

Volume V
No. 28



Saturday
21st December, 1963

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

OFFICIAL REPORT

CONTENTS

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 2898]

BILL:

The Supply Bill, 1964 (Second Reading) [Col. 2902]

DI-CHETAK DI-JABATAN CHETAK KERAJAAN
OLEH THOR BENG CHONG, A.M.N., PENCHETAK KERAJAAN
KUALA LUMPUR

1964

MALAYSIA

DEWAN RA'AYAT

(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

Official Report

Fifth Session of the First Dewan Ra'ayat

Saturday, 21st December, 1963

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

PRESENT:

The Honourable Mr Speaker, DATO' HAJI MOHAMED NOAH BIN OMAR,
P.M.N., S.P.M.J., D.P.M.B., P.I.S., J.P.

- „ the Prime Minister, Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Information and Broadcasting, 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 Finance, ENCHE' TAN SIEW SIN, J.P. (Melaka Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, DATO' V. T. SAMBANTHAN, P.M.N. (Sungai Siput).
- „ the Minister of Transport, DATO' HAJI SARDON BIN HAJI JUBIR, P.M.N. (Pontian Utara).
- „ the Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives, ENCHE' MOHAMED KHIR BIN JOHARI (Kedah Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Labour and Social Welfare, ENCHE' BAHAMAN BIN SAMSUDIN (Kuala Pilah).
- „ the Minister of Health, ENCHE' ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAJI TALIB (Kuantan).
- „ the Minister of Commerce and Industry, DR LIM SWEE AUN, J.P. (Larut Selatan).
- „ the Minister of Education, TUAN HAJI ABDUL HAMID KHAN BIN HAJI SAKHAWAT ALI KHAN, J.M.N., J.P. (Batang Padang).
- „ the Minister of Sarawak Affairs, TEMENGGONG JUGAH ANAK BARIENG (Sarawak).
- „ the Assistant Minister of the Interior, ENCHE' CHEAH THEAM SWEE (Bukit Bintang).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Labour and Social Welfare, ENCHE' V. MANICKAVASAGAM, J.M.N., P.J.K. (Klang).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Commerce and Industry, TUAN HAJI ABDUL KHALID BIN AWANG OSMAN (Kota Star Utara).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Information and Broadcasting, DATU MOHAMED ISMAIL BIN MOHAMED YUSOF, P.D.K. (Jerai).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Rural Development (Sarawak), ENCHE' ABDUL-RAHMAN BIN YA'KUB (Sarawak).

The Honourable ENCHE' ABDUL AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Kuala Langat).

„ ENCHE' ABDUL GHANI BIN ISHAK, A.M.N. (Melaka Utara).

„ ENCHE' ABDUL RAUF BIN A. RAHMAN, K.M.N., P.J.K.
(Krian Laut).

„ ENCHE' ABDUL RAZAK BIN HAJI HUSSIN (Lipis).

„ ENCHE' ABDUL SAMAD BIN OSMAN (Sungai Patani).

„ TOH MUDA HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI ABDUL RAOF
(Kuala Kangsar).

„ 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 BIN MOHAMED SHAH, S.M.J.
(Johor Bahru Barat).

„ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN SAAID (Seberang Utara).

„ ENCHE' AHMAD BIN HAJI YUSOF, P.J.K. (Krian Darat).

„ CHE' AJIBAH BINTI ABOL (Sarawak).

„ ENCHE' AWANG DAUD BIN MATUSIN (Sarawak).

„ TUAN HAJI AZAHARI BIN HAJI IBRAHIM (Kubang Pasu Barat).

„ ENCHE' AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Muar Dalam).

„ DR BURHANUDDIN BIN MOHD. NOOR (Besut).

„ ENCHE' JONATHAN BANGAU ANAK RENANG (Sarawak).

„ PENGARAH BANYANG (Sarawak).

„ 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).

„ ENCHE' DAGOK ANAK RANDEN (Sarawak).

„ ENCHE' EDWIN ANAK TANGKUN (Sarawak).

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

„ ENCHE' GANING BIN JANGKAT (Sabah).

„ ENCHE' GEH CHONG KEAT, K.M.N. (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 HASSAN BIN HAJI AHMAD (Tumpat).

„ ENCHE' HASSAN BIN MANSOR (Melaka Selatan).

„ ENCHE' STANLEY HO NGUN KHIU, A.D.K. (Sabah).

„ ENCHE' HONG TECK GUAN (Sabah).

„ 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' IKHWAN ZAINI (Sarawak).

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

The Honourable ENCHE' ISMAIL BIN IDRIS (Penang Selatan).

- „ ENCHE' ISMAIL BIN HAJI KASSIM (Kuala Trengganu Selatan).
- „ PENGHULU JINGGUT ANAK ATTAN (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' K. KARAM SINGH (Damansara).
- „ CHE' KHADIJAH BINTI MOHD. SIDEK (Dungun).
- „ ENCHE' KHONG KOK YAT (Batu Gajah).
- „ ENCHE' KADAM ANAK KIAI (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' EDMUND LANGGU ANAK SAGA (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' LEE KUAN YEW (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SIOK YEW, A.M.N. (Sepang).
- „ ENCHE' AMADEUS MATHEW LEONG, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' CHARLES LINANG (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' LING BENG SIEW (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' LIM HUAN BOON (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' LIM JOO KONG, J.P. (Alor Star).
- „ ENCHE' LIU YOONG PENG (Rawang).
- „ ENCHE' PETER LO SU YIN (Sabah).
- „ O. K. K. HAJI MAHALI BIN O. K. K. MATJAKIR, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' T. MAHIMA SINGH, J.P. (Port Dickson).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED BIN UJANG (Jelebu-Jempol).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED ABBAS BIN AHMAD (Hilir Perak).
- „ ENCHE' MOHD. ARIF SALLEH, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED ASRI BIN HAJI MUDA (Pasir Puteh).
- „ ORANG TUA MOHAMMAD DARA BIN LANGPAD (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' MOHD. DUN BIN BANIR, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ 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).
- „ TUAN HAJI MUHAMMAD SU'AUT BIN HAJI MUHD. TAHIR (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' NG ANN TECK (Batu).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Perlis Utara).
- „ ENCHE' ABANG OTHMAN BIN ABANG HAJI MOASILI (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN WOK (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' S. RAJARATNAM (Singapore).
- „ TUAN HAJI REDZA BIN HAJI MOHD. SAID, J.P. (Rembau-Tampin).
- „ ENCHE' SANDOM ANAK NYUAK (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' SEAH TENG NGIAB (Muar Pantai).
- „ ENCHE' D. R. SEENIVASAGAM (Ipoh).
- „ ENCHE' S. P. SEENIVASAGAM (Menglembu).
- „ ENCHE' SIM BOON LIANG (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' SNG CHIN JOO (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' SONG THIAN CHEOK (Sarawak).

- The Honourable 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., J.P.
(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 PHOCK KIN (Tanjong).
- „ ENCHE' TAN TSAK YU (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' TAN TYE CHEK (Kulim-Bandar Bahru).
- „ TENGKU BESAR INDERA RAJA IBNI AL-MARHUM SULTAN IBRAHIM,
D.K., P.M.N. (Ulu Kelantan).
- „ ENCHE' TOO JOON HING (Telok Anson).
- „ PENGHULU FRANCIS UMPAU ANAK EMPAM (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' V. VEERAPPEN (Seberang Selatan).
- „ WAN ABDUL RAHMAN BIN DATU TUANKU BUJANG (Sarawak).
- „ WAN SULAIMAN BIN WAN TAM, P.J.K. (Kota Star Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' YAHYA BIN HAJI AHMAD (Bagan Datoh).
- „ ENCHE' YEH PAO TZE (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' YEOH TAT BENG (Bruas).
- „ ENCHE' STEPHEN YONG KUET TZE (Sarawak).
- „ 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 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 without Portfolio, DATO' ONG YOKE LIN,
P.M.N. (Ulu Selangor).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAHIM ISHAK (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' AHMAD BOESTAMAM (Setapak).
- „ O. K. K. DATU ALIUDDIN BIN DATU HARUN, P.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN SWEE HO (Ulu Kinta).
- „ ENCHE' CHIA THYE POH (Singapore).
- „ DATU GANIE GILONG, P.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).
- „ DR GOH KENG SWEE (Singapore).
- „ TUAN HAJI HASAN ADLI BIN HAJI ARSHAD
(Kuala Trengganu Utara).
- „ ENCHE' HO SEE BENG (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' JEK YEUN THONG (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' JHUMAH BIN SALIM (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' KANG KOCK SENG (Batu Pahat).

The Honourable ENCHE' KOW KEE SENG (Singapore).

- „ ENCHE' LEE SAN CHOON, K.M.N. (Kluang Utara).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SECK FUN (Tanjong Malim).
- „ ENCHE' LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).
- „ ENCHE' LIM KIM SAN (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED DAHARI BIN HAJI MOHD. ALI (Kuala Selangor).
- „ ENCHE' PETER J. MOJUNTIN, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ NIK MAN BIN NIK MOHAMED (Pasir Mas Hilir).
- „ ENCHE' ONG PANG BOON (Singapore).
- „ TUAN HAJI OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Tanah Merah).
- „ ENCHE' QUEK KAI DONG, J.P. (Seremban Barat).
- „ DATU DONALD ALOYSIUS STEPHENS, P.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Melaka).
- „ DATO' TEOH CHZE CHONG, D.P.M.J., J.P. (Segamat Selatan).
- „ DR TOH CHIN CHYE (Singapore).
- „ WAN MUSTAPHA BIN HAJI ALI (Kelantan Hilir).
- „ WAN YAHYA BIN HAJI WAN MOHAMED, K.M.N. (Kemaman).
- „ ENCHE' WEE TOON BOON (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' YONG NYUK LIN (Singapore).

PRAYERS

(Mr Speaker in the Chair)

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MR SPEAKER

DEATH OF ENCHE' NGUI AH KUI, A.D.K. (SABAH)

Mr Speaker: Ahli² Yang Berhormat, saya dengan dukachita-nya mema'alumkan kepada Majlis ini akan kematian Yang Berhormat Enche' Ngui Ah Kui, Ahli Parlimen dari Sabah yang telah mati pada pagi ini. Bagi pehak Majlis ini, saya suka melafadzkan ucapan ta'ziah kita yang ikhlas kepada janda dan ahli² keluarga-nya.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 66 (2)—EXTENSION OF DEBATE ON THE SUPPLY BILL, 1964

Second Reading

Mr Speaker: Ahli² Yang Berhormat, saya suka-lah menyatakan ia-itu Kerajaan telah bersetuju menambahkan satu hari lagi, kerana membahathkan dasar² 'am berkenaan dengan belanjawan tahun hadapan. Yang demikian, satu usul akan di-bawa dalam Majlis ini di-bawah Peratoran Majlis Fasal 66 (2)

yang akan di-majukan oleh salah seorang Menteri dari pehak Kerajaan; akan tetapi saya suka juga hendak mema'alumkan oleh sebab banyak perkara² yang telah di-bangkitkan dalam Majlis ini dalam dua hari yang lalu dan hari ini juga lagi, maka terpaksa-lah pehak Kerajaan menjawab-nya atas satu² perkara, dan dari sebab itu, sa-berapa boleh, saya akan chuba khaskan pada hari Ithnin bagi pehak Kerajaan menjawab segala perkara dan pandangan yang di-bahathkan dalam Majlis ini; dan oleh kerana membahathkan atas dasar 'am ini hanya-lah tinggal satu hari ini sahaja, saya berharap dan merayu kepada Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang berchakap pada hari ini biar-lah berchakap sa-berapa pendek supaya dapat memberi peluang, ramai lagi, kepada Ahli² dalam Majlis ini yang akan mengambil bahagian dalam perbahathan Majlis ini.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

RUBBER INDUSTRY—PROFITS REPATRIATED OVERSEAS, 1959- 1962

1. Enche' K. Karam Singh (Daman-sara) asks the Minister of Finance to

state what are the profits repatriated overseas from the rubber industry during the years 1959, 1960, 1961 and 1962 respectively, giving a breakdown of amounts in Malayan dollars and the countries to which the profits were sent.

The Minister of Finance (Enche' Tan Siew Sin): Mr Speaker, Sir, there are no comprehensive estimates of the extent of profits repatriated overseas. Furthermore, existing estimates of profits repatriated abroad are not reliable and it is not possible to split the profits by origin, i.e., from rubber companies, tin companies, etc. The Statistics Department is, however, undertaking a survey of all the companies operating in the States of Malaya and when it is completed, the information required by the Honourable Member can be provided.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr Speaker, Sir, can I know when the information will be available?

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, we shall try to make it available as soon as possible.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: I hope the Minister would be more specific, Mr Speaker.

Mr Speaker: He said as soon as possible.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Could we have a period of time indicated—say within one month or two months?

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, I cannot give a specific date because, as the Honourable Member will be aware, the Statistics Department is very hard pressed in regard to more important work, and we have to have an order of priorities.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Is this House to understand that the Finance Minister and the Government itself are not aware of this immense drain of wealth that is going out of our country every day of the year?

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member might also be aware that the Statistics Department does not exist to give him

political ammunition with which to fire at the Government.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr Speaker, Sir, it is not a question of political ammunition to fire at the Government—it is a question of knowing; and if the information is unfavourable to the Government, it is not the Opposition to blame. Mr Speaker, Sir, am I to understand from the reply of the Finance Minister that he is deliberately withholding this information from this House?

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, we have nothing to hide and the information will be made available in due course.

Enche' Abdul Aziz bin Ishak (Kuala Langat): Mr Speaker, Sir, will the Honourable the Finance Minister say, if he has nothing to hide, if the industries have something to hide?

Mr Speaker: That is a different question.

RUBBER INDUSTRY—PROFITS BY FOREIGN FIRMS, 1959-1962

2. Enche' K. Karam Singh asks the Minister of Finance to state the profits made by foreign firms in the rubber industry for the years 1959, 1960, 1961 and 1962.

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, it is regretted that the statistical information sought is not readily available without elaborate research; neither is the expression "foreign firms" used in the question clear enough. For example, would a company, the majority of whose directors are foreigners but whose capital is largely owned by citizens of Malaysia, be defined as a foreign firm for the purpose of the Honourable Member's question, or should it be the other way round, or would a firm be classed as "foreign" if it was incorporated outside Malaysia? In other words, there are three major factors affecting this definition, viz., nationality of the board of directors, nationality of capital ownership and place of incorporation. It would be interesting to know the Honourable Member's precise definition of "foreign firms" and what

factors, in his view, should be taken into account in arriving at such a definition.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr Speaker, Sir, does the Minister have the information available now of any of those categories?

Mr Speaker: (*To Enche' Tan Siew Sin*) You have replied to that, haven't you?

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Yes.

Mr Speaker: (*To Enche' K. Karam Singh*) He has already replied that it is not available now.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Minister has been saying that a lot of statistical research is necessary, that there are no comprehensive figures and existing figures are unreliable. In that case can he just give that information which, although it may not be comprehensive and not so reliable, could be provisional, so that this House could at least have some idea about what is happening with the economy of our country?

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, firstly, I tried to make it clear to the Honourable Member that he should define his expression "foreign firms" more accurately; secondly, I told him that the information required is not available without elaborate research, and we have not got the time to go into that research—not for the time being.

IMPORTS BY FIRMS WITH FOREIGN CAPITAL

3. Enche' K. Karam Singh asks the Minister of Finance to state the value of goods in terms of dollars imported into Malaya by firms financed wholly or partly by foreign capital for the years 1959, 1960, 1961 and 1962.

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, no analysis has been undertaken of imports by firms. Import statistics are analysed by country of origin and by commodity groupings. This is the normal practice in countries the world over. With the information available, it is not possible to undertake an analysis such as the one requested.

Here, again, the expression "firms partly or wholly financed by foreign capital" is not understood. It would be helpful if the Honourable Member could define precisely what he means by this expression.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr Speaker, Sir, are we to understand from this vague reply of the Minister of the lack of precise information on the part of the Government that the Government itself is groping in the dark about the economic position in this country?

Mr Speaker: That question is out of order.

BILL

THE SUPPLY BILL, 1964

Second Reading

Order read for resumption of debate on motion, "That the Bill be now read a second time" (20th December, 1963).

Enche' Abdul Ghani bin Ishak (Melaka Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, menyambong ucapan saya pada petang sa-malam, sa-kali lagi saya suka menegaskan bahawa dasar Kerajaan ini, sa-bagaimana yang terang patut saya hendak terangkan lagi kepada Ahli² Pembangkang, umpama-nya daripada ahli Barisan Sosialis dan lain² yang sa-haluan dengan-nya yang mengkecham berkenaan dengan pergantungan kita dengan modal luar. Saya suka bertanya kepada pemimpin² Barisan Sosialis ia-itu sa-bagai negara yang baharu munchol, sa-bagai negara yang baharu merdeka atau sa-bagai orang yang baharu lahir, boleh-kah mereka itu berdiri dengan sendiri-nya, melainkan hendak-lah mendapat bantuan dan kerjasama daripada tempat² yang menasabah dan yang tidak merbahayakan kepada diri kita. Telah dikaji oleh pehak kita tidak ada lain jalan lagi yang lebeh baik untuk menyegerakan keadaan kebangkitan ekonomi kita, tidak lain dan tidak bukan dengan chara ini. Saya boleh menunjukkan mithal yang kechil kepada ahli Barisan Sosialis atau yang lain yang tidak nampak, umpama-nya, sekarang ini banyak pemodal² kechil di-kampong² yang tidak dapat berdiri

dengan kaki-nya sendiri seperti derebar teksi yang ada *permit* tetapi tidak ada modal, maka mesti-lah di-beri pinjaman daripada pehak² yang tertentu. Jadi jalan yang baik di-pinjam dari pehak RIDA, mithal-nya, dengan itu dapat-lah mereka menetapkan pendirian-nya, dan akan dapat mempunyai modal sendiri pada akhir-nya. Apa-kah ini tidak dapat di-perhatikan oleh pehak Pembangkang? Jadi, bagi pehak Kerajaan, suka-lah saya mengatakan kepada Barisan Sosialis, Socialist Front dan lain² bahawa sa-takat ini bagi pehak Kerajaan belum-lah berkehendakkan pakar ekonomi daripada sa-belah pehak sana.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya hendak berchakap tentang menubuhkan Malaysia. Sekarang kita dalam Dewan ini berada dalam negara Malaysia, tetapi maseh ada lagi pehak Pembangkang menentang mengatakan pendirian-nya tidak menyokong ini dan itu. Kalau kita mahu kaji mereka itu sa-olah² tidak ta'at kepada negara. Mengikut *majority* kita menubuhkan Malaysia, pehak Pembangkang maseh lagi mengatakan penentangan-nya. Apa-kah ini boleh di-fahamkan mereka menjalank-an anasir² dari luar, terutama dari Indonesia untuk menghanchorkan Malaysia? Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perkara ini patut-lah pehak Pembangkang yang ada dalam negara ini memikirkan perjalanan negara sekarang ini. Kita hendak-lah berkata, berchakap atau beruchap dari segi Malaysia untuk membaiki negara kita ini. Pehak Kerajaan tentu-lah tidak akan menolak dengan sewenang² sahaja kalau ada pindaan² atau chadangan² yang menasabah. Tetapi kalau penentangan yang melulu atau sengaja mengeluarkan sakit hati daripada perjuangan parti² yang telah kalah daripada perinchian kita sa-lama ini saya rasa tentu-lah tidak berguna. Ra'ayat sekarang ini mahu hidup dalam negara yang aman dan ra'ayat mahu hidup dalam chara ekonomi yang lebih baik pada masa yang akan datang. Mari kita tumpukan fikiran atau pun perjuangan kita dari segi itu daripada memberi peluang orang lain yang sama² hendak menghanchorkan Malaysia yang kita chinta itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berchakap dalam hal keselamatan dalam negeri nampak-nya ada lagi pehak² Pembangkang, umpama-nya, wakil dari Ipoh dan lain² yang tidak payah saya chakapkan maseh lagi menudoh Kerajaan bahawa Kerajaan selalu menyalahgunakan Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri. Bagi saya tidak nampak perkara itu ada di-lakukan oleh pehak Kerajaan. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bukti-nya terang. Kalau ada pun orang yang di-siasat, umpama-nya, dua orang PAS dari Kelantan kita tahan untuk di-siasat, apabila kita dapati mereka itu tidak bersalah kita lepaskan dengan tidak payah di-da'awa oleh loyar atau oleh sa-siapa pun, kita lepaskan. Ini tidak-kah nampak oleh pehak Pembangkang atau wakil dari Ipoh bahawa kuat-kuasa undang² yang ada dalam tangan Kementerian kita jalankan dengan chara yang baik? Saya bagi pehak penduduk² dalam kawasan saya, Melaka Utara, ingin hidup dalam aman, tenteram dan berbaik². Dalam masa kita membena negara kita yang akan kita tinggalkan kepada anak chuchu kita pada masa yang akan datang kita sa-bagai rintisan atau peneroka sekarang ini ada-lah meng-alu²kan Kerajaan supaya menjaga lebih ketat lagi supaya jiwa dan lain², terutama sa-kali kekerasan yang akan di-lakukan kepada ra'ayat dan kepada anak chuchu kita yang akan datang tidak dapat di-buat atau tidak di-lakukan oleh orang yang jahat.

Jadi, saya rasa tentu-lah bagi pehak Kerajaan tidak langsung menjalankan kerja² yang tidak menasabah. Saya rasa pada masa akan datang kalau sa-kira-nya hendak berchakap bagi pehak ini elok-lah chari alasan² yang menasabah, kalau alasan² yang jahat sangka sahaja yang mengatakan bahawa Kerajaan hanya untuk menyekat atau menggertak pehak parti² Pembangkang, tetapi hari ini terang dengan jelas penyokong² daripada Perikatan juga ada yang ditahan, tidak hendak dia menjalankan kerja² yang subversive atau yang boleh mengachau ketenteraman negara kita, kita tahan supaya mereka ini tidak dapat menjalankan gerakan subversive yang bagitu. Jadi, sekarang ini patut-lah kita mesti dengar di-dalam Dewan

ini bahawa wakil² daripada pehak Pembangkang, wakil daripada P.P.P., wakil daripada Socialist Front, wakil PAS atau wakil Barisan Sosialis mestilah berkata bahawa Undang² Keselamatan atau pun soal² yang ada dalam negeri ini telah di-jalankan dengan sa-chara adil dan saksama. Kita faham, sa-lagi kita bersifat sa-bagai manusia, macham saya juga tidak-lah mahu menganiaya sama² kita manusia, tidak-lah mahu menahan kemarakan atau kenaikan sa-saorang itu dalam segi apa yang mereka mahu tuju, tetapi kita mesti tahan sa-saorang itu atau pun sa-siapa pun kalau mereka hendak naik dengan chara menjahanamkan orang lain dengan chara barangkali melibatkan orang² yang tidak berdosa, orang² yang tidak tahu, dan ini ada-lah satu chara yang saya fikir di-kehendaki oleh kemanusiaan kita dan oleh negara² atau pun oleh dunia pada masa se-karang.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, oleh sebab menghormati permintaan daripada Tuan Yang di-Pertua, minta saya berchakap tidak panjang, jadi saya rasa dalam apa yang saya katakan pada pagi ini dan sa-malam terang-lah bahawa dasar atau pun daripada apa yang kita nampak daripada ucapan Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan itu ada-lah memberi harapan yang penoh kepada keadaan ekonomi dan keadaan apa sahaja di-dalam negara kita dalam masa melangkah untuk menaikkan atau pun untuk bersama² dengan negara yang maju pada masa yang akan datang. Saya menyokong dengan kuat-nya Rang Undang² ini.

Enche' Too Joon Hing (Teluk Anson): Mr Speaker, Sir, we have had quite a comprehensive report from the Prime Minister himself on the opening day of this meeting on the relations between our nation and our neighbouring countries. He has given us a detailed account of the armed attacks by terrorists from Indonesia on the border of Kalimantan Utara, air space violations of the Indonesian Air Force over the Borneo territories, high-sea buccaneering on the poor and defenceless fishermen in the Straits of Malacca, and the subversive activities which took place right in the country. I do

not think anyone can deny that these strain relations and those wild attacks in the border of the Borneo territories were of the direct result of the formation of Malaysia. Again, Sir, the Minister of Finance, in presenting the 1964 Supply Bill, has disclosed some of the worse effects of confrontation on our national economy. He has told this House that, if there is complete severance of our trade with Indonesia, just for one year, our national income would incur a reduction of \$250 million—just equivalent to the loss in price of 13 cents a pound of rubber—Sir, this amount of \$250 million is not a small amount. If we look at the Estimates under Education, we can find that practically this amount is equal to the Education Ministry's expenditure for one whole year; and, also, there are at the moment thousands of people who have been thrown out of employment directly due to the trade confrontation. Then the port trade of Singapore and Penang suffers most severely as a result of Indonesia's embargo. Sir, thus one can see that not only our country but our people have already suffered and will continue to suffer as long as Soekarno continues with his confrontation policy of destroying Malaysia. Sir, all these adversities have come to pass because the Alliance Government had rushed the project of Malaysia in spite of the repeated warnings from the Opposition Parties on this side of the House. My Party, the U.D.P., has repeatedly appealed to the Alliance, inside and outside this House, to go slow and to carry out the formation of Malaysia in a much more democratic method.

Sir, much more important than not rushing Malaysia, is consulting with our neighbouring countries. As a result of the Alliance's disregarding the views of the Opposition Parties, today we find the relations with our neighbouring countries have strained further to a situation where it has become extremely complicated to resume any friendship. Indonesia is pursuing a policy in a manner much more drastically and openly, and the Philippines has laid down conditions as a pre-requisite to our resuming of

friendly relations. However strained our relations may become with our neighbours, and whatever outcome may follow in future with the confrontation, the very fact that Malaysia has now been established, therefore, it only follows that the question of sovereignty of the Malaysian nation is no longer a matter for dispute. My party, the U.D.P., although is against the manner and method of the formation of Malaysia, will support and will call upon the citizens to come forward and defend this sovereignty as a duty and right as expected of every citizen in this country.

However, there are certain important major issues which the Alliance Government must clear up or make up its mind in order to bring absolute unity among our people. Mr Speaker, Sir, I had on many occasions in the former House appealed to the Alliance Ministers, particularly to our Prime Minister, on matters of national importance and on matters where our national security is being threatened to take into confidence the responsible leaders of the Opposition for consultation so that there may be solidarity in our foreign policy and approach. However, it is most regrettable that the Prime Minister and his Ministers chose to adopt an attitude not only uncompromising but rather aggressive. Mr Speaker, Sir, this uncompromising and aggressive attitude of the Alliance leaders had already been witnessed by Honourable Members of this House when the Prime Minister in his speech presenting the Malaysia Bill on the 12th of August, 1963, said, "There can never be unity with parties who hold divergent views in politics and it is in the national interest that we keep the Opposition at arm's length. Their views are unhealthy and on Malaysia issue are destructive, so much so that they can be branded as enemy agents. In the national interest there can be no pact with them." Mr Speaker, Sir, such a remark coming from the Prime Minister himself is extremely unwise and detrimental to our national unity, particularly at a time when our nation is being threatened with outside aggression. During the course of my

debate on the Malaysia Bill on 16th August last I had appealed to the Prime Minister not to adopt such an attitude of keeping the Opposition at arm's length and not to call them enemy agents, communists and so forth but to take them into confidence because in the event of our nation facing a crisis the Government would need everyone to back them up. Unfortunately our appeal as usual fell on deaf ears. Sir, such an attitude is highly unwise from the security point of our nation. Malaysia as a nation has a Constitution which provides a system of parliamentary democracy similar to that of the United Kingdom, but in the House of Commons the Prime Minister always consults the Leader of the Opposition on matters concerning national importance and security. Only two or three days ago it was reported in the local Press that Sir Alex Douglas-Home, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, in setting up a permanent commission for dealing with breaches in national security, told the House of Commons that the Leader of the Opposition should be consulted when the Commission investigates any case of security. This is one of the examples of the British parliamentary democracy and this is the way to take the Opposition into confidence for full co-operation. Similarly, the Alliance Government should take the Opposition leaders into confidence and keep them in the know just as the Opposition leader in the United Kingdom of the House of Commons is always kept in the know on major and important issues of the country. However, the Alliance have not only denied the Opposition of this privilege and branded them as enemy agents owing loyalty to foreign powers, but their leaders, particularly the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister, have accused the Opposition Parties of not backing and supporting the Government when our nation is faced with outside dangers, as the Oppositions do in other countries. This is absolutely untrue and very misleading and my party must refute this unfair charge and I am sure the other Opposition members would like to join

me in doing so. The Opposition members, on the contrary, are only too willing to co-operate, but has the Alliance Government ever taken them into confidence just as in the House of Commons in England the Opposition leader is taken into confidence for consultations? Obviously no. And under such circumstances, can anybody expect the Opposition parties to act otherwise. Actually the Alliance has been misleading the people of this country all this time. Constitutionally the loyalty of the people is to the country, to the Yang di-Pertuan Agong and to our Constitution and not necessarily to the party in government. However, on matters of importance concerning the security of our country we are only too willing to co-operate in as full a manner as possible. However, this is denied us, because the Alliance Government had never taken the Opposition parties into its confidence over matters of national interest, but has treated them as aliens, potential subversives and so on. Certainly unless and until the Alliance Government makes up its mind on this vital issue, it will be extremely difficult for Opposition parties to take another attitude.

Earlier on I mentioned that the Prime Minister during the presentation of the Malaysia Bill told the Opposition very bluntly that the Alliance Government would keep the Opposition at arm's length and in the national interest there would be no pact with them. What happened after this hasty and ill-considered statement directed at the Opposition? Hardly a month later the Prime Minister had to swallow those words back in his radio address and in his reception speech at Jinjang New Village. Now, let us see what was reported in the Press. Sir, I have here a copy of the *Sin Chew Jit Poh* and I have translated the speech of the Prime Minister at that reception. The headline of the Chinese Press is that "The Tunku calls on all political parties and communities in time of national difficulties to cast all differences aside and united with *satu hati* to defend our country." The report further stated that the Prime Minister said at the

reception "I have just broadcast to the nation calling on all communities that in times of national danger they should discard their differences. We must all unite with *satu hati* to protect the sovereignty of our nation. I want to repeat what I have said. No matter to what political party or community you belong, if you are a loyal citizen, this is the time when we must unite together to repulse any outside aggression."

Mr Speaker, Sir, I am sure Honourable Members can easily judge for themselves from this statement and the statement that he made in the former House on the 12th of August this year that the Honourable Prime Minister is inconsistent in his statement: one day he would say—"No pact", and another day he would say, "Come and let us be united together" I hope, Sir, this state of indecision of mind of the Honourable Prime Minister is not due to his being over-worried over the Indonesian confrontation. Therefore, I repeat: Do not be hasty and thoughtless with your wild charges against the Opposition, lest it might bring an adverse effect on our national unity, just as by your haste and rush in forming Malaysia the present deteriorating relation with our neighbouring countries had been brought about. Hurling wild accusations and using the word "disloyalty" against the Opposition parties have become a habitual practice of the Alliance, in order to discredit Members of the Opposition in public. The Alliance little realise the consequences of the reaction of these accusations, which Honourable Members have witnessed inside this House in the case of the wild accusations directed against the Honourable Member for Kuala Langat.

Sir, there was another wild charge by a Member of the Alliance only two or three days ago. He was no other than the Honourable Member for Johor Tenggara. Sir, I have here a cutting from the *Nan Yang Siang Pau*, December 20th, 1963. What did it say?—"UMNO Secretary-General, Tuan Syed Ja'afar—Called to strengthen unity to meet next year's

General Election". He said this at the Ulu Bernam UMNO Branch on the 18th December, 1963. What did he say?—"The communist is our enemy no matter what race he belongs to, even if he is our brother or our father, who does not support the Government, then he is a communist, or a communist sympathizer". Sir, this kind of unreasonable charges

Tuan Syed Ja'afar bin Hasan Albar (Johor Tenggara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, boleh-kah saya terangkan sedikit?

Mr Speaker: (*To Enche' Too Joon Hing*) He wants to give an explanation.

Enche' Too Joon Hing: Yes.

Tuan Syed Ja'afar bin Hasan Albar: Berhubung dengan kenyataan saya di-Ulu Bernam, saya memang menghentam Komunis, tetapi saya tidak kata dalam ucapan itu tiap² yang tidak menyokong Kerajaan itu Komunis. Jadi saya harap dia faham.

Enche' Too Joon Hing: Well, Sir, it was reported in the press in such a way. I took from the press what had been said by the Secretary-General, and there was no denial from him on this statement. (*To Tuan Syed Ja'afar*): if you deny it now, of course, I will accept it.

Mr Speaker: What is going on between the two of you. (*Laughter*). All remarks must be addressed to the Speaker, or to the Chair. Please proceed.

Enche' Too Joon Hing: I am sorry, Sir. We hope that the tremendous and resounding response of all the people in this country to national registration will once and for all kill this Alliance propaganda that there are subversives among our own people, and that the people who oppose the Alliance Party policy are naturally opposed to the Government. Once and for all, let the Alliance members hang their heads in shame, and never to accuse other people without proof and without evidence.

Our big problem today is to establish peace and security in

South-east Asia, so that our people may live peacefully and harmoniously and our national development projects will be successfully implemented with all our available national resources. To establish peace and security, first we must restore friendly relations with our neighbouring countries. Here, Sir, the problem of eliminating confrontation lies the key to a solution. Now that confrontation has taken place, shall we, or shall we not, resolve confrontation, in spite of Indonesia's present more vigorous attitude? I believe that confrontation must be resolved (AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: How?)

Sir, during the last meeting of this House on the debate on the Malaysia Bill, I already warned the Alliance that we must not fritter away any opportunity by thoughtless and ill-considered act, lest the peace and security of our neighbouring countries would be greatly jeopardised. We have witnessed many crucial problems in these modern times of world politics. We have witnessed the cold war between America and Russia, the dismantling of nuclear bases in Cuba, the explosive issues in Middle-East and Africa. Yet these countries would do everything within their power and try every means to divert any possibility of war. They would keep their doors wide open for negotiations, in order to preserve and maintain the peace and security of the world. Sir, likewise, we must try to resolve confrontation. How do we resolve confrontation? I believe we can resolve it by direct negotiations between our own people. We must not take the attitude of pride and face-saving. All this is so unrealistic in this modern world for an independent nation to do. It is silly for us to hide behind the army, the guns, the battleships and airplanes of our allies and friendly nations, because if once our allies and friends fail us, I am afraid that our Honourable Prime Minister will not be able to fly even to Sarawak and Sabah; if the General says, "I am sorry, Tunku, I cannot supply you a plane", then he will be left without any means of transport to Sabah. Sir, it is ridiculous for us to

try and negotiate peace between our neighbouring countries through the help of foreign embassies. I say, let us do it ourselves, and to do it ourselves does not mean that we have lost face or lowered our status, or even (*Kowtow*) to them. We do it with a specific purpose. As an independent nation, we should fight our own cause and solve our own problem at the conference table, because we believe our cause is right, and we do it primarily with the object of establishing peace and harmony in South-East Asia. We do it in a manner whereby the free, independent, nations in this area could sit down and thrash out their problems without outside interference. Although we were not given much information on the objects of Maphilindo, I believe, Sir, this is to be the true spirit of Maphilindo.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the drive for national registration is a practical and sound way of assessing our national manpower, and my Party wholeheartedly supports it to the hilt. But this must be followed up with military call-up service without delay, irrespective of whether we have a crisis or no crisis facing our country, and we must plan our national defence to meet all eventualities. Mobilising our national resources must not engender bitterness, or hatred, or fear of our neighbouring country. Building up our national manpower resources and military call-up should be engendered only with the spirit of the defence of our motherland, the defence of our King, our country and our Constitution. This should be the sole motive underlying our national call-up and the building up of our national defence. We should make it clear that we have no aggressive spirit beyond our national mobilization.

Sir, in mobilising our youth for national service, our young generations should be taught to owe their loyalty to our King and to our country, and they should be trained to lay down their lives readily in the defence of our nation. There should not be any discrimination or distinction of one group from another.

Enche' Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman (Seberang Tengah): Mr Speaker, Sir, on point of order, Standing Order 35 (6). The Honourable Member is reading his speech.

Mr Speaker: It has been the practice that unless he holds up his paper, I cannot stop him. Please proceed.

Enche' Too Joon Hing: Sir, equal opportunity should be given to everybody, depending on the merit and ability of every individual, so that there will not exist amongst our young military force discontent and frustration. We should build up our manpower resources to the extent that it would not be easy for any country to try and attack us, not even our old colonial masters. We must also build up our own manpower to such an extent that we can as soon as possible be independent of outside military forces to protect our own security. As soon as our manpower resources are mobilised in a proper manner, we should seriously consider replacing those bases which have been built by foreign forces, and we shall politely tell them that we want to take them over now.

Mr Speaker: Order, order. I do not like to interrupt you, but for the last half an hour you have been talking only on confrontation; nothing has been said about the Budget at all.

Enche' Too Joon Hing: Sir, I have been talking on confrontation and call-up—National Service.

Mr Speaker: I know that, but too long on confrontation. You are not speaking on the Budget at all.

Enche' Too Joon Hing: Because National Service is so important and we are spending money on it, I would like to speak on this subject, because the Alliance have always said that we are against something, that we never have any plan. So I am just telling how we should do it.

Sir, as a member of the United Nations, we uphold the principle of self-determination and the United Nations Charter; the principle of negotiation and the principle of peace and

harmony must be based on the self-determination of the nation. We must never attempt to impose a political way of life upon others, just as we do not wish other people to impose their will and their way of life upon us. Whatever the way of life may be, whatever choice the people may have, we must try to understand them and work with them. This is extremely important to maintain peace and harmony amongst the nations of the world. Malaysia is a South-East Asia nation and it is very important for our nation to build up peace and harmony in the South-East Asia region in order to achieve security in our political and economical fields. Therefore, let us not draw ourselves into more complicated blocs and thus hinder the possibility of restoring friendly relations with the independent nations in South-East Asia.

Sir, Malaysia is a country rich in natural resources, but with a small population, we should never have any aggressive ideas on our neighbouring countries. Our policy should be a friendly and cordial one, irrespective of the choice of ideologies of the other countries. If England and the United States can recognise Russia with a communist background, and can recognise Yugoslavia, also with a communist background, and Poland and Hungary and so forth and still trade with them, I see no reason why we have not traded with them before. Although once in a while one or two communist ships anchored in Singapore or Penang to take away a shipload or two of rubber and other products, we have no long-term trade pacts with any of these countries. No, not until the price of rubber has dropped to 65 cents, not until the threat of synthetic rubber started to face our industry, and not until our friendly countries have dropped their purchases that the Alliance Government began to scratch its head and sent a trade mission to the European countries to sell our main products. To put all our eggs into one basket is a shortsighted policy and a costly one. The Alliance should have found a free market for all our products so that our economic resources would not be affected.

Sir, I now come to the statement made by the Chief Minister of Sabah. Although yesterday a Member from Singapore has denied on his behalf, I have not seen any official denial from the Chief Minister himself with regard to the statement that he preferred expatriate officers than our Malayan and Singapore officers. Sir, this is the kind of attitude and this is the kind of gratitude which the Sabah Chief Minister has for our people and for our Government who have not only gone to the extent of incurring Indonesian confrontation but also have incurred heavy financial commitment to pave their way for independence. For all this what do we get? Abuse and distrust, and lack of confidence. They rather prefer "Mat Sallehs" than our own people, whom he has so often claimed to be blood-brothers and kinsmen. This is an outright slur on the ability and efficiency of the Malayan civil servants who have since Merdeka proved by their services that they are just as efficient if not better than the expatriates. The Chief Minister himself has made several study visits to our country and has seen with his own eyes before he made up his mind to join Malaysia, and yet I am surprised that such a statement should have come from him.

Sir, in bringing this matter to the House, I am not in any way against the expatriates, because we are indeed grateful for the good services which they have rendered in the past and which are still being rendered by those who are still here; nor am I trying to suggest that we should interfere, or have a say, in Sabah's internal civil administration. And I am against prejudicing local officers because of the past prejudice which our own civil servants had so bitterly experienced. Any right-thinking person would only expect a person of his status to have been more careful in his statement and better judgment of his own people. But instead he blindly tells us—whether as an excuse or not, he only knows—that once our officers get in, it would be hard to get them out.

Mr Speaker: How does that relate to the debate before the House?

Enche' Too Joon Hing: It relates to the Budget for Sabah. Sir, does he realise that Statements of such a nature could easily create misunderstanding between a State and the Central Government and also arouse ill-feeling and resentment among our civil servants? I would formally request the Chief Minister to give us an explanation and to assure this House that such repetition will not occur in future.

Sir, I now come to the Health Ministry. I would now, first of all, make reference to the District Hospital of Teluk Anson. Sir, the Lower Perak District has a population of about 173,599 people and yet we have only a District Hospital, which is far inadequate to justify a reasonable health service to meet the demands and requirements of such a large population. When I went through the estimates for improvements to hospitals in 1964, I was indeed envious of the allocations provided for them; but I was also indeed disappointed to know that nothing has been provided

Mr Speaker: Order, order. We are now debating on the general policy of the services provided for in the Supply Bill, 1964. If you want to ask for any hospital in your constituency, you can wait until the Minister of Health moves his Head of Expenditure in the Committee stage. It is only the general policy which we are debating now. You are trying to mix up and wasting the time of the House!

Enche' Too Joon Hing: In that case, Sir, I will do it later. Now, I would like to touch on the general policy with regard to education. Sir, I had criticised in the past the Rahman Talib Report for not conforming to the election pledges of the Alliance Manifesto of 1955 and that the policy was contrary to the true spirit of the Razak Report. Sir, this criticism I still maintain, because up to this very day the Alliance has not fulfilled these pledges and they have not provided any equal treatment to education and culture of the non-Malays in this country. The Minister of Finance in referring to the Education Estimates

of \$256.5 million said, " there is no doubt that money spent on education is an investment in the future prosperity and happiness of our country" There is no truer saying than this, and I fully support his statement. The fact that many modern countries such as America, United Kingdom, Germany, Japan and many others have achieved fast and rapid prosperity and happiness in their countries, is entirely due to the healthy and sound national education policies which are fully and wholeheartedly supported by their peoples. On the contrary it can also turn out to be a liability if the education policy here proves to be unacceptable to the people of this country. We have witnessed that in Cyprus and in our own country in 1952.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the education policy of our country has all along been a naughty problem and a very controversial issue for the past many years. The Alliance tried to formulate a policy in 1955 which would be acceptable to the people of this country, and it almost did it in 1956. However, unfortunately, due to the misinterpretation and insincere implementation of the Razak Report, in 1957 the education problems arose, and controversies once again revived much more vigorously with the implementation of the Rahman Talib Report, in 1962. Sir, I would not like to speak on this very much, because I have spoken so much before. However, I would like to say that one of the most important issues is to make Malay the main medium of instruction in all schools. Sir, this was never stated in the Alliance Election Manifesto—neither in the 1955 Manifesto nor in the 1959 Manifesto. Here I have got a copy of the Manifesto which says "The primary object of making Malay to be the national language"—and not the medium of instruction. It further says:

"The Alliance Party is to establish a type of national school that will be acceptable to the people of Malaya and will meet their needs in promoting their cultural, economical, social and political welfare as a nation so as to facilitate the fulfilment of the Alliance's aim to adopt Malay as the national language of the country."

Nowhere in the 1955 Manifesto is there any statement saying that the object is to make Malay the main medium of instruction. Here again, in the 1959 Manifesto, there are twenty-three items, none of which mentions that Malay should be the main medium of instruction. It re-emphasises, "Bearing in mind the declared objective of making Malay the national language"—that is all. So, Sir, this controversial issue of making Malay the main medium of instruction in all schools has been unsolved up to this day and today we read in the Press that educational organisations and even M.C.A. Youth Meetings and M.C.A. Conferences are now trying to solve educational problems arising from the Rahman Talib Report. Now they are trying to solve this problem which we, the Opposition, had brought in time and again before. So, Sir, if the Alliance would still insist on this issue, I suggest that in the 1964 Elections, put that down in your Manifesto and see how the people will respond to such an idea or such a controversial issue of making Malay the main medium of instruction. Thank you.

The Prime Minister: Mr Speaker, Sir, I ask your permission to speak this morning, because I have a very important task to attend to today and tomorrow. Therefore, I would like to have this opportunity to make a few observations on the speeches made by the Honourable Members.

Sir, I cannot say very much in regard to the speech made just now by the Honourable Member from Teluk Anson, because he dwells on the same subject over and over again. As far as I know, he talks about confrontation and he turns round suggesting that we should do something to get on the good books of our neighbours and to get prepared to fight this confrontation. However, he has not given us any constructive comment on which we can work, and that has been going on for the last few days. We have heard speeches in this House on matters which we are supposed to deal with—matters affecting the public interests, matters affecting the interests of the

Members of Parliament. But we have heard nothing very much from the Opposition except, of course, its attacking, blasting and condemning of this Government over and over again. In fact, it was the same theme-song the Opposition Members spoke on this Budget as they spoke before, but in view of the forthcoming elections, they seem to have laid very much more stress on matters, which they call corruption and inefficiency of this Government in order, of course, to discredit this Government for the purpose, I say, of the forthcoming elections. In fact, all these wild charges, which we have heard in this House, or which the Honourable Members have had the misfortune to hear in this House, are charges without an atom of truth, without any foundation whatsoever. They are just wild charges made with the sole purpose of trying to mislead the public, as I said, with eyes on the elections.

The Opposition has made full use of the privilege given by this House to blast the Government, and we have to bear with all these, damaging as it may be in nature of their attacks against this Government. They spared no effort in order to hurt the feelings of others on this side of the bench. Some of the blows struck at the Government were decidedly foul and mischievous, and blows which in the sporting circle are said to be "blows below the belt." When politicians are found to be politically bankrupt, they resort to unfair means to outdo their political opponents. This is what we have been hearing for the last few days in this House. So, "to hit below the belt", in boxing language, is done when an opponent finds himself unable to beat his opponent and finds it more convenient to strike him below the belt to win or lose the battle as it may be, so long as he can hurt his opponent. That is what we have been hearing in this House—"blows below the belt." So, as I said, politicians like boxers can also hit "below the belt." This resort to blows in the hope of hurting their opponents by trying to turn public opinion against this Government is, I think, the foulest of all foul means in politics. It is used in order to serve

one's own end, no matter what consequences there are, no matter whether there is truth in it at all, as we can see, or how much truth there is in it. It is immaterial to them, so long as they maintain that their blows below the belt serve their own purpose, so long as they feel that by hitting the Government below the belt they can hurt the Government and they can turn the public and the electorate against the Government. They spared no one their feeling for they know that under the privilege of this House, they are free to say anything they like without fear of being prosecuted.

The Standing Orders of this House, as we all know, are drafted to follow as closely as possible the practice in England, the Mother of Parliaments. In the course of my career, I have heard and I have read many debates in House of Parliament, but never have I heard so much trash as I have been hearing these last few days. In the United Kingdom, for instance, in matters of public interest, or where the personal conduct or integrity of individual Members of Parliament is in issue, such matters are brought up for discussion in the House, but it is done with dignity and propriety. Such matters are discussed and debated in the House frankly and freely, without any rancour, animosity, or ill-will, and with due respect for the personal feelings of the person concerned and the feelings of his relatives and members of the family. But here—no! It is just one of making wild charges at random to hit wherever they can strike—and it is hit and hit with eyes shut, without caring where the blows are going to land and how they are going to land. And this is how members of this House have gone about this debate. But, of course, one might say they can be excused, in view of the fact that they have got to fight their battle at the forthcoming elections—we give them that allowance. But, to do so without regard to a person's respect and to a person's standing, I think, is a very foul blow, and without respect to the feelings of those connected with him is, as I have said, beyond my understanding. And so whatever Members would like to say about others, my

advice is: have a little respect for the dignity of this House, have a little respect for democracy which we all declared we would uphold. So, a debate without allowing words and feelings to show rancour, or to be of use to the nation's enemies, would be the correct debate. Therefore, in this Chamber we must try and prevent the words we use to be wrongly interpreted by those who are always trying to find fault with our Government and also try to prevent at whatever cost our words from being used by the enemies who are watching and waiting to crush this new nation—Malaysia. Members, I say should live up to the prefix "Honourable" by which they are addressed, but here sometimes Members are inclined to forget the fact that they are Honourable and they use language which is commonly used in the street corners. That is unfortunate, but as I have said sometimes it is well for them to remember—their duties and responsibilities to the nation and to the constituencies which they represent.

Let me take, for instance, the case of the Honourable Member for Kuala Langat. Thank you—he is here (*Laughter*). He has in the course of his speech condemned this Government. Of course, everybody has got a right to condemn the Government, but now he feels that he has got more right than anybody else because he has been retired from the Government. These are the things which he said, and which I have picked up from the notes written by my official: (i) that the Alliance is a bankrupt Government, is a bankrupt party; (ii) that we are trying to divert attention from the mess we have made of our country by yelling about the Opposition parties; (iii) that we have altered the status and the rights of every State, citizen and Ruler without consulting the people; (iv) that we have been taken for a ride by the British; (v) that the Government is incompetent and corrupt; (vi) that the Government has shown itself subservient to foreign influence; (vii) that we are trying to maintain ourselves in power by using the police; (viii) that we are planning another round of arrests to cripple the Opposition before the elections are

held; then there are (ix) and (x). They are so many, but I do not think I need reply to each and everyone of them. Suffice for me to take them at random. But there is one thing which he said I would like to quote: "Let the fate of Ngo Dinh Diem be a warning to all those who rule by detaining political opponents", meaning, no doubt, that I have to beware or that the fate that befell Ngo Dinh Diem would befall me. That is a very nice wish on his part, but I am sure he did not mean it, because I have known him for a long time and I think deep in his heart he has got some feelings for me. I do not know whether he has or not, but that is at least what I feel. (*Laughter*). So I think he does not quite wish me the same fate as that which befell Ngo Dinh Diem. These are some of the things which the Honourable Member for Kuala Langat said in this House. And these allegations have come from the mouth of a person who had served the Alliance Government for eight years until the day, as I said, he was retired, or rather forced to resign. With another few months to go before the elections he has come here with all these charges and allegations against this Government without consideration of the ministerial oath which he took as a member of the Cabinet.

Enche' Abdul Aziz bin Ishak: On a point of clarification, when I was a Member of the Cabinet there was no opportunity to explain because I could not do so. For the very same oath that the Honourable Prime Minister mentioned I could not divulge what took place—all the arguments which I had put across to my colleagues could not be revealed. So, of course, on whatever points I disagreed in the Alliance Cabinet, they could not be made public. (*Interruption*).

Mr Speaker: Order, order! Please proceed.

The Prime Minister: The point, Mr Speaker, Sir, is that he has taken eight years to think about it. If he had remained in the Cabinet for two or three months, I could well understand the reasons which he gave just now that he could not divulge things which he

would have liked to do. But he stayed on for eight years—he came on again for the second term of another four years. So, there is no plausible excuse which he can give to this House for breaking faith with his old colleagues. But he is entitled to do that. We can only bind a person from his own feelings and from his own sense of duty to his old colleagues. Whatever he would like to say now, he is free to do it, and I would not stop him; but there is no plausible reason whatsoever for saying it, and whatever he thinks, whatever reasons he can give this House, I don't think the House will accept it. However, he might say that he is now out of the Cabinet and he is free to say it and, as I said, he can say it. But the unfortunate part of it is that he may well induce people to believe the things which he says because he had been with us for the last eight years. It is unfortunate, but if people have got any intelligence, any room in their mind for reason, they could well ask, "Why has he taken so long to say all these things? Why has he not resigned before? Why has he kept on with that corrupt Government?"

Enche' Abdul Aziz bin Ishak: Sir, on a point of explanation—I offered to resign twice.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Shut up!

Mr Speaker: Order! order!

The Prime Minister: If I had known I would not have stopped him. But I did know he said it in his temper. Like other Members of the Cabinet, I myself said that I would like to resign, but it did not mean I meant to resign. (*Laughter*). The same was the case with the Honourable Member. When at any time he was angry, he said, "I would like to resign". So I said, "It is your pleasure", but he was there the next day (*Laughter*) and he was there every first of the month to draw his pay (*Laughter*) and there is nothing—to tell you the truth—to stop him from resigning if he wanted to resign. If he felt that the Party in which he was in was not quite the right sort of people to be with, then he should have gone very, very much earlier than he did go.

The Alliance Government is far from being bankrupt, that much I can say, because we have proved to the world how well we can run this Government, how peaceful we can make this country and how prosperous we can make it. So, there is no question of the Alliance Government being bankrupt or being inefficient.

The Alliance Government which he spoke of as being bankrupt is the one which he had been pleased to serve abroad at several conferences. Every time we had a conference anywhere, he would be the first to offer himself to attend and be proud to call himself, "I am the representative of the Federation Government". Now, he comes here before this House and say, "I am ashamed of this Government, it is a corrupt Government, it is a 'no-use' Government, it is a 'no-good' Government". (*Laughter*). I do not understand the mentality of the man who has this to say about the Government which had fed and nurtured him all these years. However, that is his own lookout—not mine. It is only him who has got to be responsible for his own soul, and I hope God forgives him.

The Honourable Member has said that we are in a mess. In fact, he has repeated it so many times that we are in a mess. Sir, the only mess that I know of is in having him with us (*Laughter*) (*Hear, hear*) and for having kept him with us for so long. The only thing if I have to ask for forgiveness from the nation is for keeping our friend across the floor with us for all these years—that is the only mess I have made in my eight years of experience in the Government (*Laughter*) (*Applause*) and I can right now apologise to Members on my side of the bench.

As for the Government being corrupt, it has taken him so long to find out. However, the nation knows all this thing about corruption, all this talk about corruption, and other things. It is one thing in which there is nothing, there is no evidence, to support all the contentions, all the condemnation. It is just a matter which they can say

without hurting themselves, but which they hope will be able to help them win a few seats in the next election. So, let it go at that.

The talk which he has given to this House will be of little help to Honourable Members, at least to all the people of Malaysia. The only thing he has succeeded in doing, as far as I can see, is to assist Indonesia in its dirty propaganda against our country. Even the day before yesterday, when I was listening to the Indonesian radio, I heard it said that they had a champion planted in this country and the champion was bound to thrash me severely and thoroughly. However, I do not think he has thrashed anybody severely and thoroughly except that he has thrashed himself, and he has given his own country cause to regret.

Further, Sir, he said that we were under foreign influence and under pressure from the British. In other words, what he is saying is that we are neo-colonialists. As a matter of fact, this country is facing confrontation right here in this House—apart from the one we have outside this country—from a man who is giving service freely to the enemy, and at the same time expressing loyalty to the country of his birth. Honourable Members can ask themselves as to how much credit they can give to such a man. I will not give him anything at all. As I said, I am prepared to apologise for keeping him in the Government for so long.

According to the Honourable Member for Kuala Langat, he is a staunch Malay leader working for the right of the Malays and for nothing else. He is a man who is the champion of the Malays—not us and not anybody else; that is according to him. As a staunch supporter of the Malays, his policy is to serve the Malays and nothing else.

Enche' Abdul Aziz bin Ishak: Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of explanation. It is not true at all. It is only a flight of imagination on the part of the Honourable Prime Minister.

Mr Speaker: Order! order! One minute, do you rise on a point of order or on a point of explanation?

Enche' Abdul Aziz bin Ishak: On point of explanation.

Mr Speaker: Then you must wait to see whether the Prime Minister will give way or not.

Enche' Abdul Aziz bin Ishak: But he had, Sir. (*Laughter*).

Mr Speaker: Proceed.

Enche' Abdul Aziz bin Ishak: I have never claimed at any time that I was the champion of the Malay race in this country. Never, Sir. Absolutely!

The Prime Minister: Sir, one does not have to open his mouth and call at top of his voice that he is the champion of the Malays. We can judge it by his actions, by his speech, by his ways, by his thoughts. I am able to judge him, because I have been with him for the last eight years. (*Laughter*).

He caused me very great embarrassment once in that role, which I said he played, and very, very great distress too, when he went and confiscated all the licences held by the Chinese middlemen, or rice-dealers, in Perak and Province Wellesley. Then, I had to go back and face the wrath of my people and was condemned by them for having to return all these licences which he confiscated. In restoring these licences, I had to work in the face of a very, very, strong opposition and I had to do it, because the Alliance believes in fair play, in justice, to all: it is the policy of the Alliance not "to rob Tom in order to give it to Harry", or something like that. The policy of the Government is not to rob anybody in order to give benefit to the Malays—and so I had to return all these licences which the Honourable Member had confiscated. This shows how fair the Alliance can be. Nevertheless, as I said, this had to be done.

Now, Sir, this so-called staunch leader or champion of the Malays has made common cause with the Honourable Member for Ipoh, who is well-known for his anti-Malay feeling and his anti-Malay attitude, to judge by his words, his actions and his deeds. There is no need to elaborate on what I have said about his anti-Malay feeling. This

is already very well known by his constant demand for the confiscation of Malay rights. If that is not sufficient evidence to prove that he is anti-Malay, Sir, then I do not know what is. Luckily enough nobody gives him credence for it, otherwise I fear there might be trouble in this country, there might be conflict, and there might be a bloodshed. But as it is, the only success he has achieved by this anti-Malay attitude is to win the Ipoh elections and get the support of the Chinese in Ipoh—but, I thank heaven, nowhere else. As long as the people in this country maintain their equilibrium and their sense of fair play and justice and clear headedness, there is no fear of any clash threatening or taking place.

The Honourable Member for Ipoh also accuses the Alliance Government of dishonourable tactics in fostering the switching of sides in this House and engineering, as he said, the switching of sides in the Trengganu elections. According to him, Enche' Abdul Aziz has every right to switch sides. Nobody denies, nobody questions that. But the only difference is that when he switched sides, he was forced to do so; the other Members who switched sides to go to the Alliance bench did so out of their own free will, because they respect the Alliance, they respect democracy, and they respect the principles which the Alliance stands for (*Hear, hear*) (*Applause*). That is the only difference between the Honourable Member for Kuala Langat and the other Members of the Opposition who switched sides to

Enche' Abdul Aziz bin Ishak: Sir, on a point of clarification—when I was asked to switch from the Ministry of Agriculture to the Ministry of Health, I offered to resign. I asked the Prime Minister if he would sack me, and the Prime Minister said, "No. Why not go very nicely, go quietly and resign rather than be sacked?" He said that if he sacked me, I would not be able to get another job in the Alliance Government. So, after an exchange of letters, finally he said, "All right. You will be sacked." In fact, I wanted to be sacked first then rather than after

four exchanges of letters, when he agreed to sack me. I offered to be sacked first. (*Laughter*).

The Prime Minister: Well, anyway, none of us has lived to regret. However, when Tun Razak and Members of the Alliance including Enche' Abdul Aziz—may I call him Enche' Abdul Aziz or the Honourable Member for Kuala Langat?

Mr Speaker: The Honourable Member for Kuala Langat.

The Prime Minister: All right. Then, he was an Honourable Member of the Cabinet which discussed the postponement of the election which he mentioned here yesterday. I have got to impress upon this House that it was not because they wanted to suspend the Constitution because they feared to have election, but because they feared that, with the breakaway of the M.C.A. from UMNO under the leadership of Dr Lim Chong Eu, there might be communal trouble, there might be trouble between the Malays and the Chinese. It was for that reason that we decided to suspend the Constitution by postponing the election. It is not to suspend the Constitution for all time; it was done not to wreck democracy, but it was done to save democracy, to save bloodshed, to save the country from trouble. Naturally, as an old man, when they informed me of their trouble, I just in a simple way told them that the fact that Chong Eu was out is no reason why we should not carry on in the name of the Alliance. That is all that was done, and we won the election quite comfortably; in fact we got 74 or 75 or 76 Members, including the Speaker, as a result of that election. (*Laughter*). However, matters spoken or decided at Cabinet level—he felt he has the right to disclose it now—as I say, it is

Enche' Abdul Aziz bin Ishak: Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of explanation. This was not at Cabinet level at all. This was done in the evening in the house of the Deputy Prime Minister. It is not a Cabinet secret—No! And the Honourable the Prime Minister had already retired and he had gone to Pulau Langkawi when all these

took place. It was amongst the Alliance—the M.C.A., the UMNO and the M.I.C. It was not in the Cabinet at all.

The Prime Minister: Well, no decision was actually taken, but the matter was discussed—it was discussed among Cabinet Ministers. We expected that to be honoured by all Members of the Cabinet and not disclosed at any time, but since, as I say, he is free to do so now, he can do so. There is not much that he can tell the country about what we did, because what we did was all in dedication to this country, and they were honourable acts that we did, and we did them in honour and for the good of this country.

My Party, as I said, since we formed it and run it, had won various elections at all levels and had never resorted to any dirty work, or dirty play, or dirty tactics, in order to win elections. We have fought fairly and squarely, and we have won with a great measure of success as Honourable Members and the country know from the recent elections we have had—on the local council level, on the district council level, on the rural council level, on the town council level, we won with a comfortable majority without resorting to any unfair or dirty tactics. So, you can judge from here the faith and the belief of the people in the integrity of our Party. We have not arrested Members, and we do not have to arrest Opposition Members, in order to win elections—that the Honourable Member knows. The Honourable Member also knows that before any arrest is made, or before any detention order is made, every Member of the Cabinet is given a report on the person and he is asked to study it days ahead. He is asked, if he will, to look into it himself to see that there is every plausible reason to keep people in detention and from causing trouble—all this time Cabinet Members, of which the Honourable Member had been one, have been agreeing as to which type of people should be detained for the peace and security of this country. We have to do this, even though the job which we have to do is not quite a nice job, but nevertheless we are honour bound

and duty bound to do it in order to safeguard the interests and well-being of the people of this country and this country itself.

With regard to the charges made by the Honourable Member for Ipoh that there has been a report on corruption, I have referred the matter to the Attorney-General and have received a report both from the Attorney-General and from the Anti-Corruption Agency, and I have great pleasure in reading the letters or the reports I received from these two Departments. As regards the reference made by the Honourable Member and his allegation on the subject of a Minister's wife having received \$10,000 as bribery or corruption, this is the letter from the Attorney-General dated 20th December, in which he said:

"As regards to the reference made by the Honourable Member from Ipoh to the Police file which is lying in my Chambers and his allegations of corruption, I have to state that I have not, up to now, received any report from the Police or any member of the public that a Minister's wife has received \$10,000 as bribe or corrupt money.

The only investigation paper that I have in my possession at present is in connection with the Honourable Member for Ipoh's allegation against the Minister of Health which was made at the Chinese Assembly Hall, Kuala Lumpur, which Special Criminal Investigation Department had investigated on my behalf.

I am satisfied that no evidence has so far been disclosed to warrant me to take proceedings against the Minister or his wife in a criminal court. As the civil suit in this matter is still pending in the High Court it is therefore *sub judice* and I am not in a position to elaborate further."

Another letter, which I received from the Director of Anti-Corruption Agency as the result of my request to investigate, says:

"As far as the Anti-Corruption Agency is concerned, there has been no allegation or report received from any source to the effect that a Minister or his wife has received \$10,000 or any sum as bribery or corruption.

Up to date there is no record in the Agency concerning any allegation of bribery and corruption against any Minister or his wife."

These, as Honourable Members will see, are the results of my own instruction to produce anything there is in the file, either in the Attorney-General's

Department or in the Anti-Corruption Agency, so that I could inform this House as to the truth of the allegation made by the Honourable Member for Ipoh.

So you, I am sure, will be satisfied with the evidence I have read and, as I have said, if there is anything else that he wishes to produce to me, so as to enable me to carry out an investigation, I will be pleased to do so. But to come before this House and make such a wild charge without any substance in it at all, without any foundation in it at all, is a very mischievous act aimed at nothing but to discredit the Alliance so that the Party which he represents might be able to triumph in that little area of Ipoh. All these charges have gone too far, and I think they should be treated with contempt. His only object in making them, as I said, is just to discredit the Alliance. He well knows that it is the firm intention of my Government to stamp out corruption whenever or wherever it raises its ugly head. The Government has been able in the past to prosecute corruption charges, in some cases with success and in some without. I would like to inform this House that during the years 1959 to 1963 there were 263 cases of corruption brought before the Court for trial. The figure is not very large, and the reasons are not far to seek because the public refuse to co-operate; and some of the cases that have gone to the Court have been unfortunately thrown out for lack of evidence because, at the last moment, those who made the report changed their tune for fear that they might get into trouble. If the Honourable Member himself is public-spirited enough and civic-minded enough, he should give his co-operation to the Government to enable it to take proper action against the persons concerned. He well realises that on one report that he laid at my door, I have taken action and as I said the other day, the action that I have taken had satisfied him; and if he has anything more to say in the right spirit, he can be rest assured that I will take all action possible.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam (Menglembu): Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of

clarification—I wonder whether the Honourable Prime Minister is aware that the Chief of the Anti-Corruption Department has been to Ipoh twice, has interviewed the Member for Ipoh and has received documents and information from him?

The Prime Minister: I am aware of all those. If the Honourable Member likes to meet the Director of Anti-Corruption Agency, he is free to do so, because I have asked him to look thoroughly into it. He has been to Ipoh, has examined the case and has found nothing to substantiate the charge made against the wife of a Minister. So, one thing the Honourable Member must realise is that a public servant is governed by regulations as to his conduct. On the other hand, there is nothing, in fact, to stop his wife from working or from making a little pin money herself, so long as the work in which she has participated has nothing to do with the husband or does not require the aid or help of the husband. If the husband just lends his name to the wife to carry out any work, no matter whether he is a Minister or he is any other public servant, he is liable to be charged in Court by the Anti-Corruption Department. The Honourable Member can be rest assured that we are never slow to take action when there are reasons for it.

Then, on the subject of equal rights, I have replied before and there is no need for me to say anymore on this subject because the same theme has been repeated time and time again here. I have replied to this so many times and I think there is no need for me to repeat things again. However, one thing I can say is that the Malaysian indigenous people have got no other protection. If the protection which has been written into the Constitution is taken away from them, there will be nothing left for them. This is not a reserve, this is not discrimination, but this is a protection to the indigenous people; and if they have none of this protection, I can say that they will be driven out from jobs, from the towns, from everywhere, and the ultimate result of it will be trouble in this

country, and that is a thing we have got to avoid. The non-Malays have enough and, in fact, they have more. If you turn right and left, you will find nothing that belongs to the indigenous people of Malaysia and all you will see are those that belong to others. If the little bit that is left to the Malays and the indigenous people of Malaysia is taken away, there will be nothing left but trouble.

The Honourable Member for Bachok alleged that I gave an assurance to the Philippines Government that we could discuss their claim over Sabah later. When I came to this House on the first day of this session, he said that I said that the Philippines had no legal right to Sabah. The Honourable Member is confused either in his thinking or in his understanding of the claim over Sabah. I never said at any time that they have any right to Sabah. What I said was that whatever right the Philippines might have with regard to Sabah, they could take it to the International Court. They can take it to anywhere: there is nothing to stop them from doing so. However, they must not confuse the issue by making it a condition precedent that we should accept their claim on Sabah before they could recognise us. So, do not make a mistake. I have never confused this House, and I have never had any intention to try and confuse this House. So, whatever claim the Philippines may have, they can take it to the right place. But, as I have said, I am not going to accept that as a term precedent to the recognition of Malaysia. Malaysia is a *fait accompli*, and Malaysia has come about to exist; and by the will of God and the desire of the people, we will remain in existence forever and ever (*Applause*).

The Honourable Member for Bachok has also suggested that we are trying to antagonise our blood brothers by espousing the cause of the Western Powers. But one thing he does not realise, or he does not appreciate is this: we may be friendly with the Western Powers, but that is because of our fear of the communists. What the Honourable Member, perhaps, does not understand is that the Indonesians

are espousing the cause of communists and because of that they have confronted us. So, if we cannot defend ourselves against the communists represented by Indonesia, then we have got to try and make friends with those who will help us as friends. When I met Subandrio myself in Philippines, the first thing he said to me was, "Why don't you give up your British friends; why don't you look to us for friendship and for protection?" As he said that, I saw the fangs bared before my eyes from Indonesia, the fangs of the wolves. Obviously he has taken me for Red Riding Hood which I am not. Even Red Riding Hood knew how to take care of herself and I know how to take care of myself. When I saw these fangs bared from Indonesia, when they asked us to come and join them, I knew that we had got to take care of ourselves and close the door against those whom our Opposition calls our good neighbours.

The Honourable Member for Bachok also suggested that we are trying to gamble with the fate of this country by trying to manoeuvre with the British in a strategem to fight Indonesia. We have got no wish to fight Indonesia, and I have said this time and time again, and I am tired of repeating it time and time again. For the last time I say that I do not intend, we have nothing, to fight anybody at all. All we hope to do is to exist in peace, goodwill and in friendship with our neighbours. As proof, we have nothing but a few battalions of soldiers; we are without any fighting plane, without any fighting boat; our seamen, fishermen, are being taken, caught, and robbed every day without our being able to defend our seamen. It shows how utter nonsense it is to say that we are trying to provoke our neighbours. We have been trying to make friends with them. I have gone to Tokyo, I have gone to the Philippines, and I have gone elsewhere to try and appease them. But we can only go up to a point; we cannot go further anymore, otherwise we will be sacrificing our country's honour and our self-respect—that I am not prepared to do, come what may. In short, all this

confrontation, as I said, comes from Indonesia. It is a dangerous game for the Honourable Members of this House to play or speak about to put the fault at our door as they should know where the fault lies. I think they do know about that. But when they put the fault at our door, they are doing nothing more than to act as "fifth columnists" for our enemy. The Honourable Member has suggested that we should take this matter up with the U.N. Security Council. I know very well that we can do that, and we will do so when the time comes, but there is no point in doing it now.

An Honourable Member, I think, from Barisan Sosialis called us neo-colonialists. That is a jargon used by the communists and I say he must have a certain respect for the dignity of this House and stop using communist jargons here. They may use it with impunity in Singapore and I think our friend, the Prime Minister of Singapore, has appropriately replied to those jargons time and time again. I think I will leave it to him to do that now because it affects the member from Singapore (*Laughter*). Another gentleman from Singapore also suggested that Singapore was forced into Malaysia, every party leader was detained, leaders of trade unions, university student leaders and journalists are still in jail, 10 publications of the largest trade unions were banned, processions and meetings were not allowed. This, he said, is the sort of democracy that exists in Singapore and that Singapore citizenship is not of equal status with the rest of Malaysia and various other things. He also said that Mr Lim Chin Siong offered his services to the Tunku in friendship but the Government put him in jail. He went on to say that there is no freedom in Singapore until the leftwing leaders are released, that there will be no progress in the nation until these leaders are released and that there will be no talk of national unity until the leftwing leaders are released. When the so-called leftwing leaders are released there will be nothing left for us to work for (*Laughter*). And then he said Malaysia should not assume

the role of colonial masters, and Sarawak should not be treated as a mistress. Whose mistress, I do not know! I have got none and I do not think anybody has got any mistress in Sarawak. But we have never treated Sarawak as anything lower in status or higher in status than ourselves. We have always welcomed them as brothers and I can assure the Honourable Member that we will treat them as brothers (*Applause*).

So Members of the Opposition have had a great deal to say. Mostly, I think, what they had to say they had said it with their eyes on the elections which will take place soon—I hope next year. The Honourable Member for Kuala Langat challenged the Government and he said, “Let us go to the country”, but the Honourable Member from Ipoh, also from the Opposition, complains that the Alliance is going to spring a snap election. One says “go and have the election”; the other says “go slow, do not have a snap election”. So this is how they go about. It shows the mentality they have. They do not know actually what they want. Therefore, they speak one language but are of different minds. That is the sort of Opposition which we have heard for these two days and, therefore, I have nothing more to add. (*Applause*).

(Mr Deputy Speaker in the Chair)

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew (Singapore): Mr Speaker, Sir, I come to this Chamber as a Malaysian, not as a Singaporean, and I am happy to say that eleven other of my colleagues from Singapore come also as Malaysians. However, in the nature of things, three have come as Singaporeans and from time to time the acrid smell of Singapore gun powder will be wafted in these august Chambers. Sir, the occasion for my speech, on the first occasion in this Chamber, is the Budget. I would have preferred a more neutral issue on which pleasantries would have become more appropriate. However, since it is not unlikely that this is the last sitting of this Parliament, so far as the Malayan members are concerned, much as we would like to leave well

alone in Malaya, this is an opportunity we cannot altogether allow to pass.

Sir, the Budget which we have read with considerable interest is, if I may say so, a very business-like Budget. The fact that the Opposition Members have not gone into the intricacies of the facts and figures expounded with considerable directorship finesse by the Minister of Finance is in part a tribute to the great application that he has given to his duties. But I would like to add, if I may, that the Budget is a business-like Budget good for big business—and I have only this to say for Singapore. A tax concession has been given. No taxes have gone up in Singapore; in fact, a concession in income tax has been given. Now, everybody regardless of the value of his house, if it is owner-occupied, he gets it income tax free. We had taken a lesson from him and followed the Minister of Finance in providing for tax exemption up to an annual value of \$3,000. I have no doubt that there must be some 5,000 wealthy people in Singapore, who will be grateful for the consideration extended to them by the Honourable Finance Minister. I am glad he has not taken me up on the two other issues which I enumerated in the Singapore Assembly—the different differentials in the rate of income tax in Singapore and the Federation, which still applies, and also separate assessment for women. But, no doubt, these are matters which we can take up with greater asperity after the elections in Malaya are over, when on some other occasion we shall be meeting well before December next year to really face the economic facts of life in Malaysia. But it is fair, and the Opposition must accept this—that no Finance Minister in his right mind on the eve of elections is going to come to this House and really put the unpleasant economic facts of life to the nation. I would like to say that when that time comes perhaps he would present this problem in depth.

I read with interest the opening paragraphs of his speech, that this was the first Malaysian Budget. But I regretted as I went through the pages

that the screen remained in two dimensions. There was none of the backdrop, the panoramic sweep of the Malaysian problems, which we have inherited—for better or for worse. There must come a time when we have got to face up to it. Some of the facts of life have come to stay. The animosity of some of our neighbours, the fact that we are now considered fair game for subversion, disruption and sabotage must inevitably find reflection in the redistribution of our national effort between defence and non-productive expenditure and other development investments. I would like to congratulate him on this. Knowing the background of the figures I congratulate him on having considerably scaled down what his military advisers wanted him to do, and what we in Singapore were originally expected to pay for. I congratulate him not without a certain degree of self-interest, because if we keep up with this level, then it is not unlikely that we in Singapore to be able to get some rebate when the time comes to work these figures out all over again. As you know, Sir, we pay some 40% of our national taxes and a large part of that was in defence of Malaysia. Far from joining the cry of the Opposition on wasteful defence expenditure. I congratulate him for having kept the ambitions of the armed forces within very realistic limits. I say that it is not altogether without a certain degree of self-preservation on the part of those who determine these things, because I remember once recounting to one of his ministerial colleagues that there is no army or air force or navy in Asia that has been expanded and subsequently demobilised. Armies have been expanded in Europe, wars have been fought, armies have been brought back to size. But in Asia, particularly in South-East Asia, armies when expanded have a tendency ultimately of taking over, whether it is in Burma, Pakistan, or in some other of our neighbouring States, and we should be extremely chary about an unnecessary expansion of the army. We can count ourselves lucky in that the Finance Minister, whatever his other idiosyncrasies, is not a man who has great military ambitions for Malaysia.

But before I pass on to what has occupied most of the time of this House—confrontation—and our immediate problems—I would like to, if I may, claim the right to make this comment. Much as I admire the business-like manner of the presentation, this is not a Budget to which any one of us with aspirations to build Malaysia into a more equal or more just society would give unqualified support. One of the legacies that we have inherited is the fact that the two Finance Ministers who have looked after the larder of the nation since Malaya first got an elected government in 1955—some nine years ago—were both rich men in their own right, and I do not think it is unfair to say that one—the first, his predecessor—is a man of enormous tin interest, and he himself is not unknown in the rubber world. But whilst we cannot expect rich men to legislate themselves out of wealth, their own wealth, and not to have a certain natural affinity and sympathy for similarly wealthy men, I do urge upon Members of the Alliance, who represent the “have-nots” in the rural areas, that in the long run the problem we have to face is, can we and are we prepared to use fiscal policy as an instrument for redistribution of wealth and opportunity? If we are not, then we must face the mounting wave of social revolution which sooner or later—with universal education now already introduced in Malaya—must one day come to the force. Once you have educated a man, once he is literate, once he questions the right of why another man is better off than he is, then you must be prepared to offer equal opportunities in your society. However, more of that when we finally meet after the elections in Malaya. In this period of transition between the old and new, it is only right that any criticism that we make should be with a certain amount of reservation, because none of us, who holds the interest of this country above that of our parties, would want to rock the boat.

Now, Sir, the immediate problem before the nation is confrontation. I was enamoured to read in today's

newspapers that *Antara*, the national news agency of Indonesia, carries the Malayan Communist Party line that Malaysia should be crushed, a united front should be formed, to destroy our beloved Prime Minister and the British. Sir, I would like, if I may, to classify the division in this House on this matter as between those who are for the nation and for survival and those who are out to destroy the nation. In between these two groups is a group that vacillates between wanting to preserve the nation and themselves, and from time to time yielding to the temptation of trying to bring down the Government and the House by saying the opposition line—anti-Malaysia, neo-colonialism, anti-the-nation.

The hard core of opposition to Malaysia has come, and will continue to come, from the communists—international communism: communists in Indonesia, and communists within this country. The most strident note of all the speeches from the Socialist Front, the Barisan Sosialis, and all the other Opposition Members came from Singapore—Barisan Sosialis. I was interested to see one Member from Sarawak S.U.P.P. taking a slightly different line. He is getting a cold draught down his neck and not unnaturally, so are his supporters. I remember, two years ago in December 1961, in Kuching, taking part in a dialogue over Radio Sarawak with him and I asked him then whether he thought in all seriousness that an independent Sarawak was a feasible, practical proposition. Then he thought it was. I asked him then whether he thought, if the liberation of West Irian came before the establishment of Malaysia, whether there was not bound to be certain discomfort in Sarawak as a result of the enormous muscles that have been built up over the border—muscles which having been built up now have to be flexed. Now, I am glad to see him underline the fact that if self-determination becomes a cover for aggression and conquest and absorption, then he is all for defending the sovereignty of the nation. Quite right. One of the logical consequences of the policies enunciated by the S.U.P.P., the Socialist Front, the

Barisan Sosialis in alliance with the broad united front of Azahari's Party Rakyat in Brunei—if they were to come back and roost in Sarawak—would be that the first people to feel the pinch of discomfort would be the followers of the Member from Sarawak, who spoke yesterday, and not unlikely he himself.

But, of course, there is the safety of Singapore with all the big bases and all the jets that have been decried by the Barisan Sosialis Member. He feels, first, we should cut down the expenditure on the arms; second, we should drive out the British bases; and, third, we should then go in a position of weakness to the negotiating table and sell out Malaysia. Having first cut down our arms, tied our hands behind our back, and driven out all our friends who might, for various reasons, want to help us, we then go down and negotiate. Sir, he felt that I was being unfair when I said that that was the line of treason and treachery. What other inference can any logical, sensible, man draw? I remember that once upon a time a great orator said that the importance of negotiation was negotiating with strength. And, here, we have got a great advocate of revolutionary tactics seriously advising us that the way we should succeed in negotiations is to reduce ourselves to a position of weakness. We should destroy the bases, get rid of these jet aeroplanes, battleships, then dispose of our own weapons for self-defence, and then go down on our bended knees and say, "Would you please allow us to live in peace?" Let me ask him this one simple question. What would happen today, if we followed just one part of his advice and drove British bases out? I am not here, Sir, as an apologist for British Military tactics in South-East Asia. They are here for diverse reasons of their own. But I can say, whatever their reasons, that the only reason is one big battle cruiser of the latest type. I am told that the cruiser—it is now the flagship of the Indonesian Navy—actually carried Mr Khrushchev to Plymouth harbour, where a frogman tried to go underneath to have a look at the scientific techniques

of the hull and lost his life. Is there anything to prevent it from sailing right up into Singapore harbour and saying, "Hand over and deliver or else we fire"? What is the Member from the Barisan Sosialis going to do in that situation?

Sir, the issue, as I see it, is quite simple. Let us not go into whys and wherefors of confrontation. Where do we go from now? As I have said, we go back again to the three groups: those who want to see Malaysia survive as a nation—my colleagues and I, the Malaysian Members of 12 belonging to this group; those who want to see it destroyed and who even at this very moment deny its existence—the Barisan Sosialis of Singapore who till today do not admit the existence of Malaysia. In their speeches, in their stand, they talk of Malaya and Singapore, and there is no such thing as Malaysia. And in between—we haven't been in this House long enough to find out who is who and what is what on the other side of the House—there is a group that vacillates—from time to time it gets draughty and chilly and they say, "We are all for the survival of the nation. Three cheers for National Service!" They want to be taken into the confidence of the government to uphold the security of the nation, but from time to time they said, as the Member for Teluk Anson said, Malaysia brought about the confrontation, because of the manner in which it has been formed—unseemly haste. I beg to differ. Sir, if we had brought about Malaysia in 1962 instead of 1963, in other words if Malaysia was created before West Irian was liberated on the first May of 1963, we might well have not offered the opportunity for intervention. That is the tragedy. Because we tarried, because we talked too long and argued too long, because Sarawak and Sabah not unnaturally wanted many things written into the Constitution to safeguard themselves, we offered time for opposition to mount inside, and for external intervention to take the guise of friendly help for nationalist aspirations in Sabah and Sarawak. Does anybody believe that? There are 40 members on the

other side—do they believe that all this confrontation, this friendly help, is in order to see that they can the better express their will on behalf of their 1.2 million people?

Sir, we must be sufficiently realistic to see that this is not a situation which should be resolved by another round of discussions. The next few years will test the capacity for survival of Malaysia, whether we have enough national and social cohesiveness to be a nation. If we haven't then, as I said before on some other occasion, history will write us off in one paragraph as a polyglot community who, by an accident of British imperialism, came together to Malaya and to Sarawak and North Borneo, and who for a momentary fraction of history looked like succeeding. There are severe stresses and strains, and the most severe stress of the first phase of confrontation is on the people I represent in Singapore. Two hundred odd million dollars a year is the magnitude of our loss in profits—national income—8.7 per cent. But what is the alternative? Members on the other side talk—some members—as I have said I am not sure who is who yet, it will take some time to separate the good from the bad (*Laughter*)—they talk as if Malaysia brought about confrontation. Confrontation is the conscious act of an independent government of the Republic of Indonesia. It has got nothing to do with Malaysia. Why did they do that? Will it be over just because we go to another conference table, when everyday the stakes are mounting, prestige is involved, and more than prestige now, the struggle for hegemony, for dominance in this region? I would like to ask those who have spoken against Malaysia this one simple question. Is it really helpful to us, in Malaysia to couch our criticisms in terms which can only assist those who want to destroy Malaysia? Never mind, whether or not we agree with the policies of the Alliance Government.

Sir, I have many differences from time to time with them, and from time to time I do not find myself altogether *ad idem* with the Honourable Prime

Minister. But, surely, the question we must ask ourselves is this: is what we are publicly saying going to be detrimental or beneficial to Malaysia? I say apply that test, if you really want this country to survive. If you really want to survive as a separate entity, as a separate people in South-East Asia and not be absorbed, then surely it is in our interest not by any act or word to make things more difficult for Malaysia. Does the Opposition really believe that it is going to strengthen the hands of the Government of Malaysia for the Prime Minister to be driven to the conference table publicly, because opinion in the country has been roused and rallied against him in that he has taken an obstinate, obdurate, unreasonable, stand? Is that really helpful, even if the Opposition really believes that the right thing is quietly to get round a conference table? Is that a situation which any Government of Malaysia could negotiate from strength, to weaken it, to harry it, chase it from pillar to post?

Sir, having made my reservations as to the tactics of the government, may I say that I am with them on the objective that any settlement must be a lasting one—or it will be better to face our difficulties through now? Confrontation can remain pitched as it is, with trade boycott, pressure along the border, sabotage from within, or it could hot up, ultimately becoming from a small scale war to a big scale war; or it could be stepped down and slowly be resolved. Which of the two directions it takes depends only in part upon ourselves. Bigger considerations apply in the policy decisions of the Government in Indonesia. Surely, that must be obvious? If for one moment, they believe that the hard line will pay off in the long run, then are all the pious words of those who beseech Government to go to the conference table going to help us in resolving confrontation? What is there to resolve first of all? Malaysia? How do we resolve Malaysia? We have formed Malaysia now with the blessing of the United Nations Secretary-General. What are we to negotiate at the conference table? A resumption of good

relations with our neighbours—I am all for that. What is the price? The dissolution of Malaysia? Where do these Members, who urged that we ought to go to the conference table, stand on that? Do they really say—if the price for the lifting of confrontation is the dissolution, first, of the Borneo side of Malaysia—that that is the price we should pay? If we pay that price, then where do we go from there? What is there to prevent confrontation from again being mounted? Let us assume, for the sake of argument, that we were all stricken by some insanity on this side of the house—those who support Malaysia—and that we went to this conference table and said, “Right, hardly worth it since the Chief Minister of Sabah does not want Malayan and Singapore officers to serve in any way; all they want is more money and free education to be paid for by us from the Singapore and Malaya side of Malaysia—well, abandon them to their fate.” Is that going to help us? Having shown weakness are we not, therefore, more likely to tempt them to go one step further? Or do we now quietly and firmly say that we are digging our toes in and staying put; we want to be friends, always wish to be friendly; but we have to be firm on our right to be left in peace? It is as simple as that. I suggest to the Members opposite that there are so many ways of saying the same thing, that I find it difficult to believe that they lack the ingenuity to say constructive things to this Government, getting them to shift their position without at the same time helping the enemy. The simple yardstick is, is what we are doing helpful to our own people and our own country? Another simple yardstick is, having said and done what they have done, and finding it quoted with great relish by Radio Kalimantan Utara, can there be any doubt, whatever their intentions, who in fact they are helping?

Now, Sir, I would like to take this occasion to give by way of illustration where from time to time I find myself at variance with the Central Government—and this is a matter in which

I speak with a considerable amount of heat. We had the Bank of Indonesia in Singapore. Part of the terms for merger was that Singapore's banking laws would be concurrent, and that we would continue to allow the Bank of Indonesia and the Bank of China to carry on in spite of going into Malaysia. That was a situation which did not envisage a position of hostility between Malaysia and Indonesia. Came, the 17th of September. It was quite obvious, whether the rights and wrongs previously, a position of hostility was setting in between us. Sir, I sympathise with the feelings of the Central Government in wanting to make quite clear to the world that we intended to be left alone in our own country, but I question the wisdom of suddenly returning in kind what was being done to us, such as closing down the Bank of Indonesia? Fortunately, we didn't. It was not necessary. The Indonesians were planning it in any event. Two months elapsed and they decided to give instructions to wind it up—they decided, after having left the bait, in order that conflicts of interest between Singapore and Kuala Lumpur could be exploited. Seeing that it did not lead to such a situation, they decided to withdraw the bait and carry it out to its logical conclusion. The Overseas Chinese Bank in Medan, in Jakarta, and other parts of Indonesia, where there are branches, were given time to pack up, and they themselves set out to close down their own branch in Singapore. Where I felt sad was that, whilst they were in the process of doing that, without the knowledge that this in fact had already been ordered, our Immigration Department, under Kuala Lumpur direction, gave notice to some of the senior officers of the Bank to leave within a week's time, thereby making it appear that we were provoking the situation. Now, Sir, this is where, I take it, we are entitled to criticise the tactics of the Central Government. It would have been so much better and so much clearer to everyone, if more forbearance had been shown. The intention on the other side was manifest that they wanted to put the squeeze on us—not all the squeeze was put on at any one time—because

it was quite possible at one time, so it appeared to them, to leave behind enough bait that if we were not part of Malaysia just see how well you would have been, and then exploit these differences. As it is, the issue becomes somewhat cloudy and that is our complaint. Not that basically we disagreed with the policy of finding a lasting solution to what has now become a malady of some considerable dimensions for us. Malaysia, as I have said, has an all-embracing neighbour—to the left, to the west, to south, to east, we have got Malaysia surrounded by Indonesia—and a small people of ten million surrounded by a big people of 97 million—rounded off at one hundred million for rhetorical purposes—who are more likely to survive if they manifest a will to survive.

Therefore, having congratulated the Finance Minister on the prudence, which he has displayed in allowing only a modest expansion of the expenditure on arms and troops, I would like to go further and say that we should face up to our long-term problems. I know of one other country in the Middle East surrounded by bigger, more powerful and hostile, neighbours. Being a small country, it has survived all these years, because every one of the people in that country has manifested in no uncertain terms that it will fight to the death, and nobody has attacked it. And I say National Service should be more than just a pre-election gambit. This is a proposal serious enough for us to consider as a permanent deterrent. As I see it, Mr Speaker, Sir, the choice before us is plainly and simply this. If we do not survive as a cohesive entity, having a national will in the first three to five years of our life as a nation, then we shall perish: and when that happens we will all regret having allowed that opportunity, that moment in history, to slip by unnoticed.

What is really the answer? I agree with the Barisan Sosialis Member from Singapore that there is no chance of our expanding our armed forces to a point where we can on our own stand up to our neighbours—not when they are ten times our size; and it will be

sheer folly to try and match them even in proportions. Therefore, willy-nilly, the pattern for survival for us has been set. Small nations have survived in history—like Thailand, like Cambodia—by cancelling out of two major forces. We are not a major force, and we will be foolish to imagine that, by any stretch of the imagination, we could become one. But it does not take us long to work out the arithmetical equation by which 100-million strength can be counter-balanced by the strength of some other opposing forces. And that is what is required of us—a certain realistic grasp of our position and a will to use the circumstances we find ourselves in to our best advantage. Other nations do it. We have to do it.

I say to Members opposite, our problem now is not that the British will dominate us, but whether they have the will and the capacity over the next decade to manifest the same determination to see that Malaysia, which they have helped to come into being, survives. Is there all that amount of vested interest—to use the words of the Barisan Member from Singapore—in tin and rubber, and in other commodities in Borneo, for the British Government to find it worth its while to face a recurrent annual drain on its budget? If not, where is the cancelling force which we ourselves are unable to produce? If ever it happens in the immediate future, that these neo-colonialist, imperialist forces, suddenly withdraw from this region, I suggest that the only people in this Chamber who will take any joy from that are those who, from the very outset, have contemplated the possibility of power, which is based on the armed strength of their friendly communist parties in this region—nobody else. And that is why I say that I will not accept the party label as a line of demarcation between friends and foes on this issue. Our failing is that we have not yet brought home the seriousness of the situation to our own people that this is a long-term problem of penetration and absorption.

The recent disclosure by the Honourable the Prime Minister on sabotage and other hostile activities is

only one open manifestation of a much deeper and abiding trend of thought in our neighbouring countries. The cultural and ideological penetration started several years before Malaysia was even talked about—and that, surely, is a significant point. True, West Irian returned volunteers were not sent for military training until April this year. But the formation of women's associations, boy scouts, troops, schools, classes, friendly contacts and even a fishing company was formed in Singapore for the purpose of recruiting not men to be trained as fishermen but on the fishing expeditions to learn the art of ideological and cultural penetration in depth to weaken the will to be ourselves—what does it all add up to? Our failure really is the fact that we have not brought home this point more vividly to the people, whose fate we are temporarily in charge of. I am quite convinced—if the truth were bared that the alternatives are either survival in Malaysia or absorption—that there can be very few within this Chamber, and I hope very few outside this Chamber, who will see in the latter the lesser of the two evils, whatever our quarrels as to the imperfections of the constitutional set up for Malaysia.

Finally, may I come to what I think will be the role of this elegant, if somewhat expensive, Chamber in the history of our nation. The speeches that I have read do not give me undue cause for optimism. I do not believe for one moment now, nor did I ever believe it even before we first mooted Malaysia and came to the arrangements which are now embodied in the Constitution that power in this country depended upon the counting of heads in this Chamber—that may or may not be the power situation, the structure of power in Westminster, to which friendly references have been made by way of a model upon which we are to dress ourselves. This is an experiment in representative government and whether it succeeds, or it fails, depends as much upon the use this instrument is made of by the Opposition as it is by the Government.

I am in the singularly advantageous position of being in this Chamber both in authority and not in authority. I see from three sides. From the side of the Opposition, I would like from time to time to be able to use this Chamber, to make the Government more sensitive to certain needs and to adopt certain policies, which we feel are more likely to bring about a happier Malaysia which we all universally desire. I see it also as one, who has to run one part of Malaysia, who is quite convinced that if we go according to the British Houses of Parliament, we will all come to grief very quickly.

The Member for Teluk Anson spoke with some passion that he has not been taken into the confidence of the Honourable Prime Minister. He compared himself to Mr Harold Wilson who was taken into the confidence of Sir Alec Douglas-Home. First of all, is he really holding himself out as a constructive, democratic opposition? In other words, is he really for the survival of the nation regardless of the Government in power? Does he want this structure to endure? If that is his ambition here, then he has cause for complaint. But from time to time one gets a feeling—I have heard the Member speak for the first time today and I hope there will be many more such occasions in the future, even after the elections have been held in Malaya—we would be here (*Laughter*)—that we have got to make quite sure that all this is really not to pull the House down. An Opposition that demands the right to be treated as a parliamentary Opposition must behave as such. It is as simple as that. If the conscious, consistent, effort of the Opposition is expended on pulling the House down, then it is only natural that the Government must see to it that opportunities for doing so are very restricted and conscribed. Even this short period between now and whenever the new mandate is to be given, we all feel diffident. True, Sabah, Sarawak and Singapore, we have been voted for in the Malaysian context and we await with great interest the 104 Members who will rejoin us after the

Federal elections whenever it may be. After that, then the bits and pieces must fall into place.

Sir, I say unreservedly that having played our part in bringing Malaysia about, we have every intention to play our part in making Malaysia succeed—and I would like to define success in this context, not as a struggle for power between political parties, but as the social and economic objectives which, our nation must pursue if we are to be successful in the modern sense of that word—an emerged, developed nation. There are two sides to this: first, we must have more prosperity; second, we must have more equality to share that prosperity. I have not the slightest doubt that the aim of the Minister of Finance is to have more prosperity, and to the extent that he generates more prosperity, we will always support him. But I do have my doubts as to whether he understands the dire need for a more equal sharing out of that prosperity—that is basic.

I make no apologies for the fact that we believe in a more just and a more equal society, but I find difficult to believe that a more just and a more equal society can be created by the fiscal policies, which have been pursued by the Federation of Malaya Finance Minister—two Finance Ministers up to date—and now the Federation of Malaysia Finance Minister. What is the object of this taxation? To my mind, the object must be ultimately a redistribution of wealth and opportunity. Does it create that? How much of the revenue is raised by indirect taxation, how much of it is raised by direct taxation? Let us compare even this Budget with the budget of a Conservative government in Britain. They have been through all this and to survive, a conservative Britain to survive, they have made their adjustments. I noted the great patriotism he displayed when he upped the rates for alien residents—commendable patriotism. But I would like to see that patriotism blossoms forth into something broader and bigger, a love for his fellow-men, the “have-nots”

in Malaysia, and the "haves" must pay. It is as simple as that.

The role of this Chamber, if we are to make it constructive is from time to time to help him in what I think is a sincere desire to see a more prosperous Malaysia, but at the same time to remind him, albeit unpleasantly and painfully at times, that it must be more equally shared out. I do not know how long this curious partnership between a party of the "have-nots" in the rural areas with a party of the "haves" from the urban areas will go on for the benefit of the "haves"—not for the benefit of the people, because I believe that ultimately a party of the "have-nots" in the rural areas will find its kindred soul in a party of the "have-nots" in the urban areas. I say that without reservation. I have, from time to time, had the misfortune of having to say "No" to the Minister of Finance—and he is very peremptory person and a very insistent one and, therefore, from time to time, my "No's" had to be in somewhat equally peremptory tones, but I can assure him that there is no personal disregard for his position, or for his wisdom.

Now, Sir, what I do propound is this: that whether or not our tolerant society—multi-racial, multi-lingual, multi-cultural, multi-religious—survives depends so terribly upon a tolerant and reasonable leadership of the Malay rural population. Whether it be the present Prime Minister, or whoever succeeds him, I say without reservation that we would be fools, in our own self-interest, not to sustain in leadership a group of men basically tolerant on racial, religious, linguistic and cultural matters. The problem as I see it is how do we ensure that the leadership that emerges from this Malay rural base is always reasonable and tolerant. If they do not produce results for the mass base that has thrown them up, then I say verily that mass base will be tempted to throw up new leaders, not necessarily so reasonable or so tolerant. And my fear is that the fiscal policy of the Finance Minister is inadequate to produce rapidly enough a visible and appreciable change in the conditions of the

"have-nots" both in the rural and the urban areas. That is the core of the matter. If this leadership were replaced, then I say it can only be replaced for the worse. We have seen glimpses of what it could be. People, who in the name of God and the scriptures literally lose perspective and sanity. I heard that one policeman was killed by a man, who was just on the point of being released.

Well, whilst from time to time I feel some sympathy for Socialist Front Members, when they seek to get elucidation from Ministers, I sometimes think they are not sufficiently grateful for the fact that in some other situation they would not be there to ask the question at all. (*Laughter*). These are facts which we must face—that the real basis for power here is not the counting of heads at random, but whether in our two societies, the urban and the rural, we can throw up two leaderships—and there will be two for quite some time, may be a whole generation—that can synchronise the different momenta at which the two societies are moving. It is not only race and religion that makes this difference—it is culture and sophistication. Urban populations the world over are more sophisticated. Can the two leaderships have a syncro-mesh and go in the same direction, or will they pull asunder? If they do that, then, I say, this \$17 million monument to democracy will be no more difficult to slough off than the constitutional monument I saw in a neighbouring capital. I once had the great privilege of going to a capital in a neighbouring country with our Prime Minister and I pointed to a magnificent monument which had a casket in the middle, and I asked him what it was; and he said: "Oh, that is the constitutional monument, they had elections once upon a time in the 1930's. After six months, they abolished the whole constitution, the whole parliament, and it has never been heard of since and the country has been quite peaceful and quite prosperous ever after. (*Laughter*). Well, it is possible to laugh off one acre of public square with one monument, but a vast complex of 160 rooms

with this debating Chamber and the amount of air-conditioning, all the glorious words that have been said about it, they will all come to grief if the end result of it is not a better life for all.

I come here as I have said as friend and critic. As friend I would like to support all the things which I believe would keep this one of the sanest and most reasonable situations in South-East Asia. Mass arrests notwithstanding, mass detentions without trial notwithstanding, there is no mass unhappiness, no mass poverty, no mass fear. But as critic, I think we have the right from time to time to point out how things could be done better. And as critics we hope to find

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: Order, order, time is up. Sitting is suspended till 4.30 p.m.

Sitting adjourned 1.00 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 4.30 p.m.

(Mr Speaker in the Chair)

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDER 66 (2)—(MOTION)

The Minister of Finance (Enche' Tan Siew Sin): Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move,

That Standing Order 66 (2) be suspended in so far as it is necessary to enable the House to debate the motion on the Second Reading of the Supply Bill, 1964, for one more day on Monday, 23rd December, 1963.

Sir, I have no doubt that this motion will receive the general approbation to enable Honourable Members on both sides of the House to have one extra day.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Dr Lim Swee Aun): Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That Standing Order 66 (2) be suspended in so far as it is necessary to enable the House to debate the motion on the Second Reading of the Supply Bill, 1964, for one more day on Monday, 23rd December, 1963.

BILL

THE SUPPLY BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew: Mr Speaker, Sir, before the luncheon adjournment, I was winding up on my two major propositions that the two tests before Malaysia as a nation are, first, the immediate problem of confrontation and, second, the long-term problem of creating a more just and equal society within Malaysia. The events of the last six months, since Tokyo in June till now, have taken place with such rapidity that the full significance of the positions taken by our neighbours and ourselves has not really sunk home. The first significance that has not really sunk home, principally with those who still criticise the formation of Malaysia, or the manner in which Malaysia was formed, is that there is now no going back to the *status quo ante*—no going back to what it was in 1961, however tempting such a thought might be that we could all go back to what we were: North Borneo and Sarawak—peaceful back waters, life went on; timber trade good; Malaya all rosy in the garden; Singapore full of strikes and civil commotions, otherwise bustling and making money. There is no going back to that and there is nothing that we can do can reverse the events of the last two years.

The next two, three, maybe four years, confrontation may officially be on; confrontation may be off officially. The sooner it is off, the better it is. But I say that pressure is already on. As a counter-system in South-East Asia, offering by way of examples, by way of the alternatives, the possibilities for our neighbours, we must always be the subject of close attention. It is inevitable, we must expect it, and we must be able to survive a new crisis. What many of us have not realise is the enormous skill, diplomatic propaganda skill, of our neighbours in being able to mount an effort intended to corrode the very basis of the nation

by giving it such a harmless and engaging a slogan as "confrontation." It covers a multitude of things, some within the rights of international conventions of not trading with one's neighbour, or having anything to do with her, and the other of openly inciting, encouraging and participating in activities designed to bring a neighbouring Government down. The pressure along the periphery will always be there—Sarawak, and as long as Sabah looks like being enveloped by Philippino claims—up to recently, a certain abstemiousness in interfering in Sabah, but even now Tawau is involved so is Pulau Sebatik.

Very few could have been more correct, more earnest, in their desire to maintain cordial, if not friendly, relations than Singapore. By word, by deed, we wanted to be good friends and neighbours. It is with considerable reluctance that we had in the face of mounting evidence to admit, as I did on Wednesday evening in Singapore, that in fact once the fight is on very few holds are barred. I am convinced that this is our first and abiding test. Have we got the will and the stamina to say we are a nation, we are a people, regardless of all our differences of approach—the Constitution may be better for Sabah, Sarawak or Singapore, there may be more representation, there may be more changes in the Constitution. All that aside, the hard core of the problem is, are we a separate people in South-East Asia, or are we not? Once that will is melted, once that blandishment, the mind wanders back: what a rosy thing it could have been, if only we had not embarked on this. It is part of the business of a good propaganda outfit always to put a tempting alternative in the minds of those you wish to undermine: how nice for Singapore to be making \$204 million per annum out of the Indonesian trade—a handsome slice of our national income? Why not—we could have sold guns to both sides if we were still part of the British colonial system—sold guns and uniforms to Malaya and sold them to Indonesia? But is that really a practical, feasible alternative?

What I would like to hear from those who decry Malaysia is, what is the long-term alternative? Is there another way to survival? And I say if there is not, then it is our duty to resolve to make it succeed. Hence our anxiety that it must ultimately succeed, and the long-term test, which is probably the more difficult one, is whether we can, despite the disparate forces pulling in different directions—racial, cultural, religious, linguistic pulls—at a time when the heart lands of the various cultural groups are themselves undergoing a renaissance. Resurgent prides spread towards South-East Asia—Malays looking over their shoulders to see Indonesia, not as yet a successful nation but already a fairly powerful nation; an Encyclopædia in the Malay language that ought to delight the hearts of those who run the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, literary tracts, scientific treatises, several universities run in the Indonesian language; and all that is required now to congeal the amalgam is success. It may come, Mr Speaker, Sir, sooner than we all expect; and if it comes, then I say that is really the supreme test of Malaysia—or will the pull be so great that the easy way out is one of absorption?

I said earlier this morning that I speak as a Malaysian, but I think members will forgive me if I quite frankly say that today we have not come to that point in the evolution of a nation where we have all immersed our identities in one national whole. The test of that is whether a truly multi-racial national figure can emerge, but it has not yet. That is a statement of fact—something to be regretted. Willy-nilly, right at the back of the political sub-conscious and often the political conscious, a little arithmetic is being done. What happens to the people of immigrant stock in Malaysia? What is their future? And speaking as one of them and for them I say that it is in our interest to make Malaysia succeed—always one step ahead of our neighbours. The alternative is perdition. It is as simple as that.

The position is something akin to a vicious cycle. I do not see it within

the realms of possibility for an immigrant, for a political force based on immigrant stock, to wield the mechanics and sinews of power in Malaysia—not in this generation. By itself it is bound to set into motion a whole train of reactions. Whether it is desirable, whether it is right, or wrong, is another matter, but that is a statement of fact. If ever the ascendancy of people of immigrant stock reaches a point where, as the Prime Minister said this morning, the people of the indigenous stock feel that this is all they have got left in the Constitution, and after that if they lose that then all is gone, then I say the alternative that poses itself in the minds of all indigenous people is, why not merge in the larger whole? Must be! I would think that, if I were put in the opposite position of being in the indigenous stock facing the dilemma of being overwhelmed.

The long and short of it is this: that today we have at the outside ten years, time we have bought for ourselves, in which to try to make the system work. I am not talking here of the formalities of this Chamber or the Standing Orders. I am talking now of the real juxtaposition of raw power. We have succeeded so far, and any fair-minded person must concede that for a multitude of reasons Malaya has succeeded. Countries have got their independence all over Africa and all over Asia. One after another innovations have been tried, leading to grief. Here—true, there had been no radical alteration in the structure of society, but a surge forward was made; there has been no lowering of the standards of life. Why did it happen? Because one basic ingredient was recognised by those in authority, principally the Prime Minister, in that the secret of economic progress in Malaya was the combination of commercial and managerial skills by the immigrant peoples, or peoples of immigrant stock, providing the impetus for economic growth with the Malay rural based leaders holding the rein in order to use the economic benefits produced by the activities of the entrepreneurs and the workers to provide enough to

keep the Malay mass base in a happy frame of mind. That had been the basic formula for success.

What often worries me is, whether those not in authority are aware of this: that this is an extremely fragile arrangement, which could be so easily scrubbed away by one stroke of the pen of whoever is in authority; that if tomorrow some other party were to assume power and really put into operation—some other party which must include the Malay mass base element in it—if they were to implement some of the theories of economic growth and progress, which one has heard so often in the Opposition, then I say calamity would befall us. This happens in so many other places in Asia, let alone in Africa.

The totality of my argument really amounts to this, Mr Speaker, Sir. Assuming that we survive this first impact of confrontation, one, two, three, four, or more years—I think there is a fair chance that we will do that—are we able in five, at the outside in ten years, to reshape the structure of our society, to equalise opportunities within the country? I do not wish to present the Barisan Sosialis argument in democratic terms, but a valid point was scored, when they put this dilemma. Does one really solve rural poverty and distress by the creation of a counter group of “haves” in the Malay world? You have got it in the Chinese world—a group of “haves”; you have not got it in the Malay world. Is the problem resolved by creating, assuming that it can be created, an energetic and pushful group of entrepreneurs who move from bus licences into running of aeroplane companies, and Malayan Airways or Malaysian Airways into Malaysia International Airways, and so on? Is that the solution? My humble submission is that it is not—and can never will be—and the dilemma, with which we are all confronted is that for various reasons an education policy has already been implemented in the Federation, in Singapore, soon to be followed in Sarawak and Sabah, in which literacy becomes universal. In other words, the revolution of rising

expectations have already been set into motion, and it is no longer possible, when this generation grows up, to prevent a social revolution—a remodelling of opportunities and the structure of power in our society. And, my indictment of this Budget, as with all the other budgets, is that it has not set into train what one would call, euphemistically, social change for the better, social change to create a more equitable society where rewards are based on performance and efforts, not on property and rent.

As I have indicated at the opening, so much of the future hangs in the balance, the outcome of which we will know in a matter of months. Once the elections are over for the Federation of Malaya, then we really get down to grips. All the inhibitions, which must be cramping the Honourable the Minister of Finance, are also cramping us—the bits and pieces, the things that are slurred over, the real sharp conflicts which are muted for the time being. I do not think that it is disturbing, if I were to say that there are certain imbalances that will have to be ironed out over the few years of Malaysia—a relative spread of power and influence in the centre. Nobody in his right mind can say—and in fact in order that nobody can say—that the Federation Government of Malaya leant over backwards to give right of representation of forty seats to Sabah and Sarawak—very important men, Mr Speaker, Sir, in certain eventualities, arising out of events as yet unknown, the issue, which they must face up to as we have is this, Sir: a federation goes in one of two ways, and I heard this expounded with extreme vigour and clarity by a very able intellect at a conference in London. He said he was the Prime Minister of a big federation in the Commonwealth—that a federation goes either one of two ways, either centrifugal or centripetal—it is not static. It is either going further and further apart and breaks up, like it did in the Confederate States of America, and then the centre asserts itself by force and brings the bits and pieces together more closely in, or it becomes closer and closer

together by itself. The history of Canada and Australia has gone to show that all power must gravitate, if a federation is to survive, towards the centre. We accept that we entered the Federation with special terms, to soften the transition, but we are realistic enough to concede that, make or break, it is for us all together. And I would like to suggest to our forty distinguished Members from over the water that that goes for them also. The peculiar circumstances in which Malaysia came about brought about through a period of great courtship of the Borneo territories—which, I think, in many respects was an extremely fortunate thing for them. That being over, they will have to admit that they cannot have butter on both sides of their bread. They cannot have power in the centre in the proportion of forty out of 159—enormous power for 1.2 million people as against nearly 9 million, for the rest of Singapore and Malaya—and at the same time say, “We will not have you”. We understand the transitional difficulties. But really, as far as vulnerability goes, they are more vulnerable than any other part of the Federation, and the hiatus between the pre-Malaysia phase and the post-Malaysia phase has not quite been bridged. There, in their pursuit certain values were inculcated. The Federation has been formed. Willy-nilly, there is no going back, and our future lies upon our ability to transmit to our people—as yet different segments.

I do not think there is a Malayan leader today who can proclaim himself as the undisputed Malaysian leader. There is no such man. It will be foolish for anyone in Singapore to hold himself out as the oracle of any part of Malaya or the Borneo territories. Time must elapse before a sense of congealing and belonging comes about. The sooner that is done the better for us, because the alternative to that is the breaking up of what has been so laboriously put together, and the breaking up must mean, as I have earlier enunciated, a complete destruction of everything that we have worked for, because there is no going back. If

one could go back to Federation of Malaya, and then go back to the self-governing State of Singapore, and then forget the Borneo territories Sabah and Sarawak, maybe that is a rational proposition to be considered as an alternative. Malaysia having been founded, we having staked our lives on it, to retreat from any one part, even one iota of Sabah, or an unknown mountain range in Sarawak, is to be slowly and irrevocably pushed on to a policy of retreat that must end up in our being undermined. So, I say to Members on both sides of this House, the division lies between us in this first phase—not a division line between parties, not a division line between those governing parties in the various States, or Alliance parties, or non-Alliance parties. The line of division is between those who see the survival in Malaysia as the core of the problem, and are determined to see that it survives, and those who are determined to see that it will fail, as our communists are determined that it will fail. That is an international line. We have all agreed on that. To those who swing over from time to time between one side and the other, I say to them that the moment is fast approaching when they have to make a final decision. True, a point can be scored for election purposes that all these troubles were brought about by inept handling, rushing through with Malaysia, unnecessary truculence, and so on. All that said and done, where do we go from here? And I say at the end of this—probably, the last deliberations before elections in Malaya—let this Chamber resound with one note of complete unity that we stand for Malaysia; that we stand by Malaysia, and we are determined to see that it succeeds. If this august Chamber succeeds in doing that and nothing else, it would have been worth all the glorious words that were said of this building not so long ago, when His Majesty came and proclaimed it open. If we send out from this Chamber discordant notes of disunity, disloyalty, partisanship, the desire to manoeuvre into positions of advantage regardless of the final weakening of the overall position of the nation by

powers outside, then I say quite frankly that I do not see a future in representative government, if that is the meaning of representative government, where representatives are unable to respond to a challenge, literally, of life and death (*Applause*).

Enche' Ling Beng Siew (Sarawak):

Mr Speaker, Sir, many Members have spoken on the Supply Bill. They have spent long hours in the debate, much of which appeared to be trivial and even irrelevant. The main speeches of the Opposition Members seemed to be aiming at the coming general election. They take this opportunity to throw mud at the Alliance Government. This is a part of their election stunt and the public will not be hoodwinked. Sir, they alleged that the Alliance Government is corrupt and there has been mis-rule by the Alliance Government. To this I need only say, "Let us look at them. Even before they can do anything there are quarrels among the Opposition Parties. How can they become the Government?" Sir, if what they have alleged were true, we will not have the achievement in rural development, the construction of the numerous factories in the country, the free education system and the economic and political stability that we have now.

Sir, the prosperity of our country and the achievement so far obtained are concrete evidence of the success of the Alliance Government. People of all walks of life supported it and will support the Alliance Government.

The Honourable Member, Mr Stephen Yong and other Honourable Members from Sarawak have stressed on the point that since Sarawak is a member of Malaysia there should be equal treatment for the Borneo States as the other States of Malaya. This is the reason that we would insist on the provision of universal free primary education, establishment of vocational schools, the treatment of teachers and civil servants, and their age of retirement should similarly be introduced in the Borneo States. Perhaps there are technical difficulties in this regard but I believe that the Alliance Government

in the near future will attend to it; in any case, I believe the Alliance Government will improve the conditions in Sarawak.

Mr Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members from the Opposition stated that the establishment of Malaysia was the cause for the Indonesian confrontation and armed aggression and the creation of the tense atmosphere in this region. To this I would invite the Honourable Members concerned to analyse the situation calmly and logically with a view of finding out the real causes of the present policy of Indonesia and the action she has taken. Obviously the causes of the tension did not come from Malaysia. It was the deliberate attempt of the Indonesian Government to prevent the people of Sarawak and Sabah to attain independence.

Sir, I might say that the Indonesian attitude was, in fact, a disguise in her attempt to incorporate Sarawak and Sabah into our sphere of influence. To this the people of Sarawak and Sabah refuse to accept. After all, before Malaysia was brought into being, the Unofficial Members in the Legislative Council were invited to take part in the drawing up of the terms of entry and the same were debated in the Legislative Council concerned and approved. So the establishment of Malaysia was not the work of the British and Malaya alone. We had entered in Malaysia after careful consideration at all levels, the final result was the free choice of the people. Sir, I would like to explain the necessity for Sarawak to become a member of Malaysia, because many Honourable Members may not be very clear about the conditions prevailing in Sarawak. She has a land mass of an area nearly that of Malaya but has only a population of less than 800,000. She has very little natural resources and has very weak economy. We have no army neither could we afford to maintain one. Sarawak, therefore, could never be able to defend herself against any aggressor or to keep hundreds of miles of boundary free from being encroached upon by outsiders. In short, we cannot survive

on our own. Therefore, the only solution for us was to become a member of a large group consisting of States with which we have many things in common. Malaysia is, therefore, inevitable as far as we are concerned unless we wish to be dominated by others.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not believe that the loyal citizens of Sarawak would wish to have Sarawak included into the map of Indonesia. Because we take this stand our Indonesian neighbour has to resort to the trick of supplying arms to our misguided youths. These youths are not only made use of by foreign powers but also by the communists. The senseless killing of the innocent people by the bandits and the extreme communist elements will not only earn a bad name for Indonesia but will unite our people the more.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I am glad to hear from our Honourable Opposition Member, Mr Stephen Yong, when he said that he would advise and stop his Party members from being made use of by the Indonesians, that he would stop those treacherous acts and that he will support the Government to resist external aggression. It augurs well for Malaysia, for Malaysia is united and without discrimination as to race. I have no doubt that we will be able to build up a happy and prosperous nation.

Sir, I support the motion.

Dr Burhanuddin bin Mohd. Noor (Besut): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berdiri ia-lah kerana menambah lagi penerangan daripada Parti saya dalam general policy debate ini. Kita telah banyak mendengar hujjah² yang di-kemukakan berkenaan dengan bagaimana pendirian masing² dari pihak Kerajaan dan dari pihak parti² pembangkang dalam chara hendak menggunakan belanjawan bekalan yang ada di-hadapan kita ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bahawa ta'at setia kita kepada negara dan bangsa dan ugama ini-lah yang menjadi bukti chara bagaimana belanjawan yang hendak di-belanjakan masing² dengan chara fikiran dan dengan chara pendirian-nya. Perkara yang penting berhubung

dengan belanjawan ini ia-lah ucapan kertas putih Yang Teramat Mulia Perdana Menteri pada 11/12 hari bulan yang lalu yang bagitu juga ucapan² yang telah di-sampaikan oleh Menteri Kewangan itu sendiri. Ini-lah yang menjadi general policy yang penting sa-kali kita bahathkan dalam hendak menentukan perbekalan kita ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam keseluruhan perbahathan yang telah di-jalankan di-dalam Dewan yang mulia ini pehak Kerajaan sudah tentu-lah menyokong dengan sa-kuat²-nya pada apa bentuk belanjawan yang telah di-kemukakan dalam Dewan ini. Bagi pehak pembangkang telah menaborkan fikiran²-nya, pendirian²-nya dengan chara bentuk itu-lah yang mereka yakin bahawa itu-lah chara tegoran² yang menunjokkan di-mana kesilapan dan kesalahan² yang terbabas dari sebelum Kerajaan menubuhkan Malaysia lagi, sa-hingga tertuboh-nya Malaysia dan benchana² yang sa-makin memunchak lagi anchaman² daripada apa yang telah kita dapat dengar dan saksikan sendiri berlaku di-dalam dan di-luar negeri daripada ucapan Perdana Menteri kita sudah tiga kali di-dalam Dewan ini dan berulang² pula berkenaan dengan kechaman² daripada parti pembangkang. Tentu-lah kalau hendak saya ulang bachakan satu persatu ucapan Perdana Menteri itu baru saya bahath akan mengambil masa yang panjang, kerana perkara ini dan bagitu juga daripada ucapan Menteri Kewangan telah nyata-lah bagaimana budget kita ini telah mengadap anchaman² ekonomi, anchaman² social, anchaman² politik dari confrontasi Indonesia yang sudah pun ketara rugi-nya yang telah di-kemukakan 250 juta dan bagitu juga dalam ucapan yang di-kemukakan oleh Perdana Menteri Singapura membayangkan beberapa lagi kerugian yang akan menimpa kepada Malaysia kita ini. Ini ada-lah berpuncha sikap yang di-lakukan oleh pehak Kerajaan Indonesia dengan confrontasi-nya. Tuan yang di-Pertua, kerana banyak perkara² yang patut saya sebut supaya lebeh jelas pendirian PAS dalam chara bagaimana belanjawan bekalan itu hendak di-belanjakan. Ucapan Perdana Menteri dalam kertas putih-nya

telah ketara bahawa negara kita sekarang ini di-dalam anchaman, anchaman dari berbagai² segi, daripada segi military, anchaman daripada segi pertahanan, anchaman daripada segi ekonomi, daripada segi social, daripada segi politik dan segi yang lain lagi. Ucapan Perdana Menteri Singapura tadi memberikan satu pandangan yang kedua belah pehak supaya dapat mengambil perhatian, jadi perkara yang penting pada kita sekarang ini ia-lah bagaimana chara melepaskan diri kita daripada anchaman dan supaya dapat-lah kita menchari jalan keluar, jalan menyelamatkan bangsa dan negara kita ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada masa wakil Kuala Langat ada menyebutkan bahawa Malaysia ini ia-lah Alliance baby, dengan menyatakan Malaysia anak daripada Perikatan maka timbul-lah daripada beberapa keadaan² dan fikiran ra'ayat, timbul pertanyaan, ada-kah anak itu legal atau ada-kah anak itu anak illegal.

Ini ada-lah perkara yang menyebabkan fikiran² dan tuduhan² yang mengatakan pehak Pembangkang ini tidak setia kapada negara, tuduhan² yang mengatakan pehak Pembangkang ini menjadi alat membantu pehak² yang di-pandang musuh sa-bagai Indonesia itu. Apa yang nyata, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, bahawa Malaysia ini concept pendirian-nya sa-bagaimana kata per-patah Melayu "rumah siap pahat berbunyi". Jadi ini perkara nyata sa-kali bahawa bangkangan² daripada pehak Pembangkang yang merupakan ta'at setia terhadap tanah ayer dan penubohan Malaysia itu ada-lah gopoh-gapah dan chara semborono yang tidak tersusun-nya tidak dapat merupakan perpaduan dari pehak yang sa-patut-nya di-wujudkan perpaduan bangsa. Dan dengan jalan menyatakan pendirian national kita pada satu concept dapat-lah kita hadap dengan perpaduan national yang sunggo² merupakan satu bangsa.

Dato' Yang di-Pertua, keadaan negara kita sekarang di-dalam keadaan terancham dari luar dan dalam di-katakan oleh komunis Indonesia. Dan kita juga dalam keadaan yang sulit membawa burok-nya lagi dengan

putus-nya Diplomatic dengan Philipina yang sa-makin memburokkan keadaan-nya. Manakala dari dalam timbul kebangkitan² yang di-sebutkan dalam ucapan Perdana Menteri dalam kertas puteh-nya, ia-itu kebangkitan² subversive dan kerana itu timbul-lah penangkapan² sa-bagai yang di-katakan oleh Perdana Menteri itu timbul-lah ugutan² Kerajaan terhadap ra'ayat dan penangkapan² yang di-salah gunakan Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri dengan menangkap ulama² yang menjalankan tugas ugama. Perkara yang saperti ini, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, adalah berlaku kezaliman tetapi kezaliman yang berlaku di-atas ulama² yang menjalankan tugas kewajipan ugama-nya menyampaikan kebenaran kehendak² Tuhan terhadap manusia ini telah di-pandang zalim dan telah di-tangkap. Tetapi perkara yang saperti ini bukan-lah hanya pernah berlaku kepada Kerajaan Perikatan malah telah berlaku beberapa Kerajaan² lain yang dahulu. Apa yang berlaku, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, bahawa perbuatan² Kerajaan menekan kebenaran yang di-jalankan oleh ulama² itu yang sabenar-nya mereka hendak menyam-paikan ferman Tuhan.

Mr Speaker: Order! Order! Saya telah di-beritahu ia-itu perkara tangkapan itu akan di-bawa di-dalam Mahkamah. Jadi oleh sebab benda itu ada bersangkutan dengan Mahkamah, tidak boleh-lah di-bahathkan di-sini sama ada benda itu betul atau tidak kerana kata orang Puteh "subjudice".

Dr Burhanuddin bin Mohd. Noor: Dato' Yang di-Pertua, sa-orang daripada-nya maseh lagi di-dalam tahanan dan dua orang telah di-lepaskan. Tetapi akibat daripada itu-lah patut kita pandang supaya jangan berulang lagi. Apa yang telah berlaku kepada Kerajaan yang telah membuat kezaliman terhadap ulama² ini, Kerajaan itu akan menghadapi kekacauan dan huru hara yang besar kerana itu-lah saya bayangkan perkara itu, Dato' Yang di-Pertua.

Dato' Yang di-Pertua, sa-panjang perbahathan kita di-dalam Dewan ini berkenaan dengan bekalan ini, telah timbul-lah tudoh-menudoh dan salah-menyalahkan di-antara parti Kerajaan

dengan parti Pembangkang, tidak-lah perlu saya ulang lagi kerana kita sama² ingat tudoh-menudoh yang saperti ini, di-dalam keadaan negara kita yang terancam ini tidak-lah akan membawa perubahan dan pertolongan pada negeri dan bangsa kita. Tinggal-lah tudoh-menudoh itu dan dengan sa-chara perjalanan yang sudah berlaku ini saya tidak nampak bahawa satu perubahan baik yang akan dapat kita bawa. Dan Kerajaan kita dengan menghentam Indonesia dan Philippine, itu juga tidak-lah membawa kebaikan kepada negara dan tidak menambahkan baik kepada ra'ayat. Soal yang menjadi pokok kepada kita sekarang ini, ia-lah kita berhadapan dengan ancaman, yang pertama bagaimana kata Perdana Menteri Singapura tadi, dugaan yang pertama kita akan hadap sekarang, sama ada kita akan menchari jalan keluar dan menyelamatkan negara kita atau kita akan terus dengan keangkohan kita. Apa juga hentaman kepada kita, kita hentam balek, apa juga jawapan Philippine, kita jawab pula dengan keangkohan kita. Ini kita akan berhadapan-lah, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, walau pun semua perbelanjaan budget yang ada sekarang kita gunakan untuk pertahanan menentang jiran kita tetapi kita akan menghadap kehanchoran juga, jangankan selesai malah tambah kusut dengan keadaan yang ada ini. Jadi apa yang penting saya fikirkan bahawa kita harus-lah menumpukan chara bagaimana kita menchari jalan keluar dan bagaimana kita menchari jalan selamat negara Malaysia yang baharu kita tubuhkan dengan kita berbalah dari mula lagi semenjak kita menubuhkan Malaysia ini. Tetapi, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, saya yakin walau pun pehak Pembangkang ini dengan pendirian-nya yang begitu tajam, mengecham pehak Kerajaan bahawa chita² kita ada-lah sama dalam hendak menyelamatkan negara dan menyelamatkan bangsa supaya terdiri-lah bangsa kita yang baharu ini dengan satu bentok yang mulia dan dudok sama tinggi, berdiri sama tegak dengan bangsa² lain.

Dato' Yang di-Pertua, sa-makin bertambah-lah kemarahan dan kechaman parti² Kerajaan terhadap

pehak Pembangkang, bertambah pula kemarahan dan kechaman pehak Pembangkang terhadap parti Kerajaan. Dalam keadaan negara kita terancam sekarang apa-lah guna-nya kemarahan² itu. Saya tidak memikirkan bahawa kita berbahath di-sini kerana hendak mendengar sedap dan pandai berchakap sahaja sedangkan soal untuk menyelamatkan negara kita sa-makin menuju keruntohan dan ka-hanchoran. Kita tidak-lah suka Kerajaan kita berlutut sahaja kalau kechaman² dan ugutan² yang mengancham kemerdekaan kita dan kehormatan bangsa kita, apa yang kita mahu langkah yang betul dan bijaksana daripada Kerajaan ka-dalam dan ka-luar. Yang menjadi masalaah, yang di-titek-beratkan di atas perjuangan kita ia-lah keselamatan negara dan keutamaan bangsa dan ugama kita. Ini-lah perkara yang menjadi patut, yang menjadi titek-berat kita mendalamkan, dan kita bahathkan di-dalam tempat yang paling tinggi letak-nya harapan meshuarat bagi seluroh negara kita ini. Ada-kah boleh selamat negara kita ini dengan chara pemerintahan Perikatan sekarang ini, dengan chara bertengkar dan berbantah² dengan chara tudoh-menudoh sa-bagaimana yang sedang berjalan sekarang ini. Saya rasa pemerintah sekarang ini dengan chara yang demikian tidak akan dapat di-selamatkan negara kita, tidak dapat, bahkan kita akan sa-makin berhanyut kapada kehanchoran kekuatan kita sekarang, kerana kekuatan kita sekarang ini tidak di-asaskan di-atas kekuatan perpaduan ra'ayat yang sedarkan hasrat negeri ini. Tidak di-letakkan di-atas kekuatan ekonomi kita sendiri, tidak di-dasarkan di-atas pertahanan kekuatan kita sendiri, dari jiwa kesedaran, dari semenjak asas perjuangan ra'ayat bumi putera negeri ini. Ini-lah perkara yang sudah selalu di-sebutkan dan di-kecham oleh pehak² Pembangkang sa-hingga menudoh mengatakan bahawa Kerajaan ini menjalankan dasar capitalist lagi, bergantung kapada capitalist luar, maseh lagi mengikut kapada dasar² neo-colonialism. Itu-lah satu perkara, perkara penjajahan baharu yang di-tentang oleh seluroh ra'ayat yang mahu menghapuskan, mengikis fahaman² penjajahan dari muka dunia ini. Jadi, pehak Kerajaan

maseh lagi terikat dengan keadaan² itu. Ini ada-lah satu perkara yang negara kita akan hadapi pada tahun yang pertama ya'ani beberapa bulan sahaja kita telah merasa kesulitan², kerugian² yang sa-makin hari sa-makin membesar dan sa-makin memberat dan sa-makin menekan kapada keadaan² kita.

Ini-lah perkara yang patut kita fikirkan. Soal melepaskan sedap dengan kata² sahaja, sedap mendengar, jawab-menjawab tentang masalaah yang akan mengancham kita, yang akan menghanchorkan negara kita yang maseh terbiar dengan keadaan. Sebab²-nya sa-bagaimana yang pernah saya katakan dalam Dewan ini sa-belum Malaysia di-tubuhkan lagi bahawa siasatan Kerajaan Perikatan ini telah salah taja, telah salah bentok dan pernah saya ibaratkan saperti pantun Melayu:

Kokok kata ayam
Kichau kata murai
Sudah bongkok dek menganyam
Salah dari mulai.

Bagaimana-kah akan di-betulkan keadaan kesilapan yang ada sekarang ini, kalau berlarut² sa-bagai keadaan sekarang juga? Bagaimana pangkal-nya, tetapi manakala kita berlarut² ka-hujung, maka sa-makin besar-lah jurang kesulitan² dan jurang ka-hanchoran yang kita tujukan.

Kata orang² tua, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam keadaan kita saperti sekarang ini ia-itu kalau salah di-hujung jalan, balek-lah ka-pangkal jalan. Ini mudah sahaja bunyi-nya, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, tetapi ini ada-lah kata² hikmat yang kalau kita fikirkan dan kalau kita tenangkan di-mana sebab-nya puncha maka Malaysia jadi bagini, maka perkara confrontasi terhadap Malaysia harus kita fikirkan halus². Apa yang ternyata pada kita sekarang ini ia-lah sa-bagai bukti yang timbul terhadap ekonomi, social, politik, pertahanan, military semuanya sa-kali ta' dapat kita memahami dan mengikut-nya apa yang ada lahir di-hadapan kita sekarang ini, maka puncha kita bahathkan sahaja apa yang ada lahir sekarang dengan kita melupakan pangkal² dan puncha masalaah yang timbul. Jikalau kita

sungguh² hendak memulehkan balek dan membetulkan kembali kekusutan di-dalam negeri kita sendiri yang mana pehak kita tidak dapat sama berdiri, pada hal kalau kita tanya pada hati kechil kita, tidak ada satu pun baik Pembangkang mana sa-kali pun yang tidak sukakan negeri-nya ma'mur, negeri-nya kuat, negeri-nya dapat berkembang besar dan luas tetapi sa-bagaimana yang di-namakan Malaysia sekarang ini bertentang dengan hasrat ra'ayat dan dengan sendiri-nya bahawa bentok Malaysia itu ada-lah mengkhianati chita² bagi seluroh ra'ayat yang memperjuangkan chita² nusantara, tetapi kenapa maka terjadi bagini saperti keadaan sekarang ini. Ini-lah pangkal-nya yang kita telah mengkaji balek, kalau hasrat ra'ayat sejati ini kita lupa di-sapanjang perbahathan ini, saya dengar ini ada-lah sa-mata² kita membahathkan soal hujung ranting daun dan charang². Kita lupa, lupa kapada masaalah batang-nya kita lupa kapada soal pokok dan kita lupa kapada soal akar² yang menimbulkan bichara dengan terbentok-nya Malaysia kapada nusantara hari ini dan seluroh kepulauan Melayu.

Saya suka hendak menarek perhatian ka-arrah ini sa-muga belanjawan yang ada pada hari ini mendapat perhatian, dapat-lah kita alirkan kapada satu jalan bentok ka-luar dan bentok menyelamatkan bangsa dan tanah ayer kita. Kekusutan di-dalam negeri yang sudah kita ketahui dari bangkangan² dan dari pehak² Pembangkang, bagi pehak Kerajaan harus-lah menghalusi dalam perkara ini, jangan-lah dilepaskan bagitu sahaja sa-bagai satu perasaan yang membuta tuli dan di-tudoh tidak ta'at setia mereka kapada negeri ini, kerana pendirian dan chara fahaman, chara perasaan yang berbedza². Ini-lah perkara-nya yang pehak Kerajaan harus dan wajib dapat menghadapi dengan chara bijaksana, bagaimana chara hendak mempersatukan di-dalam keadaan yang sa-patut-nya negara kita saperti ini timbul, datang-nya perasaan sadar dan bersatu untuk kekuatan national yang betul yang dapat pula perpaduan kita itu di-sambut oleh jiran² kita.

Ini-lah pokok yang penting saya rasa. Dan kita sekarang ini patut membetulkan kembali kekusutan luar negeri dengan jiran kita, terutama-nya Indonesia dan Philipina hendak-lah kita balek ka-pangkal jalan, pangkal jalan kita ia-lah perjuangan bumi putera habis²an mengikis penjajah. Perjuangan bumi putera yang tulin, kerana perjuangan bumi putera belum selesai lagi. Ini mesti-lah kita selesaikan. Ini-lah perkara yang saya hendak ingatkan. Ini-lah perkara yang patut kita kaji dan menjadi pokok kapada kita untuk berfikir dan menjadi pokok kapada kita untuk hendak menchari jalan ka-luar dan menchari jalan terselamat.

Saya suka tegaskan lagi, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, bahawa perjuangan bumi putera mengikis penjajah belum lagi selesai, kita maseh lagi di-dalam bentok² dan tingkat² perjuangan yang mesti kita selesaikan dahulu, dan dengan sebab tidak selesai ini-lah maka timbul-nya kekusutan. Kita telah membanggakan negeri kita telah merdeka, tetapi kita telah lupa bahawa dasar bumi putera bagi memperjuangkan kemerdekaan belum lagi selesai, dan perjuangan ugama rasmi kita belum di-perjuangkan oleh Kerajaan pada mendaulatkan Al-Kur'an, hukum yang tertinggi. Ini-lah perkara yang penting. Ini-lah dua pokok yang menjadi punchak dan puncha perjuangan kita sa-belum merdeka lagi dan sa-telah kita merdeka, itu-lah yang kita hendak penohkan dan kita sempurnakan dan ini belum di-sempurnakan lagi. Ini-lah perkara yang mesti di-sedari dan ini-lah perkara yang akan dapat kita membandingkan bagaimana-kah timbul-nya tentangan² dari Indonesia dan tentangan² dari Philipina yang sa-baka dengan kita. Dan sudah kita katakan yang kita ini sudah merdeka, perjuangan kita terbengkalai, perjuangan chita² bumi putera terbengkalai, perjuangan chita² Islam kita terbengkalai, kita sebok dengan soal² ranting, soal² detail sahaja dan kita melupakan soal dua pokok yang di-sebutkan tadi. Ini tentu-lah bagi pehak Perikatan sa-bagaimana biasa-nya di-jawab apa yang kita tidak buat, kita telah

mengadakan pertandingan membaca Kur'an, kita telah membena mesjid daripada wang loteri, kita telah membantu sekolah agama, kita akan mengadakan Kongress Islam Regional dalam bulan hadapan dan ada lagi yang bermacam² saperti itu, tetapi ini, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, ada-lah detail-nya, atau ranting²-nya, dan ini bukan menjadi pokok dalam perjuangan menerusi, menyuarakan perjuangan bumi putera dan perjuangan Islam yang sa-benar-nya. Dato' Yang di-Pertua, apa yang paling hebat dan paling dahshat sa-kali Kerajaan Perikatan telah chuba hendak menjahanamkan soal² pokok itu di-hanyutkan kepada soal baharu mengikut aliran kepentingan dan muslihat saki baki yang terkenal dengan neo-colonial dan kapitalis. Saya mengulangi perkara ini, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, bahawa saya sedar dan mengetahui serta mengikuti perjuangan bumi putera negeri ini semenjak tahun 1935 lagi. Saya sudah dua tiga kali masuk penjara kerana menentang penjajah, bukan sa-bagai orang jahat dan bukan sa-bagai kominis, tetapi sa-bagai nationalist dan muslim berjuang untuk menegakkan kembali kedaulatan bangsa dan agama. Sunggoh pun tuduhan² maseh lagi di-limparkan oleh pehak Parti Perikatan kepada saya dengan tuduhan kominis dan lain², tetapi itu, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, Tuhan-lah yang akan mengetahui bagaimana usaha² yang telah berjalan berserta dengan perjuangan² yang ikhlas dan jujur hendak meneruskan chita² kemerdekaan seluroh bumi putera dan nusantara bangsa Melayu. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita telah lupa soal pokok; perjuangan ra'ayat yang dua itu. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ma'afkan-lah saya dalam chara menerangkan Belanjawan ini kerana tidak akan jelas kalau saya hanya berchakap soal perkara ranting², daun² dan charang² yang tidak mengikut balek soal pokok tadi.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, manakala UMNO di-tubuhkan kita tahu dan sedar, dan saya salah sa-orang yang sama² menubuhkan UMNO itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dan sa-hingga sa-sudah saya keluar daripada tahanan Pulau

Sekijang tahun 1950-1953 saya serta lagi dalam menyokong chita² bangsa Melayu dan chita² nusantara dan chita² bumi putera yang di-perjuangkan oleh UMNO itu sendiri dari mula-nya UMNO hendak mempertahankan hak ketuanan negeri ini. Dan sa-sudah itu bagaimana kita pehak yang progressive hendak merdeka, pehak UMNO tidak mahu merdeka. Maka dengan runtunan semangat dasar perjuangan yang saya sebutkan dua perkara tadi, ia-itu pehak bumi putera yang hendak merdeka itu, maka dengan kesedaran yang beransor, gulongan UMNO yang tidak mahu merdeka telah mahu merdeka.

Mr Speaker: Bagaimana perkara itu berkait dengan perbahathan yang ada di-hadapan Majlis ini?

Dr Burhanuddin bin Mohd. Noor: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kaitan-nya ia-lah berkenaan dengan perkembangan Belanjawan kita ini. Kalau tidak di-kaji dari pangkal dan awal kita tidak dapat tujukan Belanjawan kita menurut pandangan saya menchari jalan keluar dan menchari jalan selamat.

Mr Speaker: Jangan-lah di-panjangkan sangat pangkal itu.

Dr Burhanuddin bin Mohd. Noor: Terima kaseh, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Jadi sa-sudah beraleh UMNO kepada Perikatan, dan dengan bentok Perikatan itu-lah terchapai kemerdekaan kita dan dengan kemerdekaan itu-lah pehak Perikatan telah dapat mewakili ra'ayat dalam pilehan raya pada tahun 1955 kemudian menang lagi dalam pilehan raya bagi mewakili ra'ayat supaya dapat memerintah negeri ini dan meneruskan perjuangan chita² ra'ayat, chita² yang menjadi dua pokok yang saya katakan tadi. Maka kapada pehak Perikatan-lah terletak-nya harapan yang banyak oleh ra'ayat negeri ini bahawa apa yang di-wakili oleh ra'ayat, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-lah supaya chita² asal itu dapat terus di-perjuangkan dengan menuju kesempurnaan chita² bumi putera dan kesempurnaan kapada chita² Ugama Rasmi kita itu. Maka terus-lah pehak Perikatan menggunakan perwakilan ra'ayat kapada politik Perikatan yang berjalan sekarang. Bukan-lah lagi memperjuangkan chita² bumi putera

dan bukan-lah lagi jadi chita² Ugama Rasmi negeri ini menurut amanat ra'ayat yang memilih mereka.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sekarang sudah menyatakan perkara itu manakala hendak di-perjuangkan balek kebangsaan, hak bumi putera yang di-perjuangkan oleh UMNO dahulu sudah kena tekan, dan manakala kita hendak memperjuangkan ugama yang maseh di-perjuangkan oleh PAS ini di-atas dasar yang dua perkara tadi telah mendapat tekanan daripada pehak Perikatan. Ini-lah tekanan² (suppression) yang menimbulkan perkara² kekusutan di-dalam meneruskan chita² perjuangan ra'ayat bumi putera dan chita² ugama kita. Chontoh perkara itu nyata, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, seperti kejadian di-Trengganu bahawa ra'ayat negeri Trengganu telah mengangkat wakil mereka untuk meneruskan chita² Islam oleh PAS dan memperjuangkan dua dasar bumi putera dan chita² Ugama Rasmi negeri ini, maka dengan corruption politik Perikatan, Kerajaan PAS Trengganu telah di-rampas oleh Perikatan dan di-perintah dengan tidak mengadakan pilihan raya. Di-sini-lah moral politik telah di-chabul, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Ini satu perkara suppression yang saya sebutkan tadi yang menimbulkan perlanggaran dengan moral perjuangan politik hendak meneruskan chita² bumi putera dan chita² Islam itu. Ini-lah gambar politik yang tidak sihat telah berjalan. Saya tidak mempersoalkan orang² atau pun peribadi wakil ra'ayat, tetapi yang saya persoalkan sekarang ini ia-lah chita² bumi putera dan chita² Ugama Rasmi tidak di-perjuangkan oleh ra'ayat dari sa-belum merdeka. Erti-nya, tidak lagi di-perjuangkan oleh pehak Perikatan yang menjadi harapan ra'ayat dari pangkal perjuangan itu. Jadi sekarang telah terhenti perjuangan asli itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ini-lah root atau pangkal pokok yang penting sa-kali di-fikirkan kembali dalam kita menghadapi konfrantasi dan dalam kita menghadap murak-marek anchaman² dari luar negeri. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, usaha² Perikatan hendak menjatuhkan Kerajaan PAS di-Kelantan sa-belum pilihan raya yang di-

tetapkan dalam Perlembagaan. Kita lihat berkali² di-suarakan oleh Perikatan. Layanan Belanjawan tahun² yang sudah kapada Kerajaan Negeri tidak 'adil dan tidak saksama; berjalan dengan chara pileh kaseh, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Ini ada-lah perkara yang telah berjalan yang saya katakan, dan ini akan berjalan lagi dengan chara bentok Belanjawan yang ada ini seperti bentok Belanjawan yang sudah. Perdana Menteri Singapura tadi mengatakan bahawa bentok Budget ini ia-lah "business budget". Saya menyokong perkataan-nya itu. Ini-lah perkara suppression, ini-lah perkara corruption politik yang penting di-kaji dan di-timbangkan sa-mula supaya datang balek rasa perpaduan bangsa dan chita² kebangsaan kita yang sama² dahulu kita dalam satu chita² yang sama menentang penjajah. Setelah merdeka tenaga² itu di-ketepikan, tenaga² itu tidak di-gembelngkan lagi. Mereka mengambil jalan masing². Lain jalan tidak ada. Manakala mereka telah di-tudoh, maka bertentang-lah mereka dengan pehak Kerajaan. Ini-lah perkara yang mesti di-sedari oleh Kerajaan yang bertanggung-jawab, yang mesti menghadap perkara ini dengan penoh bijaksana, lebeh² dalam keadaan negara kita yang terancham ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, maka kerana itu saya sentoh dan ingatkan kembali dalam keadaan negara yang demikian keadaan-nya sekarang balek-lah kita kapada chita² perjuangan bumi putera itu, dan balek-lah kita kapada perjuangan mendaulatkan Kur'an supaya jadi betul² Islam menjadi Ugama Rasmi negeri ini. Ini-lah dua pokok yang akan dapat kita menchari jalan keluar dan jalan selamat dan kekuatan perpaduan yang akan jadi satu bantuan yang paling kuat kapada ra'ayat negeri ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Tuhan telah berfirman, mengingatkan seluroh manusia yang bererti, "Bila kamu berselisih dalam satu perkara kamu balekkan-lah kamu kapada Allah dan Rasul . . ." Jangan-lah kita rujok kapada perkara yang lain daripada Allah dan Rasul.

Saya katakan itu kerana mengingatkan Islam itu ugama rasmi dan

pelajaran² itu ada-lah hendak digunakan untuk kehormatan chita² itu. Jadi, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, ini-lah dua perkara yang sangat penting saya rasakan kerana di-situ-lah terletak kekuatan rakaksa bagi negeri ini kerana kekuatan kita manakala di-isi dengan keyakinan Tuhan memegang kapada pimpinan Rasul kita balek kapada perjuangan keseluruhan chita² bumi putera maka di-situ-lah terletak-nya kekuatan kita dan di-sana terletak satu magnetic yang akan menarik kekuatan keseluruhan jiran tetangga kita itu. Saya sambut kata Perdana Menteri dalam ucapan-nya dalam Dewan ini dalam menggulung usul Undang² Kesalahan Pilehan Raya yang menyatakan bahawa beliau itu berpolitik ia-lah kerana sayangkan ugama, shabas! ini, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam ucapan beliau pada muka 15 dalam kertas putih itu juga menyebutkan :

"In these times of stress and strain, let us renew our determination through faith in God to make a stout hearts and clear head."

Dato' Yang di-Pertua, kata² itu saya sambut dengan baik sa-bagaimana dia menyambut kata² saya dalam masa saya menerangkan pendirian saya menentang Undang² Tambahan Kesalahan Pilehan Raya dahulu itu. Saya kemukakan, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, supaya keseluruhan perbelanjaan yang di-bentangkan hari ini menaikkan semangat atau mengembalikan semangat balek ka-pangkal jalan. Dato' Yang di-Pertua, saya suka shorkan supaya kita belak ka-pangkal jalan, dan hendak-lah kita benar² balek kapada dasar takwallah, kita dengar terang berulang² bagi pihak Kerajaan bahawa yang di-takut-nya sa-kali ia-lah musuh kominis, maka tidak ada jalan yang paling besar dan paling selamat, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, kita hanya takut kapada kominis, hendak menentang kominis dengan kata², dengan kewangan dan dengan kekuatan sa-mata² tidak akan dapat kita bendong, dan tidak akan dapat jaminan keselamatan kita, maka jalan yang paling tepat ia-lah kita balek kapada takwallah.

Mr Speaker: Gunakan bahasa Melayu, jangan gunakan bahasa Arab.

Dr Burhanuddin bin Mohd. Noor: Ma'ana-nya takut kapada Allah. Dato' Yang di-Pertua, kata di-dalam Al-Quran: Wama Annasru Illa Min 'Indillah. Tidak ada pertolongan melainkan dari sisi Allah. Jadi, di-dalam keadaan ini bukan sahaja Malaysia yang bertentang dengan Malaysia, tetapi dunia barat semua-nya bertentang dengan Malaysia, dan kominis pun bertentang dengan dunia barat. Allah telah menerangkan di-dalam Al-Quran orang yang beriman hendaklah mengambil sa-suatu perkara yang pertengahan tidak chenderong kapada barat dan tidak chenderong kapada timur, dan bantuan yang betul² ada di-sediakan di-janjikan Tuhan yang menjadikan alam dan yang menjadikan belok kominis, dan Tuhan akan menunjokkan kapada kita bahawa bantuan² di-dalam keadaan morak-marek dunia sekarang ini hanya ada di-sisi Tuhan dan di-kembalikan kapada Tuhan, jangan-lah kita di-sini, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, hanya berchakap di-mulut sahaja tidak betul² menjalankan takwa kapada Allah itu. Saya suka-lah membachakan di-sini bagaimana benchana dan rosak-nya, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, Allah mengingatkan kita tidak sunggoh² menjalankan pengakuan kita terhadap ugama Allah itu. Ferman Tuhan di-dalam Surat Fatir ayat 42-43—Mereka bersumpah dengan Allah sa-besar² sumpah ia-itu jika datang kapada mereka Nazir, pengancam menakutkan kita kapada azab Tuhan, neschaya mereka itu menerima pertunjak janji mereka itu tadi lebeh daripada satu sendi yang lain, tetapi manakala datang anchaman² daripada peringatan Rasul maka mereka tidak-lah menimbangkan sa-lain daripada bertambah lari 42. Kerana takbur di-muka bumi dan kerana tipuan yang jahat. Dan tiada-lah yang di-timpa tipuan yang jahat itu sa-lain daripada yang empunya penipu daripada kebenaran itu—43. Ini-lah perkara yang mesti kita sedar jangan sampai kita balek bagaimana persumpahan itu.

Enche' Abdul Rauf bin A. Rahman: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, on a point of Order 36 (1) apa yang di-chakapkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Besut

itu ia-lah berkenaan dengan ugama sahaja, jadi, ini sudah lain daripada subject yang kita bahathkan sekarang ini.

Dr Burhanuddin bin Mohd. Noor: Dato' Yang di-Pertua, maksud saya ia-lah

Mr Speaker: Order! Order! Yang Berhormat dari Besut itu betul, dengan sebab dalam perbahathan kita ini sangat-lah luas, pertama berkenaan dengan konfrantasi, dan sa-lain ucapan Menteri Kewangan kita ada dua ucapan daripada Yang Teramat Mulia Perdana Menteri, kerana itu Ahli² boleh membahathkan atas apa juga yang di-chakapkan oleh Perdana Menteri dalam kertas itu. Ayat² Quran yang di-bangkitkan-nya itu bukan-nya hujah, itu chuma di-katakan-nya dalil-nya sahaja, dan di-ma'anakan, itu tidak salah. Chuma saya minta jangan-lah di-keluarkan dalil² itu banyak sangat kerana akan memakan masa Majlis ini. Tolong-lah pendekkan.

Dr Burhanuddin bin Mohd. Noor: Terima kaseh, Dato' Yang di-Pertua. Dari mula lagi saya hendak memberikan penerangan ia-itu kita hendak menunjukkan bagaimana jalan keluar—jalan selamat. Jadi kerana saya menyatakan ayat yang ke-43 kerana takbor di-muka bumi dan kerana tipuan jahat dan tiada-lah di-timpa jahat itu sa-lain daripada sunnah Allah yang menimpa orang² dahulu kala, seksa atas dosa-nya maka tiada-lah bertukar ferman Allah itu dan tidak-lah berubah² melainkan tetap sa-lama²-nya. Ini dua ayat, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, ia-lah kita menchari jalan keluar dan menchari jalan selamat. Saya hairan-lah wakil dari Kuala Kangsar yang manakala saya membachakan ayat itu, tidak dapat dia menerima-nya sa-olah² melanggar aturan.

Dato' Yang di-Pertua, itu-lah satu daripada jalan pangkal—jalan selamat tadi. Yang kedua, saya ulangkan atas dasar sharat² bumi putera. Pakai-lah siasat yang jujur yang tinggi mengatasi keadaan² yang timbul di-luar dan di-dalam, Dato' Yang di-Pertua. Ini-lah perkara yang penting kerana tiap² satu

perkara yang hendak di-dirikan mesti-lah ada asas dan dasar dan ini-lah dasar dalam chara kita meneruskan chita² negara kita sekarang ini.

Ketiga, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, berusaha bersunggo² mewujudkan chita² perahu lalu kiambang bertaup. Ini sudah saya ulang²kan dalam Dewan ini kerana maksud mengemukakan ka-arrah ini-lah, Dato' Yang di-Pertua. Suka-lah saya mengingatkan bahawa chita² bumi putera yang berakhir dengan chita² perahu lalu kiambang bertaup ini. Chita² bumi putera di-seluruh nusantara—di-seluruh kepulauan Melayu yang terjajah dengan bentok Belanda, terjajah dengan bentok Amerika, terjajah dengan bentok Inggeris, maka telah di-berikan tingkatan perjuangan chita² bumi putera tingkatan yang pertama, menchapai kemerdekaan tiap² negeri yang terjajah daripada bentok² penjajah yang tiga tadi. Ini ada-lah sama satu chita² seluruh nusantara, Dato' Yang di-Pertua. Kalau di-Philippine di-perjuangkan oleh Rezal, di-Indonesia di-perjuangkan oleh perajuri² dan perjuang² Indonesia dan di-Malaya pun bagitu-lah chita² kita, Dato' Yang di-Pertua. Chita² kita yang akhir manakala telah terchapai chita² yang kedua ia-itu kemerdekaan yang penoh maka kita seluruh baka bangsa kita ini bersatu kembali supaya menjadi satu bentok yang kuat di-Asia Timor Raya ini yang dapat membentok satu bentok yang mempuyai peribadi di-tengah² bangsa dunia untuk menegakkan keamanan, kema'moran dan kesejahteraan dunia seluruh-nya. Ini-lah chita² bumi putera, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, yang patut kita kaji dan kita sedar kembali. Seluruh kepulauan Melayu yang terjajah dahulu ia-lah satu chita², chita² untuk menghanchor-kan penjajah pada tingkatan pertama, satu chita² untuk menghanchor-kan penjajah dalam tingkatan kedua dan menchapai kemerdekaan yang penoh. Chita² yang akhir ia-lah menyatupadukan balek seluruh baka bangsa Melayu. Di-sini, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, ada-lah perkara yang sudah di-fikirkan oleh penganjor² dan perjuang² bumi putera di-seluruh nusantara untuk menyelamatkan tanah ayer kita ini.

Dan ini-lah satu bentok yang menguatkan yang akan dapat menjamin keselamatan bahagian alam bumi ini di-dalam dunia timur di-dalam hendak menegakkan chita² Bangsa Bersatu. Kerana ini ada-lah bentok jiwa politik-nya, bentok ekonomi-nya, bentok culture-nya, bentok yang di-jadikan Tuhan hendak merupakan kapada wujud yang satu.

Dato' Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam chita² tingkatan yang kedua tadi, apa yang patut kita pelajari dan kita kaji dengan sa-dalam²-nya balek dan kita kenangkan betul² dengan rasa yang insaf dan sedar menghargai perjuang² bangsa kita yang telah merengkok di-dalam jail, yang telah di-tembak dan terbunuh macham²-lah chara yang telah di-lakukan.

Dato' Yang di-Pertua, daripada tingkatan yang pertama, perjuang² di-bawah penjajah Belanda, di-bawah penjajah Amereka, di-bawah penjajah Inggeris, terpaksa-lah memikirkan dan menchari jalan bagaimana chara menchapai kemerdekaan ini. Maka masing² merasakan kapada rasa yang sesuai dengan rasa jiwa yang sesuai pada masing². Apa yang telah sedia ada di-dalam bentok jiwa bangsa kita ia-itu rasa National—Kebangsaan Melayu yang di-perjuangkan oleh PAS. Dan satu lagi rasa yang tegoh, jiwa yang kukuh ia-lah jiwa Islam. Dengan dua jiwa ini-lah, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, bangsa kita Melayu telah memperjuangkan kemerdekaan tingkatan yang pertama. Dan dengan jiwa ini-lah memperjuangkan tingkatan yang kedua tadi. Dan sekarang kita di-dalam tingkatan ketiga, baik di-bawah Belanda, baik di-bawah Philippine, baik di-bawah Malaysia, tingkatan yang pertama dan kita sudah berada tingkatan yang kedua dan yang sudah masuk tingkatan ketiga dan hendak membuktikan perjuangan yang sunggoh² pada tingkatan ketiga itu. Dato' Yang di-Pertua, daripada tingkatan perjuangan kita yang pertama, ada-lah perjuang² ini menghadap dengan sulit dan payah. Dato' Yang di-Pertua, bahawa yang banyak daripada perjuang² ini ia-lah ra'ayat jelata sendiri. Gulongan merhein—gulongan rendah bukan gulongan² yang sangat²

mewah kerana mereka itu sedap² dengan penjajah mendapat kerja dan sa-bagai-nya. Pehak ra'ayat-lah yang berchita² dan pehak yang tertindas-lah yang berchita² hendak menebus kembali kemerdekaan bangsa dan kemerdekaan ugama-nya dan kemerdekaan tanah ayer-nya. Mereka terpaksa menempoh bermacam² jalan dan kesulitan. Ada yang tidak dapat hanya-lah dengan jalan rasa nationalist, ada terpaksa mengikut jalan² ugama, maka ini-lah dua bahan yang paling besar sa-kali yang sudah ada dalam jiwa di-bumi putera di-seluruh nusantara ini.

Kemudian manakala penjajah itu berkembang. Dato' Yang di-Pertua, di-buka-lah sa-bagaimana bentok di-negeri yang lain manakala penjajah datang, capitalist international datang, memang tentang-nya datang pula socialism. Dan manakala datang imperialism, memang tentang-nya ia-lah communism international. Maka kerana itu-lah pehak nationalist tadi dengan kesadaran-nya terpaksa mengambil dua jalan, jalan Co atau jalan None. Ma'ana jalan Co, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, dengan memberikan kerjasama dengan penjajah untuk menchapai kemerdekaan negeri-nya dan jalan None, tidak payah bekerjasama dengan penjajah itu, boleh menchapai kemerdekaan ini ada-lah dua bentok keyakinan, Dato' Yang di-Pertua. Ini-lah yang menjadi pokok yang kita patut fikirkan menchari jalan keluar—jalan selamat hendak menggunakan jiwa bekalan ini. Maka ada-lah gulongan yang memikirkan bahawa bentok socialism-lah yang akan dapat membersekan chita² perjuangan tingkatan yang kedua daripada Capitalist daripada penjajah. Dan ada pula gulongan tidak ada jalan radical lebeh baik lagi melainkan melalui jalan komunis. Ini-lah yang tepat sa-kali menentang dan menghanchorkan faham imperialism dan Capitalism itu. Ini ada-lah keyakinan yang timbul dari bentok yang lain chara hendak menchapai kemerdekaan yang penoh itu manakala PAS mengikuti Islamism, Dato' Yang di-Pertua. Maka sekarang kita dalam pergerakan yang kedua ini. Kita

di-Malaya kalau mahu betul² mengikut apa yang saya rasa dan tahu bahawa kita di-Malaya ini nama-nya ada wakil-nya di-United Nation boleh berchakap sa-bagai bangsa² yang merdeka tetapi ekonomi kita 100 peratus lagi dalam kongkongan Capitalist luar. Konfrantasi sahaja sudah menunjokkan merusut-nya ekonomi kita, pelajaran kita maseh lagi di-dalam bentok² yang bergantung kepada bentok penjajah. Dan lebeh² lagi dalam lapangan military, ini-lah yang menjadi puncha yang sa-habis² besar kekusutan yang menimbulkan pertentangan dengan faham untuk menchapai chita² akhir perahu lalu kiambang bertaut, Dato' Yang di-Pertua.

Ini-lah perkara yang sangat berat. Ini-lah perkara yang menjadi pokok yang di-lupa² oleh pehak Kerajaan Perikatan yang berbangga² mengatakan bahawa mereka telah merdeka, mereka telah buat itu dan telah buat ini dengan melupakan tiga dasar perjuangan ini, Dato' Yang di-Pertua. Kita harus-lah ingat, sa-sudah sahaja Malaysia hendak di-bentok, maka pehak yang ta' dapat hendak menyatakan, atau tidak tahu hendak menyatakan, tetapi di-dorong oleh rasa chita² merdeka yang sa-benar²-nya dan di-dorong oleh rasa perpaduan yang berat dan berpadu kembali "Perahu Lalu Kiambang Bertaut"

Mr Speaker: Selalu benar bidalan itu keluar!

Dr Burhanuddin bin Mohd. Noor: Jadi, supaya tegas, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, terima kasih.

Jadi, sekarang ini, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, yang menjadi pokok yang besar sa-kali, manakala saya tahu daripada ucapan² Perdana Menteri dan daripada ucapan² yang telah di-terangkan oleh bekas Duta Malaya ka-Indonesia, Enche' Senu, bahawa pada mula-nya Indonesia bersetuju di-atas chita² Persekutuan Tanah Melayu hendak menyatukan Tanah Melayu ini dengan negeri² Sabah, Brunei dan Sarawak itu.

Dato' Yang di-Pertua, ini ada-lah asas bahawa di-dalam bentok Perlembagaan kita sendiri, suka-lah saya

mengulangkan bahawa di-dalam bentok Perlembagaan kita ia-itu-lah yang di-namakan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu itu ia-lah 11 buah negeri dan dalam bahagian yang kedua, negeri² lain yang hendak masuk, boleh-lah masuk ka-dalam Persekutuan ini. Jadi, kalau ini-lah perjalanan-nya, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, menurut undang² ini, tentu-lah saya rasa ta' ada-lah hendak menjadi perbalahan, tetapi apa yang menjadi perbalahan sekarang ini bahawa dudok-nya kita sekarang ini sudah menjadi Malaysia yang Malay-sia itu tidak lagi berbentuk Persekutuan Tanah Melayu, di-aleh nama-nya dan di-masokkan tiga buah negeri ini, tetapi Malaysia itu telah berbentuk menurut Perjanjian London dan dalam Perjanjian London yang sa-belas perkara itu, yang ka-enam itu merupakan yang kita Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini berbalek kepada bentok colony sa-taraf dengan Sabah dan sa-taraf dengan Sarawak. Dalam lapangan pertahanan kita umpama-nya, ma'ana kemerdekaan pertahanan kita itu habis dan erti-nya kemerdekaan kita yang hendak membentok kepada chita² "Perahu Lalu Kiambang Bertaut"; apa boleh buat, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, saya terpaksa mengulangkan begitu supaya jelas

Mr Speaker: Ta' ada-kah bidalan lain?

Dr Burhanuddin bin Mohd. Noor: Kalau lain bidalan ini hanyut, Dato' Yang di-Pertua.

Jadi, sekarang, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, ini-lah perkara-nya, sebab-nya manakala sa-belum Perjanjian London itu, maseh lagi Philipina dan Indonesia hendak mengadakan Maphilindo dan di-sambut oleh pehak² Pembangkang di-sini, "Hidup-lah Maphilindo", "Lanjut-lah usia Maphilindo", dan dengan gembira dan harapan bahawa chita² menerusi kemerdekaan kita dan dapat-lah memutuskan beberapa rantai² penjajah, dan rantai² pertahanan penjajah itu dan dapat di-selesaikan beberapa kekusutan. Agreement—Perjanjian Manila dan Perjanjian Maphilindo telah di-tanda tangani. Tahu² kemudian pula di-tanda tangani lagi Perjanjian Malaysia. Ini-lah yang

menjadi puncha, yang itu-lah rasa chita² seluruh bangsa Melayu yang telah terkechiwa dengan Perjanjian London, Perjanjian Malaysia ini. Maka keseluruhan titek-berat puncha huruhara anchaman ini berbalek dan berpuncha kepada Perjanjian Pertahanan, Perjanjian Malaysia bahagian ka-enam, kerana itu, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, tidak akan dapat-lah kita menchari jalan keluar dan tidak akan dapat kita menchari selamat, kalau Perjanjian London yang ka-enam itu maseh lagi bagitu dengan tidak di-pinda, tidak di-ubah dan tidak di-kaji dan tidak di-perbaiki kepada taraf yang merupakan kita benar² merdeka, maka sa-lama ini-lah, saya rasa tidak ada jalan keluar dan tidak ada jalan selamat, maka kita akan berhentam²-lah di-dalam, dan kita akan berhentam² lagi dengan jiran² kita, kerana keyakinan kita yang sunggoh² hendak merdeka, hendak melepaskan diri kita dari penjajah dan angkara tentera-nya ada-lah tidak dapat di-perchayaï.

Satu daripada perkara yang berat yang kita hendak memikirkan ia-lah sa-bagaimana yang telah di-bayangkan oleh Perdana Menteri Singapura tadi ia-itu kita ini telah terikat pula dengan Commonwealth. Jadi, kalau terikat dengan Commonwealth ini dan dengan kerana terikat-nya kita dengan Commonwealth hingga perjanjian kita itu, Perjanjian Pertahanan kita pun sa-bagaimana Perjanjian Malaysia yang ka-enam itu, maka saya rasa sangat-lah gelap memandangkan keadaan jalan keluar dan jalan keselamatan kita. Jadi, saya berharap-lah supaya pehak Kerajaan menyedari benar² akan keadaan ini dan menchari jalan balek dengan penoh bijaksana, dengan sunggoh² kembali kepada chita² bumi putera dan sunggoh² benar hendak mengujudkan chita² keseluruhan nusantara, keseluruhan chita² bumi putera dan ini-lah sahaja di-dalam dunia yang sudah bagini sedar, ra'ayat yang bagini sedar bahawa chara yang kita bentok perjanjian Malaysia ini tidak sesuai lagi dengan dunia kesadaran, dunia kemajuan, dan kebangkitan ra'ayat zaman sekarang ini. Apa yang telah berlaku di-Masir, apa

yang telah berlaku di-Iraq, atau pun di-lain² negeri tanah jajahan Inggeris, semua sa-kali telah membuktikan dan kita jangan-lah terkena dua kali lagi dengan tipu helah penjajah ini.

Dato' Yang di-Pertua, ini-lah pokok yang saya rasa patut kita kaji dan hadapi dengan penoh bijaksana bahawa chita² keseluruhan nusantara, chita² keseluruhan bumi putera di-kepulauan Melayu bahawa bentok Maphilindo itu dan bentok hendak menyatukan itu, walau dengan apa nama sa-kali pun, ta' ada nama Maphilindo-kah, atau nama apa-kah, tetapi apa yang telah saya katakan tadi tiga tingkat ia-itu balek kepada chita² bumi putera dan balek kepada chita² menyatukan balek seluruh nusantara kita. Ini-lah yang menjadi chita² keseluruhan kepulauan Melayu, dan kalau itu kita hadapi dengan penoh bijaksana dan meninggalkan keadaan² bertengkar dan perbalahan kita sekarang ini, dan kita tidak-lah dapat menekan perasaan² kita demi kepentingan bangsa, demi kepentingan keselamatan nusantara yang sa-keturunan dengan kita, demi keamanan di-Asia Timur ini, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, maka sa-wajib-nya-lah pehak Kerajaan sendiri mendalamkan dan menghadapkan perkara ini dengan penoh jujur, dengan penoh kebijaksanaan bagi mengatasi keadaan luar yang sekarang ini timbul terhadap kita dengan confrontasi dan putus-nya hubungan diplomatic di-antara kita dengan Philipina, dan timbul-nya keadaan² di-antara Pembangkang dengan Kerajaan ini.

Dalam sa'at yang saperti ini, tentu-lah bagi pehak yang memikirkan keselamatan negeri supaya dapat kita masukkan satu jalan bagi menuju kepada keselamatan dan kekuatan perpaduan negara, kita akan dapat manakala kita telah mengikuti dan mengatasi perkara² yang timbul ini dengan penoh bijaksana dan kita letakkan kepentingan negara serta kepentingan bangsa di-atas segala chita² parti kita.

Dato' Yang di-Pertua, saya mengatakan ini ada-lah saya yakin bahawa perjalanan siasah Kerajaan Perikatan sekarang ini sudah menyeleweng, sudah terbabas, tidak tepat

lagi dengan chita² yang telah saya sebut itu, kerana banyak bukti²-nya, Dato' Yang di-Pertua.

Saya suka hendak membawa satu cherita yang saya bacha di-dalam satu kitab yang di-karang dalam abad yang kelapan oleh Ibnu Usil yang bernama "Ainul adab walsiasah" ia-itu Mata Adap dan Politik. Cherita-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-lah memperjuangkan di-antara hak dan batal. Jadi perkara ini saya rasa boleh-lah menjadi menongan kita bersama di-dalam kita menghadap sekarang chita² yang tiga saya sebutkan tadi. Chita² bumi putera yang ra'ayat negeri ini maseh tetap perjuangkan nasional, co dan non, dan ada yang mengikut jalan sosialis. Jadi dengan tangkapan² yang ada sekarang ini sa-olah² pehak Kerajaan menekan (suppress) kebangkitan chita² meneruskan chita² bumi putera yang sa-lama ini kita perjuangkan, dan sa-lama ini kita telah peralatkan chita² ra'ayat dan semangat ra'ayat yang hendak merdeka telah dapat di-chapai kemerdekaan itu. Tetapi manakala kita telah membendung chita² bumi putera itu, maka ra'ayat tidak dapat lagi di-kongkong, ra'ayat tidak mahu lagi di-kongkong; mereka mahu meneruskan perjuangan mereka itu.

Maphilindo di-suarakan ia-itu chita² menyatukan seluroh nusantara telah pun di-tanda-tangan. Tahu² Maphilindo batal. Dan hidup-lah Malaysia (Perjanjian London). Ini-lah perasaan yang sangat mengkechiwakan ahli perjuangan, dan kalau itu juga-lah langkah Kerajaan, bukan-lah sa-banyak itu sahaja yang akan dapat di-bendung lagi kebangkitan ra'ayat. Kita telah melihat ra'ayat tidak dapat lagi di-salorkan melalui puncha² Perlembagaan dan melalui perjuangan Perlembagaan sedang chita² dan hasrat mereka meluap², maka mereka tidak dapat lagi mengikut saloran evolution, mereka terpaksa mengikut saloran revolution. Ini bukan salah ra'ayat. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tangkap-lah berapa banyak yang hendak di-tangkap dan bunoh-lah berapa banyak yang hendak di-bunoh, tetapi ra'ayat akan tetap menuju chita² mereka. Itu-lah perkara yang patut kita sedar. Saya

telah memberi chontoh di-Masir, Iraq dan lain². Itu sudah nature atau tabiat ra'ayat, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, mahu menchapai chita² yang mulia dan murni. Kita sekarang ini mahu menekan hak dan menjalankan kebatalan di-dalam pandangan perjuangan chita² bumi putera. Maka ini-lah cherita yang saya hendak cheritakan, saya harap mendapat persetujuan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Cherita itu pendek sahaja, Tuan Yang di-Pertua (*Ketawa*).

Mr Speaker: 5 minit boleh habis!

Dr Burhanuddin bin Mohd. Noor:

Tidak sampai. Cherita dua orang kawan. Sa-orang bernama hak dan sa-orang bernama batal. Mereka berkawan dengan baik. Pada satu pagi berkata-lah si-hak kepada si-batal, pagi ini hendak-lah ada makanan. Maka si-hak pergi ka-pekan, di-chari sakeliling pasar, kemudian dia menggeleng kepala terus balek. Si-batal tanya mengapa bawa balek duit sahaja, jawab si-hak tidak ada barang yang halal, aku jumpa semua barang haram; aku tidak tahu hendak beli. Si-batal kata, engkau bodoh, jadi si-batal pun ambil duit itu pergi ka-pasar, dia pun beli apa yang dapat sahaja, kemudian dia bawa balek barang itu untuk makan pagi. Apabila si-hak tengok barang itu, dia kata aku tidak boleh makan. Mereka berdua bertengkar, akhir-nya terbunoh-lah si-hak. Apabila si-hak mati si-batal susah hati, macham mana aku hendak buat, kata-nya, maka di-bakar-nya si-hak tadi, tinggal-lah arang dan abu. Sa-lepas beberapa ketika datang-lah kawan si-hak menchari si-hak, chari² jumpa arang dan abu sahaja menunjokkan dia telah meninggal. Mereka tanya si-batal, ya, aku yang bunoh kata si-batal. Jadi tinggal-lah arang dan abu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, yang dapat menegakkan hak itu, kawan² si-hak yang hendak menegakkan chita² hak. Arang si-hak itu di-buat dengan da'awat oleh kawan² hak. Ini-lah gambaran, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau chita² itu benar walau dia jadi arang dan abu dia boleh hidup.

Tiga orang ulama PAS telah di-tangkap di-bawah Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri. Sa-orang maseh

dalam tahanan, dua orang telah dibebaskan. Kalau berlanjutan juga keadaan seperti ini, maka huru-hara-lah yang akan timbul, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kerana hak akan terus diperjuangkan oleh gulongan² yang hak. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, supaya perkara itu lebih jelas sa-sudah saya menerangkan chita² bumi putera tadi di-mana hanyut-nya dan terbabas-nya perjuangan Perikatan sekarang. Chuba-lah kita kaji sedikit untuk sama² kita menongkan bagaimana Belanjawan negeri ini supaya dapat balek diletakkan kepada satu asas yang menuju jalan keluar, jalan keselamatan bangsa dan negara kita.

Mr Speaker: Tuan ada tiga minit lagi.

Dr Burhanuddin bin Mohd. Noor: Penganjor² Melayu dari semenjak belum merdeka lagi telah mengingatkan bahawa Malaya ini boleh jadi Palestine yang kedua. Bumi putera negeri ini telah menolak Malayan Union. Sekarang, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Malayan Union berjalan dengan ranchak-nya dengan pemimpinan Perdana Menteri kita. Bumi putera negeri ini bangun menentang Perjanjian MacMichael. Sekarang Perjanjian Pertahanan Malaysia lebih dahshat lagi daripada Perjanjian MacMichael itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Menghalalkan judi. Mengharamkan kitab Islam. Menangkap ulama² Islam. Menghukum salah menggunakan ugama dalam pilihan raya sa-bagaimana undang² yang baharu kita luluskan itu. Perkara ini saya suka bangkitkan lagi, kerana membaca Kur'an nanti boleh jadi salah. Allah Ta'ala mengajar mithal-nya: "Fansurna ala Ikaum ilfakirin", erti-nya menang-lah kita di atas gulongan² yang engkarkan Tuhan. Jadi kalau dalam masa itu di-suroh

kita bacha, itu akan bertentang-lah dengan Undang² Pilihan Raya dalam pandangan Perikatan. Gulongan² Islam dalam negeri ini akan teraniaya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Perkara ini akan timbul.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pagi kelmarin Yang Berhormat dari Bungsar bertanya berkenaan dengan Alex Josey. Beberapa pertanyaan telah timbul berkenaan dengan Alex Josey kepada pehak Timbalan Perdana Menteri, tetapi apa yang ternyata, Tuan Yang di-Pertua? Ra'ayat dalam negeri ini telah membangkitkan rasa tidak puas hati dan membawa chadangan kepada pehak Kerajaan.

Mr Speaker: Saya hendak mengingatkan ia-itu ada satu syarat dalam Peratoran Majlis Meshuarat, ia-itu tiap² soal yang telah di-jawab dengan jelas-nya tidak boleh di-jadikan perbahathan dalam Majlis ini, melainkan ada satu usul khas kerana perkara itu di-bawa dalam Majlis ini boleh di-bahathkan. Saya fikir ini kali yang kedua saya mengingatkan Majlis ini berkenaan dengan Peratoran Majlis Meshuarat.

Dr Burhanuddin bin Mohd. Noor: Terima kaseh. Saya hendak menyuarakan bagaimana bachol dan dayus-nya hendak membiarkan chita² bumi putera dalam keadaan seperti itu. Di-situ-lah rupa kelemahan Kerajaan.

Mr Speaker: Ada lagi?

Dr Burhanuddin bin Mohd. Noor: Ada, ucapan saya panjang lagi.

Mr Speaker: Order. Majlis ini ditangguhkan kepada hari Ithnin, 23 haribulan Disember, 1963 pukul 10 pagi.

Adjourned at 6.30 p.m.