



PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

OFFICIAL REPORT

CONTENTS

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 263]

MOTION:

The Yang di-Pertuan Agong's Speech—

Address of Thanks [Col. 269]



THE
LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF
MICHIGAN
ANN ARBOR
MICHIGAN
48106-1000

FEDERATION OF MALAYA
DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)
Official Report

Fourth Session of the First Dewan Ra'ayat

Friday, 27th April, 1962

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

PRESENT:

- The Honourable Mr. Speaker, DATO' HAJI MOHAMED NOAH BIN OMAR, S.P.M.J., D.P.M.B., P.I.S., J.P.
- „ the Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs, Y.T.M. TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN PUTRA AL-HAJ, K.O.M. (Kuala Kedah).
- „ the Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Defence and Minister of Rural Development, TUN HAJI ABDUL RAZAK BIN DATO' HUSSAIN, S.M.N. (Pekan).
- „ the Minister of Internal Security and Minister of the Interior, DATO' DR. ISMAIL BIN DATO' HAJI ABDUL RAHMAN, P.M.N. (Johor Timor).
- „ the Minister of Finance, ENCHE' TAN SIEW SIN, J.P. (Melaka Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, DATO' V. T. SAMBANTHAN, P.M.N. (Sungai Siput).
- „ the Minister of Transport, DATO' SARDON BIN HAJI JUBIR, P.M.N. (Pontian Utara).
- „ the Minister of Health and Social Welfare, DATO' ONG YOKE LIN, P.M.N. (Ulu Selangor).
- „ the Minister of Commerce and Industry, ENCHE' MOHAMED KHIR BIN JOHARI (Kedah Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Education, ENCHE' ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAJI TALIB (Kuantan).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Rural Development, TUAN HAJI ABDUL KHALID BIN AWANG OSMAN (Kota Star Utara).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Commerce and Industry, ENCHE' CHEAH THEAM SWEE (Bukit Bintang).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Labour, ENCHE' V. MANICKAVASAGAM, J.M.N., P.J.K. (Klang).
- „ the Assistant Minister of the Interior, ENCHE' MOHAMED ISMAIL BIN MOHAMED YUSOF (Jerai).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL GHANI BIN ISHAK, A.M.N. (Melaka Utara).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAUF BIN A. RAHMAN, P.J.K. (Krian Laut).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL SAMAD BIN OSMAN (Sungai Patani).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI ABDUL RAOF (Kuala Kangsar).

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

- „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN ABDULLAH (Kota Bharu Hilir).
- „ ENCHE' AHMAD BIN ARSHAD, A.M.N. (Muar Utara).
- „ ENCHE' AHMAD BOESTAMAM (Setapak).
- „ ENCHE' AHMAD BIN MOHAMED SHAH, S.M.J. (Johor Bharu Barat).
- „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN SAAID (Seberang Utara).
- „ ENCHE' AHMAD BIN HAJI YUSOF, P.J.K. (Krian Darat).
- „ TUAN HAJI AZAHARI BIN HAJI IBRAHIM (Kubang Pasu Barat).
- „ ENCHE' AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Muar Dalam).
- „ DR. BURHANUDDIN BIN MOHD. NOOR (Besut).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN CHONG WEN, A.M.N. (Kluang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN SIANG SUN (Bentong).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN YOON ONN (Kampar).
- „ ENCHE' CHIN SEE YIN (Seremban Timor).
- „ ENCHE' V. DAVID (Bungsar).
- „ DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI HASHIM, P.M.N. (Jitra-Padang Terap).
- „ ENCHE' GEH CHONG KEAT (Penang Utara).
- „ ENCHE' HAMZAH BIN ALANG, A.M.N. (Kapar).
- „ ENCHE' HANAFI BIN MOHD. YUNUS, A.M.N. (Kulim Utara).
- „ ENCHE' HARUN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Baling).
- „ ENCHE' HARUN BIN PILUS (Trengganu Tengah).
- „ TUAN HAJI HASAN ADLI BIN HAJI ARSHAD (Kuala Trengganu Utara).
- „ TUAN HAJI HASSAN BIN HAJI AHMAD (Tumpat).
- „ ENCHE' HASSAN BIN MANSOR (Melaka Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN To' MUDA HASSAN (Raub).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN MOHD. NOORDIN, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Parit).
- „ TUAN HAJI HUSSAIN RAHIMI BIN HAJI SAMAN (Kota Bharu Hulu).
- „ ENCHE' IBRAHIM BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Seberang Tengah).
- „ ENCHE' ISMAIL BIN IDRIS (Penang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' ISMAIL BIN HAJI KASSIM (Kuala Trengganu Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' KANG KOCK SENG (Batu Pahat).
- „ CHE' KHADIJAH BINTI MOHD. SIDEK (Dungun).
- „ ENCHE' KHONG KOK YAT (Batu Gajah).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SECK FUN (Tanjong Malim).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SIOK YEW, A.M.N. (Sepang).
- „ ENCHE' LIM JOO KONG, J.P. (Alor Star).
- „ DR. LIM SWEE AUN, J.P. (Larut Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' LIU YOONG PENG (Rawang).
- „ ENCHE' T. MAHIMA SINGH, J.P. (Port Dickson).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED BIN UJANG (Jejebu-Jempol).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED ABBAS BIN AHMAD (Hilir Perak).

- The Honourable ENCHE' MOHAMED ASRI BIN HAJI MUDA (Pasir Puteh).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED NOR BIN MOHD. DAHAN (Ulu Perak).
- „ DATO' MOHAMED HANIFAH BIN HAJI ABDUL GHANI, P.J.K. (Pasir Mas Hulu).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED YUSOF BIN MAHMUD, A.M.N. (Temerloh).
- „ TUAN HAJI MOKHTAR BIN HAJI ISMAIL (Perlis Selatan).
- „ NIK MAN BIN NIK MOHAMED (Pasir Mas Hilir).
- „ ENCHE' NG ANN TECK (Batu).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Tanah Merah).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Perlis Utara).
- „ TUAN HAJI REDZA BIN HAJI MOHD. SAID (Rembau-Tampin).
- „ ENCHE' SEAH TENG NGIAB (Muar Pantai).
- „ ENCHE' D. R. SEENIVASAGAM (Ipoh).
- „ ENCHE' S. P. SEENIVASAGAM (Menglembu).
- „ TUAN SYED ESA BIN ALWEE, J.M.N., S.M.J., P.I.S. (Batu Pahat Dalam).
- „ TUAN SYED HASHIM BIN SYED AJAM, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Sabak Bernam).
- „ TUAN SYED JA'AFAR BIN HASAN ALBAR, J.M.N. (Johor Tenggara).
- „ ENCHE' TAJUDIN BIN ALI, P.J.K. (Larut Utara).
- „ ENCHE' TAN CHENG BEE, J.P. (Bagan).
- „ ENCHE' TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Melaka).
- „ ENCHE' TAN PHOCK KIN (Tanjong).
- „ ENCHE' TAN TYE CHEK (Kulim-Bandar Bahru).
- „ TENGKU BESAR INDERA RAJA IBNI AL-MARHUM SULTAN IBRAHIM, D.K., P.M.N. (Ulu Kelantan).
- „ DATO' TEOH CHZE CHONG, D.P.M.J., J.P. (Segamat Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' TOO JOON HING (Telok Anson).
- „ ENCHE' V. VEERAPPEN (Seberang Selatan).
- „ WAN SULAIMAN BIN WAN TAM, P.J.K. (Kota Star Selatan).
- „ WAN YAHYA BIN HAJI WAN MOHAMED (Kemaman).
- „ ENCHE' YAHYA BIN HAJI AHMAD (Bagan Datoh).
- „ ENCHE' YEOH TAT BENG (Bruas).
- „ ENCHE' YONG WOO MING (Sitiawan).
- „ PUAN HAJJAH ZAIN BINTI SULAIMAN, J.M.N., P.I.S. (Pontian Selatan).
- „ TUAN HAJI ZAKARIA BIN HAJI MOHD. TAIB (Langat).
- „ ENCHE' ZULKIFLEE BIN MUHAMMAD (Bachok).

ABSENT:

- The Honourable DATO' SULEIMAN BIN DATO' HAJI ABDUL RAHMAN, P.M.N. (Minister without Portfolio) (Muar Selatan) (*On leave*).
- „ the Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives, ENCHE' ABDUL AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Kuala Langat).
- „ the Minister of Labour, ENCHE' BAHAMAN BIN SAMSUDIN (Kuala Pilah).

The Honourable the Assistant Minister of Education, ENCHE' ABDUL HAMID KHAN BIN HAJI SAKHAWAT ALI KHAN, J.M.N., J.P.
(Batang Padang).

- „ ENCHE' CHAN SWEE HO (Ulu Kinta).
- „ ENCHE' K. KARAM SINGH (Damansara).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SAN CHOON (Kluang Utara).
- „ ENCHE' LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED DAHARI BIN HAJI MOHD. ALI (Kuala Selangor).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED SULONG BIN MOHD. ALI, J.M.N. (Kuala Lipis).
- „ ENCHE' QUEK KAI DONG, J.P. (Seremban Barat).
- „ WAN MUSTAPHA BIN HAJI ALI (Kelantan Hilir).

IN ATTENDANCE:

The Honourable the Minister of Justice, TUN LEONG YEW KOH, S.M.N.

PRAYERS

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Perjanjian Pertahanan di-antara Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu dengan Kerajaan United Kingdom

1. Enche' Ahmad Boestamam bertanya kepada Menteri Dalam Negeri benar-kah naskhah Perjanjian Pertahanan di-antara Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu dengan Kerajaan United Kingdom dapat di-beli daripada Penchetak Kerajaan dan ada-kah Perjanjian itu dalam bahasa kebangsaan.

The Minister of Internal Security (Dato' Dr. Ismail bin Dato' Haji Abdul Rahman): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Pejabat Penchetak Kerajaan tidak mempunyai lagi naskhah "Perjanjian Pertahanan di-antara Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu dengan Kerajaan United Kingdom" untuk jualan kepada orang ramai.

Naskhah Perjanjian ini telah di-chetak pada mula-nya sa-bagai "Council Paper No. 53 tahun 1957" dan di-tulis dalam bahasa Inggeris sahaja.

Enche' Ahmad Boestamam: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kenapa-kah sekarang tidak dapat di-chetak lagi?

Dato' Dr. Ismail: Jika ada permintaan yang menchukupi tentang

"Perjanjian" itu sa-kurang²-nya 100 naskhah, maka Penchetak Kerajaan boleh menchetak sa-mula dan mengeluarkan-nya dalam tempoh dua minggu.

Pasokan Bersenjata Persekutuan di-Congo Chatuan Makanan

2. Enche' Ahmad Boestamam bertanya kepada Menteri Pertahanan benar-kah ashkar² kita yang berkhidmat di-Congo di-beri babi dalam tin sa-bagai chatuan makanan mereka itu.

The Minister of Defence (Tun Haji Abdul Razak): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tuduhan itu tidak benar bahawa ashkar kita yang berkhidmat di-Congo itu di-beri chatuan babi dalam tin. Ashkar kita di-Congo ada-lah menerima chatuan² barang makanan daripada Pertubohan Bangsa² Bersatu. Chatuan² ini di-beri mengikut kehendak pasokan² itu dan menurut kehendak ugama mereka itu.

Enche' Ahmad Boestamam: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bukan-kah dalam satu Jamuan Teh di-Negeri Sembilan ada sa-orang ashkar di-dalam ucapan-nya mengatakan demikian dan menunjokkan satu tin yang mengandongi makanan ini?

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tuduhan itu tidak benar. Saya telah di-beritahu bahawa sa-belum chatuan² itu di-beri kepada ashkar kita, barang² yang haram itu di-ketepikan, dan di-gantikan dengan barang yang halal.

Kejadian² Orang Bawah Memukul Pegawai

3. Enche' Ahmad Boestamam bertanya kepada Menteri Pertahanan berapakah ada kejadian orang bawahan memukul pegawai atasan di-kalangan Pasokan ke-6 Ashkar Melayu di-Raja sa-waktu bertugas di-Congo tempoh hari dan apa-kah sebab-nya berlaku hal² yang demikian itu.

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada satu tuduhan ia-itu sa-orang ashkar telah memukul sa-orang pegawai. Perkara itu telah di-bicarakan dalam General Court-Martial, dan ashkar itu di-dapati tidak salah. Tidak ada lagi tuduhan² yang lain.

Enche' Ahmad Boestamam: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam pertanyaan ini ada saya nyatakan: "sebab-nya berlaku hal² yang demikian itu". Sebab sa-bagaimana yang di-katakan itu bukan satu tetapi sudah dua di-bawa ka-Mahkamah.

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perkara itu memang berlaku dalam tentera dan juga mana² kumpulan manusia, dan perkara ini saya telah sebutkan ia-itu telah di-bicarakan dengan adil dalam Mahkamah, dan keterangan² yang lanjut telah di-beri oleh semua pihak, dan ashkar yang di-tuduh itu di-dapati tidak salah.

Enche' Ahmad Boestamam: Tidakkah hal yang demikian ini berlaku kerana sikap kurang adil dari pihak pegawai² yang di-atas-nya?

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya telah kata perkara itu kadang² tentu berlaku, dan dalam hal ini di-dapati tidak salah daripada mana² pihak, dan Mahkamah telah puas hati. Perkara itu telah di-bicarakan dengan lanjut-nya.

Enche' Ahmad Boestamam: Tidakkah juga keadaan yang demikian ini boleh berlaku kerana layanan² yang tidak memuaskan yang di-terima oleh ashkar² itu? Mithal-nya, satu kompeni telah memberi ubat penggosok gigi, tetapi tidak sampai kepada ashkar itu, erti-nya kerana layanan tidak ada, maka keadaan begitu timbul.

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perkara yang macham ini ta' dapat tiada kadang² berlaku, tetapi saya puas hati yang layanan² yang di-beri oleh pegawai² itu kepada tentera kita memuaskan sa-hingga hari ini, dan jika ada perkara² yang tidak sesuai berlaku, tindakan yang sa-wajar-nya akan di-ambil.

Enche' Ahmad Boestamam: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dapat-kah kita mengatakan layanan itu memuaskan hati kalau sa-kira-nya ashkar negeri lain yang berkhidmat di-Congo itu mendapat \$15.00 sa-hari, tetapi ashkar kita mendapat \$1.00 sa-hari?

Memberi Peluang Kepada Orang² Ramai Melayu Membeli Saham² di-dalam Sharikat²

4. Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad bertanya kepada Timbalan Perdana Menteri ada-kah Lembaga Kemajuan Kampong dan Perusahaan bersedia untuk memberi peluang kepada orang² ramai Melayu bagi membeli saham² yang di-punya-nya yang telah maju seperti di-dalam Sharikat Bas NET di-Kota Bharu itu.

The Deputy Prime Minister (Tun Haji Abdul Razak): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, memang dasar RIDA ia-itu share dalam Sharikat NET itu akan di-jual-nya oleh RIDA kepada orang² Melayu terutama sa-kali kepada pekerja² sharikat itu apabila di-dapati sharikat itu berjalan dengan memuaskan hati.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam perkara Sharikat NET ini sudah-kah Kerajaan menyiasat hal ini dan chuba² menentukan ia-itu dapat di-perbuatkan.

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, share² Sharikat NET itu hendak di-jualkan tidak berapa lama lagi terutama sa-kali kepada pekerja² dalam Sharikat NET itu.

Mengadakan Gerabak² Tempat Tidor dalam Keretapi ka-Pantai Timor

5. Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad bertanya kepada Menteri Pengangkutan bila-kah pihak Pentadbiran

Keretapi Tanah Melayu akan mengadakan gerabak² tempat tidur "sleeperette" bagi keretapi² ka-Pantai Timor dan apa-kah sebab²-nya layanan itu di-kemudiankan daripada Pantai Barat.

The Minister of Transport (Dato' Sardon bin Haji Jubir): Perkhidmatan kursandar bagi penumpang² kelas III telah di-mulakan pada bulan Oktober, tahun 1961, sa-chara perhubungan sahaja untuk mengetahui sama ada ia-nya di-gemari ramai atau tidak, dan hanya dua koch sahaja yang telah di-lengkapi dengan kursandar² itu. Ahli Yang Berhormat itu sa-patut-nya tahu bahawa pada masa ini hanya keretapi² mel malam di-antara Kuala Lumpur dan Singapura sahaja yang ada koch² ini. Oleh kerana perkhidmatan itu berupa satu perhubungan sahaja, maka soal mengutamakan pantai barat daripada pantai timur tidak timbul. Saya dengan sukachita-nya menyatakan di-sini bahawa kursandar² itu di-dapati maju dan langkah sedang di-ambil untuk menambah bilangan koch² kursandar supaya kursandar² bagi kelas III dapat di-adakan bukan sahaja di-dalam keretapi pantai timur tetapi juga di-dalam keretapi mel malam di-antara Kuala Lumpur dan Prai.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bila?

Dato' Sardon bin Haji Jubir: Sa-berapa segera kalau boleh.

Enche' Othman bin Abdullah (Tanah Merah): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya hendak bertanya kursandar-kah atau kosandar?

Dato' Sardon bin Haji Jubir: Kursandar, ma'ana-nya kursi sandar (Ketawa).

Delay in Deportation of Banishees

6. Enche' Ng Ann Teck asks the Minister of the Interior to state what are the factors that delay banishees from being deported to China and whether he would consider setting up a Special Camp for banishees awaiting deportation after having served their terms of imprisonment.

The Minister of the Interior (Dato' Dr. Ismail): Sir, arrangements are

being made to ship persons under sentence of banishment to China and until they are finalised it would not be advisable to announce the nature of such arrangements or the factors which are delaying the completion of these arrangements. The Government does not consider it necessary to set up a Special Camp for banishees awaiting deportation.

Surrendered Citizenship Certificate—Deprivation Proceedings

7. Enche' Ng Ann Teck asks the Minister of the Interior to state how many voluntarily surrendered Citizenship Certificate holders have been officially deprived of their Certificates up to 31st March, 1962, how many are still awaiting action of deprivation, and whether he could assure this House that those awaiting deprivation shall be accorded special facilities for re-application even if the period of grace for registration under Article (17) of the Constitution has expired.

Dato' Dr. Ismail: Sir, out of a total number of 12,544 Citizenship certificates surrendered under the Amnesty terms, 2,062 cases have been disposed of, leaving a balance of 10,482. Out of these 10,482 cases, 26 cases are pending reference to a Committee of Inquiry; 922 cases are awaiting Orders of Deprivation which will be issued shortly; 7,663 cases have been dealt with and deprivation proceedings are being taken; and 1,873 cases are under examination and the Registration Department is awaiting further details from the persons concerned.

Persons who have surrendered their certificates during the Amnesty period will be afforded sufficient time to enable them to apply for re-registration as Federal citizens under Article 17 of the Constitution provided, of course, that they have the necessary requirements.

Enche' Liu Yoong Peng: Is the Minister satisfied with the speed with which these certificates are being dealt with?

Dato' Dr. Ismail: I am satisfied, Sir.

MOTION

THE YANG DI-PERTUAN AGONG'S SPEECH

ADDRESS OF THANKS

Order read for resumption of debate on Question.

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

'Your Majesty.

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

(26th April, 1962).

Question again proposed.

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam (Ipoh):

Mr. Speaker, Sir, when I was interrupted on adjournment last evening, I had reached the stage when I said there was no political stability in this country. But with your permission, Sir, may I go back for one second to the clarification given by the Honourable Minister of Transport in answer to my suggestion that since 52 per cent or more than 52 per cent of taxi licences had already come into the possession of our Malay brothers, the special privilege or special right there should no longer exist in conformity with the intention of the framers of our Constitution. I have had time to think over the clarification given and it seems to me somewhat odd, because I don't think the framers of the Constitution or indeed anybody ever thought that the special right in relation to any matter would be so construed—not on a national basis but on a purely area basis, because that is what the Honourable Minister of Transport says. The explanation comes to this: if you take the Federation of Malaya, true we have reached an equal or higher stage; but if you take State by State, then you must consider how the position is in each State. I suppose when in each State equality is reached, then we will be told that we should take it now town council area by town council area, thereafter village area by village area

and thereafter rural area by rural area. I don't think that is a proper principle to work on, and I would implore that the Government should seriously consider making a special study of the position as it is in the Federation today. That raises again the whole question of the special rights under Article 153 of our Constitution, and I would urge that since it was the intention of the framers of the Constitution that this should be looked into from time to time, the position should be examined to see how it has worked and to see whether alterations are required in any of the specific objectives set out in Article 153. Now, I have no doubt that perhaps the Government has been from time to time looking into this, but we the people do not know that, and I would ask that in due course the Government should table a White Paper or give some indication to the country as to how Article 153, that is, relating to special rights, has worked, how far it has succeeded, and how far it can be amended or abrogated in its implementation. That is a matter of considerable importance, because Article 153 came into our Constitution as a bargain. It was a bargain as between the Alliance partners themselves and my authority for saying that is contained in our debates. I am referring to the debates contained in Volume II, No. 50, an address by the Member for Larut Selatan when he was speaking on the late Dato' Onn's motion on Nationality of the Persekutuan Tanah Melayu, and at column 5435 this is what the Honourable Member said in relation to Article 153—and those words are very significant in view of a certain statement made by the Honourable Member in moving this motion—

"The Alliance in its fight for independence from the British only decided on the 23rd August, 1953, at the Alliance Convention in Kuala Lumpur to accept the challenge of Mr. Oliver Lyttleton to get all the races united and with that decision racial tension in Malaya decreased—the Malays did not fight against the Chinese; and the Chinese did not fight against the Malays. And from 1955 to 1957—this period can now be described as the period of transition—the non-Malay leaders and the Malay leaders were bargaining with each other, the Malays

wanted the special rights of the Malays to be preserved, whereas the non-Malays fought for *jus soli* to be continued. However, a compromise was arrived at, the Malay leaders agreed to give *jus soli* to the non-Malays only after the Merdeka day and the non-Malays accepted that condition and agreed to have the special rights of the Malays written into the Constitution not for 15 years but for an indefinite period as in Article 153."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, that statement, coming from the authority of the Honourable Member for Larut Selatan, is indeed very enlightening, because today we have come to the position—and here I speak of political instability in this country—when a bargain which was made before Independence had been broken. What we have today, what the Malays bargained for, according to the Member for Larut Selatan, was the preservation of special rights. They got it, it is still here. What the non-Malays, what they bargained for—and in the speech the Member referred to Chinese—was *jus soli*. Today they haven't got that *jus soli* which they bargained for—we all know that the Constitution was amended and that is taken away. But the special rights still remain. Mr. Speaker, Sir, that being the position, that is the reason why I say this whole question of Article 153 should be reviewed. I do not say it should be amended, I say it should be reviewed, because in its implementation from time to time different conditions arise in the country. If you are prepared to review it, a glaring example is the taxi licences; the time has come for a review there.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I said political instability. Now, the fact that there are no disturbances of any sort in this country gives the appearance of political stability. But what is the meaning of political stability? Political stability means that the people of a country are united with a clear heart, with a common desire, and happy with the government of the day. But if the majority of the people are so happy, then you can say there is political stability. But if large sections, amounting to considerable numbers of persons are not so satisfied, then you do not say there is political stability. Because there are no disturbances, did you try

to find out why, what is the reason, if any, for this dissatisfaction?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the reasons for dissatisfaction are, I think, clear. First, as I just said, the violation of the Constitution was carried out, only at the last meeting of this Parliament. We have heard views expressed upon it from time to time by very responsible persons in this country and also by the masses. They are dissatisfied because something which was bargained for and agreed to before Merdeka has been to a degree violated. The people are dissatisfied—and when I say the people, I mean the citizens of this country, large sections of them—over the Education policy for one reason or another. The non-Malays are dissatisfied because that policy deprived them of the right, or the opportunity to preserve, maintain and use their own languages in this country. They are dissatisfied—and here the large masses of people are dissatisfied very strongly—over the administration of land matters in this country.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, rural development touches land to a large extent. Glaring examples can be given of how—in one case an Indian and in another case a Chinese—a person who has been in occupation on T.O.L. licence for periods ranging from 10 to 15 years, and like a bolt out of the blue, he is served with a notice from the Land Office saying, "Get out of this land because it is required for rural development", with no undertaking, with no assurance, that he will be entitled to get back that land after the rural development had come to its proper place in that area. This has happened in Perak; it has happened in other parts of the country. Surely, then, there is dissatisfaction. There is dissatisfaction being caused by applying a principle of not treating people equally in this country.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, then again land alienation itself is done on a basis which is beyond all sense of reason or beyond all proportion. You cannot just look after one section of the population; you look after all sections. If they are working people, if they are ra'ayats and if they are in the rural areas, then

they are entitled to equal treatment—and this Government is not giving that equal treatment.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, then you may say, why are the people not expressing it in a more positive or more demonstrative manner? The answer is clear. They dare not do it. There are sometimes subdued protests, but open protests they will not dare to do so long as the Internal Security Act is in force in this country. They leave it to politicians to do it. And here, as I mentioned yesterday, you must look to the Opposition. You may say that the Opposition is not a sizeable one. Quite true. But remember, who put the Opposition here? Who put the Opposition, at least the People's Progressive Party of Malaya—I speak of my own Party—who put them here? The sections of the community who are dissatisfied with the Government! If you total the votes of the Opposition, you will find that they are almost equal to the total votes obtained by the government of the day, and we sit here in the majority, with all respect I say, on non-Malay votes. Therefore, that proves one thing: that the non-Malays in this country are dissatisfied. They are dissatisfied, and dissatisfied to a very strong extent, and I think the Government should take notice of that, because if you look at your Benches, how many of you can say that you truly represent the non-Malays in this country. You cannot. The MCA cannot say that; the MIC cannot say that. I raise this not to show, not to try to say that I am communal; I am not. I am only drawing attention to a position which exists in this land, a position which must be remedied so that before anything undesirable should happen. If it can be remedied, it should be remedied now and here. And I hope the Government will consider what I have said in all seriousness, because if we don't do that, things are going from bad to worse. You cannot say that there is political stability when people are cowed down by undemocratic, unjust laws, which exist in this land.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, speaking on the Constitution and on citizenship, it is regrettable that in His Majesty's Speech there is no reference to the

question of how citizenship is revoked in this country. It should have been in that Speech. I take it that the Cabinet, or whoever is responsible for drafting or drawing up the policy statement, did not think it necessary to do so. There is great dissatisfaction, there is great apprehension, in view of certain events that have taken place in this country in relation to certain prominent persons with regard to citizenship and its revocation, or the manner in which attempts had been made to revoke that citizenship; there is great apprehension that the procedure by which revocation is done is not a practical and not a suitable procedure for this country.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have always thought that one of the fundamentals of justice is that, if you want to take away something from a person by lawful means, then that person should have a proper opportunity to defend himself; and if he is unsuccessful a proper opportunity should be given to him to appeal to an unbiased tribunal. Now, our method of revocation of citizenship is this. The Minister in charge of this, in this case the Honourable the Minister of the Interior, through his officers, will serve notice saying, "Your citizenship is liable to revocation and these are the grounds on which we propose to revoke your citizenship." The next step that man has, his legal step, is to say, "I want an inquiry". That Committee of Inquiry is appointed by the same person, that is the Honourable Minister, who sent out the notice through his officers saying "You are liable to have your citizenship revoked." There is only one protection in that Committee, and that is that the chairman should normally be a person with legal knowledge. But let us see who appoints that Committee—the same person who sent out the notice. The Committee sits. The Constitution says that whatever recommendations the Committee makes the Honourable Minister is not bound to accept. Even if the Committee says, "You have no right, no grounds, to revoke the citizenship", the Honourable Minister can say, "I do not bother

about your opinion. I am going to revoke it." Let us assume the order of revocation is made. It may be said that no Minister in his senses will ever say, "I do not bother about your opinion or recommendation" after having appointed the Committee. That may be so, but let us see what can possibly happen.

Now, let us say, the Minister, or even the Committee, says that the citizenship can be revoked and an order is signed revoking a man's citizenship. Now, Sir, this is the most important and fundamental point which citizens by registration in this country are facing—a constant danger and a constant threat once that order is made. He has a right to appeal, but to appeal to whom? The same Minister who made that order. I cannot understand if that is the principle of justice. If that is the thing, I should like to know, if that is the principle of justice as understood in this country.

Now, Sir, very often, at least on one occasion, the Honourable the Prime Minister, the Honourable the Deputy Prime Minister, and other Alliance Members, at political rallies, including the Honourable the Minister of Transport, have publicly declared that Mr. So-and-So should not be a citizen of this country, before any inquiry has been held, before any order has been made; it has already been declared by the Head of the Government, by Ministers, "Mr. So-and-So should not be a citizen of this country". What justice then do you expect when the inquiry comes up, if it comes up? What justice do you expect, if you have already made up your mind before a man has had a chance to appear before a Committee of Inquiry? I am defending nobody, I am attacking nobody. What I am saying is that this is not justice, and it is a disgrace to this nation that there should be this manner in which a citizen who is loyal to this country should be judged, even before he has had the opportunity to appear before the Committee of Inquiry. I do not think that any Member on the Alliance side can complain about that statement. If you want that law, then hold

your hand until the inquiry is over—at least that will show some sense of responsibility or decency in this affair. As it is, if such statements are made, what is the impression that people of this country will have? What is the impression the free world will have that in this country citizenship in that manner is always in danger? Political opponents can be victimised—I do not say that they are; they can be victimised, if that is the attitude, if people charged with the responsibility of allowing citizenship to any man are prepared to make statements even before an inquiry is held. I hope that will not be repeated. I hope that the Government will consider another method by which citizenship can be revoked. The proper method would be in a legal manner, by a court. Put the power back into the hands of the court to deal with it. Then, there will be satisfaction. So long as that is not done, certainly there is no satisfaction in this land. You ask for loyalty, for undivided loyalty. The people will give you that undivided loyalty, but in return they ask for security, a sense of security in their citizenship which they are rightly entitled to under the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, coming to the question of justice—it has been touched on by His Majesty. Let us take our minds back to the day when the Kidnapping Act was passed in this House. You will recall the comments made by the Opposition—and here, with respect, by the Socialist Front and the Peoples' Progressive Party together. We said that you were passing a law which you could never enforce. We told you that it is a law which will be made a laughing stock. It turned out to be a laughing stock. It turned out to be a law which was violated, violated flagrantly, by responsible citizens from this town, violated to such an extent, I say, in co-operation with the police of this country: ransom money was paid, we are told, in co-operation with the police. You passed a law and your own police force violated that law. When we said so, there was a barrage of bombardment from the Government side—"Oh, you do not like laws to deal with crimes in

this country." Who does not want law to deal with crimes in this country? But pass sensible laws which can be enforced! Do not pass nonsensical law which cannot be enforced—and I am glad that the Honourable the Minister of Justice has recently said, "Oh, I think we have to revoke the section which says that you cannot pay ransom to kidnappers". When we said that, you said, "No"—now you say "Yes." This is one example where, I say, the Government should listen with care and attention when the Opposition say something, because in nine out of ten cases we turn out to be right.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, kidnapping is a crime. It must be punished, but it must be punished according to law. Make the law, enforce the law. You have the Kidnapping Act. It is in force in this country today. May I ask and will the Honourable Minister be able to tell this House whether those who committed perjury in court are going to be prosecuted for perjury? Are those who paid ransom money going to be prosecuted for paying ransom money? The police who assisted in paying the ransom money, are they going to be dealt with in a disciplinary and proper manner? If they are not going to be prosecuted, then I ask, "Why did you pass the law? When people violate it, why do you keep quiet?" The law is no respecter of persons—whether one is a millionaire or beggar—and all are subject to the same law. Nobody should get away with open, flagrant, violation of a criminal law of this country. Sir, the case is no more *sub judice*. The learned Magistrate recommended prosecution of several persons for committing perjury and I do hope that this Government, who speaks of upholding law and order, will uphold the law and maintain order by seeing that those guilty of offences are prosecuted.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, when the amendment to the Kidnapping Act comes up, I can assure this House that if it is sensible, reasonable and enforceable, it will get the full backing of the Peoples' Progressive Party. But if it violates any fundamental principle of known justice, you will get opposition from the Peoples'

Progressive Party. Mr. Speaker, Sir, there are a number of other laws which call for amendment, which call for review and study, on the criminal side and on the civil side. We have been told that these are being attended to. I hope that we will get this amendment at an early date so that confidence in the administration of justice will be maintained at all times. Justice is the backbone of a nation: if the public have confidence in its administration and in the laws, then you have gone a long way towards a stable nation; and if they do not have it, then you have failed. Mr. Speaker, Sir, again on justice, power to licence various things are frequently in the hands of the Police. That is a matter of deep concern to the public, because it is usually people who are not interested in anything else except their licence who go and apply for a licence. I would ask the Honourable Minister in charge of Police to see that there is absolute impartiality in issuing these licences. There is a glaring example in Kuala Lumpur today of, what I would say, partiality. Now, up to recently there was a dancer at the Embassy Hotel performing dances. Unfortunately, one night, or fortunately one night, I should say, a police officer went to the Embassy Hotel, obviously to enjoy himself, I suppose. Now, having seen the dance, he immediately got up and cancelled the licence. I don't complain about that. I don't complain because if it was not desirable, it should be cancelled. Whether it was or not is another matter. What I cannot understand is that the same performer performing the same dance was licensed the next day to perform in another dance hall in Kuala Lumpur. What is the explanation for it? If it was obscene, if it was offensive, it was not the hall that was offensive; it was the dance. And if it was offensive in Hall "A", it must equally be offensive in Hall "B". Therefore, it raises an important question, is there impartiality in this matter? There should be. If there is not, then some investigation is necessary. Lawyers got into the matter, but the only answer they got was, "Well, that is the way we are going to have it." I can't understand it, but I do hope that investigations will be

carried out on this particular case. If a person cannot perform a dance at Embassy Hotel, why the same dance—and it is the same dance, because people have gone to see it—can be performed at B.B. Park—the same type of patrons and the same atmosphere prevails in both places. And this is not an isolated occasion. It has been happening, I understand—here I cannot vouch for accuracy—it has been happening quite often in this part of the country.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it was with very great surprise, with very great astonishment and with very great regret that I did not see one word in His Majesty's Address to Parliament on the question of South Africa and apartheid. The answer may be: we do not want to play the same record again and again. But you are playing the same record on Tibet and you are playing the same record on other international affairs. I ask one question. There was a big noise, there was a big bang, South Africa was condemned, and Malaya took the lead in the boycott. We asked other nations to join us in the boycott. I am sure this nation and other nations which are against apartheid would like to know how many are the nations which joined Malaya in a boycott of the goods from South Africa. Why this silence, so clear and so strange? Could it be that other nations said, "Well, go on and do what you like, but we do not bother about what you do"? I am sure the Honourable Prime Minister would like to tell us and the Malayan nation whether we got support from other free nations which talk so much of the human race being equal and of being treated with dignity and respect, and I do ask that the Prime Minister tell us how many nations joined Malaya in her call for a boycott of South African goods. If they have not, then what are we going to do about it? We spoke a lot, we shouted a lot—what is the result we have achieved? The Malayan nation and the rest of the world would like to know.

Mr. Speaker, on the question of West Irian, I cannot really understand what the policy statement is. It says we

cannot support anything which may lead to violence. What about Tibet? What about other countries where there is violence? You have supported one side against the other; you have declared your stand very clearly. Why in the case of West Irian you say, "Well, it may lead to this; therefore, we hope there will be peace." Nobody is fooled by that statement. You are evading the issue. You are afraid to say which side you are on because you may annoy somebody else, or there is some other reason why you are not prepared to state your stand. I call upon the Government to make its stand clear in respect of Indonesia and West Irian. Are you supporting the claim of Indonesia to West Irian, or are you not supporting the claim? As far as the Peoples' Progressive Party is concerned, we do not support the claim of Indonesia to West Irian and I ask the Government to say that they do not support that claim. I ask you to say that you do not support it because Indonesia has only guided democracy and nothing worthwhile to offer to the Papuan people of West Irian. I ask you to declare that you cannot support Indonesia claiming other territories because they are not a democratic nation. I ask you to say that you cannot support Indonesia's claim because you believe in the principle of self-determination for the Papuan people. If you disagree with me, then say you support Indonesia and tell us why you support. But make your stand clear one way or the other. You cannot fool the world, you cannot fool this nation, and you cannot evade the issue any longer.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, on the question of the Congo, on our troops in the Congo, I would be the last person to say any one single word which may reflect in any manner against our troops in the Congo. I think it is wrong. But I say this: that the recent courts-martial should be sufficient to make the Honourable Minister of Defence sit up and take action. If there is any slight thing that is wrong in Congo, make a thorough investigation, see that our soldiers in the Congo are satisfied because if there is any rumble of dissatisfaction, now is the time to see

that it is put right because our reputation as a nation stands in the Congo and we must maintain that reputation. Beyond that, at this stage I do not want to say anything except, for the information of the Government, that information does come out of Congo. It does come out and it comes to the Opposition. If we use that today, it would be most improper, because we have no means of checking its correctness. But one thing is clear—I don't say due to any deliberate intention—that the organisation in the Congo is not proper. It is not well done, because you get holidays for certain festivals; for other festivals where you should give holidays for Indians, for example, they are not given holidays. They do not complain much, but they would like to know why. You get all newspapers in all languages for others, but you don't get a single Indian newspaper or Tamil newspaper. How then you expect them to be satisfied? These are small matters, but matters which are close to our soldiers in the Congo and I ask the Government to investigate these small dissatisfactions. They are small points, put them right so that things will go all right. Now, the situation in the Congo has become a stalemate. Being a stalemate, how long are our troops going to remain in the Congo? I hope not for ever. Those responsible for murders are still in power in the Congo. Therefore, I support the PMIP's call that our troops from the Congo should be brought back at the earliest possible opportunity without causing embarrassment to the United Nations, and I ask the Government to consider that matter and make representations to the United Nations, asking them the earliest possible moment when our troops can come back from the Congo.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, on the question of the Immigration policy, again, despite several requests by the P.P.P. in this House, I regret to note that there is no reference in the Speech from the Throne. Immigration laws are necessary for all countries. I do not complain that we should have an immigration law, but I say the manner in which the discretion vested in the Controller

is exercised is not humane. I say it is exercised in the most arbitrary manner without consideration for humane feelings at all. I say that the Controller of Immigration is prepared, just because a boy is one month over the age of 7 years—I think it is the age when he will be allowed to come here—to say, "You cannot come here," although he knows very well that allowing the father and mother to come into this country, or the mother to come in, will be leaving the boy parentless in his overseas land. That is not humane at all. Here again, I would say I have got redress from higher authorities time and again. But the point is this: it should not have to reach so high authorities. Discretion must be exercised judicially and humanely; it is not being done. Here again, I ask that the matter be seriously looked into, because there again you are causing political instability in this country.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the Speech from the Throne reference has been made to the Education policy and emphasis has been laid on the fact that except for 12 schools all others have accepted full aid from the Government and become national schools. Now, you take that, perhaps, as a sign that the policy is accepted. If that is the manner in which you construed that, I say you are living in a fool's paradise, because that is not the spirit in which those schools have accepted full aid from the Government. They have accepted full aid because they cannot continue without that aid. What is forced can never be taken as consent. Where you are driven against the wall, you have no alternative—you have to do it. So long as you appreciate that, then it is all right. But if you do not appreciate it, then I say you do not know what is happening in this country.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, on the question of the Speech from the Throne, it is the opportunity for every political organisation represented in Parliament to criticise the policy set out and at the same time to take the opportunity to say what you stand for yourself. I have done that every time and I intend to do that very shortly now.

Firstly, we stand for the principle of multi-lingualism. We have stood for it and we will always stand for it. Our reasons have been given time and again in this House, and time and again outside this House. Those reasons are as valid today as they were at the first opportunity when they were given.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we stand for absolute equality of citizens in this land. We do not believe in special rights, because special rights create animosity, create feelings of hostility; and I do hope the day will come when the Constitution of the country will be amended. And here I am glad that the Honourable the Prime Minister at the last meeting of this House said that if we ever got into power, we would amend the Constitution. That is perfectly right. If ever we got into power, we will amend the Constitution; we will amend it to give the people what we now preach we will give them. I am glad the Honourable Prime Minister said so.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we will also amend the Education policy to meet the wishes of the non-Malays of this country, and the Malays of this country, because the Education policy today does not even meet with the whole support of the Malays of this country; and that is clear from the Opposition which sits in this House.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we will look into the Immigration policy so that more humane methods of immigration control will exist in this land. We will alter the method by which citizenship can be revoked in this country, because it is the most cruel method known, I think, to this country. We will amend it so that it will be in the hands of a proper person—the judiciary of this country to deal with it.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, there are several other matters of policy which it is not necessary to mention here because they are subsidiary—they follow the main political ideologies of each party.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, communism and communist terrorism and subversive activities have been referred to again in the Speech from the Throne and here I say those responsible for drafting

this policy statement are playing the same old record. It seems to me that that record is played again and again in this House, because this policy statement is really a repetition of what has gone on in this House for the past three years. Mr. Speaker, Sir, when a record is played again and again, I suppose in answer to that the same record has to be played on the other side. We say that in this country, when you speak of communist subversion, you should not brand opposition as subversive. There is a tendency, and a growing tendency, not only to brand politicians in the Federation but also to brand politicians in Singapore as subversive elements, just because they disagree with what you may think should be the policy for this country. We stand opposed to communism, but we stand opposed also to the unjustifiable attack, to the weapon being used to brand Opposition Members as communist sympathisers and subversives in this country. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do hope that the Government will stop it, because a record played too often is useless. Nobody listens to it; and the stage has been reached in this country that nobody of any sense will listen to any Government Minister who says, "They are subversive elements; they are disloyal to this country." If you use it too often, even if you use it rightly, nobody will bother to look at what you say. I hope that situation has not arisen in this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Sir, coming to my last point—but also quite an important point—is the question of Malaysia, particularly Singapore. I think the world will regret that His Majesty was advised to say in a Speech from the Throne that if the Malaysia Plan does not get through, the Causeway may have to be closed. The word used is "may". I think it is most regrettable that the policy-makers thought it fit that His Majesty should say that from the Speech from the Throne. Now, what is the background? You have a plan put forward—a Malaysia Plan and a Merger Plan. They are two different plans but for convenience we call them the Malaysia Plan. Singapore is in the midst of

having a referendum. Politicians, members of the public, members of associations, members of guilds or public bodies are commenting; a commission known as the Cobbold Commission is investigating. What is the duty of the Federation Government, who put out this Plan? Is it your duty to try to intimidate, to frighten, to cow down, or is it your duty to wait and see what these territories or what the majority of the people of these territories decide before you make reckless statements? Is it your duty, or is it in the interests of this country or in the interests of the Malaysia which you foresee to try to give the impression of "take it or leave it"? If you leave it, this is what we are going to do. Do you think it is in your interest, or it is in the interests of this nation or in the interests of the people of Singapore? Where you threaten, men will accept the challenge; where you negotiate, there is room for negotiation. The attitude now adopted by the Federation Government is closing the door for negotiation—accept this or we do this. Close the Causeway—what is the reaction in Singapore? The reaction is, "Close your Causeway, what do we care". Are you going to close trade and commerce? What do you mean by "close the Causeway"? I hope this House will be given enlightenment. What do you mean actually when you say, "We will close the Causeway"? Do you mean that persons physically would not be allowed to enter the Federation? Do you mean you close the door to trade and commerce; or what do you actually mean when you say that you will close the Causeway? And I do ask that we get an explanation or an enlightenment. What do you mean when you say you will close the Causeway, and why do you say it at this stage? Are you so frightened that Singapore's referendum will go against merger? If Singapore's referendum goes against merger, then it is your duty to leave Singapore alone.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, there are in Singapore discredited politicians, who are trying to mislead for personal gain and from personal motives. It is the people of Singapore who must

decide; and anyone, who has visited Singapore in recent months and spent their time with the people, as distinct from discredited politicians, will know that in the people there is a pride of their own land—Singapore. There is a feeling that they must have their independence. There is a feeling that they are not prepared to come into the Federation as second class people. But, there is a feeling that the ultimate union of Singapore and the Federation must come, but it must come on a basis of dignity, on a basis of equality; and it is only on that basis that a lasting union can take place; any other type of union based on intimidation and threats will only lead to chaos, because anything built on threats, suspicion and intimidation cannot last. I have no doubt that when the referendum goes on in Singapore, the people of Singapore will give their answer. I think that it is most unbecoming, most crude, to try in any way to influence that referendum by issuing threats such as, "We will close the Causeway", and in the interest of everybody concerned a clarification of that in this House should be given by the Honourable the Prime Minister—What do you mean exactly when you say, "We will close the Causeway"?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have touched on quite a number of points which I thought are of importance. Before I finish, I would like to say this. As in the previous years, His Majesty has asked all of us to deliberate with reason and good sense and in the spirit of leaders of this nation. We, of the Opposition, are always ready to receive criticisms and weigh those criticisms, to consider proposals and suggestions. I only hope that the Government side is equally ready to receive them—you like them, receive them; you do not like them, reject them; but if you reject them give us the reasons.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, to sum up what I say: the first point is that I disagree with the Honourable Mover that the children of this nation will have equal opportunities—that is a distortion of facts; it cannot be true and I had hoped that the Honourable Mover

would withdraw that statement, because that statement without qualification is a wrong statement, and it is misleading—I am sure he will agree with me, if not openly at least in his own heart, in his own conscience. I disagree with several other points raised in the Speech from the Throne. I regret that points which should have been there are not there. Therefore, whilst I associate fully with expressing our congratulations and thanks to His Majesty and Her Majesty for having been there to address us, I cannot associate myself with the contents of the Speech from the Throne and, therefore, on that point I disassociate myself.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid (Seberang Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun untuk menyokong usul yang di-kemukakan oleh sahabat saya Yang Berhormat Wakil dari Larut Selatan di-atas perbahathan Titah Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong. Saya ingin menarek perhatian Yang Berhormat sakalian, Titah Baginda yang berbunyi:

“Beta ma’alum betapa harum-nya nama negara kita di-sebut oleh negara yang bersahabat dengan kita dan Beta sendiri pernah mendengar-nya”.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada-lah Titah Baginda itu menegaskan bahawa Duli Yang Maha Mulia telah mendengar betapa harum-nya nama negara Persekutuan Tanah Melayu itu. Jadi, dengan ini saya sa-bagai sa-orang wakil ra’ayat berasa sangat bangga oleh kerana berada di-dalam sa-buah negara yang telah mendapat nama yang harum di-luar negeri. Dan lagi kita pernah mendengar bagaimana pujian² yang telah di-berikan kepada negara kita di-atas kemajuan yang terchapai tidak sampai 5 tahun daripada menchapai kemerdekaan-nya. Ini menunjukkan bukti bahawa Kerajaan kita yang berdasarkan kepada pemerintahan demokrasi ada-lah melaksanakan sa-umum-nya dengan chukup puas hati. Pemerintah demokrasi yang kita jalankan di-dalam Dewan Yang Berhormat ini kita membincangkan beberapa masaalah untuk kepentingan

negara di-dalam suasana yang sangat memuaskan jika di-bandingkan dengan chara² permeshuaratan di-Dewan² yang lain. Jadi, saya mengambil peluang, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, menguchapkan sa-tinggi² tahniah kepada Tuan Yang di-Pertua, yang telah dengan bijaksana memimpin Parlimen ini. Yang kedua kita patut berasa bangga menguchapkan terima kaseh dan juga tahniah kepada Tengku Perdana Menteri kita yang sangat bijak memimpin negara kepada haluan yang sangat memuaskan dengan nasihat² daripada Ahli Jema’ah Menteri-nya. Jadi, tidak payah-lah saya menghuraikan, tiap² wakil dapat-lah sendiri memerhatikan kejayaan yang chemerlang yang terchipta semenjak merdeka. Saya mengambil peluang lagi sa-kali menguchapkan tahniah kepada Perdana Menteri dan kita berdo’a mudah²an di-panjangkan umur-nya dan pohonkan Tuhan akan memberikan pertunjuk kepada-nya bagi memandu pemerintahan negara ini kepada haluan kebahagiaan bersama². Kenyataan² lain, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ingin mendatangkan beberapa fikiran supaya dapat di-kaji oleh pehak Kementerian yang bersangkutan; yang pertama saya ingin menarek perhatian kepada Perdana Menteri dan Ahli² Dewan Ra’ayat supaya dapat menimbangkan sama ada baik atau tidak-nya untuk mengadakan satu tabong yang dinamakan tabong derma kebajikan Ahli² Parlimen. Kerana saya dapat tahu di-England sana ada satu Jawatan Kuasa atau Lembaga menguruskan dan menjalankan tabong derma kebajikan Ahli² Parlimen. Jadi, dengan ini di-atas perkhidmatan Ahli Parlimen manakala mereka telah meninggal dunia maka dapat-lah warith-nya menerima sedikit sa-banyak sa-bagai wang bagi meringankan beban warith-nya. Saya berharap-lah supaya dapat perhatian tentang perkara ini mudah²an dapat-lah Ahli² Parlimen yang lain pada masa hadapan dapat kebajikan bersama.

Kedua, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ada membacha dalam Perlembagaan ini yang menunjukkan bahawa Parlimen boleh memilih Tuan Yang di-Pertua dan Timbalan Yang di-Pertua dalam

fasal 58 Perlembagaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu—

Parliament shall by law provide for the remuneration of the President and Deputy President of the Senate and the Speaker and Deputy Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the remuneration so provided for the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be charged on the Consolidated Fund.

Jadi, di-sini saya berharap-lah dan saya menarek perhatian di-atas kenya-taan² yang di-beri supaya menguntokkan satu peruntokan bagi allowance kepada Timbalan Yang di-Pertua Dewan Ra'ayat dan juga Dewan Negara, oleh kerana dalam peruntokan kita, ada di-untokkan sa-banyak dua belas ribu ringgit bagi Ketua Pehak Pembangkang tetapi oleh kerana pehak pembangkang tidak mengadakan satu ketua maka wang itu maseh belum lagi di-gunakan, maka boleh-lah di-putuskan supaya di-beri allowance sagu hati yang tetap kepada Timbalan Yang di-Pertua kerana dengan ini bukan-lah maksud kita Timbalan Yang di-Pertua atau sesiapa juga bahkan sesiapa pun mendapat jawatan Timbalan Yang di-Pertua itu kita beri allowance mudah²an dapat menggalakkan orang itu dan kira-nya Tuan Yang di-Pertua berasa menanggung tanggung-jawab menjalankan urusan meshuarat dapat-lah Timbalan Yang di-Pertua meng-gantikan dari sa-masa ka-samasa.

Yang ketiga, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ingin menarek perhatian pehak Kementerian yang bertanggung-jawab berkenaan dengan Kerajaan Tempatan. Saya dapat tahu mengenai kemudahan² dan allowance tetap bagi ahli² Majlis Negeri, ahli² Majlis Dewan Ra'ayat atau Majlis Tempatan sangat-lah tidak memuaskan hati oleh kerana satu buah negeri membuat keputusan dan mem-beri allowance ini ta' sama rata. Jadi, saya berharap-lah kepada Yang Berhormat Menteri itu membentok sa-buah Jawatan-Kuasa supaya mengumpulkan beberapa shor² dan dapat di-tetapkan shor² bagi kemudahan² dan allowance bagi ahli² Majlis daripada lapisan bawah ia-itu Majlis Tempatan sa-hingga kepada Majlis Dewan Negara. Dengan ini dapat-lah majlis yang lain berpandukan shor itu supaya dapat di-samaratakan apa juga allowance

dan kemudahan yang akan di-beri kepada ahli² yang berkhidmat sa-bagai ahli meshuarat.

Yang keempat, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ingin menarek perhatian Yang Berhormat Menteri Pengangkutan, saya mendahului ucapkan tahniah di-atas usaha-nya bagi mengadakan pengang-kutan darat dan juga kapal terbang, tetapi saya tidak puas hati di-atas satu perkara berkenaan dengan pengang-kutan laut. Nampak-nya sudah lima tahun usaha hendak mengadakan perusahaan kapal supaya dapat mem-bawa hasil bumi kita ka-luar negeri. Walau bagaimana pun saya berharap dengan tertuboh-nya pakatan ASA ini dapat-lah kita adakan pengangkutan kita sendiri ka-luar negeri. Dengan ini maka negara kita akan mudah lagi mengeluarkan bahan² hasil bumi dan memasokkan bahan² luar ka-dalam negeri kita, di-samping itu dapat-lah segala urusan perdagangan itu di-percepatkan dan di-perkemaskan lagi. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bersangkut dengan pengangkutan laut itu, di-pelabohan Pulau Pinang ada beberapa banyak kaum pelayaran kita yang tidak mendapat sambutan, tidak mendapat perhatian langsung daripada pehak Kerajaan. Di-Singapura di-adakan satu lembaga yang di-namakan Lembaga Kebajikan Ahli² Pelayaran, dan saya berharap pehak Kementerian yang ber-kenaan supaya mengkaji perkara ini supaya di-adakan sama dengan Singa-pura sa-buah Lembaga Kebajikan Ahli² Pelayaran yang akan menitek-beratkan di-atas perkara nasib ahli² pelayaran yang terlantar di-Pulau Pinang dan ada juga di-Port Swettenham kalau ta' silap saya, dengan ini dapat-lah satu badan lembaga ini mengawal dan memerhatikan shor² supaya di-antara orang² itu dapat ber-khidmat dengan perkapalan di-luar negeri daripada terlantar di-pelabohan yang ada di-Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini. Sa-kira-nya mereka ini hendak berkhidmat dalam hal perkapalan terpaksa-lah mereka itu pergi ka-Singapura, manakala mereka pergi ka-Singapura ta' mendapat perhatian yang baik.

Yang kelima, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ini kali yang ketiga saya hendak

merayu kepada Yang Berhormat Menteri Buroh. Saya ucapkan tahniah di atas kerja² berkenaan dengan saling mengerti dan bersefahaman di-antara wakil² buroh dan juga majikan, tetapi yang sangat mendukachitakan ia-lah mengenai Jabatan Pendaftaran Buroh yang di-jalankan pada masa sekarang ini bukan-lah dengan sechara undang² khas, chuma menasihatkan kepada majikan supaya mengambil pekerja² melalui Pejabat Buroh—bukan samesti-nya majikan mengambil pekerja di-Pejabat Buroh. Saya berharap kepada Kementerian Buroh supaya membuat satu undang² yang ketat memaksa segala majikan mengambil buroh² melalui Pejabat Buroh di-Pejabat Pendaftaran Buroh dengan ini dapat-lah ahli² yang mendaftarkan nama-nya jaminan bahawa mereka itu tidak dipermain²kan oleh majikan. Kebanyakan orang² ini mendapat kerja sabagaimana orang yang di-luar bandar khas-nya ta' dapat layanan yang sempurna, kerana di-permain²kan dengan chara pileh kaseh oleh pehak majikan. Jadi saya berharap-lah Yang Berhormat Menteri itu mengambil perhatian di-atas perkara ini.

Lagi satu perkara, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-lah mengenai mayat orang Islam yang meninggal dunia dalam masa pelayaran. Saya harap pehak yang berkenaan supaya mengarahkan pehak Kapal Haji membuat persediaan² bagi menyimpan buat sementara mayat orang Islam yang meninggal dunia waktu pelayaran dari pelabuhan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ka-Jeddah, manakala tiba di-darat baharu-lah di-kebumikan ia-itu di-tanah, bukan di-laut. Perkara ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya telah melihat sendiri yang mayat² itu di-lancharkan dalam laut, hati saya sangat sedeh melihat-nya dan berasa sangat kesal. Oleh yang demikian, patut sangat-lah di-ambil perhatian. Perkara ini bukan-lah mendatangkan kesusahan dan memakan belanja yang besar. Kita arahkan kepada pehak Sharikat Kapal Haji membuat peti yang khas. Sa-lepas mayat itu di-mandi, di-kapan dan di-sembahyangkan di-simpan dalam peti khas serta di-sil (seal) buat sementara, manakala sampai ka-darat di-kebumi-

kan, dan warith-nya dapat menziarahi kubor-nya itu. Jadi sangat-lah molek kalau pehak Kementerian mengkaji akan perkara ini, dan dapat di-uruskan.

Sa-perkara lagi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, mengenai perkhidmatan perubatan dan kesihatan yang di-laksanakan dengan ranchak-nya pada masa sekarang ini sa-hingga ka-luar bandar. Saya ingin menarek perhatian Yang Berhormat Menteri Kesihatan supaya pengambil pekerja, khas-nya jururawat, penolong jururawat dan bidan itu, di-beri lebeh kepada orang² Melayu yang di-luar bandar, kerana orang Melayu di-luar bandar banyak. Maka dengan ada-nya jururawat, penolong jururawat dan bidan dari bangsa-nya sendiri, yang faham adat resam dan ugama, maka dapat-lah mereka melayankan dengan baik dan akan dapat sambutan yang baik daripada orang ramai. Dan dapat-lah kita memperkembangkan ilmu pengetahuan mengenai kesihatan kepada orang di-luar bandar serta dapat kesan yang lebeh chepat lagi daripada orang yang bukan bangsa-nya sendiri yang mengurus dan melayan-nya. Saya harap mendapat perhatian daripada Yang Berhormat Menteri.

Lagi satu perkara yang sangat besar ia-itu kebanyakan peladang ingin sangat hendak tahu tentang harga padi. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-bagaimana yang saya tahu lebeh daripada 10 tahun harga padi yang di-tetapkan \$15.00 sa-pikul itu tidak naik dan tidak pula turun. Kalau kita bandingkan dengan barang² yang lain itu ada naik dan ada turun. Dan manakala kita lihat nasib peladang² kita sangat-lah sedeh kalau di-bandingkan dengan pekerja² yang lain. Kerana tiap² peladang itu membuat bendang hitong panjang 2-3 ekar dengan menyewa, dan mempunyai family sa-ramai 5-6 orang yang mana mengharapkan kehidupan dengan usaha di-atas bendang yang mereka sewa itu. Mereka itu kena bayar sewa bendang, beli baja dan lain² urusan lagi. Orang yang mempunyai bendang sendiri sangat sadikit. Saya mengeshorkan supaya harga padi di-naikkan sa-banyak \$20.00 sa-pikul. Chara ini ia-lah memberi galakan dan menaikkan semangat ka-

pada penanam padi supaya mereka berusaha dengan sa-penoh-nya, dan dengan nasihat daripada Kementerian Pertanian dapat-lah mengeluarkan hasil padi lebih banyak daripada yang biasa. Kalau dengan chara hendak menasihatkan dengan tidak di-beri satu akuan untuk hendak membeli padi dengan harga yang mahal tentu-lah mereka itu berasa tidak puas hati. Saya mendapat tahu lebih kurang 300,000 tan beras luar negeri di-bawa masuk ka-dalam negeri ini. Jadi molek sangat kita tahan kemasokan beras dari luar negeri ka-dalam negeri ini, dan kita naikkan harga padi negeri ini, sa-elok²-nya Kerajaan sendiri akan menambah ganti rugi di-atas harga padi itu. Kalau Kerajaan tetapkan \$15.00 sapikul, Kerajaan tambah lagi \$5.00 kapada peladang itu. Saya tahu chara ini ada di-buat oleh lain² negeri untuk menggalakkan dan di-buat Peruntukan Khas. Jadi saya harap dapat perhatian daripada pehak yang berkenaan.

Perkara yang akhir sa-kali, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-lah mengenai kedudukan harta orang Melayu yang tergadai kapada ahli yang mengeluarkan wang sa-lama 10 tahun, 15 tahun dan 20 tahun, sa-hingga hari ini banyak di-antara harta orang Melayu itu telah tergadai, dan mereka itu tidak mampu dan sanggup hendak menebus sa-mula. Oleh hal yang demikian, saya harap dapat perhatian daripada pehak yang berkenaan supaya mengadakan satu tabong atau pun di-tugaskan kapada RIDA (Undang² RIDA di-pinda sa-dikit) supaya menebus sa-mula hak orang Melayu yang ada dalam bandar itu. Dan pehak RIDA atau pehak yang berkenaan boleh mengusahakan tanah itu dengan membuat bangunan, kedai dan lain² dan pulangkan sa-mula harga nilai tanah itu kapada tuan-nya atau pun memberi beberapa buah rumah kapada-nya. Kalau di-buat sa-lain daripada rumah, kata-lah, di-buat 5 pintu kedai dengan harga tanah itu di-bahagi supaya RIDA tidak rugi, dan tuan tanah di-beri 2 pintu kedai untuk tinggal tetap dalam bandar.

Saya berpendapat dengan chara yang bagini dapat-lah kita membela

harta orang Melayu dalam bandar itu dan mereka itu dapat berusaha untuk membuat perniagaan dan perusahaan dalam bandar bersama² dengan saudara kita orang China dan lain² yang telah maju dalam perusahaan dan perniagaan.

Enche' Chin See Yin (Seremban Timor): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we are no doubt grateful for the Gracious Speech of His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong and in it is contained the policies of the Government. It is regrettable to note that the Honourable Mover, who has been given the rare privilege, should play a tune with a false note. In this, I refer to the incorrectness that Taiping is the first mining town in this country. If he should make a research, then he would agree with me that the first mining town is Lukut, which is in the State of Negri Sembilan—not in Perak. However, the economic stability of this country depends on rubber and tin.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, from His Majesty's Gracious Speech, we note that the Government is finding ways and means to bring in other industries, and I think industrialisation is the solution of the problems facing this country's growing population. However, Sir, industrialisation should not be made at Petaling Jaya alone. It should be the duty of the Government to see that every State looks into this matter of industrialisation for the growing population in each State. It is all the States that make the Federation of Malaya possible and, therefore, the Federation Government has a duty to the people of each State.

When we want industrialisation, it is important to bring in capital, and to bring in capital we must not create a feeling of fear and suspicion, because if you allow fear and suspicion to be created in the minds of capitalists, then it will be a very sad day. What is the fear in their minds? That fear is nationalisation. Nationalisation is something that people fear, because when they put in money for a factory, they want to see that the capital is returned—and when you nationalise the factory, there is nothing left for them.

Now, Sir, I have an interesting example that Government should consider. I understand that quite recently a circular has been sent to the bus companies association requesting it to give out ten per cent of their shares for Malay participation. We all agree that Malays should come into such participation, but then you have got to be very careful how you do such a thing. Now, Sir, for them to take out 10 per cent of their shares and to sell them at par will not be fair, but to sell them at the present market value will be reasonable.

Now, Sir, let us take the case of the Foh Hup Bus Company. There are 196 shares and if you were to ask them to bring out ten per cent of its shares, it means that the bus company will have to bring out 19 or 20 shares and to put them up for sale. The par value of a share of this company I am referring to was \$200. Today it is worth \$22,000 per share. Now, Sir, the Malay adults, I think, number 2,000,000. How are you going to divide the shares? How are you going to give the 20 shares at par? On what basis are you going to give it? Are you going to create dissatisfaction, are you going to create another problem relating to the sale of these 20 shares which are today worth \$20,000 per share? It is a very important factor. On the other hand, Sir, if you insist that these shares be given out at par, then you create fear and suspicion in the minds of other persons in other industries. They fear that one day one's business will have to suffer, or one will be made to give away shares at par. If you look into the shares of these various companies like Henry Waugh & Co., Straits Times, what is their value and what was the par value? Surely, if you make them to sell their shares at par, then you are going to create fear and suspicion in the minds of capitalists. If you should drive them away, then it would be a very sad day. Therefore, we should be very careful in carrying out a policy not to create fear and suspicion.

Then, again, Sir, I would ask the Minister concerned to look into certain

associations, registered associations—and in this case I would refer to the Liquor Association in the country. The Liquor Association has gone back to the sad day of the Japanese Occupation of working on a policy of "*kumiai*"—a sort of monopoly—and this Liquor Association has passed a resolution saying that any member of the Association which sells liquor, wholesale or retail, at less than a certain rate would be penalised. And what is the penalty? It is that the distributors will not give that member any further supply. As a result the people suffer, because they have to pay more. The distributors will not mind because they will be still able to sell their liquor all the same. But then, Sir, the distributors are at the mercy of this Association for the simple reason that if they were to fail to observe the requirements of this Association; they might be boycotted should they supply liquor to the member who violated the condition of the Association. For the simple reason that the people should not suffer, I ask the Minister concerned to look into this matter.

Now, Sir, I would like to refer to the mushroom insurance companies. We have a law to deal with existing problems, but then we have not dealt with the matter as a whole. Why should certain insurance companies be allowed to carry on business when they have not paid their deposits? Surely there must be something wrong somewhere; and to find out that wrong, I think, the only way is to appoint a committee to investigate the matter. Why should the Administration allow such insurance companies to carry on business without having received the deposits required by law? I think this is an important factor—important in the sense that a number of insured persons, who have contributed for death benefits, are now not able to get anything in return, because, according to the Honourable the Minister of Finance who said it at the last meeting, quite a number of such insurance companies have not paid the deposits. I think this is a serious matter, and you will agree that the only way to find out what went wrong is to appoint a committee.

Therefore, I hope that the Minister concerned will look into it in all seriousness.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I now come to the Causeway. I think no person either in Singapore or in Borneo has opposed Malaysia. Everybody has agreed to accept the formation of Malaysia in principle. But I think that it is very wrong to create a curtain. In Russia you have the iron curtain, in China the bamboo curtain, but us not create a "sarong curtain" in this connection. That sarong curtain will do us no good, because if you are going to create this curtain, then you are going to break off negotiations. So long as we can sit around the table and talk things over, I think, we can find a solution to that problem. Therefore, I suggest let us not create this curtain that we find created by other countries—let us not create the sarong curtain.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not propose to go very far and take a lot of the time of this House, but I am going to deal with the Gracious Speech very briefly. Sir, under the Constitution, we have accepted the principle that there should be freedom in every thing, particularly religion. Good Friday is an accepted holiday for a religious purpose, for a religious occasion; and I am no doubt grateful to the Government for granting a holiday for Wesak Day, but if that is the case, we have a holiday for Wesak Day and we deny the Christian people Good Friday—I think it is not a reasonable thing; it is a case of robbing Peter to pay Paul. I would ask that consideration be given to restore Good Friday as a holiday.

Now I would touch on another matter which concerns a minority of the population in this country—the Jews. Quite a number of these Jewish people are living in this country. In my town I know there is one. They have been in business even before I was born (*Laughter*). This is no laughing matter; this is a serious matter—serious in the sense that they have to suffer a loss. They have to close their business on the Sabbath day because the existing law says they must have a holiday each week either on

Friday or on Sunday. They have no choice. Therefore, they have got to close on Friday as well as on Saturday, which is the Sabbath day to the Jewish people. I think if we appreciate freedom of practice for all religions, then, Sir, the Ministry concerned should relax the law to allow these Jewish merchants in my town—I know at least of one—who have been appealing to the Government to relax the law, to allow them to close their shop on Sabbath day instead of on Friday or Sunday. For this reason I have brought the matter up and I ask for consideration, because there are 52 weeks in a year and now they have got to close 52 extra days. If you work it out, I think they suffer a great loss financially.

Now, Sir, the Honourable mover has told us that the Alliance education policy has given equal opportunity after passing the qualifying test. But in view of the special privileges for certain people and the right for employment in Government Service, I think he has made a rather incorrect statement. But to my mind, Sir, this is a matter which can be solved and I think time is a factor.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the Gracious Speech it is stated that only 12 formerly partially-assisted schools have become private schools. Now, I think the reason why these 12 schools decided to become independent is simply because their boards of management, in my humble opinion, felt that converting them into national schools would mean less time for Chinese education. As I understand it, the teaching time is 27 hours per week and the allocation for the teaching of Chinese is about 3 hours in a week. Six hours have been given to the head master to use for the improvement of those subjects in which the pupils are weak. Therefore, if you look into the true aspect of it, these Chinese schools today are more English schools than Chinese schools. If the Ministry concerned will look into this closely and allow more time for Chinese education, the matter would be different. However, Sir, I can only conclude that the problems facing us and arising in this country can only be

solved by a non-communal outlook—I think that is important. Time is an important factor and we will one day succeed. Thank you.

Enche' Tajuddin bin Ali (Larut Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun menyokong usul yang telah di-kemukakan oleh rakan saya Yang Berhormat dari Larut Selatan. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya sungguh tertarek hati kepada titah Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong beberapa hari yang lampau dan saya telah tengok lagi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, lawatan Duli² Yang Maha Mulia dan Raja Permaisuri Agong ka-India dan Pakistan. Lawatan itu ada-lah satu lawatan yang bersejarah dan saya berpendapat bahawa lawatan itu mendatangkan sangat leleh dan lelah kepada Duli² Yang Maha Mulia itu. Di-atas lawatan Duli Yang Maha Mulia itu ra'ayat Persekutuan ini menjunjung tinggi kerana dengan lawatan itu-lah dapat ra'ayat Persekutuan ini mengikat tali silaturrahim dengan ra'ayat India dan Pakistan. Dengan susah payah Duli² Yang Maha Mulia itu ra'ayat Persekutuan berdo'a moga² lama-lah memerintah Persekutuan ini pada masa yang akan datang.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, semenjak sa-malam dan sa-terus-nya hari ini kita telah mendengar cherita² Abu Nawas daripada wakil Ipoh; sebab saya katakan cherita Abu Nawas kerana cherita itu tiap² kali persidangan dalam Majlis Yang Mulia ini di-bawa dan di-ulang²-kan-nya. Cherita² berkenaan dengan kampung dan berkaitan dengan hak istimewa orang² Melayu dan mengatakan tidak puas hati kepada pentadbiran Kerajaan Perikatan. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Parti PPR baharu sahaja timbul dan sa-belum mereka itu munchul khas-nya dalam lembah Kinta di-Perak memang Perikatan telah berkuasa di-sana. Dia telah mengatakan sa-malam ada-lah jalan² di-Kampung Baharu itu jalan-nya berdebu tidak mempunyai saloran ayer. Saya perchaya beliau dan rakan-nya tidak mengetahui dengan sa-penoh-nya kedudukan kampung² di-sana dan nama²-nya sa-kali. Kerana, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-bahagian besar kampung² yang telah di-tempati saudara² kebanyakan daripada orang²

China di-dalam Lembah itu ia-lah kawasan saya dahulu. Maka jalan raya, saloran ayer dan juga sa-tengah²-nya ada mengadakan paip ayer di-sana telah di-siap sediakan oleh saya sendiri sa-belum saya masok dalam pertandingan Dewan Parlimen ini. Saya tahu dengan tegas-nya ada-lah kampung² itu tidak langsung di-ambil peduli oleh pehak PPR. Saya sangat khuatir di-atas ucapan-nya itu kerana ia tidak menyatakan di-mana-kah kampung dalam Lembah itu yang ada mempunyai jalan raya yang berdebu dan ada-kah pehak PPR telah menunaikan atau membuat apa² kehendak bagi Kampung² Baharu di-sana.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berkenaan dengan hak istimewa ini saya berpendapat ada-lah wakil dari Ipoh bukan sa-orang gentleman kerana kalau waktu bertanding, saya dengan dia bertanding, umpama-nya lari 100 ela, saya tahu dia tidak kuat lari (*Ketawa*). Saya tentu bagi handicap kepada dia. (*Ketawa*). Saya suroh dia duduk 50 ela ka-hadapan, bagitu-lah juga saya memikirkan hal istimewa itu di-berikan kepada orang Melayu dan ini bukan kepada orang Melayu sahaja, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bahkan kepada Orang² Asli juga kita beri dan kepada beliau sendiri pun kita beri hak istimewa, motokar-nya kita beri badge Parlimen, ini-lah perkara² yang istimewa atau di-namakan keistimewaan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Di-negeri Algeria dan di-mana pun bagi kaum yang tidak bernasib baik di-beri hak istimewa. Apa fasal kita beri bagitu? Ia-lah kerana menjaga keselamatan dan supaya ahli² yang lemah itu pada satu hari dapat berganding tangan dengan ahli yang kuat dan maseh kaya raya. Kita pandang, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berchakap ini bukan chakap perkauman—siapa yang mempunyai motokar besar, siapa yang jadi loyar, siapa yang jadi doctor, siapa yang ada tin mining, siapa yang ada lombong besi dan lain². Ini satu perkara yang kita fikir sa-patut-nya untuk fa'edah kita pada masa akan datang. Oleh yang demikian, pada fikiran saya yang singkat ini, kita patut adakan hak istimewa orang Melayu itu. Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh memang ia cherdek pandai, tetapi ia

memperbodohkan diri apabila ia tengok ada ranchangan Kerajaan Perikatan jalankan itu betul, ia tahu—ia chuma memperbodohkan

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise on a point of order. I refer to Standing Order 36 (4) which says: "It shall be out of order to use offensive and insulting language about members of the House." I submit, Sir, that it is out of order to refer to a person as a fool, and the suggestion coming from an idiot makes it all the more insulting. (*Laughter*).

Mr. Speaker: My ruling is that he is in order. He did not say so. Jangan gunakan perkataan yang sa-macam itu, itu ta' boleh.

Enche' Tajudin bin Ali: Pergadohan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bukan-nya apa, ia ini chepat sangat wasangka kerana dia ta' mengerti bahasa Melayu. Jadi, itu-lah sebab-nya, chakap saya itu dia ta' mengerti.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, beberapa kali dalam Dewan yang mulia ini kita telah mendengar dari Menteri² yang berkenaan ia-itu perkara² yang berkaitan dengan pemberian tanah kepada bangsa² asing. Berkenaan dengan perkara ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau ta' silap saya satu soalan yang bertulis telah pun di-kemukakan baharu² ini dan telah pun di-beri jawapan yang memuaskan hati oleh Menteri yang berkenaan berkaitan dengan pemberian tanah kepada bangsa asing. Saya suka lagi hendak menerangkan di-sini ada-lah pemberian tanah di-bawah Ranchangan F.L.D.A. kalau ta' silap saya di-beri dengan puas hati, hampir sama rata kepada sakalian penduduk dalam Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini. Kadang² bangsa asing memang di-beri lebeh pula, mana yang lebeh itu saya hendak nyata di-sini dengan tegas-nya kepada wakil P.P.R. berkenaan dengan Tanjong Tualang. Di-sini ada satu ranchangan tanah yang pada masa itu saya jadi wakil Perak dan menerusi saya jugalah ia-itu di-bawah Ranchangan Kerajaan Perikatan telah memberi 1,300 ekar kesemua-nya kepada bangsa asing, ta' ada satu inchi pun kepada bangsa Melayu. Ini apa yang dia hendak

lagi? Sa-lain daripada itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita ada di-bawah ranchangan negeri ia-itu 600 ekar dan dalam 600 ekar itu 50 peratus daripada-nya yang berma'ana 300 ekar di-beri kepada bangsa asing, ia ta' tahu kerana ia ta' melawat sana. Ia datang melawat ka-Tanjong Tualang "chum" sana, "chum" sini dan terus balek ka-Ipoh. Ada-kah ia takut kepada Perikatan saya ta' tahu. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, chakap-nya itu ia-lah saperti chakap Abu Nawas dan perkara itu di-ulang lagi dan sa-lagi dia ulang lagi saya akan ulangkan kenyataan ini dalam Majlis.

Wakil dari Ipoh sa-malam telah berchakap berkenaan dengan pelajaran perchuma. Ini kata beliau bagus, tetapi ta' chukup lengkap, sebab banyak kanak² tidak bersekolah pada masa sekarang. Jadi dia chadangkan supaya Kerajaan mengadakan undang² paksa murid² itu pergi sekolah. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Kerajaan Perikatan sangat bertanggung jawab dan mengambil berat sangat berkenaan dengan hal ehwal pelajaran. Tiap² kampung baharu memang ada bentok sekolah yang tersergam dan tidak-lah menjadi dasar Perikatan memaksa sa-siapa pun kasekolah, ada datang datang-lah. Saya rasa kalau wakil dari Ipoh itu ia-lah sa-orang siasah yang bertanggung jawab, mesti dia pergi ka-kampung, beri penerangan dengan perchuma. Satu perkara yang dia sentoh sa-malam ia-lah berkenaan dengan taxi. Taxi ini satu perniagaan masa dahulu di-katakan hina, tetapi masa sekarang sahaja-lah lepas menchapai kemerdekaan baharu orang berlumba² hendakkan taxi. Saya bersetuju dan mengalu²kan Kerajaan kerana memajukan orang² Melayu dalam lapangan ini sunggoh pun begitu ranchangan itu belum lagi sempurna. Kata-nya pada masa sekarang ini orang² Melayu ada mempunyai 52 peratus daripada perniagaan taxi dalam Persekutuan Tanah Melayu, tetapi saya khuatir

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker Sir, on a point of order—Standing Order 35 (7): "A member shall not speak on any matter in which he has a direct personal pecu-

niary interest (other than the matter of remuneration under any provision of the Constitution) without disclosing the extent of that interest". I have reason to believe that the Honourable Member has an interest in Public Service Vehicles in the Tanjong Tualang area and I ask that he declare that interest.

Mr. Speaker: Mengikut Standing Order ini kalau awak ada interest di-Tanjong Tualang itu ta' boleh chakap dalam Majlis ini, melainkan awak khabarkan interest awak itu dalam sharikat itu.

Enche' Tajudin bin Ali: Dato' Yang di-Pertua, memang saya ada sa-banyak sadikit champor tangan di-sana dan saya chuma Pengurus Agong-nya sahaja dalam company itu. Saya berchakap ini jikalau Ahli dari Ipoh itu berchakap

Mr. Speaker: Chakap-lah atas 'am sahaja.

Enche' Tajudin bin Ali: Baik-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Berkenaan dengan Ahli itu, saya rasa berkenaan dengan lapangan kenderaan ada-lah hampas sahaja daripada semua-nya ma'ana-nya satu perkara yang kechil dan kebanyakan taxi² dalam tangan orang Melayu itu pun tidak di-jalankan dengan sa-penoh-nya oleh orang² Melayu. Jadi dalam lapangan kenderaan ini yang memberi keuntungan sa-kali ia-lah kenderaan membawa barang ia-itu lori² dan bas². Ini-lah yang memberi keuntungan yang besar, jadi perkara yang kechil itu Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh nampak-nya seperti kata pepatah: Kuman di-saberang laut dia nampak, gajah di-tepi mata dia ta' nampak. Itu-lah dia. Maka perkara yang di-katakan itu kechil sangat, itu-lah yang di-ongkit²kan, sedangkan perkara² yang besar sengaja ia buat ta' nampak semua sa-kali.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya minta kebenaran membacha Titah kebawah Duli Yang Maha Mulia yang berbunyi:

"Kerajaan Beta chukup sedar bahawa kongsi² gelap dan kumpulan² samsing sedang mengancam keamanan orang ramai dan kuasa undang² yang ada sekarang bagi menchegegah perbuatan ini tiada memadai."

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, haru-biru dalam negeri ini boleh-lah saya katakan kalau tidak 'ajaib, luar biasa, sebab saya katakan luar biasa ia-lah di-mana sahaja kawasan² yang di-jaga atau pun di-kuasai oleh Perikatan jarang sangat ada pergaduhan. Umpama-nya, saya telah pergi ka-kawasan Pulau Pinang Selatan yang di-jagai oleh pehak Perikatan tidak ada kachau dan haru-biru. Apabila masok sahaja ka-seberang berlaku perbunohan, pencholekan, ada gangster dan bermacham² lagi. Bagitu juga apabila sampai ka-Ipoh dan perenggan-nya. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perenggan-nya betul² mengikut perenggan kawasan pilehan raya, umpama-nya, Ipoh dengan Parit. Apabila sampai Parit Road dan sa-berang sana dalam kawasan P.P.P. haru-biru pun timbul dan menjadi², tetapi di-kawasan Parit keadaan di-sana sangat tenteram walau pun penduduk dalam kawasan Ipoh dengan kawasan Parit itu sama banyak. Di-Kuala Lumpur ini pun sa-rupa, sampailah ka-Seremban, keadaan-nya pun bagitu juga ia-itu haru-biru, bunoh-membunoh tidak putus². Di-sini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka sangat bertanya kapada orang tengah berapakah jinayah yang tidak dapat di-selesaikan? Saya telah nyatakan terlebih dahulu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perkara ini bukan 'ajaib, tetapi sangat luar biasa.

Saya sendiri pernah mendengar ucapan Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh yang mengatakan lawan Kerajaan, jangan takut, kalau kamu kena tangkap, kami ada 2, 3, 4, loyar boleh lawan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perkara yang bagini sangat-lah di-kesalkan dan tidak patut sangat timbul dari sa-orang yang telah dapat keperchayaan sa-bahagian daripada ra'ayat jelata. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya memikirkan boleh-kah kita benarkan perkara jinayah ini berlampauan bagini? Orang²-nya kita tahu. Apabila kita bertempur dengan penganas dahulu (masa dharurat) kita tidak mendapat sadikit pun sokongan daripada mereka itu seperti PPP dan Parti Ra'ayat. Apabila kita adakan pilehan raya, dengan tipu helah-nya mereka telah dapat dudok dalam

Parlimen ini, dan mendatangkan tuduhan yang kotor dan memecah undang².

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya fikir telah sampai-lah masa-nya bagi Kerajaan bertindak sa-bagaimana yang telah ditahankan oleh Duli Yang Maha Mulia yang berbunyi:

"Oleh yang demikian pertimbangan yang berat sedang di-beri untuk mengadakan langkah² yang baharu bagi menentang anjakan ini."

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya memberi sokongan yang penoh di-atas Titah Baginda ini. Dan telah terlintas di-hati saya ia-itu sa-belum perkara ini lewat, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, molek-lah Kerajaan memikirkan satu undang² ia-itu bagi kawasan yang sangat menjadi keganasan yang melampau itu, elok sangat-lah kita fikirkan ia-itu bolehkah kita menggantungkan kuasa Wakil Dewan Ra'ayat di-kawasan itu (*Ketawa*). Saya tahu undang² tidak membenarkan menggantung beberapa lama, sebab masa pilihan raya baharu akan diadakan. Saya rasa ada kaitan-nya keganasan ini dengan penganjor tempatan, sa-bagaimana yang telah saya terangkan dengan panjang lebar terlebih dahulu, mengapa-kah tidak ada pergaduhan atau pun pembunuhan dalam kawasan² yang di-pegang oleh pehak Perikatan. Saya chuma memberi satu pandangan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya rasa ra'ayat akan menyokong kita demi kebahagiaan negara ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mendapat tahu dengan chara yang tidak rasmi murid² sekolah Menengah Jenis Kebangsaan di-paksa membayar yuran kapada satu kongsi gelap tiap² bulan, dan juga guru² di-paksa membayar yuran. Semua-nya ini terjadi dalam kawasan² yang di-pegang oleh pehak pembangkang—tidak semua pehak pembangkang. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, PAS tidak masok—pehak PAS hati-nya sudah tabah, ia ada lain sedikit (*Ketawa*) tetapi PPP dan Socialist Front (di-sampok).

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, memang senang berchakap satu² perkara, tetapi apabila kita fikirkan berkenaan dengan hal-ehwal keselamatan, semua orang yang ta'at setia kapada negeri ini mesti bersama dengan Kerajaan. Tuan Yang

di-Pertua, saya akan di-tudoh oleh pehak pembangkang, khas-nya PPP dan Socialist Front ia-itu kuasa polis bukan dalam tangan mereka, tetapi tidak-kah molek sa-bagai orang yang bertanggung jawab datang memberi rahsia yang mereka itu tahu? Saya perchaya dengan kerjasama mereka itu keganasan dalam bandar yang telah saya sebutkan itu tidak akan terjadi².

Enche' V. Veerappen (Seberang Selatan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to speak on this formal motion of thanks to His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong for his Gracious Speech. While I agree with some of the sentiments expressed by the Honourable mover the Member for Larut Selatan, I am afraid we do not see eye to eye with the views expressed. We particularly regret very much that in the Gracious Speech no mention was made of some of the basic rights and aspirations of some of the people in this country. There has been prolonged pleadings, agitations and clamourings for the removal of these acts of injustice, but unfortunately there has been no mention. However, before I go into greater detail on this matter, I wish to say a few words on some of the subjects or points that have been raised in the Speech itself and also by Honourable Members of this House earlier.

As regards education, Mr. Speaker, the speech says that substantial progress has been achieved in the field of education; universal free primary education was introduced from the beginning of this year and secondary continuation schools are being opened throughout the country as from this month. The Honourable Member for Larut Selatan was carried away by his words, and in his eagerness to congratulate the Government he rushed to say that the Alliance has given equal opportunities in the field of education for everyone, be he rich or poor. Unfortunately, it cannot be so and it is not so. From the written answers to my questions on page 10, you will find that out of 130,000 pupils who sat for the Malayan Secondary Schools Entrance Examination about 80,000 failed to get to be promoted. Out of this 80,000, 22,000 were found places

in the Post-Primary Schools. Incidentally, I do not know why, maybe for psychological purposes, these Post-Primary Schools have been renamed Secondary Continuation Schools—to give them the colour of secondary, maybe. Mr. Speaker, Sir, if 22,000 had been found places in the Secondary Continuation Schools, what has happened to the other 60,000? Why have not they joined these new schools? Is that the way we raise the school leaving age to 15, or to be more accurate 14? Mr. Speaker, Sir, I suggest there must be something wrong. I stated before the misgivings of the people as regards these new Second Continuation Schools. But from this I think that either the people have no trust, or do not take the words of the Ministry or the Minister, or they still have not understood the purpose of these schools and I think that is why these 60,000 pupils have not gone to these schools. Personally, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a waste of time to send pupils to these Secondary Continuation Schools because I know the teachers there are at a complete loss. They do not know where to start and what to teach. There is a conglomeration of pupils of all language media and after six years of education a child who goes there is taught, I understand, "this is a cat," "this is a mat." After six years if a child is to go back to that, then what is the purpose in sending the child to that school? Anyway, I hope the Ministry will clarify and try to improve the situation. If something is not done, I am afraid that the teachers who teach in these schools may have to go to the mad house—at least some of them.

As I said regarding the question of equality of opportunity, I regret that our Honourable friend from Larut Selatan did not read the words carefully. It says "universal free primary education"—I stress "primary". Education, he should know very well, is not only primary, it is not only secondary, we have so many stages. He should also know that only 30 per cent of the pupils could get beyond the primary level. The Member for Muar Utara suggested that we should raise

the examination stage by one year. May I inform him that it is not the question of whether you have the M.S.S.E. examination at the age of 12 or at the age of 20. Your policy, which you have approved, only allows 30 per cent and whether you have it at 18 or 12, it will still be only 30 per cent who get over the hurdle. Coming back to the Member for Larut Selatan, as I was saying, for the 30 per cent who get over this hurdle, education in this country is only for those who can afford, it is only for the privileged who have money or who are in a privileged position to get scholarships. Talking of scholarships, Mr. Speaker, I understand that in the question of scholarship and also in the question of appointment to the Civil Service a certain ratio is adhered to. It, I understand, is in the ratio of 1:4 or 4:1, or 3:1. This practice, Mr. Speaker, has brought a shocking state of affairs, because as far as scholarships and bursaries are concerned, there are many scholarships and bursaries which are going abegging just because pupils of one race are not in sufficient numbers to take those scholarships. Even other brilliant students are not given these scholarships and therefore everybody suffers. It is the same, I understand, in the Civil Service and that there are so many vacancies which cannot be filled, and, therefore, the Service suffers. It is not only the pupils concerned who suffer, it is the Service and it is the nation which will suffer, because if we do not encourage those people who can get along, where are we going to get the manpower? Is it not better, Mr. Speaker, to give these scholarships to those who deserve rather than get officers on contract from overseas to fill the vacancies and very often contract service conditions are more expensive. Therefore, it is my view that the time has come that this question of scholarships and appointments should be reviewed and be made more realistic with the conditions that are prevailing today, and in the interests of the nation as a whole.

I next come to the question of this part of the Speech which deals with Boards of Education, that is, National

Advisory Boards and State Education Advisory Boards. It says that these will be set up in place of the State Education Advisory Boards and so forth. Now, while we welcome this move, we hasten to add that when appointing members to these Boards, I hope the Minister will not get politicians into it. The political angle is already well taken care of and represented in the person of the Minister and therefore I would prevail upon him not to strengthen his hands further by putting politicians into the Education Advisory Boards.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, Sir, as regards the schools, our schools, as I have said before, are managed by statutory boards known as Boards of Managers or Boards of Governors. We said before that we are not satisfied with these School Boards and suggested that, in the same way that changes have been made in the National Education Board and the State Education Boards, we would like to see changes in these School Boards. We suggested that for schools in the districts, a District Advisory Board could be set up under a District Education Officer to look after or to manage these schools. We say it again because we find that more often than not most of these School Boards are a source of trouble to the officials of the Ministry, and also a great deal of time is taken up by feuds amongst the members of the Boards. In rural levels, it is unfortunate that the composition of these Boards cannot be of disinterested persons and more often than not politicians, or people with strong political views, are in, and if people in the Boards have to take sides, naturally that ghost creeps into the teachers and it will be a sad state of affairs when we have political differences in the schools itself. Even the constitutions of these School Boards are so very different, as I will try to show, that it is rather frustrating for the Boards themselves to function properly. In this matter, Sir, I wrote to the Ministry of Education asking them for copies of the different constitutions of the various Boards, because I understood that these instruments were rather different.

However, I did not get a reply to that. I do not know why, though I got replies to other things. Anyway, I managed to get the constitutions of two different schools, and I would like to read them out for the information of this House so that the difference can be visible. The instrument of School "A" says:

"The Board of Managers shall be constituted as follows:

A Chairman, who shall be appointed by the Bishop of the Methodist Church in South-East Asia;

3 members (nominated by the Bishop) as representatives of the Methodist Church in Malaya;

3 members of the Methodist Church in the State in which the school is situated (nominated by the Bishop after consultation with the District Superintendent);

3 members of the Old Pupils' Association nominated by the Bishop after consultation with the Committee of the Association);

3 members appointed by the Local Education Authority; and

Not more than 3 members who may be appointed as members of the Board from amongst the parents of the pupils of the said school."

In the case of the last category, I do not know who appoints the members. But one thing is quite clear: the Bishop appoints the members on at least four occasions. The instrument of School "B" says:

"The Board of Managers shall be constituted as follows:

A Chairman, who shall be elected by the Board;

Where there are supporters, 3 members to be appointed in accordance with Article 2"—that is, from amongst the supporters themselves.

"3 members to be nominated from the Old Boys of the school"—who nominates, we are not aware.

"3 members to be appointed as members of the Board from amongst the parents of the pupils of the school"—who appoints, in this case, is not known.

"3 members appointed by the Local Education Authority; and 3 members to be appointed from the Trustees of the school, if any."

From the instrument of School "B" itself, it does not say who appoints the members, and therefore it has led to a lot of confusion, a lot of misunderstanding and a lot of differences amongst the members of the Boards

themselves. In the constitution of the first school which I mentioned, out of 16 persons, who are on the Board, 10 to 13 persons are appointed by the Bishop. How can the Board be expected to function properly if the constitutions are confused. In fact, Sir, I do not know who framed the constitutions for these schools, but I should say it is the worst piece of drafting I have ever seen. These constitutions consist of so many loopholes that those who have the power can manipulate in such a way to their advantage and to their interest. This is shown in the appointments of Headships to these schools.

With regard to these appointments of Headships, I do not know why—and I regret very much—the Ministry has fought shy to give us the facts. We have asked in this House time and again for statistics on the Heads of Schools. Even Members from the P.M.I.P. have pressed for it, and I think you yourself, Sir, have heard it several times, but even today we regret that there is still no answer. Why? I feel that they are trying to hide something—maybe, Sir, they are trying to hide the fact that there is not a single Malay in any of the Mission schools in this country. There may be only a handful of Malays in these schools as teachers and this was so only recently for the purpose of teaching the National language. However, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would not like to dwell further. I take this opportunity to thank the Minister for the trouble he has taken to put right this question of appointments, because I understand recently he has sent a circular providing for stricter procedure to be followed in these appointments. I hope, however, that the Ministry would implement the contents of this circular faithfully. Nevertheless, I would like to urge the Ministry to take immediate steps to bring the constitutions or instruments of management of these schools into uniformity and for the sake of clarity, so that if the Boards should exist at all, they should function well.

As regards the National language, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish to say that I

am quite ashamed of the inferior status that has been accorded to this language. During one of the previous debates the Assistant Minister of Education stated that the National language was of a lower level compared with Malay. That was the difference. But if you look at the written reply given by our Minister yesterday, you will find that he says: "The national language of the Federation is the Malay Language and as such there is no difference between the two. In the teaching of this language, however, the term "National Language"—I do not know why it is within inverted commas—does it mean that one?"—"has so far been used in relation to the teaching of the Malay language to non-Malay pupils and students." Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am sure the Minister is in a better position than most of us to tell us how a word acquires its meaning. A word acquires its meaning through usage. He should know very well that certain words which mean one thing at one time, means entirely a different thing today. If we are going to give a lower status by using it to mean a lower thing, then the words "National Language" will for ever be of a lower status. That is how a word acquires its meaning by usage; and if the Ministry uses it to mean something inferior, it will definitely go down to be inferior. However, Sir, I can quite understand that the Minister wishes to differentiate between a "Higher Paper in Malay" and a "Lower Paper in Malay". It is a simple procedure which is accepted by all educationists, who used to call it "Higher Malay" and "Lower Malay". These should be equivalent to "Higher National Language" and "Lower National Language" and therefore they should be synonymous—the National Language and Malay should and ought to be synonymous. I hope that that would be practised at least.

Mr. Speaker: Are you going to be long?

Enche' V. Veerappen: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: The meeting is suspended to half-past four this afternoon.

Sitting suspended at 12 noon.

Sitting resumed at 4.30 p.m.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

THE YANG DI-PERTUAN AGONG'S SPEECH

ADDRESS OF THANKS

Debate resumed.

Enche' V. Veerappen (Seberang Selatan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I now wish to dwell on the Ministry of Rural Development. The Honourable Member for Muar Utara rightly stated something to this effect—that the efforts of rural development to increase the wealth of the kampong folks are brought to nought by the capitalists, who suck the blood of the kampong people like leeches, and I do agree with him. It would have been better if the Honourable Member had been more specific and had made suggestions to the Government. However, I feel that no real effort can be made to generally improve the earning power of the rural folks, because of the Alliance policy which, I think, does not encourage the introduction of measures to curtail the activities of these blood-suckers. With the building of roads, these people have been facilitated to bring their lorries and their trucks right into the kampongs and buy the produce at prices very much lower than those prevailing in the towns. Where before our folks used to take their products and hawk around and sell to the highest bidder, now we have the businessmen coming to do their business talk, thus easily persuading the people to part with their produce. By this method, the people get less value for the goods that they produced than what they got before.

Sir, from the extension of electricity supply, we find that people naturally would want electricity in their homes, especially as the electricity is passing just in front of their houses. To do that the people must find the money to meet the cost—somewhere about \$100—but how are they going to get the \$100 or more? Naturally, they borrow at high interest—and here again you find that their expenditure is increased. It is the same in the case of water supply where

pipng has been fixed to the houses—they would incur extra expenditure. So by these means, the people have been encouraged to spend more. I do not deny that water is a very important necessity, and we have ourselves advocated many a time for this extension of water supply; the same is the case with electricity. What I am trying to say is that the Government must genuinely take steps to increase the earning power of the people before increasing the spending power of the people, and thereby making them free of these so-called blood-suckers.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, one of our leading economists, who has made a special study of kampong life says, among other things, that the causes of rural poverty are fragmented holdings, or rather small pieces of land, indebtedness, insecurity of tenure and, of course, the middlemen, or blood-hounds. However, has the Government made efforts to remove these? What has it done in the case of land? We know that the Government has several land development schemes, but these schemes are far away from where the people are living, and it has been found not easy to persuade people to leave the security of their kampongs and their loved ones and go to a faraway place, a new place, to start a new life of insecurity. We ourselves might not, or many of us might not have come to Kuala Lumpur and stayed here, if we were not sure of getting a job in Kuala Lumpur or better job. Many of the Ministers might not have agreed to live here. They might have preferred to live in places where they could earn. If we ask our Government servants to go on transfer, if it is a case of enhanced salaries, they will go. Even in the case of our teachers, as I said at the last session, many of whom are bachelors and spinsters, fight shy of the idea of going to the East Coast, although they are offered secure jobs and a salary of over \$200 each. Therefore, how can we expect our kampong folks to leave their kampongs and go away to these out of the way places, especially when the people know that when they go and take up settlement in the F.L.D.A. Scheme they will be indebted to the

Government to the tune of over \$7,000, as the Minister said in his written reply. Therefore, I should think that a more realistic and more sensible policy would be to redistribute the land in the areas where there are people. If this is done and economic holdings are given to them, I am sure that that would increase their earning power.

Sir, certain interesting facts cropped up recently in an area in Province South, Sungei Acheh, where about 830 acres of padi suffered from a certain disease, which is called *penyakit merah*. The interesting thing was that when it was calculated to pay some sort of compensation or relief to them, the padi growers, it was found that 397 families had to be paid compensation. So we see that each family has an average of half-an-acre to cultivate. How much could a family earn, even if it is the best padi land, and even if the farmers work 365 days? It is very little. The basic thing to do is, in my opinion, to redistribute the land.

With regard to indebtedness, I wonder how much the Government has been able to do. But I think the benefit, if any, is outweighed by the expenditure that I mentioned earlier. As regards security of tenure, the reply from the Minister of Transport, who answered for the Minister of Agriculture, is sufficient evidence to show how the hands of the Agriculture Ministry are tied. In 1952 the Mission on the Economic Development of Malaya urged—I think on page 319—the Government to introduce legislation to provide for the control of rent and security of tenure to padi farmers. In 1955 some form of legislation was introduced, but the legislation was not in accordance with the recommendation of the Economic Commission. Whereas the Economic Mission recommended that legislation should accord the farmer and his family to have the right to continuous occupation of the land, the Ordinance provided only for year-to-year agreement. Now, if it is a year-to-year agreement the farmer has to be obliging to the landlord and he will have to pay more than what is provided for even in the law if he wants to gain the favour of the land-

lord in order to get agreement to cultivate the land for the next year. Such being the case, what value is there? It is amply proved by the answer from the Minister of Transport, who said that it has not been implemented in several areas, there were difficulties, so forth and so on. As far as I know, even in the State of Penang, only in the District of Province Wellesley South was this legislation ever implemented. But after one year it was scrapped and nobody cared for it. I understand there were attempts to revise it, but it is 10 years since the Economic Mission made its recommendation and I think it is still in the cold storage. If it is revised and proper legislation is made to really benefit the farmers, I am sure it would go a long way in improving the earning capacity of the farmers.

My next point is again on the matter of leeches, which was raised by the Honourable Member for Muar Utara. This is the one that really breaks the back of the rural folk and discourages them from any effort. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I happen to sit on our District Rural Development Committee in Nibong Tebal. At almost every one of our meetings we are up against this same obstacle. We spend hours sometimes discussing how best to overcome the grip of the middlemen, but usually we end up in despair because the Chairman always points out to us that we cannot go against the policy of the Government. If the Minister for Rural Development does not believe what I say, then I would ask him to conduct a survey of all the officers who deal with the rural folks and find out their real opinions in this matter—find out for yourself. Of course, I would suggest that you do not ask them to sign the documents. The products of the rural people are, as you know, rubber, coconuts and padi. Each of these is bought by the middlemen and they get the lion's share. In this connection, an incident happened in my area, and that is about rubber dealers. There are certain rubber dealers' shops there. These rubbers dealers' shops formed an association, and what was the object of the association? To rig the price in

such a way that the kampong people and the smallholders who bring their rubber to sell will have to sell at the price they state and not at the market price. Previously the producer would bring his rubber from shop to shop and may try to get the best price. But even that is not available to him now, because the price is rigged, and I understand that the prime mover of this is an Alliance State Councillor who himself is a rubber dealer. In this respect, to end the activities of the middlemen, I must congratulate the Minister of Agriculture for his guts in his efforts to get rid of the middlemen in the purchasing of padi by giving the monopoly to the co-operatives.

A further example is the question of poultry rearing in Ulu Langat. I understand that the people there were supplied with chicks; but the food for the chicks had to be got from two monopolists in the area. It is needless to add, of course, that what they got was of poor quality fodder. When the fowls were big enough to be sold, all of them were big at the same time and the monopolists, who knew that they had to sell the fowls to them, brought down the price very low. But the people could not find any alternative and had to sell them. In the end what did they get? The profit, if there was any profit at all, was very small and the lion's share was taken by the monopolists. And I understand that the people in Ulu Langat have given up hopes of rearing poultry any more.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, what is needed is not only finance but also marketing facilities. Of course, we have discussed in our District Development Committee that the best thing would be to form co-operatives. But our people are not, I should say, appreciative enough of the results that they can obtain from co-operatives and I would strongly suggest that Government should set the example by opening Government shops to buy and sell so that farmers would get better price for their produce. Once the farmers find the advantages to be derived from this business, I am sure they would agree to co-operative enterprises.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I come to the principle of equal pay which was my original point. (*Laughter*) I know this brings forth some laughter. Well, we of the Socialist Front regret very much that this principle was not even mentioned in the Gracious Speech. The principle must be differentiated from the implementation. From the written answers to my questions on this subject the Prime Minister stated that a Committee of officials comprising representatives of various Ministries, the Treasury and the Malayan Railway has been set up to examine the claim. It is not a Parliamentary Committee, neither is it a Royal Commission, and when asked whether the report of this Committee would be tabled or published, the answer was conveniently not given. It says: "This is already clarified in the answers to the questions above." Therefore, I take it that this report, if it comes up—God only knows when it will come up—may not see the light of day, just like so many other official reports. We know of the Report on Fragmentation of Estates which was, I think, way back in 1956; and we also know of a Committee that was set up in 1959 but whose report we are still awaiting. So I do not know when this report will come, and what will come out of it. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, Sir, what I am asking for is for the Government to give a categorical statement as to the fact whether the Government accepts the principle of equal pay.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, our country is a Member of the United Nations and way back in 1948, in the Declaration of Human Rights under Article 23, it says: "Everyone without any discrimination has a right to equal pay for equal work." In the I.L.O. Conference of 1951, Convention 100—concerning equal remuneration for men and women workers for work of equal value—required member States to ensure the application to all workers of the principle of equal remuneration for men and women workers for work of equal value. In 1958, 27 countries ratified this Convention. I do not know why Malaya is not one of them. Isn't Malaya associated with the I.L.O.?

But I do know that delegations after delegations yearly go to the I.L.O. Conference, and what they do, God only knows. But I wonder whether this Convention has been ratified—Convention No. 100. In 1955, the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women adopted a resolution urging the Governments of all States, whether members or not of the United Nations, to take legislative or other measures for the application of the principle of equal pay for equal work for men and women. Many countries, Mr. Speaker, Sir, including the United States of America, Canada, Russia, Czechoslovakia and even countries of the European Economic Community and many many more—I do not think it is necessary for me to take up the time of this House by giving greater details; I feel there are other opportune moment for doing this—have accepted this principle and have taken steps to implement it. It is, therefore, a feeling of shame when I note that our country has not even accepted this principle. It is really with great shock when I read Article 8 (2) of our Constitution which has no mention about any rights for women. (*Laughter*) I am surprised that this should be so. Article 8 (2), on Equality, says:

“Except as expressly authorised by this Constitution, there shall be no discrimination against citizens on the ground only of religion, race, descent or place of birth in any law or in the appointment to any office or employment under a public authority or in the administration of any law relating to the acquisition, etc.”

However, there is mention of race and religion, but no sex. (*Laughter*) But if we look at the Indian Constitution, Article 16 says . . . (*Interruption*) After all, Mr. Speaker, Sir, when our Constitution was drawn up, even the Indian Constitution was consulted. What is happening to the Member there, I do not know.

Mr. Speaker: May I appeal to Members not to interrupt.

Enche' V. Veerappen: Article 16 (2) of the Indian Constitution specifically states the word “sex” there. It is not necessary for me to read it out as it is almost the same except that the word “sex” is mentioned. Therefore,

Sir, I feel that there is all the greater reason that the Government must now . . .

Dato' Dr. Ismail: Sir, on a point of information. May I know whether the Honourable Member is going to elaborate on the Indian Constitution, because we would be very interested to know?

Enche' V. Veerappen: I am going to finish, Sir.

Mr. Speaker (To Dato' Dr. Ismail): He is not giving way.

Enche' V. Veerappen: . . . accept this principle here and now. Thank you.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam (Menglembu): Mr. Speaker, Sir, when an important Speech by His Majesty is being debated, it is important that only Members who feel that they can contribute something useful to the debate should take up the time of this House. And, of course, the best way in deciding whether you have something useful to contribute or not would be to allow your brain to think before you open your mouth. If the Honourable Member for Larut Utara had only given his brain a chance this morning, I am sure he would have decided to remain in his seat, because if you analyse his speech you will find that he has contributed not one little bit to the dignity of this House or to this debate. Ordinarily, we are used to this from the Honourable Member for Larut Utara, and I should not really trouble to reply to what he says, because I learnt a long time ago that it is a waste of time to debate with one for whose opinion you have no respect. However, the Member did make some sweeping and serious allegations, and I intend before I close my address to touch on them. Before I do that, may I refer to a few points on which I consider that I should comment.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, first of all, I would like to refer to page 4 of the printed text of His Majesty's Speech. The second last paragraph says:

“In addition to maintaining the strictest economy in its expenditure, my Government will continue to encourage the flow of

foreign funds into the Federation, particularly by way of long-term loans at reasonable rates of interest."

I touch on that merely to refer to one point. I believe it has already been stressed, but I would like to look at it from a slightly different angle. If you accept foreign aid, or when you encourage foreign trade, you must be careful not to allow those interests to influence your decisions. In that connection, I refer to the urea factory on which there appears to be some difference of opinion among the Ministers, and the Prime Minister. I do not know the history of this, I do not know the background, I do not know what the motives are, but it is quite possible—and it has been suggested in certain quarters—that the decision of the Government not to support this factory is due to business interests, capitalists who are trying to persuade the Government not to go ahead with the urea factory, because it would affect the import and export trade of this commodity, or whatever it may be. If that is true, then I consider that foreign interests are being given preference and that local enterprise is being subordinated to the interests of foreign people. As I have said, I am not prepared to go further into the point, except to say that that has been seriously suggested outside this House, and I think that the time has come when we should get a White Paper tabled in this House setting out the history of the urea factory. I think that it is in the public interest that the full facts should be known without delay.

I do not propose to touch at any length on education, because that is a subject which has been debated over and over again in this House. But I think it is necessary for me to reiterate the policy of our Party that we do not accept the present policy, and I would also ask Government not to construe acquiescence as consent or approval. When a man is forced, he just submits, and that is what is happening in Chinese schools in this country. They are being forced against their will, against their better counsel, to accept this policy, which to them is hateful

and which, in my opinion, is justifiably hateful to all those who have so often expressed their views in public.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would now touch very briefly on the Ministry of Health. I do not want to rub it in, but I cannot resist the temptation to say that on the last occasion when this House sat, we proved and proved conclusively that we were right and the Honourable the Minister of Health was wrong—100 per cent wrong; we accepted his challenge, we repeated it outside the House—the Honourable Member for Johore Tenggara was a witness—and as nothing having happened after that, I think it is fair to assume that we substantiated our allegations as we always did and will do in future.

Now, Sir, I would like to touch on the question of merger. There I think it is deplorable that the Cabinet of this country should have considered it fit and proper to advise His Majesty to utter what can only be considered as a threat to the people of Singapore. I think it is deplorable because the Cabinet should not have used the Head of the State to utter such a threat; and coming from the Head of our State, from the Head of the Federation of Malaya, from His Majesty, what will the people of Singapore think now? If the people of Singapore are self-respecting people, what will they say?—"Well, the Federation is threatening, 'Join us, or we punish you'." Are they going to accept the challenge, or are they going to submit? That is the position which this Government by its tactlessness has created—a position where the people of Singapore cannot accept or surrender, cannot accept this threat without losing dignity or pride. Those who are responsible for this indiscretion will have to take the responsibility. We have discussed it before, Mr. Speaker, Sir, and today I say with confidence that when the time comes for a referendum to be held, and if that referendum is held fairly and properly, there is bound to be an overwhelming vote against acceptance of the bogus plan for merger. As we have said before, and as we will repeat it in future, "We support the principle of merger—100 per cent merger.", but

not to take in Singapore as a vassal State. Somebody is going to be a second class State, you do not really want them, but because there is going to be trouble, you will take them in and put chains around them—that is the attitude of this Government and that is not the attitude we approve, and that is not the attitude which the people of Singapore will submit to.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in my opinion, the threat, first uttered by the Honourable the Prime Minister and later uttered by Government officially through His Majesty's Speech, has really prejudiced the issue, and there is no hope for the merger proposal put forward by the Prime Ministers of Singapore and the Federation.

The next important point which I would like to touch on is the subject of public order in the Federation. His Majesty expresses concern over the situation and has indicated that legislation would be introduced, that new laws would be introduced to deal with this matter. I, for one, Mr. Speaker, Sir, do not agree that any new laws are necessary. After all, this world has existed from time immemorial. There are other countries which have faced the same situation. Surely, this Government is not going to think up something original in the matter of laws which do not exist in any other country in the world? Surely, it is within the competence of the Legal Department in this country to go through the laws of other countries, say, within one week, and find out all what you want? Could you think up something brand new which other legal experts in other countries of the world do not know of? If you are embarking on that course, you are bound to fail. If there is any law which could deal more effectively with the situation, it must have already been framed by some legal experts in some country or another. The trouble is not with the law. The trouble, Mr. Speaker, Sir, is with the manner in which these laws are implemented, the manner in which offences are investigated with the efficiency of certain sections of the police force. I would suggest that the Government

look for what is really wrong and do not just introduce a new law. There is nothing new in law. The only thing will be to abandon law and revert to a lawless State where people can be dealt with without trial—that is the kind of law the Japanese introduced into this country, and that is the sort of law we do not want to see again. Within the framework of existing laws, there is every scope for dealing with every known crime, and I fail to see why the Government should be so panicky. We are not being given statistics, and I raised this point the last time, to justify the state of panic in Government. From a comparative study of crime figures in this country, in England, in America, and other neighbouring countries, is the Government in a position to state that crime in this country is higher than any other country. We feel certain that an investigation will show that it is not. What had the Government done at the last meeting? They introduced the Kidnapping Act. I suppose the Act was evolved and drafted after careful thinking by people who are paid to think and draft laws. But after the first case we are told that it was a failure and that somebody has got to start thinking on it again and think up some new law. When are we going to stop? When are we going to get somebody who can enact a law which will be effective and which will last for some time? Is it dignified for the Government, that just because in one case the men were found and the Police were unable to provide the evidence to secure conviction, to say that there is something wrong with the whole thing we are going to scrap it and we are going to introduce harsher law? That is not the sign of a stable Government; that is the sign of a Government which reverts to panic whenever it is in trouble. As for the last case, I suppose the Attorney-General's Department would have sent a report to those entitled to know, and I am sure the report would have indicated what was wrong with that last trial. We ourselves having been concerned in that trial, it would not be proper for us to comment or to give any information

regarding the trial or why it was a terrible flop. But I am sure the learned Deputy Public Prosecutor who conducted the case will be the first person to tell the Government what was wrong with the trial. And what was wrong there, to put it broadly, was not with the law but the way the case was prepared and brought into court, the way it was investigated....

Mr. Speaker: If the case is not completed, it will be prejudiced. Is it *sub judice*?

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: No, Sir. It is already completed.

Mr. Speaker: There is no appeal?

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: No, Sir. The way it was investigated and the Police tactics adopted there—that was what was wrong. It is important, Mr. Speaker, Sir, for the Government to reconsider the entire criminal procedure in this country. The Government adopted the Criminal Procedure Code as it was originally framed in India—I do not know how many years ago—some time in the 1800s. In India it has been amended several times, especially in regard to police statements, i.e. Section 113 of the Criminal Procedure Code. The present provision which still remains in our law is outdated in India, it is no more law in India. But we find that in Malaya somebody has been too lazy to bring the law up-to-date; somebody too lazy to make the necessary recommendations for amendment. So, we still go on with Section 113. Now, it is important when you are dealing with serious crime, in order to get the co-operation of the public, the public must be satisfied that people who are brought into court and tried are dealt with fairly and are given a fair trial. I refer to this because it is possible that the Government may be toying with the idea of prescribing a different procedure for persons who are charged with kidnapping offences. If you do that, if you deny them certain fundamental rights of an accused person to a fair trial, then you will not gain public support, you will lose public support, you will get condemnation from the public because the public is

only interested in seeing that guilty people are tried, convicted and hanged. But if you allow any loophole for innocent people to get the noose round their neck, public sympathy in every case will be on the side of the people who are standing in the dock. That is an important principle which the Government must bear in mind. I would therefore, urge the Government not to curtail any rights of persons charged with offences of kidnapping, but on the other hand to ensure that they are given every right to a fair trial, with every safeguard provided for accused persons by the laws of this country.

One such step was already taken by the Government in the Kidnapping Act, where persons charged with the offence of kidnapping punishable by death have been denied jury trial. And what is that replaced by? Assessor trial—a farce, a complete farce, which the Honourable the Prime Minister himself condemned earlier in his career as being a farce, an absolute farce. When you arrest a man charged with kidnapping, he is presumed to be innocent in law. You are putting a man presumably innocent on trial for his life. You are prescribing for him a mode of trial which jurists have described as a farce and you expect the public to say, “We hope the man will be convicted and hanged”. Give him a jury trial and then if he is convicted and hanged, everybody will say he has got a fair trial. Everybody will be on your side and they will give what information they can, because they know what information they give will be weighed by a proper tribunal, a tribunal of their own countrymen; but not the assessor trial which gives the judge power even to reject the view of the assessors and still sentence the man to death. I would, therefore, ask the Government seriously to reconsider this question of the mode of trial in cases of kidnapping. After all, the people in this country cannot be insulted by the Government by saying, “Oh, you as jury will be intimidated. We want to protect you; we do not want you to sit on the Bench”. The same thing applies to

assessors and to so many people who may give evidence in kidnapping cases.

Another unsatisfactory aspect in kidnapping cases under the Kidnapping Act, in trials under the Corruption Ordinance and one or two other Ordinances is this—that statements made to the Police by accused persons are admissible in evidence against them if recorded after caution, but those statements need not be signed by the accused. In other words, under the law of this country, a man can be hanged, put to death, on a statement produced in court by a police inspector who says, "This is the statement which the accused gave me. He has not signed it; he has not been asked to sign it, and even if he wants to sign it he will not be permitted to sign it". That is the law of this country. And why is it that it is the law of this country? Because Section 113 of the Criminal Procedure Code has not been revoked. As I said, somebody has overlooked Section 113. Even in Communist Russia they go to all sort of troubles, even forcing a man to sign a confession. Here you say—"Don't sign, we won't let you sign even if you want to sign." What does the police inspector do? Goes back to his house, sits on his typewriter and types it out and in nine out of ten cases what is tendered in court is a type-written statement alleged to have been made by the accused, on which he can be hanged. Amend the law, require the Police, if a statement is made, to get the man to sign it and, as a further precaution against fiddling with the confession, require the police officer to give a copy of the statement to the accused. Why be afraid of all those safeguards? Why give so much power into the hands of a police inspector when it is not really necessary at all?

Another point which alienates public sympathy, which the Government so often asks for, is that a very serious situation is developing in this country where junior police officers are acting in a manner which terrorises people, makes them afraid to go near the police station. I don't say it happens on a wide scale but it is

happening on sufficiently numerous occasions for the Government to sit up and take notice. Even one instance is enough for the Government to sit up and take notice. I have no doubt that the Honourable Minister of Interior, if he has received information—as I believe he has—that some such situation exists in this country, will deal with it energetically, because there is no Government, I believe, which will consciously encourage this sort of thing to go on; and I can only hope that the Minister of the Interior will pursue this matter with vigour and make it absolutely clear to the Police that the Government is not interested in securing convictions on evidence secured by terror and beatings and that the Government will mercilessly deal with any police officer who may be found guilty of such offences.

Now I come to the several matters which were raised by the Member for Larut Utara. Referring to the speech made by the Member for Ipoh, the Member for Larut Utara says that we always accuse the Alliance as not having done anything for the new villages. What has the PPP done for the new villages? I wonder if the Member thought before he spoke. Where is our power to do anything for the New Villages? Where is the money for us to do anything for the New Villages? Has he forgotten that we are not the Government of the Federation of Malaya—not even the Government of the State of Perak? But if he is interested in seeing what we can do, where we have the power, let him come to Ipoh. Let him ask us what we have done in Ipoh. I will be glad to conduct him round the town of Ipoh and show him what we could do if we had the power to do it. But don't ask us what we have done for territories or areas where you are in control, where you hold the powers. What is the use of asking such a question?

Enche' Tajudin: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untuk penjelasan saya telah sebutkan berkenaan dengan lembah Kinta itu sa-tengah daripada sa-tengah di-kuasai oleh PPP. Sa-patut-nya

wakil PPP hadir dalam Majlis Meshuarat Luar Bandar, dan chadangkan-lah apa² yang hendak di-buat di-Kampong Baharu itu. Ini datang meshuarat pun tidak. Jadi apa hendak buat pada Kampong Baharu itu!

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: On that point, Mr. Speaker, Sir, we wrote to the Honourable the Mentri Besar to put the Member for Ipoh in the Rural Development Board, but the Honourable the Mentri Besar replied that Ipoh is not a rural constituency and therefore the Member for Ipoh cannot sit on the Board. (*Laughter*) So you do not let us sit there, at the same time you blame us for not sitting there.

Enche' Tajudin: What about Batu Gajah?

Mr. Speaker: (*To Enche' Tajudin*): If you want to interrupt, you must ask my permission first. You can only interrupt on a point of information or on a point of order.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: The next point referred to by the Honourable Member for Larut Utara was this. He said: "You people, you do not know that we are giving 1,300 acres for non-Malays in the Tanjong Tuallang area?" I do not know whether he was referring to Tanjong Tuallang proper or to Sungai Durian. But if he was referring to Sungai Durian, then I must say that it was not all given to the Chinese, the Malays got their allotted share; and that the people who made that allotment were members of the State Executive Council of Perak and I am sure they would not have acted against the Constitution—against the Perak State Constitution. They would have made a proper allotment for the Malays. If there is any other area in Tanjong Tuallang where the Malays were not given a share, again that was the decision of the Mentri Besar of Perak, perhaps that was a locality which was not favoured by the Malays and which the Malays did not want; and therefore it was given to other races.

The Honourable Member for Larut Utara also complains that the Member for Batu Gajah, or PPP Members of

Parliament—I do not know what he meant—they go "whiz, whiz" (*Laughter*) in their cars up and down Tanjong Tuallang and they can't see what is going on. I do not know who his informers were that we go so fast. I know the Member for Batu Gajah has got a very powerful Mercedes Benz and he drives fast. But I do not know who has given him this information. Perhaps it is possible that the only persons who have seen him rushing up and down like that must be the attendants at his petrol pump; perhaps they complained that the Member for Batu Gajah did not patronise his petrol pump at Batu Gajah (*Laughter*). But I can assure him that we are not discriminating against him. We filled our tanks in Ipoh and there is no reason why we should not rush past if we want to (*Laughter*).

The Honourable Member also said that we are making a big fuss on a small matter as taxi licences. But may I assure the Member for Larut Utara that neither His Majesty nor the Government considers that a small matter, because the Government has taken the trouble to table a Special Appendix to His Majesty's Speech pointing out—at least sufficiently important to be printed and to be referred to by His Majesty in the third paragraph of his Speech—that 52 per cent of the taxi licences are now in the hands of the Malays. We do not grudge that. Having got your 52 per cent, why you still want to preserve your right? Why not follow the Constitution, the object of which was to give equality? Or are you going, as was pointed out this morning, to say that in every village, in every town, and perhaps later in every main street of every town, there must be an equal number of taxi licences before you withdraw that special privilege?

The Honourable Member talking on public order—he can be very vehement as he always does on thugs and gangsters—first referred to Penang, but I must apologise for not having caught really what he said. I do not know whether he said that because Penang is an Alliance State,

there is not much gangsterism. Or, perhaps, did he say that in the rest of Penang Island, except George Town which is controlled by the Socialist Front, there is not much crime? However, if he had intended to say that is not much crime in Penang, if he had thought a little, he would have discovered why Penang has less crime than the rest of the Federation of Malaya. The simple reason is that crime on a big scale cannot be perpetrated for long in Penang, because it is an island and the gangsters and thugs cannot make a quick getaway. It does not require much thinking for one to come to that conclusion and to come to that reason. Because gangsters cannot make a quick getaway from an island, therefore you do not have big gangsters in an island; they do not like to play into the hands of the Police.

Now, he referred to various towns in the Federation, the principal towns in the Federation—Ipoh, Seremban. He says the Alliance is not controlling those towns and you find gangsters, thugs, murderers, and so on. I hope he reads his newspapers. The past few days, where have there been thuggeries, gangsterism and murders—five murders in one month? Not in Ipoh, not in Seremban, but in Kuala Lumpur, which was taken over by the Alliance only a short time ago. And what do we find here in today's *Malay Mail*?—"Police step up 'war'". Where?—not in Ipoh, not in Seremban, but right here in Kuala Lumpur, after the Alliance took over. So please think before you talk. But one funny thing about this report in the *Malay Mail* is this: Why the Police have to jump into action only after an Ambassador's wife is involved? Isn't it enough if a common man is involved for the Police to jump into action? Why must we have this headlines "Reserve Unit, Field Force, etc." only when an Ambassador's wife is involved? I think that is an attitude to which we must attribute some of these crimes—laxity. Until something important happens, everybody takes it easy; but once an important person is involved, then everybody jumps.

Now coming to the Federation, let us assume there is more crime in big towns like Ipoh, Kuala Lumpur, Seremban—Malacca maybe; Johore maybe—than in the villages and kampongs. Of course, that is only natural; that happens all over the world. I think we have to credit the gangsters, thugs and extortioners with some intelligence—a little bit of brain they have got in their head. What is the use of gangsters and extortioners going to Parit—whom are they going to extort money from in Parit? The Honourable Member gave Parit as an example of a peaceful town where there are no gangsters, extortioners or thugs. What on earth are gangsters and thugs going to do in the village of Parit? They will be wasting their time. (*Laughter*) Naturally, the wealth is concentrated in the towns; the rich people are living in the towns—people with lots of money live in the towns—and extortioners go to rich people—to people who can afford to pay. They don't go to disturb a poor kampong dweller, who may have just enough to carry on his own livelihood. There again, a little bit of thought would have given the Honourable Member the reason why there is crime in the major towns. It is not because of the PPP—and I am certainly not suggesting that because of the Alliance there is crime in Kuala Lumpur; it will be silly for me to say so. Anywhere, where there is money, where there are rich people, you find crime—thugs trying to get rich out of the rich people. As simple as that!

Now, Sir, there is one serious thing which the Honourable Member said, a thing which he should have never said—I do not know whether he heard it with his own ears or not—and it is improper for him to have said it. He said that the PPP had said, "Fight against the Government. We have got three or four lawyers." Surely, we have a little bit more intelligence than that. We do not want to be shot as traitors. We do not want to be thrown into prison for sedition. Is there any sense in anyone who will say, "Fight against the Government. We have got three or four lawyers"?

That is something which we never said and will never say. Of course, it is no use asking the Honourable Member to repeat it outside this House. He will not dare to do it. Under cover of privilege, he will say it. When we challenged him the last time, he did not dare to repeat. This time I am not going to waste my time challenging him.

Another astounding thing for a parliamentarian to say, what he thought was a brilliant idea or suggestion, was that the Members for Ipoh—I suppose Menglembu also—Seremban and other places should be immediately suspended, because in those towns there was a crime wave. What a brilliant suggestion! What has a Member of Parliament got to do with the security of those towns?

Now, I have known the Honourable Member for Larut Utara—in fact, I count him as one of my friends in spite of any disagreement which we have; in fact, I knew him long before he became a Member of Parliament and long before I became a Member of Parliament; outside the Parliament we are still friends. However, I am becoming rather worried about the future of the Honourable Member for Larut Utara. I am worried in regard to the nature and tenor of his speech; and I am beginning to be worried that whether or not very soon the Government of the Federation of Malaya will have to invoke Article 48 of the Constitution of the Federation of Malaya. Article 48 says:

“Subject to the provisions of this Article, a person is disqualified for being a member of either House of Parliament if—

(a) he is and has been found or declared to be of unsound mind.” (Laughter).

Enche' Mohamed Asri bin Haji Muda (Pasir Puteh): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam perchakapan saya berkenaan dengan Uchapan Titah Duli Yang Maha Mulia Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong ini sambil menyampaikan ucapan terima kasih daripada pehak kami di-sini, maka saya rasa ada beberapa perkara yang patut saya bangkitkan daripada Titah Uchapan Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong ini.

Sa-panjang berkenaan dengan titah yang telah di-sampaikan pada 25 hari-bulan baharu² ini boleh-lah di-katakan tiga suku daripada titah itu mengan-dongi soal² berkenaan dengan ekonomi negara ini. Pada hal saya rasa, ada satu perkara yang besar yang patut di-bangkitkan juga di-dalam titah itu ia-lah soal² yang mengenai perkembangan dan kemajuan dasar pelajaran negeri ini. Satu pengkajian yang khas di-tileki dengan chermat patut-lah di-segerakan oleh pehak Kerajaan tentang soal nasib pelajar² yang tidak lulus di-dalam pepereksaan darjah VI untuk memasoki kelas² menengah di-seluruh Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini.

Pagi sa-malam Menteri Pelajaran Persekutuan Tanah Melayu di-dalam menjawab pertanyaan saya sa-chara bertulis berkata bahawa semenjak tahun 1959 sampai tahun 1961 jumlah 61,228 orang murid² yang bersekolah yang menggunakan bahasa pengantar bahasa Melayu telah tidak lulus di-dalam pepereksaan yang akhir. 32,508 murid² yang tidak lulus pula di-dalam sekolah yang memakai bahasa pengantar bahasa Inggeris. Saya perchaya sa-bahagian besar daripada murid² yang tidak lulus dari sekolah yang memakai bahasa pengantar bahasa Inggeris itu ada-lah terdiri daripada anak² Melayu juga. Jawapan yang diberikan oleh Menteri tentang soal apakah ikhtiar² sa-lanjut-nya untuk mengatasi atau pun memberi peluang kepada murid² yang tidak berjaya itu tidak-lah begitu tegas, dia tidak membayangkan satu² ikhtiar yang tegas, yang tetap, yang kuat bagi menjamin masa hadapan bagi ribuan anak² Melayu yang tidak tamat atau tidak lulus dalam satu² sekolah rendah itu. Tetapi jumlah 61,000 yang terdiri daripada tahun 1959, 1960 dan tahun 1961 kalau kita jumlahkan tiap² tahun ini ada-lah menggambarkan jumlah dari satu tahun ka-satu tahun ada-lah bertambah.

Dalam tahun 1959 13,820 orang yang tidak lulus dari sekolah² rendah yang memakai bahasa pengantar bahasa Melayu dan tahun 1960 naik menjadi 15,350 orang dan tahun 1961 telah bertambah sa-kali ganda

ia-itu sa-banyak 32,056 orang. Ini saya rasa, sa-lain daripada ikhtiar untuk menampong murid² ini supaya mereka dapat satu chara bagi menampong kehidupan di-masa yang akan datang terpaksa-lah di-kaji sa-mula sebab² kenapa murid² ini kechewa di-dalam peperiksaan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada pandangan saya satu daripada sebab yang besar-nya ia-lah oleh kerana chara²-nya tidak ada dalam peperiksaan dari tahun ka-satahun bagi murid² yang belajar di-sekolah² rendah daripada tahun yang pertama sa-hingga sampai tahun yang keenam, baharu-lah di-adakan peperiksaan. Ini-lah satu daripada sebab-nya gagal murid² itu tidak lulus di-dalam peperiksaan ini. Ini perlu-lah pehak Kementerian ini mengkaji dengan sa-dalam²-nya dan perlulah di-fikirkan satu kaedah mengadakan peperiksaan naik kelas yang boleh menjamin kechergasan dan ka-sunggohan murid² itu di-dalam menuntut pelajaran sa-hingga mereka dapat berjaya masuk ka-sekolah menengah apabila selesai mereka di-sekolah rendah. Mithal-nya markah peperiksaan pada tiap² tahun di-jadikan asas² jumlah markah peperiksaan yang akhir dalam sekolah rendah itu. Ini ada-lah satu daya pendorong yang saya fikir boleh di-bangkitkan sa-hingga murid² itu bersungguh² di-dalam menempoh pelajaran-nya di-sekolah rendah.

Sa-lain daripada itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, satu perkara yang harus di-fikirkan oleh Kementerian ini, kalau saya tidak lupa pada satu masa yang lalu pernah saya bertanya kepada Menteri Pelajaran tentang ada-kah guru² yang mengajar di-sekolah rendah yang memakai bahasa pengantar bahasa Melayu khas-nya ada diantara-nya telah di-benarkan mengambil bahagian yang chergas di-dalam politik, dan dengan chara yang ikhlas Menteri Yang Berhormat itu telah menjawab ada. Ini pun, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada-lah satu unsur yang tidak patut di-lupakan oleh Kerajaan atau Kementerian yang berkenaan tentang kechergasan guru² bergerak di-lapangan politik. Masok parti politik pada pandangan saya tidak-lah salah tetapi mengambil bahagian chergas

pada pandangan saya sedikit sa-banyak ada-lah melibatkan kegiatan² guru² itu sendiri di-lapangan pelajaran. Maka biasa-nya guru² ini mengambil bahagian chergas dalam bahagian politik ada-lah di-waktu mereka tidak mengajar, kalau mereka mengajar di-sebelah pagi di-sebelah petang-nya mereka boleh-lah bergerak untuk parti politik. Pada hal masa lapang bagi sa-saorang guru pada hari² kerja-nya itu ada-lah satu masa yang penting dan berharga untuk mereka itu bersedia mengkaji pelajaran-nya dan menumpukan sa-genap fikiran-nya bagi meninggikan lagi darjah pelajaran-nya sendiri, Ini pun harus-lah atau patut sangat Kementerian ini mengambil berat sa-hingga pada masa yang akan datang kita ingin melihat bahawa satu kenyataan di-bentangkan dalam Dewan yang mulia ini bahawa jumlah murid² yang tidak lulus di-dalam peperiksaan-nya berkurangan daripada tahun² yang lalu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berkisar kepada masaalah Pembangunan Luar Bandar dan Pembangunan Industry dalam negeri ini yang sa-bahagian besar yang di-persoalkan oleh Titah Duli Yang Maha Mulia itu. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau di-pandang sa-pintas lalu memang kehebatan Pembangunan Luar Bandar dalam negeri ini ada-lah berlipat ganda masa² yang lalu, akan tetapi satu perkara yang harus di-fikirkan oleh Kerajaan tentang dasar-nya. Ada-kah sa-mata² dasar pembangunan negara baik dari segi luar bandar atau dalam bandar itu sudut perusahaan pertanian, perkilangan atau lain² perusahaan ada-kah dasar-nya sa-mata² hendak menjadikan ekonomi negara ini suatu ekonomi yang tegoh dan tidak terancham dengan sudut² kedudukan ra'ayat dalam negeri ini. Pembangunan ekonomi dalam negeri ini pada pandangan saya tidak begitu banyak menyentuh Pembangunan Ekonomi Ra'ayat Pembangunan Luar Bandar yang di-tujukan kepada soal² pembangunan jalan raya, pembangunan jambatan, pembangunan perigi, pembangunan kelas² dewasa, pembangunan balai raya, kalau tidak di-sertakan pembangunan ekonomi ra'ayat dengan menguatkan lagi bantuan dan

sokongan, nasihat² dalam segi Sharikat Kerjasama dan sa-bagai-nya lambat laun pembangunan ini akan melahirkan satu rupa mengkechiwakan kapada ra'ayat dalam negeri ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, belum lagi kita memerhatikan kapada pembangunan Industry, walau pun telah diperkatakan dengan banyak-nya dengan soal ketenteraman politik dalam negeri ini yang banyak di-perkatakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh dan Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang lain namun dapat-lah di-perkatakan pembangunan Industry dalam negeri ini ada-lah suatu pembangunan yang pinchang. Sebab pertama sa-kali saya katakan pinchang ia-lah oleh kerana keutamaan lebeh besar yang di-berikan kapada pembangunan Industry dari modal asing di-luar negeri. Penggalakan Kerajaan sa-chara tegas untuk kebangkitan dalam kalangan ra'ayat negeri ini atau pun pembangunan kebangsaan maseh belum di-perlihatkan chorak-nya sa-chara Industry. Walau pun sana sini munchul Sharikat² atau pun perusahaan persaorangan dengan modal-nya sendiri tidak mengharapkan kapada modal luar akan tetapi jaminan untuk kelanjutan umor yang di-bangunkan oleh ra'ayat itu tidak begitu tegas dalam Kerajaan negeri itu sendiri. Pembangunan Industry dalam bahagian kain batek sudah berkali² saya menyatakan perlu-lah perusahaan saperti itu dapat kawalan yang rapi dan mendapat jaminan yang tegas daripada Kerajaan, jaminan tentang perlawanan dalam pasaran. Dengan ada-nya asas di-antara Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu dengan Kerajaan Thailand dan Philippines, kemungkinan pertukaran barang² perniagaan itu akan bertambah dengan ranchak-nya dan kita tahu di-negeri Thailand ada Industry atau kilang untuk membuat kain batek yang sekarang ini mula di-perkenalkan dalam masharakat Melayu. Kebimbangan kita dalam soal ini bertambah hebat manakala dahulu asas kain batek di-luar masok banyak ka-Persekutuan dan ini akan menjadi satu perlawanan yang hebat dalam segi pasaran. Sebab kita tahu sa-banyak

sadikit-nya kain² batek dari Thailand itu akan dapat di-jual dengan lebeh murah atau persamaan harga-nya.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, itu-lah sebab-nya kita di-kehendaki suatu dasar Kerajaan Persekutuan tentang perlindungan yang sa-sungguh-nya terhadap pembinaan Industry dalam negeri ini. Pertama-nya timbul usaha untuk mengadakan kilang plastic tetapi kemungkinan datang-nya dari negeri Philippines akibat daripada ada-nya ASA, ASA mungkin menimbulkan suatu perlawanan dari segi barang² itu. Atau pun barang² permainan kanak², ini perlu di-perhatikan oleh pemerentah negeri ini. Di-dalam soal ekonomi ini Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh sa-bagaimana biasa bila menyebut kedudukan ekonomi dalam negeri ini telah menyentoh soal hak istimewa orang² Melayu. Saya tidak tahu adakah ini telah menjadi suatu sifat bagi Yang Berhormat itu sengaja membangkitkan hak istimewa orang Melayu. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam memperkatakan hak istimewa orang Melayu Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh telah berper² ada yang hak istimewa itu tidak-lah mengganjalkan ada-nya keadilan dalam negeri ini. Itu sa-bahagian kechil daripada apa yang di-katakan dalam Rumah ini, akan tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, chakap yang di-nyatakan oleh Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh mengatakan memang tidak ada lagi hak istimewa orang Melayu di-bandingkan dengan soal lesen teksi dan sabagai-nya. Kalau di-tinjau chara yang halus, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kenyataan batin yang di-lahirkan daripada perjuangan Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh untuk menjaga hak istimewa orang Melayu ada-lah terselit di-dalam-nya asas perkauman. Kita tahu bahawa pehak pemerentah negeri ini mengadakan hak istimewa dalam Perlembagaan ia-lah sa-mata² untuk menjadi suatu asas bagi memperlindung kedudukan orang Melayu sendiri walau pun pehak kami, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada-nya hak istimewa maseh belum chukup bahkan pehak kami bahawa hak istimewa itu mesti-lah di-adakan. Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh meminta Perlembagaan Persekutuan ini di-pinda supaya

boleh merupakan sa-buah Perlembagaan yang tidak berchorak perkauman yang 'adil. Kapada pehak kami di sini juga rasa-nya menyokong chadangan supaya di-pinda tetapi bukan di-pinda untuk membuang hak istimewa orang Melayu bahkan menguatkan asas ini hak istimewa dalam lapangan politik.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berbangkit dalam soal Titah Seri Paduka Baginda tentang soal pandangan pendirian Persekutuan terhadap soal Irian Barat, Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh di-pandang dengan chara segi rupa sa-hingga terbit-lah ucapan daripada Yang Berhormat itu supaya Persekutuan ini tidak memberikan sokongan kapada kedudukan Indonesia untuk mendapatkan kembali Irian Barat. Dengan alasan Indonesia memakai dasar guided democracy atau demokrasi terpimpin. Bagi kita ia-lah soal-nya di-mana sahaja negara dalam negeri ini yang memperjuangkan untuk kebebasan penjajahan maka perlu-lah di-hormati. Indonesia memperjuangkan kemerdekaan sa-penoh-nya supaya Irian Barat kembali ka-tangan-nya. Ini-lah perjuangan Indonesia, tidak berbangkit dalam Dewan ini sama ada Indonesia itu berdasarkan kominis atau Indonesia itu berdasarkan guided democracy. Kalau-lah oleh kerana sa-buah negeri itu tidak berjuang mengikut chara democracy maka sa-barang perjuangan negara itu untuk membebaskan diri-nya daripada penjajahan kita tentang maka erti-nya kita sendiri ada-lah menyokong kapada penjajahan. Boleh-kah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mengatakan dalam Dewan ini mungkin Ahli Yang Berhormat itu berjuang untuk mempertahankan penjajahan di-Asia Tenggara dengan menentang Indonesia untuk mendapatkan kembali Irian Barat.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ini ada-lah beberapa perkara yang saya rasa patut saya sentoh berkenaan dengan soal luar negeri. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, terhadap kerja² Kementerian Pengangkutan mengikut sa-bagaimana hujongan kapada Titah Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong dan mengikut sa-bagaimana kenyataan daripada Kementerian Pengangkutan sendiri

bahawa kepala keretapi dalam negeri ini akan di-tukarkan semua-nya kapada kepala keretapi yang memakai enjen desel. Ini satu masaalah yang harus di-kaji oleh Kementerian ini. Kemungkinan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu dengan rel² keretapi itu yang boleh menerima kepala desel yang berlipat ganda harga-nya atau bagaimana. Kepala² keretapi desel yang mempunyai kekuatan yang berganda daripada kepala keretapi biasa mengikut yang saya tahu tidak-lah dapat melayakkan diri-nya dengan rel² keretapi atau kekuatan landasan keretapi yang ada sekarang ini dan dengan yang demikian hasil-nya boleh di-katakan tidak begitu jauh daripada apa yang di-lakukan tugas oleh kepala keretapi biasa dan dalam usaha Kerajaan negeri ini untuk menjimatkan perbelanjaan negeri-nya patut-lah perkara ini mesti di-timbangkan dengan sa-masak²-nya.

Satu perkara lagi ia-lah perkara kedudukan polis. Patut-lah menjadi perhatian yang berat kapada Kementerian Dalam Negeri dan Kementerian Keselamatan Dalam Negeri tentang kedudukan polis dalam negeri ini. Bertambah-nya jenayah² dalam negeri ini saperti yang di-nyatakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Menglembu bagaimana dalam bandar Kuala Lumpur sendiri telah berlaku samun—kechurian dan bagaimana isteri sa-orang Duta luar negeri telah di-samun ada-lah membayangkan keadaan² yang berat tentang soal keselamatan dalam negeri ini pada masa sekarang. Menumpukan perhatian keselamatan dalam negeri kapada gerakan² subversive sa-mata² tidak-lah boleh menjamin yang negeri ini akan menjadi sa-buah negeri yang aman dan tenteram. Soal keamanan bagi sa-sabuah bandar sama ada di-bandar Ipoh, bandar Seremban, bandar Kuala Lumpur, bandar Kota Bharu, bukan-lah menjadi tanggung jawab bagi pemerintah sa-tempat. Tidak-lah oleh kerana Ipoh menjadi aman lebeh daripada Kuala Lumpur maka itu erti-nya ketegasan pemerintah dalam bandar Ipoh atas soal menghapuskan jenayah saperti ini, atau pun tidak-lah oleh kerana negeri Kelantan banyak berlaku kejadian

jenayah maka itu boleh di-sifatkan bahawa Kerajaan PAS negeri Kelantan bertanggung jawab terhadap jenayah seperti itu. Sa-benar-nya soal ini adalah terletak kepada Kementerian yang berkenaan dan ini harus di-fikirkan oleh Menteri Yang Berhormat supaya tidak-lah menjadi satu tempelak, memalukan kepada Kementerian dalam negeri itu sendiri tentang kedudukan jenayah di-negeri ini, di-samping itu kebajikan bagi polis² itu pun tidak-lah patut di-lupai, walau pun dalam Titah Seri Paduka Baginda dan dalam hujongan-nya telah menyebutkan tentang berjuta² ringgit akan di-belanjakan untuk di-belanjakan rumah bagi pegawai² polis dan polis² biasa bagi memenuhi kehendak polis supaya mendapat tempat tinggal yang aman dan sempurna kelak dan sedang di-lakukan oleh pemerintah dalam negeri ini, tetapi soal gaji polis adalah tidak di-lupai.

Rumah yang mulia ini beberapa kali di-dengungkan suara oleh Ahli² Yang Berhormat sendiri tentang soal gaji pegawai² polis. Kedudukan polis dengan gaji-nya yang ada sekarang walau pun di-beri rumah yang baik tidak-lah boleh menjamin bahawa polis itu boleh bertugas dengan betul sa-lain daripada memikirkan soal rumah-tangga dengan anak-nya. Ini patut-lah mendapat pertimbangan dari pihak Kementerian yang berkenaan, dan pada akhir-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mengharapkan supaya semua Kementerian dalam Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini memberi pertimbangan² yang sewajar-nya supaya berlaku-nya keadaan ketenteraman politik dalam negeri. Ada-nya tekan-menekan, ada-nya beza-mem-beza, ada-nya sa-suatu yang berjalan tidak mengikut saloran² yang tertentu menyebabkan ketenteraman politik dalam Titah Seri Paduka Baginda itu tidak mempunyai erti apa². Sa-bagai mithal-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam negeri Kelantan mengikut dasar Buku Merah ada Jawatan-Kuasa Kemajuan Luar Bandar Negeri, ada Jawatan-Kuasa Kemajuan Luar Bandar Jajahan atau Daerah, dan ada Jawatan-Kuasa Kemajuan Kampong, yang sa-patut-nya semua urusan²

dalam soal pembangunan luar bandar baik pun rancangan, baik pun pemberian wang ada-lah melalui badan yang sah yang di-beri oleh Buku Merah itu, tetapi oleh sebab entah apa, pihak Kementerian Luar Bandar telah melakukan sa-suatu yang pada pandangan saya ada-lah berlawanan dengan Buku Merah sendiri.

Ada-nya beberapa projek yang pada asal-nya tidak pernah tertulis dalam Buku Merah, ta' pernah di-bincangkan dalam mana meshuarat Jawatan-Kuasa sama ada Jawatan-Kuasa Kemajuan Kampong atau Jawatan-Kuasa Kemajuan Luar Bandar Jajahan atau pun Jawatan-Kuasa Kemajuan Luar Bandar Negeri—tiba² sa-jumlah wang di-kirimkan dan supaya di-laksanakan terus oleh Pegawai Kemajuan Negeri dengan tidak mengendahkan kerja Jawatan-Kuasa Pembangunan Luar Bandar. Berpuluh² ribu ringgit untuk membayar beberapa projek telah di-kirim melalui Pegawai Kemajuan Negeri dan Pegawai Kemajuan Negeri memerintahkan kepada Ketua Jajahan supaya melaksanakan kerja pembangunan luar bandar itu. Dalam satu meshuarat kemajuan luar bandar jajahan, saya bertanya kepada Ketua Jajahan itu: diperintahkan tuan untuk melaksanakan projek ini atas nama tuan sa-bagai Pengerusi Jawatan-Kuasa Luar Bandar Jajahan atau sa-bagai tuan Ketua Jajahan. Kalau tuan sa-bagai Pengerusi Jawatan-Kuasa Kemajuan Luar Bandar Jajahan, maka mesti-lah perkara itu melalui Jawatan-Kuasa Kemajuan Luar Bandar juga dan kalau tuan sa-bagai Ketua Jajahan, saya rasa ta' dapat-lah Pegawai Kemajuan Negeri memerintah terus kepada Ketua Jajahan, lebeh² lagi oleh kerana perkara ini butir² projek itu ia-lah mengenai pembangunan soal luar bandar, maka tidak-lah mustahak perkara itu melalui tuan sa-bagai Ketua Jajahan bagi jajahan itu. Sa-sudah di-siasat, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, maka nyata-lah berlaku-nya beberapa perkara politik di-dalam-nya. Mithal-nya di-satu tempat, satu pertubohan politik yang tertentu—bukan PAS—telah menda'ayahkan pada tempat itu bahawa kalau tuan berkehendakkan jambatan

ini maka masok-lah parti kami. Keluar-lah yuran dan ada-lah senarai, maka berdasarkan yuran dan senarai itu di-adakan-lah satu pertemuan politik di-antara pegawai² parti Perikatan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dengan Menteri Muda Pembangunan Luar Bandar di-sabuah rumah dalam jajahan Kota Bharu. Dalam pertemuan sulit itu di-nyatakan-lah bahawa sa-kira-nya penduduk² kampung itu bersedia masok parti tersebut maka jambatan itu akan dapat di-laksanakan dalam bulan dua tahun 1962, dan hasil-nya dalam bulan empat baharu² ini datang-lah ia . . . itu satu daripada mithal-nya dan ada mithal²-nya yang lain lagi. Pekerjaan saperti ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya pandang ia-lah satu daripada gejala atau tanda² tidak ada-nya ketenteraman politik di-negeri ini.

Kita berjanji hendak melaksanakan chara demokrasi dalam pemerentahan negeri ini, dan kita tahu dalam demokrasi ini ra'ayat berhak memilih, dan kita tahu hasil daripada demokrasi itu tahun 1959 negeri Kelantan di-perintah oleh sa-buah parti yang lain chorak-nya daripada parti yang memerintah Kerajaan Persekutuan. Kita tahu semua-nya ini. Maka tidak-lah dapat kita membalas dendam kepada sa-buah Kerajaan, sa-buah parti atau pun kepada semua ra'ayat dalam kawasan yang memilih sa-lain daripada parti kita dengan chara yang melanggar susunan atau tata tertib pekerjaan biasa.

Saya perchaya bagi Ahli Yang Berhormat yang telah pernah menjadi pegawai kerajaan akan terasa dan mengaku dalam batin-nya sendiri bahawa chara yang di-lakukan oleh Kementerian Pembangunan Luar Bandar ini ada-lah satu chara yang tidak demokrasi, dan satu chara membayangkan ada-nya gejala ketidak tenteraman politik dalam negeri ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita tahu dalam soal politik boleh siapa sahaja mengata: Parti Perikatan boleh mengata kepada PAS, dan PAS pun ada mempunyai alasan untuk mengata Parti Perikatan tentang soal bekerjasama antara dua buah Kerajaan, tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam melaksanakan kerja² terpaksa-lah kedua pihak ini

memisahkan soal politik, dan itu-lah yang di-kehendaki supaya timbul-nya ketenteraman politik dalam negeri ini. Dan ini-lah satu daripada usaha yang patut di-laksanakan oleh Kerajaan negeri ini supaya Titah Seri Paduka Baginda tentang soal ketenteraman politik itu benar² ada dalam negeri ini.

Datin Fatimah binti Haji Hashim (Jitra-Padang Terap): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya juga turut menyokong atas usul yang di-kemukakan dalam Dewan ini untuk mempersembahkan suatu ucapan berbanyak² shukor dan terima kaseh kepada Kebawah Duli kerana Titah Uchapan Kebawah Duli pada masa membuka Penggal Keempat Parlimen. Titah Uchapan Kebawah Duli itu ada-lah menunjukkan dasar Kerajaan untuk memajukan negara di-masa yang ka-hadapan, terutama ranchangan hendak meninggikan taraf kehidupan penduduk kampung. Sabagaimana Titah Uchapan ada menyebutkan: "Kerajaan sedar peri ada-nya lagi kekurangan bahan dan makanan yang mustahak, terutama sakali padi." Oleh itu kerja² menyelidik ada-lah di-utamakan usaha pengeluaran padi dapat di-tambah lebeh banyak lagi, berkaitan dengan itu Kerajaan meranchangkan dalam tahun ini ranchangan² mengadakan parit dan tali ayer yang akan membolehkan sa-suatu kawasan itu di-tanam dengan padi dua kali sa-tahun, dan ini ada-lah menjadi chita² Kerajaan hendak menambah lagi kawasan² dan tempat yang lain untuk di-tanam padi yang sa-umpama itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ranchangan yang sa-umpama ini saya alu²kan serta ucapkan ribuan terima kaseh. Bersangkutan dengan ini juga, di-negeri Kedah sedang mengadakan penye-lidekan² bagi hendak mengadakan menanam padi sa-tahun dua kali, dan penye-lidekan dan ranchangan ini dapat di-jayakan dalam masa lima tahun yang akan datang yang akan memakan belanja sa-banyak \$130 juta. Apabila dapat di-jayakan tali ayer ini ada-lah akan memberi faedah kepada penduduk atau penanam padi di-sabelah utara negeri Kedah. Chita² dan ranchangan Kerajaan ini bagi penduduk di-situ

telah mendapat khabar dan mereka menyambut dengan perasaan sukachita dan menunggu atas ranchangan itu.

Di-sini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka menarek perhatian apa-kah yang telah jadi dan akan terjadi pada penanam padi di-sabelah utara negeri Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini, terutama negeri Kedah, kerana boleh dikatakan kebanyakan daripada penduduk negeri Kedah itu ada-lah bergantung kepada pendapatan daripada padi. Dari itu saya berharap dasar Kerajaan hendak m e n g a d a k a n ranchangan² yang besar seperti kita hendak mengadakan tali ayer yang besar itu hendak-lah Kerajaan memikirkan juga dan dapat mengadakan ranchangan² yang kecil sa-belum mengadakan ranchangan² yang besar itu. Kerana sekarang ini, mithal-nya, satu kawasan di-dalam negeri Kedah ia-itu di-kawasan Mukim Musbah di-daerah Kubang Pasu, Jitra, yang ada mempunyai lebeh kurang 2,500 relong sawah padi yang mana mereka itu sedang dalam menderita kerana kesulitan untuk mereka menjayakan menanam padi di-bendang mereka bagi tahun ini, mereka² itu tidak mendapat ayer oleh sebab tidak mempunyai sabuah empang mempertahankan ayer supaya ayer memasoki dalam bendang mereka. Tiap² tahun penduduk di-situ ada-lah berusaha dan beryuran mengumpulkan wang menganjorkan kerja bergotong royong mengadakan empang ayer di-sabuah sungai kecil yang berdekatan di-situ. Maka dengan usaha penduduk yang di-ketua² oleh sa-orang orang tua di-kampung itu, namanya To' Hassan—sa-hingga-lah bendang itu di-gelar “bendang To' Hassan” oleh sebab orang tua itu yang berusaha tiap² tahun mengadakan empang ayer bagi bendang itu. Jadi, saya harap-lah sambil dasar Kerajaan hendak mengadakan ranchangan seperti yang saya sebutkan tadi dapat-lah memandang ka-belakang sambil kita mengadakan ranchangan yang besar itu kita mengadakan ranchangan yang kecil, yang mana saya perchaya ini ada-lah lebeh memberi faedah dan chara kalau hendak meninggikan taraf kehidupan penduduk² di-luar bandar dan faedah ekonomi negara.

Sa-lain daripada itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-lain daripada penanam padi itu berkehendakkan ayer, dan ada pula tempat² yang tidak berkehendakkan ayer yang banyak. Maka di-samping Kerajaan hendak mengadakan tali ayer di-situ, Kerajaan mesti-lah mengambil berat dan berusaha juga berkenaan dengan hendak membuang ayer di-mana² kampung yang ada mempunyai sungai yang kotor dan membanjir. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pernah ada berlaku di-satu² tempat yang mempunyai sungai yang begitu kotor dan burok hingga beratus² ribu bendang di-situ tiap² tahun mendapat kerugian oleh sebab datang banjir yang besar di-kawasan bendang itu. Dari itu saya harap-lah sambil Kerajaan mengadakan projek yang besar dapat pula Kerajaan membersekan sungai² yang berhampiran dengan bendang, bukan-lah saya bermaksud membersekan sungai itu bagi menjaga kesihatan untuk minuman manusia—tetapi bagi keselamatan padi di-kampung itu dan sa-balek-nya juga. Di-negeri Kedah, jika tuan² hendak meneruskan perjalanan ka-Perlis tuan² tentu-lah nampak beberapa buah tali ayer melintang jalan. Tentu-lah tuan² berkata apa yang saya rungutkan, kerana di-kawasan Kubang Pasu telah mempunyai beberapa tali ayer, tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tali ayer itu bukan-lah untuk mendatangkan ayer, tetapi tali ayer itu membuang ayer di-satu kawasan bendang berdekatan di-situ juga.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam Uchapan Titah di-Raja ini berkenaan dengan dasar Kerajaan hendak memberi “pendidikan dan pelajaran.” Saya bagi sementara ini ada-lah mengalu²kan atas dasar Kerajaan berkenaan dengan pelajaran, tetapi saya suka hendak menyentuh berkenaan dengan urusan Kerajaan menghantar penuntut atau pelajar ka-luar negeri. Oleh sebab sa-bagaimana yang kita ketahui baharu² ini ada berlaku kesedehan ia-itu empat orang gadis guru wanita yang telah dihantar oleh Kerajaan berlatah di-Brinsford Lodge, London, telah mati kemalangan terbakar. Di-sini saya harap supaya dapat pehak yang berkenaan, khas-nya Kerajaan sambil kita mendidik dan melatah bagi ra'ayat

negeri ini untuk memperluaskan lagi dalam lapangan pelajaran mereka² itu, Kerajaan hendak-lah juga berusaha dan mengawasi kedudokan² bagi pelajar² yang di-hantar ka-luar negeri itu. Kerana saya bimbang dengan sebab berlaku-nya kemalangan baharu² ini, menyebabkan tidak mendapat semangat kerjasama, galakan dan pendorongan daripada ibu bapa mereka sanggup membenarkan anak-nya di-hantar ka-luar negeri menuntut pelajaran² yang di-kehendaki sa-bagaimana biasa. Walau pun kita ketahui ajal maut ditangan Tuhan walau di-mana kita tinggal atau dudok jika sudah sampai ajal, kita akan mati, tetapi hendak-lah berikhtiar, supaya dapat menghilangkan keraguan masyarakat masa ini, terutama keperchayaan ibu bapa supaya mereka itu tidak berasa bimbang, dan terus akan memberi semangat dan pendorong kepada anak mereka supaya suka untuk menyambut chita² Kerajaan hendak meninggikan taraf kebolehan kepada mereka, yang mana akan memberi keuntongan kepada mereka dan Kerajaan. Dengan kematian empat orang guru wanita itu bukan sahaja rugi kepada keluarga mereka bahkan rugi kepada negara sa-terus. Jadi, sa-takat ini-lah ucapan saya terhadap usul ini dan saya ucapkan ribuan terima kaseh.

Enche' Tan Phock Kin (Tanjong):

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Honourable Member for Larut Selatan in expressing our humble thanks for the Gracious Speech of His Majesty, but I am afraid I cannot join him in singing praises for the Government, nor can I join him in painting a rosy picture of this country.

It is a matter of regret that one of the most crucial problems facing this country was not mentioned at all in the Speech of His Majesty. I refer, Sir, to the price of rubber. It has been realised and it has been pointed out time and again by various responsible officers that our economy hinges very greatly on the price of rubber. The recent drop in the price of rubber has resulted in quite a substantial reduction in our income. We all know that our Five-Year Development Plan is based on rubber price being fixed at

80 cents and we know very well that rubber price today is below 80 cents, and the view of people who are experts in the rubber industry is that rubber price will go down eventually and there is a forecast that perhaps in 1972 the price of natural rubber may drop to as low as 42 cents. So, how are we going to finance our Development Plan? It is a matter of regret that no hint is being given to this House as to how Government proposes to finance the development projects. We have here talks of increasing the output, but we must realise that increasing the output is merely one aspect of the problem. We must be sure that whatever we produce will be able to get a stable price and as far as rubber is concerned we know nothing of what steps the Government proposes to take to stabilise the price of rubber. The Government in the past has been relying a great deal on the Western Powers, expressing hopes that rubber will not be released from the stockpile. Whether representations made by this Government will be considered sympathetically by their Western friends is a matter of speculation. So, I feel, Sir, that it is time that a responsible Government should consider ways and means of stabilising our rubber price. I must say that the record of the Alliance Government has shown very clearly that they pay little, if any, attention whatsoever to this very crucial problem. There were years when the rubber price had gone up very high and those were the years in which the Minister of Finance was very happy to report to this House that they are doing well, that their budget has become a surplus instead of a deficit. As a result of that, we have seen, year after year, increased expenditure, year after year we have supplementary budgets introduced and each time we have seen that it has been done on an increasing basis. No attention is paid towards saving for a rainy day. So, I put it to the Government that it is about time that they gave serious consideration to this problem. It is no use waiting for the time to come when rubber price has dropped so low that they can do nothing about it.

However, I shall come back to this question of remedies, at least our suggestion for remedies, at a later stage. At the present time, I would like to devote myself to the Speech of His Majesty. On the second page, His Majesty informed us of the primary objectives of the Government and he went on to express four points. We will see that the four points consists both of objectives as well as methods of attaining those objectives and if we scrutinise the four points carefully we will discover that there are actually two objectives. The others are merely concerned with means of achieving the two ends enunciated. The two ends are mainly to provide a higher standard of living and to redress the imbalance in living standards between the urban and rural areas; the other points are merely methods suggested to achieve those ends—mainly to increase national output, to provide expanded facilities, to bring about greater diversification, and also to extend the coverage of social services. Well, I must say here that we in the Socialist Front agree entirely with such objectives though we cannot agree with the methods as enunciated here for achieving those objectives. However, a statement is merely one aspect of the problem and action is another aspect of it. So, we must judge the Government not so much on what they say, but more on what they have done. They boast later on that their past record is eloquent testimony in itself of their ability to achieve and sustain political and financial stability—perhaps due to some accident they may have succeeded to some extent in achieving this—but can we say that of the future? Unless and until they do something now in view of the impending crisis facing the rubber industry, are they in a position to claim even this very modified form of success? I for one will venture to forecast that they will not be in a position to do so, because we have seen that they have squandered our resources to a great extent in the past two years. During times of prosperity, money instead of being saved for a rainy day was being squandered away on unnecessary projects, on projects which they claimed will contribute towards

their prestige. But one must realise what we cannot afford; we must always think on a long-term basis, and not on a short-term basis. So, on that, Sir, I must say that in spite of the well-defined objectives here, I must say that the Government has not acted in accordance with those principles.

As far as the principles are concerned, there is no element of communalism; there is no element of favouring one community against another. However, in the action of the Government, they have, whether consciously or unconsciously, acted in a communal manner, so much so that the Honourable Member for Ipoh was prompted to say something about it. It is our contention that the objectives as enunciated here can be achieved without any communal bias whatsoever. We agree that in this country there has been a great imbalance not only between the people in the rural areas and the people in the urban areas, but there has been an imbalance throughout even among the peoples in the rural areas and the people in the urban areas itself. So, any solution to this problem will lie in an over-all policy to remove imbalance of all sorts, so that the people in this country will be put in a position in which we see not a very few rich and a lot of people poor, but a position in which everyone will be quite prosperous; and this can be achieved only by concerted effort. It cannot be achieved by discrimination; it cannot be achieved on a small scale basis by tackling the problems as they come up. We must tackle it with a concerted programme.

The second point which they mentioned is the question of higher standards. Nobody can quarrel with any government intending to improve the standard of living of the people. But what do they mean by higher standards? Do they mean that everybody should be given a higher standard of living irrespective of the standards they are enjoying today? Are they suggesting that people today who can afford to drink brandy should be given a higher standard by giving them more

income so that they can drink champagne? Or do they mean that by a higher standard of living everybody should be given enough to eat, enough to drink, and a decent house to live in? I maintain here that as far as the policy Speech is concerned, there is no clarification whatsoever for this. And basing on the record of the Alliance Government, if it is going to be a testimony, if the record of the Alliance Government is going to be a testimony of their policy, then I can say that what they really meant by a higher standard of living is not so much to give everybody a better life but to give a section of the people who used to drink brandy an opportunity to drink champagne. That is what is happening in this country today. The rural development scheme and the various projects which have been put forward by the Alliance Government are not benefiting the ra'ayats; they are benefiting a very small section of the population.

Contractors who were carrying on their business on a small scale in the past have prospered a great deal. Formerly if they owned no cars, they can afford to own a few cars now. If they were drinking beer in the past, they can afford to drink champagne now. This is actually the position facing the country. And I maintain here, Sir, that if the Government is going to practise what it preaches its whole outlook must change. I am not suggesting for one moment that the Government should adopt socialist planning, but I am merely pointing out to the Government that even within their very framework of believing in a capitalist society they can surely do better than what they have been doing. We must realise that

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The time is up. The House is adjourned to 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Adjourned at 6.30 p.m.