, there are many cases of individuals who have been arrested by the Police and have been man-handled while being interrogated in Police cells, lock-ups and other interrogation centres.

We all must have read with horror the death in a cell in Kuching of a political detainee. Wong Yuen Eng. The evidence relating to his death has been so shrouded in mystery that the Coroner, even after two inquests, had to give an open verdict. This had to be so because the only people who had access to the detainees were the Police officers, and only the Police

officers and men could know what happened in the Police Station. As officers in the same service, it would not be possible for them to give evidence that would implicate their own kind from whom they would expect reciprocal treatment. Mr Speaker, Sir, may I, in this connection, quote very briefly from a report of this inquest? This is what the Coroner said of the case in question, and I quote:

"Mr Rajah is a senior officer of Police and was called in (presumably to give an objective police investigation) so that an objective police investigation could be carried out. In my view and from hearing him give evidence, it appeared that Mr Rajah, perhaps sub-consciously, was not objective at all. He conceded that alcohol was given to the deceased. He conceded that it was given by one of the staff in the Interrogation Centre. He conceded that he questioned all the staff and that they all denied administering alcohol. When the Court put to the witness the obvious and indeed the only inference which logically could be drawn from such denials, namely, that one or more of the staff was lying, his reply, after considerable hesitation, was that no one way lying but just withholding information. This is a ridiculous evasion and a quibble not expected, I would have thought, from a senior officer conducting an impartial investigation into an extremely important case. If an investigation is going to be carried out by officers who are determined, no matter what the facts are, to shield their own men, then the investigation might just as well be discontinued."

Mr Speaker, Sir, this is the finding of the Coroner in this case.

Sir, there has also been another case of a man who died in custody in a Police Station some time last year, and I think it was in Kedah or Perlis. In this case, the man was supposed to have slipped and fallen into a drain while being escorted to the bathroom, and medical aid could not be sought until the man had been dead for some time. It could not be established whether the man died as a result of the supposed fall or as a result of the Police brutality.

I shall yet quote another example of Police brutality. On the 26th of June this year at 2.00 p.m., Enche Lai Peng Seong, Vice-Chairman of the Pekan Jawi Branch of the Labour Party of Malaya, was arrested. On the 27th June, 1964, at 6.00 a.m. he was seen to have been taken to the vicinity of

a Chinese graveyard of Kampi Rasan and was beaten there. I can go on *ad infinitum* quoting such instances, but I hope these three cases that I have quoted will suffice.

I am sure members of the legal profession, who have had occasion to take up such cases, are very familiar with such Police brutality. But it cannot be denied that the Police have used unnecessary force on those who are interrogated. I myself have been approached by members of the public, who have suffered in the hands of the Police but, because of lack of medical evidence, I have asked these people to forget about such manhandling by the Police. This difficulty arises out of the fact that investigations and interrogations are conducted by officers behind closed doors and no members of the public or relations of the captives are permitted, even within hearing distance of the Police Station; hence the difficulty in getting evidence of such a Police brutality.

Mr Speaker, Sir, before I close, I wish to make it quite clear that only a few members of the Police Force have perpetrated such acts of brutality. My indictment must not be taken to mean that I am tarring the whole Police Force with the same brush. On the contrary, I wish to reiterate that the Police Force, as a whole, is doing a good job under very trying conditions, but there are a few "black sheep" in the Police Force as in any other profession, and it is because of them that I have brought these cases before this House this evening.

Dato' Dr Ismail: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am glad that the Honourable Member qualified himself at the end of his speech because, when I first heard him making the accusation, I thought that he was going to blacken the whole of the Police Force, of which I know the whole country is proud, especially at this time when we are being confronted by Indonesia.

Sir, I will not be so presumptuous as the Honourable Member to comment on the observations made by the Coroner who conducted the enquiry into

the death of that person in Kuching because, not being a learned member in law as, I am sure, the Honourable Member who is also not learned in law, I do not think we are competent to do so. However, in so far as that part of the quotation of the case read by him, I am sure the Police will take note of it. But, as far as I am concerned, the Court made this decision—it gave an open verdict.

Now, the other case that he referred to was the case in Kedah. Sir, I would like to elaborate on this case, because so many may misinterpret what the Honourable Member has said about this case. This case refers to a person who died of internal haemorrhage due to ruptured spleen in the police lock-up at the Jitra Police Station in December, 1961. On this particular occasion, the injury was inflicted when the deceased before his death tripped and fell across the concrete drain on his return from the bathroom at about 12.30 a.m. on 24th December, 1964. He was heard groaning with pain in the lock-up at about 1.05 a.m. and medical aid was immediately sought. However, by the time the Hospital Assistant arrived at 1.20 a.m., he has already passed away. The Court's findings in this case were, and I quote:

“Death through misadventure by falling on the drain but due to some negligence on the part of the Police.”

With regard to that part of the verdict where the Police have been blamed for some negligence, appropriate actions have been taken. The Coroner considered that the police escort should have warned the deceased of the existence of the drain and that the deceased's complaint of pain in the abdomen immediately following the fall should have been attended to there and then.

Police enquiries were immediately commenced on these two aspects and it was concluded that there was insufficient grounds to justify impositions of any punishment on the police officers concerned.

The spot where the drain runs across the path was adequately lighted and no one would normally miss it. Nobody,

prior to this occasion, tripped and fell on this drain during the night. The real need for any warning, therefore, did not arise.

It is admitted that the deceased complained of some pain in the abdomen as a result of the fall. However, judging from the nature of the fall and the absence of external injuries, the Inspector on duty—not being a doctor—believed in good faith that the deceased was suffering from ordinary stomach pain. Hence he was not aware of the seriousness of the sickness until about half-an-hour later when he visited the deceased in the lock-up who was then groaning with pain.

Nevertheless improvements have been made to this station by the construction of another bathroom to replace the former one which was at some distance from the station building itself. In addition, a general Force direction has been issued to this effect—

- (i) directing police officers to immediately seek medical attendance to all prisoners complaining of illness and prohibiting them from assessing the complaints themselves;
- (ii) directing all police escort to be diligent and alert.

Now, Sir, it will be appreciated that to conclude from these cases that the Police practise “third degree” methods during the course of investigations is, to say the least, highly unwholesome, especially at this juncture when public co-operation with the Police and other Security Forces is of first importance. Members of the public have co-operated extremely well in the elimination of Indonesian infiltrators and such conclusions and statements as the Honourable Member has made could only mislead the general public into believing that “third degree” methods are adopted by the Police and thereby bring the Force as a whole into contempt. But as I have said, he has qualified himself saying that not the whole Force was guilty. And here, Sir, while I would like to categorically deny that the Police ever practise any form

of "third degree" methods, it is conceded that there have been isolated cases of individual police officers abusing their powers by the use of force on persons arrested and detained by them. Allegations and complaints have been received and where investigations confirmed the truth thereof, appropriate actions (leading to prosecutions in Court in certain cases) have been taken.

The Government does not permit use of third degree methods, nor would it condone any such high-handed actions by any member of the police and, as such, the need for reforms in the manner investigations are carried out, does not arise.

Question put, and agreed to.

House adjourned at 8.15 p.m.