Volume I
No. 3

Thursday
21st May, 1964

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

OFFICIAL REPORT

CONTENTS

DI-CHETAK DI-JABATAN CHETAK KERAJAAN
OLEH THOR BENG CHONG, A.M.N., PENCHETAK KERAJAAN
KUALA LUMPUR
1965

Harga: $1

MALAYSIA

DEWAN RA'AYAT

(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

Official Report

First Session of the Second Dewan Ra'ayat

Thursday, 21st May, 1964

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

PRESENT:

The Honourable Mr Speaker, TUAN SYED ESA BIN ALWEE, J.M.N., S.M.J., P.I.S. (Batu Pahat Dalam).

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

„ the Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Defence, Minister of National and Rural Development and Minister of Lands and Mines, TUN HAJI ABDUL RAZAK BIN DATO' HUSSAIN, S.M.N. (Pekan).

„ the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, DATO' V. T. SAMBANTHAN, P.M.N. (Sungei Siput).

„ the Minister of Transport, DATO' HAJI SARDON BIN HAJI JUBIR, P.M.N. (Pontian Utara).

„ the Minister of Health, ENCHE' BAHAMAN BIN SAMSUDIN (Kuala Pilah).

„ the Minister of Education, ENCHE' ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAJI TALIB (Kuantan).

„ the Minister of Commerce and Industry, DR LIM SWEE AUN, J.P. (Larut Selatan).

„ the Minister for Welfare Services, TUAN HAJI ABDUL HAMID KHAN BIN HAJI SAKHAWAT ALI KHAN, J.M.N., J.P. (Batang Padang).

„ the Minister for Local Government and Housing, ENCHE' KHAW KAI BOH, P.J.K. (Ulu Selangor).

„ the Minister for Sarawak Affairs, DATO' TEMENGGONG JUGAH ANAK BARIENG, P.M.N., P.D.K. (Sarawak).

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

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

„ the Assistant Minister of Commerce and Industry, TUAN HAJI ABDUL KHALID BIN AWANG OSMAN (Kota Star Utara).

„ the Assistant Minister of Lands and Mines, ENCHE' MOHD. GHAZALI BIN HAJI JAWI (Ulu Perak).

„ the Assistant Minister of National and Rural Development and Assistant Minister of Justice, ENCHE' ABDUL-RAHMAN BIN YA'KUB (Sarawak).

The Honourable the Assistant Minister of Agricuture and Co-operatives, ENCHE' SULAIMAN BIN BULON (Bagan Datoh).

" the Assistant Minister of Youth, Culture and Sports, ENGKU MUHSEIN BIN ABDUL KADIR, J.M.N., 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. (Malacca Selatan).

" WAN ABDUL KADIR BIN ISMAIL (Kuala Trengganu Utara).

" ENCHE' ABDUL RAHIM ISHAK (Singapore).

" WAN ABDUL RAHMAN BIN DATU TUANKU BUJANG (Sarawak).

" TUAN HAJI ABDUL RASHID BIN HAJI JAIS (Sabah).

" ENCHE' ABDUL RAUF BIN A. RAHMAN, K.M.N., P.J.K. (Krian Laut).

" ENCHE' ABDUL RAZAK BIN HAJI HUSSIN (Lipis).

" ENCHE' ABDUL SAMAD BIN GUL AHMAD MIANJI (Pasir Mas Hulu).

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

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

" TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI MOHD. SALLEH, A.M.N., S.M.J., P.I.S. (Segamat Utara).

" TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN ABDULLAH (Kelantan Hilir).

" ENCHE' AHMAD BIN ARSHAD, A.M.N. (Muar Utara).

" TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN SAAID (Seberang Utara).

" CHE' AJIBAH BINTI ABOL (Sarawak).

" ENCHE' ALI BIN HAJI AHMAD (Pontian Selatan).

" O. K. K. DATU ALIUDDIN BIN DATU HARUN, P.D.K. (Sabah).

" DR AWANG BIN HASSAN, S.M.J. (Muar Selatan).

" ENCHE' AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Muar Dalam).

" ENCHE' JONATHAN BANGAU ANAK RENANG (Sarawak).

" PENGARAH BANYANG ANAK JANTING (Sarawak).

" ENCHE' CHAN CHONG WEN, A.M.N. (Kluang Selatan).

" ENCHE' CHAN SEONG YOON (Setapak).

" ENCHE' CHEN WING SUM (Damansara).

" ENCHE' CHIA CHIN SHIN (Sarawak).

" ENCHE' FRANCIS CHIA NYUK TONG (Sabah).

" ENCHE' CHIA THYE POH (Singapore).

" ENCHE' CHIN FOON (Ulu Kinta).

" ENCHE' C. V. DEVAN NAIR (Bungsar).

" ENCHE' EDWIN ANAK TANGKUN (Sarawak).

" DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI ABDUL MAJID (Johor Bahru Timor).

" DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI HASHIM, P.M.N. (Jitra-Padang Terap).

" ENCHE' S. FAZUL RAHMAN, A.D.K. (Sabah).

The Honourable ENCHE' GANING BIN JANGKAT (Sabah).
„ ENCHE' GEH CHONG KEAT, K.M.N. (Penang Utara).
„ ENCHE' HAMZAH BIN ALANG, A.M.N. (Kapar).
„ ENCHE' HANAFI BIN MOHD. YUNUS, A.M.N. (Kulim Utara).
„ ENCHE' HANAFIAH BIN HUSSAIN (Jerai).
„ ENCHE' HARUN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Baling).
„ WAN HASSAN BIN WAN DAUD (Tumpat).
„ ENCHE' HO SEE BENG (Singapore).
„ ENCHE' STANLEY HO NGUN KHIU, A.D.K. (Sabah).
„ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN TO' MUDA HASSAN (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).
„ TUAN SYED JA'AFAR BIN HASAN ALBAR, J.M.N. (Johore Tenggara).
„ ENCHE' JEK YEUN THONG (Singapore).
„ PENGHULU JINGGUT ANAK ATTAN (Sarawak).
„ ENCHE' KADAM ANAK KIAI (Sarawak).
„ ENCHE' KAM WOON WAH, J.P. (Sitiawan).
„ ENCHE' KHOO PENG LOONG (Sarawak).
„ DATO' KHOO SIAK CHIEW, P.D.K. (Sabah).
„ ENCHE' KOW KEE SENG (Singapore).
„ ENCHE' EDMUND LANGGU ANAK SAGA (Sarawak).
„ ENCHE' LEE KUAN YEW (Singapore).
„ ENCHE' LEE SAN CHOON, K.M.N. (Segamat Selatan).
„ ENCHE' LEE SECK FUN (Tanjong Malim).
„ ENCHE' AMADEUS MATHEW LEONG, A.D.K. (Sabah).
„ ENCHE' LING BENG SIEW (Sarawak).
„ DR LIM CHONG EU (Tanjong).
„ ENCHE' LIM HUAN BOON (Singapore).
„ ENCHE' LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).
„ DATO' LIM KIM SAN, D.U.T. (Singapore).
„ ENCHE' LIM PEE HUNG (Alor Star).
„ ENCHE' PETER LO SU YIN (Sabah).
„ DR MAHATHIR BIN MOHAMAD (Kota Star Selatan).
„ ENCHE' T. MAHIMA SINGH, J.P. (Port Dickson).
„ ENCHE' JOE MANJAJI (Sabah).
„ DR HAJI MEGAT KHAS, J.P., P.J.K. (Kuala Kangsar).
„ ENCHE' MOHD. ARIF SALLEH, A.D.K. (Sabah).
„ ENCHE' MOHAMED ASRI BIN HAJI MUDA (Pasir Puteh).
„ ORANG TUA MOHAMMAD DARA BIN LANGPAD (Sabah).

The Honourable ENCHE' MOHD. DAUD BIN ABDUL SAMAD (Besut).
" ENCHE' MOHAMED IDRIS BIN MATSIL (Jelebu-Jempol).
" ENCHE' MOHAMED NOORDIN BIN MASTAN, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Seberang Selatan).
" ENCHE' MOHD. TAHIR BIN ABDUL MAJID, S.M.S., P.J.K. (Kuala Langat).
" ENCHE' MOHAMED YUSOF BIN MAHMUD, A.M.N. (Temerloh).
" ENCHE' MOHD. ZAHIR BIN HAJI ISMAIL (Sungei Patani).
" WAN MOKHTAR BIN AHMAD (Kemaman).
" TUAN HAJI MOKHTAR BIN HAJI ISMAIL (Perlis Selatan).
" ENCHE' MUHAMMAD FAKHRUDDIN BIN HAJI ABDULLAH (Pasir Mas Hilir).
" TUAN HAJI MUHAMMAD SU'AUT BIN HAJI MUHD. TAHIR (Sarawak).
" DATO' HAJI MUSTAPHA BIN HAJI ABDUL JABAR, D.P.M.S., A.M.N., J.P. (Sabak Bernam).
" ENCHE' MUSTAPHA BIN AHMAD (Tanah Merah).
" DATO' NIK AHMAD KAMIL, D.K., S.P.M.K., S.M.J.K., P.M.N., P.Y.G.P., Dato' Sri Setia Raja (Kota Bharu Hilir).
" ENCHE' 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)
" ABANG OTHMAN BIN HAJI MOASILI (Sarawak).
" ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN WOK (Singapore).
" ENCHE' QUEK KAI DONG, J.P. (Seremban Timor).
" ENCHE' S. RAJARATNAM (Singapore).
" TUAN HAJI RAHMAT BIN HAJI DAUD, A.M.N. (Johore Bahru Barat).
" ENCHE' RAMLI BIN OMAR (Krian Darat).
" TUAN HAJI REDZA BIN HAJI MOHD. SAID, J.P. (Rembau-Tampin).
" RAJA ROME BIN RAJA MA'AMOR (Kuala Selangor).
" ENCHE' SANDOM ANAK NYUAK (Sarawak).
" ENCHE' SEAH TENG NGIAB, P.I.S. (Muar Pantai).
" ENCHE' D. R. SEENIVASAGAM (Ipoh).
" ENCHE' S. P. SEENIVASAGAM (Menglembu).
" ENCHE' SIM BOON LIANG (Sarawak).
" ENCHE' SIOW LOONG HIN, P.J.K. (Seremban Barat).
" ENCHE' SNG CHIN JOO (Sarawak).
" DATU DONALD ALOYSIUS STEPHENS, P.D.K. (Sabah).
" ENCHE' SULEIMAN BIN ALI (Dungun).
" PENGIRAN TAHIR PETRA (Sabah).
" ENCHE' TAJUDIN BIN ALI, P.J.K. (Larut Utara).
" ENCHE' TAI KUAN YANG (Kulim Bandar Bharu).
" DR TAN CHEE KHOON (Batu).
" ENCHE' TAN CHENG BEE, J.P. (Bagan).

The Honourable ENCHE' TAN TOH HONG (Bukit Bintang).
„ ENCHE' TAN TSAK YU (Sarawak).
„ ENCHE' TIAH ENG BEE (Kluang Utara).
„ DR TOH CHIN CHYE (Singapore).
„ ENCHE' TOH THEAM HOCK (Kampar).
„ PENGHULU FRANCIS UMPAU ANAK EMPAM (Sarawak).
„ ENCHE' YEH PAO TZE (Sabah).
„ ENCHE' YEOH TAT BENG (Bruas).
„ ENCHE' STEPHEN YONG KUET TZE (Sarawak).
„ ENCHE' YONG NYUK LIN (Singapore).
„ TUAN HAJI ZAKARIA BIN HAJI MOHD. TAIB (Langat).

ABSENT:

The Honourable 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 Agriculture and Co-operatives, ENCHE' MOHAMED KHIR BIN JOHARI (Kedah Tengah).
„ ENCHE' CHAN SIANG SUN (Bentong).
„ DATU GANIE GILONG, P.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).
„ DR GOH KENG SWEE (Singapore).
„ ENCHE' SOH AH TECK (Batu Pahat).
„ ENCHE' TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Melaka).
„ ENCHE' WEE TOON BOON (Singapore).

PRAYERS

Mr Speaker *in the Chair*)

MOTION

THE YANG DI-PERTUAN AGONG'S SPEECH

Address of Thanks

Order read for resumption of debate on Question,

"That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong as follows:

'Your Majesty,

We, the Speaker and Members of the Dewan Ra'ayat Malaysia in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer Your Majesty our humble thanks for the Gracious Speech with which the First Session of the Second Parliament has been opened.' "

Debate resumed.

Enche' Ali bin Haji Ahmad (Pontian Selatan): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada petang semalam saya baharu sempat menyentoh sadikit sahaja uchapan atau pun perbahathan Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Pasir Puteh. Patut saya ulang sadikit untok mengingatkan sa-mula ia-itu Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Pasir Puteh chuba mengingatkan atau meng-ajar kita tentang erti dasar chinta kapada perdamaian dan benchi kapada peperangan. Soal yang kita hadap pada ketika ini ia-lah bukan lagi soal, apa-kah polisi atau dasar Kerajaan Perikatan. Memang sejak daripada kita menchapai kemerdekaan, dasar kita ia-lah chintakan perdamaian dan benchikan peperangan. Di-mana juga timbul-nya kekerasan dan peperangan kita menentang sama ada daripada blok barat atau blok timor. Jadi dalam hal ini bukan-lah soal kita chinta damai atau tidak tetapi ia-lah soal

konfrantasi yang telah di-hadapkan kapada kita, di-lancharkan oleh Kerajaan President Soekarno, Kerajaan daripada negara tetangga yang sa-lama ini kita hormati sa-bagai saudara tua. Ta' payah Ahli Yang Berhormat itu chuba mengajar kita. Jadi siapa-kah melancharkan dasar konfrantasi, kita atau Kerajaan President Soekarno? Siapa-kah yang belligerent, kita atau Kerajaan President Soekarno? Ini dia soal-nya. Dan apabila konfrantasi di-lancharkan terhadap kita, sa-bagai satu bangsa dan negara yang mempunyaï maruah, sa-bagai satu bangsa dan negara yang ingin hidup di-dalam dunia, kita berhak mempertahankan diri, kita berhak menjaga maruah, kita berhak menjaga keutohan negara, kita berhak mengekalkan kemerdekaan kita. Ada-kah perbuatan ini semua di-anggap sa-bagai perbuatan orang yang sukakan peperangan? Dan sekarang saya kemukakan chabaran dan saya minta terutama sa-kali parti PAS, Socialist Front, Barisan Socialist supaya menyatakan terang[2] di-dalam Dewan ini bahawa ada-kah yang mereka itu menyokong atau menentang atau berkechuali terhadap pelancharan konfrantasi terhadap kita daripada Kerajaan President Soekarno. Ada-kah mereka menyokong, menentang atau berkechuali terhadap "ganyang Malaysia" oleh President Soekarno dan Kerajaan-nya itu? Nyatakan tegas[2] di-dalam Dewan' ini supaya kita tahu warna masing[2] parti untok kepentingan negara. Ada-kah mereka menyokong, menentang atau berkechuali lagi terhadap pencherobohan gurila[2] yang di-hantarkan dari Indonesia sana. Tegaskan di-sini. Ada-kah mereka juga menyokong atau menentang atau berkechuali terhadap saboteurs yang di-kirim dari Indonesia, banyak daripada-nya yang telah meletupkan bom di-Singapura atau sa-bagai-nya. Nyatakan sikap terhadap ini semua. Ini-lah sikap saya minta, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, supaya kita tahu kedudokan masing[2] parti di-dalam Dewan ini, supaya ra'ayat dapat menghakimkan mana-kah parti yang sa-sunggoh-nya mempertahankan negara, mana-kah parti yang sa-sunggoh-nya mempertahankan bangsa kita sesuai dengan sumpah kita yang telah di-angkat pada 18 haribulan. Kita telah mengangkat sumpah mempertahankan Malaysia, tetapi perbuatan kita, sikap kita tidak demikian. Maka saya takut, kalau kita mengikut keperchayaan Islam terutama sa-kali PAS, maka kita akan di-makan sumpah. Kita mengangkat sumpah, kita tidak mengikut sumpah maka kita akan di-makan sumpah.

Dan juga di-dalam pilehan raya yang lepas, soal yang paling hangat di-jadikan issue dalam pilehan raya ia-lah konfrantasi Malaysia. Ini soal yang paling besar. Di-tempat saya di-dalam pilehan raya kawasan Pontian Selatan, lawan saya ia-lah parti Socialist Front. Salah satu soal yang besar yang di-bawa-nya ka-mana[2] juga ia-lah konfrantasi, keamanan; undi Perikatan berperang, undi Socialist Front keamanan. Dengan issue ini juga tenggelam-nya chalun parti Socialist Front itu; bukan sadikit tenggelam-nya. Undi yang saya dapat lebeh sa-kali ganda daripada undi Socialist Front dan dengan issue ini juga banyak-lah tenggelam chalun[2] daripada parti Socialist Front dan chalun[2] daripada parti[2] lawan yang lain. Dan agak kechiwa juga saya masok dalam Parlimen ini kerana saya berharap dapat bertentang dengan wakil[2] ra'ayat mithal-nya daripada bekas Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bungsar. Tetapi dengan issue konfrantasi ini tenggelam-lah bekas Ahli Yang Berhormat itu dan kechiwa-lah saya tidak dapat bertentangan dengan-nya di-dalam Dewan ini.

Yang Berhormat daripada Pasir Puteh juga menyatakan ranchangan damai. Patut saya ulangi, kita tidak hendak sejarah berulang kembali. Pernah Chamberlain berlutut kapada Hitler meminta damai. Saya tidak rela Perdana Menteri kita berlutut meminta damai kapada President Soekarno. Kita tidak mahu peace at any cost and at any price, kita mahu keamanan dengan kehormatan kita di-hormati. Ini yang kita mahu, ini sikap kita. Ada-kah sikap ini sikap orang yang suka kapada peperangan? Jadi, sekarang nyata-lah sudah sikap kita. Pagi sa-malam telah di-sentoh juga

soal kita dengan Israil, patut saya nyatakan bahawa apabila Persekutuan menchapai kemerdekaan-nya maka kita masok ka-dalam Bangsa[2] Bersatu. Israil telah memang ada menjadi anggota Bangsa[2] Bersatu. Pengakuan kita terhadap Israil tidak lebeh sa-bagai anggota yang telah di-i'tiraf oleh Bangsa[2] Bersatu. Kita telah di-minta mengadakan hubongan diplomatic, akan tetapi kita tidak menerima, kita tidak mahu mengadakan hubongan diplomatic dengan Israil. Ini sikap kita, ini polisi kita. Kemudian apabila pasokan bola sepak Israil minta datang ka-mari hendak masok dalam pertandingan, kita tidak menerima pasokan Israil itu. Ada-kah sikap[2] yang sa-umpama ini di-katakan kita menyebelah Israil? Sa-balek-nya pula dalam perjuangan umat Arab chontoh-nya umat Aljeria yang menentang penjajahan Peranchis, kita tidak menyebelah kapada penjajahan, tetapi kita menyokong dengan sa-berapa daya upaya yang ada pada kita yang ada pada tenaga Kerajaan kita, kita menyokong perjuangan ra'ayat Aljeria. Ini sikap kita. Dan daripada bukti ini jelas-lah bahawa tidak-lah kita menyebelah Israil, sa-kadarkan mengakui Israil yang telah lebeh dahulu sabelum kita merdeka di-terima menjadi anggota Bangsa[2] Bersatu. Itu-lah sahaja pengakuan kita, tidak lebeh dari itu. Dan ini-lah yang kita katakan sikap kita yang bebas tidak menyebelah ka-mana[2]. Kita tidak menjadi perkakas barat, kita tidak pula menjadi perkakas belok kominis. Kita tahu sikap sa-tengah daripada parti[2] siasah dalam negeri ini kalau kesalahan itu di-lakukan puak barat maka mereka menghentam habis[2]an penjajahan, tetapi kalau kesalahan atau kekerasan itu di-lakukan oleh puak kominis, sa-patah pun mereka tidak berbunyi. Ini-kah yang di-namakan dasar bebas? Ini-kah yang di-namakan dasar berkechuali dari belok dunia? Dasar bebas Kerajaan kami Perikatan ia-lah siapa juga yang melakukan kesalahan kita tidak menyetujui-nya dan kita membangkang.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam negara demokrasi harus-lah ada rasa hormat-menghormati antara ra'ayat sama ra'ayat, antara parti siasah sama[2] parti siasah. Saya dapati kerap benar pehak P.A.P. merendah[2]kan parti[2] lawan dan merendah[2]kan orang[2] daripada parti lawan. Dan pehak P.A.P. pernah berkata bahawa orang[2] di-luar bandar, maksud-nya orang[2] yang menyokong Perikatan. orang[2] yang menyokong UMNO, kurang sophisticated dalam hal politik. Dan orang[2] yang di-bandar lebeh sophisticated. Patut saya ingatkan bahawa chakap[2] yang sa-umpama itu tidak akan dapat menolong melekaskan terchapai-nya persatuan dan perpaduan semua ra'ayat. Kita tahu di-kawasan luar bandar sa-bilangan besar daripada ra'ayat ia-lah terdiri daripada orang Melayu. Mengatakan orang[2] luar bandar itu less sophisticated maka bererti ini satu penghinaan kapada bangsa Melayu. Sa-lagi itu maseh terus-menerus di-perkatakan, maka sa-lagi itu, patut saya ingatkan, P.A.P. tidak akan dapat sokongan daripada orang[2] Melayu (*Tepok*). Ini patut saya ingatkan, kalau-lah P.A.P. hendak mendapat sokongan daripada orang Melayu lupakan-lah soal hina-menghina dan rendah-merendah dalam perjuangan parti[2] politik di-negeri ini. Kalau-lah P.A.P. hendak melekaskan hasrat terchapai-nya perpaduan bangsa di-negeri kita ini lupakan-lah soal rendah-merendah di-dalam perjuangan politik. Di-dalam negara demokrasi kita hormat-menghormati parti[2] lawan, saya hormati parti P.A.P., tetapi saya tidak dapat hendak menghormati sikap dan chakap[2] rendah-merendah, hina-menghina di-antara parti[2] siasah dalam negeri ini. Patut saya ingatkan kalau-lah orang[2] di-bandar sophisticated dalam politik mengapa-kah P.A.P. tidak dapat undi semua orang[2] Singapura, orang[2] sophisticated yang di-katakan-nya! Maseh banyak lagi Barisan Sosialis mendapat undi di-Singapura, ini juga orang[2] yang sophisticated yang di-anggap oleh pehak P.A.P. orang yang pintar dalam politik. Jadi, soal sophisticated atau tidak di-dalam politik bukan-lah terletak di-antara luar bandar dan di-dalam bandar. Soal-nya ia-lah keperchayaan ra'ayat. Orang[2] Melayu telah meletakkan keperchayaan-nya kapada UMNO

kerana pimpinan UMNO telah menchapaikan kemerdekaan negeri ini. Pimpinan UMNO telah memberikan kesenangan kapada ra'ayat, pimpinan UMNO telah memberikan keamanan kapada ra'ayat. Orang[2] yang datang daripada bandar tidak ada dan tidak tahu sa-benar[2]-nya dan merasa bagaimana pahit getir-nya kekachauan dalam masa dharurat. Saya yang tinggal dalam kampong, saya yang menoreh getah, saya pernah menangkap ikan, saya pernah memanching ikan di-sungai, saya tahu betapa pahit getir-nya kehidupan orang[2] di-kampong. Dan dengan berkat pimpinan UMNO telah terchapai-lah keamanan dalam negeri ini, dan oleh kerana itu ra'ayat perchayakan pimpinan UMNO, dan di-kampong[2] sa-bahagian yang terbesar-nya terdiri daripada orang Melayu. Maka orang[2] Melayu perchayakan pimpinan UMNO. Ini soal-nya. Dan sa-terus-nya ra'ayat perchaya pimpinan UMNO-lah yang dapat memberikan kebahagian kapada ra-'ayat, bukan-lah sophisticated atau tidak-nya, ini tidak timbul. Sa-makin selalu, sa-makin keras dan sa-makin banyak di-chakapkan soal sophisticated, pandai atau tidak pandai orang[2] di-luar bandar, maka sa-makin tipis-lah harapan parti P.A.P. untok mendapat sokongan daripada orang[2] di-luar bandar.

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam (Ipoh): (*Rises*).

Mr Speaker: Boleh benarkan dia berchakap sadikit!

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification. The Honourable speaker said, "The leadership of UMNO, UMNO, UMNO, ..." What has happened to the M.C.A. and M.I.C? Hirelings or underlings—what has happened? (*Laughter*).

Enche' Ali bin Haji Ahmad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, huraian-nya bagini: "Di-kawasan luar bandar sa-bahagian terbesar daripada pendudok[2]-nya ia-lah terdiri daripada orang[2] Melayu dan sa-bilangan terbesar daripada orang[2] Melayu ini ia-lah ahli[2] UMNO, sebab itu-lah saya berkata pimpinan UMNO di-luar bandar." Saya harap, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh itu terang dengan penjelasan saya ini.

Kemudian saya pergi pula kapada soal gerakan Trade Union. Kita tahu, kita telah banyak belajar daripada gerakan Trade Union di-Singapura. Bertahun[2] juga saya di-Singapura. Bertahun[2] juga saya memerhatikan dari dekat tentang gerakan Trade Union di-Singapura. Apa hendak buat, Singapura mempunyai autonomy dalam soal buroh erti-nya termasok dalam soal Trade Union. Sa-benar-nya Trade Union di-Singapura sudah di-jadikan alat dalam perjuangan parti[2] politik yang tertentu. Jadi sa-bahagian besar daripada perjuangan Trade Union di-Singapura itu ia-lah perjuangan untok kepentingan, untok tektik perjuangan sa-suatu parti politik yang tertentu. Jadi, soal kepentingan kaum buroh, soal kepentingan Trade Union, soal kebajikan kaum buroh sudah menjadi soal yang kedua. Soal strategy parti[2] politik itu-lah yang menjadi soal utama. Hal yang sa-umpama ini, biar kalau di-Singapura ta' usah saya sentoh, sebab Singapura mempunyai hak autonomy-nya sendiri dalam hal tersebut, tetapi saya berharap bahawa perkara yang sa-umpama ini, gerakan Trade Union, Gerakan Buroh di-negeri[2] di-sini dan juga di-Sabah dan Sarawak sana dapat di-perlindongi daripada di-jadikan alat oleh parti[2] politik. Saya berharap Undang[2] Trade Union di-tinjau kembali supaya dapat kita memperlindongi kepentingan kaum buroh, supaya dapat kita memperlindongi Trade Union, supaya gerakan Trade Union sa-benar[2]-nya dapat memberi kebajikan, dapat memberi faedah kapada kaum buroh.

Jadi, perlu juga saya rasa di-adakan pembersehan dalam gerakan Trade Union supaya maksud tersebut terchapai. Kalau-lah gerakan Trade Union sudah ada yang di-peralatkan, maka saya berharap perkara ini di-tinjau sa-mula supaya sa-benar[2]-nya-lah kita dapat memperlindongi kaum buroh. Meninjau kembali Undang[2] Trade Union bukan bererti kita memehak kapada kaum capitalist, tetapi yang kita perlukan ia-lah memperlindongi kepentingan kaum buroh. Tentang

chara[2] memperlindongi-nya itu, ta' payah-lah di-bicharakan di-sini, hanya saya menyatakan pada prinsip-nya sahaja ia-itu kita tinjau-lah kembali Undang[2] Trade Union kita supaya kepentingan gerakan kaum buroh, kepentingan kaum buroh di-negeri kita ini dapat di-perlindongi dan di-perbaiki.

Dalam masaalah konfrantasi bukan sahaja soal dari segi tentera, atau polis yang penting, tetapi soal daripada segi psychology juga penting. Sa-bagaimana kita menghadapi dharurat dahulu ia-itu kita usahakan chara[2]-nya supaya orang[2] yang terpengaroh oleh kominis itu, orang[2] muda yang di-pengarohi oleh kominis itu merasa bahawa mereka itu mempunyaï kepentingan dalam negeri ini, supaya mereka itu merasa diri mereka itu berhak untok bersama[2] menekmati keadaan hidup di-negeri ini. Jadi, dalam hal ini, saya berpaling kapada P.A.P lagi, sebab wakil daripada puak orang yang tertentu di-Singapura tidak ada dalam Dewan Ra'ayat ini, biar-lah saya menyuarakan-nya. Orang[2] Melayu di-Singapura merasa tersepit, merasa tertindeh. Orang[2] Melayu di-Singapura menuntut supaya mereka di-ambil masok dalam badan[2] Kerajaan. Soal gerai di-Geylang pun boleh saya sebutkan juga, tetapi ta' perlu-lah kerana detail sangat. Segala kehendak orang[2] kita Melayu di-Singapura itu di-chemohkan oleh pehak P.A.P. dengan mengatakan itu perkauman, ini perkauman. Ingat-lah! Kalau orang[2] Melayu di-Singapura merasa mereka tidak ada kepentingan di-Singapura, maka saya takut kita akan merasa lebeh sulit, lebeh sulit daripada menghadapi konfrantasi Indonesia sa-chara langsong dan berhadapan. Kita hendakkan ini, Kerajaan tudoh kita, Kerajaan chemohkan kita, kata-nya. Saya ta' hendak lebeh kerap bom berlaku di-Singapura daripada tempat[2] lain dalam Malaysia nanti. Jadi, saya harap pehak P.A.P. akan memberi perhatian, dan melaksanakan kehendak[2] mereka, bukan hanya sa-takat merakamkan di-dalam Perlembagaan Singapura, tetapi mengamalkan dengan sa-sunggoh-nya. Saya harap soal gerai di-Geylang telah di-selesaikan dengan baik-nya.

Sa-masa saya di-Singapura dua minggu dahulu, saya mendengar segala[2]-nya ini dan ra'ayat[2] Melayu di-Singapura minta saya sampaikan dalam Parlimen ini tentang keadaan orang[2] Melayu di-Singapura. Tidak berguna mengaku yang mereka tidak perkauman, tetapi pada amalan-nya perkauman juga. Ini yang saya kehendaki: Jalankan-lah, kalau tidak orang[2] Melayu di-Singapura sama-lah kedudokan-nya sa-bagaimana sa-tengah[2] orang China dalam masa dharurat dahulu, mudah menjadi mangsa. Dan dalam hal ini kita ta' hendak Malaysia kita kachau, kerana sikap sa-suatu Kerajaan Negeri yang pada hakikat-nya merbahayakan Malaysia.

Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh sa-malam juga telah berkata minta kita mengikut Kerajaan Singapura, khas-nya dalam soal University Nanyang. Saya ingin mengingatkan Ahli Yang Berhormat itu bahawa Kerajaan Perikatan ia-lah Kerajaan Pusat. Kerajaan Singapura hanya Kerajaan sa-buah Negeri. Jadi sa-patut-nya kalau kita hendak fikirkan logic-nya, Kerajaan Negeri-lah yang patut mengikut Kerajaan Pusat, dan bukan-lah Kerajaan Pusat yang patut mengikut Kerajaan Negeri. Kalau Singapura hendak mengakuï Nanyang University, maka oleh kerana Singapura mempunyaï autonomy dalam soal pelajaran, itu soal Singapura, tetapi logic ini tidak boleh di-kenakan kapada Kerajaan Pusat.

Satu soal lagi. Bertahun[2] saya di-Singapura. Banyak pergaulan saya dengan mahasiswa[2] Nanyang University. Boleh di-katakan saya tahu banyak juga-lah tentang kedudokan yang sa-benar-nya di-dalam Nanyang tentang taraf pelajaran dalam Nanyang itu; tahu-lah saya. Hasil Penyata Gwee Ah Ling terhadap Nanyang University sudah-kah di-selesaikan di-Singapura atau belum? Sedang kalau Singapura sendiri atau Nanyang sendiri belum dapat menghuraikan hasil[2] Penyata Gwee Ah Ling itu, maka macham mana pula-lah kita di-sini terus-menerus hendak mengaku kelulusan Nanyang University itu? Soal Kerajaan Singapura hendak

mengambil orang[2] yang lulus daripada Nanyang bekerja dengan-nya itu adalah soal Singapura—Singapura mempunyai autonomy dalam banyak hal. Boleh jadi soal mengambil orang[2] yang lulus daripada Nanyang University itu hanya-lah merupakan satu alat politik untok memenangi Pilehan Raya di-Singapura, dan kita tidak hendak menggunakan itu sa-bagai satu alat politik kita hendak menang Pilehan Raya. Tidak payah itu lagi kita sudah menang dengan hebat dalam Pilehan Raya (*Tepok*), bahkan parti yang menggunakan itu juga tidak menang, hanya satu sahaja menang daripada beberapa kerusi di-Pilehan Raya yang lepas di-sini. Jadi, ini menunjokkan saya rasa mentality kita dalam soal politik sophisticated juga. Kita tidak akan menerima apa juga yang berlaku di-Singapura itu-lah harus berlaku di-sini. Kalau parti itu menang di-Singapura pun maka parti itu menang di-sini. Lojik ini tidak berjalan di-sini.

Soal pembangunan luar bandar tidak payah-lah saya sentoh dengan panjang lebar, soal burok baik-nya. Hanya kalau parti[2] Pembangkang hendak berkata juga lagi biar-lah yang menasabah, jangan-lah di-kata ranchangan pembangunan luar bandar itu tidak berfaedah atau sa-bagai-nya. Ada-kah membuat kelinik itu tidak berfaedah, ada-kah membuat sekolah di-kawasan luar bandar itu tidak berfaedah dan ada-kah membuat jalan sama ada jalan besar atau tanah merah di-kawasan luar bandar itu tidak berfaedah? Jawab-lah masing[2]. Biar-lah saya tidak payah memberi jawapan. Tetapi apa yang pasti kapada kita, kalau kita buat jalan tanah merah parti[2] lawan itu turut sama berjalan atas jalan tanah merah itu, masok kampong[2] menggunakan ranchangan pembangunan luar bandar untok berkempen hendak menang dalam pilehan raya, tetapi banyak yang kalah juga.

Kalau susah[2] sangat berfikir, baginilah: kalau ranchangan pembangunan luar bandar ini tidak mendatangkan faedah, parti[2] lawan mengatakan ini tidak mendatangkan faedah, jangan-lah berjalan atas jalan raya, jangan-lah berjalan atas tanah merah, berjalan-lah dalam parit (*Ketawa*) atau pun berjalan-lah atas akar[2] kayu atau pun melompat[2] dari dahan ka-dahan atau dari ranting ka-ranting pokok kayu. Chuba-lah buat bagitu sebab ranchangan pembangunan luar bandar itu tidak berfaedah konon. Dan kalau hendak beranak ya'ani bersalin jangan pergi ka-kelinik, bersalin-lah di-banir kempas.

Saya tidak payah rasa-nya hendak berchakap panjang lagi, hendak menyentoh segala soal. Pada akhir-nya, saya menguchapkan sa-tinggi[2] tahniah atas Titah Uchapan di-Raja pada Pembukaan Session Parlimen ini.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon (Batu): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun untok menguchapkan terima kaseh kapada Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong atas Titah-nya kapada Dewan Yang Berhormat ini. Tetapi terlebeh dahulu saya hendak menguchapkan, oleh kerana saya datang daripada kawasan Batu, saya berharap Ahli[2] di-Dewan Ra'ayat ini jangan-lah ingat saya ialah sa-orang "mulut batu". Saya ingin mengambil peluang di-sini mengulang ta'at setia kami dari Front Socialist Ra'ayat kapada Kebawah Duli, kapada Negara dan kapada Perlembagaan yang menjamin demokerasi berparlimen dalam Negara kita ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ingin hendak menyentoh beberapa perkara dalam Titah Kebawah Duli itu, terutama atas perkara Malaysia. Dalam menyentoh soal Malaysia ini saya suka menjelaskan sa-mula lagi kapada Dewan Yang Berhormat ini sikap Partai kami terhadap soal tersebut. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya sekarang minta keizinan untok saya memberi uchapan saya di-dalam bahasa Inggeris.

Mr Speaker, Sir, like the previous speaker, the Member for Pontian Selatan, I too am a new Member of this House. In a sense I too am a green horn, or a freshie, as a senior in a university would call such a person. But I can assure Honourable Members of this House that I am not exactly a political virgin. (*Laughter*).

Mr Speaker, Sir, as I have said in the national language, I come from the constituency of Batu, and I do hope that Honourable Members of this House will not regard me, as they call it in the national language, "mulut batu", as I can well produce about a verbal diarrhoea should the occasion arise.

Mr Speaker, Sir, before I go on to my main topic of Malaysia, may I, with your permission, comment on some of the speeches of the previous Honourable speakers. The Member for Hilir Perak has commented on the Ministry of Welfare, and I do support him on the establishment of this new Ministry. Later on I shall comment on what I think should be the function of this new Ministry. He has also commented a great deal on the PAP, and the Honourable Member for Pontian Selatan, I hope, has indicated to the PAP in no uncertain manner what the UMNO thinks of the PAP. Here, if I may interject a little, the Honourable Member for Ipoh stood up and was a little perturbed and, perhaps, nonplussed as to why it was UMNO, UMNO, UMNO all the time. He wanted to ask about the significance of the MCA and the MIC in this set-up of the Alliance Party, and I do not think he did get a satisfactory reply from the Member for Pontian Selatan. The truth of the matter, Mr Speaker, is that the Alliance Party is an ill-conceived marriage of convenience with the UMNO as the husband and two wives in the persons of the MIC and the MCA. And you had during the recent elections the unsavoury spectacle of yet another party trying to be yet another wife of the UMNO. I refer to the attempts of the PAP to woo the UMNO. (*Laughter*). Mr Speaker, Sir, later on I shall comment a little further on this aspect of it. I hope I have given a satisfactory answer to the Honourable Member for Ipoh.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for Ipoh yesterday also touched on the election irregularities. My colleague, the Member from Dato Kramat, in his speech no doubt will also touch a bit on it. For my part, I do not wish to rehash what the Honourable Member for Ipoh has said. I merely want to make two comments. There was no doubt that there was intimidation on the part of the Alliance Party on a mass scale. It happened in my constituency of Batu. Mr Speaker, Sir, in the constituency of Batu there is the Sungei Buloh Settlement which has 1,500-plus voters. Naturally, all the three parties concerned campaigned in that settlement and I as a doctor perhaps had a little edge over my worthy colleagues in that place. For instance, I went to every ward and I shook hands with every patient: I did not wash my hands after shaking hands with them. Whenever I met an Indian patient I could speak to him *"Vanakam, En per Dr Tan Chee Khoon. Soru sappittacha?"* I could speak to the Tamil patient in the language that he understood. I could also speak to the Punjabi patient, Mr Speaker, Sir—*Babuji, nam khya hai? Khana khata hai?"* So, I went from house to house and from bed to bed and I think I did create a good impression amongst the patients of Sungei Buloh Settlement. But my worthy opponents, perhaps, because it was a Leper Asylum, did not dare to go near the patients until they found out that this rascal of Tan Chee Khoon had an edge over them. So, they too went and saw a few patients. Mr Speaker, Sir, came polling day, and what was the result? Our supporters in that area did not dare to put up a *pondok*. There was only one *pondok* in Sungei Buloh Settlement and that *pondok* was put up by the Alliance Party. Our supporters did not dare. What is the reason? The Alliance Party went round and said, "If you vote the *chilaka* Socialist Front, you will get discharged tomorrow." That was what happened, Mr Speaker, Sir. In 1959 the previous Medical Superintendent did exactly the same thing. I am glad to say that despite this intimidation I had a fair measure of support from the voters in Sungei Buloh.

I shall comment on another irregularity that I know of: Mr Speaker,

Sir, that was when one presiding officer took it into his head to issue only one ballot paper to four voters. As you know, Mr Speaker, Sir, in the recent elections every voter was entitled to two votes—one at Federal level and one at State level. But for reasons best known to this presiding officer, he issued one ballot paper and that was for the parliamentary seat. When it was pointed out to the senior presiding officer he admitted the fact, and then when this was brought to the attention of the presiding officer concerned, he too admitted the fact, and that is all recorded. When it was asked how could one settle this miscarriage of justice, one was told "Oh, the error has been rectified." Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not know what that rectification consisted of. As you know, Mr Speaker, Sir, once a voter leaves the polling booth and gets out of the polling compound and gets milled up in the thousands of supporters that surrounded the polling compound, I think, it is physically impossible to call the voter back and rectify the mistake. He might have gone. After voting he might have gone to Port Dickson for a sea bath having voted for the right party. Mr Speaker, Sir, this is another irregularity, and I only wish to bring up to the attention of this House these two irregularities.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for Ipoh also stated that we on this side of the House would like to have a little more information on the qualification of Ministers and the Chairman of the various statutory bodies. He, in particular, referred to the qualifications of the Assistant Minister of Education for his post. I do hope that for the education of this side of the House, when it comes to the Government front-benchers to reply, they would at least enlighten the Honourable Member for Ipoh—and I too would like to be enlightened on this matter.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for Ipoh also asked for the recognition of the Nanyang University. I notice that this produced a very harsh reply from the Honourable Member for Pontian Selatan. I think people on the other side of the House get hot under the collar very easily, Mr Speaker. I think the Member for Ipoh was wrong in saying that the PAP has recognised the Nanyang University—(*Interpolation*) he says he did not say that. The true position is that they have employed graduates of the Nanyang University and they have not recognised the degrees of Nanyang University. Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not see anything wrong in asking for the recognition of the Nanyang University, or for that matter the recognition of any university provided the academic standards are right. For example, if I remember rightly, in the previous House lots of people on the other side of the House asked for the recognition of degrees from the Al-Azhar University where I had the privilege to meet some of them when I went round the university there. I do not see the logic of the Member for Pontian Selatan when he says that because the university is situated in Singapore, how can we in the Federation recognise such a university? That coming from an honours graduate of the University of Malaya is, to say the least, puerile, because if you take that logic then you can only recognise the degrees from the University of Malaya and perhaps the University of Singapore and nobody else. If that is so, how are we to man the public services in this country? And we know that in this House there are so many graduates from venerable universities all over the world, and if you look around you you will find that Oxford, Cambridge, the London University, Australian Universities are all represented in this House. If we follow the logic of the Honourable Member for Pontian Selatan, then, because those universities are not situated in a certain place we cannot recognise those universities. We in the Socialist Front also asked for the recognition of the Nanyang University degrees. I do not see anything wrong in that request, provided there are safeguards regarding the academic standards. Surely, in a matter of the recognition of a University degree, the paramount importance is to

see whether the academic standards of that University measure up to acceptable standards.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for Ipoh also mentioned the question of equality, and I think this is a good time to dwell a little on this matter of equality. We are faced with a very grave crisis—confrontation. Every Member spouts confrontation in this House and outside this House. Quite rightly the citizens of this country are asked to register and, perhaps, when the call-up comes up, to rise up to the occasion and rally round in the defence of the country. As the Honourable Member for Ipoh has stated, the response to this has been overwhelming. Now, if the response is overwhelming and if citizens of this country are asked to take up arms and to die in the defence of this country, when it comes to the defence of the country, everybody is equal. Nobody says that if you are not of such and such race, you would not be called up, and that if you are of such and such race, you would be called up; or that—if we take that there should be really a shooting war—one particular race will be shot dead and the other race will not be shot dead. All of us must be prepared to spill our blood and die in the defence of the country. If you ask a person to register, to enrol, and to die for the defence of the country, then surely you must consider the fact that a person who is asked to make such a sacrifice should be given equality of status. To that extent, Mr Speaker, Sir, I fully support the request of the Honourable Member for Ipoh.

Mr Speaker, Sir, unfortunately, or otherwise, the Member for Ipoh spoke on multi-lingualism and, as I have said, Honourable Members on the opposite side of the House get very hot under the collar when multi-lingualism is mentioned. For my part, Sir, I am not so easily excited, and I am quite prepared to argue till the cows come home with the Honourable Member for Ipoh on the virtues or otherwise of multi-lingualism. I do not easily get hot under the collar because somebody has asked for multi-lingualism. Mr Speaker, Sir, it must not be taken that I support, or my Party supports, multi-lingualism. I only say that if anything emanates from this House, please let us not get hot under the collar on the opposite side of the House. Let us in a cool and calm manner debate this matter or any other matters that are brought up by Members on this side of the House.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for Pontian Selatan also stated, if I may quote from his speech, that "in the years to come we will not be afraid of other races and we will be prepared to compete with them on equal terms." Mr Speaker, Sir, that is a very reassuring statement to us in this side of the House. Although we do realise that there may be a place for special rights of the Malays in this country, in the long term it is not to the advantage of anybody to have special rights; and I am glad that at least one Member on the opposite side of this House recognises that and is prepared to say that in the years to come the Malays will not take things lying down and that the Malays will be prepared to compete with any other races in this country on equal terms. That is to us is a very reassuring term, and I think the Honourable Member for Ipoh will join with me in welcoming such a statement. I am not, Mr Speaker, Sir, elevating my Honourable friend to the status of the Minister of the Crown—not yet. (*Laughter*).

Mr Speaker, Sir, may I come now to the main topic of my speech? His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong mentioned the establishment of Malaysia, and Malaysia has been bandied about not only in this House but also outside this House; and not only during the Elections but long before the Elections, a lot of abuse and names had been hurled all over the show. Sir, in the recent elections, the Alliance Party, the P.A.P., and others as well, have resorted to a vicious campaign of hate, smears and abuse on the Socialist Front towards the Malaysia issue. We have been deliberately misrepresented and maligned against. As such, we wish to reiterate our stand.

When the Malaysia Plan was first given public expression by the Tunku in May, 1961, we welcomed the idea of a closer association of the Bornean territories with our country, but we warned that this should be on the basis of the freely expressed will of the people and not on the basis of a secret deal with the colonial power, i.e. Great Britain. At the Malaysian Socialist Conference held subsequently, we reiterated this stand on Malaysia and we have consistently maintained this stand since. It must be remembered that on the question of the formation of Malaysia, all the Opposition Parties in the previous Dewan Ra'ayat were unanimously against the manner in which Malaysia was being brought about.

However, the Alliance Government chose to ride roughshod over the Opposition on this important matter and, as a result, Malaysia created the very things it was designed to prevent. As a result too, Malaysia lost the friendship of two of our most important neighbours, namely, the Philippines and Indonesia; it brought about confrontation by Indonesia and the warmongers in the Alliance Party have led us to the very brink of war. That our stand on Malaysia has been right is proved by the following.

The leading political party in Brunei, which was opposed to Malaysia, had won all the seats contested in the elections held there. It decided that despite its total victory in the elections held there, it could not work the democratic process because of the colonial yoke, and hence it had no alternative but to break out into open rebellion against the colonial power.

The Sultan of Brunei too had refused to join Malaysia despite the blandishments of the Tunku and the British Government. Large sections of the people of the Bornean States and Singapore are still against Malaysia, and large numbers are now under detention. Our neighbouring countries, namely the Philippines and Indonesia, which had hitherto been friendly to us, have taken great offence at the way in which Malaysia has been established. Even U. Thant, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in his final conclusions on Malaysia has stated very clearly on page 2 that all this misunderstanding, confusion and even resentment would not have arisen, if the Alliance Government had not been over hasty. He says in his report, in paragraph 3, all this "could have been avoided if the date could have been fixed after my conclusions had been reached and made known." From this it can be seen that the manner in which Malaysia has been formed by the Alliance Government has led this country into a mess and all our warnings which were unheeded and ignored have proved true.

Now that Malaysia has been pushed through, let me state quite categorically that our Party is pledged to finding a peaceful and constitutional solution to the problems that have been created. We believe that the source of our trouble today is the Alliance Government's failure to establish Malaysia clearly on the basis of the right of self-determination of the people of Sarawak, Sabah and Singapore. We call upon the Alliance Government to declare and support any measure to establish this. Until we have demonstrated this conclusively in the eyes of the world, particularly of the Afro-Asian nations, despite the junketing of various people in the African continent, the Malaysia issue will remain unsettled and threaten the peace and development not only of our country but also of South-East Asia and, indeed, may break out into global warfare.

Towards a peaceful settlement of the Malaysia issue, we propose a five-point plan for peace, despite the sniggering that is going on. I notice the Member for Pontian Selatan is not here; I wish he was here so that he can hear what my Party stand is; and despite his absence I wish he was here to listen to what I and my Party have to say. The five-point plan for peace is:

1. *An immediate ceasefire.* (*Laughter*).
2. *Supervision of the ceasefire by either the United Nations or by contingents from the Afro-Asian nations.*

In this connection we note that the Secretary-General of the United Nations has refused to supervise the ceasefire in the Borneo territories, whereas the United Nations has played such a role in Korea, in Israel and, now, in Cyprus. This is due no doubt to the fact that the Alliance Government gave the United Nations Secretary-General a slap on the face by announcing the date for the establishment of Malaysia even before the findings of the United Nations Mission to Borneo could be announced. Thailand, in our view, because of its connection with SEATO, is not a happy choice for such a task, hence our proposal for the supervision of the ceasefire either by the United Nations or by contingents from the Afro-Asian nations.

3. *Withdrawal of all foreign military troops both British and Indonesian but Malaysian troops should remain behind. (Laughter).*

Here, let me explain why we ask for the withdrawal of foreign military troops both British and Indonesian. Both the United States of America and Great Britain have repeatedly stated that the Malaysian issue is an Asian one and must be solved by Asians. None other than the British Foreign Secretary, Mr R. A. Butler, has repeated this in Manila lately. But Mr R. A. Butler says this with his tongue in his cheek for it is the very presence of British bases in Malaysia and in particular of British troops in the Borneo territories that constitute the major problem in the Malaysia issue. Indonesia regards the presence of the British bases and troops as a dagger pointed at the heart of Jakarta. Hence her fear that her sovereignty will be threatened by the imperialists.

Next, both Australia and New Zealand have openly stated that their northern frontier lies in Malaya and as far as I know, Mr Speaker, Sir, there has been no protest by the Alliance Government over such statements. This clearly shows that both these countries are interested in us Asians spilling our blood for their defence. As we look around us we can see for ourselves whether such nations as India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon would tolerate the presence of bases much less of British troops on their soil. And would Nasser, Ben Bella or Nkrumah countenance such an imperial yoke still? May I warn the Alliance Government not to place too much reliance on our Defence Treaty with Great Britain. I well remember the day, Mr Speaker, Sir, one Sunday morning in December, 1941, when I was at Changi Point and the *Prince of Wales* and *Repulse* sailed majestically by. Then, as now, Great Britain was bent on showing her flag, but a few weeks later these two ships led by Vice-Admiral Sir Tom Philips sailed to their doom off Kuantan—and I need hardly remind the House how General Yamashita with only three divisions overran Malaya in a little over two months and sent more than 100,000 Commonwealth troops into captivity. Hence the Socialist Front calls for the withdrawal of both British and Indonesian troops from Sabah and Sarawak and a pledge by the Alliance Government for a phased withdrawal of Great Britain from her bases in Malaya and Singapore.

4. *Release of all political detainees and the restoration of normal democratic life.*

Mr Speaker, Sir, I do see there is a lot of sniggering around. People who have not come in touch with the infamous Internal Security Act may well afford to do so. If I may say so, when the Internal Security Act was debated in the last House, if I remember rightly, not that I want to cast any aspersions on the Honourable Members on my right, they did not oppose the Internal Security Act. Now I am sure they rue the day they did not do so, for they are not immune from the Internal Security Act. Mr Speaker, Sir, I need hardly say that as long as the Alliance Government uses the infamous Internal Security Act to suppress the Opposition parties there can be no real democracy in this country. A classic example of this abuse of the Internal Security Act was the detention of my election agent, Lee Kok Kuang, two weeks before polling day. Now, even if the Alliance Government had enough evidence for such a detention, they could have detained him long before polling day—as the P.A.P. did long before polling day, long before nomination day. (*Laughter*) But no, the Government must detain him on the eve of polling day, not only to intimidate me, but also to frighten the electorate into voting for the Alliance Party. I am glad to say that neither the electorate nor I were cowed by their blatant intimidation, for the Socialist Front won in both the constituencies we contested there.

5. *The holding of direct elections simultaneously in Sabah, Sarawak and Singapore to give the people the right of self determination.*

When the British held elections in Sabah and Sarawak in early 1963, they saw to it, as in Malaya, that political power would remain in the hands of the Alliance Party. There was virtually no election in Sabah, as there was hardly any opposition to the Alliance Party. (*Laughter*) What opposition that existed was either bought up or intimidated into joining the Alliance. Such tactics on the part of the Sabah Alliance were not surprising, as they learnt very fast from their masters in Kuala Lumpur. We saw plenty of such tactics in the recent Malayan elections. However, in Sarawak the Alliance Party there had to contend

with the S.U.P.P., and to make it worse P.A.N.A.S. fell out with the Alliance. Chiefly because of the four tier system of indirect elections, which makes a mockery of representative Government and which can be manipulated by the Party in power, as can be seen from what I have to say, P.A.N.A.S. left the Alliance and joined the S.U.P.P. on this account. It is true to say that the Council Negri in Sarawak could not be manipulated without the connivance of Enche' Jimat anak Intan, the sole independent winner of the Binatang Local Council, which composed of seven Alliance, seven S.U.P.P. and one Independent members. All the seven Alliance members, together with Enche' Jimat anak Intan, were brought to Malaya and bought over before they were returned to Sarawak and told to vote for the Alliance Party. No wonder people generally regard politics as a very profitable occupation. Besides, there was a whole heap of Independents, who have been bought over to enable the Alliance to manipulate and gain control of the Divisional Councils and the Council Negri, as the figures I will quote will show. These figures, Mr Speaker, Sir, are culled from the *Sarawak Gazette* that I have here with me. This *Sarawak Gazette* of August 31st, 1963, I must say that my figures are at variance with the official figures. This is because the *Sarawak Gazette* got some of the candidates' Party affiliations all mixed up, and in parts the arithmetic was all wrong. Be that as it may be, in the elections there the Alliance gained 137 seats with 42,389 votes; the S.U.P.P. 118 seats with 61,713 votes; the Independents 115 seats with 23,206 votes; and P.A.N.A.S. 59 seats with 24,701 votes. Overall, the Alliance entered 273 candidates and received 68,814 votes, the S.U.P.P. with 207 candidates got 73,843 votes, the Independents with 405 candidates got 58,960 votes; and P.A.N.A.S. had 110 candidates with 34,435 votes. I regret I have to bore this House with these figures, but I shall put it in a nutshell when I reduce them to percentages. It will be seen from these that of the valid votes cast, the Alliance had 29.2 per cent of the votes, the S.U.P.P. 31.3 per cent, Independents 25 per cent, and P.A.N.A.S. 14.6 per cent. But as you can see from the Sarawak delegation of Members of Parliament in this House, the S.U.P.P., despite the fact that they have 31 per cent of the valid votes cast, has only three representatives in this House. This is because of the electoral college system devised by the British, and we can see how farcical they are as a measure of the expression of the will of the people. We can also see how farcical it is that 6 out of the 18 Alliance M.Ps. from Sarawak in this House were persons who had lost in the Local Council elections. And one of them, the Honourable Enche' Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub, has been appointed the Assistant Minister of Justice, of all things. Even the usually staid *Straits Times* was moved to protest over this appointment and in Sarawak there was a hue and cry against the appointment of these discredited politicians to the House of Representatives. Even the *Jesselton Daily Express* described the method of choosing M.Ps. from Sabah as an ugly method. However, I see that direct elections for the States Assembly is going to take place in Sabah. I stand to correction in this matter. If that is really so, then at least the people have a chance to express their will freely by direct elections and not by manipulations. No doubt, in this connection the Chief Minister of Sabah, who campaigned extensively in Malaya, has learned the tactics of intimidation, bribery and rigging of elections from his Alliance masters, who would be assisting him in this to the hilt. Hence our call for direct elections simultaneously in Sabah and Sarawak in order to ascertain the will of the people.

Mr Speaker, Sir, as for Singapore, I need hardly remind the House that the P.A.P. won only after practically all the organizers and prospective candidates of the main opposition party had been detained and 10 publications critical of the P.A.P. had been banned. Only nine days were allowed for the election campaign. If I remember rightly, even the Honourable Member for Hilir Perak protested at this. Still I fail to see how the P.A.P. can have 12 representatives in this House. In this connection . . . .

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Thirteen!

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, twelve from Singapore. The other one is from the constituency of Bungsar, which is different from Singapore. Mr Speaker, Sir, I think I need hardly teach the P.A.P. a few lessons in geography (*Laughter*). In this connection, I wrote a letter to the Press on this matter saying that if the P.A.P. and Barisan Sosialis representation to this House should be proportionate to the seats gained in the September, 1963 elections the P.A.P. do not strictly qualify for 11 seats in this House, let alone the 12 that they now have. If the 15 seats in this House are to be divided among the 51 seats in the Singapore State Assembly, then 3.4 seats in the State Assembly qualify for one seat in this House. Hence, for 11 seats in this House the P.A.P. should have 37.4 seats in the Singapore State Assembly. But we know that they have 37 seats in the Singapore State Assembly and 12 in this House. Normally the P.A.P. Government is very quick to reply to any queries in the Press, but on this important matter that I wrote about the P.A.P. were strangely silent.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Not worth a reply!

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: May be so. Mr Speaker, Sir, I leave it to the House to decide. I shall be grateful if they will explain to this House the basis of their computation for representation to this House. Hence our call for direct elections in Singapore to this House and not coming in by the back door.

I trust that the Alliance Government will give serious consideration to our five points for peace and not reject them simply because they emanate from this side of the House.

Mr Speaker, Sir, may I come to the matter of confrontation that has been so much bandied about in this House. With regard to the Indonesian confrontation, we state quite categorically that we will oppose any attempt to crush our country either from within or from without, or to settle the issue of Malaysia by force. Let me reiterate that our loyalty and patriotism to our country is second to none and we will rally behind the Government to resist any foreign aggression from whatever quarters. Mr Speaker, Sir, if that categorical statement from me as a representative of the Socialist Front in this country is not good enough, I do not know what the other parties would want us to say more on this matter. We have no hesitation in condemning the attacks on our fishermen and the bombing incidents. The Socialist Front in the last Parliament did ask for a greater measure of protection in the form of armed escorts or the provision of arms for our fishermen. We deplore and condemn the oft-repeated threats of Soekarno to crush Malaysia by force and we do hope that the Alliance Government will not commit any more provocative act to aggravate an already very grave situation. Mr. Speaker, Sir, if this categorical statement from me does not satisfy the Government in power, I do not know what they will ask further of us. I repeat, we deplore and condemn the oft-repeated threats of Soekarno to crush Malaysia by force (*Interruption*), or *vice versa.* Our quarrel with Indonesia cannot be solved by violence or by abusive language from both sides. Such tactics will only damage the interests of the people of both our countries and also play into the hands of the imperialists.

During the recent Malayan elections the Socialist Front has been labelled as pro-Indonesia and as the running dogs of Soekarno. But what are the facts, Mr Speaker, Sir? The Alliance Government in its White Paper on the eve of the elections linked our party with Ibrahim Yaccob and called us traitors because of that. But who are the real traitors to this country? Who has signed away our country to "big brother" Soekarno? Let us pause and recollect. Now that the people have been misled in the elections, let us not fool ourselves further.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we all know that in December, 1955 the Tunku led a goodwill mission to Indonesia consisting of himself, Tun Razak, Enche' Aziz Ishak and Mr Oscar Spencer. In connection with that visit, Mr Speaker, Sir, may I ask who visited Enche' Ibrahim Yaccob in his house? Who was chummy with him? Was it not the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Defence? Does the Minister—who is not present today—care to deny this? I know he would not, even if he were present today, be so foolish to do that, because, Mr Speaker, I have before me the proof of that visit; here it is, Mr Speaker, Sir, a photograph taken in the house of Ibrahim Yaccob (*a photograph is shown to the House*) This photograph shows the Deputy Prime Minister seated beside Ibrahim Yaccob, and Members of this House can see. This is not a false picture. They can see this and we can produce any number of such pictures for Members of this House. Here is Tun Razak seated beside Ibrahim Yaccob. What was the Minister doing with such a character? Would he care to explain? Here I must confess that I am in the horns of dilemma. Are we to conclude, from this picture that the Minister's association with Ibrahim Yaccob, that our Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Defence is himself a traitor as set out in the Government White Paper?

You know, Mr Speaker, Sir, that the Alliance leaders and those who ape them do not hesitate to call us names in their desperation. But we

are not so desperate as to lose our sence of balance. We are willing to let this House and the country to be the judge on this matter. We do not wish to indulge in calling people names.

Now, in connection with that visit too, what about the Prime Minister? Would he deny that he met Ibrahim Yaccob at the Guest House in Indonesia? What was the purpose of that visit? What were they plotting? Furthermore, did not the Tunku accompany Bung Karno and lavish praises on Indonesia and its leaders? Did not the Tunku at Cherubon say that Soekarno was the greatest Statesman in Asia?

Enche' Ibrahim Yaccob was then the doyen of Malay Nationalism and was assidously courted by the Alliance leaders, but today he is the arch traitor of Malaysia. How times have changed and how confusing to us ordinary mortals!

Now, let us examine the relations of the P.A.P. Government vis-a-vis Indonesia. What did the Honourable Prime Minister of Singapore say to the Indonesian Prime Minister when he went wooing the Indonesians in January, 1960? I quote this from the *Straits Times* for the benefit of the Members of this House and—since he is not here—to refresh the memory of his colleagues. The Prime Minister said:

"We will not allow anything detrimental to the security of Indonesia to be committed in any territory over which we have control."

What concern, what assurance, what regard and what affection he had for Indonesia! Does he still stand by those sentiments or has he changed his stand today? Does he not remember declaring that the Indonesian struggle against the Dutch for independence had been a source of inspiration to the Nationalists in Singapore? I quote again:

"We watch," he said, "with even greater interest, your efforts to make up for past decades of stagnation under Dutch colonial exploitation."

Does not the Prime Minister of Singapore describe Indonesia as "our great neighbour with whom we must renew our link and our friendship"? The Prime Minister also felt this:

"This visit which you have so kindly arranged for us should open the way for closer understanding and co-operation between Indonesia and Singapore."

"This is the basic friendship," said the Prime Minister, "which we have towards our neighbours, the people of Indonesia. May that friendship strengthen and grow in mutual respect and mutual prosperity." This was the love, these were the sentiments, this was the affection and this was the regard which the Singapore Prime Minister had for Indonesia then. But today he sings a different tune and is almost a warmonger.

On the 28th of June, 1963, Mr Speaker, Sir, Senator Che' Aishah Ghani led a three-member delegation to Jakarta—that was not very long ago! The other members of the delegation included Datin Sa'adia, wife of the Minister of Transport and Che' Som binti Abdullah. Then Senator Che' Aishah Ghani stated:

"Malayan women always look to Indonesia for guidance just like a younger sister expecting guidance from her elder sister."

She also stated that the Malayan delegation had not gone to a foreign country but to meet their brothers and sisters. Finally the delegation was charmed by the warm hospitality shown to them by Mrs Subandrio. The delegation also met President Soekarno of whom Senator Che' Aishah Ghani said, "I think he is a charming man."

Finally, Mr Speaker, Sir, may I refer to an Alliance Minister, who was so moved by his admiration for Soekarno that he named his son after the Indonesian leader? But as the Malaysia issue hotted up, this Minister wisely and quietly changed the name of his son. Unfortunately, Sir, the Minister I am referring to, is not in front of me now, but as you all know—and it is generally known in this country—the Minister in question is the Honourable Minister of Transport who subsequently challenged the Indonesian leader to a fight—Siamese style, Queensbury rules, swords and

sabres. But before he had named his son after the Indonesian leader.

Mr Speaker, Sir, these four examples I quote will show that we who have been described as pro-Indonesia, we who have been called "running dogs" of Indonesia, are not so. My colleagues and I have not been to Indonesia, my colleagues and I have not mentioned words favouring Indonesia. None of us named our sons after Soekarno. None of us has called Soekarno a charming man, nor have we called Indonesia our great neighbour. I leave it to the House, Sir, and to this country to decide who have been pro-Indonesia and who have been "running dogs" of Indonesia.

I now come to the question of Maphilindo. May I ask who has signed away this country to be dominated by Indonesia with its population of a hundred million? What did the Prime Minister agree to at Manila? What is Maphilindo? Why has the King's Speech been silent on this? Is it not true that the Alliance has betrayed this country and its people by agreeing to the establishment of Maphilindo, which is to be a confederation of Malaysia, the Philippines and Indonesia? What will become of this country? Does not this Agreement pave the way for the slow absorption by Indonesia? What role will this country with 10 million people play with Indonesia which has 100 million people? Will not Indonesia dominate us?

We have been accused of paving the way for Indonesian domination, but the Alliance leaders have already sold this country to Indonesia. Can the Alliance leaders claim to protect the interests of all the people of this country, be they Malays, Indians, Chinese or any others? What else is the design behind Maphilindo? Why was the King's Speech so silent on so important and vital a matter? What is the view of the P.A.P? There is something sinister about it. That is why we must not have anything to do with it.

These few examples, I hope, will suffice to show the House—and here once again I reiterate that we have been accused of being pro-Indonesia—who have been pro-Indonesia when it suited them; and now the Alliance and the P.A.P. have the effrontery to accuse us of being pro-Indonesia and of being running dogs of Soekarno. If anything, the Alliance Party and the P.A.P. are guilty of sucking up—if I may use the word, Mr Speaker, Sir—to Soekarno when it suited their political convenience and they are now indulging in foolish talk and abuse. Because the Alliance feared an adverse vote on the Malaysia issue and confrontation, they have used the entire machinery of the State to capture the electorate by making Indonesian domination as the bogey in the elections. The mysterious plane flights, the parachute drops, the police road blocks and the bombing incidents all helped to create an atmosphere of fear, tension and war hysteria in this country.

It is interesting to note that all these have ceased after the elections. When my colleague the Member for Dato Kramat put forward the hypothesis that the bombing incidents could have been the work of the C.I.A., he was accused by the now Minister of Home Affairs of reading too many James Bond novels—not that I know whether he reads any of those novels; he does not read those novels, Mr Speaker, Sir. (*Laughter*).

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: You are quite wrong!

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: But this hypothesis is not too far fetched or absurd as the Honurable Minister would have us believe. I have here an authoritative book on the C.I.A. by Mr Andrew Tully—I do not know whether the P.A.P. has read this book, or whether the Alliance front-benchers have read this book: this is one of the latest on the C.I.A. It has a chapter on the overthrow of the Mossadeq Government by the C.I.A., and we all know that the C.I.A. organised U-2 flights over Russia until Francis Gary Power was shot down by the Russians. Now, if the C.I.A. can overthrow a government and organise U-2 flights over Russia, surely the exploding of a few bombs in Singapore would be child's play to them. I am not here, Mr Speaker, Sir, postulating that the C.I.A. did that. I merely

say that that hypothesis is not too far fetched or absurd. I am not postulating that. To come back to the war hysteria created by the Alliance and the P.A.P., they succeeded in misleading certain sections of the voters that conquest by Indonesia was imminent and thereby have won those votes. The Alliance victory is thus based on deception, using Indonesian opposition to Malaysia to confuse the voters, and those who voted for them will soon realise this and rue the day they did it. Above all, they will realise that it is not the Socialist Front that has been infiltrated by pro-Indonesian elements but the Alliance.

However, confrontation has brought a great deal of misery to the people. Many of our fishermen have lost their lives, either directly or indirectly, through Indonesian opposition to Malaysia. Our businessmen have lost their trade and thousands of workers have lost their jobs and their livelihood.

The Socialist Front refuses to accept the P.A.P. thesis that confrontation has come to stay and that we have to be prepared to live with it for many years to come. This is a defeatist attitude and may well lead us to open warfare with Indonesia. Hence in addition to the five points for peace that I have already enunciated, the Socialist Front calls on the Alliance Government to leave no stone unturned in the quest for peace. This does not mean that the Socialist Front advocates abject surrender to Indonesia as we have been accused of. There are groups in this country who are determined to prevent a peaceful settlement. I am sure the Prime Minister is aware of these pressure groups and will be wise to resist them. The Socialist Front advocates a peaceful solution of the Malaysia dispute but it must be a peace with honour and based on the integrity of our territory in Borneo. Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, if that does not satisfy the Alliance Government, I do not know what will. Hence, we once again call on the Alliance Government to take the quarrel from the jungle to the conference table and there to explore every avenue for a peaceful settlement.

Mr Speaker, Sir, may I now comment on the P.A.P. and the Malayan elections. In the recent Malayan elections the P.A.P. made their political debut, and albeit it was a disastrous one, as has been commented on by the Honourable Member for Pontian Selatan. Both the Alliance Party and the P.A.P. in particular and others as well have called us communists, toeing the P.K.I. line. They pretend to see a communist behind every bush, in every nook and corner, under every bed and in every bathroom—and all these communists are from the Socialist Front. However, the UMNO is worried over its infiltration by communist elements, and we all know that the P.A.P. rose to power with the collaboration of the Malayan Communist Party. And now both these Parties have the effrontery to accuse us of being communists.

Mr Speaker, Sir, may I now address two biblical quotations to the Alliance and the P.A.P.:

"He that is without sin, let him cast the first stone."

To the Prime Minister of Singapore, may I say this—

"The beam that thou seest in thy neighbour's eye thou seest not in thine own."

Let me lay low this communist bogey once and for all. We are not a communist party; nor are we infiltrated by communists; and we do not toe the P.K.I. line; nor are we aligned to any foreign political party.

During the recent elections also the P.A.P. was the most belligerent in its talk and most bellicose and abusive in its propaganda. The P.A.P. hopes to rise to power by hanging on to the *sarong* of the Tunku. Jumping on the bandwaggon of the ruling party is an old and profitable pastime. However, their record of double talk and double cross is so notorious that no amount of ingratiating talk can persuade even a party like the UMNO to co-operate with them. The P.A.P. sought to replace the M.C.A. as the representative of the urban Chinese masses in the Alliance. Despite repeated rebuffs from the UMNO, the P.A.P. unashamedly continued to woo the UMNO. Here the House has just heard what the Honourable Member for Pontian Selatan has

said on this matter. May I warn the P.A.P. that if they tug too hard at the *sarong* of the Tunku, that *sarong* may well come off (*Laughter*) and so embarrass the Tunku and enrage the UMNO to boot. During the recent elections too, the P.A.P., like a big circus, with great showmen and clowns, went on the Malayan circuit, and everywhere they went they drew huge crowds and caused big traffic jams. Mr Speaker, Sir, in the Singapore elections of September, 1963, the M.C.A. were quite properly described as clowns. In the Malayan elections their counterparts here were the P.A.P. and the greatest showman and clown of them all, Mr Speaker, Sir, is here—the Prime Minister of Singapore.

Here is a booklet printed by the P.A.P. entitled: "Winds of Change". Its proper caption, to me, should be: "The ill winds of change from south of the Causeway that does no one any good". Here is a picture of the Prime Minister of Singapore addressing a huge rally in Suleiman Court. Yes, you can see, Mr Speaker, Sir, this is a huge rally—truly the biggest rally that Kuala Lumpur has seen. It was really a mammoth crowd that was entertained by that great clown. Now, Suleiman Court happens to be in my constituency of Batu. Here the P.A.P. knocked their heads against a stone wall and their candidate lost his deposit.

Mr Speaker, Sir, here is another picture of the same master showman addressing another huge crowd—in Penang this time; and you can see for yourself it is in Penang . . . .

Enche' Lim Kean Siew (Dato Kramat): They lost all their deposits.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: I do not need the help of my colleague, the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat, to teach me what has happened in Penang. (*Laughter*). Let us see what were the results they achieved.

In the constituency of Tanjong my worthy colleague, Dr Lim Chong Eu, handed out a sound thrashing to the P.A.P. candidate, Mr Tan Chong Bee, who polled 733 votes out of 28,493 votes cast.

In the State constituency of Kota Dr Lim, too, applied the *coup de grace* to the P.A.P. candidate, Mr Lim Yew Hock—not our representative in Canberra, although the name sounds the same—who polled a mere 165 votes out of 9,129 votes cast.

Mr Speaker, Sir, in Johore and Penang the P.A.P. lost their deposit in all their Federal and State seats they contested. In all, the P.A.P. lost their deposits in six out of the eleven Federal seats they contested; and in the State elections they lost 9 deposits out of the 15 seats they contested. The recent Malayan elections must have taught the P.A.P. a salutary lesson, and no doubt the Prime Minister of Singapore is today a sadder but wiser man. The P.A.P. maintains that . . . . . .

Dr Lim Chong Eu (Tanjong): On a point of order. I have been trying to catch your eye, Sir. I really do not know under what Standing Rule and Order, so I beg your permission on a point of order. I thank the Member for Batu for all his references to me, but I wish to clarify that the term "colleague" probably means that we are sitting on the same side of the House; and I ask on a point of order that as I have yet to speak for myself, I hope we shall have time to speak for ourselves on the issue that were brought up by the Honourable Member for Batu. Probably there were Standing Orders under dissociation. I would ask that references to our victory in Tanjong not be so associated with Batu.

Mr Speaker: Can you mention the number of the Standing Order?

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Just on a point of order, Sir.

Mr Speaker: I think you have mentioned a Standing Order. What is the number of the Standing Order?

Dr Lim Chong Eu: I merely want to dissociate myself, and to point out to the House, that the term "colleague" used by the Member for Batu probably refers to the fact that we are sitting on the same side of the House and the fact that the Member for Batu has so kindly referred to the election results

in Tanjong in the last elections. However, I feel it should be left to us to deal with it rather than to be taken up in a manner associated by the Member for Batu.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, I hasten to reassure the Member for Tanjong that I have no intention of associating him with my views. When I said "my colleague, Dr Lim Chong Eu"—I should have said "the Member for Tanjong"—I meant he and I are both doctors and both in that sense are colleagues. (*Laughter*). I did not mean that we are both political colleagues. He and I are both doctors from the same profession, and it is usual for us on occasions like this to refer: "My colleague", or "My colleague from Larut Selatan". That does not mean that we belong to the same political party or share the same political views. (*Laughter*). Mr Speaker, Sir, may I continue?

Mr Speaker: Yes, you may continue.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: The P.A.P. maintains that whatever votes the Socialist Front gained in the previous elections were protest votes gained by default from the M.C.A. The recent elections have proved that whatever votes we garnered in were solid leftwing votes. Thus, at the Federal level in 1959 we had 13 per cent of the votes. This year we gained 16 per cent of the votes cast. They were not protest votes. In Selangor, in 1959 we had 17.7 per cent of the votes cast; this year we gained 40 per cent of the votes cast. If it is true to say that in the recent Malayan elections the P.A.P. votes were protest votes, then how is it that the P.A.P, votes were so few? Let us now examine once again the election results of the P.A.P. in the recent Malayan elections. Mr Speaker, Sir, I have here two typed sheets with me, but I shall not bother the House by reading the votes gained by them, such as, at Federal level 778 out of 28,500; 3,000 out of 20,000; or at State level 165 out of 9,000; and 359 out of 10,000. I shall not bother the House with such details, Sir. I think the Malays have a word *malu*, and this is the word which, I think, the P.A.P. does not understand. In Singapore, the Prime Minister of Singapore is the lord of all he surveys and his Ministers—or shall I call them his minions—are at his beck and call. Now, that he has come to the Malaysian Parliament, that giant is reduced to pint size by people on both sides of the House. He can no longer be the Oracle of Delphi, as he seeks to prove to be in Singapore.

May I now turn to some of the other matters that have been raised in the Gracious Speech of His Majesty. May I refer to the Ministry of Health. If I remember rightly, in the previous House the Minister of Finance once said that the Socialist Front talks the most when they are the most ignorant of the subject. I can assure you, Mr Speaker, Sir, that the Member for Dato Kramat and I are not exactly ignoramuses and that in speaking on health I am, so to say, on home ground. I regret that the Honourable Minister of Health is not here today to listen to what I have to say, but I do hope that what I have to say will be conveyed to him in due course, if not by word of mouth, through the Hansard.

Mr Speaker, Sir, it is regrettable that the Minister of Health in his very first press conference should put his wrong foot forward and antagonise the medical profession. I refer to the press statement where he stated that the Government would train Assistant Medical and Health Officers. When this matter was first mooted in the last House, I thought that the medical profession had made their views quite clear to the Ministry and that this matter would be dropped. But now I see that the Honourable Minister of Health has chosen to raise this matter again. I do hope sincerely that he has been mis-quoted on this matter, and I do hope that when the time comes for the Government benchers to reply to my speech they will clarify this point, for it is a point that is of great importance, not only to the medical profession but to the health of this country.

Mr Speaker, Sir, if I may say so, in that Ministry there is so much confusion that, to say the least, many medical officers are disillusioned. They are disillusioned because you see quite a

number of young M.C.S. officers holding the reigns in that Ministry and ordering venerable doctors who had qualified long before the war about as if they are peons. This is strongly resented by the medical profession and the medical profession has asked that a medical man be put in charge of that Ministry instead of an M.C.S. officer.

Mr Speaker, Sir, another aspect of the Ministry that has antagonised the profession has been the cholera outbreak in Malacca last year. Through the inapt handling of the officers concerned there, the cholera outbreak was allowed to spread; and instead of putting their house right, we saw various statements from the various Ministers. We had a statement from the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, reassuring the country that there was no need to worry and that all was under control. But meanwhile the cholera raged and spread north and south, and even across the Causeway. Mr Speaker, Sir, if I may, I would like to quote here from a report of the Malayan Medical Association on this aspect. As you know, during that cholera outbreak the Acting Minister of Health, again I repeat, instead of putting his own house in order, started maligning the private practitioners in this country. Now, I would read the report from the Malayan Medical Association tabled at their fourth annual general meeting in 1964:

"Your Council appointed a Committee to visit Malacca and investigate the cause of the outbreak of cholera in the State. The Malayan Medical Association submitted a memorandum on its findings. The unsatisfactory state of affairs regarding the sanitation, water supply and sewerage disposal was the fundamental cause of the outbreak."

"The Ministry of Health appears to have no jurisdiction over the health services in local authorities like the Municipality of Malacca town. It is also unfortunate that the Ministry of Health were unprepared at all levels to meet with an emergency outbreak of cholera of the proportions it reached. It is wrong to apportion blame to any single officer when the system is at fault."

"It is the view of the Malayan Medical Association that the attacks made against the private medical practitioners during the epidemic were uncalled for. We are glad to know that the Government Commission of Enquiry has remarked that a better relationship should exist between the Ministry of Health and the private medical practitioners during an epidemic."

"It is interesting to note that the Commission has accepted most of the 14 recommendations put up by the Malayan Medical Association to the Commission to prevent further outbreaks of major epidemics in Malaya."

Mr Speaker, Sir, we all know that there is a shortage of medical personnel, particularly of doctors. What has the Government done to solve this problem? Yes, the Government has done through ASA to try and recruit some doctors from Manila until its unwise move in the matter of Malaysia brought an abrupt end to that arrangement. It is true that the Ministry of Health is searching high and low for doctors, but what has the Ministry of Health done? I do know that it is very inept in its handling of doctors. I do know of doctors, who have applied for jobs in the Ministry of Health, having to wait for two, three or four months before they are appointed. Sir, if you ask any doctor to wait that length of time and expect him to wait for the Government to appoint him that length of time, can you wonder if the doctors choose to go elsewhere, even to go back to U.K. to practise rather than to wait for this dilatory delay on the part of the Government.

Here, Mr Speaker, Sir, I must pay a tribute where tribute is due. I do know that the P.A.P. Government has a different type of Ministry of Health, and I think the Minister is here today. There I know that if a doctor sees the A.D.M.S. (Health) today, in a very short time—even in a day or two—he is appointed to the service. If that can be done South of the Causeway, I do not see why there should be such great delays in this country.

Instead of finding out the causes as to why doctors leave the hospitals, Mr Speaker, Sir, the Government and the Minister seek to blame the doctors for not thinking of the national interests of this country and for seeking private fortunes in private practice. Sir, I do know that times without number doctors, and I for one, have urged the people who sit in air-conditioned rooms in that Ministry to descend from their Olympian heights and go and meet the lowly houseman

in his houseman quarters. Unless you go and meet the lowly houseman and talk with him and find out what are his problems, can you wonder why he is all at sea, and does not know what to do, and as a result, he says, "To hell with the Government Service, I will go into private practice."? Hence, I do hope that the people from the Ministry and the various Medical Superintendents in the various hospitals in this country will go and meet and talk to the young doctors, and find out what their problems are and try and solve their problems and thereby you can retain the doctors in the service. If you ignore them, if you neglect them, then there is no wonder that the doctors in Malaya will all leave the Government Service.

Mr Speaker, Sir, if I remember rightly in the previous House, the former Member for Seberang Selatan once asked the question about the shortage of drugs and materials in the Government hospitals. Unfortunately for him, he was fobbed off by the previous Minister of Health. Mr Speaker, Sir, here I again say that there is a grave shortage, not only of drugs but also of materials, in most of the hospitals in this country, and I do hope that if the Honourable Minister of Health returns here this evening, he will stand up and answer what I have to say, because it is not that easy to fob me off, because I do know what is the truth. If he will care to walk with me at the General Hospital, which has been described as a cowshed by the Alumini Association of the King Edward VII College of Medicine, he will know what are the terrible conditions that prevail in the General Hospital of the Capital of Malaysia. He will know that Government officers are asked to work without tools, surgeons are asked to operate without cat guts, and they are asked to attend to fractures without plaster of Paris, and officers and hospital assistants are asked to attend to dressings when there are no dressings, when the operation list is governed by the amount of dressings, the amount of spirit, that are present in the operation theatre at that time. This to me, Mr Speaker, Sir, is a disgraceful state of affairs, and I do not blame the Ministry of Health totally for it, because I do know that "Health" comes very low down in the queue, when it comes to the question of allocations from the Ministry of Finance. May I quote a Latin phrase, *mens sana in corpore sano*—a sound mind in a healthy body? Mr Speaker, Sir, these words were true in Cicero's days as they are today.

Mr Speaker, Sir, may I also ask the Ministry of Health whether it knows that the Lady Templer Hospital is living from hand to mouth. Literally every year it is very worried as to what is going to happen in the next year. I am told that that this Hospital has an allocation of only half a million dollars from the Government. For an institution that caters for about three hundred patients and that provides specialised treatment at a cost of about $13 to $14 per bed per day, when it costs the Government probably about $28 per bed per day, I think that it is dirt cheap and I think the Lady Templer Hospital is doing a wonderful piece of work and deserves better treatment not only from the Ministry of Health but also from the Ministry of Finance and that the medical officers there and all those connected with it should not go on begging for money, but should concentrate on what they have been engaged to do—that is, the care of the sick in that Hospital—and they should not be worried that the next year they might have to close down because there is no money in the kitty.

Mr Speaker, Sir, may I also raise the question of the Kinrara Hospital? As you know, Sir, the Kinrara Hospital is going to be vacated very soon by the British troops. I do not know what plans, if any, the Ministry of Health has for that Hospital. But may I humbly offer a suggestion? We all know that the General Hospital is filled to overflowing. If you go to Ward 23, which is the acute surgical ward, or Ward 22, which is the gynecological ward, you cannot have space to walk then as the patients lie down on the floor and transfusions have to

be given by the medical staff to patients lying down on the floor. If you go across the other side, the Orthopaedic Ward, you will see that the patients overflow into the corridors—maybe right up to the road sometimes. If there is a call from Borneo to prepare the Ward for casualities from the Bornean territories, I know for a fact that a lot of ills cases have been discharged just like that, because casualities are coming in. Consequently, Sir, may I suggest that the Kinrara Hospital should be converted into a sub-acute Hospital to take off the load from the General Hospital until such time as a new General Hospital is built?

Here, Mr Speaker, Sir, may I come to this question of a new General Hospital for Kuala Lumpur. We know that, times without number, the previous Ministers of Health have assured this House that there would be built a new General Hospital for Kuala Lumpur. If I remember rightly, Dato' Ong Yoke Lin assured this House that the hospital would be ready before the next general election, i.e. 1964—of course, he was talking through his hat—even though the medical profession advised him that it was physically impossible to build a hospital in that length of time. We all know that it takes two to three years to plan a hospital, and perhaps two to three years to build a hospital—that is by the Government. And we all know that in the University of Malaya there they are building a hospital in a little less than three years, but as you know, Mr Speaker, Sir, the Government moves in a mysterious way that only the Government can understand. I do hope that the Minister of Health can tell us what are his plans for the new hospital in Kuala Lumpur. We have been told, times without number, that there would be a new hospital, and I have yet to see it being taken off the launching pad.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I now come to the question of labour. We are told, Sir, that this Government now has a new dynamic approach to labour questions and that employees and employers have been exhorted to place the national interest before their own. Mr Speaker, Sir, times without number, we have seen in recent months and days a rash of strikes, or threatened strikes that have broken out—a strike has been on and off, and you do not know whether it is on or off. We want to know from the new Minister what is this new dynamic approach to labour relations. We do know that, whenever a strike takes place, very often it is due to the fact that the union leaders are all sacked without "by your leave". When a strike takes place, the employees are exhorted to place the national interest before their own, but there is not a word said about the employer. I have yet to see any statement from the Ministry of Labour condemning unethical practices from the employers. We have known, we have seen, and there is evidence still, of employers locking out workers. Mr Speaker, Sir, if the Minister cares to go to the 3rd mile Gombak, he would see there a strike going on, and that has been going on for more than three months, and the cause of that strike was all because the workers there wanted to form a union; and when they legitimately formed a union, the Committee was sacked *en masse*. I want to know what has the Ministry of Labour done to persuade the employer to come to an amicable settlement with the employees? We do know that in almost all of these cases it is the employees who have been victimised by the employers; and we do know that very often the employees run to our benevolent Prime Minister to find a solution to their problems. But I must warn the workers of this country that that is a very dangerous practice, because today you may have a benevolent Prime Minister, tomorrow you may not have such a benevolent Prime Minister; and if you continue to run to the Prime Minister for all the solutions of your labour ills, then one day the workers of this country will rue the day they have established this practice.

Mr Speaker, Sir, in the dispute between the M.P.I.E.A. and the

N.U.P.W. we have the astonishing statement advice by the Honourable the Prime Minister that the N.U.P.W. should go to London to find a solution to their problems with the Rubber Growers' Association in London. Mr Speaker, Sir, if that is not pure colonialism, *colonialism tulin* as the Malays say, what is it? It shows that this Government is still tied to the apron strings of London and this Government still takes orders from its masters.....

Enche' Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman: Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of order—Standing Order 36 (2) says "Reference shall not be made to any matter which is *sub judice* in such a way as might in the opinion of the Chair prejudice the interests of parties thereto." Sir, the matter of the M.P.I.E.A. and N.U.P.W. is under arbitration now.

Mr Speaker: (*To Dr Tan Chee Khoon*): Yes, he is referring to Standing Order 36 (2). The matter is *sub judice* because it is still under discussion. Please proceed.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, that is not a court proceeding, and as such I do not think it is *sub judice*. That is merely a mediation. We can see the employees and employers still spouting their pieces both inside and outside the Press—and I do not see why I should be reminded of that. Mr Speaker, Sir, I shall not continue, not in deference to the Honourable Member, who interrupted me, but that I merely wanted to make my point that this Government is still being tied on to the apron strings in London.

Mr Speaker, Sir, may I now come to the Ministry of Education? Just now you have heard me referring to the recognition of the Nanyang University degrees. I wish to remind this House that the graduates of this country are very perturbed over a section of the Constitution of the University of Malaya. I refer to Section 47, and may I, Sir, with your permission, read out Section 47—

"A student shall not be admitted to the University to a course of study for a degree unless he (hereinafter in this Part referred to as a 'matriculated student') shall have satisfied such requirements as may be prescribed by Act: provided that except with the agreement of the Minister, students who have been awarded Federal and State scholarships or other similar financial assistance from public funds for University degree courses, shall not be refused admission if they satisfy such requirements."

Mr Speaker, Sir, I think I am right in saying that a large body of academic people, and certainly the graduates of the University of Malaya, are perturbed over this section that gives the Minister of Education the right to compel the University to accept a student chosen by the Government, be it the State or Federal Government; and I believe I am right that the University of Malaya Graduates' Society has already made representation to the Government on this matter.

May I also, Mr Speaker, Sir, say that because of certain events in the University of Singapore, where the Vice-Chancellor, in the words of a distinguished and academic man, has been hounded out of the University. That has caused the Guild of the Graduates of the University of Malaya to hold a protest meeting on this matter and to send their views to the Council of the University of Malaya and through it to the Government. I do hope that the present Minister of Education will give us an assurance that the autonomy of their University shall not be tampered with.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I shall now dwell for a little while on the Ministry of Welfare, and here, Mr Speaker, Sir, may I say that I welcome the formation of the Ministry of Welfare, and may I have your permission to speak in the National Language.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam pilehan raya yang lalu saya ada melawat Rumah Pertolongan di-antara kampong[2] Melayu di-kawasan saya. Di-beberapa keluarga di-kampong itu saya ada menengok beberapa kanak[2] yang tidak bersekolah. Apabila saya bertanya: Enche' mengapa anak kamu tidak pergi sekolah? Beliau menjawab, Tuan Doktor, apa kata awak? Macham mana anak saya boleh pergi ka-sekolah, perut saya lapar, saya

tidak ada wang, tengok perut saya kenyang-kah? Dan bagaimana saya boleh menchari chukup wang untok membeli buku[2]. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berharap Menteri Kebajikan 'Am boleh menengok perkara yang saya bawa ini dan saya berharap Menteri itu boleh menolong orang yang miskin dan orang yang tidak ada wang untok membeli buku[2] bagi anak[2] mereka.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kami dari Socialist Front berasa sangat dukachita sebab Titah Uchapan Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda tidak menyentoh tentang Bulan Bahasa Kebangsaan yang akan datang. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau Kerajaan sendiri tidak menyentoh perkara ini dalam Titah Uchapan, bagaimana kami boleh memanggil ra'ayat belajar Bahasa Kebangsaan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya hendak memberitahu kapada Ahli[2] Yang Berhormat, pada tahun yang lalu saya ada menjemput Menteri Muda di-hari menyampaikan hadiah di-sekolah jenis kebangsaan rendah yang saya menjadi pengerusi lembaga-nya. Apabila guru besar itu dan saya telah memberi uchapan dalam Bahasa Kebangsaan dan bahasa Inggeris, Menteri itu memberi uchapan-nya di-dalam bahasa Inggeris sahaja. Kalau Menteri Kerajaan tidak membacha Bahasa Kebangsaan bagaimana kami boleh memanggil ra'ayat belajar Bahasa Kebangsaan?

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Kerajaan Perikatan kerana kemenangan-nya yang gilang-gemilang mungkin tidak mahu mendengar shor[2] dari kami ini. Satu daripada jawapan yang selalu di-dengar dari uchapan Menteri[2] Kerajaan Perikatan dalam Parlimen yang lalu ia-lah yang pemerentah sekarang ada-lah kami. Kalau partai kamu yang memerentah, kamu boleh buat apa[2] yang kamu fikir baik. Ada-lah menjadi satu pertanyaan, apa-kah jawapan yang bagini boleh menggalakkan pertumbohan Demokerasi Berparlimen dengan sihat dalam negara kita ini? Sunggoh pun Socialist Front mempunyai dua orang wakil sahaja dalam Dewan yang berhormat ini, saya suka mengingatkan bahawa kami mewakili 16 peratus pengundi[2] negeri ini dan beberapa banyak lagi pendudok[2] yang bertimbang rasa dengan kami.

Dari itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya anjorkan kapada Kerajaan menimbangkan pendapat kami memandang bahawa anjoran kami itu ada-lah datang daripada sa-bahagian ra'ayat yang ta'at setia-nya tidak kurang daripada pengundi[2] yang mengundi Parti Perikatan. Kita mempunyai satu masaalah yang besar—masaalah konfrantasi di-hadapan kita. Satu perpaduan ra'ayat ada-lah perlu menghadapi masaalah ini. Mari-lah kita berpedomankan peribahasa lama: yang berat sama di-pukul (pikul) (*Ketawa*) yang rengan sama di-jenjeng dalam menghadapi masaalah ini.

Sa-kian-lah sahaja, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau sa-kira-nya uchapan saya tidak sedap atau kasar saya minta ma'af dan sa-kali lagi saya menguchapkan terima kaseh (*Tepok*).

Mr Speaker: Honourable Members, I wish to remind you that the debate on His Majesty's Address must be concluded before the end of tomorrow's sitting. In view of this, and also in view of the fact that only a few Members have spoken so far, I wish to appeal to Members not to indulge in irrelevancy or repetition so that other Members may have a chance to speak on the Royal Address.

Tuan Haji Rahmat bin Haji Daud (Johor Bharu Barat): Yang Berhormat Tuan Speaker, saya mengambil peluang ini untok melafadzkan sa-tinggi[2] terima kaseh di-atas Titah Uchapan Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong dalam Isti'adat Pembukaan Parlimen pada hari Selasa yang lalu.

Sa-bagai Wakil Ra'ayat yang datang dari Johor Bahru Barat dan sa-orang anggota parti yang memerentah saya sunggoh berasa megah di-atas kejayaan pemerentahan Parti Perikatan di-dalam masa 7 tahun, dan pula saya yakin bahawa dalam 5 tahun yang akan datang kemajuan dan pembangunan negara dalam sa-genap lapangan akan di-lipatgandakan sa-hingga negara Malaysia kita ini merupakan sa-buah

negara yang terkemuka di-dunia sa-belah sini.

Yang Berhormat Tuan Speaker, oleh kerana telah di-uchapkan oleh Tuan Speaker ia-itu tiap[2] Ahli Yang Berhormat di-minta beruchap dengan sa-berapa rengkas, maka ada satu perkara sahaja yang saya hendak uchapkan di-sini ia-itu bahagian Ke-selamatan Dalam Negeri. Terlebeh dahulu, saya ingin menyatakan ke-banggaan saya kerana kita mempunyai Angkatan Bersenjata Pasokan Polis yang handal lagi kebal. Mereka telah menunjokkan kesanggupan luar biar pun mempertahankan negara meng-hadapi konfrantasi Soekarno baik dalam usaha mempertahankan pen-cherobohan mahu pun dalam usaha menyekat penyeludupan dan usaha mengelakkan penghianatan berlaku di-dalam negara kita.

Ra'ayat negara kita ini juga merasa megah di-atas lantekan sa-orang bumi putera mengetuai angkatan bersenjata dalam tanah ayer kita ini. Tetapi tidak bagitu keadaan-nya dengan Pasokan Polis yang kita tahu hingga hari ini ia-itu bagaimana yang telah di-terangkan dalam uchapan Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong ia-itu maseh juga di-sandang oleh sa-orang pegawai expatriate dan bukan bumi putera Malaysia. Pada hal bumi putera yang layak untok menyandang jawatan itu tidak kurang dari mereka. Kuasa yang ada di-tangan Inspector-General itu bagitu besar berhubong dengan me-naikkan pangkat dan pertukaran pegawai[2] di-atas pangkat A.S.P. Kita tahu 7 tahun lama-nya kita merdeka tetapi maseh juga menggunakan pega-wai dagang. Untok menjaga maruah dan keperibadian kita, saya harap kira-nya Kerajaan akan dapat segera bertindak dengan tegas Malaysiani-zesankan semua jawatan[2] yang penting dalam puchok pemimpin negara ini. Dan saya sokong penoh atas uchapan terima kaseh kapada ka-bawah Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Bagin-da Yang di-Pertuan Agong, terima kaseh.

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew (Singapore): Mr Speaker, Sir, with the ceremonial opening of this Second Parliament of Malaysia, the curtain rises on a new chapter in our history. The stage is set for the next five years, and yesterday and this morning we had a prelude of the many interesting and sometimes anxious moments, which we will spend in this Chamber in the next five years.

Up till now the struggle has been to establish Malaysia. From May, 1961, when the Prime Minister first mooted the formation of Malaysia, until the 25th of April this year, the communists and other groups, who for diverse reasons went along with them in their anti-Malaysia campaign, could pretend that the people did not want it, that in fact Malaysia was a neo-colonialist plot, foisted upon the people by a stooge Government. Sir, whatever else the votes on the morning of the 26th of April proved, or did not prove, it nailed for ever the lie that Malaysia did not enjoy the support of the people. One by one, first Sabah, Sarawak and Singapore and now the eleven old States of Malaya have endorsed the new nation. But, although the forma-tion of Malaysia was inevitable, I think, it is also true to say that its success is not inevitable, and upon us, both in Government and in Opposition, upon the lines of policy that we will enunciate in this Chamber will depend the survival or the destruction of this new nation.

Sir, it gives me great satisfaction to see amongst our midst so many old friends and faces of people, who stuck their necks out for Malaysia before it succeeded. It gives me equal satisfac-tion to see absent from these benches so many of the false prophets, who did their vicious best to destroy it (*Applause*)—we shall not miss them. But I think I should be forgiven, if I remind the House that perhaps the balance of forces outside this Chamber, on the ground, is not as reassuring as the deployment of representatives in this Chamber. We would do well to remember, Mr Speaker, Sir, that 1969 will present us with a very different set of problems in very different circumstances. Here, we have only two representatives from the Socialist Front, three from the Barisan Sosialis,

Singapore—their leader spoke separately yesterday. I do not know if in anticipation of the failure of their leaders in Kuala Lumpur, they would wish to have a separate line—and three from the Sarawak United People's Party. Eight do not constitute a menace, and even amongst the P.M.I.P. benches there has been some reduction in their ranks. But to those of us, who have been anxiously studying the election results in Malaya, comparing them with what it was in Singapore, trying to fathom what it meant in Sabah and Sarawak, it leaves us with a deep anxiety that all that is needed is a shift, between 10 to 15 per cent, of the mass base and in a fragmentised Chamber, no coherent authority would be possible. So, I hope I will be forgiven, if I sound this note of caution in the midst of the renewed self-confidence and even a touch of euphoria, which is forgivable, on the Government side. The lease of life that they have been given for another five years could so very easily be frittered away if they interpret these results as a blanket approval for carrying on in the same old way—malpractices, inefficiency, ineptitude; and we have had in only two days listened to some very unhappy anecdotes of what took place in these elections. I do not wish, Mr Speaker, Sir, to say that I believe or disbelieve what has been said, but what I do say is that these things should never be allowed to be said unchallenged, or uninvestigated. If we want the democratic system to survive, then we must be prepared to run it openly and manifestly beyond reproach.

Sir, some time within the next five years, the immediate pressures of Indonesian confrontation will slacken and people's minds will begin to dwell once again on the economic and social conditions. And if life is not made better for the mass of the people, the mandate the next time against the broader canvass of Malaysia may not be so easy to come by.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we share these seats on the Opposition benches with some very curious gentlemen from some very curious parties, and the differences between us and some of those on my right are more abiding than the differences between us and those opposite me in this Chamber. The chasm that divides us from the Socialist Front, Barisan Sosialis, SUPP, as parties and not as individuals—because they do not really represent what their Parties mean—is unbridgeable. Between us it is not political rivalry, it is a matter of life and death. Similarly, whatever the *bonhomie* in this Chamber, I do not think very many, even on my right, can seek solace and consolation if ever the Members from Kelantan were to assume office in this House. So, whatever the party rivalries between the Government benches and us, let us never forget that they fade into insignificance when we face a common threat from the communists as represented in their open front organisations, like the Socialist Front, Barisan Sosialis and the SUPP, or when we face religious racism in the PMIP. The fundamental distinction between us and the two other Opposition parties, we have yet to find our water-level with the People's Progressive Party and the United Democratic Party . . .

Enche' Lim Kean Siew (Dato Kramat): Sir, on a point of clarification . .

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew: Surely.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Sir, is the Honourable Prime Minister sitting on the wrong side of the House?

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew: Sir, the geography of this Chamber (*Laughter*) can itself be a subject for an interesting essay on political shades in this House. May I, for the enlightenment of Members on this side of the House, say that we are in full agreement with the views of the Government that we should not lead the Opposition benches. There are various other factors besides just taking the lead in this Chamber. The future of this country has graver issues at stake. The difference between them and us is that we want Malaysia to succeed, even if it reflects credit on the Prime Minister and his colleagues. We want the democratic system to endure, even if it means that for many years we shall be denied an opportunity of office. We are

a loyal opposition—loyal to Malaysia. Our criticism will, therefore, be directed to pointing out the dangers of policies, which we consider may lead to failure, and to checking the lapses of political leaders and administrators—lapses from high standards of public conduct which could lead to a breakdown of public confidence and a collapse of the whole system of democratic Government. But a loyal Opposition does not mean a subservient Opposition and criticisms, however unwelcome, will have to be made seriously and in good faith. We hope that they will be taken equally seriously and in good faith.

On all external matters, foreign policy, confrontation, questions of national integrity and survival, there is no difference in either objectives or attitudes between us and the Government. We may differ on what is the most effective way of securing our integrity and survival, but we are at one in warning to achieve that goal. Even on domestic issues there is a large measure of common agreement on the tolerant approach to cultural, racial and linguistic problems. Our differences will arise over questions of economic and social policies in the domestic scene, issues of taxation that provide for the amenities of a modern civilised society—education, housing, health, welfare and so on—and how these are to be paid for. How acute these conflicts will be, will depend upon how the Minister of Finance and his colleagues are able to bring themselves to view the world—not from the standpoint of the rubber estate owners, or the shareholders and the stockholders of companies, but to view it also from the point of view of the rubber tappers and the workers in the companies that produce profits for the stockholders and the shareholders. We consider it our duty to open up the windows for the "winds of change".

We are unrepentant, Mr Speaker, Sir. We believe that it is easier to make the transition from a colonial society into a modern democratic State, if we consciously strive to meet our problems before we have to react acutely to them, and we are not pessimistic. Criticism and example can set off a change for the better. Free secondary education in Singapore has triggered off the proposal for nine years' primary education in Malaya. Low cost housing in Singapore has triggered off, stimulated, the creation of a Ministry for Local Government and Housing. The process of change is relentless. There is no going back. They have accepted our premises of a more free and a more equal society. The consequences will be drawn with relentless consistency at every meeting in this Chamber. It is inevitable that the newly independent countries of Asia and Africa must move towards a more egalitarian society. To obtain freedom, political leaders stimulate the minds of their people to eradicate the injustices of a colonial society. Having inspired these hopes for a better life in an independent country of their own, the process has been set, and cannot be checked by their leaders, who set it into motion. This is a tide of history. Men's minds and energies having been mobilised to get rid of the inequalities of an old order, cannot be suddenly unscrambled to accept the *status quo* which carries the inequalities of the old, and we deem it our duty to ease the way forward towards a more just and equal society.

Mr Speaker: Order, order. The time is now one o'clock. The sitting is suspended till half-past four this afternoon.

Sitting suspended at 1.00 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 4.30 p.m.

(Mr Speaker *in the Chair*)

EXEMPTED BUSINESS

(Motion)

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Dr Lim Swee Aun): Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move,

That notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 12, this House shall not adjourn today until 7.30 p.m.

The Minister of Welfare Services (Tuan Haji Abdul Hamid Khan bin Haji Sakhawat Ali Khan): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 12, this House shall not adjourn today until 7.30 p.m.

THE YANG DI-PERTUAN AGONG'S SPEECH

Address of Thanks

Debate resumed.

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew: Mr Speaker, Sir, before the adjournment for lunch, I referred to the two periods with regard to Malaysia—the first is the creation, now comes the time for its consolidation. I have said that whilst the formation of Malaysia was inevitable, we cannot assume that its success is also inevitable. In fact, some extremely delicate and sensitive issues will always pose a problem to our integration and development as a cohesive nation, and it does no harm to pose the problems frankly in this Chamber in order that we can seek consciously to find rational and intelligent solutions.

Malaysia has to be consolidated in two aspects—first, from outside threats to its continued survival, second, by consolidating the various groups within Malaysia so long as Indonesian confrontation is there, threatening all and sundry within Malaysia, threatening as much Sabah and Sarawak as Singapore and the old eleven States of the peninsula. So, all the fourteen States will come together. So, too, as long as Indonesian confrontation threatens not only the Malays, the Dayaks, the Dusuns, the Muruts and the others but also the Chinese, the Indians, the Eurasians, the Ceylonese and others, so these communal barriers are forgotten as they rally to defend a common interest. But, there will come a time probably within the next five years, when this external pressure will slacken. I do not say that Indonesian ambition to absorb us into their *Nusantara* will ever disappear, but from time to time they must slacken off their confrontation for their own internal reasons. Before this happens, we would do well to achieve our consolidation first as between the States within Malaysia, second, as between the communities within Malaysia. As long as the three new States of Sabah, Sarawak and Singapore think and feel as part of one nation, part of one federation, there is no danger of the centrifugal process of the outer periphery of States breaking away. But this is a two-way process, and the leaders of the Central Government set the pace and the tone of the process of coming together as a Federation. I have had it once analysed by a very distinguished statesman of one of the Commonwealth nations. It goes in one of two ways, either centrifugally in which case it goes further and further apart as in the Southern States of the United States in the old Confederation and then had to be brought back together by force, or it comes together on its own—centripetal, closer and closer together.

Sir, the leaders of the State Governments can only respond to the pace set by the Central Government. What I am saying is, if they set the tone in this two-way process of give-and-take between what are sometimes competing interests between the State and the centre, then they make the pace that much quicker. Within these five years we must strive to make people in the three new States regard themselves and be regarded by the eleven old ones as part and parcel of one nation and as closely integrated as the old eleven. Then, and only then, will we begin to talk, think, and feel in the same language as Malaysians, and in turn we will imbue our people with the same values and objectives. But bringing the States together is a somewhat less difficult objective to achieve than getting the various communities to forget their distinctiveness—their cultural, their linguistic, and racial distinctiveness. With Malaysia some new communities have joined us—the Dayaks, the Dusuns, the Muruts, the Ibans, the Kadazans, the Melanaus and a host of other indigenous people in Borneo.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: (*Interpolation*).

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to my Honourable friend from Dato Kramat. I do hope that if he has anything upon which he thinks the House should be enlightened, he will not hesitate to rise. I will always oblige him. But he should at least extend me the civility of allowing me to make my speech, (*Laughter*) either with interruptions, in which case I will yield; or without interruption, in which case I may be given a hearing.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Mr Speaker, Sir, may I know what the Prime Minister of Singapore is referring to and what did I say that he objects to?

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew: I think whilst I am not his leader—his leader has already objected to him telling how Penang was won. If he really felt that he would like to enumerate all the other indigenous peoples in the Borneo territories instead of mumbling away about the *Kalabits* and so on, I think he should say so.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: (*Rises*).

Mr Speaker: Sit down. Is it on a point of order or on a point of clarification?

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: On a point of clarification, Sir. I think the Honourable Member for Batu took objection to my pointing out that the PAP lost all its deposits in Penang. Of course, he wanted to save the face of the PAP, but that is another matter. I was trying to point out that there are other peoples like the *Kalabits* and *Kadayans,* which he had missed out—the *Punans* also—because he had referred to somebody from Cambridge, or somebody outstanding from abroad, who had taught him about centrifugal and centripetal forces. So, I thought I might help. (*Laughter*).

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew: I am grateful for the assistance of the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat, but I do hope it will be made audible and vocal for everybody, because a running commentary is hardly one likely to assist the proceedings in this House.

Sir, to succeed in the long run, we must make sense out of Malaysia. (*Enche' Lim Kean Siew—Interpolation*) He was saying "dollars". (*Laughter*) I thought, Mr Speaker, Sir, the House might like to know.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: (*Rises*).

Mr Speaker: Do not interrupt him. (*To Enche' Lee Kuan Yew*) Please proceed.

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew: We must build a sense of national identity and unless the new Federation becomes a living unit, we will always have to depend on external pressures to generate a sense of unity. Although the last eight months have found Indonesian pressures acting as a catalyst for this unity, we must remember that we cannot go on forever to play this game of communal checks and balances with impunity, for unless new values are instilled into the generation now growing up in our schools, our long-term chance of survival are not very high.

We are trying, Mr Speaker, Sir, to forge a nation out of the three major groups whose racial, cultural and linguistic inspirations spring from three larger countries around us. The Malays cannot be unaware of Indonesia and what is happening there; the Chinese are conscious of China and her growing power; and the Indians are proud of their ancient civilisation, which is the largest living democracy in the world, striving to make its way into the industrial age by consent and not by coercion.

At the time when the three mainsprings, the cultural mainsprings, of the three major communities in Malaysia have to come together and forge themselves into a nation, the three sources are themselves undergoing a renaissance, tending to pull loyalties, and sentiments, away from each other. Today, fortunately, Malaysia offers a better life to all of us than either Indonesia, China or India can offer her own people. So, whatever the racial, cultural and linguistic loyalties, Malaysia commands the material loyalties of all her peoples, because it offers a better life. But how long shall we occupy this pre-eminent position in Asia? No one can tell.

Let us hope that we will always be able to sustain our rate of economic growth and maintain our supremacy in standards of life in Asia. But the possibility of one, or two, or even all three, of these mainsprings of our culture, our various cultures, ultimately outstripping us in material success must be one which we must take into consideration in our prognosis of the future. If it is only cupboard love which holds the loyalty of our people to Malaysia, a loyalty dependent only on material well-being, then the ability to stick together as a people and be a nation will be slowly undermined. If, for example, a strong coherent leadership were to emerge in Indonesia and a few years later, through disciplined, dedicated and effective administration, restore order out of chaos, increase production in an economy which is going down, then the consequences upon all of us in Malaysia will be very grave, unless before then we have inculcated new values in our Malay population. At present no one feels proud of Indonesia and many, even of Indonesian descent, are secretly ashamed of it. But we shall be in very grave trouble if a new ruling elite emerges in Indonesia that can make the Malay people here as proud of Indonesia as some Chinese were of China not so very long ago when it looked like succeeding rapidly before the trials and tribulations of the Great Leap. And if all three countries— Indonesia, China and India—provide a better life for their people than we can for those in Malaysia, then we shall be lost, unless before then we have created that national spirit and identity, which can withstand the blandishments of identification with higher cultures and civilisations, which may by then be also able to provide higher standards of life.

No one really knows how much time we have got, for no one can see the pace and direction in which Indonesia will progress, nor are we certain that the political prophets are right when they say that China may take another forty to fifty years to catch up with the modern industrial giants of America and Russia, or how long it will be before India emerges as a modern industrial nation. But we must ensure before that time, whenever it may be, that we have welded a nation out of the three component communities and we have cut off all sentimental, cultural or chauvinistic ties with the mainsprings of our three communities. Only in this way is there any hope of guaranteeing our survival as a separate and coherent nation in South-East Asia. If we do not set out to do these things to integrate our communities and imbue them with a sense of belonging to Malaysia and to each other, then all we shall be doing would be living on borrowed time day by day, year by year, from hand to mouth, to disintegrate as a nation the moment the pulls from outside—pulls of culture, language and sentiment—become stronger than the pulls together inside—pulls which today are largely of a material nature.

Mr Speaker, Sir, this morning I listened with some interest to the Member for Pontian Selatan and to the speech made by the Member for Batu. The Member for Pontian Selatan made play of the distinction between rural and urban. The point he made was that, in fact, what I meant was Malay for rural and Chinese for urban, that therefore when I said the urban population was more sophisticated than the rural, I meant the Chinese were more sophisticated than the Malays: therefore, it was an insult on the Malays. I am reducing it, Mr Speaker, Sir, crudely to the point, because if we as representatives of the people are unable to talk in blunt terms to each other, it is unlikely that we will ever get the different communities to understand the problems, which we must face in a multi-racial, multi-cultural community. Sir, if in fact I meant that, then of course either I am out to create racial trouble or I am a fool, or both. Sir, it is true that the majority of the population in the urban areas are Chinese and the majority of the population in the rural areas are Malays. But when I say that the people in the towns are more sophisticated than the people in the

country, I am stating a proposition of general validity, true in many countries, in many societies, throughout the world, without regard to the racial composition of town or country. Let us take Britain and Australia. The towns regularly return parties of the left—the British Labour Party and the Australian Labour Party draw their support from the working classes in the towns. The British Conservative Party, the Australian Liberal and Country Party and other Conservative Parties draw their support from the country people, people who by their mode of life are more conservative in their approach. So it is also in Japan, where the ruling right-wing party draws its sustenance from the country.

Let us take this election results. One of the interesting facets of this election results is that the smaller the town and the nearer it is to a rural area, the higher the percentage of non-Malay votes the M.C.A. candidates obtained: conversely, the bigger the town and the more sophisticated, the smaller the percentage of non-Malay votes the M.C.A. candidates obtained. Our calculations based on the election results and on the electoral registers, on a breakdown of Malay and non-Malay voters, show that in places like Kuala Lumpur, Seremban, Ipoh Penang and even Malacca, the non-Malay votes that went to the M.C.A. ranged between 10 per cent at its lowest point and 20 per cent at its highest. But in the smaller towns like Taiping, they were able to get as much as 40 per cent, ranging up to 45 to 50 per cent of Chinese votes, illustrating the general principle that the more urbanised the population, the more politically sophisticated it becomes, the less its support for parties of the right. As a corollary, the more urbanised the Malay voters were, the less solidly for UMNO they were, although unfortunately in these last elections for diverse reasons they were solid enough even in the towns so that a difference of 10, 15 or 20 per cent of the non-Malay votes were enough to ensure the election of M.C.A. candidates. Be that as it may, we shall have to accept this decision. It is no use pretending that is does not exist. Such is a given position at a given moment in the history of Malaysia. It will not always remain so. It is our duty over the years to make sure that it does not remain so, and that thinking, feeling shall cut across race lines and shall cut across language, culture, race, and integrate and rally around economic interests. If we do not succeed in doing that, then we shall always be playing this game of checks and balances.

One of the interesting features of this debate is the issues raised by representatives of rural areas as compared to those raised by the representatives of urban areas. By and large, it is fair to say that UMNO, including the other parties of the Alliance—the M.C.A. and the M.I.C.—and the P.M.I.P. raised issues which show their sensitivity to their own Malay mass base, the rural base being, as the Member for Pontian Selatan honestly stated, largely Malay; and the urban base Members, including the non-Chinese Member for Ipoh, they raised issues which in turn reflected their sensitivity to the susceptibilities of their ground, which is largely Chinese. So, the Member for Ipoh raised issues about multi-lingualism, Nanyang University, equal rights—issues which have in fact been settled in Singapore; and the Member for Pontian Selatan raised issues about Geylang Serai markets, special rights for Malays and the need for more special privileges. This is a new phase in the political development of the various States in Malaysia. For as long as we were sectionalised into the old eleven States of Malaya, Singapore and the Borneo territories, burning issues, which were in fact common issues to all the territories, found expression only in parts of it. Multi-lingualism and Chinese education were fought fiercely in Singapore, whilst there was a silence maintained over the last few years in the old House of Parliament before Malaysia. Demands for Malay rights, for special treatment, for jobs in the Government—I think that is a fair

interpretation of the phrase used by the Member for Pontian Selatan, Badan[2] Kerajaan, these issues never became burning issues in the different context of Singapore. Now we have all these issues thrown into the same political arena. We would all be well advised, if we all took some time to let things settle and find a new equilibrium. It is no longer possible for people in the Peninsula to pretend that Nanyang University is not a problem of the 11 States of Malaya, even though 60 per cent of the students in Nanyang come from Malaya. Similarly, in spite of the different constitutional guarantees of the Government's obligations to the economic, religious and cultural advancement of the Malay people, it is going to be more and more difficult for us to find different solutions to the imbalance caused by unequal development, both economic and educational, between the Malays on the one hand, the Chinese, Indians and others on the other.

Now, the differences of treatment of these problems must continue for some time. We should on both sides try to approximate our solutions to what are basically the same problems. The only difference in the problem is that in one territory it manifests itself in a greater degree than the other. Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not believe that at the end of our five-year term, if we talk frankly to each other in this Chamber, as it is our duty so to do, we shall be talking in the same language that we are using today. We face the same problems, because we live in one society. If we do not resolve them, if we are only to pander to particular sections of the community, then our chances of survival—long term—are nil, because the moment external pressures are removed, the various communal sections go their separate ways, and perdition awaits us. But if we consciously try to imbue those, who look up to us as leaders of opinion—for after all the 159 Members in this House do represent, in varying degrees a broad cross-section of the population—if we can come and speak on the same wave-length and understand each other's mutual difficulties, first as between States and then as between communities, then we are that much the more certain to endure and survive.

Sir, I come now to the external threat—confrontation. The verdict given on the 25th of April has added to the strength of the Prime Minister and his colleagues to face the rigours of Indonesia's confrontation. Already in the last few weeks one senses the confidence with which the Prime Minister is standing up to the stresses and strains of what is likely to be a prolonged period of tension. The paramount problem is how to resolve confrontation without undermining the basic security and integrity of Malaysia. Let us never deceive ourselves. Indonesia's geo-political ambition to engulf us and absorb us is an abiding one, and we have got to learn to live with this for the rest of our lives. But if we show a resolution to be a nation, if we exhibit strength and stamina in combatting their pressures, then we will make it worth their while to find some way of withdrawing temporarily from the aggressive activities which they have euphemistically called "confrontation".

We have gone through nine months of these pressures. Militarily and politically today we are stronger than we were nine months ago in September the 16th, 1963. Economically, the collapse of Singapore and Penang, which Indonesia anticipated would follow her economic boycott, has not happened. We have learnt how to live nearly as well without our entrepot trade with Indonesia. I do not think, Mr Speaker, Sir, anybody in his senses can say that the same thing is true with Indonesia—that militarily, politically, or economically she is as strong as she was on the 16th September last year. In fact, if foreign reports are to be believed, then militarily she has made only token gestures, about 21 million volunteers, one brigade of which will be sent to the Borneo territories at some indeterminate date.

Politically, the President, in spite of his great powers of oratory, is finding himself more and more dependent on

the communists mobilising people to attend his rallies. An interesting one-million strong rally in front of the Merdeka Palace turned out to be 50,000 people, and I am told by my colleague from Singapore, Dr Toh—and I think the point well known to the former Ambassador to Indonesia—that the power of the President of Indonesia to enthral hundreds of thousands of people was something quite fantastic. So, it cannot be said, when the masses are floating away, that politically he has strengthened himself. Economically, Mr Speaker, Sir, everybody knows that without a large dose of American economic aid, Indonesia may find it difficult to continue her economic confrontation and feed her population at the same time.

Sir, all it means is that with every passing month our position vis-a-vis Indonesia improves. Hence, I see very little merit in the five-point programme for peace propounded by the Member for Batu. I notice that he had altered the contents and the presentation of these five points from what was enunciated in the elections by his Party. Let me ask him this one very simple question, which I hope his colleagues, either from Singapore or from Sarawak, will find time later to answer. What benefit will we get by agreeing to his five points? I can see the benefit that he would get and Indonesia would get by our agreeing to these five points. All his friends in detention will be released to run around and win the next elections, so he says (*Laughter*). I can see an obvious advantage in that—that is one of the five terms. Obviously it has been agreed with Indonesian President that they will continue confrontation for as long as these gentlemen are incarcerated. When they are released and they can bring the nation down from within, then the Indonesian President need no longer try to destroy Malaysia from without, because these gentlemen will continue to destroy it from within.

He says, "Let us withdraw all our foreign troops". Mr Speaker, Sir, I remember the last time in the elections, when we pointed out to them that this would leave four hundred thousand Indonesians to confront ten thousand Malaysians. Obviously the point was taken by those in authority, and now he underlines it and says "British and Indonesian". What I fail to understand is this. Is he suggesting to the Bung that Indonesian troops should withdraw from the island of Borneo, or is he suggesting that Indonesian troops withdraw from our side of Borneo to Kalimantan, British troops withdraw altogether from the whole of this region and we leave, therefore, on the borders Malaysians troops, which he has very kindly allowed that we should have the right to keep in Borneo—five battalions of Malaysian troops to be confronted by four hundred thousand Indonesian?

Mr Speaker, Sir, the people of Malaysia, either urban or rural, even if we go to the utmost hinterland of the Rejang River, are sophisticated enough to see what else must follow in those circumstances. We get rid of the British, we have become independent, we shall tell the world that we are free, and then what? Afro-Asian troops, says he, will guard our borders—for the rest of eternity to ensure that we are not overrun. Afro-Asian troops to guard our coastline, patrol Singapore's waters, to see that infiltrators and saboteurs do not come through? Afro-Asian navies to patrol the Straits of Malacca to ensure that fishermen are not robbed and killed? He has today taken a very bold step. He has denounced the murder of our fishermen—I listened to it with considerable interest. He is against the President of Indonesia's policy to crush Malaysia. Well, that is an advance, Mr Speaker, Sir (*Laughter*)—that is something. At least now we know, because before that we thought they were actively inciting them to crush us, but now we know that, at least on face value, they are against it.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: We never did.

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew: Of course they have to be against it. If they do not switch line, the masses will melt away. These are phrases which, if he

would consult his good friends, who have spent many years in places where reflection and contemplation brings better wisdom to left-wing adventurers (*Laughter*), he will know that is actually what is happening. One of them recently released, far from denouncing the Government for incarcerating him, preventing him from being an election agent in Singapore, or elsewhere, to win elections for them, he thanked the Government for kindness and courtesy and good treatment; and he went on to add that as long as they oppose Malaysia, there will be an albatross around their necks. That is what it is. What I would like to know now, having seen this switch in line to prevent the masses from disintegrating around the Party, is whether that line is supported by their counterparts in Singapore. This is an interesting ideological problem. There, in Singapore, the issue is whether anti-colonialism must be fought to the bitterest end, whether national service should be opposed, registration should be opposed, even to the point of open defiance of law and authority. They have been unable to resolve their problem.

Now, the two remaining leaders (*Laughter*), of the communist open front in Malaya say, "Let us go one step further and dissociate ourselves from Indonesia's crush Malaysia policy". Now, let me tell them the problems that they face. Once they embark on them, the ideological theoretician from Nanyang University—trained minds—will be able to tell them this: that more and more they will be pushed to the revisionist line. First, you dissociate yourself from Soekarno and crushing Malaysia; next you will be taxed as to whether you are prepared to defend Malaysia. For a long time that again was a bit of equivocation. Some said they were defending Malaya, some said they were defending Malaysia; they were not quite sure what they were defending (*Laughter*). Now, we have it on authority that in principle they will defend it against anybody. But I would like to know from the Barisan Sosialis of Singapore.....

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification. I have been wondering for the last five minutes whether or not to rise on a point of order—Standing Order 36, Sub-section (6), which says, "No member shall impute improper motives to any other member". But, Mr Speaker, Sir, having heard the last ten minutes the ridiculous length to which the Prime Minister of Singapore was going—by the way, I do not know why he calls himself Prime Minister, since Singapore is already a State he should in fact be called Chief Minister so as not to confuse the fact that we have only one Prime Minister—but having heard him for the last ten minutes going to such ridiculous lengths, I thought that the subject was more senseless than improper and therefore I had not objected. But on a point of clarification, I think we have always maintained, and I personally have maintained during the elections that if our country or, in fact, if any part of Malaysia, including the Bornean territories, were attacked by an aggressive force, we would defend it, and I did invite the Honourable Prime Minister of Singapore to go forward first and then I would follow (*Laughter*), but he has not as yet accepted the challenge. (*Laughter*). I do not know why he has not accepted and is talking of loyalty, since he keeps on telling everybody else to go to war. The issue that we are confronted with is the nature and the character of the so-called fighting in Borneo, and I have heard, Mr Speaker, Sir, for the last twenty minutes a diatribe from the Prime Minister of Singapore on ideological stand and revisionist lines and so on. Mr Speaker, Sir, we have not had the advantage of reading subversive literature; therefore, we were not quite well up on the question of revisionism of Moscow as opposed to that of Peking. Perhaps, the Honourable speaker could enlighten us in that further before he proceeds with his condemnation. But, Mr Speaker, Sir, we must object, however, very strongly to his

constant reference that we are a communist open front organisation. If he has any evidence, then he should prove it, and he should prove it in the proper quarters, and not use political slander against his opponents. We know that he finds sitting next to us to be sitting next to very strange companions, but as he is used to sleeping with so many strange bed companions that I am sure he has got used to the idea that all his friends are very strange. Mr Speaker, Sir, we admit that he has arrested people whom he disliked and one or two may have revised their policy. But, Mr Speaker, Sir, I think that the Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore should be more careful, when he makes references to the Socialist Front of Malaya which he knows very little.

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew: The very lax clarification, Mr Speaker, Sir, is ample testimony of a very confused situation. (*Laughter*).

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Of course, Mr Speaker, Sir, with thanks to him.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification, I have made it quite clear that we are not a communist party, nor are we a communist open front organisation, nor do we toe the Partai Komunis Indonesia line, nor are we aligned to any foreign political party. I have stated that, Mr Speaker, Sir, just now very, very clearly in no uncertain terms.

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew: The very fact that both the leader and his follower have come to the rescue in the clarification makes my point even the stronger. (*Laughter*). Sir, obviously our two Honourable Members from Batu and Dato Kramat are unaware of the mass of jargons, which their own followers have been spewing forth in the course of this election. The Member for Dato Kramat says he does not understand this jargon. I suggest to him that he ought to read what his own.....

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: On a point of clarification, Mr Speaker. I do not understand his jargon. (*Laughter*).

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew: Be that as it may. I was just quoting phrases from pamphlets distributed by the Socialist Front in this election. Their line against Malaysia is purely coincidental to that the P.K.I. uses—exactly the same terms and the same words. In fact, quite unashamedly they have the brazenness to claim that it is the P.K.I. that followed them. (*Laughter*). Sir, we are not able to read men's minds, we can only read their open avowals. We compare their open declarations with those of the P.K.I. We find a similarity not only of intention but of the phraselogy. What inference can we draw, I ask the Member for Batu, other than the fact that both pens must have sprung from the same source? But be that as it may. I am glad, anyway, that here is one, who is prepared on behalf of the ignorance of the dangers to which he has opened himself, to say, "Prove that we are an open front communist organisation?" Mr Speaker, Sir, that invitation we accept. I did not know that this was going to be the line. I mean the line that more intelligent and sophisticated communists have taken in Singapore is, "This is all nonsense. We refuse to discuss all that". That is a much better line. When a prisoner is in the dock, a good counsel always tell him, "If you really did it, better make a statement from the dock and refuse to get into an argument". (*Laughter*). But here is one who said that he is not a political virgin, Mr Speaker, Sir—I think his must have been an artificial insemination—(*Laughter*). I can assure him that this invitation now opens him up to a humiliation, the end results of which would make him completely disqualified for any nunnery. However, to more serious matters.

Sir, whatever the temporary changes in policy or line from Indonesia, whether confrontation is switched on or off, her intention to absorb us and complete her hegemony of the South-East Asian archipelago will always remain and always be a constant threat to our separate existence. Every time an Indonesian nationalist looks at the map of *Nusantara*—this is what they

call the archipelago in South-East Asia—they see the peninsula of Malaysia running parallel to Sumatra pointing towards Jawa; and they see a very agreeable part of Northern Kalimantan cut off by a small mountain range to form part of Malaysia.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we had the advantage in Singapore of the biggest Indonesian mission outside Washington. The only place where they had a bigger mission of more importance to them was Washington, because of the various reasons, material reasons, which everybody is aware of. We once put on a cultural show and invited all the representatives of the various missions in Singapore to put on their contribution, and the vivid presentation by the Indonesian mission was one for which, we should always be grateful to them. When the curtains opened, there was some magnificent map illuminated in neon lights of *Nusantara*, and a voice gave a graphic commentary of the various costumes worn by the various peoples of *Nusantara*, stretching from Acheh in the north down to Merauki in the South. "Three thousands miles", said this voice as we sat back enthralled by this map, "farther than from Tokyo to Washington—*Nusantra*"; and the lights blinkered forth from Acheh, from Medan, and as each light blinked, the costume of that area came forth in a man and a woman, and at any single moment I expected the bulbs for Kuala Lumpur and Singapore to light up. (*Laughter*).

Sir, every time, if I were an Indonesian national which, fortunately, I am not, I look at that map, there is the temptation to round of *Nusantara* and complete the hegemony of the whole region. As President Soekarno says, if he had Malaya—this is in 1945 before the formation of Indonesia—then the control of the Straits of Malacca is complete. It is not complete as long as he has only one side of it. Then, if you control the Straits of Malacca, you control the sea access to the whole of the Indonesian archipelago, and the Australian Navy will be refused access to sail upwards to Japan. So, let us be quite frank and honest. It may be "on" or it may be "off", but only a strong and united Malaysia can dampen the temptation to incorporate this wealthy and attractive sector into their map.

Finally, Mr Speaker, Sir, may I sketch out the role that my Party hopes to play in this Parliament. We would like to speak for those in Malaysia who are against bigotry, bigotry either ideologically of the communists, or of religious obscurantists. We would like to speak for those against communal chauvinism of any community. We would like to represent that desire which must exist in those who are born and bred here, who understand that our fates are interwined, the fates of the various communities in Malaysia, that there should be intelligent and rational solutions to the special problems of a multi-racial society. We are here to help to create a harmonious non-communal society, where prosperity is shared amongst all more equally regardless of race, religion, culture.

Sir, the diverse origins of the people of Malaysia bringing together into one-hundred and thirty thousand square miles so many different languages, cultures, social habits, traditions, customs and morals make tolerance the key pre-requisite to any success. British colonial domination brought these disparate groups together, and it was the over-riding British strength which ensured that conflicts and contradictions between these diverse groups were never allowed to lead to conflict and anarchy. The position is vastly different today. The easy solution of an authoritarian Government, whose will is backed by overwhelming force, is not open to us; nor can we provide a permanent solution to our own social, cultural and linguistic problems. Ours is a much more difficult task of persuading and reconciling competing, loyalties to different cultural and social values into a rational, harmonious, whole. From out of this Chamber must come the first Malaysians, and if Malaysians constitute the majority of this Chamber at the end of the five years, then we would not have failed. But if at the end of that term we are thinking, feeling, reacting, not as Malaysians but

as so many Malayans, Singaporeans, Sarawakians, Sabahans, or worse reacting as so many Malays, Chinese, Indians, or equally bad reacting as so many Muslims, Christians and others, then our future will be in jeopardy.

One of the reasons, Sir, why western style parliamentary democracy has not taken roots in the newly independent countries of Asia and Africa is because the Governments in power do not contemplate with equanimity the thought that power could pass to an Opposition, and also because the Opposition usually opposes merely to bring the Government down regardless of the harm inflicted upon the country generally.

Sir, we have the advantage in the P.A.P. of having played the role both of Opposition and of Government in Singapore, and we bring to our duties as the Opposition in this Parliament an acute understanding of the difficulties that faces the Government, the delicate and sensitive issues with which from time to time it will be confronted. We want Malaysia to succeed. It will give us very little consolation if our Party's prospects heighten as the nation goes down. For what could be worse than the prospect of sharing responsibility for the running of the Government, when both the economy and the administration have sagged. The more prosperous the country, the more efficient and honest the administration, the better are the nation's chances of success.

Sir, the Prime Minister has never been personally in so strong a position. In fact, he is even stronger now than in 1955 when the Alliance won 50 out of 51 seats, for this time, he is returned after nine years in office and everybody knew what they were voting for. From his position of strength, he can demand high standards, high standards from his colleagues in the Party and in the Government and from the officials in the administration. And if he does so, the country will be that much the healthier and eventually the happier for it. From us he will get no carping criticism for the sake of scoring points, for the simple reason that we have a vested interest to see that Malaysia succeeds—and Malaysia cannot succeed unless he succeeds. Our criticism will, therefore, be directed to this end for if he fails, we know it does not mean that we shall succeed. The chances are we shall all fail together, as the country changes from the system of representative government to one of authoritarian government.

We are not here, Mr Speaker, Sir, in the naive belief that power is vested in the counting of heads in this Chamber. If perchance, the counting of heads go wrong, if, for example, on the 25th of April the Socialist Front, instead of being exposed as a pro-P.K.I. Party, had been believed as the saviours of the nation and they had, let us say, won 60 out of the 104 seats—barring the 40 seats from Sabah and Sarawak and 15 from Singapore—nobody in his right mind would expect that the following day a great leader would be summoned to the Istana. That is not the realities of power, Mr Speaker, Sir. We are here representing what I hope are political adults. We represent various forces which are real and abiding, and we must reconcile them. If we do not reconcile them within the system of representative government and let the interplay of forces create a new equilibrium on social and economic matters—on questions of language, culture, Malay special rights, jobs in the Government and so on, if we just take communal premises, on either side, whether it is for or against, then I say one day the counting of heads will go wrong and then resort is had to other means of administering the country. It has happened in so many other countries in Asia. If we are wise—and by that I do not mean just the Government, if we in the Opposition are also wise—we could ensure that this system works to the advantage of all, because it is in nobody's advantage to abandon this for more authoritarian forms. Authoritarian form once established never relinquishes its position, and the relentless process must go on—perhaps, first, a dictatorship of the right, eventually ending up with a dictatorship of the extreme left. But just in case our friends

from the Socialist Front, Barisan Sosialis, and S.U.P.P. take any comfort in that, let me remind them that, if and when that happens, it will be an Indonesian extreme left and they would find life equally uncomfortable—I suggest more uncomfortable than they are now, today.

So, my closing remark, Mr Speaker, Sir, is this: that having a vested interest in the survival and success of representative government in Malaysia, it is our intention to make our contribution to this end.

Enche' Lim Huan Boon (Singapore): Mr Speaker, Sir, these are critical years in the history of our country and a great responsibility rests upon us to speak our minds clearly and without fear, so that our people may know the issues that are at stake. Sir, we are now reaping the harvest of poisonous fruit from the Malaysian seed. The full price in misery and suffering for our people arising out of Malaysia is yet to be paid in full. The fact that there is national registration and national call up indicates the way our country is moving. For all this, both the Federal and the State Governments must be held responsible, for although it is the British who are calling the tune in our Malaysia policy, it is these Governments that must be held accountable to our people.

Sir, I have searched vainly in His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong's Gracious Speech for one sign that the ruling party intends to break away from the tutelage of the British to join a truly independent nation. I have only found a slavish adherence to imperialism. Sir, Malaysia is a neo-colonialist creation, because it is the most major act of consolidation of colonialism in South-East Asia. By its formation . . .

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew: On a point of clarification . . .

Mr Speaker: Do you give way?

Enche' Lim Huan Boon: No, Sir.

Mr Speaker: No, he does not give way.

Enche' Lim Huan Boon: The British could crawl back through the back window and continue to exert their influence by creating tension and then return on the pretext of defending Malaysia. Yet we are fed with the propaganda line that Malaysia is anti-colonial in character. We are expected to believe that Britain, who is imposing the Aden Federation on the Arab-Yemen people, is a force of nationalism. How ridiculous can you become?

The Malaysian Federation is a twin of the Aden Federation. The British military bases and financial investment are the motives behind the creation of both these Federations. Both these Federations are created and maintained by the British as fortresses for the defence of their economic interests and as a basis for intervening in the affairs of the neighbouring countries. Just as the people of the trucious States, the Yemen and the Aden will one day come together. Similarly, the people of Borneo States and of Malaya will come together out of their own free will and in peace with their neighbours if they are let alone to form the kind of unity suitable to themselves. But the way Malaysia has been formed, the type of Malaysia and its terms make a federation unreal. We should have no part in a foreign-inspired federation. We prevent our country from becoming an unsinkable aircraft carrier for British military adventures in South-East Asia.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the central fact that has created the present conflict in South-East Asia, is a British attempt to create a Malaysian Federation by denying the people the simple but fundamental right to decide for themselves through self-determination, proper explanation and voting. If the Government has not tired of saying that the people of Singapore and Borneo support Malaysia, why don't they give them the right to say "yes" or "no" to Malaysia under conditions of full democracy? It is because their evading the simple process of letting the people to decide their destinies for themselves, that we have the present Malaysia crisis. All criticisms can be silenced, Afro-Asia

can be won over, confrontation can be ended, if only this Government dare to tell the world that it is prepared to give the people of Singapore, Sabah and Sarawak the right to say a simple "yes" or "no" to alternative choices for their country. The fact that the Government dare not do this speaks for itself than all the comments I could make.

Sir, Malaysia is an artificial creation. It is an empty shell that cannot survive without British troops. We all know that the people of the Borneo States resent domination from Kuala Lumpur and as a result Malayans are unpopular there. We know that Federal officers sent from Malaya are being kicked around by the expatriates there with the support of the Alliance leaders. We know that as far as the Borneo territories are concerned, the Central Government is a fiction as expatriates are still running Borneo and the British military is running the war. In fact, nothing has altered in Borneo except that a few Alliance "sarongs" have replaced a few expatriate "trousers".

Sir, as far as Singapore is concerned, let me reiterate once more that Singapore is a captive State in Malaysia, that we have a second class citizenship and a semi-colonial status. It is foolish, therefore, to come to Singapore to make propaganda to ask the people to die for Malaysia. As long as the people of Singapore do not feel that they belong to a free community of people, so long will they have nothing to do with anything that will help preserve Malaysia.

Dato' Donald Stephens (Sabah): Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the motion of the Honourable Member for Port Dickson and, before I proceed, I would like to take upon myself to say, on behalf of His Majesty's people of the State of Sabah, how truly grateful we are for His Majesty's remarks in the Royal Address about Sabah and Sabah's Development Plan.

I am sure that the Government of Malaysia will do everything possible to help Sabah in regard to our Development Plan. As the youngest State in Malaysia, Sabah needs all the help she can get, and we are encouraged to know that the Government will help us not only in dollars and cents but also in something just as important—"know-how". We have all seen how rural development is shaping here in Malaya, and we are learning from the success which has taken place here. To us, rural development must be the key to a better future for the majority of our people. In colonial times, the people of the rural areas have been sadly neglected and we, the elected representatives of the people, would have failed in our duty if we were to fail to improve the living standards of the people of the kampongs. Everywhere I visited in Sabah, I was asked about the promises which were made before Malaysia—to give the people more and better schools, more and better health facilities, improvement of agricultural methods, more and better roads—and the work and the planning we are now doing is aimed at bringing to the people all these things which they have a right to expect.

Sir, I might also mention that in Sabah stress not only is laid on social development but that we have in mind also the expansion of our economic development. In the colonial days non-British interests were strongly discouraged from taking part in the economic development of the State. But those days are gone. The Sabah State Government now encourages and welcomes those who would help in the economic development of the State. In this respect naturally, the State welcomes Malaysians from other States more than anyone else.

I would like, Mr Speaker, Sir, also to touch on the subject of confrontation, the shadow of which looms large along our border with Indonesia. Sabah and Sarawak have a common border with Indonesia and it is a long border—930 miles long. On the other side we know that the Indonesians are building up their forces which are being used to commit aggression against us. The Indonesians speak of guerillas and volunteers, but we know for a fact—and the world should by now also know—that these men are

not guerillas or volunteers, but that they are men belonging to Soekarno's Army, Navy and Air Force, men sent to Borneo from Java to commit acts of terrorism amongst our peace-loving people.

We see in this morning's newspaper that on the one hand Soekarno is reported to have agreed to the withdrawal of troops from the Malaysian soil and to a summit meeting and on another page we read a report which says that Soekarno has spoken publicly in front of foreign diplomats that he intends to crush Malaysia by the end of this year, summit or no summit. How does one deal with people like him? Be that as it may, Sir, I can say this for the people of Sabah: we the people of Sabah (and I know the people of Sarawak also) are not afraid of the evil confronters of Jakarta; and the people in the Borneo States, like their brothers throughout Malaysia, are prepared for any sacrifice in the fight to preserve their independence and the independence of Malaysia.

Not so long ago, I had the honour of addressing a gathering of Malaysian soldiers from the Peninsula, who had served along our borders. These men have shown the Indonesians that they are real soldiers, who came to Sabah to defend Malaysia, but in so doing also used up what spare time they had in helping the people of the kampongs in building schools, in providing temporary teachers from amongst themselves to help with the teaching. They not only kept the enemy at bay but they also provided the people with amenities which they had wanted for a long time; and they have also proved that they not only could fight the enemy but they also helped in instilling the people of our kampongs with civic pride, and the realisation that Malaysia was not merely a new word but had meaning in its truest sense in that all the peoples of Malaysia, from whatever corner they may come, are one. The men of the Royal Malay Regiment have done much to put Malaysia in concrete form before the people of our distant kampongs in Sabah and I feel I would be failing in my duty if I did not mention this here and thank them for the magnificent job which they have done, and continue to do, in Sabah. This also puts the lie to the assertion, just made by the Socialist Front Member from Singapore, that the soldiers who are fighting in Singapore are only British soldiers.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. The Chief Minister of Sabah mentioned the Socialist Front, which meant we. There are only two Socialist Front Members here—I did not mention Singapore.

Dato' Donald Stephens: Sorry, Mr Speaker. I meant the Barisan Sosialis. (*Laughter*).

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Well, that is better, Mr Speaker.

Dato' Donald Stephens: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Royal Address also mentioned the Philippines. We in Sabah, closest to the Philippines, have naturally been dismayed in the past by the action of some Filipino leaders. But I must say that we are now glad to hear that the Philippines have openly declared that they are not partners of Soekarno in Jakarta's policy of confrontation. We hope that the consular relations which have been started between Malaysia and the Philippines will soon bloom forth into full diplomatic relations between our two countries.

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, I must refer to the assertions made by the Honourable Member for Batu that Malaysia only came about because the Alliance rode roughshod over the wishes of the Opposition. The Honourable Member used the word "puerile" when referring to the statement of another Honourable Member earlier today. I think that the same word can aptly be used to describe the Honourable Member for Batu's remark about the formation of Malaysia and his so-called five points to solve what he called the Malaysian dispute but which is, in fact, Indonesian aggression. Mr Speaker, Sir, I say this, and I say this with pride: as far as the people of Sabah is concerned, Malaysia was what they wanted; Malaysia

was what they worked for; Malaysia was what they have achieved; and Malaysia is what they will die for, if necessary (*Applause*). What the Member for Batu has asked was not a solution of the Indonesian problem, but what amounts to total surrender to Soekarno. For someone who had taken the oath of loyalty in this Honourable House to propose such a move is, to say the least, surprising.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, may I rise on a point of order?

Mr Speaker: What order?

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: On a point of clarification, Mr Speaker. He has stated that I had advocated in my speech abject surrender to Indonesia, whereas I have stated that we should have peace—peace with honour and peace that safeguards the integrity of our territory. Perhaps the Chief Minister of Sabah did not hear me properly.

Mr Speaker: That is on a point of clarification, not on a point of order.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Yes.

Dato' Donald Stephens: Mr Speaker, Sir, what I said was that the so-called five-point proposals put forward by the Member for Batu amounted to total surrender to Soekarno.

The Honourable Member for Batu referred to the Sabah Alliance in derogatory terms. It not only showed his complete ignorance of affairs in Sabah, it showed also that his colleagues in the Socialist Front—former members like Karam Singh and David, and the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat—had failed to tell him that they had visited Sabah once before Malaysia came into being; and once only, and that once was enough, because they found in Sabah that the poison they had intended to implant there was totally rejected by every section of the population. They found that the Sabah soil was no place for their form of subversion and they have not returned since. They know that the Alliance in Sabah is made of pure steel and the acid of their communist propaganda could not dent it, not even one bit of it, and because of this the Sabah Alliance had been picked as the subject of their puerile attack.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for Batu spoke of desperation. A party which had won the sort of victory won by the Alliance in the recent elections certainly has no reason to be desperate, but a party which has since got its already meagre number reduced to two in this Honourable House certainly has good reasons to be desperate, and the voice we heard this morning singing Soekarno praises—the voice of the Honourable Member for Batu—was indeed the voice of a desperate person.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, may I rise on a point of clarification? I did not sing any praise of Soekarno. In fact, I stated that we deplore and condemn the oft-repeated threats of Soekarno to crush this country. I did not sing any praise of Soekarno nor of Indonesia. Perhaps the Chief Minister of Sabah did not hear me quite properly. If he wants, I can give him a copy of my speech.

Dato' Donald Stephens: There are various ways of singing a song, Mr Speaker, Sir, and various ways of interpreting this song. The way I interpreted what the Member for Batu said was that he did indirectly sing songs in praise of Soekarno. As I said, Mr Speaker, Sir, this was a desperate voice, a voice of someone who sees with clear eyes that his Party is on the verge of being totally liquidated, liquidated not by the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs, as he would make it appear, but by the people of Malaysia themselves, who are now wise as to what the Socialist Front aims to do—to sell Malaysia down the drain. That is the first step in their endeavour to help in the creation of a greater Communist Unprosperous Sphere in South-East Asia. Thank you.

Mr Speaker: The sitting is suspended for 15 minutes.

Sitting suspended at 6.00 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 6.20 p.m.

Wan Hassan bin Wan Daud (Tumpat): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka hendak mengambil peluang dalam membahathkan Titah Uchapan Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong ini. Saya suka menyentoh di-dalam masaalah pilehan raya sa-bagaimana yang terkandong dalam uchapan titah Baginda itu. Satu perkara yang paling menghairankan telah berlaku dalam pilehan raya baharu[2] ini yang mana ini ada-lah menyebabkan saya merasa sangsi di-atas kechekapan Surohanjaya Pilehan Raya yang di-adakan baharu[2] ini. Satu perkara yang saya menyatakan kehairanan itu, ia-lah dalam kawasan saya dalam pilehan raya baharu[2] ini orang[2] yang mempunyai kad pengenalan merah ya'ani yang tidak menjadi kera'ayatan juga telah di-daftarkan dan telah menjadi pengundi pada hari mengundi itu. Saya perchaya ini ia-lah satu perkara yang tidak patut berlaku demikian kerana sa-bagaimana kita tahu orang[2] yang tidak menjadi kera'-ayatan—(tidak mempunyai taraf warga negara) ini sa-patut-nya tidak di-boleh-kan mengundi dan tidak mempunyai hak[2] politik dalam negeri ini. Sudah tentu-lah pehak Kerajaan akan bertanya kenapa-kah tidak di-buat pengaduan? Yang sa-benar-nya, saya telah pun membuat pengaduan pada hari yang tersebut kapada P.O. tetapi pengaduan saya itu telah di-diamkan bagitu sahaja.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, satu perkara lagi yang saya fikir tidak patut berlaku dalam pilehan raya yang saya fikir mengancham demokrasi negeri ini ia-itu-lah pehak Kerajaan Perikatan telah menggunakan alat[2] negara saperti Jabatan Penerangan, Radio untok berkempen bagi pehak-nya dalam pilehan raya ini. Dalam kawasan saya boleh di-katakan pegawai[2] penerangan yang telah di-tugaskan oleh Kerajaan untok membuat penerangan kapada ra'ayat telah berubah menjadi pegawai[2] Perikatan yang memberi penerangan dan kempen bagi pehak Perikatan dan pernah berterang[2] menyeru orang ramai supaya mengundi kapada pehak Perikatan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Hilir Perak telah mengeluarkan tudohan yang bukan[2] kapada pehak PAS yang saya perchaya tudohan ini ada-lah tidak berasas dan tidak mempunyai bukti sadikit pun umpama-nya tudohan[2] azimat. Saya perchaya tudohan ini di-buat oleh orang Perikatan yang telah kehabisan modal dalam pilehan raya baharu ini, entah di-mana dia berjumpa azimat chaching barangkali, entah ada orang[2], kebanyakan orang Melayu di-kampong[2] perchaya kapada azimat untok di-gantongkan di-tengkok—(di-leher) anak[2] yang berpenyakit chaching barangkali, maka itu di-katakan-lah azimat sabil yang telah di-keluarkan oleh pehak PAS. Yang sa-benar-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kami pehak PAS tidak-lah berniat dan tidak akan melakukan pekerjaan[2] yang sa-umpama ini. Dengan tidak mempunyai azimat pun kita pehak PAS telah berjaya—telah mendapat kemenangan dalam pilehan raya dalam tahun 1959 dahulu di-Kelantan. Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Hilir Perak juga telah mengatakan yang orang PAS ini telah banyak melakukan dosa dan PAS akan di-tanya oleh Tuhan lebeh dahulu dalam kubor nanti. Entah-lah saya tidak tahu barangkali Ahli Yang Berhormat itu amat bijak bersabit dengan kubor dan sa-patut-nya dia di-lantek menjadi Menteri kubor.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka menyentoh di-dalam hujongan Uchapan Titah Baginda ia-itu berhubong dengan Ranchangan Melawat Sambil Belajar. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ranchangan Melawat Sambil Belajar ini lebeh banyak merupakan lawatan makan angin bagi orang[2] Perikatan. Kerana boleh di-katakan 95 peratus daripada orang yang di-pileh untok mengadakan Lawatan Sambil Belajar itu terdiri daripada orang[2] Perikatan. Saya menyatakan umpama-nya dalam lawatan gerakan sharikat kerjasama, sa-patut-nya orang[2] yang ahli dalam sharikat kerjasama atau yang mengambil bahagian dalam sharikat kerjasama-lah di-beri peluang dalam lawatan ini. Tetapi apa yang telah berlaku, dalam lawatan bagi ahli[2] sharikat kerjasama yang terpileh untok

mengadakan lawatan itu ia-lah Setia-Usaha atau pun Ketua Pemuda UMNO atau pun Ketua UMNO. Dalam lawatan untok ahli[2] kesatuan sekerja pun yang terpileh untok pergi dalam lawatan ini ia-lah Setia-usaha atau Ketua Pemuda UMNO atau Ketua UMNO juga.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bagaimana uchapan Yang Berhormat dari Temerloh menyesali bahawa dalam titah Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong tidak menyebutkan sadikit pun masaalah ugama Islam sa-bagai ugama rasmi dalam negeri ini. Saya juga pehak PAS sangat menyesali di-atas hal ini dan saya suka menyentoh sadikit dalam masaalah pelajaran yang berhubong dengan guru[2] ugama di-sekolah[2] menengah. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pelajaran ugama dalam sekolah[2] menengah boleh-lah di-katakan amat-lah tidak terator-nya dari segi sukatan pelajaran, juga dari segi guru[2]-nya yang mana guru[2] ugama di-dalam sekolah[2] menengah telah tidak di-beri layanan yang sa-wajar-nya sa-bagai sa-orang guru. Kita pernah mendengar rayuan[2] dari pehak guru[2] ugama melaluï akhbar[2] yang mengatakan mereka ini telah di-beri gaji yang sama dengan peon atau pun office boy yang saya fikir sangat-lah tidak patut. Bagaimana-kah sa-orang yang bertaraf guru untok mendidek keturunan kita di-masa yang akan datang dengan baik-nya sedangkan mereka itu telah di-beri layanan sa-bagitu burok yang mana sa-tengah[2] daripada-nya telah di-beri gaji sa-banyak hanya-lah $90 sa-bulan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berharap pehak Kementerian Pelajaran memandang berat akan perkara ini dan saya berharap supaya perkara ini manakala di-sampaikan kapada pehak yang berkenaan tidak-lah di-tanggoh[2]-kan lagi dengan menubohkan Jawatan-kuasa itu dan Jawatan-kuasa ini bagaimana yang telah berlaku dalam masa[2] yang lepas. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untok merengkaskan masa dalam Rumah yang mulia ini saya suka menyentoh sadikit lagi pertama dalam hujongan titah uchapan Baginda ia-itu-lah masaalah pelajaran dewasa. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak-lah hendak mengatakan bahawa ranchangan itu satu ranchangan yang membazir, sa-benar-nya tidak-lah ranchangan itu kesemua-nya membazir bagaimana kata Yang Berhormat dari Hilir Perak bahawa PAS semua-nya menganggap ranchangan luar bandar itu membazir. Sa-benar-nya tidak semua, tetapi ada sa-tengah[2]-nya di-fikirkan membazir, tetapi tidak-lah membazir 100%, ada faedah-nya, tetapi sadikit sangat. Yang sa-patut-nya ranchangan ini di-ubah kapada ranchangan lain yang lebeh banyak memberi faedah, umpama-nya pelajaran dewasa, apa yang berlaku terutama sa-kali di-Kelantan kelas[2] dewasa di-adakan bukan-lah bertujuan untok mengajar bersunggoh[2] supaya orang[2] ramai dapat menulis dan membacha, tetapi lebeh banyak merupakan kelas[2] untok mengajar perkara politik Perikatan.

Dan sa-lain daripada itu saya fikir kelas[2] itu ada-lah paling banyak sa-kali menipu wang Kerajaan, kerana dalam tiap[2] kelas guru[2]-nya itu mereport kata-nya ada 20 orang atau 25 orang, yang sa-benar-nya kelas itu sa-tengah[2]-nya ada dua atau tiga orang murid dan ada sa-tengah-nya tidak mempunyaï murid langsong, saya dapat membuktikan hal ini, boleh di-katakan orang[2] di-Kelantan sekarang ini mengubah nama kelas dewasa itu dengan kelas duasa kata-nya, kerana kebanyakan kelas[2] itu ada dua orang dan sa-orang pun ada dan sa-tengah kelas itu tidak ada murid langsong dan guru[2] yang mengajar itu hanya-lah dapat elaun pasang lampu sahaja $4 satu jam. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya fikir ini ada-lah satu perkara yang tidak bagus dan tidak baik, maka kalau-lah ranchangan ini hendak di-lanjutkan juga saya berharap supaya pehak Kementerian yang bertanggong-jawab supaya menyiasat betul[2] hal ini dan menyusun kelas[2] itu biar-lah menjadi kelas dewasa yang benar[2] mengajar dan benar[2] murid-nya ada untok di-ajar menulis dan membacha supaya tidak-lah wang negara membazir bagitu sahaja. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka menyentoh masaalah kesihatan. Tadi, ada Yang Berhormat memperkatakan masaalah kekurangan doctor. Masaalah ini ada-lah sangat

di-rasaï terutama sa-kali bagi kami pendudok[2] di-Kelantan. Umpama-nya kawasan yang saya wakili yang mempunyaï lebeh kurang 45 ribu pendudok tidak mempunyaï sa-orang doctor pun. Dan ini ada-lah satu perkara yang sangat[2] menyusahkan ra'ayat dan baharu[2] ini dalam dua minggu yang lalu satu kejadian cholera telah berlaku dalam kawasan saya yang menyebabkan beratus[2] orang telah menghidapi penyakit itu dan dua orang telah mati. Manakala perkara itu di-beritahu kapada pehak pegawai kesihatan maka pehak pegawai kesihatan hanya pergi sahaja di-situ tidak membuat penyiasatan kerana dia bukan-lah sa-orang doktor, tetapi hanya sa-orang Hospital Assistant sahaja. Jadi, terbiar-lah masaalah itu hingga-lah penyakit itu bermahrajalela terutama sa-kali di-kampong[2] kawasan saya yang bersempadan dengan Thailand.

Saya berharap kapada Kementerian yang berkenaan supaya mengambil perhatian berat dalam masaalah ini dan jangan-lah pehak Kementerian ini memikirkan orang[2] di-negara PAS tidak di-serangi oleh penyakit, sabenar-nya penyakit itu akan menyerang manusia ini di-mana sahaja mereka berada. Sakian-lah sahaja, Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

Enche' Abdul Karim bin Abu (Melaka Selatan): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam membahathkan titah uchapan di-Raja saya wakil Melaka Selatan suka-lah mengambil kesempatan beruchap dalam Dewan yang bertuah ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, baharu sa-bentar tadi kita telah mendengar wakil PAS beruchap berhubong dengan pilehan raya. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pilehan raya telah berlalu. Wakil PAS telah menapikan azimat yang telah di-sebarkan dalam akhbar itu bukan datang-nya daripada PAS. Tetapi di-negeri Melaka bukan sahaja azimat yang di-laungkan oleh PAS, sa-hingga PAS menyuarakan kalau tidak mengundi PAS tidak masok shorga, kalau undi PAS masok shorga. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, telatah PAS semua makhlok tahu. Jadi, tidak usah-lah PAS hendak berlindong[2] kerana kekalahan PAS yang telah terbukti walau pun negeri Kelantan PAS menang. Tetapi Perikatan telah dapat kejayaan juga. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada hari sa-malam wakil PAS juga telah memainkan tarian, tarian yang lama dan gendang yang lama, walau pun saya baharu menjadi Ahli Dewan ini, tetapi saya mengikuti 5 tahun yang sudah atas telatah[2] PAS, apa yang di-katakan oleh wakil PAS memberi kata[2] kapada Perikatan menunjokkan kapada parti Perikatan, menyuroh supaya menchari jalan damai menchari jalan baik berhubong dengan konfrantasi Indonesia. Tetapi saya suka hendak bertanya kapada PAS, tolong beri jalan bagaimana chara damai chara yang baik untok kita hendak berdamai dengan Indonesia? Perkara ini memang pernah di-laungkan oleh PAS sa-tiap masa, pada pendapat saya apa yang di-uchapkan-nya oleh wakil PAS 5 tahun yang lalu sa-rupa dengan rupa uchapan-nya pada hari sa-malam dan hari ini juga.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, wakil PAS pada hari sa-malam telah beruchap, sanggup menudoh Kerajaan Perikatan yang memerentah Malaysia ini akan menjadikan negeri ini negeri Cowboy. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, rasa saya pemerentahan PAS di-Kelantan-lah yang akan menjadi negeri Cowboy, kerana selalu berlaku perkara katok, perkara takut. Ini kerja Cowboy.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka beraleh kapada uchapan yang di-laungkan oleh wakil P.P.P. Wakil ini juga beruchap apa yang di-laungkan-nya pada tahun[2] yang sudah. Pada kali ini itu juga uchapan-nya. Uchapan-nya sa-mata[2] hendak memechah-belahkan ra'ayat negeri ini, membawa kapada semangat perkauman di-dalam negeri ini dengan menyebutkan berulang[2] kali hak istimewa orang[2] Melayu. Berulang[2] kali menyebutkan hendak memperjuangkan berbagai[2] bahasa dalam Malaysia ini. Malang-nya wakil P.P.P. tidak ada dalam Majlis ini. Kalau dia sedar ra'ayat telah mengutok dia, kekalahan P.P.P. juga telah terbukti apa yang di-laungkan-nya itu tidak di-perchayaï oleh ra'ayat lagi. Dia hanya bergantong mendapat kerusi, kerana undi daripada orang[2] Tionghua, sebab itu-lah

dia berchakap hendak memperjuangkan berbilang bahasa.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, hak istimewa orang[2] Melayu selalu di-sebut[2]kan dalam Dewan yang bertuah ini. Wakil P.P.P. telah menyebutkan konon-nya, dia beri satu chontoh berhubong dengan licence taxi ia-itu 47 peratus telah di-beri kapada orang[2] Melayu, dan 53 peratus di-beri kapada orang[2] yang bukan Melayu. Ini sahaja wakil dari Ipoh itu nampak, tetapi saya suka mengalehkan pandangan pada Dewan ini, kalau sangat[2] hati orang[2] Melayu di-sakitkan, bagi pehak orang[2] Melayu juga boleh memberikan pandangan yang sa-rupa dengan wakil itu. Mari kita pandang di-Jabatan Keretapi, berapa orang[2] Melayu ada? Mari kita pandang di-Jabatan Pos, berapa orang[2] Melayu ada? Tolong-lah wakil P.P.P. itu jawab.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berasa bimbang uchapan yang di-laungkan oleh wakil P.P.P. ini. Saya nampak lagu lama-nya itu akan hapus dalam tahun 1969 harus dia juga tidak dapat dudok dalam Parlimen ini, ra'ayat sahaja yang akan menentukan-nya.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berhubong dengan uchapan lain[2] parti, rasa saya untok menghormati masa, kita sama[2] telah mendengar serang balas berlaku di-antara satu parti dengan satu parti yang lain pada petang ini. Jadi, saya mengambil kesempatan dalam Titah Uchapan Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong berhubong dengan pembangunan negara, ia-itu ada terchatit dalam Titah Uchapan berhubong dengan Kementerian Pertanian dan Sharikat Kerjasama.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita tidak boleh menapikan ia-itu ada-lah gerakan sharikat kerjasama ini ia-lah satu daripada-nya hendak meninggikan taraf hidup ra'ayat di-dalam Malaysia ini. Jadi, kalau kita semak dalam Titah Uchapan itu, banyak sharikat[2] kerjasama telah di-tubohkan di-tanah ayer kita, tetapi saya suka memberi pandangan pada pehak yang berkenaan, bagitu banyak sharikat[2] kerjasama di-tubohkan, maka yang menjadi kesusahan pada pegawai[2] yang menjalankan tadbir sharikat[2] kerjasama itu ia-lah perkara hendak memereksa buku[2] sharikat. Ini diharap dapat di-tambah Pegawai[2] Odit, umpama-nya di-bahagian selatan ia-itu Melaka dan Johor chuma ada dua orang sahaja Pegawai Odit, pada hal beratus[2] buah sharikat ada dalam kawasan[2] itu. Ini satu daripada-nya yang menyebabkan kelemahan perjalanan sharikat kerjasama.

Berhubong dengan sharikat kerjasama, saya suka menarek perhatian pada pehak yang berkenaan, saya merayu supaya sa-buah Badan Lembaga Pemasaran patut di-tubohkan dengan sa-berapa segera, kerana dalam negeri[2] yang telah maju, Lembaga Pemasaran ini telah di-tubohkan bagi mengawal barang[2] umpama-nya padi dapat di-jual oleh petani[2] dengan harga yang baik dan tidak menguntongkan orang[2] tengah. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, terlanjor saya berchakap dalam hal sharikat kerjasama ini, walau pun bagi pehak Kerajaan telah menguntokkan banyak wang bagi memajukan sharikat kerjasama, tetapi banyak orang tidak tahu ia-itu dalam tanah ayer kita ini telah di-tubohkan sa-buah bank, Bank Agong Sharikat Kerjasama (Apex Bank) yang di-dokong oleh ahli[2]-nya daripada sharikat[2] kerjasama di-seluroh tanah ayer kita.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berhubong dengan Bank Agong Sharikat Kerjasama ini, saya sa-bagai salah sa-orang daripada Ahli Jema'ah Pengarah merayu kapada pehak yang berkenaan supaya dapat mengambil perhatian yang berat untok memberi sokongan kapada Bank Agong Sharikat Kerjasama ini bagi dapat melancharkan pertolongan kapada kaum[2] tani yang ada bersipah, berselirak di-tanah ayer kita. Umpama-nya, bagi pehak Kerajaan ada menguntokkan wang lebeh kurang $5½ juta kerana hendak menghapuskan padi kuncha. Jadi, wang ini tidak dapat Bank Agong menjalankan dengan baik kerana tidak di-beri kuasa dengan penoh hanya dapat dengan chara beransor[2]. Saya harap bagi pehak yang berkenaan akan dapat memberi keperchayaan kapada Bank Agong dengan mempertarohkan wang itu

menjadi modal kapada Bank Agong bagi memberi pertolongan kapada seluroh sharikat[2] kerjasama dalam tanah ayer kita.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya beraleh pula kapada Kementerian Pelajaran. Berhubong dengan Bulan Bahasa Kebangsaan kita sedia ma'alum Kerajaan telah menguntokkan wang yang bagitu banyak, $378,000 kerana Bulan Bahasa Kebangsaan. Jadi saya berpendapat wang ini kira-nya di-belanjakan kerana untok peraduan, sharahan, membacha dan lain[2] sahaja tidak akan memberi kesan pada Bulan Bahasa Kebangsaan. Jadi, di-harap bagi pehak Pengarah Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka dapat mengambil perhatian yang berat supaya menguntokkan sa-bahagian daripada wang itu mengikut sempena Bulan Bahasa Kebangsaan dengan menentukan satu[2] pejabat, kata-lah, Pejabat Pelajaran hendak-lah di-tukar semuanya sa-kali mesti-lah dengan menggunakan surat-menyurat dalam bahasa Melayu. Jadi, kalau dahulu ada pejabat menjawab hendak menghabiskan surat yang di-chap lama, ia-itu bahasa Inggeris, kalau di-tukar sama sa-kali pada satu[2] pejabat tentu-lah tidak ada jawapan itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berhubong dengan kesihatan, saya juga berchakap mewakili pendudok di-kawasan saya di-Melaka Selatan yang hampir saramai 50,000 orang di-Jasin tidak ada sa-orang pun doktor saperti yang di-laungkan oleh wakil PAS. Ini saya berharap mendapat perhatian daripada pehak Kementerian Kesihatan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berhubong dengan Kementerian Penerangan dan Penyiaran. Kita tidak boleh menafikan tugas[2] yang di-jalankan oleh Jabatan Penerangan. Berhubong dengan penerangan ini lebeh mustahak lagi kerana dalam masa kita menghadapi konferantasi Indonesia ini. Ra'ayat di-luar bandar hendak-lah di-beri penerangan yang jelas supaya kekeliruan tidak berlaku. Ejen[2] Indonesia tidak dapat mengelirukan fikiran ra'ayat hanya dapat kita salorkan dengan melalui siaran daripada badan penerangan ini. Dari itu bagi pehak Kementerian ini saya merayu-lah pada membanyakkan lori[2] penerangan supaya dapat tiap[2] kampong menerima penerangan ini, umpama-nya sa-bulan sa-kali, tetapi dalam kawasan saya kadang[2] sa-sabuah kampong itu sampai 4-5 bulan baharu dapat badan penerangan ini datang. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dengan ada-nya tambahan yang saya rayukan ini tentu-lah berkehendakkan beberapa pegawai lagi. Ini tentu-lah ada dalam ma'aluman Kementerian Penerangan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya beraleh kapada Ranchangan Perumahan. Ranchangan Perumahan juga bagi pehak kawasan saya di-Melaka Selatan merayu pada Kementerian yang berkenaan, kerana umpama-nya dalam pekan Jasin ada sa-buah kedai di-dudoki sampai 10 kelamin. Jadi pendudok yang sesak bagini harap mendapat perhatian daripada Kerajaan. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untok memberi peluang kapada orang lain, sa-kian-lah sahaja uchapan saya. Terima kaseh.

Dato' Abdullah bin Abdul Rahman (Kuala Trengganu Selatan): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya wakil dari Kuala Trengganu Selatan suka menyertai dan menyokong usul yang di-majukan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Port Dickson. Dari Titah di-Raja kita patut-lah berasa bershukor kerana walau pun negeri ini pada masa sekarang sedang menghadapi konferantasi dari Indonesia dan negeri kita berada di-dalam keadaan tidak sa-bagitu menyenangkan namum pehak Kerajaan tetap berazam akan memberi keutamaan kapada ranchangan pembangunan ekonomi dan juga keutamaan meninggikan taraf pelajaran di-dalam negeri ini.

Sa-bagai sa-orang wakil yang menyebelahi Kerajaan saya sunggoh rasa bangga dan rasa bershukor kerana Kerajaan Perikatan telah membuat banyak jasa kapada ra'ayat jelata di-dalam negeri ini seluroh-nya dan telah menchapai sa-bagitu banyak kejayaan di-dalam masa yang singkat bagi faedah pendudok[2] di-dalam negeri ini.

Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh ada mengkecham Kerajaan berkenaan dengan ranchangan luar bandar yang di-jalankan oleh Kerajaan pada masa

ini. Saya tidak bagitu faham chachian[2] yang di-limparkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat itu.

Kita semua sedia ma'alum dan sedar bahawa walau pun telah banyak usaha[2] tenaga yang telah di-jalankan oleh Kerajaan tetapi perbedzaan di-antara orang[2] yang berada dengan orang yang tidak berada itu maseh berjauhan lagi. Apa yang saya ma'ana, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perbedzaan kehidupan—taraf hidup di-antara orang[2] miskin dengan orang[2] kaya di-dalam negeri ini maseh jauh lagi. Jadi patut-lah menjadi kesukaran kapada kita semua kapada pehak Kerajaan yang sentiasa berazam untok menghapuskan kemiskinan dan pen-deritaan di-dalam negeri ini. Kita juga ada dengar perchakapan yang di-keluarkan oleh Perdana Menteri Singapura berkenaan dengan angin perubahan—winds of change. Patut-lah Perdana Menteri Singapura sedar ia-itu winds of change atau angin perubahan ini kalau sesuai dengan Singapura di-mana kita dapati lebeh kurang satu million sa-tengah pendudok tidak sa-mesti sesuai dengan keadaan dan kehendak di-negeri Malaysia saperti Malaya, Borneo dan Sarawak. Saya bimbang kalau banyak sangat di-pusing[2]kan oleh Perdana Menteri Singapura dengan angin perubahan ini, bukan akan menjadi satu perkara yang membena bahkan akan menjadi per-kara yang merbahaya—perkara yang akan meruntohkan perpaduan yang ada di-antara segala kaum yang menjadi pendudok di-Malaysia ini. Saya juga bimbang akibah daripada permainan dan perchakapan saperti ini yang di-keluarkan oleh orang[2] di-Singapura akan membawa kita semua kaum[2] yang ada di-Malaysia ini kapada keadaan jahanam. Saya rasa Titah Uchapan Ka-bawah Duli berkenaan dengan azam dan keutamaan yang hendak di-beri oleh Kerajaan kapada ranchangan pembangunan ekonomi ada-lah sangat tepat sa-kali dan sesuai sa-kali dengan kehendak masa dan suasana di-negeri ini pada masa sekarang.

Saperti saya katakan tadi, walau pun telah banyak di-buat oleh Kerajaan di-merata[2] tempat tetapi maseh ada lagi kita dapati penderitaan, pen-deritaan kita boleh lihat di-sini di-situ di-negeri Malaysia ini. Khas-nya di-negeri Trengganu daripada mana saya datang kita maseh lagi dapat lihat penderitaan. Sa-masa penjajahan dahulu kemajuan di-negeri itu telah ketinggalan; boleh di-katakan di-dalam segala lapangan baik di-dalam lapangan pelajaran mahu pun lapa-ngan kesihatan dan juga lapangan ekonomi. Maka ada-lah harapan saya Kerajaan akan memberi perhatian yang istimewa kapada kemajuan[2] dan pembangunan ekonomi di-sabelah Pantai Timor ia-itu di-negeri Treng-ganu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam sa-sabuah negeri itu kalau kita ber-kehendakkan dan kalau kita chuba hendak menchipta satu bangsa yang sehat, satu masharakat yang bersatu padu, mesti-lah taraf ekonomi pen-dudok[2] negeri itu sebalek-nya sa-imbang di-antara satu sama lain. Kalau perbedzaan terlampau banyak di-antara yang miskin dengan yang kaya, saya bimbang kita tidak boleh dapat menubohkan atau menchipta satu bangsa atau masharakat yang sehat dan boleh menjadi aman damai. Daripada jurusan ini saya tidak faham pengkritek[2] Kerajaan di-atas ran-changan[2] luar bandar dan ranchangan[2] kemajuan yang lain. Saya tidak guna-lah berchakap panjang berkenaan dengan gerakan[2] ranchangan luar bandar ini oleh kerana saudara saya Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Pontian Selatan telah berchakap panjang berkenaan dengan perkara ini.

Berbalek kapada pelajaran, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, memang-lah Kerajaan telah banyak berusaha dan membuat kerja di-dalam bahagian pelajaran ini dan telah mengeluarkan wang yang banyak tetapi sekarang maseh lagi kita dapati pendudok[2] di-negeri ini tidak berpeluang mendapat pelajaran yang benar sempurna, sama ada di-sebab-kan oleh kemiskinan atau pun kekurangan wang. Saya ketahui di-ulu[2] di-Trengganu mithal-nya, ada kita dapati antara anak[2] kita tidak mampu hendak pergi ka-sekolah. Jadi di-sini saya minta-lah pehak Kemen-terian Pelajaran mengambil perhatian

ulangan supaya dapat menyiasat lebeh lanjut berkenaan dengan persekolahan anak orang di-ulu[2] di-negeri Trengganu ini. Berkaitan dengan pelajaran tinggi pula, sekarang saya nampak, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, daripada lawatan[2] saya ka-negeri[2] luar khasnya di-negeri[2] Eropa. Perbedzaan antara orang[2] yang ada dan orang[2] yang tidak berada terlalu jauh mengambil pelajaran tinggi. Kita dapati hanya bilangan yang sangat kechil daripada orang[2] yang tidak berada mengambil pelajaran tinggi. Jadi ini pun menjadi kebimbangan saya. Kalau-lah hanya kebanyakan orang[2] bandar sahaja mengambil pelajaran tinggi walhal orang[2] di-luar kawasan bandar hanya segulongan yang kechil sahaja mengambil peluang pelajaran tinggi, kedudokan saperti ini boleh jadi akan membawa suasana yang tidak sebagitu di-ingini.

Jua kedudokan yang saperti ini boleh mengeluarkan banyak perasaan yang tidak puas hati di-antara pendudok[2] negeri Malaysia ini. Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh ada berchakap panjang berkenaan dengan pilehan raya dan berkenaan dengan rasuah atau corruption. Saya bukan-lah hendak menjawab perchakapan Ahli Yang Berhormat itu, bahkan hanya sa-kadar hendak memberi pandangan atau membuat kenyataan. Berkenaan dengan pilehan raya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ini perkara yang telah sudah, kalau Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh itu betul[2] bacha undang[2] kesalahan pilehan raya tidak dapat tidak beliau itu akan dapati banyak perkara yang beliau boleh buat dan yang beliau boleh bertindak terhadap kerani[2] pilehan raya itu kalau tidak menjalankan kerja[2]-nya dengan baik dan sempurna. Bagitu jua terhadap pegawai[2] yang menjadi Presiding Officer yang tidak menjalankan kerja dengan baik atau betul, dan seterusnya kapada Returning Officer. Kalau ada kesilapan atau kesalahan yang besar, perkara itu boleh di-bawa sa-hingga ka-Mahkamah Tinggi dan terpulang-lah kapada Mahkamah Tinggi membuat keputusan siapa yang betul dan siapa yang bersalah. Berkait dengan corruption atau rasuah Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh telah menchachi Kerajaan dan polis berkait dengan perkara itu. Nampak-nya Ahli Yang Berhormat itu berkehendakkan tiap[2] perkara yang berkait dengan corruption mesti di-bawa ka-Mahkamah oleh pehak polis atau oleh pehak Kerajaan. Saya rasa, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sama ada polis patut meneruskan dengan penyiasatan di-dalam satu[2] perkara yang di-adakan atau pun sama ada patut di-bawa ka-Mahkamah, itu ada-lah terpulang kapada pehak polis. Mithal-nya satu[2] perkara itu tidak ada keterangan yang banyak, tidak dapat keterangan yang jelas atau terang, tidak mustahak dan tidak patut pehak Kerajaan atau pehak polis membawa case itu ka-Mahkamah. Jua tidak patut mereka membuang masa dan tenaga membuat penyiasatan lanjut. Jadi, saya berharap-lah kapada Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh itu sa-belum membuat chachian terhadap sesuatu perkara sila-lah memberi pertimbangan yang sa-wajar-nya dan berpatutan; jangan hanya pandai membuat kechaman. Sekarang walau pun sudah banyak usaha di-jalankan oleh Kerajaan ka-arah mengurangkan penganggoran atau unemployment, tetapi harapan saya dengan ada-nya ranchangan pembangunan ekonomi yang sempurna makin berkurang lagi-lah penganggoran dalam negeri Malaysia ini. Saya dapati di-Trengganu juga ada lagi orang[2] yang maseh tidak dapat pekerjaan. Tetapi saya berharap dengan ada-nya keazaman daripada pehak Kerajaan untok terus menerus menghapuskan kemiskinan dan meninggikan taraf hidup pendudok[2] di-dalam negeri ini penganggoran akan lenyap dengan chepat-nya dari satu masa ka-satu masa.

Sekarang, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka juga menyentoh sadikit berkenaan dengan kedudokan scheme of service pegawai[2] yang ada di-dalam Judicial and Legal Service. Kalau-lah ada peluang-nya, kalau-lah ada kelapangan saya rasa elok-lah juga pehak Kerajaan mengkaji sa-mula scheme of service bagi pegawai[2] kita yang ada dalam Judicial and Legal Service ini kerana saya sendiri pada suatu masa

dahulu berada dalam Judicial and Legal Service dan sekarang saya melahirkan perasaan ini sa-bagai dari sa-orang yang telah mengalami jawatan itu. Sangat-lah mustahak tiap[2] sa-orang pegawai yang ada di-dalam Judicial and Legal Service itu menjaga kehormatan-nya, dan maruah-nya, kerana sebab itu scheme of service atau pun pendapatan gaji mereka elok-lah kalau boleh di-kaji sa-mula. Bukan-lah berma'ana sekarang juga Kerajaan mesti bertindak, fasal kita pun tahu Kerajaan sekarang sedang menghadapi konfrantasi. Kerajaan sedang ada di-dalam kesukaran. Saya katakan kalau ada kelapangan dan kalau ada peluang elok-lah di-kaji sa-mula. Itu-lah sahaja Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya rengkaskan uchapan saya.

Enche' Othman bin Wok (Singapore): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-telah selesai-nya pembukaan rasmi yang telah di-lakukan oleh Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong pada hari Thalatha yang lalu, saya pada mula-nya telah menganggap bahawa Dewan yang mulia ini akan mula menjalankan tugas-nya untok membinchangkan perkara[2], atau masaalah[2] yang akan kita hadapi bersama dalam masa lima tahun yang akan datang, tetapi sedeh-nya saya menyatakan di-sini, apa yang telah di-pertutorkan sejak Dewan ini bersidang, bukan-lah perkara[2] baharu yang harus di-binchangkan dengan chergas dan lanchar, tetapi sa-balek-nya ia-lah perkara[2] yang telah di-sebutkan berkali[2] dalam Dewan ini sejak pilehan raya tahun 1959 yang lalu.

Ada-lah menjadi tujuan saya hendak menyentoh banyak perkara yang telah di-sebutkan dalam Titah Uchapan Seri Paduka Baginda, tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua telah pun mengarahkan kami supaya jangan mengambil banyak masa Dewan ini agar Ahli[2] yang lain berpeluang sama untok memberi uchapan masing[2] dan oleh yang demikian biar-lah saya hanya menumpukan masa yang di-beri kapada saya kapada beberapa perkara yang tertentu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya terpaksa mengambil sadikit masa Dewan ini untok menjawab beberapa tudohan yang telah di-suarakan oleh beberapa orang Ahli yang ada di-hadapan saya sa-malam dan hari ini. Saya rasa adalah menjadi kewajipan saya untok menjelaskan, atau menjawab tudohan[2] itu supaya jangan semua Ahli[2] yang ada dalam Dewan yang mulia ini kekeliruan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-malam Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Hilir Perak dalam uchapan-nya telah menudoh konon-nya Parti Tindakan Ra'ayat ia-lah sa-buah parti dictator yang memerentah sa-olah[2]-nya dengan menggunakan kuasa kuku besi. Kapada Ahli Yang Berhormat itu, konon-nya Kerajaan Petir di-Singapura telah menudaï, atau telah mengenepikan, atau tidak mengamalkan sama sa-kali pemerentahan sachara democracy. Untok pengetahuan-nya, biar-lah saya tegaskan di-dalam Dewan ini bahawa telah menjadi kenyataan yang tidak dapat di-napikan kemenangan Parti Petir di-dalam dua pilehan raya umum yang telah di-adakan di-Singapura ia-lah kerana dasar Petir yang democratic, social dan bukan komunis. Kerana ra'ayat Singapura yang terdiri dari berbilang bangsa, hatta orang[2] Melayu sendiri yang menerima dan mengakuï dasar ini, maka itu-lah sebab-nya Petir telah di-pileh menerusi pilehan raya sa-orang satu undi untok memegang teraju pemerentahan sa-hingga tahun 1968.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli Yang Berhormat dari kawasan Hilir Perak telah juga menyebutkan soal yang sudah pun selesai, yang tidak harus di-kemukakan lagi di-dalam Dewan ini. Beliau telah membangkitkan soal uchapan pilehan raya Perdana Menteri Singapura yang konon-nya telah mensifatkan Yang Teramat Mulia Tunku Perdana Menteri sa-bagai sa-orang pemimpin yang tidak bercalibre. Perkara ini sa-benar-nya sudah pun selesai dalam masa kempen pilehan raya yang baharu lalu maseh berjalan lagi. Perdana Menteri Singapura telah pun menemuï Tunku Perdana Menteri dan menjelaskan

keadaan yang sa-benar-nya. Lebeh dari itu, Perdana Menteri Singapura telah meminta supaya rakaman uchapan beliau yang telah di-rakamkan oleh polis dalam perjumpaan ramai pilehan raya di-Seremban itu di-mainkan sa-mula dan di-semak.

Kita semua tahu apa yang sa-benarnya telah berlaku ia-lah timbul dari salah faham sa-tengah pemimpin[2] MCA yang sendiri tidak faham bahasa China. Saya rasa tujuan Ahli Yang Berhormat sengaja menimbulkan samula soal yang sudah luput ini ia-lah sa-mata[2] untok menaikkan sentiment sa-gulongan yang tertentu di-kalangan orang[2] Melayu kita supaya benchikan Petir dan menganggap Petir sa-bagai sa-buah parti yang anti-Melayu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tujuan yang sa-umpama ini ada-lah sangat merbahaya sa-kali di-dalam negeri ini yang mengandongi pendudok[2] dari berbagai[2] kaum dan ugama.

Sekarang biar-lah saya beraleh pula pada uchapan yang telah di-lafadzkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Pontian Selatan. Saperti yang telah dilakukan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Hilir Perak, beliau telah menggunakan tactic yang sa-rupa. Beliau telah menimbulkan soal[2] lapok yang telah di-sebutkan berkali[2] dalam kempen pilehan raya yang lalu, saperti orang[2] Melayu di-Singapura di-tekan, taraf orang[2] Melayu di-rendah[2]kan, hak istimewa orang[2] Melayu di-abai[2]kan dan lain[2]-nya.

Keadaan orang[2] Melayu di-Singapura—ini saya tidak membandingkan di-antara orang[2] yang bukan Melayu dengan orang[2] Melayu—saya chuma membandingkan sa-belum Petir berkuasa dan sa-sudah Petir berkuasa. Keadaan orang[2] Melayu di-Singapura sejak lima tahun yang lalu ada-lah lebeh baik dan lebeh maju daripada sa-belum pilehan raya di-Singapura pada tahun 1959. Kerana mereka mendapat layanan yang istimewa, maka itu-lah dalam pilehan raya yang telah di-adakan di-Singapura pada bulan September yang lalu, mereka telah memberi mandate sa-kali lagi kapada Kerajaan Petir untok memerentah Singapura sa-lama lima tahun lagi. Kita dapat mengikuti bagaimana chepat-nya perubahan[2] yang telah mereka tunjokkan daripada sikap anti-Petir dalam tahun 1959 kapada sikap pro-Petir dalam pilehan raya yang lalu. Kita tidak memaksa mereka, kita tidak menakut[2]kan mereka. Mereka mengubah sikap dengan kerilaan mereka sendiri sasudah menyaksikan serta mendapat nekmat daripada ranchangan[2] yang telah di-lancharkan oleh Kerajaan Petir untok mewujudkan satu masharakat yang lebeh 'adil dan lebeh ma'amor. Mereka mengubah sikap satelah merasa angin perubahan yang telah bertiup di-Singapura sejak tahun 1959.

Baharu sa-bentar tadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli Yang Berhormat dari sa-belah sana telah menyatakan mungkin angin perubahan di-Singapura itu tidak di-terima oleh ra'ayat di-Malaya. Tetapi saya berasa besar hati mendengar beliau itu beruchap tadi bahawa dia telah sedar tentang merbahaya-nya, jikalau di-lambatkan lagi keadaan perbedzaan yang besar di-antara orang[2] yang miskin dan orang[2] yang kaya. Ini juga telah disebutkan oleh kita dalam sidang Dewan ini pada bulan Disember yang lalu. Saya rasa lebeh banyak orang[2] di-sini yang faham saperti Ahli Yang Berhormat di-sana, lebeh lekas angin perubahan di-Singapura itu di-sedut oleh ra'ayat di-Malaya .....

Mr Speaker: Panjang lagi?

Enche' Othman bin Wok: Panjang lagi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

Mr Speaker: Masa sudah sampai. Meshuarat ini akan di-tanggohkan pada pukul 9.30 pagi besok.

Adjourned at 7.30 p.m.

3231—616—16-2-65.