

Members. But we know the people of this country expect and have confidence in us and we know that countries of the world hold us in high esteem. These are our main concern Sir, and we shall continue to serve the people and the country- in a way that we think best.

## "ENEMY FROM WITHIN THE NATION"

— REPLY TO A QUERY IN PARLIAMENT

*Figuring prominently in Tun Abdul Razak's speech in Parliament on 3rd June, 1965, was his reply to Mr Lee Kuan Yew, the Prime Minister of Singapore, who had asked for clarification as to the meaning of the words "the threat from within contained in the last paragraph of the Royal Address. In the course of that speech, given below, the Tun made it clear<sup>41</sup> the Alliance Government has always believed in the principle of parliamentary democracy and has practised it faithfully not only in our political parties but also in the Government*

We have had a debate on the speech from the Throne for the last four days and almost all Hon'ble Members have had the opportunity of expressing their views. Members of the Opposition have had ample opportunities of taking the floor and some of their views *were* complimentary to the Government while others were not so. However, I would like to say that we, on the Government side, are grateful to those who have supported our policies in the past and our plans for the future.

My colleagues on the Government bench had made suitable replies to most of the points raised by the Hon'ble Members and the Prime Minister feels that there is nothing of any importance left for him to speak in winding up the debate. There is only one thing that he has to reply to and that is on the clarification asked for by the Hon'ble the Prime Minister of Singapore, Mr Lee Kuan Yew, as to the meaning of the words "the threat from within", contained in the last paragraph of His Majesty's speech.

The Prime Minister has asked me to explain this on his behalf. The Royal Address is the responsibility of the Government. The Prime Minister and my colleagues in the Cabinet take full and

undivided responsibility for every word contained in that address. However, Sir, before I come to this point I would like to reply to certain aspects of Government policy which have not yet been replied to by my colleagues.

The Hon'ble Member for Sarawak, Mr Ong Kee Hui, said that the recent crisis in the Sarawak Alliance was due to interference by UMNO.

I would like to say categorically this had nothing to do with UMNO, because the matter is for the leaders of the Alliance and Sarawak. However, as the Sarawak Alliance is affiliated to the Malaysian Alliance Party, it is within the right of the Alliance leaders here to intervene if requested to do so in order to settle any difference.

In this particular case, they were able to settle the differences themselves.

The Hon'ble Member also mentioned that since the formation of Malaysia the people of Sarawak have not received any benefit from Malaysia. Sir, with the establishment of Malaysia, we promised the people of Sarawak and Sabah independence and with it the possibility of progress and development as we were able to achieve here in Malaya.

However, despite all this we are determined to carry out our development plan. We have now geared the machinery of the Government of Sarawak to undertake work on development. I would like to say that we are determined, with the co-operation of the State Government to do all we can to give the people of Sarawak the benefit from independence and development.

The Hon'ble Member also made reference that the Simanggang Road Sub-Branch of the SUPP was proscribed by the Sarawak Government. It was not clear what his intention was in touching on this subject. I believe that he also suggested that since those concerned are officials of the Party, it would be logical, therefore to arrest only the officials. Let me, therefore, clarify to this House on the grounds why this particular Branch **WAS** proscribed by the Federal Secretary in Kuching under the Preservation of Public Security Regulations 1962. We had information that the establishment of the Party in the first place was engineered by the Communist organisation in Sarawak through one of its leading cadres and that all along the activities of this Sub-Branch were

conducted on the lines laid down by Sarawak Advanced Youth Association, formerly known as CCO (Clandestine Communist Organisation) for its open front work. Four of the five officials of the Party are now known to be in Indonesia. In short, there is, therefore, evidence to indicate a long-term Communist planning to create, through the medium of an open and legal front organisation an ideologically dominated area where political consciousness could be directed through the Communist policy of struggle through the legal and constitutional means.

For the information of this House there was no change in the registered officials since 1959; there had been merely a reshuffling of the key posts amongst the Communist faction. The Communists had all the time been in control. It is ridiculous for Mr Ong Kee Hui to suggest that the officials concerned should be arrested; most of them are in Indonesia now. The branch has to be closed as it is being used by Communist elements as a cover to carry out their subversive activities.

The Hon'ble Mr Lee Kuan Yew has asked the Prime Minister to explain what is meant by "threat from within". He said when he heard this portion of His Majesty's speech he looked around him and it was clear to him it must have meant some sector of this House. It could not be the Members from PMIP or the Members from Barisan Sosialis. It could not also mean the Member for Batu. So he was left with only one assumption, that is, that it was meant for him and his colleagues whom he said are "loyal Malaysians" gathering together now to establish the Constitution that Malaysia is a Malaysian nation, perhaps, "we were that 'threat from within"\*.

This statement, coming from him is sheer deceit. The Hon'ble Member knows fully well what is meant by the "enemy from within" the nation. He is the Chief Executive of the State of Singapore. He has helped the Central Government with a lot of information which eventually led to the arrest of enemies from within Singapore. He knows who they are because when Singapore and the Federation were discussing the question of Merger which led to the formation of Malaysia he was on the Singapore Internal Security Council together with my colleague, the Minister of Home Affairs.

He produced a book which gave information about the activities of the Communists. He made statements about their danger to the peace and security of this country; now his representative sits in

the National Defence Council where matters of internal security and defence are freely discussed. He receives briefings from the Intelligence Branch of the Security Service and knows fully well who are the enemies from without and who are the enemies from within.

As the executive head of Singapore he receives all the intelligence reports which give information as to the activities of those people whom His Majesty referred to in His speech as the enemies from within. They are the traitors—the Communists. He knows that about 1,500 persons from Sarawak alone have gone over to Indonesia and there are no less than 150 Communists from the mainland and Singapore who likewise have gone over.

With confrontation from Indonesia we have also those who are not Communists, but who either for money or some other form of inducement have rendered service to the enemy in co-operation with the Communists and their object is to hand over this country to Indonesia or to the Communists. Some of these people have been taken in and kept in custody but others are at large who are actively working to undermine the authority of the legally established Government of this country.

The Prime Minister has never thought of Mr Lee Kuan Yew or his party as the enemy from within. In the first place he does not think they have indulged in these activities, at least not so far. They are not trusted enough by the Communists, nor considered important enough or strong enough for the Communists to take them into their confidence. As a Barisan Sosialis member has revealed in this House, that he who works with Mr Lee Kuan Yew and his party must expect to be discarded whenever it suits him.

The Prime Minister doubts if Indonesia will make use of Mr Lee Kuan Yew and his party for a take-over of this country unless it be to serve their own end. So it is obvious from here that it was not him whom His Majesty referred to in his speech as the enemy from within. If we had thought of him as such we would have dealt with him as we had done with all the other enemies from within. Our duties and responsibilities are clear. We would not be afraid to act whenever we consider any person a security risk.

Mr Lee Kuan Yew would like to hear what explanation the Prime Minister can offer. What explanation does he want? It is

clear to all that he is out to make trouble. From the reports which have appeared in the Press and from the visits he has made abroad he had attempted to blacken the image of the Central Government in a way which was so aptly described by the Hon'ble the Minister of Home Affairs the other day.

Not so long ago, according to the Prime Minister, he was asked by a member of the diplomatic corps why was it that he hated Mr Lee Kuan Yew. The Prime Minister had always thought of him as his friend and therefore it was a surprise that such a story had gone round. Who was responsible for this story? It could be nobody else but Mr Lee Kuan Yew himself. Why did he invent such a story and for what purpose? Now we are all beginning to understand—it was done for a purpose and that purpose was to give the impression that the intention of this Government is to dominate Singapore and to discriminate against the people of Singapore.

According to the Prime Minister of Singapore this Government is Malay-dominated and that the Central Government is trying to foist a Malay rule on the entrapped peoples of Singapore, Sabah and Sarawak and that the Government is treating all these other states as inferiors.

That was why he came to see the Prime Minister some time ago and put forward a proposal that his party should share in the administration of this Government in place of the MCA. This idea was wholly unacceptable, in fact, most objectionable to the mind of an honest and loyal leader. The MCA had been a partner since the formation of the Alliance and they have been our true friends indeed and together with the MIC, we have worked for the independence of Malaya which led eventually to the independence of the other States which now make up Malaysia. It is unthinkable that the Prime Minister could discard the MCA for the PAP. He has always regarded the MCA as a true friend of UMNO and as a partner who, together with the MIC, has worked together for the well being, prosperity and happiness of this country.

The MCA represents the Chinese views and interest, and so the MIC in respect of the Indians and through the co-operation of these two organisations we were able to work for the welfare and the good of the peoples of this country. This cannot be said of the PAP. As has often been said in this House Mr Lee Kuan

Yew in fact thinks in terms of the Chinese and his party, in fact, represents that group of Chinese who share his views and he has asked to replace MCA. The only Government which will be acceptable to him is the one in which he can have a big share and ultimately a Government in which he alone can have a say without resort to Parliamentary democracy.

Since his proposal is not acceptable to the Prime Minister he has switched on to this new insidious plan of a Malaysian Malaysia. In other words, a break-up of Malaysia as constituted under the agreement signed in London.

Hon'ble Members can now understand the imputation when he said there are some who want secession. We have never talked about secession, at least not by the Prime Minister or by members of the Government. He also said that probably the people of Penang, Sabah, Sarawak and Singapore and Malacca could come together. In short he has suggested that Malaysia must be broken up into two—one is as he stated—Malay Malaysia and the other one Mr Lee Kuan Yew's Malaysia or as he calls it Straits Settlement Malaysia. Hence the reason for his bringing this amendment to the Royal address alleging that we in the Central Government consider him a threat to the security of this country. Sir, we do not consider Mr Lee Kuan Yew of that importance to be a threat to the Alliance. We are quite capable of dealing with him. As my colleague, the Minister of Home Affairs said, we are quite capable of fighting him democratically and constitutionally so long as he and his colleagues do the same.

As one Hon'ble Member said the Prime Minister of Singapore Mr Lee Kuan Yew, is like a bride, who was madly in love with a man and having married him, finds the new home unsuitable and would like to go back to the mother—the old Colonial master. Having married to this new family, the bride is not content with being just a member of the family or having the right to inherit the family property—he wants to dominate and rule the family at the same time.

9 I

Now, having had this marriage trouble, Mr Lee Kuan Yew went around the world to tell people of our domestic trouble. Where has all this got to do with people outside? If there are differences between political parties in this country, these are matters for us to settle internally. We are a democratic country, in the last resort it IS a matter for the people to decide.

*would like to tell our friends in the Commonwealth and outside that these differences we have with the PAP are internal matters. He, in the Central Government, are quite capable of dealing with them. We have a clear mandate from the peoples to govern this country and we shall not shirk our responsibilities. Sow that Mr Lee Kuan Yew has made his stand clear, we will fight him democratically and constitutionally.*

There is no use for Mr Lee Kuan Yew to resort to tactics that he is so familiar with, of twisting facts and of casting doubt in the minds of the people that the Alliance Government has an intention of resorting to undemocratic and unconstitutional methods.

Everyone knows, everyone in this country and throughout the world knows that this Government, the Alliance Government has always believed in the principle of parliamentary democracy and has practised it faithfully not only in our own political parties but also in the Government.

Indeed the only criticism we have heard from friends who have visited our country and from responsible citizens of this country is that we have been too democratic and too liberal in our attitude. This attitude has been interpreted by certain quarters as weakness and some have taken advantage of it.

It is known to everyone that we in the Alliance Party practise democracy strictly. In the UMNO, ever since our Prime Minister took over the leadership of UMNO in 1951. we practised absolute democracy.

We have held elections to choose leaders of our Party, once a year. Every member of our Party from the branches to the Division and to our General Assembly has a say in the elections of the leader of our Party. And the same is true with the other panics of the Alliance—the MCA and the MIC.

But what of the PAP? The Hon\*ble Member from Batu was indeed right when he said that the PAP has never practised democracy. The leadership of the PAP nominates a number of cadres and these cadres elect their leaders, so that the leadership of the PAP can never be challenged, not even by their own members.

Is this democracy by any stretch of the imagination? How can a leader who does not practise democracy in his own party be expected to uphold the principle of democracy and practise democracy in Government?

The Hon'ble Member for Batu was again right when he said that there is no democracy in Singapore. What is the use of having elected legislators if they are not given a chance to express their views and to criticise the Government if need be.

We, on the other hand, the Alliance Party, have followed the rules strictly. We have held meetings of Parliament regularly and in our State legislatures we have held meetings just as regularly too. We have in this House allowed the Members of the Opposition full freedom and particularly the Hon'ble Prime Minister of Singapore himself—full freedom to speak and we gave them full hearing.

Therefore, Sir, it is clear to all that we in the Government really practise democracy in this country. I say clearly that the PAP does not believe in democracy. The PAP believes in one-party Government and in absolute rule by that Party. J

There is no need for the Prime Minister of Singapore to impute any motives in the present Alliance Government, because we have shown by our deeds, by our action and by our practice that we are really true democrats. We have held National Elections three times and had followed not only in terms but also in the spirit of the practice of democracy.

Hon'ble Members of this House will remember that during the last General Elections, we gave the Opposition ample notice of our intention to hold the Elections. And we gave them six weeks in which to campaign throughout the country and put their views to the people. While in Singapore, the PAP only allowed other political parties nine days to prepare for the Elections. Is this following the true spirit of democracy?

In a democracy we are allowed freedom to speak, freedom to hold meetings, freedom of expression and freedom of thought but there are rules to the game and we cannot practise democracy unless we are prepared to follow the rules.

We on this side of the House know the Constitution of the country because we are responsible for drafting this Constitution.

We are responsible for giving the people the Constitution because we strongly believe in the principles of democracy and the fundamental rights of the people.

We have practised democracy in this country for almost ten years and no one can truthfully accuse us of not upholding the true principle of democracy. And not even the Prime Minister of Singapore could produce any evidence to say that we in the Alliance have not upheld the Constitution, both in terms and in spirit.

As of Parliamentary democracy, we welcome constructive criticism. We welcome a responsible and loyal opposition. But, Mr. Speaker. Sir. what have we seen in this new so-called Malaysia Solidarity Convention or Party or Organization, whatever they choose to call themselves—we had the privileges the other day, in the course of this debate, to see how members of this organization giving a display of their so-called unity or solidarity.

The Prime Minister of Singapore, presumably the leader of this solidarity group, stated repeatedly and stressed strongly that he would uphold the Constitution, and that he supports Malay as the national language of the country and he supports Article 153 of the Constitution.

And then we had another Member of this Solidarity Convention, the Hon'ble Member from Sarawak, the leader of the SUPP, who said he did not support Malay as the national language and would have the other languages to be recognised as official languages of the country.

Then, soon after that, we had the Member from Ipoh. the leader of the Peoples' Progressive Party, who said, equally strongly, that he docs not support Malay as the national language as the sole official language, and that he does not support Article 153 of the Constitution.

Now. Sir. where is the unity or solidarity or even common grounds among these panics that form themselves into this group or convention?

Sir. we find another set of strange bed-fellows of the PAP in this so-called Convention, i.e.. the UDP. It is interesting to know that the UDP had become respectable socialists to make common cause with the PAP.

We all know that the present leaders of the UDP left the MCA because they could not agree on the vital national issues such as the questions of national language and national education policy.

It may be that the UDP now has become supporters of PAP socialism. They only say they are against communalism in order to camouflage their continuing dependence for political support on communal and chauvinistic issues.

It seems, Mr Speaker. Sir, from the Opposition bench other than the PMIP and the Barisan Sosialis, only the Hon'ble Member from Batu is left out from the so-called Solidarity Convention.

Although at times we may disagree with the Hon'ble Member for Batu, he is basically a decent man and a man of principle. If he has been an opportunist, he will be sitting next to the great leader of the Convention, Mr Lee Kuan Yew himself. But the Member for Batu being a decent man cannot swallow this practice of discarding and ditching out of friends however misguided he may think they are. Even if he disagrees with his colleagues and supporters even in public, he still stands by them.

Now, Sir, having seen the coming together of the strange bed-fellows, it is pertinent to ask ourselves why Mr Lee Kuan Yew, the so-called socialist who not so long ago had the most utter contempt for all these men that he has now collected as colleagues in arm in a political battle?

The fact is that Mr Lee Kuan Yew's political base in Singapore is being eroded. The people of Singapore are disillusioned with his policies and promises. The ordinary people of Singapore, the workers and the shop-keepers are questioning his policy and all that he promised them in the past. Therefore he has to find new issues and if there are none, he has to create them to prove that he is still the only man who can rule Singapore.

He has to find a giant to fight with and in this he has found the Central Government which he says is a Malay-dominated Government of the UMNO.

He no longer has Mr Lim Chin Siong to mobilise the mass support for him and to instruct energetic cadres for him. Instead, now, he has to pay the Workers' Brigade, the People's Association and other Government organisations to produce the cheering crowds for him.

He hopes to build himself up as the Champion of the Chinese against the Malays and in this he has his allies—the UDP, SUPP and PPP. Mr Lee Kuan Yew, being a man of intelligence and calculates everything he does, knows and we know that he is playing a dangerous game. He knows that by whipping this anti-Malay feeling he may be pushing the Malays too far and the situation can get out of hand.

But he believes that as the Tunku is a man of goodwill and a man of peace, the Tunku and the Alliance Government will do everything possible to maintain communal harmony and goodwill. It is this belief that gives him the courage in this reckless adventure—this mad seeking for power.

But I must warn him that although we stand for racial harmony, for goodwill, for peace and for unity if, as a result of his adventure, troubles should break out in this country we must hold him fully responsible. I must ask his colleagues in the PAP, some of whom are dedicated men whom I have the privilege of knowing to ponder carefully the dangerous road their leader is leading them into.

In politics you can calculate, you can take your pencil and paper and work out various assumptions and presumptions but you can be wrong.

As my colleague, the Minister of Home Affairs said, we the leaders of the Alliance do not pretend that we are clever. But we know we are honest and sincere and we play straight politics and in whatever we do we always place the interest and safety of our people in this country uppermost in our minds.

As I said, Sir, in the Parliamentary democracy which we believe, we would not object to the Opposition. But what we resent in this attempt, in this time of our national crisis when we are facing a threat to our independence and sovereignty from outside, is to blacken the image of our country in the eyes of our friends abroad, to create doubts and suspicions among the minds of our people, and to undermine the goodwill and harmony among the various races of this country.

The Hon'ble Prime Minister of Singapore is a great expert in creating a situation which does not exist. He is an expert in organising campaigns, to create doubts, suspicions and confusion

in the minds of the people so that ultimately there will be chaos and troubles in the country and out of that chaos and troubles, he hopes to emerge as the leader who can save the country.

There is no need for the Prime Minister of Singapore to waste his time in this sort of campaign and under-hand activities, because ordinary men and women of Malaysia are practical people as he himself admitted. They have the common-sense to distinguish what is right and what is **wrong**. They have enough common-sense to know where the truth lies. There is no need for him to sweeten the feelings of the Malays and the natives by saying that he supports the National Language in Article 153 of the Constitution, i.e. the special position of the natives and of the Malays, when in actual fact he continuously, by words and deeds, undermines these two fundamentals.

In one breath he supports Malaya's National Language and in the next, he makes sneering remarks about the National Language. He said how could Malay language help to uplift the standards of living of the Malays? Of course he knows as well as we do that language has nothing to do with the standards of living of the people.

*Language is a soul of the nation: Bahasa Jiwa Bangsa. This is nor a matter which can be measured in terms of wealth or of the standard of living or of material advantage. We know this and the Hon'ble Member knows this too.*

Why make such a remark if one sincerely believes in promoting the National Language, in making it the language for unity of our people. This continual habit of double talk in which the Hon'ble Member is a great expert cannot influence the people in any way because truth and sincerity must prevail.

Then the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew and his newly found friends in the so-called Solidarity Convention speak of a "Malay-sum Malaysia". They put it across to the people as if this is something completely new which has never been thought of before.

But everyone knows this is the object of the formation of Malaysia. Everyone knows that this is the objective in the Constitution of Malaysia. The Hon'ble Member himself knows the Constitution. He accepted it and defended it in the General Assembly of Singapore.

There have not been any changes in the fundamental provision of the Constitution. However, just because the Hon'ble Member is not part of the Central Government and is not responsible for the affairs of Malaysia, he cannot accept the situation as it is.

Malaysia which he supported is no longer the Malaysia that he wanted. That is why he talked about the winds of change. That is why he accused us of not integrating the various territories together.

If he is part of the Central Government as he had wanted to be, then everything would be all right. The PAP now talks about the winds of change. We had our winds of change in 1957. And it is our duty now to consolidate the independence that we have achieved to give our people of all races a better and higher standard of living and a rightful place in our country.

The truth of the matter is, as my colleague, the Minister of Home Affairs said, the PAP in Singapore found that they cannot adapt themselves to the new situation. They cannot accept the fact that they are one of the 14 States of Malaysia.

And that the Prime Minister of Singapore is the leader of the Government of only one of those States. Mr Lee Kuan Yew has found himself like a frog in a big lake. Obviously he has to croak in order to show his presence and to be heard.

As my colleague, the Minister of Finance said we in the Alliance have talked about Malaya for the Malaysians since we first formed the Alliance Party in 1953. When our Prime Minister first mooted the idea of Malaysia, we told the people of Sarawak, Sabah and Singapore that we would like them to achieve independence together with us so that they would have the same status as we have enjoyed, the same rights and privileges as we had as an independent and sovereign nation.

We, the leaders of the Alliance are now fortunately accustomed to this sort of talk, to smearing campaigns and to double talk ever since the Prime Minister of Singapore came into the political arena of Malaysia.

But we hope and trust the people of Malaysia of all races know this and should be aware of this double talk. We in the Alliance have always tried to be fair. We always like to play the game and although politics is a dirty thing, there are rules to the game and we always want to follow the rules.

The Prime Minister of Singapore spoke as if we in the Alliance have not upheld the Constitution and have prosecuted the people of this country particularly the non-Malays.

Now, I say categorically. Sir, ever since the Alliance came into power in Malaya since 1955, have we ever discriminated against any group of people in this country whatever their racial origins? We have allowed everyone complete freedom to lead their lives. Indeed we have always said and our Prime Minister has always said that it is our policy to make everyone happy.

Those who are poor to be rich and those who are rich, if out of their initiative and enterprise, they can be richer. Let them be so.

For generations in this country the people of all races have lived in peace and harmony. Ever since we achieved Independence in 1957, there have been peace and harmony. Since we established Malaysia in 1963, people of all races have lived in goodwill and harmony.

But why should this sudden talk of racial tension of one race tending to dominate another or of possible trouble. If there is trouble, let it be now? Why should there be such talk. Mr Lee Kuan Yew has to find some issues to make noise. Otherwise his voice cannot be heard beyond the island of Singapore. As my colleague the Minister of Home Affairs said, he shouts, "Fire, fire" while at the same time commits arson.

This is the tactic employed by a desperate politician who is ready to use any means to get himself some support.

Of course in the happy situation that the people of this country of all races are, the Prime Minister of Singapore finds it difficult to see anything wrong to criticise the Government—the Alliance Government.

He has, therefore, to create an imaginary situation, the most sensitive issue and one which can easily arouse the sentiment of the people.

What is this racial issue, differences and imbalances among the different races? He, therefore, decided to throw a wedge between different races. At first in order to make friends with the UMNO and the Malays, he attempted to discredit the MCA, stating that the MCA did not represent the Chinese, did not stand for the rights of the Chinese.

When he found that this tactic did not work and was completely rejected by the people at large and found out that UMNO decided to stand solidly with the MCA, he switched round his tactics and attacked the UMNO and the Malays.

He hoped by doing this he would get the non-Malays to support him. This is a tactic and that is why he has been whipping up this campaign of anti-UMNO and anti-Malays.

I say, Sir, this is a dangerous way of attempting to gain political support in a multi-racial country like this. This method must lead to racial strife and tension and ultimately to trouble and chaos.

I do not believe the Prime Minister of Singapore cares very much about this as long as he has a chance of getting additional support for himself. But we in the Alliance are responsible people. We have the interests and welfare of the country. We place the peace and harmony, the unity of our people of all races above everything else.

We say whatever we do, we must not upset this goodwill, this harmony and unity among our people. We must assure our people of various races that they have a place under the Malaysian sun.

Our policy is clear. We have made it clear many times that we are determined to maintain harmony and goodwill of our people of all races, to give them a proper place in our country, to help the less fortunate and have-nots so that they will have a decent standard of living and a proper place in our society.

It is our policy to maintain and strengthen the harmony, goodwill and friendship of our people of all races so that ultimately they will regard themselves as members of one nation and not members of various races. This is our policy- and our approach as my colleague the Minister of Home Affairs has made it clear.

And our method of unifying our people by a slow and steady process has proved a success in the former Federation of Malaya. There is no reason why they should not prove a success in Malaysia provided the people give us their confidence and their support. Mr Speaker, Sir, I have no doubt the people will continue to give their support to the Alliance for many, many years to come.

The gulf that divides the PAP and us, the Alliance, is now wide and clear. We, the Malaysian Alliance Party, stand for unity

of Malaysia, of harmony and goodwill among our people of various races, of peace and progress. The PAP stands for division, for partition and for disunity—therefore, in short, Malaysia Alliance Party (MAP) means Malaysia Abundance Progress. PAP means Partition and Perish—dalam Bahasa Kebangsaan PAP means Pechah akan Punah.

## THE WAY TO BUILD A STRONG ECONOMY

### — WHAT THE BERLIN WALL SYMBOLISES

*The need to encourage initiative and enterprise of Malaysians was emphasised by Tun Abdul Razak in the course of this speech in Parliament on 24th December, 1964. In moving the Malaysia Development Estimates, 1965, he appealed to "every able-bodied man, throughout the country, to do a little more, to work a little harder because it is not money alone which will make us a great nation..."*

"That this House resolves that a sum not exceeding S801.156,"<sup>24</sup> be expended out of the Development Fund in the year 1965 and that to meet the purposes of the Heads and Sub-heads set out in the second column of the statement laid on the Table as Command Paper No. 37 of 1964 there be appropriated the sums specified against such Heads and Sub-heads in the tenth and eleventh columns in respect of Heads 100-153 and the eight and ninth columns in respect of Heads 155-210."

These estimates totalling an amount of \$801 million are in no way symptomatic of a crushed, dejected and defeated nation; they are the very opposite of the dream of Soekarno. to cripple us with his "Confrontasi",

I feel very proud. Mr Speaker. Sir, and I feel also that this pride should be shared by each and every Member of this House irrespective of what Party he belongs to that we. as a united, democratic and free people have been able to press on. in the