

**Jilid IV
No. 26**



**Hari Sabtu
27hb Januari, 1968**

**PERBAHATHAN
PARLIMEN
DEWAN RA'AYAT YANG KEDUA
PENGAL KEEMPAT
PENYATA RASMI**


KANDONGAN-NYA

PENANGGOHAN (USUL) [Ruangan 4297]

**PENERANGAN OLEH AHLI YANG BERTHORMAT
DARI BATU (Dr Tan Chee Khoon) [Ruangan 4298]**

RANG UNDANG²:

**Rang Undang² Perbekalan, 1968 (Bachan Kali Yang
Kedua) [Ruangan 4301]**



MALAYSIA

DEWAN RA'AYAT YANG KEDUA

PENGGAL YANG KEEMPAT

Penyata Rasmi

Hari Sabtu, 27hb Januari, 1968

Persidangan bermula pada pukul 10.00 pagi

YANG HADHIR:

- Yang Berhormat Tuan Yang di-Pertua, DATO' CHIK MOHAMED YUSUF BIN SHEIKH ABDUL RAHMAN, S.P.M.P., J.P., Dato' Bendahara, Perak.
- „ Perdana Menteri dan Menteri Hal Ehwal Luar Negeri, Y.T.M. TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN PUTRA AL-HAJ, K.O.M. (Kuala Kedah).
- „ Timbalan Perdana Menteri, Menteri Pertahanan, Menteri Hal Ehwal Dalam Negeri dan Menteri Pembangunan Negara dan Luar Bandar, Y.A.B. TUN HAJI ABDUL RAZAK BIN DATO' HUSSAIN, S.M.N. (Pekan).
- „ Menteri Kewangan, Y.A.B. TUN TAN SIEW SIN, S.S.M., J.P. (Melaka Tengah).
- „ Menteri Kerja Raya, Pos dan Talikom, Y.A.B. TUN V. T. SAMBANTHAN, S.S.M., P.M.N. (Sungai Siput).
- „ Menteri Pengangkutan, Y.B. TAN SRI HAJI SARDON BIN HAJI JUBIR, P.M.N. (Pontian Utara).
- „ Menteri Pelajaran, TUAN MOHAMED KHIR JOHARI (Kedah Tengah).
- „ Menteri Kesihatan, TUAN BAHAMAN BIN SAMSUDIN (Kuala Pilah).
- „ Menteri Perdagangan dan Perusahaan, DR LIM SWEE AUN, J.P. (Larut Selatan).
- „ Menteri Kebajikan 'Am, TUAN HAJI ABDUL HAMID KHAN BIN HAJI SAKHAWAT ALI KHAN, J.M.N., J.P. (Batang Padang).
- „ Menteri Buroh, TUAN V. MANICKAVASAGAM, J.M.N., P.J.K. (Kelang).
- „ Menteri Hal Ehwal Tanah dan Galian dan Menteri Ke'adilan, DATO' HAJI ABDUL-RAHMAN BIN YA'KUB (Sarawak).
- „ Menteri Muda Kebudayaan, Belia dan Sokan, ENCKU MUHSEIN BIN ABDUL KADIR, D.P.M.T., J.M.N., P.J.K. (Trengganu Tengah).
- „ Menteri Muda Pelajaran, TUAN LEE SIOK YEW, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Sepang).
- „ Menteri Muda Kewangan, DR NG KAM POH, J.P. (Teluk Anson).
- „ Menteri Muda Hal Ehwal Dalam Negeri, TUAN HAMZAH BIN DATO' ABU SAMAH (Raub).
- „ Setia-usaha Parlimen kepada Menteri Kesihatan, TUAN IBRAHIM BIN ABDUL RAHMAN, J.M.N. (Seberang Tengah).

- Yang Berhormat Setia-usaha Parlimen kepada Menteri Buroh,
TUAN LEE SAN CHOON, K.M.N. (Segamat Selatan).
- „ Setia-usaha Parlimen kepada Menteri Kewangan,
TUAN ALI BIN HAJI AHMAD (Pontian Selatan).
- „ TUAN NIK ABDUL AZIZ BIN NIK MAT (Kelantan Hilir).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDUL GHANI BIN ISHAK, A.M.N. (Melaka Utara).
- „ TUAN ABDUL KARIM BIN ABU, A.M.N. (Melaka Selatan).
- „ WAN ABDUL KADIR BIN ISMAIL, P.P.T. (Kuala Trengganu Utara).
- „ TUAN ABDUL RAZAK BIN HAJI HUSSIN (Lipis).
- „ Y.A.M. TUNKU ABDULLAH IBNI AL-MARHUM TUANKU ABDUL RAHMAN, P.P.T. (Rawang).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABU BAKAR BIN HAMZAH, J.P. (Bachok).
- „ TUAN AHMAD BIN ARSHAD, A.M.N. (Muar Utara).
- „ WAN ALWI BIN TUANKU IBRAHIM (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN RAFAEL ANCHETA, A.M.N. (Sabah).
- „ DR AWANG BIN HASSAN, S.M.J. (Muar Selatan).
- „ TUAN AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Muar Dalam).
- „ TUAN CHAN CHONG WEN, A.M.N. (Kluang Selatan).
- „ TUAN CHAN SEONG YOON (Setapak).
- „ TUAN CHAN SIANG SUN, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Bentong).
- „ TUAN CHEW BIOW CHUON, J.P. (Bruas).
- „ TUAN CHIN FOON (Ulu Kinta).
- „ TUAN C. V. DEVAN NAIR (Bungsar).
- „ TUAN SYED ESA BIN ALWEE, J.M.N., S.M.J., P.I.S. (Batu Pahat Dalam).
- „ DATIN HAJJAH FATIMAH BINTI HAJI ABDUL MAJID (Johor Bahru Timor).
- Yang Berbahagia TAN SRI FATIMAH BINTI HAJI HASHIM, P.M.N. (Jitra-Padang Terap).
- Yang Berhormat TUAN GANING BIN JANGKAT (Sabah).
- „ TUAN GEH CHONG KEAT, K.M.N. (Pulau Pinang Utara).
- „ WAN HASSAN BIN WAN DAUD (Tumpat).
- „ DATO' HAJI HUSSEIN BIN MOHD. NOORDIN, D.P.M.P., A.M.N., P.J.K. (Parit).
- „ TUAN HUSSEIN BIN SULAIMAN (Ulu Kelantan).
- „ TUAN HAJI HUSSAIN RAHIMI BIN HAJI SAMAN, S.M.K., J.P. (Kota Bharu Hulu).
- „ TUAN LEE SECK FUN, K.M.N. (Tanjong Malim).
- „ DR LIM CHONG EU (Tanjong).
- „ TUAN LIM PEE HUNG, P.J.K. (Alor Star).
- „ TUAN T. MAHIMA SINGH, J.M.N., J.P. (Port Dickson).
- „ TUAN JOSEPH DAVID MANJAJI (Sabah).
- „ DATO' HAJI MOHAMED ASRI BIN HAJI MUDA, S.P.M.K. (Pasir Puteh).
- „ TUAN MOHD. DAUD BIN ABDUL SAMAD (Besut).
- „ TUAN MOHAMED IDRIS BIN MATSIL, J.M.N., P.J.K., J.P. (Jelebu-Jempol).

Yang Berhormat TUAN MOHD. TAHIR BIN ABDUL MAJID, S.M.S., P.J.K.
(Kuala Langat).

„ TUAN HAJI MOHAMED YUSOF BIN MAHMUD, A.M.N. (Temerloh).

„ WAN MOKHTAR BIN AHMAD (Kemaman).

„ TUAN HAJI MOKHTAR BIN HAJI ISMAIL (Perlis Selatan).

„ TUAN MUHAMMAD FAKHRUDDIN BIN HAJI ABDULLAH
(Pasir Mas Hilir).

„ DATO' HAJI MUSTAPHA BIN HAJI ABDUL JABAR, D.P.M.S., A.M.N.,
J.P. (Sabak Bernam).

„ TUAN MUSTAPHA BIN AHMAD (Tanah Merah).

Yang Berbahagia 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).

Yang Berhormat TUAN NG FAH YAM (Batu Gajah).

„ TUAN HAJI OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Hilir Perak).

„ TUAN OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Perlis Utara).

„ TUAN RAMLI BIN OMAR (Krian Darat).

„ TUAN HAJI REDZA BIN HAJI MOHD. SAID, P.J.K., J.P.
(Rembau-Tampin).

„ RAJA ROME BIN RAJA MA'AMOR, P.J.K., J.P. (Kuala Selangor).

„ TUAN SEAH TENG NGIAB, P.I.S. (Muar Pantai).

„ TUAN SENAWI BIN ISMAIL, P.J.K. (Seberang Selatan).

„ TUAN SOH AH TECK (Batu Pahat).

„ TUAN HAJI SULEIMAN BIN ALI (Dungun).

„ PENGIRAN TAHIR PETRA (Sabah).

„ TUAN TAJUDIN BIN ALI, P.J.K. (Larut Utara).

„ TUAN TAMA WENG TINGGANG WAN (Sarawak).

„ DR TAN CHEE KHOON (Batu).

„ TUAN TAN TOH HONG (Bukit Bintang).

„ TUAN TIAH ENG BEE (Kluang Utara).

„ TUAN HAJI ZAKARIA BIN HAJI MOHD. TAIB, P.J.K. (Langat).

YANG TIADA HADHIR:

Yang Berhormat Menteri Kerajaan Tempatan dan Perumahan,

TUAN KHAW KAI-BOH, P.J.K. (Ulu Selangor).

„ Menteri Hal Ehwal Sarawak, Y.B. TAN SRI TEMENGGONG JUGAH
ANAK BARIENG, P.M.N., P.D.K. (Sarawak).

„ Menteri Penerangan dan Penyiaran dan Menteri Kebudayaan,
Belia dan Sukan, TUAN SENU BIN ABDUL RAHMAN
(Kubang Pasu Barat).

„ Menteri Pertanian dan Sharikat Kerjasama, TUAN HAJI MOHD.
GHAZALI BIN HAJI JAWI (Ulu Perak).

„ Menteri Muda Ta' Berjabatan, TUAN HAJI ABDUL KHALID BIN
AWANG OSMAN (Kota Star Utara).

„ Menteri Muda Pembangunan Negara dan Luar Bandar,
TUAN SULAIMAN BIN BULON, P.J.K. (Bagan Datoh).

„ Setia-usaha Parlimen kepada Timbalan Perdana Menteri,
TUAN CHEN WING SUM (Damansara).

„ TUAN ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAJI TALIB, P.J.K. (Kuantan).

Yang Berhormat WAN ABDUL RAHMAN BIN DATO' TUANKU BUJANG, A.B.S. (Sarawak).

- .. TUAN HAJI ABDUL RASHID BIN HAJI JAIS (Sabah).
- .. TUAN ABDUL TAIB BIN MAHMUD (Sarawak).
- .. DATO' ABDULLAH BIN ABDULRAHMAN, S.M.T., Dato' Bijaya di-Raja (Kuala Trengganu Selatan).
- .. TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI MOHD. SALLEH, A.M.N., S.M.J., P.I.S. (Segamat Utara).
- .. TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN SAAID, J.P. (Seberang Utara).
- .. PUAN AJIBAH BINTI ABOL (Sarawak).
- .. TUAN JONATHAN BANGAU ANAK RENANG, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- .. PENGARAH BANYANG ANAK JANTING, P.B.S. (Sarawak).
- .. TUAN CHIA CHIN SHIN, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- .. TUAN FRANCIS CHIA NYUK TONG (Sabah).
- .. TUAN D. A. DAGO ANAK RANDAN *alias* DAGO ANAK RANDEN, A.M.N. (Sarawak).
- .. TUAN EDWIN ANAK TANGKUN (Sarawak).
- .. TUAN S. FAZUL RAHMAN, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- .. DATU GANIE GILONG, P.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).
- .. TUAN HAJI HAMZAH BIN ALANG, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Kapar).
- .. TUAN HANAFI BIN MOHD. YUNUS, A.M.N., J.P. (Kulim Utara).
- .. TUAN HANAFIAH BIN HUSSAIN, A.M.N. (Jerai).
- .. TUAN HARUN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N., J.P. (Baling).
- .. TUAN STANLEY HO NGUN KHIU, A.D.K. (Sabah).

Yang Amat Berbahagia TUN DR ISMAIL BIN DATO' HAJI ABDUL RAHMAN, S.S.M., P.M.N., S.P.M.J. (Johor Timor).

Yang Berhormat TUAN ISMAIL BIN IDRIS (Pulau Pinang Selatan).

Yang Berbahagia TAN SRI SYED JA'AFAR BIN HASAN ALBAR, P.M.N. (Johor Tenggara).

Yang Berhormat PENGHULU JINGGUT ANAK ATTAN, Q.M.C., K.M.N., A.B.S. (Sarawak).

- .. TUAN KADAM ANAK KIAI (Sarawak).
- .. TUAN KAM WOON WAH, J.P. (Sitiawan).
- .. TUAN THOMAS KANA, K.M.N. (Sarawak).
- .. TUAN KHOO PENG LOONG (Sarawak).
- .. TUAN EDMUND LANGGU ANAK SAGA (Sarawak).
- .. TUAN AMADEUS MATHEW LEONG, A.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).
- .. TUAN LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).
- .. DATO' LING BENG SIEW, P.N.B.S. (Sarawak).
- .. TUAN PETER LO SU YIN (Sabah).
- .. DR MAHATHIR BIN MOHAMED (Kota Star Selatan).
- .. TUAN C. JOHN ONDU MAJAKIL (Sabah).
- .. DATO' DR HAJI MEGAT KHAS, D.P.M.P., J.P., P.J.K. (Kuala Kangsar).
- .. TUAN MOHD. ARIF SALLEH, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- .. ORANG TUA MOHAMMAD DARA BIN LANGPAD (Sabah).

- Yang Berhormat **TUAN MOHD. ZAHIR BIN HAJI ISMAIL, J.M.N.** (Sungai Petani).
- „ **TUAN HAJI MUHAMMAD SU'AUT BIN HAJI MUHD. TAHIR, A.B.S.** (Sarawak).
- Yang Amat Berbahagia **TUN DATU MUSTAPHA BIN DATU HARUN, S.M.N., P.D.K.** (Sabah).
- Yang Berhormat **TUAN ONG KEE HUI** (Sarawak).
- „ **TUAN QUEK KAI DONG, J.P.** (Seremban Timor).
- „ **TUAN HAJI RAHMAT BIN HAJI DAUD, A.M.N.** (Johor Bahru Barat).
- „ **TUAN D. R. SEENIVASAGAM** (Ipoh).
- „ **DATO' S. P. SEENIVASAGAM, D.P.M.P., P.M.P., J.P.** (Menglembu).
- „ **TUAN SIM BOON LIANG, A.B.S.** (Sarawak).
- „ **TUAN SIOW LOONG HIN, P.J.K.** (Seremban Barat).
- „ **TUAN SNG CHIN JOO** (Sarawak).
- „ **TUAN SULAIMAN BIN HAJI TAIB** (Krian Laut).
- „ **TUAN TAI KUAN YANG, A.M.N.** (Kulim Bandar Bharu).
- „ **TUAN TAN CHENG BEE, A.M.N., J.P.** (Bagan).
- „ **TUAN TAN KEE GAK** (Bandar Melaka).
- „ **TUAN TAN TSAK YU** (Sarawak).
- „ **TUAN TOH THEAM HOCK** (Kampar).
- „ **TUAN YEH PAO TZE, A.M.N.** (Sabah).
- „ **TUAN STEPHEN YONG KUET TZE** (Sarawak).
- „ **TENGKU ZAID BIN TENGKU AHMAD** (Pasir Mas Hulu).

DO'A

(Tuan Yang di-Pertua *mempengerusikan Meshuarat*)

PENANGGOHAN (USUL)

Timbalan Perdana Menteri: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menchadangkan.

Bahawa apabila tamat meshuarat hari ini, Majlis ini akan di-tanggohkan hingga pukul 10 pagi hari Isnin, 5hb Februari, 1968.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saperti yang di-chadangkan Dewan ini di-tanggohkan sa-minggu lama-nya untuk hendak membolehkan Ahli² Yang Berhormat menyambut tahun baharu China, dengan sebab itu tidak di-adakan meshuarat pada minggu hadapan dan meshuarat ini di-mulakan pada 5hb Februari, hari Isnin, minggu sekali lagi.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya sukachita menchadangkan.

Menteri Kewangan (Tun Tan Siew Sin): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong.

Usul di-kemuka bagi di-putuskan, dan di-setujukan.

Di-putuskan,

Bahawa apabila tamat meshuarat hari ini, Majlis ini akan di-tanggohkan hingga pukul 10 pagi hari Isnin, 5hb Februari, 1968.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua: Ahli² Yang Berhormat, ada satu permintaan daripada Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu di-bawah Atoran dan Peratoran Meshuarat 14, ia-itu dia menerangkan sedikit berkenaan dengan perkara yang di-sebutkan di-dalam perbahathan petang hari semalam—Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu berasa hangat dan di-kachau, translation-nya, "hot and bothered", berkenaan dengan perkara ini. Jadi, saya izinkan dia menerangkan.

PENERANGAN OLEH AHLI YANG BERHORMAT DARI BATU (Dr TAN CHEE KHOON)

Dr Tan Chee Khoon (Batu): Mr Speaker, Sir, I am indeed grateful to you for your kind indulgence in this matter.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua: Hendak berchakap apa Bahasa?

Dr Tan Chee Khoon (*dengan izin*): Mr Speaker, Sir, I wish to make a personal explanation regarding the personal attack made on me by the Minister of Education yesterday. I regret that the Minister of Education felt that I had made a personal attack on him when I referred to the fiddling of examination results. I did not—I repeat I did not at any time say he was personally responsible for doing that. But if I had attacked the civil servants who were responsible, the Minister would say that I was unfair as the civil servants had no chance to make a personal reply to my charges. I have in my short stay in this House tried not to make any attack on civil servants personally, and hence I had to lay the blame on the Minister of Education. There is nothing personal about it. But someone has to take the blame and I had to lay the blame on the Minister of Education in his official capacity. It is significant that the Minister did not say a word regarding the charge about the H.S.C. Entrance Examination. As for the statistics that he has produced, I shall comment on them when we reach the Committee stage of the debate on the Ministry of Education.

The other personal explanation that I wish to make is in regard to my son. It is unfortunate that the Minister should want to drag my son into this debate. Mr Speaker, Sir, to put the matter in its true perspective, I shall quote, very briefly, from the testimonial that my son obtained from the Headmaster of the Victoria Institution, Kuala Lumpur. I quote—

“Tan Kee Kwong (that is the name of my boy) has been a pupil of the Victoria Institution since 1960. He has made steady progress in his work and passed the School Certificate Examination with a Grade I in 1964. In 1966 he obtained the full Higher School Certificate with a pass in the General Papers, Principal level passes in Botany, Chemistry and Zoology, and Physics at Subsidiary level.

Kee Kwong had a coloured and rich life in the school, participating in every conceivable aspect of school life. He has been a real credit to the school in his diverse extra-curricular activities. In the field of sports he

has been an exceptionally active figure and has represented the school in cricket, soccer and hockey, and the House in athletics and water-polo.

Owing to his enthusiasm and able leadership, he was elected the school Hockey Captain and the House Captain for two successive years. Besides these, he has been a Committee member of the Literary and Debating Society, a member of the Science and Mathematics Society, and a senior Scout.

He was made a school Prefect in 1964, and two years later he achieved the rare distinction of being school Captain, a post requiring outstanding sportsmanship and leadership and scholastic ability. Tan Kee Kwong has been one of the outstanding pupils of the Victoria Institution, especially as an all-round sportsman, leader and scholar. He has rare leadership qualities and has helped greatly in maintaining discipline amongst the pupils during his tenure of office as school Captain in 1966. As school Captain too he has played a very leading part in moulding and shaping school life and helping the Headmaster in the day-to-day administration of the school. The post also entails great difficulties and sacrifice, especially as the Victoria Institution is a large school with so numerous activities. Kee Kwong was a very unselfish leader and could have done very much better in his examinations if the school had not made so many exacting demands on him.”

For the benefit of the Minister of Education, I have another boy who is now doing his finals in Medicine in the University of Singapore and he ended up there as the President of the University of Singapore Students Union and had a confrontation with the Prime Minister there. This boy that the Minister quoted, had applied for admission into the University of Malaya for courses in Medicine, Agriculture and Science. He failed to get into Medicine but got admission into Agriculture and Science. Although at that time I was already the Deputy Chairman of the University Council, I did not breathe a word of my son's application to any of the staff of the University of Malaya. But as the boy wanted to do Medicine, I persuaded him to repeat his examination.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Minister knows the boy personally and he also knows full well that the only reason why I approached him was that I felt the boy had literally sacrificed his studies for the good name of the school, as the Headmaster has stated. I am still grateful for the great favour that the Minister

has made to the boy, but it is unfortunate that he should drag this matter into this debate. To him I shall repeat what Caesar said to Brutus—"Et tu Brute" freely translated it means "And thou too Brutus". Thank you.

Menteri Pelajaran (Tuan Mohamed Khir Johari) (*dengan izin*): What the Honourable Member for Batu has said has not altered the situation. (*Applause*).

RANG UNDANG²

RANG UNDANG² PERBEKALAN, 1968

Bachaaan Kali Yang Kedua

Atoran Urusan Meshuarat di-bachakan bagi menyambong sa-mula Perbahathan yang di-tanggohkan atas masaalah, "Bahawa Rang Undang² ini di-bachakan kali yang kedua sekarang" (26hb Januari, 1968).

Menteri Hal Ehwal Tanah dan Galian (Dato' Haji Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Temerloh telah menyeru Kementerian Pertanian dan Sharikat Kerjasama supaya berikhtiar bagi mengawal tanaman padi supaya masa menuai padi tidak pula jatuh pada musim hujan dengan chara menukarkan masa² bagi menuai. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-tiap² Jajahan ada Jawatan-kuasa yang di-pengerusikan oleh Tuan Pegawai Daerah yang menetapkan tarikh untuk bertanam padi mulai dari menyemai dan menuai dan tarikh² ini ada-lah sa-lepas mengkaji musim hujan dan panas supaya bekalan ayer dapat di-adakan sa-bagai mana yang di-kehendaki. Di-beberapa kawasan terutama sa-kali di-Pantai Timor maseh berkurangan tali ayer dan petani menanam padi dengan berkual ka-langit, ia-itu bergantung kapada ayer hujan. Dengan hal yang demikian sangat sukar hendak menentukan tarikh menanam dan membuat segala pekerjaan menanam padi mengikut keadaan chuacha. Dengan hal yang demikian sangat-lah sukar bagi mengawal tanaman padi mengikut tarikh yang tertentu, malah petani² maseh menanam mengikut keadaan chuacha dan dengan hal yang demikian mereka terpaksa mengalami berbagai

jenis benchana alam saperti banjir, kemarau dan lain² yang di-sebabkan oleh perubahan keadaan iklim.

Walau pun bagitu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jadual bertanam padi di-tempat² ini di-buat dengan berpandu kapada chatitan² hujan² yang ada tersimpan di-Pejabat²-nya.

Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Muar Utara telah menyeru supaya Kementerian Pertanian dan Sharikat Kerjasama hendak-lah mengambil langkah bagi menambahkan lagi pengeluaran makanan² umpama-nya padi, jagong, ubi kayu dan lain². Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak-lah berniat hendak memberi penjelasan yang panjang lebar dalam perkara ini, pada petang kelmarin saya telah memberi penjelasan mengenai dasar² Kerajaan untuk membanyakkan tanaman² padi dan buah²an yang lain atau pun makanan² yang lain di-dalam negara kita. Di-dalam perbincangan untuk peruntukan pembangunan negara, saya perchaya, satu perbahathan akan lagi timbul dalam perkara ini, jadi elok-lah penjelasan dalam perkara ini di-tunggu sampai kapada tingkat itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Kuala Kangsar telah berkata sa-malam, ia-itu memandang kapada kekurangan Pegawai² Kerjasama di-kawasan Kuala Kangsar, Kerajaan mesti-lah mengadakan empat orang Pegawai Kerjasama bagi menjalankan tugas² yang banyak itu. Menurut susunan pentadbiran Bahagian Kemajuan Kerjasama, sa-orang Pegawai Kerjasama ada-lah di-tugaskan mengawal di-antara tiga puluh hingga empat puluh buah sharikat dalam satu kawasan atau lingkungan yang biasanya mengandongi satu District atau pun Daerah.

Di-kawasan Kuala Kangsar ada hanya 40 buah Sharikat Kerjasama yang boleh di-kawal dengan sempurnanya oleh sa-orang Pegawai Kerjasama. Walau pun bagitu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Bahagian Kemajuan Kerjasama menhadangkan hendak menempatkan sa-orang pemereksa kerjasama di-Kuala Kangsar untuk menolong pegawai yang ada. Demikian-lah sahaja jawapan saya bagi pehak Yang Berhormat Menteri Pertanian dan Sharikat Kerjasama.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-bagai Menteri Hal Ehwal Tanah dan Galian, saya ingin menjawab beberapa pandangan yang telah di-kemukakan dalam Dewan ini. Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Jitra-Padang Terap telah bertanya mengapa tidak di-buka tanah dengan lebih giat lagi, umpama-nya tanah² yang di-dapati tidak sesuai untuk ranchangan F.L.D.A. boleh-lah membuka untuk pemohon² persaorangan. Ahli Yang Berhormat itu telah menerangkan, ia-itu patut-lah perkara ini di-bincangkan di-dalam Majlis Tanah Negara untuk membuat ketetapan menggesa Negeri² itu membuka tanah. Saya ingin memberi penjelasan ia-itu Majlis Tanah Negara memang-lah telah membuat polisi seperti yang di-katakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat itu.

Ahli Yang Berhormat Dato' Ling Beng Siew daripada Sarawak telah menyeru supaya lebih banyak tanah lagi di-Sarawak di-beri kepada ra'ayat supaya dapat ranchangan pembangunan di-jalankan. Masaalah pemberian tanah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-bagaimana kita ketahui ada-lah masalah Kerajaan Negeri, bagaimana pun kita sakalian tahu bahawa Kerajaan Negeri Sarawak telah pun membahagi²kan tanah untuk ranchangan yang di-jalankan oleh Kerajaan, dan di-masa² yang akan datang, saya percaya lebih banyak lagi tanah² yang akan di-keluarkan oleh Kerajaan Negeri.

Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Temerloh telah menyentuhkan Jabatan Kehutanan, mengenai masaalah perusahaan kayu balak ya'ani tentang sukatan 50 cubic feet satu tan dan juga tentang timbangan 40 cubic feet satu tan apabila kayu balak itu di-muatkan di-atas kereta² atau pun terak².

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perkara 50 cubic feet satu tan yang di-kemukakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat itu dalam ucapan-nya, ia-lah chara mengira yang tertentu, ya'ani ukuran di-gelarkan true measure dan chukai² yang di-perbuatkan di-atas ukuran mengikut cubic feet, seperti juga dua ela satu depa, tiga kaki satu ela, bagitu-lah juga 50 cubic feet di-kirakan satu tan. Ini yang di-panggil true measure. Ukuran yang di-perbuat pada diameter balak,

atau pun pangkal dan di-dharab dengan panjang-nya. Tetapi kilang² papan dalam negara kita ini atau pun si-pembeli² di-ukur-nya lilitan balak² itu di-tengah² di-bawah kulit dan di-dharab dengan panjang-nya. Ukuran yang di-perbuat oleh si-pembeli, ia-lah chara yang di-gelar Hopp measure yang mana isi kayu kurang daripada true measure. Perbuatan ini ia-lah dengan suka hati si-pembeli sahaja dan betul-lah orang yang menjual kayu balak itu akan rugi, jikalau tidak berjaga².

Berkenaan dengan tafsiran berat kayu, maka telah di-persetujui oleh Jabatan Kerja Raya, Jabatan Kenderaan, Polis dan juga Jabatan Hutan menentukan 40 cubic feet, ia-lah bersamaan satu tan berat, bukan satu tan mengira volume kayu itu, tetapi satu tan berat. Persetujuan ini di-perbuat, ia-lah bagi menyenangkan mentaksirkan berat kayu balak yang di-muatkan dalam lori, jika tidak terpaksa-lah tiap² lori berisi kayu balak di-timbang, sebab jalan² raya ada-lah di-hadkan berat-nya bagi satu² kenderaan yang boleh melalui jalan itu. Maka dengan persetujuan ini, dapat-lah perkara berat kayu yang di-bawa oleh lori² di-tafsirkan dengan mudah. Perjalanan ini ada-lah menyenangkan yang sa-benar-nya pembalak² kayu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perkara cubic feet bagi mengenakan chukai tidak menjadi soal, sebab chukai kayu ada-lah di-kenakan kepada satu² cubic feet, sama ada di-Malaysia Barat, mahu pun di-Malaysia Timor. Bagitu juga kepada kenderaan, tiap² lori itu di-tentukan berapa cubic feet dia boleh memuatkan daripada segi berat kayu itu, tetapi bagi si-pembeli membuat ukuran-nya sendiri itu, ia-lah di-atas persetujuan si-pembeli dengan si-penjual.

Di-atas perkara menggalakkan perusahaan² kayu kayan mendirikan kilang² papan, memang-lah menjadi dasar Kerajaan di-dalam negara kita ini, ia-itu dengan sa-berapa boleh-nya kita menggalakkan penjualan keluar negeri kayu² yang telah di-jadikan papan, tetapi baru² ini tadi, kita terpaksa melonggarkan polisi itu, oleh kerana banyak sangat kayu balak yang keluar

dalam negeri kita dan kilang² papan tidak dapat membeli semua-nya untuk di-proseskan dalam kilang² itu. Polisi Kerajaan memang suka kayu² ini di-proses dalam negara kita sendiri, kemudian itu baharu-lah di-jual keluar negeri. Saya ingin menerangkan bahawa tidak lama lagi, saya akan mengadakan satu meshuarat dengan Pengerusi MARA mengenai perusahaan kilang² papan di-kalangan bumi-putra² kita di-Malaysia Barat di-sini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sedikit sahaja lagi, ya'ani saya minta kebenaran untuk berucap di-dalam bahasa Inggeris, memberi jawapan kepada Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for Ipoh, as usual, has made many wild allegations, which I am sure he himself does not honestly believe, against the Ministry of Justice. He alleges, amongst other things, that lawyers in this country do not know who the Minister of Justice is, because I, as Minister of Justice, was never seen in the courts. I agree, Sir, that I have never appeared in any court in West Malaysia, nor in East Malaysia, from the time I became a Minister. If I do show myself, as the Honourable Member appeared to have suggested, too often in courts, then I am sure he will come to the Dewan and he will say: "Look, what is the Minister of Justice doing in courts every now and then? Is he trying to interfere with the administration of justice?" Mr Speaker, Sir, this is the sort of Honourable Member of the Opposition with whom we have to deal in this Dewan. To say that lawyers in this country do not know who the Minister of Justice is, is really not to speak the truth. In fact, it is really an insult to their intelligence. In this House alone there are so many lawyers, to our right here, and also in front, and I have many other lawyers friends outside who have come to see me in the course of my duties as Minister of Justice.

His allegation that the Ministry of Justice or the Government has made no plans whatsoever for improvement of the courts, is again a cheap, wild attempt to pull wool over public eyes. If he had taken the trouble to study

the First Malaysia Plan, he would have discovered that there are provisions under Head 102 of \$4.4 million for Court Houses in West Malaysia, and again \$1.3 million for the Jesselton High Court. Whatever may be the provisions voted, Mr Speaker, Sir, the most important thing in the administration of justice is not whether or not we have first-class air-conditioned court rooms, but whether or not the Constitution, the Government, the Executive, and others in this country, guarantee that justice is done and seen to be done in Malaysia, and I think we, the Alliance Government, are very proud of our record that we have never at any time interfered with the administration of justice here.

Mr Speaker, Sir, for the information of this House—this really comes under the Development Plan—I would like to say briefly that since 1964 we have carried out these improvements to Court Houses: Court House, Kuala Berang, costing \$22,700, that was done in 1964; Court House, Klang, \$225,430, done in 1965; Court House, Kuala Trengganu, \$308,306 in 1965; Court House, Kuala Selangor, \$88,967. There are many other details which I can give to disprove the allegations of the Honourable Member, but I will reserve these until the proper time, that is, until the debate on the Development Estimates. Thank you, Mr Speaker, Sir.

Perdana Menteri: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kebenaran Tuan saya pohon menjawab dalam bahasa Inggeris diatas orang² yang telah memberi ucapan-nya dalam bahasa Inggeris. Sayang sedikit kebanyakan orang yang berchakap itu, masa kita hendak balas itu, mereka lari, tidak mahu dengar. Mereka tahu apa yang dia chakap itu bohong sa-mata² (*Ketawa*).

Mr Speaker, Sir, many things have been said and have been repeated in this House in the course of the general debate on the Budget. Some of them were said with the best intention for the good of this Government and in all honesty and sincerity, and I will say that whatever have been suggested which could be used by this Government will be used by this Government.

I would like to thank the Alliance Members for supporting the Government with their constructive proposals for the betterment of our society and the well-being of our country. What has been suggested by them, the Government will take due notice of, and I can promise that when the time comes, and if we are able to implement them, we will do so certainly.

We have had for instance Tun Dr Ismail, who told the House about the security of this country and this region, and what measures he considered necessary to guard ourselves against aggression. The suggestion is that, in view of the British withdrawal, we should strive to provide neutralisation for this area of South East Asia, guaranteed by the big powers, and in this neutralisation zone all the countries must sign treaties of non-aggression and a declaration of policy of co-existence. This is something which is worth giving thought to, but at the same time it is something which is difficult of achieving, without working hard and conscientiously for it and without making the right approach, and approach at the right time. So, while we bear the suggestion in mind, we will try and put it across to the countries with which we come in contact, either in this region or outside this region of South East Asia, in the hope that such a proposal would find acceptance by them. We must, as I have said, try and sound these nations and as they are all, or most of them are, very sensitive about this, we have got to find out the right time to do so and how to do it, and to sound them on the soundness of this scheme proposed by the Honourable Member.

Today Malaysia is moving well in the society of the other nations while, before, we were not so well disposed in the eyes of the other nations. Now they look more favourably upon us than they did before. We have emerged really from a period, when many countries ostracised us in the belief, or at least they thought, that we were stooges of the imperialist powers and so on. Not only did they ostracise us, but an attempt was made of course,

by President Soekarno, to crush us and also to wipe us out of existence. He found quite a lot of support from other countries, because he had a very strong propaganda machine, and with the support of this propaganda he was more or less believed. However, during all that difficult period, we maintained our position by carrying on as best as we could and at the same time trying to work our way into the confidence of these other nations in the hope that sooner or later the truth would come out and they will know as to who is at fault. Now, we all know that the President has swallowed his bitter pill and that those leaders who were helping him or working with him are similarly placed, while at the same time we have managed to win friends abroad. Today, even the Communist countries are more friendly disposed towards us. In the course of the next few days, perhaps you will find that we will be having diplomatic relations with Russia, who will set up an Embassy here, and at the same time we will have diplomatic relations with Yugoslavia, who will have their Ambassador in Bangkok accredited to the Court of His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong.

We are now free and able to move about and have been accepted by all free and independent countries as equals whereas we were not before. When we sign treaties with these countries we might persuade them to agree to peaceful co-existence, agree to non-aggression pacts and at the same time agree to the neutralisation of certain zones, in particular, South East Asia. But, as I said earlier, we must wait for the time to do and we must choose the right moment to do so. We must, at the same time, bear in mind that these so-called non-aggression pacts and so on are not 100% fool-proof; nevertheless, they will give us some form of confidence to feel that some of these countries do not intend to make war against us. We have had experience in the last War, when there were so many non-aggression pacts that were signed, but before the ink was dry on the paper one country started to attack another. But under

the new modern conception of non-aggression, I hope it would be much better than it was in those times of the second World War.

Now, as regards the five-power talk which we propose to have with Britain, Australia, New Zealand and Singapore, it is only to discuss how best we can make arrangements to defend ourselves against aggression in keeping with the terms of the Treaty which we made with Britain, with which these other countries associate themselves. These countries and ourselves have been associated in the Defence Agreement which we made with Britain since we became independent, and this so-called Treaty has held good in the face of the enemy—confrontation, aggression and what not—and in the face of the Communist trouble which we met in the last 10 or 12 years. But I will say that the agreement reached should be confined to the role that each participating country proposes to play in the event of trouble in pursuance of that agreement, and no more. We must at the same time look further ahead than just confine ourselves to the arrangements agreed to between these five countries. There must be other countries perhaps who find themselves in a similar position as we are, countries who might like to have a pact with us and with those of our neighbours; we must not try to exclude these countries but try to work with them as well, using this pact perhaps as a complement to this other agreement. Armed with this defence agreement with Britain, Australia, New Zealand, Singapore and ourselves, we would be in a good position to make agreements with others, because we will be confident in entering into any pact with others that we have the backing of these other countries who have associated with ourselves over the defence of this region of Asia. So, as I have said, it would be a good thing as and when we come into contact with these countries to sound them if the proposition is agreeable to them—the proposition to set up a neutral zone in this area of Asia. Whatever happens, there is still plenty of time between now and 1971 when the British propose to withdraw from this

area, and during this time—in the next four years—it is up to us to think to plan and to see how best we can secure ourselves against any aggression which naturally small countries like ourselves fear—and we have reason to fear all this, because we have had the experience of the confrontation which we had during the last few years from President Soekarno. However, there is no reason why the people of this country should panic, why they should change their mode of living, or why they should get anxious. They should not worry unduly but to rather have confidence that this Government will do everything within its power to safeguard our people from aggression from outside or trouble from within.

The pact with our old Allies will provide us with a certain amount of strength and will make us more dependable for any agreement with other countries. Our alliance may even be a source of strength to each other. Whatever it is, it will be understood that the Agreement which was made with our old Allies does not preclude us from making any other agreement with these other countries who want to make some defence arrangements with us to safeguard their sovereignty and their independence, in the same way as we are trying to safeguard our sovereignty and our independence.

It would be wrong, therefore, for anybody to think that this pact with our old Allies might prejudice our chances to work with the others. I emphasise here and now that it is not so and that it is our intention to seek friendly ties with all our neighbours and at the same time to include in any form of treaty we make with them, or we might enter with them, provisions within the treaty for non-aggression and for setting up of this neutrality zone.

This is the calm attitude we have taken, and this has brought forth, as Members have heard, from the Honourable Member for Bungsar, the remark—I quote—

“The projected withdrawal, ‘he said,’ of the British military presence from South East Asia by 1971 has caused the vigorous expression of distress and concern in Australia

and New Zealand, but in Kuala Lumpur we have only had the consolation of a barren calm."

I have given the reason for it just now. After all, what else can we do? We cannot go and shout threats, curses and throw bricks and to attempt to black-mail all these countries that have given us help all these years, just because they find that they are unable to maintain their position in this part of the world. We cannot cry our hearts out to them. After all, we are supposed to be independent and so we have got to take the bad and the good with independence. We cannot at the same time be independent and at the same time ask to be protected by some other power. After all, Britain, as I said, has got her economy to think about and I feel we have got to sympathise with her. Though what she has done is wrong, we know there is no point in repeating it, and it does not lead us anywhere. It is for us to look after ourselves and see how best we can arrange for the defence of this region and at the same time we can depend, as we have heard it said and we have been assured, that when there is need Britain will not leave us in the lurch.

The Honourable Member has also suggested that the security crisis and challenge that faces the nation does not appear to have received adequate response from the Government. I do not know what sort of response does he expect from the Government other than to take action in the manner we have already done. We have taken action to call the five nations for this talk to see how best we can plan and work out our plan for the defence of this region. We must not lose our heads and our mind by taking precipitate action over this, because it will lead us nowhere.

The Honourable Member can rest assured that the Government is not callous, as he suggested, nor unaware, nor unmindful of our duty to the nation which it has been our pleasure and privilege to lead for these last ten years from success to success. We have fought the Communists with the help of our allies within the country for 12 long years to a successful con-

clusion, and we have defended this country against Soekarno's "Crush Malaysia" policy of confrontation for three years with equal success. So, he can depend on it that we will not let this country down. If we remain calm and quiet, it is for some very good reason and for good purpose. There is nothing for the Honourable Member to get worried about. After all, he is in this House and he can always be informed if things change for the worse. So, no one, as I said, can accuse us of letting this nation down, for we shall never let this nation down.

The Honourable Member for Ipoh is not here to listen to my reply to his charges. However, that is his habit, we cannot stop it. The leopard cannot change its spots and so I do not suppose the Honourable Member for Ipoh can change. Having attacked people as much as he liked, lashing at them with his venomous tongue, he does not find it agreeable for him to be here to listen to our replies—so let it be. Whatever I have to say I will say and if he does not hear about it, at least it will be recorded in the Hansard of this House. The Honourable Member had much to say, as he always had, and when it comes to making slanderous attacks on the Government he is not found wanting in words. So, he comes out loudly with offensive lashings of the tongue. That is characteristic of him. He has never given credit to this Government for anything we do; we do not expect credit from him; and neither do you expect anything from a pig but a grunt. While he is loud in his abuse of this Government, about what this Government does and does not do, he has never at any time offered any constructive suggestion or proposals to the Government other than to attack us when opportunity arises.

He talked about the denial of freedom of expression and association. You can all see by the way he talks that there is no such thing as denial of freedom of expression for him. He has spoken in this House as he liked; he has spoken outside this House as he liked; and the things he said do not bear repetition in any decent society. The things he said, I do not think many

decent people would even say in private, but to him it comes out naturally because he is just that type of man. So there is no point of condemning him any more than we can, or try to correct his ways any more than we can, because he will never learn. If there is no such things as freedom of movement, freedom of speech, he would not have been free today and to take the platform outside this House.

He was appraised of what His Imperial Majesty the Shah of Iran had said in respect to certain human rights and equal opportunities for all who live in undivided loyalty—and equal opportunities for all who give undivided loyalty to this country is our motto. We agree with what His Imperial Majesty has said. We cannot, however, give equal opportunities to people who look elsewhere for their allegiance, people who jeer at everything we hold dear, people who disrespect our flag, people who make fun of our National Anthem, people who refuse to honour our Constitution, less still uphold it. Until these people can show their loyalty to this country, the problem of this equal opportunity, unfortunately, will forever exist. When we tried to introduce our education policy and then implement our National language, he was one of those who was violently opposed to it. He urged others to oppose it. It is people such as him, who bring discredit to this country and the society in which we live, people like him slither like a snake in the path ready to strike whenever an opportunity presents itself. If we want to build a united nation of Malaysia, we must have the material for it, and to collect all the good material that we need for the building of this nation will take time—a strong united Malaysian nation can never be built with the material we have today, where the people are so divided. All Malaysians will stand to lose if we listen to leaders such as the Member for Ipoh. He indulges in communal politics, because he knows if trouble breaks out it will be trouble between the Malays and the Chinese, who will be, perhaps, doing one another harm, and he and his friends probably will be sitting back and doing nothing. Therefore, if the Chinese and the Malays kill them-

selves, he is there, perhaps, to watch the fun. It does not harm him to say what he has said and does not harm him to continue saying what he has been saying and creating this communal suspicion and hatred and fear, because he will escape it.

When we were attacked by Indonesia, or by Soekarno, more than 3,000 people in this country left this country to join Soekarno's forces, in order to come back and attack us and dominate us. For whom? For Soekarno and for those powers who are foreign to us. The greatest challenge, therefore, to the Alliance Government, and to the well-being of this country, is the treachery of those who are pretending to be citizens of this country while working against it—working to overthrow this Government by force of arms. For whose benefit? For the benefit of some other power outside here.

The ten years that we have been in power have taught us our lessons and taught us on whom we can depend when we are in real trouble. Malaysia is not yet, as I said and I maintain it, a united nation; it takes time for us to work towards that end, and we can only achieve it when everybody in this country, however much he is opposed to the Government, at least can say, "I owe my loyalty to this country and to this country alone." But how many people can say that?

The Honourable Member mentioned about the arrest of Mr Lim Kean Siew. He has misquoted what I said in this House. What I said when I agreed to the release of Mr Lim Kean Siew was that he provided no more security risk to the country and he could safely be released, because at the time things were quietening down and there was no point in keeping him behind bars. I did not say that we had no right to arrest him—that was the impression he gave to this House. Mr Lim Kean Siew himself had admitted what he had done was wrong and that if he had known that things were going to turn out the way they did, he would never have supported it. It is not for me to quote any correspondence I had with him, because it would not be fair on him, but I can ask this House to believe me, when I

say that, when he was taken in, the arrest was justified in the interest of the peace of Penang, or in the interest of peace in Malaysia.

The Honourable Member also said that the members of the "Holy War" organisation in Kedah were released, and yet the non-bumiputras who were arrested at the same time were not. But this is not an absolute misrepresentation of facts to this House, and for that matter to the country, to the people of this country, to the public of this country, who, I think, are entitled to know the truth. There is no point for an Honourable Member of this House to get up and misquote facts just in order to make himself look big, or to make the Government look miserable, because the facts are that this organisation, the so-called "Holy War" organisation, has not done anything at all. When the Police knew of their existence, they just got hold of them and detained them, investigated all what they have done and then finally found that they have not done anything harmful and that they are no more a security risk, and they told them to go to the Sultan and swear that they would not do anything that is likely to jeopardise the peace of this country—and that is what they did. At the same time, those people, who were found to be at fault, or suspected to be a danger and security risk, are detained up to now. We do not care who they are—whether they are Malays or Chinese or Indians, or anybody. If they are a security risk to the country, it is our duty to put them in, so that the people in this country can expect to have peace in the country. So, it is mischievous to suggest that so many Chinese have been taken into custody and yet the Malays have not been. I could supply figures, but I do not think it is going to be of help to anybody. If I were to do that, it would merely create more suspicion, and it is going to create more communal consciousness, and that is the thing I am trying to avoid, because everybody must know that in a country like Malaysia with a multi-racial society, we all are living and sitting more or less on a keg of gunpowder. Anything wrong, anything that is not right,

anything that is likely to cause trouble between the races is just like setting alight this keg of gunpowder which would blow us all to smithereens. Nobody will benefit by it. So, we have got to be very careful of what we say and what we do, and that is the purpose of the Alliance Government, and since we have been in power we have been trying to prevent all this—and I think we have done quite well.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah (Bachok): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, minta penjelasan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua: Kemudian boleh minta penjelasan.

Perdana Menteri: So, he has espoused the cause of these mischievous people who owe no loyalty to this country; he is espousing the cause of these criminals who have no loyalty to this country at all, who are here to make trouble—and this is a dangerous thing to do. We know what *hartal* is; I think it is an Indian word. I know from reading about *hartal* that it is a form of passive resistance where all the shops and businesses close to show their resistance or to show their objection to any action taken by Government, but it is never intended to show force or to retaliate with force. So, in this case of Penang, when they called a *hartal*, they could perhaps enforce a *hartal* in respect of the big shops and businesses, but there was no point in their going round beating up peaceful small vendors who sell *goreng pisang*, *kachang puteh*, *belachan* and what not. This is pure wickedness. And the Honourable Member, while he stays quietly in security in his house in Ipoh, can talk about it now, but people like us who went among these people, who visited these troubled areas know what it is all about; and when we talk, we talk from experience. It was a dangerous thing for those people who called a *hartal* to set about it, using violence which had caused death and injury to so many innocent lives.

He talked about dictatorship in this Government—he said there is no more democracy in this Government. He mentioned as an example that we disallowed peaceful demonstration. He

himself knew the situation: he asked to hold a demonstration when President Johnson was here a year ago; he asked permission to hold a demonstration, and Tun Razak offered to him: "You can have your demonstration provided it is peaceful. If you can give your guarantee to have a peaceful demonstration, you can have as many demonstrations as you like." He immediately refused to have the demonstration, because he could not guarantee that it was going to be peaceful, and yet he comes into this House and talks about our disallowing peaceful demonstration. Who disallowed peaceful demonstration? The University of Malaya students held a peaceful demonstration when the American visitors were here and we allowed it, and things went on smoothly. But there is no guarantee that these people who are going to have a demonstration are going to have a peaceful demonstration.

As the Honourable Member for Batu knows himself—he is not here now—when there was a demonstration in Batu Road, he had to flee for security at the same time crying out: "These are not my men. These are not my men. I do not know them." (*Laughter*). These are the sort of peaceful demonstrations they want. And so now, where are they? (*Laughter*). If the Honourable Member wants a peaceful demonstration and provide himself as hostage, and if there is any outbreak of force or any outbreak of trouble we can put him behind bars, he can have as many demonstrations as he wants (*Applause*). So, this is the position.

As regards his remark that the Malaysian medals were given to UMNO and M.C.A. members only that is not really true and that is really mischievous. So many medals were made at the time and they were given as souvenirs to members—he himself got it. (*Laughter*). He got a gold one too. That he would not say here. They were given to politicians, Members of Parliament, members of the Police and security forces. It was given to everybody who had anything to do with this Government, and yet he can come here and say that it is only given to UMNO

and M.C.A. members—he did not even mention M.I.C. (*Laughter*). The truth is that nobody was excluded from receiving this medal, just because they happened to belong to some other party, or they are not affiliated to the Alliance Party. So, it is mischievous on the part of the Honourable Member to say something which he knows is not true, and that has all along been his politics—saying things which he, deep in his heart, knows are not true. Yet he says it because it suits him to say it.

On the subject of *ex gratia* payment to Tun Dr Ismail, I think no man deserves it more (*Applause*), because this payment was made in recognition of his services to this country, services which he gave even when this Party was working to win independence for this country. He had given up his own profession, given up everything he had, in order to work with us to win independence for this country and when independence was won, he served this Government all these years—in fact, he was the first Minister among us. He even served when he was asked to do during the time of the British administration. That is the least we can do for him. A Minister in his portfolio, if he wanted to enrich himself, he could have made millions. There was nobody who could stop it, nobody would know about it, but he did not. So, what is the paltry sum of \$60,000 to reward a person for the glorious service which he has given to this country? This is the sort of thing that the Honourable Member has brought up. When Tun Dr Ismail retired, he did not retire just because he wanted to retire. He had to retire on medical grounds, and I see from reports I have received from his doctors that he is very serious. He is a little bit better, but one cannot tell how long he will be (*Laughter*). I hope he will be well for many, many years to come (*Applause*). Whether he is out of the Cabinet or he is in, he has always been ready to offer us his help as he has done in this Budget debate when he gave his proposal of having this neutral zone and what not. It is a pity that the Honourable Member for Ipoh should find cause to quarrel about it at all.

Now, he has mentioned about dissatisfaction in the Civil Service, without quoting facts. I have got all the facts and figures here, but I do not think I need worry this House over this, because he is not here and I am taking too much time to give him too much publicity; and I do not think he deserves all this publicity (*Laughter*).

The Honourable Member for Batu—he also has disappeared—complained about wasteful items of expenditure and he brought up the subject of the Banqueting Hall for His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong. In actual fact, the Palace for His Majesty was originally a house that belonged to a rich Chinese man with ten wives and it had ten bedrooms. (*Laughter*). They were there for good purpose (*Laughter*). There is only one small place where His Majesty could give a dinner and, therefore, it is necessary to build a new Banqueting Hall for His Majesty, because we have had visits from Heads of State, important people from outside, and we want to hold functions in a proper place and in a proper manner. It is not possible to hold these in the Istana as it is now. So, we have had to build this new Banqueting Hall. In fact, I can tell this House that His Majesty is not staying in the Istana today, because when it rains it leaks. So, he is staying in Istana Trengganu just to keep himself dry and comfortable. In fact, we should not be building just a Banqueting Hall for His Majesty, but we should have built a good Istana befitting His Majesty's person.

Sir, as regards the Sungei Way Golf Course—he has mentioned that too—he thought that it is waste of money whereas, in fact, it is not a waste of money. It is a loan from the Government, and we have marked out these lots and we propose to sell them. When we realise money from the sale of these lots, we can not only pay back the Government the money which we borrowed from the Government but also run the Golf Club as a first-class Golf Club. It is something that this country needs because everybody has taken to golf. It is a good game and I think people, whether young or old,

should take to it, and while we can provide amenities for them to do so, I think they should take advantage of it.

The Honourable Member for Batu also touched on education and various other things like MARA and so on, and I think my colleagues, the Ministers, have suitably replied to them, which necessitated him standing up in this House this morning with the permission of the Speaker to try and defend himself, and as the Honourable Minister has said, it did not alter the situation. That is so. There is, however, one matter which he mentioned, again like the Honourable Member for Ipoh, about the denial of fundamental rights and so on. These are all nonsense, because nobody is denied any right here. He talked about depriving certain people of their citizenship and that it would make them stateless and so on. But he must realise that these people who worked against us are not, truly speaking, citizens of this country, and many of those who are earmarked for deportation, have not even got citizenship papers. While they are here, they have abused their right to be here: while they enjoy all the privileges and the rights, they have given nothing in return except to make trouble for this country. In other countries, I would say they might have been lined up and shot. A man from Formosa once told me, "If you do not want any of these chaps in your country, why don't you send them to Formosa? We know what to do with them. What we have done with them in our country", he said, "is to put them in a *sampan* and tell them to row straight down to the mainland of China. But if they even turn their face to look back, they will be shot. That is the way to treat them". But, I have no heart to send these people to Formosa, if they are going to be tossed about by a storm, if they are going to be shot when they turn back. So, these people should remember that while they are here, they have been given the same protection as anybody else who are citizens of this country and they enjoy all the privileges and amenities, and they should at least show their gratitude by conforming to law and order and by respecting this country. But they do not. Then, again,

as I said, when we talk of human rights, we must talk about those people who are good, who deserve to be given these rights as others. But these people do not.

The Honourable Member for Batu has, quite truthfully in the past, been quite free from slant or leaning on communalism in his speeches to this House, but this time he has changed a bit, as my colleague has pointed out in his reply to the Honourable Member. This is quite, I think, out of trend with the policy which his party, or the Labour Party advocates, and it is a sign that the Labour Party has probably become weak, and has nothing else to say except to turn to chauvinism—and so he spoke perhaps in the hope to rally the support of the chauvinists to agree with him. He spoke about the MARA College and so on. I think my colleague will reply to that. But when he talked about apartheid and so on, he knows fully well that we have got no apartheid here. When apartheid was first brought up at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference I was the first to condemn it. Therefore, it is not for us to practice apartheid in this country. He says things like that without really thinking of the implications of statements such as that. All we are trying to do is to try and help these less fortunate people to do a little bit of business. Unless the Government can help them, we know nobody else will, because the Chinese businessmen cannot help them because they have got to provide employment for the Chinese. We know one business firm was charged with trying to show favour to the Malays and they are trying to boycott the goods produced by this business firm. That is the mentality of the people here, and so the Government has to do something for these people, as otherwise the gulf of differences between the "haves" and the "haves-not" will be so great that in the end it will cause nothing but trouble.

He talked about building a Chinese University here. That is very well. For those people who can afford to build a university, why not invest the money

in our University and expand it and set up, perhaps, a Chinese Faculty in the University? With the money that they collect, it will not only serve the Chinese but it will help the Malays and Indians, who want to learn Chinese, to go in for this is our University. But to build a Chinese University in this country is to continually remind the Chinese that they are Chinese and the Malays that they are Malays. And when are we going to get a united Malaysian nation if the people are going to retain that sort of mentality?

The Member for Tanjong has spoken about economising by preventing some of our Ministers from taking frequent trips abroad. I can assure him that we have been very, very careful about these trips to the foreign countries, because we know that they cost money and the Minister of Finance is very much against it. So, he can rest assured that Ministers do not go abroad unless we feel that their trip is absolutely necessary and that their participation at a conference is of benefit to us and to the countries who are attending the conference.

He mentioned again about my new office—I think he said that it is an expensive building to have. But I must tell the Honourable Member that since these last few years my Ministry has been absolutely cramped; as the country has developed, so has my Ministry, and in the end we found it is necessary to build a new office for the Prime Minister; and also in that new office we provide a hall for dining, because in the old days when the Prime Minister had to do his official entertainment it was necessary to build Dexion tent, which cost money every time he held any function or reception. I think it is not a waste of money at all, and I consider it absolutely necessary.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, fasal perkara pakaian Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tiap² kali kita adakan meshuarat Ahli² Yang Berhormat bergaduh fasal pakaian Tuan Yang di-Pertua—tidak sesuai kata-nya dengan keadaan kita negeri yang merdeka. Jadi, saya ingatkan, kita ini ikut Peratoran Parlimen di-England, maka dengan ikutan itu,

bukan ikut sahaja Peratoran-nya tetapi pakaian-nya sama. Jikalau kita boleh fikir, apa-kah chara pakaian yang sesuai, boleh-lah kita gantikan, tetapi buat sementara ini, saya ingat tidak payah-lah kita hendak ganti² lagi.

Bagitu juga sungutan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Muar Utara berkenaan dengan Majlis Raja². Fasal apa kata-nya tidak di-panggil bagaimana dahulu Majlis Raja² Melayu. Yang sa-benar-nya Raja² sendiri berkehendakkan bagitu dan terkandung-nya perkataan Majlis Raja² di-dalam Perlembagaan Majlis itu, kerana ma'ana Majlis Raja² termasuk-lah negeri² yang tidak beraja, Negeri² yang ada Gabenor². Jadi, dengan sebab itu-lah di-sebutkan Majlis Raja².

Berkenaan dengan hal orang² Islam yang ada kata-nya menukar ugama, saya pun biasa mendengar dan hal ini saya akan bawa ka-Majlis Raja² supaya di-ma'alumkan kepada Raja² dan dapat-lah di-fikirkan apa-kah chara² yang boleh di-buat, kerana kuasa menjaga ugama bukan-lah di-tangan Kerajaan; beberapa kali kita bawa dalam Majlis Raja², hendak minta Pejabat Ugama di-dalam Kerajaan Malaysia ini, tetapi Raja² tidak bersetuju, takut dengan ada-nya Majlis ini, kuasa Raja² sudah pun kurang. Jadi hal² yang berbangkit saperti yang di-sebutkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat ini, saya akan bawa persembahkan kepada Majlis Raja² masa di-adakan persidangan pada bulan hadapan.

Berkenaan dengan pertahanan bersama dengan Singapura, saya di-tegor oleh Ahli² di-sini, jaga-lah baik² Perdana Menteri Singapura. Saya pun kenal dia, saya pun sudah kenal sangat. Jadi, Ahli² Yang Berhormat boleh-lah perchaya, saya akan jaga baik², kerana tidak dapat tidak, kita ini hendak-lah kena kerjasama, kerana terhadap dengan soal keamanan negeri dan keselamatan negeri kita. Jadi apa² yang telah lepas, lepaskan-lah. Pada masa yang baharu kena-lah kita bekerja bersungguh² dengan tulus ikhlas untuk kepentingan negeri kita ini.

Berkenaan dengan public orator, Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Pasir Puteh bawa fasal public orator apa sebab

masa Duli Yang Maha Mulia Shahanshah Iran datang berangkat ka-sini kita ini tidak mengambil orang Melayu. Berkenaan dengan ini, saya sebutkan di-sini, masa kita angkat public orator itu di-lantek-nya di-dalam Majlis Meshuarat Senate di-dalam Universiti, semua suara bersetuju lantek orang itu jadi public orator. Mula² di-minta hendak di-lantek Professor Ungku Aziz; Ungku Aziz tidak mahu, dia tolak. Jadi di-angkat-lah orang ini dan semua dengan sa-bulat suara menerima-nya. Jadi, Ahli² Yang Berhormat pun tahu sama di-Convocation pada waktu itu, public orator telah menjalankan tugas-nya dengan chukup terpuji dan pantun² yang di-keluarkan dalam bahasa Melayu, kita yang dudok di-sini pun tidak boleh reka pantun yang sa-umpama itu.

Jadi di-dalam hal universiti ini perkara public orator dan lain²-nya yang sa-umpama itu, soal perkauman tidak berbangkit dan orang² yang membangkang di-atas public orator ini telah pun berjumpa dengan saya dan saya memberitahu hal ini bukan hal yang patut di-bawa, kerana Ahli Yang Berhormat sendiri pun ada di-situ pada waktu di-lantek orang ini menjadi public orator, dan Ahli² Yang Berhormat pada waktu itu tidak ada tegoran langsung. Apa-kah guna sudah terjadi hal itu sudah lantek, baharu ini sahaja hendak menegor fasal itu dan hendak membangkang? Bukan-kah hal ini boleh mengechilkan hati orang yang di-lantek itu, dan apa-kah faedah-nya yang boleh timbul daripada bangkangan Ahli² Yang Berhormat itu?

Berkenaan dengan alat² Kerajaan di-gunakan dalam pilihan raya, ini sudah saya terangkan, dan Menteri Penerangan akan menjawab hal ini, tidak payah-lah saya hendak bangkitkan. Dan juga Penyata Bersama atas lawatan Duli Yang Maha Mulia Shah Iran dengan kita di-katakan kita tidak sebutkan di-atas hal Baitul Mukaddis (*Jerusalem*). Hal ini, lawatan ini adalah lawatan muhibbah dan hal² yang sa-umpama itu yang sangat sulit, yang sangat susah, tidak harus di-bawa, kerana jikalau di-keluarkan sa-suatu benda yang tidak sesuai dengan

kawan² kita dengan negeri² Arab itu, sudah tentu-lah tidak boleh guna-nya kepada sa-siapa, dengan kerana itu tidak di-bawa hal itu.

Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Johor Bahru Barat, beliau itu pun suruh kita jaga Perdana Menteri Singapura dan saya sudah jawab hal itu, tidak payah-lah saya sambong lagi.

Berkenaan dengan pinjaman kepada Kerajaan Kelantan daripada bank², saya ingat sahabat saya Menteri Kewangan boleh jawab sendiri.

Setakat itu-lah dapat saya sebutkan di-sini bagi menjawab perkara² yang timbul daripada meshuarat ini (*Tepok*).

Tuan Yang di-Pertua: Persidangan ini di-tempohkan sa-lama 15 minit.

Persidangan di-tempohkan pada pukul 11.20 pagi.

Persidangan di-sambong sa-mula pada pukul 11.35 pagi.

(Tuan Yang di-Pertua *mempengerusikan Meshuarat*)

Timbalan Perdana Menteri: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon izin menjawab pandangan² yang di-datangkan oleh Ahli² Yang Berhormat terhadap perkara² di-bawah Kementerian² saya dan saya mohon izin kadang² hendak berchakap dalam bahasa kebangsaan dan kadang² hendak berchakap dalam bahasa Inggeris.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, mula² saya suka menjawab berkenaan dengan perkara² berkaitan dengan Kementerian Pembangunan Negara dan Luar Bandar. Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Pasir Puteh ada menyentoh berkenaan dengan perlantikan sa-orang tokoh politik menjadi Pengerusi MARA. Ahli Yang Berhormat itu bertanya, apa-kah sebab-nya ahli tokoh politik itu di-jadikan Pengerusi MARA? Saya berkata, inilah satu langkah yang baik yang sudah kena pada tempat-nya, kerana Pengerusi MARA ini mempunyai tanggung-jawab yang berat untuk menjalankan kehendak² dan hasrat² ra'ayat. Jadi, hanya-lah sa-orang tokoh politik yang berjiwa ra'ayat, boleh mengetahui kehendak²

ra'ayat yang sa-benar-nya dan dapat menjalankan tugas² MARA.

Saya fikir Ahli Yang Berhormat tidak usah bimbang dengan perlantikan sa-orang tokoh politik sa-bagai Pengerusi MARA ini. MARA akan berjaya, sebab ra'ayat negeri ini semua mengetahui bahawa MARA ini, ia-lah dasar Kerajaan Perikatan dan rancangan yang di-jalankan oleh Kerajaan Perikatan, dan Parti PAS pun tidak ada satu rancangan kemajuan.

Perkara yang kedua, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berkenaan dengan masalah Kilang Kain Puteh. Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Pasir Puteh berkata mengapa kilang ini di-tempatkan di-Padang Batang Kali, tidak di-tempatkan di-Kelantan. Kalau boleh di-tempatkan di-Pantai Timor, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tentu tempatkan di-Pahang, tidak di-Kelantan, akan tetapi bagi hendak menempatkan kilang yang sa-macam ini, ada-lah beberapa faktor² yang kena di-timbangkan. Di-Batang Kali ini di-dapati ada ayer yang baik dan juga dekat dengan jalan raya dan ada kuasa letrik yang chukup dan kilang ini hendak mengeluarkan kain puteh, bukan sahaja untuk di-gunakan membuat batek, bahkan kain puteh untuk kegunaan² lain juga. Jadi, itu-lah sebab-nya di-tempatkan di-Batang Kali ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu ada menyebutkan berkenaan dengan Maktab MARA. Rakan saya Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran dan Yang Amat Berhormat Perdana Menteri telah pun menjawab perkara ini. Pada pendapat Kerajaan sangat-lah mustahak di-adakan pusat latihan yang saperti ini untuk memberi latihan² kepada pemuda dan pemudi dari luar bandar supaya mereka itu dapat mengambil bahagian yang lebeh sempurna dalam lapangan perniagaan dan perusahaan. Ini ia-lah menjadi dasar Kerajaan untuk hendak menolong ra'ayat yang mundur dan Maktab ini telah berjaya mengeluarkan penuntut² yang berkeelayakan dengan banyaknya dan di-harapkan Maktab ini dapat di-perbesarkan dan di-perluaskan supaya menjadi satu teknologi dan dengan itu dapat-lah pemuda dan pemudi dari luar bandar, ia-itu pemuda dan

pemudi yang dahulu-nya tidak ada peluang hendak menerima latehan dalam lapangan perniagaan dan perusahaan di-beri peluang berlateh supaya dapat mengambil bahagian dalam lapangan perniagaan dan perusahaan, ia-itu lapangan yang mempunyai perlawanan yang hebat.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sekarang saya datang kepada Kementerian Hal Ehwal Dalam Negeri. Ada dua perkara yang saya hendak sebutkan. Pertama sa-kali berkenaan dengan Kementerian ini, yang pertama pada hari Khamis, Yang Berhormat Menteri Muda telah memberi jawapan yang mengatakan, ia-itu semenjak kemerdekaan 14,711 orang telah di-benarkan dudok tetap di-Malaysia ini.

Saya suka terangkan bahawa kebenaran dudok tetap ini, bukan berm'ana-nya kita memberi citizenship atau kera'ayatan. Dan kebanyakan daripada mereka² yang di-beri kebenaran dudok tetap ini, ia-lah isteri² ra'ayat Malaysia dan juga anak² ra'ayat Malaysia yang berada di-luar negeri. Jadi supaya tidak di-kelirukan hal ini, saya ambil peluang memberi keterangan atas perkara ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Kota Star Selatan ada menyebut berkenaan dengan surat² khabar dan saya dapati ada dua tiga orang Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang lain juga mengatakan mustahak-lah akhbar² di-Malaysia ini menchatet, menerbitkan akhbar² di-Malaysia. Perintah telah di-berikan kepada akhbar² ini supaya menerbitkan di-Malaysia dan boleh di-katakan ka-semua akhbar², melainkan satu dua sahaja lagi yang belum dapat menerbitkan di-Malaysia ini dan mereka itu akan menjalankan perkara ini tidak berapa lama lagi. Saya telah beri tiga bulan, atau empat bulan, untuk mereka itu hendak menyiapkan jentera² supaya akhbar² itu dapat di-tempatkan, di-chetak dan juga di-keluarkan di-Malaysia.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Pasir Puteh ada menu-doh bahawa dalam pilehanraya kechil yang di-adakan di-Kelantan baharu² ini, pehak Kerajaan, Pegawai² Kerajaan

ada menggunakan jentera² Kerajaan bagi menolong Parti Perikatan. Di-sebutkan juga Pegawai² Polis menye-belah pehak Perikatan dan champor tangan dalam hal ini, dan dia ada sebut juga yang saya menggunakan helikopter untuk berkempen dalam pilehanraya itu. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berada di-Kelantan dua tiga hari sa-belum hari meletakkan undi di-negeri Kelantan dan saya dapati keadaan di-situ ada tegang, di-sebabkan oleh perbuatan² penyokong² Parti PAS menggunakan kekerasan, mengugut² penyokong Parti Perikatan, menyerbu tempat² Perikatan dan menggunakan senjata². Dengan sebab itu-lah pehak Polis kena mengambil tindakan dan sa-tengah²-nya mereka itu telah di-tangkap. Dan mereka² yang mempunyai senjata api yang di-fikirkan, akan menyalah-gunakan senjata api ini, telah di-tarek senjata itu. Jadi langkah ini di-ambil, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-lah dengan tujuan hendak menjaminkan supaya pilehanraya di-Kelantan itu berjalan dengan terator saperti di-tempat² yang lain.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita telah mengadakan pilehanraya sudah tiga kali Pilehanraya Umum di-seluruh Malaysia ini dan keadaan yang samacham ini tidak berlaku, melainkan di-Kelantan. Jadi dengan sebab-nya berlaku keadaan yang samacham ini, ia-lah saya kata penyokong² daripada Parti PAS menggunakan tektik² yang liar yang luar daripada batasan demokrasi. Jadi dengan sebab itu-lah pehak Polis terpaksa mengambil tindakan untuk hendak menjaminkan yang pilehanraya di-Kelantan itu menurut peratoran yang sa-benar-nya.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menggunakan helikopter pada hari menaruh undi itu, kerana hendak melihat sendiri yang pengundi² ada di-benarkan mengundi dengan terator dan tidak diugut dan tidak ada berlaku apa perkara yang tidak di-ingini. Jadi, saya menggunakan helikopter sa-bagai Menteri Hal Ehwal Dalam Negeri untuk hendak menjaga dan memerhatikan keselamatan pada masa hari mengundi itu, dan tiap² kali di-tiap² tempat saya turun, pehak Presiding Officer telah

di-beritahu dan Presiding Officer membenarkan saya turun dan tidak-lah seperti kata Ahli Yang Berhormat itu yang Presiding Officer tidak bersetuju atas perkara ini.

Jadi, ini bukan-lah menentang undang², larangan pilehanraya, sa-bagai sa-orang Menteri, saya ada-lah berhak pergi melawat, memerhatikan yang keamanan ada terjamin dan pengundi² tidak di-ugut dan saya tidak-lah masuk ka-tempat mengundi, hanya-lah duduk di-luar, melihat keadaan keselamatan Polling Station di-tempat² yang tertentu sahaja.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu ada menyebutkan dan Yang Amat Berhormat Perdana Menteri telah pun menjawab, ia-itu berkenaan dengan chadangan Kerajaan hendak deprive the citizenship of certain citizens of this country who have acquired their citizenship by registration or naturalisation. The Honourable Member for Batu says that is against fundamental human rights and against the Principles of the United Nations. Sir, as I have explained before, these people were given the privilege of citizenship and it is expected that they would be loyal to this country, but because of their disloyal acts, because of activities which are prejudicial to the security of this country—and they have shown by their acts they are disloyal to this country—obviously they should not be allowed to continue to enjoy the privilege or the citizenship of this country. It is different, Sir, if they are citizens by operation of law. Then, they have a right to be citizens of this country. But these people were given citizenship as a matter of privilege, and obviously if they abuse their privilege, then it is only fair that we should take away their privilege.

Sir, the Honourable Prime Minister has already replied on the subject of the arrest of Mr Lim Kean Siew, but I would like to say that it is within the right of the Police to arrest and detain any person pending enquiries, if the Police have reasonable grounds to justify the detention of such a person, and in this particular case, the Police had more than justifiable grounds to

detain Mr Lim Kean Siew for enquiries, because he himself admitted that he was responsible for planning the *hartal*. Although he later stated that he did not expect that the *hartal* would turn out in the way it did, whatever it is, he was responsible for planning the *hartal*, and obviously as lives were lost and properties were destroyed, the least that should be done was that he should be made to answer for what he did.

On the question of banishment, Sir, the Honourable Member for Ipoh asked why there should be delay in sending people out of this country. There has been some difficulty in arranging ships to take them to China for several reasons, but the majority of these people refused to go back to China and that is why we have to continue to detain them. But their cases are reviewed from time to time and if they are considered no longer to be of any security risk, they would be released.

Now, Sir, I come to the serious allegation by the Honourable Member for Ipoh that Government is interfering in the working of the Public Service and in the work of the Anti-Corruption Agency and also in the work of the Police. Sir, I would deny here categorically that there has been any interference from whatever quarter in the functions of the Anti-Corruption Agency.

The Honourable Member for Ipoh has made a sensational reference to an incident involving a traffic policeman and a woman driver, who is the wife of a Ministry official. Now, the Press stated that this woman is the wife of the Secretary to a Ministry. This is not so. She is the wife of an Assistant Secretary of the Ministry of Home Affairs and not the Secretary. The account given by the Honourable Member was half-truth. I do not blame him because he must have got it from someone, but I would like to state the facts. Sir, the woman driver one day was stopped by a traffic policeman for a minor breach of traffic regulations, namely, driving along the wrong lane, and when the car had been stopped by the policeman and while the driver's licence was being examined by the

policeman, it was alleged that the policeman had been unnecessarily offensive to her in that he had used abusive and vulgar language in the presence of her teen-aged daughter. She had, therefore, lost her temper and spat at the policeman. The policeman, however, denied having used any abusive language as alleged. Now, following normal procedure whereby if a member of the Police is involved in any incident, which is likely to prejudice the good name of the Police and the discipline of the Force, the Deputy Inspector-General of Police ordered a full enquiry into this allegation and statements from both the policeman and this lady driver were taken and the statements were referred to the Attorney-General as this is a non-seizable offence. On the advice of the Attorney-General's Office, no further action was taken as both parties concerned expressed agreement to forget and forgive the incident as contained in the allegation and also counter allegation by the two parties. I repeat here that there has been no interference at all, because it is the normal practice that in cases like this there should be full investigation into the incident in accordance with the normal Police Force directions.

Regarding the transfer of Haji Noordin from the post of O.C.P.D., Kuala Lumpur to the Police Headquarters, this was made at his own request and his transfer was approved by the Police Force Commission. Therefore, it is not correct to imply that this transfer was the result of interference from senior officers of the Police force.

The Honourable Member for Ipoh also alleged, on the subject of the *hartal* in Penang, that everyone knew about the *hartal* except the Police. The Police knew that there was going to be a *hartal* in Penang and they were informed about it, but they were also informed that it will be carried out in a peaceful and constitutional manner. Under our democratic practice, clearly the Police could not take any steps to prevent people exercising their democratic rights and it is only when incidents took place, that the Police could

intervene. That was the position, Sir, but it is, of course, easy to be wise after the event. If we had stopped the *hartal* from being held at all, then there would have been allegations against us for interfering with the liberty of the people.

On the subject of this Tentera Sabilullah, the Prime Minister has already explained, but I would like to say this. These people were members of what we call a secret society. We did not know of their membership until they themselves confessed to us and quite clearly it would be morally wrong for us to arrest them on an evidence which they themselves confessed to us. That is why no arrest was made, but if subsequently they were to commit any offence, quite obviously we would take action to arrest them.

I now come to the other Ministry of mine—the Ministry of Defence. The Honourable Member for Pasir Puteh spoke of the purchase of *senapang katak*. Actually, Sir, during the early days of Confrontation because we had to recruit local defence corps urgently to protect the various areas, we thought the best weapon for these people would be shotguns and we ordered 30,000 shotguns from a known American firm and they are good guns. Of course, some of them have not been used because our Army is using the SL Rifle, but these shotguns were thought to be the best weapon that we could have for use by villagers in the protection of their own villages. On the question of the trucks, he alleged that we bought 200 trucks which can no longer be used. I think he must be referring to the International Harvester Three-ton Tippers, which were presented to us by the Australian Government. It is true that these trucks are not suitable for military use in cross-country roads, but nevertheless they can be used in certain areas for short-distance transport. However, they were a gift by the Australian Government to us, and we cannot look a gift horse in the mouth.

On the subject of promotion, the Honourable Member for Pasir Puteh said that there were Brigadiers who were made to do desk work and not

given field training. This is not true. We do train them from time to time. All officers have to do field duty as well as desk work. This has been done regularly. On the question of promotion, we follow the proper practice. Promotion is normally carried out on the recommendations of the senior officer and promotions to Colonel and above is carried out by a Committee of the Armed Forces Council on which I myself preside. On the question of refund of rent for officers, he alleged that Army officers were given refund of rent less than the members of the Malaysian Home and Foreign Service. Officers in the Armed Forces are given refund from \$250 to \$400 per month in certain areas. However, this matter is being looked into and it is intended to recommend that the rates should be brought up to the level of the Home and Foreign Service officers.

I now come to our defence policy. The Honourable Prime Minister has today explained it at great length. I myself listened with particular interest to the wise, imaginative and far-sighted statement by my former colleague and friend, the Honourable Member for Johor Timor. I fully agree with him that in the final analysis the peace and security of countries such as Malaysia, indeed the peace and security of this region of South-East Asia, can only be secured if it is guaranteed by all, and I emphasise, by all the major powers. In order to achieve this, we must follow a policy and we must be seen to follow a policy, which is not directed against the basic interests of the major powers concerned. That is to say, a policy of neutralisation if we wish to call it that way. It would be equally appreciated that the prerequisite for adopting such a policy of neutralisation is a clear and categorical undertaking by the major powers to respect the integrity and independence of the countries in this area. This, in fact, must mean that the major powers would not permit any action calculated to endanger and to subvert the security in this region and that peaceful co-existence is beneficial to all concerned, both big powers and small nations. We cannot achieve this objective in the immediate future as the

Prime Minister has explained, but this must be our long-term objective. The facts of political life today, which are themselves the product of circumstances and forces going back over many years, require us to proceed with caution in that direction. We cannot in our desire to attain our long-term objective ignore the immediate realities and dangers which confront us and we must leave open to ourselves all options to safeguard our national independence and our integrity. But I can assure Honourable Members and the House that whatever we may do in response to the immediate problem, to the new situation, we shall act and we shall do so within the framework of the long-term objective which I have indicated above and which had been so clearly set out by my Honourable friend the Member for Johor Timor. We shall do our best to ensure that whatever we do in the short-term will assist us in serving the long-term objective, or at least, we shall not hinder it. Now, Sir, so much then for our relations and for the relation of the countries in this region with the major powers. Next, there is the question of relations of South-East Asian countries with one another. Certainly the suggestion by the Honourable Member for Johor Timor of a non-aggression pact, as the Prime Minister has said also, and of a declaration of co-existence, are laudable and have the full support of the Government. It is clear that this Government is committed, as it has always been, to a policy of peaceful co-existence and friendly co-operation with all of our neighbours. In this connection, I venture to think that the best way initially of ensuring co-operation among South-East Asian countries is through ASEAN, the Association of South-East Asian nations. I readily appreciate the fact that a number of countries in this region are not members of this organisation and that it is still in its very initial stage. I am convinced, however, that ASEAN has within it the seeds of future growth. The ASEAN Declaration has taken cognizance of the mutual interests and common problems among the countries of South-East Asia and has affirmed that the countries of South-East Asia share primary responsibility

for strengthening the economic and social stability of the region and ensuring their peaceful and progressive national development, and that they are determined to ensure their stability and security from external interference in any form or manifestation in order to preserve their national identities in accordance with the ideals and aspirations of their people.

It is our view, Sir, which we have persistently maintained ever since discussion began on the formation of ASEAN, that while the Association was primarily one for co-operation in the economic, social, cultural and related fields, there should also be room for discussion on all matters of common interest or concern and for such co-operation as may be possible. We believe that the emphasis should initially be on small and specific projects on which there can be agreement. In this way a spirit of goodwill, of trust, and of friendship and an atmosphere of confidence and co-operation can gradually be built up and which would be directed to serving the common interests of all countries in this region and not the particular interest of any one country. I believe ASEAN to be the ideal vehicle for building up this spirit of goodwill and co-operation which are the essential first steps to realising the laudable objectives which have been put forward by the Honourable Member for Johor Timor, and it is the policy of this Government to work towards this end.

We in Malaysia harbour no ill-will against anyone, nor are we against anyone. We seek only to live in peace and co-operation with all countries—our immediate neighbours as well as those farther from us, big powers, not so big powers, and small powers—on the basis of mutual respect and friendship. As Honourable Members are aware, the Prime Minister has informed this House that we have proposed, in view of the British decision to withdraw all their forces stationed in Malaysia and Singapore, a conference of the five powers involved in the Defence Treaty that we now have with Britain, Australia and New Zealand.

It is necessary for us to review this Defence Treaty and the defence arrangement we have had in view of Britain's latest proposal. But this endeavour on our part must be regarded as complementary to the efforts that we are making to bring together the countries in this region for close co-operation in all fields for mutual benefit. Whatever the outcome of this five-power talk may be, it will be in no way a substitute for our efforts in regional co-operation but rather it will be in furtherance of the objectives that we have set ourselves of establishing peace and stability in this region of South-East Asia.

Now, Sir, finally I come to the speech of the Honourable Member for Bungsar, who said in winding up his speech that after a decade of independence Malaysia cannot boast of anything but a declining political, economic and military situation. Sir, this is a statement which is completely contrary to the facts pertaining in this country. It is a statement deliberately made to belittle the efforts which this Government and the people have made in all fields of progress during the last ten years. It is needless for me to state here the progress we have made in the field of development since we achieved independence. Malaysia today stands as the most stable country in this region, politically and economically. Although we had to face difficult times last year due to the lowering in the price of rubber, but because of the success of our economic diversification policy our Minister of Finance was able to tell this House in his Budget speech that the finances of our country show a slight surplus on current account.

Now, Sir, on the question of the military situation, the Honourable Member showed a spirit of despondency because the British have decided to withdraw their forces in this region. We in the Government knew, Sir, when we achieved independence in 1957, that we could not depend on the British, or any power, for all time to look after us. The time must come when we have to defend ourselves. Now, with withdrawal of the British forces here, quite

obviously we have to adjust our defence policy and to some extent our foreign policy, so that there will be no vacuum but that our survival will continue to be guaranteed. Obviously, Sir, the future of any nation and its survival must depend in the ultimate resort on the will and determination of the people themselves. Now, we, Malaysians of all races, must show determination that we are prepared to survive as a nation, to defend our independence and our integrity, and to continue to forge ahead and become a modern, progressive and affluent country. We in the Government are determined to do this. We have given leadership to this country in the last ten years with great success, gaining respect and the admiration of our friends throughout the world, and we will continue to give that leadership. Of course, if the Honourable Member for Bungsar still looks to the British for leadership, he will find that there is no leadership. We in the Alliance have always mapped out the path of progress of our nation not only for the next decade but for hundreds of years to come.

As I said, we have brought up this country during the last ten years of independence to be one of the most progressive and stable countries in this region of Asia, and we will continue to do that while at the same time upholding and nurturing the principle of parliamentary democracy and our democratic way of life which we uphold and cherish. Now, I must ask the Honourable Member to look for leadership to this country and not outside this country. Our former colonial masters have decided to leave this region for good. It is just as well and we can now look after ourselves and look towards our neighbours in this region as friends and as brothers to work together for mutual benefit and for the peace and stability of this region. Thank you (*Applause*).

Menteri Kerja Raya, Pos dan Telekom (Tun V. T. Sambanthan): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam meshuarat pada 26 haribulan ini, Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Muar Dalam ada mem-

bangkitkan tiga perkara berkenaan dengan Kementerian saya.

Perkara yang pertama, di-Jabatan Kerja Raya jurutera² maseh lagi menjalankan tugas Pegawai² Pentadbiran dan di-dapati keputusan² di-atas tender² biasa-nya mengambil masa berbulan². Sa-orang jurutera, bagitu jugalah mana² Pegawai Iktisas yang bekerja dengan Kerajaan, sa-lain daripada menjalankan tugas² iktisas-nya, kena-lah juga sedikit sa-banyak membuat kerja² pentadbiran. Ia tidak boleh mengasingkan diri-nya daripada kerja tulis menulis (paper work), tambah² lagi kalau ia sa-orang Ketua Pejabat, oleh sebab dia ada-lah bertanggungjawab terhadap kecekapan pentadbiran pejabat-nya.

Tiap² tawaran yang di-terima kena-lah di-kaji dengan teliti bagi membentangkan supaya tidak ada kesalahan yang besar berlaku. Sa-lepas itu tawaran itu akan di-sampaikan kepada Lembaga Tawaran Persekutuan yang bermeshuarat tiap² dua minggu sa-kali untuk pertimbangan Lembaga tersebut. Jika tawaran itu berharga lebih daripada \$1 juta, maka perkara ini akan di-bawa balek, oleh wakil daripada Perbendaharaan ka-pejabat-nya bagi mendapat keputusan pegawai atas-nya. Jika satu² kerja itu di-minta di-buat oleh Kementerian yang lain maka sa-lepas keputusan tawaran itu di-terima dan sa-belum surat permintaan boleh di-keluarkan, Jabatan Kerja Raya mesti-lah terlebih dahulu meminta pengesahan daripada Kementerian itu tentang ada-nya peruntokan wang yang di-kehendaki bagi di-bayar dalam tahun yang berlaku, dan juga pengesahan bahawa peruntokan wang ada disediakan bagi tahun² yang berikut. Sa-belum pengesahan itu di-terima daripada Kementerian yang meminta supaya satu² pekerjaan itu di-buat, maka Jabatan Kerja Raya tidak-lah boleh menerima tawaran itu dan memulakan kerja.

Tawaran yang berharga di-antara \$10,000 sampai \$25,000 ada-lah di-panggil di-tingkat daerah dan ini ada-lah juga di-kehendaki di-sampaikan melalui Jurutera Negeri yang berkaitan

untuk di-timbang oleh Lembaga Tawaran Persekutuan. Tawaran yang berharga di-antara \$25,000 sampai \$100,000 ada-lah di-panggil di-tingkat Negeri dan peratoran yang sama ada-lah di-ikuti.

Perkara yang kedua, sa-masa banjir di-negeri Johor baharu² ini, banyak jalan² raya tidak dapat di-gunakan, oleh kerana keadaan jalan² itu. Jabatan Kerja Raya di-minta supaya jalan² itu di-tinggikan dan culvert di-bena supaya keadaan-nya dapat di-baiki lagi. Saya sedar bahawa beberapa bahagian jalan itu di-negeri Johor telah terkena banjir baharu² ini. Jikalau bahagian² jalan ini hendak di-pertinggikan, maka kita kena-lah menimbangkan perkara ini pada segi perbelanjaan, bukan sahaja di-negeri Johor, akan tetapi perbelanjaan bagi meninggikan jalan² yang terkena banjir di-negeri² lain juga. Pada masa ini perundingan daripada Bank Dunia sedang membuat satu kajian pengangkutan dan mereka di-jangka akan juga membuat perakuan tentang jalan² mana-kah di-seluruh negeri ini yang patut di-perelokkan atau di-perbaiki.

Perkara yang ketiga, sungguh pun bahasa kebangsaan telah di-jadikan bahasa rasmi, di-dapati Operator² Telephone maseh lagi menggunakan bahasa Inggeris, sa-masa menjalankan tugas²-nya. Arahan tetap telah pun di-keluarkan kepada Operator Telephone, ya'ani mereka hendak-lah menjawab: "Nombor, Enche'." Akan tetapi oleh sebab ada sharikat² perniagaan dan orang ramai yang membuat permintaan dalam bahasa Inggeris, maka kena-lah di-jawab dalam bahasa yang di-minta-nya. Terima kaseh.

Setia-usaha Parlimen kepada Menteri Buroh (Tuan Lee San Choon) (dengan izin): Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for Batu dwelt at length on many aspects concerning labour. While I welcome his concern and interest in the matter, it is difficult to go along with his extremely general criticisms and comments that he has made. He has charged that the Government's labour policy needs to be reviewed, re-organised, revitalised and pursued with more imagination. While

these are noble sentiments, I am afraid that they are not sufficient to be the basis of any serious examination.

The Government has kept its labour policy under very close and constant review. We in the Government have approached labour problems not only with a view to promoting the standard of welfare and well-being of the ordinary working people in this country, but have tried to integrate the well-being of the workers and other sections of our citizens with the general growth and progress of the nation as a whole. I submit, Sir, that this is the only positive and permanent way of approaching the question. The welfare and the standard of living of the workers can only be increased if the economy itself is assisted in performing much better. Productivity in existing industries has to go up significantly and new industries have to be established, if the size of the cake to be shared among the workers is to get bigger and bigger; otherwise, Sir, we would only be heading towards a contraction in the economy which must inevitably lead to extremely depressive effects on the standard of living not only of the workers but also of the other sections of the economy.

The Honourable Member for Kota Star Selatan has referred to the necessity for such an attitude, and I agree with him fully. All of us, workers, employers and Government alike, have to make a determined and joint commitment to economic progress to ensure the continued growth of the country, so that all of us can share a higher standard of life. The example of Britain, quoted by the Honourable Member for Kota Star Selatan, is well worth having in our minds.

The Honourable Member for Batu has charged that the Ministry of Labour has been responsible for, what he calls, the depressing labour situation. Facts and figures available do not indicate that there has, in fact, been any depression in the labour situation, and they can definitely prove that the Ministry of Labour has played an active part in the general improvement in the terms and conditions of employment

of our workers. Sir, during 1967, about 40 collective agreements covering wages, conditions of employment, retirement benefits and bonuses were concluded. These collective agreements covered more than 20,000 workers and registered a general 4% to 6% increase in wages and other benefits. The Ministry assisted in the drawing up of most of these agreements and the settlement of 161 odd disputes that arose during the year. These figures can by no means be termed as depressive, nor do they indicate any inaction on the part of the Ministry of Labour. The Ministry of Labour will continue to offer its services to employers and workers who are faced with any difficulties in their mutual relationships. We will continue to approach these problems with a sense of national purpose and a conviction to promote the general well-being of our economy and its people.

He has also charged that the labour laws in existence in this country are antiquated and colonial, and continued to name virtually all the labour laws that we have in this country. He referred to the Labour Code. May I point out to him that what is left in the Labour Code are only certain provisions relating to health and places of employment? The other portions of the Code have been incorporated into new laws, such as the Employment Ordinance of 1955, the Workers (Minimum Standards of Housing) Act, 1966 and the Children and Young Persons Employment Act, 1966. The Factories and Machinery Act passed by this House some time last year also make substantially improved provisions for the health and welfare of workers in places of employment. These are no mean accomplishments and will stand up to any test to determine the progressiveness of our labour policy.

Regarding his comments on the Workmen's Compensation Ordinance, I need only reiterate here our assurance that the benefits to be provided under the proposed social security legislation would be much superior to the present benefits and that the risk of employment injury would be taken care of in a much more effective manner than under

the Workmen's Compensation System. He has asked about the Social Security Scheme itself. Let me point out to the Honourable Member that it is the Government which has taken the initiative on this matter and that we are giving this all possible priority. The Colombo Plan expert with us has already submitted his full report on the scheme and is now engaged in drafting the necessary legislation for this purpose. We hope to be able to submit this legislation to this House fairly shortly. The Honourable Member need have no doubts about this method.

Regarding the rates of contribution under the Employees' Provident Fund Ordinance, it must be pointed out that 5% contribution by both employer and worker prescribed in this Ordinance is merely the minimum rate. There are a number of industries where the rates of contribution are much higher than this.

He has charged that the Trade Union Ordinance and the Trade Unions Act, 1965, are undemocratic and restrict freedom of association unduly. The data that we have of trade union organisation in this country prove otherwise. More than a third of the wage-earning population in this country is now organised in trade unions, and this figure compares favourably with the figures of any other country which the Honourable Member might hold up as examples.

He has alleged that the Registrar of Trade Unions has acted arbitrarily. I am sure that the Honourable Member knows that the Registrar of Trade Unions is an officer appointed under the law and carries out his functions as provided in the law. This law provides the various channels of appeals to redress any alleged arbitrary actions. He perhaps does not like what has happened to some of the trade unions under the wing of the Labour Party, whereas such unions had been led into all sorts of violence in defiance, not only of the law, but also the rights and interests of the workers as a whole. It is with regret that we have to take firm action, and fast action, on these elements and the Honourable Member

should in fact support such action as they have been taken with the view of promoting the true interest of the workers and the interest of parliamentary democracy in this country.

He has claimed that the Industrial Relations Act, 1967, makes a travesty of the industrial relations practice. Let me assure the Honourable Member that the Industrial Relations Act was the outcome of a long and careful review of our industrial relations system and practice, a review that he himself advocates so strongly. The Act is a balanced one if seen objectively in the context of Government labour policy that I referred to earlier. It may indeed be a stumbling block to those who choose to pursue a path of destruction of our economy and of cashing in on the workers of this country, but that is a matter with which no respectable person can have sympathy. He has claimed that there are all sorts of penalties imposed upon unions but not so for employers. I do not know from where he got this impression, as the Act provides for equal penalties for both employers and workers in any given situation. He has asked that when a strike has been called, the employer should just fold up his business and not try to continue to operate with the help of workers who are not on strike. This is, indeed, a very strange argument as every one knows that when a strike is called or a lock-up is enforced, it is a trial of strength between the parties. No one should launch into such action if they are not sure of their case or the strength of their side. It is perfectly legitimate for an employer to try to continue to operate his business in the place of a strike with whatever help he can get. The law provides for this right and only vests the right on striking workers to try to persuade non-striking workers to abstain from work. It does not empower striking workers to intimidate or threaten non-strikers. Where such intimidations and threats do take place, the Police have a duty to ensure that the necessary action is taken, as the Police have a duty not only to prevent crimes but also to protect persons and properties. Strikes are weapons of the last resort and lead to

wasteful trials of strength. The Industrial Relations Act provides adequate procedure to avoid such action, and it would be more profitable for trade unions to attach more importance and attention to greater usage of the provisions of this Act.

Finally, Sir, various other Honourable Members touched on the question of employment exchanges. Employment exchanges, as the House is aware, merely match an employer's request for workers with those workers seeking such employment. They do not create employment and, as such, cannot be criticised for having not done enough. My Ministry, however, is aware that the operations at these exchanges can be improved somewhat and, in fact, we have now with us an I.L.O. expert advising us on this matter, and improved techniques of operations are already being tried out in a few pilot projects, notably in Petaling Jaya and Butterworth. I hope with these improvements the exchanges can be of much better service to both employers and employees. Thank you.

Menteri Kewangan (Tun Tan Siew Sin) (*dengan izin*): Mr Speaker, Sir, during the past few days I followed with very great interest the proceedings in this House on the 1968 Budget. I would like to add that although I was not able to be present in the Chamber itself for as much time as I would have liked to, my aides have noted all the points which concerned the Treasury. In accordance with my usual practice, I shall deal with the major issues raised in the course of this debate. Honourable Members, however, can rest assured that constructive suggestions and proposals put forward by them will be carefully considered and adopted, if this is considered desirable.

I think it is fair to claim, Sir, that the Budget has been generally well received both inside and outside this House, and there was general support for the policies pursued or advocated by the Government. Many of the speeches made showed that Honourable Members were, by and large, alive to the difficulties facing the Government, and realised that the Government

was determined to mobilise all the resources at its command, in order to maintain economic stability and financial viability. In particular, I would like to express my thanks and appreciation to those Members of our Party, who have spoken in favour of the Budget, and to say that although this support has been available all these years, nonetheless it is valued on this occasion. Honourable Members on the other side of the House have, as expected, criticised the Budget—some have criticised it moderately, others violently. I should add that I was not surprised by such violent criticisms, because one cannot help coming to the conclusion that such Honourable Members would be sorry to see this country prosper in peace and prosperity. We cannot avoid the conclusion that they would prefer to see this country going down the drain.

Under these circumstances, the very violence of their criticism can be regarded as a compliment by those of us who are on this side of the House. Indeed, it might be desirable for us to think again, if they and we were ever to be in agreement on the things which matter and the things which affect this country vitally. I do not think that my strictures are unjustified because it is crystal clear that they have gone out of their way to misconstrue the facts and figures in my speech, in order to deceive and mislead. They cannot be so unintelligent as not to realise that such blatant exaggeration is both irresponsible and dangerous, and is clearly calculated to destroy the existing climate of confidence which this Government has laboured so hard and so long to foster.

GNP Growth in 1967—There appears to be serious, if not deliberate misunderstanding on the part of Opposition Members on the question of the overall state of the Malaysian economy in 1967 in terms of the gross national product. As I stated clearly in my Budget speech, the Malaysian economy continued to expand during the past year, though at a slower rate, namely 2½% in 1967, compared with almost 6% in 1966. This slackening in the rate

of growth was, of course, unavoidable because it was a result of factors which were largely beyond our control, namely the fall in rubber prices to their lowest level in 18 years, aggravated by declining prices for tin and palm oil as well, and these are three of our most important export products. Instead, those Opposition Members who spoke on this subject interpreted this slackening in the rate of growth as an absolute decline in the rate of growth. I need hardly explain that there is a vast difference between a slackening in the rate of growth and an actual decline in growth, and yet Honourable Members of the Opposition have not hesitated to distort this simple fact.

In 1958, one year after independence, the gross national product actually declined even though commodity prices in which we were interested did not fall so heavily as in 1967. This shows that our economy is more diversified, and hence more resilient than it was in the early years of our independence. Indeed, the very fact that the GNP has managed to increase at all, in spite of the fact that rubber prices in 1967 fell to their lowest level in 18 years, is a silent but nonetheless eloquent tribute to the soundness and strength of our economy and to the Government and its policies which have made this achievement possible. It is not my intention, at this stage of the game, to burden this House with more facts and figures, but a simple illustration will suffice to reinforce my point. For example, rubber directly accounted for nearly 30% of the total gross domestic product in 1950, but only 25% in 1957, and this figure dropped to only about 20% in 1967. In fact, these figures speak more eloquently than mere words.

There is no gainsaying the fact that the performance of the Malaysian economy in 1967 indicates that it is basically strong and healthy. This fact emerges clearly when one examines the country's national accounts and balance of payments. In terms of physical output, the key sectors of the economy showed satisfactory growth. For example, the production of rubber

increased by 3½% in 1967, tin by 4½%, saw logs by about 8%, sawn timber by 17%, palm oil by 15%, Government consumption by 8½% and manufacturing output by about 14%. Unfortunately, however, much of the increase in output was offset by a sharp decline in the prices of some of our major export commodities.

On the external front, despite the sharp deterioration in the terms of trade, a substantial merchandise trade surplus, though smaller than in 1966, continued to be recorded during the past year. We have monetary stability and a strong currency, and our gold and foreign exchange reserves are relatively high. These cold, hard facts which I have enumerated and which demonstrate the strength of our economy, are facts which even Honourable Members of the Opposition cannot brush aside in spite of their fiery eloquence.

Public Debt—Considerable concern was voiced during the past few days at the size of the Central Government's public debt and the debt servicing charges. This is understandable, though in some ways this is rather amusing, because the people most concerned, namely our creditors, are not in the least bit concerned and they know far more about international and public finance than Honourable Members of the Opposition. Their views matter, even if they are only slightly concerned, but if they are not concerned, that is good enough for the Government of Malaysia. As at the end of last year, the Central Government's public debt amounted to \$3,514 million. I agree that this is a large amount of money in absolute terms, but expressed as a proportion of the G.N.P., it amounted to about 37%, which is by no means high by international standards.

What is more basic is the composition of the debt. In this respect, it is important to note that nearly \$3,000 million of the total debt, that is, about 85%, comprise domestic debt, and I should point out that there is a world of difference between domestic and foreign debt. Whereas domestic debt and its service burden represent the Government's liabilities and transfers to

the other sectors of the domestic economy and thus have no effect on the balance of payments, foreign debt and its service burden the Government's liabilities and transfers to non-resident institutions and individuals, with their accompanying adverse effects on the balance of payments. In our context, domestic borrowing by the Government is essentially non-inflationary, since most of the funds involved represent real savings from the other sectors of the economy. In fact, there is something to be said for this sort of operation. As the Employees Provident Fund is the major holder of Government securities, Honourable Members should note that there could be important income redistribution effects in such an operation since interest payments come out of revenue and E.P.F. funds essentially belong to the less well-to-do sector of the economy.

It is, therefore, the external debt which should interest Honourable Members. At \$517 million at the end of last year, the Government's external debt is modest by any standards. It accounted for about 5½% of the G.N.P. What is more significant is the Government's external debt servicing charges amounted to only about \$57 million or about 1½% of our export earnings in 1967. This is a modest price to pay, whichever way you look at it. In fact, the World Bank has repeatedly stated that the Malaysian economy can absorb a far greater volume of foreign loans without adversely affecting its creditworthiness, and the World Bank is distinctly conservative, whatever else one may think of it. Honourable Members of the Opposition will, I hope, forgive me when I say that if I have to choose between their opinions and the opinion of the World Bank, I would feel the opinion of the World Bank is rather more reliable and more important, to put it at its lowest. In October last, the Government successfully floated its second sterling loan of £7½ million in the London market. I take it that Honourable Members of the Opposition are aware that very very few developing countries have been able to float a commercial loan on their own in the major capital markets of the world, and the very fact that we

have been able to do it a third time in five years clearly demonstrates our high credit standing in the financial circles which matter.

It cannot be denied that if we have to spend vast sums on the development effort, in order to maintain our progress, the Government must continue to borrow both from the domestic market as well as from abroad. Few countries in the world are blessed enough to be able to finance their entire budget from aggregate revenue. As such, the public debt and the service charges for it can be expected to increase with the passage of time. This is the price we have to pay for sustained development, and I suggest that so long as the borrowed funds are expended wisely, i.e., on economic and revenue earning projects, the price we have to pay is not beyond our means, either now or in the future. To expect the Government not to borrow and yet increase the size of the economic cake is equivalent to, if I may borrow a metaphor from the ladies, asking a housewife to make a much larger cake, but use less sugar, less eggs, less butter, and so on. Like the housewife, even Finance Ministers are human (*Laughter*) and cannot be expected to achieve the impossible.

Taxation—One or two Honourable Members pleaded for less taxes. This is understandable, and I can assure such Honourable Members that no one would be happier than I, if we could accede to this request. The same Honourable Members, however, should also understand that it is useless to suggest less taxation under present circumstances unless they can also suggest, at the same time, ways and means of replacing the revenue which would be lost if their suggestions were adopted. Let us remember that we are still living on earth and we are not yet in Heaven.

One Honourable Member complained about the surtax payable by the timber industry. I should explained that surtax is only levied on imports, not exports. If he received this information from the timber industry, then I can only say that that industry has misled

him. He made further mis-statements of facts in regard to Customs valuation procedures on saw logs (*kayu balak*). I would suggest that he drops into the Department for a chat so that he would be able to understand the position better.

Income Tax Evasion—I can assure the Honourable Member, who spoke on this subject, that there has been no let up on the activities of the Department of Inland Revenue in this field. For example, emphasis is now put on on-the-spot inspections with the primary aim of achieving speedy settlements when evasion is detected. In 1967 alone, nearly 800 visits to business premises were made by Inland Revenue officers. In the last two years, the increase in the yield from income tax alone averaged \$40 million per annum without an increase in tax rates, apart from the 10% reduction in the abatement of income tax in East Malaysia in respect of chargeable incomes not exceeding \$50,000 per annum. Honourable Members will not expect me to reveal our methods of detection nor the devices employed, as this would clearly not be in the public interest. When I have said on this subject, however, should serve to demonstrate that the Department is maintaining and will maintain the tempo and vigour of its efforts in this direction, and that no stone will be left unturned to reduce evasion to the maximum extent possible.

Excise Duties—A number of Honourable Members have questioned the wisdom of levying the new excise duties. I cannot understand their arguments, because it is clear that the Government has to replace the revenue lost by declining yields from import duties as a result of industrialisation. The question which should be asked is whether these new levies are fair. In this connection, I should point out that the rates of new excise duties imposed on home manufactured products are no higher and, in fact, are, in several cases, much lower than the rates of import duty payable in 1957, when these products were imported. In that year an import duty of 20% was levied on soap and soap powder, dental paste

and powder, rubber products, paints and varnishes, and mono-sodium glutamate. The import duty on cement was \$12 per ton, or \$6 per ton at the preferential rate. In either case, the duty then was much higher than the new rate of excise duty of \$2 per ton now imposed. The effective tax burden on these products is, therefore, no higher than it was ten years ago. That the rates of the new excise duties are low is readily apparent, when they are compared with the rates of import duty imposed on these products for protective purposes. The manufacturers concerned have, therefore, little cause for complaint and, for this reason, they have no right to raise the selling prices of their products. At the same time, I would like to make it clear that excise duty is not payable on domestic manufactures which are exported as it is not our intention to reduce the competitiveness of our manufactured goods in export markets.

Port Swettenham—Honourable Members will be glad to know that the measures taken by the Government to channel more trade through our own ports are now bearing fruit. For example, more rubber from the East Coast is now flowing through Port Swettenham. For the sixth-month period commencing 1st April, 1967, when the new schedule of port and railway charges was introduced, exports of dry rubber had risen to about 153,700 tons, compared with 125,000 tons exported during the corresponding period of 1966. This is an impressive increase of 22% and is something which is clearly more than just normal growth. In fact, Port Swettenham has now become the largest port for Malaysian rubber exports. During the six months commencing 1st April, 1967, Port Swettenham accounted for 37½% of West Malaysian rubber exports, while Penang accounted for 35½%. In other words, the percentage of West Malaysian dry rubber exported during this six-month period via Port Swettenham and Penang has increased from 68½% in 1966 to 73% in 1967, while that exported through Singapore has declined from 31½% in 1966 to about 27% in 1967.

Unemployment—A number of Honourable Members referred to the unemployment situation. As regards the source of the unemployment figures which I gave in my Budget speech, I might point out that the comprehensive sample survey of 30,000 households in West Malaysia was conducted in June last year by the Departments of Statistics and Labour. This survey was scientifically designed and the data quoted are based on some of the preliminary findings of the survey. I am assured that these figures are firmly based.

It should, however, be noted that although the overall rate of unemployment is a little too high for comfort, it has nevertheless remained relatively stable in recent years—6% in 1962 and 6½% in 1967. While it is true that there has been an actual increase in the number of unemployed, it is also true, and this is a source of some satisfaction, that the economy has been able to absorb a substantial proportion of the annual additions to the labour force in recent years, despite rapid population growth. In the last analysis, promising solutions lie in two directions in the long term. Firstly, our education system has to be reorientated to meet the technological requirements of the economy. This is being done and the process will be accelerated in the years to come. The other solution would seem to lie in the direction of greater private investment, and this is where State Governments can help by being more forward looking and liberal in their land alienation policies. On their part, Honourable Members on both sides of this House can also help, by seeing to it that the Government and country as a whole reflect an image of financial prudence and economic sobriety, in order to induce more massive investment.

Miscellaneous Matters—One Honourable Member of the Opposition suggested a much greater increase in expenditure, in order to offset the deflationary effects of the rubber price decline. This would be the popular thing to do, and if we really had elections in mind, we would have done this also. I am convinced, however,

that it would be dangerous to increase Government spending at this stage, whatever the political advantages of this course of action might be. It is rather odd that the Honourable Member who made this suggestion has consistently castigated the Government for spending too much. I wonder if he himself really knows what he wants us to do.

Conclusion—To sum up, considering the unexceptionally harsh circumstances which we had to face in 1967, we have done far better than we could have hoped. Far from being downcast with our performance in 1967, we have cause for a fair measure of restrained optimism (*Applause*). In 1967, we took more than one blow, we took several

blows, each one of which could have floored us for the full count, if I may be permitted to use some boxing expressions (*Laughter*). Instead, we are up and as springy as ever, and ready for the next round, and still fit and fresh. This is what really matters (*Applause*).

Usul di-kemuka bagi di-putuskan, dan di-setujukan.

Rang Undang² di-bachakan kali yang kedua.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua: Majlis meshuarat di-tanggohkan hingga pukul 10.00 pagi hari Isnin, 5hb Februari, 1968.

Dewan di-tanggohkan pada pukul 12.56 tengah hari.