

Volume I
No. 51



Friday
5th March, 1965

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

OFFICIAL REPORT

CONTENTS

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 6661]

**APPLICATION FOR ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE
UNDER STANDING ORDER 18 (Motion):**

Statement by the Prime Minister on the suspension of
Local Government Elections [Col. 6666]

ADJOURNMENT *SINE DIE* (Motion) [Col. 6668]

MOTION:

Detention of Socialist Front Leaders and Members
[Col. 6668]

EXEMPTED BUSINESS (Motion) [Col. 6709]

ADJOURNMENT SPEECH:

Sungei Buloh Leprosarium [Col. 6758]

THE
LIBRARY OF THE
MUSEUM OF MODERN ART
1000 MUSEUM AVENUE
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10028

THE
LIBRARY OF THE
MUSEUM OF MODERN ART
1000 MUSEUM AVENUE
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10028

THE
LIBRARY OF THE
MUSEUM OF MODERN ART

THE
LIBRARY OF THE
MUSEUM OF MODERN ART
1000 MUSEUM AVENUE
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10028

THE
LIBRARY OF THE
MUSEUM OF MODERN ART

THE
LIBRARY OF THE
MUSEUM OF MODERN ART
1000 MUSEUM AVENUE
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10028



MALAYSIA

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)
Official Report

First Session of the Second Dewan Ra'ayat

Friday, 5th March, 1965

The House met at half-past nine o'clock a.m.

PRESENT:

- The Honourable Mr Speaker, DATO' CHIK MOHAMED YUSUF BIN SHEIKH ABDUL RAHMAN, S.P.M.P., J.P., Dato' Bendahara, Perak.
- „ the Prime Minister, Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Culture, Youth and Sports, Y.T.M. TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN PUTRA AL-HAJ, K.O.M. (Kuala Kedah).
- „ the Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Defence, Minister of National and Rural Development, TUN HAJI ABDUL RAZAK BIN DATO' HUSSAIN, S.M.N. (Pekan).
- „ the Minister of Home Affairs and Minister of Justice, DATO' DR ISMAIL BIN DATO' HAJI ABDUL RAHMAN, P.M.N. (Johor Timor).
- „ the Minister of Finance, ENCHE' TAN SIEW SIN, J.P. (Melaka Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, DATO' V. T. SAMBANTHAN, P.M.N. (Sungei Siput).
- „ the Minister of Transport, DATO' HAJI SARDON BIN HAJI JUBIR, P.M.N. (Pontian Utara).
- „ the Minister of Education, ENCHE' MOHAMED KHIR JOHARI (Kedah Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Health, ENCHE' BAHAMAN BIN SAMSUDIN (Kuala Pilah).
- „ the Minister of Commerce and Industry, DR LIM SWEE AUN, J.P. (Larut Selatan).
- „ the Minister for Welfare Services, TUAN HAJI ABDUL HAMID KHAN BIN HAJI SAKHAWAT ALI KHAN, J.M.N., J.P. (Batang Padang).
- „ the Minister for 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 Information and Broadcasting, ENCHE' SENU BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Kubang Pasu Barat).
- „ the Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives, TUAN HAJI MOHD. GHAZALI BIN HAJI JAWI (Ulu Perak).

- The Honourable the Minister for Sabah Affairs and Civil Defence,
DATO' DONALD ALOYSIUS STEPHENS, P.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ the Minister of Lands and Mines, ENCHE' ABDUL-RAHMAN
BIN YA'KUB (Sarawak).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Commerce and Industry, TUAN HAJI
ABDUL KHALID BIN AWANG OSMAN (Kota Star Utara).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives,
ENCHE' SULAIMAN BIN BULON (Bagan Datoh).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Cluture, Youth and Sports,
ENGKU MUHSEIN BIN ABDUL KADIR, J.M.N., S.M.T., P.J.K.
(Trengganu Tengah).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Education, ENCHE LEE SIOK YEW,
A.M.N., P.J.K. (Sepang).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL KARIM BIN ABU, A.M.N. (Melaka Selatan).
- „ WAN ABDUL KADIR BIN ISMAIL, P.P.T. (Kuala Trengganu Utara).
- „ WAN ABDUL RAHMAN BIN DATU TUANKU BUJANG (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDUL RASHID BIN HAJI JAIS (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAUF BIN A. RAHMAN, K.M.N., P.J.K.
(Krian Laut).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAZAK BIN HAJI HUSSIN (Lipis).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL SAMAD BIN GUL AHMAD MIANJI
(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).
- „ ENCHE' ABU BAKAR BIN HAMZAH (Bachok).
- „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN ABDULLAH (Kelantan Hilir).
- „ ENCHE' AHMAD BIN ARSHAD, A.M.N. (Muar Utara).
- „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN SAAID, J.P. (Seberang Utara).
- „ CHE' AJIBAH BINTI ABOL (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' ALI BIN HAJI AHMAD (Pontian Selatan).
- „ O.K.K. DATU ALIUDDIN BIN DATU HARUN, P.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ DR AWANG BIN HASSAN, S.M.J. (Muar Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' JONATHAN BANGAU ANAK RENANG, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ PENGARAH BANYANG ANAK JANTING, P.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' E. W. BARKER (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN SEONG YOON (Setapak).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN SIANG SUN (Bentong).
- „ ENCHE' CHEN WING SUM (Damansara).
- „ ENCHE' CHIA CHIN SHIN, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' CHIN FOON (Ulu Kinta).
- „ ENCHE' C. V. DEVAN NAIR (Bungsar).
- „ ENCHE' EDWIN ANAK TANGKUN (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN SYED ESA BIN ALWEE, J.M.N., S.M.J., P.I.S.
(Batu Pahat Dalam).

The Honourable DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI ABDUL MAJID
(Johore Bahru Timor).

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

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

„ ENCHE' GANING BIN JANGKAT (Sabah).

„ ENCHE' GEH CHONG KEAT, K.M.N. (Penang Utara).

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

„ ENCHE' HANAFIAH BIN HUSSAIN, A.M.N. (Jerai).

„ ENCHE' HARUN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Baling).

„ WAN HASSAN BIN WAN DAUD (Tumpat).

„ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN TO' MUDA HASSAN, A.M.N. (Raub).

„ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN MOHD. NOORDIN, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Parit).

„ TUAN HAJI HUSSAIN RAHIMI BIN HAJI SAMAN
(Kota Bharu Hulu).

„ ENCHE' IKHWAN ZAINI (Sarawak).

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

„ ENCHE' ISMAIL BIN IDRIS (Penang Selatan).

„ DATO' SYED JA'AFAR BIN HASAN ALBAR, P.M.N.
(Johore Tenggara).

„ ENCHE' JEK YEUN THONG (Singapore).

„ PENGHULU JINGGUT ANAK ATTAN, Q.M.C., A.B.S. (Sarawak).

„ ENCHE' KADAM ANAK KIAI (Sarawak).

„ ENCHE' KAM WOON WAH, J.P. (Sitiawan).

„ ENCHE' KHOO PENG LOONG (Sarawak).

„ ENCHE' EDMUND LANGGU ANAK SAGA (Sarawak).

„ ENCHE' LEE SAN CHOON, K.M.N. (Segamat Selatan).

„ ENCHE' LEE SECK FUN (Tanjong Malim).

„ ENCHE' AMADEUS MATHEW LEONG, A.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).

„ DATO' LING BENG SIEW, P.N.B.S. (Sarawak).

„ DR LIM CHONG EU (Tanjong).

„ ENCHE' LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).

„ ENCHE' LIM PEE HUNG, P.J.K. (Alor Star).

„ DR MAHATHIR BIN MOHAMAD (Kota Star Selatan).

„ ENCHE' T. MAHIMA SINGH, J.P. (Port Dickson).

„ DATO' DR HAJI MEGAT KHAS, D.P.M.P., J.P., P.J.K.
(Kuala Kangsar).

„ ENCHE' MOHD. ARIF SALLEH, A.D.K. (Sabah).

„ ENCHE' MOHAMED ASRI BIN HAJI MUDA, P.M.K.
(Pasir Puteh).

„ ENCHE' MOHD. DAUD BIN ABDUL SAMAD (Besut).

„ ENCHE' MOHAMED IDRIS BIN MATSIL, J.M.N., P.J.K., J.P.
(Jejebu-Jempol).

„ ENCHE' MOHD. TAHIR BIN ABDUL MAJID, S.M.S., P.J.K.
(Kuala Langat).

„ ENCHE' MOHAMED YUSOF BIN MAHMUD, A.M.N. (Temerloh).

- The Honourable ENCHE' MOHD. ZAHIR BIN HAJI ISMAIL, J.M.N. (Sungai Patani).
- „ WAN MOKHTAR BIN AHMAD (Kemaman).
- „ TUAN HAJI MOKHTAR BIN HAJI ISMAIL (Perlis Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' MUHAMMAD FAKHRUDDIN BIN HAJI ABDULLAH (Pasar Mas Hilir).
- „ TUAN HAJI MUHAMMAD SU'AUT BIN HAJI MUHD. TAHIR, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ DATO' HAJI MUSTAPHA BIN HAJI ABDUL JABAR, D.P.M.S., A.M.N., J.P. (Sabak Bernam).
- „ ENCHE' MUSTAPHA BIN AHMAD (Tanah Merah).
- „ DATO' NIK AHMAD KAMIL, D.K., S.P.M.K., S.J.M.K., P.M.N., P.Y.G.P., Dato' Setia Raja (Kota Bharu Hilir).
- „ ENCHE' NG FAH YAM (Batu Gajah).
- „ DR NG KAM POH, J.P. (Telok Anson).
- „ ENCHE' ONG KEE HUI (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN HAJI OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Hilir Perak).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Perlis Utara).
- „ ABANG OTHMAN BIN HAJI MOASILI, P.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ 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, P.J.K., J.P. (Rembau-Tampin).
- „ RAJA ROME BIN RAJA MA'AMOR, P.J.K., J.P. (Kuala Selangor).
- „ ENCHE' SEAH TENG NGIAB, P.I.S. (Muar Pantai).
- „ ENCHE' SIM BOON LIANG, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' SNAWI BIN ISMAIL, P.J.K. (Seberang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' SNG CHIN JOO (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' SOH AH TECK (Batu Pahat).
- „ ENCHE' SULEIMAN BIN ALI (Dungun).
- „ PENGIRAN TAHIR PETRA (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' TAJUDIN BIN ALI, P.J.K. (Larut Utara).
- „ ENCHE' TAI KUAN YANG (Kulim-Bandar Bharu).
- „ ENCHE' TAMA WENG TINGGANG WAN (Sarawak).
- „ DR TAN CHEE KHOON (Batu).
- „ ENCHE' TAN CHENG BEE, J.P. (Bagan).
- „ ENCHE' TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Melaka).
- „ ENCHE' TAN TOH HONG (Bukit Bintang).
- „ ENCHE' TAN TSAK YU (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' TIAH ENG BEE (Kluang Utara).
- „ ENCHE' TOH THEAM HOCK (Kampar).
- „ PENGHULU FRANCIS UMPAU ANAK EMPAM (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' YEOH TAT BENG (Bruas).
- „ ENCHE' STEPHEN YONG KUET TZE (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN HAJI ZAKARIA BIN HAJI MOHD. TAIB, P.J.K. (Langat).

ABSENT:

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

- „ ENCHE' ABDUL GHANI BIN ISHAK, A.M.N. (Melaka Utara).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAHIM ISHAK (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAJI TALIB (Kuantan).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI MOHD. SALLEH, A.M.N., S.M.J., P.I.S. (Segamat Utara).
- „ ENCHE' AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Muar Dalam).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN CHONG WEN, A.M.N. (Kluang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' FRANCIS CHIA NYUK TONG (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' CHIA THYE POH (Singapore).
- „ DATU GANIE GILONG, P.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).
- „ DR GOH KENG SWEE (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' HAMZAH BIN ALANG, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Kapar).
- „ ENCHE' STANLEY HO NYUN KHIU, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN SULAIMAN (Ulu Kelantan).
- „ DATU KHOO SIAK CHIEW, P.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' KOW KEE SENG (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' LEE KUAN YEW (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' LIM HUAN BOON (Singapore).
- „ DATO' LIM KIM SAN, D.U.T., J.M.K., D.J.M.K. (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' PETER LO SU YIN (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' JOSEPH DAVID MANJAJI (Sabah).
- „ ORANG TUA MOHAMMAD DARA BIN LANGPAD (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' ONG PANG BOON (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN WOK (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' QUEK KAI DONG, J.P. (Seremban Timor).
- „ ENCHE' S. RAJARATNAM (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' SANDOM ANAK NYUAK (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' D. R. SEENIVASAGAM (Ipoh).
- „ ENCHE' S. P. SEENIVASAGAM (Menglembu).
- „ ENCHE' SIOW LOONG HIN, P.J.K. (Seremban Barat).
- „ DR TOH CHIN CHYE (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' WEE TOON BOON (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' YEH PAO TZE (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' YONG NYUK LIN (Singapore).

PRAYERS

(Mr Speaker in the Chair)

ORAL ANSWERS TO
QUESTIONSADVISER TO DIRECTOR OF
PUBLIC WORKS

1. Enche' C. V. Devan Nair (Bungsar) asks the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications to state why it

was necessary for the former Director of Public Works to be made an "Adviser" to the present Malayan Director.

The Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications (Dato' V. T. Sambanthan): Mr Speaker, Sir, in my written reply on October 12th, 1964, to a similar question from the Honourable Member, I stated that the date of Malayanisation of the post of Director of Public Works is 1st July,

1965. However, by creating the post of "Adviser" it was possible to Malayanise the post of Director earlier than the target date. The former Director is now Adviser as it is considered that with his experience he would be useful in his advisory capacity. I do not know what more to add as that reply appears to me to be adequate.

NO. OF EXPATRIATE OFFICERS IN DEPARTMENTS OF THE MINISTRY OF WORKS, POSTS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS

2. Enche' C. V. Devan Nair asks the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications to state (a) the number of serving expatriates in the Departments under his Ministry, their names, and the dates they are due to be Malayanised; and (b) whether there is any expatriate whose service would be extended beyond the dateline and the reasons for such extension.

Dato' V. T. Sambanthan: Mr Speaker, Sir, the target date for Malayani- sation is July, 1965. Of the three Departments under my Ministry, the Postal Department has been completely Malayanised. The details required by the Honourable Member in respect of the Public Works and Telecommunications Departments are as follows:

Public Works Department: There are 26 expatriate officers to be Malayanised, and they are:

S. F. Owen
R. S. Kenrick
G. S. Glaister
J. W. Wright
L. R. Stewart
A. J. Colman
D. P. Grace
J. W. Simpson
H. G. Skepper
L. W. Kirwan
H. Rook
K. S. Nadin
Tulloch
J. S. Rattray
J. P. Woodcock

G. Gorman
F. L. Galdolfo
J. M. Hundley
A. Brazier
R. G. S. Duncan
R. S. Whitelaw
P. W. M. Dudeney
F. W. Hazlewood
A. J. Broom
J. A. Wallace
G. Ward.

No officers will be retained beyond the dateline.

Telecommunications Department:

D. Smith (July, 1965)
R. F. Swallow (July, 1965).

QUALIFICATIONS OF EXPATRIATES IN THE SURVEY DEPARTMENT

3. Enche' C. V. Devan Nair asks the Minister of Lands and Mines to state whether it is a fact that a few expatriates in the Survey Department are underqualified and are holding more senior posts than Malaysians who possess better qualifications and experience.

The Minister of Lands and Mines (Enche' Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub): Mr Speaker, Sir, the answer is in the negative, that is to say, it is not a fact that a few expatriates in the Survey Department are underqualified and are holding more senior posts than Malaysians who possess better qualifications and experience.

For the benefit of this House, especially the Honourable Member for Bungsar, I would like to mention here that the minimum qualification for appointment as a surveyor is one of the following:

(a) A statutory licence to practise as a Land Surveyor issued in Canada, Australia, New Zealand or South Africa except that an officer of Malayan domicile shall not be required to obtain a licence as a surveyor provided that he has passed the required examinations and has fulfilled

- the necessary conditions in regard to practical work; or
- (b) Corporate membership of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (Land Surveying Division); or
 - (c) A Degree in Surveying from a recognised university; or
 - (d) An Honours Degree in Mathematics or Civil Engineering or Geography or Physical Science from a recognised university plus a pass in the Intermediate Examination of the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (Land Surveying Division).

In the Survey Department today, there are six expatriates: four on the Superscale and two on the Timescale. The four on the Superscale are:

Mr Garnham, who is the Assistant Surveyor-General and will be leaving on the 11th of April this year. The other three are Mr Emery, who is the Chief Surveyor for Penang, Mr Roe, Chief Surveyor for Pahang and Mr Renshaw, Chief Surveyor, Negri Sembilan. All these three Gentlemen will leave Malaya not later than 1st July this year.

The other two on the Timescale are Mr Mathew and Mr Reid. Mr Mathew joined the Department in October 1963, on a three-year contract and his salary is now \$798 per month. Mr Reid joined the Department in December 1964, and he is now the District Surveyor, Pahang, stationed at Kuala Lipis. His salary is now \$662.

When the expatriates go, the local officers, qualified ones, will fill in the vacancies.

PEMBENAAN RUMAH SAKIT BAHARU DI-KUCHING, SARAWAK

4. Enche' Abang Othman bin Abang Haji Moasili bertanya kepada Menteri Kesihatan sa-takat ini apa-kah tindakan yang telah di-jalankan berhubung dengan pembenaan Rumah Sakit baharu di-Kuching, yang berharga \$13 juta.

Menteri Kesihatan (Enche' Bahaman bin Samsudin): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pelan²-nya sudah siap dan tindakan

telah di-ambil bagi memanggil tender yang di-jangka akan di-terima dalam bulan Mei tahun ini juga. Pembenaan Rumah Sakit baharu di-Kuching itu akan di-mulakan sa-telah tender itu di-terima.

APPLICATION FOR ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE UNDER STANDING ORDER 18 (MOTION)

Statement by the Prime Minister on the suspension of Local Government Elections

Enche' Lim Kean Siew (Dato Kramat): Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise to move the suspension of Standing Orders to discuss a matter of urgent and public importance, namely, the statement made by the Honourable Prime Minister in this House on Monday that the Local Government Elections are to be suspended.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I am gratified to inform this House that in moving for the suspension of the Standing Orders, the Socialist Front has the full support of the Opposition Members who consider that this is a matter of urgency, because the elections in Seremban have already started—nomination papers have been filed and election campaigns have started, and the elections were to have taken place on the 13th of this month. None of the fears of the Honourable Prime Minister that unrestricted use of epithets would cause chaos has materialised.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we also consider this as a matter of public importance, because it is even more essential that a frail thought of democracy in this time of threat should be carefully nurtured, so that it may grow in strength instead of being snuffed away.

I know, I am not supposed to go into the merits of the motion because it is purely to move the suspension of the Standing Orders. So, we hope that you will grant us this request.

Mr Speaker: Honourable Members, I have been informed by the Honourable Member from Dato Kramat that he would rise in this House at the appropriate time this morning and ask leave to move a motion under Standing

Order 18 in connection with the question of the suspension of the forthcoming local elections, which question he claims to be definite, urgent and of public importance. We have heard him, and if the House will bear with me I would like to explain briefly the significance of Standing Order 18.

In accordance with our Standing orders, all private motions to be introduced in the House requires 14 days' notice, that is to say, if a private member wishes to discuss a matter in the House he must submit the necessary notice at least 14 days before the meeting. All Members are aware of this, I am sure. Now, Standing Order 18 however allows a private member to seek my leave to move a motion in respect of which the necessary 14 days' notice had not been given. Under Standing Order 18 not only the usual notice is dispensed with but also, if accepted, the motion must be discussed at 4.30 p.m. on the same day and that other items of business set in the Order Paper for the day must at that time be suspended.

Consequently, it is clear that where a matter is not allowed to be brought under Standing Order 18, it does not necessarily follow that it cannot be discussed in the House at all. It can be introduced if the private member concerned so wishes in the normal manner by submitting the necessary 14 days' notice.

Because of the special consideration accorded to a motion under Standing Order 18, such a motion is only allowed if it satisfies certain conditions. Standing Order 18 states that such a motion must be definite, urgent and of public importance. In the interpretation of these words and the detailed operation of this Standing Order, I have had recourse to the practice in the United Kingdom House of Commons as contained in Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, to which we subscribe with, of course, necessary modifications.

In respect of the present application for leave to move a motion under Standing Order 18, I am prepared to grant that the subject matter is

important, but after due consideration in the light of the authorities which I have mentioned above I am certainly not satisfied that it is of such urgency that the motion should be allowed to be moved under Standing Order 18. In the circumstances, I regret that I cannot grant the Honourable Member leave as requested.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification. In view of the fact that it is virtually impossible to satisfy you of the three ingredients necessary to grant such a motion, would it not be preferable for the Government itself, whenever it makes a public statement of importance in this House, to initiate a debate on it?

Mr Speaker: That is a matter for the Government Members.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: I am recommending it to the Government Members.

ADJOURNMENT *SINE DIE* (MOTION)

The Minister of Home Affairs (Dato' Dr Ismail): Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move—

That at its rising today the House shall stand adjourned *sine die*.

The Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications (Dato' V. T. Sambanthan): Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That at its rising today the House shall stand adjourned *sine die*.

MOTION

DETENTION OF SOCIALIST FRONT LEADERS AND MEM- BERS

Dr Tan Chee Khoon (Batu): Mr Speaker, Sir, in my brief period in Parliament there have been many moments of levity as well as many occasions of criticisms and tensions. But never have I risen to speak with such earnestness and filled with such grave forebodings for my country. Within the brief span

of five years since independence our liberties have one by one been extinguished so that today we are on the verge of dictatorship. My colleague the Member for Dato Kramat has just now in making his request for a suspension of the Standing Orders said that he hoped that the frail light of democracy will not be snuffed out in this country.

Mr Speaker, Sir, our country has known little of normal times. World War II ended in 1945 and in 1948 the Emergency was imposed and political life came to a standstill. The British nurtured the Alliance into power in 1955. In 1960 the Emergency was lifted in name, but all the laws of the Emergency Regulations, including arbitrary detention, have been incorporated into the ordinary laws of the land, namely, the infernal and infamous Internal Security Act. Since September, 1964 we once again have been living in a state of Emergency. When this will end I dare not say, but the question is how can we ensure the survival of our liberties under conditions of prolonged Emergency.

Mr Speaker, Sir, Article 5 of the Constitution of Malaysia stipulates that when a person is arrested he should be informed as soon as possible of the grounds of his arrest and he should be allowed to consult a lawyer of his choice. All the people, except one, who have been detained by the Police since the 28th of January, 1965 have not been allowed to see their lawyers although a month has elapsed since their arrest. So much for the rights that are enshrined in our Constitution.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we have heard none other than the Minister of Home Affairs say in this House on Monday the 1st of March, 1965 that he had decided that the friends of the detainees have to get permission from him personally to see the detainees as they had abused the privilege accorded to them by making false accusations about the conditions of the detention camps.

Mr Speaker, Sir, it is not generally known that when a man is arrested by the Police he is incarcerated in a small cubicle where the ventilation is bad, where he has a plank bed and a blanket

and where he is denied reading and writing material. Thus it is that in between relays of interrogation he has to gaze at the ceiling and four walls of his cubicle, and it is small wonder that weaker ones amongst them very soon go nuts. I can understand the austere conditions of the cubicle, but to deny these people reading and writing material even if it is for the first few days is inhuman. I call on the Minister of Home Affairs who is present here this morning, and who incidentally is also the Minister for Justice as well, to rectify this immediately so that the mental institutions in this country will not be overcrowded by political detainees.

Mr Speaker, Sir, today a man may be detained in this country for his entire lifetime without knowing the precise nature of the charges against him. The secret hearing before a selected judge known as the review committee has become a farce. Few have been released as a result of this and, in any event, the review committee's decision can be overruled by the Minister of Home Affairs. Over and beyond this, the Police can order a man not to participate in politics or trade unions. The Police can order a man not to meet party officials, to stay indoors after 6 p.m., and to get permission before he leaves a district. There are a large number of persons outside our jails whose fundamental right to participate in the political life of the country have been abrogated by a Police order. As all of you know, a police permit is needed to hold a public rally. Very often this is refused. If given, numerous conditions are attached. For example, speeches must be only on approved subjects and topics like the Congo are taboo. No records or tapes must be played. No banners may be put up without the prior approval of the Director of Publications. And the Police must be given space to take the proceedings of the rally. The United Nations Charter of Human Rights guarantee the right of peaceful assembly and so does our Constitution. I have shown now how the right to hold public meetings in the country are being

whittled away and how even a simple procession is never allowed.

Mr Speaker, Sir I have earlier on said that the Review Committee is a farce. Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, let me quote a very prominent Member of this House from the proceedings of the Federal Legislative Council held in March 1953. I quote:

"I will now turn to Council Paper No. 24 of 1953, which is the Paper dealing with detentions and deportations during the Emergency. This Paper takes great pains to emphasize that these powers of detention and arbitrary arrest are necessary. No one in his senses will quarrel with this contention. I for one would not quarrel with these detentions even now, but I do maintain that the procedure for review gives rise to certain misgivings. Let us look back to July, 1948. At that time there were Advisory Committees empowered to hear objections by detainees, but these Committees had no executive power. They were purely advisory. The next stage was the Committees of Review. These Committees of Review had executive power but—and this is the most important qualification—in practice these Committees had only 2 members sitting, and one of them was the Chairman. To use the words of the Paper which says: 'The Chairman of each Committee of Review is a person who holds, or has held, judicial office or office as a law officer'. The other members are unofficial persons and decisions are taken by a majority of votes of the Chairman and of any members present and voting; in a case of an equality of votes the Chairman has a casting vote, and a minimum of one member sitting with the Chairman constitutes a Committee of Review. One can see from this that, in practice, these Committees of Review were very much at the mercy of the Chairman because there are only two members and the Chairman has a casting vote, and the Chairman very often is a member of the Bench. I maintain, Sir, that in the early days of the Emergency there were many cases, more than is probably generally realised, of persons unjustly detained. I do not blame anybody for that. The position was difficult, it was urgent and it was desperate; and in a situation of that sort as the popular saying goes: sometimes the innocent must suffer with the guilty. But it is at the same time the duty of this Government to ensure that the minimum of injustice is inflicted and to take reasonable precautions to ensure that this is achieved.

May I suggest as a possible solution that we have a much larger Committee of Review, equipped with executive powers but with an unofficial majority."

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, the person who made this speech was none other than Enche' Tan Siew Sin, now Minister for

Finance. Then, he held very definite views of the Committee of Review. As a Member of Government, what did he participate in? We all know now that a Committee of Review is headed by a retired Judge, and he has two assessors helping him. Where before it was mandatory on the Government to accept the decision of the Committee of Review now the Minister of Home Affairs can over-rule that decision. Thereby, Mr Speaker, Sir, one can see that the Government is assuming more and more the powers of the Executive. Further, Mr Speaker, Sir, with reference to the Chairman, who is a retired Judge, I understand—and here I am open to correction if I am wrong—that his total emoluments come to about \$5,000 a month. Now, a retired person is not likely to jeopardise his \$5,000 a month knowing full well that any adverse decision may well incur the wrath of the Government of the day.

Mr Speaker, Sir, Article 10 of our Constitution guarantees freedom of speech, freedom of association and freedom of assembly to all the peoples of Malaysia. One precious fundamental freedom is that of expression. To publish in this country, one needs a permit. To print one needs a permit. These permits have to be renewed every year.

Mr Speaker, Sir, just before the last elections, our Party organs the NYALA and BERITA BUROH were refused the renewal of their licences and our printers were also refused the renewal of their licence. So much for your democratic elections. When we enquired of the Ministry for Home Affairs the reasons for the non-renewal of our printing licences, in a sense the reply was, "The Minister of Home Affairs is not in duty bound to give any reasons for the non-renewal of the licences." That, Mr Speaker, Sir, is the attitude of the Executive in this country. If I may make an aside, Mr Speaker, Sir, there was not a whisper of protest from the International Press Institute. This International Press Institute would have raised hell if a pro-Western paper such as the *Straits Times* was touched. This year we have been refused licences for an English and Malay organs for the

Socialist Front. This shows that the Alliance Government is firmly entrenched on the path towards totalitarianism. All of us know that our newspapers are kept on a tight leash and that editors are often called up and given a talking to and reminded that their licences are renewable annually. So much for freedom of expression. Further, Mr Speaker, Sir, the Government benches would like us to live in a world of make-believe, in a world of Alice in Wonderland, and proclaim loudly and boldly that there is complete freedom of the press. But if the Government would just talk to the foreign journalists who come to this country, it will hear the opinion about our press in this country—they are nauseated by our sycophantic press.

Mr Speaker, Sir, so where do we go from here? What does a political party do when it is denied publications, rallies, processions and house to house canvassing, when its leaders are arrested one by one and its members are threatened? Mr Speaker, Sir, if it is a constitutional party it will slowly die. But opposition will not die—it will pass into the hands of those with the stomach and the will for an armed struggle. People like me have neither the stomach nor the will to become a rebel (*Laughter*), so we can easily be pushed aside. My Party, the Socialist Front, can be banned by a stroke of the pen of the Minister for Home Affairs, as has been asked for in this House; whenever Government speakers speak they will ask for the banning of my Party, the Socialist Front. But that, Mr Speaker, Sir, would solve nothing, for the people you will have to deal with after us will be a different kettle of fish. Recent history shows the fate of those who chose to rule through their police force, and I need only recall the fate of the Vietnamese Head, Ngo Dinh Diem.

Mr Speaker, Sir, there are those who feel they are all right so long as what happens to others is no concern of theirs. There are individuals who are contented with one newspaper and no politics until taxes go up or their union is closed down. Those parties that are too small to be worth the Government's

attention now are contented. They too must learn. The P.M.I.P. once voted in the House to have the Internal Security Act because, I thought, it was whispered to them that the Internal Security Act would be used only against the non-Malays. Now they know better. At one time the P.A.P. gleefully joined in arresting their political opponents, banning publications and refusing rallies. Now it is their turn. The day is not far off when persons in the P.A.P. may well get a taste of their own detention medicine. Already the P.A.P., which is pro-Malaysia, anti-Indonesia and non-Communist to boot, have been refused police permits to hold public rallies in the Federation. It beats me how this can be justified but, nevertheless, the Alliance Government does so. If I may take another example, the *Straits Times* which has kept quiet on the ban of other papers in this country, must now realise that its own fate as that of any other newspapers in this country is not so sure. So, Mr Speaker, Sir, I say, when the bell tolls for the death of democracy in this country, ask not for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for thee.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the question of democracy, of equality, of all citizens before the law and in the Constitution of the rule of law, has become the main issue before the nation. Neither the Indonesians nor the Communists can conquer us if our people know that they possess a free way of life that would not be lost if they did not forget. If our people are deprived of their liberties and rights, then all the foreign troops in the country would not save us from disintegration. The time has come, I think, for all the people who want to maintain a free, just, equal and open society in this country to take cognizance of this trend towards totalitarianism. It is not sufficient to say that one must oppose Communism or Indonesian tyranny. Fighting tyranny begins at home. Only then can you fight it abroad. Recently I have been reading the ravings of certain people in this country which cannot be read in the English press. I have also seen the extreme intolerance of Government to a simple procession. I realise that the

root is setting in deeper and further than I imagined. I say that if the honest, God-fearing and liberty-loving people do not unite and stand firm, then their liberties, their languages and their religion, as well as their livelihood, will be taken away. So I say that all freedom loving people in this country should arrest this trend before it becomes irreversible, because if that happens then only radical surgery will save this country.

Mr Speaker, Sir, recently too there have been outbursts in the sycophantic press to ban this party and that. I must warn the Government that if it does so then those of us who firmly believe in democracy and the rule of law will be pushed aside and there will be a vacuum, and then to take our place there may well be new leaders who may well not believe in the rule of law and who may well believe that the sword is mightier than the pen.

Mr Speaker, Sir, recently there has been published in a paper something about democracy in certain parts of Malaysia. I quote:

"One of the most efficient governments in all history was the German Government headed by Hitler and the Nazis before World War II. Not many people, including the Germans, would care to live under such a Government again, however, efficient such a Government may be. It is no consolation to have the most efficient government in the world ruling over you if all the time you live under the shadow of fear, the fear that if you should happen to displease someone in authority, or even appear to displease someone in authority, that may be the end of yourself or those near and dear to you."

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, those are not my words. Those were the words uttered by the Minister of Finance and they were meant to apply to the Government of Singapore. Those words could equally well apply to the Government of Malaysia.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I now come to the White Paper. My colleague, the Member for Dato Kramat, will reply at length to it and I shall confine myself to a few general observations.

Mr Speaker, Sir, at long last the Special Branch in this country has caught up with the technique perfected by the Russians of extracting confes-

sions from their prisoners. In the middle thirties during the Stalin Era the Russian Secret Service, then known as the OGPU, reduced torture and extraction of confessions to a fine art.

The world then saw the spectacle of Marshal Tukhachevsky, the head of the Red Army then, and at that time probably the ablest army commander, confessing to the crime of passing military secrets to the Germans. Then Moscow was treated to a stage-managed trial which ended in the execution of Marshal Tukhachevsky and practically the top echelon of the Russian Army hierarchy. But post-war documents showed that the Russian Secret Service at the instigation of Stalin had planted documents on these accused, then arrested them and later liquidated them.

Then came the blood bath of the Vyshinsky trials where the jailors and judges of one day were the prisoners and victims of the next.

First it was A. A. Yagoda the head of the OGPU who was brought to the block. He was succeeded by N. I. Yezhov who too suffered the same fate.

And over this whole macabre procedure presided Stalin with diabolical and cynical composure.

The world now also knows that these plots against the State existed in the mind of Stalin and that the thousands who perished in that blood bath were victims of Stalin's megalomania. It seems to me that in one respect the Special Branch has caught up with the Russians in the art of extracting confessions. But they have still a great deal to learn as the Member for Menglembu had pointed out. The Special Branch has overlooked the elementary fact that, for overseas consumption at least, the so-called confessions should be signed by those who confessed.

My colleague, the Member for Dato Kramat, as I stated before, will deal at length with these confessions. My job today is to deal with the encroachment into the fundamental liberties of this country. All that I will say at this stage is that if the Government has a cast iron case then why should it not

bring these detainees to trial? Then justice will not only be done but will be seen to be done.

Mr Speaker, Sir, one word about the disturbances of 13th February, 1965. The Honourable Prime Minister has stated that he had advised the Socialist Front to hold indoor meetings on that day. The Honourable Prime Minister may well have given that advice but that bit of advice was not conveyed to us. In point of fact we had wanted to hold only indoor meetings of our members on that day but we were prevented by the Police from doing so.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I have here a copy of the Socialist front statement issued in the early hours of 13th February, 1965. It was given to the Press, and which I tried to telephone Radio Malaysia unsuccessfully at about 12 o'clock midnight on Friday the 12th. I quote:

"We have decided to hold instead closed door meetings in our branches and at the Headquarters tomorrow, and another meeting will be held during which future plans will be laid. We hope that there will be no provocation committed among us."

Mr Speaker, Sir, I just wish to draw the attention of this House to the fact that in September, 1963, I think, the Malaysian Peoples' Action Front held a procession which started from Kampong Bahru and ended in Ampang at the office of the Indonesian Embassy. The next day, or a few days later, there was another procession that went to the residence of the Indonesian Ambassador. Mr Speaker, Sir, on both these occasions the people who participated in the processions did not have a Police permit. On both occasions the Police had prior notice of the processions. Presumably, both processions were illegal. On these two occasions—I think I am correct in saying—the Police almost guided these two processions to their destinations. They did not use tear gas.

Mr Speaker, Sir, does it mean that when a procession is illegal but its objectives in the minds of the authorities are worthy that different methods must be used to cope with such a

situation. And, Mr Speaker, Sir, in front of these processions there were numerous women, and why not such allegations as "use of women shows that the Communists are at the back of such processions" used? I leave this not only to the House but to the world and the country at large to judge whether it was right of the Police almost to connive at those processions but to use tear gas at what was publicly declared to be a peaceful procession.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not wish to say anything more about the events of the 13th February as there are cases pending before the Court in connection with these events.

Mr Speaker, Sir, in tabling this motion now before the House, I do know that both my colleague, the Member for Dato Kramat, and I and the Socialist Front will face an avalanche of hate, abuse, smears, smears and threats. But we will not flinch from them, and I can assure this House that in adversity the Socialist Front will not be found wanting.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we are willing to abide by the verdict of the history whether we are right or wrong. I shall quote only three instances where the verdict of history must of necessity say that we are right—at least two in connection with this country and one outside.

Mr Speaker, Sir, when Malaysia was established, the Socialist Front warned that the country would face financial crisis with the establishment of Malaysia. Then, of course, everyone laughed at us. Now we know that the confrontation is costing this country millions upon millions, and now this country must know that we were right when we warned the Government about the financial consequences of confrontation.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I think it was at the May sitting of this House that I urged the Government to make use of the Afro-Asian Conciliation Commission to solve this dispute with Indonesia. At that time I was laughed at. I think it was two months later that I made a suggestion in this House also that we

should negotiate with Indonesia without pre-conditions. Then, Sir, there were threats, and I was almost called a traitor. Now, we know that in this very House, the Prime Minister on Monday has stated that this country is willing to negotiate with Indonesia without pre-conditions; and even after the ambush at Kota Tinggi, the Prime Minister has said that despite that ambush, this country is willing to negotiate with Indonesia without pre-conditions. Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, if the Prime Minister had not made that statement and if after that ambush I had made that suggestion in this House, no doubt the Minister of Home Affairs would order the Special Branch to wait for me outside (*Laughter*), and this House would brand me a traitor. Mr Speaker, Sir, that shows that we are not afraid of making what we think to be right, though at that time unpopular, suggestions to the Government. This House will then know that we are not always wrong.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Prime Minister started his speech with a quotation about Lord Haw Haw. May I end by making another quotation about yet another Irishman, namely, Sir Roger Casement. Sir, Roger Casement was a worthy servant of the British Government, for whose services in Africa he was knighted. But later on, being an Irishman, he had certain ideas about the war in Europe. He has some ideas about the freedom of Ireland, and he might have participated in what was then thought to be illegal activities, for which he paid the final penalty—he was hanged in Britain. Then he was branded as a traitor. Today we know that his remains have been sent back to Ireland and he is almost a hero of Ireland.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew (Dato Kramat): Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise to second this most important motion. In rising to speak on this motion, I would like immediately to warn this House not to make use of laughter where reasoning has failed. It would appear that, in the course of the Mover's speech, this House was interjected by a series of explosive though senseless hysteria. (*Laughter*). Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to remind this House of the famous

words of Voltaire when he said, "I disagree with what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it". Democracy is not a very exciting thing; it is not as exciting as revolutions; but nevertheless, in many instances, it was established through revolutions, and in the history of England the loss of King Charles I's head in the 17th century has proved this. We cannot hope for democracy to succeed if we are to sit down and keep quiet, whilst we lose our liberties one after another. If we want democracy to succeed, there must be checks, there must be balances to power and to extremism, and we must not be over-sensitive.

Recently, a new phenomenon has taken place in Malaysia. This is over-sensitivity to the press, especially to the foreign press, and the demand to have correspondents removed from Malaysia, merely because they have criticised the Government, and this, in the domestic scene, has turned into words of abuse and demand for the eclipse of political parties, who dare to stand up in the defence of the liberty of the subjects. Democracy, Mr Speaker, Sir, must be defended, if it is to survive. It is not merely lip-service.

This is a motion on the march towards totalitarianism in this country, which has led recently to the arrests of several leaders of the Socialist Front and other Parties in the Opposition who are generally opposed to the policies of the Socialist Front. But we speak on their behalf, as indeed we speak on everybody's behalf whose liberty has been taken away from them through arbitrary arrests and detention and who have been damned to incarceration without trial. When we look into this White Paper carefully we see an interwoven web of untested confessions . . .

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Unsigned!

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: . . . unsigned and filled with analysis, with narrative, with part history supported by letters which have not been printed in the appendix for us to see; and we wonder how long it will be before the last of us who dare to speak our mind in opposition to the Government will be removed from the scene leaving only

those in opposition who are prepared to play ball (*Laughter*) with the Government in order that the pantomime of parliamentary democracy may be performed for all the world to see.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable mover of this motion has referred to the various aspects of our political life to show that we are slowly snuffing out the torch of democracy. Let us review our history. From 1945 to 1948 there was a comparative period of peace. By 1947 there was agitation for independence and the emancipation of the people in this region from the last shackles of colonialism. At that time many of the people who have been detained today—Ishak bin Haji Mohamed, Dr Burhanuddin and the others—were working in conjunction with some members on the opposite side of this House. When the Emergency was declared these people were detained and after a few years they were released, in the case of Boestamam through popular agitation.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Emergency was declared to be at an end in 1960. In 1960 the worst aspects of the Emergency Regulations were embodied in the Internal Security Act. By that time, after twelve years of the Emergency Regulations, people had got used to moving, shall I say, in conformity, i.e., to move as the authorities would require them to move and not to step out of line. They had got used to being restricted in new villages, and others had got used to the sight of barbed wire surrounding new villages and police sentinels. The people had got used to road blocks and demand by police officers that identity cards be produced for their scrutiny. The newspapers themselves had long ago decided that to survive they had to toe the line. Movements were restricted, no processions had been allowed for years, so that the people had got used to these things and these things were finally put down in the Internal Security Act without protestation.

Then, Mr Speaker, Sir, came the year 1963. In 1963, in Singapore, the whole of the effective echelon of the

Opposition party, the Barisan Sosialis, were arrested and detained. Certain people who are today either doing law or studying law abroad with Government support were also detained. It was quite clear that many of these people, though some may have been guilty, were innocent and it became very apparent on looking through the lists of the detainees that the purpose of the detention was not so much to destroy subversion but to prevent the Opposition from mounting an effective offensive during the elections. Together with these people, ten publications were banned and eight giant unions were dissolved. By February the 13th, Boestamam had been arrested. On three separate occasions three separate reasons were given for his arrest: one being he was having secret meetings with Communists, another was that he was subverting the Army, and the third reason was—as is put down in this Introduction—he was planning a secret route to Indonesia. Mr Speaker, Sir, the very fact that people could have gone over to Indonesia and had come back with the Indonesians in the Pontian landings is clear proof that whether Boestamam was in or out of jail, the route was there, the route has been there and the route will always be there and there is no need for a secret route. Nevertheless, Boestamam's activity was put down as an introduction in this White Paper with the statement that—

"It is against this background that this paper takes up the chain of events described in the previous White Paper to show how a number of politicians in Malaysia have treacherously conspired together to bring this country under the domination of the Sukarno regime."

But, Mr Speaker, Sir, before we even go to this final phase, let us go back once again to the practical effects of these Regulations and Acts upon a young man or young girl about to launch into the world. Boys and girls in schools—like those today in the Strangers' Gallery (*Laughter*)—how do they have to conform politically? We would have thought that the whole purpose of education is to encourage independent thinking and courage in the belief that one is right and to say

it because one is right. These students before they can graduate through school to go to University, have, first of all, to pass examinations; and the next thing is, as they leave school, to obtain a certificate of suitability. This certificate of suitability is issued by the Chief Education Officer of the State. Now, the Chief Education Officer of any State has no Special Branch to follow the activities of the students in school; therefore, no doubt, he would have to wait for recommendations from the Special Branch which comes under the Ministry of Internal Security and, therefore, it leads us to the Minister of Home Affairs. Now, in order to obtain this certificate, or to make certain that he or she will have this certificate, she has to behave, she has to conform, and therefore she is forced to spotted thinking; in other words, thinking according to the headlines and the magazines that can be found in our newspapers in this country.

Mr Speaker, Sir, having jumped over the first hurdle and having obtained the certificate of suitability they can then, as Shakespeare has put it, "start upon their seven stages of life", bearded like the Bard, but, in this instance, meekly stepping forward with a certificate of suitability. These students, having left school and having put examinations behind them, would like, of course, to understand more of world affairs. So they read newspapers.

* Then, we come to the second row of "blocks" against democratic right of free speech and thinking, because, Mr Speaker, Sir, as they wake up in the mornings and open their newspapers, they will find right at the bottom of the title, in the first page, the letters KDN, followed by numbers. KDN stands for Kementerian Dalam Negeri and the numbers stand for the number of the licence that has been issued to the newspaper, which is annually renewable upon conditions. There is not one single newspaper in this country that has not got this secret magical letters—KDN 1159, KDN 1129, KDN 1101 and KDN 1160 standing for the *Straits Times*, *Malay Mail*, *Sunday Times*, *Sunday Mail* and the *Nanyang*. I am just quoting at random.

Mr Speaker, Sir, it is not so much that papers should be licensed, but why should newspapers be licensed by the Ministry of Internal Security—so that they come under the purview of the Special Branch? Can you say that the *Straits Times* is a subversive paper, or the *Sunday Mail*, or even the *Malayan Times* which, I understand, was started by supporters of the Alliance? It is because the need to have licences enables the Government to hold the big stick.

Mr Speaker, Sir, not only are our papers licensed, but publications are controlled on importation. Some are banned because they are published by publishers the Government does not like, like the magazine *Eastern Horizon*; and some because to quote the Honourable Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, they have no moral fibre to move openly, they are classified "prejudicial". Now, what do we mean by "prejudicial"? It means this. The Special Branch has the right to go to any book shop and confiscate those books, or to request that the books be put away. In one instance, in the Penang Library, a book by Felix Green—he an American author of no political connection whatsoever and certainly not a communist at that—on China called "Wall has Two Sides" was taken away because it was prejudicial, and woe betides the student who is interested in politics, who has one of those prejudicial books, because he would not know he has a prejudicial book until he is arrested, when the Police will tell him, "You are having in your possession a prejudicial book and, therefore, you are under suspicion of being subversively inclined".

Mr Speaker, Sir, when one looks at our newspapers, one is not struck by the uniformity of support shown to the Government by these papers but by the absence and the lack of papers which are critical of the Government. Surely, there must be some newspaper men who must sometimes disagree on the basic Government policies, but, Mr Speaker, Sir, there is a total absence of severe criticism in our papers. Look at the editorials; many of you who have read the editorials of the last three years

will agree with me that on basic policies the papers have been inclined either to be silent or to repeat support for the Government.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I am also told—and this is subject to correction—that certain newspaper men have been removed because of their rather open and hostile attitude to the Government. There was one person by the name of Francis Hwang, who was at one time very active in the *Sunday Mail*—I believe, Mr Speaker, Sir, he was a kind of editor there. After an article entitled “A City Divided” in which he attacked the Singapore Government, this man suddenly disappeared from the pages of the *Sunday Mail*.

Then, Mr Speaker, Sir, if these students want relaxation and they want to go to pictures and films, well, they see Hollywood galore—but what else does he see? Then, he may turn to television or listen to Radio Malaysia, like many of us do. Does he find any controversy, any serious debate in which views opposite to the Government are given? Yes, it is true that during elections the Opposition was given a chance to speak, to make official statements—once for each speaker; but throughout the rest of the year and for year in and year out propaganda materials are fed to the public—and before the last elections, there were a series of films and talks on development, rural and industrial, and the strength of our economy.

Let us look at Television. Last night, for example, Mr Speaker, Sir, the motion of the Honourable Member for Batu was rejected. Television Malaysia gave a short news commentary on that motion, and in that news commentary it was stated that the motion had been rejected and that Tun Abdul Razak had made certain statements. Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister did not speak yesterday—he spoke the day before yesterday.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: On Monday.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: On Monday, I am sorry. Those people like ourselves who spoke were not mentioned in the television but the statements of the

Honourable Deputy Prime Minister made on Monday was put through the air last night, which was Thursday, after newspapers had published his statements and after they were no longer of news value.

To continue with my speech, Mr Speaker, Sir, the students after having left school have got used to the idea that if they wanted to travel to other States in groups of five or more they would have to apply for a permit. So, they would imagine that if they wanted to have a rally or procession they could easily apply for a permit. But then they come across a further series of hurdles: to get a permit for a rally they would have to apply to the Special Branch; the Special Branch will consider their permit; and, finally, the Special Branch may allow them to hold a rally. But, Mr Speaker, Sir, what kind of a permit would the Special Branch give? Mr Speaker, Sir, I have here a specimen copy of the permit. For the enlightenment of the House, I would like to read it:

“Permission is hereby granted to so-and-so of so-and-so to convene a meeting in a public place subject to the provisions of Section 39 of the Police Ordinance, 1952, under the following conditions:

Purpose of meeting ...	See overleaf.
Public place for which the licence is granted	Basket Ball Court, Jeram New Village.
Period for which licence is valid ...	15th January, 1965.
Time of commencement	8.00 p.m.
Time of conclusion ...	11.00 p.m.

Speakers' platform shall be adequately illuminated, and shall be erected securely.

Person in charge of the platform is so-and-so.

Music not allowed unless with a separate music licence.

In the event of a person in charge of a meeting invoking Section 20 (a) of the Minor Offences Ordinance, 1955—of course you have to carry a whole set of Ordinances too in case you might commit offences without knowing—“or if any contravention of the conditions, the undersigned deserve the right to cancel the licence forthwith”—in which case once it is cancelled it becomes an unlawful assembly and if it can be brought under the Internal Security Act, that fellow will be liable to imprisonment.

"The convener undertakes that the Police may, if they wish, be present at the meeting for the purpose of maintaining order or for recording the proceedings thereat and shall have the right to install any necessary equipment for the purpose"—and this means, in simple language, that the Police have the right to tape whatever you say.

Now, where in the world do you have all these licences for rallies and so on? It goes on:

"The convener undertakes to obtain a written permission of the owner of the land on which the meeting is to be held.

In the event of any meeting being cancelled, the person in charge of the meeting shall inform the O.C.P.D."—in Kampar, in this instance, the telephone number is given as 222.

"This licence shall be carried by the licensee and shall be produced whenever required to do so by the Police.

The licensee shall be present at the assembly and shall see to it that the meeting is conducted in an orderly manner. (See further conditions on the reverse)"—

There are some more. (*Laughter*)

"That no tape-recorded speeches be played during the meeting.

In the event of loudspeakers being used, no annoyance or inconvenience shall be caused to occupants of any premises in the vicinity. (Section 13 (1) (c) of the Minor Offences Ordinance (No. 3 of 1955) refers).

That the following speakers only who have applied shall be permitted to speak at the rally"—here a list of eleven names is given.

"The purpose of the meeting is to speak on the following subjects only:

New Government taxes;

Recent arrests of Socialist Front members.

That the speakers should confine their talks only to the subjects for which approval has been granted to them under this licence.

That all slogans, banners, posters, publications and so on to be displayed or distributed at the rally must be produced to the Controller of Publications"—

I suppose that means sending these to Kuala Lumpur for examination, at least two weeks before the date of the rally, which means that you cannot speak on anything urgent or important because you must submit your slogans for examination at least two weeks before the date of the rally.

"That the speakers shall only be full members of the M.P.S.F., i.e., the Malayan Peoples' Socialist Front, and that they must produce their membership cards when required to do so by a Police officer.

That the speakers shall refrain from speaking on the subject of American interference in the Congo." (*Laughter*).

How Congo got into the rally at the Basketball Court in Jeram New Village, heaven alone knows.

Mr Speaker, Sir, that is the kind of position that we find ourselves in today. Newspapers are told when they renew their licences, "Do not speak on this; do not speak on that" and you will find that certain subjects are never mentioned in the newspapers. Statements made by certain politicians are never fully reported, or not properly reported, in the newspapers. Why is that so? People surely like to hear the Opposition's views. Why are the Opposition's views confined only to a particularly selected list of people?

Then, Mr Speaker, Sir, these young persons, having come out of school and having decided to take part in the affairs of the State—and the very fact that they are here (*Indicating the public gallery*) obviously shows their keen interest in the affairs of the nation—suddenly find themselves cramped and unable to move freely so that they will not be able to develop their minds to the fullest maturity. But, Mr Speaker, Sir, the student, having come out of school and having decided to take part in politics and having realised the amount of obstacles placed in his way, decides to hold a demonstration. But can he do so? Well, I must warn these people that since 1957 over 1,000 people have been arrested and detained—over 1,000! Many of them have been released on conditions, and the conditions are that a released detainee shall report to the Police once in every month, that once he changes his place of residence he must inform the Police where he is going and the new district in which he is going to live, that he shall not talk to his old friends who are political—if he is political, of course, most of his friends will also be political, but he is not supposed to talk to them; he has to start with a new batch of friends—and until further notice he has not only to report to the Police but he must stay indoors by a certain time. Of course, finally, he shall not take part in politics.

Mr Speaker, Sir, by the period of three years I am sure the young student will have become geared for our national politics, for he will have known all the obstacles. So, he decides to apply for a permit to hold a procession. The permit is refused. You know why? Because no procession has ever been allowed since 1948, except the procession against the Indonesian Embassy. We remember the stoning of the Indonesian Embassy, the burning of effigies. We remember how the windows of the USIS library were broken prior to the February 13th by members of the UMNO, because they thought the Americans were supporting Indonesia too unduly. But have you heard of any arrest?

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, perhaps this student becomes disillusioned and decides to seek a job, but then having been a member of the Socialist Front he finds it difficult. So, what does he do? He joins anti-social groups. After joining anti-social groups, he may find that he has committed offences. If he has committed three or more offences, his blue card may be taken away from him, and he will be given a chocolate card instead—this chocolate card is not as sweet as chocolate biscuits. (*Laughter*) This chocolate card mars this man for life. It means that he is a person of bad character. That means that at any time, when is asked to produce his identity card, he may be detained further for further questioning, and it is up to the grace of God, and the generosity of the Minister of Internal Security, as to when he will have that chocolate mark removed, as to when he will be able to obtain the removal of the chocolate markings on his card.

Mr Speaker, Sir, let us assume that this boy is arrested and is taken to prison. Now, what are the prison conditions? I have here a note written by some one recently arrested, who was an officer of the Government at one time, and by an error he was detained during the recent demonstrations. This is what he has to say:

"The Central Police Station lock-up held thieves. The thieves were left locked-up together with us. The Police gave us worse

treatment than they gave the hardened gangsters. The political prisoners were herded nine to ten in a cell meant only for two. The cell had not been washed for some time and it stank of sweat, of urine, and of left over food. We were all crammed on a bed which could not take more than six persons, and the remaining of us had to sleep on the dirty cold cement floor."

Mr Speaker, Sir, then he goes on to describe about feeding. He says:

"The food was bad, consisting of rice, a piece of fried fish and a few strings of long beans. No forks or spoons were provided, and we had to use our hands, which were dirty, and we were given no soap to wash our hands; and to quench our thirst we had to drink water from the tap.

We were denied everything, and some of us had even their pants removed and were left standing in their suspenders." (*Laughter*)—and apparently this in public.

Mr Speaker, Sir, as for the lavatory, this is what he has to say:

"It may be befitting to describe it as a quagmire of human excrement and urine. The walls and floors were covered with dry human faeces and the toilet holes were filled to the brim"—filled to the brim, mind you—"due to non-repair and clogging, and the smell was, of course, suffocating and unbearable. Added to these obnoxious conditions, we had to perform our call of nature with our bare feet and with no toilet paper."

On interrogation, he says:

"The interrogation cannot be described as fair as the atmosphere surrounding it was that of fear and intimidation."

Later on, Mr Speaker, Sir, he was sent to Pudu Jail. The position there was not much better. He says:

"One of the first things to get routinized to is to be able to squat and to squat in rows of four. The word 'routinized' is used because this is practised at least twelve to twenty times every day while I was in prison"—twelve to twenty times per day—"and each of us were made to strip completely naked in full view of the rest, so that we could be scrutinised for scars and other physical abnormalities."

Mr Speaker, Sir, in Pudu Jail they were put three to a cell and they had to sleep on the floor. The breakfast was given at six in the morning, consisting of broken rice porridge with salt added. Lunch and dinner was given at half past ten in the morning and half past three in the evening, and it was contrived in such a way that there was no food for them after 3.30 p.m. until

6.30 the next morning—that is about fourteen hours. As for the rice, he says :

"It is doubtful if it had ever been washed before being cooked as worms were found in our rice in abundance."

So, Mr Speaker, Sir, if our young student, who has passed out of school, still has the stomach to continue in the national affairs, he may do so. But in doing so, he comes across his next hurdle—direct action of arrest and detention without trial, condemnation made upon confessions not attested.

Mr Speaker, Sir, my Honourable friend, the Mover of this motion from Batu has talked of the Vyshinsky trial, but to that list we must add the infamous doctor's trial in which nine doctors were executed for having plotted to murder Stalin under the Russian Secret Police Chief, the Chief of the OGPU Beria. I have had occasion to warn this House that we should not follow the footsteps of Beria before, and I rise today to say the same thing. Let us make connections. This is important. Let us connect what is happening today with what we have accused other countries of doing in the past.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I am sure you will remember the famous trial of Gary Powers, the man who was a spy for the United States flying a U-2 plane over Russia, when he was shot down. I think it was Khrushchev who, in making this exposure, stated that there had been a confession made by him whilst in detention. Immediately the outcry of the international press was, "What! Another of those confessions that we have heard so much before? Surely this must be false!" Then suddenly everything became silent and Gary Powers was convicted. We all have heard of countries which have held trials on confessions, and now we are asked to condemn on confessions without trial and, therefore, we have out-Beria the Beria. We have done better than Beria, because at least the Russians had trials. Here, we do not need to have any trials.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we rise here not to defend these people because we believe that they are innocent. We are here to defend their right that they should be

tried and that they should not be condemned without trial. We are here, and we rise to speak in support and in the defence of their right and their liberty as subjects of this country. The White Paper, Mr Speaker, Sir, gladly emulates the system of confessions to prove guilt: these people who were detained were not allowed to see anyone, and suddenly we have had their confessions put on the radio; and yet when the newspapers wanted to interview these people, they were not granted the permission to do so. Why not allow the independent press to see them in congenial circumstances, without the Special Branch hanging around with tape-recorders, hidden microphones and cameras?

Mr Speaker, Sir, by this White Paper, the people of Malaysia are supposed to say, "Not by the Grace of God that we have been saved from disaster but by the Grace of the Special Branch and confessions the country has been saved from damnations." The White Paper is part innuendo; it is part analysis, part confessional, part narrative, part suggestion, part historical, part fantasy, and it is a pamphlet of disjointed confessions and statements. It is, in fact, a caricature of a damnation.

I will, Mr Speaker, Sir, as I go through this White Paper, show what are the most important fallacies. As somebody very kindly pointed out to me, I was wrong to have said that this White Paper has outbonded James Bond, because there are no women involved and at least James Bond was intelligent. Mr Speaker, by the recent arrests, all the important Malay leaders in Opposition, who had so gallantly fought for so many years for the emancipation of the Malays in this part of the world from colonial domination, have been effectively removed from the political scene. Mr Speaker, Sir, we all know, as this Paper puts it, that they fought for Melayu Raya. Now the Paper says that Melayu Raya however is an adaptation of the term Indonesia Raya. But we all know that Melayu Raya was a term which was used since 1938, and by many members who are not sitting on the Cabinet Bench, long before Indonesia came into being, and for that

very cause they had fought. We are now being asked to condemn them, and I, as a non-Malay, as a Chinese, can say this, because I cannot be accused of racialism in saying this. With these arrests and this White Paper, we are now asked to condemn not only these people without trial through an interwoven web of untested confessions, but we are also asked to condemn whole organisations. The White Paper stands as a new pinnacle in our short history of political rule through a system of preventive detention and police control.

As I have said, we stand here today to speak not so much to find out whether they are guilty, or that they be innocent, for they may be equally guilty as well as innocent, but to fight for that democratic right which is theirs. We ask, Mr Speaker, Sir, that we allow them the liberty and we judge them according to the Charter of the United Nations as embodied in all democratic constitutions; and, we say, let them be dealt with according to the ordinary and democratic laws of our land. Is it no excuse to say that we cannot afford democracy in times of national stress, for it is in such very times that the rights of the individual must be carefully nursed and democracy protected and nurtured, so that it will not wither away but be strengthened. It is easy, Mr Speaker, Sir, to join in with the rest of the crowd or to bay with the hounds and fan the flames of hysteria in times like this and to join in the witch-hunt for subversives and Communists who may not be there, and to rush headlong finally into the abyss of totalitarianism. Mr Speaker, Sir, it seems rather strange that the political climate in Malaysia has come to the point whereby all those people who are not in the Government, or who are not supporters of the Government, are trying to sell this country either to China or to Indonesia. What kind of climate have we gone into that all those people, including post office workers and railwaymen who want to go on strike, can be accused of being extremists and subversives?

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, in general, let us survey this White Paper. It is clear that it is meant to be consumed abroad,

because it contains pages and pages of Indonesian offensives which have nothing to do with the characters involved. But, first of all, what is lacking here? The first things lacking are the statements themselves. Why are the statements not published in the appendix, so that we may see exactly what they have confessed to and the limits of their guilt, because they must have limits of guilt? Secondly, those special letters written to the master spy and from the master spy have somehow or other fallen miraculously into the hands of the Special Branch. These letters are also not published; excerpts are taken from them and these excerpts themselves show contradictions which I shall demonstrate. These letters show a very poor lack of security consciousness and it would appear that these letters contain information which was not necessary but which could be used for the purposes of the White Paper, such as, statements like these, "Thank God and I am happy that the Front's shop has been established." This is writing to a conspirator, telling him, "Thank God and I am happy that the Front's shop has been established." Why mention it to a conspirator who knows it already? And this is from a master spy—Soenita. It goes on, "Its members will not only be drawn from party members but also from the broad masses, organisations, intellectuals, men, women and progressive youths, who share the same struggle as our leaders. Besides facilitating to unite the opposition parties, it will also draw and influence the above-mentioned masses for the purpose of strengthening the Front." Why all these statements when you are conspiring in secrecy to overthrow the Government, when one of the first things that you have to know is that you are not supposed to speak more than what is absolutely necessary? Other examples here, of the same sort, begin to make one wonder as to the genuineness of these letters.

The third point is this: why was the Press not allowed to interview these people although some of them spoke over Radio Malaysia and obviously had been interviewed by Radio Malaysia workers?

Mr Speaker, Sir, the last, and perhaps even more important point, is that this White Paper says that they were intending to go to Karachi to set up a Government-in-Exile. Pages and pages contain statements as to how they could not go because they were short of funds. Paragraphs are devoted to arguments as to how much Aziz Ishak should be paid and as to when the others could go to join him. Paragraphs are spent on the question of inadequacy of funds which had not enabled the conspirators to move to Karachi. Mr Speaker, Sir, if the purpose of this White Paper is to establish the fact that these people were going to set up a Government-in-Exile, why could they not have gone across the border to Haadyai or to go to Bangkok and from there take money from the Indonesian Government and fly to Karachi? Why do they have to sit in Kuala Lumpur waiting for the money to be sent from Bangkok through couriers to Kuala Lumpur, in order to buy tickets to fly to Karachi, in order to meet Soenita in Karachi, when, in fact, Soenita was already in Bangkok? So, Mr Speaker, Sir, all these things make us wonder as to the extent each of these persons were involved.

Mr Speaker, Sir, let us remember that this White Paper contains a part of a statement here, a part of a statement there, a little bit of analysis by the Special Branch, a little bit of narration by the writer of this pamphlet, a few little excerpts of letters all joined together—a pot-pourri of statements. It is a series of, perhaps, little truths or little half-truths joined together to make a whole big lie, sorry—untruth; it is unparliamentary to say “lie”. Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, it is as if we take a head from somebody else, we draw the hands of another person, fit in the legs of a third person, get a body from a fourth, take a photograph of the composition and present to the world the Devil himself.

Now let us look, Mr Speaker, Sir, first at the letters by Soenita. Soenita's letters, Mr Speaker, Sir, start at page 17, paragraph 80—

“I jubilantly welcome the formation of the Front. Let us hope that its members will not be drawn from the Opposition

groups only, but also from the broad masses of men, women, youths, intellectuals and others.

I just want to know for certain when the elder gentlemen are coming to meet us, so as to enable me to get everything ready and to render all assistance. Destination Karachi! As for you, I think it is better that you come along also. The question whether to return (to Malaysia)”—

I do not know who put “Malaysia” in brackets—

“or not will be brought before a meeting at which everything will be discussed in detail. It is hoped that this question will be settled smoothly. Amen. But I earnestly hope that the meeting will be on, in the interest of the struggle of the elder gentlemen and the friends here, and also in the interest of the realisation of a new world.

I hope, if possible, your representative who is to meet me in Bangkok will come between 28 and 30 January, 1965. I hope you will give me his name and photograph, and also let me know the person he usually contacts in Bangkok, so that it will be much easier for me to contact him”.

Very long-winded letter, you must admit, especially from a conspirator.

Then, at paragraph 81, Soenita wrote to Hussain Yaacob, and he calls him Che Jusof—

“Che Jusof (code name for Hussain Yaacob) requested the meeting at Bangkok to be held in the middle of the fasting month . . . , but Salleh (code name for Ishak bin Haji Mohamed) asked it to be held in the middle of February. If possible, it is better to hold it between 28th to 30th January, 1965. I want the photograph of the courier and his name”

Mr Speaker, Sir, a letter written by Soenita to Hussain Yaacob says, “Che Jusof (code name for Hussain Yaacob) requested the meeting at Bangkok to be held in the middle of the fasting month”. I am writing, Mr Speaker, Sir, to Dr Tan and say, “Dr Tan Chee Khoo asked that a meeting be held in Kuala Lumpur”—and I am writing to Dr Tan Chee Khoo. So is the letter written to Che Jusof has to start off with the sentence, “Che Jusof requested the meeting at Bangkok”

Dato' Dr Ismail: What page?

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Page 17, paragraph 81. Then, Mr Speaker, Sir, at paragraph 82, Soenita wrote—he is supposed to have written to Dato' Raja

Hanifah—again talking of the establishment of the Front's shop and the broad masses of organisations.

Then, Mr Speaker, Sir, not only do we have unnecessary information presented on a plate to the Special Branch to be used in this White Paper but we have peculiar changes of names. For example, Bapak Ishak, Aziz Ishak, has been known as Bapak A and in other instances he is referred to as A.1., and in paragraph 82 Soenita refers to him as Che A, for Aziz. Dr Burhanuddin, somehow or other, suddenly obtains for himself the code name of Towkay—K-A-Y (*Laughter*) in paragraph 82.

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, at paragraph 92, Abdul Aziz, according to the Special Branch, has suddenly become B.A., that is a step before M.A. And in paragraph 93, Aziz Ishak becomes A.1. and Dr Burhanuddin becomes Dr B.D.; and Aziz bin Ishak, in paragraph 91, at page 20, becomes A.A. So from A.1. (A one) he becomes A.A.

Enche' Tan Toh Hong (Bukit Bintang): It says A.1. (A "I") not A. 1 (A one), Sir.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: I thank the Honourable Member for Bukit Bintang for that very slight correction. If he prefers it, I will call it A.1. instead of A.1 (A one) (*Laughter*).

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, it is rather odd that four letters written by Soenita were intercepted and that those letters written by or to him were also intercepted, and according to the White Paper he was the master spy. How were these letters intercepted? That is what we would like to know. Was it because the courier who carried these messages was a paid agent of the Special Branch, or was the mail intercepted? I have every reason to suspect that these letters, or supposed letters, must have been intercepted by the Special Branch, through their courier, and that this courier must be a Government agent, and therefore we want to see the letters to make certain that they are genuine. If he is an agent provocateur, it is quite possible that he could add a little here or subtract a little there to make all the difference in the world.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we also have irrelevant bits. First of all, we have the bit about Boestamam. Surely, the bit about Boestamam, which ended up in his arrest on February 13th, cannot have any direct connection with the plot, because on page 2, paragraph 10, it is stated:

"A close contact was maintained between Hussain Yaacob and Soenita"—the names are mine—"until 21st September, 1963, when R. M. Soenita returned to Indonesia following the severance of diplomatic relations between Malaysia and Indonesia. During the period of the association Hussain Yaacob who had become a paid agent of Soenita"—he might have been a double agent, being also a paid agent of the Special Branch—"drawing a monthly payment of \$200, introduced to R. M. Soenita a number of Malay individuals and politicians including Dato' Raja Abu Hanifah, Ishak bin Haji Mohamed and Dr Burhanuddin Al-Helmy—

and we are supposed to draw from that introduction a sinister innuendo. Surely Soenita was a member of the diplomatic corps. I do not remember if I had met him. But if I had met him it could easily have been inferred that I was among one of those who had been introduced to him. Fortunately, it is not my habit to go to diplomatic conclaves. So, I had not met him. No doubt, he must have met thousands of people. In any event, my point is that until 1963, after the arrest of Boestamam, there could have been no plot, because they had just been introduced. So, what has this Boestamam's detention got to do with the White Paper called "A Plot Exposed" which, in fact, is being used as a condemnation of these conspirators.

Then, Mr Speaker, Sir, pages 5 and 6, under the heading "Indonesian landings on the Malay Peninsula", have no relevance whatsoever with the plot, except paragraph 29—

"All these acts of aggression proved abortive with the complete elimination of the armed infiltrators within a comparatively short period, often within a day or two, after landing. The expected Reception Committees had been disrupted by prior Police action, and the local inhabitants rendered ready assistance to the Security Forces in rounding up the infiltrators."

Mr Speaker, Sir, all the arrests by the Special Branch are published. If there were so many Reception Committees,

why have we not heard about them until the White Paper revealed that there had been disruption of the Reception Committees due to arrest? We know, as a matter of fact, that until the landings took place there was practically no arrest by the Special Branch. But, in any event, to my mind, Mr Speaker, Sir, that is an irrelevant section of the White Paper, deliberately put in to arouse emotions and prejudice. Then, Mr Speaker, Sir, from page 6 under the heading "The plot takes shape" and under the sub-heading "Diplomatic offensive", we get a series of irrelevant statements, starting with "The pattern of Indonesian aggression". Then, Mr Speaker, Sir, in an attempt to prove this plot, so to speak, paragraph 34 was put in. Paragraph 34 says—

"There is concrete evidence to show that underground organisations which were set up by the Sukarno regime in Singapore for this task were responsible for the racial disturbances in Singapore during July and September, 1964. The work of these organisations was supplemented by vicious and malicious propaganda disseminated from Indonesia through the radio and through anti-racial pamphlets distributed in Singapore."

Mr Speaker, Sir, if this White Paper tells the truth, why is the Government wasting public money in setting up the Commission of Inquiry to look into the riots in Singapore?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Dato' Dr Ismail bin Dato' Haji Abdul Rahman): Mr Speaker, Sir, if the Honourable Member wants to see copies of the letters, I can hand them over to him now. *(Applause)*

(Clerk hands over copies of the letters to Enche Lim Kean Siew)

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: By handing me copies of these letters, the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs had admitted that they are important. They should have been published—that is my point—and should not have been handed to me in this House.

Now, I come back to where I was before I was interrupted. Mr Speaker, Sir, I will look into the letters in due time if I may be allowed to finish what I have to say

Mr Speaker: Have you got much more to say?

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Yes, Sir. *(Laughter)* Mr Speaker, Sir, I cannot help it if Members on the opposite side of the House suffer from lack of ability to speak. I have plenty to say, and I do not think I should be interrupted because I have so much to say.

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, if paragraph 34 is correct, then there is no need to have the Commission of Inquiry and waste public funds; and yet the Government has assured this House that Justice Chua has been appointed and this Commission of Inquiry will be held very soon and that its findings may not be published. If paragraph 34 is correct, why have the Commission of Inquiry? If you are going to have this Commission of Inquiry, you must admit that paragraph 34 may be wrong. Yet paragraph 34 was put down in the White Paper in order to suggest that these people were part of a big plot.

We know, Mr Speaker, Sir, that the Indonesian landings—paragraphs 26 to 31—were put in to give colour.

However, Mr Speaker, Sir, in order to allow chance for other Members to speak, I will deal with the individual people who are members of the Socialist Front. In the first place, there were three: V. David, Tan Kai Hee and Tan Kwa Kim. They have been detained. There is not one word about them in this White Paper at all. On February 13th, the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs made a statement that with their arrests all those people responsible had been taken in for their part in the February 13th demonstration, which was part of a Communist plot and pro-Indonesian.

Mr Speaker, Sir, with regard to V. David, in 1964, when he applied to study in the Inns of Court, the Honourable Prime Minister was gracious enough to certify that he was a gentleman fit enough to be admitted to the Inns of Court. But the Special Branch denied the Honourable Prime Minister even that right to certify that a person is a gentleman and fit to be admitted into the Inns of Court.

Mr Speaker, Sir, in 1963, during the Railway strike, a telegram was sent to V. David by the Honourable Prime Minister again, asking him as a responsible member of the Union to exercise his good offices to settle the strike.

Mr Speaker, Sir, surely these three people at least are not implicated. Then we have the case of Hasnul bin Abdul Hadi. Again, Mr Speaker, Sir, I must reiterate that we are not here to try them, but we are here to defend their right to be heard in their own defence. Allegations made against Hasnul bin Abdul Hadi are mainly in paragraphs 44 to 53 on pages 10 and 11. Sir, if you glance through the White Paper, it might appear that they were to a large extent implicated, but if you read these paragraphs carefully, you will find that their connection with the conspiracy was indeed a very small one. Paragraph 44 reads:

"Abdul Aziz bin Ishak and Hasnul bin Abdul Hadi, went to Cairo with the intention of attending the 2nd Conference of Non-Aligned Nations. The background of this may be traced to on or about 21st September, 1964, when according to Abdul Aziz bin Ishak, a leading member of the Labour party of Malaya (LPM) met him and suggested that he (Abdul Aziz bin Ishak) should represent the Malayan People's Socialist Front (MPSF) at the Cairo Conference. Abdul Aziz bin Ishak replied that he could hardly do so because he had no invitation from the organisers and was not in a position to arrange for such an invitation. This person said that he would try to arrange for an invitation."

Mr Speaker, Sir, there is nothing wrong in that at all. The members of the Singapore Government went to Kenya to attend the Afro-Asian Conference and they tried to gain admission. That itself is not a plot. Then the Report goes on:

"Abdul Aziz bin Ishak then suggested that he would require the assistance of an active, energetic and intelligent person to attend the Conference, and that he had in mind the Chairman of the Socialist Front, Hasnul bin Abdul Hadi. According to Abdul Aziz bin Ishak, the LPM member undertook to persuade Hasnul bin Abdul Hadi for this purpose."

Again, there was nothing wrong in that. It was openly known that the Socialist Front has, in fact, tried to gain support for its political beliefs. Surely, we have

a right to our beliefs and we cannot be hanged for our beliefs. Paragraphs 46 and 47 read:

"The question of expenses was then discussed. Abdul Aziz bin Ishak disclosed that he had only about \$1,500 which would not be sufficient. He was advised to arrange with a travel agency to pay for his journey by instalments, and he was promised repayment.

A meeting was held towards the end of September, 1964, at the Socialist Front Headquarters in Kuala Lumpur during which talking points, newspaper cuttings and other material were made ready for Hasnul bin Abdul Hadi so that he and Abdul Aziz bin Ishak would be adequately prepared to carry out their task of convincing the Afro-Asian countries that their assistance was needed by the people of Malaysia to rid themselves of the existing 'British-controlled' government."

It says "newspaper cuttings and other material"—surely (*showing some documents*) these are also newspaper cuttings and materials.

Mr Speaker: They are copies of the original ones!

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Paragraph 48 says:

"Abdul Aziz bin Ishak left for Singapore on 2nd October, 1964, where he was joined by Hasnul bin Abdul Hadi. They left Singapore on the same day by air and arrived at Cairo . . ."

We all know that, Sir. They were then put under quarantine and afterwards Aziz was first released and a day after he was joined by Hasnul. They were then put up in a steamship called "Lotus" on the River Nile; and they both tried to get admission into the Conference, but all their attempts were in vain. Abdul Aziz bin Ishak contacted various officials of the United Arab Republic to gain admission to the Conference but was unsuccessful. Then, they tried to contact delegates of the Conference outside the Conference Hall, but apart from a few chance encounters, nothing useful was discussed. Afterwards, they managed to get accommodation in Hotel Longchamps, where certain Indonesian Officials attending the Conference also had rooms. It is insinuated that they somehow managed to obtain admission, therefore, inferring that there must be something sinister in their changing their accommodation from the steamship "Lotus" into a

hotel, which happened to contain certain Indonesian officials.

On the evening of October the 8th, Abdul Aziz and Hasnul bin Abdul Hadi were visited by Indonesian officials who took them the next morning to meet an Indonesian official in a private car. During the meeting, according to Aziz bin Ishak, the atmosphere was cordial. It appeared, however, that during the meeting General Djatikusumo was trying to dictate terms to him, and Abdul Aziz told Djatikusumo that he and Hasnul had come to Cairo as representatives of the MPSF to attend the Conference and that they could not gain admission to the Conference. General Djatikusumo replied that since the Conference was by then almost over, it was pointless to pursue the matter further and he did not offer any assistance to Abdul Aziz and Hasnul to gain admission at all. So, we have here a categorical statement that, according to these two people, they were representatives of the Malayan People's Socialist Front, and they made no bones about it, they told Djatikusumo so, and they thought that Djatikusumo was trying to dictate terms to them. Further, they said that they were trying to get admittance to the Afro-Asian Conference and the Indonesian Government did not help them. Sir, if they were trying to get admittance to the Afro-Asian Conference, is that itself an illegal and subversive matter?

According to the Honourable Prime Minister in this House, when he was asked as to what he intended to do when these people were away, he said, "What they do outside this country is no concern of ours. They can do what they like." Yet, this White Paper is trying to suggest that although they may do what they like, it was very sinister that they did what they liked.

"General Djatikusumo then asked Abdul Aziz bin Ishak about events in Malaysia. General Djatikusumo appeared impressed by what Abdul Aziz bin Ishak told him and enquired about Abdul Aziz bin Ishak's plans. Abdul Aziz bin Ishak stated that he planned to leave Cairo for Jeddah, Algeria and, if possible, Ghana, but that these plans were still indefinite."

Is that enough to convict?—No. Why was it put in?—To show background.

Why? Is it for the ulterior motive content? Mr Speaker, Sir, that is all so-called Hasnul's part in this plot.

It is admitted, Sir, that there was no co-ordination between Indonesia and Aziz and, in the main as far as Hasnul is concerned, nothing else in the White Paper incriminates him. He was arrested on February 13, when he himself was a member of the meeting at which I was present, where we decided that there should be no public procession because the Government had not granted us the permission. As for Aziz Ishak, Mr Speaker, Sir, his part in the main was that which I have read. When he was coming back to Malaya, he was at several places stopped by Indonesian official who tried to prevent him from returning to Malaya. Yet, Mr Speaker, Sir, he returned—and that is the point. He need not have returned if he wanted to set up a Government-in-exile and he should have discussed plans. But these so-called statements made by him were, in fact, not confessions at all—they appear to be a series of denials to questions put to him and explanatory statements as to why he went to Indonesia and what happened on his way back. By informing the Government, why he went to Indonesia and why he came back, his statements have been used against him. When he came back to Malaya, he refused to see Hussein Yaacob, because he suspected, rightly or wrongly, that Hussain Yaacob was an agent provocateur. Aziz then met several people, including Dr Burhanuddin and they met several times. They were interested as to what happened in Afro-Asian countries, as the Special Branch was, because they asked some questions about that, and I myself was curious as to the attitude of the Afro-Asian countries with regard to our dispute. There is nothing wrong in that. Mr Speaker, Sir, according to Aziz, he told Dr Burhanuddin that they should go abroad in good time to meet the Afro-Asian nations in advance of the Afro-Asian Conference to canvass support for their cause. This cause was merely the anti-Malaysia stand that they advocated for some time. Mr Speaker, Sir, to say that we do not like Malaysia,

that it is bad, is no crime. Then a meeting was held to form a National Front, and it was decided to send Aziz and Ishak as representatives abroad. This is found in paragraph 74—

"74. Meanwhile Dato' Raja Abu Hanifah received instructions from R. M. Soenita in December, 1964, to take the initiative in forming a National Front to consist of all opposition political leaders and personalities in the Malay Peninsula. On or around 13th December, 1964, Dato' Raja Abu Hanifah said that he received a telephone call from Tajuddin Kahar to attend a meeting at the Golden Hill Hotel at Klang Road, Kuala Lumpur, which was attended by Hussain Yaacob (representing Ishak bin Haji Mohamed), Tajuddin Kahar, Datu Kampo Radjo (representing Abdul Aziz bin Ishak), Dato' Raja Abu Hanifah (representing Dr Burhanuddin) and a member of the PMIP."

Aziz Ishak was not present at that meeting and it is put by the Special Branch that Datu Kampo Radjo was supposed to have represented him. Now, at paragraph 77 it is stated, "Datu Kampo Radjo reported that Abdul Aziz bin Ishak had agreed to go abroad and that the latter would inform Hussain Yaacob as soon as he had decided on the date of his departure. This meeting also decided that Abdul Aziz bin Ishak, Dr Burhanuddin and Ishak bin Haji Mohamed should attend the forthcoming 2nd Afro-Asian Conference." On January 14th, 1965 at a further meeting it was disclosed to the meeting that Aziz had agreed to the National Front. Aziz, again, was not present at the meeting. Datu Kampo Radjo was sent to Penang to inform him of the decision.

Then, Mr Speaker, Sir, there comes a "*mikadoish*" part of the White Paper. This part deals with a series of motor car drives and the arguments as to whether Aziz should receive \$1,500 or \$3,000 to \$4,000; and this sums up the whole of the part played by Aziz Ishak in this White Paper. The White Paper says this—

"86. On the following day, 15th January, 1965, Datu Kampo Radjo was sent to Penang to inform Abdul Aziz bin Ishak of the decision of the meeting. Abdul Aziz bin Ishak agreed to the decision and accompanied Datu Kampo Radjo back to Kuala Lumpur on the next day to make arrangements."

"87. On 17th January, 1965, in Dato' Raja Abu Hanifah's car cruising from Treacher Road to Gombak, Kuala Lumpur, a meeting

was held among Abdul Aziz bin Ishak, Hussain Yaacob, Datu Kampo Radjo and Dato' Raja Abu Hanifah himself, during which Dato' Raja Abu Hanifah and Hussain Yaacob offered Abdul Aziz bin Ishak \$1,500 for the latter's expenses for the proposed trip. Abdul Aziz bin Ishak refused because the sum was too small. He also asked Hussain Yaacob for financial support for his family during his absence abroad. Hussain Yaacob and Dato' Raja Abu Hanifah finally agreed to raise more money by 30th January, 1965, and promised to look after Abdul Aziz bin Ishak's family during his sojourn abroad."

That means during his short stay abroad, which means, from this alone, that there was intention on the part of Aziz to return. The White Paper goes on—

"88. They then took Abdul Aziz bin Ishak back to his father's house at Gombak and drove to the former PMIP Headquarters at Jalan Raja Uda, Kampong Bahru, Kuala Lumpur, where they met Dr Burhanuddin. Dr Burhanuddin was told of what happened and expressed the desire to speak to Abdul Aziz bin Ishak. Leaving Dato' Raja Abu Hanifah and Hussain Yaacob behind, Datu Kampo Radjo took Dr Burhanuddin in the car back to the house at Gombak where Dr Burhanuddin in the presence of Datu Kampo Radjo advised Abdul Aziz bin Ishak to obtain information on the following items during his forthcoming trip to the Afro-Asian countries before taking any positive steps:

(a) Support for Sukarno regime in her confrontation against Malaysia;"—

That means these people were still doubtful as to the Indonesian attitude.

"(b) Communist influence in Indonesia;"

It has been suggested that the conspirators were supporting the Sukarno regime which was supporting the Communist regime, and yet why should Aziz Ishak be asked by Dr Burhanuddin to find out the Communist influence in Indonesia? Was it because they were supporting Communism, or because they were afraid of Communism? If they were afraid of Communism and there was strong Communist influence, it is quite possible they would not support the Sukarno regime.

"(c) Reaction to the banning of the Partai Murba by President Sukarno."

Obviously, again, this is a fundamental question that had to be decided. Then the White Paper further goes on to say—

"89. On the following day Datu Kampo Radjo called upon Abdul Aziz bin Ishak

at the house at Gombak again to tell him that Hussain Yaacob had failed to raise more money. Abdul Aziz bin Ishak wanted to go on the trip as soon as possible, and set the date of departure for 22nd January, 1965. He needed \$3,000 to \$4,000 to cover his travelling expenses instead of the \$1,500 offered him by his colleagues, apart from additional funds for his family maintenance."

After that

Enche' Kam Woon Wah (Sitiawan): On a point of clarification, I would like to know from the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat whether he and his party are in favour of bringing these prisoners to trial; and if they are convicted, whether they are in favour that these prisoners should be hanged.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: I am afraid the Honourable Member must have been sleeping when I started to speak, because I have made my position very clear. I have already said that I am not interested in the guilt or innocence of these men, but we are here to defend their right to be heard in their own defence.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Bring them to trial!

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Enche' Senu bin Abdul Rahman): Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise to ask your permission to make an announcement in this House. In view of the doubt expressed by the sponsors of this motion, there will be a film show on the confessions of the leaders which Opposition leaders mentioned just now. Sir, I would like to invite all the Members of this House, including Members of the Opposition, and the Press as well, to this film show to be held at the Parliament theatre in this building at 3 o'clock this afternoon (Applause).

Enche' Tan Toh Hong (Bukit Bintang): Would the Honourable Minister say whether diplomats are also invited to the show or not?

Enche' Senu bin Abdul Rahman: Well, there is no objection to it, Sir.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Mr Speaker, Sir, dealing first with the interpretation, the motion says that "This House views with grave concern the march towards

totalitarianism in Malaysia", and then it is put down to support this motion "as evidenced by the recent detention of Socialist Front leaders and members and calls on the Alliance Government either to bring them to trial or free them unconditionally"—this is exactly what I have been addressing this House upon, that is that these people have a right to be heard in their defence, and that whether they are guilty or innocent is at the moment no concern of ours, but that they should be tried democratically. I repeat, if the Honourable Member who interrupted me so rudely did not understand what I was trying to say, then obviously he could not understand me or he must not have been paying attention.

Dr Ng Kam Poh: If the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat will give way—I would like to ask him whether he has got the permission of these people to voice their opinion in Parliament. If so, upon trial, if they are convicted, they will be sentenced, and they will die for treason. You are playing with the lives of those people. Does the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat realise that? (Laughter).

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not know whether the Honourable Member for Telok Anson is trying to make a speech. If he is, he is very unsuccessful indeed. It is very clear what my stand is, and I repeat it again: we are here to talk about democratic rights and to deplore the Government for its march towards totalitarianism. As for the permission of these people to speak, I would gladly appoint him as my delegate to speak to them and to ask them whether they want me to speak on their behalf or not. I do not think that he will be able to see them, of course, without permission from the Minister of Home Affairs.

The second point of his interruption

Mr Speaker: The time is 12 o'clock.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: What time do we finish, Sir?

Mr Speaker: 12 o'clock. The Honourable Member will have a chance to continue his speech at 4.30 p.m. when

the House resumes. In the meantime, I would like to remind Honourable Members that at 3 p.m. this afternoon there will be a film show at the Parliament theatre dealing with the detentions, the subject matter under discussion. The sitting is suspended until 4.30 p.m.

Suspended at 12.02 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 4.30 p.m.

(Mr Speaker in the Chair)

EXEMPTED BUSINESS

(Motion)

Dato' Dr Ismail: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move,

That the proceedings of this House this day shall be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order 12 (1) until 7.00 p.m. today.

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

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That the proceedings of this House this day shall be exempted from the provisions of Standing Order 12 (1) until 7.00 p.m. today.

DETENTION OF SOCIALIST FRONT LEADERS AND MEMBERS

Debate resumed.

Mr Speaker (To Enche' Lim Kean Siew): May I ask how long you will be?

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Mr Speaker, Sir, many people have asked me that question. (*Laughter*) I do not think the House need be unduly alarmed. I think there will be enough time for the Ministers to speak. I will be about 20 minutes.

Mr Speaker, Sir, to continue with that interruption, I was asked just now by the Honourable Member for Telok Anson whether or not I was asking that these people be brought to trial. Well, Mr Speaker, Sir, I need not go further into that question except to say that if he agrees that they should be brought to trial, then my advice to

him is that he stands up and vote "Yes" to this motion when it comes to voting.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I am very much obliged to the Honourable Minister for Home Affairs to show me those photostat copies of the letters mentioned in the White Paper, and one of those letters demonstrate clearly what I mean when I talked of the dangers of taking such an arbitrary course of action. In the first place, the letter alleged to have been typed by Ishak bin Haji Mohamed, who is the person I am now dealing with, appears to have come from the same type of typewriter, if not the same typewriter, as the letters alleged to have been sent by Soenita himself. I understand the Press is now allowed to view the photostat copies and, if they will notice, the address on that letter is also the same address as Soenita's, which is Bukit Timah. Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, the third point is that that letter was not signed, or the signature was completely invisible in the photostat copy. Therefore, we have in this instance an unsigned letter, typed by the typewriter appearing to be the same typewriter, probably used by somebody else which is now being used as evidence against him.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I am sure the House is very grateful to the Government for the film show we had at 3 o'clock; and in that film show, dealing again with Ishak bin Haji Mohamed, he denied that he wrote such a letter. This film, I must say, Mr Speaker, Sir, demonstrates what I have said to this House this morning that you cannot take confessions and convict people on confessions alone. The film was pathetic; it was badly edited. There were cuts, and, furthermore, it falls into the category of stage film confessions. There we had in a sitting room Ishak bin Haji Mohamed, sitting down with a coat and a necktie, and a pocket handkerchief to boot, making statements to Radio Malaysia, which, we are told, is a confession.

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, what was that confession? According to the White Paper and according to the film, Ishak took a sum of \$5,000 from Hussain

Yaacob. He said he did it because he did not have money and wanted to fight elections and he had had a bad ward. Mr Speaker, Sir, to take contributions for elections, we must all admit, is not a crime, otherwise the Alliance will be equally as criminal as Ishak, because I am sure that the Alliance did collect money not only from local but also from foreign firms; and if I am not wrong, they collected a sum of about \$2 million, which is far in excess of the \$5,000 which Ishak was supposed to have obtained.

Mr Speaker, Sir, furthermore, Ishak, according to the White Paper, turned down direct connection with the National Front which, as suspected, was secret because it was pro-Soekarno. In the White Paper he was alleged to have said that he had heard about it. In the film show he said he had heard about it from common gossips because he knew many people. That was all he knew of the National Front. Mr Speaker, Sir, according to the film show, and according to the White Paper, Ishak did nothing more than what I have said in this House, except that in the White Paper it was stated that he was preparing to go to Karachi. That he admitted in the film show. But he also said in the film show that he had no intention of going to Karachi—he merely wanted the others to go first (*Laughter*). Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, again in the film show there was no admission that he was going because of the National Front or because he had intended to go to Indonesia, but merely because he had thought of going to the Afro-Asian Conference. He said in the film show that after the others have gone he had no intention of following. Further, Mr Speaker, Sir, when he was asked about his political activities, he stated that he had once upon a time believed in militant struggle but that he no longer believes in such a struggle and that he now believes in the goodwill of all men. Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, is that sufficient to detain a man and to condemn others who happened to know him?

Now, coming on to another aspect of the White Paper, we move from the

ridiculous to the fantastic. According to the chapter on election expenses, it was stated that Nazar Nong received a sum of \$145,000 for election expenses in March and April, 1964, and that Tajuddin Kahar had asked for \$200,000 but the courier was arrested *en route*. Mr Speaker, Sir, I have no means of knowing whether or not Nazar Nong had received \$145,000 for the elections, but it is quite clear that Ishak said in the film show that the Labour Party and the Socialist Front for that matter is a poor Party and that we had great difficulties in raising funds.

With regard to the plot itself, Mr Speaker, Sir, we have been informed in this House that the nation is facing great difficulties within and because of that the elections have to be postponed.

Let us see what the White Paper has to say about the National Front. On the 14th of January, certain people were supposed to have met, and it was decided what the National Front's objectives ought to be. On the 15th January a person went and informed Abdul Aziz bin Ishak of the decision of that meeting in Penang. On the 17th, January Abdul Aziz bin Ishak came down to Kuala Lumpur and, there, had a drive in Dato' Raja Abu Hanifah's car cruising from Treacher Road to Gombak where there was discussion as regards the sum of money he should be given before he could leave Malaya. In fact, Mr Speaker, Sir, it would appear that if there was any plot, it was nipped even before it had come to bud, because according to the White Paper they were considering all these points when they were arrested; and there was nothing in the White Paper to say that the National Front had actually been formed and that it had been organised and its plans had been put into execution. As I have said, we have not only to thank the grace of God for our safety but, of course, to the great efforts of the Special Branch.

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not wish to go into other details on the White Paper. But this motion is a motion to discuss whether or not there is a march towards totalitarianism in

this country. The film demonstrates that heavy reliance is put by the Special Branch on confessions. The fact that the letters have now been photostated and have been given to me show that it is an admission on the part of the Government that there is something lacking in the White Paper.

So, Mr Speaker, Sir, I say that we must make connections. If we, for so many years, have stood up against totalitarian rule, against colonial domination, then should we today fall into that seething cauldron of arbitrary laws and detention?

Mr Speaker, Sir, I started off with the hypothetical student who, after creeping like a snail unwillingly to school, has come up bearded like a bard—of course, holding in his hand a certificate of suitability given to him by the Chief Education Officer of the State. Now, this hypothetical student has gone through the whole gamut of what I have said this morning and has experienced the machinery of the Government. But let us assume that he is still undaunted and that now he is still prepared to go on in spite of the fact that it is dangerous even to have indoor rallies, that he cannot have procession, and that there have been so many restrictions. Let us assume that he wants to fight the elections. So, he goes and puts his name down as a candidate to fight the elections, and what does he find? No elections! Why? Because the Honourable Prime Minister has made a statement on Monday, 1st March, that all local elections are to be suspended in view of the present emergency situation; and not only will he find that he cannot take part in the local elections, which is the grass root of democracy, but that it is quite possible that in future he may have no opportunity of fighting any elections at all—not even the State and Parliamentary elections—for the Honourable Prime Minister has said on Monday, when asked whether the State and Parliamentary elections will take place, that it is his prayer and his wish and his hope that the Indonesian confrontation will not last that long and it would appear, therefore, that the Government

contemplates that there may, in fact, be no State and Federal elections.

Mr Speaker, Sir, one look at the smallest book on history of the modern state will show us that restrictions will come before loss of elections and that the loss of elections would lead us on to a long march towards totalitarianism, and it is my fervent hope, Sir, that this House will support this motion by my friend.

Enche' Mohamed Asri bin Haji Muda (Pasir Puteh): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, timbul-nya perbahathan di-hadapan kita pada masa sekarang ini ia-lah oleh kerana penangkapan yang di-lakukan oleh pihak Kerajaan kepada beberapa orang pemimpin baharu² ini, dan penangkapan itu di-lakukan di-bawah Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri, undang² yang mana, seperti yang di-sebut oleh penchadang Yang Berhormat dari Batu, telah di-sokong dengan kuat-nya oleh pihak saya dan partai saya pada satu masa yang telah lalu. Tetapi ada satu kesilapan yang perlu di-betulan sebelum daripada saya memasuki dengan lanjut-nya dalam perbahathan pada petang ini, ia-itu-lah Yang Berhormat dari Batu mengatakan bahawa PAS menyokong Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri itu dengan tujuan supaya menangkap orang² yang bukan Melayu. Ini ada-lah suatu kenyataan tidak betul. Sebab kita menyokong Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri pada masa itu bahawa kita memandangi kehidupan demokerasi dan keselamatan negara kita tidak akan terjamin kalau sakra-nya tidak ada satu undang² yang dengan tegas dapat mengawal keselamatan negara kita. Erti-nya Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri itu kita sokong dengan tujuan dapat menahan gerakan² dan kegiatan² mereka yang tidak bertanggung-jawab yang hendak menghancurkan kehidupan demokerasi dan kemerdekaan negara kita. Apa-kah orang itu dari kalangan orang Melayu, atau bukan Melayu, apa-kah orang itu dari kalangan PAS atau Front Socialist, atau pun juga dari pihak UMNO, M.C.A., atau M.I.C.—itu ada-lah soal undang². Soal kesalahan, siapa sahaja

melakukan kesalahan, mesti-lah di-tahan bagi menjaga keselamatan negeri ini. Itu-lah asas mula-nya Parti PAS ini berdiri dengan tegas menyokong Undang² Keselamatan dan pindaan² yang kemudian-nya datang dan di-kemukakan di-dalam Rumah yang mulia ini. Dengan satu peringatan yang ikhlas, yang di-tujukan kepada Menteri yang bertanggung-jawab bagi pelaksanaan Undang² Keselamatan ini, ia-itu bahawa jangan-lah Undang² Keselamatan ini di-salah-gunakan, dengan erti-kata yang lain, jangan-lah di-gunakan Undang² Keselamatan itu sa-lain daripada tempat yang sa-benar-nya, ia-itu bagi menjamin keselamatan dan kemerdekaan negara kita.

Berhubung dengan soal ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ingin menyentuh sedikit bagaimana hal yang berlaku atas penangkapan yang terdahulu daripada kejadian² apa yang di-gelarkan Pakatan Khianat, ia-itu-lah penangkapan yang di-tujukan kepada beberapa orang Ahli² dan penyokong² PAS di-negeri Kelantan. Mengikut sa-bagaimana kenyataan daripada Yang Berhormat Menteri dan kenyataan² yang tersiar di-dalam akhbar² bahawa penangkapan itu di-lakukan demi untuk menjaga keselamatan negara, di-atas tuduhan bahawa mereka itu menyebarkan fatua² yang boleh menimbulkan huru-hara dan kachau-bilau di-dalam negeri ini. Soal-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, chara pelaksanaan itu tidak tegas. Saya dapat mencheritakan salasilah penangkapan itu dengan lebeh terator supaya dapat di-fahami dengan sa-benar dan sa-penoh²-nya.

Pada mula-nya di-tangkap dua orang; di-tangkap sa-orang dahulu, kemudian di-tambah dua orang lagi, kemudian yang sa-orang terlibat dengan kesalahan membunuh, yang mengikut kenyataan Tunku Perdana Menteri bahawa pada malam kejadian membunuh itu, beliau pun sudah menyatakan niat-nya hendak membebaskan orang itu daripada tahanan, tetapi apabila beberapa hari kemudian, kerana terlibat kejadian membunuh, maka dia terpaksa di-tahan sa-bagai sa-orang jenayah biasa, sa-bagai pembunuh yang kemudian-nya di-bicharakterkan, dan di-dapati oleh kerana waktu

membunuh itu kedapatan fikiran-nya tidak sioman.

Penangkapan yang kedua kepada dua orang guru ugama daripada Kelantan yang hanya beberapa minggu sahaja yang kemudian di-bebaskan dengan tidak bersyarat. Saya tidak dapat tahu dengan jelas sa-sudah penangkapan itu, apa-kah penyiasatan yang lebeh rapi yang di-lakukan oleh pehak Kerajaan terhadap dua orang tahanan itu sa-hingga terbukti bahawa mereka itu tidak bersalah dari segi Undang² Keselamatan, tetapi soal-nya mereka itu di-bebaskan. Kemudian apakala menjelang-nya hampir² pilehan raya Parlimen di-Negeri² di-dalam bulan April, 1964, ia-itu lebeh kurang satu bulan lebeh daripada tempoh itu sa-belum menamakan chalun, beberapa orang lagi di-tahan, termasuk tiga orang Ahli Dewan Negeri daripada Parti PAS dan empat orang daripada guru ugama, sa-orang daripada-nya belum lagi dapat di-namakan guru ugama, sebab kerja-nya mengajar Kur'an di-kampung sahaja, dengan alasan yang sama dan tuduhan yang sama seperti mana yang di-tangkap orang² yang terdahulu daripada itu.

Ada dua masalah di-dalam perkara ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Yang pertama, alasan menangkap, kerana mereka itu merbahaya kepada Keselamatan Dalam Negeri, kerana menyebarkan fitnah dan fatua²-nya. Yang kedua, ini alasan yang saya pandang dari pandangan yang halus, ia-itu-lah dengan kerana desakan sa-bahagian besar daripada gulongan² pehak Menteri sendiri supaya orang² yang tertentu itu di-tahan. Ini berkaitan, pada pandangan saya, dengan perkembangan² politik sa-tempat di-dalam ikhtiar dan usaha untuk memenangi pilehan raya tahun 1964. Maka ternyata-lah di-dalam perenggan ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, menyalah-gunakan itu telah berlaku di-dalam menggunakan Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri, terutama sa-kali tuduhan bahawa mereka itu telah menyebarkan sa-suatu yang boleh membahayakan keamanan dalam negeri, sedangkan apa yang berlaku—kemerbahayaan itu—tidak zahir dan tidak nampak, malah tidak ada. Apa yang ada ia-lah bayang²

yang sentiasa menakutkan orang² yang tidak sedap duduk di-dalam menghadapi suatu suasana yang tegang, yang lebih suasana untuk mencapai kemenangan di-dalam satu pilihan raya—tidak berlaku soal pechah keamanan, dan tidak berlaku soal merebak-nya satu fahaman yang boleh, sa-hingga sampai kepada tingkatan Undang² Keselamatan itu—perlu lagi, sebab saya kata begitu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tangkapan yang di-lakukan dengan begitu mudah dan kemudian di-bebaskan dengan begitu mudah.

Sa-bagai mithal-nya, dua orang daripada tiga orang yang di-tahan pada masa yang akhir² ini, yang saya sebutkan tadi telah di-bebaskan di-dalam bulan puasa baharu² ini, dengan tidak semena²—saya kata tidak semena²—erti-nya tidak memberitahu kepada orang ramai terlebih dahulu, atau pun dengan tidak apa kira bichara sa-lain daripada saya telah menghantar sa-puchok surat rayuan kepada Tunku Perdana Menteri sendiri supaya membebaskan mereka itu, dan surat itu tidak menjawab, tetapi alhamdulillah, jawab-nya ia-lah mereka itu di-bebaskan.

Kebebasan mereka itu di-kenakan dengan sharat² yang ketat, yang pertama tidak boleh keluar rumah antara pukul 8.00 malam sampai pukul 6.00 pagi; sa-bulan sa-kali mesti melaporkan diri kepada Balai Polis yang berhampiran; tidak boleh berpindah rumah ya'ani duduk di-tempat lain melainkan dengan kebenaran polis; tidak boleh keluar negeri melainkan dengan kebenaran polis; tidak boleh menjahap politik; tidak boleh berhubungan dengan orang² tahanan politik dan bekas² tahanan politik. Baharu sa-belah pagi tadi, Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Dato Keramat telah berchakap panjang lebar berkenaan dengan perkara sharat² pembebasan orang² ini. Tetapi saya terpaksa menyebutkan sa-kali lagi hal ini supaya lebih jelas keadaan kedudukan. Apakah erti-nya kebebasan yang seperti ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua? Sedangkan penangkapan yang di-lakukan pun, apa yang kita pandang tidak sa-chara sunggoh² dan membebaskan mereka pun dengan tidak chara bersunggoh².

Saya telah membuat rayuan sa-kali lagi, apakala hampir kepada Hari Raya, kepada Perdana Menteri sendiri supaya mengikhtikarkan pembebasan orang² yang baki lagi. Soal sharat tidak berbangkit lagi pada masa itu. Saya merayu kepada ke'adilan dan timbang rasa Kerajaan Perikatan supaya membebaskan mereka² yang saya pandang tidak bersalah itu supaya mereka dapat berhari raya dengan anak² isteri, apa lagi mereka pun di-tangkap tidak terlibat dalam soal konfrantasi atau pun pakatan pengkhianat sa-bagaimana yang di-hebohkan sa-hari dua ini. Tetapi malang-nya surat itu belum menjawab sampai sekarang dan mereka alhamdulillah maseh merengkok dalam tahanan di-Batu Gajah. Alang-kah mahal-nya harga ke'adilan, alang-kah mahal-nya harga timbang rasa dan perasaan sama seperti mahal-nya harga sakulum senyum daripada Yang Berhormat Menteri Keselamatan Dalam Negeri sendiri. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ini ia-lah kesah dahulu belum masuk kesah baharu.

Waktu dalam pilihanraya kecil di-kawasan Tumpat Tengah, chalun Perikatan dan ahli² pensharah Perikatan telah melaong²kan kepada orang ramai supaya mengundi Perikatan kalau ingin Tuan Guru Haji Ya'kub atau Tok Guru Tok Kop mengikut istilah orang kampung, di-bebaskan. Wakil kita sanggup membebaskan Tok Guru Tok Kop atau Haji Ya'kub ini kalau Perikatan menang; kalau Perikatan kalah, tentu-lah tidak ada harapan lagi mereka itu akan di-bebaskan. Dan sa-chara kebetulan, Perikatan menang. Kemudian daripada itu sampai-lah kepada cherita pembebasan tiga orang tadi yang termasuk sa-orang daripada Tok Guru Tok Kop. Apa-kah ini semuanya tidak dapat kita katakan sa-bagai satu permainan politik kotor, mempertarongkan kebebasan orang persaorangan demi untuk kepentingan partai?

Kita maseh ingat, bahawa sa-belum daripada mereka itu di-tangkap, Kaum Ibu UMNO di-negeri Kelantan telah pun membuat rayuan dan rayuan ini di-siarkan dengan besar-nya di-dalam surat² khabar di-negeri kita ini.

Mereka mendesak Kerajaan supaya menangkap ulama² yang konon-nya mentafsirkan kafir-mengkafir yang konon-nya merosakkan pergaulan masyarakat dan merosakkan keselamatan negeri yang kemudian mereka di-tangkap. Dan akhir-nya apa-lah hendak membebaskan tiga orang ini, Kaum Ibu UMNO lebeh dahulu tahu daripada kaum keluarga orang yang hendak di-bebaskan itu. Dan mereka mengambil kesempatan ini menyambut pembebasan mereka itu dan mengadakan perjumpaan yang rasmi di-rumah Perdana Menteri di-Kuala Lumpur, membawa mereka balek ka-Kota Bharu, Kelantan, dengan kapal terbang di-sambut sa-chara besar²an dengan suatu arahan yang tertentu.

Sa-olah²-nya pehak Perikatan atau UMNO di-negeri Kelantan hendak mendebeh dada kapada masyarakat Malaya atau Malaysia, mereka telah berjasa membebaskan tiga orang daripada tahanan politik daripada parti PAS kerana rasa kasehan belas dan bertimbang rasa. Apa-kah desakan untok menangkap mereka itu terlebih dahulu berdasarkan belas kasehan dan timbang rasa kita? Apa-kah erti-nya kalimah kasehan belas dan timbang rasa bertimbang balek? Tidak tahu-lah saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalimah² seni dalam bahasa Melayu yang boleh mengertikan perkataan kasehan belas dan timbang rasa atau sa-bagai berma²ana kebelakang daripada hakikat yang sa-benar. Seruan—desakan bagi menangkap alim-ulama² kemudian seruan dan desakan bagi membebaskan sa-bahagian daripada alim-ulama². Apa-kah yang baki itu terkeluar daripada rasa ihsan dan kasehan timbang rasa daripada pehak Perikatan sendiri? Dan apa-kah perasaan kasehan belas dan timbang rasa itu ada kota (quota) ini terpulang-lah kapada pehak Perikatan dan orang² yang berkenaan sahaja bagi menjawab-nya.

Saya tahu bahawa kenyataan saya ini akan di-jawab oleh pehak Kerajaan atau penyokong²-nya. Soal jawab menjawab dalam Parlimen masing² boleh-lah berchakap dan keputusan-nya bergantung kapada Ayes atau Noes. Tetapi hakikat dapat menjadi

hakikat dan sejarah akan menchatit tiap² kejadian dengan sa-penoh²-nya hakikat-nya sendiri.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sekarang yang empat orang lagi maseh dalam tahanan. Apa-kah di-tahan mereka berempat ini kerana tidak ada rayuan kasehan belas daripada kaum ibu atau apa-kah di-tahan empat orang ini kerana tidak mahu menanda tangani sharat² yang ketat ka-atas diri mereka, barangkali pehak Kementerian dan pehak polis sendiri tahu hakikat yang sa-benar-nya. Tetapi saya mengambil kesempatan dalam Rumah yang mulia ini, di-sa²at negara kita menghendaki perpaduan yang erat, menghendaki supaya perpaduan itu dapat di-gunakan dengan sa-penoh-nya bagi mempertahankan kedaulatan negara kita, maka tahanan politik ka-atas ahli² PAS di-lakukan terdahulu itu hendak-lah di-bebaskan dengan segera-nya, supaya dengan demikian dapat-lah mereka kembali ka-tengah² masyarakat dan berjuang bersama² bagi mempertahankan kehidupan demokrasi dalam negeri ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berchakap berkenaan dengan demokrasi dalam negeri ini, kadang² terasa naik sedeh dalam diri kita sendiri, kadang² naik marah tetapi apa boleh buat, sebab demokrasi tidak berkaki dan bertangan, demokrasi akan berjalan kalau orang yang memegang tampok pimpinan itu menggerakkan-nya. Demokrasi akan pergi ka-kiri atau ka-kanan mengikut arah steering yang di-pusingkan oleh pimpinan negara itu sendiri.

Pada mula-nya saya pernah menafikan atau tidak mahu menerima satu daripada tiori tentang demokrasi ini. Kata tiori itu demokrasi bukan-lah sa-benar-nya Kerajaan orang ramai, demokrasi ia-lah Kerajaan sa-kelompok manusia, tetapi aktif. Jadi, pada mula-nya saya tidak mahu menerima asas saperti ini. Akan tetapi, bila melihat kapada perkembangan² yang berlaku dalam satu dua tahun dalam negara kita ini, maka terasa-lah kapada saya betapa benar-nya tiori yang saperti ini—demokrasi bukan-lah Kerajaan orang ramai, tetapi Kerajaan sa-kelompok manusia, tetapi aktif

atau chergas bergerak, sama ada chergas melalui apa chara sahaja pun, itu masaalah lain.

Dapat-lah kita perhatikan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perjalanan demokerasi negeri ini menjelang Pilehan Raya tahun 1964, tekanan² yang berlaku di-seluruh negeri Kelantan sa-bagai mithal-nya, justeru negeri Kelantan pada masa itu di-perintah oleh PAS dan demi untuk menebus malu pehak Perikatan supaya sa-kali lagi dapat menampas PAS dan menubuhkan Kerajaan Perikatan di-sana, maka dapat-lah kita melihat bagaimana kegiatan (activities) yang di-lakukan oleh Kerajaan yang memegang asas demokerasi dalam menghadapi Pilehan Raya. Sa-kali menjelang Pilehan Raya bertambah-lah jumlah orang yang di-tangkap, sama ada di-bawah Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri atau pun yang di-tangkap di-bawah Prevention of Crime.

Habis Pilehan Raya Besar, 1964 meninggal pula aruah Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bachok dahulu, ia-itu-lah Yang Berhormat Enche' Zulkiflee Mohammad, di-adakan pula Pilehan Raya-Kechil di-Bachok. Berbelas orang pula yang kena tangkap di-bawah Prevention of Crime. Apa-kah Polis untuk menahan orang² di-bawah Undang² Kesalahan Jenayah itu hanya berlaku di-sa'at kempen Pilehan Raya sedang berjalan sahaja, atau apa-kah orang² yang di-sifatkan jahat itu hanya muncul sa-waktu kempen Pilehan Raya sedang bergolak. Apa-kah terdahulu daripada itu atau terkemudian daripada itu tidak ada orang² jahat, yang maka-nya penangkapan itu perlu di-lakukan di-sa'at ra'ayat hendak melaksanakan satu tugas besar-nya memberi undi keperchayaan mengikut asas² demokerasi dalam negeri ini? Ini menjadi tanda-tanya bagi seluroh orang² yang faham, insaf dan sedar akan keadaan politik pada masa ini. Kadang² kita terpaksa berfikir bagi mana-kah hendak di-adakan satu kebulatan tenaga ra'ayat dalam negeri ini kalau demikian-lah sikap kehidupan demokerasi yang berlaku dalam negara kita ini. Perasaan takut berkeliaran di-mana². Takut terlalu jinak

lebih jinak daripada sa-ekor semut yang merayap di-lantai yang burok. Perasaan takut sudah menjadi mewah dan sudah menjadi bagitu lumayan di-dalam tiap² kepala ra'ayat dalam negeri ini. Apa-kah nanti kita menyokong suatu parti politik akan di-sifatkan kita sa-bagai pengkhianat, sa-bagai orang yang subversive atau sa-bagai ini dan itu?

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka ma'alumkan bahawa ada sa-orang sahabat saya Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Dewan Ra'ayat dengan sa-chara rahsia saya dapat tahu dalam masa sabulan ini, bagaimana kira² kewangan dalam Bank-nya di-siasat oleh Special Branch untuk mengetahui sa-banyak mana wang yang ada dalam Bank kalau² ada baki wang daripada Indonesia atau sa-bagai-nya, tetapi alhamdulillah, sa-bahagian besar daripada Ahli² Dewan Ra'ayat yang ada simpanan dalam Bank pada penghujung bulan tulisan angka wang-nya merah sahaja yang sampai.

Ini-lah yang dapat kita nyatakan sa-chara terus-terang, jujur serta ikhlas bagaimana perasaan takut itu telah mulai merebak: takut di-kalangan ra'ayat dan takut di-kalangan Kerajaan sendiri. Kerajaan takut—terlalu takut dan gelisah dalam menghadapi suasana politik sekarang ini, menghadapi konferantasi, menghadapi perkembangan politik di-Timor Jauh dan menghadapi perkembangan² yang timbul sa-sudah ini dan itu, takut sa-hingga tunggul pun di-sanggakan hantu. Dan ra'ayat takut—takut kepada Kerajaan oleh kerana tekanan² yang berlaku sa-demi-kian rupa, oleh kerana bukan sahaja ahli politik yang boleh di-katakan sa-bagai sa-paroh pemimpin, malah ahli politik biasa, pengikut yang tidak mengenal alif, ba, ta politik pun di-tangkap.

Siapa yang dapat menyangka saperti Jajahan Kota Bharu, atau ta' usah-lah Kota Bharu, di-sakitar daerah, kata orang Kelantan, mukim, kata orang sa-belah sini, Mukim Limbat, satu kawasan Penghulu, sa-orang yang bernama Haji Mohammad, yang hanya pergi mengajar Quran pada 3-4 orang, boleh oleh kerana dalam kedai kopi

dia berchakap²: apa-lah Kerajaan Perikatan mithal-nya begitu, dia di-tahan di-bawah Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri bersama² dengan Ahli² Yang Berhormat. Siapa dalam negeri Kelantan itu yang kenalkan Haji Mohammad, Haji Mohammad yang mana, Haji Mohammad yang tidak pernah memakai coat dan yang tidak pernah memakai pantaloons, yang dia tahu kopian putih yang sudah berkarat di-birai-nya dengan baju kemeja dan kain sarong bergerak menanam padi, getah dan menorek getah—itu sahaja. Siapa yang tidak tahu, mithal-nya, di-pekan Pasir Tumboh sa-orang tua yang umur-nya 60 tahun lebeh nama-nya Haji Wan Ahmad, yang di-dalam sejarah hidup-nya tidak pernah sa-kali pun kena kesalahan jenayah, yang kerja-nya mendokong chuchu dan mengajar membacha Quran di-tangkap di-bawah P.C. (Prevention of Crime), di-buang jauh ka-Hulu Kelantan di-tempat harimau bertendang. Siapa yang tidak tahu?

Ini-lah sa-tengah daripada chachat² demokerasi yang berkembang dengan subur dan biak-nya dalam negeri ini. Ini-lah sa-tengah daripada-nya yang menyebabkan sa-bahagian besar orang sudah memandang bahawa demokerasi itu sudah tidak bernafas dan tidak bernyawa dan kadang² saya menggelar demokerasi yang liar sedang hidup dengan subur-nya mengganas dalam negeri ini.

Saya mengemukakan kesah² dan pandangan² ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-mata² hendak menchari kebaikan supaya Kerajaan yang di-pilih oleh ra'ayat ini di-pandang benar² sa-bagai Kerajaan ra'ayat, bukan Kerajaan menindas ra'ayat, akan di-pandang benar² sa-bagai Kerajaan demokerasi yang sihat, bukan demokerasi yang sudah kena penyakit T.B. atau penyakit cancer. Kita mengharapkan supaya Kerajaan yang di-pilih oleh ra'ayat ini berkhidmat membela ke'adilan dan bertimbang-rasa kepada seluroh ra'ayat, sama ada yang mengundi-nya atau pun tidak, sebab demikian pengajaran demokerasi kepada kita. Tidak sa-buah Kerajaan yang hanya tahu bertimbang-rasa kepada pengundi-nya, tetapi ber-

sikap kasar dan tegas terhadap orang² yang anti-partai-nya.

Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sudah-lah sampai masa-nya bagi Kerajaan kita ini mengubah sikap dan langkah dan bersikap lebeh lunak, lebeh lembut, lebeh bertimbang rasa terhadap ra'ayat dalam negeri ini dengan tidak mengenal bulu, ugama dan sa-bagai-nya.

Sa-lain daripada itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka masok sedikit kepada perkara² lain—perkara Kertas Putih. Sa-belum daripada saya menyentuh sedikit sa-banyak berkenaan dengan perkara yang berkaitan, yang sa-patut-nya saya menyatakan kepada Rumah yang mulia ini berkenaan dengan pendirian saya, Parti PAS, terutama sa-kali saya, menyesali terhadap Kerajaan yang telah menombor-duakan Anggota² Parlimen yang telah meletakkan taraf Anggota² Parlimen ini sa-bagai orang nombor dua. Kertas Putih Pakatan Khianat Pechah, baik di-dalam tulisan Rumi, atau pun di-dalam bahasa Inggeris yang di-berikan kepada Anggota² Parlimen pada pagi 1 haribulan March, tetapi orang² surat khabar, orang² radio dan talivishen telah menerima-nya lebeh awal daripada kita, walau pun di-chap-nya "Embargo", tetapi erti-nya mereka telah menerima lebeh awal daripada Anggota² Parlimen.

Saya dapat membacha kandungan Kertas Putih pada pagi hari sa-belum daripada saya menerima Kertas Putih yang rasmi, yang sa-patut-nya kita dapat terima lebeh awal dahulu daripada orang² lain. Apa-kah ini di-lakukan dengan tidak sengaja, atau di-sengajakan—terserah-lah kepada pehak Kerajaan sendiri, sebab dia yang melakukan, bukan sahaja Kertas Putih yang kita terima pada pagi itu, malah Orders of the Day dan lain² kertas yang biasa, yang kita dapat terima daripada tempat duduk kita sa-minggu lebeh dahulu, tetapi Parlimen kali ini sudah lain tabi'at-nya. Kita menerima pada pagi hari sa-belum persidangan ini di-jalankan, seperti orang yang gopoh-gapah yang hendak melakukan sa-suatu, atau hendak bertolak ka-mana² seperti orang tua yang nyanyok tidak

pernah ketinggalan penumbok sireh-nya, atau gobek-nya, kata orang Kelantan, tetapi pada kali itu, entah macham mana yang sentiasa terikat di-pinggang-nya itu ketinggalan. Baik-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berkenaan dengan kandungan Kertas Puteh ini.

Saya tidak hendak berchapak panjang, apa-kah orang² PAS yang termasuk nama-nya di-dalam Kertas Puteh ini benar² melakukan kesalahan, atau tidak—itu ada-lah soal-nya, bukan soal saya dan bukan soal PAS. Apa yang dapat saya nyatakan bahawa kalau benar gerakan itu di-lakukan, saya terpaksa katakan, kalau benar, sebab perkara ini maseh lagi di-dalam peringkat, di-dalam proses, kalau tidak permulaan pun—pertengahan, tidak sampai kepada hujung. Tayangan filem yang kita lihat pada petang ini bertambah terang dan jelas bahawa benda itu di-dalam proses.

Agak berlainan dengan siaran² radio yang di-keluarkan pada pagi 13 hari-bulan February—itu biar-lah soal proses, biar-lah kepada tukang dapur yang menentukan—Yang Berhormat Menteri Keselamatan Dalam Negeri sendiri, tetapi apa yang dapat saya tegaskan, seperti kenyataan saya di-dalam surat² khabar sa-sudah pechah-nya berita ini bahawa kalau itu berlaku, maka itu berlaku kegiatan orang persaorangan—tidak boleh di-libatkan sama sa-kali kepada diri PAS, atau diri orang² lain di-dalam PAS.

Di-dalam Kertas Puteh ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bacha yang tulisan Jawi-nya, muka 19, perenggan 69:

Satu meshuarat Jawatan-kuasa Kerja Pusat PAS telah di-adakan pada atau kira² 23hb Disember di-Ibu Pejabat PAS di-Kuala Lumpur untuk membincangkan perkara ini. Doctor Burhanuddin, Dato' Raja Abu Hanifah dan ahli PAS tersebut ada-lah antara beberapa orang yang hadir. Meshuarat itu membuat keputusan bahawa PAS, sa-bagai Pembangkang, tidak boleh menyetujui memasokkan wakil-nya dalam perwakilan Kerajaan tetapi hendak-lah menghantar perwakilan-nya sendiri. Dalam meshuarat itu wakil PAS yang berasingan itu tiada di-namakan.

Ini ia-lah soal menghantar wakil ka-Persidangan Algeria yang di-chadangkan dahulu hendak di-adakan dalam bulan March tahun 1965. Ini saya suka

menjelaskan di-dalam Rumah yang mulia ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bahawa berita, atau khabar yang di-tulis di-dalam Perenggan 69 ini belum chukup, ya'ani tidak penoh—belum chukup lagi berita ini; yang sa-patut, kalau-lah pehak Special Branch, atau intelligence, pehak Kerajaan ini, boleh dapatkan lagi butir² dengan lebeh jelas, akan bertambah nyata kedudukan-nya, tetapi ini tidak jelas dan tidak menchukupi bahawa Meshuarat Jawatan-kuasa Agong yang bersidang pada hari itu telah mengkaji kemungkinan Kerajaan menjemput sa-orang anggota Parlimen daripada PAS bersama² rombongan Malaysia ka-persidangan negara² berkechuali di-Algeria. "Kemungkinan" jikalau ada jemputan seperti itu. Itu-lah kajian, kesimpulan yang kami dapati bahawa pehak PAS tidak ber-setuju hendak memasokkan sa-orang anggota PAS di-dalam perwakilan Kerajaan, akan tetapi jikalau Jawatan-kuasa di-Algeria menjemput wakil PAS sa-bagai pemerhati,—“jikalau” di-jemput wakil PAS sa-bagai pemerhati, maka kita boleh-lah menerima jemputan itu sa-kadar sa-bagai pemerhati. Ini-lah kesimpulan-nya. Siapa yang hendak di-kirimkan itu, tidak di-putuskan, sebab benda itu “kalau” tidak berbangkit lagi—jemputan tidak di-terima, sama ada daripada Kerajaan Pusat—saya pun fikir, tentu-lah Kerajaan Pusat ini ta' hendak jemput orang PAS ini, sebab banyak rombongan² yang telah di-buat, ta' ada-lah orang PAS masok di-dalam-nya, kechuali dahulu sa-kali ada wakil PAS sa-orang termasuk di-dalam-nya ka-Persidangan Bangsa² Bersatu sa-bagai salah sa-orang daripada perwakilan Malaysia—ada sa-kali itu-lah! Terima kaseh-lah, akan datang ini ta' tahu-lah kita lagi, kok ta' perchaya lagi—itu dia punya fasal-lah, tetapi ini-lah dia kedudukan-nya tentang soal para 69.

Pada pandangan saya, keputusan yang seperti ini tidak ada apa², tidak-lah boleh hendak di-kaitkan dengan kegiatan ini, walau pun Dato' Raja, atau pun Dato' Raja Hanifah dan Dr Burhanuddin hadir dalam meshuarat itu, sebab memang beliau mesti hadir, kerana Dr Burhanuddin menjadi Yang di-Pertua Agong dan

Dato' Raja Hanifah menjadi Naib Yang di-Pertua Agong PAS.

Mereka mesti hadir tetapi dengan kehadiran orang² ini tidak boleh Kerajaan dengan sumberono chuba mengkaitkan di-dalam hakikat—mengkaitkan dengan sa-chara tidak langsung bahawa parti PAS ini terlibat. Saya tetap mempertahankan bahawa PAS tidak terlibat. Akan bertanya-lah orang bagaimana boleh di-katakan tidak terlibat sedangkan wang \$105,000 di-terima oleh Dato' Raja Hanifah bagi belanja kempen parti PAS.

Ini pun satu masaalah, saya terpaksa menong sa-bentar, apa-kah ini dan apa-kah erti-nya. Kenapa saya terpaksa termenong sa-bentar, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya sa-bagai Timbalan Yang di-Pertua Agong PAS, sa-sudah meninggal-nya Zulkiflee Muhammad, saya telah di-pilih menjadi Timbalan Yang di-Pertua Agong PAS menggantikan tempat Zulkiflee Muhammad. Erti-nya saya orang nombor dua dalam PAS sa-sudah Dr Burhanuddin, Dato' Raja Hanifah orang nombor tiga. Kalau kegiatan yang di-lakukan oleh Dato' Raja Hanifah sama ada menerima wang, sama ada apa sahaja seperti yang disebutkan di-dalam tayangan film baharu sa-bentar tadi sa-bagai gerakan PAS sa-chara indirect, tentu-lah saya yang lebeh tahu, sebab saya rasa, saya orang nombor dua.

Saya rasa, saya lebeh bertanggung-jawab daripada Dato' Raja Hanifah sendiri di-dalam mengendalikan bahtera PAS ini. Tetapi dengan sangat malang-nya perkara itu tidak sampai kepada pengetahuan saya sa-bagai Timbalan Yang di-Pertua, ini ia-lah fact bukan-lah perchakapan yang saya beri untuk membersehhkan diri, akan tetapi untuk menyatakan hakikat yang sa-benar. Saya pernah menyatakan ini kepada surat khabar, sama ada di-siarkan sa-penoh-nya itu soal lain, tetapi ini-lah kenyataan. Jadi, hendaklah kita sipatkan, jika benar gerakan² yang di-lakukan oleh sa-tengah² orang terutama kalangan PAS itu, maka itu ada-lah gerakan atau activity yang di-lakukan oleh orang persaorangan.

Enche' Tajudin bin Ali (Larut Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, minta

penjelasan. \$105,000, ketua PAS tidak tahu, apa pula kata-nya \$1,000 yang di-beri pinjam kepada Dato' Raja Hanifah?

Enche' Mohamed Asri bin Haji Muda: Saya hendak terangkan ini. Dalam surat khabar pun saya sudah mengaku itu. Saya, yang benar, saya mesti katakan benar, yang tidak, saya mesti katakan tidak. Sa-hingga-lah sampai kepada sa'at beliau kalah dalam pilihan raya dan beliau berchadang hendak pergi ka-Tokyo menghadziri Sukan Olympic di-Tokyo. Waktu di-adakan satu masa persidangan Raja² Melayu di-Kuala Lumpur ini, datang Dato' Raja Hanifah menyatakan, "aku tidak chukup duit-lah Asri, pinjam aku sedikit"; yang sa-benar-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya dengan Dato' Raja Hanifah ini kawan akrab. Bukan sa-kali itu saya pinjamkan duit kapada-nya tetapi tidak sampai ka-tangga \$1,000, kalau \$500 itu biasa saya pinjamkan dan biasa di-pulangkan balek—keperchayaan saya ada pada-nya. Saya berikan pinjam itu dengan sa-keping cheque. Akan berkata orang, alang-kah murah-nya hati saya meminjamkan sa-ribu ringgit. Di-kalangan kami ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perkara seperti itu biasa berlaku. Kalau persahabatan sudah begitu, pinjaman boleh di-berikan. Kalau saya tahu Dato' Raja Hanifah dapat menerima duit begitu banyak; entah-lah barangkali terlalu tolol-lah, saya tidak tahukan duit itu sudah di-terima, ta'kan saya bagi pinjaman itu. Sampai sekarang ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, wang itu tidak bayar. Ini dia-lah dudok-nya hakikat perkara ini. Apa-kah guna-nya saya menafikan yang saya bagi sa-ribu ringgit bukan-lah saya hendak mengelakkan diri saya tetapi ini kenyataan.

Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, banyak lagi perkara² yang di-kaitkan di-dalam Kertas Puteh ini tentang soal perjuangan membentuk Malaysia yang PAS ini menentang, dan oleh kerana PAS ini menentang Malaysia maka besar-lah kemungkinan bahawa PAS itu terlibat dengan gerakan hendak meleborkan Malaysia ini sendiri. Memang PAS ini menentang Malaysia, Tuan Yang di-Pertua—menentang gagasan Malaysia. Sa-waktu gagasan Malaysia itu mula²

di-muncholkan, PAS telah mengadakan mesuarat agong khas di-Hotel Majestic, di-Kuala Lumpur dan telah mengambil keputusan kita menentang. Barangkali Dewan ini maseh tidak lupa waktu Malaysia Act di-bentangkan dalam Rumah yang mulia ini, Ahli daripada Bachok, pada masa itu Zulkiflee Muhammad, telah berchakap hampir 3 jam sa-tengah membahathkan Undang² tersebut, ini tidak dapat dinafikan.

Saya boleh bacha keratan daripada ucapan Enche' Zulkiflee itu sendiri berkenaan dengan kenapa PAS tidak bersetuju dengan Malaysia ini sendiri. Sa-bagaimana kata-nya kedudukan bangsa Melayu dalam bilangan akan berkekurangan, ini satu fact dan bagi sa-tengah orang yang tidak memandang kan kepada kurang lebeh-nya bangsa Melayu dalam negeri ini ia-itu perkara kecil, mari kita hadapi kata-nya, biar hanchor mari kita hadapi. Perkara saperti itu chara yang sesat sa-telah kita mengetahui bahawa perimbangan kedudukan bilangan ra'ayat negeri itu saperti yang ada sekarang ini pun berkehendakkan layanan, maka sudah pada tempat-nya kita insaf dan sedar jangan oleh kerana khayal kita, maka kita lakukan sa-suatu yang akan memberi kehurokan kepada bangsa kita sendiri.

Kata sa-tengah Ahli Yang Berhormat bagaimana PAS mahukan Maphilindo, dengan terang dia tidak mahu dengan Malaysia. Dia mahu kepada buah tetapi tidak mahu kepada pokok. Saya terpaksa-lah memberi tahu bahawa pokok Malaysia tidak akan membuah kan Maphilindo. Saya terpaksa-lah kuatkan sedikit kata Yang Berhormat itu lagi, tidak akan dapat Maphilindo itu di-timbulkan oleh Malaysia, sebab duri² dan hama² yang ada dalam pokok Malaysia itu, sudah cukup untuk menghapuskan bibet² Maphilindo; entah-lah kalau ada Malaysia 'ajaib tetapi kita mahu memperkatakan fact—kenyataan—apabila jadi Malaysia, maka akan bertambah bilangan orang² yang bukan Melayu, orang² tidak ada tersebut di-dalam Manila Accord itu. Ini sa-bahagian kecil

Mr Speaker: Berapa lama lagi Yang Berhormat hendak berchakap?

Enche' Mohamed Asri bin Haji Muda: Sadikit lagi.

Mr Speaker: Ini sudah dekat satu jam.

Enche' Mohamed Asri bin Haji Muda: Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya sambong sedikit lagi. Kata-nya dalam Manila Accord di-Manila dinyatakan bahawa Manila Accord adalah timbul daripada orang² sarumpun bangsa tetapi dengan orang² yang tidak sarumpun bangsa sudah bertambah bilangan-nya. Apa-kah jalan bahawa Maphilindo ini akan dapat timbul di-dalam Malaysia. Sa-orang Ahli Yang Berhormat telah berkata dengan chara falsafah-nya ia-itu kita tidak ingin kepada quality. Baik juga, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tetapi peti undi tidak tahu quality dia tahu quantity. Dia tidak kenal yang elok tetapi dia kenal apa yang banyak undi. Kalau ra'ayat-nya berkeinginan kepada mengenakan diri-nya kepada warna yang tertentu dalam masyarakat yang dia berasal bukan daripada gulungan Maphilindo sendiri, maka kalau-lah angan² yang mengatakan Maphilindo akan di-buahkan oleh Malaysia ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita tambahkan lagi di-dalam Dewan Ra'ayat yang mulia ini dengan satu usul—usul yang tegas supaya pembentokan Maphilindo itu di-lakukan dengan sa-berapa segera-nya. Akan tetapi, pada masa itu oleh sa-suatu hal dan keadaan, usul kita tidak mendapat tempat. Memang bagitu-nya sa-barang usul daripada PAS ini jarang mendapat tempat. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bila kita kajikan rintisan perjalanan politik negeri ini sejak dari dahulu sampai sekarang ini, maka akan tersiar dan ternyata-lah kepada kita bahawa Persatuan Islam sa-Tanah Melayu ini di-dalam menuju chita²-nya dia tidak berchadang dan berniat sa-kali² akan menempoh jalan lain sa-lain daripada jalan Perlembagaan atau jalan demokerasi.

PAS menentang Malaysia, tetapi Malaysia wujud—wujud oleh kerana memang ia di-kehendaki wujud walau pun kita tahu bahawa dalam chara pengwujutan itu maseh banyak dapat di-pertanggung-jawabkan dan di-pertengkarkan, akan tetapi dia tetap wujud walau pun undi yang di-jalankan

di-Singapura, perwakilan daripada Bangsa² Bersatu telah pergi ka-Sabah dan Sarawak, tetapi apa yang berlaku dalam Persekutuan Tanah Melayu pada masa itu tidak pernah di-lakukan seperti yang demikian, dan malah di-dalam kempen pilihan raya, baik Perikatan yang menang itu pun, tidak pernah terchantum asas²-nya hendak mewujudkan satu Malaysia.

Kerajaan² Negeri tidak di-bawa berunding dan itu-lah yang menyebabkan Kerajaan PAS di-negeri Kelantan membuat satu penda'awaan terhadap Kerajaan Pusat kerana mewujudkan Malaysia dengan chara² yang mengikut pandangan-nya tidak betul, yang penda'awaan itu maseh tersimpan dalam Mahkamah. Bila pembicharaan itu soal Mahkamah dan oleh kerana negeri kita dalam keadaan samedikian, saya pun lebih suka-lah *case* itu simpan dahulu. Kita berunding sa-mula-lah, sebab kita sekarang tengah sebok sedikit menghadapi Indonesia ini, ta' apa-lah yang kita berkelahi sama sendiri ini kita masok dalam file K.I.V. tetapi benda itu tetap wujud seperti itu. Malaysia wujud. Penentangan PAS terhadap gagasan Malaysia pun wujud.

Tetapi, kata saya tadi, kita menghendaki tujuan kita itu lahir melalui chara² Perlembagaan dan melalui chara² yang benar dan betul yang di-halalkan, sebab itu kita akui kenyataan ini dan kita berjuang di-dalam negara Malaysia sekarang ini. Parti PAS telah merupakan parti politik dalam Malaysia. Di-Sabah PAS telah menubuhkan chawangan dan mungkin di-Sarawak akan di-tubuhkan juga—di-Singapura memang telah ada. Kerajaan PAS Kelantan sa-sudah Pilihan Raya, walau pun undi berkurangan daripada dahulu oleh sebab² seperti yang saya cheritakan tadi, maseh tetap merupakan Kerajaan PAS ia-itu satu yunit atau satu negara bahagian di-dalam sa-buah negara yang bernama Malaysia. Ini erti-nya mengakui wujud-nya kenyataan. Dan ini menunjokkan bagaimana chara perjuangan Parti PAS ini berasas kapada Perlembagaan.

Kita berkehendakkan kapada chita² yang lohor mengikut pandangan kita,

tetapi chara yang kita berkehendakkan itu ia-lah dengan chara *legal*, chara Perlembagaan dan chara demokrasi, sebab itu-lah di-mana² sahaja pun kita menghendaki semangat demokrasi itu, sama ada chita² itu akan berjaya atau pun sama ada chita² itu akan berkubor atau tenggelam atau pun akan timbul dan tegak, bergantung-lah kapada masa akan datang dan bergantung-lah kapada sa-juah mana fahaman ra'ayat dapat mengikuti kehendak chita² PAS yang benar. Kalau orang tidak dapat ikuti dan kalah Pilihan Raya, tidak-lah salah bagi saya dan tidak-lah salah bagi PAS, salah-nya orang tidak mahu. Apa boleh buat? Dan kalau Kerajaan Perikatan ini kalah dalam Pilihan Raya pada masa akan datang, oleh kerana perkembangan² politik baharu, pengundi² bangsa asing banyak mital-nya, naik satu parti lain yang dapat mempengaruhi orang² asing umpama-nya, tidak-lah boleh di-salahkan Perdana Menteri atau Menteri Hal Ehwal Dalam Negeri, tetapi salah-nya orang tidak mahu, dan kita terpaksa-lah redha menerima keadaan kejadian seperti itu. Ini-lah demokrasi nama-nya.

Saya perchaya sangat kapada asas² demokrasi ini seperti kepercayaan yang di-beri oleh Allahyarham Enche' Zulkiflee Mohammad sa-bagai pemimpin kami dahulu, kepercayaan itu yang saya pikul sa-bagai satu amanah yang besar yang akan di-teruskan sampai ka-masa akan datang, sehingga Tuhan menentukan kalah menang-nya. Ini-lah asas perjuangan kami.

Jadi, Kertas Puteh yang di-keluarkan oleh pehak Kerajaan ini tidak sedikit pun menggoyangkan semangat perjuangan PAS (Persatuan Islam sa-Tanah Melayu) dan kawan² saya sa-bagai Ahli Dewan ini, sebab kami perchaya bahawa asas perjuangan kami di-sini ada-lah benar. Kegiatan itu kalau benar, kegiatan orang persorangan. Siapa yang buat, kalau salah, dia tanggung. Kami tidak menyertai gerakan seperti itu. Chuma satu daripada keputusan yang di-buat oleh PAS ia-lah menghendaki orang² itu di-adili dalam Mahkamah, bukan

kerana tidak perchaya kepada penguasaan itu, soal perchaya dan tidak perchaya tidak-lah soal mutlak. Akan tetapi, kita berkehendakkan bahawa kesalahan-nya itu di-nyatakan dalam Mahkamah dan dia di-adili, sama ada sa-bagai pengkhianat, sama ada sa-bagai *hero* atau sama ada sa-bagai orang yang tersasul oleh kerana salah perjalanan. Itu kehendak dan kehendak itu sampai sekarang ini maseh kita pegang. Kita tidak ragu² bahawa kehendak itu-lah kehendak yang sa-benar² yang adil supaya mereka dapat-lah merasa bagaimana perkara mereka di-adili. Dan ra'ayat akan tahu—akan tahu dengan chara benar bahawa mereka itu telah melakukan sa-suatu. Ini bukan sahaja terkena kepada orang² itu, malah orang² yang terdahulu dari itu pun patut-nya-lah di-lakukan saperti demikian. Sa-sudah itu kita kembali berkuat antara kita sama kita, bersehekan semua sa-kali perasaan dendam tersumat, kemudian kita bersatu menghadapi musuh negara kita dengan hati yang redha dan ikhlas, sebab ini-lah chara yang menasabah dan satu chara yang benar bagi menjamin kekuatan negara kita.

Beri-lah berapa banyak senjata sa-kali pun, datang-lah bantuan Amerika pulohan melion dolar sa-kali pun, datang-lah tentera² daripada Australia, Canada dan New Zealand Malaysia, tidak dapat mempertahankan diri-nya dengan kuat dan utuh dan kita tidak akan dapat berdiri tegoh kalau ra'ayat tidak bersatu-padu. Yang di-namakan ra'ayat itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-lah termasuk Ahli² Perikatan, Ahli² PAS, Ahli² Socialist Front dan parti² lain dan orang yang parti atas pagar, P.A.P. Tanah Melayu, bukan P.A.P. Singapura parti atas pagar itu. Itu yang di-namakan ra'ayat. Ikhtiar Kerajaan sekarang ini sa-berapa boleh menyatupadukan sikap kita bersama dalam menghadapi musuh yang sama dengan tidak mengira fahaman politik yang ada kepada masing² orang, yang ada pada masing² pemimpin atau yang ada pada masing² parti. Sa-barang sikap, sa-barang usaha, sa-barang perbuatan, sama ada yang di-lakukan oleh Menteri sendiri atau yang di-lakukan oleh Kerajaan atau

di-lakukan oleh kaki-tangan Kerajaan yang boleh menimbulkan rasa retak dan pechah sama sendiri maka itu-lah merupakan pengkhianat yang besar di-dalam chita² untuk mempertahankan kedaulatan negara. Sa-kian-lah sahaja, Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

The Minister of Home Affairs and Minister of Justice (Dato' Dr Ismail): Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not think we need fear that the people of this country will be afraid that we are marching towards totalitarianism because of the recent detention of the Socialist Front leaders, because the people of the country know, as was evidenced at the last general election, that the Internal Security Act is a necessary instrument to be given to the Government, so that our country would be saved from communism and, in particular, from Soekarno and his clique. What I fear is that the people of this country would lose faith in democracy, because of the abuse of democracy by the Opposition Parties especially the Socialist Front (*Applause*). The people of this country would lose faith in democracy if I were to fail in my duty to them. They have given me a mandate, as a Member of this Government, to see that this country is secure, that our independence is guaranteed. Sir, I plead guilty to the people of this country because I have not exercised the power given to me as rigorously as I should have done; (*Applause*) but in mitigation to the people of the country, I say that I would rather risk taking chances rather than that I should implement the Internal Security Act as a totalitarian regime would implement it. (HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!).

Sir, the arrests of these people, who consort with the communists, who conspire with the communists, who conspire with Soekarno and his clique, so that this country would be under the domination either of the communists or of Soekarno, give security to the people of this country (*Applause*). The arrests of these people ensure stability to this country (*Applause*). The arrests of these people give confidence to foreign capital to come to

this country. (AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear! Hear!) (*Applause*).

Sir, let us go into all the arguments put forward especially by the Member for Dato Kramat in his allegations that this Government is marching towards totalitarianism. First of all, he brought up all the old, old arguments which had been debated fully in this House whenever the Internal Security Act was mentioned. He mentioned about the freedom of the press. It is true that the press has to take a licence, but it is not true that the press of this country is muzzled. There are many instances of reporting by the press which in other countries would have entailed the banning of the press but which this Government, believing in democracy, just forget. In the case of criticisms of other more sensitive governments, who are not well nurtured in democracy, a young country emerging into democracy would ban the press, but we would rather have the press criticise us and we reply accordingly in a democratic manner.

Sir, the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat gave an instance of the suppression of the press. He mentioned about a certain newspaper man who, he said, had vanished because he dared to criticise the Government. Now, my information is that that particular gentleman is now with the *Straits Times* and is playing a leading part in the *Straits Times*. This is the sort of "truths" that we expect from Members of the Opposition (*Applause*).

Sir, let us see all the reasons put forward by the Members of the Socialist Front in this House. The Honourable Member for Dato Kramat made a lengthy speech—and here, incidentally, Sir, I think there is no greater tribute to this Government that democracy is functioning in this country than what we have witnessed today. This is a motion by a Member of the Opposition. The whole morning was taken by two Members of the Socialist Front, the last one hour was taken by a Member of the Opposition Party, the Leader of P.A.S. in this House, whereas the Government is only left with an hour to reply to them.

Sir, talking about democracy, there is such a thing as "practice of democracy" which is not written into the Standing Rules and Orders but it is accepted in Parliament, and that is, you must consider that there are other people in this House besides yourself who would like to speak (*Applause*).

Now, Sir, the Honourable Member for Batu has referred to the incident on the 13th February, 1965. Sir, an illegal demonstration was held by the Socialist Front in Kuala Lumpur. I would like to inform this House that the Police were aware that such an illegal procession would be held in defiance of the Police decision not to issue a permit earlier. Though it was contended that there was no intention to hold a rally on the morning of the 13th February, the situation outside the Socialist Front building had by then become very grave. The Honourable Member for Batu himself witnessed that. He went with a Police officer and a military officer and tried to appease the crowd. He was booed and jeered—that much control the leaders of the Socialist Front have over their followers. It was obvious that the leaders were no longer able to exercise control over the mob. The Police would only be failing in their duty if they did not intervene in the way they did.

In this connection also, I believe the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat mentioned that several persons who were arrested by the Police under the Public Order Preservation Ordinance, 1958, were ill-treated by the Police in that they were subjected to various inconveniences. Sir, I am a frank Member of this House. I am noted for that. I admit that there would be some who had to undergo a certain amount of discomfort in the Police lock-up, but it should be noted at the same time that the Police lock-ups are built to cope with normal circumstances, and very few people are locked up during the night. In such an emergency as the one that took place on the 13th February, it is quite likely that certain discomforts would be experienced by some of those arrested

in view of the seriousness of the situation.

An allegation was made that there was no proper sanitary system in Police stations. But, Sir, Police stations are inspected by Health Inspectors twice a week and anything that was found to be unhealthy from the sanitary point of view would certainly be pointed out. In this connection, I wish to point out that some members of the Police Force still have quarters which are in the same condition as Police stations with regard to the sanitary system. I would like to inform this House that my Ministry is now looking seriously into the question of improving the conditions of the various Police stations as well as the living quarters of the members of the Police Force.

Sir, if I remember correctly, an attempt was made by the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat to link the arrest of an Opposition Member, Mr V. David, to the plot dealt with in the White Paper. I would like to state here, Sir, that Mr V. David was not arrested for that reason. Honourable Members may be aware that under the Internal Security Act, 1960, the Police are empowered to arrest and detain a person for a period of 30 days after which the case would have to be submitted through me to the Cabinet for decision as to whether or not an order of detention should be issued.

Now, Sir, the Honourable Member for Batu, I think, or Dato Kramat—I cannot remember which Honourable Member stated that one of the conditions imposed by the Police on the holding of a rally in Kampar was that the subject of American intervention in the Congo should not be discussed. Sir, maybe what he said is true, but the Police may have their reasons for doing so. Certainly, if the Honourable Member feels very strongly about it—this is a political question—he could easily ring me up and I would consider his complaint from the political angle. The Police purely considered it from the security angle.

The Honourable Member for Batu also alleged that detainees were living in poor conditions, being confined to

a small room. Now, Sir, after having heard the statements from Dato' Raja Abu Hanifah and Enche' Ishak bin Haji Mohamed with regard to the living conditions, I do not think I need elaborate on them at all.

I now come to the White Paper itself. Now, Sir, the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat went into the White Paper in detail. However, one thing was quite clear to all of us here in that he never convinced us that those people arrested were not connected in a conspiracy by Soekarno and his regime to down this country. During the two hours that both Honourable Members have spoken, they have never denied that these people were involved in a conspiracy against us. They go into the details of the matter, questioning this page and that page.

However, Sir, there are certain queries raised by the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat regarding the various extracts of letters used in the White Paper. Now, Sir, he has seen the papers, and the Press also has seen the papers. He has doubted the authenticity of those letters, and I would let the Press, who saw those papers, and the public to judge. We have nothing to hide.

Sir, those who were detained for involvement in a conspiracy to overthrow this Government and who have given active support to our enemy should consider themselves lucky indeed that they perpetrated this act under the Alliance Government (*Applause*). If this Government were a totalitarian Government, as is suggested in the motion, those Honourable Members would not be alive today! (*Applause*). (HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!). They would be shot right away! (*Laughter*) (*Applause*) I think even the Members of the Opposition would think that, in this particular instance, the I.S.A. is a real blessing to them.

Sir, on the question whether these people should be brought into a court of law, or whether they should be taken in under the Internal Security Act, I would like to make it quite clear

that the Internal Security Act is as much the law of the country as any other law; and, what is more, we have the mandate of the people to use the Internal Security Act to make this country secure, to protect our independence, and to put those who are traitors and those who conspire with the Soekarno regime inside to be the guests of His Majesty (*Applause*).

Sir, I agree with the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat, after seeing the film today, that the two people were really pathetic. Enche' Ishak bin Haji Mohamed admitted that he conspired, and in mitigation he said that it was all for money. Dato' Raja Abu Hanifah admitted that he conspired, giving as his reason that he was misled by the Melayu Raya of Indonesia. Now, Sir, it is not for me to pass judgment on what is the effect on the people of this country of the Socialist Front denying that the acts of these people are divorced from those of the Party. It is contended that Enche' Ishak bin Haji Mohamed did the act in his personal capacity rather than in the name of the Party. It is contended by PAS that Dato' Raja Abu Hanifah also did the act in his personal capacity, and in this instance I must give credit to PAS in that they did not dispute, except for certain passages, the authenticity of the evidence in the White Paper. Sir, the essence of any democratic party is that the top leaders are responsible. In a lighter vein, I am sure Honourable Members will remember the famous Christine Keeler's case (*Laughter*), which led to the fall of the Conservative Government.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Conservative Government did not fall as a result of the Profumo's case—this is merely to put the record straight.

Dato' Dr Ismail: Well, this is a matter of opinion. After all, the people of this country will judge you at the next election!

Now, Sir, I am very much surprised that the Honourable Member for Batu in this case—I have always admired him, but today he has fallen in my estimation (*Laughter*)—condescended

to make use of communalism in order to buttress his case: he has told the PAS, "Look, don't you regret having supported the I.S.A.? You were told that this I.S.A. would be used against the non-Malays!" He has heard the Member for Pasir Puteh this morning denying even those whispers that were reported to have been made.

Sir, the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat, as usual, having heard himself speak in an unparliamentary and undemocratic manner, refused to be here to listen to the Government's side of the story, not even for fifteen minutes—and this is the man who tries to teach democracy in this country (*Laughter*). Now, Sir, he even, I think, rather unjustly accused the Government, he said that the film that was shown at 3 o'clock today was censored because there were "cuts" in the film. I have not seen that film myself, Sir. It was just processed and was shown as it was taken. Naturally, there were some disconnections in that film, but to say that that film had been purposely cut just to suit our case is rather unfair, in view of the fact that we have invited all the Opposition Members to see that for the first time, as we do.

One of the arguments used by the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat is that all political parties accept donations, and he asked why should the Socialist Front be denied this opportunity of taking donations. Sir, there is nothing wrong for political parties to take donations, but I suggest that it is wrong for you to take donations from the enemies of this country (*Applause*). That is where the wrong is. You take money from Soekarno and his regime who is trying to down this country—and you call that in line with democratic practice to collect donations!

It was contended by the Member for Dato Kramat that "This plot is nibbed in the bud, and so what is the fuss?" (*Laughter*). Is he suggesting, Sir, to let the horse get out of the stable and then close the door? But this is not horse racing. This is a fight with Soekarno and his regime, and we will nib the Socialist Front every time in

the bud whenever we find it trying to conspire with Soekarno and his regime.

Sir, he criticises that there is something lacking in the White Paper because there were no appendices. Sir, this is a White Paper. This is not a treatise on how the Socialist Front conspired with Soekarno and his regime, as there is no time to do research and to bound it properly. We are not interested in the Socialist Front as such. We are interested in them in the way that they conspire with Soekarno and his regime to down this Government and this country.

Sir, I have always advised the Socialist Front to set up a really socialist party. Don't rely on the communists, don't rely on Soekarno and his regime. Soekarno has let down our astute Prime Minister many a time and what are the members of the Socialist Front and their children in the hands of Soekarno? "Don't trust Soekarno", I advise them, "depend on yourself and be a really socialist opposition party in this country." Here is a chance for such a budding man like the Member for Batu (*Laughter*) to set up a real, democratic, socialist party. I extend my hand to him to help him to get rid of the communists, to get rid of all the traitors from his party. We would like real opposition in this country. As for myself, I would even like a real and democratic socialist government if it can convince the people of this country. That is our belief in democracy. I have advised them many a time. If they have taken my advice, there would have been no more arrests (*Laughter*). Instead of blaming me for the arrests, they should blame themselves for conspiring with Soekarno and his regime for being the tools of the communists in this country.

Now, I come to our sleek friend, the Member for Pasir Puteh, who is also the Menteri Besar of Kelantan. Sir, I am glad that he did not deny what was in this White Paper, except on one fact about the proceedings of the Central Executive of PAS. Well, I do not want to comment on that. I stand by with what is stated in this White Paper.

Di-sini saya hendak berchakap dalam bahasa kebangsaan sedikit. Saya tidak boleh berchakap terlampau halus dan terlampau faham sa-bagaimana Ahli dari Pasir Puteh, yang pertama saya tidak-lah berapa pandai menggunakan perkataan² yang chantek², memujok macham Perdana Menteri, saya ini orang yang lurus yang kata orang Kedah "bebal" (*Ketawa*). Yang pertama dia mengatakan bagaimana-kah hendak di-katakan demokerasi dalam negeri ini, tokoh² PAS ditangkap dengan chara politik, kemudian di-lepaskan dengan chara politik. Yang sa-benar-nya, tidak ada masa hendak di-mainkan pula *recording* Tuan Haji Omar di-sini, kerana di-situ akan menunjukkan bagaimana di-negeri Kelantan dahulu di-salahgunakan ugama dalam *election*, dan orang ini di-tahan bukan-lah saya menyalahgunakan Internal Security Act ini, dan jika termasuk politik dalam Internal Security Act ini, saya menuduh Ahli dari Pasir Puteh ini yang mula membawa politik dalam Internal Security Act ini. Kalau dia merayu kepada saya—ini dia merayu kepada Perdana Menteri, dia tahu Tunku Perdana Menteri ini lemah hati, murah hati (*Ketawa*). Merayu kepada Perdana Menteri minta lepaskan. Dia tahu saya senyum susah hendak di-beli kata dia (*Ketawa*). Jadi, saya yang bertanggungjawab, dia terus kepada Tunku Perdana Menteri.

Jadi, bila orang ini di-lepaskan oleh sebab pada taksir Special Branch tidak ada merbahaya lagi. Jadi, parti saya hendak membuat chara politik juga hendak menyambut orang ini. Tetapi siapa yang mula bawa politik dalam Internal Security ini? Jadi terlibat politik dalam Internal Security Act ini ia-lah PAS yang mula-nya. Kalau dia berjumpa saya, saya akan terangkan kenapa orang ini semua kena tangkap, dan bila masa dia akan di-lepaskan. Dia merayu kepada

Enche' Mohamed Asri bin Haji Muda: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menghantar rayuan kepada Yang Teramat Mulia Perdana Menteri dan tidak kepada Menteri Keselamatan Dalam Negeri itu bukan kerana politik, kerana saya memandang Tunku

Perdana Menteri sa-bagai Kepala Kerajaan dan Ketua Kabinet.

Dato' Dr Ismail: Saya tahu merayu kapada Perdana Menteri ini kerana beliau hati-nya lemah-lembut (*Ketawa*). Itu sebab banyak perkara² beliau serahkan kapada saya sekarang (*Ketawa*). Jadi, itu-lah sebab-nya terlibat politik dalam Internal Security Act ini.

Orang² yang di-tahan itu mengikut pada taksir Special Branch merbahaya kapada negeri ini, oleh sebab menyalahgunakan ugama dalam *election*.

Berkenaan dengan soal Ahli² yang Berhormat itu telah di-selideki yang di-simpan dalam Bank, saya fikir kalau Ahli² PAS tidak ada membuat apa² kesalahan tentu-lah suka yang kira²-nya itu di-pereksa. Oleh sebab, Dato' Mohamed Hanifah bukan orang ahli biasa, tetapi ahli yang tinggi dalam Parti PAS. Kalau hendak di-siasat pun berkenaan dengan Dato' Mohamed Hanifah, kerana Parti PAS ini walau bagaimana pun hendak nafilah ini tidak kena-mengena dengan Parti PAS, tetapi dia dahulu menjadi sa-orang penganjur Parti PAS. Jadi, kalau di-pereksa kira² Ahli² PAS dalam Bank, kalau betul-lah hendak beri kerjasama tolong Special Branch supaya di-pereksa semua sa-kali kira² Parti PAS itu (*Ketawa*).

Yang kedua, Ahli dari Pasir Puteh menuduh yang saya-lah membelakangkan Parlimen ini kerana Kertas Puteh ini di-beri kapada surat khabar dahulu sa-belum di-beri kapada Ahli² Yang Berhormat. Saya telah berunding dengan Parlimen dan saya kata saya tidak hendak beri kapada surat khabar kalau Kertas Puteh ini belum di-hantar kapada Ahli² Yang Berhormat sakalian. Kalau tidak dapat itu bukan salah saya, dan surat khabar pula sa-bagaimana yang di-katakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat itu di-embargokan (*embargo*) benda ini.

Jadi, penghabisan-nya sa-kali—saya ta' hendak berchakap panjang, chuma saya mengambil masa dua puloh minit sahaja, tetapi bagi Ahli² Yang Berhormat daripada Pembangkang mengambil masa empat jam, dan yang penghabisan sa-kali ia-lah atas soal

orang² yang di-bawah restricted residence. Di-sini, saya fikir, Menteri² Besar baharu² ini bersetuju dengan saya, dahulu kuasa hendak melepaskan orang² restricted residence ini di-beri kapada semua Menteri² Besar bagi tiap² Negeri—sekarang saya sudah terek balek, kerana saya nampak, barangkali, ramai di-antara Menteri² Besar ini ada yang bersifat macham Tunku, lemah sangat, barangkali ada berlainan sadikit. Tunku ini orang-nya tulus ikhlas kadang²—yang lain² itu dia lemah, kerana hendak menggunakan orang² itu pula. Jadi, itu saya terek balek-lah fasal restricted residence yang mana sekarang ini di-bawah kuasa saya, saya yang bertanggung-jawab dan jikalau ada bagaimana yang di-katakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Pasir Puteh tadi ada mengatakan, yang polis salah menggunakan perkara ini, rayu kapada saya, minta kapada saya dan saya akan selideki. Jangan merayu kapada Perdana Menteri—banyak kerja dia. Dia ini pun kadang² lemah sangat (*Ketawa*). Jangan merayu kapada dia.

Sir, I think I have taken enough of the time of Honourable Members and I hope I have rebutted all the arguments put forward by Members of the Opposition. I would plead with Honourable Members of the Opposition that democracy can only flourish in this country if they co-operate with the Government to make this parliamentary democracy succeed. There are many a country who have departed from the path of democracy, most of them, because the Opposition, when they could not get things in the constitutional way, tried to do it unconstitutionally. So, my advice to Members of the Opposition is to try to emulate the Alliance Government and be really democratic. Then democracy in this country is guaranteed and our sovereignty will be guaranteed and Soekarno and his regime will be defeated. Thank you (*Applause*).

Mr Speaker: I would like to ask the Member for Batu how long he will take to wind up the debate.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Five minutes.

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: *Rises.*

Mr Speaker: I am afraid the Opposition should give a chance to the other side of the House (*Applause*).

Dr Ng Kam Poh (Telok Anson): Mr Speaker, Sir, it is not for me now to take all your time. I have more or less, as you can see, packed up to go home, because I know the tactics of the Opposition. They took the whole morning, then the whole afternoon and now they want to speak again. So what is the point in waiting? However, I would like to clarify a few points.

The motion says, "the march towards totalitarianism in Malaysia as evidenced by the arrest of leaders", and asks for their trial or that they be conditionally freed. Now, Sir, I have taken the trouble to go to the library to find out the exact meaning of "totalitarianism". The word "totalitarian", according to the Oxford Dictionary, means relating to a policy that permits no rival loyalties or parties; state with only one, the governing party. According to Webster's Dictionary, it is "designating, of, or characteristic of a government or state in which one political party or group maintains complete control and illegalizes all others." Sir, I can see the Members from the P.A.P. there: I can see the Socialist Front Member from Batu; of course, I seldom see the Member for Dato Kramat; this is the fourth time I think that he has been to Parliament—I suppose perhaps because he has a few cases in Kuala Lumpur which he has to fight for, but this is the fourth time in my knowledge that he has been to Parliament: first for half-an-hour, second for 15 minutes, third for 15 minutes, and this is the fourth time—I stand corrected of course. However, the P.M.I.P. is also there. Now, how can you call our Government a totalitarian one when we have Opposition Members here who take the whole morning—two of them took the whole of this morning—voicing their opinion against us? They say, as evidence, that we have arrested their leaders. Now, is it totalitarian? Is it proper? That is the point at issue. We arrested them under the Internal Security Act and, as pointed out by the Honourable

Minister of Home Affairs, this issue of the Internal Security Act was debated in Parliament and, best of all, was also debated in the general elections in 1964. My opponent then was a Socialist Front Member. He brought up the question of the Internal Security Act and the possibilities of abuse and so on and so forth. This was debated and he was defeated. The Opposition Members from Dato Kramat and Batu have gone the whole gamut from Malaysia to the Internal Security Act, going forward to totalitarianism, then coming back again talking about "suitability certificates" and so forth. But let us go to the point. What is the motive behind this motion?

Does the Honourable Member for Batu really want us to take these people to court, because he knows full well that should they go to court and lose they would be charged with treason and thereby they would be hanged? If the Government loses the case, they will be free. Now, what is the motive behind this motion? Sir, I put it to the Member for Batu that his party is urging him on knowing full well that these people if they go to an open court will lose and die and they, the others, will take over power (*Laughter*). I put it to him that the Communists are behind him in this matter. I also put it to him that the Member for Dato Kramat who is so blase today and who fled during the riots and went to Penang and gave a press statement

Mr Speaker: May I interrupt you? Take over the power of Government or of the party?

Dr Ng Kam Poh: Of their party (*Laughter*). I also contend that they want these people to die so that they can take over power in the party—in Penang too—because as you know this is inter-party politics. They might want them to die. So he asks me to raise my hand. If I raise my hand, they will win the motion; we will go to court; they will die; and these people will become leaders (*Laughter*). Sir, I do not mind the Member for Batu being a leader of the Socialist Front. Obviously I know him for the

last six years or more and to be honest I do not think he is a Communist (*Laughter*). I do not think the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat too is a Communist. I think he is a silly-headed man, but still, to be fair, I do not think he is a Communist, because both of them are millionaires. How can they be Communists?

Sir, the fact remains that this motion so puts the Government in a way that we have to reject this motion, because our Government is kind enough just to put them under detention; should we accept his motion they will be hanged. So, Mr Speaker, Sir, I ask all our Members here to reject this motion and let the people who are in detention have a chance to live unless they want to die themselves (*Laughter*).

Mr Speaker, Sir, in conclusion, I would like to say that the riots which the Member for Batu spoke so much about were communist inspired—there is no doubt. They knew full well and they said that they would have a closed door meeting in their branches; but according to the statement by the Member for Dato Kramat, he said there were 5,000 people in Kuala Lumpur—Socialist Front members in Kuala Lumpur—marching through the streets. I cannot foresee how they are going to have a closed door meeting at 11.30 in the morning when about 100 or 200 youths were assembled in certain places, ready for a demonstration. They were also communist inspired because they were led through slogans, led through orders, and marching in such a way. On the word “Go” they were given banners. On the word “Go” they marched. On the word “Go” they sang slogans. All these, Sir, are part and parcel of the communist tactics to overthrow a government. Sir, I contend that communism has three ways to win over a nation. The first way is by this way: to test the strength of the Government and to overthrow the present Alliance Government by this method. Slowly and slowly they will gain ground. Sir, a guerilla war, according to Soekarno, is not a guerilla war where they just infiltrate. A guerilla war is in three phases. The first phase is to create

civil unrest in the nation, secondly to make the government spend money on defence by infiltration, and thirdly, when the time is ripe, by revolution. The Member for Batu, Sir, might not know his implications; he might be innocent of it—“he might be” only, I did not say he is (*Laughter*). However, he should learn the ways of the communists. Perhaps, he can get some lessons from the P.A.P. They have been with the communists together and they know the riots. Such riots happened in Singapore. They marched down. One Assemblywoman, who was pregnant, marched up to see the Prime Minister of Singapore. There was a Court case. Similar things had happened. So, Sir, I suggest that the Member for Batu consult the P.A.P. as to how the communists go about whipping up mob frenzy.

Therefore, Sir, in conclusion, I would like to say that this Government could not be more lenient than allowing the two Members from the Socialist Front to sit in their benches today and to more or less criticise us for nothing. Thank you very much.

Enche' Tan Toh Hong (Bukitintang): Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Honourable Minister for Home Affairs for what he said as regards the Member for Dato Kramat, who has spoken so long and who has spoken for two hours trying to discredit the White Paper. I wonder, Sir, if the Member for Dato Kramat has really made a careful and analytical study of this White Paper. Let me illustrate with one simple case. He casts doubt why Aziz Ishak has so many code names, A, AA, A.I—he said A one but I corrected him to A.I. Sir, to anyone who takes the trouble, one would have realised that “A” stands for Aziz, “AA” for Abdul Aziz, and “A.I.” for Aziz Ishak.

Sir, this White Paper has gone into detailed explanation of conspiratorial activities. Many of us have heard the radio broadcast of Ishak bin Haji Mohamed. Today, in this very sacred, very solemn Parliament building, we have seen a movie on Ishak bin Haji Mohamed, ex-Chairman of the Socialist

Front, and on Dato' Raja Hanifah of the P.M.I.P. Both of them gave a free and unbridled confession of their activities. To those of us who have seen the movie, it is absolutely clear that they gave their confession freely, and freely alone. I would like to challenge anyone who says that their confession was obtained under compulsion or under torture, as the Member for Dato Kramat has suggested this morning.

This is a plot of conspiracy and disloyalty against the nation. Money and hard cash have passed hands from our national enemies to some leading members of the Opposition parties. In their own, free confessions, the plot to subvert from within the constitutional sovereignty of Malaysia is true.

Sir, there are only two words to describe all that—"High Treason." Treason against our nation. In time of present aggression and war, this amounts to betrayal of our right to live, and this amounts to selling away the birthright and future of our children. If there is any law, Sir, in this country to punish high treason, I suggest, for our children's sake, if not for our own, that the Government must apply this law to deal with these internal enemies.

After all, Sir, the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat said this morning: "If democracy is to succeed, we must have checks and counter-checks." If I may add to his remarks, not only must we have checks and counter-checks, we must ensure that acts of treason must be deterred and deterred most strongly. Democracy must be defended against treason from within if it is to survive. I am, therefore, most amazed that the Member for Batu and the Member for Dato Kramat are defending those Socialist Front leaders and members who are known to be traitors of this country.

Sir, it is very rare in any sovereign country that Members of Parliament are allowed to openly defend self-confessed traitors of a nation, especially in times of war.

In this case, I say democracy has gone too far. When political leaders

are arrested for working hand in hand with enemies who are invading our nation, killing our people, Opposition Members can stand up in this solemn Chamber and cry "Totalitarianism".

Mr Speaker, Sir, I say that this nation is not marching towards totalitarianism as the motion says, but we have over-marched democracy. The Alliance Government has been too democratic, so much so that this has been exploited and abused by some other political parties.

Sir, this motion is unwarranted and unfounded and it deserves to be rejected entirely, *in toto*.

Dato' Abdullah bin Abdulrahman (Kuala Trengganu Selatan): Mr Speaker, Sir, I, for one, do not support the motion which is now before the House. I do not like to repeat what has been said by the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs.

We have heard a lot about democracy in relation to this motion by the Honourable Member for Batu and the Honourable Member for Pasir Puteh. They are complaining that those detainees are not brought for trial. Well, to me, complaining that these detainees have not been brought to trial is the same as complaining as to why we should go on having the Internal Security Act in this country. It is a fact that this very Act which has been passed by Parliament, gives powers to the Government to detain persons without trial. We must remember, Mr Speaker, Sir, that besides guaranteeing the security and peace in this country, this Internal Security Act would also serve the following purposes—

- (1) We know that there are many people who try to subvert and destroy democracy itself, and to deal effectively with these people I find there is no other better law than the Internal Security Act.
- (2) We find that there are many people who try to abuse freedom given by democracy in this country and, again, I would say that to effectively deal with these people there is no better law than the Internal Security Act.

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, we know there are many countries, besides Malaysia, who have laws in the nature of our Internal Security Act, though in some of these countries such law is not called the Internal Security Act. That is all, Mr Speaker, Sir.

Dr Mahathir bin Mohamad (Kota Star Selatan): Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to make a few comments on what the Honourable Member for Batu has said in defending his charge that the Government is marching towards totalitarianism. I think the Honourable Member for Batu must have been making a comparative study of the trends in governments all over the world, particularly in the countries which have been newly independent. He would have noticed that in most of the newly independent countries, including that which he admires so much—namely, Indonesia—there is real totalitarianism. These are the countries, in particular, Indonesia, which he seems to favour, and yet when we do something in defence of democracy he calls this a march towards totalitarianism. However, he should know very well that, if we were really to implement things in exercise of the Internal Security Act as a totalitarian country, he would not have been here speaking as he did this morning, because it is now common knowledge that in most countries which are newly independent, members of the Opposition side usually land themselves in jail or march over to this side of the House in order to save their skins.

Among other things which were said about the Alliance Government is that the British nurtured the Alliance to power, which means that since the Alliance was in power when Britain handed over Malaya to us, it therefore follows that it was the British who nurtured us to power, in which case he might as well say that the British nurtured the Congress Party of India to power or President Nkrumah of Ghana to power which, I feel sure, he would not be able to say or even convince anybody at all.

There was the citing of the United Nations Charter and the rights of peaceful assemblies. In this, of course,

he was remarking about the peaceful assembly that was held by the Socialist Front on the 13th of last month. Now this so-called peaceful assembly which was held by the Socialist Front was not quite the same. It was not a peaceful assembly, and I was there to watch it: there were these youngsters—school girls and school boys—marching along the road, shouting slogans and hurling abuses at the Police and carrying red flags. Now, if he calls that a peaceful assembly, I do not know what he would call an ordinary riot.

Regarding permits to hold rallies, I would like to say that, as a member of the UMNO, I proposed that we should send some UMNO members, roughly about 200,000 to demonstrate our support for the Government, and I am sorry to say that the Government turned down this offer as much as it turned down the application for a permit to hold a rally by the Socialist Front. This goes to show that the Government does not favour its own Party but exercises its authority impartially.

The other thing he said was that confrontation cost us a lot. What I would say is that if it has cost us a lot it is because there are people in this country who have been working hand in hand, hand-in-glove, with Indonesia, thus prolonging this confrontation. Now, if all the leaders of the Socialist Front were to take a responsible stand and see that their members do not collaborate with Indonesia, we would have ended this confrontation much earlier than we would be able to now.

There was also this reference to the Rodger Casement's case and one of the lines of defence in the Rodger Casement's case was that the accused was not committing treason simply because he was an Irish. It is my hope that the Opposition Members will not make that stand, when they are defending themselves that they are not committing treason, i.e., because they are not Malaysians.

There was a reference to a letter which was addressed to Hussian bin Yaacob. Unfortunately, the Member

for Dato Kramat read only the English edition of the letter, but the letter which was actually written was in Malay or Indonesian and the passage that was quite acceptable is:

"Soal pertemuan di-Bangkok. Enche' Yusof minta pertengahan kuasa, tetapi Pak Saleh."

This is a normal way of writing in Malay regarding meetings, and it is quite common for Malays to write to each other mentioning their names e.g., "Che' Yusof minta pertengahan", which means, "Wish to have the thing postponed, or held during the Bulan Puasa". So and so requested something else; it is the translation into English which is wrong. There is actually nothing wrong with the passage in the original letter.

Finally, of course, the Member for Dato Kramat says that the whole of the White Paper was a pot-pourri of words; if that is the description of the White Paper, I do not know what is the description of the Member for Dato Kramat's verbal diarrhoea that he led this morning in this Chamber. Thank you, Sir.

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair (Bungsar): rises.

Mr Speaker: The Mover will have to make a reply. How long will you take?

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: As long as you will allow me, Sir! (*Laughter*).

Mr Speaker: The Mover has asked for five minutes to make his reply. So, will you confine your speech within five minutes?

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: I shall try to be very brief indeed, Mr Speaker, Sir.

First, some of us who listened to the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat this morning, may have been tempted to have given him the benefit of the doubt. Sir, after witnessing that film show, nobody can escape the conclusion that this morning we actually allowed the Member for Dato Kramat to inflict on this House two hours of continuous, unbridled, undiluted drivel. Sir, if I had been him, after witnessing

that film show, I would have probably decided to scoot off quietly from the House, go up to Penang Hill and in the calm and silence of Penang Hill meditate on the vagaries of human life and the vagaries of a comrade in the party, a Chairman, who is supposed to be the champion of progressive forces, surrendering everything for \$5,000 Indonesian dollars.

Sir, I would agree with this part of the motion that there is indeed a growing evidence of tolerance, which means ultimately perhaps a drift towards totalitarianism in this country, but I must differ from the Honourable Members of the Socialist Front who state in their motion that the evidence of this drift is to be found in the arrests and detention of the Socialist Front leaders. Sir, the protection of the integrity of the nation against internal and external enemies is not a sign of totalitarianism. Every democratic country in the world faced with the dangers which Malaysia faces today, has necessarily to arm itself with powers to protect its citizens, to protect the integrity of the nation against hired prize fighters and fifth columnists of a foreign ideology or a foreign power. Sir, indeed, the march towards the subjection of the Malaysian people to a foreign totalitarianism would begin in earnest and gather momentum if the authorities did not act against fifth columnists but instead allowed them to carry on treacherous activities in freedom. Sir, what we have to safeguard ourselves against is not so much foreign totalitarianism. As long as Malaysians are able to stick together, and rally round the concept of parliamentary democracy, then Malaysia will be safe. But what we have got to safeguard ourselves is not so much totalitarianism from foreign sources, but the growing symptoms of an absence of tolerance, intolerance, in the public life of our country. Sir, recent events have led large sections of the Malaysian public to feel that what is required today is for us to vigorously counter the growing intolerance in our public life which, if allowed to go unchecked, threatens the very basis of our democratic institutions. The

success of our democratic institutions must mean a broad and a liberal outlook on the part of our leaders embracing the best interests of Malaysians of all communities, races, creeds. However, Sir, in the past few months, there have been ominous indications of a growing intolerance of legitimate, democratic opposition and criticism of the Government's policies. This, Sir, is the cause of concern not only to me and to my colleagues but I believe to large sections of the public. Sir, I would refer in particular to criticisms of the Budget. Even the criticism of the Budget, Sir, was construed as subversion. In other words, Sir, if I disagree with the views of the Minister of Finance and if that is subversion, then I stand condemned of high treason in the same way as Sir Alec Douglas Hume, leader of the Conservative Opposition in the United Kingdom Parliament, would be guilty of high treason simply because he disagrees, and disagrees very violently, with the fiscal policies of Mr Wilson's Government

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Rubbish!

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: It is not so much rubbish. Sir, we in the P.A.P. have disagreed with many of the taxation measures introduced by the Minister of Finance. It is natural. No Budget in any democratic country in the world goes uncriticised. In making our criticism of these taxation measures introduced by the Minister of Finance, we were doing no more than exercising our constitutional prerogatives to offer legitimate criticisms of budgetary provisions. However, this criticism is treated as subversion—it has been said so, Sir. I consider myself, whatever the Members on the Government Benches may feel, as a loyal Malaysian; my colleagues and I have both within this House and outside this House and in international forums, upheld the cause of Malaysia to the best of our abilities; and if loyalty to Malaysia is to be equated to agreement with the views of the Minister of Finance, then, as I said earlier, I am guilty of high treason. Sir, this is not the only indication of

this growing intolerance that is experienced these days in public life. A top Alliance leader, Sir, is recently reported to have remarked that a proved pro-Malaysian and democratic party like the P.A.P. poses a greater threat

Mr Speaker: I would like to point out to the Honourable Member that we close the debate at 7.00 p.m., and if there is no reply before that time by the Mover of the motion, then it will not be put to the House!

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: I intend to give the Honourable Member for Batu at least half a minute to reply. So, I will end here, Sir. As a matter of fact, I had intended to move an amendment to the motion to the effect that the evidence to this drift towards intolerance and, perhaps, ultimate drift to totalitarianism does not lie in the detention of the fifth columnists and the rest but lies in this growing intolerance which is developing in our public life. That is the danger, Sir, and I have got lots of examples but, unfortunately, I have not got the time to quote them. Sir, the Member for Batu has got exactly quarter of a minute!

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, the occasion is far too serious and serious for me to try to be a "smart Alec" and reply point by point to whatever charges made here against my colleague, myself and my Party, and I shall not attempt to do so.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I just merely want to touch on one point made by the Minister of Home Affairs. He said that I was booed and jeered by the crowd and then the Honourable Prime Minister said that I was chased by the crowd. Sir, I regret to say that both the Prime Minister and the Minister of Home Affairs seem to act on the thesis that the bigger the lie the more it will stick. On that I leave it.

Mr Speaker, Sir, when I brought this motion, we knew very well that we would be subjected to abuses, smears, criticisms and outright threats. As I said this morning, we do not try to seek to do what is popular in this

House, and we are prepared to abide by the verdict of history, and I reiterate again that we will not flinch from what we think is right.

Question put, and negatived.

ADJOURNMENT

(MOTION)

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

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

ADJOURNMENT SPEECH

SUNGEI BULOH LEPROSARIUM

Dr Tan Chee Khoon (Batu): Mr Speaker, Sir, I make no apology for bringing to the notice of this House and the Minister of Health and to the people of this country the trials and tribulations of the inmates of Sungei Buloh Leprosarium. During the adjournment speech that I made in this House on 10th July, 1964, I had touched on—

- (i) the lighting in the chalets—now happily switched on at night;
- (ii) the 20% disability cut—which the Government still stubbornly imposes on the inmates who are working in the Leprosarium;
- (iii) the frequent change of medical superintendent—a practice that now has happily stopped; and
- (iv) the poor food and other living conditions of the inmates.

Mr Speaker, Sir, today I wish to bring to the attention of the Minister and this House the following:

(1) Cloth Rations: Mr Speaker, Sir, the 3½ yards that are given to the inmates is not enough. The inmates need at least 7 yards if not more, so that they can have one suit for daily use and one for night wear. And in the case of those who are unable to use their hands, ready-made suits should be provided for them. This is only logical seeing that this class of inmates cannot use their hands to make the clothes themselves.

(2) Mr Speaker, Sir, next is the recognition of the inmates as employees in the Government Service. All these years the inmates who are working in the settlement not only have had to suffer a disability cut of 20% in silence but they have not gained recognition as employees in the Government Service.

On the question of the disability cut, I wish to bring to the attention of the Minister that in the Trafalgar House in Singapore the allowances are very close to wages paid for equivalent work done by staff in the Government Service. I hope the Government will do the same for the inmates at Sungei Buloh Leprosarium instead of imposing a 20% cut.

Then I wish to make a plea that they should be recognised as employees in the Government Service so that they can have E.P.F. contributions, sick leave, vacation leave, gratuity, etc. There is a monstrous ruling that should they fall ill and are warded 70% of their pay is cut while they are being hospitalised. I hope the Government will stop this monstrosity forthwith and give serious consideration to the recognition of the working inmates as employees in the Government Service. Many of them have described themselves as being no better than two-legged animals being exploited by the Government.

(3) Mr Speaker, Sir, the beef ration is not wanted by more than half of the Chinese population there and I do hope that the Minister will look into this. It is no use giving the inmates food that they do not want.

(4) Mr Speaker, Sir, the aftercare of the patients also leaves much to be desired. I do know that the M.A.L.R.A. has done something in this direction, but more can be done. For example, I do hope that the Minister will make use of his good offices to try and persuade the various people in charge of the Federal Land Development Authority schemes to see that these people when they leave the Settlement can have a piece of land where they can put up houses for themselves, instead of being shunned

and rejected by a cruel society. If the Minister will do this, I think, and I do know, that he will earn the undying gratitude of the inmates in the Settlement. This question of land and employment is of paramount importance to those who are to be discharged. Many of them refuse to be discharged because they cannot find a piece of land and cannot find any work and therefore are not prepared to face a hostile world.

Mr Speaker, Sir, these are some of the needs of the inmates of the Sungei Buloh Leprosarium, and I do hope that the Minister and Members of this House will support me in my efforts to improve the unhappy lot of these unfortunate people.

The Minister of Health (Enche' Bahaman bin Samsudin): Mr Speaker, Sir, before I reply to the points raised by the Honourable Member for Batu, I wish to inform the House that the Government is spending more than \$2,100,000 per year to run and maintain the Sungei Buloh Leprosarium. This works out to something like \$840 per inmate per year. This figure is continually on the increase not only because of the increasing number of inmates but also on account of the rise in the prices of foodstuffs and other essentials.

The Sungei Buloh Leprosarium is well looked after by the Government. It is a self-contained settlement where every attempt is made to enable the patients to live as normal a life as possible. Some of the inmates who are capable of doing work are paid an allowance for the work they do. About 585 of them are receiving such allowances the total cost of which is more than \$40,000 per month. Irrespective of whether they are in receipt of allowances or not, all inmates receive free ration, free housing and free light and water in addition to free treatment.

With regard to the cloth rations mentioned by the Honourable Member, I wish to state that all the male inmates at present receive a yearly supply of 3½ yards of cloth while female inmates receive 4½ yards. In

addition, the inmates, including the school children, receive an extra issue of sarong or cloth for festivals, viz., Hari Raya, Chinese New Year, Thaipusam and Easter. The school children are supplied with three sets of school uniforms at the time of their admission to school. These uniforms are replaced as and when necessary. However, I will consider carefully the suggestions made by the Honourable Member.

On the question of recognition of the inmate workers as employees in the Government Service, I should like to point out that these workers are taken to do the work as part of occupational therapy in order to keep them occupied until they are fit to be discharged. Their employment is therefore temporary. They are paid allowances and not salaries and these allowances are comparable to the salaries paid to the ordinary Government employees who do comparable work, but subject to a disability deduction of 20 per cent. In addition, they receive free rations, free housing, free light and water and, of course, free treatment. As these workers generally work for a short period, it is not considered advisable to treat them as employees in the Government Service. It is true that if a worker is absent for any reason, whether sick or otherwise, he receives only a portion of the allowance for the period that he is absent. This is because a replacement will have to be provided and paid for. However, I will look into the matter more closely with a view to improving the position especially in regard to those who are absent on account of illness.

With regard to the beef ration to the Chinese inmates, I am told that at the beginning of the year patients are allowed to select their diets, and unless it is against medical advice the inmates are allowed to have their choice. If there are inmates who do not like beef, they can easily get other meat or fish; the Chinese inmates at present get beef once a week.

With regard to the rehabilitation of discharged patients, I am informed that the Malayan Leprosy Relief

Association is giving a lot of assistance for their rehabilitation. For example, there are apprenticeship schemes and also projects run by the Association, such as palm oil and rubber estates and poultry farms, which provide employment for such persons. All these projects are in Sungei Buloh.

With regard to the question of land to be given to them, I will discuss this matter with the M.A.L.R.A.

I would like to add, for the information of this House, that the care and

treatment of patients and the conditions in the Sungei Buloh Leprosarium had been very highly commended by many foreign experts who visited this country. Nonetheless, Government have and will always continue to improve the position where such improvements are considered necessary and justified.

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr Speaker: The House is now adjourned *sine die*.

Adjourned at 7.15 p.m.