

Volume V
No. 8



Wednesday
14th August, 1963

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

OFFICIAL REPORT

CONTENTS

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 855]

MALAYSIA AGREEMENT (Motion) [Col. 861]

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

1963

FEDERATION OF MALAYA

DEWAN RA'AYAT

(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

Official Report

Fifth Session of the First Dewan Ra'ayat

Wednesday, 14th August, 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 Internal Security and Minister of the Interior, DATO' DR ISMAIL BIN DATO' HAJI ABDUL RAHMAN, P.M.N. (Johor Timor).
- „ the Minister of Finance, ENCHE' TAN SIEW SIN, J.P. (Melaka Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, DATO' V. T. SAMBANTHAN, P.M.N. (Sungai Siput).
- „ the Minister without Portfolio, DATO' SULEIMAN BIN DATO' HAJI ABDUL RAHMAN, P.M.N. (Muar Selatan).
- „ the Minister of Transport, DATO' HAJI SARDON BIN HAJI JUBIR, P.M.N. (Pontian Utara).
- „ the Minister without Portfolio, DATO' ONG YOKE LIN, P.M.N. (Ulu Selangor).
- „ 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 Assistant Minister of Commerce and Industry, TUAN HAJI ABDUL KHALID BIN AWANG OSMAN (Kota Star Utara).

- The Honourable the Assistant Minister of the Interior,
ENCHE' CHEAH THEAM SWEE (Bukit Bintang).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Labour,
ENCHE' V. MANICKAVASAGAM, J.M.N., P.J.K. (Klang).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Information and Broadcasting,
ENCHE' MOHAMED ISMAIL BIN MOHAMED YUSOF (Jerai).
- „ 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).
- „ TUAN HAJI AZAHARI BIN HAJI IBRAHIM
(Kubang Pasu Barat).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Kuala Langat).
- „ ENCHE' AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Muar Dalam).
- „ DR BURHANUDDIN BIN MOHD. NOOR (Besut).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN CHONG WEN, A.M.N. (Kluang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN SIANG SUN (Bentong).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN SWEE HO (Ulu Kinta).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN YOON ONN (Kampar).
- „ ENCHE' CHIN SEE YIN (Seremban Timor).
- „ DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI HASHIM, P.M.N.
(Jitra-Padang Terap).
- „ 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 HASAN ADLI BIN HAJI ARSHAD
(Kuala Trengganu Utara).
- „ TUAN HAJI HASSAN BIN HAJI AHMAD (Tumpat).
- „ ENCHE' HASSAN BIN MANSOR (Melaka Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN TO' MUDA HASSAN (Raub).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN MOHD. NOORDIN, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Parit).
- „ TUAN HAJI HUSSAIN RAHIMI BIN HAJI SAMAN
(Kota Bharu Hulu).

The Honourable ENCHE' IBRAHIM BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Seberang Tengah).

- „ ENCHE' ISMAIL BIN IDRIS (Penang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' ISMAIL BIN HAJI KASSIM (Kuala Trengganu Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' KANG KOCK SENG (Batu Pahat).
- „ ENCHE' K. KARAM SINGH (Damansara).
- „ CHE' KHADIJAH BINTI MOHD. SIDEK (Dungun).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SAN CHOON, K.M.N. (Kluang Utara).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SECK FUN (Tanjong Malim).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SIOK YEW, A.M.N. (Sepang).
- „ ENCHE' LIM JOO KONG, J.P. (Alor Star).
- „ ENCHE' LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).
- „ ENCHE' LIU YOONG PENG (Rawang).
- „ ENCHE' T. MAHIMA SINGH, J.P. (Port Dickson).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED BIN UJANG (Jelebu-Jempol).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED ABBAS BIN AHMAD (Hilir Perak).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED ASRI BIN HAJI MUDA (Pasir Puteh).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED NOR BIN MOHD. DAHAN (Ulu Perak).
- „ DATO' MOHAMED HANIFAH BIN HAJI ABDUL GHANI, P.J.K. (Pasir Mas Hulu).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED YUSOF BIN MAHMUD, A.M.N. (Temerloh).
- „ TUAN HAJI MOKHTAR BIN HAJI ISMAIL (Perlis Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' NG ANN TECK (Batu).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Tanah Merah).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Perlis Utara).
- „ ENCHE' QUEK KAI DONG, J.P. (Seremban Barat).
- „ TUAN HAJI REDZA BIN HAJI MOHD. SAID, J.P. (Rembau-Tampin).
- „ ENCHE' SEAH TENG NGIAB (Muar Pantai).
- „ ENCHE' S. P. SEENIVASAGAM (Menglembu).
- „ TUAN SYED ESA BIN ALWEE, J.M.N., S.M.J., P.I.S. (Batu Pahat Dalam).
- „ TUAN SYED HASHIM BIN SYED AJAM, A.M.N., P.J.K., 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 TYE CHEK (Kulim-Bandar Bahru).
- „ TENGKU BESAR INDRA RAJA IBNI AL-MARHUM SULTAN IBRAHIM, D.K., P.M.N. (Ulu Kelantan).
- „ DATO' TEOH CHZE CHONG, D.P.M.J., J.P. (Segamat Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' TOO JOON HING (Telok Anson).

The Honourable ENCHE' V. VEERAPPEN (Seberang Selatan).

- „ WAN MUSTAPHA BIN HAJI ALI (Kelantan Hilir).
- „ WAN SULAIMAN BIN WAN TAM, P.J.K. (Kota Star Selatan).
- „ WAN YAHYA BIN HAJI WAN MOHAMED, K.M.N. (Kemaman).
- „ ENCHE' YAHYA BIN HAJI AHMAD (Bagan Datoh).
- „ ENCHE' YEOH TAT BENG (Bruas).
- „ ENCHE' YONG WOO MING (Sitiawan).
- „ PUAN HAJJAH ZAIN BINTI SULAIMAN, J.M.N., P.I.S. (Pontian Selatan).
- „ TUAN HAJI ZAKARIA BIN HAJI MOHD. TAIB (Langat).
- „ ENCHE' ZULKIFLEE BIN MUHAMMAD (Bachok).

ABSENT:

The Honourable ENCHE' AHMAD BOESTAMAM (Setapak).

- „ ENCHE' V. DAVID (Bungsar).
- „ ENCHE' KHONG KOK YAT (Batu Gajah).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED DAHARI BIN HAJI MOHD. ALI (Kuala Selangor).
- „ NIK MAN BIN NIK MOHAMED (Pasir Mas Hilir).
- „ ENCHE' D. R. SEENIVASAGAM (Ipoh).
- „ ENCHE' TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Melaka).

IN ATTENDANCE:

The Honourable the Minister without Portfolio, ENCHE' KHAW KAI-BOH, P.J.K.

PRAYERS

(Mr Speaker *in the Chair*)

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

THE MALAYAN SECONDARY SCHOOL ENTRANCE EXAMINATION FAILURES

1. Enche' V. Veerappen (Seberang Selatan) asks the Minister of Education to state the reasons for the large number of failures in the M.S.S.E. Examination (more commonly known as the Standard Six Examination) in the Chinese, Tamil and English Medium Fully Assisted Primary Schools, this year.

The Minister of Education (Tuan Haji Abdul Hamid Khan): Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member's concern

on this question would, I think, have been set aside by the various statements made by my Ministry in connection with the M.S.S.E. Examination. I would also like to explain that it is not correct to regard those pupils who were not promoted to secondary academic schools as failures. The Malayan Secondary School Entrance Examination aims at finding out the capability and suitability of a primary pupil for an academic form of secondary education. The rest are offered places in schools less academic in nature and with a practical bias, i.e., secondary continuation schools. I must further explain that my Ministry does not regard the M.S.S.E. Examination results as final in respect of those who were not promoted to secondary academic classes. We are only too aware of "late developers" in secondary continuation schools and for such late developers the door of the secondary academic school is not totally closed.

Enche' V. Veerappen: I am afraid the Minister did not answer the question. Would the Minister say that the main reason for the poor number of promotions from these schools was the fact that Malay, our national language, was made compulsory in these schools without adequate provision for the teaching of this language in these schools?

Tuan Haji Abdul Hamid Khan: Sir, we have tried to make as adequate a provision as possible, but due to the rapid expansion of education and the need for more and more teachers the Ministry realises that there are some schools which do not have the type of teachers they should have. Because of that, the Ministry has already given consideration to this factor of teachers in assessing the promotion marks or promotion to the academic schools.

Enche' K. Karam Singh (Daman-sara): Is the Minister aware that a number of brilliant students with brilliant results in other subjects, but who just failed in the Malay test, have not been promoted—boys who are brilliant except for having failed in Malay? They had their chances destroyed—is the Minister aware of that?

Tuan Haji Abdul Hamid Khan: Sir, I have just now explained that the factor in regard to a pass in the national language has already been given consideration, and the pass mark had been lowered to such an extent that any child should have been able to gain a pass with such a very low pass mark.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: That may be as regards the future. But is the Minister prepared to allow promotion to those who have failed the last time just because of the Malay test? Is he prepared to go back to his Ministry and allow promotion to those brilliant pupils who have been penalised?

Tuan Haji Abdul Hamid Khan: This is not only in regard to the future, but it has already been given in regard to the 1962 examination.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Regarding the large number of failures, will the Minister deny in this House that even

before the pupils have gone into the examination hall a large number of them have already been decided to be failed according to the present Education Act, because the Education Act says only 30 per cent of the children will get places in secondary schools?

Tuan Haji Abdul Hamid Khan: I have already explained the purpose of this examination. It is not correct to say that all those who are not promoted to academic schools are failures. The purpose of the examination is to find out who are suitable for an academic education; the others are directed to other types of education.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: I think the Minister is misleading this House. The purpose of this test is not to find out who is suitable, but just to allow 30 per cent to be suitable. The Government has already pre-determined that 70 per cent are not suitable. So a large number of them must be failed.

Mr. Speaker: It is outside this question. It is not relevant to the question before the House.

LOWER CERTIFICATE OF EDUCATION EXAMINATION

2. Enche' V. Veerappen asks the Minister of Education to state whether he would take steps to revise the requirements of the L.C.E. Examination (Lower Certificate of Education Examination) in order that a unit system could be introduced on the lines of the Cambridge Overseas School Certificate Examination so that pupils with exceptional ability in some subjects, especially Mathematics and Science, may not be completely penalised for weakness in English.

Tuan Haji Abdul Hamid Khan: Sir, at present there are already adequate safeguards in the Lower Certificate of Education Examination system to ensure that pupils are not being penalised merely for their weakness in English. However, for the purpose of safeguarding further the interest of the pupils and of ensuring the maximum justice to our children my Ministry continues to analyse the Lower Certificate of Education results each year

and necessary changes and modifications to the requirements have always been made from time to time.

Enche' V. Veerappen: Would the Minister say that the requirements of the L.C.E. as stated in Appendix III of the Razak Report has never been changed?

Tuan Haji Abdul Hamid Khan: Sir, I need notice of that question.

Enche' V. Veerappen: A little explanation, if you would permit me, Sir. My question states that pupils who pass in other subjects very well but who do not get a credit in English are penalised and the answer appears to be that the Ministry has been constantly keeping in view, but the requirement of the L.C.E. Certificate for awarding of promotion as stated in Appendix No. 3, which is followed, is that out of 22 subjects a student is required to have a credit in English—must have a credit in English if he is to be promoted. That is my question. Would the Minister say if he would review this requirement?

Tuan Haji Abdul Hamid Khan: Sir, the normal requirement is "Credit" in English and adequate safeguards referred to in the original answer which I gave are: for candidates who obtain a "Pass" in English (in contrast to "Credit") may be awarded limited promotion and sit for the F.M.C.E. only; and in the case of those who wish to sit for the School Certificate they have to pass the Cambridge qualifying test. Now, this "limited promotion" is awarded to (a) candidates who have entered an English medium secondary school through Special Malay/Remove class. And (b) for all other candidates provided they secure two or three credits as the case may be in addition to a "Pass" in Mathematics or technical drawing. It will be seen therefore that there are already safeguards and relaxation in the matter requiring a "Pass" in English and this cannot be relaxed further because it is felt not unjust to enforce such requirement in view of the fact that the pupil should have a fair standard in the language in order to enable them to have a reasonable chance of passing the Cambridge School Certificate or the F.M.C.E. in

the medium of this language, i.e., English. For the Malay medium candidates (sitting for the Malay medium F.M.C.E.) such requirement is not at all enforced.

Enche' V. Veerappen: Mr Speaker, Sir, why is the Government making so much emphasis on the obtaining of a credit in English although his answer is to a student who has two languages?

Tuan Haji Abdul Hamid Khan: Yes, I need notice of that question.

INCREMENT FOR DAY TRAINING CENTRE TEACHERS WITH SCHOOL CERTIFICATE FOR PASSING MALAY LANGUAGE (L.C.E. LEVEL)

3. Enche' V. Veerappen asks the Minister of Education to state whether it is true that a D.T.C. trained teacher (Man) with School Certificate qualifications gets a \$15 increase for passing in Malay L.C.E. level whilst a woman with similar qualifications gets an increase of only \$7.50 and if so, to state the reasons for the anomaly; if not, to state the facts.

Tuan Haji Abdul Hamid Khan: Yes, it is true. This difference cannot be considered an anomaly as these rates are based on the incremental rates provided in the existing salary scales which are different for these two categories of officers.

Enche' V. Veerappen: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Minister says that it is not an anomaly, but I ask the reason why there is a difference in a lady teacher getting \$7.50 and a male teacher getting \$15 for passing the same examination.

Tuan Haji Abdul Hamid Khan: That is a matter of Government policy at present. The salaries of women teachers including the salaries of the feminine sex of other Government services are at present being considered by the Government as a whole.

Enche' V. Veerappen: There is already a difference in the salaries. This is an inducement for passing the Malay examination; this is not salary. Why must girls be penalised for passing the Malay examination? Don't we want girls in this country to learn Malay?

Tuan Haji Abdul Hamid Khan: Sir, I have already given my views.

Enche' K. Karam Singh (Daman-sara): Sir, on this Government policy which the Minister spoke about, is he aware that there is a vast difference between \$15.00 and \$7.50? (*Laughter*).

MOTION

MALAYSIA AGREEMENT

Order read for resumption of debate on Question :

That this House, noting the desire of the people of North Borneo, Sarawak and Singapore to be federated in Malaysia with the existing States of the Federation in accordance with the agreement signed in London on 9th July, 1963, hereby endorses that agreement.

To which the following amendment was moved by Enche' Tan Phock Kin :

To delete the words "hereby endorses that agreement" at the end, and insert in place thereof the words "is not yet ascertained, hereby defers the endorsement of that agreement".

The Prime Minister: Mr Speaker, Sir, we had two days debate on this amendment and a great number of Honourable Members of this House have had the opportunity to air their views very freely. It has now come to me to reply to some of the remarks made by the Opposition. Of course, in the first place, I must say that I have in mind that this is another attempt by the Opposition to baulk Malaysia by proposing this amendment. It is obvious that if we accept this amendment, we are not accepting the first part of the motion which reads :

"That this House, noting the desire of the people of North Borneo, Sarawak and Singapore to be federated in Malaysia with the existing States of the Federation in accordance with the agreement signed in London on 9th July, 1963, hereby endorses that agreement."

Therefore, I say, if we accept even the first part of the amendment, we deny that the elections in North Borneo had been held fairly and squarely and not in accordance with the democratic principles and practices of the day.

The Opposition Members, in the course of the debate on the amendment, have said—I do not need to go into or mention the names of several speakers because that will take time, and so it would be sufficient for me just to run along on what they have said, more or less roughly—that according to the Cobbold Commission only one-third wanted early Malaysia, one-third asked for safeguards and the remainder preferred independence first. It must be remembered by the Honourable Members of the Opposition that the Cobbold Commission's Report has ceased to be an authority on the Borneo situation, and it had, in fact, been committed to the Archives. Since the Cobbold Commission's Report, so much progress has been made in these territories that the views and opinions of the people, which have been expressed by the means I have mentioned in the course of the debate, have become out of date. It was also suggested that I have failed to keep President Soekarno at arm's length as I have kept the Opposition here. It was suggested by the Honourable Members that I was afraid of President Soekarno's guns, and that I have been accordingly discredited internationally, because according to Honourable Members of the Opposition, a show of force had done what democratic principles at home failed to do. I am not afraid of anybody's guns. As far as I am concerned, I can avoid them as well as the Honourable Members themselves. A show of force, to my mind, can also be met by an equal show of force by us in this country. But the fact remains that we do not want war, we do not want trouble, but when we are shown force like that we will always have friends and allies on our side; further I can say that we can always defend ourselves to the best of our ability. I can also tell Honourable Members of the Opposition that I am not afraid of anybody's bullets for that matter, but it is my duty and responsibility, as the Leader of this country, to protect the lives and property of the people here whose lives and property are in my care and in my charge. It was for that reason that I sought peace, and it was for that reason that I went to Manila to talk in order to

preserve life and property and the happiness of the people of this country. I do not believe that any international bodies, or any country for that matter, would be opposed to what I have done, except, of course, Honourable Members of the Opposition and those who are opposed to us in any case.

On the question of referendum which was brought up yesterday, it was suggested that I spoke double Dutch in this matter of referendum. I suggested that the Borneo people were not ready for a referendum—and I mean it, because I have said it in this House when I moved this motion. On the question of referendum, I suggested that in Borneo it would be interfered with by the authorities or by the administration there. Therefore, a referendum held in Borneo would not represent the views of the Borneo people. What we have done in place of a referendum is to hold elections where Opposition Parties have every right to take the platform and to explain to the people the meaning of Malaysia and what it portends, and that had been done.

According to the report in hand, 73 per cent overall majority agreed with Malaysia, and on top of that the sole issue which was played up was the issue of Malaysia; and also the same issue was played up at the elections held in Sabah where, as Mr Donald Stephens had rightly said, almost 90 per cent were in favour of Malaysia. That is ample proof that the people in those territories wanted Malaysia.

There is another Opposition Member who suspected that the elections were not properly run and that they were rigged in these territories. Whatever may be our feelings against the British or against their administration, we are all agreed—I think we have reason to believe it—that the elections were properly held, as it was in the case of election here, when the issue of elections was “Merdeka”. There was no reason to suspect that it would be otherwise in these territories, and I have every faith and confidence that the elections held in the Borneo territories were well run.

Again, it was suggested by another Member of the Opposition that I have agreed to a survey by a United Nations team with a changed date for Malaysia, not because I wanted peace, but because I wanted to save my face. Well, if that is so, if I had wanted to save my face, I would never have agreed to the postponement or deferment of the date of Malaysia (*Applause*). It was to save the face of my other friends and partners in MAPHILINDO that it has been agreed to defer the date of Malaysia. There was no need for me to save my face; there is nothing in it to save.

Then again it was also said, or suggested, that it was I who irritated Indonesia and, therefore, if a war should come about, I am the sole person to be blamed for it—and that is the first time I heard that I am a war-monger, that I am out to make trouble, out to make war. Can the Honourable Member tell me, what I have with which to shoot the other countries?

Time and again I have mentioned, of course to my discredit, that we have got nothing at all with which to fight; we have got no planes, we have got no war machines, we have got no boats, we have got nothing with which to fight any war against a powerful enemy. Therefore, I am not out to make war—that is clear to everybody except, of course, the Opposition Members. Such a statement, I consider, can come, pardon my saying so, only from a distorted mind—but the Honourable Member is not here to listen to me. What better proof is there for the people of this country than that because we do not want war, we have planned for peace, and this country has enjoyed and is enjoying peace and prosperity? It has become so monotonous for me to repeat time and again what is already known to all Honourable Members. If we had planned for war, this country would never have enjoyed the peace and prosperity which we are still enjoying today.

Honourable Members of Party Islam have suggested that with Malaysia the Chinese would outnumber the Malays and others, and that because of this the Malays would stand to lose. We have

always maintained that Malaysia is aimed at achieving peace in this region of Asia. The number of Chinese in the whole of Malaysia will no doubt be larger than the number of Malays on the basis of population—that we do not have to read the American Magazine, or any magazine for that matter. We know, and know it quite well. So, if we were to work on the basis of that, then I think we would be in for a lot of trouble. Whatever happens to Malaysia, whether Malaysia comes about or does not come about, the number of Chinese will always be larger than the Malays here. The only people, in fact, whom we have reason to fear are not so much the Chinese but the communists, and, for that matter, others as well who are not Chinese but who are communists. They are the people whom we have reason to fear—and we fear them. A few of them, I maintain, as Honourable Members well know, can do much more harm than the larger number of others whose only desire is to live in peace, in security and in happiness in the country of their adoption. If you continually harp on the racial theme, the country can never achieve peace and happiness even when the number of Chinese—assuming—is smaller than the number of Malays. The country would still not achieve happiness if the people cannot live in peace and harmony with one another. Even in a country, where the whole population of that country is of one race, there is still no peace and no happiness, when there is trouble over issues such as religion, issues which are racial, issues such as castes and other things. We have got to see for ourselves what is happening elsewhere, and take a lesson from it, in order to enable us to run our own country well and in order to allow us to provide for the well-being of our people and for those who live in this country.

Assuming that there is danger, or a threat of danger, from the direction which Party Islam members fear, their attitude would appear to be like that of a tortoise: when a tortoise sees danger—and I wonder if Honourable Members have seen a tortoise—immediately its head goes in (*Laughter*) leaving just the body; and the enemy could easily

pick up that body and smash it to smithereens: or in the case of an ostrich, it would just run away from its enemy, or would just bury its head, leaving its body, and all that the enemy has to do would be just to chop off its head and make soup (*Laughter*). If that is the attitude of Party Islam, I am worried, worried for those who have placed any faith in them at all, because they cannot see far and they cannot see the danger.

Sir, what we are afraid of is not these peace-loving people, who are living with us in unity in this country, the Federation of Malaya, today, and in Malaysia tomorrow. So, rather than run away with the other danger, we have got to stand up together with those concerned for the well-being and peace of this country. We must stand together with them and meet the common enemy. Do Honourable Members from Party Islam know what would happen to this country, if ever Singapore is given independence, which it is by right entitled to be given? The first thing that would happen here would be this—and I have said this before and I repeat it now though it is a little monotonous for me to keep on saying the same thing over again and again: if Singapore were given independence, the first thing that would happen is that Singapore would invite all the communist countries, would make pacts with those communist nations, and you would then find them next door to this country. What would happen then? What would happen to this country then is what you have seen happening in China, in Korea, in Vietnam, and in Cuba. They will not leave us alone; they will worry us, they will disturb us until they have achieved their purpose of creating trouble and, finally, culminating in a serious war. It would not be a war between the communists and ourselves. It would be war between the communist powers and the western powers, reducing this country to ashes as the battlefield for these powers. Who then would enjoy peace and happiness in this country? I am sure that it will not be Party Islam; it will not be anybody. Everybody will suffer, everything we hold dear will be lost—just

because we have not planned to meet the danger as we see it. And, therefore, to live the life, or to pursue the policy of a tortoise or that of an ostrich is a mistake, a mistake that will be condemned in the days to come for having adopted it.

What have we done after independence? The Alliance policy is broad-visioned and farsighted, and it has brought us dividends for which we have reason to be proud, and which have won the admiration of all democratic countries in Asia. We have formulated our policies, as I said, with our vision ahead and not confined ourselves to narrow racialism, or narrow religious intolerance, but on a very very broad outlook, and for that reason, we have won confidence at home and we have won friends abroad. So, for as long as we are in power, we will always continue with this policy of ours.

It follows, as I said, coming back to the amendment itself, that if we are to accept this amendment it would mean that in the first place that all elections, which have been held in Borneo, all the opinions expressed in favour of Malaysia, we deny as right and correct as representing the views of the people of these territories. Some suggested that by carrying on with this debate, by adopting this motion, we would be prejudging the issue and we would make a mockery of the whole talks I had recently with President Soekarno and President Macapagal in Manila, and that it will no doubt bring about another confrontation from the good President Soekarno. That I do not agree. We are asked to endorse this Agreement which we have signed in London along with our friends and partners—the States of Singapore, Sarawak, Borneo and also Great Britain. This particular Agreement has been endorsed by the British Houses of Parliament; it has been endorsed by the Assemblies in Singapore, Sarawak and Borneo, and we are the last to endorse it. You might well ask the reasons for this delay. That is the most you can do. The delay I can tell you is because I thought, out of respect for the feelings of our friends in MAPHILINDO,

that I should bring with me the Agreement itself and show it to our partners what it is all about, and they themselves have agreed that there is nothing wrong in the Agreement itself, except the question of British bases. On the question of British bases, I have said that we need them while danger threatens us from without; we need the bases because we cannot man the bases ourselves for lack of money, for lack of equipment, for lack of men, and for lack of so many things which I have just mentioned to you. It is necessary for the preservation of peace and for the security of this country that we have got to have our friends to help us here. Until the day comes when we are assured that we can live in peace and sleep in our beds without any disturbance then, perhaps, we may get together with the British and say that we need no more their help—and that has been agreed to by our partners.

If you glance at paragraph 11 of the Statement from Manila (Appendix B to the Manila Accord), you will appreciate, you will understand, what I am talking about. Paragraph 11 of Appendix “B” says:

“The three Heads of Government further agreed that foreign bases—temporary in nature—should not be allowed to be used directly or indirectly to subvert the national independence of any of the three countries . . .”

That is all they have asked for and this Agreement had been shown to them and they had the chance to see it. This is the Agreement which we have here today and in respect of which this motion is moved to ask the Honourable Members to agree to it. It has been shown to our friends, and the reaction from them is not at all violent—it is only what runs in the imagination of the Opposition Members in this House. I am glad to be given this opportunity, therefore, to assure them that the endorsement of this Agreement today would not be looked upon by our friends in MAPHILINDO as a hostile act, or as an act prejudging the issue which is before the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

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

clarification, if I may be permitted—is it not a fact, Mr Speaker, Sir, that the House is asked not only to endorse the Agreement but also to note the desire of the peoples of the Borneo territories to join the Federation?

The Prime Minister: That was why I mentioned about the desire of the people earlier on when I opposed the amendment. I said that the desire was quite clear; the next one is to endorse.

Mr Speaker: I would like to point out the wording of the motion which says “noting the desire” and it is because of this desire, the House is asked to endorse the Agreement. Please proceed.

The Prime Minister: Then there was the suggestion that President Soekarno might start confrontation again because of the endorsement of this thing and that what I had done before had annoyed President Soekarno who started his confrontation. Well, I can tell this House that the Agreement reached between President Soekarno and I in Tokyo was to the effect that, if there is any misunderstanding between us, we should invoke the Treaty of Friendship signed between the two countries in 1959 and that we should meet, and it is for me to clarify the position to his satisfaction. But it was when I was in London, when the Agreement was signed, that he started this confrontation without giving me an opportunity to explain. However, when I met him in Manila recently and had the opportunity to explain, he was very quiet, though before he went there he declared openly, “I am going there with one reason only and that is to confront Malaysia.” And did he confront Malaysia when we met in Manila? We parted as friends: we signed the Statement, the Accord and everything else. In fact, we were very pally indeed (*Applause*), and before I left I said to President Soekarno, “Don’t you go back and confront me again” (*Laughter*). He was quite friendly, and don’t Honourable Members suggest or put it into his head to confront me again! Let us remain friends for such time at least as there is that good President. Anyway, he is not well now and I hope he will have a speedy

recovery from his illness. But his illness is not due to me or due to members of my side (*Laughter*), but it is entirely the act of God (*Laughter*).

One thing I can assure this House—I never went back on my word as proved by what happened in Manila recently, and I won’t like to suggest but, I think, that by the tacit agreement of the President, at least by not doing what he had intended to do—to start confrontation—he agreed that I had not gone back on my word. As I said, the Summit Meeting ended very well to the satisfaction of all except, of course, for the Members of the Opposition. All we had agreed to do was to delay the date of the declaration of the Malaysia Day which we had agreed to do on the 31st of August.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I might as well go on because, I think, if I can explain more, the less the Opposition may have to say afterwards. So, I might as well go on and tell the Honourable Members, in case they have missed the point in this Joint Statement. In the Joint Statement it is stated in paragraph 4:

“Pursuant to paragraphs 10 and 11 of the Manila Accord the United Nations Secretary-General or his representative should ascertain prior to the establishment of the Federation of Malaysia”—prior to the establishment of Malaysia—“the wishes of the people of Sabah (North Borneo) and Sarawak within the context of General Assembly Resolution 1541 (15), principle 9 of the annex, by a fresh approach”—we have got to have a fresh approach and that is the reason why we have the Secretary-General there—“which in the opinion of the Secretary-General is necessary to ensure complete compliance with the principle of self-determination within the requirements embodied in principle 9, taking into consideration:

(I) the recent elections in Sabah (North Borneo) and Sarawak but nevertheless further examining, verifying and satisfying himself as to whether

(a) Malaysia was a major issue, if not the main issue;

(b) Electoral registers were properly compiled;

(c) Elections were free and there was no coercion;

and (d) Votes were properly polled and properly counted . . .”

This is the function or task which the Secretary-General of the United Nations, or his representative, will undertake in Borneo.

I am glad to inform this House that the Secretary-General has already nominated the team to go to these territories. The team consists of—and I think Honourable Members might have known it—Mr Laurence Michelmore (United States) representative of the Secretary-General, Mr George Janacek (Czechoslovakia) representative of the Secretary-General, Mr George Howard (Argentina), Mr Neville Kanakarathne (Ceylon), Mr Kenneth Dadzie (Ghana), Mr Irshad Baqai (Pakistan), Mr Jasushi Akashi (Japan), Mr Abdel Dajani (U.A.R.) and Mr Jose Machado (Brazilian Administrative Officer). These members have been accepted by our partners in MAPHILINDO, and we have ourselves nominated two observers and they are Mr Athi Nahappan and Enche' Zahir, both of whom are members of the Senate, who will be ready to leave for Borneo territories whenever members of the United Nations team are there. It is expected that within 24 days the United Nations team will be able to complete its work, or even sooner than that if all the members of the team can get whatever they are after easily. But, of course, in the case of Sarawak, the distance and the journeys to be covered are by no means easy, and, therefore, if there is any delay at all it will be due to the difficulty of travelling.

Enche' Abdul Aziz bin Ishak (Kuala Langat): Sir, may I ask on a point of information? Is it possible for the Prime Minister before he ends his speech to say: (i) whether an opportunity will be given to the Opposition to go as an observer, and (ii) in the event that it is an act of God—as he himself has said that the President is ill because of an act of God—and in this case it might be an act of God if the result is the opposite of what he expected, will he still pursue with the declaration of the formation of the Federation?

The Prime Minister: I don't think there is any need for the Opposition Members to go there as observers because if, by an act of God as the Honourable Member has said, the tide is turned against us, I don't think the Members of the Opposition could put

it right. I think their only reason for wanting to go is perhaps to make it more complicated. I think we had better leave it to the Alliance (*Laughter*), with all due respect to the request of the Honourable Member. If we had got more time to spare we would certainly have asked the Opposition to go, but we have not got very much time.

It was really out of deference for the wishes of the others that I moved yesterday for the adoption of the London Agreement with provision for delay in the establishment of the Federation of Malaysia until such time as the Secretary-General can make his recommendation. Hence if you read the Corrigenda that has been put before the House you will understand that everything has to be delayed out of deference to the wishes of our partners and to the feelings of our partners in MAPHILINDO. There is nothing for us to worry unduly about the passing of this motion by this House, and there is no reason at all for the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Tanjong. If there has been any doubt in the minds of anybody in this House about the wishes of those people in regard to Malaysia, I think all that is purely imaginary, or probably they have been influenced by something or somebody from outside, because we have had in this House thrashed it out time and again, and we had every opportunity to see for ourselves, to find out for ourselves, how things were going on there.

In a report published this morning, we find that there is opposition to Malaysia even when President Soekarno has agreed to Malaysia; there was a rally in Bandoeng the day before yesterday which opposed Malaysia. These people, I say, will oppose and continue to oppose as long as they are communists. I do not want to repeat what I have said before, because it is just going to take the time of this House, but I do say that Honourable Members should content themselves that everything that can possibly be done has been done to ascertain the wishes of these people—and I repeat that we do not force any State or any people against their will to join us, and for

that reason Brunei stayed out. So all we are looking forward to is the day when we can welcome our friends and brothers from across the seas and in these territories of Malaysia to join with us in the pride of place in this new nation of Malaysia—therefore, do not let us do anything to delay that day. When they heard that Malaysia was likely to be postponed, they were very disappointed, and they sent their representatives to see me. In fact, Mr Donald Stephens, the Chief Minister-designate of North Borneo, has just gone back. The Prime Minister of Singapore had been here to remonstrate with me, and so did the members from Sarawak. It is a disappointment for them to have to agree to a deferment of the date of Malaysia. Nevertheless, out of regard for the wishes of our partners in Malaysia and for the sake of peace, I think we will have to agree to this postponement. But that delay, I can assure this House, will not be too long. What we have agreed to in Manila is to wait until the Secretary-General has completed his work before we establish Malaysia—this in itself is sufficient—and the passing of this motion which is before the House does not aim to do anything more. It is not intended to annoy those members in MAPHILINDO. The adoption of this motion is purely procedural. The other signatories have adopted it, as I have said, and it is for us now to adopt this motion. If we accept the amendment, it would mean delay, it would mean irreparable loss to our prestige abroad, and it would mean we have given in to pressure from the communist group. And the communists would play it up as a great victory for them, and that I think would be end of all what we stand for—freedom and the right of man to be free to choose his own way of life.

If we were to defer this motion now, it would mean that we will have to meet again in October in order to pass this; and when we meet in October, I can assure the Members of this House that we will be made the laughing stock of the whole world, and therefore I am strongly opposed to this amendment proposed by the Honourable Member from Tanjong. I therefore ask the House to support me (*Applause*).

Enche' Lim Kean Siew (Dato Kramat): Mr Speaker, Sir, I hope I will not take too long to answer to the Honourable the Prime Minister.

Mr Speaker: One minute. (*To the Clerk*) Has he spoken on the amendment?

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: I have not spoken on the amendment, Sir.

Mr Speaker: Please proceed!

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Mr Speaker, Sir, I agree with many of the fine sentiments voiced by the Honourable Prime Minister this morning. After all, one cannot but agree with any sentiment provided it is nicely expressed and provided it is a nice sentiment. But, of course, we do not want peace (*Laughter*)—I am sorry, of course, we do not want war. We all do not want war, but, nevertheless, this motion says—

That this House, noting the desire of the people of North Borneo, Sarawak and Singapore to be federated in Malaysia with the existing States of the Federation in accordance with the agreement signed in London on 9th July, 1963, hereby endorses that agreement.

From what the Honourable the Prime Minister has told us, the United Nations has sent a team, he has agreed to it in deference to the wishes of President Soekarno, and this team will go to Borneo to ascertain the wishes of the people. If, as he says, there is need to have this motion passed before October, then I think he could easily have removed the first clause and produced a motion reading thus—

“That this House hereby endorses the agreement signed in London on July 9th, 1963.”

if that is his main purpose. But his motion further wants us to note the desire of the people of North Borneo, Sarawak and Singapore to be federated in Malaysia. How can we know the desire of the people of North Borneo, Sarawak and Singapore when we ourselves have agreed on the other hand that there should be a referendum and that the United Nations should send a team to investigate the wishes of the people? The Honourable Prime Minister has spoken of the tortoise and the

ostrich hiding their heads. If I may go further and refer to the ostrich again, perhaps I can say that the Honourable Prime Minister is not like the ostrich which buries its head in the sand, but the ostrich which tries to fly without wings. And we all know what happens to that kind of ostrich. Even if the ostrich can fly long enough, it will fly in circle and come back to us, and all we have to do is to wait to cut off its head (*Laughter*).

Mr Speaker, Sir, I agree that we have a duty and a responsibility to protect the lives and properties of the people here, and that we do not want war. But if we say that we do not want war but peace and that therefore we must have Malaysia at all costs, then I say it is wrong, because no matter what the intention may be, there will be no doubt that if we have Malaysia that is forced against the people's wishes we will have the same situation as has arisen in the Union of Burma, of which the Secretary-General of the United Nations must be well aware. The Union of Burma was formed without taking the wishes of the Karens into consideration and until today there is trouble in Burma because the Karens have never agreed to the Union of Burma. Now, that is the point. The point is not whether or not we should have Malaysia to stop communism, because I do not think that that is a valid argument at all. The question is this: are we going to have Malaysia against the wishes of the people? Now, the Honourable the Prime Minister has tried his best to convince us that the wishes and the desires of the peoples of the Bornean territories have been accounted for. First of all, he says that 90 per cent of the people in Sabah have shown by their elections that they are agreeable to Malaysia and that, in fact, their disappointment was so great that Donald Stephens himself had to fly to Kuala Lumpur to cajole our Prime Minister not to change the date. Very well. But let us remember what Donald Stephens further said. He said: "Either Malaysia by August 31st or independence." Now, what does he mean by that? Surely, we can only imply two things. First of all, we can

say that that is a threat and the threat is, "If we do not have Malaysia, we want to go our own way."

The Prime Minister: On a point of clarification. I do not think there is any fear of that now. He has agreed to abide by whatever decision we take in this House.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: The power of persuasion of our Prime Minister is great indeed.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Of course!

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: But it does not alter the fact that Donald Stephens did say, "either Malaysia on 31st August or independence." If we are going to judge the desires of the people by Donald Stephens, we must then say that the people of Sabah want independence or Malaysia by 31st August. If that is so, surely one cannot say that the elections that were held in Sabah were definitely for Malaysia by August 31st and nothing else. If that is so, we cannot then say that the wishes of the people of Sabah have been ascertained.

Mr Speaker, Sir, with regard to Sarawak, I am very glad that the Honourable the Prime Minister has said that the Cobbold Commission is over and done with; it is dead, and it has been removed to the archives of the British Museum.

The Prime Minister: Malayan Museum. (*Laughter*).

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: . . . to the archives of the Malayan Museum. I hope he will not express the same sentiments about the elections in Sabah because, after all, the elections in Sabah are also over. So what is sauce for the goose must be sauce for the gander. So, if we are going to maintain that any findings are, in fact, out of date (although the Commission was set up specially for that purpose), then we cannot arrive at any conclusion at all, for the elections too, like the Cobbold Commission, is also over. I am very very glad to hear him say that many things have happened since the Cobbold Commission which have perhaps changed the complex of the situation

in Sarawak. Yes, we know that many things have happened. For example, there have been many arrests and the arrests have prevented people from expressing their views properly and without fear. For example, in Sarawak Mr Fenner Brockway and Mr Bottomley visited the detention camps and said that the conditions in the detention camps were very good, for which we must give credit to the British Government. But, nevertheless, a detention camp is a detention camp, no matter how good the conditions are; and it is a fact that many people of Sarawak have been detained. How can we then get the proper views of the people under such circumstances? We have in the Cobbold Commission Report statements which go further to show definitely that if there were no fear and there were complete freedom of expression we might even have obtained a higher percentage of the population expressing opposition to Malaysia. Thus, for example, the Cobbold Commission in one passage says:

"In a number of instances, delegations consisting almost entirely of Chinese were headed by a spokesman of another race and we could only assume that this was done to convey the impression that the delegation was multi-racial."

The Cobbold Commission was careful enough to express the opinion that the assessment of anti-Malaysian views were to some extent clouded over by fear of those people who were anti-Malaysia. Now, we cannot, of course, deny that there is such a fear because, as the Honourable the Prime Minister has shown quite clearly this morning by his assertion that anyone who is anti-Malaysia is communist, or communist-influenced, because the communists are anti-Malaysia. It is just like saying that since the communists want us all to brush our teeth, if we all brush our teeth we must be communists; because the communists want us to brush our teeth, in order to show that we are not communists should we stop brushing our teeth? It is this kind of logic that is being applied to our arguments all the time.

A mandate was given to the Honourable the Prime Minister formerly to proceed with negotiations because we

agreed with the concept of Malaysia. It was argued that the concept meant the Malaysia Plan and since the Malaysia Plan meant Malaysia, it meant therefore that we were in total agreement with Malaysia! But there is a difference between the concept and the reality as much as there is a difference between a dream and a fact. One agrees with an idea but one may not agree with the reality because the reality may not be similar or equal to the idea.

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable the Prime Minister went on at great length to prove that, because of the elections, the people were in agreement to Malaysia, and produced the Joint Statement issued in Manila to support the argument; but he failed to read this portion of the Agreement, in paragraph 4, which says that the Secretary-General, in approaching the question of self-determination, should take into consideration the following:

"(I) the recent elections in Sabah and Sarawak but nevertheless further examining, verifying and satisfying himself as to whether

(a) Malaysia was a major issue, if not the main issue;

(b) Electoral registers were properly compiled;

(c) Elections were free and there was no coercion; and

(d) Votes were properly polled and properly counted; and

(II) the wishes of those who, being qualified to vote, would have exercised their right of self-determination in the recent elections had it not been for their detention for political activities, imprisonment for political offences or absence from Sabah or Sarawak."

The Honourable the Prime Minister therefore admits in this joint Statement that in the elections the question of Malaysia may not have been the main issue and that, even if it was the main issue, the electoral registers may not have been properly compiled, or that the elections may not have been free, or that there may have been coercion and that the votes may not have been properly counted, if the Honourable the Prime Minister believed that Malaysia was the major issue in the elections and that everything was properly done, he should not have signed this Agreement. But he signed the Joint Statement to which he must be bound.

As for the second part of this paragraph 4, it was also decided that we should take into consideration the right of the people, who, had they not been detained for political activities, would have voted. Now, the fact that this is mentioned shows the importance of political detention, for without political detention the people may have moved completely the other way; and, therefore, I agree that a lot of things had happened since the Cobbold Commission Report—a lot of things, since the Cobbold Commission, that forced the people to take a line which they are not formerly in favour of.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the imperatives, which may have moved Indonesia and Philippines in Manila when they agreed to the Referendum by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, may not be the same imperatives that have moved us to oppose this Malaysia. We cannot say, in this instance, that what is suitable for Philippines and Indonesia is suitable for us. For example, we feel that the Secretary-General of the United Nations should have required that those who had been detained for political activities ought to be first released. They were detained after the Malaysian proposals were brought up because they were anti-Malaysia. If you really want the wishes freely expressed on Malaysia, then those political detainees, including Enche' Ahmad Boestamam, ought first to be released. Without the release of the political prisoners, we cannot have a balanced view on Malaysia. It is just like tying up one arm of your opponent and then claiming a victory over him in a fight. That would be unfair. If we want to get proper views on Malaysia, then all political detainees must be released. If they are not released, we cannot say that the referendum has been held in a free and democratic atmosphere. We believe in democracy; so let us see the ends justify the means, because apparently I understand that that is how you distinguish communism from the rest. It is claimed that communism says the ends justify the means. What have we done? We have imprisoned the people first and then are holding

a referendum afterwards. Secondly, there must be a proper period within which an assessment can be taken. The way we are rushing through, it would appear that we are afraid that, if time is given, the people would definitely come out against Malaysia.

Of course, I am sorry to have disappointed the Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore, Mr Lee Kuan Yew, by holding this view. But it is not the Prime Minister of Singapore that we should think about. We should think about the people of the Malaysian territories, now that since we have postponed it. What harm is there, if we postpone Malaysia a few months or a few weeks later?

Mr Speaker, Sir, it has been said by the Honourable Member for Sepang—I mean it has been read out by the Honourable Member for Sepang—that the Opposition was trying to block Malaysia, and that they were not thinking in the interest of Malaysia. It is fortunate that he has spoken before the Honourable the Prime Minister because, if he has spoken after the Honourable the Prime Minister, it would at least have been ascertained that he is repeating the words of his leaders. As it is, we do not know which is which. Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for Sepang, in his vituperative abuse of the Opposition and his imputation of improper motives to the Opposition in the whole of his half-an-hour speech, was not stopped.

The Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications (Dato' V. T. Sambanthan): On point of clarification, I thought vituperation meant abuse? *(Laughter)*.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: I was emphasizing. As I was saying, his abuse, his violent abuse or his vituperative abuse, was not stopped for one instance. Why should he have been allowed to call us names? Surely, if a person has any argument to put forth, he should be able to put them forth with logic and without abuse. Of course, we appreciate humour once in a while, such as the humour from the Honourable the Prime Minister this morning, but we

note that these were embellishments to a speech that did not really alter the speech one way or another in its logic itself.

Mr Speaker, Sir, so if we would allow a longer period by which to ascertain the wishes of the Malaysian peoples, and if the Malaysian peoples were in agreement, then we can say with all conscience that we have been right, and nobody has the business to stop us. As it is, we are asking that that there should be a referendum and that it should be done within so many days and so few weeks. However, in any event, as the Honourable the Prime Minister said, we are only trying to ascertain the wishes before declaring Malaysia; in other words, Malaysia is going through at any event. If that is so, then I am sorry for Malaysia.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I now come to the question of Singapore. There has been a great confusion with regard to the position of Singapore. Everybody tends to talk of Malaysia and Singapore—and the unity between Singapore and Malaya—as if it is one and the same subject. That is not true—and it cannot be true. In 1947 the British Government severed Singapore from Malaya and thereby severed the head from the body.

Mr Speaker: Order, order. The debate at this stage is only on the amendment. After the amendment has been disposed of, we will go back to the original motion. I can allow you to reply to what the Prime Minister has said but not to introduce anything else.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: I am replying to the Honourable the Prime Minister, who referred to the referendum in Singapore and the presence of the Singapore Prime Minister here begging on his knees, no doubt, that Malaysia should take place on the 31st August, 1963. I am just trying to distinguish Singapore from the rest of Malaysia.

Sir, Singapore was severed from Malaya in 1947 and thereby the British Government severed the head from the body of Malaya. We have a right to ask back Singapore. We have a right

to say that Singapore merge with us completely, because Singapore is part of Malayan territory. The Prime Minister of Singapore did hold a referendum, but let us remember the terms of the referendum. It was nothing but a fraud to the people of Singapore, who were given three alternatives: the Lim Yew Hock alternative; the Lee Kuan Yew alternative, whereby all citizenship (Singapore type) is retained with reservation in labour and educational control; and the third alternative of what was called the Barisan Sosialis alternative, the Penang and Malacca type merger, but with the loss of half of the citizenship of Singapore. It is the wording and the presumption of the third alternative which is unfair. If he had said merger with Malaya, Penang and Malacca type, with citizenship being also on the same terms, then the answer might have been different since there ought to have been no loss of citizenship. The Prime Minister, Singapore, unfortunately, gave a referendum to the people of Singapore which we in Malaya should never accepted, because there is a fourth alternative—Singapore to come in as Malacca and Penang, and as any other State of Malaya. If it had offered that alternative, then, perhaps, the number of Members from Singapore would not have been limited to 15, but would have been exactly the same proportion as that of any other Malayan State which is based on the number of citizens and population of Singapore. As it is, the people of Singapore are limited to 15 representatives in the Malaysian Parliament according to the terms of this Bill.

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, one of the last points dealt with by the Honourable Prime Minister of Malaya was that if we do not have Malaysia, we will have communism—that is that unless Malaysia takes place, communism will come. Is that a fact? Further, if Malaysia comes by force and there is revolution—there is trouble—because the wishes of the people have not been properly ascertained, because a fraud has been committed upon them, what then? We have no arms; we have no planes, as it has

been stated; we have to borrow from our allies, planes, guns, tanks, ships, to shoot our own people. What then? If we have the interests and the welfare of the millions of people at heart, surely we do not want to put ourselves in the position whereby we will have to use somebody's guns, planes and tanks to shoot them. Once Malaysia takes place, the people of Sarawak are the people of Malaysia, and if one person in Sarawak is killed we will have killed one of our own people. If the British government does that, it is its own business. If we do it, it would be on our conscience.

Mr Speaker, Sir, unfortunately, since the Malaysia project has been mooted, there have been so much talk and so much abuse, and so much—can I use the word “lies”? (AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No, you cannot use it.)—untruth that it is difficult now to know what is the truth. Our Honourable Prime Minister keeps stressing, or rather he has stressed, that Singapore might become another Cuba, that Singapore might be taken over by the communists; and the Prime Minister of Singapore on the other hand keeps on insisting that Singapore would never become communist. In fact, I think, it was when our Prime Minister was on his way to Tokyo that he stopped at Singapore—or was it on his way back—that the Prime Minister of Singapore made it a point to repeat to our Prime Minister that Singapore would never go communist. It is impossible to know who is right. If the Singapore Prime Minister is right then our Prime Minister is wrong. Therefore, the whole basis of his Malaysia has fallen through, since he has claimed that that is the basis for Malaysia. He has no longer any basis for Malaysia. He does not even stand on shifting “Sandys”.

The Prime Minister: Mr Speaker, Sir, perhaps a little clarification is necessary. What is intended by the Honourable Prime Minister of Singapore is that jointly with Malaya, Singapore will never go communist—but not without Malaya.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Mr Speaker, Sir, unfortunately, those were not the words of the Singapore Prime Minister,

but may be the honest interpretation of the words of the Singapore Prime Minister by our Prime Minister. The Prime Minister of Singapore said that he assured the Tunku that, “Singapore will never go communist.”—without any condition. (*Laughter*).

Mr Speaker, Sir, if the words of the Prime Minister of Singapore is true, then it is clear that our Honourable Prime Minister has no basis for his Malaysia. If the words of the Prime Minister of Singapore are not correct, then what words of his are correct and proper? Was the Singapore referendum proper, for instance? If the referendum was not proper, then we cannot say that the people of Singapore have expressed their will freely and democratically.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to end up by saying again that we have, in fact, warned this Government of the hostility of Indonesia; we have, in fact, warned the Government that there would be trouble in the Bornean territories unless we approached the question cautiously; we have warned the Government that unless there is a proper referendum, this Malaysia would fall through. When we warned the Government in regard to Indonesia, nobody paid heed to us; when we asked that there should be a proper referendum and self-determination, nobody again took heed of us. For the last two years we have been here and we have been stressing self-determination—and we were shouting in the face of the wind—nobody paid any heed. Yet at Manila, the Honourable Prime Minister had to give in to Indonesia because, as he said, he did not want war. Therefore, I repeat again that what we could not achieve by sweet words was achieved at the point of a gun—and I repeat it again: what was not achieved by sweet words was achieved by seduction and violence.

Mr Speaker: I think it is time to suspend the sitting.

Sitting suspended at 11.30 a.m.

Sitting resumed at 11.55 a.m.

Dato' V. T. Sambanthan: Mr Speaker, Sir, I would have thought that after

the very long and informative speech of the Prime Minister that the Member for Dato Kramat at least would have held his peace and would not have made us hear his extremely complicated harangue on many things—at times I felt that he was himself in a confused state of mind. However, he has a right to say what he wants. While hearing him, I was wondering why the Opposition generally, an Opposition which just now is quite absent, the Opposition generally, should seek to sabotage this farsighted move for Malaysia.

I am reminded of a famous Chinese poet, Chu Yuan, who lived more than 2,200 years ago. That poet even now is remembered in Chinese homes by the very nice rice dumplings that are made every year. Chu Yuan, who was a poet and a stateman, must have come across some gentlemen like the gentlemen of the Opposition, and then in poetry form he had to say a few things. I am sure Honourable Members would like to hear what he had to say from this admirable translation, but before I read it, I would like to say that some Honourable Members of the Opposition have their eye jaundiced, blackened by jealousy and envy; they just cannot hold back from the thought and the fear that the Alliance Party, under our farsighted Prime Minister, has been forging ahead. To them this is a bad thing but the more jealous they get, the more blinded they are. So, to them, with your permission, Sir, I read:

“You see a Picture in the Night,
And black the Colours find.
Now Darkness is construed as Light,
And Fair to Foul is turned,
Now Hens and Geese”—the Honourable Member even mentioned ostriches—“can fly on high,
While Phoenixes are spurned.
Now Good and Bad are thought the same,
And Jade confused with Stone.
To men made blind by Prejudice,
Virtues are unknown.”

I quote to them Chu Yuan and I hope wiser counsels prevail.

Dato' Mohamed Hanifah bin Haji Abdul Ghani (Pasir Mas Hulu): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun menyokong pindaan yang di-kemukakan oleh

pehak Socialist Front ia-itu supaya pengesahan perjanjian di-London itu di-tanggohkan, kerana susah payah Yang Amat Berhormat Perdana Menteri Persekutuan Tanah Melayu pergi ka-Manila bagi menghadziri Persidangan Kemunchak untok menchari ketenteraman di-sebelah Tenggara Asia ini. Ini ada-lah satu sejarah yang mana segala keputusan dan semangat yang di-chapai itu dapat di-amalkan dengan sa-penoh-nya oleh Kerajaan pada hari ini. Saya mensifatkan perjanjian yang telah di-buat di-London itu ada-lah satu perjanjian yang di-buat dengan bergopoh gapah, maka lebeh² lagi dengan membawa usul ka-dalam Dewan ini oleh Perdana Menteri supaya mengesahkan perjanjian itu ada-lah satu kerja yang sangat² gopoh. Maka pada tempat-nya sa-barang pengesahan perjanjian ini dapat di-tanggohkan dan di-timbangkan pada satu masa yang lain pula.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya dukachita kerana sa-bentar tadi Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri telah berchakap berdolak dalek mengenai Penyata Cobbold kerana pada masa dahulu Penyata ini boleh di-pakai dan sekarang ini kata-nya ta' boleh di-pakai, pada hal Penyata ini ada-lah di-buat oleh orang² Tunku sendiri atau boleh-lah di-katakan orang tengah. Dalam Penyata itu menyatakan, satu pertiga daripada penduduk² Borneo itu bersetuju kepada Malaysia dan satu pertiga lagi tidak bersetuju Malaysia bahkan lebeh dahulu mesti-lah di-merdekakan negeri itu. Maka itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada-lah sangat berlawanan dengan kehendak² yang ada dalam Penyata Cobbold itu. Saya hairan kerana Perdana Menteri mengikut kata² bakal Ketua Menteri, Donald Stephens, yang mengatakan ra'ayat di-wilayah itu menyokong Malaysia. Saya nampak Donald Stephens ini sa-orang yang memikirkan soal kepentingan diri-nya sendiri.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam keterangan Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri tadi ia-nya sendiri telah mengaku bahawa orang² Melayu telah tenggelam di-dalam Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini dan akan bertambah tenggelam dalam Malaysia. Jadi nyata-lah

bahawa Perdana Menteri ini tidak lagi memperjuangkan bangsa Melayu dan niat beliau itu sa-mata² hendak melebarkan jajahan. Walhal, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, banyak perkara² yang menjadi kerunsingan pada orang Melayu di-tanah ayer kita sendiri. Orang² Melayu dahulu pernah menentang penerimaan kera'ayatan Jos Soli yang memberi kepada orang² asing dengan mudah menjadi ra'ayat Tanah Melayu, maka kedudukan orang Melayu akan lebeh terancham dengan penerimaan Malaysia; kata Perdana Menteri orang Melayu lebeh lagi tenggelam. Jadi macham mana-kah kedudukan orang Melayu? Ka-mana orang Melayu hendak bergantung kalau Perdana Menteri Melayu yang di-harapkan akan membela orang Melayu tidak mahu lagi membela Melayu. Nyata-lah pada hari ini bahawa Perdana Menteri kita dan pehak UMNO sendiri tidak ada niat hendak membela orang Melayu bahkan sa-mata² hendak melebarkan jajahan dan mendapat kemegahan di-dunia luar.

Satu lagi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri tadi mengatakan ia-itu sa-kira-nya Singapura di-merdekakan maka komunis akan berkuasa. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, siapa-kah yang boleh menahan pengaruh komunis itu apabila dia berada di-dalam Malaysia? Mereka akan bertambah kokoh, mereka dapat menjalarkan pengaruh² mereka itu ka-dalam Tanah Melayu ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Perdana Menteri tadi telah mensifatkan Persatuan Islam sa-Tanah Melayu ini sa-macham burung kesuari tetapi sa-benar-nya, Perdana Menteri itu-lah yang menjadi arnab yang sentiasa di-makan singa kerana beliau sendiri tidak insaf akan bahaya terhadap bangsa Melayu. Dahulu sa-bagaimana telah di-bimbangkan oleh orang Melayu dalam penerimaan kera'ayatan Jos Soli maka telah di-terima juga maka akhir-nya bangsa Melayu hampir tenggelam. Maka patut-lah sekarang ini Perdana Menteri dan rakan² saya dalam UMNO supaya sedar dan insaf dalam perkara ini. Di-katakan komunis merbahaya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua,—memang-lah merbahaya dan kita mesti tentang, tetapi siapa-kah komunis itu? Jawab-nya orang² bukan

Melayu. Negeri ini pernah mengalami satu benchana pergerakan komunis dan siapa komunis itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bukan-nya orang² Melayu. Dengan ini, patut-lah Perdana Menteri insaf dan hendak-nya Perdana Menteri itu kembali kepada semangat Melayu yang sa-benar-nya. Kalau sa-kira-nya Perdana Menteri telah mengikuti bagaimana semangat yang di-putuskan dalam rundingan di-Manila itu—rundingan di-antara tiga negara Melayu maka sa-patut-nya Perdana Menteri menghormati perjuangan bangsa Melayu dan apa-kah erti-nya negeri itu di-lebarkan jajahan-nya tetapi kedudukan orang Melayu bertambah terancham pada hari ini?

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, semangat baharu atau tenaga baharu yang pernah di-cheritakan dalam surat² khabar, yang pernah Perdana Menteri sendiri menyebut-nya, tenaga baharu yang harus timbul dalam kalangan ra'ayat negeri ini maka tenaga baharu ini patut-lah di-timbulkan dengan kuat di-kalangan orang Melayu pada hari ini. Kerana kita orang Melayu tidak akan dapat lagi menahan perasaan yang tertekan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tetapi orang Melayu-lah yang sengaja di-tinggalkan ka-belakang. Membuat perundingan dan perjanjian di-London itu tidak menguntongkan kepada orang Melayu tetapi ada-lah menguntongkan kepada pehak² pemodal² dan pehak² penjajah. Orang² ini-lah yang akan dapat keuntungan dan akan mengisap darah orang² Melayu. Maka orang² inilah yang sedang di-pelihara oleh Perdana Menteri.

Mr Speaker: Order! Order! Saya hendak mengingatkan di-bawah Peratoran 36 (10) (c) berkata: "Ada-lah salah pada peratoran menggunakan perkataan² yang harus menaikkan perasaan bersakit² hati atau bermusoh²an di-antara satu kaum dengan satu kaum dalam Persekutuan Tanah Melayu."

Kemudian, ada satu pindaan atas Peratoran 36 (11) yang di-beri kuasa kepada saya boleh memberhentikan siapa² juga Yang Berhormat di-dalam Majlis ini membuat kesalahan berchangkap di-bawah fasal yang saya sebutkan tadi. Jaga sedikit kalau tuan banyak menggunakan perkataan yang boleh

menyakitkan hati kalau saya dapati salah di-bawah Peratoran 36 (10) (c) saya ada kuasa boleh menahan tuan melangsungkan perchakapan.

Dato' Mohamed Hanifah bin Haji Abdul Ghani: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak-lah berhajat hendak berchakap dalam Dewan ini untuk menaikkan semangat atau membawa faham perkauman, tetapi berchakap sa-bagai orang Melayu yang telah merasa himpitan dalam negeri sendiri, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, apa-kah salahnya pehak Kerajaan Tanah Melayu chuba menanggohkan Usul ini supaya dapat di-binchangkan dengan lebeh mendalam lagi pada masa akan datang sa-telah rombongan Bangsa² Bersatu sudah mengkaji dan menyiasat kedudukan di-wilayah² Kalimantan Utara itu? Kalau sa-kira-nya kita menerima usul Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri pada hari ini maka sa-olah² kita ini membelakangkan kerja² yang sedang giat di-jalankan oleh Bangsa² Bersatu di-wilayah² Kalimantan Utara itu. Maka ini-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mengatakan satu kerja yang gopoh gapah yang tidak patut di-amalkan kerana pernah pehak UMNO dahulu menerima Perlembagaan Tanah Melayu di-buat oleh Jawatan-Kuasa Reid, satu penerimaan yang sangat gopoh yang membawakan kebenchanaan kapada umat Melayu kita. Pada hari ini sa-kira-nya kita menerima usul ini maka akibat-nya akan lebeh merbahaya kapada penduduk bangsa Melayu di-negeri ini. Itu-lah saya berharap supaya Kerajaan dan rakan² saya di-dalam Perikatan mengkaji benar² soal ini jangan hanya memandangkan di-atas kemajuan negeri ini, atas kechantekan negeri ini, tetapi sa-balek-nya bangsa Melayu yang akan merana, bangsa Melayu merasa kehimpitan yang amat pedeh-nya pada masa akan datang.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berharap kapada Perdana Menteri dan pehak rakan² saya di-dalam Perikatan, terutama sa-kali orang² Melayu supaya menyadari hakikat ini kerana perjanjian² yang telah di-buat di-London itu bukan meninggikan taraf dan darjah bangsa Melayu, bahkan merendahkan serta menjatuhkan maruah bangsa Melayu dan Raja² Melayu

sendiri. Maka biar-lah sa-takat itu sahaja, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berharap kapada pehak Kerajaan supaya dapat menerima pindaan yang di-kemukakan itu dan di-sini suka-lah saya menyatakan kami menyokong pindaan itu bukan-lah ma'ana-nya kita menerima usul itu, bahkan untuk menanggohkan supaya Kerajaan dapat mengulang kaji dan memikirkan dengan dalam supaya perbuatan itu jangan di-terima dengan tergopoh gapah.

Wan Yahya bin Haji Wan Mohamed (Kemaman): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mengambil bahagian dalam membahathkan Usul yang di-pinda oleh wakil dari Tanjong. Sa-lepas mendengar keterangan² dan hujah² yang di-bawa oleh pehak pembangkang, ada beberapa perkara yang menarek perhatian saya dalam Usul yang di-pinda itu, yang bertujuan menanggohkan pengesahan perjanjian di-London di-antara negeri² yang menjadi ahli di-dalam Persekutuan Malaysia. Sa-benar-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada pendapat saya dalam masaaalah ini ada dua perkara yang mesti kita fahamkan, yang pertama ada-lah perjanjian di-antara negeri² yang menjadi ahli yang akan bersekutu dalam Malaysia. Dan yang kedua ia-lah keputusan Manila dengan Kerajaan Indonesia dan Philippines. Jadi, bererti Malaysia akan di-laksanakan sa-lepas persetujuan Manila itu di-laksanakan. Pada pendapat saya perjanjian di-London yang kita hendak sahkan sekarang ini bukan-lah bererti Malaysia ini akan di-jalankan bagaimana yang telah di-tetapkan pada 31hb August. Sebab-nya, ia-lah Perdana Menteri sudah beberapa kali menerangkan dalam Dewan Yang Berhormat ini bahawa dengan peninjauan yang akan di-jalankan oleh rombongan Setia-Usaha Agong Bangsa² Bersatu itu bererti harus mengambil beberapa ketika untuk menentukan hasrat ra'ayat di-wilayah itu.

Jadi, andaikata kita mempersetujuan pengesahan perjanjian pada masa ini tidak-lah bererti Malaysia itu akan berjalan pada 31hb August. Dengan sebab persetujuan Manila ada-lah

menjadi satu perkara yang kedua yang akan menentukan hasrat ra'ayat di-wilayah itu sama ada penyata itu akan memberi satu keterangan sa-chara umum bagaimana-kah pandangan rombongan itu terhadap fikiran dan pendapat ra'ayat di-wilayah² itu. Jadi, dengan persetujuan Manila yang telah di-adakan di-antara tiga negeri itu-lah menjadi soal pokok kepada kita bilakah tarikh yang akan di-jalankan Persekutuan Malaysia itu. Pada pendapat saya di-dalam soal Usul untuk menanggohkan persetujuan itu tidak berapa kena, dengan sebab pelaksanaan mustahak di-nanti hasil yang di-tinjau oleh rombongan daripada United Nation. Kemudian, saya nampak pula pehak PAS yang pada pandangan saya tidak tentu arah di-dalam mengeluarkan hujah²-nya untuk hendak menanggohkan Usul ini. Saya maseh ingat dahulu PAS membangkang Malaysia, concept Malaysia yang di-anjorkan oleh Yang Teramat Mulia Tengku, tetapi sekarang ini nampak-nya dia tidak membangkang terus, sa-kadarkan hendak menanggohkan saja bererti pada pokok-nya dia bersetuju. Yang kedua, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, . . .

Date' Mohamed Hanifah bin Haji Abdul Ghani: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untuk penjelasan Persatuan Islam menyokong penanggohan bagi mengesahkan perjanjian itu, bukan PAS bersetuju pada pokok-nya Malaysia itu. Sebab, hanya di-tanggohkan, dan apabila di-tanggohkan, satu meshuarat akan di-adakan oleh Dewan ini. Di-situ berpeluang-lah pehak wakil Kemaman akan mendapat tahu pendirian Persatuan Islam.

Mr Speaker: Kalau hendak memberi penjelasan, jangan panjang sangat.

Date' Mohamed Hanifah bin Haji Abdul Ghani: Sa-kira-nya pehak wakil Kemaman tidak faham pendirian kami, tangguhkan sahaja usul ini, maka akan dapat-lah Yang Berhormat itu tahu bagaimana pendirian PAS yang sa-benar-nya.

Mr Speaker: Please proceed!

Wan Yahya bin Haji Wan Mohamed: Pada pendapat saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jika Persatuan Islam Sa-Tanah Melayu mungkin-lah tegap dengan

pendirian-nya mengatakan mereka tidak akan bersetuju dengan konsep Malaysia ini, mereka harus membangkang sahaja usul ini; tidak payah menyokong pindaan ini. Jadi pada pendapat saya dengan sebab itu-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak nampak satu pendirian yang agak tegas di-dalam menghadapi usul yang ada di-hadapan kita ini.

Ada lagi satu perkara, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-itu pehak Pembangkang nampak-nya gadoh sangat yang mengatakan takut mungkin kita tidak mendapat persetujuan daripada ra'ayat di-negeri Sabah dan Sarawak, yang sekarang ini kita chuma dengar daripada Mr Donald Stephens dengan tidak ada referendum di-sana. Saya fikir perkara ini tidak mustahak di-bangkitkan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kerana soal yang telah di-persetujui dari Sidang Manila yang sa-lama ini kita chuma menghadapi satu masaalah ia-itu bagaimana-kah chara melaksanakan Persekutuan Malaysia ini dengan sa-baik²-nya. Ini masaalah kita. Di-dalam melancar dan dalam melaksanakan Persekutuan Malaysia ini kita tidak mahu menghadapi konferantasi daripada mana² pehak dan kita tidak mahu persengketaan daripada mana² jiran. Ini menjadi soal pokok kita, kemudian ini sudah lojik ia-itu persetujuan Manila yang sah yang sudah di-persetujui oleh ketiga negara yang berjiran dan yang bersaudara itu bahawa Malaysia itu ada-lah boleh di-lancharkan, boleh di-adakan dan boleh di-tubuhkan chuma dengan penentuan daripada Rombongan United Nations untuk menentukan hasrat ra'ayat di-wilayah itu. Jadi dengan sebab itu-lah saya tidak nampak benar² di-mana lojik-nya usul pindaan ini di-bawa ka-dalam Dewan ini. Dan saya fikir tidak payah saya berchakap panjang. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-takat ini-lah sahaja.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid (Seberang Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun membangkang usul pindaan yang di-kemukakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Tanjong. Sa-bagaimana yang kita sudah ma'alum, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bahawa sikap, pendirian dan kerja parti Pembangkang ia-lah membangkang. Jika mereka itu

sokong rancangan Kerajaan tentu-lah kerusi mereka itu harus hilang. Oleh sebab itu, kerja parti Pembangkang ialah membangkang. Sungguh pun chadangan ini baik bagi pihak Kerajaan, tetapi mereka itu bangkang. Saya tahu sikap parti Pembangkang, khas-nya Socialist Front. Saya ingin menarek perhatian Dewan Yang Berhormat ini, ia-itu masa perbahathan mengenai pencherobohan di-negara Hungary, kita mengambil sikap untuk mengutok perbuatan itu, tetapi pihak Socialist Front berdiam diri, dan manakala pencherobohan di-negara Tibet berlaku, sikap Socialist Front berdiam diri, tetapi kita mengambil langkah dengan membawa perkara itu kepada Bangsa² Bersatu.

Saya dengar Yang Berhormat dari Bungsar mengatakan: "we do not want to see the horrors of war", atau kita tidak suka melihat kekejaman peperangan. Tetapi saya ingin menarek perhatian Dewan ini ia-itu masa kita berjuang untuk menghapuskan keganasan komunis, apa-kah kerja dan langkah yang telah di-buat oleh pihak Socialist Front? Dan bila kita merayu kepada orang ramai supaya jangan sokong pihak komunis, Socialist Front tidak buat apa², dan manakala diishtiharkan dharurat tamat, mereka itu tiada mengambil bahagian. Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita tentu-lah faham bagaimana tabi'at mereka itu.

Saya ingin menarek perhatian mengenai pencherobohan Komunis China di-sempadan India. Yang Amat Berhormat Tunku

Mr Speaker: Masaalah yang di-hadapan Majlis ini bukan pencherobohan dan pendirian satu² parti politik. Saya hendak ingatkan, ia-itu masaalah yang di-hadapan Majlis ini ia-lah satu pindaan yang sangat mudah di-fahamkan. Saya hendak menyambong lagi, perbahathan usul ini hanya pada hari ini sahaja dan tidak disambong lagi pada hari besok. Ramai Ahli² sudah berchakap dalam pindaan yang ada di-hadapan Majlis ini, maka sa-lepas daripada kita membahathkan pindaan ini, kita akan kembali sa-mula membahathkan usul yang asal itu, dan saya telah di-beritahu ramai Ahli² yang hendak berchakap tentang usul yang asal itu. Jadi saya merayu kepada

Ahli² Yang Berhormat supaya berchakap sa-berapa pendek, dan jangan ulang apa yang telah di-chakapkan. Saya dapati *preamble* itu sangat panjang. Tolong pendekkan.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, oleh sebab pihak Pembangkang telah mengeluarkan tuduhan terhadap Kerajaan, maka saya sa-bagai sa-orang daripada Ahli Kerajaan patut juga-lah memberi fikiran di atas apa yang di-tuduh itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perkara penanggohan ini tidak patut di-tanggohkan, kerana dalam Article V dalam perjanjian itu ada menyebutkan—

"The Government of the Federation of Malaya will take such steps as may be appropriate and available to them to secure the enactment before Malaysia Day by the Parliament of the Federation of Malaya an Act in the form set out in Annex E to this Agreement for the purpose of extending and adapting the Immigration Ordinance, 1959, of the Federation of Malaya to Malaysia and of making additional provision with respect to entry into the States of Sabah and Sarawak; and the other provisions of this Agreement shall be conditional upon the enactment of the said Act."

Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam perjanjian ini pun

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of order—Standing Order 36 (1). This Honourable Member is purposely wasting the time of the House so that we in the Opposition will be deprived of our right of a chance to speak. He is repeating what has been said and, in fact, the reply of the Prime Minister covered the majority of the ground of whatever the Government may want to say. So, Mr Speaker, Sir, under S.O. 36 (1) I would urge you to stop any irrelevant remarks by back-benchers of the Government unless those remarks are absolutely new.

Mr Speaker: I think the speaker himself has a right to speak and I cannot stop him except to advice him not to repeat what has already been said. That is my ruling. Please proceed!

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ucapkan terima kasih. Yang Amat Berhormat Perdana Menteri telah menunjukkan Article V, oleh sebab Yang Berhormat dari

Damansara tidak faham, saya terpaksa baca apa erti Article V itu. Oleh yang demikian, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, usul ini patut di-tolak.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise on the same point of order. The Honourable Member is still wasting the time of the House.

Mr Speaker: (*Kapada Tuan Haji Ahmad*) Chakap atas pindaan sahaja.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid: Dalam pindaan ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Article V menunjukkan mesti di-luluskan oleh Dewan ini sa-belum kita ada-kan usul mengenai perjanjian Malaysia yang telah di-binchangkan—ia-itu mengenai Perlembagaan; dan oleh yang demikian terpaksa-lah di-luluskan dahulu oleh Dewan ini. Berkenaan dengan apa yang di-katakan mengenai keputusan daripada Bangsa² Bersatu itu akan di-tunggu, dan manakala telah dapat keputusan itu, dapat-lah kita terima atas apa juga yang di-buat-nya, chuma yang mustahak mesti-lah di-terima perjanjian ini, sebab lain² negeri sudah terima.

Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Pasir Mas Hulu telah membangkitkan tentang kedudukan ahli² UMNO di-sini dan mengatakan bahawa Yang Amat Berhormat Perdana Menteri tidak meng-hiraukan berkenaan dengan orang² Melayu. Perkara ini telah pun Kerajaan masukkan di-dalam Perlembagaan Persekutuan dalam Bab 153. Saya harap Ahli Yang Berhormat itu tolong-lah semak sedikit, jangan menudoh dengan melalui sahaja

Dato' Mohamed Hanifah bin Haji Abdul Ghani: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya hendak beri penjelasan sedikit.

Mr Speaker: Hendak beri jalan?

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid: Saya beri.

Dato' Mohamed Hanifah bin Haji Abdul Ghani: Sa-benar-nya saya telah mengikuti ucapan Yang Amat Berhormat Perdana Menteri tadi yang mengatakan bahawa orang² Melayu telah tenggelam dalam Malaya, dan bertambah tenggelam lagi dalam Malaysia.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli Yang Berhormat itu chuma hendak menarek orang² Melayu supaya menyokong Parti Islam sa-Tanah Melayu dengan alasan² bahawa dengan terwujud-nya Malaysia kelak, orang² Melayu akan tenggelam. Jadi perkara ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau-lah bagitu pendirian Persatuan Islam sa-Tanah Melayu yang sunggoh² memperjuangkan perkara orang² Melayu, saya yakin dan perchaya ia-itu di-dalam pilehan raya dahulu tentu-lah mereka itu mendapat sokongan yang penoh dalam Negeri Kelantan sendiri, tetapi apabila di-adakan pilehan raya Majlis² Tempatan di-negeri itu, tujuh buah Majlis² Tempatan telah di-bolot oleh Perikatan. PAS chuma hendak menudoh, atau pun hendak menjadi juara sa-bagai pembela bangsa Melayu. Saya ingin menarek perhatian Ahli² Yang Berhormat Parti PAS ia-itu dalam manifesto mereka tahun 1959 antara lain menyatakan:

- (d) Meletakkan Melayu sa-bagai kebangsaan negeri ini dan memberi taraf kera'yatan Melayu kapada orang² yang bukan Melayu dengan syarat² yang kemas dan chara yang tidak berlawanan dengan kepentingan bangsa Melayu
- (h) Memberi layanan yang saksama dengan orang² yang bukan Melayu yang menjadi ra'ayat negeri ini dan memelihara kepentingan mereka yang halal sama ada dalam hidup umum atau pun dalam lingkungan khas mereka itu.

Jadi, menda'wa bahawa mereka itu menjadi jagoh memperjuangkan untuk orang² Melayu ada-lah bertentangan, berlawanan dengan manifesto PAS tahun 1959. Jangan-lah chuba hendak mengelirukan ra'ayat. Chuba-lah terangkan apa yang ada dalam manifesto itu:

- (t) Berikhtiar meminda, atau mengubah Perlembagaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu supaya dapat menjamin terlaksana-nya hukum² Allah dan menegakkan sa-mula kedaulatan bangsa Melayu dalam negeri ini.

Hendak memerintah sa-chara hukum Allah, tetapi negeri Kelantan yang mereka mendapat 28 buah kerusi dan Perikatan chuma dua kerusi, sa-hingga hari ini ta' dapat di-laksanakan hukum² Allah itu. Jadi, saya berharap supaya

Ahli² Yang Berhormat itu, kalau hendak berchakap, tolong-lah berpandu kapada manifesto yang mereka itu dikeluarkan dalam tahun 1959 dahulu.

Enche' Tan Cheng Bee (Bagan): Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose the amendment to the original motion because I feel that every right thinking man who has been following the results of the elections in Sabah and Sarawak will not fail to come to the conclusion that the majority of the people in these two territories favour Malaysia. Even the Assistant Secretary to the United Nations, Mr Narashiman, who came here on a spot investigation has spoken favourably of the feelings of the people of these territories. And if we believe that the papers do not lie, we read of the tremendous welcome that was accorded to the Prime Minister of Singapore when he returned to Singapore after the signing of the Malaysia Agreement in London, and we have also found since then he has been accorded popular welcome when he visits constituencies after constituencies in Singapore which proves that he has suddenly become very popular since the signing of the Malaysia agreement. All this therefore go to prove that the peoples in the territories of Singapore, Sabah and Sarawak favour Malaysia and if any right thinking people think otherwise, I think something must be really wrong with them.

Sir, our popular Prime Minister has said that he agreed to go to the Manila Talks because of his sincere desire for peace and goodwill with our neighbours' the Indonesians and the Filipinos and the agreement reached by the heads of these three States in Manila is only to ascertain the desire of the people of Sarawak and Borneo taking into consideration the recent elections in Sabah and Sarawak. For this we must give high praise to our Prime Minister—for his tactfulness in inducing the two heads of Governments to come to this agreement—and that shows really high statesmanship on his part in getting these two heads of Governments to agree to ascertain the wishes of the people through the results of the recent elections. This may defer the proclamation of Malaysia by a

very short period, and probably it will be not longer than a fortnight since the Secretary-General has already announced that it would take him about four weeks to do the job; It is my opinion that with all the foregoing facts, it would not be sufficient to pre-judge the result of the U.N. investigation team. As the Government of Singapore and the newly elected Governments of Sabah and Sarawak have been very keenly and anxiously wanting to hail the proclamation of Malaysia, I think it would be really very silly to think that the results could be otherwise. The Socialist Front has always opposed Malaysia and we can expect them to make every effort to oppose it as long as they could do so.

But, Sir, while the Socialist Front have always requested our Government to hold a referendum in Borneo and Sarawak on the issue of Malaysia, they seem to be blind to the affairs of another territory where the United Nations have demanded as a condition to its occupation by another Power, that a referendum be taken in the territory. Of course, I do not wish to touch on this matter, as the Prime Minister has advised us not to say things now to rupture the feelings of the Indonesians, or breach the peace that has already been agreed to. The Socialist Front would know to which territory I am referring to, i.e. the West Irian issue. I see that the Socialist Front Members have been very silent over this matter, despite the fact that the United Nations have demanded that a referendum be taken in West Irian six months after its occupation by the Indonesians, but in the case of Malaysia, they thought it right to level every criticism at our Government.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Sir, on a point of order, Standing Order 36 (1). Mr Speaker, Sir, that is utterly irrelevant. Whatever the speaker has said, Mr Speaker, Sir, we have already heard in this House from the Government benches.

Mr Speaker: He is only giving an example. The example is quite relevant.

Enche' Tan Cheng Bee: Sir, I was trying to show the inconsistencies of the Socialist Front. These misgivings have gone to expose the Socialist Front of their inconsistent and suspicious stand towards the democratic action of our Government.

Question put, amendment negatived.

Mr Speaker: Now we come back to the original motion.

The Minister of Finance (Enche' Tan Siew Sin): Mr Speaker, Sir, the motion before the House is a very important one. It asks the House to signify its approval of the establishment of Malaysia, a federation which would mean increasing the present area of the Federation two and a half times, increasing its population by 50 per cent, and its potential for good by very much more. If the hopes of its founders, and these hopes are based on a sober assessment of hard realities, are realised, this farsighted concept will without doubt broaden the area of stability and prosperity in an area which is none too stable at the moment. We are therefore entering a solemn moment in our history. We are being asked to make a decision on a matter which would have a decisive impact on our destiny for at least a generation. Under such circumstances, one would think that this matter is too serious to be regarded by any party in this House, whether Government or Opposition, as one of party politics, which could appropriately be used as an instrument to further party interests. Unfortunately, however, it is all too clear that the Opposition has disregarded national interests in order to advance the cause of their respective parties. This House, as the repository of the nation's political conscience should, at a time like this, reflect the greatness of the hour, the solemnity of the occasion, when 10 million people decide to come together of their own free will in order to work out their common destiny, spurred on by their desire to progress on the road to peace and prosperity. This subject, Sir, has instead been turned by the Opposition into a matter generating bitter emotions as a result of party polemics. A climax has been turned into an anti-climax.

Honourable Members on the other side of this House will, of course, stoutly deny that, if what I have said is true, they could be held responsible for it. Let us, however, examine whether the charges I have levelled against them can in fact be substantiated. As far as one can gather, no Honourable Member of the Opposition has actually opposed the principle of Malaysia itself. The gist of their criticisms has been that the methods of securing it have left something to be desired. One school of thought feels that Singapore should have been brought in on rather different terms. Whatever the merits or demerits of the arrangements which have been agreed to with Singapore, one must bear in mind that they have been freely negotiated with and agreed to by an elected Government, reinforced by a referendum which endorsed its decision by a majority which any impartial observer would regard as unmistakable.

One Honourable Member of the Opposition has suggested that the referendum was not fair in the sense that the choices left open to the electorate were such that the result would not really reflect the true feelings of the population. Whatever may be the case, even that Honourable Member of the Opposition must admit that it was open to anybody who did not want Malaysia at all not to vote or to put in blank votes. In spite of that, the results showed that an overwhelming majority of those eligible to vote did cast their votes, and of those who cast their votes, a substantial majority voted in favour of Malaysia. Another Honourable Member of the Opposition suggested that because the conduct and methods of the Prime Minister of Singapore left something to be desired, that was a case against Malaysia. I would suggest to this House, Sir, that it is not fair to visit the sins of the Prime Minister of Singapore on the heads of the population of Singapore. That should dispose of Singapore.

In regard to both Sabah and Sarawak, let us remember that elections held there for the first time in their history have also endorsed the decisions of

their respective Governments in favour of Malaysia. There was a conclusive majority in one case and an overwhelming majority in the case of the other. At the elections in question, Malaysia was clearly the main issue before the electorate, in fact, in view of the circumstances in which the elections were held, it could not possibly have been otherwise.

In all three cases, i.e. in the case of Singapore, Sabah and Sarawak, difficult and protracted negotiations preceded final agreement. Agreement with Singapore was reached after what can probably be regarded as some of the toughest negotiations one could possibly think of, and this is a fact which is known to all the world, and perhaps, I can speak with some feeling on this subject as I speak from personal experience. It would be fair to say that final agreement was on the basis of finely balanced give and take and all-round compromise. In regard to Sabah and Sarawak, the negotiations were equally arduous though not so lengthy or acrimonious. This was however chiefly due to the fact that all parties to the negotiations firmly resisted the temptation to speak to the Press at inopportune moments. The conclusion one can safely draw from these negotiations is that the final agreements were freely entered into, without any element of compulsion from any quarter. Whether the terms were favourable or unfavourable to one party or the other is really irrelevant. The relevant fact is that the final agreement in each case was acceptable to both parties to the negotiations, as it represented the broadest area of agreement possible under the circumstances. One therefore wonders how it can possibly be asserted that the concept of Malaysia has transgressed any known, or even unknown principle of equity. The principle itself has been accepted by the peoples concerned through free elections. The terms of merger have been arrived at after free negotiations.

There only remains the question of the reactions of neighbours. There is nothing, Sir, to prevent the 10 million people living in the 14 States,

which will come together to form the Federation of Malaysia, to decide that it is their business, and exclusively their business, to decide their own destiny. If they have so decided, it would be difficult, by whatever standards their conduct is judged, to say that they are wrong to think that they should be masters of their own fate. They have, however, been much more conciliatory and agreed to go some way to meet the wishes of their neighbours. If, in spite of this, it is still considered that they are not conciliatory enough, one can only suggest that it is high time to change the definition of this adjective, or somebody's head should be closely examined.

Now, Sir, it is clear that the Opposition have opposed for the sake of opposing, and this is putting the most charitable interpretation on their motives and actions. If one were to be uncharitable, one could assign baser motives and they would still stick. What we are proposing to do is a natural evolution, it is in fact a logical consummation of past history which dictates that territories linked together by common traditions, political and administrative, which have so much to gain by economic union, should pursue this process to its inevitable conclusion and come together into a political union as well. It is a resolve based on sheer political and economic realism, reinforced if anything by developments outside the boundries of the proposed Federation and reinforced also, in this case fortunately, by the free will of the peoples concerned. There is, therefore, everything to gain and nothing to lose by our resolve to go ahead with this common endeavour. Hesitation now would be fatal, a resolution to go forward with "malice towards none, with charity for all, and with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right", if I may quote the exact words of the immortal founder of one of the greatest nations in modern history, will one day assuredly earn the gratitude of posterity and of generations yet unborn. (*Applause*).

Sitting suspended at 1.00 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 4.30 p.m.

(Mr Speaker in the Chair)

MALAYSIA AGREEMENT

Debate resumed.

Enche' Abdul Aziz bin Ishak (Kuala Langat): Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose the motion, which for the last two days various speakers from this side of the House have spoken opposing it. Sir, I wish to relate that during the period I was on the Government side, and for the last two and a half years, I consistently opposed the formation of Malaysia—this clearly showed that it is not only after I left the Cabinet that I oppose it. In fact, from the very beginning I did repeatedly inform the Cabinet that it was foolish to rush this thing through. It will not benefit the people as a whole. For the last seven and a half years, or eight years now, we have not been able to put our own house in order: many or almost all of our programmes have been done on an *ad hoc* basis; there had been no proper planning of any kind for the last eight years; hence we see the appalling result to date. It is a great pity that while we are still trying to set things in order, we are plunging into something of which we do not know very much about.

Now, Sir, does the present state of affairs indicate that we had planned ahead? In the last seven and a half years, when I was in the Government, you will remember, all of us were united. In 1955, after we won the elections, we strongly resolved to plan properly, but as I said on a previous occasion in this House, we did not have that opportunity. In the Alliance Cabinet then, there were ten of us, Malaysians, I think, and there were five or six senior British officials, and these same five or six British officials' persuasiveness was so effective that we were not able to plan as we wanted to. Actually, what planning we did was merely on trivial matters, but concerning really important matters we were not able to do, because as I said the British Officers were very persuasive and they managed to ask

us to do things trivial and for them to do things major. You will remember, Sir, and Honourable Members of this House will remember too, we planned to have our Merdeka in four years, but after the persuasiveness of the British officials, including the then High Commissioner, who sat as Chairman in our Cabinet or the Executive Council as it was called, we, including myself at the beginning, agreed. Of course, our Prime Minister is very persuasive himself, so much so that we had to agree with him to what the British wanted us to do. So, they planned for our finance, economy, defence and every thing else, and we were happy to plan only the protocol side, uniform designing for the Ministers and for others and for ceremonies and all the rest of it, including, of course—I do not deny that we did quite a lot—on education and culture, but that was not really important. Therefore, when eventually after a year, during the time of the negotiations for Merdeka with Britain, they found that we were easy meat. Consequently, they agreed when we demanded Merdeka within two years, because they knew very well that they would be leaving from the front door and would be coming back through the back-door, which they have done. They found that our Government, or rather the Alliance Government, was easy to work with—ready to compromise: that has been the great virtue of our Prime Minister. So, Sir, it is abundantly clear we had not done very much, and there is no need for me to recall what we have done in the various spheres. The Alliance Government had been easy to work with, so much so that two and a half years ago the idea of Malaysia was mooted—and, of course the Prime Minister has claimed that as his own. However, Sir, it is a well known fact that the British wanted to be assured of the continued prosperity of their commercial interests, of their industrial interests in this part of the world—they wanted the assurance of the Alliance Government, of the Prime Minister—not mine; of course, as shown, he was ready to unbend on things which he originally did not want to agree, and it was easy

for the British to use their influence, so much so that today we find all the original plans of them by the Secretary for Economic Affairs, Dato' Oscar Spencer—and I suppose for that reason he was made a Dato'. We the ordinary people did not get much at all; in fact, we got nothing. I do not want to say very much. It is enough. In the last two and a half years, since Malaysia was mooted, nothing very much was done in many of the Ministries, because priority was given to Malaysia and every thing else was left out. I am sure that Ministers opposite will bear testimony to that. Nothing is important except Malaysia. As we all know, on various occasions whenever the Government bench was asked to explain why things were not done, it was always said that there was shortage of staff, shortage of officers, lack of money and so on. But then if the Government is short of money, how are we going to deploy the officers and money that we are in short supply of to the territories that we are going to embrace. I am sure the ordinary people will suffer. It is a rash thing, I say, for the idea of Malaysia to be steamrollered through at this stage.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid: Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification

Enche' Abdul Aziz bin Ishak: I am not giving way, Sir. The Prime Minister is a good friend of mine or was. In fact, I have known him as well as anybody. I have worked so well with him. He is often incapable of telling the truth (*Laughter*) and sometimes he has claimed somebody's efforts as his very own. Very often, if you ask him—and if he is in his expansive mood—he will tell you himself but, of course, he will not say so today as it is too public.

Sir, the prestige of the Alliance Government is very important to the Alliance Government, but mere prestige with nothing else does not carry far anywhere—so it is with Malaysia. The failure of the Alliance Government in trying to rule the Federation of Malaya will be a projection in Malaysia, and who will suffer? We will suffer?

The people in the kampongs, the ra'ayats, will suffer. But the British will benefit—absolutely. When I went to North Borneo, Sarawak and Brunei on a flying visit last year, I found that work on development to build new plants and godowns was carried out at great speed by the big British commercial firms. They want to be assured that they will rule the roost for a long, long time with the Alliance leadership of the Government. They hope that this situation will prevail.

Sir, it is up to the Opposition to be united—and God knows how we tried to be united—with the objective eventually to change the Government constitutionally. The Prime Minister is very glib. He is fond of accusing people of affiliations to communist parties, or agents of the enemy, and so on, and he had even called people lunatics. In fact, Sir, I had been called a lunatic by him one day (*Laughter*)—I do not know whether it was in venom or it was in joke. I will tell you the incident.

When I came back from Cairo in April last year, Vice-President Pelaez was here for the ASA Conference in the Cameron Highlands, complete with golf and the rest of it. When I returned from a party given to Dr Hatta, by the former Indonesian Ambassador, I received a telegram at nine o'clock at night addressed to me saying, as far as I can remember, this: "Having seen your pictures in the press I am convinced more than ever that something is wrong with your head." (*Laughter*) (AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Correct). (*Laughter*).

Mr Speaker: Order, order.

Enche' Abdul Aziz bin Ishak: The telegram goes on to say: "I suggest a Board of Medical Officers examine whether you are fit mentally." As I said, Sir, I am not sure whether there was venom in it. But I am sure sometimes that, although the Prime Minister looks so benign and friendly, he is not entirely that. (*Laughter*). There was venom, and I could sense it straightaway. So, I took up the telephone and asked for a phonogram addressed: "Prime Minister, Cameron Highlands:

Thank you very much for your telegram. I think we are in the same boat." (*Laughter*). I was very glad he took it very nicely and he even showed the telegram to the Vice-President of the Philippines and the Deputy Prime Minister of Thailand. Of course, in this House he also pretends to be friendly, and sometimes he pretends to be foolish—and when he appears foolish he is most dangerous. (*Laughter*). He calls people names and the rest of it, but because we all remember that he is proud of his virtue of looking foolish, a pride of his antecedent—he often claims that he is happy about it.

Sir, to call a person an agent of the communist, or an agent of the enemy is not so bad, because it is not true, but I can call him straightaway—I think you will agree with me and the world will agree too—that he is an agent of imperialism. The Alliance Government is the agent of imperialism—absolutely. When I was a Minister attending international conferences, I found that the other delegates from the Afro-Asian countries were inclined to look down on the representatives of Malaya. I was trying to find out why. They shunned us because of our being dominated by the western bloc. The trend today, the fashion today, of course, is to align ourselves with the Afro-Asian bloc—neutral, non-alignment. But for years the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister had said that we, this Government, this country, would sink or swim with the West. Well, I think, it is all right to swim but not to sink. (*Laughter*). It will be fatal. It is all right if it is fatal to the Alliance Government alone. But fatal to the people, I think it will be very sad indeed. Sir, if the Prime Minister feels that my charge that he and his colleagues are tools of the imperialism is unfair, I can repeat it outside and they can take me to court. I am prepared to do that, because I am telling the truth. It is the truth, because everything today—all the big industries and all the big businesses—is in the same position as pre-Merdeka. What more proof you want? And you are not able to make a change directly or indirectly—substantial change, I mean.

Mr Speaker: You have been dwelling too long on outside the motion.

Enche' Abdul Aziz bin Ishak: No, Mr Speaker, it is on Malaysia. It is Malaysia which is the jumping board.

Mr Speaker: Don't speak too much on personalities.

Enche' Abdul Aziz bin Ishak: No, I am speaking on the personality of the Prime Minister who is important. Sir, the Prime Minister in his speech said that the virility of this nation is important. I am afraid there is no virility in the nation at all today. There may be virility among the Ministers; I do not deny that. They are generally very virile. But the virility of the nation is almost nil, because the people have not benefited; they have not reaped the harvest of Merdeka. In the past two years we have done very little to improve ourselves because we give priority to Malaysia and for the next 10 years, if Malaysia comes into being, the position will be worse. As I have said earlier, we will have to deploy our officers, our money and our experts to those countries. So the chances for the ordinary man are very, very slim and the future very bleak indeed.

Sir, coming to the Manila accord, the whole world is waiting to see whether there is going to be a substantial change in what I have said earlier; whether we are going to keep our word or whether we are going to cross the line and are going to be the beachhead for the British and the Western bloc. If it comes into being, then the whole achievement of the Manila Accord would be nil. So it is important that the present smug complacency of the Alliance Government that they can carry on in the way they want should be changed. They say that socialism is not for this country. I think that was said repeatedly over the years and they often used it as a threat. But I think socialism in a very reasonable form will have to take the place of the present type of government that we have, with no policy and with only *ad hoc* planning. Although the Alliance Government has been in power for eight years, compared

with the Singapore Government—although in many other respects I do not like the Singapore Government—but in planning and efficiency they have done much better in the short space of time that they have ruled Singapore. So it shows in comparison that we have done very, very little.

Sir, I have nothing much more to say, except that I sincerely hope and pray to God that the findings of the United Nations officers would be otherwise than expected by the Alliance Government. I have no axe to grind personally. As the Prime Minister in his speech on the first day had said let posterity judge for itself whether the Alliance Government is right or not, I would say the same thing: let posterity judge for itself whether the Alliance is right or not; then it would be too late. Now probably my former colleagues are ringing the bells, but very soon they will be wringing their hands. Thank you.

Mr Speaker: Ahli² Yang Berhormat, saya hendak mengingatkan ia-itu perbahathan di-atas usul yang ada di-hadapan kita ini hanya-lah tinggal sa-hingga 6.30, kerana tepat pada pukul 6.30 nanti saya akan undi. Kalau ada Ahli² Yang Berhormat hendak berchakap, saya merayu-lah supaya berchakap sa-berapa pendek. Juga janganlah di-ulang²kan perkara² yang telah di-bahathkan. Saya dapati ramai diantara Ahli Yang Berhormat mengulang² lagi apa yang telah di-chakapkan. Masa-nya pendek untuk Ahli² Yang Berhormat hendak mengambil bahagian di-dalam perbahathan yang ada di-hadapan Majlis ini.

Dato' V. T. Sambanthan: Mr Speaker, Sir, I was rather aghast when my ex-colleague rose up and said a number of things. I was aghast when he charged that we planned to have Merdeka in four years and then achieved it in two. That I suppose is meant as a black mark and a pointer to the fact that we are stooges of the British imperialists—fighting for freedom and getting it ahead of schedule being a hallmark of imperialist stooges. But the world judges for itself, and the world knows that in Malaya by dint of our ability

to see into the future we were able to cut short the four years into two and so we broke away from the old Executive Council and had our own Cabinet from 1957 August the 31st. That is a hallowed day and a hallowed day for which I think we are very thankful. Now, how did we achieve this? Did we achieve it by sabre-rattling, by yelling at the top of our voices, or by steady belief in our purpose and by doing what we wanted to do?

As I have said, the world judges and the world knows that we achieved Merdeka in two years. But my friend and ex-colleague says that it is wrong; and then he goes on to say that we are very easy to work with, we are ready to compromise—the Prime Minister is ready to compromise. Indeed, yes, the Prime Minister is ready to compromise and see that good things are maintained. There is no such thing as a hard and definite road to any place or anything. Life is a compromise and compromise has got to be carried on throughout this life. The fundamental question is: are we able to achieve our objectives or are we not? The past many years will show to the world whether we have achieved this objective or not. My friend and ex-colleague said that for two years now we have been speaking of Malaysia and we have done nothing, I repeat, nothing at all. He has only to look at the Development Estimates for 1963 to disprove of that. In 1963 alone we are spending \$493 million on a variety of objectives. Turn over the pages of the estimates and you can see what they are: land development schemes, roads, houses, and what have you. If this is not achievement, I do not know what is. What then does my friend go by? Does he go by merely saying what he wants? He may have broken with the Party, but then there has got to be some objectivity. He has got to say the truth. The truth today is seen by the world. Let any foreign observer come and he will see in Malaya an oasis: an oasis of achievement, an oasis of stable government, an oasis of a peaceful and happy people living together looking to the future on the basis of achievement. He said that

for two years we have done nothing. Is it not a fact that during the past two years we have broken the back of the Five-Year Development Plan? We have planned and have put up, for instance, 1,200 miles of roads for the rural dwellers, for the ordinary people, the peasantry, the poorest of the poor. Before, when the British were here, was it not a fact that kampongs, which had been there for 500 years and more, could not have an ordinary car to go in, where a pregnant mother could not be brought out? Is it not a fact that nursing sisters could never go to these places? And is it not a fact that the very achievement of 1,200 miles in 2½ years has meant that these villages are now open to all the services of Government? Is this no achievement then? I could show a variety of other factors where we have achieved substantially, so substantially, in fact, that the whole world is surprised at our achievement. Today, what have we been shouting about? For instance, if I were to shout, I could shout only of achievements, and I would be thoroughly objective. But let us face this fact; whether one is in the Opposition or not, one has got to give the devil its due, even if the devil is the Alliance Government, even if the devil is the Alliance Party. Today, if you look around in Asia, if you look around in many parts of the world, you could say with a certain amount of definite objectivity that there are not many governments which tomorrow morning you would be certain, would still continue. But there is one government at least in Asia, or a few governments in Asia, of which you could say, "Tomorrow I will wake up and that government will be there"—and one of those governments is certainly the Alliance Government. (*Applause*). In a world of troubled waters, in a world where troubles threaten at many places, this stability that we show to the world, this peaceful living that we give to the world, this area of peace that we have around us, is it not something to be proud of? If we have been able to achieve this by dint of good government, what is it that they are attacking us for? I do not know myself. But I

would appeal to the Opposition, please be objective. See for yourself this achievement. Maybe we have not kicked the British firms out from here. But then, what would the objective be if we are going to kick the British firms, the American firms, or any other firms from Malaya? If we have been geared to the policy of industrialisation, if we think we want American firms to come here because we want more and more employment for our people, if we think by that a certain amount of expertise would be of benefit to our boys, if we think through that, we will also give training to our youngsters, is that not something laudable? I am really surprised, Mr Speaker, Sir, that my ex-comrade should have said these things. (*Laughter*). He also spoke of virility of this and the other.

Enche' Abdul Aziz bin Ishak: On a point of explanation. I spoke on virility because the Prime Minister raised the question of virility.

Dato' V. T. Sambanthan: I suppose he does not want me to touch upon that aspect, but I can assure him that this Government is thoroughly virile, that this Government is not complacent, that this Government is not, as he said, easy-going and showing smug complacency. He spoke of our opposition to socialism, or this, that and the other. Sir, ideologically, this Government of ours has not tied itself to any doctrinaire ideology. We do not believe in doctrinaire socialism or anything else. But if one were to look around—and my friend will know it, as he was the ex-Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives—it will be shown that for the past many years we, the Alliance Government, have prevented land from being given in large sections to anybody, and this means that we have taken a step to prevent the rich getting land, while at the same time we have doled out land in small sizes of six acres, eight acres, and ten acres. Is that not something good? If that is not a form of giving to the poor man an opportunity to have his own land, I do not know what is. Further, let us look at our land development schemes. They are nearer collectives than anything

else. Is that capitalistic then? And yet my friends says that we must be doctrinaire. We believe in pragmatism—in doing things for the people. We believe that tying ourselves down to some doctrinaire ideological approach will only tie ourselves hand and feet. We do not need to have a doctrinaire ideological approach, but we need to have a pragmatic approach. We are a nationalist Government. We feel that as the people want certain things to be done, we will do it, and our progress—the signs of what we have done for the past few years—is proof enough of the many things that we have done. If putting people on some 80,000 acres of land during the past few years is not an achievement, I do not know what is. Even currently—my friend says that we are doing nothing, and he even charges us of smug complacency—he should have known that there is a huge plan for putting people on some 300,000 acres of land in what is called the Jerantut Triangle. Surely, he must have heard of it? And if he has heard of it, why charge this Government of smug complacency? However, he might turn round and ask, why did you not do it before? I have got a very good reason, and the good reason is this. You must have heard of Mr John Strachey. The late lamented Mr John Strachey was a very good socialist and a very good man. But, unfortunately, in Africa soon after the end of the war, the Labour Government tried to start what was called a huge groundnut scheme. At that time they put millions and millions of pounds into this huge groundnut scheme.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Peanut.

Dato' V. T. Sambanthan: Groundnut and peanut are the same. (*Laughter*). They went into this very huge scheme and they poured a lot of money into it together with a lot of other things without any proper soil test, and even without a proper investigation as to whether the tractors can plough that land, and whatnot. Ultimately, there was what was called the Groundnut Scandal. Now, they had the money to waste, but we cannot afford to make this mistake. We have got to go in small stages.

Sir, during the past few years, through the F.L.D.A., we have learnt the expertise, the knowledge, the know-how of doing this thing, and having acquired this knowledge, this know-how, we feel we can go in for a 300,000-acre plot in what is called the Jerantut Triangle. That land would be very rich soil, and I am sure the country would have that. But, who would have it—the capitalists? Certainly not the capitalists, but the poor men, the landless men, the peasants. We are now trying to build a peasantry with people owning five acres, seven acres, or ten acres of land each. Is this, I ask my friend, something, not good? Does this show smug complacency? I do not think so.

Today, if you go to Borneo, to Sabah or Sarawak, you would see that there is very little or no development. If the people of Sabah, or Sarawak, want to join us, it is because they have come and they have seen for themselves the tremendous development that is going on in this country. They have seen for themselves how the ordinary man is made to raise his standard of living by these very things that we are doing. They find an efficient administration; they find a good Government going on; and they find parliamentary democracy working. So, they say, "This is a country with whom we can join." We have common methods of administration, we have a common language, and the people by racial stock are almost the same. Therefore they feel that they should come with us. Now, what did the people find under the old colonial administration? Little or no improvement, either in Sabah or in Sarawak. Therefore, the achievements that we have made during the past four or five years have been tremendous. These are the things with which we have been selling the idea of grouping, or bringing them together with us. I think my friend should pay attention to these things. Sir, I should not dwell too long except to say that Malaysia is something which has got very prodigious and great potentialities. As I have said earlier, we are living in a very troubled world and that we in this country have been able to create a stable Government. I would like to say further that the stability of

the Governmnet that we have here will spread to the Malaysian region, and that will mean then a stable area of peace and happiness. This, I think, is a laudable objective.

Earlier on, some Members of the P.M.I.P., I think, mentioned about the Malay race, about their being a minority and all that. Sir, I do not wish to be narrowly racial, but I think it would not be wrong when I, as the Malayan Indian Congress President, say that my community today—the Malayan Indian community—has a population of about 800,000 here, and Singapore has a population of about 140,000. So, in all there will be 950,000 people of Indian stock and Indo-Ceylonese stock speaking a common language—some of them—wanting to come into this new Malaysian region, though in terms of proportion they will come down from about 12 per cent to about 10.5 per cent. However, I am not rueing it. I belong to a minority but I feel that, under the present system that we have here, we have been having a fairly good existence here. In the past—in 1953-1954—before all these things came about, there were two sections among the Indians: one section said: “Before freedom you must see to it that you must have separate electorate, you must have a guarantee of so many seats.” However, some of us felt that this was nonsense, utter nonsense, and we said: “If you want to live in Malaya, you have got to live with the people. Do not ask for special rights. Live with them together as Malaysians”.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah (Kota Bharu Hilir): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, on a point of explanation, kerana orang India tidak gadoh tentang keselamatan mereka itu dalam tanah ayer ini, kerana bukan negeri mereka itu, sebab mereka itu tidak merasa . . . (*Di-sampok*) (*Ketawa*).

Mr Speaker: Please proceed!

Dato' V. T. Sambanthan: I think it was a misunderstanding. I am saying that as a minority we have no fears and that in Malaya, as it develops, we do not need to have fears. As I was saying just now, we in this country found, as I was saying earlier on, that there were

two sections amongst the Indians, and we in the Malayan Indian Congress and such as those belonging to us, felt that the future rested in the non-communal approach, in a multi-racial approach to all problems. We have got to be with all the races here; we have got to build this country together; then there is a future. It is in that respect that we have to look at Malaysia—and let us not look at it on narrow racial lines. There will be a future for everybody; the communities are racially heterogeneous but we have till now shown to the world that we have been able to make a good show of this place. Sir, we, in this House, are now discussing a momentous issue, an issue which in many years to come, many generations to come, will have its own results. I feel that in this the Honourable the Prime Minister has been moved by the very highest of motives. He is an elderly man and he is not going to live for all time, and it is our children who are going to enjoy these things, and yet he takes all the trouble to go in for Malaysia, and he looks at it objectively. For him there is no personal reward, for him there is no self-seeking, for him the objective is, “Let us see this country, which has been so peaceful, gather in peace and strength”. I think we should recognise this particular fact. After all, is it not true that God rewards all those who do good? With your permission, Sir, I would like to read a few quotations. (*Laughter*).

Mr Speaker: Another poetry? (*Laughter*).

Dato' V. T. Sambanthan: Let me read, Sir, and I would like Honourable Members to forgive me if my pronunciation is not quite correct. (*Laughter*).

“Hal Jazavul Ihsahni
Illal Ihsahn”.

This is a quotation from the Holy Koran which means:

“What ought to be the reward
to those who do good?”

Only good can be the reward.

The Honourable the Prime Minister, Sir, is moved by the highest of motives. In the GITA, it is said:

“Niyatam kuru karma tvam”.

which means:

“Yours to do your action”.

Again, in an ancient Tamil text, it is said:

"Those who do good,
God will accompany a man
who does good".

This is from the immortal Thirukkural, a Tamil Poem, which was written a few thousand years ago.

A second quotation, Sir, is from the Hindu Religious Book called the GITA, which says:

"Tasmad asaktah satatam
karyam karma samacara
asakto hy acaran karma
param apnoti purusaha".

which means:

"Therefore unattached ever
Perform action that must be done;
For performing action without attachment
Man attains the highest".

I think, Sir, God will be by our side, and I shall end again this quotation from the Holy Koran, which says:

"Hal Jazavul Ihsahni
Illal Ihsahn".

(Applause).

Enche' Abdul Samad bin Osman (Sungei Patani): Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the motion of the Honourable the Prime Minister to endorse the Agreement signed in London on July 9th, 1963.

Sir, I would not have stood up and spoken today, had it not been for one of my old friends, the Honourable Member for Kuala Langat, who spoke just now. He rose and spoke something which hurt my ears. (*Laughter*). Well, as you know, he was formerly the Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives, and during that time I used to bring up matters to him once in a while during the Budget Meeting and he used to bring some back to me. So, now that he has crossed over to the Opposition, I think there is no harm for me—I am more or less duty-bound to do so—to bring some more back to him. (*Laughter*).

Sir, the Honourable Member for Kuala Langat has said just now that for the last two years, before he was sacked from the Cabinet (*Laughter*), he was actually opposed to Malaysia. No wonder he was sacked, Sir, from the Cabinet! (*Laughter*). Sir, when he was

the Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives, you will remember, he was supposed to be the Wonder Minister who could produce wonder hens, wonder eggs, wonder fertilisers and wonder padi and so forth. But, Sir, now that he is no more a Minister, I wonder where these wonder things have gone—where are these wonder eggs, wonder hens, wonder . . . (*Laughter*).

Enche' Abdul Aziz bin Ishak: Sir, on a point of information, I think the present Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives could decide, because I maintain that what was done about the wonder hens, about the wonder padi (*Laughter*)—they are still there.

Mr Speaker: (*To Enche' Abdul Samad*): Please proceed.

Enche' Abdul Samad: Well, anyway he was a wonder Minister. (*Laughter*). What I am wondering is, since he is no more a Minister, where have those wonder things gone to?

Enche' K. Karam Singh (Damansara): Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of order 36 (1). I do not know what relevance these wonder eggs and other things (*Laughter*) have with this debate on Malaysia. (*Laughter*). Mr Speaker, Sir, we have been given to understand that we are not given much time. So, I think this is unnecessarily wasting valuable time.

Mr Speaker: Tolong-lah tumpukan hujah tuan atas usul yang ada di hadapan Majlis ini sahaja, kerana masa yang di-untokkan perbahathan ini sangat-lah pendek.

Enche' Abdul Samad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, baik-lah kalau begitu. Yang sa-benar-nya saya bawa perkara ini ia-lah menunjukkan bahawa Ahli yang berchakap itu di-pereksakan kerja-nya supaya dapat timbangan. Ahli itu selama tujuh tahun jadi Menteri . . .

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr Speaker, Sir, again on the point of order, the personality of the Honourable Member for Kuala Langat has got nothing to do with this debate. Standing Order 36 (1), Mr Speaker, Sir, will rule him out of order?

Mr Speaker: Tolong tumpukan hujah atas usul yang ada ini, dan jangan ulang perkara yang tidak kena-mengena.

Enche' Abdul Samad: Mr Speaker, Sir, what I am trying to bring out is this. (*Laughter*). Today what he said has hurt me, because he could stoop so low as to say that the Alliance Government is the agent of imperialism. In fact, for seven years, by the grace of God and by the kindness of the Alliance Government, he was made a Minister drawing \$3,000 a month. He got over a quarter of a million dollars by the kindness of the Alliance Government to enrich himself, to support his wife and family (*Laughter*). And today, Sir, after he got so much, he stooped so low

Mr Speaker: I am afraid I have to stop you if you continue in that manner. Will you concentrate your speech on the debate itself?

Enche' Abdul Samad: Sir, that is what I am coming to in the debate. If some other people were to say something like that, I do not mind. But for a man like him who had been given a quarter of a million dollars for seven years to stoop so low (*Laughter*).

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

Mr Speaker: Order! Order!

Enche' Abdul Aziz bin Ishak: Sir, on a point of explanation.

Mr Speaker: (*To Enche' Abdul Samad*): Do you give way?

Enche' Abdul Samad: No, Sir! Ahli dari Bachok

Enche' Tan Phock Kin (Tanjong): Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise on a point of order. Standing Order 36 (4) reads: "It shall be out of order to use offensive and insulting language about members of the House." and Standing Order 36 (5) says: "No member shall refer to any other member by name." Here, Sir, the word "he" is being used. He should refer to the Honourable Member as, "the Honourable Member for Kuala Langat" (*Laughter*). Further, Standing Order 36 (6) states, "No member shall impute improper motives

to any other member." I am afraid that the Honourable Member for Sungei Patani, in the course of his speech has imputed quite a number of improper motives, including the fact that the Honourable Member for Kuala Langat, during the period when he was a Minister, was utilising the funds of the Alliance Government, and because of this he is ungrateful to attack the Alliance Government.

Mr Speaker: So far he has not committed a breach of the Standing Orders. If he had done so, I would have stopped him.

Enche' Abdul Samad bin Osman: Tuan Yang di-Pertua,

Mr Speaker: Please sit down! Ada di-dalam Standing Order ini mengatakan, kalau Speaker berchakap, tidak ada sa-orang Ahli pun boleh berchakap. Kalau ada Ahli daripada Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang ada di-sini tidak hendak mengikut perintah saya, saya boleh dikeluarkan daripada Majlis ini.

Saya ingat awak jangan lagi berchakap di-atas hal² yang ta' ada kena-mengena dengan usul yang ada di-hadapan Majlis ini. Tolong tumpukan hujah² itu kapada usul yang ada di-hadapan ini, kalau tidak, saya akan berhentikan awak dengan serta-merta ta' boleh meneruskan ucapan itu lagi. Please proceed.

Enche' Abdul Samad bin Osman: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kelmarin Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bachok ada mengatakan ia-itu perkara Malaysia ini ada-lah satu perkara yang sangat besar, dan oleh kerana Kerajaan berkehendakkan perkara ini, maka perkara ini hendak-lah di-bawa kapada pandangan umum. Saya ta' tahu apa-kah pandangan umum itu, ada-kah pandangan umum itu di-maksudkan referendum, atau plebiscite. Tetapi saya suka juga hendak memberi tahu kapada Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bachok itu bahawa kata-nya Malaysia ini tidak termasuk dalam manifesto pilihan raya Perikatan tahun 1959. Saya suka memberitahu Ahli Yang Berhormat itu, kalau-lah ini berma'ana dalam manifesto kita itu, walau pun bukan-lah berma'ana yang benda ini ta' boleh

masuk, ta' boleh buat, yang mana betul itu ia-lah janji daripada parti itu yang hendak di-buat-nya, tetapi oleh sebab semua-nya sudah di-buat di-atas janji² itu, maka yang ta' di-masokkan janji itu, kalau di-fikirkan elok, di-buat-nya juga. Saya suka memberikan satu pandangan ia-itu di-Britain, Perdana Menteri British, Mr Macmillan, beliau ini ta' mendapat mandate daripada pengundi²-nya, tetapi kata-nya dia boleh berunding berkenaan dengan European Economic Common Market, kenapa-kah dia boleh berunding dalam hal itu, ada-kah salah? Dan juga baharu² ini kita telah mendengar bahawa Britain dan dua buah negara lagi telah menanda tangani perjanjian tidak serang-menyerang (nuclear test ban treaty) di-antara kuasa² besar itu, kenapa-kah bagi pihak Britain boleh menanda tangani perjanjian itu sedangkan Mr Macmillan tidak ada mempunyai mandate dari ra'ayat? Tetapi, nampak-nya kita semua puji dan juga ra'ayat semua-nya puji, tetapi sa-balek-nya hujah² Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bachok itu mengatakan yang Kerajaan ini ta' ada mandate, itu ta' dapat-lah di-terima.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Rises.

Mr Speaker: Would you make it as short as possible so as to give a chance to other Members to talk.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr Speaker, Sir, this is a very important debate and, perhaps, this may be the last time we have of warning the Alliance before it takes the plunge, and then we cannot say anything more but lament. So, Sir, I would say that I may take some time—and Mr Speaker, Sir, there will be a move on the part of the Opposition to urge you to give us more time in view of the seriousness of the matter before the House.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I will go back into the history of this country and show to the House the true nature of the independence that we have and what sort of independence it is that we seek to spread to Singapore and the Bornean territories. Mr Speaker, Sir, I must mention that this land lost its sovereignty to the British when the Malay Sultans signed treaties with the

British—these treaties were cruel treaties and were virtual surrenders to the British authority.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid: Mr Speaker, Sir, I would refer to Standing Order 36 (8) which says:

"The conduct or character of His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong, of any of Their Highnesses the Rulers, or Their Excellencies the Governors of Penang and Malacca, of Judges or other persons engaged in the administration of justice, of members of the Armed Forces Council or of any Service Commission established under Part X of the Constitution, of members of the Election Commission, or of sovereigns of friendly States shall not be referred to except upon a substantive motion moved for that purpose." (Laughter).

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr Speaker, Sir, it is a fact that in the last century, the sovereignty of this country was lost to the British when the Malay Sultans were forced to agree to the treaties. Again, Mr Speaker, Sir, on the 31st August, 1957, the Merdeka Day of Malaya, it was to be a day of political triumph, an epoch-making point in the history of this country, and it was supposed to be a day when the people of this country

Enche' Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman (Seberang Tengah): Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member is reading his speech.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr Speaker, Sir, these are notes.

Mr Speaker: I think he is referring to his notes. (To Enche' K. Karam Singh). Please put that down.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr Speaker, Sir, the 31st August, 1957, was supposed to be the day when the people of this country would break the British chain that bound them. But Mr Speaker, Sir, when the Prime Minister felt safe after the declaration of Independence to shout "Merdeka" seven times, it was just like a cry to a companion, a cry of Merdeka, Merdeka, Merdeka, of a merdeka which had drowned before it had arisen.

Mr Speaker, Sir, what is the truth and reality of that Merdeka that was proclaimed on 31st August, 1957? Malaya emerged from this so-called

victory of the proclamation of independence under conditions fit only to be imposed upon a defeated and subject country. The State of Malaya's independence on August 31st, 1957, was no better than that of Germany after World War I, and the provisions of the Versailles Treaty imposed on Germany were, perhaps, better than the conditions under which Malaya was allegedly made free. But there is one difference, Sir, a painful and bitter difference, between the sham triumph of August 31, 1957, and the surrender and humiliation of Germany after World War I. The triumph of Malaya was a fiction, a made-out-to-be triumph while the surrender of Germany and her humiliation was true and forced upon an unwilling Germany, forced down its throat. But, Mr Speaker, Sir, Malaya's humiliation and fresh subjection in the name of independence was agreed to willingly by the so-called leaders of Malaya. It was not independence. It was accompanied by the humiliating and almost surrender terms willingly agreed to by those who were appointed leaders with the help of the British—that is the shame and humiliation and degradation of Malaya today. I do not imagine that even the victorious allies took the power of imposing upon defeated Germany their own judges in the judiciary of Germany. But, Mr Speaker, Sir, Britain has reduced independent Malaya to a state where even British judges sit upon our Bench and our Chief Justice is not a citizen of this country, but a British citizen. Even the victorious allies dared not impose such a humiliation upon defeated and broken Germany. (*Laughter*).

Mr Speaker, Sir, with this so-called independence of Malaysia—Singapore, Sarawak and Sabah included—the judiciary of this country is still going to be under a British Chief Justice. Is this independence or pretence? I hope the pretenders will reply.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid: Sir, on a point of order—Standing Order 36 (8) reads:

“The conduct or character of His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong, of any of Their Highnesses the Rulers or Their Excellencies

the Governors of Penang and Malacca, of Judges or other persons engaged in the administration of justice shall not be referred to except upon a substantive motion moved for that purpose.”

I think, Sir, the Honourable Member is touching the conduct of judges.

Mr Speaker: Dia tidak influence kepada House ini. Dia belum habis lagi (*Ketawa*). Please proceed.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: This, Sir, is a humiliation imposed upon our country and exploited by its unnationalistic leaders. This is the truth of liberated Malaya and it will be the truth of liberated Malaysia, freed Malaysia.

Mr Speaker, Sir, further, even a defeated country in a war passes under the military power of the victorious country only for a brief period—until a proper peace treaty is signed—but free Malaya is stuck with the British army permanently and the key and vital points of her own armed forces are controlled by British foreign soldiers under the pretext of technical posts. That this is a shameful and degrading state of affairs is obvious when even the Defence Minister of Malaya is forced to hide the fact under the excuse of technical posts for which there are no local people available.

Again, no victor in a war can make the defeated country follow his dictates after peace has been signed, but Malaya's Alliance Party leaders have established as a constitutional convention the practice of British secretaries writing their speeches for them. In fact, how many of the international pronouncements made by Malaya's statesmen have been hatched and written by these British secretaries?

Mr Speaker: Are you still on the preamble? (*Laughter*). You have not yet touched on the motion. If what you have so far said is preamble, don't make is a very long one! The motion before the House is very simple—to endorse the agreement signed in London; and so far you have not touched on any provision in that Agreement!

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am only taking the dead skeleton

out of that Agreement and showing it to this country.

Mr Speaker: Please proceed!

Enche' K. Karam Singh: So, Mr Speaker, Sir, these humiliating and degrading spectacles of Ministers in a so-called free country mouthing pronouncements written by foreigners are not a sign of independence.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Dr Lim Swee Aun): Sir, perhaps, he is mouthing the directions from Communist Russia! (*Laughter*).

Mr Speaker: (*To Dr Lim Swee Aun*) Before you make any comments, you must wait for the speaker to give way! Time and again I have warned the Members of this House that they could only interrupt a speaker on two occasions, i.e. on a point of order and on a point of clarification. If it is on a point of order, they have a right to speak straightaway; but if it is on a point of clarification, they have to wait until the speaker gives way. (*To Enche' Karam Singh*) Please proceed!

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr Speaker, Sir, a defeated country in a war has to pay reparations to the victor and its economy is temporarily subjected to the victor's dictates. I ask the Government of this country, for what crime is Malaya atoning by having to pay reparations to the British in the form of undisclosed millions of dollars which go as profits out of this country every day? For what crime is this payment made every day, for what unimaginary, unutterable crimes, are the blood and sweat, the cream and means of fulfilment of the hopes of Malaya's masses transfuse from our country to Britain every minute and second of the day? Even defeated Germany refused to pay reparations to the Allies, but this Government willingly throws away the wealth of this country to the beasts of prey, the imperialists, who have subjected our country for so long. I ask, again, Sir, what sort of an independence is this that we seek to bless the other territories with? I ask the Government, for what crime the people of this country have committed that

it is allowing millions of acres of the best land in this country to be held by the British foreigners? A citizen, an ordinary citizen, has to produce his citizenship certificate to get a mere plot of land to put his *pondok* upon. But here millions of acres are held by people who make no pretence to be citizens. Where is justice of this country? The Government says, to the ordinary citizens of this country, "Produce your citizenship papers for a piece of land"; and to the capitalists it says, "Take what you want." Is this the independence, is this the justice for the people, or is this what the British want out of you by joining and hitching the other territories to you?

Mr Speaker, Sir, we have become free, or are supposed to become free, but why is our tin still taken by the British? Our people work for a mere few dollars. They work for others in their own country. They help others to take their tin. They help others to become rich, while they just have a few crumbs of the bread. Should not that tin and that wealth be for the people themselves, who stay in this country and provide us with a better living? Mr Speaker, Sir, these are the happy visions the British have—these are the happy visions and dreams which they have when Malaysia comes about.

Enche' Tan Cheng Bee: On a point of order—Standing Order 36 (1) says—

"A member shall confine his observations to the subject under discussion".

He has not said in the last 10 minutes anything about the motion, except showing his grievance against the British.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: These are the happy dreams and visions which the British have for creating Malaysia—for us to be their labourers, for us to receive wages in our own country, for enriching them; and that is why we will fight Malaysia, we will oppose it and, if possible, we will stop it.

The action of the Malayan Government in allowing the British so flagrantly to dominate the economy of this country, the judiciary of this country, the army of this country, and enjoying that domination by the British

is an act of political subversion, an act of political sadism and perversion, which has very few parallels in the world—an unprecedented sadistic and perverted political behaviour demonstrated by the Alliance Government. Not only that, the Alliance Government has allowed the British to influence it into putting into the Federal Constitution—in Article 13—a guarantee for the economic subjugation of the country by the British. Article 13 of the Constitution guarantees the right of property and virtually says that there will be no expropriations. But, Mr Speaker, Sir, the full implications of this Article become perfectly clear when it is realised that it is the British group that is the largest property owners in Malaya, and it is clear that this is primarily a guarantee to the British capitalists, a guarantee further strengthened by the voluntary abdication of the military responsibility to the self-same foreign British capitalists. So, Sir, even if the people of Malaya democratically decide by constitutional means to become masters of their economy and land and resources, there is nothing to prevent any ambitious Minister within the Alliance Cabinet, in collaboration with the British Army, to overthrow the Constitution and rule Malaya like Ngo Dinh Diem with the help of the naked British bayonets. The liaison with the British Army, I must warn this House, has already been established by the Cabinet of this country and the danger is ever present that constitutional means will be overthrown. The danger of the overthrow and the tearing up of the Constitution of Malaya is very, very likely from within the Alliance Cabinet itself.

Mr Speaker, Sir, to return to the humiliating condition of Malaya, the condition of Malaya is nothing but a continuation of the surrender conditions imposed on Malaya by the British in the last century. Mr Speaker, Sir, the substance of the surrender established in the dark days of the last century has survived major historical events. Imperialism has spread through Africa and Asia in the intervening years and has receded from a large

part of the territory. The world has seen the rise of new ideologies and seen them spread through the world. The world has seen the penetration of space by man. Despite these great events in the history of man, the substance of the surrender by the Malay Sultans to the British of political and economic rights in this country still continues and proceeds across the barrier of independence to this very minute that we are assembled here today, and that condition of surrender will be spread—from the dark days of the last century—on this day to Singapore and the Borneo territories. Mr Speaker, Sir, this is a fact that the Alliance Government does not dare to face, and while there is talk of freedom and glory and pious phrases, that is nothing but the sanctioning and sanctifying of a century of foreign subjugation of these people by a foreign government. Mr Speaker, Sir, I ask you whether there is a country in the world, where foreigners have such wide powers over the citizens of the country as in Malaya? White managers of Malaya

The Assistant Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Enche' Mohamed Ismail bin Mohamed Yusof): On a point of order—Standing Order 36 (1)—are we still on the preamble, Sir? (*Laughter*).

Mr Speaker: Well, I have allowed the Honourable Member to speak because we have an Agreement here which is a very wide one and a Member can touch on anything under this Agreement, because we want to endorse this Agreement here.

Enche' Mohamed Ismail: I was thinking he was still on the preamble.

Mr Speaker: No, he is not. (*Laughter*). (*To Enche' K. Karam Singh*): Time is very short. Will you make your speech as short as possible, in order to allow other Members to speak?

Enche' K. Karam Singh: I ask this House: is there a country in this world over whose citizens foreigners enjoy so much power as in Malaya? White managers of Malaya's plantations have not got over humiliating and sacking

and ill-treating their former indentured labour, because these foreigners—the British capitalists—hold land and house and employment in the palm of their hands; and they can cow and bully our workers subtly but as effectively as they did with whips. They have, Mr Speaker, Sir, the power of breaking the rice bowl of our citizens, the workers of this country. In fact, the British today in this land still have the right, still have the power of life and death over our workers and our citizens. But, Mr Speaker, Sir, we who give so much to the British, what do we see in England today that justifies these concessions to them? Mr Speaker, Sir, it is difficult for a coloured man even to rent a proper house in England for money. There is so much prejudice against foreigners. Recently, Mr Speaker, Sir, there was the Immigration Act of that country

Mr Speaker: What has that got to do with this motion?

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am only saying that under this Agreement we should make provision for the ending of British domination and interference in the internal life of this country. It is a shame that this document does not mention such facts and allows such conditions to continue. I would be ashamed, Sir, if I were a signatory to this document. Mr Speaker, Sir, I was saying that it is difficult for a Malayan even to rent a house in England

Mr Speaker: I have told you that that is not relevant.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr Speaker, Sir, these very rights conceded to the British capitalists are not reciprocated to our people and we get only humiliation and disrespect from them. These rights should be ended—and until they are ended, all pious phrases and talks mean nothing. But, Mr Speaker, Sir, the shame of it, and the tragedy of it, is that these humiliating conditions are christened with joy and celebrations, with song and dancing, by a shameless and spineless Government which does not dare to stand up against these foreign intruders for its own people, but which against its own people does

not hesitate to destroy their rights by harassing and suppressing them. Mr Speaker, Sir, it is time the people of Malaya were saved from the imperialist beasts of prey that have fed too long upon this country.

I ask you, Mr Speaker, Sir, in which Independent country of this world can a Member of Parliament be forbidden to see his own countrymen and address them as in Malaya? The British, who are not citizens, can prevent me from meeting my voters and speaking to them under the pretext of property rights. But I ask you, Mr Speaker, Sir, is this Government not ashamed that it has allowed this phrase “property rights” to extend from property to the personal rights and freedoms—fundamental freedoms—of the citizens of this country? Is this Government not ashamed that it has allowed the British estate owners, under the pretext of proprietary rights, to deprive the workers of their political rights, deprived them even of being addressed by the Members of this House, the highest body in this land? Any government would be ashamed but the one that is in power in this country today.

Mr Speaker, Sir, as I have said, this is the truth of the freedom of Malaya—the shame and degradation and abasement of Malaya and its people and their rights. And now with great fanfare, with great proclamation, and with great celebrations this degradation in the name of pious phrases is proposed to be extended to Singapore and the Borneon territories. But, Mr Speaker, Sir, the people of this country refused to be deceived, the people of Singapore refused to be deceived; they refused to get into the state of mind which the Alliance was in 1957 of surrendering their country to the British. The people of Singapore, the people of Sarawak, the people of Brunei and of Sabah refused to surrender their country in the name of a formal freedom. That is why, Mr Speaker, Sir, this Malaysia will be opposed by them.

Mr Speaker, Sir, there is a certain newspaper which is speculating on, “Oh, when will Malaysia joy be proclaimed?” A naive paper like the

Malayan Times was speculating, "Oh, when will this joy be?"—such childish sentiment. But, Mr Speaker, Sir, this Malaysia is not a joy. A great political leader of Brunei, T. A. Hidup, has been killed by the British forces; Azahari's brother has been shot dead by British troops. It is upon their blood and upon their debts that this Malaysia is sought to be built. Countless number of people are in the jails of Brunei to make way for this Malaysia, for this joy. Only an undertaker's mentality, only a grave digger's mentality would induce a man to say in the paper "the joy of Malaysia". (*Laughter*). Only joy at death would produce that state of mind.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Prime Minister said this morning that Mr Donald Stephens and Mr Lee Kuan Yew came running up to him. All I can say is, "I hope Papa gave them some sweets", because these people, if there were a crisis, will go back to their people and stand with their people—but nevertheless, now they run and come to stand beside the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister is not the people of Singapore; he is not the people of Sarawak, or the people of Sabah. So, I tell these people—Donald Stephens and Lee Kuan Yew—"Go back to your people. Let your people be free rather than be stooges again of the British under the flag and name of the Prime Minister of Malaya." And moreover, Mr Speaker, Sir, Mr Donald Stephens must be having in mind the fact that he is wanted by the unitary State of Kalimantan Utara and that the army of that State is waiting to try him. (*Laughter*). It is for these people like Mr Stephen Ningkan and Temenggong Jugah—especially Temenggong Jugah, who is a feudal collaborator of the British—that this Malaysia is sought to be brought about. But, Mr Speaker, Sir, people like Lee Kuan Yew, Temenggong Jugah, Stephen Ningkan and Donald Stephens are like tropical plants in European hot houses. You remove the hot houses and these plants die. The only difference, Mr Speaker, Sir, is that these are Anglicized tropical plants which can only survive in the British hot house of suppression,

emergency, detentions and deportations and military action. Only these hot houses will keep these delicate plants standing in that country; remove them and they will wilt and vanish.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Prime Minister of Malaya must be aware of the grim resolve of the Tentara Nasional Kalimantan Utara to oppose him; and if he has been listening to Radio Kalimantan Utara—I know he has been doing so quite secretly—(*Laughter*).

The Prime Minister: I have never heard it.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: I am sure he has.

Mr Speaker: He said he has never heard it. (*Laughter*).

The Prime Minister: Mr Speaker, Sir, I only heard some people accusing me of running away with somebody's wife, some actor's wife; that is about all I heard from that Radio; after that I did not hear any more. So, if the Honourable Member has got any information to give me from that Radio, I would be very happy to see him. (*Laughter*).

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I know that at every weekend the Members of the Cabinet go and listen to recordings of Radio Kalimantan Utara; people are keeping those recordings, and let them not pretend that it does not happen. Mr Speaker, Sir, according to the Radio, General Zulkifli has said (*Laughter*). . . .

Mr Speaker: Order! Order! Which Zulkifli are you referring to?

Enche' K. Karam Singh: I am referring to the fighter of Borneo independence. General Zulkifli has said over Radio Kalimantan Utara that it is the resolve of the people of that country to crush Malaysia, and I have even heard them say that they would want to destroy the leaders of the Alliance, and they mentioned the Honourable Prime Minister personally. I ask, Mr Speaker, Sir, is this a happy compliment to the Honourable Prime Minister, and why is it that he has brought this intensity of hatred upon himself from a people with whom hitherto he has nothing to

do? Why? Because he has associated with the British Army in the killing of the patriots of that country—in the name of liberation, in the name of Malaysia, to kill the innocent people of that country. That is why there is a fire of hatred burning in the hearts of the people of that country for the Alliance Government.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid: Mr Speaker, Sir, Standing Order 36 (3) says:

“It shall be out of order to attempt to reconsider any specific question upon which the House come to a conclusion during the current session except upon a substantive motion for rescission.”

We have already debated about the sending of Police to Brunei; we have already debated that part.

Mr Speaker: (*To Enche' K. Karam Singh*): I have already told you that this is irrelevant.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I would ask the Honourable Prime Minister and his colleagues in the Cabinet to retrace their steps from disaster, because such intense hatred can only be generated when people have been wronged—and the people of North Borneo have been wronged by the Alliance Government.

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, when and in case Sabah and Sarawak come into Malaysia, one fact that he will have to face, the Honourable Prime Minister will have to face, is that he will be in the same boat as Azahari, because the Revolutionary Government of Kalimantan Utara, the *de facto* Government of that area, will still operate, and there may be recognition for that Government: there will be one territory, but two governments will be recognised by various and different powers in different countries. Mr Speaker, Sir, further to the recognition of the two Governments, this territory will be born with two *de facto* governments—there will be support, varying in degree of strength; and Malaysia will be born with the seeds of civil war in it, because I am sure the revolutionists of Kalimantan Utara are not going to keep quiet.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I now come to the circumstances in which the Honourable

Prime Minister is moving his motion. Before he went to Manila to meet President Soekarno and President Macapagal, this area was on the point of exploding. He went there and signed the Accord which established peace, as he himself has said; but before the expressed terms of that Accord have been carried out by the exercise of the right of self-determination of the people of these territories, the Honourable Prime Minister is pushing through the London Agreement in this House. The signing of the London Agreement was taken as a breach of good faith. Its adoption in this House is a reiteration of that bad faith. Mr Speaker, Sir, if the Honourable Prime Minister and the Cabinet know any international law, the repudiation of a pact, which has brought about peace, amounts to a virtual declaration of war. And, Mr Speaker, Sir, the repudiation by the Malayan Government of the Manila Accord, not by words but by its deed of proposing to adopt the London Agreement in breach of the terms of the Manila Accord, is a hostile act to the Borneo territories and to Indonesia.

Mr Speaker, the area is already on a powder keg—a dry powder keg—and the action of the Honourable Prime Minister in moving this motion in this House will put the match to that powder keg. Mr Speaker, Sir, even before the Honourable Prime Minister went to Manila, there were people in the Cabinet—perhaps, Mr Speaker, Sir, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Defence—who were already resolved that any accord that is reached in Manila must be sabotaged, and this act of bringing this London Agreement to this House for endorsement is such an act of sabotaging the peace accord that was reached in Manila.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I must say to the Honourable Prime Minister that it is no use his falling to the pressure of Donald Stephens, Lee Kuan Yew and the other renegades of their people. It is no use destroying your own country

The Prime Minister: Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of order—I think the Honourable Member has gone too far

to refer to all these leaders of other territories as renegades in this House.

Mr Speaker: (*To Enche' K. Karam Singh*) They have no chance to reply to your allegations. They are not in this Chamber and have no opportunity to reply to those allegations which you are making. I think it is not fair for you to do that.

Enche' K. Karam Singh: I would not use this word in respect of Donald Stephens, but I would definitely say that Mr Lee Kuan Yew has reneged on his own colleagues and has sheltered himself from that act of renegacy—he is with the Prime Minister of Malaya today. Mr Speaker, Sir, I think, Mr Lee Kuan Yew, at 7.30 can go on the air (*Laughter*) over Radio Singapore to criticise me, if he can.

Mr Speaker: What has that got to do with this motion—whether he is on the air or not? (*Laughter*).

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to give another word of advice to the Alliance leaders. They have been talking about tortoises and about ostriches, but those examples are far removed—and I will give a better example. Remember the frog—not the frog in the well, but the frog who tried to be as big as the bull? Sir, there was a little frog who thought that other animals were too big, and so he felt humiliated. He was not contented with his size. On seeing a bull he said, "I will be as big as you", and he tried to blow himself up, and in three puffs he had already blown himself to bits. Sir, this is what the Alliance Government is trying to do—"Oh! Indonesia is very big? Philippines is very big? I must puff myself up." Sir, if one tries to puff oneself up, one may elbow one's neighbours. This Government is disturbing them already and, Mr Speaker, Sir, there is very very great likelihood, and there are strong indications, that it will end up like the frog.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I ask the Prime Minister and his ambitious colleagues to be content with their size and stature which nature has endowed them with. Do not be unnatural, or they may meet with fate that they would not like. The Prime Minister has very blandly told

us that colonialism is now in the limbo of history. If colonialism is in the limbo of history, I must say that the Prime Minister is there with the limbo; the Alliance Government is there lingering with the limbo, holding on to that limbo, refusing to come into this year of freedom; and it is in that limbo with the British to sabotage the progress of the people of this region.

Mr Speaker: How long more will you take?

Enche' K. Karam Singh: Five minutes more. Mr Speaker, Sir, the Prime Minister has said that the days of colonialism and protectorates are over. I think the Prime Minister is not even aware of the implications of the Malaysia Agreement. The day of protectorates is not over. This Malaysia Agreement is going to establish and continue a protectorate over Malaysia—an economic protectorate, a military protectorate over the people of this area. So, I hope the Prime Minister will not try to deceive us that the day of protectorates is over.

Lastly, Mr Speaker, Sir, to the people of Borneo, I will say—and to the people of Singapore also—remember that a famous fighter, a leader in the vanguard of anti-colonialism struggle for freedom of this country—Enche' Ahmad Boestamam—is looking across the prison walls on what is happening in this country. Enche' Ahmad Boestamam is the symbol of imprisoned Malaya and he is also the symbol of the fate that this country has in store for the people of Singapore and the people of Borneo. Those prison bars are a symbol of the Alliance to the people of these territories as they are already a symbol to the people of Malaya.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the adoption of the Malaysia Agreement and the putting into effect of Malaysia by the Alliance Government may lead to very serious constitutional developments—even the existence of constitutional government in this country may be in danger. I ask the Alliance Government to hold back this Malaysia Agreement, this London Agreement, so that we can still talk at the round table of Parliament, so

that this country can be saved from the danger of the overthrow of constitutional means in regard to political struggle, the overthrow of Parliament, thus resulting, perhaps, in more violent forms of struggle. Sir, I oppose this motion.

Mr Speaker: I think I had better suspend the sitting for about ten minutes. I do not know whether we should extend the sitting until we finish debating this or not. I have got to consult the Opposition as well as the Leader of the Government Party.

Sitting suspended 6.15 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 6.25 p.m.

(Mr Speaker in the Chair)

Debate resumed.

The Prime Minister: Mr Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members in this House have had two days during which to debate on this very important subject, that is, the adoption of the London Agreement signed on the 9th of July, 1963

Enche' Tan Phock Kin: Sir, on a point of order—it appears to me that the Honourable Prime Minister is winding up the debate. I must refer this House to S.O. 40 which states very clearly the manner in which the closure of debate can be applied. To my knowledge, there are quite a number of Members of the Opposition who still want to speak on this particular motion. If it is the desire of the Government to apply the guillotine, then they should apply the provisions of S.O. 40 which reads as follows:

"40. (1) After a question has been proposed a member rising in his place may claim to move, "That the question be now put", and, unless it appears to the Chair that such motion is an abuse of the rules of the House, or an infringement of the rights of the minority, the question "That the question be now put", shall be put forthwith and decided without amendment or debate, notwithstanding that the mover of the original motion (or amendment) has had not opportunity to make his reply.

Sub-section (2) reads

Mr Speaker: You do not have to read all that, because I know that very well.

Enche' Tan Phock Kin: It is my submission here, Sir, that the Government cannot have it both ways. If it is the intention to have a guillotine, to have a closure, then somebody from the Government bench should move a motion under this particular section of Standing Order. Under the circumstances, the Honourable Prime Minister, who is the mover of the original motion, will have no right of reply. I feel, Sir, that it is most unfair to discard this particular section of our Standing Orders merely for the convenience of the Government. This is a very important debate, and I feel that everybody who wants to speak should be given the opportunity of speaking. But if the Government is not willing to allow free expressions here and if they propose to have a closure, then I submit, Sir, that they must abide by this particular Standing Order. If they are not prepared to do so, they just cannot do it as they are doing it today; and we on this side of this House are not prepared to allow this to go unchallenged.

The Prime Minister: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am quite prepared to give way to the proposal made by the Honourable Member, because I had said a lot this morning and I think all the Honourable Members have had enough to speak. Further, when my colleague moves the Malaysia Bill, all Honourable Members will have a chance again to speak on this same subject. There is no point, in my mind, in going on with this, and I am prepared to give way to the proposal made by the Honourable Member and would ask one of my colleagues to move the guillotine of the debate.

Mr Speaker: Ahli² Yang Berhormat, oleh sebab Ahli dari Tanjong telah meneger atas peratoran yang di-jalankan dalam Majlis ini, saya patut juga menjawab atas tegoran-nya itu dengan sebab saya nampak tegoran itu menepati atas Speaker. Saya telah menempohkan Majlis ini sa-lama 10 minit tadi supaya berunding dengan pihak Kerajaan dan pihak Opposition juga ia-itu apa hendak di-buat dengan usul yang ada di-hadapan Majlis ini,

sebab pehak Kerajaan tidak hendak melebihi masa perbahathan ini sehingga pukul 6.30 petang ini, kerana pehak Kerajaan berpendapat perbahathan telah di-dapati chukup selama dua hari sa-tengah. Saya telah memanggil Ahli² yang hendak berchakap ka-hadapan saya dan saya tanya kalau mereka bersetuju tidak payah berchakap atau mengambil bahagian dalam perbahathan ini. Mereka telah bersetuju tidak hendak berchakap, sebab kata-nya mereka ada lagi peluang berchakap di-dalam masa membahathkan Rang Undang² itu. Jadi perbuatan Speaker menjalankan kerjanya menepati-lah sa-bagaimana yang saya telah terangkan lebeh dahulu ia-itu perbahathan ini tidak di-lanjutkan lebeh daripada pukul 6.30 petang ini, maka dengan sebab itu-lah sa-telah Majlis ini bersidang sa-mula saya tujukan kepada Yang Amat Berhormat Perdana Menteri supaya menjawab. Saya fikir Ahli dari Tanjong tidak tahu yang saya telah

memanggil Ahli² yang saya nampak hendak berchakap tadi ka-bilek saya berunding dan semua-nya bersetuju tidak hendak berchakap.

Sekarang, kalau sa-kira-nya Yang Amat Berhormat Perdana Menteri tidak hendak berchakap apa² lagi, usul ini akan di-undi sahaja. Saya minta pehak Kerajaan membawa chadangan "Closure of Debate" di-bawah Section 40.

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move under Standing Order 40 (1) that the question be now put.

Dato' Dr Ismail: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Main Question put.

The House divided: *Ayes* 67; *Noes* 18; *Abstention* Nil.

AYES

Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra
Al-Haj

Tun Haji Abdul Razak bin Dato'
Hussain

Dato' Dr Ismail bin Dato' Haji
Abdul Rahman

Enche' Tan Siew Sin

Dato' V.T. Sambanthan

Dato' Suleiman bin Dato' Haji
Abdul Rahman

Dato' Haji Sardon bin Haji Jubir

Dato' Ong Yoke Lin

Enche' Mohamed Khir bin Johari

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji
Talib

Dr Lim Swee Aun

Capt. Haji Abdul Hamid Khan
bin Haji Sakhawat Ali Khan

Enche' V. Manickavasagam

Enche' Mohamed Ismail bin
Mohamed Yusof

Enche' Abdul Rauf bin
A. Rahman

Enche' Abdul Samad bin Osman

Toh Muda Haji Abdullah bin
Haji Abdul Raof

Tuan Haji Abdullah bin Mohd.
Salleh

Enche' Ahmad bin Arshad

Enche' Ahmad bin Mohamed
Shah

Tuan Haji Hassan bin Haji
Ahmad

Enche' Ahmad bin Haji Yusof

Tuan Haji Azahari bin Haji
Ibrahim

Enche' Aziz bin Ishak

Enche' Chan Chong Wen

Enche' Chan Siang Sun

Datin Fatimah binti Haji Hashim

Enche' Geh Chong Keat

Enche' Hamzah bin Alang

Enche' Hanafi bin Mohd. Yunus

Enche' Harun bin Abdullah

Enche' Hassan bin Mansor

Enche' Hussein bin To' Muda
Hassan

Enche' Hussein bin Mohd.
Noordin

Enche' Ibrahim bin Abdul
Rahman

Enche' Ismail bin Idris

Enche' Ismail bin Haji Kassim

Enche' Kang Kock Seng

Enche' Lee San Choon

Enche' Lee Seck Fu

Enche' Lee Siok Yew

Enche' Lim Joo Kong

Enche' T. Mahima Singh

Enche' Mohamed Abbas bin
Ahmad

Enche' Mohamed Nor bin Mohd.
Dahan

Enche' Mohamed Yusof bin
Mahmud

Tuan Haji Mokhtar bin Haji
Ismail

Enche' Othman bin Abdullah

Enche' Othman bin Abdullah

Enche' Quek Kai Dong

Tuan Haji Redza bin Haji
Mohd. Said

Enche' Seah Teng Ngiab

Tuan Syed Esa bin Alwee

Tuan Syed Hashim bin Syed
Ajam

Tuan Syed Ja'afar bin Hasan
Albar

Enche' Tajudin bin Ali

Enche' Tan Cheng Bee

Enche' Tan Tye Chek

Tengku Besar Indera Raja ibni
Sultan Ibrahim

Dato' Teoh Chze Chong

Wan Sulaiman bin Wan Tam

Enche' Yahya bin Haji Ahmad

Wan Yahya bin Haji Wan
Mohamed

Enche' Yeoh Tat Beng

Enche' Yong Woo Ming

Puan Hajjah Zain binti Sulaiman

Tuan Haji Zakaria bin Haji
Mohd. Taib

NOES

Enche' Abdul Aziz bin Ishak
 Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah
 Dr Burhanuddin bin Mohd. Noor
 Enche' Chan Yoon Onn
 Enche' Harun bin Pilus
 Tuan Haji Hasan Adli bin Haji
 Arshad

Tuan Haji Hassan bin Haji
 Ahmad
 Tuan Haji Hussin Rahimi bin
 Haji Saman
 Enche' K. Karam Singh
 Enche' Liu Yoong Peng
 Enche' Mohamed Asri bin Haji
 Muda

Dato' Mohamed Hanifah bin
 Haji Abdul Ghani
 Enche' Ng Ann Teck
 Enche' Tan Phock Kin
 Enche' Too Joon Hing
 Enche' V. Veerappen
 Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad

ABSTENTIONS

Nil

Resolved,

That this House, noting the desire of the people of North Borneo, Sarawak and Singapore to be federated in Malaysia with the existing States of the Federation in accord-

ance with the agreement signed in London on 9th July, 1963, hereby endorses that agreement.

Adjourned at 6.40 p.m.