

Volume III
No. 18



Monday
23rd January, 1967

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

OFFICIAL REPORT

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

CONTENTS

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 2801]

BILL:

The Supply (1967) Bill [Col. 2865]

ADJOURNMENT (MOTION) [Col. 2905]

ADJOURNMENT SPEECH:

**Recognition of Selected Indian University Degrees in the
Teaching Profession [Col. 2905]**

MALAYSIA
DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

Official Report

Third Session of the Second Dewan Ra'ayat

Monday, 23rd January, 1967

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

PRESENT:

- The Honourable Mr Deputy Speaker, TUAN SYED ESA BIN ALWEE, J.M.N., S.M.J., P.I.S.
- „ the Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs, Y.T.M. TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN PUTRA AL-HAJ, K.O.M. (Kuala Kedah).
- „ the Minister of Home Affairs and Minister of Justice, TUN DR ISMAIL BIN DATO' HAJI ABDUL RAHMAN, S.S.M., P.M.N. (Johor Timor).
- „ the Minister of Finance, TUAN TAN SIEW SIN, J.P. (Melaka Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, TAN SRI V. T. SAMBANTHAN, P.M.N. (Sungei Siput).
- „ the Minister of Transport, TAN SRI HAJI SARDON BIN HAJI JUBIR, P.M.N. (Pontian Utara).
- „ the Minister of Education, TUAN MOHAMED KHIR JOHARI (Kedah Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Commerce and Industry, DR LIM SWEE AUN, J.P. (Larut Selatan).
- „ the Minister for Sarawak Affairs, TAN SRI TEMENGGONG JUGAH ANAK BARIENG, P.M.N., P.D.K. (Sarawak).
- „ the Minister of Labour, TUAN V. MANICKAVASAGAM, J.M.N., P.J.K. (Klang).
- „ the Minister of Information and Broadcasting and Minister of Culture, Youth and Sports, TUAN SENU BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Kubang Pasu Barat).
- „ the Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives, TUAN HAJI MOHAMED GHAZALI BIN HAJI JAWI (Ulu Perak).
- „ the Minister of Lands and Mines, TUAN ABDUL-RAHMAN BIN YA'KUB (Sarawak).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Culture, Youth and Sports, ENSKU MUHSEIN BIN ABDUL KADIR, J.M.N., S.M.T., P.J.K. (Trengganu Tengah).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Education, TUAN LEE SIOK YEW, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Sepang).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Finance, DR NG KAM POH, J.P. (Teluk Anson),

The Honourable 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).
- „ TUAN MUSTAPHA BIN AHMAD (Tanah Merah).
- „ TAN SRI 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).
- „ TUAN NG FAH YAM (Batu Gajah).
- „ TUAN ONG KEE HUI (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN HAJI OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Hilir Perak).
- „ TUAN OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Perlis Utara).
- „ TUAN HAJI RAHMAT BIN HAJI DAUD, A.M.N. (Johor Bahru Barat).
- „ TUAN RAMLI BIN OMAR (Krian Darat).
- „ TUAN HAJI REDZA BIN HAJI MOHD. SAID, P.J.K., J.P. (Rembau-Tampin).
- „ TUAN SANDOM ANAK NYUAK (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN SEAH TENG NGIAB, P.I.S. (Muar Pantai).
- „ TUAN D. R. SEENIVASAGAM (Ipoh).
- „ TUAN SIM BOON LIANG, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN SIOW LOONG HIN, P.J.K. (Seremban Barat).
- „ TUAN SNAWI BIN ISMAIL, P.J.K. (Seberang Selatan).
- „ TUAN SNG CHIN JOO (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN SOH AH TECK (Batu Pahat).
- „ TUAN SULEIMAN BIN ALI (Dungun).
- „ TUAN SULEIMAN BIN HAJI TAIB (Krian Laut).
- „ PENGIRAN TAHIR PETRA (Sabah).
- „ TUAN TAJUDDIN BIN ALI, P.J.K. (Larut Utara).
- „ TUAN TAI KUAN YANG (Kulim Bandar Bharu).
- „ TUAN TAMA WENG TINGGANG WAN (Sarawak).
- „ DR TAN CHEE KHOON (Batu).
- „ TUAN TAN CHENG BEE, J.P. (Bagan).
- „ TUAN TAN TOH HONG (Bukit Bintang).
- „ TUAN TAN TSAK YU (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN TIAH ENG BEE (Kluang Utara).
- „ TUAN STEPHEN YONG KUET TZE (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN HAJI ZAKARIA BIN HAJI MOHD. TAIB, P.J.K. (Langat).

ABSENT:

The Honourable MR SPEAKER, DATO' CHIK MOHAMED YUSUF BIN SHEIKH ABDUL RAHMAN, S.P.M.P., J.P., Dato' Bendahara, Perak.

- „ the Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Defence and Minister of National and Rural Development, TUN HAJI ABDUL RAZAK BIN DATO' HUSSAIN, S.M.N. (Pekan).
- „ the Minister of Health, TUAN BAHAMAN BIN SAMSUDIN (Kuala Pilah).

- The Honourable 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, TUAN KHAW KAI-BOH, P.J.K. (Ulu Selangor).
- „ the Minister for Sabah Affairs, TUN DATU MUSTAPHA BIN DATU HARUN, S.M.N., P.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ the Assistant Minister without Portfolio, TUAN HAJI ABDUL KHALID BIN AWANG OSMAN (Kota Star Utara).
- „ the Assistant Minister of National and Rural Development, TUAN SULAIMAN BIN BULON, P.J.K., (Bagan Datoh).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDUL RASHID BIN HAJI JAIS (Sabah).
- „ PUAN AJIBAH BINTI ABOL (Sarawak).
- „ O. K. K. DATU ALIUDDIN BIN DATU HARUN, P.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ WAN HASSAN BIN WAN DAUD (Tumpat).
- „ TAN SRI SYED JA'AFAR BIN HASAN ALBAR, P.M.N. (Johor Tenggara).
- „ TUAN AMADEUS MATHEW LEONG, A.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).
- „ TUAN PETER LO SUN YIN (Sabah).
- „ DATO' DR HAJI MEGAT KHAS, D.P.M.P., J.P., P.J.K. (Kuala Kangsar).
- „ ORANG TUA MOHAMMAD DARA BIN LANGPAD (Sabah).
- „ TUAN QUEK KAI DONG, J.P. (Seremban Timor).
- „ RAJA ROME BIN RAJA MA'AMOR, P.J.K., J.P. (Kuala Selangor).
- „ DATO' S. P. SEENIVASAGAM, D.P.M.P., P.M.P., J.P. (Menglembu).
- „ TUAN TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Melaka).
- „ TUAN TOH THEAM HOCK (Kampar).
- „ TUAN YEH PAO TZE, A.M.N. (Sabah).

PRAYERS

(Mr (Deputy) Speaker *in the Chair*)

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

ENCHE' K. C. TAI AS MEMBER OF MALAYSIAN DELEGATION TO THE UNITED NATIONS, SEPTEMBER, 1966

1. Dr Tan Chee Khooon (Batu) asks the Minister for Foreign Affairs what qualifications has Mr K. C. Tai for him to be selected as a member of the Malaysian Delegation to the United Nations in September, 1966, and whether he is aware that Mr K. C. Tai is a lecturer in engineering at the University of Malaya and taking him

away from his work at such short notice has caused disruption of his work in the University of Malaya.

The Prime Minister: Mr Speaker, Sir, I was assured, or rather the Ministry was assured, that no inconvenience would be caused by sending Mr Tai to the United Nations. In fact, no inconvenience had been caused to the University because Mr Tai, before he went on this mission to the United Nations, had provided extra classes for his students and covered all the grounds that he thought he might lose. In fact, the students were pleased with his appointment. They gave him a good send off including a farewell dinner; and when he was there at the United Nations, I was told, he did very, very good work by helping to prepare the

Budget and other matters associated with finance. Again, it was the intention really of the Ministry to include in the team to the United Nations intellectuals, whether they are members of the University, or members of other professions; and I think we have done well by sending him to the United Nations.

I do not know who told the Honourable Member that Mr Tai's absence from the University had caused a great deal of inconvenience to the University. I am sure no member of the University had told him that and I, as the Chancellor of the University, have never heard of this until today.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, it may be that the Honourable Prime Minister is the Chancellor of the University of Malaya. However, I am also a member of the Council of the University of Malaya, and I can assure the Honourable Prime Minister that when this matter was brought up, it came as a shock to the University of Malaya not because of the selection of Mr Tai, but because of the manner in which it was done; and if the Prime Minister wants, I can produce the minutes of the meetings of the Council of the University of Malaya stating very clearly that, in future, if the Government wishes to make use of personnel in the University for such purposes, it should give the University adequate time to make alternative arrangements. I am not revealing any secret—obviously the Prime Minister is not well briefed—but at that meeting the Acting Vice-Chancellor was sitting beside the Chairman of the University Council and he himself was shocked and said that it was inconvenient to make alternative arrangements. Definitely somebody, Mr Speaker, Sir, has led the Chancellor of the University and Prime Minister of this country up the garden path.

However, the assurance I wish to seek from the Prime Minister, Mr Speaker, Sir, is this: will the Government give the University adequate time, because teaching periods and the like are not easy to arrange, or rearrange, in the University of Malaya

as in other organisations? All that the University asks for is that the Government should give its officers adequate time to make alternative arrangements.

The Prime Minister: I will note that, Sir.

SURRENDER OF ARM AND AMMUNITIONS TO THE POLICE FOR SAFE-KEEPING—SARAWAK

2. Tuan Khoo Peng Loong (Sarawak) asks the Minister of Home Affairs, in view of the ending of confrontation whether the Arms and Ammunitions which the Chinese in Sarawak were ordered to hand over in April, 1963, to the Government for safe custody, will be returned; and if so, whether the Government will buy these up from owners who are willing to sell, as the longer they are kept, they are bound to get rusty and unserviceable.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Tun Dr Ismail): Sir, owing to the internal security situation in Sarawak as set forth in Government's White Paper entitled "The Communist Threat to Sarawak" which was issued in September, 1966, it is not yet possible generally to release private firearms surrendered for safe keeping by non-native residents of Sarawak. No question of compensation arises; the weapons were not confiscated, but were ordered to be surrendered for safe custody. They may be returned to the owners as and when the security situation permits.

Tuan Ong Kee Hui (Sarawak): Could the Honourable Minister assure this House that while they are in the Police custody, these weapons are being maintained and kept in good order?

Tun Dr Ismail: The Police are quite quite conversant with the upkeep of firearms and I am sure that they will do their best to see that these firearms do not deteriorate.

Tuan Ong Kee Hui: Will the Honourable Minister then direct that this be done?

Tun Dr Ismail: I have confidence in the Police in this respect, and there is no need for any direction from me. I am sure they will do it with their free love labour.

TINDAKAN TERHADAP PENUNJOK² PERASAAN PADA MASA PRESIDEN JOHNSON MELAWAT MALAYSIA

3. Tuan Ramli bin Omar (Krian Darat) bertanya kepada Menteri Hal Ehwal Dalam Negeri ada-kah penunjak² perasaan pada 30hb Oktober, 1966, sa-masa Presiden Johnson melawat Malaysia, terdiri daripada warga² negara Malaysia; dan apa-kah tindakan yang Kerajaan berchadang hendak ambil terhadap orang² yang bukan warga negara Malaysia yang di-dapati di-antara penunjak² perasaan itu.

Tun Dr Ismail: Pada tanggal 30hb Oktober, 1966, 145 penunjak² perasaan telah di-tangkap di-Pulau Pinang, Ipoh, Kuala Lumpur, Seremban dan Melaka.

Kesemua penunjak² perasaan ini telah pun di-da'awa di-mahkamah di-bawah Section 147 Penal Code.

Di-Kuala Lumpur jumlah ramai yang di-tangkap ia-lah 124 dan case² mereka akan di-bicarakan pada 24hb dan 29hb April tahun 1967. Di-antara 145 orang penunjak² perasaan yang di-tangkap ini hanya sa-orang sahaja yang bukan warga negara negeri ini dan tindakan di-bawah Undang² Buang Negeri sedang di-pertimbangkan terhadap-nya. Kesemua mereka² yang di-tangkap akan di-da'awa mengikut undang² yang telah sedia ada. Ada-lah menjadi dasar Kerajaan meng-ambil tindakan terhadap mereka² yang bukan warga negara negeri ini yang telah bergerak, yang bertindak untuk menimbulkan keadaan yang dapat meruncingkan ketenteraman awam dan keselamatan negara.

TINDAKAN TERHADAP AHLI² PARTI BUROH MALAYA YANG BERSHUBAHAT DENGAN PEMERENTAHAN KOMINIS PEKING

4. Tuan Ramli bin Omar bertanya kepada Menteri Hal Ehwal Dalam

Negeri ada-kah benar bahawa Parti Buroh Malaya bershubahat dengan Pemerintahan Kominis Peking; jika ya, apa-kah tindakan yang telah di-ambil oleh Kerajaan terhadap parti tersebut dan ahli²-nya yang terlibat.

Tun Dr Ismail: Kerajaan tidak-lah sedar yang Parti Buroh Malaya bershubahat dengan Pemerintahan Peking. Walau bagaimana pun ada-lah jelas di-terangkan bahawa Parti Kominis Malaya telah menyerap dalam Parti Buroh dan oleh sebab itu-lah dari sa-masa ka-samasa ahli² Parti Buroh yang tertentu telah di-tangkap dan di-tahan. Mereka² itu di-tangkap ia-lah kerana mereka² ada-lah kominis atau bershubahat dengan-nya dan tidak samata² kerana mereka² menjadi ahli² Pembangkang.

Telah banyak bukti² dan keterangan² terdapat yang menunjukkan mereka² itu bergerak mengikut arahan dan perintah yang datang-nya dari Parti Kominis Malaya, tetapi tidak-lah dapat bukti² dan keterangan² yang dapat memunjukkan Parti Buroh Malaya bershubahat dengan Kerajaan Peking.

Tuan Ramli bin Omar: Soalan tambahan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Sa-patut-nya sa-kira-nya parti yang sa-macham ini jujur dan ta'at setia kepada negara Malaysia sudah tentu-lah di-reportkan hal itu kepada pehak yang berkuasa. Di-sini saya hendak mendapat tahu daripada Yang Berhormat Menteri yang berkenaan, ada-kah parti ini mereportkan kepada pehak yang berkuasa berkenaan dengan tahniah yang di-terima-nya daripada Peking?

Tun Dr Ismail: Tahniah ini entah apa sebab-nya telah di-siarkan dalam surat khabar, tetapi dia tidak ada-lah, sa-bagaimana saya kata, dengan adanya taligeram ini tidak-lah menunjukkan yang sa-benar-nya yang Parti Buroh ini ada bershubahat, sebab apa taligeram ini di-dapati-nya dengan tidak di-minta oleh Parti Buroh.

Dr Tan Chee Khoo: If it is postulated, Mr Speaker, Sir—not by the Honourable Minister but by others—that we have that *perhubungan* with

Peking on the strength of an unsolicited telegram from Peking and Hanoi, is the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs aware that the Chief Minister of Malacca did receive an award from Moscow? Does that make him a Communist in the eyes of the Special Branch in this country, or in the eyes of the Minister of Home Affairs?

Tun Dr Ismail: Just as there are members and members of *Partai Buroh* in Malaya, so are there Communists and Communists.

Tuan Abdul Razak bin Haji Hussain (Lipis): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada-kah Kerajaan berchadang, oleh sebab sudah nyata pemerresapan kominis parti dalam Parti Buroh, maka Parti Buroh ini di-timbangan bagi di-haramkan?

Tun Dr Ismail: Sa-bagaimana yang tuan kata, ia-itu bagi diri saya, saya perchaya kapada democracy yang memang-lah saya ada jasa kapada Parti Buroh ini lebeh daripada Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Batu itu, chuma Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Batu itu tidak hendak mengambil nasihat saya, hendak menolong dia supaya menghapuskan Kominis ini, tetapi dalam pada itu tidak-lah boleh di-katakan yang Parti Buroh ini, oleh sebab dengan tindakan Kerajaan, dikuasai oleh kominis, chuma pengan-jor²-nya sa-umpama Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Batu itu, tidak-lah berani—macam saya hendak menolong parti dia itu supaya lepas daripada genggamannya kominis.

Tuan Lim Kean Siew (Dato Kramat): Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Prime Minister has stated in this House that he distinguishes between good and bad Communists, and today we find that the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs stating that if they were Communists, he would take action against them and help the Party to clear itself. Can this House have a clarification whether the Honourable Home Minister is interested in subversion and subversives, or in Communists and non-Communists as such?

Tun Dr Ismail: Sir, the Honourable Member apparently does not under-

stand my stand in this matter. As the Prime Minister has said, we have nothing against the Communists, who practise Communism in their own country; it is another matter if the communists are directing or making use, such as in Malaysia, the Labour Party to further their ends to subvert our democratic way of life. Now, in future we may have relations with some Communist countries and if, for example, they are not subverting us and they are here in accordance with international practice to observe the diplomatic practice then, of course, we have nothing against the Communists. We are anti-Communism in this country, because of the acts of the Communists; and as I have already said some of the Honourable Members in the Labour Party instead of helping the Government are just standing still or are not willing to help to rid the Communist members in their party.

Tuan Lim Kean Siew: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Minister can correct me, if I am wrong, but I gather from the text of his reply that he is again repeating the fact that he is not so much interested in whether a person is a Communist or not, but whether or not the Communists subvert the Government in this country. If, therefore, it is a question of subversion and that the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs is not interested in whether a Communist exists in this country or not, but whether he subverts the Government or the country, then what about capitalist agents or Western agents, or shall we use the word "imperialist agents"? What about the Peace Corps? If the Peace Corps is spreading capitalism, would it be not subverting the country? Or is the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs saying that it would not subvert the country, if it works in accordance with Government policy, but is not against it.

Tun Dr Ismail: The Honourable Member has a distorted from of logic. As far as we know, all these people, the Peace Corps and those he has mentioned, they have not done any subversion in this country, but he

knows as well as I do that the Communists in this country are making use of his Party, making use of the trade unions, and making use of students to subvert the Government of this country in an undemocratic manner. And as far as I am concerned, from the record of the Communists in this country, they are synonymous with subversives.

Tuan Lim Kean Siew: Again, if I am not wrong, I heard Honourable Home Minister stating that his objection is because of subversion by undemocratic means in this country by the so-called Communists. Mr Speaker, Sir, can the Honourable Home Minister then explain why it is that a demonstration against President Johnson is undemocratic and is subversion? After all, there are demonstrations all over the world against American policy in Vietnam. Surely, the Labour Party has a right to object to the American policy in Vietnam, and if that is subversion—purely because we could not agree with the Government policy over Vietnam which is involving the whole of Asia, and if the Government wishes to say that it is subversion because we do so—then what is opposition?

Tun Dr Ismail: Sir, the Honourable Member does not attend this Parliament regularly (*Laughter*): he does not follow exactly the record in this House. He knows that there are demonstrations in this country going on, and in fact the Honourable Member for Ipoh wanted to demonstrate last time against the visit of the President of the United States of America, and I willingly gave him permission and the Police were even willing to co-operate with him but I did mention in this House that I would never let the Labour Party of Malaya to do so, because it had been made a stool pigeon, or the stooge of the Communists, and every time the Communists had demonstrations it ended in riots and people being killed. Indirectly, the Honourable Members opposite there are slightly responsible for this thing because of their allowing the Communists to make use of their Party and by not having got the guts to get rid

of the Communists from their Party. (*Applause*).

Tun Lim Kean Siew: Will the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs not divert from the main point at issue? It is not a question of whether I understand the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs or not, or whether a person has to attend this House to understand what he says, because what is said is published in the newspapers, and millions of people read the newspapers, and the impression given was clearly that action was taken against the Labour Party prior to the demonstrations against President Johnson's visit, in order to prevent the demonstrations, and during the demonstrations it is not true that because of the Labour Party's demonstration, people get killed. It was a member of the Party who was shot by the Police, under circumstances which is at the moment under enquiry, and if we demonstrate against American policy and we are called stool pigeons because we demonstrate against American policy, then when and under what circumstances can we demonstrate?

Mr Speaker, Sir, according to the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs, it is quite clear that we can only demonstrate provided the Communists do not hold the same views; if the Communists hold the same views as us, then we are the stool pigeons of the Communists; and if the Communists are against American policy in Vietnam, we are therefore the stool pigeons of the American policy in Vietnam. If therefore, according to his logic, which he claims is not distorted, if the Communist Government in China tells all the school children to go to school

Tun Dr Ismail: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am prepared to debate this matter, but this is question time.

Tuan Lim Kean Siew: Yes, that is correct, Mr Speaker, Sir. I will explain the point to come to this question, and it is this: if the Communist say that children should go to school and all children should brush teeth, therefore, the Government should not ask the

children in Malaya to go to school and brush teeth, because in that case you will be stool pigeons of the Communist Government of Peking. Is that not a fact? (Pause). The Minister has not answered my question.

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: It is not a question. (*Laughter*).

**SIKAP KERAJAAN BERHUBONG
DENGAN TARAF KERA'AYATAN
RA'AYAT MALAYSIA YANG
TELAH DI-TOLAK
PERMOHONAN-NYA UNTUK
MENJADI WARGA-NEGARA
NEGERI LAIN**

5. **Tuan Ramli bin Omar** bertanya kepada Menteri Hal Ehwal Dalam Negeri apa-kah sikap Kerajaan berhubung dengan taraf kera'ayatan ra'ayat Malaysia yang telah di-tolak permohonan-nya untuk menjadi warga-negara negeri lain sa-telah tinggal di-negeri itu untuk beberapa lama, dan mereka telah pun di-hantar balek ka-Malaysia.

Tun Dr Ismail: Mengikut Fasal 24 (1) Perlembagaan, Tuan, pehak Kerajaan boleh dengan perintah menarek balek kewarganegaraan sa-saorang warga-negara Malaysia sa-kira-nya pehak Kerajaan telah berpuas hati yang ia telah berjaya menjadi sa-orang warga-negara negeri asing, dengan ini bermana-lah yang pehak Kerajaan tidak dapat menarek balek kewarganegaraan sa-saorang warganegara Malaysia yang chuma memohon untuk menjadi warganegara sa-buah negeri asing yang telah bermastautin di-situ sa-lama beberapa tahun tetapi tidak-lah berjaya menjadi warganegara tersebut, di-antara-nya balek ka-Malaysia yang di-lakukan oleh negeri di-mana ia telah bermastautin itu juga tidak akan kena mengena dengan taraf kewarganegaraan Malaysia-nya.

Tuan Ramli bin Omar: Soalan tambahan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-sini orang² yang sa-macham ini sa-patut-nya tidak boleh di-anggap lagi maseh berkerayaatan Malaysia? Tuan Yang di-Pertua, oleh kerana niat dan tujuan-nya kita sudah tahu bahawa orang ini tidak suka mendudoki dan menjadi

keluarga kita lagi dan dia benchi, saya fikir, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, patut orang² yang sa-macham ini di-usir keluar dengan sa-berapa segera-nya.

Tun Dr Ismail: Berkenaan dengan itu kita mesti-lah mengikut Undang² dan Perlembagaan yang saya terangkan, sunggoh pun nampak-nya pada perbuatan-nya patut di-buat bagaimana yang telah di-chadangkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat itu, tetapi oleh sebab dengan ada-nya Undang² yang ada pada masa sekarang tidak dapat-lah kita hendak bertindak yang sa-macham itu.

**SURRENDER OF TERRORISTS
UNDER OPERATION
HARAPAN—NUMBER**

6. **Tuan Tan Tsak Yu (Sarawak)** asks the Minister of Home Affairs to state:

- (a) how many terrorists have surrendered under the "Operation Harapan", and
- (b) what other effective steps will be taken by the Government to deal with the subversive and communist elements if "Operation Harapan" does not produce its desired result.

Tun Dr Ismail: Mr Speaker, Sir, to-date, the total number of surrenders under "Operation Harapan" is 33. The breakdown is as follows:

(i) Indonesian Nationals	...	14
(ii) Sarawak Chinese	...	12
(iii) Sarawak Natives	...	5
(iv) Brunei Nationals	...	2
		33

The Honourable Member will recall that in early December the Government arrested 120 persons in Sarawak. This action was taken because the response to the "Harapan" offer was so poor and because the terrorists were exploiting the situation. All those arrested have been detained. They each have Communist connections and some are, to use their own terminology, "professional cadres". We have checked evidence to show that these arrests have disrupted critically Communist

efforts to build up reception committees to help armed revolutionaries now on the run along the Sarawak/Indonesian border.

For security reasons, the Honourable Member will appreciate that it is not possible for the Government to reveal what other effective steps are being planned by the Government to deal with subversive elements, who have not surrendered. I can, however, assure the Honourable Member that the situation is constantly being reviewed and the Government will not hesitate to introduce new effective measures to deal with the situation should this become necessary.

ISSUE OF RED IDENTITY CARDS TO CHILDREN OF MALAYSIAN PARENTS BORN OUTSIDE SARAWAK

7. Tuan Thomas Kana (Sarawak) asks the Minister of Home Affairs whether he is aware that children born outside Sarawak, but within a British protected state, were given Red Identity Cards while their parents who are Malaysian by operation of law were given Blue Identity Cards, and if so, whether he would explain why such discriminatory treatment was given to these children of Malaysian parents.

Tun Dr Ismail: Mr Speaker, Sir, there is no provision in the Malaysian Constitution whereby children born outside the Borneo States before Malaysia Day may automatically become citizens just because their parents are citizens by operation by virtue of Section 2 of Part 1 of the Second Schedule to the Constitution. Hence, these children are issued with red identity cards. However, the parents of these children may apply for their children to be registered as citizens under Article 15 (2) of the Constitution, and on being registered the children will of course be issued with blue identity cards.

COLLECTION OF TURNOVER TAX

8. Tuan Khoo Peng Loong (Sarawak) asks the Minister of Finance whether he will consider an easier method to

collect the 2 per cent Turnover Tax, so that the merchants will not feel the heavy burden of paying in a big lump sum.

The Minister of Finance (Tuan Tan Siew Sin): Mr Speaker, Sir, this question no longer arises for, as the Honourable Member will be aware, I announced in my Budget Speech on the 19th January last that this tax will be repealed as from 1st January, 1967, and replaced by a Customs Surtax at the same rate, namely, 2 per cent. I should, however, emphasise that notwithstanding this repeal, the Comptroller, or the Commissioner of Inland Revenue, would still be empowered to assess or collect any Turnover Tax for Assessment Years 1965/1966, which remain to be assessed or collected, as the case may be, on the day of the repeal of the Turnover Tax.

In regard to the actual method of collecting the Turnover Tax, the Honourable Member would be aware that the Comptroller or Commissioner of Inland Revenue, already has power to consider requests for the payment of this tax by instalments in cases of genuine financial hardship.

MALAYAN BANKING LIMITED—LOANS TO MEMBERS OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS

9. Dr Lim Chong Eu (Tanjong) asks the Minister of Finance in view of the general public concern over the affairs of the Malayan Banking Ltd, whether he will inform this House whether or not any member of the previous Board of Directors of this Bank, or any member of the family of any of these Directors directly or indirectly obtained loans from the Bank, if so, whether he will further inform this House who these persons are; what the sums borrowed were; and how are the loans secured.

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, whilst there was some concern on the part of a number of depositors over the affairs of the Malayan Banking Ltd in the latter part of 1966, I do not think it is true to say that this concern was widespread or has persisted. To the best of my knowledge, there is no

general public concern now about this particular Bank.

The Bank is now conducting its business in a normal manner, and the Honourable Member will be aware from recent newspaper reports that there has been a re-organisation of both the Board of Directors and the Management of the Bank. I have every reason to believe that this re-organisation will fully restore public confidence in the bank.

As regards the Honourable Members question on the subject of loans to directors of the Bank, I hope he will appreciate that it would not be in order for me to discuss the affairs of a duly licensed bank publicly, nor would it be proper for me to reveal details of its business transactions with its directors or, for that matter, anyone else. This is an elementary principle, and whilst the Honourable Member may feel free to ask for such information, I regret that I am not in a position to provide him with the information he seeks.

As I informed the Honourable Member for Batu last Saturday in my reply to his adjournment speech on the same subject, confidence is a very tender plant and uninformed statements in this House, or outside it, on the operations of Malayan Banking Ltd, or any bank for that matter, may adversely affect public confidence in the soundness of the bank concerned. I would, therefore, ask Honourable Members to exercise a degree of discretion and restraint in their remarks on banking matters.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: In view of the fact that the Honourable Minister of Finance says that confidence in a bank is a very tender plant that must be nurtured and nourished by the Government, will the Honourable Minister tell us whether or not it is the intention of the Government, in view of the importance of this confidence, that there should be a veil of secrecy, and that the workings of any bank should be shrouded in mystery, so as to nourish and nurture such a bank?

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, I said nothing of that sort. The Honourable Member is clearly distorting both my remarks and the purport of my remarks.

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Sir, I appreciate the views expressed by the Honourable Minister of Finance. However, I think he will agree with me that it was not improper for this question to have been asked, because under the Central Bank of Malaya Ordinance the Minister is kept informed over the operations of the Bank. If, however, the Honourable Minister chooses, from whatever point of view he may have, to withhold the information, may I ask the Honourable Minister just to inform this House whether in fact he is generally aware of the fact that such loans have been made?

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, I have already tried to tell the Hon'ble Member who asked this question, and the Hon'ble Member for Batu, that the Government and Bank Negara have done all they can to ensure not only that Malayan Banking but all banks in this country are operated on sound lines, and I can give the assurance that we will do what we can. But it is clearly not in the public interest that the affairs of any bank should be discussed publicly. That will certainly not do any good either to that particular bank, or to the banking system in general.

Tuan D. R. Seenivasagam (Ipoh): Mr Speaker, Sir, supplementary question. Whilst we all realise the importance of not making public statements prejudicial to banking, perhaps this can be answered without any offence to that requisite. Question (1) is, has the Malayan Banking at all times complied with the provisions of section 12 of the Banking Ordinance, 1958, which requires monthly statements setting out the affairs of the Bank to be sent to Bank Negara, particularly during the period June, 1966, July, August, September, October, November, and December 1966? Question No. (2)—if I may put it together—if they did send in this return under section 12, did the return show unsecured

advances, unsecured loans, or unsecured credit facilities granted by it to private or public companies in which it has any of its directors, or the wife, husband, daughter of the director, or officers or employees, interested as director, manager, agent, guarantor, as required under section 11 (1) of the Banking Ordinance? In other words, were returns sent showing unsecured advances to persons interested in the Bank?

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, in so far as I am aware, Malayan Banking has complied with all the provisions of the Banking Ordinance.

Tuan D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr Speaker, Sir, did they show any unsecured loans?

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am not in a position to give details, because I do not run Malayan Banking. The Treasury keeps an eye on the banking system through Bank Negara. If Hon'ble Member would like to know, I can send a note to him on this point or I can ask Bank Negara.

Tuan Lim Kean Siew: Mr Speaker, Sir, is the Hon'ble Minister of Finance informing this House that he has the information, but he cannot divulge it in this House, or that he has no information at the moment?

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Government certainly is in full possession of the facts, but the last thing that the Government would like to do is to divulge information to the Labour Party of Malaya, simply because I cannot believe that the Labour Party of Malaya is interested in the banking system for its own good.

Tuan Lim Kean Siew: Sir, Supplementary question. We are not asking this question as the Labour Party of Malaya for the benefit of the Labour Party of Malaya, but I am asking this question as a member of the Labour Party for the benefit of the members of the public generally.

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, when the Hon'ble Member for Batu spoke on this subject in his adjournment speech last Saturday, he made the statement that the Labour Party of Malaya was very much interested in the subject, and that to me was very ominous.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Sir, I did not say anything of the sort. I said the Labour Party of Malaya called on the Government to tighten its legislation.

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: To my mind, Sir, the very fact that the Labour Party of Malaya is interested in the subject is extremely ominous (*Laughter*).

Tuan Lim Kean Siew: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am very glad that the Hon'ble Minister of Finance considers our interest ominous, but no doubt ominous to the Government. Thank you. (*Laughter*).

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Mr Speaker, Sir, whilst I appreciated the views of the Hon'ble Minister that uninformed opinions may injure confidence in the Bank, I do feel, however, that probably the only source of informed opinion can come from Government; and in view of the fact that the Hon'ble Minister prefers, at this present moment, to keep things that are private for dealing in private, there is how one fact, which I can think can be brought up as a public matter because it was published as a public document. Is the Hon'ble Minister aware that the Chartered Accountants of the Bank on the 19th November, 1966, did state—and that is why there was this concern and I quote: "However at the date of the Balance Sheet certain material advances to customers were inadequately secured"—I think this is the most important term of all—"Since the 30th June, 1966, additional securities have been lodged with the Bank and the directors are of the opinion that such advances are now adequately secured and fully recoverable" Sir, the question is simple. Is the Hon'ble Minister aware of this and, secondly, although the Minister says that the affairs of the Bank are now going on well, it is quite

clear that the view do not reflect the views of the Chartered Accountants, but the views of the directors themselves?

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Governor of Bank Negara is aware of everything of which Bank Negara should be aware.

Tuan D. R. Seenivasagam: Supplementary question. Since the Honourable Minister feels that there are many matters, which the Opposition may be speaking on rumour—I assure the Minister that is not so—but perhaps the Honourable Minister will condescend to meet us in his Chambers to discuss this matter, because the meeting here will be going on for two months, and we have a series of matters to raise on Malayan Banking. Perhaps, if clarification is given, many of them could be solved outside this House.

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, I have already said that it would not be proper for me to divulge the affairs of Malayan Banking to members of the public, even though they may be Honourable members of Parliament.

Tuan Lim Kean Siew: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Minister of Finance has not until now replied to this question which is, will he inform this House whether or not any member of the previous board of directors of this Bank, or any member of the family, or any of these directors, directly or indirectly, obtained loans from the bank. He has so far said that he is prepared to inform the Honourable Member for Ipoh, or give information to the Honourable Member from Ipoh in private, but of course the House does not conduct its affairs as a matter of conspiracy. The question I asked was this, when the Honourable the Minister of Finance stated that he could give this information, whether or not the Honourable Minister of Finance has the information today, or that he will get the information, in order to divulge it to the Honourable Member for Ipoh—and this is the question I ask.

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, when I replied to the Honourable Member for Ipoh all I said was that I could ask Bank Negara to get in touch with him, and that is as far as I am prepared to go at the moment. I have made it crystal clear that I am not prepared under any circumstances whatsoever—I shall repeat the words “under any circumstances whatsoever”—to divulge the details asked for of Malayan Banking, or of any bank licensed in this country, to anybody who is not authorised to have such information, because I do not feel it will do any good to anybody.

Tuan Lim Kean Siew: Mr Speaker, Sir, now the Honourable Minister of Finance has given us two answers to this House; the first answer was, “We do not wish to subvert the public confidence in the banking system of Malaya and that the banks must be nurtured in order to grow”; the second statement that he has made in this House is that he is not prepared under any circumstances whatsoever to divulge what is confidential to this House. Mr Speaker, Sir, will the Honourable Minister inform this House, how he could hope to get the public confidence in our Malaysian banks in general, if he is not prepared to divulge anything, even though it is crooked.

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, the people who, after all, would be more interested in the affairs of Malayan Banking than Members of the Opposition would be the shareholders and the depositors of this Bank. This Bank recently held its annual general meeting and that went off very well; not a single shareholder has complained about the Bank in the manner that Honourable Members opposite have, and there is no run on the Bank. There was a little bit of trouble towards the end of last year, but since then confidence in the Bank has been restored, and that is my answer to the Honourable Member.

Tuan Lim Kean Siew: Mr Speaker, Sir, I think the Honourable Minister of Finance must be aware that we are not making any accusation at all in

this House, and he need not take on such a defensive position, on behalf of the Bank. As far as I can be aware, today, the questions by the Opposition are purely probing questions—questions asked in order that we may get a satisfactory picture. Now, the Honourable Minister of Finance has stated that the only people, who are interested in the Bank are the shareholders, and not the members of the public generally. Mr Speaker, Sir, to clarify this position, I want to make it clear that the Bank is a public bank—therefore, the shareholders are members of the public; secondly, that this Bank has done business publicly, and members of the public invest in the Bank, or put money in the Bank, and therefore it is again public. So, will the Honourable Minister of Finance stand corrected?

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: I have made it clear, Mr Speaker, Sir, that even the depositors are happy with the Bank, because there has been no run on the Bank since the events of late last year—and I think that is the acid test. That is my reply to the Honourable Members for Batu and Dato Kramat that something is seriously wrong with the Bank.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Is the Honourable Minister of Finance, in asking for restraint on us on this side of the House, trying to tell us that if there is something rotten in the body politic that is should not be exposed to the glare of publicity by us in the Opposition?

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, I regret to have to say this, but to me it is becoming increasingly clear that the Honourable Members for Batu and Dato Kramat hope by their questions to provoke another run on Malayan Banking (AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: “Hear, hear”) and I therefore think that their acts are mischievous (*Inter-ruption*).

Tuan Lim Kean Siew: Sir, on a point of order for using offensive language. Will the Honourable Minister of Finance withdraw that remark in that he has given us an improper motive;

it is that we are deliberately out to scandalise and sabotage the Malayan Banking; and is he aware that, in fact, we ourselves are concerned with Malayan Banking from the financial and business point of view as well, and professionally.

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, this must be the first time in the history of this country that the Labour Party of Malaya is concerned with the economic welfare of Malaysia. (*Laughter*).

Tuan Lim Kean Siew: Mr Speaker, Sir, will the Honourable Minister of Finance withdraw that offensive remark, firstly. Second, in order to clarify his mind, the fact that we are Socialists does not mean to say that we are not concerned with economics.

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, I judge the Labour Party of Malaysia by its actions and deeds, and not by its words.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Malaya!

Tuan Lim Kean Siew: Mr Speaker, Sir, will the Honourable Minister of Finance stick to the issue which is, will he withdraw that offensive remark?

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: (*To Tuan Tan Siew Sin*): Do you wish to withdraw?

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: There is nothing to withdraw, Sir.

Tuan D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr Speaker, Sir, the point in issue here is a simple one. It is not whether Malayan Banking today is one in which the public can have confidence; perhaps, they can and the Government should know, and they have told us they can. Well, that is a stop to that. But the question which will be raised in the course of the Budget debate—and, perhaps, the Honourable Minister will get the answers ready—is, was there anything wrong with Malayan Banking which violated the Banking Ordinance but which Bank Negara and others responsible did not take action? That

will be the question at least I will raise during the Budget debate.

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, I have already answered the question. I have made it clear that as far as I was aware, Malayan Banking has not contravened the provisions of the law.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, is the Honourable Minister of Finance aware that far from the shareholders and the depositors having full confidence in Malayan Banking Limited, it was the steady fall in the price of the shares on the Stock Market of Malayan Banking Limited that drew the attention of the "Economist"—the article which I quoted from in the session of October. Consequently, there was concern on the part of the shareholders as reflected by the fall in the price of the shares of Malayan Banking Limited, and that price has not gone up to its original level of \$12 before the fall.

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not think it was an unfair statement for me to make—that it was the very speech of the Honourable Member for Batu which precipitated the initial run on Malayan Banking Limited, and that, I think, speaks volumes, speaks for itself.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah (Bachok): Soalan tambahan yang terakhir sa-kali. Sa-bagai Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan kita sudi memberi tahu Dewan ini, siapa-kah lebeh banyak mempunyai share didalam Malayan Banking itu, orang² Perikatan-kah, orang² Front Socialist-kah (*Ketawa*).

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not think that is a proper question to ask, and I obviously cannot speak for anybody apart from myself, because I do not know what shares they have. But speaking for myself I do not have a single share in Malayan Banking or, for that matter, any other bank in this country.

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: Time for Oral Question is over!

BILL

THE SUPPLY (1967) BILL

Second Reading

Order read for resumption of debate on Question, "That the Bill be now read a second time" (19th January, 1967).

Dr Tan Chee Khoon (Batu): Mr Speaker, Sir, the fact that when the debate on this Bill starts the Minister of Finance leaves this House, shows how much of attention he pays to not only we on this side of the House but the public in general.

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: I think he is in his room (*Laughter*).

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, every time the Minister of Finance delivers his Budget Speech, despite the barbs and the stings that he inflicts on the poor tax-payers in this country, he tries to generate a sense of euphoria. Thus, although he says that we are living in times of financial difficulties, and although he warns us of the dire consequences of deficit budgeting, he quickly re-assures us that there is really nothing to worry about as long as he remain Minister for Finance and as long as the Alliance Party remains in power. But is this in keeping with the financial difficulties that we are in at the moment? The answer is a definite "No". The Minister of Finance, in seeking to generate a sense of euphoria, is in effect trying to lull the country into a false sense of security.

Mr Speaker, Sir, all the States in Malaya have by now held their budget sessions and all of them have one common feature—they all show a deficit. Thus in my own home State of Selangor, the deficit is to the tune of \$6.8 millions and the Menter Besar went on to reassure the Selangor State Assembly that there is really nothing to worry about. In this, all the State Governments are in good company, for deficit budgeting is characteristic of the Budget of the Central Government for the past few years. Mr Speaker, Sir, this sorry state of budgetary deficits, if not arrested both at State and Central

levels, will lead us to financial ruin and Malaysia to bankruptcy. The writing has been on the wall for the past few years, but the trouble is that the Minister of Finance refuses to read it, despite the attempts of those of us on this side of the House to make the writing more legible for the Minister for Finance to read.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the high watershed of financial surpluses was in 1960, when there was a surplus of \$213.43 millions. Thereafter, the surpluses rapidly diminished and in 1963 the writing began to appear on the wall with a deficit for the year of \$26.47 millions. This jumped to \$250.07 millions in 1964 and in 1965 it was \$48.87 millions. Last year the Minister of Finance budgeted for a \$77 millions deficit and this was soon followed a month later by a Supplementary Supply Bill of \$48 million—in the event, the deficit for 1966 is estimated to be \$80 millions. After discounting the transfer of \$52 millions from the Ordinary Expenditure to the Development Estimates, we are left with a deficit of \$28 millions on the Current Account. This he said was an extremely serious trend, which he stated must be clearly reversed. But his deeds belie his words, as I shall presently show.

Mr Speaker, Sir, this sorry tale of budgetary deficits becomes really alarming when we include the vast sums spent on development. Taking into account the Development Estimates—and here in considering the Budget estimates, one must really merge the Ordinary Expenditure and the Development Estimates into one—the overall deficit in 1965 was \$519 millions and that for 1966 was \$571 millions. One does not need to be a financial wizard to predict that, when the accounts are totalled at the end of 1967, the overall deficit for 1967 may well exceed \$600 millions.

These enormous deficits do not seem to worry the Minister of Finance too much, for in para 56 of his speech he stated that the overall deficit for 1966 was uncomfortably large. He went on

to say: “It leaves the Government’s realisable assets at about \$400 millions, or around the level prevailing during 1958.” One may well ask the Minister what has he done in his eight years of stewardship that we should be worse off than when he assumed office as Minister of Finance eight years ago. The tax-payers are entitled to ask: “How long are we to be inflicted with such high deficits despite the new taxes that are heaped on us, how long can we afford to eat into our reserves and how much longer can we remain solvent at this rate budgetary deficits?”

Mr Speaker, Sir, when the Minister of Finance in 1964 made his ill-advised move to impose a tax on crown corks and the multi-stage turnover tax, we on this side of the House opposed these two taxes and called on him to think again. But, as is usual with all Ministers of Finance, he persisted with them. Protests to these taxes were made not only in this House but it would be true to say that the whole country was against these taxes. It took the Minister of Finance one whole year to realise that old corks could still be of use and that the revenue from new crown corks was paltry. In the case of iniquitous and obnoxious turnover tax the Minister of Finance mulishly stuck on to it. The only concession he was prepared to make in 1965 was to make the conversion of the multi-stage turnover tax to a single-stage one of 2%. We on this side of the House still called on him to abandon it and to impose a tax at source as being the most equitable way out, but for reasons best known to the Minister he rejected our call to do so. Now, what do we see before us to-day? A surtax of 2% which was exactly what we on this side of the House called on him to adopt. Thus it cannot be said that we on this side of the House are always wrong, or that the Minister of Finance is always right.

Mr Speaker, Sir, no Minister of Finance should embark on any new taxation without pondering carefully on all the likely consequences of such taxation. It is evident that the Minister of Finance and the Alliance Government have not done their home work

carefully, for, to withdraw the tax on crown corks after one year and the turnover tax after two years is an admission of failure on the part of the Minister of Finance. Let the failure of these two taxes be a salutary lesson to the Minister of Finance, so that he will be more careful, before introducing any new taxes, and that he should pay more regard to constructive criticisms from us on this side of the House. But, is it really necessary for the Minister of Finance to introduce new taxes every year? I submit that if what the Minister of Finance tells us about the G.N.P. is correct, then there is no need to introduce new taxes to meet the growing needs of the country.

Sir, we are told that the G.N.P. for 1965 was 9.7%, in 1966 it was 6.3%, and the overall annual rate of growth for the period between 1960 and 1965 was 5.7%. These figures are very impressive, Mr Speaker, Sir, and any developing nation should well be proud of them. With the economy growing at this rate, then automatically revenue should increase from the buoyant economy and the increasing prosperity. There should be no need for taxation, for the increase in revenue should be a self-sustained process. The manner in which the Minister of Finance frightens the poor tax-payers out of his wits every year shows that either the G.N.P. figures are not as accurate as the Minister of Finance would have us believe, or that there is something seriously wrong with our tax structure in that he is not getting an increase in revenue from the increased prosperity as reflected by the increase in G.N.P. I commend this idea to the Minister of Finance. In any case, the Minister of Finance himself has admitted that he cannot go on heaping new taxes on the poor tax-payers every year *ad infinitum*. Sooner or later he must call a halt, and I need hardly remind the Minister and the civil servants, sitting behind him, that 1969 is not too far away.

No one in this House should cavil with the Minister of Finance on the surtax of 2%. However, I wish to impress on the Minister of Finance and his colleague, the Minister of Com-

merce and Industry, that the businessman must not exploit the poor consumer by passing on more than what should be the case. Let me illustrate. Thus, if an article cost \$1 the increase in price should be \$1.02 cents, but very often it is rounded off to \$1.05 cents and thus, in the ultimate analysis, it is the merchant who makes more from the new taxation than the Government, and the poor tax-payer is the unfortunate victim. I have experienced this myself, for some import houses of drugs in Kuala Lumpur have done what I have described, and it was only when I threatened to report the matter to the Minister of Commerce and Industry that they thought the better of it. Let the Minister of Commerce and Industry reassure this House, and the country at large, that there will not be a surcharge by merchants over and above the surtax and that they will have no excuse to raise prices above the pre-Budget levels. An assurance on this by the Minister of Commerce and Industry when his turn comes to speak will go a long way towards curbing prices in this country and towards prevention of exploitation of the consumer in this country.

Development Tax—Mr Speaker, Sir, this tax is a misnomer. A development tax is generally meant to be a tax for any appreciation of property as a result of development by Government. As the Minister himself has said, the development tax is in the nature of a corporation tax. The only difference is that the tax is levied at the base rather than at the top should there be any increase in corporation tax. I hope that collecting this development tax does not mean that extra staff will be engaged. If this is so, then as a measure of economy in public expenditure, it will be neater and less expensive to collect by increasing the company tax to 45% and the individual income tax to 55%. Such a proposal will not entail any new expenditure in its collection.

The Minister of Finance has asked for constructive criticisms particularly for suggestions to increase the revenue. Mr Speaker, Sir, here are certain of my

observations on some of the minor tax proposals.

Aerodrome Service Fees—Mr Speaker, Sir, the new tax on aerodrome service fees is expected to garner in \$1 million during 1967. The Minister himself admits that those, who travel by air, are normally much better off financially than those who travel by other means of transport. I heartily agree with him and call upon him to double the rate of this taxation. He will then get \$2 million instead of \$1 million, and I can assure him that the air travellers should not have too much ground to grouse, as they can well afford such increase that I have proposed—and as the Minister of Finance himself has admitted.

It is obvious, Mr Speaker, Sir, from the Minister's speech that money is in short supply particularly to finance our development projects. He has gone round the capitals of both the East and the West, bowl in hand, to borrow money and to beg for alms. He has been outstandingly unsuccessful. He, himself, admits in his speech that he could only raise \$6 million last year from foreign sources. This year he hopes to raise \$150 million from foreign sources—some hope. As such, I fail to understand why he should not take the bold step to nationalise our insurance companies. It is well known that insurance companies garner in millions every year. Recently, most of this money, particularly that in foreign insurance companies, is sent abroad. Although there is now a restriction on such outflow of capital, it is not enough. If the Government takes the bold measure that I have advocated, it will get millions of dollars, which would otherwise be sent abroad or be utilised by the private companies for their private gains. There is no reason why this money should not be put to public use, and I commend this proposal to the Minister of Finance and to his backroom boys sitting behind the Ministerial benches.

Mr Speaker, Sir, equally alarming as the budgetary deficits is the rapidly worsening situation with regard to our public debt. Here are the latest

figures, Mr Speaker, Sir, in regard to our internal and external debts:

Year	Internal Debt \$ (million)	External Debt \$ (million)	Total \$ (million)
1955 ...	472.00	286.00	758.00
1957 (the year of Merdeka)	661.00	316.00	977.00
1962 ...	1,368.25	334.04	1,702.29
1963 ...	1,583.1	387.54	1,970.64
1964 ...	1,769.44	387.63	2,057.07
1965 ...	2,183	509	2,692
1966 ...	2,510	502	3,012

Mr Speaker, Sir, this House will, I hope, notice the alarming rise of our public debt. I venture to say that before the First Malaysian Plan is over, if this Government succeeds in borrowing the foreign loans that it needs, our public debt will hit the six thousand million mark. I wonder if the Alliance Government will regard this as a matter of pride—that generations yet unborn are to be saddled with financial burdens caused by the squandermania and the extravaganza of the Alliance Government.

Another alarming feature of our public debt is the fact that the external debt element will continue to increase and this, of course, will accelerate the outflow of capital from this country.

Mr Speaker, Sir, when the Alliance Government took over in 1955, the public debt in this country was \$758 million. Today it is \$3,012 million—it has increased four-fold. Whereas a short time ago it cost four cents in the dollar to service our public debts, today it is 12 cents in the dollar. According to the Minister, debt service in 1962 cost \$121.7 million and in 1967 it will cost \$219.6 million—the figure has more than doubled in the space of five years—and this alarming increase has only caused some concern to the Treasury, according to the Minister of Finance. Although he has sounded a word of warning, I say that he has not done enough to arrest this alarming trend. Mr Speaker, Sir, the Minister of Finance himself has stated that it is paradoxical and ironical that the more we are able to borrow for development, the deeper we will get into debt.

Thus, when we see the impressive and costly prestige projects that have been erected up and down the country, we must not forget that we are living on borrowed money and that all these so-called affluence is not what we really can afford but what we spend now and ask future generations yet unborn to pay for in future. We must be careful, lest we get too deep into debts. I need hardly remind the Minister of Finance that many developing countries and, for that matter, developed countries as well, have come to grief because they have got themselves too deep into debts. We have seen how some countries cannot afford to pay the interest on loans, let alone pay back the capital. The Labour Party of Malaya calls on the Minister of Finance not to get us too deep into debts before it is too late.

Mr Speaker, Sir, let us examine some of the allocations for next year. A glance at page 2 of Command Paper No. 49 of 1966 will show how lopsided the allocations are.

Economic Services—Thus economic services are allocated 148.2 millions which amounted to 8.1% of the budget. This surely shows that our development is unbalanced. If this country is to export more rubber, palm oil, tin, manufactured goods, etc., then surely the Minister should allocate more for economic services in order that we may survive. Instead he has cut down expenditure on economic services to 8.1% and given \$397.1 millions or 21.7% of the budget to security. Now, I do not see the need to spend so much on security and members will agree that this is an unproductive and unremunerative expenditure. Surely we should cut down on security, in order that economic services may have more of the cake. Mr Speaker, Sir, perhaps if we have more freedom in this country instead of being hemmed in by restrictive laws, then we may well cut down on the expenditure on security.

Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries—Mr Speaker, Sir, the Minister tells us that nett output in agriculture, forestry, and fisheries constitute 30% of our G.N.P. and that this large sector of

the economy provides employment for about 60% of the working population; further, it is evident that despite all the industrialization that the government boasts of, this country will still have to depend on its agricultural base for many years to come. As such it is incomprehensible why agriculture, fisheries and forestry should get only 24.05 millions or 1.3% of the cake.

Let the Minister of Finance or his backroom boys not tell us on this side of the House that the expenditure on these three—agriculture, forestry and fisheries—are provided for also in the Development Estimates. I have looked up the Development Estimates and I also note that the allocation in the Development Estimates for next year for these three are \$100 millions. I think the taxpayer in this country is justified in asking “Why should there be so little cake for fisheries, agriculture and forestry from the ordinary expenditure?”

On the ground of job opportunities, if nothing else, surely the Minister should allocate more for this sector, so that we can, not only provide more work for the thousands, who are entering the labour market every year, but also provide us with much needed export earnings as well. Thus, we can see how lopsided has been the allocations for this year and how the emphasis has been placed on the wrong sectors.

Governmental Expenditure—Mr Speaker, Sir, every year governmental expenditure keeps on mounting and this does not seem to cause the Minister of Finance too much concern until recently. It is fashionable for the Minister of Finance to proclaim loud and bold that we enjoy the highest standard of living in South-East Asia, and that we are the third Asian nation with the highest *per capita* income. With this has gone prestige buildings with luxurious furnishings, monuments, etc., as evidence of our affluence. How long can we afford to have these huge budgetary deficits?

In calling for a halt in Government expenditure, I want to make it quite clear that I am not advocating a

continuance of the wage freeze that the Alliance Government has imposed on its workers. I hope that the Suffian Salaries Commission will complete its work soon, so that the Government workers, particularly those in the I.M.G. i.e., Industrial and Manual Group of workers will have a living wage. Rather, I wish to sound a clarion call for stopping the wanton waste of public funds as revealed by the reports of the Auditor-General for the year 1964. I have here with me a copy of that Report. If the Civil Servants will read this, and if the Public were to read this as well, one can see how there have been wanton waste of public expenditure, and I shall quote some of these 'wasteful expenditure.

1. \$1.728 millions have been spent on the purchase of land for the Sungei Way for a Golf Course, and \$14,229.40 for a landscape architect, and the work has not yet even started there.
2. Fringe alienation schemes have cost millions of dollars and most of them have been total failures.
3. \$911,919 have been spent on consultants' fee for the survey of the road from Rompin to Kampong Aur and doubts have been expressed regarding the economic value of such a road.
4. The Ex-Special Constables Rehabilitation Loans is outstanding by \$1+ millions and (in 1964) \$349,677 was spent in collecting it, and it has still not been collected.
5. Millions have been thrown down the drain on co-operative societies.
6. When RIDA was inaugurated it was proclaimed as a New Deal for those living in the rural areas. Millions have been spent on RIDA and the Deputy Prime Minister at long last has admitted: "MARA will not repeat the mistake that sent RIDA to its grave". I think you should put these words up in MARA now, so that those who are operating

MARA now in the years to come will not have this epitaph written on their graves.

These are but few examples of wasteful expenditure in the past.

I shall now quote a few more examples from the present budget.

Malaysian Centre of Development Studies—Mr Speaker, Sir, new departments are mushrooming every year in the Prime Minister's Department. One such department is the Malaysian Centre of Development Studies. Is this Department really necessary? Cannot development studies be made by the Faculty of Economic and Administration of the University of Malaya? It has a division of rural development and of applied economics and these divisions can easily undertake such development studies for the Government—and what is equally important, use such material for teaching as well to be undergraduates so that they can play their part in the First Malaysian Five-Year Plan. Instead, a new Department is started, and we can see how top heavy it is. It has three Superscale officers and one Division I officer. In addition, there are three stenographers, two clerks, and one typist. Are all these bodies really necessary? Are all these top notchers in that Department producing so much that they need three stenographers, two clerks and one typist? This Department costs \$112,811 in P.E., i.e. personal emoluments, and \$285,520 for O.C.A.R. This figure includes the enormous sum of \$240,000 for transport and travelling. Is this sum really necessary, or is it for *makan angin* as well? Is this Department meant to boast of our mistakes in development to visitors from Africa?

Development Administration Unit—Then there is the Development Administration Unit which costs \$287,342 in personal emoluments and \$76,420 in O.C.A.R. This Department, too, is top heavy with six Superscale officers and seven Division I officers. Why cannot these two units be merged, so as to save administrative costs?

Here are other items of more wasteful expenditure, Mr Speaker, Sir;

S. 7, Sub-head 12, shows an allocation of \$400,000 for study tours. I suppose the taxpayer must be thankful that the vote has been pruned down from half a million dollars to \$400,000. If selected tours are necessary, why should such a huge sum be necessary? Why should Members of Parliament be so prompt in voting for themselves such a large sum of money for *pusing*², while the poor taxpayers are groaning under the heavy burden that the unmerciful Minister of Finance has heaped upon them?

S. 7, Sub-head 53, shows an allocation of \$175,000 for Orders of Chivalry. Even if these Orders are necessary—and I maintained, Mr Speaker, Sir, that all the prominent people in this country are already overburdened with such orders—is it really necessary to spend such a large sum on Orders of Chivalry? Do we want to see every person a “Tan Sri” and confuse them with the “Tan” in this country?

Mr Speaker, Sir, S. 7 Sub-head 55 shows as item of \$11,200 for a yellow carpet, although there is a proviso that this sum should not be spent without Treasury approval. I thought that the Prime Minister's Department has enough of red carpets, and now it is venturing into the field of yellow carpets. I should be very grateful for the Minister, or the Treasury back-room boys, to tell us the subtle difference in this question of yellow and red carpets that the taxpayers have got to foot the bill of \$11,200. I thought that every one is satisfied with the red carpet treatment that is accorded to them when they come to this country.

These are but few of the items of Governmental extravaganza and the Minister would do well to curb governmental expenditure before he heaps new taxes on the poor taxpayers. These examples of gross extravagance that I have quoted soon to be never ending and have become a permanent feature of our Budget.

These expenditures made a hollow mockery of the repeated calls for economy made by the Minister of Finance and other ministers as well. Let them practise what they preach, and let them make sincere efforts to economise by cutting down the wasteful expenditure that I have quoted.

Financial Gap and Creditability Gap—Mr Speaker, Sir, the financial gap between income and expenditure of the past four years is bad enough, but this is made worse by the credibility gap to use a current cliché. Mr Speaker, Sir, one could quote *ad infinitum* of the credibility gap of the Alliance Government. Today I do not propose to do so. I only propose to quote a few examples from the statements made by the Minister of Finance.

Thus on 17th December, 1966, the Minister of Finance in an address to the Standards and Costs Sub-Committee of the N.D.P.C. was quoted to have said: “Only one thing the Department can do and that is talk”. About a week later, he thought the better of it and got one of the Treasury officials to offer an explanation to water down the original statement.

At the same meeting too, the Minister is reported to have stated: “If I cannot bring down Government expenditure by 1968 by hook, then I will do it by all the crooked means that I can find.” Mr Speaker, Sir, these are brave words even for the Minister of Finance. He has been Minister of Finance since 1959, and what efforts has he made to keep governmental expenditure within bounds? One effort of his comes readily to mind. Amidst a great deal of fanfare he appointed a Controller of Austerity and all that I can say Mr Speaker, Sir, is that the appointment could equally have been re-labelled De-Controller of Austerity. It has achieved exactly nothing and meanwhile governmental expenditure has spiralled upwards all the time.

These two examples will, I hope, convince this House that the credibility gap is getting wider and wider where the Minister of Finance is concerned,

and very soon one cannot place any reliance on the words of the Minister of Finance.

Consequences of the Eviction of Singapore—Mr Speaker, Sir, when the Alliance Government decided to kick out Singapore from Malaysia, I suppose it did not bargain for the dire economic and fiscal consequences that followed. But before I touched on them, let me say that nowhere is the credibility gap greater than is seen in the Malaysia—Singapore relations. After the break the leaders of both countries, with their tongue in their cheeks, spouted such platitudes as the need to co-operate in all fields of human endeavour and then promptly proceed to kick each other in the teeth. Small wonder the ordinary man in the street is left wondering whether the leaders of both nations are soft in the head, as we say in medicine; or do they say “When the Gods would destroy they first make mad”?

One immediate result of the eviction of Singapore is the fact that the big business has lost confidence in the political stability of both countries. This is seen in the fact that in Jurong, out of 3,000 acres earmarked for development only 800 acres have been taken up. Malaysia has not fared better—and the Minister of Commerce and Industry is in front of me. More than half of Batu Tiga is empty. The position in respect of other industrial estates is even worse.

Dr Lim Swee Aun: On a point of clarification, Sir, Batu Tiga is just starting.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: We will see how it progresses, Mr Speaker, Sir, then he will eat up his words (*Laughter*).

Thus, only last week the Negeri Sembilan State Government made the plea that it was willing to sell land at its industrial estate near Seremban at even less than cost, and there has been no takers. Tasek has found it difficult to attract industries. All this is due to the folly of the leaders of both nations.

Currency Split—One other result of the eviction of Singapore has been the currency split that has caused alarm and dismay in commercial and financial circles. Now that the die is cast, we are told that both the Singapore and Brunei Governments have agreed with Malaysia in principle to adopt arrangements which will ensure free interchangeability of their respective currencies after 11th June, 1967, when three new currencies will take the place of one. While free inter-changeability of currencies is important, it is regrettable that the Minister of Finance did not tell this House, whether every effort will be made by the Government to maintain parity of the currencies. One does not need to be a banker to see the importance of parity, and I call on the Minister of Finance to make a statement on this in his reply. Equally important is the omission by the Minister of Finance to touch on the disposal of the Currency Preserves. I suppose that this Government takes the view that Currency Preserves Agreement. If this is the procedure to be adopted, then Malaysia will get 76.90%, Singapore 22.25%, Brunei 0.75% and Labuan 0.10% of the Currency Preserves. The profits of the Currency Board for 1963, however, were divided in the following proportions: Malaysia 74%, Singapore 18.3%, and Brunei 7.7%.

However, Mr Lim Kim San in a statement that appeared in the *Straits Times* of 7th January, 1967, is reported to have stated and I quote:

“In clause 5 (1) of the Agreement, it is clearly stated that the Agent of the Currency Board shall pay, on demand by any person, sterling to the equivalent value of currency notes lodged with it by that person.

The value of assets, which each Government received depends, therefore, largely on the amount of notes redeemed in its territory.

For instance, if \$500 million worth of Currency Board notes are redeemed, or in other words, exchanged for new Singapore notes in Singapore, then the new Singapore Currency Issuing Authority shall receive from the Currency Board the sterling equivalent of \$500 million.”

In other words, what Mr Lim Kim San says is that the currency reserves will be divided in the proportion of the old notes turned in, in each territory.

I am amazed that the Minister of Finance and his backroom boys in the Treasury have allowed this statement to go unchallenged. For, if this method of division is adopted, then it will lead to a currency war which will have disastrous consequences for both countries. Thus, one country, in order to get physical possession of more of the old currency, and hence a bigger proportion of the currency reserves, may well offer bonuses of new notes for old notes turned in and thus start a currency war.

The Labour Party of Malaya calls on the Minister of Finance to take immediate steps to prevent a currency war, which will further sour up the relations between the two countries, and I shall be very grateful to the Honourable Minister of Finance for an answer on this very important matter.

The Minister of Finance took pains to lull us into a false sense of security by saying that the system of currency backing will not alter after Bank Negara takes over the function of currency issue. He lectured to us about the non-use of the fiduciary issue although the law will allow the bank to do so. In other words, he took pains to indicate that the *status quo* will be maintained.

If this is the case, why the need to take over the issue function? By his own admission, the Minister has stated that the added flexibility and ability to use financial and monetary policy to assist development will not be there. If this is the case, then we have paid a high price, in terms of the split, for another status symbol to satisfy the foolish value of the Minister and Bank Negara. No benefits will accrue to the nation from this step. Future generations will not thank the Minister and the wizards in the Bank.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Minister of Finance has poured his spleen and venom on Singapore by his move to impose an additional export duty of two cents a pound on all loose rubber exported from West Malaysia on and after 1st April, 1967. Why he chose that day I do not know. Why he chose

April Fool's Day to start off this apparently foolish measures, I do not know. But he is prepared to haul loose rubber all the way down from Kelantan to Gemas, and then up again to Port Swettenham. He is prepared to inveigle Malayan Railways to charge about \$2 a ton less than existing rates. This is a blatant attempt to stick a knife into the back of Singapore.

I wish to make it clear, once again in this House, that I am no apologist for the P.A.P. Government—my exposure of the chicanery of Mr Lim Kim San proves this—but petty tax impositions, such as this, is not likely to improve our relations with Singapore.

It is also no secret that the Minister of Finance has wanted to impose an export duty on all goods going to Singapore and that it is only our international trade agreements, for example, GATT, etc., that has restrained the Minister from doing this.

Even before the eviction of Singapore, there has been a trade war between Singapore and Malaysia. Thus even before 9th August, 1965, tyres from Singapore had to climb a high tariff wall to enter Malaya, and vice versa Malayan cement, which was then in short supply in Singapore, could not go south of the Causeway. This makes a mockery of ASA and Asian regional promotion of trade, which ASA and Asian leaders spout in public. This includes statements by the Minister of Commerce and Industry. If we cannot find a common market with our nearest neighbour, how on earth can we remove the trade barriers amongst ASA countries, let alone talk of promotion of regional trade in Asia. It is obvious that the removal of trade barriers between Singapore and Malaysia is in the interest of both countries, and hence the Labour Party of Malaya calls on the Alliance Government and the leaders of both countries to cast aside their personal prejudices and to work for the benefit of the man-in-the-street, in both countries.

Both Governments are competing to see who can be more irrational and short-sighted. When the history of

Malaysia-Singapore relations comes to be written, the vindictive and petty attitude of our Minister of Finance will figure prominently in it.

Industrial Sector—Despite all the ballyhoo and the tax incentives, it is evident that all is not well with our industrial sector—and here I am very glad that the Minister of Commerce and Industry is present to hear what I am to say. It is not generally known that our manufacturing sector is the smallest in South-East Asia. So, let us not crow too much every time either the Minister of Commerce and Industry, or some other high personages opens up a factory in this country. The private sector is growing at a very slow rate as compared to Taiwan, the Philippines and even Thailand. Something must be wrong and I shall be grateful for a clarification from the Minister of Commerce and Industry.

The Minister of Finance has admitted the failure of the industrial sector when he stated that full time employment rose from 10,000 to 12,000 between 1964 and 1965. This paltry figure of 2,000 is not going to make an impact on the 150,000 youths who will be entering the labour market at the end of this year.

In the past, I have warned the Minister of Commerce and Industry of the danger of economic enslavement from pioneer industries which are largely in the control of foreigners. Let me give but one example. I have already pointed out that Dunlop Company Limited has used synthetic rubber in the manufacture of tyres. This is an insult to us. Even if the combination of synthetic and natural rubber can give such tyres a longer life as postulated by the Minister of Commerce and Industry—and apparently here he is swallowing the story given by Dunlop Co., Ltd.—we should still not use synthetic rubber.

Next, what efforts have Dunlop Co., Ltd., made to export its tyres? I shall be grateful for the export figures of tyres of Dunlop Co., Ltd, from the Minister of Commerce and Industry. The reason why Dunlop Co., Ltd, is

not keen to export tyres is that it is part of a world-wide organisation and we are but pawns in their hands. The remedy lies in our hands. Dunlop Co., Ltd, should be told to gear their production for the export market, and they should make efforts to promote export sales themselves.

The other thing about some of our pioneer industries is that they are merely package or assembly plants. They merely pack the goods from the larger container to a smaller one, and in some cases Malaysia has been made the dumping ground of such materials, and these factories are accorded pioneer status. Here, I must admit that the Minister of Commerce and Industry is in the horns of a dilemma; for the export market the industry must be capital-intensive in order to compete in the export market. But what Malaysia needs at the moment is labour intensive industries to absorb the growing rate of unemployment in this country. I shall be very grateful if the Minister of Commerce and Industry will tell this House how he proposes to reconcile these two conflicting interests.

Incentives—The Minister of Finance laboured hard to talk about providing increased incentives. We were told of what the Government intends to do to help feather bed industrialists. I contend that enough in the way of incentives is being provided. It is the form of these incentives that need to be looked at. There is no use in heaping incentives which help manufacturers to exploit a captive market. What is required is a realistic approach whereby incentives are geared to needs, to encourage the use of local raw materials, to promote exports, to use more labour methods of production.

I would like the Minister of Commerce and Industry to tell us of FIDA is over to see the light of day. We know he will probably hide behind the statement that a “superman” is awaited in this country. Will he ever arrive? The Minister commissioned a prominent firm of consultants to undertake feasibility studies for the purpose of assisting the process of

industrialisation. This cost a few hundred thousand dollars (\$300,000 to be precise). What has become of these studies? Presumably, it is gathering dust in the Ministry, while the officials of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry go on world-wide jaunts.

For the rest the Minister of Commerce and Industry should do the following:

(1) Launch a massive campaign to persuade Malaysians to buy goods made in Malaysia. I do know that the Minister has done this already, but his efforts have not been impressive enough as shown by the statistics of imports into West Malaysia from 1953 to 1965. Thus manufactured goods imports rose from \$246.4 millions in 1953 to \$510.2 millions in 1965. Similarly, miscellaneous manufactured goods imports rose from \$103.3 millions in 1953 to \$216.6 millions in 1965.

The only evidence of the impact of the manufacturing sector is seen in beverages and tobacco, where the imports fell from \$83.6 millions in 1953 to \$60.1 millions in 1965. But manufacturers must not hide behind the tariff wall to exploit the domestic market and victimize the consumers.

(2) Launch a massive *Export Drive*. The industry should be *outward looking* instead of being satisfied with the domestic market, and I would commend this to the Minister of Commerce and Industry, that the operative word is "*outward looking*" as the economists say.

Likewise even with the passage of the S.I.M., i.e. Standards Institute of Malaysia, very little has been done to bring the standards of locally manufactured goods to acceptable international standards.

Tuan Tan Siew Sin and Labour—It is evident Mr Speaker, Sir, that the Minister of Finance in addition to venting his spleen on Singapore should go out of his way to antagonize the Government servants. Most of the top notches are sitting behind the Ministerial benches. He warns them of the

agonising reappraisal that has to be made, when the Report of the Salaries Commission comes to hand later, and accuses the workers of this country of giving less service for more pay. I do not know whether the civil servants sitting behind him squirmed when he said that the civil servants were giving less service for more pay.

This is not surprising seeing that the Minister of Finance has blatantly been anti-labour ever since he entered the former Federal Legislative Council. I have made this quotation before, but I think it will do well to make the quotation once again. I read from the proceedings of the Federal Legislative Council, 6th Session, March, 1953 to January, 1954. The relevant passage is this:

"We cannot deny that personal emoluments is largely unproductive expenditure, and unless we can either reduce the emoluments or reduce the staff, I do not see how funds could be diverted to other and more useful purposes. What strikes me as rather odd is that Government officers of all people should now be clamouring for more pay."

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, we see that the Minister of Finance like a leopard has not change his skin. He has taken that attitude way back in 1953. Today he takes the same attitude. Worse—he said the Government workers of this country are giving less service for more pay. Clearly this shows that the Minister of Finance is anti-labour and will continue to be anti-labour. But only in this year of 1967, the Minister of Finance should have no justification for the warning he has made.

May I warn him that out of the domestic of \$2,500 millions at the end of 1966, about \$1,500 millions come from E.P.F., which represents the savings of the poorer workers of this country. The E.P.F. was started in 1952 and the domestic debt in 1955 stood at \$472 millions. Thus, since that year till the end of 1966, and domestic debt has increased by about \$2,038 millions. Of this the workers of this country have contributed \$1,500 millions, or roughly 75% of the domestic borrowings by the Government. Thus we can see that but for the E.P.F. the Minister of Finance would

not be able to raise any domestic loan worth talking of. If this is so, he should be grateful to the workers of this country. Instead he has gone out of his way to antagonise them, he has gone out of his way to castigate them, everytime he makes his Budget speech.

Pay Cuts—It does not need an economist to see that a pay cut through its multiplier effects could have disastrous consequences to the economy. Does not the Minister remember the stupid move by the P.A.P. in 1959 in cutting the civil servants pay? Does he not know even basic Keynesian economics which postulate that in recessionary period, there is need for an injection of purchasing power, rather than the withdrawal of it? This lack of knowledge on the part of the Minister of Finance clouded by this 19th Century economic thinking makes him totally unsuited for the high office he holds. If there is to be any agonising reappraisal, it is the Minister of Finance who should do it. Admittedly the wage bill is very big, but the solution lies in reorganising the Civil Service and making it more efficient, rather than major retrenchment or overall cut from top to bottom, or both these measures, as advocated by the Minister of Finance. If there is to be any cut in pay, then let the Ministers set the lead by accepting pay cuts and giving up their fringe benefits, before they ask the workers of this country to tighten their belts in the interest of economy of this country.

Before I leave the subject of the speech of the Minister of Finance, let me admit that the tax-payers of this country are lame ducks in his eyes and that they are also sitting ducks for him to take pot shots at: and even when the lame ducks are dead, he will demand his pound of flesh for has he not placed a tax of 30 cents a pound on dead ducks?

Mr Speaker, Sir, undoubtedly the most important problem that confronts the nation today concerns the implementation of the National Language as the sole official language—*Bahasa rasmi yang tunggal*. At our last Budget session I drew the attention of the

Alliance Government to the urgent need to find a solution to this vexed problem. I cited the examples of language riots in the Punjab, Madras, Ceylon, etc., and warned that such riots could easily occur here. The fanatics in both camps could make human barbecue of themselves. Unfortunately, very little attention was paid to my clarion call, until the hawks in both camps began to make their voices heard.

The Alliance Government, instead of examining the problem properly and carefully for a long time, chose to hide its head in the sand ostrich-like fashion. Thus, when the clamour of the ultras and mad mullahs in the UMNO and other parties became too strident, the Alliance Government suddenly woke up and swung to the other extreme. Now, newspapers have been warned to play down the language issue, associations, guilds, etc., have been told by the Registrar of Societies that they should not discuss the language issue, or face the pain of cancellation of their licences. This topic cannot be aired at public rallies and discussion on it is frowned upon. But suppression of the discussion of the language issue is not going to improve the matters. If one's feelings on this subject are suppressed for too long, then the issue will blow up with disastrous consequences.

Equally preposterous is the claim by the M.C.A. President, Enche' Tan Siew Sin, that the issue is best left in the hands of the Alliance Party and that Party is the only one capable of resolving the language issue. The national language belongs to the whole nation and not to the Alliance Party, and the Chinese and Tamil languages belong not to the M.C.A. and M.I.C., but to all the non-Malays in this country.

The Labour Party of Malaya calls on the Alliance Government to give due recognition to the status and study of the Chinese and Tamil languages in this country.

Floods on the East Coast—Mr Speaker, Sir, at the last Budget session of this House, while the floods were

ranging in the East Coast, I called on the Alliance Government not to regard the floods there as a visitation by God, to bring to book the recalcitrant P.M.I.P. Government in Kelantan for daring to disagree with Central Government on many issues. I think I was the only Member in this House to urge the Government to adopt measures to prevent floods but, unfortunately, Mr Speaker, Sir, the Alliance Government paid not the slightest attention to what I said. Instead, the Welfare Department took some months to assess the extent of the damage and then proceeded to dole out about \$2 million to the people on the East Coast. *Baksheesh* is not what the people want. What is needed are active steps to prevent floods. Evidently, the Alliance Government has not heard of the old English adage "Prevention is better than cure".

Now, that the East Coast is overwhelmed with such disastrous floods the Alliance Government belatedly talks of preventing floods, of harnessing the power of the floods for useful purposes. This is small comfort to the people of the East Coast, who have suffered so much from the floods. Damage in Kelantan alone is estimated to be about \$400 million.

It behoves all of us to contribute generously to the National Flood Relief Fund. Mr Speaker, Sir, here I am glad to say that the Malayan Medical Association, on its own, is collecting funds from its members and will soon make a substantial contribution to the Honourable Prime Minister. In addition, an appeal has gone out to private practitioners, especially those practising in the flood stricken areas, to give of their services generously to the flood victims.

Once again the Labour Party of Malaya calls on the Alliance Government to take active steps to prevent floods in the East Coast and let not this call go unheeded this time.

Alliance Government and Organised Labour—Mr Speaker, Sir, with a Minister of Finance, who is blatantly anti-labour, and a Minister of Labour, who has chosen to slug it out in the

open with organised labour, what hopes have the workers of this country for a richer and fuller life. It is true to say that the Alliance Government's relations with organised labour is now at a new low.

This is not surprising as the Government's labour and trade union policy is one of restrictive periphery. If Government genuinely believed in fostering the development of a responsible and strong Malaysian Trade Union Movement, enjoying the respect of workers and employers, then it should first give favourable consideration to the ratification of I.L.O. Convention No. 87 concerning freedom of association and protection of the right to organise. This is the key to the development of a strong and responsible Malaysian Trade Union Movement. The Movement at present is of an erratic structure. In fact, it has inherited the British colonial pattern of trade unionism. It encouraged rivalry, factions and all the vices of a divided house. This suited the Alliance Government but does not meet the normal requirements of a lively trade union policy. I call on the Alliance Government to give immediate consideration to the ratification of I.L.O. Convention No. 87 on freedom of association and the right to organise. This would automatically remove the stigma on the Government that it did not permit freedom of association of workers.

Ministry of Labour and the M.T.U.C.—It has become quite evident in recent months that there has occurred an alarming deterioration of relations between the Minister of Labour and the M.T.U.C. Admittedly, there are shortcomings within the M.T.U.C., but it is clear that the Minister of Labour does not enjoy the confidence of the M.T.U.C. This is a serious situation and calls for immediate rectification, otherwise the workers would suffer from serious inadequacies.

Essential (Trade Disputes in the Essential Services) Regulation, 1965—Mr Speaker, Sir, these Essential Regulations were introduced at the height of the Indonesian confrontation in May 1965 against the vigorous protests

of the M.T.U.C. and of us on this side of the House. These Essential Regulations are an anachronism in a democratic set-up. The Minister for Labour had pledged that these Essential Regulations would be withdrawn when the Indonesian confrontation ended. The Indonesian confrontation ended on 12th August, 1966, and I call on the Minister for Labour to honour his pledge.

Labour Laws—Our labour laws are a legacy of the erstwhile British colonial era. They need to be revised to meet with the aspirations of the workers of this country. The workers should not be required to work more than 8 hours a day. 8 hours of work, 8 hours of rest, and 8 hours of sleep, should be the guide line for the Minister of Labour to follow. He knows very well that thousands of workers in this country work longer hours without extra pay.

Workmen's Compensation—Workmen's Compensation Ordinance No. 85 of 1952 was introduced in 1952. Nothing has been done by Government to revise the amounts of compensation payable under this Ordinance to equate with the changes that have occurred since then. Compensation amounts payable are as follows:

(a) Permanent total disablement—

- (i) In the case of an adult, a lump sum equal to 48 months earnings or \$9,600 whichever is the less;
- (ii) In the case of a minor a lump sum equal to 96 months earning or \$9,600 whichever is the less.

(b) Compensation for death—a lump sum equal to 36 months earnings or \$7,200 whichever is the less.

Incidentally, Mr Speaker, Sir, one can see how callous this Government is that it rates the value of a person when dead as \$7,200.

These amounts are woefully small and should be immediately revised upwards. Let us hope that the Social Insurance Scheme that the Minister intends to introduce will rectify all these.

Employees Provident Fund—The Ordinance became effective from 1st July, 1952. Contributions to the E.P.F. averaged 5 per cent on either side. There has been no revision of this amount. In the light of changing economic conditions, this figure should be revised. I call on the Government to make upward revisions on contributions to the E.P.F.

National Joint Labour Advisory Council—This started off well some years ago, but it has completely gone out of existence except in name. This should be revised and vigorously activated.

In conclusion, Mr Speaker, Sir, in this mundane world, nothing goes on forever and even the weariest river ends up in the sea. The Alliance Government will have to end some time. It has been with us long enough, and most people will agree that it is far too long. In the early days, the Government did well and we are grateful to them for that period, but for the last several years they have done little but made endless speeches, go on orbital missions at tax-payers' expense and restrict the freedom of the individual. When our Ministers get to some foreign countries, the red carpet is no sooner rolled up but they inquire the way to the nearest golf course. With such Ministers how long can such a Government last?

Akhir-nya Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ingin baca sedikit ucapan yang di-beri oleh Yang Berhormat Enche' Hanafiah bin Hussein pada 17hb Jun, 1966, di-Rumah yang berhormat ini. Kata-nya:

"Kita sudah merdeka sejak tahun 1957, masa kita sudah dekat 10 tahun lebih. Nampak-nya, sa-tengah daripada sa-tengah orang kita sudah mabok dengan kuasa. Kita tidak kenal lagi kepada kemahuan² ra'ayat." Terima kaseh.

Tuan Ahmad bin Arshad (Muar Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun ini ia-lah bagi menyokong ucapan Belanjawan yang telah dibentangkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan kita.

Saya dapat mengikuti atas ucapan² nya itu ia-itu perubahan² kenaikan

chukai itu, tidak-lah mengejutkan seluroh ra'ayat jelata, kerana kita dapat tahu kenaikan barang² yang saban hari di-makan oleh ra'ayat—beras, garam, susu tidak di-kaitkan dengan kenaikan ini, malahan pula kalau manusia ini berfikir panjang yang mereka dudok di-alam dunia ini memang tidak boleh lari daripada dikenakan chukai walau di-mana Kerajaan mereka diam. Kerana daripada kutipan chukai itu-lah Kerajaan akan kumpulkan, di-jadikan kerana Rancangan Pembangunan Negara yang akan memberi faedah kepada sa-tiap ra'ayat dalam negeri ini.

Yang melegakan ra'ayat lagi, Belanjawan tahun ini dalam segala rancangan bahagian Pertahanan dan Pelajaran tidak di-kurangkan malahan di-tambah dalam bidang pelajaran.

Sa-lain daripada itu saya gemar menarek perhatian Dewan ini atas ucapan yang telah di-bangkitkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan ia-itu berhubung dengan ketegasan beliau mengatakan akan mengurangkan kaki-tangan Kerajaan.

Saya nampak, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, langkah ini satu langkah yang tegas, berani dan berdasarkan kebenaran. Tidak-lah benar atas apa ucapan yang di-buat oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu tadi yang sa-olah² hendak menonjolkan diri-nya menjadi juara atau pembela kaki-tangan Kerajaan yang telah di-sentuh oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan tadi. Kita bukan tidak gemar kepada kaki-tangan Kerajaan dan kita banyak berterima kasih kepada semua kaki-tangan Kerajaan sebab dengan perantaraan kaki-tangan Kerajaan itu-lah maka pembangunan negara ini dapat berjalan dengan baik. Tetapi sa-telah kita merdeka 10 tahun saya mengatakan Kerajaan ada-lah terlampau berlembut dengan kaki-tangan Kerajaan. Kita pernah terima dari pada kaki-tangan Kerajaan sejak kita merdeka ini berbagai² lagu, lagu mogok, lagu kerja lambat, lagu kerja ikut peratoran dan lain² lagi, walau pun perkara ini hak mereka, tetapi mereka meninggalkan tujuan yang mereka bekerja ini untuk negeri ini, untuk kepentingan

negara. Jadi saya bersetuju sangat-lah langkah ini di-buat oleh Kerajaan.

Sa-lain daripada itu, dalam ucapan Menteri Kewangan telah di-bangkitkan ia-itu akan di-lancarkan pembangunan yang amat besar sa-kali untuk menambahkan pendapatan ra'ayat. Saya nampak, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ini ada hubungan-nya dengan satu perkara yang tersentuh dalam Kementerian Pembangunan Negara, ia-itu Kerajaan telah menjalankan Gerakan Maju daripada peringkat Pusat, Negeri, daerah, mukim dan kampung untuk mengambil kehasilan kemajuan yang dapat di-lancarkan oleh Kerajaan. Tetapi saya fikir tidak akan sempurna sa-kira-nya Kerajaan tidak dapat menimbang dan memikirkan satu jentera yang menggerakkan Gerakan Pembangunan ini di-peringkat kampung ia-itu dalam bidang Lembaga Kemajuan Kampung ia-itu peringkat yang keempat bidang P.N. dan luar Bandar yang di-pengerusikan oleh Ketua² Kampung dalam tempat itu.

Gerakan Maju yang di-buat itu ia-lah di-usahakan oleh Ketua Kampung dengan melalui Jawatan-kuasa Kemajuan Kampung, tetapi kita nampak bila Ketua Kampung yang menjadi Pengerusi itu hanya Kerajaan beri elaun mereka sa-banyak \$80 atau \$180.00 sa-tahun. Ini kalau di-nilaikan kepada usaha yang di-buat pada sa-panjang tahun tidak-lah berpatutan. Chuba kita bandingkan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau Ahli Majlis Meshuarat Tempatan atau Ahli Majlis Meshuarat Bandaran, atau pun Ahli Majlis Meshuarat Daerah Luar Bandar, Kerajaan memberi pada meshuarat Luar Bandar \$100.00 sa-bulan, Majlis Tempatan \$20.00 sa-bulan, kawasan-nya hanya 70 atau 200 orang. Ketua Kampung ini kita beri satu tahun \$180.00, kawasan-nya sa-kurang² 300 buah rumah dan pendudok-nya sa-ramai 2,000 orang. Merah di-pakai kampung² yang tersebut dalam Buku Merah ada Rukun (6). Dalam Rukun (6) itu ada di-pechahkan hingga 21 pechahan. Maka semua ini kemajuan yang hendak di-surohkan, yang hendak di-arahkan kepada Ketua Kampung bagi menyemaikan semangat kemajuan kepada ra'ayat di-kampung². Jadi saya

fikir sudah sampai-lah masa-nya Kerajaan memikirkan supaya dapat disamakan elauun Ketua² Kampong seluruh Malaysia ini, ia-itu di-beri mereka \$50.00 sa-bulan, mereka boleh dapat sa-tahun \$600.00.

Kita sangat berbesar hati Kerajaan Negeri Perak baru² ini telah menaikkan elauun Ketua Kampong itu kepada \$224.80 sen sa-tahun. Kalau Kerajaan Perak boleh buat, saya fikir semua Kerajaan² Negeri dalam Malaysia ini dapat berbuat demikian.

Yang kedua, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan telah menyentoh supaya dapat mengurangkan perbelanjaan. Saya menganjorkan ia-itu satu ikhtiar dalam bentuk bagi jenis² bangunan Kerajaan dan taraf kelengkapan-nya pada masa akan datang hendak-lah di-samakan dengan dasar kita berjimat chermat dengan pembelian dan borong. Segala bentuk rekaan bangunan Kerajaan, sama ada besar atau kecil, pada masa akan datang, hendak-lah di-minta peta dari Jabatan Kerja Raya, tidak lagi kita menggunakan akitek bersendirian, ya'ani *private*, kerana ini dapat kita membelanjakan dengan lebih chermat.

Demikian juga segala alat² perabut yang di-gunakan oleh Kerajaan sama ada di-rumah² Kerajaan atau di-sekolah² hendak-lah kita dapati, sa-lain daripada kita beli di-luar, kita dapati daripada ahli² penduduk kampong yang lepas daripada Sekolah pertukangan Kerajaan dan kita boleh dapat perkara² ini daripada orang² yang dalam penjara. Perkara ini mutunya sama dengan apa yang kita dapat sekarang dan kita boleh dapat lagi dengan harga yang rendah. Demikian juga dalam Ranchangan Pembangunan Luar Bandar pada masa akan datang, saya menarek perhatian, bahawa peruntukan wang kerana di-beri hiburan kepada ra'ayat di-luar bandar itu patut-lah kita berhentikan—saperti padang permainan dan juga rumah² kerana bahagian sukan. Ini satu perkara yang kita nampak, kalau hendak menumpukan kemajuan kepada ra'ayat pada masa akan datang, segala sukan dan hiburan ini kita patut berhentikan

sadikit. Kita mahu ra'ayat supaya hidup mewah, sa-telah itu akan menyusul-lah hiburan dan kesukaan kepada mereka. Sebab, kita tengok di-satengah² tempat, Kerajaan memberi wang, Balai Raya padang permainan yang banyak, ra'ayat tinggalkan padang itu hutan—kadang² rumah kerana bahagian sukan tinggal kosong begitu sahaja.

Yang ketiga, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, atas ucapan yang di-beri oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan itu ada menyebut berhubung dengan pertahanan. Pada hemat saya, perbelanjaan tidak akan bertambah pada masa depan sa-kira-nya dapat Kerajaan mengambilkan perhatian atas pandangan saya berhubung dengan pertahanan ini, ia-itu bagi memajukan sa-langkah lagi dalam pertahanan negara, maka sa-patut-nya kita tidak boleh bergantung kepada negara asing. Pada masa ini kita telah mengadakan perjanjian pertahanan dengan Britain pertolongan dengan beberapa negeri dalam Commonwealth yang ada kepentingan mereka itu dalam negeri ini, tetapi kita dalam fajar baharu. Di-Tenggara Asia ini, dengan kehendak masa, negeri² itu akan menarek balek ashkar mereka atau pengkalan tentera-nya di-kawasan kita, maka menjaga keselamatan dan kedaulatan negara kita patut kembali dalam bentuk Tentera Pertahanan Kebangsaan supaya tidak di-champor-adokkan oleh kuasa luar dalam negeri kita ini. Kita sedang menuju chita² dan perhatian dalam lapangan ekonomi dan sosial, kebudayaan atas perjanjian ASA. Menurut hemah saya, ASA ini tidak-lah dibataskan dalam bidang ini, bahkan boleh di-luaskan bukan sahaja dalam negeri² yang tiga buah itu, kita chuba pada negeri yang lain yang berjiran dengan kita ia-itu Singapura, Indonesia, Vietnam Selatan dan Burma. Dan dari itu dapat-lah pula kita lanjutkan dalam lapangan ketenteraan untuk menjaga, mengawal, mempertahankan bersama dalam kawasan ini. Sa-bagai Malaysia dan Philipina, Thailand, Vietnam dan Singapura, maka negeri² ini kuasa luar telah mengadakan pengkalan tentera-nya ia-itu Amerika dan Inggeris.

Di-Malaysia, Perjanjian Pertahanan sa-yugia di-kaji sa-mula dengan Inggeris, walau pun kita telah dapat mengurangkan ashkar² Inggeris di-Malaysia Timor. Sa-kira-nya di-adakan perjanjian pertahanan dalam negara² yang saya sebutkan tadi, dapat-lah negeri² itu mengisi kekosongan ashkar² daripada Inggeris dan juga daripada ashkar² Commonwealth tadi. Ini juga tidak menjadikan pertumpahan darah di-kawasan ini, oleh sebab sa-tengah² manusia tidak berapa gemar kepada manusia yang berkulit puteh ber-lamaan duduk dalam kawasan Tenggara Asia ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan telah membangkitkan dan telah menunjukkan kepada ra'ayat negeri ini satu kerisauan yang di-hadapi oleh Kerajaan Malaysia ini berhubung dengan ramainya penganggoran dalam negara kita di-masa akan datang. Saya nampak, bagi mengatasi penganggoran itu, menurut hemah saya yang chetek ini, satu perkara yang patut di-fikirkan oleh Kerajaan ia-itu bagaimana kita tahu, kemajuan negara kita, hasil-mahshul negara kita ini bertambah pesat dari sa-tahun ka-satahun. Pada mengatasi penganggoran itu, saya nampak ia-itu patut Kerajaan Malaysia ini mengadakan sa-buah pelabohan kelas satu lagi. Sa-hingga Ketua Negeri saya sendiri ia-itu Duli Yang Maha Mulia Sultan Johor telah menhadangkan salah sa-buah pelabohan supaya di-adakan di-Selatan Malaysia ini. Saya sa-bagai ra'ayat negeri Johor ada-lah menyokong pandangan ini dan saya harap kerjasama dapat di-beri oleh Kerajaan Pusat bagi menyelideki hal mengadakan pelabohan di-Selatan Malaysia ini. Saya mempersetujui-lah atas penyelidekan itu, sama ada pelabohan yang hendak di-buat dalam negeri saya itu di-Tanjong Puteri atau pun di-Tebing Runtuh yang berhadapan dengan Jurong di-Singapura. Alasan²-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Kerajaan Persekutuan telah mengemukakan pinjaman atas ranchangan ini sa-banyak \$16 juta untuk pelabohan baharu. Pakar² dari luar negeri tentu-lah akan di-datangkan bagi menjalankan penyelidekan ini. Pada masa ini

kira² 40% perdagangan keluar-masok Malaysia ini melalui Singapura. Sa-kira-nya di-adakan pelabohan baharu, beberapa pekerja, beberapa ramai buroh² yang kita katakan menganggor itu dapat di-beri pekerjaan dan dapat lagi menambahkan hasil negara kita, malahan pula dalam pengumuman Menteri Kewangan mengatakan bahawa chukai pelabohan itu dapat di-kurangkan dan juga daripada itu dapat di-kutip chukai melalui pelabohan. Sa-lama ini tidak tertahan-lah lagi dengan kechaman, sendiran yang di-buat oleh Perdana Menteri Singapura hingga termasuk Ketua Menteri-nya sendiri, ada-lah menjadi satu chabaran kepada Kerajaan kita supaya berdiri di-atas kaki sendiri berhubung dengan pelabohan di-Selatan Malaysia ini.

Kita benar ada pelabohan di-Penang, pelabohan di-Port Swettenham—dan pelabohan di-Port Swettenham itu pun saya harap Kerajaan supaya mengubah nama-nya, jangan pakai Port Swettenham lagi. Kita ambilkan satu nama orang yang berbangga dengan Kerajaan Melayu dahulu seperti Tun Perak—Tun Perak pernah menjadi Gabnor dalam Port Swettenham pada masa Kerajaan Melaka yang lalu.

Bagi pehak Kerajaan Johor sentiasa memberi kemudahan jika di-kehendaki oleh Kerajaan Pusat. Pelabohan Selatan Malaysia itu, bukan sahaja boleh memberi kemudahan perdagangan, atau pun saudagar² di-Selatan Malaysia, bahkan memberi kemudahan kepada saudagar² di-pantai timor dan dengan wujud-nya satu projek jalan raya daripada Rompin ka-Endau, dan Kuantan dengan Kuala Trengganu, walau kita ada perpanjian bersama dengan Kerajaan Singapura dalam perniagaan ini, tetapi kita tidak boleh berdiam diri; Singapura pada satu masa menurut himat saya, akan menjadi Cuba dengan Amerika. Kalau Singapura menjadi pengkalan-nya, pengkalan China Communist, apa akan jadi dalam tanah besar Malaysia?

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berchapak saya dalam keselamatan dalam negeri ini, saya chuma menyentoh sadikit sahaja perkara ini, sebab saya melihat waktu yang akhir² ini telah menjadi²

tunjuk perasaan yang di-beri oleh ra'ayat negeri ini dan bagaimana jawapan yang telah di-beri oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Keselamatan Dalam Negeri pada pagi tadi, termasuk juga ra'ayat luar negeri. Perkara yang samacham ini, menurut himat saya, tidak boleh di-biarkan berluas²an. Manusia ini, kita beri kera'ayatan dengan segala hormat-nya kepada negeri ini, tetapi telatah dan kelakuan mereka, menurut himat saya, ada-lah merendahkan moral atau pandangan negeri kita kepada dunia luar. Oleh itu, saya fikir, manusia yang sumpama ini, chuba Kerajaan fikir, dan timbangkan—luchutkan sahaja kera'ayatan mereka itu, hantar mereka itu balek kepada negeri asal-nya. Kalau Kerajaan Indonesia boleh menghantar mereka itu balek ka-negeri asal-nya, kenapa kita sa-bagai sa-buah Kerajaan tidak boleh berbuat demikian? Kita sangat berterima kaseh. Warga negara yang kita terima menjadi ra'ayat negeri ini, yang ta'at setia, kita uchapkan terima kaseh, tetapi kalau manusia yang hendak menghanchorkan negeri ini, yang hendak merosakkan negeri ini, manusia yang macham ini patut kita pertimbangkan, kita hantar dia balek dengan segala hormat-nya.

Sa-lain daripada itu—Kementerian Dalam Negeri juga—perlu menyegekan perundingan dengan Kerajaan Indonesia supaya mengkaji beberapa perkara besar dalam bidang keselamatan dalam negeri, kerana dua² buah negeri ini menghadapi musoh yang satu, ia-itu kominis² yang hendak merosakkan keamanan dalam negara Malaysia dan juga Indonesia. Musoh², atau anasir² kominis sama juga di-Indonesia, atau pun di-Malaysia. Kita juga telah mengikat satu Perjanjian Perniagaan Bertukar Barang di-Indonesia, tetapi dengan ada-nya gangguan perompak² yang boleh kita katakan perompak, asal-nya daripada askar Indonesia yang tidak ta'at setia kepada Kerajaan yang ada sekarang, mereka menjadi perompak. Dengan ada-nya perompak dan lanun dalam kawasan perayeran antara bangsa akan mengurangkan perniagaan yang telah kita jalankan dengan Kerajaan Indonesia itu dan mengurangkan penjualan

barang² kita kepada saudagar² Indonesia.

Saya kata terlambat kita membuat perundingan dalam bahagian ini; dahulu telah saya katakan bahawa ada gulungan kominis yang berasal daripada negara ini lepas lari ka-Indonesia, tetapi dengan sebab kita lambat berunding dengan Kerajaan Indonesia, kominis itu sekarang telah lari ka-Vietnam Utara yang di-antara-nya sa-orang daripada-nya termasuk Shamsiah Fakeh—apa sudah jadi! Bila mereka dudok di-Korea Utara, mereka akan dapat sokongan daripada Kerajaan Peking, mereka akan menghuru-harakan negeri ini yang mana ejen²-nya tunggu siap sedia akan perintah daripada kominis yang hendak menghanchorkan negeri ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berchap dalam bidang Kebajikan 'Am yang telah di-sumbangkan oleh Kerajaan pada masa yang lalu dan juga pada tahun ini yang kebanyakan-nya Kerajaan telah memberikan wang kerana kebajikan dalam bidang ugama. Hal ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sejak masa yang akhir ini bertambah banyak hal ehwal ugama Islam, demikian juga ugama lain di-pertanggung jawabkan dan di-tadbirkan oleh Kerajaan Pusat dan di-biaya² oleh Kerajaan Pusat sa-bagai chontoh yang saya hendak kemukakan bagi perhatian Dewan ini. Pada ugama Islam-nya, pentadbiran sekolah ugama, gaji guru ugama peringkat menengah, peringkat atas, peringkat tinggi, ujian Qur'an, College Islam, Masjid Negara, bangunan masjid, surau, Lembaga Tabong Haji, Urusan Haji, sharahan² ugama, forum ugama dalam radio dan talivishen, yang bukan Islam pula Kerajaan telah mengambil berat dalam pembangunan rumah² ibadat sama ada Gereja, rumah tok kong dan juga dalam hal bahagian ibadat yang lain. Yang saya hendak bangkitkan ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, belum pernah terjadi di-Malaya, atau di-Malaysia, orang² Sami ini membunuh diri, tetapi baharu² ini telah berlaku orang² Sami Budha daripada negeri saya telah berani membakar diri-nya. Maka perkara yang samacham ini, saya nampak angin perubahan daripada negeri lain itu

telah menyusop pengaruh-nya kepada Sami² dalam Malaysia. Oleh itu, saya mendatangkan pandangan, telah sampai-lah masa-nya Kerajaan mengkaji dalam Rancangan Malaysia Yang Pertama ini, ia-itu mewujudkan Kementerian Ugama dalam Cabinet Kerajaan yang ada sekarang.

Kementerian ini akan bertanggungjawab penuh dalam segala urusan ugama yang di-anuti oleh ra'ayat Malaysia, sama ada ugama Islam, ugama Christian, ugama Budha, ugama Majusi, tambahan pula kita tahu dalam Malaysia Timor ini, ramai ra'ayat kita yang menganuti ugama Christian.

Saya tidak pula bertujuan mengambil kuasa ugama Islam dalam Raja² Melayu atau Majlis Ugama Raja², malahan ini akan menolong membantu kuasa² yang ada itu. Chuma Kementerian Ugama ini mengambil urusan lunas kuasa pentadbiran yang sa-lama ini di-bawah Kerajaan Pusat. Pernah Kerajaan Pusat berasingan dengan pentadbiran-nya seperti pentadbiran tanah ada-lah kuat kuasa daripada Kerajaan Negeri dan kuasa Majlis Tempatan ada-lah kuasa Kerajaan Negeri, ini juga termasuk dalam bahagian pentadbiran ugama dalam bahagian 'am. Lebih menguatkan shor saya ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dengan pengumuman yang di-buat oleh Yang Amat Berhormat Tunku Perdana Menteri ia-itu sa-buah jawatan-kuasa untuk mengkaji bagi menyatukan pentadbiran ugama Islam dalam negeri ini akan di-tubuhkan dan telah mendapat izin daripada Duli Yang Maha Mulia Raja² Melayu dan badan ini boleh di-dudokan dalam Kementerian Ugama yang saya chadangkan itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menarek perhatian dalam perkara ini sa-chara lanjut sadikit, sa-belum Inggeris, sa-belum Sepanyol, menjajah Gugusan Pulau² Melayu bahawa semangat ugama sangat kuat pada sisi ra'ayat. Mereka tahu Melayu satu bangsa yang ta'at setia kepada Raja, maka dengan kepintaran penjajah menyusun majlis mentadbirkan pentadbiran ugama Islam itu di-berikan kepada Raja². Sejak itu-lah susunan perjalanan pen-

tadbiran ugama itu terbatas walhal sa-belum penjajah menjajah negeri ini kita bagi pehak Kerajaan Melayu dalam Gugusan Pulau² Melayu itu dalam pentadbiran ugama-nya di-jaga dan di-kawal oleh sa-buah badan yang bernama Sheikhu'l Islam dan hal ini barangkali maseh ada lagi pada sa-tengah² negeri seperti di-Kedah atau pun di-Indonesia.

Kemudian, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya hendak membangkitkan satu perkara berhubung dengan Kementerian Perdagangan dan Perusahaan. Kementerian ini telah menjadi sungutan ra'ayat pada masa yang lalu dalam bidang membekalkan leterek—bekalan api leterek ka-kampung². Tidak pula boleh di-nafikan bahawa Lembaga Leterek Negara ini telah memberikan api kepada 210,000 buah rumah diseluruh Malaysia ini.

Sa-lain daripada itu, yang menjadi sungutan kepada ra'ayat luar bandar dan menjadi satu salah tanya pula kepada Wakil² Ra'ayat dan barangkali Kerajaan Perikatan dengan sebab menurut hemat saya kurang bijak-nya pentadbiran Lembaga Leterek ini. Sungutan ini sa-makin memunchak, oleh itu saya mengeshorkan kepada Kerajaan supaya Lembaga Leterek Negara ini dapat merombak Undang² dasar-nya yang berjalan sekarang kerana Undang² yang dahulu itu di-chipta di-zaman penjajah. Saya tidak bermaksud Lembaga ini supaya di-ambil alih oleh Kerajaan Pusat, chuma dengan perombakan dan pindaan itu dapat di-selaraskan dan di-sesuaikan dengan Rancangan Pembangunan Luar Bandar. Lembaga Leterek yang meminjam wang daripada Bank Dunia sa-banyak \$305.2 juta untuk rancangan leterek pada tahun ini akan membekalkan api kepada penduduk² luar bandar. Yang saya fikir patut di-fikirkan oleh Lembaga Leterek ini tidak dapat bekerjasama dengan Jawatan-kuasa Pembangunan Luar Bandar Peringkat Daerah, Peringkat Negeri, walau pun telah diputuskan oleh Jawatan-kuasa Peringkat² ini manakala di-hantar kepada Pejabat Lembaga Leterek Pusat ini segala rancangan yang di-kemukakan oleh ra'ayat dalam tempat itu di-tolak

terus tidak mahu di-terima. Mereka membuat satu arahan sendiri supaya dapat di-ikuti oleh Jabatan Leterek di-daerah² itu.

Lagi satu, peruntokan biasa-nya di-berikan kerana Ranchangan Pembangunan Luar Bandar ini sangat sedikit. Menurut yang saya tahu, kalau saya salah betulkan, pada tahun ini Lembaga ini akan memberikan wang kira² \$11 million kepada sa-buah negeri hanya \$1 million sahaja kerana bekalan api leterek di-kampung². Kalau \$1 million sa-buah negeri saya—negeri Johor dalam ranchangan kawasan saya Muar Utara, saya berterima kaseh-lah kepada Lembaga ini yang ada bertujuan hendak membuat ranchangan ini, ranchangan dalam kawasan Muar Utara itu sa-banyak \$3 million. Kalau di-gunakan dalam Muar Utara sahaja bagi negeri itu \$1 million itu seluruh negeri Johor yang daerah² yang lain tidak dapat.

Yang kedua-nya, dalam membekalkan api itu dia tidak meliputi semua. Umpama-nya, bekalan api di-kawasan Merlimau terus ka-Tangkak tetapi antara Kampung Merlimau dan Tangkak itu berapa buah kampung pula tidak di-bekalkan. Ini menjadi satu sungutan kepada ra'ayat di-kampung². Lagi satu, Lembaga ini maseh mengutamakan kepada pemodal² asing—ladang² Eropah dan lombong² dan Kerajaan juga memberikan sokongan dalam hal ini kerana kilang² dan di-ladang² Kerajaan mengurangkan pembayaran bekalan leterek. Jadi, saya harap perkara ini kalau dapat di-kaji balek supaya tidak-lah menjadi sungutan kepada ra'ayat dan bertambah baik mutu Lembaga Leterek ini di-sisi ra'ayat, jangan khuatir ra'ayat di-luar bandar sekarang, menuju ma'amor, mereka telah memberikan borang-nya kepada Lembaga ini. Lain daripada di-minta bekalan api ka-kampung itu dia mengadakan satu borang pengakuan dia sanggup bila mana bekalan ini di-teruskan ka-kampung-nya mereka sanggup memasokkan bekalan api karumah-nya. Mereka juga tahu menggunakan talipon, Taliveshen, seterekar baju dan buat kueh melalui leterek sebab mereka sudah belajar dengan

kelas dewasa yang di-anjorkan oleh Kerajaan.

Satu perkara lagi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam ucapan Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan telah menyebutkan berhubung dengan peruntokan Pelajaran di-beri tambahan. Dalam beberapa tahun lagi menurut hemat saya banyak bilangan chalon yang chukup berkelayakan masuk University malahan pula Siswazah kita tentu-lah penoh keinginan meneruskan pelajarannya, sudah tentu tidak dapat di-tampung dengan sa-buah University yang ada sekarang. Menurut ramalan orang yang menjalankan penyelidikan berhubung dengan pelajaran ini pada tahun 1970 Mahasiswa kita mencapai angka 5,000 yang layak dudok di-University, oleh itu saya mengeshorkan kepada Kerajaan supaya mengkaji bagi mewujudkan sa-buah University Kebangsaan di-Malaysia ini. Saya tidak kira-lah di-Pantai Timor atau dalam negeri Johor, di-mana sahaja, kerana memandangkan daripada beberapa aspek yang sesuai dengan dasar pelajaran sekarang. Kita telah beroleh kejayaan yang Kerajaan mewujudkan Sekolah Alam Shah Tingkatan Enam dalam Bahasa Kebangsaan, 85 orang sekarang telah berada di-Universiti malahan Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran telah mengumumkan bahawa pada tahun ini 12 kelas Tingkatan Atas akan di-buka, sa-paroh daripadanya dalam Bahasa Kebangsaan.

Mewujudkan Universiti Bahasa Kebangsaan ini tentu-lah kena timbangkan dari berbagai² bidang sama ada kewangan dan dari mana-kah kita dapat pensharah dalam bahagian ini. Saya berbesar hati pada hari sa-malam satu rombongan daripada Kementerian Pelajaran ini telah pergi ka-Indonesia untuk mendapatkan Pensharah² daripada Indonesia untuk memberi sharahan kepada Maktab² kita dalam Malaysia ini, dan ini juga kita boleh dapat untuk memberi sharahan² dalam Universiti yang saya katakan, dan bagi pehak UNESCO barangkali akan memberi bantuan kepada penubuhan Universiti kita ini. Yang menyebabkan saya kuat mengutarakan perkara ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, supaya dapat benar² memenohi peranan

dengan sa-luas²-nya sa-bagai bahasa Melayu ini itu bahasa rasmi, bahasa yang tunggal. Bahasa Kebangsaan dapat dengan di-adakan Universiti Bahasa Kebangsaan itu bahasa ini di-jadikan bahasa perantaraan.

Bahasa dan kebudayaan dan ilmu pengetahuan dalam bidang kebangsaan kita itu dapat di-pertinggikan dan dapat pula kedaulatan bahasa kita di-negeri ini yang merdeka dan berdaulat sama dengan negeri² yang lain. Perkembangan dan seluroh dunia tertarek hati dengan Bahasa Kebangsaan kita, mereka sedang mengkaji, Bahasa Kebangsaan dan Kesusteraan kita pada Universiti² mereka, kita jangan hendaknya terus menerus bergantung kepada Universiti yang ada sekarang atau Universiti yang ada di-seberang laut. Kita patut melebuhkan pengajian lanjutan ini dalam negeri kita sendiri, kerana dari pengajian ini akan tumbuh mewah kemajuan fikiran cherdek pandai yang berchorak kebangsaan, malahan kita mesti tegas demi tumbuh bahasa dan kesusteraan kebangsaan kita sudah sewajar-nya mempunyai universiti bagaimana yang saya katakan tadi.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah (Bachok): Kalau bagi jalan sedikit hendak bertanya sedikit. Ahli Yang Berhormat mahu itu Universiti barukah atau pun bahasa pengantar dalam Universiti itu di-jalankan dalam Bahasa Kebangsaan? Jadi, yang mana satu? Jadi, kalau buat Universiti baru Bahasa Kebangsaan erti-nya orang lain tidak boleh masuk, bagaimana itu? Pusing kepala saya hendak fahamkan itu.

Tuan Ahmad bin Arshad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, oleh sebab Ahli Yang Berhormat itu barangkali juga satu keturunan dengan saya, orang Melayu, dia pun faham saya berchakap saya minta kepada Kerajaan supaya mengadakan sa-buah Universiti baru—baru—hendak di-tubuhkan Universiti baharu itu boleh-lah di-Pantai Timor atau pun di-mana juga dalam Malaysia sa-lain daripada Universiti yang ada ini dengan menggunakan Bahasa Kebangsaan.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Saya bermaksud bagini: Universiti ini merupakan kumpulan beberapa fekaliti, kalau kita membuat Universiti kolej, itu betul, tetapi hendak membuat Universiti lagi satu ini bukan perkara kecil. Jadi, saya tidak faham bila kita buat Universiti lain—baru—satu Universiti yang ada sekarang ini macham mana pula jadi-nya?

Tuan Ahmad bin Arshad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, oleh sebab dalam ucapan saya tadi, pemikiran hendak membuat Universiti ini sangat dalam, sangat jauh, memakan masa yang lanjut, jadi, tidak payah-lah Yang Berhormat itu memikirkan. Biar-lah saya utarakan kepada Kerajaan sendiri memikirkan dan menyelideki bagi mendapat di-atas apa yang saya chakapkan tadi.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada akhirnya saya kemukakan dalam Dewan ini ia-ini lanjutan daripada ucapan yang di-beri oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan dengan mengatakan bahawa salah satu sumber hasil negara kita ini ia-lah getah, dan pada tahun 1965 penghasilan getah ini bertambah 6%. Jadi, satu perkara yang berkait dengan getah, bagaimana kita sedia ma'alom kemewahan dalam negeri dan kema'amoran ra'ayat di-laur bandar yang banyak bergantung kepada getah, juga harga getah turun dan naik itu akan melibatkan kehidupan ra'ayat meleset daripada mewah. Oleh sebab negeri kita ini yang banyak sa-kali mengeluarkan getah dalam dunia, hampir 40% pengeluaran getah yang di-datangkan oleh Malaysia ini dan ra'ayat sentiasa mengikuti perkembangan getah ini dari sa-masa kasemasa dan Kerajaan juga sentiasa memberikan penyelidekan membaiki mutu getah, oleh itu satu ikhtiar, saya fikir, patut Kerajaan usahakan bagi mengatasi penurunan harga getah ia-itu di-adakan Pusat Pasaran Getah Asli di-Malaysia ini. Sekarang Pusat Pasaran Getah ini berada di-negeri² yang jauh ia-itu di-England. Sa-lama kita menggunakan Pasaran daripada negeri sa-berang laut, terpaksa-lah melalui harga getah yang di-beri oleh orang luar itu mahal dan kita dapati ra'ayat yang mempunyai getah sendiri

dalam negeri ini dapat harga yang kurang. Kita patut berbangga dengan hasil pengeluaran getah dan wajib kita berdiri di atas kaki sendiri dengan ada-nya pemasaran bagaimana yang saya katakan itu. Bahkan getah² yang di-keluarkan daripada Malaysia di-masa akan datang akan bertambah sa-kira-nya Kerajaan tidak dapat mengadakan pasaran sendiri dalam negeri ini dengan ada-nya Perjanjian Perdagangan dengan Kerajaan Indonesia boleh-lah kita mengadakan Pemasaran getah bersama dengan Indonesia sebab dua² buah negeri ini di-antara negeri di-Tenggara Asia ini yang banyak sekali mengeluarkan getah, dan tat kala itu getah yang kita keluarkan daripada dua buah negeri ini tidak payah-lah pembeli² getah itu datang ka-England lagi, mereka boleh membeli di-Malaysia ini. Sekian-lah terima kaseh.

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: Meshuarat ini di-tangguhkan hingga pukul 4.00 petang ini.

Sitting suspended at 1.00 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 4.00 p.m.

(Mr (Deputy) Speaker in the Chair)

THE SUPPLY BILL, 1967

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Tuan Sim Boon Liang (Sarawak): Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Minister of Finance, in his Budget speech to this House last Thursday, outlined the Government's policy when introducing the Supply Bill for 1967. It drew comments from various quarters and it was apparent that the Budget proposals for 1967 were a painful one.

It was a great shock to the people of Sarawak in East Malaysia, that it came in such a manner. The Minister of Finance outlined the new tax levy and it was evident that the burden which the public of Sarawak was being asked to shoulder was a very heavy one. He also said that the Central Government intended to harmonise taxation throughout Malaysia. Sir, it is only to be expected that another step nearer to this objective would be

taken, and in such harmonisation some states should not benefit more than others. For instance, although West Malaysia are paying higher taxes, the people here are getting free primary education, comprehensive system education, and all other social services, whereas the people of Sarawak in East Malaysia have to pay the same rate of taxes as West Malaysia but they do not enjoy the same facilities which the people in West Malaysia are enjoying. If one looks through the Estimates, there is still no provision for free primary education to be introduced into Sarawak this year, nor is there any indication for its introduction in the future years. Sir, the people of Sarawak would naturally want to know as to when is the Central Government going to fulfill its promise. Sir, at present, only school fees are waived for our children in Sarawak in primary schools, but this is not free primary education which the children of West Malaysia have enjoyed for many years. Sir, as the Chairman of Mukah District Council myself in the Third Division of Sarawak, I wish to remind this Honourable House that we in Sarawak have to pay a higher education rate. School children have to pay for their text books and so on. Yet in West Malaysia everything is provided for the school children by the Government. Therefore, Sir, I urge that the Government should take definite and concrete steps to harmonise the benefits, instead of taxation, and they should be extended and be enjoyed by the people of East Malaysia, particularly Sarawak.

Now, Sir, coming back to the Budget proposals for new taxes by the Honourable the Minister of Finance, the 5% development tax could be quite a blow for the professional men or the individual businessmen in Sarawak with a medium or low income who may find that the 5% on income will be more than equivalent to doubling their income tax.

Sir, while the repeal of the turnover tax, which has since its introduction two years ago been a thorn in the side of the business community, will be welcomed by the business community, its immediate replacement by the 2%

surtax will merely mean that the burden is no lesser. Sir, this new tax would save business houses the complicated process of accounting, but taxing the value of imports, excluding import duty, and not on sale prices, which include import duties that might have been paid, would still mean that some of this burden would be passed on to the consumers, especially the poor people, who have to pay now higher costs for their goods. Sir, I would emphasise that the Government ought to take into serious consideration the already high cost of living in Sarawak. This new taxation would mean one added burden to the people of Sarawak who have to pay for their children's primary education. Now, Sir, I would like also to suggest to the Government that the rate of taxation for Sarawak should be considered fairly as an assurance in the Inter-Governmental Committee Report that taxation would be brought into line gradually and I hope that this undertaking should be honoured.

In conclusion, Sir, I would like to say that it is not my purpose to indulge in any kind of criticism but to contribute in a constructive manner to the debate as a Member of this House from Sarawak. Thank you, Sir.

Tuan C. V. Devan Nair (Bungsar): Mr Speaker, Sir, I have been a harsh critic of the Finance Minister's fiscal and taxation policies in the past, and I had expected to say harsh things again this year about his Budget. But as I sat back and listened to the Finance Minister presenting his Budget this year, I was pleasantly surprised to discover that this was practically a new man, shocked into a belated awareness of the cold and clammy fingers of financial stringency clutching at the nation's throat. Here was a man speaking, by and large, and surprisingly for himself, in the accents of sobriety and realism. Gone was the self-righteous flamboyance and the purblind certitudes of previous years. Gone was the proneness to rush experimentation and disastrous innovations in the field of taxation. Gone also were the blinkers and the ear-plugs.

In his new-found sight and hearing, he has plucked up enough courage, for instance, to remove the turnover tax. When winding up the debate on his Budget speech last year, he charged the Opposition with intentionally or unintentionally misunderstanding his Budget and he concluded as follows, and I quote, "What they say, and what they do, are utterly irrelevant because they certainly have neither the power nor the means to assist us in any way. In other words, they just do not count, and we can afford to ignore them."

It was gratifying for us, Sir, to note that this year, the Finance Minister has learned that what the Opposition says, he is obliged to say one or two years later. The House will recall that I for one asked him last year to work up enough courage to remove the turnover tax, and we are certainly glad that he has done so now.

The nation can at last take some heart—for our Finance Minister has begun to see and he has begun to hear. I would be dishonest, Sir, if I did not begin with a tribute to the Finance Minister's sober presentation of the disturbing economic facts of life facing this nation. It is to be fervently hoped that his realisation of the seriousness of the economic situation has dawned with equal force, impact and clarity on his Ministerial colleagues in the Government.

The decisive question, surely, is whether there is a general realisation, among those in authority, that the mounting public debt, the depletion of reserves, the continuing Budget deficits, and the need for new taxation, could have been avoided, if we had not been prodigal in our spending, squandering the nation's funds and assets on frivolous and unproductive projects, on a whole lot of white elephants, as it were; and one prays that this realisation is general, for only then would this nation be able to edge back from the brink of inevitable disaster to which we have been brought. And in this spirit, I say God-speed to the new new-found economic sobriety and wisdom of the Finance Minister.

The Finance Minister has even asked for criticism, although he reserves the right to apply his own label as to whether it is constructive or destructive. I hope he will treat what I have to say about the taxation provisions in the Budget as being constructive, at least in intention.

For some years, some of us on the Opposition side have droned about the need to spread taxation fairly, getting most from those who reap most, and spending it on those with the greatest need. And for years, we have advised him to be cautious about getting into debt. This year, he has at last begun to show signs of alarm. It could be that too many doors were slammed in Malaysia's face last year, when our Finance Minister went on a borrowing spree abroad. Perhaps the foreign experts he places so much faith on, studied our credit-worthiness in the cold light of our performance.

As on 31st December, 1965, this country's Public Debt stood at \$2,643 million. From the same statement supplied in the Estimates of Expenditure for 1967, the outstanding Public Debt before Independence in 1957 stood at less than \$500 million. In eight years, in short, this country's Public Debt has been increased by more than five times over the debt incurred over a century of colonial rule. But there is still hope, as I indicated. This country is rich, and it can now boast of a Finance Minister who has at last begun to see and begun to hear.

In the matter of taxation, the Minister has decided on a cautious plunge into the pockets of those who can well afford to pay more. He has introduced the "Development Tax", which in fact may be described as a modified corporation tax of 5 per cent. Until the Bill is presented, and the full exemptions, if any, are known, it is difficult to offer any constructive criticism other than to point out to him that as his statement stands and on the face of it, every hawker, every *kachang-puteh* man and every trishaw peddler, will have to fill in an intricate income tax form, for which he will probably have

to pay \$25 to someone to complete for him, and then face a demand for 5 per cent, which could well come to less than \$50 as development tax. Apart from the exorbitant costs of collection in such cases, the Minister should also note the inequity of making such people, whose incomes at best are equal to the grade of employees who pay no income tax and will not be asked to pay development tax.

It is to be hoped, Sir, that the Minister will also take into account those small family businesses, such as groceries and coffee-shops, where the brothers are partners as well as employees. Each brother's total receipts, if he were an employee, would not render him liable to either income tax or development tax. Now, if there are three brothers in the business, they will have to pay \$300. In addition, they will further be collectively liable to another \$25 as registration fee.

The Minister should also be aware of the many cases of husbands and wives being partners and sole workers in a barber or hairdresser's shop. Their combined income did not, and will not render them liable to income tax, and it is to be hoped that now they will not be expected to pay \$200 as development tax.

I have long and consistently advocated, Sir, that our rich are but lightly taxed compared to those in Europe and America. The Minister now seems to agree, although he uses different words and a negative manner of expression by saying, and I quote him, "This country is by no means over-taxed."

A case could therefore be made out, if necessary, for a special additional levy to be raised on the planting and tin industries. Planters and miners have been getting more than their fair share of profits and are people we need least to attract. Furthermore, far too many of them avoid the maximum personal rate by not declaring dividends from companies they own, and therefore development tax at even 10 per cent will only be getting from them their moral due.

On business registration fees, the Minister exempts what he terms as the smallest businesses, the rubber small-holders, with less than 25 acres. There is surely, Sir, a misplaced generosity here. Sir, the Minister should know that the possession of 24 acres really means a working capital of at least \$24,000, taking roughly an average of \$1,000 an acre. But if the Minister will go round to all the grocers, the hair-dressing saloons, the coffee shops, the sundry-goods shops, and a whole host of other small businesses, he will find very, very few indeed with a working capital of \$24,000. There would therefore seem to be little justification for exempting one and penalising the others. Neither does it help to say that the country is better off without those coffee shops which cannot pay, what he calls, "a paltry sum."

I welcome the Minister's levy of \$4.5 million on the logger, who in my view has been getting on finely with our country's natural resources. But my doubt here is over the method of collection. Must we have this rather circuitous way of taxing them? The Minister proposes to disallow as deductions 50% of royalties paid to State Governments for the extraction of timber and to charge income tax thereon, and presumably, also development tax. Income tax rates will vary with the individual, and company rates will be different from the personal rates. The Minister says that his main purpose is to collect taxes from those who can well afford to pay and this is surely agreed. Then why not use a simpler and more direct method, such as a levy on timber extracted?

A second reason given by the Minister is that his way may discourage the hawking of licenses—what has been called as an "Ali Baba" form of business. This object is again praiseworthy. But here again, why not have recourse to a simpler and more direct remedy? Why not just ban such transfers, or slap a tax on such transfers?

In his Budget speech, the Finance Minister served notice of things to come. He indicated two fundamental changes—one, a change from the basis

of taxation of income derived or remitted to world income, and the other, the abolition of commencement and cessation provisions. Both steps are progressive, but comments have to be reserved until more is known. May I, however, caution him at this stage, in the light of his several unworkable innovations in the past, to be extra careful. We do not want to create a situation in which companies might well prefer to be non-resident, and resident individuals might prefer to by-pass the law by having companies abroad that do not declare dividends. We started off on a rather bad footing when we introduced income tax in this country with those cumbersome and annoying commencement and cessation provisions. But these defects have, as it were, grown into our tax system, and if I may, I should like again to urge the Minister to consider the matter very thoroughly, especially the mechanics of the change to be effected in the light of the observations I have offered.

His two per cent surtax on the value of imports is a lighter burden than the original turnover tax, and a good deal lighter than the modified turnover tax. While businessmen would welcome the surtax as a preferable substitute, it would be wrong to expect any enthusiasm from the general run of consumers who would, in the last resort, have to bear the entire burden of this tax.

The new rates on diesel oil from 8 cents to 20 cents a gallon, i.e. an extra 12 cents a gallon, will essentially hit those in the haulage business and in the construction business. Private vehicle owners using diesel oil will also feel the pinch, but as the Finance Minister has asked for sacrifices, the demand from such owners is not too high a price to pay.

I would like, however, to commend to the Minister's further consideration, the potential adverse effects that the diesel oil tax may have on general prices as a result of increase in the cost of transportation, and particularly on those who already have long-term contracts to fulfil. All countries, Sir, try to develop on the basis of cheap

transportation of men and of goods. Most enlightened countries attempt to secure revenue from the end-result of an enterprise, and not in the course of the process of any given enterprise. In other words, the State should attempt to derive revenue when profits have been made and ascertained, and not when work is being done. Hauling goods from one place to another is merely work in progress, and to raise revenue here is really tantamount to putting an obstacle, a disincentive, in the path of work.

Be that as it may, the Finance Minister has decided and so be it. I would urge him only to consider further the effects on prices, both of consumption and of investment goods, as a consequence of the changes in the retail price of diesel oil. I would also urge the Minister to consider the plight of those who are already working under long-term contracts, and who have the misfortune to use a great deal of diesel oil. One hopes that the Minister will watch the position carefully to ensure that none of these people will go bankrupt as a result of his action. The Minister has estimated that the increase in duty on diesel oil will yield the treasury some \$27 million a year. It will be pertinent to ask whether this figure has been calculated after taking into account the probable drop in income tax collections from those who use diesel oil.

The duty on beer and stout has been increased by almost 10%. The Minister hopes that this increase will be absorbed by the domestic breweries. But I think we can safely assume that the domestic breweries will have other ideas. It may, of course, turn out to be a misplaced hope on the part of the Minister, and in that event, if the duty will in fact be passed on to the consumer, the Finance Minister will, at his next Budget, find greater difficulty in maintaining his illusions about the stability of the retail prices index.

The Minister goes on to numerous other changes in customs duties and excise charges including the surtax, the net result of which he expects to yield

an additional revenue of nearly \$88 million. It may bore the Minister, Sir, but I am sure that it bears repetition, that every time the Government needs money, it seems to go for consumer. I have repeatedly stated in this House the adverse effects on the working class of ever-increasing indirect taxation. But year after year, the Minister of Finance stands in this House and waves his retail prices index and says that prices have not gone up. He admits that customs and excise duties have gone up. He admits that he has put up a tariff wall. He has raised transportation charges. And it is admitted that because of the general trend towards lower prices for rubber, the wages of those tappers whose earnings are tied to the price of rubber must necessarily have fallen. And yet it is still maintained that the Treasury statisticians are correct, and that the people are better off. We can only hope, Sir, that at the next year's Budget the Minister would have mustered enough courage to tell this House that he has overhauled the Statistics Department and has produced a more realistic index.

So much for the Minister's attempts at raising revenue. May I now touch upon his attempts at spending the revenue?

It would appear that year after year, the pressures on our Finance Ministers's spending have been considerable. The Opposition have warned him for many years that he ought to resist much more strongly these pressures on him for more and more money, especially for unproductive projects that have not been absolutely necessary for development. Now, at long last, the Minister admits that the general picture is one of increasingly severe strain as far as our Budget is concerned. We are now back to 1958 which, according to the Honourable Minister, was one of our worst years. He now produces figures far more bleak than the most pessimistic member of the Opposition had dared to envisage. The overall deficit is now estimated at \$571 million for 1966, and this, as the Minister himself admits, is uncomfortably large. It

would have been larger by at least \$70 million if Britain had not given grants totalling \$57 million, if Canada had not freely given Caribou air-crafts and motor-cycles valued at some \$12 million, and if New Zealand had not supplied a large quantity of military equipment. But even so, this country had to run down its reserves by \$165 million, and had to borrow \$400 million locally and \$6 million abroad.

The Minister estimates an overall Budget deficit for 1967 of \$684 million if no changes in taxation are made. Assuming that he really gets his estimated \$115 million, the overall deficit will be in the region of last year's. The question now is whether we can go on and for how long, with overall Budget deficits of approximately \$600 million, every year. Earlier, Sir, I referred to the fact that in eight years of independence, we have increased our public debt by more than five times the amount bequeathed to us by over a century of colonial rule. If we carry on at this rate, we will have broken all records in getting into debt and we will soon follow the path of a neighbouring country, whose solvency is now a matter of international concern and whose entire exports are insufficient to service its foreign debt.

There can be no quarrel with the increasing expenses to be incurred by the Ministries of Education and of Health. Indeed, if at all possible, such social investments must not only continue to be made, but the rate must be increased. There is also very little to quarrel with the demands of the Ministry of Defence as it is appreciated that, to defend a large territory, an adequate force must be kept. I would like, however, to warn the House that military expenditure generates its own pressure for ever increasing amounts. Parkinson's Law operates best in the armed forces. A private cannot hope for promotion to lance-corporal until he has induced somebody, probably his M.P., to successfully lobby for at least another six recruits. A Lieutenant-General cannot hope to become a full General until the number of men at his command have increased to justify

the creation of the post of General, and a General cannot hope to become a Marshal unless the number of Generals justify the creation of such a post; and it is needless to point out that from the experience of several developing countries, Marshals and even Generals begin to nurse ambitions to take over the direction of the country, if Finance Ministers do not find the wherewithal to keep the country solvent and to keep the Army going.

Before I leave this topic, Sir, I should like to touch briefly on one of the points in the estimates of Expenditure for the Armed Forces for 1967. On reading these Estimates, one gets the distinct impression that the \$250 million sought for the Ministry of Defence forms but part of a temporary bid for funds. We note that in the Development Estimates for the same Ministry, provision is made for the purchase of aircraft and ships. In the Ordinary Estimates, I find that there is a net reduction of 1,770 men. Perhaps, when the planes and the ships arrive, this House will be asked to approve supplementary votes to enable the airmen and sailors who man the planes and the ships to be paid their salaries. The Honourable Minister, Sir, has complained of the ever-increasing wages paid to civil servants. I think he should pay equal attention to the increasing wages paid to the armed forces. The Ordinary Estimates show a decrease of about 3½% in personnel but an increase of about 7% in personal emoluments. What the Minister said about the civil service seems to apply with equal force to the armed forces.

The Minister offers, as it were, an apology for his inability to control what he termed as expenditure charged by law. He quite rightly says that such expenditure cannot be reduced. But what he failed to say was that with better management, he can prevent such expenditure from increasing. Of the \$463 million, or some 25% of the 1967 Estimates of Expenditure that is charged by law, over \$219 million arise as charges on account of the public debt. What this House can hope for is that the Minister will in future try to

prevent this charge from growing by not borrowing. And if we must borrow, let it be only for projects which can pay their way.

The Minister's strictures on the civil service, I regret to state, are less than profound. If standards of public service have deteriorated, as is alleged, the cause must be sought at deeper levels, in a steady demoralisation that seems to have taken place in the civil service. Recruitments and promotions on the basis of an arbitrary ratio can only mean that the best man does not get the job. As head of the Treasury, it might be worth the Minister's while to inquire why one of the most efficient civil services in the world should have become less efficient over the years. The lessons to be learned from such an inquiry would prove to be of considerable value all round.

All in all, Sir, the Budget presented this year gives hope that wisdom has at last begun to dawn on at least some of the rulers of the nation. We cannot afford continuing Budget deficits, a rising public debt, depleting reserves and galloping and unproductive public expenditure, without seriously endangering the good luck this country has enjoyed so far. The Finance Minister appears to have at last appreciated the truism that we must out our coat according to our cloth. What is not so clear, of course, is as to whether it is also appreciated that the cloth must not be borrowed cloth either! Let us, however, hope that the signs of caution and wisdom displayed by the Finance Minister will prove catching and infect all ranks of a hitherto lavish and spendthrift administration. Examples of prudence and restraint must be set at the very highest levels. The Finance Minister has begun the process and any efforts that the Government makes towards these goals will enjoy our full backing and support. Thank you.

Dato' Abdullah bin Abdulrahman (Kuala Trengganu Selatan): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya sokong Bill Perbekalan yang ada di-hadapan kita ini. Saya rasa Kerajaan terkena-lah chari puncha² chukai baharu dari sa-masa ka-samasa untuk menambahkan hasil

negara guna bagi menjalankan ranchangan² pembangunan bagi faedah ra'ayat negara dan untuk lain² perbelanjaan, dan ini-lah yang di-buat oleh Kerajaan pada tahun ini.

Bagi pehak Pembangkang sentiasalah mereka tidak suka dengan usaha² Kerajaan menchari puncha² baharu bagi menambahkan hasil negara ini, pada hal mereka sa-tiap masa menggesa Kerajaan supaya menjalankan berbagai² ranchangan kemajuan untuk ra'ayat.

Kita semua tahu kalau wang negara, atau pun hasil negara kurang, bagaimanakah kita boleh menjalankan ranchangan² pembangunan dan ranchangan² kemajuan untuk ra'ayat itu dengan sempurna. Apa yang saya berharap, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-lah pehak ra'ayat jelata, khas-nya orang² yang mampu, atau pun orang² yang berada, benar² berkorban untuk membolehkan pehak Kerajaan menambahkan hasil negara dari sa-masa ka-samasa.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita ketahui petanian ada-lah satu²-nya puncha hasil yang terpenting buat negara kita pada masa ini dan bagitu juga perindustrian di-dalam negeri ini. Saya nampak ada beberapa kesulitan yang pada masa ini di-hadapi oleh pehak petani² dan ahli² perindustrian. Beberapa faktor² ini telah menyebabkan yang taraf ekonomi petani² ini tidak sa-bagitu tinggi dan taraf hidup mereka tidak sa-bagitu tegoh. Ada beberapa faktor, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tetapi saya hanya hendak sebutkan tiga faktor yang penting di-dalam hubungan ini ia-itu:

Yang pertama, ia-lah petani² kita maseh banyak lagi menggunakan chara pertanian yang lama dan di-samping itu pula mereka kurang ilmu pengetahuan mengenai chara² hendak menambahkan hasil pertanian mereka. Using old method in farming and lack of knowledge in the technique of modern farming.

Yang kedua—faktor yang kedua ia-lah kurang modal, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untuk membeli tanah², membeli jentera dan membeli beneh².

Yang ketiga, ia-lah pemasaran yang tidak sa-bagitu sempurna lagi.

Untuk hasil² pertanian, maka di-sini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menggesa kepada pehak Kerajaan supaya boleh kita menambahkan hasil negara kita ini supaya menjalankan segala ikhtiar untuk mendapatkan petani² kita menggunakan jentera di-dalam pertanian mereka. To encourage mechanise farming, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Dan saya juga berharap kepada Kerajaan supaya lebeh banyak lagi mengeluarkan pinjaman² untuk modal kepada petani² ini dan juga kepada ahli² perindustrian supaya dengan modal² itu, maka dapatlah petani² kita membeli tanah² sendiri, jentera dan lain².

Dan yang ketiga, saya berharap Kerajaan akan chuba sa-bberapa daya membaiki kedudukan pemasaran untuk hasil² petani² ini dan ahli² perindustrian.

Berhubung dengan pemasaran ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, patut juga saya sebutkan tentang ada-nya banyak pertandingan, atau pun persaingan, atas barang² yang di-keluarkan oleh petani² kita dan ahli² perindustrian kita. Maka segala langkah patut-lah di-ambil oleh pehak Kerajaan supaya dapat mengatasi masaalah persaingan, atau pertandingan ini, muga² petani² kita dan ahli² perindustrian kita tidak menderita.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-lain daripada itu, saya juga berharap kepada Kerajaan supaya menggalakkan lagi petani² kita mengadakan majlis² perbinchangan dan kursus² dari satu masa ka-satu masa untuk membinchangkan bagaimana hendak menambahkan hasil mereka dan bagaimana hendak mengatasi kesulitan² yang mereka hadapi.

Sekarang saya sebut tentang kemungkinan mengurangkan kaki-tangan dan mengurangkan gaji² mereka. Sekarang ini apa yang patut difahamkan baik² oleh sa-tengah² pehak kaki-tangan Kerajaan, saya tekankan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-tengah², saya kata bukan semua, kaki-tangan Kerajaan, ia-itu pada masa sekarang ini negara Malaysia kita sedang menuju ka-arrah revolusi ekonomi yang dynamic, tetapi yang sayang-nya ia-lah pada masa ini juga kita dengar banyak

daripada kaki-tangan² Kerajaan ini yang mengancham hendak mogok, yang mengancham hendak bekerja mengikut peratoran dan ada pula mengancham hendak berhenti dan lain² perkara.

Saya suka menggesa kepada mereka² ini supaya mengambil sikap yang lebeh berpatutan, supaya mengambil sikap bertimbang rasa terhadap pehak Kerajaan, kerana kita tahu kalau mereka maseh meneruskan tindakan² mereka itu maka akibat-nya tidak lain, tidak bukan, ia-lah mengancham kepentingan negara dan bangsa kita. Now if some of these Government employees exist in their own desirable activities the consequences would be the destruction of the interest of our country and our nation. Dan ini-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, yang telah terjadi kepada sa-tengah² negara dan bangsa yang tidak jauh daripada kita. Apa yang kita lihat akibat² itu tidak menguntungkan kepada sa-siapa termasuk-lah kepada pegawai² Kerajaan sendiri.

Satu perkara, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untuk menambah hasil negara, saya suka hendak mengeshorkan kepada pehak Kerajaan, supaya menggalakkan badan² di-bawah kelolaan Kerajaan menyertai lebeh banyak lagi di-dalam bidang perniagaan dan perusahaan. Juga Kerajaan² Negeri patut-lah diberi sa-bberapa banyak galakan untuk menambah hasil masing², dengan jalan mithal-nya di-beri kepada mereka² itu atau masing² negeri perkhidmatan pegawai² kanan Kerajaan dan pakar² untuk menjalankan penyiasatan mengenai puncha² hasil baharu bagi negeri² itu. Sekarang kita tahu hasil negeri kita tidak sa-bagitu banyak dan dari itu kita boleh bayangkan bagaimana berat beban pehak Kerajaan Pusat kerana hendak memberi pertolongan kepada mangsa² banjir yang terjadi baharu² ini. Dan baharu² ini Kerajaan telah melancarkan Derma Kebangsaan untuk menolong mangsa² banjir. Di-sini, pada pendapat saya, ia-lah ini satu chabaran untuk mengukor sa-takat mana jujor-nya ra'ayat yang menjadi warga negara di-dalam Malaysia ini, dan untuk mengukor sa-takat mana ra'ayat ada perasaan timbang rasa terhadap ra'ayat sa-sama

ra'ayat. Dengan tulus ikhlas supaya kurang sedikit beban Kerajaan, saya berharap bagi pehak orang² yang mampu akan menghulorkan sa-berapa banyak derma terhadap Derma Kebangsaan ini. Kita yang menjadi warga negara di-dalam Malaysia ini patut-lah mengambil sikap sa-tiap masa ia-itu sikap berkorban dan sikap bantu membantu—to adopt the sense of dedication and the sense of sacrifice and civic consciousness, untuk menolong kita sama kita. Sekian-lah sahaja, terima kaseh.

Tuan Othman bin Abdullah (Perlis Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mengambil kesempatan berchakap bagi mengalu²kan peruntukan perbelanjaan yang telah di-bentangkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan itu. Saya sangat tertarek hati dengan beberapa perkara berhubung dengan hasil negeri yang telah di-bentangkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan dan telah pun menekankan sa-hingga terlanjur hendak mengurangkan pegawai² dan kaki-tangan² Kerajaan. Pada pendapat saya bahawa soal ini boleh dapat di-atasi dengan tidak payah mengurangkan pegawai² Kerajaan dan kaki-tangan² Kerajaan yang kita rasa sekarang ini amat perlu pegawai² dan kaki-tangan² Kerajaan itu menjalankan jentera kemajuan kita untuk mengikut kehendak² pembangunan kita pada masa sekarang terutama sa-kali jabatan² yang berkaitan dengan keselamatan dalam negeri dan juga pertahanan negeri ini yang mana bukan untuk di-kurangkan tetapi perlu di-beri layanan lebeh banyak lagi gaji dan layanan² yang istimewa lagi kepada mereka itu.

Pada pendapat saya, ada beberapa jalan yang dapat kita tambahkan hasil negeri ini sa-bagaimana yang telah ditegaskan bahawa Jabatan Keretapi selalu membuat beban bagi kita sa-tiap tahun dan perkara ini, saya rasa, boleh jadi kita atasi dengan melebehkan sedikit keuntongan, terutama sa-kali masa perjalanan keretapi haruslah di-tentukan jangan kadang² lewat, kadang² chepat, sa-hingga menyusahkan pelanchong², menyusahkan orang ramai yang akan menjadikan keretapi itu sa-bagai kenaikan kebangsaan,

kenaikan orang ramai. Bagi ahli² perniagaan dengan masa yang tidak tentu arah itu amat menyusahkan mereka.

Yang kedua berhubung dengan tambang keretapi perlu juga di-kaji kerana pehak Jabatan Penerbangan ia-itu kapal terbang telah pun mengurangkan tambang-nya tetapi keretapi maseh sa-takat itu saja tetapi saya rasa jikalau di-kurangkan sedikit sesuai dengan tambang motokar dan tambang² yang lain saya rasa keretapi menjadi kenaikan kebangsaan.

Bagitu juga sa-panjang sungutan² yang saya dapati bagi penumpang² keretapi yang perlu di-ambil perhatian sekarang ini ia-itu berhubung dengan kemudahan² yang ada di-atas keretapi, umpama-nya tempat ayer dari kelas satu sampai kelas tiga yang kadang² ada kadang² kering langsung yang menyusahkan penumpang². Bagitu juga saya rasa patut pehak Jabatan Keretapi menambahkan satu gerabak lagi ia-itu yang di-namakan gerabak pelanchong yang dapat menarek pelanchong² berjalan dengan keretapi dan di-samping itu untuk menarek pelanchong² melawat atau berjalan dengan keretapi. Jabatan Keretapi haruslah mengadakan beberapa pemandangan² yang elok dan chantek dan pehak Kerajaan harus mengadakan projek² pembangunan umpama-nya kilang² dan tempat² yang menarek pelanchong² supaya mereka gemar menaiki keretapi dari Utara sa-hingga ka-Selatan.

Dan lagi oleh sebab perkembangan baru sekarang ini banyak sudah lori² pengangkutan yang telah di-benarkan oleh Kerajaan dan beberapa jenis pengangkutan barang² sentiasa di-muatkan dengan lori² dan pengangkutan² lain tidak menggunakan keretapi lagi. Dan saya berseru kalau sa-kira-nya dapat pehak yang berkenaan membuat satu peratoran mewajibkan barang² yang tertentu umpama-nya kayu balak, batu², simen, lembu-kerbau dan sa-bagai-nya di-muatkan dalam keretapi dengan kemudahan² yang tertentu. Saya rasa dengan peratoran² ini dapat-lah ahli² perniagaan menggunakan keretapi, menyewa dan membawa barang² mereka itu.

Satu lagi berhubung dengan keretapi juga ia-itu sa-panjang yang saya dapati jalan² untuk menunggu ka-steshen² keretapi, sa-lain daripada steshen² besar, jangan terbiar begitu sahaja dan kemudahan² kenaikan umpama teksi khas untuk penumpang² keretapi yang berkehendakkan ada kemudahan² itu. Maka itu-lah yang menyebabkan orang ramai tidak banyak tertarek hati, terutama sa-kali pelanchong², menggunakan keretapi. Dan sa-terus-nya sa-panjang yang saya tahu bahawa satu perkara lagi yang harus di-buat oleh Jabatan Keretapi ini ia-itu mengadakan kelas satu bukan sahaja sa-hingga ka-Bukit Mertajam atau ka-Penang tetapi harus-lah sampai ka-Utara lagi kerana sa-panjang yang saya tahu bahawa pelanchong² yang hendak pergi ka-Utara dia lebih suka naik teksi dari Bukit Mertajam pergi ka-Perlis dengan tidak mahu menaiki keretapi daripada Bukit Mertajam ka-Padang Besar, kerana di-situ hanya kelas dua atau pun kelas tiga sahaja.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, satu perkara yang saya suka menarek perhatian Kerajaan lagi ia-lah berhubung dengan usaha² Kerajaan untuk mendapatkan penghasilan yang lebih banyak yang tidak payah mengurangkan pegawai² bagaimana yang saya katakan tadi. Pertama sa-kali Kerajaan harus-lah dengan serta-merta membentok sa-buah Jawatan-kuasa bagi memeriksa sa-mula keperluan kenaikan² seperti *Truck, transport, Land Rover* yang digunakan di-Pejabat² Kerajaan seperti mana yang biasa di-perbuat, sa-panjang ingatan saya, biasa di-buat oleh Majlis undangan Persekutuan pada masa yang lalu. Jadi, dengan ada-nya pengkajian itu saya rasa ada sa-tengah² Pejabat yang mempunyai truck atau pun land rover berlebihan telah memakan perbelanjaan yang chukup banyak. Jadi, dengan ada-nya pembentokan sa-buah Jawatan-kuasa bagi mengkaji satu persatu dari semua pejabat maka akan dapat-lah mengurangkan perbelanjaan bagaimana saya katakan tadi.

Yang kedua, pada masa sekarang ini Kerajaan sedang sebak membetulkan jalan, membesarkan jalan yang ada pada masa sekarang ini, tetapi saya rasa perkara itu harus-lah di-

berhentikan buat sementara waktu dan patut-lah di-tumpukan di-tempat² yang menjadi mangsa banjir dan juga tempat² yang mendatangkan faedah dalam meninggikan ekonomi, umpamanya, jalan² untuk menuju tempat² yang mengeluarkan kayu balak, yang mengeluarkan bijeh dan kemudahan² perhubungan masharakat, umpama-nya, jalan besar dari Pantai Timor ka-Pantai Barat dan sa-bagai-nya yang berhubung dengan hal-ehwal ekonomi, kerana saya rasa dari Utara sa-hingga ka-Selatan soal jalan raya ada-lah yang terbaik sa-kali di-antara negeri² lain, di-bandingkan dengan negeri² jiran kita yang ada pada hari ini. Jadi, saya rasa usaha² itu hanya sa-olah² usaha yang tidak banyak mendatangkan faedah dan melibatkan wang Kerajaan bermillion² ringgit pada tiap² tahun.

Yang ketiga-nya, Kerajaan membena bangunan² Pejabat² Kerajaan dan *quarters* atau rumah² pegawai yang menelan belanja yang banyak dengan alat² yang datang daripada luar harus-lah di-rentikan dan harus-lah Kerajaan menggunakan bahan² dan alat² yang ada di-dalam negeri kita sendiri, umpama-nya, menggunakan kayu kayan daripada negeri kita sendiri. Kerana dengan peralatan menggunakan kayu kayan lebih chantek, lebih murah dan lebih menarek dan menimbulkan *image* Malaysia kita ka-luar negeri mengatakan yang kita mempunyai bahan yang tersendiri untuk membena Pejabat² Kerajaan dan rumah² pegawai² Kerajaan. Saya rasa dengan chara kayu kayan daripada negeri kita ini boleh tahan berpuluh² tahun dan tidak banyak melibatkan wang untuk kita belanjakan atas perkara ini. Kita dan ra'ayat sekarang bukan berkehendakkan Pejabat² yang elok tetapi berkehendakkan semangat dan jiwa tiap² pegawai yang menjalankan kewajipan itu hendak-lah benar² berjiwa kebangsaan yang dapat menolong orang ramai dari semua segi, kita tidak boleh, umpama-nya, macham yang di-katakan oleh Yang Berhormat sahabat saya tadi membiarkan pegawai² itu duduk dalam pejabat² yang chantek dan molek berhawa dingin, umpama-nya, tetapi tidak banyak mendatangkan

faedah² bagi ra'ayat seluroh-nya. Kita berkehendakkan walau pun bangunan² itu daripada kayu berbentuk Malaysia tetapi jiwa yang ada di-dalam-nya dapat menolong ra'ayat dalam segi pembangunan yang ada sekarang ini.

Dan lagi saya rasa sa-tiap pejabat yang di-dirikan oleh Kerajaan pada masa sekarang ini dengan sendiri-nya ada *aircondition*. Sa-belum kita merdeka dahulu *aircondition* pun tidak ada, pejabat Kerajaan berjalan bagitu juga tetapi sekarang ini tiap² pejabat ada dengan *aircondition* yang memakan perbelanjaan yang chukup banyak, pada hal negara kita ini bukan-lah negeri yang panas sangat atau bukan-lah macham negeri² Eropah yang harus dudok dalam bilek sejok sa-tiap hari. Hal ini patut-lah di-kaji sa-mula supaya pejabat² yang berkenaan sahaja patut di-adakan *aircondition* atau berhawa dingin, biar pejabat lain terbuka supaya ra'ayat² tak takut untuk masuk berjumpa dengan pegawai² yang berkenaan, kerana ada satu pejabat yang saya fikir, tidak usah saya sebutkan di-mana, ada-lah satu pejabat yang berhubung dengan orang ramai mitha¹-nya berhubung dengan pehak D.I.D. dan Pejabat Tanah. Pejabat itu sekarang ini telah pun di-*aircondition*kan atau pun di-buat dengan baru dan ra'ayat² tidak berani hendak masuk ka-dalam, hanya dudok di-luar sahaja, kerana takut pegawai² itu marah kerana office ini chukup chantek pada hal pada masa dahulu orang itu pergi ka-pejabat itu masuk terus² bagitu sahaja. Jadi dengan kerana itu saya rasa tempat² yang tidak berkenaan yang mithal-nya saperti itu tidak payah-lah di-adakan *aircondition*, adakan-lah di-pejabat² yang berkenaan sahaja.

Sa-lain daripada itu, Kerajaan hendak-lah mengkaji sa-mula tentang lesen² teksi yang sekarang ini kita dapat tahu ada dengan quota-nya sakian banyak penduduk sakian banyak teksi, tetapi dengan ada-nya quota itu melibatkan berlipat² ganda ada-nya *private* sapu yang tidak langsung membayar hasil kepada Kerajaan. Jadi saya berseru kepada pehak yang berkenaan supaya mengkaji sa-mula

quota² ini kalau boleh di-lepaskan langsung quota² itu, ambil orang² yang benar², yang chenderong di-lapangan teksi itu supaya di-beri lesen² di-mana ada kemajuan² bagi pehak mereka itu—kita menjaga kepentingan orang yang dapat quota tadi, tetapi kita melupakan yang kita bermillion ringgit juga tidak dapat kutip chukai² dari *private* sapu itu. Dan berkenaan sharat² mengutamakan atau pun memberi keutamaan kepada bekas Pasokan Keselamatan itu juga patut di-luaskan lagi ia-itu di-beri peluang kepada orang ramai yang berpuluh² tahun bekerja hidup dengan menjalankan kereta itu-lah patut-lah di-utamakan lebeh dahulu dan di-beri peluang kepada mereka itu memiliki teksi² dengan bayaran chukai² yang banyak itu kepada Kerajaan kita.

Dan lagi Kerajaan hendak-lah mengadakan satu chukai lagi oleh sebab bersempena dengan tahun 1967 ini, tahun tamat-nya bahasa Inggeris sabagai bahasa rasmi dalam tanah ayer kita ini, perlu-lah Kerajaan membuat satu peratoran baharu ia-itu mengenai chukai bahasa bagi kedai² dan rumah² perniagaan yang menulis iklan atau nama kedai itu dengan bahasa yang lain daripada bahasa kebangsaan. Dengan chara itu boleh-lah menggalakkan orang ramai semua, tuan² punya kedai yang besar², terutama di-Ibu Kota ini jarang sangat menulis dalam bahasa kebangsaan macham di-negeri Siam yang dekat dengan negeri kita itu, ada bayaran pula dan dengan sharat mesti menulis dengan bahasa Thai di-letakkan di-atas di-perbuat lebeh besar daripada bahasa yang lain². Jadi dengan peratoran yang samacham itu akan menggalakkan orang ramai menggunakan bahasa kebangsaan sunggoh pun tidak tahu berchakap dengan chara lanchar tetapi bahasa itu ada. Itu menunjokkan yang ia menghormati dan menggunakan bahasa kebangsaan.

Satu perkara lagi yang saya suka hendak mengeshorkan kepada Kerajaan, sa-panjang perjalanan saya dari utara ka-sini, saya dapati banyak tanah² lombong yang telah di-ambil bijeh-nya tetapi tanah² itu terbiar dan kalau sa-kira-nya perkara ini berlaku

terus-menerus menunjukkan orang ramai akan terhempit kehidupan-nya pada masa hadapan kerana tanah² itu tidak di-pulehkan oleh Kerajaan. Jadi saya mengeshorkan kepada Kerajaan supaya berusaha dengan sa-daya upaya memulehkan tanah² bekas lombong itu supaya dapat orang ramai kembali hidup di-atas tanah dan dapat berchuchok tanam di-atas tanah itu supaya dapat mengatasi kesulitan tanah dan kesulitan² tempat tanaman dan kesulitan² tempat rumah tinggal bagi ra'ayat kita terutama sa-kali bagi ra'ayat keturunan kita pada masa hadapan. Dengan chara itu saya rasa boleh-lah mendatangkan ber-bagai² hasil lagi yang kita inginkan.

Satu perkara yang saya suka hendak shorkan juga bahawa walau pun ada pehak Kementerian Keselamatan Dalam Negeri mendaftarkan rumah² dan mendaftarkan orang² yang tinggal di-dalam tiap² rumah, tetapi saya rasa itu tidak mencukupi. Yang demikian saya shorkan supaya Kerajaan mendaftarkan rumah², sa-lain daripada dalam kawasan bandar, maka hendaklah di-jalankan pendaftaran dalam kawasan² luar bandar dengan di-beri nombor yang kekal, 'alamat yang tetap sa-bagaimana di-tempat² lain ada nombor² yang kekal dan 'alamat² yang tertentu dan ada pula penghuni² di-dalam-nya dan hasil daripada pendaftaran tadi boleh-lah Kerajaan mengenakan satu bayaran kechil, umpama-nya sa-buah rumah sa-ringgit untuk mengadakan pelan² rumah itu sendiri yang menyenangkan perhubungan surat menyurat; perhubungan luar dan sa-bagai-nya dan beruntung pula dari segi keselamatan dalam negeri. Perkara ini belum lagi di-buat oleh Kerajaan. Saya rasa perkara ini patut-lah di-ambil perhatian supaya pendaftaran balek samula rumah² dan di-beri nombor² yang tertentu supaya dapat kita mengetahui bilangan rumah yang sa-benar²-nya yang ada di-dalam Malaysia kita dan bilangan penduduk² (penghuni) tiap² sa-buah rumah itu sendiri dengan 'alamat² yang tertentu yang memudahkan pehak postman menghantar surat dan sa-bagai-nya untuk berhubung dengan pehak² yang

berkenaan. Kerana saya dapati dengan tidak ada-nya nombor² rumah di-kawasan² luar bandar itu tadi, bukan-lah saya hendak mengatakan pada siapa, surat² itu di-letakkan di-kedai², kadang² hendak panggil temuduga, kadang² soal Jema'ah Haji, kadang² di-panggil hendak memberi wang, langsung surat itu hilang berchichiran di-kedai² dan di-dewan². Dengan ada-nya pendaftaran sa-bagaimana saya kata tadi, maka itu akan dapat menyelamatkan barang² dan keselamatan sa-bagaimana yang saya kata tadi.

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: Panjang lagi!

Tuan Othman bin Abdullah: Sadikit lagi.

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: Berapa minit?

Tuan Othman bin Abdullah: Dalam lima sa-puluh minit lagi.

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: Persidangan ini di-tanggohkan sa-lama 15 minit.

Persidangan di-tanggohkan pada jam 5.15 petang.

Sitting resumed at 5.35 p.m.

(Mr Deputy Speaker in the Chair)

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: Perbahathan di-sambong sa-mula.

Tuan Othman bin Abdullah (Perlis Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, menyambong ucapan saya tadi, saya sukachita menarek perhatian Majlis ini ada satu soalan lagi ia-itu saya amat tertarek hati dengan suatu Bill yang akan di-bentangkan oleh Kerajaan ia-itu berhubung dengan Persatuan Peladang.

Saya rasa Persatuan Peladang ini satu persatuan yang memang sudah kena pada tempat dan masa-nya untuk mewakili seluroh petani² dan peladang² di-negeri ini. Kerana sudah banyak badan² yang terdahulu daripada itu, umpama-nya, Sharikat Kerjasama, maseh belum lagi dapat mengatasi kesulitan² hidup terutama sa-kali kaum² tani yang ada di-kampung².

Apa yang saya rasa perlu-nya Persatuan Peladang ini di-beri semangat dan jiwa yang baru bagi mewakili

petani² kerana baru² ini berlaku-nya banjir, malapetaka yang dahshat yang menyebabkan hasil petani² terutama sa-kali padi khas-nya di-kawasan utara rosak di-tenggelamkan ayer, dan sa-tengah-nya binasa langsung, dan ada sa-tengah² daripada itu yang hanya basah sahaja, tetapi pehak pekedai², kilang² dan orang² yang membeli padi menchari kesempatan untuk membeli padi² itu dengan harga yang paling murah dan menyedehkan sa-kali. Padahal orang ramai terpaksa menjualkan padi² mereka itu dengan serentak-nya datang bulan puasa dan Hari Raya dan di-sambut dengan pembukaan sekolah yang memerlukan wang² yang banyak untuk membantu pelajaran anak² mereka itu.

Mahu tidak mahu, terpaksa mereka itu menjual dengan harga yang paling murah dan menyedehkan sa-kali dan pada ketika itu saya perhati tidak ada badan² yang akan membela harga² padi itu supaya dapat mengatasi kesulitan² mereka itu.

Jadi dengan sebab itu-lah mereka itu terpaksa menanggung kerugian² yang banyak. Maka dengan tidak adanya badan² seperti itu teringat-lah saya kepada Persatuan Peladang supaya pehak Kerajaan harus-lah menumpukan bantuan supaya dapat persatuan ini mengadakan gudang² padi yang tersendiri yang dapat menyimpan padi² hasil keluaran petani² itu sebelum padi² itu di-jual dengan alat² pengering yang di-beri oleh pehak Kerajaan sendiri, dan juga berikutan dengan itu di-beri peluang dan bantuan kepada persatuan ini supaya mendirikan kilang² besar supaya dapat menjamin harga padi dan harga beras pada masa yang ka-hadapan.

Dengan jalan ini, tidak-lah petani² tadi menanggung kerugian yang banyak daripada harga² yang di-ambil kesempatan oleh pehak² pekedai² dan juga kilang² membeli dengan harga² yang paling murah sa-kali. Pehak FAMA dan juga pehak Sharikat Kerjasama harus-lah memberi bantuan atau pun pertolongan dan kerjasama salaras dengan ranchangan itu.

Berchakap berhubung dengan soal meninggikan taraf hidup peladang²,

saya rasa di-dalam Majlis ini perlu-lah saya ulangi sekali lagi memberi tahu Dewan ini, bahawa di-dalam negeri kita ini maseh banyak lagi keperluan hidup kita yang maseh di-bawa masok daripada negeri² yang lain, terutama sekali macham beras, bee hoon, gula dan lain² barang² keperluan yang di-bawa masok daripada luar ka-negeri kita ini. Jadi, dengan sebab itu, saya rasa sesuai-lah sangat chita² dan niat Kerajaan terutama sekali yang di-ucapkan oleh Menteri Pertanian dan Sharikat Kerjasama untuk menchukupkan keperluan² itu, di-usahakan dari sekarang dengan lebeh giat dan berlipat-ganda lagi dan dengan membagi bantuan yang penoh umpama-nya alat² untuk mereka usahakan perusahaan dengan sa-chara bersunggo² dengan meninggalkan sadikit sa-banyak usaha² yang terok dan tidak mendatangkan hasil² yang banyak, umpama memberi bantuan trekter dan juga memberi bantuan baja yang chukup juga menyediakan alat², tempat² yang dapat di-usahakan umpama-nya sawah padi dan sa-bagai-nya. Dan di-dalam hubungan² ini, sa-lain daripada tanah² Kerajaan yang banyak yang patut di-majukan oleh Kerajaan, yang patut di-ambil perhatian oleh Kerajaan, maka banyak lagi tanah², umpama-nya hutan simpanan sendiri, yang di-tengah² kawasan hutan simpanan itu tidak bertumbuh langsung dengan pokok² yang berguna dan tidak ada harapan langsung untuk bertanam dengan pokok² kayu *teak* dan sa-bagai-nya, jadi, hutan² itu patut-lah di-kaji samula, supaya di-beri peluang kepada perusahaan bertanam padi dan lain² tanaman yang dapat mengeluarkan hasil² negeri. Saya rasa, dalam negeri ini juga banyak hutan² simpanan yang tersebut itu juga perlu-lah di-kaji, dan saya rasa di-negeri² lain juga sama juga seperti di-negeri saya, ia-itu banyak hutan² yang tidak bertumbuh, hanya dalam lingkungan simpanan bagitu sahaja. Jadi, kalau sa-kira-nya hutan² itu di-buka maka saya rasa akan mendatangkan hasil² yang banyak. Sa-lain daripada padi, saya rasa minyak kacang juga di-bawa masok ka-dalam negeri kita ini. Dan lagi, saya rasa banyak lagi kawasan²

tanah dalam Malayasia kita ini yang sesuai dengan tanaman tebu yang mana patut di-beri bantuan dengan sa-penoh²-nya untuk penanaman itu, supaya dapat mengeluarkan hasil gula. Satu tempat yang saya berasa menarek hati, ia-itu sa-belah kawasan utara, ia-itu di-kawasan tanah yang chukup subur, dengan tanaman jagong dan juga ada satu kawasan lagi yang amat sesuai dengan tanaman tembakau. Tembakau Rothman yang ada sekarang ini, kebanyakan menggunakan tembakau² daripada tempat saya dan tempat² yang lain yang sangat subur di-tanam tembakau. Saya rasa bukan sahaja negeri Perlis, tetapi negeri Kedah dan Kelantan juga banyak tanah² saperti itu yang boleh di-galakkan dengan tanaman tembakau supaya mengeluarkan hasil tembakau yang lebih banyak dalam negara kita ini, dan kita kurangkan atau pun kita berhentikan langsung kemasokan daripada negeri² luar walau apa jenis tembakau sekali pun.

Sa-lain daripada chara² pertanian yang telah saya katakan tadi, bahawa masalaah penganggoran dalam negeri kita ini boleh di-katakan maseh belum dapat di-atasi lagi, terutama sekali di-kalangan pemuda-pemudi kita. Dalam meshuarat yang lalu saya juga me-minta pehak yang berkenaan supaya dapat menchari satu jalan untuk mengatasi masalaah penganggoran ini dan satu daripada perkara yang saya shorkan pada masa yang lalu yang perlu saya ulangi sa-mula ia-itu berhubung dengan ada-nya kilang² atau fektri bukan sahaja di-Ibu Kota ini di-penohi dengan kilang² dan fektri, tetapi perlu-lah di-siasat dan di-kaji supaya di-negeri² lain, di-negeri² di-Utra, di-Selatan, di-Tengah dan sa-bagai-nya harus-lah di-dirikan kilang supaya dapat kemudahan pemuda-pemudi tempatan yang ada di-tempat itu dapat pekerjaan, terutama sekali pekerjaan bagi anak² bumiputra kerana, apa yang saya dapat tahu, bahawa kilang² atau fektri yang ada dalam tanah ayer kita ini kebanyakan di-penohi oleh orang² yang bukan daripada bumiputra. Dan kalau ada pun, daripada pekerja² yang rendah², dan kalau hendak nampak pun hanya

hari pembukaan itu sahaja chuba² buat² ambil orang Melayu, kemudian chari jalan dua tiga bulan, buang hamba Allah itu. Jadi, dengan chara itu, tidak-lah dapat banyak orang² Melayu kita bekerja di-situ kerana kebanyakan yang meminta pekerjaan di-situ terdiri daripada bukan anak bumiputra. Kalau sa-kira-nya fektri² itu di-buat di-dalam kampong², maka dapat-lah di-ambil orang² yang daripada bumiputra—menggalakkan mereka itu menjalankan pekerjaan² dan lain² perusahaan yang berthabit dengan fektri atau gudang² perusahaan tadi ini.

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: Ini lebih daripada lima minit.

Tuan Othman bin Abdullah: Sadikit sahaja lagi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Sekarang saya berchakap dalam soal lain ya'ni soal yang berhubung dengan bekalan leterik. Saya chukup tertarek hati dengan ucapan Yang Berhormat dari Muar Utara dan kawan² saya tadi, berhubung dengan bekalan letrik ka-kampong² yang saya rasa patut-lah pehak Kerajaan mengambil aleh dan juga mengkaji sa-mula peratoran² ber-hubong dengan pemberian bekalan letrik di-kampong². Kerana, memang-lah benar sa-bagaimana yang telah di-suarkan oleh beberapa orang wakil² mengatakan yang bekalan letrik ini mengutamakan atau mengutarakan kapada kilang² perusahaan sahaja, tidak bagi kampong². Padahal *hydro electric power* telah pun di-buat untuk memberi kemudahan kapada semua tempat² termasuk kampong², tetapi apabila orang kampong minta supaya letrik itu sampai ka-kampong² mereka, pehak yang berkenaan letrik menjawab rugi dan sa-bagai-nya. Saya rasa perkara ini patut-lah pehak letrik memberi pengorbanan sama dengan Kerajaan negeri ini, ia-itu sama² menanggung rugi, supaya dapat kemudahan dan kesentosaan bagi orang ramai sakalian.

Satu Perkara lagi yang berthabit dengan kerugian yang di-buat alasan, ia-itu sebab banyak sangat memakan belanja soal memasang *cable*. Saya rasa soal ini boleh dapat di-atasi ia-itu kira-nya dengan memakai *over-head* bagitu sahaja, sa-bagaimana yang

di-buat di-negeri Thai yang mana lampu letrik itu sampai ka-kampong², rumah² atap dan sa-bagai-nya yang hanya memakai *over-head* bagitu sahaja, tidak memakai *cable*. Dan kata mereka itu, tidak-lah ada apa² bahaya, kalau buat *cable* pun ada juga bahayanya—kalau hendak bagi kemudahan pada orang, dengan chara *over-head* pun orang terima dan tidak-lah banyak merbahaya-nya. Jadi, saya rasa kalau sa-kira-nya hendak kurangkan belanja, itu chara yang lebeh selamat, yang lebeh baik kerana orang ramai berkehendakkan bekalan² letrik.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya amat tertarek hati dengan seruan Yang Teramat Mulia Tunku Perdana Menteri berhubung dengan Kaji Sejarah, terutama sejarah tanah ayer kita. Saya mengambil peluang memberi sa-penoh² sokongan dan menyeru pehak yang berkenaan supaya mengeluarkan sejarah² yang benar dan mengkaji samula sama ada tulisan² sejarah yang pada masa ini di-keluarkan menjadi bacaan anak² di-sekolah itu benar atau tidak. Umpama-nya, saya beri satu mithal, di-antara sejarah² Melayu yang saya baca berhubung dengan Singapura umpama-nya, atau pun Pulau Pinang. Orang yang membuka Singapura ia-lah Tuan Raffles dan orang yang membuka Pulau Pinang ia-lah Captain Light. Jadi, yang sa-benar-nya sejarah² yang sa-benar-nya bukan Raffles, atau Captain Light yang membuka negeri Singapura yang harus di-ketahui oleh anak chuchu kita pada masa ini dan pada masa ka-hadapan, tetapi ada orang Melayu yang membuka negeri² itu, tetapi oleh sebab sejarah itu telah di-bakar oleh Raffles di-laut Bengkalis pada pertengahan abad yang ka-19 dahulu, maka sejarah² yang benar tidak-lah dapat di-pungut dengan sa-benar²-nya.

Bagitu juga saya beri mithalan-nya, hal² yang lain berhubung dengan sejarah tanah ayer kita ini di-salah-balekan, atau pun di-salah-gunakan, atau pun di-baharu²i dengan meminda sejarah² yang benar. Jadi, saya berseru kepada pehak² Kaji Sejarah, terutama sa-kali Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, supaya mengusahakan soal² ini, mengkaji sa-mula sejarah² itu,

bukan sahaja untuk kita pamirkan tulisan² lama, tetapi yang sa-benar-nya patut-lah kita tulis kembali sejarah² yang benar yang menjadi bacaan umum bagi anak chuchu kita pada masa hadapan dan kalau perlu sejarah² yang ada pada masa sekarang ini yang di-anggap sa-paroh palsu supaya di-mansokhkan langsung dan di-haramkan langsung daripada menjadi bacaan umum, terutama sa-kali untuk jenerasi kita pada masa ini dan pada masa ka-hadapan.

Pada akhir-nya, saya amat-lah dukacita sa-kali menyebutkan, mendengar ucapan dari Yang Berhormat wakil dari Batu yang maseh lagi membangkit²kan soal bahasa lain daripada bahasa kebangsaan di-jadikan bahasa rasmi yang mana soal ini ada-lah satu soal yang melanggar Perlembagaan dan ketahui-lah kita sa-umum-nya bahawa wakil dari Batu dan Parti Buroh sa-benar hanya bukan-lah gulongan² yang chintakan dan ta'at setia kepada tanah ayer kita ini, tetapi sa-balek-nya ini-lah gulongan² dan Parti politik yang akan menjahanamkan perpaduan dan akan merosakkan Perlembagaan dan menjadi puncha perpechahan dan pergadohan dalam tanah ayer kita ini.

Saya berseru sa-kali lagi kepada Kerajaan supaya mengawasi soal ini supaya mengambil perhatian dari sekarang, kerana tahun ini-lah tahun bahasa kebangsaan akan di-jadikan bahasa rasmi yang tunggal, maka tahun ini-lah patut di-jadikan satu undang² yang ketat mengkaji sa-mula ta'at setia sa-tiap warga negara yang ada dalam tanah ayer kita ini supaya bersiap sedia dan bersedia untuk menghadapi sa-barang kemungkinan dan sa-barang perubahan. Sekian.

Tuan Stephen Yong Kuat Tze (Sarawak): Mr Speaker, Sir, the significant part of the Honourable Minister of Finance's Budget speech is where he stated that it would be necessary to reappraise the existing Government policies in the course of 1967, so that the expenditure could be accommodated, as he said, within bounds. He also sounded a warning note that a

choice has to be made between comprehensive schools and the increased pay for public service. He said, and I quote:

"With some strain, we might be able to afford one or the other but we simply cannot afford both."

This, Mr Speaker, Sir, shows, if I might say so, a sad lack of direction on the part of the Alliance Government. Is the comprehensive schools system to go, or should a major retrenchment exercise, as he has said, and an overall pay cut from top to bottom of the Civil Service take place? Either event, in my view, is basically wrong. Surely, the expenditures of these two were anticipated years ago—with a little bit of calculation? The rate of expansion, for instance, the current expenditure and other expenditure in this connection, could have been foreseen and worked out. If the education bill is becoming too much, we will ask: "Why did not the Finance Minister put down his foot in the first place, why embark on something when it could be calculated that the financial burden would be too heavy to bear? If the comprehensive school system were to go, then all the million of dollars that we have spent would be a dead loss, a write-off, and a waste which need not have occurred at all in the first place.

I think the trouble, Sir, is that the Alliance Party has the habit of making promises to people for the sake of winning votes and later the people will have to be told, as the Honourable Minister of Finance now tells us, that they have to face the facts of life and must accept that we can only provide what we can afford. That leads me, Sir, to the question, why should the Honourable Minister of Finance have to come to this House to present us with a situation of having to forego something which is already there. Surely, a decision of this sort is a prerogative of the Cabinet? Are we, therefore, to assume that the Finance Minister has failed to make his colleagues in the Cabinet appreciate the facts of life?

The Honourable Minister of Finance told us that the increase of expendi-

ture in 1966 had taken place in spite of Treasury efforts to limit or turn down demands for additional funds from various Ministries and Departments. That leads us to ask, why should the Treasury and the Finance Minister allow themselves to be prevailed upon by the Ministers and Departmental heads to incur additional expenditure? This is not expected of an efficient and methodical Government. In other democratic countries, if the Finance Minister cannot control his colleagues, he would invariably tender his resignation.

Now, in view of this serious financial position we are in and the gloomy economic future, there should be a second look at the Development Plan and the expenditure incurred. Have we got the money's worth after all these years? Ministers talk glibly of immense success of the Development Plan, and of the millions which have been poured in. Now, how much really of these which have been poured in have come back in the form of higher production and higher national income? The Finance Minister talked of priority and I think he is right there, but I would say that the emphasis now ought surely be on projects which will generate income, or economic projects, rather than on social projects. We have heard Honourable Members talk of prestige projects which are white elephants. Now, without being disrespectful to religion, and also mindful of its importance in one's life, I think the building of houses of prayers and such like would not enjoy priority over, say, land development schemes or hydro-electric schemes, which will materially benefit many people; nor do I think the habit of some Ministers making on the spot donations of public funds to localities visited by them is going to streamline the development schemes or help towards savings.

Sir, with the ending of confrontation and the agreement reached with the Indonesians, there is really no necessity to spend too much on defence. The Communists trouble that we have heard so much of is more of an internal trouble than an external one, and, if we were to take the words of

the Indonesians, there seems to be no difficulty at all to clear up the incursionists along the border in Eastern Malaysia under the joint operation of the Indonesian and Malaysian forces.

Now coming to dealing with subversive elements within the States, Communists or otherwise, I think, it is more of a battle for one's mind than the using of physical force. Many young men and women are being detained and such detention cost a lot to the State and public funds. People are asking, is there any rehabilitation programme at hand for these people? If the Government were to take a negative attitude to this, then there will be required more and more funds under the Head of Internal Security. The Government, therefore, can do well by showing not in words but by deeds that we have genuine democracy here, and instruments of mass media, such as television and radio should not be made the monopoly of the Party in power. Let the Opposition have the opportunity to use them, and let the Opposition's view be voiced also, and thereby show the people that democracy exists and is being practised. That is the sort of way that we would like to see in our battle for ideology and it is the only way we can win and the only way we can save money in internal security.

After the Bangkok Agreement in which our Deputy Prime Minister participated early last year, we were told that a general election would be held in Sarawak. The wording of the Agreement was, "as soon as possible." Since then, several Ministers have also stated that for the Sarawak State general election will be held in August or September this year. We know that the Election Commission went into action, and the Chairman of the Election Commission told the Press that the work as far as the Commission was concerned would be completed by November, 1966, and that a 30-day period would be given to the public to make comments on the recommendations, and that the recommendations together with the report would be tabled at this meeting of this House.

We must assume, Mr Speaker, Sir, that the Chairman of the Commission knows or knew what he was talking about, and that the report and recommendations were in fact ready by the end of last year. However, Sir, we have come here to this meeting, and I regret to find that such a report and recommendations are not to be found. What is holding up this report and recommendations? Has the Alliance Government stopped these from being made known or has the Sarawak State Government stopped these from being made known? If so, I would urge the Central Government to use its influence to see that the State Government would refrain from doing so. After all, we know very well that the Alliance Government here is in complete control of the Sarawak Alliance. They even managed to relieve the former Chief Minister of his office, because he proved to be recalcitrant—and, after all, the Government has given its words to the Indonesian on behalf of us all that election would be held as soon as possible. I think the time since the words were given—the time of August or September, over a year—could be quite adequate for the term "as soon as possible" to apply. And if we were to expect Indonesians to keep their words, then I think we expect the Alliance Government to keep its words too. If election were not to be held for any reason this year, then I think it would be a breach of faith not only to the Indonesians but also to the people of Sarawak. I notice that the Minister of Lands and Mines has been appointed the Director of the Election for the Sarawak Alliance Party. He may have to be away in Sarawak for some months when the election is going on, or before the elections take place. Now, since the Minister of Lands and Mines' portfolio has nothing to do with the State election, I hope he will relinquish his post as such, when he takes up his post as Director of Elections, so that he may not seem to be receiving a salary as a public servant while doing a private job.

To save expenditure, I would commend to the Honourable Minister of Finance to persuade his colleagues in

the Cabinet to abolish certain Ministries which are sinecure, or which have come about because of political expediency. For instance, I do not know what the Ministers of State are doing—and the expenditure on Civil Defence should have been axed completely.

It is a very depressing picture as painted by the Minister of Finance that the prices of primary products, such as rubber and tin, have always been affected adversely by the releases of stockpile by the United States of America, a country which we are told is our ally and friend. The unpardonable sin here, I think, is, according to the Minister of Finance, "All these releases were made without prior consultation". This had been repeated time and again. Sir, we have to ask what happened to our man in Washington? Surely, this is the sort of job that he is primarily supposed to do and, therefore, it leads us to look at the men the Government has sent abroad to represent the country. All the money that we spend on the establishment of embassies, the furnishings and the salaries being paid, are they worth being paid at all? What have they done to promote trade for the country? Are the people sent abroad of the right calibre, or are the posts just rewards for certain performances which they have done for the Party in power but not because of their capabilities? The Honourable Minister of Finance and his colleagues ought to look into this. Perhaps, we can save quite a large sum of money, if we are going to apply a strict test on that score. We ought to have for our products good markets, and we have to ensure that we get economic prices for them. The way to maintain prices is to find some better use for our products. The Honourable Minister of Finance referred to intensive research activities on rubber, and he remarked, "I wonder if enough is being done in this field." If he thinks that an intensive research is necessary—and I think it is so—then I think the Honourable Minister of Finance should make adequate provisions for such research, because the ball is in his court.

Tuan Hanafi bin Mohd. Yunus (Kulim Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun menyokong Anggaran Perbelanjaan yang di-bentangkan oleh Menteri Kewangan di-dalam Rumah ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, walau pun sa-tengah² chukai yang akan di-kenakan dalam tahun ini ada yang membebankan sa-bahagian kechil ra'ayat², tetapi pada perasaan saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-kira-nya ra'ayat² yang mendudoki negara ini, yang telah mendapat kesenangan di-dalam negara ini, yang sentiasa mengaku ta'at setia dalam negara ini, maka tidak patut-lah mereka itu bersusah hati dan berasa bimbang dengan kenaikan chukai sedikit sa-banyak yang di-naikkan oleh Kerajaan sekarang ini.

Kita lebeh tahu—bagitu juga yang di-terangkan oleh parti pembangkang tadi yang bermaksud supaya pembangunan negara ini di-jadikan nombor dua, pehak saya sendiri tidak setuju dengan shor² yang di-kemukakan oleh parti pembangkang dari Sarawak tadi. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam negara kita yang baru, kita hendak membena segala ranchangan² untuk memberi kesenangan kepada ra'ayat seluruh-nya. Maka terpaksa-lah kita mengeluarkan segala wang yang banyak bagi mempertahankan negara kita walau pun yang di-terangkan oleh parti pembangkang tadi yang negara kita telah habis konfrontasi-nya dengan Indonesia, tetapi saya perchaya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, keadaan negara kita sekarang ini tidak-lah bagitu puleh dan tidak-lah bagitu aman. Maka sa-memangnya-lah pehak² parti pembangkang ini suka menjadikan negara kita ini di-dalam kachau bilau dan di-dalam huru hara.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam ucapan Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan ada menyebutkan: di-sebabkan kekurangan wang ini, maka terpaksa-lah boleh jadi kata-nya segala pegawai² Kerajaan akan di-kurangkan gaji-nya dan juga akan di-kurangkan sa-bahagian-nya. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada fikiran saya tidak-lah baik kalau kita jalankan dasar negara kita ini semacham kerana maseh banyak lagi chara² dan jalan² yang kita dapat mengurangkan perbelanjaan. Satu chara.

pada fikiran saya, yang tidak menguntongkan sa-siapa, tidak menguntongkan pegawai² Kerajaan dan tidak menguntongkan pehak Kerajaan ia-itu elaun² sewa rumah yang kita berikan kepada pegawai² Division I yang saya dapat faham elaun² ini sa-hingga \$400 dan \$500 yang di-beri kepada pegawai² ini bukan-lah dapat kepada pegawai ini hanya dapat kepada tuan² punya rumah. Maka ini kalau sa-kira-nya dapat di-atorkan supaya Kerajaan dapat membena rumah² Kerajaan yang chukup atau pun Kerajaan dapat memberi pinjaman² kepada pegawai² ini dapat membena rumah-nya sendiri, maka di-sini saya perchaya kita dapat menchermatkan beberapa million² ringgit di-masa yang akan datang.

Di-samping itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ingin berchakap sedikit di-dalam mana kita menerima warga-negara daripada orang² lain daripada bumiputera ini ia-itu sharat² kera'ayatan dalam negara kita ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berbangkit gema daripada segala pertunjok² perasaan dan bantahan² yang di-jalankan oleh sa-tengah² warganegara yang asal-nya lain daripada negara ini, yang lain daripada bumiputera ini, maka gema ini bukan sahaja telah menghebohkan dalam negara² kita sendiri bahkan samasa saya mendapat peluang di-berikan saya melawat baharu² ini kanegeri² ia-itu Siam dan Filipina maka di-dalam negeri Filipina saya telah berjumpa dengan sa-orang China yang asal-nya daripada Malaya ini. Ia telah mencheritakan kepada saya bagaimana mereka² orang China yang menjadi warganegara dalam Filipina sekarang ini telah di-tekan dan tumpit, di-tindas oleh Kerajaan Filipina di-sebabkan pertunjok² perasaan dan segala tindakan² yang di-jalankan oleh orang² China dari Malaya ini. Maka bukan sahaja orang² di-sini yang dapat kesusahan bahkan di-sebabkan sedikit bahagian orang² yang tidak ta'at setia yang sa-benar²-nya kepada negara ini, telah membuat kachau bilau, maka orang² China di-luar negeri telah mendapat kesusahan. Maka ini-lah pada fikiran saya patut sangat dan wajib sangat-lah bagi Kerajaan kita sekarang ini mengkaji sa-mula segala kera'ayatan

dan warganegara yang kita telah berikan kepada pehak orang² luar yang lain daripada bumiputera negara ini. Kerana, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada fahaman saya tidak ada satu negara saperti mana Malaysia ini yang penduduk²-nya dari pada orang² lain daripada bumiputera yang dapat kesenangan sa-olah² mereka itu berada di-dalam shorga, apa yang di-chitakan semua-nya dapat. Maka ini-lah yang kita kehendaki sangat supaya Kerajaan, apabila hendak meluluskan satu² orang yang lain daripada bumiputera menjadi ra'ayat dalam negeri ini, bukan sahaja sa-kadar di-soal, dan dapat di-jawab dengan pelat dan telur bahkan kalau sa-kira-nya dia dapat berchakap dengan faseh sa-kali pun, dia dapat tulis-menulis sa-kali pun, maka saya berchakap ini sangat-lah berkenaan Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kerana dalam tahun 1967 ini ia-lah tahun bahasa kebangsaan akan menjadi bahasa rasmi yang di-gunakan tunggal dalam negara kita ini bahkan siasatan itu hendak-lah kita siasat daripada ra'ayat² yang asal daripada negara lain itu yang meminta menjadi warganegara ra'ayat negeri ini latar belakang yang kera'ayatan itu. Kadang² mereka itu faseh berchakap dalam bahasa kebangsaan, bijak, chekap menulis, sa-tengah²-nya ada mendapat kelulusan dalam bahasa kebangsaan tetapi kalau sa-kira-nya segala kelakuan dan tabi'at dan segala latar belakang tidak menta'ati, tidak mengikutinya segala undang² yang di-jalankan oleh Kerajaan pada hari ini, maka tidak-lah berfaedah, tidak-lah patut diterima mereka menjadi warganegara negeri kita ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka menarek perhatian ia-itu negara Thailand sa-buah negara yang berhampiran sangat dengan negara kita dan negara sahabat kita, maka orang² di-sana kalau sa-kira-nya ada bangsa² lain yang tinggal keturunan yang lama di-sana, maka dapat-lah mereka itu menjadi ra'ayat negara itu dengan sharat mereka terpaksa bertutor dalam bahasa Thailand dan terpaksa boleh surat-menyurat bahkan nama-nya sa-kali diubah. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, maka saya tidak-lah berkehendakkan

supaya Kerajaan kita ini mengubah nama² orang² lain negara dengan nama² bumiputera, tetapi sa-takat mana yang patut yang saya terangkan tadi, patut kita selidek dengan halus²-nya, jangan sa-kadar orang itu dapat berchakap dengan faseh, bersharah, maka kita dengan bulat² telah menerima mereka menjadi warganegara yang kita serahkan nyawa dan negara dan anak chuchu kita kelak kapada mereka yang pepat di-luar dan renchong di-dalam.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berbangkit dengan ini-lah juga maka di-dalam negara kita sekarang ini telah berlaku berbagai² jenayah, berbagai² rampasan yang tidak menghiraukan nyawa manusia. Maka daripada segala kelakuan² ini telah bangkit dengan sebab segala ra'ayat² yang mengaku ta'at setia, sa-benar²-nya mereka tidak ta'at setia kapada negara ini. Maka ini saya fikir Menteri Keselamatan Dalam Negeri dan juga Menteri Hal Ehwal Dalam Negeri supaya mengambil perhatian yang berat sa-kira-nya di-dapati sa-saorang yang melakukan kesalahan yang berat yang kita pandang akan merosakkan negara kita, yang kita pandang akan menjahanamkan segala keturunan² kita yang akan datang. Maka sa-kira-nya mereka itu berasal dari negeri lain yang telah menjadi warganegara di-sini, maka patut-lah di-luchutkan kera'ayatan mereka itu dan di-seru keluar dengan baik-nya daripada negara kita ini, barangkali dapat mereka itu dudok dengan selamat di-negara² lain.

Sa-kira-nya segala apa² yang di-jalankan mengikut chara² demokrasi dalam negeri kita ini maka kita tangkap dan bichara di-hukum enam bulan, sa-tahun, dua tahun. Maka, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada fikiran saya—tetapi entah-lah saya belum pernah masuk lagi—di-dalam jail kita ini chukup senang, dapat melihat wayang gambar, makanan chukup, exercise, main itu main ini, maka tidak menjadi kesusahan kapada pehak² yang sedia hendak membuat kekachauan, hendak merosakkan negara kita.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ingin berchakap lagi ia-lah berkenaan dengan pelajaran. Saya menguchapkan terima kasih dan sa-tinggi² tahniah kapada

Menteri Pelajaran yang ada sekarang ini yang telah lama menjawat jawatan Menteri Pelajaran ini, dan keseluruhan Pegawai²-nya yang telah mengator, dan mengusahakan dasar² pelajaran hingga dapat di-jalankan dasar pelajaran kita ini dari sa-tahun demi sa-tahun bertambah² baik, tetapi apa yang saya merasa runsing sejak daripada tahun 1960 lagi saya telah berchakap dalam Dewan yang lama dan berulang² sahingga pada hari ini, saya suka hendak mengungkit balek ia-itu tentang buku² text sekolah. Ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, menjadi sangat² keberatan kapada anak² kita yang hendak pergi ka-Sekolah² Menengah, walau pun kita selalu hendak memberi kelebihan kapada anak² kita supaya dapat mem-pelajari ilmu² dan pelajaran yang tinggi tetapi di-sebabkan buku² text ini, maka telah menjadi kesusahan. Saya tertarek hati dengan Renchana Pengarang *Utusan Melayu* pada hari ini yang telah menyiarkan cherita bagaimana helah guru² bukan-lah semua guru² besar dan guru², tetapi ada sa-bahagian kechil telah menchari keuntongan dari pada buku² text ini yang di-tempah khas tidak mahu di-beli di-tempat lain, tidak mahu ada perlawanan buku ini di-sebabkan ada keuntongan (komishen) dan berbagai² chara, maka yang ini satu perkara yang tuan² kedai buku ini menaikkan harga terpaksa di-kenakan bagi komishen, kerana dia kena menderma itu, derma ini, maka pengeluar² buku ini untuk hendak mendermakan balek maka terpaksa-lah di-naikkan harga buku.

Yang kedua, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, buku² sekolah ini tidak sama, dalam sekolah² di-Tanah Melayu ini, bahkan satu² negeri, bahkan satu² district. Saya telah beberapa kali telah merayu kapada Menteri yang berkenaan supaya buku² text sekolah ini di-samakan supaya kita dapat menggunakan-nya 3, 4 tahun. Kerana dalam 3, 4 tahun ini kita dapat faedah kapada orang² yang mempunyai anak lebeh dari pada satu. Kalau sa-kira-nya anak-nya dalam Darjah III, Darjah IV, Darjah V, maka sa-kira-nya anak² darjah 3 naik darjah 4 maka dapat-lah dia menggunakan buku-nya yang di-bacha oleh

abang atau kakak. Maka ini ia-lah menjadi satu chara mengurangkan perbelanjaan kepada penduduk² terutama sa-kali penduduk² dari kampung yang kita dapati tidak dapat melanjutkan pelajaran-nya ka-Sekolah² Menengah di-sebabkan buku² text-nya sangat mahal sekarang ini.

Mr Deputy Speaker: Panjang lagi!

Tuan Hanafi bin Mohd. Yunus: Dalam lima minit lagi.

Mr Deputy Speaker: Masa sudah sampai pukul 6.30 petang, sambong sa-mula hari esok.

Tuan Hanafi bin Mohd. Yunus: Terima kaseh.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion

Tuan Mohamed Khir Johari: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menhadangkan supaya Majlis ini di-tangguhkan.

Tuan Senu bin Abdul Rahman: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong.

ADJOURNMENT SPEECH

RECOGNITION OF SELECTED INDIAN UNIVERSITY DEGREES IN THE TEACHING PROFESSION

Tuan C. V. Devan Nair (Bungsar): Mr Speaker, Sir, I raise the subject of the recognition of University degrees from India not merely as a politician but this is a matter which has concerned trade unionists in this country for quite some time. I think this House was told more than a year ago that the question of recognition of foreign degrees, including degrees from Indian universities, and the equivalences that would be accorded to these degrees in local terms, was a subject of consideration by some Ministerial Committee. To-date we have not heard about the results of the work of this Committee.

Meanwhile, several graduates from reputable Indian universities who are working in our schools and performing the work of graduate teachers, continue to be treated on a discriminatory

basis. I would appeal to the Honourable the Minister for Education to consider this matter on the basis of justice and equity. There can be very little doubt what the result would be if the question of recognition of Indian University graduates was considered on such a basis, bearing in mind also the principle of equal pay for equal work.

Let us examine Sir, the basic facts. The Senates of the Universities of Malaya and Singapore recognise Indian University degrees, as do all the leading British universities, for purposes of determining acceptability of Indian graduates for the Diploma of Education courses provided by these two universities in this region. Several of the Indian University graduates teaching in our schools teach in upper sixth form classes in Government or Government-aided English secondary schools. Heads of our leading English schools are satisfied that these Indian graduate teachers doing sixth form work have been producing satisfactory, if not excellent, results. But for purposes of remuneration they are treated on the same basis as Grade III Malayan School Certificate holders if untrained professionally, and on the government normal trained salary scale or Grade IIA of the Unified Salary Scale if they have passed professional examinations. Such treatment, Sir, I would submit is clearly inequitable.

For all practical purposes, the Indian graduate teachers perform graduate functions, and the rate for the job must be applied. The Ministry would clearly not be prepared to allow the Grade III School Certificate holder to teach economics or mathematics in sixth form classes. Then, it may be asked, why this discriminatory treatment and the refusal to face facts.

The principles of justice and equity would demand that Indian graduate teachers be emplaced on scales applicable to local graduates and the graduates of other recognised foreign universities, with or without professional qualifications, as the case may be. The Indian university graduates do not ask for special treatment or for

more pay. They only ask that the *de facto* equivalences of their functions and responsibilities with those of other graduate teachers should be given *de jure* recognition and translated in terms of equal emoluments for equal work. Thank you, Sir.

The Minister for Education (Tuan Mohd. Khir Johari): Mr Speaker, Sir, I assure the Honourable Member that I am in full sympathy with all teachers, and not less among them the Indian graduate teachers. Now, the position with regard to Indian degrees in the teaching profession at present is that all such University graduates are considered for employment on a lower grade than graduate status for a number of years before being emplaced on graduate status, where their services have been found to be satisfactory.

However, the general question of the recognition of Indian degrees for Government service is the responsibility of the Government Standing Committee on the Evaluation of Foreign Degrees under the Chairmanship of the Principal Establishment Officer of Malaysia. This Committee has so far dealt with the question of American degrees. Other foreign degrees, including those of India and

other Commonwealth degrees, are still under consideration by this Committee. Now, this process has necessarily got to take time in view of the complexities involved. In India, for example, the accreditation system as they have in the states does not exist. However, for teachers recruited into the U.T.S., my Ministry has already improved the former terms of employment to give a better status and salary to graduates of Indian universities of international repute.

Now, with regard to the question of Indian graduates teaching in Form Six classes, it must be appreciated that there is no provision in the U.T.S. regulations to provide for special consideration for teachers who teach at form six level. There are Indian graduates who teach in the upper secondary level, as there are also other normal trained and college trained teachers, but such teachers are paid their respective salaries according to qualifications and grade until such time when they achieve a promotion post after satisfactory teaching experience at this level.

Question put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at 6.40 p.m.