

Volume II
No. 2



Thursday
27th May, 1965

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

OFFICIAL REPORT

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

CONTENTS

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 507]

**MENANGGOHKAN MESHUARAT KAPADA HARI
LAIN (usul) [Col. 526]**

MOTION:

**The Yang di-Pertuan Agong's Speech—Address of Thanks
[Col. 526]**

ADJOURNMENT (motion) [Col. 637]

ADJOURNMENT SPEECH:

**Detention of Enche' Tan Kai Hee—Treatment accorded
[Col. 637]**

MALAYSIA

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

Official Report

Second Session of the Second Dewan Ra'ayat

Thursday, 27th May, 1965

The House met at Ten 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. (Sungai 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 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, ENCHE' MOHD. GHAZALI BIN HAJI JAWI (Ulu Perak).
- „ the Minister for Sabah Affairs and Civil Defence, DATU DONALD ALOYSIUS STEPHENS, P.D.K. (Sabah).

- The Honourable 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 Culture, Youth and Sports, ENGKU MUHSEIN BIN ABDUL KADIR, J.M.N., S.M.T., P.J.K. (Trengganu Tengah).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Education, ENCHE' LEE SIOK YEW, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Sepang).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL GHANI BIN ISHAK, A.M.N. (Melaka Utara).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL KARIM BIN ABU, A.M.N. (Melaka Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAHIM ISHAK (Singapore).
- „ WAN ABDUL RAHMAN BIN DATU TUANKU BUJANG (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDUL RASHID BIN HAJI JAIS (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAUF BIN A. RAHMAN, K.M.N., P.J.K. (Krian Laut).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAZAK BIN HAJI HUSSIN (Lipis).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL SAMAD BIN GUL AHMAD MIANJI (Pasir Mas Hulu).
- „ DATO' ABDULLAH BIN ABDULRAHMAN, Dato' Bijaya di-Raja (Kuala Trengganu Selatan).
- „ Y.A.M. TUNKU ABDULLAH IBNI ALMARHUM TUANKU ABDUL RAHMAN, P.P.T. (Rawang).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI MOHD. SALLEH, A.M.N., S.M.J., P.I.S. (Segamat Utara).
- „ ENCHE' ABU BAKAR BIN HAMZAH (Bachok).
- „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN ABDULLAH (Kelantan Hilir).
- „ ENCHE' AHMAD BIN ARSHAD, A.M.N. (Muar Utara).
- „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN SAAID (Seberang Utara).
- „ CHE' AJIBAH BINTI ABOL (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' ALI BIN HAJI AHMAD (Pontian Selatan).
- „ O.K.K. DATU ALIUDDIN BIN DATU HARUN, P.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ DR AWANG BIN HASSAN, S.M.J. (Muar Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Muar Dalam).
- „ PENGARAH BANYANG ANAK JANTING (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' E. W. BARKER (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN CHONG WEN, A.M.N. (Kluang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN SEONG YOON (Setapak).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN SIANG SUN (Bentong).
- „ ENCHE' CHEN WING SUM (Damansara).
- „ ENCHE' CHIA CHIN SHIN, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' FRANCIS CHIA NYUK TONG (Sabah).

- The Honourable ENCHE' CHIA THYE POH (Singapore).
- „ 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).
- „ DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI ABDUL MAJID
(Johor Bahru Timor).
- „ DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI HASHIM, P.M.N.
(Jitra-Padang Terap).
- „ ENCHE' S. FAZUL RAHMAN, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ DATU GANIE GILONG, P.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' GANING BIN JANGKAT (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' GEH CHONG KEAT, K.M.N. (Penang Utara).
- „ ENCHE' HAMZAH BIN ALANG, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Kapar).
- „ ENCHE' HANAFI BIN MOHD. YUNUS, A.M.N., J.P.
(Kulim Utara).
- „ ENCHE' HANAFIAH BIN HUSSAIN, A.M.N. (Jerai).
- „ ENCHE' HARUN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Baling).
- „ WAN HASSAN BIN WAN DAUD (Tumpat).
- „ ENCHE' STANLEY HO NGUN, KHIU, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN TO' MUDA HASSAN, A.M.N. (Raub).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN MOHD. NOORDIN, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Parit).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN SULAIMAN (Ulu Kelantan).
- „ TUAN HAJI HUSSAIN RAHIMI BIN HAJI SAMAN
(Kota Bharu Hulu).
- „ ENCHE' IKHWAN ZAINI (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' IBRAHIM BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Seberang Tengah).
- „ ENCHE' ISMAIL BIN IDRIS (Penang Selatan).
- „ DATO' SYED JA'AFAR BIN HASAN ALBAR, P.M.N.
(Johor Tenggara).
- „ 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).
- „ DATU KHOO SIAK CHIEW, P.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' KOW KEE SENG (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' EDMUND LANGGU ANAK SAGA (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' LEE KUAN YEW (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SAN CHOON, K.M.N. (Segamat Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SECK FUN (Tanjong Malim).
- „ ENCHE' AMADEUS MATHEW LEONG, A.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).

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

- „ DR LIM CHONG EU (Tanjong).
- „ ENCHE' LIM HUAN BOON (Singapore).
- „ DATO' LIM KIM SAN, D.U.T., J.M.K., D.J.M.K. (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' LIM PEE HUNG, P.J.K. (Alor Star).
- „ ENCHE' PETER LO SU YIN (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' T. MAHIMA SINGH, J.P. (Port Dickson).
- „ ENCHE' JOSEPH DAVID MANJAJI (Sabah).
- „ 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).
- „ ORANG TUA MOHAMMAD DARA BIN LANGPAD (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' MOHD. DAUD BIN ABDUL SAMAD (Besut).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED IDRIS BIN MATSIL, J.M.N., P.J.K., J.P. (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).
- „ ENCHE' MOHD. ZAHIR BIN HAJI ISMAIL, J.M.N. (Sungai Patani).
- „ WAN MOKHTAR BIN AHMAD (Kemaman).
- „ TUAN HAJI MOKHTAR BIN HAJI ISMAIL (Perlis Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' MUHAMMAD FAKHRUDDIN BIN HAJI ABDULLAH (Pasir Mas Hilir).
- „ TUAN HAJI MUHAMMAD SU'AUT BIN HAJI MUHD. TAHIR, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ DATO' HAJI MUSTAPHA BIN HAJI ABDUL JABAR, D.P.M.S., A.M.N., J.P. (Sabak Bernam).
- „ ENCHE' MUSTAPHA BIN AHMAD (Tanah Merah).
- „ DATO' NIK AHMAD KAMIL, D.K., S.P.M.K., S.J.M.K., P.M.N., P.Y.G.P., Dato' Sri Setia Raja (Kota Bharu Hilir).
- „ ENCHE' NG FAH YAM (Batu Gajah).
- „ DR NG KAM POH, J.P. (Telok Anson).
- „ ENCHE' ONG KEE HUI (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' ONG PANG BOON (Singapore).
- „ TUAN HAJI OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Hilir Perak).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Perlis Utara).
- „ ABANG OTHMAN BIN HAJI MOASILI, P.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN WOK (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' QUEK KAI DONG, J.P. (Seremban Timor).
- „ TUAN HAJI RAHMAT BIN HAJI DAUD, A.M.N. (Johor Bahru Barat).
- „ ENCHE' RAMLI BIN OMAR (Krian Darat).

- The Honourable TUAN HAJI REDZA BIN HAJI MOHD. SAID, P.J.K., J.P. (Rembau-Tampin).
- „ RAJA ROME BIN RAJA MA'AMOR, P.J.K., J.P. (Kuala Selangor).
- „ ENCHE' SANDOM ANAK NYUAK (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' SEAH TENG NGIAB, P.I.S. (Muar Pantai).
- „ ENCHE' D. R. SEENIVASAGAM (Ipoh).
- „ ENCHE' S. P. SEENIVASAGAM (Menglembu).
- „ ENCHE' SIM BOON LIANG (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' SIOW LOONG HIN, P.J.K. (Seremban Barat).
- „ ENCHE' SNAWI BIN ISMAIL, P.J.K. (Seberang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' SNG CHIN JOO (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' SOH AH TECK (Batu Pahat).
- „ ENCHE' SULEIMAN BIN ALI (Dungun).
- „ 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 TOH HONG (Bukit Bintang).
- „ ENCHE' TAN TSAK YU (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' TIAH ENG BEE (Kluang Utara).
- „ DR TOH CHIN CHYE (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' TOH THEAM HOCK (Kampar).
- „ PENGHULU FRANCIS UMPAU ANAK EMPAM (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' YEH PAO TZE (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' YEOH TAT BENG (Bruas).
- „ ENCHE' STEPHEN YONG KUET TZE (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' YONG NYUK LIN (Singapore).
- „ TUAN HAJI ZAKARIA BIN HAJI MOHD. TAIB, P.J.K. (Langat).

ABSENT:

- The Honourable the Minister of Health, ENCHE' BAHAMAN BIN SAMSUDIN (Kuala Pilah).
- „ the Minister of Labour, ENCHE' V. MANICKAVASAGAM, J.M.N., P.J.K. (Klang).
- „ WAN ABDUL KADIR BIN ISMAIL, P.P.T. (Kuala Trengganu Utara).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAJI TALIB, P.J.K. (Kuantan).
- „ ENCHE' JONATHAN BANGAU ANAK RENANG, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ DR GOH KENG SWEE (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).
- „ DR MAHATHIR BIN MOHAMAD (Kota Star Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' S. RAJARATNAM (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Melaka).
- „ ENCHE' WEE TOON BOON (Singapore).

PRAYERS

(Mr Speaker in the Chair)

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

SPECIALIST FEES FOR MEDICAL OFFICERS IN SARAWAK

1. Enche' Stephen Yong Kuet Tze (Sarawak) asks the Minister of Health whether consideration will be given to permitting medical officers serving in Sarawak to receive specialist fees when they are called upon to render services as specialists, on the same term as the specialists in Malaya.

The Minister of Sabah Affairs and Civil Defence (Dato' Donald Aloysius Stephens): Mr Speaker, Sir, the payment of specialist fees, particularly the structure thereof, is under review by a special committee set up for the purpose. It is therefore premature to state whether consideration will be given to permitting medical officers serving in Sarawak to receive specialist fees.

Enche' Stephen Yong Kuet Tze: Does the Minister admit then that specialist fees are payable to doctors serving in the Peninsula States but not to the medical officers serving in Sarawak?

Dato' Donald Aloysius Stephens: At present specialist fees are payable to certain specialist medical officers.

Enche' Stephen Yong Kuet Tze: Do we understand, Sir, that the Ministry is considering the bringing into line all these fees payable to these specialist officers?

Dato' Donald Aloysius Stephens: The Ministry is considering that.

MEETINGS TO CELEBRATE MAY DAY IN SARAWAK— PROHIBITION

2. Enche' Stephen Yong Kuet Tze asks the Minister of Home Affairs why it was necessary to prohibit the holding of meeting to celebrate the May Day by workers in Sarawak, even within their own Union premises.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Dato' Dr Ismail): Sir, the decision was made on security grounds.

Enche' Stephen Yong Kuet Tze: Would the Minister inform this House whether the holding of meetings by workers in their own premises would constitute security risks?

Dato' Dr Ismail: Sir, normally I would allow trade unions to hold rallies in their own premises, but when I have definite indication that any such meeting is against the national and security interests of the country, then I prohibit it.

RANCHANGAN LUAR BANDAR DI-SABAH DAN SARAWAK

3. Enche' Mohd. Arif Salleh (Sabah) bertanya kepada Menteri Pembangunan Negara dan Luar Bandar bilakah hendak di-mulakan Ranchangan Luar Bandar lima-tahun di-Sabah dan Sarawak.

The Assistant Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives (Enche' Sulaiman bin Bulon): Pembangunan Luar Bandar, seperti Ahli Yang Berhormat itu sedia ma'alum, telah pun di-perluaskan ka-Sabah dan Sarawak. Suatu ranchangan lima tahun untuk Pembangunan Luar Bandar akan di-majukan sa-bagai sa-bahagian daripada Ranchangan Malaysia yang pertama untuk Pembangunan Ekonomi dan Masharakat bagi tahun 1966-70. 1hb Januari, 1966 akan di-jadikan tarikh pelancharan Ranchangan Malaysia yang pertama, dan berserta itu juga Ranchangan Pembangunan Luar Badar untuk Sabah dan Sarawak.

AHLI² ROMBONGAN TUN HAJI ABDUL RAZAK KA-AFRIKA TIMOR

4. Enche' Mohd. Arif Salleh bertanya kepada Perdana Menteri mengapakah ahli² rombongan Tun Abdul Razak ka-Afrika Timor kebanyakan-nya terdiri daripada orang² di-Malaya, tidak daripada orang² Sabah dan Sarawak.

The Prime Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, rombongan yang di-pimpin oleh Tun Abdul Razak baharu² ini kanegeri² dalam Afrika ada-lah tujuannya hendak mengenalkan Malaysia kepada negeri² dalam Afrika itu. Jadi, dalam fikiran Tun Abdul Razak, siapa² yang di-bawa-nya ada-lah

orang² yang boleh mewakili Malaysia tidak kira orang² itu datang daripada mana. Tetapi ada sa-orang yang datang daripada Sabah ia-itu Datu Ganie Gilong. Jadi, dari Sarawak tidak dibawa. Pada masa ka-hadapan jika dikehendaki orang Sarawak mewakili Sarawak dalam rombongan sa-um-pama itu, hal itu akan di-timbangkan.

MEMPERBAIKI LAPANGAN² TERBANG DI-SABAH

5. Enche' Mohd. Arif Salleh bertanya kepada Menteri Pengangkutan, oleh kerana banyak daripada lapangan² terbang di-Sabah tidak boleh di-pakai dalam musim hujan, bila-kah akan diperbaiki lapangan² terbang tersebut supaya kapal² terbang tumpangan senang mendarat baik dalam musim hujan sa-kali pun.

Menteri Pengangkutan (Dato' Haji Sardon bin Haji Jubir): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, lapangan² terbang yang besar di-Sabah akan di-lengkapkan dengan tempat² pendaratan yang boleh digunakan sa-panjang musim (all weather runways) menjelang bulan April 1966. Jesselton dan Tawau sudah pun mempunyai kelengkapan demikian, sedang Sandakan akan memperolehi-nya pada bulan November 1965 ini dan Lahat Datu bulan April 1966. Soal pembinaan di-lapangan² terbang yang kecil yang akan di-gunakan tempat² pendaratan kapal² terbang kecil yang dapat di-gunakan sa-panjang musim dan yang akan juga memakan belanja yang mahal, tidak-lah memadai dengan jenis kapal terbang dan jumlah perkhidmatan-nya yang mana lalu-lintas terhad di-situ. Oleh kerana itu perkara ini sedang di-timbang dan di-semak balek. Sudah terma'alum bahawa sa-lepas hujan yang lebat, ada ketika-nya yang tempat² pendaratan yang tidak berkonkreit atau (grass runways) itu terpaksa di-tutup sehingga-lah tempat itu chukup kering untuk kapal terbang yang kecil² yang berhampiran di-situ kerana hendak mengelakkan kemerbahayaan. Tetapi terbukti bahawa keadaan sa-macham itu jarang berlaku dan sa-kira selalu berlaku tentu-lah pihak Jabatan Kerja Raya dan Pejabat Penerbangan 'Awam

akan melihat dan memperbaiki sa-tengah² padang kapal terbang yang kecil itu. Sunggoh pun bagitu, saya harap Yang Berhormat yang berhampiran dengan padang kapal terbang kecil itu ia-itu akan bekerjasama sa-kira-nya sa-suatu waktu kita mendapat peruntukan yang lebeh kita akan memperbaiki dan akan boleh di-gunakan padang kapal terbang itu sa-tiap waktu.

DEVELOPMENT OF LUMUT HARBOUR

6. Enche' Kam Woon Wah (Sitiawan) asks the Minister of Transport whether the Government has any intention of developing Lumut Harbour, if not, to state the reason.

Dato' Haji Sardon bin Haji Jubir: Mr Speaker, Sir, a paper on port development is being prepared by my Ministry and will be circulated to various Ministries and Departments concerned for their views. Whether or not a port will be developed at Lumut will depend on the outcome of the recommendations in this paper.

AHLI² ROMBONGAN KA-LUAR NEGERI

7. Abang Othman bin Haji Moasili bertanya kepada Perdana Menteri sama ada peluang akan juga di-beri kepada orang² Malaysia di-Sarawak untuk mengikuti rombongan² yang akan melawat keluar negeri dan supaya ahli² rombongan tidak terhad kepada mereka dari Semenanjung dan Singapura sahaja.

Perdana Menteri: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soal ini saya telah jawab. Di-dalam jawapan saya berkenaan dengan soalan No. 5 ia-itu ada-kah masa hadapan kita chadangkan hendak membawa sa-orang daripada Sarawak di-dalam rombongan yang keluar negeri. Jadi jawapan saya sa-bagai-mana saya jawab tadi, ya.

PENANAMAN PADI DUA KALI SA-TAHUN DI-SARAWAK

8. Abang Othman bin Haji Moasili bertanya kepada Menteri Pertanian dan

Sharikat Kerjasama, sa-bagai tam-bahan hasil pengeluaran padi bumi-putra, ada-kah Kerajaan akan meng-galak supaya penanam² padi di-Sarawak dapat berpeluang menanam padi dua kali sa-tahun.

Menteri Pertanian dan Sharikat Kerjasama (Enche' Mohd. Ghazali bin Haji Jawi): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, adal-ah menjadi dasar Kerajaan untuk menggalakkan penanaman padi dua kali sa-tahun juga di-Sarawak. Pihak Kementerian Pertanian dan Sharikat Kerjasama telah pun menghantar beneh² padi dan juga beneh² padi Malinja ka-Sarawak untuk di-tanam sa-bagai perchubaaan. Jikalau sa-kira-nya beneh² ini berjaya di-tanam di-Sarawak maka beneh² itu akan di-bahagi atau di-edarkan kepada pesa-wah² di-negeri itu.

MENYINGGAHKAN KAPAL HAJI DI-PELABOHAN KUCHING

9. Abang Othman bin Haji Moasili bertanya kepada Menteri Hal Ehwal Luar Negeri bagi mengurang dan menggalakkan kesukaran bagi bakal² Haji di-minta-lah kalau dapat kapal Haji "Kuala Lumpur" singgah di-Pelabohan Kuching untuk mengambil bakal² Haji yang akan naik ka-Mekah pada tahun yang akan datang.

Perdana Menteri: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berkenaan dengan Kapal Haji masok dalam Pelabohan Kuching, saya telah dapati tidak dapat hendak masok kerana sungai itu changkat. Kerajaan telah pun memereksa supaya kapal Ansun dapat masok. Di-dapati di-dalam pemereksaan itu harus Kapal Ansun boleh masok tetapi barangkali 3 batu jauh daripada Kuching. Ini ada-lah dalam pemereksaan lagi dan apabila tamat pemereksaan itu saya boleh bagi jawapan dengan tepat.

TRAFFIC CHAOS AT CROSS ROADS AT JALAN GASING AND JALAN TIMOR AT PETALING JAYA

10. Enche' C. V. Devan Nair (Bung-sar) asks the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications whether he is aware of the traffic chaos on the Federal

Highway at the cross roads at Jalan Gasing and Jalan Timor and whether he proposes to send a few officers to foreign countries to study and imple-ment a more imaginative system of traffic lights.

The Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications (Dato' V. T. Sambanthan): Mr Speaker, Sir, there have been hasty judgments on the traffic lights in Jalan Utara and Jalan University. With the experience from the use of these lights, traffic has tended to move with greater efficiency. It is considered, therefore, not neces-sary at this juncture to send officers overseas for studies of traffic lights system.

UNQUALIFIED OR UNDERQUALIFIED FOREIGN ENGINEERS

11. Enche' C. V. Devan Nair asks the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecom-munications if he is aware that a number of unqualified or underquali-fied foreigners are posing as qualified engineers and are at present employed by foreign consultant engineering firms engaged by the Public Works Department and the Central Electricity Board on important Malaysia Govern-ment projects and that such unqualified or underqualified foreigners are depriving qualified Malaysian engineers of opportunities and, if so, whether the Government would agree to investigate the qualifications of foreign engineers employed in Malaya and take steps to ensure that unqualified or underquali-fied foreign engineers who entered the country by giving false information to the Immigration authorities are sent back to their country of origin and that in future unqualified and underquali-fied engineers are not given visas to enter this country.

Dato' V. T. Sambanthan: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am not aware that unqualified or underqualified foreigners pose as qualified engineers and are at present employed by foreign consultant engi-neering firms, and I am not also aware that such unqualified or underqualified foreigners deprive qualified Malaysian engineers of opportunities to work.

According to my colleague, the Minister of Home Affairs, who is responsible for immigration since 1959, when the Immigration Law was amended, the entry of foreigners for the purpose of taking up employment has been controlled in order to safeguard the interests of qualified citizens of the country. It will be of immense help if the Honourable Member for Bungsar would supply me the names and particulars of the qualifications of those foreign engineers who have gained entry and employment passes from the Immigration Authority under false claims.

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to know whether the Honourable Minister has received a circular letter, with copies to all Members of Parliament, where—it is signed not by anyone in particular, but they style themselves as “Malaysian Engineers”—they allege that in Thomas, Anderson and Partners there are four gentlemen who are qualified or underqualified, in Crooks, Mitchell and Peacock there are two gentlemen qualified or underqualified and in Preece, Cardew and Rider, one gentleman qualified or underqualified. If the Minister has not got a copy, which I presume most Members of Parliament have, I am prepared to pass on my copy to him for his study.

Dato' V. T. Sambanthan: Mr Speaker, Sir, I think it will be useful if the Member would himself check up whether these are correct, because it is an unsigned letter, and it may well be that it is quite mischievous. I do not think it is “kind” of the Honourable Member to have mentioned the names of the various firms based upon an unsigned letter, which was circulated to everybody, without checking up on the veracity of the facts concluded in that particular circular letter. I did, in fact, get this circular letter, and I must say that my officers checked up on the various allegations made therein and have found that they have been quite baseless.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Is the Honourable Minister aware that this firm in question, Messrs Thomas, Anderson

and Partners have been appointed as consultants both in electrical and mechanical works not only to this building but to the Teaching Hospital and, what is worse still, to the General Hospital. Is the Honourable Minister aware that this firm purports itself to be a firm of consultant engineers? Is the Honourable Minister aware that any consultant engineer worthy of note should have his name listed in this list of Institution of Engineers. Is the Honourable Minister aware that all the members of this Consultants Firm except one are not in this list and that person in question has time and again applied for admission to this Institution of Engineers and has been refused, and has been only admitted as an associate of the Institution of Engineers?

Dato' V. T. Sambanthan: Is the Honourable Member aware that some of the names included in this particular letter have not been shown by Thomas Anderson as engineers working in their firm?

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: That is beside the question. My question is whether the Honourable Minister is aware that the members of this Consultants Firm, none of them are listed here, except one who is listed as an associate of the Institution of Engineers and that person in question has time and again applied for admission to this Institute and has been refused admission—that is my question, Mr Speaker, Sir.

Dato' V. T. Sambanthan: I think the Honourable Member still does not understand my answer.

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: Mr Speaker, Sir, I have not suggested at all that the charges made here are established facts. All that I wanted to know was, whether the Minister had received these allegations and whether he had agreed to check them. He has asked me, Sir—and this is not a statement—he has asked me to check on the veracity, but I would like to inform him, and if he will place the facilities of his Ministry at my disposal and step down as Minister, I will probably do a better job of investigation. *(Laughter).*

Dato' V. T. Sambanthan: I would like to thank him very much for the offer he has made. I suppose he will have to wait for some time for that. *(Laughter)*.

With regard to the point made by the Member for Batu, I would like to read out some details I have here with regard to consultant firms.

"Consulting firms which are placed on the panel of consultants by this Department are considered on the experience of the firm, either overseas or locally, in either civil, electrical, mechanical, structural, etc. A consulting firm, when commissioned to carry out a job, accepts collective responsibility. As such the qualifications of employees are not, as far as the clients are concerned, looked into, although it is in the interest of the firm itself to employ those who have necessary experience in a particular field so as to carry out the work. For Government employment, there is a scheme of service which sets out the qualifications for engineers, but there is no ruling as regards private employment. We cannot, therefore, stop people who study in institutions which are not acceptable for Government service in this country from calling themselves qualified engineers."

We have, for instance, CITRA, a famous engineering firm which does a lot of work here. Now, we don't have any method of recognising or de-recognising the degrees given at Marseilles, or Paris, or any other place. We recognise these firms on the basis of the merits that they have gained in various other countries, and then when they do come and get registered here, we register them on this particular basis. But the main question that was asked by the Member for Bungsar was: Have there been persons unqualified, by every way, have such persons posed as engineers, and have they deprived local engineers of this very employment? That is really the question. Any other question, even supplementary is not quite germane; to this particular point at issue. That, I hope, the Member for Batu would bear in mind.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, is the Honourable Minister aware that this firm in particular—Thomas, Anderson and Partners—in connection with this work of the teaching hospital, made a proposal that the hospital should have a resident engineer, and it also made a proposal that with regard

to the qualifications of the resident engineer, among the qualifications listed was that he should have a mechanical engineering degree. Is the Minister aware that that firm in particular proposed one of its employees, who it was openly stated in writing by the firm of Thomas, Anderson and Partners that he has no qualifications, no engineering qualifications; but yet he is suitable for employment at a salary of \$3,100. What has the Minister to say to this, Mr Speaker, Sir?

Dato' V. T. Sambanthan: The question is, precisely, what has the Honourable Member for Batu been doing all these days about this particular question? I am not aware of everything. The construction of the teaching hospital at the University is now under the direct control of the University of Malaya. He may have known it as a member of the University Council, and having known these details, if he could not have used his influence to have stopped any "monkeying" that was going around in the University, I do not know who is going to do it. *(Laughter)*. Secondly, if the Member has been responsible in his particular task, the moment he came to know of this, why did he not bring it to my knowledge? Even if it is beyond my purview, I might still be able to bring some influence to bear on the subject.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, in answer to the Honourable Minister, I can inform him in this House that, amongst other people, I was responsible for throwing this person out, and I believe he has left this country as a result of my exposure.

Question number two is, Mr Speaker, Sir, the Minister has absolved himself of the responsibility for the teaching hospital. Mr Speaker, Sir, is the Minister aware that this consulting firm of engineers has been foisted on the University of Malaya? It was not a free choice of the University of Malaya to have this firm of consultants in as much as it is the same with the General Hospital. This firm has been foisted on the Ministry of Health by the P.W.D.

Mr Speaker: I want to point out that we are going further and further away from the question.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: It is very relevant, Mr Speaker, Sir. This question of underqualified engineers, totally unqualified engineers, posing as qualified engineers is not only depriving local engineers of their jobs but asking for \$3,100—that is in excess of what the Ministers get on the opposite bench. *(Laughter)*.

Dato' V. T. Sambanthan: Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not know what the Honourable Member is driving at. If it is a point of fact that he wants to crave public credit for what he has done in private, well, we do give him the credit. But having stated that, I do not know what else he wants to say. This particular engineer or the firm has been commissioned

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: The term “engineer” is a misnomer. *(Laughter)*.

Dato' V. T. Sambanthan: This particular person, as we understand it, happened to have been allegedly suggested by Thomas, Anderson and Partners, and Thomas, Anderson and Partners was the consulting engineers of the University of Malaya Teaching Hospital. Now, as I said, this is beyond my purview, and then the Honourable Member said that he had acknowledge of it and he chuckled this man out. Well and good—congratulations! *(Laughter)*.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Minister asked that if I had known of these things, why did I not bring it to his notice. Mr Speaker, Sir, more than a year ago I brought up the name of an engineer in Johore, who, before he went into private practice, was the State Engineer, Johore. Then he farmed out all the work in Johore to a consulting firm; then when he left the service of the Government he promptly joined this consultant firm—I brought it up to the attention of the Minister. Will the Minister enlighten this House as to what action he has taken on the matter which I brought to the notice of this House.

Mr Speaker: That, I think, is a different question.

SOUTH VIETNAM CONFLICT

12. Dr Tan Chee Khoon asks the Prime Minister to state the full extent of involvement of this country in the South Vietnam conflict.

The Prime Minister: We are not heavily involved in the Vietnam question, because of our own involvement as a result of the Indonesian confrontation. However, we are training a few personnel from Vietnam in the field of administration. I think that is about all we are doing for Vietnam at the moment.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, is the Honourable the Prime Minister aware that not only some personnel but trucks had been almost smuggled out of this country in the darkness of the night to South Vietnam? If so, will he tell us whether this is not aiding and abetting? Whether you call it American aggression or imperialism, it certainly does not lend itself to a peaceful settlement in that area of South-East Asia.

The Prime Minister: Well, I heard of that. At the outbreak of this aggression from the North, we did send a few of our transport to South Vietnam—that is about all we did, and we have not been able to afford to do any more than we could—because what is happening in South Vietnam is likely to involve us later on.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Is the Honourable the Prime Minister aware that whatever little help we may give to South Vietnam, to the almighty United States of America, it may lead to an escalation of an already very tense situation? And is the Honourable the Prime Minister aware that this escalation may bring the United States into direct conflict with Red China? If so, has he calculated the consequences of such a disastrous eventuality?

The Prime Minister: I am aware of quite a lot of things which the Honourable Member has in mind, and I think the best way to answer that is in this general debate as quite a lot of this question has been brought up in

the course of the debate. But in answer to this question, I think that is all I am able to do at the moment.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, is the Honourable Prime Minister aware that being more and more involved in South Vietnam, in particular in supporting American action there, will drive us farther and farther away from the comity of Afro-Asian nations and that, because of our support of American action in North Vietnam, no number of embassies that we open in Africa or in Asia, no amount of junketing and spending money on specially chartered K.L.M. planes, will help us to draw closer to Afro-Asia?

The Prime Minister: Sir, that is a matter of opinion—his opinion and mine is quite divided. There is a strong distinction of political ideologies. There are some countries in Asia that favour North Vietnam and others that favour the freedom of the South Vietnam system of government. And we are one of those countries which favour South Vietnam, and if there is anything we can do to help South Vietnam we will willingly do it. But, unfortunately, our hands are tied up, because we have this Indonesian confrontation. Whatever is the opinion of the other group in South-East Asia, that does not worry us in the least, because Soekarno himself has divided the countries into two groups: one, NEFO, which he calls new emerging nations, according to his own opinion, and the other is OLDEFO. However, as far as I know, and as far as these people are concerned we are in a much happier position than those in the NEFO, because we have plenty of food, plenty of clothes, plenty of dresses—everything; we have our freedom, we have our democracy, and we have our way of life—and I think we prefer to stand by it.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: If I heard the Prime Minister correctly, he said, “what other countries think of our action in South Vietnam did not matter”. Correct me if I am wrong.

The Prime Minister: What those countries in that group, which Soekarno called NEFO, think about us

is immaterial. I think the Honourable Member will agree with me that we are in much happier circumstances than those countries that come within the group called by Soekarno “NEFO”.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: I am not talking of NEFOs or OLDEFOs. Mr Speaker, Sir, is the Prime Minister aware that both Pakistan and India have disapproved of American action in South Vietnam?

The Prime Minister: Well, that has got nothing to do with our country.

MAIN HEALTH CENTRE AT BUKIT TUNGAL, KUALA TRENGGANU

13. Dr Tan Chee Khoon asks the Minister of Health to state the necessity of building a Health Centre complete with quarters for medical and dental officers at Bukit Tungal, which is about 4 miles from Kuala Trengganu, and whether he is aware that there is a General Hospital at Kuala Trengganu and, as such, the Health Centre is superfluous and a waste of taxpayers' money and that since its opening, the Health Centre is only being manned by a Hospital Assistant.

Dato' Donald Aloysius Stephens: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Ministry of Health is well aware that the Main Health Centre at Bukit Tungal is not very far from the General Hospital, Kuala Trengganu. It is, however, about seven miles by road and not four miles from Kuala Trengganu, as stated by the Honourable Member.

It is to be stated that a Main Health Centre is primarily for the implementation of the preventive health programmes, activities which are complementary to other forms of medical care generally available at a hospital. The location of the Main Health Centre, as it is, would in fact facilitate reference to the Kuala Trengganu Hospital, of cases requiring hospital care. It is, therefore, not correct to suggest that this Main Health Centre, located as it is, is superfluous and a waste of the taxpayers' money.

It is also not true to state that since its opening that the Main Health Centre is only being manned by a Hospital Assistant. Since last year the Bukit Tunggul Main Health Centre has been manned by a Public Health Inspector, a Hospital Assistant, a Public Health Nurse, an Assistant Nurse, a Midwife, a Public Health Overseer and supporting staff of attendants, a driver and a gardener.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable acting Minister has contradicted my statement that Bukit Tunggul is not four miles from Kuala Trengganu but seven miles. Mr Speaker, Sir, I have just returned from Kuala Trengganu. I have just visited that Health Centre in question and I did particularly measure the mileage on my car (*Laughter*), and so if I record four miles, then he must have been misinformed. I wonder whether the Minister has been to that Health Centre.

Mr Speaker, Sir, is the Honourable acting Minister aware that with regard to the quarters for medical and dental officers, one of them is occupied by a member of the District Office, Kuala Trengganu, and another is occupied by Hospital Assistant? Is the Honourable acting Minister aware of this? That is so, because I have gone and have seen those quarters myself. Is it not a waste of public funds?

Dato' Donald Aloysius Stephens: Mr Speaker, on the question of the distance between Bukit Tunggul and Kuala Trengganu, it is quite possible that the Honourable Member's speedometer might not have worked properly. (*Laughter*). Anyway, my information is that the distance is seven miles through the new road.

On the question of those quarters, pending improvement in the staffing position which would make it possible to post medical and dental officers to the Main Health Centre, they are being allotted to others only as a temporary measure.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Is the Minister aware that there has been a wanton

waste of electricity in that area? On the evening in question when I went there, there were lights in three rooms, fans were all going at full speed, but there was not a single soul anywhere around the building, and when I asked the attendant's wife why this was so, she said, "*Apa boleh buat?*" (*Laughter*). I shall be very grateful for an explanation from the Honourable acting Minister, in view of this austerity drive that we are all asked to participate in.

Dato' Donald Aloysius Stephens: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am not aware of this wastage of lighting, but I am very grateful to the Honourable Member for the information he has given and I will look into the matter.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, can we have an answer from the Honourable acting Minister as to when medical and dental officers will be posted to this palatial Health Centre, and whether this Health Centre, being situated in the particular State constituency of the Dato' Mentri Besar of Trengganu, has anything to do with him?

Dato' Donald Aloysius Stephens: On the first question, as I said in my original answer, the posting of medical and dental officers will be done when the staffing position has improved.

On the second question, it has nothing to do with the question as tabled.

NEW MEDICAL GRADUATES FROM UNIVERSITIES OF SINGAPORE AND MALAYA FOR NATIONAL SERVICE

14. Dr Tan Chee Khoon asks the Minister of Defence if it is the intention of the Government to conscript new medical graduates from the Universities of Singapore and Malaya under the National call-up; if so, is it not an abuse of the National call-up.

The Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Defence and Minister of National and Rural Development (Tun Haji Abdul Razak bin Dato' Hussain): Sir, it is not clear what the Honourable

Member means by 'National call-up' here. Under our National Service laws, all persons within certain age groups have to register themselves for National Service.

It is not our intention to provide military training for all these people. There are indeed over 400,000 persons on the register and we can only provide military training for only a small number. Certain of these persons will have to be given jobs under our Civil Defence regulations and also there are provisions for exemption under the law for military training.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, what I am trying to get an elucidation is this: Is it the intention of both the Ministry of Defence and the Ministry of Health to call up new graduates of the Faculty of Medicine, University of Malaya, and new graduates of the Faculty of Medicine, University of Singapore, and put them in uniform to serve in civilian hospitals and not in military installations?

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: It is not the intention of the Government, Sir.

NEW AIRPORT AT MIRI

15. Enche' Chia Chin Shin asks the Minister of Transport whether it is possible to expedite completion of Miri New Airport in order to avoid the inconvenience caused to travellers at present by the fact that the present Lutong Airport is usable only in good weather.

Dato' Haji Sardon bin Haji Jubir: My Ministry is anxious to complete the new Aerodrome at Miri at the earliest, and at the present time Malaysian Airways Ltd, are endeavouring to position an extra DC. 3 at Kuching which will provide additional services to Lutong. The period of unserviceability after rain is of short duration and every effort will be made to minimise inconvenience to the travelling public.

EXTENSION OF THE GENERAL HOSPITAL AT MIRI, SARAWAK

16. Enche' Chia Chin Shin asks the Minister of Health whether his Ministry considers it is now time to extend

the Miri General Hospital, in view of the pressing and increasing demand for additional beds for patients in Miri.

Dato' Donald Aloysius Stephens: Mr Speaker, Sir, the question of extending the Miri General Hospital has received consideration by my Ministry and provision for the purpose has been included in the First Malaysia Development Plan, 1966/1970, which is now under consideration by the Government.

Amendment to the Sarawak Customs Ordinance, 1953

REFUND OF DUTY IN RESPECT OF GOODS DAMAGED OR STOLEN, ETC.

17. Enche' Chia Chin Shin asks the Minister of Finance whether the Government will consider amending the Sarawak Customs Ordinance, 1953, to enable abatements of duty to be made in respect of goods which are damaged or stolen, or lost in transit or short-landed, or, as occurs at Miri, where transshipment takes place in open sea, do not arrive altogether.

The Minister of Finance (Enche' Tan Siew Sin): Mr Speaker, Sir, the Government considers that the provisions of Section 11 and 16 of the Sarawak Customs Ordinance provide adequate powers for the Minister of Finance or the Comptroller-General of Customs to grant a remission or refund of duty in case this is considered to be justified. Therefore, the Government does not consider that any amendment to the law is necessary.

Section 41 of the Sarawak Customs Ordinance provides for the imposition of duty on manifested goods which are not accounted for and are short-landed. This provision is essential for the protection of revenue, and the owners of goods short-landed can recover the cost of such goods including any import duty paid from the insurers.

The Government cannot agree to special treatment for goods landed at Miri.

DECREASE IN PRICE OF SAGO FLOUR

18. Enche' Sim Boon Liang asks the Minister of Commerce and Industry to state the reasons for the present decrease in the price of sago flour.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Dr Lim Swee Aun): Mr Speaker, Sir, from reliable past published data, it is seen that the price of sago flour does not remain steady in any one year but rather follows a fluctuating trend. The price tends to move upwards during the first quarter of the year but slowly decreases as the second quarter approaches. The price then moves slowly upwards towards the end of the year. It is felt, therefore, that the present decrease in the price of sago flour is attributed to price fluctuations due mainly to normal market conditions and it is not expected that this decline will persist.

AUTOMATIC TELEPHONE EXCHANGES FOR MUKAH, DALAT AND BALINGIAN

19. Enche' Sim Boon Liang asks the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications to state when will an Automatic Exchange for Telephones in Mukah, Dalat and Balingian be installed, and whether Government will put more lines in the area to cater adequately for the amount of telephone calls and to extend at least 12 hours' service daily, for the convenience of the public.

Dato' V. T. Sambanthan: Mr Speaker, Sir, it is proposed to convert both Mukah and Dalat to automatic working during the First Malaysian Plan. Balingian will remain manual as it is a very small isolated exchange with a low telephone growth rate and it is considered uneconomic to install an automatic exchange. The number of junction lines to Mukah and Dalat is at present in the process of being increased. On completion of automatic working, 24-hour service will be provided. Mukah will be made automatic in the period 1966/1967 and Dalat 1967/1968. Eight additional lines will be provided for Sibu/Mukah and it is

expected that Sibu/Dalat will have one more junction by the end of 1965.

MENANGGOHKAN MESHUARAT KAPADA HARI LAIN (USUL)

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menhadangkan bahawa sunggoh pun telah ada sharat²-nya dalam Peratoran Meshuarat 12 (2) apabila tamat meshuarat hari ini Majlis ini hendaklah di-tanggohkan hingga pukul 10 pagi hari Ithnin, 31 haribulan May, 1965.

Dato' Dr Ismail: Saya sokong.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

Bahawa sunggoh pun telah ada sharat²-nya dalam Peratoran Meshuarat 12 (2) apabila tamat meshuarat hari ini Majlis ini hendaklah di-tanggohkan hingga pukul 10 pagi hari Ithnin, 31 haribulan May, 1965.

MOTION

THE YANG DI-PERTUAN AGONG'S SPEECH ADDRESS OF THANKS

Order read for resumption of debate on Question,

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

'Your Majesty,

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

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: Mr Speaker, Sir, at the adjournment yesterday I was still on foreign policy, and I would have a few more observations to make in view of the fact that the Press Secretary to the Prime Minister, a gentleman by the name of Mr Frank Sullivan, has decided to unlearn the lesson which was learned at Winneba. Sir, in this letter, which was published in this morning's *Straits Times*, Mr Frank Sullivan takes us

through a great deal of history concerning the formation of this Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organisation. That is known, Sir. It is primary school stuff and no purpose whatsoever is served in shoving this, primary school stuff to people who have already been through the higher school certificate, and even as a primary school textbook it contains a few errors on which I shall not waste the time of the House. But dealing with his basic thesis that in any case we would have lost, he says at the end of his letter "the fact that Indonesia was ready to sponsor the acceptance of delegates from the Barisan Sosialis and the Socialist Front in Malaya indicates the true nature of this particular international group." Sir, how can this indicate the true nature? What else could anyone expect the Indonesians to do but to support the delegations of their friends in this country? But how does that indicate the nature of the conference? This kind of asinine logic is contained in the whole of the letter. He says that my letter contains some interesting impressions and some glaring omissions. He says, "For instance, nowhere does he mention (i.e. I) the presence at Winneba of the Chinese Communist delegation." Sir, the chap does not even take the trouble to read my letter. There was a paragraph in my letter which clearly stated that unlike Moshi where the Conference was dominated by sino/Soviet rivalry, this time there was a strong undercurrent of Sino/U.A.R. rivalry. That was in the letter and the chap says I was ignorant that the Chinese Communists were there. Sir, let this be emphasised for the benefit of all of us in Malaysia. The Chinese were there, the Russians were there, the communist delegations were there, the non-aligned delegations were there, the United Arab Republic, India, Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania and so forth. And in Afro-Asia, Sir, we must recognise the fact that wherever there are Afro-Asian gatherings, there will be communists, there will be Chinese; and just because the communists are there, you assume that the only thing we can do is to give up the fight.

Malaysia's problem, Sir, is to do battle in Afro-Asian grounds and you meet these people; and our failure is not because the communists were there, but because the non-aligned group which, as I submitted earlier yesterday, were a very potent group, could not find it in themselves to support us because, in their view, we have not yet succeeded in carving out for ourselves an Afro-Asian image. There is no point in saying that the Indonesians were there, that the communists were there and that the Indonesians and the Chinese communists would have seen to the non-admission of Malaysia. If that is the argument, then the same factors will hold good in Algiers when we go there—the Indonesians will be there, the Chinese will be there—and in Algiers too our problem is to carve out for ourselves an Afro-Asian image which will secure for us acceptance in the Afro-Asian world by the non-aligned bloc. But this kind of purblind blinkered logic is not going to help us at all.

Sir, what frightens me is that, perhaps, a gentleman like Mr Frank Sullivan, probably, advises the Prime Minister on foreign policy, and it frightens me to think the effect of such advice on the foreign policy of our nation. Sir, I am not a cruel man, and I do not believe in cruelty to animals or to expatriates. I would suggest, in all sincerity, that, probably, the best thing that we could do would be to pension off this gentleman into retirement, so that our image is not muddled in Afro-Asian circles. If this letter is published in the U.A.R., where the Afro-Asian Secretariat has its headquarters, and where the Secretary-General and the Assistant Secretary-General of the Afro-Asian Secretariat are Nasser's men, supporters of Nasser, this is not going to do us any good in Algiers, Sir, so much for that.

Lastly, I would like to touch on labour policy generally. His Majesty, Sir, in his Gracious Address has said, and I quote:

"During the duration of the Emergency when the country is facing a serious threat from outside, My Government must feel free to face that threat without being embarrassed

by internal struggles. My Government was forced recently to prohibit strikes in certain essential services for the duration of the Emergency."

Sir, this House passed the Emergency Regulations and the Internal Security Act in order to enable the Government to deal with the enemies of Malaysia and not to deal with the friends of Malaysia. We have the word, Sir, of the Honourable Prime Minister himself about the high respect in which he held the Malaysian Trades Union Congress. Not more than five months ago, the Honourable Prime Minister, in a message to the Annual Delegates Conference of the M.T.U.C., said:

"The Government of this country has taken deep interest in the growth of your Congress. Because of your sober and farsighted policy, we have had industrial peace in this country. The useful role played by the workers and the M.T.U.C. in helping to build up our nation on the path to progress and prosperity is a matter which this nation is justly proud of. You have kept the Congress free from the insidious influence of the communists. Both your Congress and your leaders are able and dedicated men. Many of them have travelled far and wide to learn the operation of the movement in other countries and to introduce what is good here. As a result of that, we have a trade union movement here comparable to the best in the world. I would like the M.T.U.C. to know that the present Emergency is not intended to hamper the freedom of action of the trade union movement."

That, Sir, was said by the Honourable Prime Minister five months ago, and in those last five months, Sir, the M.T.U.C. has not been captured by the communists. Its international image remains just as good as it was before, and the only conclusion that trade union leaders in Malaya can come to is that what has changed is the attitude of the Government to labour. Sir, if we take the logic of the Government one or two steps further—"My Government must feel free to face that threat without being embarrassed by internal struggles"—it means labour claims, labour action and so forth. Sir, in this Parliament there are several pro-Malaysia political parties. There are, as part of the democratic process, legitimate political activities which the Government can also claim as embarrassing it in its effort to meet the threat of confrontation. It may be said later

on, on the basis of this very same logic, that this Parliament itself ought, perhaps, to be abolished during the period of confrontation. This kind of logic, Sir, can lead ultimately to totalitarianism and to perdition for all of us. Sir, let us ask this: what was the need for these Emergency Regulations, banning strikes and so forth? There was no need. You do not solve labour problems and claims of labour by heading them off, but you solve them, Sir, by meeting them as a democratic Government in dealing with the free democratic labour movement. You do not solve labour problems by anticipating problems which have not yet occurred. You solve them, Sir, by solving the problems which have occurred already, and these are the basic dissatisfactions which continue in the Government.

The Malaysian Trades Union Congress has listed these out:

Claims for living wage—the M.T.U.C.'s living wage claims raised a long time ago have not yet been settled;

Cheap housing for workers—still a dream; Social security for workers—promised, but not yet fulfilled;

Marketing boards—still in the air;

May Day holiday—very much in the air;

Wages Councils—all the Councils have not been set up to protect and improve the wages of workers;

Amendments to the Trade Union Ordinance—nothing done;

Facilities for trade union officials—are still being denied by most employers;

Port, harbour and water front workers—still unable to settle their longstanding problems;

National Joint Labour Advisory Council—proving ineffective and inefficient;

Arbitration Tribunal award—not honoured by the Government;

National Whitley Council—getting more inefficient and ineffective;

Registration of the M.T.U.C. as an effective trade union—flatly refused by the Government;

Representation of the workers in all public bodies where workers' interests will be considered and decided—still being denied to the M.T.U.C.

and so on.

Sir, disputes which hanged fire for 14 months, 15 months or 2 years

cannot be legislated out of existence and cannot be banned. Sir, this is the tragedy, that the effect of these Emergency Regulations is to create an opportunity for the enemies of Malaysia to strengthen their hands in the trade union movement. That will be the net effect of these regulations; and trade union leaders, who had openly professed loyalty to Malaysia, who had earned encomiums from the Prime Minister and from the Minister of Labour about their sobriety and responsibility and loyalty, will now find their hands weakened in dealing with dissatisfactions which have not really been removed.

Sir, it is my hope that the Government will see it from this point of view, not just to say, "the trade unions have claimed this, that and the other, so we are going to ban strikes." But by taking this action, Sir, the Government have struck a blow in favour of the enemies of Malaysia. I was told, Sir, that at the M.T.U.C. Delegates' Conference which met recently, it was Socialist Front leaders who drew the loudest applause; and that is the lesson. You do not repress democratic trade unionism without giving advantage to non-democratic trade unionists—political forces who are the enemies of Malaysia. And far from saving the Government any embarrassment, I say that this is going to create new embarrassment for the Government; new problems, greater and more difficult to solve. I hope that it is still not too late for the Government to reconsider these measures, reconsider them in the light of the effect that they will produce—and that is to strengthen the hands of the enemies of Malaysia. Thank you, Sir.

Tuan Haji Rahmat bin Haji Daud (Johor Bahru Barat): Yang Berhormat Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun untuk menyokong usul Titah Uchapan shukur dan terima kasih atas Titah Uchapan Kebawah Duli Yang di-Pertuan Agong pada masa membuka Parliman Yang Kedua sa-malam.

Saya berchakap sa-bagai Wakil dari Johor Bahru Barat. Saya hanya merayu

berkenaan dengan penduduk² di-dalam kawasan saya sahaja, ia-itu berkenaan dengan pelajaran. Pada tahun ini, sekolah² di-Johor hanya dapat dua buah sekolah baharu sahaja, pada hal banyak sekolah² yang di-minta di-Johor, terutama sa-kali sekolah di-kawasan saya, ia-itu satu di-Skudai dan satu lagi di-Pengkalan Rinting, ia-itu dalam kawasan Johor Bahru Barat. Saya telah membawa perkara itu lebeh kurang tiga kali dan berharap pada tahun ini sekolah itu akan dapat di-dirikan, tetapi tidak juga, kerana saya mendesak kapada pehak yang berkenaan, terutama sa-kali sekolah di-Pekan Skudai.

Pada masa ini murid² di-sekolah itu ada lebeh kurang sa-ramai 250 orang dan hanya ada empat bilek darjah, atau empat kelas sahaja, maka berasak²-lah kanak² itu belajar, lebeh kurang dalam satu darjah di-letakkan sa-ramai 50 orang kanak². Sa-bagaimana yang saya telah ucapkan di-dalam masa Meshuarat Budget tahun dahulu, dan sekarang keadaan-nya lebeh burok lagi ia-itu kanak² yang lebeh di-letakkan dalam masjid Skudai, dengan tidak ada kerusi meja, bahkan kanak² itu belajar sa-bagai chara lama. Saya perchaya banyak juga sekolah² di-dalam negeri² yang lain pun ada yang sa-macham itu. Jadi, untuk mendapatkan wang, saya suka-lah mengeshor-kan di-sini supaya wang itu dapat daripada Kementerian yang lain, umpama-nya, katakan-lah jalan² yang bengkok-bengkok yang hendak di-betul dan di-luruskan, supaya jalan² itu jadi pendek dan lebeh molek lagi, ini hendak-lah di-tanggohkan dahulu, umpama-nya, macham jalan yang di-buat di-Mantin, satu gaong yang dalam yang telah di-tambak, dengan belanja wang beratus² ribu ringgit, jalan itu jauh-nya hanya lebeh kurang sa-tengah batu sahaja, dan kalau-lah wang itu di-belanjakan untuk sekolah², maka lebeh banyak faedah-nya kapada anak² kita. Banyak jalan² yang bengkok-bengkok yang tidak begitu mustahak, boleh-lah di-tanggohkan hingga masa aman nanti. Saya fikir lebeh baik wang² itu di-belanjakan untuk membena sekolah², atau membetulkan sekolah² bagi

kanak² kita yang kurang tempat untuk belajar. Sungguh pun sekolah² baharu banyak telah di-bena, tetapi kanak² kita yang kecil² yang baharu lagi hendak belajar, dan ada semangat hendak belajar, apabila mereka itu di-letakkan di-dalam satu sekolah yang tidak chukup serba-serbi-nya, maka terbantut-lah hati kanak² itu pada hendak belajar.

Dengan ini saya minta kepada Kerajaan supaya ranchangan² yang tidak memberi faedah kepada umum, di-tanggohkan dahulu, supaya wang itu dapat di-belanjakan pada membena sekolah² yang sangat di-kehendaki.

Yang kedua, saya suka menyentuh berkenaan dengan tanah. Saya ucapkan shukor kepada Allah subhanahu wata'ala dan terima kasih kepada Kerajaan yang mempunyai timbang rasa kepada penduduk², atau warga negara kita yang tidak mempunyai tanah, terutama sa-kali pak² tani kita, bukan sahaja daripada orang² Melayu, bahkan juga daripada orang² yang bukan Melayu—orang² bangsa lain, ia-itu warga negara Malaysia ini, tetapi di-kawasan saya itu ia-lah kawasan Tampoi, separoh daripada kawasan Johor Bahru Barat yang banyak penduduk²-nya terdiri daripada kaki²-tangan Kerajaan yang mana mereka itu pun berkehendakkan tanah juga, dan banyak yang telah datang berjumpa dengan saya meminta saya membawa perkara ini di-sini supaya dapat mereka itu peluang mempunyai tanah, sa-bagaimana orang² kampong juga, ya'ani tanah² yang tidak dapat perbelanjaan daripada Kerajaan. Mereka itu bolehlah berbelanja sendiri. Umpama-nya macham kaki-tangan Kerajaan yang telah bekerja bertahun², apabila mereka itu bersara, mereka tidak mendapat hasil, melainkan penchen yang separoh sahaja. Kalau-lah mereka itu di-beri tanah sa-lepas mereka bekerja 10 atau 15 tahun, saya perchaya mereka boleh kerjakan dengan wang sendiri, maka apabila sampai masa-nya, mereka itu bersara, maka ada-lah harapan bagi mereka itu mendapat hasil daripada tanah² kebun itu. Saya harap bagi pehak Kerajaan dapat menimbangkan, supaya kaki-tangan Kerajaan di-beri tanah yang ta' ada bantuan.

Saya perchaya kaki-tangan Kerajaan di-Negeri² yang lain ada juga berchita² berkehendakkan tanah sa-bagaimana kaki-tangan Kerajaan di-kawasan saya itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ucapkan sa-tinggi² tahniah kepada kaki-tangan Kerajaan, semenjak kita merdeka, mereka ini telah menjalankan kerja dan tugas-nya yang sangat memuaskan, oleh kerana kerja² pembangunan luar bandar dan lain² juga yang telah bertambah² banyak, sa-hingga sa-tengah daripada pegawai² Kerajaan itu dengan kerana terlampau banyak kerja, telah mendapat penyakit HYPERTENSION, atau darah tinggi.

Saya perchaya oleh kerana fikiran-nya runsing, sa-hingga kerja di-bawa balek ka-rumah dan mereka tidak dapat rehat dengan sa-chukup-nya.

Waktu saya melawat ka-Australia pada tahun 1962, saya dapati kaki-tangan Kerajaan di-sana bekerja rajin, riang dan sehat dan mereka itu suka bekerja dan mereka tidak tahu menchuri tulang. Saya dapati di-sana chuti minggu-nya bukan 1½ hari bahkan 2 hari ia-itu hari Sabtu dan hari Ahad. Umpama-nya, kalau mereka itu lepas pada hari Sabtu, maka kaki-tangan Kerajaan dan juga sa-tengah daripadanya pekerja² dalam kilang² dan gudang² mereka itu bekerja di-rumah untuk membersehhkan rumah-nya saperti memotong rumput dan lain² lagi, maka pada hari itu juga mereka itu pergi pasar membeli-belah dan menolong isteri di-rumah dan pada hari Ahad-nya pula mereka itu berehat 100 peratus. Mereka itu pergi ka-tepi² laut, ka-kebun² bunga, ka-kebun² binatang dan di-tepi tasek yang boleh merihatkan fikiran dengan menyedut hawa yang dingin, dan segar, maka bila sampai hari Ithnin mereka itu bekerja balek dengan sehat dan riang.

Ini-lah satu ubat yang sangat baik kepada pekerja², terutama sa-kali pekerja² dalam pejabat². Dari itu kalau-lah chuti yang 2 hari sa-minggu itu di-adakan atau di-beri kepada kaki-tangan Kerajaan di-sini, saya perchaya kaki-tangan Kerajaan kita akan tidak mendapat penyakit HYPERTENSION atau darah tinggi yang saya katakan

tadi, oleh kerana mereka telah berikat sa-lama 2 hari. Sungguh pun kita ada $1\frac{1}{2}$ hari, tetapi $\frac{1}{2}$ hari itu boleh di-katakan bukan hari chuti, dan ini sangat merugikan kepada Kerajaan dan juga kaki-tangan Kerajaan. Sa-tengah hari itu ia-lah hari Sabtu, jika di-sa-belah petang-nya ada pula peraduan golf, football atau racing, boleh di-katakan kaki-tangan Kerajaan dan juga pekerja² di-mana² pun hati-nya runsing mengingatkan apa yang hendak buat pada petang itu. Sa-tengah daripada sa-tengah-nya pula kalau ada kerja² saperti perkahwinan kenduri-kendara dan lain²-nya terpaksa-lah berchuti. Kalau chuti itu chuti yang sa-benar-nya tidak apa-lah, ini chuti *French leave*. Ini sangat merugikan Kerajaan, kerana chuti $\frac{1}{2}$ hari itu tidak chukup, dia tambah lagi buat 2 hari menjadi $2\frac{1}{2}$ hari. Kalau mereka itu dapat 2 hari chuti tiap² minggu tidak payah mereka mengambil chuti lagi. Umpama-nya, kalau dia dudok di-Johor Bahru, dia ada kerja kahwin atau hendak melawat orang sakit di-Muar, mereka tidak payah berchuti lagi, petang hari Rabu itu, mereka itu boleh-lah berangkat, hari Khamis dan Juma'at kelepasan dan sa-belah petang boleh balek semula dengan tidak berchuti.

Pada fikiran saya sa-kira-nya Kerajaan beri chuti tiap² minggu 2 hari, ini akan memberi keuntungan kepada kedua² pihak ia-itu Kerajaan dan kaki-tangan Kerajaan. Kalau mereka itu ada kebun dapat-lah mereka bekerja di-kebun-nya sa-lama 2 hari dan menyedut hawa² yang baik di-sana. Apabila mereka bekerja sa-mula pada hari Ithnin atau hari Sabtu di-Johor, mereka akan bertambah sehat dan fikiran-nya tidak runsing.

Saya harap pihak Kerajaan akan menimbangkan perkara ini, sebab ada-nya kelepasan $1\frac{1}{2}$ hari ini sa-olah² 1 hari juga. Saperti di-Johor sana, hari kelepasan hanya $1\frac{1}{2}$ hari ia-itu hari Khamis dan Juma'at. Saya pun telah bekerja dengan Kerajaan sa-lama 31 tahun, saya tahu-lah bagaimana keadaan-nya pada hari Khamis itu kelepasan alang-kepalang, hari Juma'at pula hendak memikirkan kewajipan kita untuk sembahyang Juma'at, jadi tidak ada kelepasan terus. Hari

Juma'at tengah hari-nya kita orang Islam hendak pergi sembahyang, jadi ta' dapat hendak pergi ka-mana². Apabila sudah petang hanya pergi ka-bukit Katel berihat. Kalau hendak berjalan ka-tepi² laut pun tidak molek nanti, orang akan kata Haji Rahmat tidak pergi sembahyang. Ini-lah satu perkara yang sangat merunsingkan dan yang sangat merugikan.

Saya suka shorkan sungguh pun di-Johor hari kelepasan-nya hari Khamis dan Juma'at dan di-sini hari Sabtu dan Ahad, ini boleh-lah kita atorkan, ia-itu di-Johor biar hari Juma'at dan hari Sabtu dan di-sini hari Sabtu dan Ahad. Hari Sabtu itu kelepasan pada semua negeri dalam Malaysia. Kalau ada perjumpaan, pertandingan football, sokan dan lain² boleh-lah mereka itu berjumpa pada hari Sabtu, pada hari Juma'at dan hari Ahad itu hari kelepasan yang sa-benar-nya, dengan ini, akan menjadi keuntungan kepada kedua² majikan dan kepada pekerja².

Di-sini saya suka juga menyentoh berkenaan dengan ugama Islam, Dua hari sa-belum saya datang ka-Kuala Lumpur ini ada sa-orang bangsa China yang bukan Islam di-bawa oleh sa-orang Melayu ia-itu bekas imam di-Singapura. Beliau itu datang membawa orang ini hendak di-masokkan Islam. Jadi, saya tanya kepada bekas imam tadi, mengapa tidak di-masokkan Islam di-Singapura. Maka jawab-nya, ini sangat susah dan banyak cherewet. Jadi kerana kewajipan saya sa-bagai orang Islam kepada sa-orang yang bukan Islam yang hendak masok Islam, maka terpaksa-lah saya bawa ka-Johor Baharu. Dengan hal yang demikian apabila saya berjumpa Kadhi, maka Kadhi ambil form dan nama orang yang masok Islam tadi terus-lah di-masokkan Islam. Jadi bukan itu sahaja rupa-nya banyak lagi orang² yang bukan Islam datang dari Singapura ka-Johor Baharu masok Islam dan berkhitan di-sana. Perkara ini sangat mendukachitakan. Saya tidak suka berchakap di-sini, apa sebab²-nya, kerana tidak molek kalau saya berchakap. Terpulang-lah kepada pihak yang berkenaan menyiasat perkara ini. Sa-tengah daripada

orang² yang masuk Islam daripada Singapura itu di-hantarkan oleh Pegawai Ugama Singapura, bukan-lah masuk Islam di-Johor Baharu sahaja boleh, bahkan di-Singapura pun boleh. Di-sana ada beberapa Pegawai² Ugama yang boleh memasokkan mereka Islam, tetapi malang-nya orang² yang hendak masuk Islam itu banyak sangat di-soal, ini dan itu, yang saya tidak suka sebutkan di-sini, mengapa mereka itu di-hantar ka-Johor Baharu.

Ini-lah saya harap, kerana Islam ia-lah agama rasmi negara kita, dan sa-bagaimana Titah Uchapan Duli Yang Maha Mulia Yang di-Pertuan Agong dan juga Y.T.M. Tengku Perdana Menteri pun menggalakkan orang² yang bukan Islam masuk Islam, maka orang yang bukan Islam di-Singapura yang hendak masuk Islam terpaksa datang ka-Johor Baharu. Saya harap pehak yang berkenaan, supaya merengan atau memberi kesenangan kepada orang² yang bukan Islam yang hendak masuk Islam, supaya dapat diselenggarakan di-Singapura. Sampai di-sini-lah dan saya ucapkan terima kasih dan saya sokong akan usul yang di-bawa pada hari sa-malam.

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew (Singapore): Mr Speaker, Sir, with the formal opening of this second session of the Parliament of Malaysia, we open a new chapter in the drama of Malaysia. Parliamentary democracy makes the joining of the political issues in the open debate often a dramatic and vivid way in which alternative programmes, policies, can be presented to the people; and it is therefore with special significance, after what has happened in the last 10 months, that we listened to the address of His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong. The issues are being clarified; they are being joined.

It was a brief, succinct, if somewhat equivocal address in parts. I would like, if I may, to read to the House first the last paragraph of this Address:

"We"—said His Majesty—"are now facing threats to our security from outside,"—and he defined it—"i.e., from Indonesia. In addition, we are also facing threats from within the country."—There is no definition of where this threat from within the country is coming

from, but he went on—"Both these threats are designed to create trouble. If those concerned achieve their objective, it will mean chaos for us and an end to democracy." And it ends up with an incantation "to Almighty God to give us strength and determination to face these threats."

Mr Speaker, Sir, I think no useful purpose is served, if we pretend that we do not know what was intended. When I heard this speech I looked around me, Mr Speaker, Sir, for obviously it must mean some sector of this House. Honourable Members from PAS are they the threats from within? Their leader has been arrested for conspiring with the Indonesians.

I looked at the three Members from Singapore, from Barisan Sosialis; they looked reasonably meek and polite but men of great determination. Could it be they?

If it is not these two Parties—the Member for Batu? No less an authority than the Prime Minister has given him a certificate of clearance; "He is a good man", said the Prime Minister, at our last meeting, "because he tried to placate the crowd and ran away from it the moment the crowd got into disorder."

Dr Tan Chee Khoon (Batu): Mr Speaker, Sir, may I on a point of clarification say that the Honourable the Prime Minister for Singapore is but repeating the lie perpetrated by the Prime Minister of the Central Government. The bigger the lie the more it will stick, we presume. Birds of the same feather! (*Laughter*).

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew: Well, Sir, obviously it could not be the Member for Batu. I concede that straightaway. In any case he has already stated in this House that he has not got the stomach of which martyrs are made—he said so. He is a man of peace, and from time to time he makes quite sure that Honourable Ministers on the other side know that he is a man of peace.

So, Mr Speaker, Sir, we were left with this doubt that, perhaps, we loyal Malaysians, gathering together now to establish the Constitution, that Malaysia is a Malaysian nation,

perhaps we were that threat from within. I do not know what was intended and I hope the Prime Minister took full responsibility for the text of his Address. There is an advantage in the ceremonial, Mr Speaker, Sir, of the Prime Minister solemnly mounting the dias to hand the speech to His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong and I have no doubt whatsoever that in the course of the Prime Minister's speech, he will be able to add to the second sentence the same explanatory "i.e."—"from within the country, i.e." So be it. Let it be said so in this Chamber; let it not be insinuated, let it not be sowed insidiously in the Malay press to the Malays in the kampongs—in Jawi.

I would like, Mr Speaker, Sir, to read, if I may, what the same Malay press, the *Utusan Melayu*, was saying at the very same time as His Majesty was making the Speech—and it is not what *Utusan Melayu* said that worries me but whom *Utusan Melayu* is quoting from. Said *Utusan Melayu* of the 25th of May, *Headline*—"LEE IS AN ENEMY OF THE PEOPLE OF MALAYSIA."

Klang, 24th May "Dato' Harun bin Haji Idris, Mentri Besar of Selangor, described Lee Kuan Yew as an enemy of the people of Malaysia and was endangering the peace of the country."

In the same issue, the day before yesterday—this time it is the *Berita Harian*—the Mentri Besar of Perak, Dato' Ahmad bin Said, has called upon the Malays—and amongst the things he called upon them—to take note of his statement: "Lee Kuan Yew is now not only our enemy but he is also the most dangerous threat to the security of this country."

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, I think no advantage is served by equivocation. This has been going on and I have got a whole file; it goes back to a campaign mounted immediately after we announced our intention to contest in the last elections; it goes back one whole year. This is what the Secretary-General of U.M.N.O. said in *Utusan*

Melayu on this very same day, the 25th:

"Secretary-General also called on the Malays to be more strongly united to face the present challenge; he stressed that the Malays should realise their identity, 'Wherever I am, I am a Malay. If the Malays were split the Malays would perish from this earth.'"

Now, Sir, I would like, if I may, to start with the Oath, which we all took when we came into this Chamber before we had the right to participate in debates. It is laid down that no Member shall have the right to participate as a representative of the people unless he swears this Oath, and the Oath which I read myself, Mr Speaker, Sir, read in the Malay language—reads "I(full name), having been elected as a Member of the House of Representatives do solemnly swear or affirm that I will faithfully discharge my duties as such to the best of my ability and that I will bear true faith and allegiance to Malaysia and will preserve, protect and defend its Constitution."

This is its Constitution, Mr Speaker, Sir, published by the Government Printer with the authority of the Yang di-Pertuan Agong, compiled in the Attorney-General's Chambers, Kuala Lumpur.

What is it, Mr Speaker, Sir, that I, or my colleagues, or the other Members in the Malaysian Solidarity Convention, what is it that we have done which deserves this denunciation as "enemy of the people, a danger, a threat to security"? We have said we believe in a Malaysian Malaysia. We honour this Constitution, because that was what we swore to do and, if I may just crave the indulgence, Mr Speaker, Sir, to remind Honourable Members of what they swore to uphold:

Part II—Fundamental Liberties: Articles 5, Liberty of the person; 6, Slavery and forced labour prohibited; 7, Protection against retrospective criminal laws and repeated trials; 8,

Equality—equality, Mr Speaker, Sir, political equality; 9, Prohibition of banishment and freedom of movement; 10; Freedom of speech, assembly and association; 11, Freedom of religion; 12, Rights in respect of education; 13, Rights of property.

But I will be fair to Honourable Members. There is also a part of this Constitution we swore to uphold, under Part XII—General and Miscellaneous: Article 153, Reservation of quotas in respect of services, permits, etc., for Malays and just before that, Article 152, National Language. We uphold that, we accept it. This is what we swore to protect, to preserve and to defend, and this is what we have every intention of doing, Mr Speaker, Sir, by every constitutional means open to us and given to us by this Constitution, the basis on which, solemnly and in good faith, we came into Malaysia.

Sir, I would like to quote, if I may, no less an authority than the Prime Minister of Malaysia, when he recently again stressed that we must abide by the Constitution. We promised to do that, Mr Speaker, Sir, faithfully, and both in the letter and spirit of the Constitution. But I must confess that the actions taken by the Central Government over the last few months give rise to growing doubts as to where and in what direction we are drifting. Strikes have been prohibited, the M.T.U.C., as the Member of Bungsar said, cannot now be registered as a trade union; public meetings are prohibited in danger areas; local government elections have been postponed indefinitely; and it is in this context, Mr Speaker, Sir, that people were told that for reasons of *amour-propre*, a feeling of nationalism, pride in ourselves as Malaysians, appeals to the Privy Council will be abolished—now, mark you, Mr Speaker, Sir, appeals to the Privy Council *only* in constitutional and criminal matters, not in civil matters. I would not wish to say more on this, because I am quite sure the Honourable the Prime Minister will be able to reassure us of our many doubts on these matters, and he is in a position to do so. If he would say to us publicly

what I had the advantage of discussing with him privately two days ago, then I think a lot of fears will be allayed, and I hope that it will be our privilege to hear from him the words of reassurance.

Sir, I think it is time we took stock of our position and we began to face each other on fundamental issues; where we stand in respect of Malaysia, what we propose to do to advance its cause, what we are prepared to do if, in fact, we are to be thwarted from our legitimate objective to get what was agreed in this Constitution implemented. Therefore, I noted with regret that, in spite of the protests that we have made as Members of the Opposition, in grave constitutional matters which require at least solemn deliberations by Members of this House, we are still faced with Standing Orders which entitle the Government to bring about radical and fundamental changes in the Constitution, all within one day—one day's notice of the Bill—the intention of the first, second and third readings, if the government so chooses. Is this likely to protect, to defend, to uphold the Constitution?

Sir, I would like to divide the Opposition between loyal and not-so-loyal Opposition. The Member for Batu reminded the House that I once said there was a gulf between them and us. There is still, Mr Speaker, Sir; perhaps, not between him personally and us because he is not really what his Party represents. Parties like the Socialist Front, Mr Speaker, Sir, and PAS parties which have over a series of elections spread over 10/15 years have almost abandoned all hope of ever achieving what they want to do constitutionally; it is only those parties that then begin to become disloyal. I can give the Prime Minister and his colleagues this very firm assurance that we have a vested interest, Mr Speaker, Sir, in constitutionalism and in loyalty because we know, and we knew it before we joined Malaysia, that if we are patient, if we are firm, this Constitution must mean that a Malaysian nation emerges. Why should we oblige the Member for

Johore Tenggara to get out of Malaysia? "Secede," says he "I demand that he says so now." We tell him and all his colleagues now that we have not the slightest intention of secession. Secession is an act of betrayal, to leave like-minded people like ourselves in Sabah, in Sarawak, in Malaya to the tender mercies of those who talk in terms of race: "Wherever I am, I am a Malay." I would have thought, Mr Speaker, Sir, that if one were to say, "Wherever I am, I am a Malaysian", it would have sounded enormously more comforting to all of us and would have helped to consolidate the nation. But let me assure him. He has asked and urged the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs to take action—he has been going on for some months now, but it is reaching crescendo.

This was the 24th, the day before we met: *Utusan Melayu*, 24th: "Albar challenges Kuan Yew: Don't be fond of beating about the bush—Lee asked to state openly his stand whether Singapore wants to secede from Malaysia." And it goes on to say: "If Lee Kuan Yew is really a man he should not be beating about the bush in his statements and should be brave enough to say, 'I want to secede from Malaysia because I am not satisfied.' But, said Albar, Lee did not dare say that because he himself had signed the Malaysia Constitutional Agreement. Regarding Lee, 'the most stupid person he has ever come across', Albar said that Lee entered Malaysia with his eyes open and the present Malaysia is the same Malaysia which he entered. Why did he not think of all these before? Why only now has he regretted? 'Why?', asked Albar in a high-pitched tone—"not I who said that—the *Utusan Melayu*, 'high-pitched note', and his audience replied, 'Crush Lee, crush Lee.....'

"Lee," continued Albar in a lower tone, "was really like an 'ikan sepat' which cannot live save in muddy water." (*Laughter*).

"Several voices shouted, 'Arrest Lee and preserve him like entrails in pickle.'" Dato' Albar smiled for a moment and then he replied, "Shout

louder!—Shout louder," said he, Mr Speaker, Sir,—"so that Dr Ismail can hear the people's anger."—Well, I want to make quite sure that everybody hears the people's anger.

Albar then went on. It is a very long piece, Mr Speaker, Sir. I leave that for Honourable Members who are interested, and we can put them on the mailing list—those who do not read Jawi, we will put them on the mailing list and provide them with copies, so that day by day they can follow the theoretical expositions of this ideological group.

"Albar regarded Lee Kuan Yew as a frightened man chased by his own shadow." What can I do about my shadow, Mr Speaker, Sir? It must follow me! (*Laughter*).

"Lee is like a traveller in the sands of the Sahara," said Albar—vistas of the Hadramaut, Sahara, Saudi Arabia. (*Laughter*).

"He looks to his left and sees the desert sands, to his right a vast emptiness and to his rear a wide open space, and so he becomes frightened. To subdue his fear he shouts on the top of his voice."

Well, Mr Speaker, Sir, I have quite a number of things to say. So, I hope Members will forgive me if I say what I have to say in a fairly modulated way, but I think sufficiently distinct and clear to leave nobody in any doubts as to where we stand.

Sir, I have no regrets about this document, the Constitution. It was passed in this House and in the old Parliament of Malaya; it was passed in the Assembly of Singapore. Why should we regret it? What we will regret very much is, as was obliquely hinted in the Address of His Majesty, there would be an end to democracy—the Constitution suspended, brushed aside?

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, I think these are important matters which affect all of us. And, therefore, by the time a campaign, which has been going on for some months, finds an echo, albeit an oblique one, in His

Majesty's Speech to us, it is worthwhile going into the credibility of this insinuation.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we all want peace, we all want Malaysia to succeed, and that is why we came into Malaysia. But if we echo "yes" to this pernicious doctrine, "Wherever I am, I am a Malay." Said Dr Mahathir yesterday, "The trouble with us," said he, "from Singapore is we are not accustomed to Malay rule. That's why"—the implication being we ought to be, Mr Speaker, Sir.

The bigger English language newspaper for some reason or the other has left out this very important passage, but the smaller English language newspaper very kindly put it out in script for us; so if I may read this:

"On the question of Malay privileges about which Mr Lee made so much play while in Australia and New Zealand, the saviour of Malaysia ignores the facts as they really are. We Malays are very sensitive but this is a total war declared by the P.A.P. and even if it hurts our feelings it is wiser to demonstrate that in this land the privileged Malays, Ibans, Dayaks and Kadazans live in huts while the under-privileged Chinese live in palaces, go about in huge cars and have the best things in life."

If I had just read that without having heard what Dr Mahathir said yesterday, I would have thought it came straight out from Radio Jakarta, Mr Speaker, Sir—that is the line, that all the Chinese have got big houses and big cars. I can show Dr Mahathir any number of Chinese in very miserable hovels in Singapore, where there is a housing programme, let alone in other parts where they have not got a housing programme yet.

"It is, of course, necessary to emphasise that there are two types of Chinese"—and this is very interesting; a bit of theory here—"Those who appreciate the need for all communities to be equally well off and these are the M.C.A. supporters to be found mainly where Chinese have for generations lived and worked amidst the Malays and other indigenous people, and the insular, selfish and arrogant type of which Mr Lee is a good example. The latter type live in a purely Chinese environment where Malays only exist at syces level. They have been nurtured by the British and made much of because they helped the British economic empire. They have never known Malay rule and

couldn't bear the idea that the people they have so long kept under their heels should now be in a position to rule them."

--Ominous words, Mr Speaker, Sir.

"They have in most instances never crossed the Causeway. They are in fact overseas Chinese first—more specifically Chinese of the Southern Region as their mind sees China as the centre of the world—and Malaysians a very poor second—a status so utterly artificial to them that it finds difficulty in percolating through their criticisms."

What does that mean, Mr Speaker, Sir? They are not words uttered in haste, they were scripted, prepared and beautifully read out; and if we are to draw the implications from that, the answer is quite simple: that Malaysia will not be a Malaysian nation. I say, "Say so, let us know it now." Why waste five-ten years' effort to build this, defend this—for whose benefit, Mr Speaker, Sir? According to this sacred document, we are obliged on oath to uphold this for the benefit of all Malaysians—and a Malaysian is there defined. But all Malaysians have a duty, also defined there under the General and Miscellaneous provisions, to ensure that the development, preservation of jobs, licences and so on in Malaya, Sabah and Sarawak will go to Malays—quite clearly a distinction between our political equality and our duty as part of that political equality to give special attention to the economic and social uplift of the Malays and the other indigenous peoples in Sabah and Sarawak. We accept that obligation and I was delighted when I discovered that the Secretary-General of UMNO agreed in print that I had an aliquot part in the right to determine the destiny of Malaysia.

Well, on that basis I say there is ground for believing that the future of Malaysia is fair. Deny that basis, I say we don't need Soekarno and confrontation to destroy us.

Now, I believe it would be helpful, Mr Speaker, Sir, if I were to spell out, not for the benefit of the Prime Minister or the Minister for Home Affairs, because I think they have already sat down and worked these things out in their minds and therefore they speak with greater and wider circumspection.

Is it really that simple that you can resolve these problems on the basis of stifling, or negating, your democratic constitutional opponents?

This is *Utusan Melayu* again, Mr Speaker, Sir, "and the Secretary-General of UMNO urged in the strongest possible terms that action should be taken *now*." Well, I am a frightened man according to him and, therefore, I see shadows. I think it would help if I could sort of work out the various logical consequences. Frightened even though I may be, we are still not bereft of our senses. There are two ways in which developments in Malaysia could take—first, in accordance with the democratic processes set out in the Constitution; and second, not in accordance with it, using extra-constitutional capacities and the administration of the Police and the Army.

We have calculated this before we came into Malaysia and we must accept the consequences, but let me spell out the consequences. First, Mr Speaker, Sir, I go back again to His Majesty's Speech. Said he, "I would like to pay special tribute . . ."—not just a tribute, a *special* tribute, and to those this special tribute was addressed were besides our own Security Forces and the police, the British, Australian and New Zealand Armed Forces. Now, what does that mean, Mr Speaker, Sir? It means quite simply that if we are without assistance, the air links between Malaya and Western Malaysia and Eastern Malaysia will be closed. The sea links will be closed. We cannot carry troops on the "Mutiaras" to go and fight in Sabah. Can we? We know all that. We might be able to buy some, I don't know, perhaps. Let us be frank and honest to ourselves first, that Malaysia by itself has not got the capacity to be governed by force. That is as simple as that and, therefore, that capacity must be borrowed from somewhere—the British, Australians, New Zealanders.

Well, Sir, I do not know the Australians and the New Zealanders as well as I know the British, for I

happened to have lived in that country for several years and, therefore, I took particular care and interest when I visited them recently to find out whether there was a possibility that such extraordinary aid can be given in order to hold Malaysia down. I will not talk about the Governments, because they are friendly Governments, friendly to all Malaysians, which includes me: I will talk more pertinently of the people in these countries.

One battalion was sent to South Vietnam recently from Australia in defence of what the Australian Prime Minister called the survival of the democratic world, and a very vociferous and articulate Opposition disagreed profoundly—they may be right or they may be wrong, but of one thing I am certain: neither Australia, nor New Zealand, has got the capacity to play the role of the Americans in South Vietnam. Therefore, we ask—have the British got this capacity?—May be for some time. But for all time? Because that is what it means. Once you throw this into the fire and say "Be done with it", it means that you do it for all time and history is a long and a relentless process. People born, people destroyed, but more are born and more surge forward. It is part of the story of the human race on this earth. Can it be done? Will the British public be parties to that? Well, I am not talking about the British Government, Mr Speaker, Sir. I am now talking of the British public and whatever Government it is—Conservative, or Labour—it faces the same British public.

All right, so they want us to secede and leave our friends from Sabah and Sarawak, from Penang and Malacca, and all the other parts of Malaysia at their tender mercies. We cannot oblige, Mr Speaker, Sir. We will not. We know the juxta-position of strength and weakness on both sides. We are fervently of the opinion that, if we give and take and accommodate, this can succeed, and there is no other way to make it succeed and we shall be patient, but I will tell Members on

the other side why I think what they are doing is not likely to lead to success for them.

I was intrigued, Mr Speaker, Sir, when the Members foregathered for the ceremonial Opening on Tuesday, I met the Chief Minister of Sarawak—he had to sit next to me. I also noted the Minister for Sarawak Affairs. I felt reassured, Mr Speaker, Sir,—completely reassured—not because I believe in a Chinese Malaysia, because if I look at them and I believed in a Chinese Malaysia, I will be very unassured. This is where the Member from Kedah talking about the P.A.P., is making a very grave error—that what we want is a Chinese Malaysia, a Chinese state; that is wrong. The Minister for Sarawak Affairs cannot go with a Chinese Malaysia, nor can the Chief Minister for Sarawak come along with us on a Chinese Malaysia—that is folly. I may be a very foolish man, Mr Speaker, Sir, according to the Secretary-General of UMNO, but I do sit down with paper and pencil and calculate and I have; I took out all the annual reports of all these territories, compiled before Malaysia, and, apart from the fact that fundamentally I will oppose a Chinese Malaysia, because it is wrong, there is the added incentive which I keep reminding Barisan Sosalis of—that an appeal to a Chinese Malaysia cannot attract majority support. It is not possible. There are only 42 per cent Chinese in Malaysia—a permanent minority.

Now, Sir, I have been accused of being communal, because I urge the Chinese not to be stupid. If I went round, Mr Speaker, Sir, saying what the Member for Johore Tenggara says, “Wherever I am, remember, I am a Chinese”, where would we be? But I keep on reminding them, and sometimes I feel that with some members of the Barisan Sosalis, it is not a futile effort—even they are learning.

I am a Malaysian, and I am learning Malay. *Bahasa Kebangsaan*—that is right—and I accept my duties under Article 153 of the Constitution to

uplift the Malays and the indigenous people, including the Minister from Sarawak. I felt reassured, Mr Speaker, Sir, without disclosing any confidence that they would find it very difficult to go along with the Member for Johore Tenggara, if he goes around shouting and beating his chest, “I am a Malay”, where does that Member for Sarawak come from? (*Laughter*) I felt concern for him and I was reassured when I found that in spite of everything, he was still with his distinctive haircut. Unconcealed, Mr Speaker, Sir, unconcealed, he was proud of it. It is true that our Kadazan Minister from Sabah was more willing to try and conform, but even he, Mr Speaker, Sir, had a rakish look about the way in which he presented himself as a Malaysian. Therefore, Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to remind Members on the other side that frightened though we may be, we are always sitting down looking at the figures, calculating what all this means; and I suggest to Honourable Members that to suggest that if we pursue what we are entitled to pursue under the Constitution—a Malaysian Malaysia—there will be an end to democracy—so be it.

There is another oblique—perhaps this is really not so oblique, Mr Speaker, Sir, as has been suggested by my colleague, Dr Toh from Singapore who wrongly quoted, I think, the Member for Johore Tenggara, that he said he was going to join Indonesia—I think it was wrong—it was Malaya Merdeka. On behalf of my colleague, I would like to put that right, because I think we want to be fair to the Member for Johore Tenggara; I think originally he was from Singapore just before the war, Mr Speaker, Sir. (*Laughter*) I don’t know. I am prepared, as I have said to him, to share equally with him the right to have a say in the political destiny of this country. I have got certificates to prove, Mr Speaker, Sir—and proof is really not required in accordance with this Constitution, but if necessary, just to argue the moral righteousness of it—that my father and my grandfather before me were born there in

Singapore and their labours helped build this little place from the marshland it was, and I have not the slightest intention of allowing it to go back to marshland. Forward, never backwards! Forward to a Malaysian Malaysia, never backwards to secession and an isolated and a contained Singapore. That is not progress.

But this threat in *Malaya Merdeka*: "Push too hard and we will join the Indonesians". Well, Mr Speaker, Sir, let us be quite frank about this. Who has got the right to say we join or we don't join? Malaysians, isn't it, have the right? That is in accordance with the Constitution. Let us assume that they do things in accordance with the Constitution: I would like to put that to the test. I would like to see how many people really want to join Indonesia. The Minister for Sarawak Affairs? I think he is quite clear where his interests lie. The Minister for Sabah Affairs—not just a Member, the Minister for Sabah Affairs? He knows where his interests lie. That is why we came together in Malaysia.

I hope the Member for Johore Tenggara will tell us where his interests lie. I would like to know; and if it has to be, if really they can carry a large number of people, let us know now—not in 5/10 years' time. It's better we know now, because now we can make alternative arrangements; and our alternative arrangements, if they would sit down and look at the map carefully and the juxtaposition of the islands and the demographic structure of these territories; there are alternative arrangements possible, and if we have to seek them then I say the sooner the better. But I have more than a faint suspicion that in fact there are some people, who do think, and think a little deeper than what is published in *Utusan Melayu* and they have calculated where this would lead to.

Can I, for the benefit of *Utusan Melayu* and those who only follow this argument in the *Utusan*, spell out some of these steps, so that we know whether the threat is credible? It is

very important, Mr Speaker, Sir. The Chinese say, "Let us send volunteers to North Vietnam" and then they always add, "if the North Vietnamese ask for it." The Russians also say, they are going to send volunteers to North Vietnam, and they also add, "if the North Vietnamese ask for it." I do not know how they are going to fly over the North Pole and miss all the lands routes to land up in Hanoi, but that is what they say. And now says *Malaya Merdeka*, repeated and echoed in *Utusan Melayu*, which has been elevated to the voice of the Malays; "We will join Indonesia unless you agree to be ruled by the Malays", says the Member from Kedah. Really? Really?

Let us go into the credibility; let us assume first that really they are going to do this. What are they facing? Three million PKI cadres—communists—who can speak Malay with far greater passion in their type of Indonesian Malay. I am told their capacity for mass oratory is at least equal to the Member from Johore Tenggara, (*Laughter*) not to mention the "Bung". There are 50 million members of SOBSI and other peasant organisations controlled by the communists. The Member for Johore Tenggara is going to join them. I say: well, so be it! Perhaps, he can join them; we will make other arrangements for ourselves and we are not without friends, either in Asia, or in Africa, or in the Commonwealth. If it has to be so, let us know it now. Let us not just take out this big stick every other day, frightening people, bludgeoning them into a state of neurotic fear. We have an obligation to our fellow Malaysians. Every now and again the Minister for Sarawak Affairs is being told that he is going to be abandoned. He is fighting for the the freedom of Sarawakians, freedom which he thought best secured within Malaysia and which is only valid and worthwhile, if it is a Malaysian Malaysia in which he has a proprietary interest. If it is not a Malaysian Malaysia, he has no proprietary interest, neither has the Minister for Sabah Affairs. Then, where do we go from there?

So, you see, Mr Speaker, Sir, when we go into the credibility of this, I am reassured that being a thinking commonsensical people, and I don't think it is only the Chinese—you know, the Prime Minister has referred to the Chinese as a very practical, business-like people—I would like, if I may, to pay that tribute to all Malaysians. I would not like to single out any group for special mention. I think the Member from Kelantan, the Menteri Besar of Kelantan, the Honourable Member, is as intelligent and is as shrewd and astute as any Member in this House. I think he can think too. Where would he find his place in that kind of a situation?

We all can think, and we are thinking very deeply and very profoundly about these matters, and I would suggest to the editor of *Malaya Merdeka* that really, you know, it sounds very much like the Russians saying that they are going to send volunteers to North Vietnam. But in case the Russians do, I do not think the rest of the world will just sit back and watch that happen. There will be reactions, many reactions, within, internally, and internationally. And whilst we consider all these possibilities remote—because reason, logic (the law of probabilities) must ultimately triumph—nevertheless may I allay their fears that in fact even in the unlikely eventuality of such steps being taken we will not be found unprepared—not to be found unprepared, Mr Speaker, Sir.

And if I may, in conclusion, spell out to all Malaysians where we stand, what we want to achieve and how we are going to achieve these things; then they will know what are their problems. Their problem is not that we are against Malay as the National language. We accept it.

Kita terima bahasa Melayu menjadi bahasa kebangsaan, sanggup dengan sa-penoh²-nya. Kita tidak bantah hak² istimewa yang di-chatit di-dalam Perlembagaan Malaysia. Kita sokong dengan sa-penoh-nya Article 153. Apa guna tiap² hari meluap²kan perasaan

orang² di-kampong yang baca surat khabar Jawi sahaja. Tidak-kah ahli² dari UMNO tiap² hari menggalakan² ra'ayat dalam kampong kata kita anti-Melayu. Kata Ahli Dewan ini dari Kota Star Selatan, kita menjadi anti-Melayu. Sa-belum Malaysia, 1959, kita telah sanggup menerima bahasa Melayu menjadi bahasa kebangsaan. Singapura ia-lah satu pulau 75 peratus penduduk²-nya orang China atau keturunan China, 10 peratus keturunan India dan lagi 3 peratus keturunan Pakistan, Ceylon dan lain². Apa sebab, jikalau kita mahu negeri kita menjadi negeri China, apa sebab kita berchantum dengan Malaya menjadi satu negeri dalam Persekutuan Malaysia. Kurang akal-kah kita? Apa sebabnya kita hendak membantah atau mengancam orang² Melayu? Kewajipan kita ia-lah oleh sebab kita Warga Negara Malaysia, mahu meninggalkan taraf kehidupan orang² Melayu dan oleh sebab yang demikian-lah kita bersetuju di-chatit dalam Perlembagaan Article 161G: Saya bachakan-nya dalam bahasa Ingeris:

"Nothing in Clause (2) of Article 8 of Clause (1) of Article 12 shall prohibit or invalidate any provision of State law in Singapore for the advancement of Malays: but there shall be no reservation for Malays in accordance with Article 153 of positions in the public service to be filled by recruitment in Singapore, or of permits or licences for the operation of any trade or business in Singapore."

Erti-nya oleh sebab kita belum mahir lagi, tapi maseh belajar, kita mahu belajar bahasa kebangsaan, sesuai dengan aliran sejarah kita. Erti-nya hak² istimewa yang di-chatit dalam Article 153 chara melaksanakan-nya tidak sama di-Singapore. Kita menolong orang² Melayu dengan chara demokratik sosialis, bukan dengan memberikan kepada mereka wang sahaja bagini. Sebak-nya meningkatkan kebolehan-nya, latehan-nya, pelajaran-nya supaya ia boleh hidup dengan sama taraf dengan lain² kaum di-Singapura. Jikalau kita betul menindas orang² Melayu, 3 kawasan penduduk²-nya kebanyakan-nya Melayu—Pulau² Selatan, Geylang Serai, Kampong Kembangan—bagaimana chalon² P.A.P. boleh menang? Betul-kah kita menindas orang² Melayu?

Jikalau tokoh² UMNO betul sayang, kasehi ra'ayat jelata—bukan sayang hendak menahan kedudukannya, tetapi ra'ayat jelata—mari kita bertanding menunjukkan siapa yang ada ranchangan, atau dasar, atau policy yang boleh meninggikan kehidupan orang² Melayu dan bumi putera lain seperti rakan² kita dari Sarawak dan rakan² kita dari Sabah. Mari kita bertanding menunjukkan hal ini. Kerajaan Pusat sudah menubuhkan satu Sharikat Perumahan Kerjasama, kita tolong—rumah itu yang kita bena, sudah bena, kita jual kepada sharikat ini untuk Kerajaan Pusat mendapatkan sedikit nama baik, kita sama² tolong dia. Kalau kita tidak mahu jual, bukan-kah kita menunjukkan kita tidak tulus ikhlas, tidak mahu menolong orang² Melayu. Tetapi mari kita bersama² bertanding dalam tiga atau empat tahun yang akan datang. Sa-belum 1959 bulan empat mengikut Perlembagaan ini, kita mesti berjumpa ra'ayat lagi—siapa yang membena lebih banyak rumah, siapa yang menjual rumah lebih murah. Mari kita chuba! Chuba kita tengok siapa yang kuat; kita tidak mundur atau undor tidak mengelak kewajipan kita, kita sanggup bertanding.

Dasar pelajaran pun kita sanggup; bahasa kebangsaan—ya; dan saya sangat sukachita membacha titah dari Duli Yang Maha Mulia mengenai bahasa² ibunda—orang² keturunan China dan India:

“One important feature introduced last year in the field of education is in respect of the teaching of Chinese and Tamil languages in English Medium Schools. This is in keeping with the aim of My Government to preserve and sustain the use and study of the languages of the various communities in this country.”

Ini saya tengok memberi harapan kepada M.C.A. kalau bunyi begitu; kalau tidak begitu, habis M.C.A.—ta' ada penyokong²-nya habis langsung; bagus dengar, dengar yang demikian lembut rasa bunyi-nya. Inilah juga dasar kita. Belajar bersama² bahasa kebangsaan, bahasa persamaan; erti-nya jikalau saya di-rumah hendak berchakap bahasa ibunda saya, ta' akan saya tidak ta'at setia kepada

Malaysia. Menteri dari Sarawak ta' akan bila dia balek ka-rumah panjangnya, dan dia berchakap bahasa-nya, dia tidak ta'at setia kepada Malaysia? Saya tidak perchaya. Dia maseh selalu ta'at setia kepada Malaysia, oleh sebab dia boleh berchakap bahasa ibunda-nya. Dia-lah dan penyokong²-nya semua, saya dengar ada banyak di-Sungai Rejang, semua berchakap dalam bahasa ibunda-nya, walau pun ada sedikit beza-nya barangkali. Bunyi-nya kalau kita tidak tahu, saya ingat, bahasa Melayu; tetapi apa yang saya faham di-jelaskan oleh Menteri dari Sarawak, lain sedikit beza-nya—bukan jalan, jalai kata-nya. Jadi, sa-patut-nya dia berchakap demikian, apa salah-nya? Tetapi bila kita berjumpa dengan Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Johor Tenggara, mesti kita berchakap dalam bahasa kebangsaan sa-lepas tahun 1967. Tetapi sa-lepas tahun 1967 pula, saya bimbang—apa sebab saya bimbang, Tuan Speaker? Kita Ahli² dari Singapura, Sarawak dan Sabah ada 10 tahun lagi, ia-itu boleh tunggu sampai 1973, baharu kita terpaksa beruchap dalam bahasa kebangsaan. Tetapi saya bimbang, jikalau Menteri² dari Kerajaan Pusat berchakap dalam bahasa kebangsaan, bagaimana? Susah, payah saya bimbang. (*Ketawa*).

Katakan-lah, saya tulis surat dalam bahasa kebangsaan, hantarkan-nya kepada Menteri² Kerajaan Pusat, bukan-kah buat kerja-nya susah sahaja? Terpaksa dia panggil kawan terjemahkan, sudah di-terjemahkan, dia tulis dalam bahasa Inggeris. Habis di-terjemahkan, balek masuk dalam bahasa kebangsaan lagi—nanti keliru isi dan erti-nya. Kita sudah chukup berlateh, sungguh kita berlateh; rakan² saya semua berlateh.

Hak² istimewa, kita sa-tapak lagi ka-hadapan, ta'at setia atau tidak. Tetapi saya mengaku, Tuan Speaker, saudara,—“saudara” kita gunakan di-Singapura sahaja, minta ma'af; saya mengaku oleh sebab tidak chukup mahir dalam bahasa kebangsaan, lebih sesuai bagi saya berchakap, kadang², dalam bahasa Inggeris. Jadi, oleh sebab saya tahu banyak Ahli² Yang Berhormat dalam Dewan ini faham

bahasa Inggeris, biar-lah saya menutupkan ucapan saya dalam bahasa Inggeris.

We stand by this Constitution. We intend, in accordance with the Oath we have taken, to preserve, to protect and defend it. This Constitution provides, amongst other things, that all the fundamental rights of all Malaysian citizens are equal as set out in Part II of the Constitution—Fundamental Liberties in accordance with our obligations as Malaysian citizens. We accept the duty of all Malaysian citizens to have reservation of quotas in respect of services, permits, etc., for Malays in the States of Malaya, Sabah, Sarawak and, by an amendment of the Malaysia Agreement, the indigenous people of Sabah and Sarawak. We accept it and honour that obligation. That having been said, let me say, Mr Speaker, Sir, there it says in Article 43—"The Yang di-Pertuan Agong shall appoint a Jemaah Menteri, Cabinet of Ministers to advise him in the exercise of these functions, and the Cabinet shall be appointed as follows, that is to say—

"(a) the Yang di-Pertuan Agong shall first appoint as Perdana Menteri (Prime Minister) to preside over the Cabinet a member of the House of Representatives who in his judgment is likely to command the confidence of the majority of the members of that House;"

and

"(4) If the Prime Minister ceases to command he shall tender his resignation.

We have not the slightest doubt that the Prime Minister would continue to command—and in fact we like him to continue to command. But in accordance with that right, it is open to us to demonstrate that we can do as much, if not more, for the Malays and the indigenous people; that our policies and what we stand for will bring about a more just and a more equal society in which Malays, Dayaks, Dusuns, Kadazans will slowly find themselves not just with padding on their shoulders and added heels, but real strength which can only come through education, training, in the techniques and methods of modern industrial production.

Let us be honest, Mr Speaker, Sir. There are two different things. One, our accepting Malay as the National Language—it is good. We must have over the years one language to unify the people. We also agree for the happiness of all those of non-Malay stock, which includes the Dayaks and the Kadazans, that they can speak their own languages—I am quite sure that that is the right policy. But let me remind members in UMNO—and I would like to draw this to the attention of the members in the M.C.A., their associates—that it is a very dangerous thing leading people to believe that if we just switch in 1967 from talking English in the courts, and in the business, to speaking Malay, therefore the imbalance in social and economic development will disappear. It will not disappear. How does our talking Malay here, or writing to the Ministers of the Federal Government, both Malays and non-Malays, in Malay, increase the production of the Malay farmer, the price he gets for his products, the facilities he gets from the Government, fertilization, research into better seeds, marketing boards? How does that raise him? In fact, our worry is not with Article 153, which gives special reservations to Malays for jobs and licences. I am not saying it. It is inimical to the country—What I am saying is that it has been in force now for 10 years and the imbalance between the rural and the urban areas is widening.

The Minister of Finance is aware of this. He has the figures. He knows what is the rate of growth between the urban and rural areas. We have got evidence of that, visible evidence, as the Malays are drifting from the kampongs into the towns in Kuala Lumpur—shanty towns around the suburbs. And they are coming to Singapore looking for jobs—Malays. Last year, on the change of identity card addresses, 10,000 young men came to Singapore looking for jobs—equivalent to one quarter of our birth rate of that generation, the 20 to 25; we were having an annual rate of 40,000—one quarter added to our burden. Of that 10,000, more than

3,500 were Malays—more than 3,500 who *tumpang* with friends looking for jobs. Just solving these problems on the basis of Article 153? Are you going to solve these problems on the basis of a *Congress Ekonomi Bumiputra*? What does it say the Congress is going to do?—"Intended to give opportunities to all those who are familiar with the problems connected with participation of the Malay and other indigenous population in the field of commerce and industry."

Let us start off with the Chinese and the Indians—the non-Malays—first. What percentage are in commerce and industry as bosses or shareholders? 2 per cent., 3 per cent.—that is the total. Let us take the example of one bus company—that is the simplest unit, because I think everybody will understand it. It is a simple operation, it has been done very often, so everybody knows. One bus company, let us say there are 20 shareholders, employs 2,000 workers—mechanics, fitters, ticket collectors, drivers, people who repair the buses, paint them up. Let us assume that out of the 4½ million Malays and another ¾ million Ibans, Kadazans and others, we create that .3 per cent shareholders. Have we solved the problem? How does the Malay in the kampong find his way out into modernised civil society. If you create this .3% how does that create a new and more just society for them? By becoming servants of the .3% who will have money to hire them to clean their shoes and open their motor-car doors? We have not done this before, because we tried to do it the friendly way. But I am afraid the time has come in which we have to state quite clearly what we think is happening, and how we think those problems have to be tackled.

The urban rate of growth—the Honourable Minister of Finance, can confirm this—is at least 2½ to 3 times the rural rate over the whole population *per capita*. He knows that. He has had discussions with my colleague, Dr Goh, and he knows why Singapore's *per capita* income is also higher. How can you lift this up? By trying to compete with Singapore as to who can build a

better urban society? It is the wrong objective! Surely, by setting out to bring about a social uplift, change and progress in your rural areas! We never touched on these matters before, Mr Speaker, Sir, because we felt we would like to help members of UMNO with ideas, and so on, privately, but it is now necessary, because they will not listen to us privately, to speak our position publicly.

The Ministry of Agriculture—last year's Estimate was \$18,000,000. I said this and it raised a lot of excitement: \$9,000,000, half of it, was for paying salaries—from the peon upwards to the Minister—and you have another \$9,000,000 for general purposes of the Ministry of Agriculture—out of a total of \$1,300 or nearly \$1,400 million budget. Yes, we were told that there was a lot of planning and development going on—over a hundred million dollars of which more than 80 per cent is going into rubber research for the benefit of rubber estate owners—and, of course, there are a few Malays who own a little bit of rubber. But who gets the benefit?

Let's face this: Malay special rights?—They open a bottle of Coca Cola, they do not pay five cents? Is that special rights, putting the load on to the poor? Malays do not drink Coca Cola? Crown cork tax? We are not communal, we do not want a Chinese Malaysia and, in fact, we are telling anybody who thinks of a Chinese Malaysia that it is the surest way to lose. But, we believe if you want this nation to survive, when you want cohesion and unity, then you must raise the level of life between the rural and the urban areas to a point where everybody feels that he is getting something out of this society.

Of course, there are Chinese millionaires in big cars and big houses. Is it the answer to make a few Malay millionaires with big cars and big houses? That is what *Allianceism* means, you know, Mr Speaker, Sir—I am sorry to say it, but that is how it works. How does that solve the ground problem? How does telling the Malay bus driver that he should

support the party of his Malay director and the Chinese conductor to join the party of his Chinese director, how does that improve the living standards of the Malay bus driver and the Chinese bus conductor, who are both workers of the same company? It is just splitting the workers up. We have taken some time before we have sort of come down to the bone, but now we have. It cannot go on like this. If we delude people into believing that they are poor, because there are not enough Malay rights, or because Opposition Members oppose Malay rights, where are we going to end up? You let people in the kampongs believe that they are poor, because we do not speak Malay, because the Government does not write in Malay, so he expects a miracle to take place in 1967. The moment we start speaking Malay, he is going to expect an uplift in the standard of living and when this does not happen, what happens then? You say, "Oh well, they are opposing Malay rights." We are not opposing Malay rights. We honour and support it, but how does Malay rights solve your Malay Ra'ayat's living standards? So, whenever there is failure in economic, social and educational policies, you come back and say, "Ah, these wicked Chinese, Indians and others are opposing Malay rights." We do not oppose Malay rights. They have their right as Malaysian citizens to come up to the level of training and education, which the more competitive societies, the non-Malay societies, have produced. That is what must be done, isn't it? Not to feed them with this obscurantist doctrine that all they have got to do is to shout for Malay rights, for a few special Malays, and their problem has been resolved. I do not see how that follows.

So, Mr Speaker, Sir, we are posing to the Alliance Government now the fundamental challenge. Not Malay national language—accept, agreed. Not Clauses 153—accept, agreed, implement and honour this Constitution. Let us go one step further and see how you make a more equal society. By taxing the poor to pay for the defence of the country, special rights, or do you tax

those who have, in order to uplift the "have-nots," including many non-Malays—Chinese, Indians, Ceylonese and Pakistanis? There are many poor such people—don't make any mistake about that. And I say, over the months, they will have to come across and meet us on these issues—development in the economy, in the social, and educational sectors. Meet us. Show to the people that *Allianceism* has got the answers to these problems. If they haven't, don't stifle us, give us a chance to put forward an alternative, for we have an alternative, which can work, and has worked in Singapore and will continue to bear fruit.

We will wait and see. In 10 years we will breed a generation of Malays with educated minds, not filled with obscurantist thought, understanding the techniques of science and modern industrial management, capable, competent, assured. The family background, the diet, the health problems, the economic and social problems that prevent a Malay child from taking advantage of the educational opportunities, which we offer free from primary school to university; we will solve them, we will meet them, because in no other way can you hold this multi-racial society together, if over the years the urban areas, populated largely by people of migrant stock, go up and up and the rural areas remain stagnant. Surely, this is an unstable and unsafe situation.

I would like to remind members of the Government that they will find in the P.A.P. and I hope in the members of the Convention—Malaysian Solidarity Convention—a loyal, constructive Opposition, an Opposition in accordance with this Constitution. It is no use threatening us that you are going to take our local autonomy in Singapore, and so on. It cannot be done, unless you are going to use the guns—and, as I have said, you haven't got enough guns; and we are not going to allow them to get rid of the Member for Sarawak Affairs and the Member of Sabah Affairs. I think they are valuable parts of Malaysia, because you can put one hundred thousand troops in Sabah and Sarawak and they

may never be seen or heard of again, if the Ibans do not like it (*Laughter*). Let us be frank. We did this calculation carefully and methodically. There is no other way. It is not credible. You want to hold little Malaya, may be, to hold Malaysia on that basis—no. The threat is not credible. The Minister for Sarawak Affairs has got a knowing smile. (*Laughter*) He knows. They are head hunting people, Mr Speaker, Sir. Let me inform all these Members here, who say, “We will change this, we will change that”, that this document says—161H—you will change nothing of the sort without the consent of the State Government—and, first, you have got to win a democratic election in Singapore, and we hold it democratically, you know. They say 9 days: all right, I promise them, next time, a full real long spell on radio and television, the whole works. We never run away from the open confrontation as our friends from the Barisan Sosalis can testify. We love it; we relish the prospect of a meeting of minds, a conflict of ideas, not of force. We are gentle people who believe very firmly in ideas.

Enche' Tan Toh Hong: On a point of clarification. On this open confrontation of minds, I wonder if he could enlighten this House about the charge by the Honourable Member for Batu that the Singapore Assembly has not met although half a year is almost gone.

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew: There is no trouble—A meeting has been selected for the 16th of June. You need not worry about that. Members of the Barisan Sosalis are much more competent to look after themselves than members of the M.C.A. are (*Laughter*)—I give them this tribute. They know what they are after, and they know how to look after themselves, but I often wonder whether the M.C.A. boys know what they are after. (*Laughter*) Do they realise what is happening, when these things are being said by the Secretary-General of UMNO “Wherever I am, I am a Malay,” What happens to the Member for Bukit Bintang? He is not being

asked to unite to strengthen the muscles of the Member for Johore Tenggara. I will be much happier if he will say, “Malaysians, where are they? Who are Malaysians?—UMNO/MCA/MIC. Unite, get all supporters to unite”. No, he is not required, he is not wanted, and I worry for him. If he were wanted, if he were required, his little strength added to the elbow. I would be so much happier; and I would cheer for him, because he was fulfilling a useful function, but he is not required. But the Member for Johore Tenggara does not speak like that in English. He speaks differently in English. He only speaks like that in Malay, and particularly in the Jawi script. So the Member for Bukit Bintang does not know what is going on. (*Laughter*) As I had said, we will put him on the mailing list so that, Mr Speaker, Sir, he will know what is being said—that he is not required as I will tell him. We will not abandon him, we will look after him, we will look after him, because after all he has done no great harm. All he wanted was to get on in life. This is *Allianceism* the Chinese can do business. Every time I read that, Mr Speaker, Sir, I feel sorry for myself because I do not do business. I do not trade in people's miseries. My business is the people's happiness. His business is the accumulation of wealth and that is what is encouraged by *Allianceism*. Chinese do business. You know how many Chinese do business? I have already said, .3 per cent, let's round it off, round number, make it one per cent—never mind. What about the 99 per cent that do not do business? What satisfaction do they get out of life?

No, we have a vested interest in constitutional, democratic methods, because we know history is on our side. We cannot lose—not the ideas we represent. Time must go. It has gone in all the countries of Asia and Africa, away from the tribal traditionalist society. As men get educated, as men move from kampongs to towns, they free their minds from hidebound traditions; and when they do, they question not just that Malays and some

Chinese have got big cars and big houses—quite a number of Malays have got them too. These are the people who are threatening to join the communists in Indonesia. I am told that some of them have got black marble in their bathrooms, where they did not even have a shower in the old days. They have done well—and why not, why not? I am all in favour of good hygiene. (*Laughter*) But I am not going to take that threat that they are going to give all this black marble to the army commander that will come with the Siliwangi Division—not credible; and even if it does happen out of stupidity, we will take certain precautionary measures.

We know that once you educate, you liberate men's minds then they question, and when they question you must convince them, not by stifling them, not by preventing people from being heard. The Minister of Information and Broadcasting, he should know this. In Japanese occupied Malaya he was here, I believe. I was. Nothing was published in the newspapers other than victories of the Dai Nipon Army and Navy, and everybody knew exactly when the last battleship was sunk.

You see, you get to a situation where, Mr Speaker, Sir, the talk in the coffee-shop carries more weight than the official gazette for the publication; and when a government gets into that position it is in a very dicey position—no weight, no credence. On the other hand, I commend this to him, and if he really believes that he has ideas that can solve this problem, I have already offered him—I complained to him, Mr Speaker, Sir, that the reception in Singapore from the television tower in Gunong Pulai is not good enough. We get the snowflake effect, it is not good enough, a bit shadowy and requires special aeriels. We offered to put up his transmitter relay in Singapore itself next to ours, make it equally crisp, equally clear. All we ask in return is, similar facilities—compare and contrast: is it true that day by day we are feeding our people with figures, or balderdash.

The Minister for Broadcasting and Information (Enche' Senu bin Abdul Rahman): Mr Speaker, Sir, if he will let me have the floor.

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew: Surely.

Enche' Senu bin Abdul Rahman: I think the question which was mentioned by the Honourable member from Singapore just now was irrelevant, but I have been listening to his talk for the last one hour and I think we will have enough time for our reply later on. However, as regards the television, when he mentioned about getting some sort of connection with our television, so that we get that both ways, I did mention to the Honourable Minister that what we are now seriously thinking in terms of national interest, we are seriously thinking of having only one voice—we want only one voice. I think I did mention to the Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore that instead of having so many voices from Malaysia, we should have only one voice from Malaysia. This is what we are thinking now.

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew: With one idea? This is a sacred document, Mr Speaker, Sir . . . (*Interruption*) . . . We are prepared for it to be thrown into the dust-heap but, I say, do it openly—do not do it surreptitiously. It is no use just changing—you know—the Court of Appeal; that creates a lot of doubts in people's mind. If you want to change the law, change it openly here. We accept it—you have got the right, go ahead. But when you start switching around the interpretation, people begin to get doubts, more confidence is lost. What will happen? We are prepared to face everything in a constitutional and democratic manner; and if after being never off-side the referee blows the whistle and puts us out of the field, the spectators will know, and, you know, a melee is an inevitable consequence of such a referee's verdict, when spectators can see and spectators include internally eleven million and internationally one hundred odd nations.

We are prepared to take the penalties of being ruled off-side, when

in fact we are playing strictly in accordance to the rules. We have a vested interest in constitutionalism. We are not afraid that our ideas are unable to overcome the shroud of silence in the newspapers. By all means, stifle us, close down the volume, take over the station, contrary to the constitutional agreement, and we will keep quiet? No, the voice will be heard ultimately and echoed in people's hearts and minds.

Abandon elections in 1969? We have considered that too. Justify Malaysia to the world as the will and the self-determination of eleven million Malaysians. Abandon elections in Sabah? The Minister for Sabah Affairs from time to time, I think, must have dealt on these possibilities. Abandon them? We shall see. Every act carries a penalty and, I say, the penalty of not playing in accordance to the rules so far as Malaysia is concerned—and it's not Malaya now, it is Malaysia—is disintegration. And I will be honest with the Minister opposite and his colleagues: either a Malaysian Malaysia or nothing—we are satisfied. We cannot agree to anything but a Malaysian Malaysia. We are prepared to play in accordance with the rules to wait 5 years, 10 years, 15 years, but the ideas we represent must come true.

Mr Speaker, Sir, there is barely a few minutes left and I really want to give others an opportunity to talk after this.

I would like to mention to Members on the other side, remember this: an Opposition is not loyal and will not abide by the constitution only when, like P.A.S. and the Socialist Front, they find that they are unable to put their ideas into force in accordance with the democratic process. An Opposition which is sufficiently confident that the weight on the ground is such that eventually it must emerge will always find that it pays to play and talk and argue strictly in accordance with the rules. Never depart, never off-side. We will honour the Constitution, because we believe it can provide a solution to the problems of a multi-racial society in Malaysia.

But we are concerned by the statements that have been made and the many things that have been done, and I would like to add and move by way of an amendment, Mr Speaker, Sir, the following words to the Motion of Thanks to His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong, and the words are to add at the end thereof, removing the fullstop—

“but regrets the Address by His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong did not reassure the nation that Malaysia will continue to progress in accord with its democratic Constitution towards a Malaysian Malaysia, but that on the contrary the Address has added to the doubts over the intentions of the present Alliance Government and over the measures it will adopt when faced with the loss of majority popular support.”

I would like to make this one observation in moving this amendment. Loyalty to Malaysia is not equal and not the same to loyalty to the Alliance Party or the Alliance Government. I am under no constitutional obligation to be loyal to the Alliance Party or the Government, but I must be loyal to the Constitution of Malaysia and I must obey the dicta of a democratically elected government of Malaysia: I accept it. But do not confuse these two things, as I fear His Majesty was somewhat confused by this, that we are facing threats from within the country—threats to security of the nation, and to democracy, because unions want to strike for better conditions, wages, because we speak our minds and propound a better policy for Malaysia, because we exercise our prerogative in accordance with this Constitution to pose to Malaysia an alternative, how Malaysia can become a prosperous, happy nation, given honest, effective government and dynamic ideas to propel it?

It is because we know that time is on our side, Mr Speaker, Sir, that we will always be loyal, always act in accordance with the rules of this Constitution and with the decisions of the Government which are made and taken constitutionally.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move this amendment.

Enche' Stephen Yong Kuet Tze (Sarawak): (*Rises*).

Mr Speaker: Do you wish to support the amendment?

Enche' Stephen Yong Kuet Tze: I would like to second the amendment, Sir.

Mr Speaker: The time is now one o'clock. (*To Enche' Lee Kuan Yew*) I shall put your amendment to the House when we resume. Sitting is suspended until 4 p.m. today.

Sitting suspended at 1.00 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 4.05 p.m.

(*Mr Speaker in the Chair*)

THE YANG DI-PERTUAN AGONG'S SPEECH

ADDRESS OF THANKS

Mr Speaker: The amendment proposed by the Honourable Enche' Lee Kuan Yew which reads as follows is open for debate:

"To add at the end of the original motion the words—

'but regrets that the Address by His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong did not reassure the nation that Malaysia will continue to progress in accord with its democratic constitution towards a Malaysian Malaysia, but on the contrary the Address has added to the doubts over the intentions of the present Alliance Government and over the measures it will adopt when faced with the loss of majority popular support.'"

Enche' Stephen Yong Kuet Tze: Sir, I would like to speak on the amendment.

Mr Speaker, Sir, sometimes certain important aspects of certain issues may not have been said in clear terms or even said at all. This will give rise to speculations which will not take us anywhere, or in the interest of anybody. I, therefore, support this amendment in that the omission in His Majesty's Address, as stated in the amendment, can be a vital issue which is to be settled. On the other hand, words spoken and promises made must be honoured.

Sir, this takes me to the Royal Message from His Majesty proclaimed in Sarawak on the Anniversary of Malaysia Day last year. That Message

of His Majesty, in putting forward the Government's policy, has made a statement or declaration that free primary education would be extended to the Borneo territories at the beginning of this year. Sir, in consequence thereof, I, as a Member of the Sarawak Legislative Assembly, or Council Negri, tabled a motion thanking His Majesty for His Gracious Message. The motion in substance was adopted by the Council, by the State Government and the Opposition. Sir, the people of Sarawak took it in good faith that the Alliance Government would honour their words. The matter of education is, and has been, a burning issue in Sarawak and, I believe, also in Sabah, because we realise that it is only through education can real progress be made, that it is only through education can the people in Borneo ever catch up and can find a place in this competitive world. If the Alliance Government is genuinely sincere, it should give to the people in Eastern Malaysia the same facilities that have been given to, and enjoyed by, the people in the peninsular States. So, Sir, such words have been spoken and promises made, but so far nothing seems to have happened; so far not even the preliminary, or temporary measure of abolishing school fees in primary schools has been put into practice. No one can blame us or the people of Sarawak for feeling frustrated and losing faith in the Alliance Government and in the promises made by them. Sir, we have heard the Royal Message of the Alliance Government giving at least nine years education to all children. We may be forgiven if we say that this sounds "very hollow" in the ears for us in Borneo. It looks as if the Central Government is prone to be irresponsible or to indulge in bluff. Sir, there is nothing being done at all.

Sir, in the formation of Malaysia, the terms of entry by the States other than the peninsular States into the Federation of Malaysia were reduced into writing in the form of minutes as contained in the London Agreement which, I believe, forms part of the Constitution under which we are now working. We know that words alone are not enough and we realise that we

must maintain the spirit and intent of the Agreement, and above all they must be made in good faith. Without these, I think, the set-up must be shaken to the core. If the Alliance Government were to depart from the clear terms of the Agreement, then the end must have come unless, of course, before it comes we call a halt.

In this connection, Sir, I wish to refer to His Majesty's Speech about the decision of making the National language as the only Official language by 31st August, 1967. How would that affect the Malaysia Agreement, which provides for the use of English as the Official language in the Borneo States for ten years as from Malaysia Day? Should this provision go before the ten-year period is up, in the name of unifying the various communities in this country? Sir, language is certainly a unifying factor. But the question is: Is it the only factor, is it the only way by which the country can be united? To me, Sir, language is only a vehicle, or an instrument, whereby we can communicate with one another our thoughts and our views. It does not follow that because we speak one language, therefore we can think alike in the same way. People speaking the same language may have different sense of values—that we all know to be so from everyday life—and may not be of the same wavelengths, and may be talking at cross purposes. Sir, while not objecting Malay as the *Bahasa Kebangsaan*, as the National language, I think it should not be hastily made the only Official language in Malaysia. Other languages used or spoken by the large section of the people in this country ought to be allowed to have some status. In Sabah, I think, the then Chief Minister, the present Minister of Sabah Affairs and Civil Defence, was reported to have stated that he would support Chinese as one of the Official languages. He is not in bad company, because similarly the Chief Minister of Sarawak has publicly declared that he has no objection to the use of Iban and Chinese as official languages. In Singapore we know that multi-lingualism has been adopted. Sir, if we think in

terms of the formation of Malaysia as the coming together of the four different political units—namely, the Federation of Malaya, Singapore, Sarawak and Sabah—then I feel the views of the three other units are not to be disregarded lightly. People who advocate this, I think, ought not to be called names. I said this, Sir, because I was rather taken aback by some suggestions coming from Honourable Members from the opposite side who stated that anyone who had the audacity to put this view across shall be guilty of chauvinism or communalism.

The Alliance Government comprise predominantly of persons in the peninsular States. As we know, the Malaysian Government is, to all intent and purposes, the same Government which comprised the Government of the former Federation of Malaya. They must learn to respect the views of other component States of Malaysia and not to force their views upon others who happen to hold views different from theirs. Sir, whatever may have been proclaimed and in spite of what have been said in this Chamber by Honourable Members, Sarawak's entry into Malaysia was not without hesitation and apprehension. It was only with much persuasion, urging, cajoling, dangling of carrots and political underhand deals that Sarawak was brought in. Assurances of good faith and declarations of good intentions were then freely given. We in the Opposition have warned that the way by which Sarawak was taken into Malaysia would not be the creation of a real partnership but merely an appendage to the Federation of Malaya. The question is: Has the Alliance Government now treated Sarawak as an equal partner? We have just now witnessed what happened in Sarawak—a Crisis. How did it happen? To all appearances there was a dispute among the component parties of the Sarawak Alliance which forms the State Government there, and it was two of the parties, namely, the Berjasa and Pesaka (Berjasa, as we know, is headed by the Federal Minister of Lands and Mines and the former State Minister of Works and Communications, and Pesaka is headed by our

Minister for Sarawak Affairs) apparently they protested against the consideration of the Land Bills which they claimed to be detrimental to the interests of the natives. Sir, I am not here to say whether such an allegation is correct or not or whether it has any basis or not, but suffice it for me to say that those Bills had been considered in most of the Local Councils as long ago as two to three years and had also been considered and passed by the Sarawak Alliance Council, which, of course, dictates the policy of the Sarawak Alliance, and by the Supreme Council, in which these two parties which I mentioned were members and took active part. So the claim, on the eve of the tabling of the Bills, that they have objection to them must be taken with a grain of salt and I would say it was merely an eye-wash.

Mr Speaker, Sir, what really happened was this. There was political manipulation and such a manipulation could be traced back to Kuala Lumpur. I say this, because soon after the visit of the Minister of Information and Broadcasting these two parties—Berjasa and Pesaka—gave notice to withdraw from the Sarawak Alliance. As I have said, their objection took place on the eve of the tabling of these Bills. The Bills were prepared and was on the Order Paper and it was understood that these Bills had the support of all the component parties in the Sarawak Alliance and yet on the eve we had this sudden withdrawal by these two parties, which of course would have the effect of bringing down the Sarawak Government. Sir, I am not a member of the Sarawak State Government, but I am merely here to inform this House as to the extent of the manipulation that has taken place. Earlier to this, the former Minister of Works and Communications in Sarawak and the Minister for Lands and Mines here had been instrumental in attempting to form another party. Sir, may I say here that the Minister for Lands and Mines seems to be a person who has many feats and could play many roles. He is not only said to be the leading Berjasa man in Sarawak but now we have seen in the papers that he is also

an executive member of the UMNO. How he got himself into that position, I am not able to say. How he as a member of one party which is not a component part of UMNO could be an executive member of UMNO is another matter which rather puzzle us. Sir, these two persons I have mentioned had attempted to form an UMNO in Sarawak and they intended to take in Berjasa and a party called Panas (Party Negara of Sarawak) and the joint party to be called UMNO which was then to be known as the United Malays National Organisation of Sarawak. For some reason, it did not come to anything because they did not get support from the members. So this Ex-Minister of Works and Communications started yet another UMNO, but this time he called it the United Malaysian Natives Organisation. That did not see the light of day for lack of support. So now we come to this new move which I have already mentioned and this move was forming a new body called the Sarawak Natives' Alliance and the purpose of withdrawal from the Sarawak Alliance was to form this party and this party was to comprise of this time the Berjasa, Panas and Pesaka to the exclusion of the other members in the Sarawak Alliance, namely, the Sarawak Chinese Association and the Sarawak National Party which is the Sarawak Chief Minister's own party.

Mr Speaker, Sir, as a member of the Opposition Party in Sarawak, I hold no brief for SANAP, or S.C.A. for that matter. The internal squabble would not have been the concern of us at all, but when the real reason of the new set up was made known it became a matter of concern to all of us. Why? Because it was publicly published that the reason for the exclusion of the SANAP was that it was a multi-racial party, although we all know that the leadership in that party is in the hands of Ibans who, as we also know, are the indigenous people of Sarawak. How alarming then it is to find the extent to which the UMNO in Kuala Lumpur would go to even topple a Government headed by an Iban who happened to hold non-racial views. I cannot say and

I do not know why the Minister of Sarawak Affairs got himself mixed up in this, but I am sure he was misled. And I can say that the Minister for Lands and Mines and the former State Minister of Works and Communications would not have done all this very highly charged communal set up without being instigated by the UMNO. It is sometimes incomprehensible why these two Ministers, both of them were appointed by the Sarawak Alliance, mind you not elected—they were not elected in the general election, they were appointed by the Sarawak Alliance, one to this House to become Minister and the other to the Council Negri to be Minister also—should take part in the destruction of the very body which appointed them. It is really a case, to my mind, of biting the hand that fed them. So we have the spectacle of the Alliance Government apparently not tolerant of any non-racial element even in the State of Sarawak.

As far as the Minister of Sarawak Affairs is concerned, I believe later on good sense seems to have prevailed upon him, because we heard later that he gave up the idea of Sarawak Natives' Alliance and he gave his support to the SANAP. That, of course, save the Sarawak Government and the Chief Minister of Sarawak.

Sir, in the meantime, the Chief Minister of Sarawak had sacked two Ministers from his Cabinet who belong to Party BARJASA and one of whom is the former Minister of Works and Communications. Then what happened? We learned from the press that the Chief Minister was sent for to come to Kuala Lumpur—he was treated just like a school boy sent for by his headmaster. I must say to his credit that the Chief Minister told the press that the problem had been solved and his decision made and that there was no need to come to Kuala Lumpur. We must, therefore, now ask these questions. Why should there be such a manipulation in the first place and why should not let the Sarawak Government to solve its own problems in its own way and on its own ground; why had the Chief Minister to be

sent for and ordered to do certain things about which he had already made known his views and made his decision? Is then Sarawak a colony, or is it a partner in Malaysia? Why should there be a racial Government in Sarawak? Those, who have had doubts about the good faith of the Alliance Government, must have now been quite convinced that their doubts are confirmed and that the intention of the Alliance Government here is to make Sarawak a vassal of the Peninsular State which we know is being controlled by the Alliance Party, which in turn is controlled by UMNO. I would, therefore, sincerely urge the Alliance Party and UMNO here to cultivate a stronger sense of tolerance and understanding and make an effort to adjust their views about Malaysia that it is no more the former Federation of Malaya, so as to make Malaysia work. What a ridiculous situation, as I have pointed out, as in Sarawak, of a case now confrontation among erstwhile friends.

Sir, His Majesty's Address refers to the "Congress Ekonomi Bumiputera". I support any move to improve the economic status of the Malays and the indigenous people in this country. But in saying so, I would like to point out that poverty is no respecter of persons. I can say so, Sir, because I know of poverty. I have come from a poor family and I must be one among the few of us here who really have experienced hunger. So, what about the poor persons who happen to be non-natives? Why can't a Congress be held to determine the causes of poverty in this country?

Sir, is the land in the country put to good use? Is there a proper policy for the utilisation of land? Sir, in Sarawak the population is very small—only about 800,000 people or so—but the land area is nearly as big as the whole of the Federation of Malaya and yet, strange it may seem, we have land hunger there and people wanting land have no land. Obviously something is wrong there. The State Land Bill which, as I have mentioned, has unfortunately been withdrawn because of the manipulation (about which I have

stated already), might have gone somewhere to remedy the situation—Anyway, I hope so. But I have another hope and that is this: let us not have further interference from the UMNO or the Alliance Party here in Sarawak. The Sarawak people, if accorded sympathy and understanding, will solve their own problems in their own way, and we do not want communal politics there.

Enche' Chen Wing Sum (Damansara):

Mr Speaker, Sir, before lunch, we were entertained by the great performance of a very good actor

Mr Speaker: Will you hold on a minute! I wish to inform the House that this amendment will, in fact, widen the scope of the original motion, and I propose, in accordance with the past practice, to allow the debate on both the original motion and the amendment to proceed simultaneously.

Enche' Chen Wing Sum: Mr Speaker, Sir, before lunch, we were entertained by the great performance of a very great actor, Mr Lee Kuan Yew, the Honourable Prime Minister of Singapore. There were a lot of sweet words, dramatic acts, and a beautiful song of "Malaysian Malaysia". However, we all know that the composer of that song is not the P.A.P. It has been there for a long time and has been initiated by the Alliance.

Mr Speaker, Sir, recently, we have seen the formation of the so-called great Solidarity Front. Now, let us examine this Solidarity Front. By whom?—By the P.A.P. joined up by the S.U.P.P. Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to draw your attention to page 410 of the Parliamentary Debates (the *Hansard*). On the 21st May, 1964, the very person, the Honourable Prime Minister of Singapore, Mr Lee Kuan Yew, stated in this very House:

" let us never forget that they fade into insignificance when we face a common threat from the communists as represented in their open front organisations, like the Socialist Front, Barisan Sosialis and the S.U.P.P."

Today, Mr Speaker, Sir, we have seen them come to this House joining hands to sing the very song "Malaysian Malaysia." One must believe that a

Communist organisation will sing the song of "Malaysian Malaysia." Can anybody trust them? Now, if Members of the P.A.P. have any doubts, I can offer them a copy of the very words said by the Honourable Prime Minister of Singapore, and that statement has never been denied. What is the use today of them coming to this House to tell the country, "We are true Malaysians"? Now, can a Communist become a true Malaysian? I hope that the P.A.P. Members, and the public today, can understand this.

Now, what is this Solidarity Front? Can the Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore deny that he has associated with a Communist organisation, that he has dragged in a Communist organisation to form this Solidarity Front? I do not know what the leader of the P.P.P. and the leader of the U.D.P. would say about this.

Sir, a lot has been said about the extremists, the so-called ultra-Malays. I do not deny, Mr Speaker, Sir, that there are some Malay politicians in this country who, as part of their job, made an attempt to speak a bit too much for the Malays. Similarly, we have Chinese politicians, who want to get the votes of the Chinese, and they also tried to speak too much for the Chinese. However, it is part of their job and, as I have said just now, they have to do their duty.

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, if these Malay politicians had gone further and further today, we would like to ask this House what was the cause and who had made them like this. Mr Speaker, Sir, only last year, before the general elections, the P.A.P. wanted to come into the Federal elections and they put up two candidates in Johore and when they knew that two UMNO members were going to stand there, they withdrew their candidates. If there was any cause to make these Malay politicians go a bit further and further, it was because of the stupidity of the Prime Minister of Singapore, who had encouraged them and who said: "No, we do not want to fight against you. You are a nice people. It is only the M.C.A. we want to fight." That was the cause and

the cause was aggravated by the very unpleasant statements made by the Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore.

The Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore this morning has tried to tell the Malays in the kampongs that there are more Malays now coming to Singapore to seek for jobs—as if only Singapore has done so well that they can offer them jobs, and as if the Ministry of National and Rural Development of the Central Government has done nothing for them and they do not get what they are entitled to. That is quite wrong, Sir. We all know that time has changed. Rural development has become a spectacular success and even children in the rural areas have a chance to be educated. You do not expect an educated young Malay to go back to work in the kampongs of Kelantan or Trengganu. They have got to come out to face this “open society”, as it was called, to get jobs, to better themselves. But that does not mean that they have not got what they want in the rural areas. They are looking for better opportunities. That is a good sign of progress, that is a good sign that the Government has done them a good job. Even the people in the rural areas have a chance to challenge the people in the cities. Do not expect them to go back to the kampongs and also that when their parents are farmers they should be farmers and their grandchildren should also be farmers.

Mr Speaker, Sir, this morning we have heard the announcement by the Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore of the grand result of the election in Singapore. He said this as if the P.A.P. was infallible, as if it was the only party, as if Mr Lee Kuan Yew is the only man, who can govern this country. Why did Mr Lee Kuan Yew not mention the result of the Federal election? Was it because Mr Lee Kuan Yew did not think that it was important to him? Was Mr Lee Kuan Yew, who claims to be the champion of the Chinese, disappointed by the Chinese in the Federation? No. The only thing is that the Chinese in this country know what they want.

They know a singer can sing many songs today, can sing many songs tomorrow, can sing many songs the day after tomorrow, but they never know what he is going to do. Therefore, the M.C.A. has once again been elected.

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, the M.C.A. has been challenged time and time again, even recently, by the Deputy Prime Minister of Singapore in that the M.C.A. is just a rubber stamp and that it has no say in the Alliance. Sir, let me tell him this. We do not quarrel in public. We do not want to air our differences in the newspapers just to gain publicity. We do not believe in championing a community by accusing the others. We do not believe in gaining our political ends at the expense of others. What we do believe in is that we would do whatever we think is right, whatever is for the benefit of all the people in this country irrespective of their colour, their race or their religion. (*Applause*).

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, it is not my intention to dig up old dirt again, but it is my earnest intention to appeal to the leaders of the P.A.P. not to make any more unnecessary statements to hurt the feelings of others, so that this nation may be united to face the external threat and in order that the seed of lasting harmony may be nursed. Thank you.

Enche' Ali bin Haji Ahmad (Pontian Selatan): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, oleh kerana Tuan Yang di-Pertua telah mengizinkan bahawa bahathan ini di-langsungkan sa-kali gus, ia-itu usul yang di-kemukakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Kota Star Selatan dan pindaan yang di-kemukakan oleh Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri Singapura, Tuan Harry Lee, maka saya akan membahathkan kedua²-nya sa-kali.

Pertama, saya merasa perlu untuk turut sama menguchapkan terima kaseh kapada Uchapan Di-raja yang telah di-sampaikan kapada Dewan Parlimen yang mulia ini. Saya merasa amat berpuas hati, kerana sa-makin lama, sa-makin-lah dasar luar negeri kita chondong dan chergas dalam

politik Afro-Asia, sa-bagaimana yang di-sebutkan oleh Duli Yang Maha Mulia. Saya bachakan petekan-nya:

Beta suka juga hendak menyatakan ia-itu dasar Kerajaan Beta ia-lah hendak berikhtiar supaya Malaysia dapat menjalankan peranannya di-kalangan bangsa² Afro-Asia.

Saya rasa tidak ada orang yang menyedari hakikat arus perjuangan politik international di-Asia dan Afrika ini dapat menyangkal ini. P.A.P. juga tidak menyangkal, bahkan P.A.P. juga selalu gadoh bahawa kita terlalu pro barat, terlalu pro Amerika, terlalu pro British atau sa-bagai-nya. Tetapi dalam masa Kerajaan Pusat begitu chergas merapatkan diri-nya dengan negara² Afro-Asia dan juga termasuk-lah negara² Arab maka dalam masa ini juga Kerajaan P.A.P. di-Singapore membawa masuk pegawai² dari negara Israel. Beberapa orang pegawai sedang bekerja di-Pulau Singapura di-bawah Kerajaan P.A.P. Dalam masa kita hendak menghampiri dunia Arab, hendak menarek perhatian dan hendak menarek perasaan muhibbah dunia Arab maka Kerajaan P.A.P. membawa masuk pegawai² dari Israel di-pekerjakan di-Singapura. Tiga daripada-nya ia-lah Area Levy, penasihat (adviser), sa-orang lagi Dam Sek, instructor dan isteri-nya Havibah, specialist instructor. Mereka bekerja di-Pusat Latehan Pemuda dan Pemudi di-Vona Vista Road, di-Singapura. P.A.P. gadohkan bahawa kita terlalu pro barat, tetapi Kerajaan mereka di-Pulau Singapura mengadakan hubungan yang rapat dengan negara yang di-anggap oleh seluruh dunia Arab sa-bagai boneka imperialist Amerika dan British. Seluruh dunia Arab menganggap Israel sa-bagai negara boneka chiptaan penjajah barat. P.A.P. mengatakan dia pro Afro-Asia, tetapi sa-makin lama sa-makin rapat dengan dan membawa masuk pegawai² Israel. Ada-kah ini dengan sa-chara tidak langsung bahawa P.A.P. hendak men-sabotage polisi Kerajaan Pusat yang hendak berbaik² dengan seluruh dunia Arab? Ini-lah perkataan P.A.P. yang berkata P.A.P. pro Afro-Asia, P.A.P. anti penjajah. Apa-kah ada hubungan-nya P.A.P. dengan imperialist Amerika, British atau sa-bagai-nya? Bila

Kerajaan Pusat hendak berbaik dengan dunia Arab, P.A.P. sabotage dari belakang, dan P.A.P. berkata dia pro Malaysia dan menyokong Malaysia. Kita mengharapkan sokongan moral daripada negara U.A.R. dan lain² dunia Arab, P.A.P. berbaik² dengan musuh negara² Arab. Ini polisi P.A.P. Ini tindak-tandok perjuangan P.A.P. Tetapi, P.A.P. di-dalam Dewan ini ada muka berkata bahawa ia menyokong Malaysia.

Pada saya, P.A.P. tidak lain dan tidak bukan daripada satu parti yang pada hakikat-nya sama dengan S.U.P.P., Barisan Sosialis, Socialist Front yang pada hakikat-nya, sama ada sa-chara langsung atau tidak langsung, berikhtiar hendak memechah-belahkan, hendak merobohkan dan hendak menghancurkan Malaysia. Ini-lah pada hakikat-nya P.A.P. Jadi, di-mana-kah letak-nya dawa'an P.A.P. bahawa politik-nya ia-lah politik Afro-Asia, politik Israel. Ini-lah politik P.A.P.

Kemudian P.A.P. berkata Malaysian Malaysia, hendak menyatukan seluruh ra'ayat, tetapi daripada langkah mengambil pegawai² dari Israel ini, maka saya takut timbul-lah perasaan sa-kali sa-kala di-dalam hati saya ka-mana-kah P.A.P. hendak pergi. Ada-kah P.A.P. hendak menegakkan sa-buah negara Israel di-chelah² bangsa dan negara kita? Kalau ini-lah yang di-tujukan oleh P.A.P. padan-lah P.A.P. selalu menyatakan gloomy (mendong) nasib Malaysia pada masa akan datang. Kalau ini berlaku P.A.P. yang akan bertanggung-jawab. Bukan Melayu yang bertanggung-jawab, bukan China yang bertanggung-jawab, bukan India yang bertanggung, bukan Perikatan yang bertanggung-jawab, tetapi P.A.P.-lah yang bertanggung-jawab.

P.A.P. sembunyi²kan akan ada-nya pegawai² Israel-nya di-Singapura itu. Mithal-nya, pada suatu ketika salah sa-orang Menteri atau Menteri Muda daripada Kerajaan Pusat pergi ka-Singapura. Pegawai² Israel ini chubalah di-surok²kan, di-beri chuti, di-seludupkan suroh pergi ka-Melaka, takut hendak berhadapan. Mana dia

yang di-katakan oleh P.A.P. *open society*? Tetapi P.A.P. takut menunjokkan pegawai² Israel-nya kepada Menteri² Kerajaan Pusat kepada seluruh ra'ayat Malaysia. Yang paling akhir, ma'lumat yang baharu saya terima dua tiga hari dahulu, Levy sekarang sedang berchuti, apabila kembali akan di-tempatkan di-Work Brigade, Singapura, Sek dan Habibah baharu sahaja pulang ka-Israel. Ini perbuatan P.A.P. Perbuatan yang pada hakikat-nya mensabotage Kerajaan Pusat, sabotage segala usaha yang sedang di-jalankan oleh Kerajaan Pusat yang hendak menarek hati, hendak berbaik² dengan negara² Arab di-Timor Tengah. Tidakkah ini bererti P.A.P. juga sedang bergerak untuk menghanchorkan Malaysia? Dan nada² suara P.A.P. di-dalam dan di-luar Parlimen ada-lah menimbulkan shak wasangka di-hati ra'ayat negeri ini, menimbulkan ketakutan ra'ayat, menimbulkan kurang kepercayaan ra'ayat kepada Kerajaan Perikatan, menimbulkan kurang kepercayaan ra'ayat di-Sarawak dan Sabah terhadap Kerajaan Pusat.

Pada saya tidak jauh beza-nya P.A.P. dengan Barisan Sosialis atau Socialist Front. Dan saya takut kalau Singapura menjadi sa-buah negara Israel atau sa-macham Israel di-chelah² bangsa dan negara kita, maka akan hanchor-lah Malaysia, akan lebor-lah Malaysia dan akan musnah-lah kehidupan ra'ayat dari seluruh keturunan. Ini-lah politik mainan P.A.P.

Kalau kita dengar ucapan Perdana Menteri Singapura saudara Harry Lee pagi tadi maka memang enak bunyinya, tetapi P.A.P. pandai main, pandai berlagu: bunyi lain, erti lain, tujuan lain. Ini-lah lagu P.A.P. Kita sudah masak dengan dia. Tetapi yang malang-nya kalau kita mendengar sa-pintas lalu, kalau kita memikirkan sa-chara tidak mendalam, maka semua orang akan percaya, akan bersetuju dengan saudara Harry Lee pagi tadi. Tetapi sa-tiap ucapan Harry Lee pagi tadi mengandongi segala putar belit. Kalau kita tidak menyelideki dengan dalam maka kita tidak akan mengetahu². Dan oleh kerana ini-lah banyak wartawan² luar negeri tertarek

hati dengan analisa² yang konon-nya baik, tetapi bunyi lain, erti lain, tujuan lain. Ini lagu P.A.P. ini lagu saudara Harry Lee—comrade Harry Lee.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak dapat menyetujui pindaan yang di-kemukakan oleh Perdana Menteri Singapura, comrade Harry Lee, bukan oleh kerana saya tidak menyetujui Malaysian Malaysia, tidak sa-kali², tetapi saya tidak menyetujui pindaan ini oleh kerana sa-belum P.A.P. menyatakan bahawa mereka pro Malaysian Malaysia kita Perikatan telah mengamalkan, bahkan sa-belum Malaysia sa-kali pun kita telah mengamalkan negara ini untuk seluruh ra'ayat-nya. Bagaimana-kah hendak di-katakan di-dalam UMNO terdapat pelampau² Melayu (ultra-nationalist), chauvinist Melayu? Kalau sa-kira-nya di-dalam UMNO banyak gulungan ini, maka saya tidak fikir UMNO dapat bekerjasama dengan M.C.A. dan M.I.C. di-tanah besar Malaysia ini. Allahyarham Dato' Onn dalam kempen Pilihan Raya Tahun 1955 telah memainkan peranan narrow nationalism, ultra-nationalism ini, tetapi telah kalah hebat. Seluruh ra'ayat Melayu berdiri di-belakang Perikatan. Kalau sa-kira-nya kuat-lah dan banyak-lah gulungan ultra-nationalist (pelampau Melayu) atau sa-bagai-nya dalam UMNO, maka saya tidak fikir kedudukan Yang Teramat Mulia Tunku, kedudukan Yang Amat Berhormat Tun, Yang Berhormat Dato' Dr Ismail dan lain² itu tidak di-chabar di-dalam tiap² Meshuarat Perhimpunan Agong UMNO.

P.A.P. tidak ada meshuarat perwakilan—meshuarat agong—dalam mana tiap² ahli P.A.P. boleh menentukan siapa-kah ketua-nya. Tetapi, dalam UMNO tiap² tahun kita buat, dan tiap² tahun semenjak Yang Teramat Mulia Tunku memimpin UMNO tidak pernah di-tandingi jawatan-nya itu. Ada-kah P.A.P. berfikir Yang Teramat Mulia Tunku dan lain² pemimpin tertinggi juga sa-bagai ultra nationalist atau pelampau Melayu? Kalau sa-kira-nya mereka ini pelampau Melayu tidak akan ada-lah Perikatan di-dalam negeri ini.

Bagitu juga di-kalangan M.C.A. Di-dalam pilihan raya tahun 1959, ada golongan² chauvenis chuba hendak menguasai M.C.A., chuba hendak menguasai Perikatan. Apabila tidak dapat mereka keluar bertanding dengan nama party U.D.P. Dalam tahun 1959, U.D.P. habis kalah, chauvenis² ultra nationalist ini telah di-hanchorkan. Jadi, nyata-lah dalam Perikatan tidak ada chauvenis, tidak ada ultra nationalist, tidak ada pelampau² sama ada pelampau Melayu atau pelampau China. Tetapi kita memang-lah sudah sa-benar²-nya menganut dan mengamalkan fahaman, dahulu Malayan Malaya, dan sekarang sudah pasti-lah Malaysian Malaysia. Soal ini tidak payah di-ungkit²kan lagi—tidak perlu. Tetapi mengapa-kah P.A.P. berbuat bagitu? P.A.P. telah gagal dalam pilihan raya yang lepas dan sekarang chara-nya, sa-lagi ra'ayat mempunyai keperchayaan penoh kapada party Perikatan sa-lagi itu P.A.P. tidak boleh mimpi—tidak akan sampai mimpi-nya hendak menguasai Malaysia. Apa hendak di-buat? Kalau bagitu “create a situation and exploit”—adakan hal² yang tidak ada, kemudian di-pertajam²kan, di-runching²kan dan dengan itu P.A.P. berharap akan dapat menghilangkan keperchayaan ra'ayat kapada party Perikatan untuk memerintah Malaysia. Kalau demikian maka ada-lah peluang saudara Harry Lee hendak berkuasa menjadi Perdana Menteri Malaysia. Tetapi, kalau inilah permainan politik P.A.P., saya beri jaminan di-dalam Dewan ini tidak akan sampai ketika-nya itu yang P.A.P. akan dapat memerintah Malaysia—tidak!

Sa-bagaimana saya katakan tadi, “create a situation and exploit”, mula² P.A.P. memainkan soal Melayu tidak boleh halau yang bukan Melayu. Soal ini tidak timbul lagi. Apabila terbentok-nya Persekutuan Tanah Melayu dahulu dan kemudian Malaysia, soal orang Melayu dan lain² bumi putera hendak menghalau orang² yang bukan Melayu atau bumiputera, ini tidak timbul. Kalau sa-kira-nya orang² Melayu tidak mahu menerima orang² yang bukan Melayu menjadi ra'ayat, kalau mereka hendak menghalau, maka

mereka tidak-lah menerima orang ini menjadi ra'ayat. Apa-kah bodoh-nya sudah di-terima menjadi ra'ayat—sudah sama mendapat hak mengundi, hak politik dan lain², kemudian baharu hendak halau. Jadi soal ini tidak berbangkit lagi tetapi P.A.P. sengaja menimbulkan²kan.

Yang Berhormat saudara Harry Lee mengatakan di-Seremban, sakian² peratus orang Melayu tidak boleh menghalau orang² bukan Melayu. Memang-lah perkara biasa bagi P.A.P. beruchap berchabang², dalam bahasa Melayu lain, dalam bahasa Inggeris lain, dalam bahasa China lain, untuk golongan yang mengetahui banyak bahasa lain, lagu-nya di-sini lain, lagu-nya di-hadapan kadar² P.A.P. yang terdiri daripada golongan China lain. Kemudian beruchap hari ini, besok nafikan dan kalau tidak perchaya dengar-lah tape record. Tetapi uchapan² yang di-tapekan itu tidak mesti 100 peratus benar—tidak dapat 100 peratus reliable. Boleh di-sunting—can be edited. Jadi, mana² bahagian yang perlu di-buang, di-buangkan. Soal orang Melayu hendak menghalau orang yang bukan Melayu—ini tidak timbul sama sa-kali. Kita semua sudah menerima seluroh ra'ayat yang bukan dari keturunan Melayu dan bumi-putera menjadi ra'ayat Malaysia. Kita tidak timbul²kan tetapi berusaha merapatkan perpaduan seluroh ra'ayat. Kemudian datang-lah P.A.P. dengan mengongkit² perkara yang sudah selesai itu. Kemudian berkata-lah party P.A.P. hendakkan Malaysian Malaysia. Sa-belum P.A.P. masuk politik ka-tanah besar ini kita telah bergerak menuju ka-arrah Malaysian Malaysia. Jadi, P.A.P. “create a situation and exploit” dengan harapan untuk berkuasa di-negeri ini. Soal² yang umpama ini tidak mendatangkan sa-barang faedah, kalau hendak di-bangkit²kan apa lagi hendak di-tajam²kan. Saya ingin menyatakan; P.A.P. selalu mengatakan bahawa penchilkan dan musnahkan—isolate and liquidate pelampau² di-dalam UMNO. Di-sini saya menyatakan, UMNO tidak akan berpechah belah untuk di-isolate dan di-liquidate, tidak perlu. Dan P.A.P. tidak akan berjaya

untuk me-isolatekan gulungan² tertentu dan meng-liquidatekan itu. Yang sa-benar-nya chara isolate² dan liquidate ini ia-lah chara kominis—chara kominis yang P.A.P. bekerja sama pada satu masa dahulu. Sekarang P.A.P. menafikan yang dia kominis. Dalam masa Kerajaan Pusat berusaha sedaya upaya menguatkan kedudukan Malaysia di-dalam dan di-luar negeri, pergi-lah Perdana Menteri Singapura dengan membawa alat² Kerajaan; mula² di-katakan lawatan peribadi kemudian menjadi lawatan rasmi dengan membawa Wartawan Alex Josey bersama² sa-bagai Press Officer. Patut di-ingatkan; saya harap Wartawan Alex Josey ada di-sini; pagi tadi dia datang, bila Lee Kuan Yew hendak berchakap dia datang, bila saudara Harry Lee tidak berchakap dia tidak datang petang ini.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Mulut Lee Kuan Yew.

Enche' Ali bin Haji Ahmad: Ya, mulut Lee Kuan Yew. Ini-lah permainan P.A.P.—permainan Harry Lee.

Pertentangan antara Parti P.A.P. dengan Kerajaan Pusat ini ada lah pertentangan atau perselisihan atau perbezaan dalam negeri. Apa-kah perlu-nya perbezaan ini di-bawa ka-luar negeri. Apa-kah perlu di-bawa ka-Australia, New Zealand dan ka-lain². Ada-kah P.A.P. hendak melibatkan negara² luar, hendak di-libatkan ka-dalam soal² dalam negeri kita? Kita tidak mahu Australia, New Zealand dan lain² negeri lagi champor di-dalam soal di-dalam negeri. Biar-lah kita bereskan urusan kita dengan P.A.P. Kita tidak perlukan tenaga² kuasa luar, tetapi P.A.P. chuba melibatkan kuasa² luar. Kalau kita benarkan ini berlaku, maka Malaysia akan menjadi medan pertarongan kuasa² luar, dan Malaysia akan lemah, Malaysia akan hanchor. Siapa-kah yang berusaha membuat ini? Tidak lain tidak bukan P.A.P., terutama Comrade Harry Lee, Perdana Menteri Singapura.

Lagi satu perkara perbezaan antara Kerajaan Pusat dengan Kerajaan Singapura ada-lah satu perkara biasa di-dalam negara yang berbentuk Federal. Tetapi P.A.P. chuba memutar

belitkan dengan mengatakan Kerajaan Pusat yang konon-nya di-control oleh orang Melayu chuba hendak menindas orang China. Kalau lojik ini kita ikutkan, ada-kah bererti juga bahawa Kerajaan Pusat hendak menindas orang Melayu di-Kelantan? Sebab telah bertahun² lama-nya Kerajaan Pusat mempunyai perbezaan dengan Kerajaan di-negeri Kelantan. Ada-kah Kerajaan Pusat yang di-control oleh orang Melayu hendak menindas orang Melayu? Ini lojik yang di-pakai oleh P.A.P. Jadi mereka chuba memutar belitkan kenyataan sa-olah² Kerajaan Pusat di-control oleh orang Melayu hendak menindas orang China. Perkara ini di-bawa ka-mana² sampai ka-luar, di-libatkan negara² luar. Tetapi kadang² geli hati juga, Parti yang konon-nya mempunyai kepercayaan kepada tenaga sendiri perlu kepada tenaga kuasa² luar untuk tolong menguatkan perjuangan-nya dalam negeri. Perlu tenaga negeri² luar untuk meminta kepada Kerajaan Pusat supaya mereka dudok dalam Cabinet. Parti yang konon-nya begitu gagah berani kerana ideology-nya pergi ka-luar negeri berharap untuk masok ka-dalam Kerajaan Pusat. Saya harap perkara² perbezaan antara Kerajaan Pusat dengan Kerajaan² Negeri tidak perlu di-bawa keluar negeri. Ini ada-lah juga political etiquette. Sa-bagai contoh-nya Party Conservative, kalau keluar daripada United Kingdom atau datang ka-mari, Party ini tidak membawa perbezaan-nya dengan Kerajaan Party Buroh di-United Kingdom meminta kita champor tangan, meminta kita melibatkan diri kita, tidak. Begitu juga Party Buroh Australia tidak meminta, tidak membawa, tidak menarek kita supaya terlibat di-dalam soal² politik di-dalam negeri Australia. Tetapi inilah yang di-buat oleh saudara Harry Lee dalam lawatan-nya ka-Australia, ka-New Zealand, baharu² ini. Kadang kali terkeliru-lah wartawan² luar negeri dengan apa yang di-katakan analisa yang baik tetapi yang sa-benar-nya analisa putar belit. Kita tidak payah berchakap lagi, kita telah melaksanakan jauh sa-belum P.A.P. chuba dengan perchakapan di-dalam Dewan ini mengenai Malaysian Malaysia.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tadi telah saya kata sa-pintas lalu ia-itu memang perkara biasa bagi pemimpin² P.A.P. membuat sa-suatu statement, kemudian menafikan-nya. Buat statement didalam atau di-luar negeri, kemudian senang² pergi jumpa kepada Yang Teramat Mulia Tunku Perdana Menteri, menafikan, kata tidak. Perkara biasa bagi P.A.P., tidak perchaya tengok tape record kata-nya. Perkara biasa. Sa-belum Perdana Menteri Singapura itu keluar menghadziri Sidang Socialist baharu² ini, ia ada membuat statement mengatakan semua orang di-Malaysia ini baharu datang dalam masa 700 tahun yang terakhir. Tidak ada orang yang berhak mengaku bumiputra di-negeri ini. Pertama sekali ucapan² yang sa-umpama ini tidak akan mendatangkan faedah sama sa-kali kepada bangsa dan negara kita, bangsa Malaysia, bangsa Malaysia Malaysian dan kepada negara Malaysia, negara Malaysian Malaysia. Orang selalu menggelar Perdana Menteri Singapura ini sa-orang yang pandai, sa-orang yang brilliant, sa-orang yang mengetahui. Tetapi di-sini nyata-lah kejahilan Perdana Menteri Singapura. Jahil tentang ethnology, jahil tentang ilmu bangsa², sama ada di-kepulauan Melayu dan Lautan Pacific, mahu pun ethnology manusia² di-dunia ini. Saya tidaklah bermaksud hendak memberikan kuliah tentang ethnology di-sini tetapi saya merasa berkewajipan juga untuk menerangkan kepada ahli² P.A.P. yang jahil dalam perkara sejarah dan ethnology di-kawasan Asia Tenggara ini. Kira² 4,000 tahun, sa-belum Nabi Isa turun-lah gelombang manusia yang di-namakan Melanesia, kemudian turun-lah gelombang manusia yang di-namakan Polynesia, kemudian turun-lah manusia yang di-namakan dalam istilah ilmu pengetahuan dahulu dipanggil gulungan orang² Melayu. Jadi jarak masa daripada 4,000 tahun sampai-lah 2,000 tahun sa-belum Masehi. Jadi gulungan pertama ia-lah Melanesia, gulungan kedua orang Polynesia dan gulungan ketiga ia-lah orang Melayu, sama ada orang totok atau pun orang Melayu modern. Jadi kemudian-nya sa-hingga pada kira² tahun 1,000 sa-belum Nabi Isa kekal-

lah kedudukan orang² Melanesia di-sa-belah timor laut Pacific dan orang² Polynesia di-sabelah selatan sedikit dan orang² Melayu atau pun sekarang dalam menurut istilah yang di-reka oleh Sarjana German ia-lah Indonesia di-kepulauan Melayu. Jadi orang² ini datang kira² 2,000 tahun sa-belum Nabi Isa mendiami kawasan² ini dan pada tahun kurun ka-5, 6 dan 7 ter-tegak-lah Empire Melayu yang berpusat di-Pelembang yang menguasai hampir seluroh kepulauan Melayu. Pada kurun ini, pada masa keturunan Melayu telah mempunyai tamaddun dan Empire-nya di-kepulauan ini, Bangsa Anglo-Saxon baharu sahaja datang ka-kepulauan Inggeris. Kalau sa-kira-nya P.A.P. sanggup menapikan bahawa orang Melayu bukan bumiputra di-negara ini, maka sanggup-kah P.A.P. atau saudara Harry Lee menapikan bahawa keturunan Anglo-Saxon bukan bumiputra di-tanah England. Kemudian kita berpindah ka-India. Kira² sa-ribu atau dua ribu tahun sa-belum Nabi Isa, di-India sudah ada tamaddun Dravidian, atau yang di-kenal dengan nama Indus-Valley Civilization. Orang² keturunan Aryan datang kemudian. Maka terdesak-lah orang² Dravidian ka-tempat² di-sebelah selatan. Pada kira² ketika itu juga turun-nya gelombang manusia Melayu ka-pulauan Melayu ini. Kalau saudara Harry Lee sanggup menapikan orang² Melayu bukan bumiputra di-Malaysia, orang² Iban bukan bumiputra, orang² Murut bukan bumiputra, orang² Kadazan bukan bumiputra, sanggup-kah Harry Lee menapikan bahawa orang² keturunan Aryan ini bukan bumiputra India? Sanggup-kah dia menapikan ini?

Pada ketika itu juga berpindah-lah manusia² neo-Mongoloid ka-negeri China pada kira² empat ribu tahun, tetapi sa-belum kedatangan neo-Mongoloid ini, sudah ada penduduk² yang lebeh asal di-negeri China, yang kemudian hampir² di-zaman moden bertumpu ka-sabelah selatan negeri China. Kalau oleh kerana orang² Melayu dan lain²-nya datang ka-mari, maka mereka tidak berhak mengatakan mereka bumiputra, maka sanggup-kah Harry Lee menapikan bahawa

orang² China yang ada di-negeri China sekarang bukan bumiputera di-negeri China?

Negeri Jepun. Sa-belum datang-nya orang² neo-Mongoloid ka-negeri Jepun, sudah ada orang² yang lebeh asal di-negeri Jepun yang sekarang mendiami di-sabelah utara Pulau Hokkaido—orang² yang sekarang ini di-panggil Ainu. Mengikut theory anthropology, orang² ini sama sa-keturunan dengan orang² Melayu. Sanggup-kah Harry Lee menapikan bahawa orang² Jepun ini bukan bumiputera di-negeri Jepun? Kerana sudah ada-nya yang asal, kerana orang² neo-Mongoloid ini datang kemudian?

Sanggup-kah Harry Lee menapikan bahawa Perdana Menteri Shastri tidak berhak sa-bagai bumiputera di-India? President Ayub Khan tidak berhak menjadi bumiputera di-Pakistan? Chou En Lai tidak berhak menjadi bumiputera di-negeri China? Ini-lah erti-nya bila Harry Lee menapikan tidak ada yang lebeh bersifat bumiputera di-dalam Malaysia ini. Implication-nya terlalu besar keseluoh dunia. Ini-lah orang yang menganggap diri-nya terlalu brilliant, terlalu pandai, terlalu pintar, sampai² akhir-nya menjadikan dan menunjokkan diri-nya sa-bagai sa-orang yang jahil, sa-orang yang tidak mengetahui hal² sejarah, hal² ethnology, hal² anthropology.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak-lah bermaksud hendak berchakap panjang pada petang ini, tetapi perlu—saya merasa perlu melanjutkan juga, kerana tadi Harry Lee mengatakan Kongres Ekonomi Bumiputera ini tidak dapat menghuraikan masalaah bumiputera—masalaah ekonomi bumiputera. Memang benar, mungkin dengan satu kongres tidak dapat terhurai seluroh masalaah ekonomi bumiputera, tetapi ini ia-lah langkah pertama untuk mencari jalan menghuraikan masalaah² ekonomi yang di-hadapi oleh seluroh bumiputera, sama ada orang Melayu, orang Iban, orang Murut, orang Kadazan, orang apa juga. Jadi di-dalam hal ini, nyata-lah bahawa P.A.P. tidak jujur kepada sa-golongan ra'ayat negeri ini. Bila kita chuba hendak menghuraikan

masalaah yang di-hadapi oleh sa-golongan besar ra'ayat, P.A.P. menentang mengatakan ini bukan jalan yang baik, tetapi apa-kah jalan yang baik yang telah di-laksanakan oleh P.A.P. di-Pulau Singapura untuk menghuraikan masalaah ekonomi orang² Melayu di-Pulau Singapura itu?

Dasar sosialis, sosialis apa yang dapat menghuraikan kedudukan ekonomi orang² Melayu di-Pulau Singapura yang menjadi bumiputera yang telah di-napikan oleh Lee Kuan Yew sendiri. Dalam masalaah ini, saya harap supaya sa-tiap golongan ra'ayat Malaysia memberikan kerjasama kepada ranchangan² untuk memperbaki kedudukan ekonomi bumiputera, sebab sa-lagi tidak ada perimbangan di-dalam segala bidang kehidupan negara kita, maka sa-lagi itu-lah tidak akan dapat di-hapuskan perasaan takut antara satu dengan lain; perasaan churiga antara satu dengan lain. Kita terpaksa-lah mengimbangkan keadaan antara seluroh golongan ra'ayat Malaysia di-segala bidang dan untuk kepentingan negara dan ra'ayat Malaysia seluroh-nya, maka kita terpaksa-lah memberi sokongan dan bantuan dan kerjasama kepada segala ikhtiar untuk memperkuatkan, atau untuk memperbaiki kedudukan ekonomi bumiputera.

Baharu² ini oleh kerana Perikatan pun ada dengan convention-nya, Parti P.A.P. pun mengadakan juga convention-nya. Nampak-nya sa-chara tergesa², sa-chara bersulit². P.A.P. menda'wa bahawa convention ini ia-lah convention di-antara Parti² Pembangkang yang pro-Malaysia. S.U.P.P. yang tegak² menentang Malaysia dudok di-dalam convention Parti² Pembangkang anjoran P.A.P. Convention ini tidak menentang hak² istimewa orang² Melayu dan lain² bumiputera, tetapi juga ada di-dalam convention itu P.P.P. yang terang², yang tegas² menentang hak istimewa orang² Melayu dan lain² bumiputera. Ini convention yang di-katakan convention parti pro-Malaysia, dan tidak menentang itu dan tidak menentang ini. Kalau sa-kira-nya parti atau convention yang saperti ini dapat menguasai negara Malaysia, muram

benar-lah nasib masa hadapan Malaysia.

P.A.P. berkata dia pro-Malaysia. S.U.P.P. menentang Malaysia, tetapi sama² dudok di-dalam Kerajaan, kalau ada peluang. P.A.P. berkata dia tidak menentang hak istimewa orang² Melayu dan lain² bumiputera. Parti P.P.P. menentang terang², tegas² walau di-mana sa-kali pun. Berkechamok-lah dasar Kerajaan, kalau sa-kira-nya mereka ini dapat-lah berkuasa di-dalam negara Malaysia. Gloomy sung-goh, muram sunggoh nasib negara Malaysia, kalau sa-kira-nya mereka ini dapat berkuasa, tetapi perchaya-lah, gulungan² yang tidak jujur kepada Malaysia, yang sa-sunggoh-nya tidak jujur kepada bangsa dan negara kita tidak akan di-izinkan oleh Tuhan untuk menguasai negara dan bangsa kita. Hak istimewa orang² Melayu dan lain² bumiputera. Hak ini yang sa-benar-nya bukan-lah sa-mata² untuk menimbulkan gulungan kapitalis Melayu—tidak. Kalau tidak-lah kerana hak istimewa ini, maka saya fikir sedikit benar-lah anak² bumiputera yang dapat melanjutkan pelajaran-nya, boleh di-katakan 99 peratus anak² bumiputera yang dapat melanjutkan pelajaran tinggi ia-lah dengan kerana hak istimewa ini-lah. Ini bukan menimbulkan gulungan kapitalis—tidak. Kalau sa-kira-nya tidak ada hak istimewa ini, maka barisan hadapan di-sana akan kekosongan-lah daripada bumiputera. Ada-kah ini gulungan kapitalis? Ada-kah hak istimewa ini menimbulkan gulungan atau sa-mata² untuk gulungan kapitalis, menimbulkan gulungan pedagang² dan pengusaha² Melayu? Ini hanya-lah sa-bagai suatu aspek daripada hak istimewa ini. Jadi dengan berkata demikian sa-olah² P.A.P. dan juga loudspeaker atau trumpet-nya saudara Othman Wok menjadi juara anti-kapitalis. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kapitalis Melayu merupakan gulungan yang paling kecil, tidak sampai 1 peratus kekayaan negara ini di-dalam tangan gulungan kapitalis Melayu. Mengapa yang kita hendak pusing kepala tentang kapitalis Melayu? Tetapi gulungan yang sa-kecil ini-lah yang di-tentangi oleh

P.A.P. Konon-nya juara socialist, anti-capitalist, tetapi di-Pulau Singapura di-galakkan kapitalis—ta' chukup kapitalis dalam negeri bawa lagi kapitalis² baharu dari luar negeri untuk menguasai ekonomi Singapura. Ini konon-nya juara socialist, juara anti-capitalist. Pada saya, parti yang sa-macam ini tidak lain dan tidak bukan merupakan parti dan orang² socialist chelup (pseudo socialist).

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam (Ipoh):

Mr Speaker, Sir, parliamentary democracy and the existence of parliamentary democracy in this House must necessarily follow Standing Orders which will be enforced, I have no doubt. It is for that reason alone that I cannot refer to the Honourable Prime Minister of Singapore as "Harry Lee" or just "Lee Kuan Yew". And since those Standing Orders are here, I do not intend to break those Standing Orders, because I am sure I will be pulled up if I do so.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Prime Minister of Singapore has certainly delivered an address to this House today which has struck the right points in the right places, because it has generated heat to such an extent that the effect of the speech is obvious, because truth hurts very much.

Yesterday we had the spectacle of the Honourable Member moving the motion of thanks in a speech which, I say, is unprecedented in parliamentary democracy in any part of the world, because no mover of a motion of thanks would have, in any democratic parliament, embarked on a vicious and callous disregard of the consequences of observations made in the course of moving that motion of thanks. Therefore, Mr Speaker, Sir, it is of very great importance that the proposed amendment to the motion of thanks should receive the support of Members of this House.

Mr Speaker, Sir, on hearing the Honourable Member who moved the motion yesterday, I am sure one could not but form the impression and conclusion that a chauvinist of

the first grade was addressing this House, a chauvinist in his own self addressing this House—a super-chauvinist, Grade No. 1—and the Honourable Member has the audacity to brand others in this House as chauvinists.

Mr Speaker, Sir, whether members of this House like it or not, one thing must be made very, very clear, not only to Members of this House but to the world, that the non-Malay citizens in this country stay here by right and not by sufferance of any community in this country. Once that principle is understood then Malaysia will succeed, but if that principle is not understood and anybody in this House, or in this world, thinks that the non-Malay citizens of Malaysia are here on sufferance, then Malaysia will fall and will be crushed.

Mr Speaker, Sir, it is not my intention to bring in points which are, at this stage of Malaysian history, touchy when external aggression faces this nation. However, the events of the last few months, the disclosures in the *Utusan Melayu* as we heard this morning from the Honourable Prime Minister of Singapore, cannot but put this nation in fear and anxiety, an anxiety as to what is going to happen in the near future to Malaysia itself.

Mr Speaker, Sir, it is, I think, surprising that a citizen of this country, be he a native of this land, or be he a citizen by registration, is allowed to move freely about in this land after inciting people almost to violence. That a man can stand up and say, "Wherever I am, I am a Malay. Crush Lee Kuan Yew! Shout louder!"—if that is not an offence against the laws of this country, then I say the laws of this country are inadequate to deal with the situation. It will be of interest to know after what we have heard of what was published in the *Utusan Melayu* why that paper is allowed to carry on in this country without any action from those responsible for maintaining law and order in this land. Mr Speaker, Sir, if those articles and those statements were not incitement to violence, then I submit to this

august House that our laws are inadequate and the Cabinet and the Government in power should introduce new laws with immediate effect but I say our laws are more than inadequate to deal with it. Mr Speaker, Sir, one would only have to ask oneself if an Opposition Member had addressed the gathering and shouted, "Wherever I am, I am a Chinese!", or "Wherever I am, I am a Ceylonese!" and "Crush so and so"—say a Member of the Cabinet—"Crush! Crush! Shout louder!", what would happen, I wonder, to the person who dares to say that? And yet other persons are allowed to roam this land—when peace and harmony are essential to be maintained at this stage—freely, trudging around Malaysia itself.

Mr Speaker, Sir, let it be known again to parliamentarians and to the peoples of Malaysia that the people of Malaysia wherever they may come from, whichever territories they may come from, will do constitutional and democratic battle to preserve their rights and get their rights which they do not now have. No amount of threats, no amount of shouting, no amount of saying, "Well, if you push us this far, we may look to Indonesia", no amount of such kind of talk is going to intimidate the peoples of Malaysia.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore put it very subtly this morning, but I do not think that, perhaps, all understood what was really intended by the Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore. But I would like to put it in plain words. This is what I say. If you say, "Don't ask for this, don't ask for that, don't push us too far, we will think of Indonesia", what is going to happen if somebody turns round and says, "Give us this, give us that; do not try to keep us like subordinates for too long, then we will look to Red China"? What would you do then if somebody says that? What is going to happen if you say something and somebody else says another thing? That is where you raise communal strifes, communal problems and communal distrust and it is in the

interests of everybody concerned—whether Government or Opposition, whether parliamentary or not parliamentary—that this sort of thing must stop, because every action has a reaction.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable mover of the motion has put a very strange point forward. He says “power corrupts”. If he believes in that, then he must go further and say that “absolute power corrupts absolutely”, and if that saying is true, then it cannot but apply with greater force than to the Alliance Party—absolute power corrupts absolutely. And I think the trend of events clearly shows that corruption in the Alliance by absolute power is to such an extent that today they are prepared to do anything so long as they have the power to do it, irrespective of consequences, irrespective of pledges given and promises made.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the question of fundamental rights and the special position of the Malays in Article 153 of the Constitution have been referred to and the last Honourable Member who spoke said, “What about the P.P.P.? How can the P.P.P., P.A.P., S.U.P.P., U.D.P., all get together?” Mr Speaker, Sir, I thought that there was enough publicity given to the declaration of the Solidarity Convention, but the Honourable Member did not read it. If he reads it I am sure he will tell himself, “Yes, these parties can come together on these agreed principles.” The declaration made it very clear that each political party works in its own entity without subordination to each other. The Peoples’ Progressive Party of Malaya has always made it clear that it is against Article 153 of the Constitution. That stand it still maintains for many reasons, the most important of which has in fact been explained by the Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore—that it is not doing good to our Malay brethren. On the other hand, it is subordinating, victimising, not allowing other businessmen to progress as they should progress; and the ultimate result is a few capitalists to

counter the capitalists of the M.C.A. That is all that is happening under Article 153 of the Constitution.

Mr Speaker, Sir, one Honourable Member, who fortunately or unfortunately is also an Honourable Member of the Bar, spoke before the last member, and he said that we were entertained by a great actor this morning. Mr Speaker, Sir, we on this side of the House do act in the interests of the nation. At least, we are capable of doing that. Honourable Members of the M.C.A. do not act at all. But, if they act at all, they act only to sell out and to betray. That is all that they are capable of doing.

Mr Speaker, Sir, when Malaysia was formed, the Peoples’ Progressive Party of Malaya sounded a number of warnings and the most pertinent of them today are that the Central Government would try to take over Singapore within the power of the Central Government, that the Central Government, would interfere in what is to be autonomy in education and labour, and that is what is going to happen in the future, unless people are more sensible and follow the Constitution of Malaysia in its letter and in its spirit. The Peoples’ Progressive Party of Malaya was perhaps one of those few who foresaw that to trust implicitly the Federal Government was a mistake. We warned of possible war, we warned of possible conflict and I am sad to say—I would not say I am happy to say it—that those warnings appear to be becoming day by day truer and truer. I am sad that they are becoming truer—I am not happier.

Mr Speaker, Sir, personal liberty of the subjects is something which we all cherish very much, but it is obviously clear that personal liberties, democratic rights, are being slowly but steadily removed and taken away by the Government of this land. Examples are simple: Prevention of Crimes Ordinance, Internal Security Act; persons arrested—days, weeks, months, nobody even knows where they are. Brought up for trial? No! The organisation in this department is so poor that in one case where—I was

not counsel, but somebody else was—a counsel went all the way to Alor Star was told this; the Enquiring Officer in a detention case told the counsel that he had no right to appear, and the counsel asked, “Who told you that?” and the officer replied, “Police tells me that counsel has no right to appear.” Mr Speaker, Sir, what kind of an organisation have we got? Ultimately telegrams had to be sent to the Minister of Home Affairs and the Attorney-General, I suppose, and only then it was put right. Why all this trouble? Why all this bad organisation? Why is it that officers are not properly instructed? Is it because there is a lack of interest in the liberty of the subjects?

Coming on top of all this is the shocking news that appeals to the Privy Council in criminal matters and constitutional issues are to be done away with, and also in civil matters appeals as of right, where the subject matter is over \$25,000, and in other matters in some cases by special leave. I am glad and I am happy that the second reading of that Bill is not at the present session of this House. It is a matter of great satisfaction to us that where there have been such strong public protests, at least there is time for those responsible for the introduction of the Bill to reconsider whether it should be proceeded with. In fact, somewhere—I would not like to say where or who said it—a very responsible officer said, “Oh, we must do away with the Privy Council, because Indonesia says we are so much controlled by England. So we must do away with the Privy Council.” Mr Speaker, Sir, that, I think, is certainly not a reason and it will not be a reason given by the Government. Whatever Indonesia says, what do we care? If we are doing right, we continue to do right. Mr Speaker, Sir, it is not a question of national pride whether we have the Privy Council or we do not have it at this stage. I say we must have it because, in the interests of law and order, justice, and confidence in the administration of justice, the Privy Council must exist for some time more. Mr Speaker, Sir,

if it is the policy of the Government to do away with the Privy Council, then I ask what other body is going to replace the Privy Council? Why is there no Bill, why is there no law being made to replace the Privy Council? In the first place, we have not got the judges—I hasten to add we have not got the judges in numbers to replace the Privy Council. In fact, we have not got enough High Court Judges in this country. India did away with the Privy Council after many, many years. But they just did not do away with it, they replaced it with the Court of India. And I would suggest that if ever that Bill is going to be introduced in this House, simultaneously there should be introduced another Bill telling us how, where and in what manner the functions of the Privy Council will be replaced in our own land, if such replacement is indeed possible at this stage of the development of this land.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I would implore—here I do not say “I would condemn”—the Government to reconsider that decision, because it has been unanimously opposed—I emphasise “unanimously opposed”—by the Malaysian Bar at a meeting held at Kuala Lumpur and by Honourable Members of the legal profession, who sit opposite me in this House belonging to the M.C.A.: they have also opposed it unanimously.

Here, Mr Speaker, Sir, I will take the opportunity to refer to the remarks made by the Honourable Member who spoke just before the last Honourable Member and who is also a member of the Bar. He has said that the M.C.A. does have its voice heard within the Alliance group. If that is so, he has a golden opportunity. You are lawyers and you have opposed it of your own freewill: see that your persuasive powers are good enough to stop this Government from carrying on further with that Bill.

Mr Speaker, Sir, on the question of political activities of political parties in this country, it is becoming more and more important because, as the

UMNO or the Alliance has embarked on a campaign of lies and falsehoods, it has become necessary for the Opposition parties to reply to those falsehoods, and because in a democratic country both sides must court the people. But what have we here? Public rallies are banned. We cannot have public rallies, but the Alliance Party has its public rallies, not by meetings of its own, but by using as cover the Solidarity Week rallies, Language Month rallies, where you are supposed to solidify the support of the people. The leaders of the Alliance go there and start attacking Opposition parties; they do not speak on solidarity, but they speak of splitting up the people. Their speeches inflame the people; they destroy unity; they do not build unity. The Honourable Members, who speak at the National Language Month rally, also destroy unity. They make the wedge-gap wider between the communities. I hope it will stop. I hope it will not be repeated because, if it is, then Opposition parties must take action—and we intend to take action, but we will take it, as always, constitutionally and democratically, and in no other way. We will fight in this land, but our fight will be a constitutional one and a democratic one; and no threats from any person however high, or otherwise, in power in this land will ever stop that battle. History will repeat itself in that so long as anybody tries to rule by force, the end will be soon. If it is the intention of this Government to rule by force, and I use the word “force” in the sense of doing away with the elections and other matters, if it is that intention, then it cannot last, because men will rise to the defence of their legitimate rights—and, I say, we in Malaya have always, at all times, conducted actions which have been legitimate, constitutional—perhaps violent in our views, but always constitutional and always legal.

Mr Speaker, Sir, His Majesty has referred to the teaching of Chinese and Tamil in English schools, and that has been taken by the M.C.A. as being very, very satisfactory. Sir, what is this? What is the value of it? You can teach anything you like—Latin, French,

German—in the school, but of what value is it, if you do not recognise it? What value is it going to be to the Chinese, or to the Indians, if you are not going to recognise what you teach in that school?

Honourable Member from Sarawak, Mr Stephen Yong, has said that he advocates multi-lingualism for this whole land. He is echoing what the People's Progressive Party of Malaya has said for many, many years, what Singapore has implemented and what Singapore under the Constitution has preserved for itself and for posterity in that Island. Therefore, let the M.C.A. not hoodwink themselves into thinking that anything good has been done. I would like to ask the leaders of the M.C.A., who sit in this House, about the resolution of its Youth Section asking for the recognition of Chinese as a language to be used in Local Councils in this country and otherwise. What has happened to that? Was it ever forwarded to the Honourable Prime Minister as requested by its Youth Section, or has it gone into the wastepaper basket?

Mr Speaker, Sir, I think the time has come when people of this country are now in a state of political awakening, aware to the dangers of racial rule, aware to the danger that within the Alliance is only racial rule and nothing else, as made clear by the Honourable Mr Stephen Yong from Sarawak as to the events in Sarawak. Are we then as Opposition Members going to keep quiet? We owe a duty to the people. Whether we succeed in our fight, or we do not succeed, is immaterial. Whether we come back to this House, or we do not come back to this House, is immaterial. But what is material is that, so long as we sit here, it is our duty to keep on this battle; and that duty we intend to keep, and for that purpose to see that there is a Malaysian outlook in Malaysia, and for that purpose alone it was sufficient for the Solidarity Convention to get going. I am glad it got going, and we wish every partner—each other—in the Solidarity Convention, not for our own glory but for the glory of Malaysia, that that Solidarity Convention can

persuade, if not take over, those in power to have a Malaysian outlook.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the People's Progressive Party of Malaya opposed the formation of Malaysia. But we are sensible people, we still say that the method in which it was brought in was wrong, and the events have proved it so. However, once it has come in, once the Constitution has been approved, then it is our duty as loyal citizens to uphold the Constitution of Malaysia and to give our support to see that Malaysia can work. Our opposition to the formation of Malaysia still stands, not withdrawn at all, and the dangers we foresaw are—one by one—coming through.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we support a Malaysian outlook where Malaysia will be ruled by Malaysian people—and we are the Malaysian people. However, we will never and, I say it to the Honourable Mover of the motion, we refuse to get used, as he says, to the fact that the Malays will rule, because that will never be. Malaysians will rule Malaysians. Thank you.

Enche' Tan Toh Hong (Bukitintang): Mr Speaker, Sir, I fully support the motion by the Honourable Member for Kota Star Selatan to thank His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong for the Address delivered in this House. His Majesty's gracious speech is a speech of the first order—deep in its significance, impressive in its reality and awesome in its high political social and economic import.

Sir, we heard from the Honourable Prime Minister from Singapore and a few other Members on the Opposition side speaking mainly on domestic, internal grievances. I wish to ask the Prime Minister of Singapore this question: at this critical juncture, when Malaysia is facing Indonesian confrontation and the people of Malaysia must fight internal and external enemies all at once, why should he demand that the nation should settle his self-created trouble?

What is the nation's greatest trouble today? It is not the question of national survival, is it not the question of

national existence, in the face of external aggression and internal subversion? This question, Mr Speaker, Sir, must take precedence over all other problems and difficulties of Mr Lee Kuan Yew, whether genuine or purposely created for his personal objectives.

By bringing up his pet subject of a Chinese Malaysia or a Malay Malaysia at this time of national crisis, he distracts the people's minds from the main issue and thereby he is helping Soekarno's cause.

Mr Lee Kuan Yew's repeated insistence in this House this morning of his favourite question of a Malay Malaysia sounds like a voice from Jakarta. With thousands of Indonesian troops massing along the borders of Sarawak and Sabah, and with daily infiltration and sabotage taking place in Singapore and Malaya, threatening the very existence of this new nation, all loyal citizens and leaders should be thinking of ways and means of strengthening our defences and fighting our enemies. Instead, we have the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew here arguing at great length about a Chinese Malaysia or a Malay Malaysia. We therefore ask Mr Lee Kuan Yew and his fellow P.A.P. leaders to go back and do some homework, think seriously what steps they should do to help strengthen the defences of the nation and not to weaken them.

As for the Malaysian Malaysia, concept, surely it was already in existence and formed the basis of our Merdeka. This point has never been disputed until the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew brings it up to confront confrontation. He is therefore doing no good to anyone in Malaysia at all. The only one who may be happy over Mr Lee's question is Soekarno in Indonesia. (HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear).

Sir, the Honourable Member from Singapore in fact devoted practically his entire two-hour speech on internal problems and grievances. I strongly feel that this is not the proper time to harp on internal grievances and differences, particularly we are facing

a determined external enemy, hellbent to destroy this very nation. If President Soekarno succeeds in his "ganyang Malaysia", then all the talks on internal problems are meaningless. If we are still alive by then, all we can probably talk about is the forward revolution of Greater Indonesia.

Sir, in my maiden speech last year, I discussed the question of confrontation, and because of what I heard this morning I shall, therefore, not follow the example of the Prime Minister of Singapore to talk on internal differences and problems, in fact I feel duty bound to talk on external threat and foreign affairs.

As I was saying, last year in my maiden speech I discussed the basic assumptions underlying the concept of Malaysia, *vis-a-vis* confrontation. Now I would like to examine confrontation on a wider context. The past year, Sir, has been one of increased hostility from Indonesia and Malaysia still faces a total threat to her very existence. Under an explosive situation like this one, there is every possibility that this conflict will spread to other parts of the world, especially in the light of Soekarno's increasing militancy. Nevertheless, there are still some nations in a recent international conference who put forward the premise that the active Indonesian confrontation against Malaysia is an isolated incident and that it is not a threat to world peace.

My submission, Sir, is that this premise is not only totally unsound, but also completely at odds with international realities. If allowed to go unchallenged this premise may gather momentum, carrying with it, amongst others, the danger of lulling unsuspecting nations into believing that the turmoil in this region is comparatively insignificant. In fact, let there be no doubt about the gravity of the present situation here. Let not any nation delude itself that Indonesian confrontation against Malaysia is just a series of incidents along our borders. It is more serious than that. It is persistent blatant aggression committed by Soekarno against Malaysia. With the objectives of political domination through

sheer size of number, weight and pressures, it is a total war on all fronts: military, economic, political, psychological propaganda and fifth-column subversion, and so forth. Lest these nations are still in doubt, I will recapitulate very briefly what is already very well known to our people and to some of our friends overseas.

On the question of military invasion, there should not be any doubt at all in the minds of the world. Dr Sudjarwo, the Indonesian delegate, openly admitted in the Security Council debate last year that she has arrogated to herself the right to take the law into her own hands by use of force, just because she does not like the colour of our political concept. In addition, the captured arms and equipment of Indonesian guerillas bearing the insignia of the Indonesian regular troop and the open confession of Second-Lieutenant Soetikno, an Indonesian paratroop leader, should dispel any doubt whatsoever of Indonesian armed aggression.

On the economic, fifth-column and political fronts, President Soekarno launched a series of insidious actions with the objective of igniting a political explosion within Malaysia, thereby crushing Malaysia by itself.

Two major offensive actions are applied: internal subversion and economic boycott. The work of the Indonesian master spy, R. M. Soenita, had been exposed. He tried but failed to organise an intelligence network to subvert the loyalties of Malay population, particularly those of Indonesian origins, to overthrow the duly-elected Government, so that a puppet government could be set up. Economically, Soekarno tried to create a grave situation of industrial unrest in Singapore by complete withdrawal of trade with Singapore in particular and with Malaysia in general.

Through military and guerilla offensive, Soekarno wanted us to spend a large portion of our funds in defence at the expense of our developmental projects. All these of course was to create internal, political and social chaos in Malaysia. Fortunately, we are

still alive and we are not only still alive, but kicking very hard too, thanks to the Alliance Government and to some of our overseas friends.

Past events have demonstrated very clearly that Soekarno is launching a total war on all fronts against Malaysia. The fact that Soekarno employed an unconventional strategy of "hard-soft, fight-talk" facade is all the more dangerous, because it is so illusionary. Even a very able politician, our good friend, Mr Kawashima, was deceived by Soekarno's smoke-screen.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I have taken some pains to review and to define confrontation. I do this mainly to emphasise that in this region, we have here an ugliest war, launched and perpetuated by President Soekarno. It becomes all the more disturbing to peace-loving people when Soekarno said at the Cairo's Non-Aligned Conference, "South-East Asia is a sea of insecurity. I see no speedy end to this solution".

But what is more frightening is in his active, all-front war against Malaysia: Soekarno injects into it Peking's militant brand of communism, a brand of power struggle, particularly Communist China has just exploded her second nuclear bomb.

For long, Sir, certain Western Powers have subscribed to the naive belief that President Soekarno is the main force preventing a Communist take-over in Indonesia. Yet what are the facts?

Soekarno has steadily and relentlessly moved in lock-step with the Communists. He helped to encourage the growth of the P.K.I., the *Partai Komunis Indonesia*, by destroying the P.K.I's chief opponents within Indonesia, the Masjumi and the P.S.I. But when in 1961-1962 when Aidit began to move in the direction of Peking, Soekarno, too, strengthened his relations with the Peoples' Republic of China.

Just as Soekarno has marched in lock-step with the P.K.I., Indonesia's foreign policy has also been gradually geared to Peking's foreign policy, namely, the policy of hard-line non-co-existence.

Let me give three examples of what I mean. After Indonesia's aggression was exposed and pinpointed at the United Nations Security Council last year, Soekarno made another major international move in support of Peking's foreign policy. At the Cairo Conference of Non-Aligned Countries last year, President Soekarno tried very hard to persuade the non-aligned countries to accept the thesis that co-existence is a myth and that the non-aligned countries must engage in international confrontation against "imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism".

President Soekarno's militancy took his listeners by surprise. Here was a man who blatantly preached the Peking's hard-line of no peaceful co-existence. Here was a man who was willing to barter away his country's foreign policy to the Chinese Communists in a desperate attempt to make effective his threat to crush Malaysia.

The outcome of President Soekarno's threat to envelope the Non-Aligned Conference on the "cold war" issues was predictable. None of the major Non-Aligned Powers—namely, India, the U.A.R. and Yugoslavia—were prepared to allow the Conference to degenerate into a platform for Peking's revolutionary diplomacy as expressed by its puppet, President Soekarno. Even the title of the final resolution of the Conference, "Programme for Peace and International Co-operation" is indicative of the mood of the Non-Aligned thinking. This final resolution clearly spelt out the determination of the Non-Aligned nations to reject the wicked and dangerous thesis put forward by Jakarta/Peking axis.

President Soekarno has broken every of the five principles of *Panchasila*, of the concept of peace through non-alignment and neutrality, particularly when she started her *ganyang Malaysia* policy. I would like to take this opportunity, therefore, to congratulate our Honourable Minister of Foreign Affairs for the work his boys had done at the Cairo Conference in exposing President Soekarno's complete disregard

of the *Panchasila* principles of Non-Aligned nations.

Having failed in his attempt, President Soekarno retreated from Cairo licking his wounds. Still, far from realising that he is losing the sympathy of Afro-Asia, he seemed utterly determined to press on with his ambition to impose upon the Afro-Asian nations the joint Peking/Jakarta thesis that "all power flows from the barrel of a gun". In the holy name of "Newly emerging forces", he decided to confront the United Nations, the world organ of peace, when Malaysia was elected to the Security Council. When he withdrew from the world body, to the puzzlement and indignation of the Afro-Asia's group, he made it very clear that since the U.N. in its desire to seek and to promote peaceful solution to international disputes was unwilling to be led by the nose by Indonesia he, the Great Soekarno, was no longer interested in the United Nations. But what is interesting is that simultaneously Peking and Jakarta made grandiose proclamations about the forthcoming Conference of the New Emergent Forces (Conefo) which is scheduled to be held in August, 1966.

Conefo is meant to be the rival body to the Non-Aligned Conference and to the United Nations. Since the U.N. Security Council condemns Indonesia's aggression and since the Non-Aligned Conference rejects Peking/Jakarta thesis, Afro-Asian solidarity must be split according to Soekarno. Alternatively, as the majority of Afro-Asian nations do not follow the Peking/Jakarta revolutionary line of "hard-soft, fight-talk" militancy, Afro-Asian solidarity must be wrenched from its non-aligned moorings, and pushed into the direction of Conefo. Through these, President Soekarno and his masters hope to create a major international crisis, in which they would put into good use their "double-think, double-talk" schemes. This dangerous process by then will have reached a stage of explosive danger to the whole world, particularly in the light of Peking/Jakarta militancy and the Cold War issues. The imperious and the unforeseen associated

with such a crisis cannot be ignored if they launched forth the "hard-soft, fight-talk" strategy.

The machinery for the establishment of Conefo is already at work. Millions of dollars are being poured into Indonesia by Peking for the construction of a huge complex of buildings and stadiums. Even at the recent Bandung Celebrations, there were many big banners, proudly bearing the Legend "Bandung-Algiers-Conefo", and the Djakarta propagandists announced to the world that, just as Bandung paved the way for Algiers, Algiers will pave the way for Conefo.

Those of us who might regard this analysis as far-fetched should remember that President Soekarno has consistently reiterated his determination to alter the Afro-Asian concept into a Nefo concept, which is supposed to include not only the Afro-Asian group, but also the Latin American group and of course the Socialist camp led by the Chinese Peoples' Republic. Soekarno's intentions become all the more alarming if we recall his speech in the United Nations. He said: "We are not trying to maintain the world we know; we will build a new world, a better one! The whole world is one big source of energy of revolution, a very extensive revolutionary arsenal!"

This brings me back to my submission, Sir, that Indonesian confrontation against Malaysia is definitely a threat to world peace. Malaysia's struggle to survive must therefore be not seen in isolation. She is not fighting for her own survival alone. She is in fact in the front line of defence against totalitarian expansionism. If peace-loving, freedom-loving nations want to help, now is the time before it is too late.

Throughout the history of mankind, there are some frightening chapters in which men are butchered with maniacal fury and nations are swept into the holocaust of devastation. If unchecked, Soekarno's confrontation against Malaysia will be the beginning of such a chapter. It is still not too late to stop it.

In this respect, Sir, I would like to congratulate the Honourable the Deputy Prime Minister for taking the positive stand in his latest Afro-Asian Mission of welcoming all kinds of aids from all other countries in the Commonwealth as well as in Afro-Asia who are prepared to help us. It is not true for the Honourable Member for Batu to suggest that the Alliance Government is not receiving the support of Afro-Asian nations. The very warm and cordial welcome given to our Deputy Prime Minister in his latest truth-mission to Africa and Asia, of which I had the honour to be associated, is symbolic of our good standing with our Afro-Asian brothers. Our Afro-Asian brother nations, with the exception of some Communist camps, recognised us, accepted us as a sovereign nation and gave our Deputy Prime Minister a warm and lavish official welcome which tantamounts to complete rejection of Jakarta's diplomatic offensive. In fact, all the African and Asian nations visited by the Deputy Prime Minister support Malaysia's participation at the forthcoming Algiers Conference. On that score, there has been no reservation whatsoever—thanks to the excellent work of our Deputy Prime Minister. They all believe we have a right to attend the meeting and cannot see any reason why we should be prevented from doing so. After all, the criteria for admission into the Afro-Asian Conference is that the nation must be independent and it must be situated in Asia or Africa. The success of the Alliance Government's foreign policy is clearly reflected in the jittery concern of the Jakarta regime for the Afro-Asian's recognition of Malaysia and the open declaration of many Afro-Asian nations to support Malaysia's participation in Algiers. The latest tour to some African countries by Mrs Supeni as reported in the Press today is a manifestation of this success.

Mr Speaker: How long more will you take?

Enche' Tan Toh Hong: Another five minutes, Sir.

Mr Speaker: Make it as brief as possible! Will you?

Enche' Tan Toh Hong: Yes, Sir. I have no doubt that the leaders of those countries our Deputy Prime Minister had talked with were convinced that Malaysia is an independent, self-determined, peaceful nation and that the aggression committed by Indonesia against Malaysia is contrary to the Afro-Asian spirit and has no place under the Afro-Asian sun. Besides, it was clearly shown that President Soekarno has not only broken every golden rule of Non-Aligned Nations, but also those fundamental principles of the Charter of Organisation for African unity. I definitely feel that the Deputy Prime Minister's effort in the Afro-Asian missions deserve the commendation of this House.

On the other hand, I do feel very sad and very disappointed at the attitude of the Honourable Prime Minister of Singapore regarding the nation's need for foreign help and moral support. For example, in his latest statement in the *Sunday Times* dated May 25, 1965, he said and I quote:

"Can Australia and New Zealand afford to be associated with the defence of any form of Malaysia other than a united Malaysian Malaysia?"

Sir, is it not true that statements like this will have the effect of discrediting Malaysia's needs of help from friendly nations?

It is exactly a year and six days ago that the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew said in this august House, and I quote from page 422 of our Hansard:

"The paramount problem is how to resolve confrontation without undermining the basic security and integrity of Malaysia."

Sir, a year and six days have passed, but till now, I have not heard him give any worthwhile suggestions and concrete proposals on how to resolve confrontation. Perhaps, confrontation is no longer as urgent as having private lunches with the British High Commissioner. I understand that the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew never misses his lunches with the British High

Commissioner whenever he is in Kuala Lumpur. At least, the Honourable Member for Batu gave his five-point peace plan. The Barisan Sosialis said some time ago that the P.A.P. is a stooge of imperialism. There is very little that I agree with the Socialist Front or the Barisan Sosialis. But, on this point, I am in complete agreement with them.

After all, the British tried very hard to persuade Kuala Lumpur to include the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew in a senior Cabinet position. Incidentally, I am not disclosing any official secret. Even a wellknown Australian journalist, Mr Denis Warner, reported it in "The Bulletin". Sir, I suppose had the Honourable Member for Batu had a god-father like the British High Commissioner, to whom he could release all his frustrations and to whom he could seek powerful advice whenever in trouble, he would probably forget all his five-point peace proposals! Thank you.

Dato' Syed Ja'afar bin Hassan Albar (Johor Tenggara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-panjang pagi tadi Dewan ini telah menyaksikan bagaimana sa-orang daripada Singapura bernama Mr Lee Kuan Yew berhempas pulas hendak memperkenalkan diri-nya, hendak memperkenalkan siapa dia dan apa dia. Dalam ucapan-nya yang panjang lebar dalam Dewan ini sa-panjang pagi tadi, beliau telah chuba mempertahankan diri-nya, mempertahankan parti-nya daripada kesilapan², kesalahan², kelancaran² mulut-nya.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam ucapan beliau pagi tadi saya telah menangkap ia-itu rupa²-nya dalam ucapan di-Raja ini ada satu ayat yang sangat² menggerunkan dia dan menakutkan diri-nya. Ayat yang sangat menakutkan Mr Lee Kuan Yew ini ia-lah, saya bachakan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua:

"Keselamatan negara kita sedang diancam dari luar negeri ia-itu dari Indonesia dan lagi negara kita sedang menghadapi juga anchaman dari dalam negeri. Kedua² anchaman itu tujuan-nya ia-lah hendak menimbulkkan kekacauan. Jika pehak² yang

membuat anchaman² itu berjaya, maka huru-hara akan timbul dan demokrasi akan berakhir."

Ini ayat sangat menggerun dan menakutkan Mr Lee Kuan Yew, kerana kata-nya anchaman dari luar ada di-sebutkan dari pehak mana datang-nya ia-itu dari Indonesia, tetapi anchaman dari dalam tidak di-terangkan, dari mana, dari siapa, dari pehak mana akan datang-nya. Dia takut dengan ayat ini. Gerun sungguh Mr Lee Kuan Yew dengan ayat ini. Kalau ta' makan chabai, kenapa berasa pedas? (*Tepok*). Ya, kenapa dia mesti bimbang dan berhempas pulas mempertahankan diri dan membawa constitution berlindung di-sabalek constitution, konon-nya dia hendak mempertahankan constitution. Dia telah mengangkat sumpah hendak mempertahankan constitution. Jadi, bahaya tidak harus timbul dan terbit daripada dia. Kasehan saya melihat telatah Lee Kuan Yew hendak menchuba bersembunyi di-balek jari-nya, tetapi orang nampak juga.

Saya juga hairan memikirkan, mengapa dia bimbang perkataan ini menghala menuju kepada dia dan kepada parti-nya, barangkali Mr Lee Kuan Yew teringat bahawa semenjak P.A.P. lahir di-Singapura, semenjak P.A.P. di-lahirkan di-Singapura pada tahun 1954 berbagai² rusohan telah berlaku dalam pulau Singapura yang kecil itu, berbagai²; daripada ke-kechohan postmen kepada Hock Lee Riot, kepada Rusohan Penuntut² Sekolah Menengah China, dan saya tidak fikir Mr Lee Kuan Yew dapat membersehan diri-nya daripada kejadian² kechoh yang berlaku dalam pulau Singapura ini. Dia terbayang semua kejadian burok yang berlaku dalam pulau Singapura itu. Itu sebab dia memberi ucapan yang begitu panjang lebar, chuba hendak membersehan diri-nya dan tangan-nya yang berlumoran dengan kejadian² yang ngeri dan yang dahshat di-Singapura itu, dia chuba datang ka-mari hendak membersehan diri-nya, tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, history—sejarah tidak dapat di-bohongi oleh sa-siapa, walau dia sa-bijak mana dia berchakap, walau sa-pandai mana dia beruchap,

walau sa-petah mana dia bersharah, dia tidak dapat membohongi sejarah, sejarah akan menetapkan siapa yang di-belakang kekechohan yang berlaku di-Singapura semenjak P.A.P. dilahirkan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untuk membersehhkan diri-nya dan untuk menyembunyikan ketakutan dan kebimbangan-nya daripada ayat yang ada di-dalam ucapan titah di-raja ini, dia telah menyebut² diri saya sendiri, *Utusan Melayu* dan ucapan yang mengecham-nya daripada Yang Amat Berhormat Menteri Besar, Perak. Jadi, di-sini saya ingin memberitahu Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Singapura itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, walau bagaimana dia chuba hendak berkelit dan bersembunyi—tidak dapat, tidak sa-orang dapat menutup mata hari yang sedang terpanchang di-tengah langit pada pukul 12 tengah hari. Orang kenal siapa P.A.P. dan siapa Lee Kuan Yew. Kita tahu tektik-nya. Kita tahu permainan-nya yang kotor di-pulau Singapura itu dan kita tahu bagaimana dia naik memegang kuasa dalam pulau Singapura itu dan chara² yang di-gunakan-nya untuk memegang tampok kuasa di-dalam pulau Singapura itu.

Di-sini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ingin mengambil peluang menyatakan bahawa Ahli dari Singapura itu telah menyebutkan ucapan saya, atau telah quote ucapan saya dengan tidak betul. Saya biarkan dia tadi dengan tidak hendak membetulkan ucapan-nya, kerana saya yakin yang saya akan dapat peluang untuk menjawab dan membetulkan kedudukan itu. Kata-nya saya telah memberikan ucapan di-Penang, mengikut bagaimana yang di-fahamkan daripada siaran *Utusan Melayu* yang di-terjemahkan kapada-nya, oleh agak-nya boneka²-nya, mengatakan bahawa saya menyeru orang² Melayu bersatu dan mengatakan “di-mana aku berdiri aku Melayu”.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ingin hendak menerangkan bahawa lagu ucapan saya ini bukan sahaja di-Pulau Pinang yang saya beruchap sa-umpama ini bahkan di-kebanyakan tempat dan ucapan saya ia-lah

mencheritakan—biar saya tegaskan di-sini—mencheritakan bagaimana UMNO ini telah di-tubuhkan dan telah dapat menghilangkan perasaan bernegeri² di-kalangan orang² Melayu. Itu hakikat ucapan saya, kerana sa-bagaimana yang kita ketahuⁱ sebelum lahir-nya UMNO, bagaimana kita orang² Melayu hidup dalam Tanah Melayu ini? Kita di-pechah²-kan, kita di-cherai²kan masing² hidup di-dalam kotak dan pitak-nya sendiri—orang Perak bermegah dengan Perak-nya, orang Kelantan bermegah dengan Kelantan-nya, orang Johor bermegah dengan Johor-nya; masing² menganggap orang yang datang dari luar negeri, orang luar dan orang dagang. Itu yang saya cheritakan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tetapi apakala UMNO telah datang dan menyatukan orang² Melayu, sempadan daerah dan sempadan negeri telah hapus. Orang² Melayu pada hari ini tidak berperak, tidak berkelantan, tidak berjohor, tidak berpahang, tetapi mereka Melayu di-mana mereka berdiri.

Jadi, soal hendak mengambil ucapan ini konon-nya sa-bagai satu alat yang saya gunakan untuk mengapi²kan orang² Melayu, saya fikir ini salah ambilan. Kalau Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Singapura tidak faham bahasa Melayu, saya minta dia belajar lebeh mendalam lagi dan saya minta daripada boneka²-nya dan orang² upahan-nya yang menterjemahkan ucapan saya dari dalam bahasa Melayu ka-dalam bahasa Inggeris yang di-bachakan-nya tadi supaya tolong-lah amanat sadikit, bila menyalin ucapan—jangan khianat ucapan saya, jangan membuat perangai tikus membaiki labu. (*Tepok*).

Kalau pun saya menyeru orang² Melayu bersatu, apa salah-nya? Apa yang di-takutkan-nya? Thima ucapan saya dari semenjak UMNO dilahirkan tahun 1946 ia-lah mengajak orang² Melayu bersatu, apa salah-nya, apa silap-nya—oh! communal, tetapi jangan pandang kapada soal seruan ini—pandangan pada hasil-nya; apa yang telah di-buahkan-nya, atau di-hasilkan oleh seruan² saya supaya

orang² Melayu bersatu. Buah-nya harmony, buah-nya persefahaman, buah-nya dan hasil-nya tolong-menolong di-antara semua kaum dalam negeri ini.

P.A.P. yang menda'awa tidak perkauman, berbagai² riot dalam Singapura, di-mana hendak taroh muka? Berbagai² rusohan berlaku di-Singapura, berbagai² kekechohan berlaku dalam Singapura. Ini orang yang tidak menyeru Melayu bersatu, atau China bersatu. Kita mengaku dengan megah-nya di-sini bahawa M.C.A. menyeru orang² China bersatu supaya jangan di-masokki oleh anasir² busok dan jahat yang hendak merosakkan orang² China, dan juga orang² China dahulu dalam negeri ini berpechah-belah mengikut clan masing², mengikut kabilah masing², tetapi apakala M.C.A. datang, orang² China kenal diri mereka orang China, bekerjasama dengan orang² Melayu, dengan orang² India, dengan semua bangsa yang ada dalam negeri ini—apa salah-nya? Dan Malaya yang di-kuasa' oleh Perikatan tidak pernah menemui rusohan bagaimana yang berlaku di-Singapura dalam mana ada parti yang menepok dada: "Kami bukan parti perkauman". Kita proud, kita megah dan bangga dengan apa yang kita buat dalam negeri ini, walau bagaimana Ahli² daripada P.A.P. hendak menuduh kami di-sabelah sini perkauman—itu tidak menjadi soal kepada kami. Apa yang kita perlukan ia-lah harmony—perhubungan terbaik², kerjasama, tolong-menolong, bantu-membantu yang ada exist di-kalangan berbagai² kaum yang ada di-dalam Tanah Melayu ini. Ini yang menjadi penting. Ini yang menjadi soal. Bukan-nya menjadi soal pergi tepok dada: Ta' mahu perkauman, ta' mahu racialist, ta' mahu chauvinist, tetapi rusohan berlaku—apa guna-nya ini? Apa guna-nya ini—apa guna-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua—apa guna-nya kita bertepok dada, berbagai², bermegah² kita bukan racialist, kita bukan chauvinist, kita bukan communalist tetapi berbagai rusohan berlaku dalam Singapura. Ini sejarah hitam yang di-tinggalkan oleh P.A.P. dalam Pulau Singapura tidak akan di-lupakan oleh anak chuchu kita beribu dan bermelion tahun yang

akan datang. P.A.P. konon-nya menjadi jagoh, tidak perkauman, tetapi segala hatred atau benchi, segala rasa permusohan exist dalam Pulau Singapura. Tetapi rasa harmoni kekal di-antara satu sama lain dalam Tanah Melayu ini. Malaya yang di-perintah oleh konon parti² perkauman yang di-tuduh chauvinist, kata oleh kamu apa yang kamu hendak kata, kami puas hati dengan harmoni yang ada dalam negeri ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, barangkali Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Singapura itu marahkan saya mengajak orang Melayu bersatu ini kerana apakala orang Melayu tidak berpechah, bersatu-padu dan bulat dan tidak akan ada keluar daripada kumpulan ini, orang² yang boleh di-beli dan di-jadikan-nya alat seperti kawan² kita Rahim Ishak dan Othman Wok, itu yang dia marah. Kalau orang Melayu berpechah ada peluang dapat sa-orang dua yang boleh di-gunakan jadi perkakas yang boleh di-gunakan menjadi alat.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, layanan P.A.P. kepada orang² kita Melayu dalam Pulau Singapura saya tidak mahu sebutkan, dia berbangga tadi dengan mengatakan kami buat dalam education, kami buat dalam ini, tepok dada tanya selera, megah betul dia dengan pertolongan kepada orang kita, tetapi mengikut ma'lumat² dan information yang ada pada saya bahawa layanan kepada orang² Melayu kita di-sana terlampau burok. Saya sendiri bertanya bagaimana burok, dia kata kalau hendak tengok layanan kepada orang Melayu terlampau burok maka saksi, tanda dan dalil yang menunjukkan layanan burok kepada orang Melayu hingga orang Melayu yang masok dalam P.A.P. bangsa-nya kena kata, kena nesta pun tidak berani hendak keluar daripada P.A.P. kerana dia tahu, dia keluar daripada P.A.P. tidak dapat layanan. Itu sebab-lah kita kasehan Rahim Ishak dan Othman Wok, hendak kata orang Melayu kata-lah, aku tidak boleh keluar, sebab kalau keluar tidak dapat peluang di-Singapura.

Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Singapura telah menyebut chabaran saya

kapada beliau supaya menyatakan pendirian dan sikap-nya yang terang dan tegas ada-kah dia hendak berpisah daripada Malaysia atau tidak? Kata-nya, ini chabaran saya, saya buat kerana sa-hari atau dua hari sa-belum saya membuat chabaran itu dia telah menyatakan dalam satu siaran dalam *Straits Times*—saya tidak ingat hari-bulan-nya—mengatakan yang dia tidak puas hati dengan keadaan Malaysia ini dan dia minta supaya new arrangement di-buat. Apa ma'ana-nya new arrangement. Apa-kah Malaysia yang ada hari ini bukan Malaysia yang di-lahirkan dua tahun dahulu waktu dia meletakkan tanda-tangan-nya dalam Perjanjian Malaysia? Apa yang sudah berubah? Tidak ada yang berubah? Malaysia yang lahir tempoh hari dia-lah juga Malaysia yang ada hari ini dengan segala rupa dan bentok-nya, dengan segala warna dan chahaya-nya. Tidak ada yang lain. Kenapa hendak minta new arrangement? Tentang mana new arrangement itu yang akan memuaskan Ahli dari Singapura itu? Ada-kah tujuan-nya hendak berpisah daripada Malaysia? Itu yang saya chabar, sebab, Tuan Yang di-Pertua saya telah banyak mendengar risek² dan berita² angin bahawa dia sedang giat berusaha hendak memecahkan Singapura daripada Malaysia. Itu sebab saya chabar, dan pada hari ini dia datang, kata dia, tidak mahu. Alhamdulillah, chabaran saya berhasil. Tetapi jangan perchaya manusia ini (*Ketawa*).

Ini hari di-sini dia di-Dewan yang mulia ini dia berkata tidak mahu berpechah, tidak mahu berpisah, tetapi di-luar buat kerja² yang dengan sendiri-nya akan meleborkan Malaysia ini, dia ada-lah orang yang tidak boleh di-perchaya. Hari ini berkawan dengan kominis, besok dia jadikan lawan. Ini manusia yang capable of doing anything which suit his ends or his purpose. Ini-lah manusia-nya. Bila berkawan dengan kominis menjadi guna untuk-nya kominis kawan² aku, tetapi apakala kominis tidak boleh di-gunakan menjadi alat dan perkakas-nya kominis musuh aku. Ini-kah manusia yang kita boleh perchaya? Saya tidak dapat memperchaya sa-

barang pengakuan yang di-berikan-nya dalam Dewan ini, kerana kita telah tahu bagaimana manusia ini berkawan. Ong Eng Guan kawan baik-nya, sahabat akrab-nya, Bendahari P.A.P. Akhir-nya, di-buat-nya sampai hanchor kawan itu. Segala cherita yang bukan² berkenaan Ong Eng Guan ini di-keluarkan. Ini-kah manusia yang boleh di-harap dan di-perchaya? Ini hari kita berkawan dengan dia, gadoh sadikit besok di-pechahkan segala rahsia persahabatan yang lama? Ini-kah manusia yang boleh di-perchaya? Dengan hanya layanan kapada satu orang pun kita tidak boleh perchaya bagaimana-kah manusia dalam Malaysia ini akan memperchaya orang yang bernama Lee Kuan Yew untuk memerintah Malaysia ini (*Tepok*).

Jadi, di-sini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kerana tidak dapat dudok dalam Cabinet Kerajaan Pusat dia menyembah (*Ketawa*) dia menyembah datang minta, tidak chukup dia datang minta sendiri, konon-nya di-hantar orang pula jadi orang tengah antara dia dengan Kerajaan Pusat, tolong-lah dia sumbatkan dalam Cabinet, konon²-nya dia hendak jawatan luar negeri, tetapi dia lebeh tahu-lah. Nasib baik Kerajaan Pusat tidak terima dia, kalau tidak anai² betul masuk dalam batang Kerajaan Pusat ini. Jahanam, nampak kuat sahaja, tetapi akhir-nya runtoh tiang itu dengan tidak sedar. Kerana tidak dapat peluang hendak masuk, kalau merajok sahaja tidak apa, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau aku tidak boleh dapat masuk dalam Kerajaan yang di-pimpin oleh Tunku ini, biar aku jahanamkan Kerajaan ini, binasakan dia dan hanchorkan dia, dia chari-lah peluang dan berbagai², hinggakan membawa pertelengkahan perselisihan di-antara kita sama² kita dalam negeri di-heret² di-bawa keluar negeri. Mengapa? Hendak minta sokongan dari Australia, hendak minta sokongan dari New Zealand supaya champor tangan dalam hal negeri kita sendiri. Saya fikir Australia dan New Zealand tidak bodoh bagaimana Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Singapura hendak interfere dalam local affairs atau pun hal dalam negeri kita. Saya tidak fikir kalau dia berfikir dia dapat mempengaruhi

orang² ini untuk menyokong niat dan hajat-nya itu, maka dia telah membuat salah perhetongan, dia kata dia selalu buat calculation tetapi tiap² kali dia buat calculation silap calculation-nya itu. Sa-besar² kesilapan P.A.P. dan Mr Lee Kuan Yew bila dia buat calculation hendak menang 9 kerusi dalam Pilihan Raya yang lepas. Akhir-nya, bukan kerusi yang dia menang, chalun-nya hilang wang pertarohan. Itu-lah orang yang bijak membuat calculation.

Jadi di-sini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dia menyebutkan Malaysian Malaysia. Apa-kah ini Malaysian Malaysia? Kalau ini satu benda baharu pada dia, itu bukan baharu kapada kita. Kita yang mulakan benda ini tetapi dengan bijak pandai-nya dia hendak tunjukkan kapada dunia konon-nya dia-lah yang mengcreate, dia-lah yang menchiptakan Malaysian Malaysia. Pada hal itu-lah perjuangan Perikatan dengan tidak menggembar-gemborkan dan dengan tidak berchakap besar. Kita berjalan mengikut plan, kita mengikut ranchangan, kita mengikut asas² yang kita telah tetapkan sa-hingga kita sampai kapada matalamat kita, tidak menggembar-gemborkan dalam soal Malaysian Malaysia. Dia bertanya, siapa-kah hendak Malaysian Malaysia; dia bertanya kapada kita. Tanya-lah dirinya sendiri, dia hendakkan Malaysian Malaysia atau tidak, dan apa yang dia hendak? Malaysian Malaysia pada kita, kita sudah tahu ma'ana-nya dan tujuan-nya. Tetapi Malaysian Malaysia yang dalam otak dan perut-nya, saya tidak tahu apa dia. Dan dia pun tidak terangkan apa dia itu Malaysian Malaysia dalam keterangan-nya tadi. Ada-kah kerana Malaysia mempunyai satu Perlembagaan yang di-dalam-nya terkandung hak² istimewa orang Melayu dan bumiputera, maka itu tidak akan menjadikan Malaysian Malaysia, ada-kah itu maksud-nya? Atau ada-kah kerana pada hari ini Yang Teramat Mulia Tunku Abdul Rahman menjadi Perdana Menteri Malaysia, maka Malaysian Malaysia belum wujud lagi—belum lahir lagi baharu hendak di-lahirkan oleh segelintir manusia yang tidak laku ditempat-nya masing² ini? Apa maksud Malaysian Malaysia kapada mereka ini,

Tuan Yang di-Pertua? Saya tidak mengerti apa itu Malaysian Malaysia, apa yang kurang? Kita sedang menuju ka-arrah pembentukan satu bangsa yang betul² bersatu padu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam negeri yang pendudok-nya daripada berbagai² kaum, berbagai² keturunan telah beratus tahun di-jajah oleh penjajah yang telah memainkan jarum berpecah belah di-kalangan kita bukan mudah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita meminta tiap² satu kaum ini melupakan rasa sentiment kaum-nya—bukan mudah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Hendak membentok satu bangsa dan satu negara bukan dalam sa-hari dua, bukan dalam sa-bulan dua, bukan dalam sa-tahun dua, memerlukan masa dan ini-lah yang kita telah letakkan asas²-nya dan telah meletakkan tujuan-nya dan kita sedang berjalan atas asas yang kita letakkan, insha Allah kita akan sampai kapada tujuan yang kita kehendaki itu. Tetapi apa yang di-gaduhkan-nya berkenaan dengan Malaysian Malaysia ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya pun tidak tahu. Dan apa maksud-nya daripada Malaysian Malaysia, kita tidak faham.

Kelmarin beberapa minggu yang sudah Ahli daripada Singapura itu telah mengatakan bahawa tidak ada satu kaum dalam negeri ini boleh mengaku lebeh native—lebeh asal daripada kaum yang lain. Benda ini dia tidak nafikan tetapi datang Rahim Ishak atau Osman Wok menafikan, ada-kah kerja dia tukang menafikan, biar-lah dia nafikan ta' usah awak buat penat (*Ketawa*). Mulut dia lebeh petah daripada mulut awak. Pena dia lebeh tajam daripada pena² orang yang menafikan ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kenapa budak² ini di-buat sampai bagitu sa-kali? (*Ketawa*).

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Singapura tadi ada menyebutkan fundamental liberty yang ada dalam bahagian 2 dalam Constitution atau dalam Perlembagaan kita. Tahu-kah dia bahawa fundamental liberty yang ada dalam Perlembagaan Malaysia itu di-copy atau di-salin bulat² daripada Perlembagaan Persekutuan Tanah

Melayu? Tahu-kah Ahli² daripada P.A.P. benda itu di-salin bulat² daripada Perlembagaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu dan di-bubohkan dalam Perlembagaan Malaysia? Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada-kah orang² ini tahu siapa yang menchipta Perlembagaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu; P.A.P. itu jam belum ada lagi, maseh dalam alam ghaib, Mr Lee Kuan Yew maseh struggle belajar Undang² dia di-London masa itu maseh baharu belajar. Kita sudah ada fundamental liberty dalam Perlembagaan kita. Jangan datang di-sini tepok dada bermegah² kata, ini-lah Malaysian Malaysia yang kita hendak dengan ada fundamental liberty. Kita yang chiptakan ini, kita yang buat dan kita yang jalankan. P.A.P. datang menenggek—menumpang tepok dada konon (*Tepok*). Itu-lah yang saya katakan dalam satu ucapan-nya, saya tidak pernah melihat manusia yang lebeh bodoh daripada Lee Kuan Yew—memang betul-lah. Benda yang kita buat, dia bawa dan chuba jualkan balek kepada kita. Hendak pergi jual kepada lain orang pergi-lah, jangan-lah jual balek kepada kita, kita kenal barang kita.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pendek kata, saya rangkaskan ucapan saya ini dengan mengatakan bahawa tidak ada salah-nya bagi sa-siapa daripada kita menyeru kaum-nya bersatu untuk bekerja-sama dengan lain² kaum di-dalam negeri ini. Dan jangan-lah dijadikan ini sa-bagai satu senjata untuk menikam saya, ini senjata saya, kalau ada orang hendak gunakan senjata itu saya akan menikam dia sa-mula, terima kaseh.

Enche' Abdul Rahim Ishak (Singapore): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, nampak-nya Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Johor Tenggara marah peri hal dalam P.A.P. ada orang² Melayu. Bukan sa-takat itu sahaja kemarahan-nya, nampak-nya bahawa sa-sudah dua krisis masuk krisis yang ketiga baharu² ini, orang² Melayu dalam P.A.P. tetap dan tegoh menyokong dasar² P.A.P. Lagi² dia marah. Sa-olah² dia mahu saya masuk UMNO. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, belum pernah lagi saya masuk UMNO sa-hingga hari ini dan ada sebab-nya. Demikian pula saudara

saya dari Singapura yang menjadi Menteri Kebajikan Masharakat disana. Dia juga sa-umur hidup-nya belum pernah masuk UMNO lagi dan ada sebab²-nya.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, antara lain, bukan kami menganggap UMNO itu sa-buah pertubohan Melayu chelup, bukan. Tetapi antara lain, sebab²-nya saya dan orang² lain dalam P.A.P. tidak mahu masuk dalam UMNO sebab-nya ia-lah bahawa kami juga mengikuti perkembangan politik dalam negeri ini, kami juga nampak, kami juga dengar dan kami dapat menjalankan analisa. Dan kalau pendapat kami tidak sa-alir dan sa-chuchok dengan perjuangan UMNO saya rasa tidak patut orang² saperti Ahli daripada Johor Tenggara yang berucap sa-olah² menjual ubat di-tepi jalan tadi, dan khabarnya sa-waktu dia datang dari Sulawesi dahulu menjual ubat di-tepi jalan. Tidak sa-patut-nya dia marah kerana orang² Melayu dalam P.A.P. tetap dan tegoh dengan perjuangan-nya. Sadikit masa lagi saya akan memberikan sebab² yang sa-lanjut-nya.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam Titah Duli Yang Maha Mulia Yang di-Pertuan Agong sa-malam, tidak ada sa-patah pun tersebut tentang P.A.P., tetapi nampak-nya daripada sa-malam sa-hingga-lah petang ini tiap² ahli dari pihak Kerajaan membuang masa mereka itu menghentam, menyelar P.A.P., Lee Kuan Yew, berulang kali. Saya hairan mengapa mereka membuang masa begitu banyak sa-kali terhadap P.A.P. dan Lee Kuan Yew. Bahkan ahli daripada Batu pun nampak-nya bersama² dengan pihak Perikatan menyelar Lee Kuan Yew dan P.A.P. Dalam ucapan yang di-buat oleh Yang di-Pertua UMNO ia-itu Perdana Menteri Malaysia, beliau telah menyeru dengan pengikut²-nya jangan terlalu menumpukan perhatian, jangan terlalu membuang masa, kepada ucapan² pemimpin² P.A.P. dan juga ucapan², khas-nya, Lee Kuan Yew, Setia-usaha Agong, P.A.P. Nampak-nya segala nasihat daripada orang tua saperti itu yang bijaksana sudah diketepikan oleh pengikut²-nya.

Dalam perenggan yang penghabisan Titah Yang di-Pertuan Agong tempoh

hari, ada tersebut bahawa Malaysia menghadapi ancaman daripada luar dan juga daripada dalam negeri. Dan nampak-nya pihak Perikatan mentafsirkan ancaman ini ia-lah ancaman daripada P.A.P. Itu-lah sebab-nya agak mereka itu telah membuang masa terhadap P.A.P. Tetapi dalam pada menjalankan serangan²-nya terhadap P.A.P. mereka nampak menyalah-gunakan dan mengkeritik diri mereka sendiri. Mereka kata bahawa mithalan-nya P.A.P. telah kalah dalam 8 buah kawasan dalam pilihan raya dalam tahun yang lalu dan hanya menang dalam satu kawasan sahaja. Mereka semua-nya berkata, tidak ada kechualih-nya, bahawa P.A.P. tidak ada harapan di-masa depan untuk menang dalam pilihan raya. Sebab ra'ayat tidak menyokong P.A.P. bahawa P.A.P. tetap lenyap dari muka bumi Malaysia. Ini menembusi sa-tiap ucapan mereka itu. Mereka kata orang² China dalam Malaysia tidak akan menyokong P.A.P. Sebab menurut Perdana Menteri Malaysia juga orang² China orang yang practical kata-nya, tidak akan menyokong P.A.P., orang India tidak akan menyokong P.A.P. Tambahan pula orang² Melayu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tetap tidak menyokong P.A.P., orang² Kadazan, orang Iban, Murut, Bajau dan lain² bumiputra di-Sabah dan Sarawak tidak akan menyokong P.A.P., demikian juga orang Eurasian, Ceylon, Pakistan, orang Thai di-Kedah, Kelantan dan Perlis juga tidak akan menyokong P.A.P. Kalau begitu apa-kah guna-nya membuang masa sa-bagitu banyak dua hari suntok menchemar, keritik P.A.P. sebab ra'ayat tidak mahu menyokong P.A.P. Tetapi saya minta jangan dalam pada menjalankan serangan² yang sa-demikian rupa menipu diri sendiri.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, katakan-lah mereka itu tidak dapat bertindak jujur terhadap diri mereka sendiri. Tetapi biar-lah mereka mengaku bahawa bukan P.A.P. mengancham Malaysia, itu yang sa-benar-nya. Dan ra'ayat juga tahu apa itu yang benar dan apa itu yang tidak benar. P.A.P. mengancham Parti Perikatan. P.A.P. tidak mengancham Malaysia. Tetapi dalam pada menjalankan ucapan² mereka agak

payah sa-kali mahu menyuarakan kebenaran. Saya baharu sebut tadi ia-itu P.A.P. mengancham Parti Perikatan di-masa depan meski pun bukan di-masa ini. Tetapi jika mereka itu hendak membuang masa dua hari suntok mengancham P.A.P. biar-lah kami peluang dapat bergerak sa-chara bebas membuka chawangan² lain daripada tempat² yang sudah kami buka dalam pilihan raya tahun yang lalu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, mari-lah kita meninjau bagaimana P.A.P. merupakan ancaman terhadap Perikatan. Perikatan sa-bagai sa-buah Parti dalam negeri ini yang atas akuan-nya sendiri bersifat sayap kanan. Ini adalah akuan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua beberapa tahun yang lalu. Sejak tahun 1957 dahulu Perikatan menjalankan dasar² yang telah pun di-jalankan oleh Kerajaan British. Ia menjalankan dasar penjajah. Dan sa-sudah Kerajaan Perikatan menerima kemerdekaan negeri ini dari penjajah British, mereka terus-menerus menjalankan dasar penjajahan itu juga yang merupakan dasar ekonomi yang *semi-feudal* yang menggalakkan capitalism orang² yang mempusakai system economy daripada penjajah British itu. Pertama-nya ia-lah UMNO dengan puchok pimpinan-nya yang bersifat traditionalist yang memang mempunyai kepentingan dalam menjalankan terus-menerus dan mengekalkan susunan kemasyarakatan yang telah di-pusakai-nya daripada penjajah British. Sa-lain daripada itu siapa-kah lagi yang mempunyai kepentingan dalam susunan economy ini. Sa-lain daripada itu yang sama² mempunyai kepentingan ia-lah tauke² M.C.A. yang sudah banyak sa-kali membolot kekayaan daripada system dan susunan yang telah di-pusakai oleh mereka bersama² daripada penjajah British. Ini ia-lah sejarah tidak boleh di-nafikan oleh sa-siapa juga. Bersama² dengan tauke² M.C.A. ini kita tahu bahawa sejak daripada kemerdekaan tahun 1957 dahulu, meski pun ketika itu kebanyakan ahli² UMNO, sama ada diperangkat Parlimen, Dewan² Undangan Negeri, Majlis² Bandaran, ketika itu maseh berseh lagi, maseh belum lagi berchampur-gaul dengan tauke²

M.C.A. Tetapi sudah berlalu beberapa tahun mereka itu sudah pandai, bukan sahaja berchampur-gaul, bukan sahaja duduk bermakan dan berminum, Tuan yang di-Pertua, tetapi sudah pandai berchampur-gaul dalam lapangan² yang lain seperti perniagaan. Memang itu halal. Tetapi erti dan akibat-nya dari segi Kerajaan memang luas sa-kali.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-bawah penjajah British, bangsa Melayu adalah bangsa yang di-sebutkan "Protected" atau terpelihara, dengan berbagai² hak istimewa-nya seperti tanah² simpanan-nya dan lain² lagi. Tetapi walau pun ada apa yang di-katakan pemeliharaan ini, bangsa Melayu telah menempoh zaman kemerdekaan sebagai suatu bangsa yang paling menderita dan paling miskin. Ini kita tahu dan bangsa Melayu mempusakai kemerdekaan sa-bagai kaum yang paling mundur sa-kali dalam lapangan ekonomi. Dalam Perlembagaan Malaya dahulu dan sekarang ini dalam Perlembagaan Malaysia, orang² Melayu di-berikan hak² istimewa.

Hak² istimewa ia-lah nama baharu bagi kedudukan istimewa dan lain² hak lagi yang sa-memang-nya konon penjajahan British memberikan kepada bangsa Melayu. Masaalah yang kita menghadapi, yang kita sama² menghadapi sa-bagai ra'ayat dan warga-negara Malaysia ia-lah apa-kah hak² istimewa ini, seperti yang berjalan konon di-zaman penjajahan British dahulu, harus terus berjalan dalam bidang dan bentok yang kita tahu dahulu kala. Sebab dari peninjauan yang sa-pintas lalu, sa-kali pun chara melaksanakan hak² istimewa ini atas akuan tidak lain tidak bukan dari sa-buah Lidah Pengarang dalam surat khabar UMNO, ia-itu *Utusan Melayu*, memang perlaksanaan ini tidak memuaskan sama sa-kali. Ini sa-buah Lidah Pengarang yang barangkali tersilap tulis oleh penulis Lidah Pengarang. Ia mengaku bahawa ini bukan chara-nya hak² istimewa orang Melayu yang sa-harus-nya di-laksanakan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, P.A.P. mahu mengadakan perubahan² supaya atas akuan Pengarang *Utusan Melayu* yang

menulis Lidah Pengarang itu, kehidupan bangsa Melayu dapat berubah sedikit demi sedikit, meski pun tidak dapat berubah sa-kali gus dengan banyak. Oleh kerana itu-lah P.A.P. mempunyai ranchangan yang tertentu untuk meninggikan taraf hidup bangsa Melayu berdasarkan ideology-nya tersendiri dan bukan-lah menurut orang² seperti Ahli dari Johor Tenggara itu yang memang mudah memutar-belitkan tujuan dan niat hati P.A.P. atau pun pemimpin²nya. Sudah memutar-belitkan—hari² memukul, menyerang, berdasarkan putar-belit yang telah terbit dari mulut mereka sendiri.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tadi Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Johor Tenggara bertanya kepada saya, apa-kah faedah-nya saya menapiakan konon apa yang di-keluarkan oleh Perdana Menteri Singapura yang berkata bahawa tidak ada kaum dalam Malaysia yang dapat menda'awa diri-nya lebeh Malaysia daripada yang lain. Saya tidak menapiakan yang itu, sebab sa-waktu perkataan² itu terbit, saya ada di-Bombay. Tetapi sa-benar-nya ada saya menapiakan bahawa Perdana Menteri Singapura pernah berkata bahawa orang² Melayu bukan bumiputera negeri ini dan sa-memang-nya Perdana Menteri Singapura tidak pernah berkata demikian. Saya sendiri tahu, sebab sudah lama kami berjuang sama². Beberapa tahun dahulu dan baharu² ini pun Perdana Menteri Singapura manakala mempertahankan diri-nya, selalu-nya sa-bagai orang mendatang. Walau pun di-masa yang lalu beliau tidak pernah menapiakan bahawa orang² Melayu bumiputera, tetapi beliau sendiri memperkatakan diri-nya sa-bagai orang mendatang. Oleh kerana itu berma'ana-lah beliau mengaku bahawa orang² Melayu ada-lah bumiputera dalam negeri ini.

Penduduk² Malaysia khas-nya di-kampong², atau di-kawasan² luar bandar, ada-lah terdiri, di-Malaya khas-nya, kebanyakan daripada orang² bangsa Melayu. P.A.P. mempunyai ranchangan untuk meninggikan keluaran hasil penanam² padi, kaum nelayan dan lain² penduduk luar bandar dan kampong² untuk menghapuskan penderitaan ekonomi bangsa

Melayu. P.A.P. dan kami berbangga bahawa kami suka berikhtiar untuk menghapuskan penindasan yang dijalankan oleh lintah² darat yang kebanyakan-nya, Tuan Speaker sendiri tidak dapat menapikan, ada-lah terdiri daripada orang² M.C.A. sendiri sama ada mereka itu pehak peminjam wang, sama ada mereka itu tuan² punya kedai kechil di-kampong², sama ada mereka itu peminjam² kapal² kechil, perahu² kechil, pukat² mereka itu ada-lah terdiri daripada gulungan yang bersangkut-paut sa-chara rapi dengan M.C.A. Ini kami mahu merentikan.

Ya, kami mahu merentikan-nya. Orang² UMNO sendiri bukan semua-nya—itu saya tahu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua pun tahu dan pehak Cabinet pun tahu juga—bukan semua-nya terlibat. Tetapi mereka yang semenjak beberapa tahun yang lalu sudah terkait sama² pehak M.C.A. yang menghisap darah bangsa Melayu. Ini yang kami mahu merentikan. Itu-lah yang merupaan anchaman.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bukan anchaman kapada Malaysia, tetapi anchaman kapada pehak mana sa-kali pun yang sekarang ini di-sabelah Kerajaan menghisap darah bangsa Melayu. Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Johor Tenggara nampak-nya tidak sedar bahawa P.A.P. bukan hanya sa-buah parti politik. P.A.P. pada masa ini ada-lah satu gerakan, lebih daripada parti politik. Segala chita²-nya, segala perjuangan-nya terbayang dari ranchangan² itu, meresap di-dalam akal ra'ayat Malaysia. Segala putar-belit, segala fitnah, dusta dan bohong tidak akan makan. Sa-tahun, dua tahun, segala fitnah dan dusta yang di-terbitkan dalam *Utusan Melayu*, *Malaya Merdeka*, mungkin ra'ayat terpengaruh oleh fitnah dan dusta itu. Tetapi memang bukan bagi manusia di-tipu sa-lama²-nya. Kebe-naran akan terbit sa-bagaimana sinar matahari juga akan terbit, akan di-rasai, akan meresap dalam fikiran ra'ayat. Meski pun di-kampong² pada hari ini *Utusan Melayu* dan fitnah-nya dapat menembusi fikiran ra'ayat, tetapi tidak lama. Kami chukup yakin, sebab kami tahu perjuangan kami ada-lah sah-aluan dengan sejarah. Hanya masa

akan menentukan-nya. Orang² saperti Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Johor Tenggara tidak sedar mithal-nya apabila beliau menerusi *Malaya Merdeka*, walau pun beliau menapikan, itu nampak-nya beliau dengan senang hati mahu melepaskan tangan-nya daripada tanggong-jawab-nya sendiri. Apa yang di-terbitkan dalam *Malaya Merdeka*, rasa saya harus di-pikul oleh Setia-usaha Agong UMNO, tetapi beliau telah menapikan tempoh hari bahawa beliau tidak mengancham mahu memecah ka-sabelah Indonesia sa-kira-nya tidak dapat menjalankan politik-nya.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Soekarno—diktator Soekarno dan Parti Komunis Indonesia memperkatakan Malaysia sabagai chiptaan neo-colonialist. Antara lain ada-lah sebab penindasan² yang dijalankan oleh gulungan², saperti M.C.A. dan tokoh² saperti Tan Lark Sye dan banyak lagi yang ada kaitan pula dengan orang² itu saperti Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Johor Tenggara. Antara lain itu-lah sebab-nya P.K.I. menuduh kita semua neo-colonialist kalau Ahli² Yang Berhormat dalam pehak Kerajaan belum tahu lagi. Manakala P.K.I. dan Soekarno hendak mengganyang kita, antara lain itu-lah sebab-nya. Mereka bertujuan menghapuskan penindasan saperti yang dijalankan oleh M.C.A. dalam negeri ini. Tetapi nampak-nya itu tidak menjadi amaran kapada orang² saperti Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Johor Tenggara.

Tujuan Partai Komunis Indonesia sekarang ini ia-lah mengganyang bukan Maphilindo, sebab itu ada-lah chiptaan dan rekaan gulungan² yang lain. Sudah terang bahawa P.K.I. di-Indonesia ada-lah menentang Maphilindo. Tetapi Ahli² Yang Berhormat termasuk Ahli dari Johor Tenggara harus memahami bahawa tujuan Soekarno, Aitid dan lain² hendak mengganyang Malaysia ada-lah tujuan mereka hendak mengganyang orang² yang menjalankan penindasan terhadap manusia yang lain.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bagaimana-kah Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Johor Tenggara itu bertujuan hendak menanggohkan anchaman kapada parti-nya itu? Sudah terang bahawa anchaman

itu ada-lah anchaman kepada Parti Perikatan oleh P.A.P. Kita tahu, mereka tahu dan ra'ayat pun tahu apakah jalan² yang mereka hendak mengambil untuk menanggohkan atau menyingkirkan anchaman itu. Ra'ayat juga nampak, ra'ayat bukan buta bahawa salah satu jalan ia-lah mengapi²kan perasaan bangsa Melayu, menimbulkan rasa churiga, rasa shak dan bimbang dalam hati sanubari bangsa Melayu bahawa hak² istimewa mereka itu hendak di-rebut oleh P.A.P. yang di-pimpin oleh orang China yang kebanyakan ahli²-nya orang China, yang sering kali di-perkatakan oleh mereka itu parti orang China. UMNO sa-chara halus sa-kali menjalankan diayah ini untuk menanggohkan, saya kata menanggohkan dengan sengaja, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sebab itu-lah yang dapat mereka lakukan, menanggoh atau menunda anchaman itu sa-belum anchaman itu mengganyang mereka sendiri satu hari nanti. Mereka menggunakan sa-chara halus permainan politik menakutkan bangsa Melayu dengan berkata bahawa P.A.P. menindas dan hendak melenyapkan bangsa Melayu daripada muka bumi ini, tetapi chara yang halus ini konon bukan perkauman—ini bukan perkauman.

Kalau Perdana Menteri Singapura berkata sedikit sa-banyak tentang kedudukan kaum² dalam negeri ini—ini perkauman, Ra'ayat bukan buta. Manakala P.A.P. menuntut nasib baik, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada orang² China dalam negeri ini yang mahu mengakui diri-nya bangsa Malaysia—nasib baik saya rasa, khas-nya di-Singapura dan di-lain wilayah² juga dalam Malaysia ada orang² China yang sanggup mahu menda'awa diri-nya, mahu mengakui diri-nya bangsa Malaysia. Tetapi apakah kebanyakan orang China dalam negeri ini, sa-bagaimana ada dalam Jema'ah Menteri di-sabelah sana yang berulang alek ka-Formosa, yang sendiri takut mahu pergi ka-Formosa menghantar isteri-nya ka-sana, yang mahu menunjokkan kepada orang² China yang lain bahawa beliau itu maseh lagi perhubungan kechinaan-nya. Saya rasa lebih baik bagi Malaysia kalau kebanyakan orang China dalam negeri

ini sanggup memutuskan perhubungannya sama sa-kali, sama ada dengan Peking mahu pun dengan Taipeh.

Pendek kata, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, memang susah kalau mereka hendak menjalankan politik sa-chara tidak mengapi²kan perasaan bangsa Melayu bagi mereka dalam pada niat-nya hendak menanggohkan anchaman daripada P.A.P. Tetapi saya menyeru sa-bagaimana yang telah di-serukan juga oleh sa-orang Ahli daripada pehak UMNO sa-malam supaya fikir-lah, jangan terlalu ringan lidah-nya dalam membuat seruan² perkauman sa-bagaimana yang suka di-laongkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Johor Tenggara. UMNO dan Perikatan hanya-lah satu parti politik sahaja. Kalau mereka mengaku bahawa ini negeri yang berdasarkan demokerasi, maka sa-harus-nya mereka mengaku bahawa UMNO, M.C.A. dan M.I.C. itu ada-lah gabungan yang merupakan satu parti politik. Dalam negeri ini ada tempat untuk parti² politik yang lain termasuk P.A.P. yang mempunyai ranchangan². Dan memang dasar kami untuk bertanding bila² masa sahaja kalau mereka itu maseh perchaya terhadap dasar demokerasi. Tetapi kalau pehak mereka sudah putus asa, sudah kechewa tidak dapat menanggung anchaman daripada P.A.P. kalau mereka hendak mengantong Perlembagaan—itu lain fasal.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, akhir-nya biar-lah saya menamatkan ucapan saya ini dengan berkata bahawa orang² yang jual ubat atau orang² yang bertingkah laku saperti orang jual ubat yang saya sebutkan tadi, saya rasa tidak lama tingkah laku mereka itu akan laku. Lama kelamaan ra'ayat sendiri akan mengganyang mereka itu, kerana ra'ayat akan sedar bahawa mereka-lah yang membantu tauke² M.C.A. menghisap darah bangsa Melayu. Mereka satu hari akan menghadapi bangsa Melayu, dan terpaksa menerangkan dan memberi jawapan atas tindakan mereka yang sa-bagitu kejam terhadap bangsa-nya sendiri.

Dr Lim Chong Eu (Tanjong): Mr Speaker, Sir, right from the very outset, I wish to say that I rise to associate myself with the amended

proposition which is made by way of a motion of thanks to His Majesty's Gracious Speech, and it seems to me that much of the arguments that were put forward earlier in the day have again regressed to the level of emotional and rather unhappy strong, communal feeling. So, I feel it might be worthwhile to repeat exactly what we are trying to put across to Honourable Members of this House by this amendment, because this amendment as tabled "regrets that the Address by His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong did not re-assure the nation that Malaysia will continue to progress in accord with its democratic Constitution toward a Malaysian Malaysia but, on the contrary, that the Address has added to the doubts over the intentions of the present Alliance Government and over the measures it will adopt when faced with the loss of a majority popular support". That is the amendment.

I wish, Sir, in the course of my speech, to be able to try, with as little emotion as possible, to put across exactly what is meant by the importance of this amendment.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I feel that it was perhaps a little unfortunate and sad that the Honourable Member for Kota Star Selatan in moving the motion of acceptance of His Majesty's Gracious Address should have forgotten the very gracious manner whereby His Majesty presented the Address, and thereby had rather determined the heated nature of the debate to some extent, because it was largely through the manner whereby he suddenly switched from Bahasa Kebangsaan into English and launched a rather vigorous tirade against the P.A.P. members and the Socialist Front members that the present tone and emotionalism of the debate had begun to take shape. Sir, I realise that I shall take some time. So I would wish the members to be able to return to their homes over the weekend to be able to think very carefully over what has been said by the Honourable mover of the motion and also over what has been said by the Honourable mover of the amended motion, because

the length whereby they went at one another I feel merits our closest attention.

I feel, however, Sir, that it is correct and proper for us, in this the beginning of the second session of our Parliament of Malaysia, to briefly take up deeply seated emotional issues and air them in this House, exchange them with all the righteousness and realism that they mean to each one of us and in this House, under the guidance of the Chair and according to the system of parliamentary democracy. Let us once and for all try to eliminate the feelings that have been burning steadily and slowly as an undercurrent within our nation. I feel very sad indeed to be in this House to listen to speeches that seem to revive memories which take me back well-nigh 10 years, because statements that have been made here or made recently outside this House have not been made for the first time. The reactions to these statements very often seem to present to the outside world an unhappy, divided nation with people uncertain about their future and about themselves. These statements were first made at the time prior to the formation of the Federation of Malaya and at the time when the Constitution of the Federation of Malaya was being introduced, and as we all accept (as indeed the member for Johore Tenggara himself has said) the Constitution of the Federation of Malaya in a large part has been carried over into the present Constitution of the Federation of Malaysia, it is chastening for all of us, who were associated closely together 10 years and more ago in the struggle to achieve Merdeka for the States of Malaya, as we know them today, that having achieved it in so a happy a manner that we probably could say we achieved independence without any loss of blood, that we should again have to face after 10 years the same kind of problem, the same kind of emotional reactions, the same kind of sensitivities. To a large extent, Sir, it goes to show that on both sides of the House, especially by members on the Government Benches, we must always

exercise eternal restraint among ourselves and a perpetual determination to understand one another, respect each other's points of view, and be not too hasty to immediately condemn another person because he has made a statement which revives old unpleasant memories.

Sir, 10 years have gone by and we have apparently not solved our problems. Probably many more decades will have to go by before we can satisfactorily solve these problems.

I hope that those Members who have already spoken and others who will speak, will express themselves fully, with all the fire in their hearts, but let us understand this is within the confines of this House, and what we say here and what views we exchange in what heat and in what vigour in this House are meant for the ultimate and eventual benefit of the nation. We should understand that the feelings of the moment that we carry, although they may burn very strongly, will never cloud our own determination to make sure that what we today in this country have to very consciously learn to accommodate, give and take, with one another, what we have to all the time try to do in order to understand one another in the process of this very important task of building our nation, will one day develop into a matter which our children and their children and the future generations will accept as a matter of precedent and as a matter of habit. That is why, Mr Speaker, Sir, I feel that, although it was unfortunate that this particular aspect of the debate, namely, the question of what we mean by a Malaysian Malaysia was introduced in the process of a motion of acceptance of His Majesty's Gracious Speech, because it could probably have been done on another occasion. But now that it has been taken up, I think we should earnestly and sincerely debate and debate it, all of us, with the same spirit of loyalty to His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong as the symbol of our Malaysian nation. Don't let us stray from this fact that what every single Member of this House says, whatever his political expressions may

have been elsewhere, so long as he is a Member of this House and so long as the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs has not considered it, in the very careful way whereby he handles these terrific powers which he holds, necessary to remove us from this House and put us behind bars—don't let us go to the extent of pressing others in the course of the debate that what we say is intended either, under the terms of the Constitution, to be an expression of disloyalty to the nation or, under terms of the Internal Security Act, an expression which could lead to the destruction and to danger to the security of our nation. Let us accept it that whatever we say here is said with all good intention of building up towards what we all want, namely, a peaceful, equitable and happy nation.

Sir, I am not trying to flatter my good friend, the Honourable Member for Johore Tenggara but, in the course of many years, I have got myself accustomed to the manner whereby he says exactly what he means—straight from the shoulder. However, I don't immediately say, "Well, this is a *hantu*, a man who is mischievous." I have tried to understand what he is trying to say. Sometimes, when I find it difficult—and I think he will give me a certain amount of credit when I say it—we sometimes meet outside the lobby and try to explain to one another what we mean. And I feel, Sir, that Members of this House either inside during the debate, or outside, should at least try not to immediately jump into wrong conclusions, but we should be more patient and take time to think, re-think and double-think, although that has got a certain unfortunate semantic connotation; but think, think, think and think again, if necessary, before we utter one word which may, by misinterpretation, by being read out of context, be used and twisted, not against us but to the detriment of the nation.

Sir, all of us are quite experienced with regard to each other's idiosyncrasies and our methods and styles; and during election periods we have had the licence to express views which sometimes have been much more

volatile than those that we have heard here today. Sir, it is in that spirit that I would really begin to look at the Gracious Speech of His Majesty and try, only towards the end, to refer to these rather unhappy statements which have caused doubts to us on this side of the Opposition.

Sir, in view of the fact that His Majesty felt it necessary, right from the very beginning of His Speech, to indicate that it was of special significance to Him because this is His fifth and last year of His reign according to our Constitution, we the members of my Party, would like to take this occasion to say that we certainly reciprocate His feeling of special significance, because we have thoroughly understood the importance of His Majesty and the very able, very dignified manner whereby He has represented us as the Head of our State not only in our nation but also abroad and, also, not only under times of happiness, prosperity and peace but also under times of great stress, strains and danger. I think all of us in this country must accept it as a fact that the very able manner, whereby His Majesty conducted His duties as defined under the Constitution as the Head of our State in these last five years, has helped a great deal towards the progress and the development of our country; and it has helped us tide over many of our difficulties, especially under times of stress and strain.

Mr Speaker: Time is up!

ADJOURNMENT

(Motion)

Dato' Dr Ismail: Tuan Speaker, saya bangun menhadangkan, ia-itu Majlis ini di-tangguhkan sekarang.

Tuan Haji Abdul Hamid Khan: Saya sokong.

ADJOURNMENT SPEECH

DETENTION OF ENCHE' TAN KAI HEE—TREATMENT ACCORDED

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, today I wish to bring to the attention

of this House the callous and almost inhuman conditions under which Enche' Tan Kai Hee was incarcerated when he was kept in Kuala Lumpur. At the onset I wish to make it quite clear that I shall not dwell on the merits and demerits of his detention.

Mr Speaker, Sir, Enche' Tan Kai Hee was detained on the night of Friday, 12th February, 1965, and he was dumped into a dingy cell measuring 12' x 15' approximately and which was infested with mosquitoes. There were two cement slaps which passed for beds and there was a coconut husk mattress. There was no table or chair in the room, and there was only a small window high up.

Throughout the 56 days that he was incarcerated in Kuala Lumpur he was kept in solitary confinement. Mr Speaker, Sir, this in itself must surely be an infringement of human rights for throughout his stay in Kuala Lumpur he did not at any time cause any trouble to the police and he did not resist interrogation. On the contrary, the police interrogated him for the first two weeks and then left him severely alone for the rest of his stay in Kuala Lumpur.

That being so, why he was being kept in solitary confinement? For the first two weeks he was not given tooth-brush, tooth paste, soap, towel, etc. How on earth one can keep clean and healthy under such conditions only the Special Branch can tell. After two weeks the police provided him with soap and with a tooth-brush. The family of Enche' Tan Kai Hee on 17th March, 1965, brought tooth-paste, tooth-brush, and some medicine for his gastritis, towel, etc., for Enche' Tan Kai Hee but for reasons best known to the Special Branch, the Special Branch refused to hand these things over to Enche' Tan Kai Hee but they only handed him these things when he was about to leave for Batu Gajah on 9th April, 1965. If this is not callous and inhuman treatment, I want to ask the Minister for Home Affairs to tell me what is callous and inhuman treatment.

What is more inhuman is the total denial of reading and writing material. Even after several repeated representations had been made to the Special Branch they bluntly refused to let Enche' Tan Kai Hee have newspapers or books or writing material. Now, when one considers that he was kept 23 hours out of the 24 hours in the cell, one can realise how cruel this is so. It means that he has to pace about in his small room 12' x 15' or lie down and stare at the ceiling and the four walls. That he has been able to keep his sanity under such appalling conditions is a wonderful tribute to his courage and iron will.

Mr Speaker, Sir, let me briefly describe how Enche' Tan Kai Hee spent a typical day in cell. He had to get up at 6.30 a.m. and was given 15 minutes to wash himself and to empty his bowels, then he was locked up again. At 8.00 a.m. he was given breakfast, which consisted of a slice of bread and a cup of coffee or tea. At 12.30 p.m. he had lunch, which consisted of rice and some vegetables or meat. He was not allowed the use of a spoon or chopsticks. What would it have cost Government or the Special Branch to have provided him with a spoon or a pair of chopsticks, I do not know, Mr Speaker, Sir, unless it was calculated to break his spirits in the most inhuman way. At 5.00 p.m. he was allowed out of his cell for another 15 to 20 minutes to wash himself. At 6.00 p.m. he had dinner and thereafter he was incarcerated in his cell until the next morning. If in between these periods of getting out of his cell he had to answer any call of nature, he had to wait for as long as about 15 to 30 minutes before his request was allowed. Thus it will be seen that he was locked up 23 out of the 24 hours for all the 56 days that he was kept in Kuala Lumpur.

Very early on he had asked to see a lawyer. This was refused point blank. Then, when the lawyer appointed by him applied to the Special Branch for permission to see his client, he was asked to apply to the Minister for Home Affairs. When that was done

the lawyer was asked by the Ministry for Home Affairs to apply to the Special Branch as the person in question had not been served with a detention order and thus it was the responsibility of the Special Branch to deal with it. The Special Branch finally did give permission for the lawyer concerned but by then Enche' Tan Kai Hee was slated to go to Batu Gajah and the necessity to see a lawyer did not matter so much. Mr Speaker, Sir, surely it is the right of every detainee, when he is detained, to be allowed to see the lawyer of his choice and not for his lawyer to be shuttled between the Special Branch and the Ministry. Mr Speaker, Sir, in this connection may I say that I myself applied to both the Minister for Home Affairs and to the Special Branch to see Enche' Tan Kai Hee but I did not even get the courtesy of an acknowledgment to the letter that I wrote to the Minister for Home Affairs. If this is the way Members of Parliament are treated, I shudder to think how the poor ra'ayat can get anything done from the Government.

Mr Speaker, Sir, may I propose to the Minister for Home Affairs to appoint a Committee of independent persons to inquire into these allegations and to make recommendations for the amelioration of detainees while they are in police custody.

Finally, Mr Speaker, Sir, I am taking this matter up with the International Commission of Jurists, both locally and at their headquarters in Geneva, and with other interested bodies like Lord Fenner Brockway, Earl Bertrand Russell and the Eltham Group of Amnesty International. Thank you.

The Minister of Home Affairs and Minister of Justice (Dato' Dr Ismail bin Dato' Haji Abdul Rahman): Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like, first of all, to reply to the first allegation, that is, in regard to the size of the cell. The subject was provided with normal cell accommodation and this was recently examined—not by me—by the Honourable Minister of Defence,

my colleague, and he considered it adequate.

Now, the Honourable Member said that the mattress and blanket supplied to Enche' Tan Kai Hee had been used many times before. That I admit, but they were considered in serviceable condition. Clearly we cannot provide a new mattress for every detainee, and we do condemn those that are considered unsuitable for further use.

Now, in regard to the detainee's solitary confinement for fifty-six days of his stay in Kuala Lumpur, I would like to inform the House that when a person is arrested he is sent to a Police lock-up in which there is adequate room to accommodate him. Wherever facilities exist, it is the practice to place each man in each cell while the case is under investigation. In the case of Enche' Tan Kai Hee the cell selected for him was designed to accommodate only one person.

Now, as regards the complaint by the Honourable Member about no soap, tooth-brush, towel, etc., supplied to Enche' Tan Kai Hee for the first two weeks, I would like to say that it is not the practice to supply these articles unless asked for. Enche' Tan Kai Hee did not make any request until after ten days of his arrest, and when he made the request all these things were supplied to him.

Now, the Honourable Member made the allegation that the detainee was denied reading and writing materials for the fifty-six days of his stay in Kuala Lumpur. Sir, it is not the practice to provide reading and writing materials for detainees during the initial stage of investigation. Apart from this, the record did not show that Enche' Tan Kai Hee made any request for reading or writing materials to be supplied to him.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: On a point of clarification, Mr Speaker, Sir. I wish to inform the Minister that I myself have rung up the Special Branch many a time that I wanted to provide Enche' Tan Kai Hee with newspapers. These

attempts on my part were refused point blank.

Dato' Dr Ismail: Sir, I now come to the Honourable Member's accusation that the detainee's mid-day meal was supplied with rice, vegetables, meat and curry but that no spoon or chopsticks were included. Sir, I am not being facetious but I myself feel that if I take my rice, curry and meat with my hands I enjoy them better than with a spoon and chopsticks. However, if Enche' Tan Kai Hee feels that he can enjoy his food better by using a spoon and chopsticks, I am sure if he applies for these and even if the Police refuses, I will give the instruction to supply these to Enche' Tan Kai Hee.

Now, the Honourable Member stated that the detainee was locked up in his cell for twenty-three out of twenty-four hours. The Honourable Member has described the routine in the cell and I do not intend to contradict him, except on one point. Sir, as regards the lock-up to which Enche' Tan Kai Hee was sent, it is the practice to permit detainees to leave their cells twice a day, as the Honourable Member said, for about fifteen minutes—each time for the purposes of washing themselves and exercising. Now, this procedure was carried out in the case of Enche' Tan Kai Hee. I am sure half-an-hour exercise will keep anybody in good physical condition. I never take more than twenty minutes exercise daily.

As regards the Honourable Member's charge that there was denial of legal aid until the very last week of the detainee's stay in Kuala Lumpur, I would like to state that on 16th March, 1965, when Enche' Tan Kai Hee's godmother, Madam Ng Moi, visited him he was requested to write a letter to Dr Tan Chee Khoon, the Honourable Member concerned, to arrange for a lawyer to handle this case. The letter was handed to Madam Ng Moi in the presence of a Police officer. The detainee did not make any such request before that date.

Now, as regards the letter from the Honourable Member for Batu which

he complained had not even been acknowledged let alone replied, I would like to inform him that every time I received a letter from a Member of the Opposition I had always made it a point to reply as soon as possible. I will of course make an inquiry as to why the Honourable Member's letter has not been replied to.

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: Ahli² Yang Berhormat, Yang Berhormat Enche' C. V. Devan Nair menarek balek Uchapan Penanggohan-nya. Persidangan ini akan di-tanggohkan hingga pukul 10 pagi hari Ithnin, 31hb Mei, 1965.

Adjourned at 8.15 p.m.