



PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

DEWAN RA'AYAT

(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

OFFICIAL REPORT

CONTENTS

BILLS

THE SUPPLEMENTARY SUPPLY (No. 4) BILL [Col. 3431 THE
HOUSING TRUST (AMENDMENT) BILL [Col. 344] THE TREASURY
DEPOSIT RECEIPTS (AMENDMENT) BILL [Col. 3451 THE PINEAPPLE
INDUSTRY (AMENDMENT) BILL [Col. 347] THE EMPLOYEES
PROVIDENT FUND (AMENDMENT) BILL [Col. 3M1
THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR OFFICERS (OATHS AND FEES) BILL
[Col. 347]
THE LOANS (EXPORT CREDITS GUARANTEE DEPARTMENT) BILL
[Col. 3M]
THE PETROLEUM (AMENDMENT) BILL [C*1. 374]
THE COMMON GAMING HOUSES (AMENDMENT) BILL [Col. 37*1
THE OATHS AND AFFIRMATIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL [Col. 3771
THE BETTING (AMENDMENT) BILL [Col. 37*1
THE NATIONAL REGISTRATION BILL [Col. 3711
THE INCOME TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL [Col. 441

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

Official Report

First Session of the First Dewan Ra'ayat

*Friday, 27th November, 1959 The
House met at 9 JO o'clock tun.*

PRESENT:

- The Honourable Mr. Speaker, DATO' HAJI MOHAMED NOAH BIN OMAR, D.P.M.J., P.I.S., J.P.
- the Prime Minister, Y.T.M. TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN PUTRA AL-HAJ, K.O.M. (Kuala Kedah).
- the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Defence, TUN ABDUL RAZAK BIN DATO' HUSSAIN, S.M.N. (Pekan).
- the Minister of Finance, MR. TAN SIEW SIN, J.P. (Malacca Tengah).
- the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, DATO' V. T. SAMBANTHAN, P.M.N. (Sungei Siput).
- the Minister of the Interior, DATO' SULEIMAN BIN DATO' ABDUL RAHMAN, P.M.N. (Muar Selatan).
- the Minister of Agriculture, ENCHE' ABDUL Aziz BIN ISHAK (Kuala Langat).
- the Minister of Transport, ENCHE' SARDON BIN HAJI JUBIR (Pontian Utara).
- the Minister of Health and Social Welfare, DATO' ONG YOKE LIN, P.M.N. (Ulu Selangor).
- the Minister of Education and Minister of Commerce and Industry. ENCHE' MOHAMED KHIR BIN JOHARI (Kedah Tengah).
- the Minister of Labour, ENCHE' BAHAMAN BIN SAMSUDIN (Kuala Pilah).
- TUAN SYED JA'AFAR BIN HASAN ALBAR, J.M.N., Assistant Minister (Johore Tenggara).
- TUAN HAJI ABDUL KHALID BIN AWANG OSMAN, Assistant Minister (Kota Star Utara).
- ENCHE' ABDUL GHANI BIN ISHAK, A.M.N. (Malacca Utara). ENCHE' ABDUL RAUF BIN A. RAHMAN (Krian Laut). ENCHE' ABDUL SAMAD BIN OSMAN (Sungei Patani).
- TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI ABDUL RAOF (Kuala Kangsar).
- TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI MOHD. SALLEH, A.M.N., P.I.S. (Segamat Utara).

The Honourable TUAN HAH AHMAD BIN ABDULLAH (Kota Bharu Hilir).

ENCHE' AHMAD BIN ARSHAD, A.M.N. (Muar Utara).

ENCHE' AHMAD BOESTAMAN (Setapak). ENCHE' AHMAD

BIN MOHAMED SHAH (Johore Bahru Bant). TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN SAAID (Seberang Utara). ENCHE' AHMAD BIN HAJI YUSOF (Krian Darat). TUAN HAJI AZAHARI BIN HAJI IBRAHIM (Kubang Pasu Barat). ENCHE' Aziz BIN ISHAK (Muar Dalam).

DR. BURHANUDDIN BIN MOHD. NOOR (BeSuU).

MR. CHAN CHONG WEN (Kluang Selatan).

MR. CHAN SIANG SUN (Bentong). MR.

CHAN SWEE Ho (Ulu Kinta). MR. CHIN

SEE YIN (Seremban Timor). MR. V.

DAVID (Bungsar).

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

MR. GEH CHONG KEAT (Penang Utara).

ENCHE' HAMZAH BIN ALANG, A.M.N. (Kapar).

ENCHE' HANAFI BIN MOHD. YUNUS, A.M.N. (Kulim Utara).

ENCHE' HARUN BIN ABDULLAH (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 (Malacca Selatan). ENCHE'

HUSSEIN BIN To' MUDA HASSAN (Raub). ENCHE'

HUSSEIN BIN MOHD. NOORDIN, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Parit).

TUAN HAJI HUSSAIN RAHIMI BIN HAJI SAMAN (Kota Bharu Hulu).

ENCHE' IBRAHIM BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Seberang Tengah).

ENCHE' ISMAIL BIN IDRIS (Penang Selatan).

MR. KANG KOCK SENG (Batu Pahat).

MR. K. KARAM SINGH (Damansara).

CHE' KHADIJAH BINTI MOHD. Srore (Dungun).

MR. KHONG KOK YAT (Batu Gajah).

MR. LEE SAN CHOON (Kluang Utara).

MR. LEE SECK FUN (Tanjong Malim).

MR. LEE SIOK YEW (Sepang).

MR. LEONG KEE NYEAN (Kampar).

MR. LIM Joo KONG (Alor Star).

MR. LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato* Kramat).

DR. LIM SWEE Aim, J.P. (Larut Selatan).

MR. Liu YOONG PENG (Rawang).

MR. T. MAHIMA SINGH (Port Dickson).

The Honourable ENCHE' MOHAMED BIN UJANG (Jelebu-Jempol).

ENCHE' MOHAMED ABBAS BIN AHMAD (Hilir Perak).

ENCHE' MOHAMED ASRI BIN HAJI MUDA (Pasir Puteh).

ENCHE' MOHAMED DAHARI BIN HAJI MOHD. ALI (Kuala Selangor).

ENCHB' MOHAMED NOR BIN MOHD. DAHAN (Ulu Perak).

DATO' MOHAMED HANIFAH BIN HAJI ABDUL GHANI, P.J.K. (Pasir Mas Hulu).

ENCHE' MOHAMED ISMAIL BIN MOHD. YUSOF (Jerai).

ENCHE' MOHAMED SULONG BIN MOHD. ALI, J.M.N. (Lipis).

ENCHE* MOHAMED YUSOF BIN MAHMUD, A.M.N.

(Temerloh). TUAN HAJI MOKHTAR BIN HAJI ISMAIL (Perlis Selatan). NIK MAN BIN NIK MOHAMED (Pasir Mas Hilir).

MR. No ANN TECK (Batu).

DATO* ONN BIN JAAFAR, D.K., D.P.MJ. (Kuala Trengganu Selatan).

ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Tanah Merah).

ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Perlis Utara).

MR. QUEK KAI DONG (Seremban Barat).

TUAN HAJI REDZA BIN HAJI MOHD. SAID (Rembau-Tampin).

MR. SEAH TENG NGIAB (Muar Pantai).

MR. D. R. SEENIVASAGAM (Ipoh).

MR. S. P. SEENIVASAGAM (Menglembu).

TUAN SYED ESA BIN ALWEE, S.MJ., P.I.S. (Batu Pahat Dalam).

TUAN SYED HASHIM BIN SYED AJAM, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Sabak Bernam).

ENCHE' TAJUDIN BIN ALI (Larut Utara).

MR. TAN CHENG BEE, J.P. (Bagan)..

MR. TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Malacca).

MR. TAN PHOCK KIN (Tanjong).

MR. TAN TYE CHEK (Kulim-Bandar Bahru).

TENGGU INDRA PETRA IBNI SULTAN IBRAHIM, J.M.N. (Ulu Kelantan).

DATO' TEOH CHZE CHONG, D.P.MJ., J.P. (Segamat Selatan).

MR. V. VEERAPPEN (Seberang Selatan).

WAN MUSTAPHA BIN HAJI ALI (Kelantan Hilir).

WAN SULAIMAN BIN WAN TAM (Kota Star Selatan).

WAN YAHYA BIN HAJI WAN MOHAMED (Kemaman).

MR. Woo SAIK HONG (Telok Anson).

MR. YEOH TAT BENG (Bruas).

MR. YONG Woo MING (Sitiawan).

HAJJAH ZAIN BINTI SULAIMAN (Pontian Selatan).

TUAN HAJI ZAKARIA BIN HAJI MOHD. TAIB (Langat).

ENCHE' ZULKIFLEE BIN MUHAMMAD (Bachok).

ABSENT:

The Honourable the Minister of External Affairs, DATO* DR. ISMAIL .BIN DATO' ABDUL RAHMAN, P.M.N. (Johore Timor).
 ENCHE* ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAH TALIB (Minister without Portfolio) (Kuanlan).
 ENCHE' ABDUL HAMID KHAN BIN HAJI SAKHAWAT ALI KHAN, J.M.N., J.F., Assistant Minister (Batang Padang).
 MR. CHEAH THEAM SWEE, Assistant Minister (Bukit Bintang).
 MR. V. MANICKAVASAGAM, Assistant Minister (Klang).
 ENCHE* MOHAMED ISMAIL BIN MOHAMED YUSOF, Assistant Minister (Jerai).
 ENCHE' YAHYA BIN HAJI AHMAD (Bagan Datoh).

IN ATTENDANCE: The Honourable the
 Minister of Justice, TUN LEONO YEW KOH, S.M.N.

PRAYERS

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

EXEMPTED BUSINESS

(Motion)

the Prime Milliter: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 12, the House shall not adjourn this day until after the completion of all Government business on the Order Paper.

The Deputy Prime Minister (Tun Abdul Razak): Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That, notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 12, the House shall not adjourn this day until after the completion of all Government business on the Order Paper.

BILLS**THE SUPPLEMENTARY SUPPLY (1959) (No. 4) BILL**

Second

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Tan Siew Sin): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to apply a sum out of the Consolidated Fund for additional expenditure for the service of the year 1959, to appropriate such a sum for certain purposes and to provide for the replacement of amounts advanced from the Contingencies Fund" be read a second time.

Yesterday this House approved the Supplementary Estimates of 512,024,288 in the fourth Supplementary Estimates of Expenditure for the current year which have been tabled as Cmd. Paper No. 24 of 1959. As I indicated when I moved that those Estimates be approved, the purpose of this Bill is to appropriate that sum of \$12,024,288 from the Consolidated Fund for the services specified in those Estimates.

I do not consider that this Bill involves any question of policy on which I need speak or that it is necessary for me to add anything to what was already said yesterday.

Sir, I beg to move.

Ton Abdul Razak: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time.

Question, that the Bill be DOW read a third time, put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read the third time and passed.

HOUSING TRUST (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second

The Minister of the Interior (Dato* Sniebnan bin Dato* Abdul Rahman): Tuan Speaker, saya bangun mfimbawa usul supaya Rang Undang-undang mJSminda Undang- Housing Trust tahun 1950 dibachakan kali yang kedua.

Dalam bulan July tahun ini sa-orang Timbalan PnggSrusi tfilah di-lantek sabagai mSnjalankan kfrja dalara Housing Trust, mengikut kghfindak dalam Bab 5 Undang² Housing Trust.

Tujuan mengadakan Timbalan Pngg-rusi ini ia-lah supaya dapat Timbalan P&dge'rusi ini me'njalankan pgrkara pfn-tadbiran hari² yang tidak dapat di-jalankan oleh PnggSrusi-nya. Tujuan ini-lah Rang Undang² ini di-bawa ka-hadapan Dewan ini.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to amend the Housing Trust Ordinance, 1950" be read a second time.

In July this year, a Deputy Chairman was appointed to the Housing Trust in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of the Ordinance. The purpose of this appointment was to relieve the Chairman, who is at present myself, from the day-to-day routine administrative matters in housing affairs. In order to achieve this object, however, it is necessary to amend the Housing Trust itself. This Bill before the House gives effect to its implementation.

Sir, I beg to move.

Tomn Syed Ja*afar bin Hasan Albar (Jobore Tenggara): Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House,

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

Clauses 1 and 2 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported without amendment: read the third time and passed.

THE TREASURY DEPOSIT RECEIPTS (AMENDMENT) BOX

Second Reading

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: I beg to mov? that a Bill intituled "an Act to amend the Treasury Deposit Receipts Ordinance, 1952" be read a second time. The purpose and effect of the Bill are set

out clearly in the explanatory statement attached thereto.

At present the Government may borrow for periods up to twelve months by the issue of Treasury Bills and for periods of 3, 4 and 5 years by the issue of Treasury Deposit Receipts. The Government does not have power to issue two-year securities other than two-year registered stock under the provisions of the Loan (Local) Ordinance, 1959, which up to the present tune has been used for the issue of longer term loans, as any monies raised under the provisions of that Ordinance are paid into the Development Fund. It is important that the market for Government Securities should be widened and this will be facilitated by increasing the range of such securities, and the amendments now proposed to the Treasury Deposit Receipts Ordinance will contribute towards the achievement of this objective as two-year deposits will meet at least part of the requirements of the State Governments and statutory bodies in particular, for short-term Government Securities. Similarly, it is hoped that the reduction of the minimum deposit to \$50,000 will make Deposit Receipts more attractive to private investors.

Treasury Deposit Receipts are not normally marketable prior to their maturity dates, but the Federation Government will give sympathetic consideration to any request for early repayment by holders and will in normal circumstances be prepared to make repayment although no definite prior commitment to do this in any particular case can be accepted.

Sir, I beg to move.

TUB Abdul Razak: Sir. I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive ordered to stand part of the BUI.

Bill reported without amendment: read the third time and passed.

THE PINEAPPLE INDUSTRY (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Enche* Mohamed Kkir Johari): Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to amend the Pineapple Industry Ordinance, 1957" be read a second time.

Sir, one effect of the increasingly keen competition in the international market for canned pineapples, which became evident since 1958, has been the development of a number of problems in the pineapple industry in Malaya, particularly in the marketing of the fruit to the canneries during the peaks of the fruit season. Honourable Members will no doubt recall the sad experience we had late in December last year, when the sudden closure of one of the canneries in Singapore disrupted the normal marketing of smallgrowers' fruit, causing hardship to certain smallgrowers who had to be financially assisted by the Government. Since then, although the international market is reported to have shown a steady improvement (at least so far as the Federation is concerned) there have been several developments which make it extremely difficult to assess what the market situation is likely to be in the next few months. In the face of such uncertainties and the possibility that difficulties may arise again in the industry, the Government considers it desirable that the purposes for which the Pineapple Industry Cess Fund may be legally used under the Pineapple Industry Ordinance, 1957, should be extended to include the provision of assistance to any section or sections of the industry which may justify such assistance. Hence the proposed amendment at clause 2 of the BUI.

The other amendment at clause 3 seeks to authorise the Minister responsible to make orders for the imposition, collection, variation or cancellation of a cess or cesses on the exportation of canned pineapple, after consultation with the Malayan Pineapple Industry Board. In this connection. I would like to emphasise that

the principle of giving such authority to the Minister is not new and has been incorporated, for instance, in the Malayan Rubber Fund (Research and Development) Ordinance.

I should also like to add that the Government of Singapore, which administers a parallel legislation in that territory, has agreed to support the introduction of the proposed amendments in Singapore.

Sir, I beg to move.

The Minister of Agriculture and Cooperatives (Enche* Abdal Ariz): Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Cache* ZdkMee bta Mi (Bachok): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam Cheraian 3 Bill ini ada me*nunjukkan Amendment yang hendak di-gantikan "after consultation with*" dfingan yang ada "on the recommendation of*". Jadi, saya suka-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau Yang Bfirhormat Menteri dapat rngmbSrikan sedikit kfctgrangan ia-itu apa-kah sa-bSnar-nya yang di-tujukan dgngan perbezaan dalam perbahathan ini. Ada-kah dahulu usaha ini umpamanya di-dapati oleh Ke'me'ntftian atau Mentfiri Yang Berhormat bahawa melakukan sa-suatu "on the recommendation of" nienygbabkan berapa kgpayahan besar atau sa-bagai-nya hingga terpaksa di-tukarkan p&kataan "after consultation with" itu?

Mr. V. David (Bungsar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think the assistance to the pineapple industry by the Government should have come a long time ago. The pineapple industry in fact has been facing repeated crises during the last few years due to competition in the international markets.

Mr. Speaker, there is another thing that I would like to emphasise here. As far as I know, most of the pineapple growers in this country are looking forward to the report of the Commission which sat to enquire into the position of the pineapple industry somewhere in the middle of 1959. Approving this Bill and at the same time publishing that report would provide more scope for the pineapple industry in this country to make its progress.

As we know, to-day rubber is the main product of this country, and it is always risky to completely rely on one product and if we have another agricultural product like pineapple which could compete in the international market it would be to the advantage of the Malayan economy. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the pineapple industry has a wide scope in this country due to the Malayan climate which is suitable for this product and I would request the Honourable Minister to give all support and all encouragement to this industry which employs a large number of workers of this country; and at the same time it should be encouraged to produce finished products—on the agricultural side the industry employs large numbers of workers; and also, in the manufacturing side, such as canning and so on. Therefore, if encouragement is sufficiently given to this industry, in time to come we can kad in the international market and at the same time thousands of unemployed workers in this country can be given employment. Mr. Speaker, Sir, finally I request the Honourable Minister to publish the report on the findings of the enquiry as early as possible, because most of the employers and workers are looking forward to the report to make adjustments and improvements in the industry. Thank you.

Cache' Mohamed Khir Johari: Tuan Speaker, bagi me'jawab soalan yang telah di-bangkitkan oleh Ahli Yang Bgrhormat dari Bachok, saya suka me'jawab bahawa yang sa-bSnar-nya ada bSrjaku sedikit kesusahan tSntang pfirkara³ bgrsangkutan dengan Nanas di-sini, maka d ngan s bab itu-lah kita beikghndakkan Bill ini di-pinda.

In reply to the Honourable Member from Bungsar I would like to say here and now that the Government.....

Cache* Zolkiflee bin Mahammad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya minta sedikit lagi penerangan berkenaan dengan kaltmah: "after consultation with", ada-kah itu timbul ke*rana dengan "on the recommendation of mgnye"babkan be"berapa kfiPAYAHAN?

Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari: Ya-sa-bagaimana yang di-s5butkan "after consultation with" berma'ana kita tEr-LSbeh dahulu hendak'lah bounding dSngan pehak LSmbaga Nanas, kern udian dari pad a itu baharu-lah Mdnt^ri yang bgrkgnaan membuat kSputusan "on the recommendation of". Ini boleh jadi, balk atau ta' balk bglum-lab di-tfntukan lagi, tgtapi "after consultation with", saya ingat Ifibeh sesuai lagi daripada apa yang telah tErkandung dahulu.

In reply to the Honourable Member from Bungsar, I can assure him, and also the House, that the Government fully realises the importance of the pineapple industry to the economy of this country, and I can assure him that we fully support what he said just now in regard to the encouragement that the Government should give to the pineapple industry. In return, I would ask for the co-operation of the unions connected with the industry.

With regard to the point he raised about the report of the Commission of Enquiry, the Commission has already completed its work and the report is now being considered by the Government. It will be published, as soon as it has been fully considered, for the information of the public.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee. (Mr.

Speaker *in the Chair*).

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported without amendment: read the third time and passed.

THE EMPLOYEES PROVIDENT FUND (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Mr. Tan Slew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to amend the Employees Provident Fund Ordinance, 1951," be read a second time. The purpose of this Bill

is fully set out in the explanatory statement attached thereto, but it may be desirable for me to enlarge on the reasons which have led the Government to introduce this Bill.

Honourable Members of this House will, I am sure, agree that the rapid economic and social development of our country is one of the primary responsibilities of the Government. The rate and extent of such development will be determined largely by the volume of money provided by our own people that is devoted to this purpose. At the present time, during the formative period of the Fund the largest single source of money derived from the people themselves that is available in the Federation is the contributions that are made to the Employees Provident Fund. It is therefore in the national interest that these funds should not be lost for this purpose which would be the case if the assets of the Fund were invested outside the Federation. I do not wish to imply by this that there has been any disregard of this need by those who have been responsible for the investment of the funds accumulated to date. The identity of interest between the contributors to the Fund and the people of the Federation generally has been fully recognised by the Employees Provident Fund Board and reflected in its investment policy, as the major part of the Fund has been invested in Federation Government loans raised for development purposes. I can assure Honourable Members, therefore, that the introduction of this Bill in no way indicates a lack of mutual trust and confidence between the Government and the Board of the Fund.

The actual investment of the large sums received by way of contributions and interest on capital rests with the Board and I consider it desirable that it should continue to do so. Nevertheless, the responsibility is a heavy one and it is desirable that Parliament should define more precisely by legislation the broad lines of investment policy to be followed. The Government is satisfied that it is in the long-term interests of all contributors that the assets of the Fund should be used to

promote economic and social development in the Federation. Nevertheless, in the short-term, more favourable opportunities may arise for investment in foreign countries than are available in the Federation. For instance during the 1957 credit squeeze in the United Kingdom interest rates were higher in the United Kingdom than in the Federation. This possible conflict between national and short-term interests might possibly render the Board open to criticism that it is neglecting the interests of depositors, should it fail to take advantage of favourable opportunities for investment which may arise in overseas countries. The Bill before you to-day, by giving statutory recognition to the over-riding claims of investment within the Federation, will resolve this difficulty.

Honourable Members will note that the Bill provides for not less than 70 per cent of the monies invested or re-invested in any one year to be invested in Federation Government securities. Some of you may consider that this unduly restricts the Board's field of investment. The Government has given most careful consideration to this point and, after full consultation with the Board, has reached the conclusion that it is right and proper that the bulk of the assets of the Employees Provident Fund should be invested in Government securities as the money so invested is utilised to finance a development programme approved by the people's elected representatives in this House. I am satisfied that the right of the Board to invest 30 per cent of the assets of the Fund in other than Government securities will allow the Board adequate flexibility in the determination of their investment policy. It may indeed happen that the Board will have some difficulty in finding an outlet even for this 30 per cent within the range permitted for trustee investment.

I also wish to assure Honourable Members that should the Federation Government at any time not be willing to issue securities which would meet the essential requirements of the Fund, I am prepared to allow the Board to invest more than 30 per cent in non-Government securities in the Federation as may be necessary in the

circumstances and will also be prepared to allow investment outside the Federation should the Board be able to show that such investment was essential in the interests of depositors. Sir, I beg to move.

The Minister of Labour (Encbe' Bahaman bin Samsudin): I beg to second the motion.

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam (Ipoh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Employees Provident Fund was originally formulated and passed to be of some assistance to the employee in his old age, principally. The E.P.F. has, in fact, by its very nature worked not to the benefit of the employees, but in a large number of cases to the detriment of them in this country. I say that consciously and I hope that the Ministry concerned will in due course present to this House an amendment to the Employees Provident Fund to give effect to the following suggestions, which I say the Government party itself did promise in 1955.

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: On a point of order. Sir, I wonder whether the Honourable Member is speaking on this Bill; I think he is referring to another matter.

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: I am speaking on the E.P.F. Ordinance.

Mr. Speaker: We are dealing with the amendment to sub-section (2) of section 4 of the Bill.

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: The amendment deals with how money belonging to the E.P.F. should be dealt with, and I submit that I am entitled to say how the money should be disposed of.

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: You are talking of withdrawals.

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: Yes, when you put in money you withdraw it, and when you withdraw money you dispose of that money. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the monies which are going to the E.P.F. are contributed by employers and employees; and on the principle of how that money should be disposed of, I have a few suggestions to make. I am not making suggestions which are new because in 1955 those suggestions were made by the Government party to the people in their manifesto: that steps

would be taken to amend the E.P.F. in relation to how money should be disposed of, and in cases of urgent necessities, how money could be withdrawn by contributors. That was promised in 1955. but throughout this time in the Legislative Assembly, questions have been asked of the Government to allow employees in cases of dire necessity to withdraw money and answers given by the Government Bench that there would be no amendment. Money belonging to the Employees Provident Fund, I see, can only be disposed of to the employee now in three ways:

- (i) when he is over 55 years of age;
- (ii) when he is certified medically unfit for the rest of his life to work; and
- (iii) when he is declared no longer an employee (I presume to be a capitalist).

But there are cases where an employee cannot work temporarily through illness or for the fact that he cannot get a job, and he has a wife and children and they are on the verge of starvation, and yet money from the E.P.F. cannot be refunded back to the employee. What is the use, the man is on the verge of starvation and still the E.P.F. says: "Wait until you are 55." By 55 that man may be dead. I hope that the Ministry concerned will in due course amend the E.P.F. Ordinance, as promised by the Government party in 1955, to give effect that in case of urgent necessity workers can withdraw their money so as to live and exist; and that is the way I suggest should be done.

Mr. V. David: Mr. Speaker, Sir, we feel that there is really a genuine necessity to revise the complete Employees Provident Fund Ordinance. The Ordinance itself was enacted sometime in 1951 after repeated demand from the workers of all sections that they should have a certain amount of contribution to safeguard their interests in times of necessity. But now the contribution made by the workers are becoming not to their interest. For instance, a female employee can only withdraw the contributions when she reaches the age of

55. In Asia, I don't think a woman lives, on the average, more than 55 or 60 years. I think when she reaches 55 she neither can see and neither sometimes she can hear, and at this juncture the money doesn't go to the employee but becomes an asset to the Government itself. So what I would feel is that the age limit should be relaxed with the view of the Asian living, and it should be reduced to a certain extent where the employee concerned will have the opportunity of enjoying the contributions. The workers themselves have been contributing to these funds.

The Ordinance which was enacted in 1951 was enacted in a very hasty manner because at that time the conditions in the country were quite different. We were still a part of British territory, and the treatment embodied in that Ordinance was colonial in nature. I think that it should now be redrafted to suit Malayan needs with a view and with a spirit that Malaya is an independent nation. Therefore, the Minister concerned will take these into consideration and do everything possible for the benefit of the workers who make the contributions to safeguard their interests in the latter part of their lives.

Cache* Zulkiflee bin Muhammad:

Tuan Yang di-Pfirtua, saya suka metn-bSri sedikit pgnjelasan ia-itu dengan ada-nya Undang² Employees Provident Fund ini, kita tflah mgndSngar bSbfirapa sungutan di-sini yang tglah disampaikan orang² kampong yang dahulu-nya bgkfrja sa-bagai pe'ke'rja K«rajaan atau b5k6rja di-bandar. Pada masa ini me'reka tfrpaksa balek kampong. Saya tidak-lah mSngatakan orang² yang hSndakkan itu be'rke'he'ndak minjadi kapitalis sa-sudah dia mgnjadi buroh di-bandar tStapi tSr-paksa me'reka itu mSnghadapi hidup baharu di-kampong. Dan oleh k rana kftat sangat, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Undang² berkngnaan Provident Fund—hanya mSmpunaf tiga jalan yang disSbutkan oleh rakan saya tadi, maka oleh kSrana kStat-nya itu tfrasa-lah kapada me'reka ini bahawa Undang² Provident Fund ini tidak mSnolong

me'reka itu pada masa mSreka itu Wr-kShendakkan sangat². Saya harap bahawa Yang Bgrhormat MSntSrij Kfiwangan dapat mgnimbangan jalan² yang sa-kira-nya mSbolehkan orang² yang bSnar² bSrke'he'ndakkan kapada bantuan daripada wang Provident Fund itu sSndiri sa-b&lum sampai dia-nya bgrumor 55 tahun supaya membolehkan dia bSrdiri di-atas kaki-nya di-dalam kShidupan baharu-nya.

Mr. Chin See Yin (Seremban Timor):

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am in full agreement with the submission made by the Honourable Member of Ipoh Constituency. Sir, it is of the utmost importance that those employees who have contributed towards that fund in their time of need should be given assistance. I think, we all will agree that the employees in this country are the mainstay of and have provided the financial aspect of the country. So long as the workers have money, the traders will find it easier to carry on with their business. This is a sort of a circle—it goes round and round. When a worker has money, he has money to make purchases, and the shopkeepers will Jiave money to buy goods, and when the shopkeepers have money to make purchases for their shops, the Government will find revenue. Therefore, in this way we will have more money. Not only it will benefit the workers, it will benefit the Government as well. Therefore it is of the utmost importance that the provision should be revised. The legislation of this law was made under pressure made by the workers* unions or the workers' representatives. As a result of this, contributions were made not only by the employees but by the employers as well. But unfortunately the law was made in such a way that only when you are 55 that you can draw this money.

There are many cases in welfare homes where you find inmates who through no fault of their own are unable to get some sort of relief from the Provident Fund because, they were told, they would not be able to withdraw their money as they had not come to the age of 55 or they have

not been pronounced absolutely unfit for employment. Therefore, it is of great necessity that the Government should consider to revise this law.

Mr. K. Karam Singh (Damawara): Mr. Speaker, Sir, as at present the Employees Provident Fund is meant to provide security for the workers of this country in times of need and in time of old age and when they are unable to work, but the working of the Employees Provident Fund Ordinance is entirely inadequate. It has failed to give the workers a sense of security. On the other hand, it has only added to their frustration because when they are hungry, when they are unemployed, when they are in difficulties, they have their money in the Fund but are unable to use it. It is like having water everywhere, but not a drop to drink. I would like this House to remember that the security, social and otherwise, of the workers is not guaranteed by this Ordinance alone. We must make provision for the workers when they are old. Not only do Government servants require pensions, but all workers and every peasant in this country require support of one kind or other from the Government in their old age.

Mr. Speaker, when we say that this Ordinance is inadequate to provide the security that any working man requires, we mean he may have collected a little money and when he draws it out and uses it, after that what security? Once that money is used, he is left again to the mercy of the trade cycle or the boom and depression of industry.

I would request the Government Bench not to be complacent. The difficulties of the working class are great, and the security provided for by this Employees Provident Fund is not sufficient, and we would request, as other Honourable Members have requested, that the Ordinance be thoroughly revised to provide full security for all working people of this country.

Cache* Ottoman bin Abdullah (Taaah Mcrah): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berkgnaan dSngan tujuan asal daripada

Provident Fund ini ia-lah untofc mSmberikan satu kfhidupan baharu kepada mSreka² yang bekSrja di-waktu tua kSlak dan sa-t&ah dia tidak b&rdaya lagi dalam ke"hidupan-nya, tStapi didalam Umiang² atau Peratoran kepada pgkerja² yang akan dapat k&nbali wang-nya itu ia-lah sa-telah di-hadkan apabila sampai umur-nya 55 tahun.

Tuan Yang di-PSrtua, ini tidak pula di-jamin bahawa dia boleh be'ke'rja sampai umur-nya 55 tahun. Ini be're'rti bahawa sa-b&lum dia mendapat wang-nya itu inaka dia terpaksa mgndeiita. Saya mSndapat pfingalaman dalam soal ini yang mana ada bSberapa orang manusia, kawan² yang telah bgrhSnti dari pgk&rjaan-nya sa-b&lum dia mendapat atau sampai umur-nya 55 tahun, mithal-nya dia mSnjadi sa-orang anggota Polis Tambahan yang hanya be'ke'rja dalam masa 4-5 tahun atau salama 8 tahun, kSmudian dia bSrhentia dari p&ke'rjaan-nya itu oleh kSrana kontrek-nya telah selgsai. Jadi, apakala dia hgndak m&mulakan penghidupan baharu-nya, inaka dia tfilah gSlisah, oleh kcrana itu dia pgrnah da tang b&jumpa dfingan kawan² yang lain, mithal-nya mSminta p&lolongan hidup, t&tapi dia kgchiwa akhir-nya pSrgi-lah ia mgnchuba mSndapatkan wang daripada Provident Fund itu. Ikhtiar telah di-jalankan, dan apa-kah yang timbul daripada dalam pfirkara ini—sa-hingga ada yang bgrani m^ngatakan bahawa diri-nya bukan ra'ayat n^ggri ini dan oleh kCrana itu dia hgndak keluar dari nggfiri ini dgngan ta' Wrmaksud k mbali ka-Tanah MSlayu ini. Maka dibuat-nya-lah surat² sumpah pelsu m ngatakan bahawa dia bukan ra'ayat negeri ini d^ngan tujuan dan maksud semata² hendak mSndapatkan wang. Dia ta' tahan lapar m&nunggukan umur-nya sampai 55 tahun, jadi apa yang tfilah tgrjadi, Tuan Yang di-P&rtua, dia terpaksa melanggar Undang² dan akhirnya terpaksa-lah m^n^rima binchana pilaoggaran ini.

Jadi, nampak-lah daripada keadaan dan maksud Provident Fund ini elok-lah P6mSrentah atau KSrajaan nSgSri kita mgmikirkan d&ngan sa-jauh-nya bahawa bagaimana-kah supaya m^reka itu tidak teYUbat dengan sSbab²

kemiskinan-nya bag! mfilanggar Pfirotan Undang² negfri ini. Dan banyak lagi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. pSrkarat² yang seperti ini berlaku dan kalau sakira-nya Kfirajaan atau PgmSrentah kita mSmikirkan ini satu perkara yang besar dan mustahaf supaya di-p&rbaiki lagi, maka ada harapan bahawa mereka itu tidak akan mSlanggar Undang² neggri ini sa-hingga bSrani mSngatakan bahawa dia bukan ra'ayat negSri ini. S&ian-lah sahaja, terima kaseh.

Mr. Speaker: Ahli² Yang B&rhor-mat, nampak-nya perkara ini telah di-ulang²kan bSbfirapa kali d&ngan point itu juga.

Ence* Othman bin Abdullah (PerUs Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka hfindak bSrchakap sedikit dalam soal Provident Fund ini. Nampak-nya, Ahli Yang BSrhor-mat dari pehak pSmbangkang telah me'nitek-be'ratkan soal kfisusahan bagi orang yang m&nyimpan Provident Fund. Saya suka mSnarek pgrhatian di-sini bahawa umur 55 tahun itu memang menasabah di-beri kepada tiap² orang yang bSkfirja bagi pSkSrjaan-nya itu, ke'rana pada masa muda tSnaga maseh kuat. Oleh itu, sa-harus-nya jangan-lah m'ng-harapkan Provident Fund itu sahaja samata² dalam mSnSmpoh pe'rjuangan hidup. tetapi gunakan tSnaga dan gunakan-lah kSkuatan dengan kSmudaan bagi p&k&rjaan untuk pgnghidupannya sendiri. Kita harus fanam &rti Provident Fund itu yang akan mSmben pertolongan bSsar bagi kita pada masa hadapan.

Soal Provident Fund pula ia-itu sampai umur 55 tahun itu lupakan sahaja, tftapi nanti-lah di-masa tua apabila t&naga tidak ada lagi. Maka d&ngan ini di-harap para pgmbangkang tadi mSmikirkan dSmi kSselamatan tiap² orang yang bSkerja dan m&nvimpan Provident Fund pada hari ini bukan sahaja akan mSnjaga waktu muda atau waktu belc&ja, tftapi KSrjaan akan mSnoLong daripada muda hingga ka-tua. Terima kaseh.

Cbe* Khadijah binti Mohamed Sidik (DimgDn): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mnguatkan, ia-itu akan s&uan rakan² saya tadi, mSminta kepada Kfirajaan,

supaya melonggarkan Undang² Provi-dent Fund. Sa-bagai menjawab ucapan saudara Yang B rhor-mat yang baharu b&rchakap tadi, yang menyatakan bahawa kita harus mSmikirkan k&selamatan manusia; maka saudara²—itu bgnar, kgrana untuk mfikirkan kS&lamatan manusia-lah, maka kami dari pehak pgmbangkang, mSmbangkang atau m&rayu kepada Kfirajaan, supaya melonggarkan Undang² Provi-dent Fund itu, ke'rana banyak daripada saudara² dari pehak pgmuda² kita yang maseh bSrumor 35 atau 36 tahun yang tglah di-berh&ntikan daripada pSkeVjaan-nya, mithal-nya. Special Constable, atau Polls Khas dan sa-bagai-nya, Apakala nrfreka balek ka-kampong d&ngan ntfmpunyai anak istdri, maka bila sampai di-kampong d&ngan tidak ada mimpunyai wang, tegas-nya untuk bSk&rja beYchucbok tanam. bagi m^mulat pfinghidupan baharu, maka mereka bSrusaha m&mintam mSngeluarkan wang Provident Fund-nya yang ada itu.

B&bgapa orang telah datang mS-minta pgrtolongan kepada saya, sa-hingga ke'rana desakan p&nghidupan. kadang² m&reka tCrpaksa mahu mglanggar Undang² yang telah ditdtapkan. Mithal-nya, jika ta* ada Certificate dari Doktor, maka ta' boleh di-keluarkan Provident Fund itu. maka m&reka t^rpaksa-lah beitungkap kepada Doktor, mSminta Certificate dari Doktor d&ngan mgoyatakan: Toionglah Doktor, bSri saya Certificate, saya sakit ta' boleh b&k&fja. d&ngan makrad supaya dapat di-k&luarkan Provident Fund itu.

Tuan Yang di-PSrtua, sa-telah mSnyatakan tidak ada alasan untuk mgndapat modal bagi pinghidupan baharu, tftapi sa-bagaimana yang dikatakan oleh Ahli Yang Berbormat tadi, hgndak-lah di-kgrahkan tfinaga p&muda—m&reka mesti di-suroh M-kSrja. Ya. jika sa-orang did, tidak mfimpunya! tanggongan boleh. tftapi bila mSreka ada mempunyai anak dan istSri, apa-kah yang harus di-makan oleh anak dan istSri-nya? TSntu ttap mfireka akan m&njadi mangsa. De*ngan ini, bagaimana pula kalau tidak ada m&mpunya! modal, boleh memulai pSnghidupan baharu?

Oleh sebab itu, saya minta kepada Yang BSRhormat 'MfintiSri yang bfrkSnaan dalam soul mi, supaya m&nikirkan sa-dalam²-nya, d&mi k&f-s&amatan orang ramai supaya dilonggarkan Undang² itu.

Cache' Mohuned Sulong bin Mohd. Aii (Lipis): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sungoh pun pSrbahathan ini tSrgfilinchir sadikit daripada dasar-nya, sSmua tSlah berchakap bSrknanaan hal undang². Saya suka mgnchampori sadikit b&ke'naan dengan Provident Fund ini, ada-lab Provident Fund ini bukan-lah satu perkara yang di-k&hgndaki oleh Kerajaan nSgeri ini tStapi ia-lah d&ngan desakan ahli² kfirja terutama sa-kali p^kerja yang bSrgaji murah, k&rana henda& mendapat kSselamatan hidupnya dalam masa b&kSrja atau pun dalam masa tua-nya. Jadi, pada hari ini jikalau hgndak mSngikut kShendak² p&ke*rja² yang sudah berhe'nti, yang susab, barangkali kita bukan sahaja hSndak pinda Undang² Provident Fund ini t&tapi sa-patut-nya kita patut hapuskan. Jikalau m^mikirkan orang yang mgminta, ia-itu daripada orang yang sudah k&uar daripada kerja, supaya K&ajaan mSmikirkan d&ngan panjang, saya fikir yang b&rh nti, tidak bgrapa p^ratus yang bSrkg&ndakkan pgrtolongan sa-chepat mungkin dibandingkan d&ngan orang² yang ada dalam p&kerjaan yang maseh berk&hgndakkan kepada Provident Fund int.

Saya sgndiri ada b&grapa kali di-datangi oleh orang kita juga minta k&uarkan Provident Fund, tetapi saya mgmikirkan, umpama-nya bagaimana Yang BSRhormat sa-b&lah sana tadi berchakap b^rkenaan S.C. Sa-b^nar-nya banyak pSrtolongan daripada Kerajaan, S.C. m&ndapat pgrtolongan yang istimewa, dapat wang \$1,500, tanah free, itu pun ta' chukup—hgndak juga Provident Fund. Maka k&hgndak umpama ini jika di-layan, jadi ta* ada fa'cdah kita mgngadakan Provident Fund.

Jadi pada mgnyokong Kerajaan, saya memikirkan permintaan² sa-dgmikian yang bolch kita m&nbagi pgrtolongan daripada lain chawangan atau pun lain perusahaan dan ranchangan, tidak-lah ratut kita mSngeluarkan Provident Fund yang sadikit itu, kfrana orang

yang bgkrja 7, 8 tahun ada-lah l^beh kurang \$ 1,000—banyak-nja dalam Provident Fund. Jika di-beii d&ngan tidak di-kont&rol sSbab hak dia sSndiri, barangkali sampai sa-bulan dia minta lagi, tolong di-sana sini. Ini perkara, jikalau h&ndak raenjaga kesSlamatan ra'ayat n^gdri ini, kita m&sti fikirkan d&ngan panjang perkara yang sudah dibuat. S&karang saya m&miu*kan kita hendak-lah fikirkan d&ngan halus-nya b^rknanaan d&ngan hal ini, kerana dihadapan kita pada hari ini banyak ranchangan² yang akan m&nb&ri fa'edah kepada sgmua gulongan ra'ayat.

Mr. Speaker: Sa-bfinar-nya Dewan ini bSlum lagi mgmbahathan pindaan b&rkgnaan d&ngan perkara hgndak mSn^rima wang daripada 55 tahun.

tnche' Mohamed Solong: Saya faham.

Mr. Speaker Jangan mSnjadikan satu perbahathan dalam p&rkara ini.

j&uhe* Mohamed Solong bin Mohd. Ali: Itu-lah saya sudah katakan pSrka ini terfgilinchir sadikit dari mula-nya tadi t&api saya h&idak mSnj&laskan fasal-nya t^rkd luar, saya tahu ini t&rg - linchir

Cteche* Othman Abdullah (Tanah Merah): Tuan Yang di-Pfirtua . . .

Cache* Mohamed Solong bin Mohd. Ali: Oleh s&bab itu saya m&mendekkan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-itu saya harap kita tidak-lah boleh mSrengan²kan ma'ana-nya m&fionggar²kan barang yang kita fikirkan baik, demikian, Tuan Speaker.

Turn Syed Ja'afar bin Hasan Albar (Jobor Tenggara): Tuan Yang di-P&rtua, nampak-nya Ahli² Yang B&rhormat di-sabSlah sana chuba hSndak mgnunjokkan atau m&njadi champion bagi puak gulongan² pek&rja. T&tapi sakira-nya Ahli² Yang B rhormat itu mSniek pandang kepada tujuan asal daripada mgngadakan Provident Fund, ia-itu hSndak mSnjamin hidup sa-sa-orang pSkSrja itu sa-l&pas umor-nya mgningkat 55 tahun dan lain² lagi, nSschaya Ahli² Yang Bfirhormat itu tidak akan me'minta supaya pSratoran² bSrksnaan hSndak mgng&luarkan wang Provident Fund itu di-s&gbutkan dalam

Dewan ini. Kira-nya Dewan ini mengikut atau pun melayan dan me'mperse'tujukan kShtadak dan angan² daripada Ahli² Yang BSRhormat di-sabelah sana supaya di-longgarkan dan di-buka Undang² Provident Fund ini dan barang siapa sahaja bfrhfinti daripada kfrja-nya dan m&nuntut Provident Fund itu, maka di-se>ahkan balek kapada-nya, maka akhir-nya tujuan asal Provident Fund itu akan rosafc binasa dan akan me'ne'rbitkan ktlamkabut di-dalam kShidupan orang itu sgn diri. Umpama-nya sa-orang itu bila be'ke'ra sa-tahun, kgmudian ia bfrhenti sa-bulan dua, maka katakan-lah dalam ia Udak be'ke'ra itu ia mgnuntut balek wang Provident Fund-nya. dan di-bSrikan pula wang simpanan-nya itu. DSngan yang deniikian ini maka rosak-lah tujuan asal Provident Fund ia-itu he'ndak mgnjamin kfhidupan sa-orang itu sa-telah ia tidak dapat bfrkerja ia-itu sa-telah umur-nya 55 tahun atau pun tflah di-sabitkan oleh doktor yang dia tjdak dapat bfrkirja lagi kfrana satu² kguzuran. maka dgnan itu batal-lah sa-kali maksud Provident Fund itu. Jadi untok m -minda atau melonggarkan syarat² mnggmbali balek atau mglfipaskan balek wang² Provident Fund kapada pgk rja² itu akan me'rosakkan tujuan Provident Fund.

Dari s5bab itu. tuan², saya tidak nampak di-maqa hikmat, rauslihat-nya bagi p&kirja² itu, jika di-sfrahkan balek wang² Provident Fund itu kapada mfireka bila sahaja mSreka bCrh²nti daripada k'rja. Tambahan pula, bfrapa-lah lama-nya Provident Fund itu. akan tab an, Tuan Yang di-Pfirtua, kalau sa-orang itu sa-tahun be'ke'ra dan sa-bulan dua bgrhfinti kfrja, dan bSrapa-lah lama-nya wang kumpulan-nya itu dapat mgnyara, m^njamin k bidupan-nya kalau dia ta' mgndapat balek k rja-nya dalam masa yang lfbh lanjut. Jadi itu-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya nampak bahawa Ahli² Yang Berhormat di-sab lah sana itu chuba h^ndak mgnjadi champion bagi pfrkerja² dgnan tidak mfmandang pSrka ini dari s6gala sgg-nya.

£adbe* Othnuw AbdoUfth (Tuuh Mendi): Tuan Yang di-P&rtua, saya

nampak buat p5rkara ini tflah di-datangkan suatu bahathan, Tuan Yang di-Pfirtua. kami dari pfimbangkan bukan-lah manusia² hanya datang mgmbangkang di-dalam Majlis ini tetapi apa yang kami k^mukakan di-sini ada-lah pandangan kami yang patut Kerajaan mSmikirkan sa-mula.

Mr. Speaker: Ya,

finche* Othman Abdullah: Kerajaan mgsti mgmikirkan, bukan kami mgrnbangkang-nya, ini hfindak-lah Yang Bfrhormat Mgntfiri Muda kita itu mSmahkan apa yang kita bahathkan, di-sini kami bukan mSmbangkang. Tuan Yang di-PSrtua, tftapi mngg-mukakan fikiran- yang patut di-ambil oleh P^mSrentah bagi mSnimbangkan sa-mula. Kami tidak m mbangkang dan kami tidak mahu mgnjadi jagoh.

Mr. Speaker: Sudah-lah.

Cncbe* Othman Abdullah: S&bab itu saya minta pgrkara ini

Mr. Speaker: Dalam pfrkara ini saya m^mutuskan ta' patut di-bahathkan atas pCrkara b rkfnaan dfingan umur tadi. Saya mgmbe'narkan pehak dari Mr. Secnivasagam yang pSrtama tadi d&ngan s&bab dia bSrpegang kapada bagaimana hfndak mSngfluar-kan wang itu. maka dari s&bab itu bgrbangkit-lah pCrbahathan p5k2rja² ini. Dari masa ini, saya minta-lah kalau Ahli² Yang B-grhormat ini mS-numpukan atas dasar Rang Undang² yang ada di-hadapan Majlis ini sahaja. tgntang pgrmohonan daripada pehak p^kerja supaya pehak KementiSrian mgmikirkan bagaimana he'ndak m -minda undang² ini. saya sa-memang²-nya-lah luluskan, tftapi saya minta tidak botch mgnjadi peYbahathan dalam Dewan ini. Saya jfimput M8ntSri itu kira-nya he'ndak mgnjawab.

Mr. Tan Slew Sin: Mr. Speaker. Sir. I think that there is probably a certain amount of misunderstanding in connection with the purposes of the Employees' Provident Fund, but before I deal with that I should like to answer an Honourable Member, who suggested that in the 1955 election we did promise to amend the Ordinance.

We promised then that we would consider the matter and, in fact, the matter has since been considered by the Board of the Fund.

Mr. D. R. Seenivagan: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification, the Manifesto states, "we will consider and make provision for withdrawal in case of dire necessity". If you look it up, you will find it.

Mr. Tan Slew Sin: In any case, this matter has been considered by the Board of the Fund, and in this connection I should add that the Fund or rather the Board consists of 18 representatives—6 are nominated by the employees themselves, 6 by the employers and 6 by the Government. It will, therefore be seen that this Board is a representative Board in which the claims and interests of the employees will always receive due consideration. I should add that the Board has turned down the request that withdrawal should be permitted in cases of unemployment, whether temporary or otherwise.

Sir, I can appreciate the anxiety of many Honourable Members about unemployment. In this connection, if I may be permitted to digress a little, I recall an incident about two months ago when I was attending a meeting of Commonwealth Finance Ministers in London. Someone then observed that out of 10 Commonwealth Finance Ministers who attended in 1957, only four were left as six had become casualties. Speaking, therefore, as a Minister of Finance, I, myself, would welcome an unemployment insurance scheme, in view of the high casualty rate in my profession. (*Laughter*). I suggest, Sir, that if the object is unemployment, the answer is not a provident fund but an unemployment insurance scheme; and in this connection I am informed by my Honourable colleague, the Minister of Labour, that there is at the moment in this country an I.L.O. expert who is looking into this question.

I also appreciate the anxiety of some Honourable Members about sickness. I agree that if you are sick you cannot

work, and that although you cannot work, you still have to eat—that I think is self-evident; but again, the answer is not a provident fund but a national health insurance scheme.

The object of the Fund, if I may say so, is to provide for old age. It is intended as a security against old age, and the whole object of the scheme would be defeated if the Government were to allow withdrawals in cases of unemployment, whether such unemployment is temporary or otherwise. It is as simple as that. We should, I suggest, look on this matter as adults, and we should not behave like children who put some money into a box for some specific purpose, but who the moment they want a new toy say, "Let us raid the box for buying a new toy." This question is a serious matter. If, to-day, the Fund were to permit withdrawals before an employee in question has reached a certain age—in this case we have fixed the age at 55—the time may come when he reaches that age but finds that he will have nothing to look forward to.

One Honourable Member has made the point that the weakness of the Fund is that it permits withdrawal in one lump sum. I agree that there is validity in that criticism, and I myself have been thinking about it for some time. It may be that the final answer is not to allow an employee to withdraw in one lump sum—and that means eventually we may have to turn this Fund into an old age pension scheme. I should hasten to add that I am making no promises, because an old age pension scheme is a vast undertaking and it will cost a lot of money—and I do not know whether at the moment the Fund is in a position to convert into an old age pension scheme. However I have got the matter in mind. In fact, I wrote a minute about it a few days ago, and if it is possible we are prepared to consider it. But before we do so, it will be essential to have an expert actuarial survey made to find out whether it is financially and economically practicable; and if it is so, I suggest that that is the ideal solution, that is to turn it

eventually into an old age pension scheme, so that this Fund will really fulfil the object for which it was originally set up, that is to provide for an employee at the time when he needs help most—when he is old.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker in *the Chair*)

Clauses 1 and 2 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported without amendment: read the third time and passed.

THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR OFFICERS (OATHS AND FEES) BILL

Second Reading

Ton Abdwl Razak: Mr. Speaker. I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to provide for the administration of oaths and the levy of fees by diplomatic and consular officers"* be read a second time. This is straightforward and a simple Bill. Sir. It is customary for the convenience of citizens abroad to give diplomatic and consular representatives power to administer oaths, to take affidavits and to do any notarial act abroad. It is also customary to fix fees arising from the performance of such functions. Now, this Bill is simply to make provision for this. As can be seen in clause 3, provision is made here for powers to be exercised by the diplomatic and consular representatives of the Federation abroad and also under sub-clause (4) of that clause, provision is made for the purpose of taking oath provided under the Constitution, provided that it be taken by someone who is a citizen of the country. And clause 4 of the Bill provides for the levying of fees for this purpose.

Sir, I beg to move.

Date⁹ Suleiman; Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker in *the Chair*)

Clauses 1 to 9 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported without amendment: read the third time and passed.

THE LOANS (EXPORT CREDITS GUARANTEE DEPARTMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Mr. Tan Slew Sin: Mr. Speaker. Sir. I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to provide for the raising of loans from the Export Credits Guarantee Department of the Board of Trade of the United Kingdom by the Federation of Malaya" be read a second time.

The purpose of the Bill is clearly set out in the explanatory statement attached to it. The general pattern of the Bill follows that of the Loans (International Bank for Reconstruction and Development) Ordinance, 1959, which respectively authorised the borrowing of monies from the International Bank and the Development Loan Fund. I should, however, like to describe briefly the use which the Government proposes to make of the powers conferred by the Bill.

As Honourable Members are aware agreement in principle has been reached between the Governments of the Federation and the United Kingdom on the grant of a loan to the Federation, equivalent to just over \$19 million. This loan will be used to finance over* seas expenditure on certain telecommunications projects which are set out under Head 144—Telecommunications. Sub-heads 28, 30, 32, 36, 37, 42, 45, 46, 47, 48, 51, 55-62 and 64 of the Development Estimates, 1960. In addition \$1.2 million will be spent on the conversion of the Taiping Exchange from manual to automatic working, and this project will appear in the 1961 Development Estimates,

The total cost of these projects is just over \$28 million and the Federation Government has undertaken to provide funds to meet the local expenditure involved, i.e., round about \$9 million.

The terms and conditions of the loan have not been finally decided, but it has been agreed that the loan shall be made available to the Federation through the agency of the Export Credit Guarantees Department of the United Kingdom and shall be fully repaid by 31st December, 1969. The loan will be drawn as and when required to pay for equipment purchases and the rate of interest will be calculated separately for each drawing. The rate applicable to each drawing will depend on the rate at which the U.K. Government is itself borrowing at the time when the drawing is made for periods similar to the period of this loan plus a small charge of £ per cent per annum to cover the working expenses of the Export Credit Guarantees Department. Such rates are likely to be appreciably lower than those at which the Federation itself could borrow in the United Kingdom for a comparable period.

The loan will be used for the purchase of British equipment and this is considered to be in the best interests of the Federation. The equipment and planning of the whole telephone and telegraph network in the Federation is based largely on the practice of the British Post Office. In this way Malaya is able to take full advantage of the vast research, development and experience of the British Post Office Engineering Organisation and the proposed purchase of British equipment which will ensure continuing standardisation of equipment enables the maximum economies to be effected in the training of staff and in the holding of spare parts and lastly facilitates planning and development of the whole network.

The terms of the loan are similar to those which apply to all other loans granted by the United Kingdom to Other independent members of the Commonwealth under the provisions of the Export Credit Guarantees Act of the United Kingdom.

The provision of this loan by the United Kingdom will enable the development of the Telecommunications Department to be accelerated and thus help in meeting the ever-increasing public demand for the facilities provided by the Department both in the rural and urban areas, and I should like to take this opportunity of expressing the Government's appreciation of the U.K.'s generosity in granting this loan to the Federation.

Sir. I beg to move.

The Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications (Date' V. T. Sambanthan): I beg to second the motion.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad:

Tuan Yang di-P&tua, di-hadapan kita ini ada-lah satu Bill untuk m&mbolehkan Kfirajaan PfrsSkutuan Tanah MSlayu b&rhutang sa-banyak yang di-t&tapkan. Tuan Yang di-Pfirtua, dasar b&rhutang ini memang-lah dasar yang boleh di-katakan tidak boleh di-elakkan oleh manusia apabila k&Ssudahan, t&tapi patut-lah soal² yang sapgtri ini kita kaji d&Sngan ISbeh halus dan satu dasar yang t&Stap bagi m&Sngurangkan hutang bagi Pfr&skutuan Tanah M&layu di-lakukan. Mngtkut ucapan Yang B rhormat MSntgri Kfiwangan dalam me'nyatakan bahawa p&Srka yang di-buat d&fngan wang hutang ini ada-lah bagi me'mb&Sli alat Telecom yang datang dari ne'ge'ri Ingt&Sris juga. Ini tidak-lah dapat di-hairankan, s&gab kalau kita b&rhutang daripada orang Ingg&Sris maka terpaksa-lah kita me'mbe'U barang² Ingg ris supaya m&Snguntongkan orang Ingg&Sris juga.

Tuan Yang di-Pe*rtua, p&grka yang sa-m&cham ini t&fintu-lah dapat di-chari helah² sap&Srti p&grkataan² yang m&nggatakan ini akan m&Snyngangkan be'be'rapa soalan; ia-itu soal m&Sng&Sndalikan hal² j&ngt&ra dan soal alat² simpanan, soal m&fnyatukan chara² Telecom di-ng&firi ini, t&tapi saya be'Yharap-lah kalau dapat hutang² yang di-lakukan oleh Persfikutuan Tanah Melayu ini dikurangkan dan d&fngan yang d&fimikian dapat-lah kita m&Snjalkan n&f&Sri kita ini d&Sngan ta' banyak te'Vpaksa b&Srbuat bagitu dan b&firbuat bagini. Tuan Yang di-Pfirtua, t&fntu-lah Yang B&Srhormat M^nteri K&fwangan akan bangun dan m&Sngatakan bagaimana-kah kita

hendak mSjalankan sSgala ranchangan pfembangan kalau kita tidak bfirmhutang? Bagaimana hendak mSmbulkan wang—memang b&ul, Tuan Yang di-Pgtrua, t&tapi dalam mfimbuat ranchangan itu hendaklah di-fikir halus apa-kah ranchangan yang tebeh-hendak di-gunakan—ranchangan Telecom, ranchangan berk&naan d&ngan alat Telephone, ranchangan chara Microwave yang h&ndak di-buat ini sgmua-nya bagus belaka. T&tapi, hf&ndaklah kita fikir bahawa ada-kah ini satu p&rkara yang mustahak dari seluruh ra'ayat—seluruh Tanah Mfilayu. Bagi saya tidaklah h&ndak mfimbahatkan satu p&rsatu-nya, t&stapi saya nampak bahawa kiadaan bfirmhutang ini t&slah pun m&ngikat KSrajaan Pf&rsfikutuan Tanah Melayu. Apa-lah salah-nya kalau kita chuba b&rhutang daripada satu pehak dan m&Smbeli alat dari pehak yang lain. Memanglah boleh di-jawab orang itu ta' h&ndak m&Smb&eri hutang d&fingan m&Smbeli alat orang yang lain. Maka ini-lah saya katakan bahawa hutang yang di-lakukan oleh KSrajaan P&grs&skutuan ini ada-lah m&fingikat KSrajaan PS&rs&skutuan Tanah Mfilayu.

The Minister of Transport (Cache* Sardon bin H&ji Jubir): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli Yang B&srhormat yang baharu sa-b&ntar blrchakap tadi t&slah m&ngatakan kalau hendak b&rhutang biarlah di-pereksa sama ada hutang itu m&Snguntongkan atau pun tidak, bukan h&ndak m&Smbuat Microwave atau me'ambahkan p&rusahaan. Saya b&siharap Yang B&rhonnat akan mfinyiasat hasil dari PSjabat Talikom ini yang t&glah pun b&rtambah dari sa-tahun kasa-tahun yang m&Snguntongkan n2g&fri ini dan m&ftnambah s&Sgala k&Smajuan p&rtama sa-kali n&figgri yang di-Pantai Timor. Sa-waktu saya m&Snjadi MSnt&ri K&grja Raya, Pos dan Talikom ranchangan, memanglah t&filah m&Smbawa peYhubongan ka-hulu sa-bagaimana Talipon M&rdeka yang raana banyak lagt s&Sdang t&rtunggu. DSngan s bab ada-nya ranchangan ini dan d&fngan s&Sbab ada-nya hutang ini hasil nggiri ini yang patut kita gunakan ia-lah m&mbgri layanan kepada ra'ayat yang jauh itu supaya dapat kita selamatkan Microwave yang baharu di-buka itu m&Smakan belanja

ISbeh kurang \$13 juta, itu akan membanyakkan hasil daripada talipon. Ini ia-lah m&ldkaskan p&firhubongan kasa-luroh dunia k&grana kita Wrharap harga g&lah dan bijeh ini d&Sngan k&dua-nya ISkas di-k&etahui. Di-situ-lah dapat harga yang baik dan di-situ-lah m&mbaikkkan ekonomi n&Sgri kita. Oleh itu saya m&nyatakan KSrajaan Perikalan pada waktu b&Sunding b&Sr&k&naan hutang, apa juga hendak di-timbangkan s&fmua-nya di-nalusi daripada s&Sgala s&Sgi yang akan m&Snguntongkan nggiri, m&Snguntongkan ra'ayat dan mfimbaikkkan s&fiala perhubongan bukan sahaja di-dalam ndgeri ini bahkan sa-luroh dunia. Saya sa-bagai M&nt&ri Kerja Raya, Pos dan Talikom baharu ini telah m&Cng&hadhiri p&firsidangan Talipon Sa-dunia di-Geneva dan t&slah mfimbawa nama baik PS&rgkutuan Tanah M&glayu. M&fireka t&glah hairan k&dmajuan P&firs&skutuan Tanah MSlayu ini chukup maju di-dalam lapangan Talikom dan chukup m&Snguntongkan (*TSpok*). Saya b&Crharap pehak parti p&Smbangkang b&Sr&banyak tirima kaseh kapada PSjabat Talikom dan kapada KSrajaan yang tidak pe'nah di-gunakan orang di-zaman dahulu; raasa dahulu orang ta* dapat b&Srtalipon d&ngan ring titapi hari ini m&Sreka boleh b&firtalipon daripada Talipon MS&rdeka. Tolonglah sadikit m&Smb&eri k&grja sama mudahan hasil yang dapat dari Talikom dapat digandakan, t&fima kaseh.

pato' V. T. Sambanthan: Sir, some points were raised with regard to the equipment, and why British equipment has been bought. It was bought precisely because it falls into line with the equipment we already have, and it facilitates the working of the Department.

Secondly, a point was raised by the Honourable Member asking why we are spending so much money in terms of economics. I would like to inform him that after this new network comes in, we would be getting a revenue of \$6.65 million every year, and this should pay for itself in a very short time.

Tnan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid <S&berang Utara): Tuan Yang di-PS&rtua. Bill ini ada-lah pada fahaman saya.

bukan-lah kita hendak hutang duit, Pada fahaman saya, ia-lah di-beli alat itu daripada pehak Ke"rajaan British dan mgreka hargakan alat itu dan dijadikan hutang kepada nSgara PSrsfikutan Tanah Mfilayu. Yang BeYbormat wakil Bachok tadi mgngatakan dengan ada-nya alat Telecommunication itu bagus, tStapi kata-nya ta' mustahak. Pada fikiran saya sangat mustahak diadakan, oleh k5rana pada dahulu-nya waktu belum kita ada Telephone Merdeka di-bgbSrapa kampung, orang tfrharu hendak tahukan harga getah berapa, harga kSlapa b rapa dan lain barang. Dan juga pada waktu kfmalangan, sap^rti di-patok ular, macham tSmpat yang jauh, jika ta' di-bawa ka-Hospital di-inject ubat harus nyawa-nya hilang. Pehak kaum ibu yang mgngandong pula, manakala bidan di-tfmpat itu tidak da pat me'nye'lamatkan d'ngan chara dia pelajari, t&rpaksa di-bawa ka-Hospital, kalau ta* di-be'ri tahu kepada Pejabat itu (Hospital) dengan ch&pat dan pertolongan itu terlambat datang harus nyawa orang itu pun tidak akan sglamat. Jadi, s&karang ini saya fikir sangat mustahak di-adakan untok m5mbSri fa'edah sfrnua penduduk di-luar bandar. Sakian-lah t^rima kaseh.

Date' Mohamed Hanifah bin Haji Abdul Ghani (Pasir Mas Hulu): Tuao Yang di-P^rtua, kami s^dar bahawa sanya talipon t&lah Wrtambah banyak dalam nSgara kita sa-bagaimana yang t6lah di-nyatakan oleh Mgntgri yang berk^naan. Tgtapi berapa kerat-kah orang kampung yang mSme'rlukan mgnggunakan talipon ini, yang sangat mSmentingkan talipon ini ia-lah saudagar dan KSrajaan. Pandangan yang di-bSrikan oleh Wakil Bachok tadi, ada-lah berhubung dengan pinjaman wang yang harus ragngikat nfiguri ini. Bagitu juga sapSrti pinjaman wang daripada United Kingdom dngan m&ngambil pinjaman wang ini, maka Kerajaan kita terpaksa memWli pula alat daripada United Kingdom itu. Maka itu, Tuan Yang di-PSrtua, pehak kami mSnaroh kSbimbangan, supaya jangan-lah dngan m^minjam wang boleh m5ngikat n^ggri kita, sakian-lah sahaja.

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not think there is very much for

me to say because many of the points raised by Honourable Members have already been dealt with by my colleagues.

As has been pointed out, it has been considered desirable to buy British equipment for the very simple reason that at the moment we have British equipment in this country and, obviously, it would be extremely expensive to change over to new equipment. It is as simple as that.

One Honourable Member made the point that we should not borrow. I am sure he also disagreed with the increase of taxes. I merely would like to know how we could find money to pay for this equipment.

Cache' Zalkiflee bin Muhammad (Bachok): Tuan Yang di-PSrtua, ta' ada yang m&igatakan, we should not borrow.

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: It is admitted that this is a revenue-earning project. In fact I am told that, although it is very difficult to assess exactly the return, the average return would be about 10 per cent on the amount invested, and the interest we will have to pay, although it has not yet been decided, would certainly be far less than 10 per cent. So, by any standards, I think we can say that this is not only a revenue-earning project but it is a revenue-earning project which is well worthwhile.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee. (Mr. Speaker in *the Chair*) *Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive* ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported without amendment: read the third time and passed.

THE PETROLEUM (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading Enche*

Mohamed Khir bin Johari:

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a

Bill intituled "an Act to amend the Petroleum Ordinance, 1949" be read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill as stated in the objects and reasons, is to provide for the appointment of a Chief Inspector for the purpose of directing and supervising the duties to be carried out by inspectors appointed under the Petroleum Ordinance, 1949.

The local authority (Municipality, Town Board or District Officer) is the "licensing authority" for the storage of petroleum under the Ordinance. A large number of officers belonging to local authorities and State Governments have been gazetted as inspectors to enable them for licensing purposes, to inspect and control petrol storage tanks throughout the Federation.

A defect of the present Ordinance, however, is that an inspector is automatically given powers to board vessels, inspect and test petroleum and examine tanks as well as the powers needed to control actual storage within the Federation. Inspections and testings of tankers and bulk petrol storage containers involve hazardous duties and require properly qualified professional or technical officers: it would be potentially dangerous for unqualified inspectors to undertake such duties and to date, the duties of unqualified inspectors have been limited by administrative action to the less dangerous functions of control under the Ordinance. It is however clear that co-ordination of the duties and responsibilities of the various Inspectors under the various parts of the Ordinance is essential as a matter of public safety.

The bill provides for the appointment of a Chief Inspector (who will be the Director of Chemistry), and gives him powers to exercise general supervision over all Inspectors appointed under the Ordinance, and to issue such directions to them as may be necessary for the proper enforcement of the law, and to ensure public safety in the handling of petroleum.

Many State Officers are at present gazetted as Inspectors and therefore all State Governments have been consulted

regarding this proposal. No objections have been raised.

Sir, I beg to move.

EndM' Sardon bin Haji Jvbin I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker in *the Chair*)

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive ordered to stand pan of the Bill.

Bill reported without amendment: read the third time and passed.

THE COMMON GAMING HOUSES (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Mr. Tan Slew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir. I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to amend the Common Gaming Houses Ordinance, 1953" be read a second time.

In prosecutions under the Common Gaming Houses Ordinance, 1953, and the Betting Ordinance, 1953, expert evidence is frequently required to be given on illegal gaming. The important function of giving expert evidence in such gaming cases has largely been performed by detective-sergeants. This arrangement has not proved entirely satisfactory. There is an insufficient number of such detective experts in the force. Their usefulness for this purpose is, besides, limited to the type of games that they have become expert in.

A book entitled "Gambling Games in Malaya" by Mr. Dobree has recently been published. Mr. Dobree is an authority on gambling in this country, having served in the Federation of Malaya Police from 1928 to 1955, when he retired as Assistant Commissioner. Secret Societies Department, Police Headquarters. In view of the difficulties attending the giving of expert evidence in the matter of illegal gaming, it is the object of the present measure not

only to permit the Court to refer to Mr. Dobree's book but also to refer to such other books or articles on gaming as the Court may consider authoritative on the subject. There is precedent for this measure in section 25 of the Societies Ordinance, 1949, under which the Court is permitted to refer to works on secret societies. Sir, I beg to move.

Tan Abdul Razak: Sir: I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on *the Bill*.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker in *the Chair*)

Clauses 1 and 2 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported without amendment: read the third time and passed.

THE OATHS AND AFFIRMATIONS (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

The Minister of External Affairs (Dato* Dr. Ismail): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "An Act to amend the Oaths and Affirmations Ordinance, 1949,*" be read a second time.

This, Sir, is a short and simple Bill, and, as I have said just now in moving the second reading of the Diplomatic and Consular Officers (Oaths and Fees) Bill, it is customary in most countries for the law to provide for the recognition of oaths and affidavits taken in other countries. No such provision is contained in the present law of the Federation. The object of the present BUI is to give recognition to oaths and affidavits taken in other countries. It is noted, however, that the draft Bill provides that no oaths for the purpose of the Constitution shall be taken outside the Federation except before a diplomatic or consular officer of the Federation who is himself a citizen of ^{the} country.

Sir, I beg to move.

Dato* Suleiman: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker in *the Chair*)

Clauses 1 and 2 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported without amendment: read the third time and passed.

THE BETTING (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "An Act to amend the Betting Ordinance, 1953**" be read a second time.

This Bill proposes to amend the Betting Ordinance in the same way as the Common Gaming Houses (Amendment) Bill has amended the Common Gaming Houses Ordinance and for the same reasons as I gave when moving the second reading of that Bill. I therefore see no point in amplifying on what I said then.

Sir, I beg to move.

Tan Abdul Razak: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker in *the Chair*)

Clauses 1 and 2 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported without amendment: read the third time and passed.

THE NATIONAL REGISTRATION BILL

Second Reading

Dato¹ Suleiman: Tuan Speaker, saya bangun mSmbawa usul la-itu Rang

Undang² bagi m&ndaftar penduduk² dalam Tanah MSlayu, kgrana m&ng luarkan Kad P&ng&nalan dan percara yang bgrkaitan tfilah di-bachakan bagi kali yang k&dua. Ahli² Yang B&rhormat dalam Dewan ini t&rlSbeh ma'alom sa-bagaimana yang saya katakan pada hari sa-malam bahawa Kad PSnge¹-nalan baharu akan di-k&luarkan pada tahun hadapan. Kad Pe'nge¹-nalan yang ada ini di-k&luarkan di-bawah Undang² Dharurat dalam tahun 1948, maka tfilah di-fikirkan bahawa jikalau h&ndak di-k&luarkan Kad P&ng&nalan baharu ini patut-lah di-k&luarkan di-bawah Undang² Yang Tfitap sa-lain daripada Undang² Dharurat.

Rang Undang² ini pendefc, ia-itu ada-lah Rang Undang² yang mimb&ri kuasa bagi mfinjalankan tujuan² sa-bagaimana yang saya katakan tadi dan ada di-bawah-nya section di-mana juga boleh di-buat Pe²ratoran²-nya. Ada satu dua p&rkara yang saya suka m&mb&ii k&ste²rangan sap&rti yang di-t&rangkan di-dalam Bab 3 ia-itu sa-orang p&sgawai akan di-lantek mfojadi K&ttua P&fgawai PSndaftaran. Di-sini patut-lah saya terangkan bahawa K&ttua P&ggawai PKndaftaran Tuan McDonald yang telah b&krja—Wrk&hidmat sa-lama 22 tahun yang tidak b&rapa lama lagi akan b&rsara. Pada masa ini sa-orang P&fgawai MSI ay u. Cnche' Ibrahim All akan m&njadi K&ttua PSjabat ini. Jadi, di-chadangkan ada satu p&ndaftaran ia-itu tiap² orang p&nduduk di-dalam n&g&ri ini sa-lain daripada yang di-k&g&hualikan h&ndak-lah m&ndaftar diri-nya bagi m&ngambil Kad² P&ng&nalan.

Sa-bagaimana yang saya katakan tadi bahawa Rang Undang² ini ia-lah Rang Undang² yang m&mb&ri kuasa dalam Bab 6 dan satu kuasa akan di-b&ri kepada M&nt&ri yang bgrk&naan ia-itu dalam p&rkara dirj saya s&idiri bagi m&mbuat PSratoran² supaya m&ndapatkan bagaimana tujuan² Rang Undang² ini. Kad P&ng&nalan baharu ini bukan-lah pula di-gunakan sap&rti k&rtas² yang dahulu. Ada satu k&rtas yang baharu yang di-buat dari Amerika oleh Todd Co., Rochester. U.S.A. Kad ini akan di-gunakan dan harga h&ndak m&ngiluarkan s& mua-nya ia-lah 16beh \$3,280,000. Dan di-chadangkan bahawa ra'ayat akan m&mbayar sa-banyak

50 sen bagi satu Kad P&ng&nalan dan orang yang bukan ra'ayat akan m&mbayar sa-banyak \$5.00. D&ngan jalan ini kita berharap dapat-lah balck p&fir-b&slanjaan-nya sa-bagaimana yang saya katakan tadi akan di-beianjukan.

Ada &mpat warna kad yang akan di-k&luarkan. Sa-bagai ra'ayat nigiri ini warna bun. Yang bukan ra'ayat warna merah dan p&lawat² yang dudok s&mf&ntara bukan p&lawat² yang dudok dalam n&g&ri ini yang nt&ndapat k&sb&fnaran dudok dalam n&sg&ri ini di-k&luarkan satu kad yang birwarna hijau. Satu lagi kad yang Wrwarna choklat akan di-k&luarkan kepada orang² yang telah m&ndaftarkan dalam p&ndaftaran Prevention of Crimes Ordinance. P&lawat² yang m&ndapat k&^b&snaran niasok di-dalam nig&ri ta^{*} l&beh dari satu bulan tidak-fah di-k&h&ndaki m&ngambil Kad P&ng&nalan baharu ini. Banyak sudah k&erja² Wrk&naaan dgngan h&ndak mfinjalankan ini dan yang se&ng di-jalankan dan bagaimana h&ndak m&njalankan febeh² lagi nampak-lah di-dalam Bab 6 P&ratoran yang akan di-jalankan.

Kad PSng&nalan ini banyak g&na-nya dan boleh di-katakan satu daripada k&sgunaan yang m&f&sti di-adakan dan kad² yang ada ini tidak-lah nampak-nya boleh di-gunakan lagi, o!\$h k&frana sudah banyak k&nyataan di-dalam-nya yang tidak b&tul dan ta' t&ntu. Ini-lah dia tujuan Rang Undang² ini.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to provide for the registration of persons in the Federation, for the issue of identity cards and for purposes connected therewith," be read a second time.

As the House will be aware it is proposed next year to introduce a new system of identity cards. The present issue was made under the provisions of the Emergency (Registration Areas) Regulations, 1948, but it is considered that with regard to the new issue, permanent legislation should be enacted and the purpose of the Bill before the House is to give effect to this intention. The measure itself is a short one and as will be seen is an enabling measure. There are however one or two points in the Bill on which I should like to touch. It will be seen from Cause 3 that the Commissioner of

National Registration is to be appointed and it is of course intended that this Officer should be the Chief Registration Officer. At this point I should like perhaps to remark that Mr. E. M. McDonald, the present Chief Registration Officer is shortly retiring after some 32 years loyal service to this country in many different fields and his successor is to be a Malay Officer of the M.C.S., Enche* Ibrahim bin Ali. It is proposed that a register should be maintained of all persons in the Federation who are required to be registered—and indeed every person in this country, unless especially exempted, will be required so to register.

As I remarked just now this measure is an enabling one, and section 6 will confer the necessary powers on me to make Regulations for carrying out the intentions of this legislation. The new issue of identity cards will be laminated and are being supplied by the Todd Co. of Rochester, U.S.A. The cost of the issue will be of the order of \$3,280,000 but it is proposed that a charge of 50 cents should be made for the issue of these cards to citizens, whilst non-citizens will be required to pay \$5; thus it is hoped that the cost of the issue will be more than recouped in due course.

To facilitate identification the cards will be of different colours; blue for citizens, red for non-citizens, and temporary passes will be in green. Persons registered under the Prevention of Crime Ordinance will be issued with a brown card in place of their existing cards which are stamped with a large black cross. Persons who visit this country for a period of less than a month will not be required to take out an identity card. There are a considerable number of administrative arrangements to be made in connection with this new issue, and section 6 of the Bill will give some idea of the scope of the undertaking, and the various matters on which Regulations will be required. I should add that administrative arrangements will be made to ensure that proper precautions are taken to prevent non-citizens acquiring identity cards as citizens.

The identity card system has many uses and has become accepted in the

fabric of our national life. The present issue however is unsatisfactory, and clearly the time has come for us to examine the matter afresh, and produce a new and up-to-date form of registration. The object of the Bill before the House is designed to achieve these ends.

Sir, I beg to move.

Cncbe* Sardon: Tuan Yang di-Pe*rtua, saya mohon m&iyokong dan membSri pSluang bagi di-bahath.

Mr. Lim Kean Slew (Dato Kramat):

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish to speak in opposition to this Bill, but before doing so, in view of the fact that the many speakers who have spoken have not done so under S.O. S3 (4), I would like your ruling on this. Standing Order 53 (4) says:

"On the second reading of a Bill, an amendment may be proposed to the question, 'That the Bill be now read a second time', to leave out the word 'now' and add, at the end of the question, 'on this day six months', or an amendment may be moved to leave out all the words after the word 'That' in order to add words stating the object and motive on which the opposition to the Bill is based, but such words must be strictly relevant to the principle of the Bill and not deal with its details. If the House agrees to an amendment in either of such forms, the second reading of the Bill shall be considered to have been negatived."

Sir, in opposition to the Bill, I intend to move an amendment under S.O. 53 and my amendment is, "That this Bill be rejected in view of the fact that it is contrary to the intent and purpose of the present national registration regulations, and is an attempt to extend the national registration beyond the period to which national registration under the Emergency Regulations Ordinance, 1948, would apply." I believe that prior to this stage this morning most of the Honourable Members who have spoken have assumed that the Bill was a motion. So, I think, Sir, it would be correct for me to move an amendment under this Standing Order.

Mr. Speaker: Now, the Bill is before the House for debate and you have the liberty to oppose the Bill now.

Mr. Lim Kean Slew: I oppose it by this amendment.

Mr. Speaker: If you have an amendment, you must give me notice of the amendment in writing. You can oppose

the Bill and you can give your reasons for opposing it,

Mr. Lim Kean Siew: As it may please you, Sir. According to the explanatory statement of this Bill, it is stated that:

"At present identity cards are issued under the provisions of the Emergency (Registration Areas) Regulations, 1948. It is considered that these regulations should be revoked, and replaced by a more comprehensive and permanent system of national registration, involving the creation of a central registry and index: and it is the object of the above measure to provide the machinery for such a system."

Sir, this Bill is against the spirit of our Constitution. It seeks to make permanent what was in fact a temporary measure under the Emergency. Under our Constitution the Emergency Regulations Ordinance is extended under Article 163 (1)—this comes in Part XIII under the Temporary and Transitional Provisions chapter. Article 163 (1) says:

The Emergency Regulations Ordinance, 1948, and all subsidiary legislation made thereunder shall, if not sooner ended by a Proclamation under Clause (2X) cease to have effect on the expiration of one year beginning with Merdeka Day or, if continued under this Article, on the expiration of a period of one year from the date on which it would have ceased to have effect but for the continuation or last continuation."

and under Cause (4) of the same Article, it is stated:

"While the said Ordinance continues in force any subsidiary legislation which could have been made thereunder immediately before Merdeka Day may be validly made thereunder notwithstanding that it is inconsistent with any provision of this Constitution, and Parliament may, notwithstanding anything in this Constitution, by law amend or repeal any provision thereof."

The national registration at the moment is a subsidiary legislative measure under this Emergency Regulations Ordinance and ought to end with it. Therefore, it is very clear that, since it is the intention that this National Registration BUI should replace the present Regulations, it is intended to make this registration permanent and outside and beyond the period of the Emergency and the Emergency Regulations. Sir, I submit that this is against the spirit of our Constitution. It has been said very often that we are trying to develop a

democratic system, but I would like to submit that it can be said that though we say, "We are free", we are now in chains.

The purpose of the identity card system was to combat terrorist activities under the Emergency Regulations. If we approve of this legislation, we would be going over and beyond the Emergency period. Since the purpose of the identity card system was to fight the terrorists effectively during the period of the Emergency, what then is the purpose of the extension of the identity card system into a period of non-emergency? If we say that it is to combat the Emergency, then it is useless. If we say that this is not to combat the Emergency then. Sir, what is the purpose of extending the period of the Emergency under our Constitution in order to have certain regulations promulgated and continued?

Sir, the Minister of Justice in presenting this Bill

Date* Svldnun: The Minister of the Interior.

Mr. Lim Kean Siew: I am sorry—the Minister of the Interior, and not of Justice. (*Laughter*). In presenting this Bill, he gave a lot of reasons but. Sir, he missed giving the purpose and intent of the legislation. It is the intent and purpose of the legislation with which we are always concerned. We are not only concerned with whether the card is blue, pink, green or red in colour. We want to know why does he intend to have this Ordinance, but instead we have been told that we are going to buy paper that is known as laminated paper. Whether laminated paper is better than ordinary paper, whether it is better than parchment paper or not, we do not know nor do we care very much. However, on this point, since identity card is a document, I presume that parchment paper would be more appropriate.

The danger of this National Registration Ordinance is this. Firstly, it will make registration permanent. Now, do we want this to be permanent? In considering this, I would ask another question, "Do you want us to divide into classes, into sections?"^M We

would have blue, red, green and chocolate cards—blue for citizens, red for non-citizens, green for visitors and chocolate for persons who are registered under the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance. Soon, we might also have different shades of blue—light blue, dark blue and not so dark blue: dark blue for Ministers, not so dark blue for non-Ministers and light blue for opposition members, (*Laughter*) and so on. We begin to divide and segregate ourselves into classes of citizens. Already we have two—those with chocolate and those with blue cards.

Now, Sir, people who have been registered under the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance may change in character. Sometimes it may be due to administrative oversight; sometimes we may have young children who are 15, 16 years or 17 years of age who go against authority, not because they are criminal by nature or by some psychological distortion, but because they might have been antagonistic to authority as represented by the father, and in their fight against authority sometimes they might psychologically be fighting against the authority of the father whom they dislike and oppose; and very often we find that these people after they have settled down say at the age of 25 or 26, change for the better. Now, Sir, if you are going to give them chocolate identity cards, every time they produce their identity cards, they feel a sense of guilt—thus if a person has to produce his card ten times a day he would feel guilty ten times a day. After, say, a period of five years it is very difficult to remove that guilty complex in a person. Consider also the effect on a son of a father who carries a chocolate card and we know that a lot of people who are so-called 'subversives' or so-called anti-social people, who are not really anti-social at all, but people who feel that they should at that time of their lives rebel against what they believe to be unjust authority. You might ask, "How do we deal with these people?" exactly. When we want to register a person, do we have a trained psychiatrist to deal with that person's personality first, do we have the person examined, his home background examined? Do we examine the falsity

of the reports or otherwise? Some of my friends have been accused of being so-and-so inclined, and then after they have met people, after they have been introduced to their accusers, the accusers have often changed their opinion making such ridiculous statements as: "Oh, he is not a bad chap after all, we did not know him before." But once you give that person a chocolate identity card, he has got to go before that very man, who put the colour on his card, to remove that colour and to give him a blue card. Now, we all know that once a person has decided on a course of action, very often it is very difficult for him to admit that he has been wrong and that he wishes to redeem himself by admitting his mistake. This also applies especially to authorities. So, we must understand that permanency as regards colour of identity cards is something we must avoid.

The purpose of the present national identity cards is to make sure that certain people are not found in certain areas and, perhaps, to arrest and detain certain persons under the Emergency Regulations: but because of the fact that every person has to carry an identity card that purpose is to a large extent defeated.

Sir, according to the Honourable the Minister of the Interior, the present identity card system is rather chaotic and it should be revised. I agree that it is chaotic, and if you make it permanent, it will be permanently chaotic. (*Laughter*). The point we must remember is this—if the present identity card system is chaotic, there is no reason why it cannot be corrected under present Regulations.

Dato* Suleiman: I thought you object to the present Regulations.

Mr. Lim Kean Siew: No, I do not object to the present Regulations. That is irrelevant in this discussion. I say that this is an attempt to make the present Regulations, which is temporary under the Emergency Regulations, into a permanent legislation which is divorced from the present Emergency, and therefore divorced from the purpose on which the present system is based. If we wish to correct the

present system—there is no reason why it should be made permanent—it can still be corrected under the present Regulations. Therefore, one of the reasons given for this by the Minister of the Interior is illogical. In fact, I would go so far as to say that it is not so much a reason but an excuse.

Now, if we say that this registration will do good, because it has been found necessary under the Emergency Regulations, then we must also say, once the Emergency is ended, that its goodness or otherwise need no longer be a matter of discussion.

The other point that we must remember is this: that when we register people, we are in fact proceeding along lines as has been done in armies, for criminals, by fascists and among police personnel. In other words, we still have to understand this—would this measure not in the end be a rather dictatorial and fascist method of democracy? If it had been the purpose that the registration of people should be permanent the Constitution would have stated so quite clearly, but as you see under Section 163, it states that the Emergency Regulations shall cease one year after Merdeka day. Therefore, the first intent of our Constitution is to end the Emergency as early as possible. Secondly, if you wish to continue it, you may extend it from time to time under sub-section (3). From year to year the Emergency Regulations Ordinance has been extended—from 1958 to 1959 and from 1959 to 1960, in other words, twice. It also states quite clearly that:

"While the said Ordinance continues in force any subsidiary legislation which could have been made thereunder immediately before Merdeka Day may be validly made thereunder notwithstanding that it is inconsistent with any provision of this Constitution . . . *"

The national registration system as it stands to-day is made under the Emergency Regulations. From this Constitutional statement it would appear, therefore, that this Bill is in that sense contrary to the Constitution or the spirit or the intent of our Constitution which, under Part n. Sections 5 to 11, deals with the liberty and the freedom of the people. Under

Section 9, there is prohibition of banishment and the freedom of movement. So, when you give a person a chocolate card you limit his freedom: when you give him a blue card you give him more freedom, and when you give him a red card he may probably be under police surveillance all the time. I do know that when a person is registered, every time he finds a job he finds difficulty in maintaining his job because according to the relevant Ordinance, when a person is registered the police may demand for his identity card and for that purpose the police can go anywhere and very often they go to these people and ask for their identity cards in order to check their movements and therefore embarrassing them. That Ordinance, we must remember, has very little to do with the Emergency—that is registration of criminals. But once you introduce this National Registration Ordinance, this Ordinance would apply also in those cases and therefore we must carefully consider it; and I hope that when we come to this point Members of this House will vote according to what their belief in democratic principles rather than on party lines, because during election time, everywhere I went I heard the same phrases uttered by all sides of the House—that we believe in democracy, that we are upholding the principles of democracy and justice, the liberty of the person, and the freedom of the individual. Well, this is a chance for us to prove it. (*Laughter*).

Dato* Suleiman: I would ask members of all parties to come in to vote to show either they can understand the spirit of our Constitution or that they would rather accept party discipline.

Mr. D. R. Seenivaimgani: Mr. Speaker, Sir, in Hitler's Germany, Hitler made the Jews put on the star of David whenever they went out of the town and the Jews were identified by the star of David. In Malaya, it appears that the people in this country, or those who are living here, are to be identified, as were the Jews by the star of David, by different coloured identity cards: blue, in my presumption, is for loyal citizens; red for those

hundreds of Chinese, Indians and some Malays, who are not citizens, or citizens who have close connection with China, or India, or perhaps Kerala State, which has a Communist government; green for visitors is no clanger at ail, because they will be here for a very short time; and chocolate—of course, that is meant for criminals. Well, why should an independent country have an identity card system as a permanent feature in its laws. The system of registration and the issue of identity cards have been carried out in a number of countries, but when the emergency or the situation which is dangerous or explosive *is* over this registration of identity cards no longer exists in countries where democracy is practised or democracy in the form it is believed in—not guided democracy as some people say we have in this country. Now, the Emergency Regulations brought into existence the identity card system and it has served a useful purpose. We are told that the Emergency is coming to an end very, very quickly.

Now, when the Emergency Regulations were framed, they were framed as an emergency measure and the law in regard to identity cards was included there. Therefore, it was clear that the intention of the Colonial Government, which was blamed for what happened in the past, was that this system should be temporary, or for so long as the Emergency lasted. Why should a government elected by the people, a government which represents the majority of these people, now say that it wants to make the law permanent? What is the necessity? I may be ignorant of world affairs—I am not so widely travelled as some Honourable Members on the Government side—but all I would like to know is—in which country is there a permanent feature of registration by the issue of identity cards? It is true that it may last for many years, but the time comes when it is no longer a feature in the laws; and for that reason there is no permanent legislation, there is only temporary legislation. What is the need to make the thousands of

citizens and the thousands of non-citizens, who will one day become citizens of this country, and there is a large number of them, to spend more money in getting a new identity card when the national registration cards issued under this can last for one year, two years or 4 years? What is the position of those who get red identity cards? He gets it in January and he becomes a citizen in March: who is to pay for the alteration of his card? Does the Government pay for it? No. the poor individual has to pay for it and for that he pays \$5 and after 3 months when he becomes a citizen he has to pay 50 cents to the same person who issued him with a red card in the first instance to change it from red to blue, so that he will become a loyal citizen of the Federation.

Mr. Speaker: Are you going to be long?

Mr. D. R. Seeuivasagam: Yes, Sir. I am going to be a bit long.

Mr. Speaker: In that case, to-day being Friday, I have to adjourn the House until 2.30 p.m.

Sitting suspended at 12 noon.

Sitting resumed at 2.30 p.m. o'clock.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

THE NATIONAL REGISTRATION BILL

Resumption of debate on Question, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Question again proposed.

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, as I was saying before the adjournment, this move by the Government to make the need for identity cards a permanent feature is undemocratic and brings to mind the dictatorial methods adopted in, as I said, Hitlerite Germany. But there are more important points at issue to-day here. A non-citizen will receive a red identity card for which he will have to pay a sum of \$5. It must be remembered that there are thousands upon thousands of people who are non-citizens to-day but who will in the

very near future—a month, two months perhaps—become citizens of this country, and that state of affairs will proceed month after month, and even after they receive their red identity card in a very short time they may have to get blue identity cards. The expense will of course have to be borne, I presume, by the man who is to change his identity card. In the first place, why should a non-citizen have to pay \$5 and a citizen pay only 50 cents? Is it proposed by this Government that non-citizens who have resided here for years and years should be penalised? Is it the intention of the Government to force or to suggest that if you are not a citizen you are going to be penalised in one way or another? What is the purpose of giving a different coloured card to a non-citizen of this country? I do not know why the colour red is chosen, whether it is significant or not is another matter—why not another colour? Is there a sinister motive behind the choice of this colour? Is there a motive to keep in readiness information at all times within the knowledge of the Government of the persons who are non-citizens of this country? So that the Government, if it so wishes, if it so turns out, may intimidate, try to frighten non-citizens of this country from not opening their mouths for a single moment in respect of any matters which the Government does and which they consider should not be done?

But more important than all that—what will be the effect of this identity card as proposed by the Government have on the ordinary citizen or non-citizen of this country who lives here. We know that to-day—I say this knowing very well, very sincerely, that it is true—there are certain Police officers—and when I say "officers" I do not mean only officers of the highest rank, I mean every Police officer in the Police Force—there are some of them who for one reason or another, whenever the opportunity arises, bully and try to disturb members of the public by asking them to produce and show their identity

card—not once, not twice, but maybe ten times. We know that there have been people of this country, both citizens and non-citizens, who are, from day to day, pulled up to the Police Stations for no reasons whatever—because out of the hundreds of persons pulled in in and around the State of Perak, from the written replies given by the Minister in charge to the question: "How many people were arrested under the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance in the State of Perak—35". Mr. Speaker, Sir, we who move about with the people know that in one day you may have to visit the Police station more than 35 times, and you get the answer that you are detained under the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance—and yet the answer is: 35 persons arrested under the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance.

With regard to the chocolate identity card—people who are registered under the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance—there is perhaps justification for a different coloured card. But for the non-citizen there is no justification whatever, because non-citizens are entitled to have the same freedom in this country as anybody else has. We from the Opposition Bench have time and again asked for the revocation of the Emergency Regulations, and when we ask for the revocation of the Emergency Regulations, we do not mean revoke the Regulations by name but reimposing them in another form. When we say revoke the Emergency Regulations, we mean: take them away for good. Let us not have that kind of law in this country any longer. It has become more and more significant, more and more clear, that from time to time the Government is trying on the one hand saying: "We are revoking the Emergency Regulations—or certain parts of it" but next day we find them being re-enacted as a permanent part of the law of this land under a new law. I do not think any of us are foolish. I do not think any of us can be misled. It has been said: "You do not like the Emergency Regulations, therefore we revoke this part relating

to identity cards". That is no answer, by having that part revoked when it is re-enacted in a more fearful, in a more deadly form, in the form of this Bill which is now before us.

In the Honourable Minister's supporting remarks for this Bill, one significant statement was made: that some of the identity cards or a large number of them were not in proper order, that the details there are not true. I shudder to think that the Legal Department, or the Department of Public Prosecutions, or the Attorney-General's Department, is incapable of dealing with this matter. If the Minister knows that there are untrue particulars on identity cards, then, surely, that must have come to his knowledge by proper sources, by investigation, and I think this House is entitled to know why no action has been taken if that is within the knowledge of the Government. The Government seems to be so resourceful, they are so powerful that they can deal with crime, any crime, yet in a matter which is within their knowledge no action has been taken because if action has been taken then I am sure the Honourable Minister would not have found it necessary to say that particulars on identity cards are now not true.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, as I said, before I conclude, the Emergency Regulations were meant to be a temporary measure to meet with a particular situation. We have been informed time and time again that the situation is now so much improved that in due course the Emergency Regulations will cease to exist. Let them exist if necessary as Government thinks, but let them go away as soon as possible. But once they go away, let us not get them back under disguise, under a more fearful, a more dreadful feature. The people of this country are under many restrictions, and even among citizens themselves, some citizens are under certain restrictions. There is no equality. The basic foundation is not there—equal **citizens** in an equal country. Now you want to go and place restrictions on those who are loyal citizens of this

country. You want to make a distinction between human beings living in this land. You hold a red identity card, therefore I look upon you with suspicion. You hold a blue identity card, I look upon you as a citizen. You hold another type of card—you are a criminal, branded for the rest of your life without conviction in a Court of law. Is that the justice, is that the Merdeka which the Alliance Party have fought for and has been put back into power in this country for another term of five years?

Tun Haji Ahmad bin Saaid (Seberang Utara): Tuan Yang di-PSrtua, Ahli² Yang Bgghormat sakalian, saya telah mgndSngar pgnSrangan⁷ dari pehak pgmbangkang yang telah mngfmukakan be'berapa buah fikiran t&tapi pada pgndapat saya chadangan itu sangat-lah baik-nya dan tiap² warga nSgara PgrsSkutuan Tanah MSlayu yang mfingaku ta'at sfitia yang tidak berbelah bagi me'sti-lah sokong chadangan ini. Oleh k&rana pada pSndapat saya, Tuan Yang di-Pfirtua, ada-lah Undang² PSndaftaran Kad Pngnggualan ini tidak kita hams bandingkan dgnan Undang² Dharurat. MSngikut kfcnyataan orang wakil yang sudah bfrchakap bfrkfnan d'ngan dhamrat, s'bab saya katakan bagitu Undang² Dharurat t'lah di-istiharkan pada tahun 1948 kalau tidak silap saya. Bfrk6naan dgnan Pgndaftaran Kad Pengfinalan ini t'lah di-jalankan pada tahun 1951. Bukan-kah Undang² PSndaftaran ini diadakan oleh kerana hendak mfinye' nangkan pehak yang me'ngawal kfi-amanan ne'ge'ri ini bagi mSnjalkan tugas-nya raasing²? Yang sa-bonar-nya walau ada atau tidak ada Kad P'enge*nalan ini, Undang² Dharurat itu akan di-kfnakan kepada siapa² juga yang mglanggar Undang² itu, ini ad a-l ah fahaman saya.

K&dua, Tuan Yang di-Pfirtua, nggara kita yang sSdang di-agong²kan banana sahaja mulai m&deka dan hakikat yang sa-b nar-nya di-adakan Undang² ini ia-lah oleh kSrana hgndak mfn5ntukan siapa-kah warith-nya yang bfrhak bagi nggara Pgrsgkutuan Tanah M&ayu ini. S'bab itu di-adakan Kad Pe'ngf-nalan kepada orang yang bSrhak kepada n^gara PSrsfikutuan Tanah

Melayu ini; dan yang ada hak mene- rima k&gstimewaan. Sa- bagaimana yang di- katakan oleh Yang B&rhorat wakil daripada Ipoh. Ra'ayat n&Sgri ini di- k&Snakan 50 sen dan orang yang bukan ra'ayat ne'ge'ri ini di- k&Snakan \$5. Sa- bagai sa- orang warga n&gara ia- nya me'sti- lah ada k&stimewaan dan dia be'rhak di- k&Snakan bayaran.

Tuan Yang di- P&firtua, kita patut- lah msaf apa- kah s&bab- nya di- adakan Undang² Dharurat dan apa- kah s&bab- nya di- adakan Kad P&nge'naln? Undang² Dharurat itu di- adakan oleh k&Srana kita mengikut Piagam Bangsa- Bersatu ia- itu "freedom from fear**— m&fingawal k&gbebasan daripada takut, itu- lah² s&gab- nya yang di- adakan Undang² Dharurat. Untok h&findak m&fijnalakan k&gwajipan bagi pehak yang m&Sngawal Undang² itu maka di- adakan P&Sndaftaran Kad P&ngenaln. Pada tahun 1948 sampai tahun 1951. Tuan Yang di- P&Srtua, tiap* orang yang dudok di- dalam n&Sgara P&rs&ktuan Tanah M&Slayu ini walau pehak p&ng- ganas, walau pehak orang 'awam semua- nya di- dalam k&takutan. Yang puak p&ngganas ini takutkan kapada puak orang yang m&Sme'rtahankan k&S- amanan daripada di- tembak atau di- bunuh. Yang orang 'awam pula takut h&findak tidor di- waktu malam, s&ntiasa b&Erjaga² s&Srta siapkan s&gnjata takut bahaya akan tiba. Alhamdulillah, kita berada di- dalam keamanan d&ngan chara Kad P&Snggnalan, yang mana kita pada hah ini patut W&rtafkor dan W&rtang budi kapada sa- orang ahli p&Srujuan yang t&firkorban jiwa- nya yang sangat kita k&ngankan jasa- nya kalau tidak silap saya dia- lah yang mula² sa- kali m&Sng&feluarkan fikiran untok m&ngadakan Kad P&Snggnalan. B&Stiau ada- lah sa- orang daripada t&fempat kita dari Pulau Pinang ia- itu Dr. Ong Chong Keng. Patut kita b&f- shukor kapada Allah s&gab dia- lah yang mula² sa- kali m&ng&feluarkan fikiran m&Sngadakan Kad P&Sng&Snalan ini.

Tadi saya d&ngar Yang B&rhorat wakil daripada Ipoh m&Snggakan bahawa dengan ada- nya Kad P&ng&- naln ini, konon- nya akan m&fny&kat k&gbebasan bagi s&fgala warga n&^gara P&rs&ktuan Tanah M&Slayu. Mengikut Artikul No. 5 yang m&fny&butkan "No person shall be deprived of his

life or personal liberty save in accor- dance with law", dan No. 9 mingata- kan "No citizen shall be banished or excluded from the Federation". Jadi, dia ingat istilah k&gbebasan birma'ana t&Srus bebas boleh buat apa². Yang Berhormat itu ta* tahu, tiap² apa yang ada dalam n&fg&Sri, dan apa yang ada k&gnyataan² dalam dunia ini mesti- lah ada s&mpadan atau p&rgnggan- nya. Sa- hingga langit itu pun di- jadikan mithalan kata orang Puteh "The sky is the limit¹*. Langit itu pun di- jadikan s&Smpadan dan b&bebasan kita ini pun me'sti- lah ada s&Smpadan.

Oleh s&bab itu saya m&ne'gaskan kalau sudah ada Undang² "No citizen".....(ta' ada satu warga n&fgara yang boleh di- buang n&Sgeti) kalau ta' ada Kad P&Snggnalan yang m&gn&Sntukan dia itu ada- lah warga n&Sgara, maka harus warga n&fgara itu akan di- buang n&fg&fri. s&Sbab tidak ada k&St&ntuan. D&ngan ada- nya Kad P&ng&- naln yang sa- macham itu maka boleh- lah di- t&ngtukan bahawa orang itu ada hak- nya dan orang ini ta' ada hak- nya. Dan b&rhubong d&ngan apa yang saya katakan tadi bahawa k&f&be- basan itu ada p&Srgnggan- nya roingikut Article 149 (1) "If an Act of Parlia- ment recites that action has been taken or threatened by any substantial body of persons whether inside or outside the Federation, to cause, or to cause a substantial number of citizens to fear, organised violence against persons or property, any provision of that Uw designed to stop or prevent that action is valid notwithstanding that it is inconsistent with any of the provision of Article 5, 9, or 10, or would apart from this Article be outside the legislative power of Parliament; and Article 79 shall not apply to a Bill for such an Act or any amendment to such a Bill."

Dato* Onn bin Jaafan On a point of information. Sir, will the Honourable Member quote the Article?

Mr. Speaker: You will have a chance to talk afterwards.

Dato' Onn bin Jufar: I am only just asking if he will quote the number of the Article.

Mr. Speaker: What number is the Article?

Tnan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid: No. 149. Yang Bgrhormat wakil dari Ipoh telah mfingatakan ia-itu Kerajaan Perikatan bgrsikap Dictatorial. Kita ta' boleh bandingkan d'ngan sikap Hitler; sangat jauh beza-nya. Sikap Hitler, ia-lah b'rfahaman sa-bagai "Lust for power" atau dahaga kapada kuasa. Kita bukan dahaga kapada kuasa bahkan kita hendak menjaga keamanan dan hak bagi ra'ayat negeri ini (*Tepok*). Kata-nya lagi "EH-mana pun ta' ada Kad Pengenalan". Saya tabu bahawa waktu saya berada di-M'k'ab, Saudi Arabia, di-sana pun ada Kad Pdngenalan.....

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification, I never said there was no identity card system anywhere. I said there was no permanent identity card system anywhere.

Mr. Speaker: Tidak ada sa-lama²-nya.

Tnan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid: Saya ta' s'ntoh kata Yang Berhormat wakil dari Ipoh itu di-atas soal Kad Pengf'nal-an, Saya chuma sambongkan p'rchakapan yang lain (*Ketawa*). Jadi, kalau ada orang yang mengatakan di-lain t' mpat ta' ada Kad PngngSnalan sa-lama²-nya maka di-Saudi Arabia ada Kad Pngnggnalan sa-macham itu. D'ngan ada-nya Kad Pnggenalan sap&t'i itu maka mudah-lah bagi orang² kita ia-itu warga nggara kita yang p'Srgi ka-sana. Dalam sa-tahun sampai lima enam ribu orang pergi ka-Saudi Arabia. Banyak orang² atau p'Snuntut² yang mendapat scholarship atau biasiswa p'Srgi ka-luar negSri. Kalau ta* ada Kad Pengenalan bagaimana kita h'Sndak menentukan yang mana b'Srhak mendapat biasiswa? Sa-kira-nya mereka yang bukan warga ntgara yang p'f'rgi ka-Saudi Arabia itu waktu m'Snunaikan fardzu Haji-nya dan juga yang beYharapkan bantuan daripada wakil Duta kita di-sana, **dgngan** ini t'entu sa-kali wakil Duta **lota** ta* tahu yang dia itu warga negara **nggeri** ini. Jadi. dengan jalan itu

banyak orang² yang bukan kena pada t'mpat-nya mfiminta p'rtolongan.

Oleh yang demikian saya suka me-
nggaskan ia-itu Yang Bfirhormat wakil dari Dato* Kramat merayu kapada pehak Kerajaan menggunakan fikiran-nya se'ndiri—undi ikut fahaman sendiri. Sekarang saya sa-balek-nya suka hendak merayu kapada Yang Berhormat wakil dari Dato' Kramat sa-muga fikir sa-mula; kalau sa*b'f'nar-nya mengaku warga negara neg'ri ini dan yang ta'at setia dengan tidak b'br'f'lah bagi, maka patut sangat di-sokong chadangan ini (*Tepok*).

Mr. V. David: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the previous Honourable Member has really given a different meaning to the Emergency Regulations which was enacted in 1948. His first argument was that these Regulations were enacted in order to protect the people from threat. The first thing I would like to know is, whether it is the Government's original intention to protect the people from threat, or is it merely to prevent the people from demanding Merdeka for Malaya. I will give examples and illustrations to show that the Regulations were misused and abused. For instance, the Honourable Member for Setapak, Enche' Ahmad Boestamam, was arrested under the Emergency Regulations—he is not a Communist; and the Honourable Dr. Burhanuddin was arrested—he is not a Communist either.

Tuan Syed Ja'afar bin Hasan Albar: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ta' ingat Dr. Burhanuddin ada di-tahan.

Mr. V. David: All these people were arrested under the Emergency Regulations because it was stated that they were a threat to the country. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I can confirm that the original intention of the British Government in enacting these Regulations in this country was to prevent the people rising on their feet to demand for independence. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the British Government realised that they could not sabotage the Malayan people's aspiration in demanding for self-government and finally knowing this aspect very well, they granted independence to this country. Sir, the

United Nations Charter clearly sets out the fundamental human rights. The Constitution of Malaya is a sacred document to us and we believe in it. It is a sacred document which is for the guidance of the Malayan people and all the parliamentarians in this country. But our acts are contradictory and contravening the provisions of this sacred document. The previous speaker quoted Article 5 of the Constitution—"No person shall be deprived of his life or personal liberty save in accordance with the law". However, I do not think that this Bill is in the spirit of the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have been talking about aggression in other parts of the world. But here, under our roof, we are having laws which are aggressive in nature and oppressive in structure. Sir, the previous speaker said that these identity cards are documents for use whenever people visit overseas so that they could be identified by our Ambassadors in the various countries. But the Honourable Member failed to realise that without a Malayan Passport he cannot leave Malaya, and that the Malayan Passport is a document for our Ambassadors to recognise that we are from Malaya.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would request and plead to the Government and the Honourable Minister not to be guided by their expatriate Private Secretaries. Let them be guided by their own conscience and think what is right for this country.

When you talk about the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance, it is the most dictatorial law which I have ever seen—a law which is similar to the law which has been used by the Britishers in Guiana to oppress the people who are aspiring for national freedom. Sir, the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance vests powers on individual persons who the Minister appoints. He can appoint anybody to investigate a case. Any man can be bound over under the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance without being given substantial reasons and produced before a Court of law.

Mr. Speaker: That Ordinance is not before the House to-day and the Honourable Member should confine

himself to the National Registration Bill.

Mr. V. David: I am sorry. There are certain relevant points in connection with the Bill, because the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance is the part where we have a chocolate identity card. This law is of such a nature that it deprives one of the rights of a citizen. When you talk about chocolate it looks very delicious, but when a man is given a chocolate identity card, and if he carries it. I can assure this House that he cannot forever obtain a job, for the very simple reason that when the man happens to show his card, with an "X" mark to the employer, he will call his watchman to drive him to the gates.

Sir, are we trying to create frustrated youngsters who are vengeful, because they are discredited in this country by all men; or are we going to reform youths to be good future citizens and who will make a better Malaya? I am afraid we are now on the path of negative approach—not positive; and this identity card, chocolate in colour, will never never produce good citizens. There have been in the past, as my previous colleague has said, youngsters having gone out of the way for some time; but a man is bound to change and when he changes it is the responsibility of the Government to give him all the guidance, and to reform him and make him a new man in society. If the Government is going to enact such laws as to make him permanently not acceptable to the society, I am afraid we are only driving him in despair.

Sir, the Honourable Minister when moving the Bill stated that revenue could be collected by the issuing of identity cards

Date* Suleiman: Sir, on a point of order, I object. I did not say to get revenue. What I said was to recoup the cost of the cards.

Mr. V. David: It is all the same. Mr. Speaker, so long as it is collected from the people. You can call it recoupment or income because there will be lot of money coming in—I am not disputing on that fact. But my principle here is that the identity card, chocolate in colour, will and can never

reform any citizen of this country. I remember a High Court Judge from the United States once said "We cannot buy the minds of the people through bullets and guns, but we must find a solution whereby we can reform them." To-day I find that we are now strictly following guns and bullets method and driving the people to despair.

A man who is given a chocolate identity card is not kept in his local town. Usually he is under restricted residence where the Honourable the Minister of the Interior says: "My friend, you cannot stay here; you will have to live 30 or 40 miles away." The C.I.D. picks him up and takes him and leaves him somewhere in Banting or Rawang. And the poor man will not have a single dollar in his pocket; he will be stranded in the street. This is not law, it is a mockery of the law. If the Honourable Minister has any sense of responsibility towards society, he must consider that the other people in this country are human beings. I know personally things like this has happened. People have been left in quite strange places where they are unknown and do not have any relatives—they are left stranded on the streets without jobs.

Dato* Suleiman: Mr. Speaker. Sir, this is my Bill: I do not know whether the Honourable Member is speaking on the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance or not.

Mr. V. David: Sir, I have to say this because it is mentioned here—chocolate cards and Prevention of Crimes Ordinance—and they automatically come together.

Mr. Speaker: You must confine yourself to the principle of the Bill.

Mr. V. David: Well, I will confine to that. Sir, certain speakers have already spoken in this House about the Emergency Regulations. Now, certain parts are being taken from the Emergency Regulations to be made into the permanent laws of this country to deprive them of their fundamental rights as the people of this country. Sir, if we are going to lead a nation,

if we are going to lead a Government, which is to be recognised at the international level—and if you want international reputation—I feel that laws of this nature are below our integrity and dignity. Sir, I would plead and appeal to the Honourable the Minister of the Interior to reconsider this Bill—to reconsider the issue of chocolate identity card. You are now driving the people to frustration. Hundreds of them have been sent out of this country, or out of the States; and various men from one State have been sent to another State, without ample reasons being given as to why they have been sent there: these people are collared at midnight and sent out.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would request the Honourable Minister to use his discretion and also to judge with his own conscience and not allow himself to be led by expatriate officers. If you want a democratic nation—a democratic country—to function within the framework of our Constitution, which my colleagues and I regard as a sacred document, I would once again plead that he might reconsider this carefully and see that chocolate identity cards are not issued to people.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, turning again to National Registration of Identity Cards. In 1948 when the Emergency Regulations were enacted, it was said that the legislation was only as a temporary measure. To-day, according to the statement by the Honourable the Defence Minister and Deputy Prime Minister, it has been clearly stated that the Emergency is coming to an end. Therefore I do not know why we are going to have this new identity card system. Sir, since the Emergency is coming to an end, why are we now trying to bring in some new legislation which is going to be a permanent feature in this country? Before the war I know, from my school days, that we only go to the Municipality to get licences for our dogs and that my forefathers or fathers have not taken a licence for themselves. But to-day the moment a child reaches the age of 12 years, he has to run to the Identity Cards Office

to take an identity card to identify himself—even though he is born and bred in this country, he would have to identify himself that he is from the Malayan territory. Sir, this state of affairs should not continue and should cease forthwith. I would appeal not to let this become a permanent feature. The Emergency Regulations were enacted as a temporary measure, so let that be regarded as temporary; and let us now explore the possibilities of bringing the Emergency to an end as early as possible and thus do away with the identity card system. Thank you.

Toan Hftji Abdullah bin Haji Abdul Raof (Koala Kangnr): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun menyokong di atas Bill ini oleh sSbab mSmandang bahwa Bill ini ada-lah mustahak. Pada pSndapat saya bukan-lah soal bSr-kaitan d'ngan wang patut di-jadikan kgsulitan dalam m&nimbangan Bill ini, tetapi perkara Kad PnggSnalan ini patut-lah kita timbangkan atau pun kita fikirkan ia-itu ada-kah National Registration dan Kad PSngSnalan ini satu pSr-kara yang bSrguna atau pun tidak? Pada pendapat saya bahwa Kad PSngSnalan ini jikalau kita pandangan dari s gi kSgunaan-nya b'rkSnaan dSngan dharurat sahaja yang mana boleh di-katakan hampir tamat. maka saya rasa Kad PnggSnalan ini tiada-lah mustahak lagi. Akan tStapi jikalau kita pandangan perkara² yang beilaku di-neggri ini ia-itu pSr-kara² saumpama orang² n'fge-ri asing yang chuba raasok ka-ngggri ini d'ngan jalan haram, maka dengan sSbab itu-lah saya rasa Bill ini di-kSmukakan oleh Yang BSRhormat Mgntfiri Dalam. Kita tabu bahwa b'rhampiran dngan kita ini ada bSrmacham² bangsa yang mahu dan suka datang ka-ngggri ini kerana n'fgen ini ada-lah satu ngggri yang ma'amor d ngan mgndapat khdupan yang sngang. Oleh sgbab me*reka tgrasa susah dalam ngggri merefca maka mgreka chuba datang ka-negfiri ini dSngan b'rmacham² helah walau pun dngan jalan yang tiada di-bSnar oleh undang².

Saya bawa satu p'ndapat untuk pSnggetahwan tuan² di-Majlis ini ia-itu

di-Dindings satu District di-dalam nSg^ri Perak di-mana dalam masa P'frentahan J^pun dan juga pada masa tamat perang saya ada b&kerja di-satu terapat yang di-namakan Pasir Panjang. Di-sana banyak Orang² Indonesia datang ka-nSgSri ini d'ngan jalan samp-an. Jadi, ini-lah sSbab-nya, jikalau kita tiada mSngadakan undang² ini, maka saya pSrchaya bahwa banyak orang² dari ngggri asing akan masuk dSngan jalan sa-macham itu dan bSrbagai² jalan lagi. DSngan s'bab itu saya rasa bahwa BUI ini sangat-lah mustahak kerana kita bukan sahaja hfindak mfgunakan Kad PSnggnalan itu b'rk'knaan dngan dharurat bahkan hendak mSnjaga dan m'nahan k'masokan orang² asing ka-negeii ini dengan sa-chara haram. Di-atas soal warna Kad Pngggnalan, ini bukan-lah satu perkara yang rumit oleh sSbab pgrkara itu boleh di-pinda jika di-dapati tiada s'fsuai. S kian-lah sahaja, terima kaseh.

Dato' Onn bin Jaafar (Koala TriEof-gano Selatan): Tuan Yang di-PSrtua, wakil SSbSrang Utara t'lah rainySbutkan bSrksnaan fasal 149 dalam Undang² ini. Pada pSndapat saya s5n-diri bahawa fasal 149 itu tidak ada kSna-mnggna d'ngan perkara yang di-bahathkan, oleh kgrana fasal 149 itu b'rkata; "Sa-kira-nya ada sa-suatu Undang² Parlimen yang mfingatakan ia-itu langkah yang t'lah di-jalankan atau pun yang h'ndak di-jalankan oleh sa-suatu puak yang ramai, maka sa-barang Undang² yang di-luluskan bagi mSnahan langkah itu sa-kali pun mglawan d'ngan k'fh'ndak² dalam Undang² PSrISmbagaan ini boleh di-jalankan."

Pgrkara yang di-bahathkan pada pgtang ini ia-lah b rk'naan dSngan h'ndak mSngadakan suatu P&atoran. satu chara bagaimana yang akan dapat di-p'rtimbangan lagi k'fria² b'rfkfinaan dSngan Kad P'nggnalan itu. Wakil Sprang Utara, tadi telah bSr-kata ia-itu Undang² Dzarurat telah di-mulai pada tahun 1948 dan Kad P^nginalan t6lah di-adakan pada tahun 1951-1952. Sa-bagai satu alasan yang mana pada pendapat dia bahawa Kad Pengenalan itu tidak ada kSna-mengSna

dengan Undang² Dzarurat. Di-sini saya sangat² tidak bdrsetuju dSngan pgn dapatan-nya itu, oleh kerana Kad Pngnalan itu telah di-jalankan dngan sebab ada-nya Dzarurat. Kalau sa-kira-nya Kad Pngnalan itu di-jalankan sa-bfilum bSrbangkit Dzarurat, maka boleh-lah di-katakan tidak ada kngna-mengngna perkara yang kita bahatkan pada petang ini. Yang sa-bSnar-nya bukan perkara sama ada patut atau tidak di-adakan Kad Pngnalan itu, tftapi oleh kSrana pgrkara mSngadakan Kad Pngnalan itu ada-lah birsangkut dengan perkara Undang² Dzarurat. Maka di-sini saya suka hSndak menygbutkan fasal 163 dalam Undang² PSrIsmbagaan ini yang bSrbunyi dSmikian:

"The Emergency Regulations Ordinance, 1948, and all subsidiary legislation made thereunder shall, if not sooner ended by a Proclamation under Clause (2), cease to have effect on the expiration of one year beginning with Merdeka Day or, if continued under this Article, on the expiration of a period of one year from the date on which it would have ceased to have effect but for the continuation or last continuation."

Now, under Clause (3) of the same Article, it says—

"The said Ordinance and subsidiary legislation may be continued from time to time by a resolution of each House of Parliament."

Well, the points arising from these are—Was a proclamation made one year after the date of Merdeka continuing the Emergency Regulations? I presume it was. This must have been made some time in 1958. Again, was a proclamation made in 1959? For that I am not so sure. But whatever the position is, with the institution of this Parliament, I say that the provisions of Clause (3) of Article 163 now applies. Therefore, it is logical that before introducing this Bill, the Honourable Minister concerned or the Government—I do not mind which (*Laughter*)—should have moved a resolution in this Parliament to continue the Emergency Regulations. If such a resolution is not brought in, then, in **my** view, the Emergency Regulations do not exist.

Ton Abdul Razak: On a point of explanation, Sir, a resolution has

already been brought into this House on the 24th June this year to extend the Emergency Regulations for a period of one year from the 31st August, 1959, to 31st August, 1960.

Dato* Onn bin Jaafan Thank you for the information. But, as I say, Parliament has now been convened and I feel that the correct procedure would have been to bring in a resolution in this Parliament.

Identity cards were issued under the Emergency Regulations. Identity cards were made purely as a temporary measure; it was not intended at any time within my knowledge that it should be a permanent feature of the law of this country. The intention of this Bill is to make it so. We have the words of the Bill which says in the Explanatory Statement—

"... It is considered that these regulations should be revoked, and replaced by a more comprehensive and permanent system of national registration..."

The fact that identity cards are to become a permanent feature of registration is in conflict and at variance with the original intention that it should be a purely temporary measure. I therefore move, in accordance with Standing Order 53 (4), that the second reading of this Bill be postponed till the same day 12 months hence or the nearest date thereto.

Mr. Chin Sec Yin: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Mr. Speaker: May I have the wording of the amendment?

Dato* Suleiman: I am sure we require notice of that, Sir.

Dato* Onn bin Jaafar: No.

Mr. Speaker: Honourable Members, I have received an amendment to the motion for the second reading of the Bill, namely, the National Registration Bill, which is before the House to-day, and I shall read the amendment. The amendment has been proposed and seconded. It reads—

"That the second reading of this Bill be postponed to the same day 12 months hence or the nearest date thereto."

This is not quite clear.

Dato' Suleiman: Sir, although I am the mover of the motion, I have not been given a copy of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: I have already read the wording of the amendment. I suggest to the Honourable mover of the amendment that it would be better to substitute the words "on this day twelve months" for the word "now".

Dato' Onn bin JaaCar: But I was trying to obviate the possibility that Parliament does not meet this day 12 months.

Mr. Speaker: I think it would be better to use the words "on this day twelve months."

Dato' Suleiman: Sir, I do not know whether the Honourable Member is moving the amendment or you are moving it. (*Laughter*).

Mr. Speaker: I am only trying to help the Honourable Member, because the wording of the amendment is not very clear and therefore I have suggested to the Honourable Member to make it clearer, and he has agreed to it. In fact, if you read Standing Order 53 (4) the wording there is clearer.

Dato* Soleiman: Thank you, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Now, Honourable Members, the motion before the House, That the Bill be now read a second time, is amended to read "That this Bill may be read on this day twelve months hence." The amendment has been proposed and seconded; it is now open for debate.

Mr. Chin See Yin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will confine myself to this amendment only.

Mr. Speaker: Yes. (*Laughter*).

Mr. Chin See Yin: Thank you, Sir, as you have heard just now from the various speakers in this House, the matter now before us is the result of the Emergency that prevails in this country. And at that tune I think we all agreed that when these regulations came into force the former Government had given an assurance that it would only be a temporary measure.

That being the case, we must admit that according to the information given to us by the Honourable Minister of Defence, the Emergency will soon come to an end. We are yet to see the end of the Emergency, but we hope to see it very soon.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, under the Emergency Regulations, provision was made for the issue of identity cards. These cards will be valid, under their assurance, for such time as the Emergency is on, and under the regulations it was also necessary to have it extended from time to time. Sir, the reason why I strongly support this proposed amended motion is because we have to give time for the Emergency to come to an end. On the other hand, Sir, it would be expensive if we were to rush the Bill through. It will cause everybody to spend money and we all agree that this country is an agricultural country where 90% of the population have to work for a living, and they have already been contributing so much in various taxation. Now if this National Registration Bill is passed through and put into operation, it would mean that we will have to spend \$4[^] million to implement it. Mr. Speaker, Sir, \$41 million is a lot of money, and I think this money can be used for more useful purposes. We have heard from the Honourable Ministers holding various responsibilities the amount of progress that we can achieve if we have sufficient money. Sir, it is for this reason that I stand up to support this amendment. On the other hand, I need not repeat what has been said by the Honourable Members in this House regarding the liberty of the human beings.

Mr. Speaker: Will you confine your speech to the proposed amendment?

Mr. Chin See Yin: Yes Sir, I will confine to it. As I said, Sir, if we all will sit up and think for a moment, we will agree that this costs so much money; and the proposal made by the Honourable Member for Kuala Trengganu Selatan. is for a deferment of this Bill, which is, I think, a very good thing.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, may I refer, with your permission, to the speech by His Highness the Timbalan Yang di-Pertuan Agong.....

Mr. Speaker: Is it in connection with this?

Mr. Chin See Yin: Yes, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: With the amendment?

Mr. Chin See Yin: Yes Sir. It reads: "Whatever is good for the people should have the support of all parties irrespective of where the idea has originated," and it goes on further to say, "but on the majority party in any Parliament lies the special responsibility of listening with receptive minds to constructive criticism of their policies....."

Dato' Suleiman: On a point of order, I have not objected.

Mr. Speaker: Do not read too long.

Mr. Chin See Yin: No Sir. "..... ever ready to accept sincere contributions to the common weal." I am referring to this, Sir, because when you put this proposed resolution to vote, I am asking the Government party to be considerate so that we all will work for a common cause, in the interests of the people and for the betterment of the country. Let us vote with our conscience.

• **Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the proposed amendment, and I would ask the Government to accept this amendment, when it is put to the vote for this reason—that it will not cause hardship or damage to the Government side by deferring this matter for the period asked for. I think, as an Honourable Member has said, the Government must be ready to accept constructive criticisms. This amendment cannot be destructive—if anything at all, it will be a useful suggestion. In any event, it can only be a constructive and not a destructive suggestion.**

Toan Haji Ahmad Saaid (Seberang Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada-lah pfrkara masa'alah di-had a pan Majlis

ini sama ada kita hendak binchangkan di-atas usul National Registration atau hendak tanggohkan. Saya hairan, kalau-lah hendak mngngmukakan chadangan hendak di-tanggohkan, waktu mula² tadi patut di-bawa chadangan hgndak di-tanggohkan, sekarang sudah jalan sa-tengah, hampir sampai ka-pangkal—di-kemukakan chadangan tanggohan. Jadi sekarang terpulang kepada Majlis ini menimbang dan menjalankan, sakan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Mohammad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun memberi sokongan, berdasarkan bahawa apa yang hendak di-buat oleh Kerajaan ia-lah hendak mengemaskan atoran Pendaftaran KSbngsaan seluroh PersSkutuan Tanah Mglayu. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, oleh kerana tSrbt atoran pendaftaran ini dahulu daripada ada-nya keadaan dharurat negeri ini, maka sudah-lah pada tempat-nya p^r-kara saperti ini kita lihat kepada keadaan negeri. Maka Yang Berhormat Timbalan Perdana MSnteri telah mngnyatakan kepada kita ada harapan bahawa dharurat akan di-tamatkan pada tahun 1960, mudah², Tuan Yang di-PSrtua, apabila sampai pada tahun 1960, kita dapati ta' payah lagi kita ini menggunakan pendaftaran. kalau dengan maksud hendak menjaga subversive.

Soal pendaftaran ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tidak-lah bSRbangkit tentang asas ada-nya. TStapi tentang menanggohkan dasar-nya, raglihat kapada keadaan, saya rasa patut-lah di-fikirkan oleh KSrajaan. Ada satu soalan yang tglah di-bangkitkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri yang bersangkutan tadi ia-itu keadaan pendaftaran sekarang ini tidak memuaskan. Saya perchaya dengan pendirian Kerajaan yang ada sekarang ini akan dapat-lah dalam masa penanggohan ini KSrajaan mnggemaskan p^ndaftaran negSri ini dan menggtatkan bSbSrapa screw yang longgar pada machine ini supaya membolehkan pndaftaran ini menjadi satu alat bagi mengawal kgtenteraman ra'ayat negeri ini.

finch* Abdul Ghani (Metaka Utara):

Tuan Yang di-PSrtua, saya bangun beichakap pada kali ini ia-lah m&nfn-tang usul yang di-bawa untuk m&Snang-gohkan perbinchangan berkngnaan d&-ngan Bill tadi. Saya m&Smandang p&Rkara yang di-chakapkan oleh pehak pifmbangkang atas alasan m&nggohkan se'me'ntara sa-hingga tahun akan datang mithal-nya, itu ada-lah saya rasa ta* ada pgrkara yang b&Ssar di-keluarkan untuk alasan bagi pehak saya h&Sndak menyokong atas cha-dangan itu. K&rana saya dapat tahu pehak kami—Peiikatan atau pun KSrajaan, bila kami h&Sndak m&nge¹-mukakan satu² pfrkara ada-lah kami telah timbangkan, pgrkara ini pgrkara yang m&Snasabah hfindak di-jalankan terutama sa-kali bagi m&Snygggrakan tamat-nya dharurat. Tuan² pgmbangkang tadi ing in sangat supaya lfikas di-tamatkan atau pun dapat kita sampai kepada sa'at yang kita janjikan, jadi sama² mgnikmati bahwa nggara kita tidak dharurat.

Jadi saya rasa kita telah binchangkan pgrkara ini saya agak macham sudah masak, k&fmudian pfrkara ini hendak di-tanggohkan, ini pfinanggohan adalah p&Snchuri masa untuk tn&ngaman-kan negara, terima kaseh.

Dato* Suleiman: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I feel that I should be given the opportunity to say whether I am in favour of the amending motion or not. Sir, I say that I oppose the motion, because . . .

Mr. V. David: Mr. Speaker, Sir, there are many more speakers and before the Honourable Minister replies

Mr. Speaker: (To Date' Suleiman)

You can speak. I must warn the Honourable Mover of the amendment that he has no right of reply under the new Standing Orders. This is an amendment moved by somebody—not by the Minister.

Dato* Soleiman: May I remind the Honourable Member that I was the Mover of the original motion; so, it is up to me to say whether I accept the amending motion or not. If I accept it, then there will be no debate. As I have

said just now, I oppose the motion, because I feel that so far there has been no good ground given as to why this Bill should be delayed for one year. On the other hand. Honourable Members who have spoken—before this amending motion was brought—did not suggest that this Bill was completely of no help to the masses.

Sir, the Honourable Mover of this amendment, to my mind, has not given—I say so with due respect—any good ground or reason as to why this Bill should be delayed. If I were to reply afterwards, on the criticisms that have been made on the original motion, I would be able to disclose the reasons as to why it is rather urgent that we should have this Bill through.

Tuan Yang di-Pe²rtua dan Ahli² Yang BeYhbrmat, saya b&Srchakap di-sini ia-lah bagi pehak KSrajaan. Kita mgnolak usul yang di-bawa tadi bagi di-tanggohkan. Rang Undang² yang saya bawa pada pagi tadi maseh di-bahathkan, k&Srana pada fahaman saya Ahli Yang Be²rhorat yang m&Smbawa usul yang h ndak m&Snanggohkan ini b&Slum-lah lagi ada dan tidak-lah akan m&Snambah-kan s&Sbab² yang munasabah. Fasal apa Undang² ini patut di-tanggohkan dan jika sa-kira-nya pula saya m&Snjawab s&fkarang di-atas usul yang saya bawa tadi di-hadapan Ahli² Yang Birhorat yang telah berchakap maka saya akan m&SmbSri kgt&rangan sibab[^]-nya yang Rang Undang² ini me'sti di-luluskan d&Sngan sa-beYapa s&fg&ra, kerana ini ada-lah satu Undang² yang mustahak pada hari ini. Undang² ini tidak ada ke'na-m&Snge'jia ia-itu Identity Card dgngan Emergency Regulation, sunggoh pun barangkali asal-nya datang oari Emergency Regulation dgngan Identity Card ini. S&Sbab[^]-nya saya boleh t&frang-kan pada masa s&fkarang kalau sa-kira-nya usul pindaan yang ada ini di-tolak.

fioche* Ahmad Boestaman (S&apak):

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-Wnar-nya kami dari pehak Socialist Front b&frmaksud untuk m&Snolak s&Smua sa-kali National Registration Ordinance ini s&fbab itu-lah Wberapa oraog dari pehak kami tadi telah menyatakan bangkangan t&rhadap Undang² itu. K&Smudian timbul satu usul baharu.

usul yang meminta supaya Undang² ini di-tanggohkan p^rbinchangan-nya untuk sa-lama 12 bulan. Tuan Yang di-P^rtua, Yang BeYhormat Mfintfiri Dalam NegSri tadi mⁿgatakan bahawa pehak yang mⁿchadangkan usul ini tidak ada mⁿnggumukakan s^sbab² yang t gas, yang konkrit kenapa dia mahu tanggohkan. Saya mⁿngambil kesfimpatan untuk member! tiga s bab kenapa p^r nanggoahan hams di-lakukan.

Yang pert am a, mengikut apa yang di-nyatakan di-sini belanja m^smbuat Kad² baharu \$3,287,660. Kalau sa-kiranya di-tanggohkan 12 bulan wang itu dapat kita simpan, kita gunakan untuk b^slanja lain.

Kedua, M²nt^ri Dalam Negeri t^sIah mⁿgatakan Kad baharu ini akan dibuat di-Amerika. Kalau di-tanggohkan p^rbinchangan ini sa-lama 12 bulan grti-nya Undang² ini tidak akan bejalan sa-lama 12 bulan, dan Amerika tidak dapat duit tiga million itu.

K²tiga, ada e^mpat macham Kad Pⁿnggnalan. Bagi ra'ayat negSri ini di-kfikan bayaran 50 sen dan bagi yang bukan ra'ayat n^sgeli ini di-kⁿakan bayaran \$5. Jadi, jumlah-nya yang akan di-terima sa-banyak \$4J- juta.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau kita kaji Anggaran B[&]anjawan kita ini meskipun kita naikkan chukai p^sndapatan. Kita maseh kekurangan \$14 juta ISbeh dan d^sngan tidak m^snjalankan Undang² ini sa-lama 12 bulan itu maka \$4J million untuk m^smbayar Kad² itu dapat kita gunakan untuk k^mmajuan Tanah Ayer.

Itu-lah tiga s bab k napa saya nyokong chadangan dari Yang BSrhor- mat wakil Kuala TrSngganu Selatan itu, t^rima kaseh.

Mr. Speaker: Jika tidak ada Ahli² Yang Be'rhorat yang lain hⁿndak b^rrchakap, saya hendak mⁿng⁶mu- kakan chadangan ini untuk pindaan. Pindaan-nya ia-lah kalimah "second" itu di-buang. "Now" di-gantikan dgngan kalimah "on this day 12 months hence". BeYma'ana jika pindaan ini di-p^rse'tu- jukan, Bill ini akan di-tanggohkan sa- lama 12 bulan. Ini saya t^rpaksa t^rngarkan kapada Ahli² Yang BSrhor- mat. S karang saya h^sndak k^mukakan pindaan ini, pindaan ini hⁿndak di- buang kalimah "second" dan kalimah "now" di-gantikan dengan kalimah "12 bulan yang akan datang".

Date' Onn bin Jaafar: Tuan Yang di- Pertua, ada-kah saya b^rrhak b^sr- chakap?

Mr. Speaker: Pehak yang m^smbawa pindaan ini tidak ada hak berchakap,

Question put. That the word "now" be left out of the Question.

Mr. V. David: Mr. Speaker, Sir, could we have a division?

Toan Haji Abdul Khalid: Sir, I do not think that there is justification for a division from the voices.

Mr. Speaker: The decision rests with the Speaker. Nobody can challenge the decision of the Speaker. Will Honour- able Members desiring a division stand?

(More than 15 Members stand).

The House divided; Ayes, 29; Noes, 64; Abstentions, Nil.

AYES Twu Haji

Tmm Ha# Ah«*d hi* AMd-
Uh
Eacfee* Ahv«d Bocttum
Dr. BwfcMMddb MB M«M.
Noer
Mr. Cku Swec Ho
Mr. CUiSec Vta
Mr. V. D^U

Han* MB Pulu

AdU bi>

Hwti* K«k»l Km

Mr. K. Kwui

Cbc' KhiJQab Uiti Mohd.
SUUt

Mr. U«t Km Slew

Mr. UN Yo«c PM]

A*ri

WM D»lo* M*huud Rwdhk

btm

Nft MM Mi N* Mokuied

Mr. fif Amm Teek

Dale' OMB bia Jaafar

Eacnc' Otbnu hfa AbdtOlah

Mr. Q«k Kal Doaf

Mr. D. R. Setaivatfffaai

Mr. S. P. Sce»lvasat«Bi

Mr. Taa Kec Gak

Mr. Taa Phodt Kia

Mr. V. Vccrappcai

Waa MMtapa bU Haji Ali

Mr. Y«oa Tat Bnf

Each*' Zalkfice bla M «««!-
mad

Taa AMd Rank MB Data'
Hi
Mr. TIM Slew Sic Date*
V. T. SaataBthaa
Date* SaMaUB Ua Date'
Abdal RahauB
Eacbc* Abdal Arfi bin bfcak
Eachc' Sardoa Ma Hail labir
Data* Oaf Yack Ua
Eachc* Mobjuacd Khir Ma
Joharl
Each** BahaaMa Ma Saauadia
TUB Syed Ja'afar bU Hun
Albar
TaaB Haft Abdal KhaUd Ma
Awaag OUBB
Earhc' Abdal Ghaai bia libak
EacfcV Abdal Raaf Ua A.
RahBUM
Eachc' Abdal Saaiad bu
Oaaua
Tua H.U Abdalah Ma Hag
AMaTRaaf
TaaB Hap Abdalah him Haii
Mohwacd SaMeh
Eachc' Ahaud bia Anhad
Eachc' Ahaiaf bia Mvhaacd
Sbch
TaaO Hajl Ahaud b« SaaM
Eachc' Abaud bbi Ha^ Yuof

NOES

Axahari Ma Ha#
TUB HafI
IbrabIM
Eacbc* Aril bia Uak
Mr. Cb»a Choac Wea
Mr. Chaa Si»ag \$**
Datia FatiM»h biati Hajl
Haiblai
Mr. Gcb ChoBB Kcat
Eacbc' Haaiiah Ua Abwf
Ea«be' Haal bfai Mokaaiid
YMOJ
Eacbc' Ham bia AbdalIdi
Cache' Homo bia Miatar
Eachc' HaHdB bia Tub Mwfa
Hanu
Encbe' Haueia bia Mokd.
Noordia
bia
Abdal
Each** Ibrabua
Ruhataa
Eacbv baiaP bia Idra
Mr. Kaag Kock Seat Mr.
Lcc 5aa Chooa Mr. Lcc
Scdc Faa Mr. Lcc Slok
Yew Mr. Lcoag Kcc Nycaa
Mr. Uni Joo Koai Dr.
LIm Swcc ABB Mr. T.
Mablau Siagb Eacfcc'
M«bM«d bla

Eacbc' MabaBMd Abba* MB
Abatad
Each** M*bwW Dakari bam
HaH MaaaantI AK
Each** MahaamI Nar bia
Mohd. Daha*
Eatbe' Mohaatcd Satoag bla
Mahd. AH
Eachc' MahaamMd YBM| bia
Mahaiaid
Taw Hifl MoUtar bai RaJl
liaiaB
Eacbc' Olhaaa bU AbdaHah
TMB Hai Beta Ua Hmji
Mobd. Said
Mr. S*ah Tcai Nftob Taai
Syed Eta Ma Ah*«c Eacbc*
Tabjdla W. AH Mr. Tia
Chcac Bw Mr. Taa Tyc Chck
TMaka ladra Pttra ibaJ Saltaa
Ibrabiai
Date' TcoH Chxc CbMf Wia
SBWBMB bia Waa Taai
Waa Yahya MB Hag Waa
Mohaiaid
Mr. Woo Salk H*BC Mr.
YOBK Woo Mat Hajfeh
ZaJa btati S«W«ua
Tau Hai Zakaria bai Raji
Mobd. Tab

ABSTENTION

NI

Amendment accordingly negated.
Original Question again proposed.

Mr. S. P. Seeoivasagam (MengtombD):

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose the Bill before this House. For some time past we have had suspicions that the Emergency Regulations were going to be done away with, but at the same time—we have had no illusion about it—we knew that the idea was to do away with the name and to re-enact the substance. And this Bill before the House today is the first step in that direction.

Sir, I wonder whether the Honourable Minister responsible for introducing this Bill has considered the possible effects of it. We as free citizens of this country have a right to live in this country without having to carry around with us a badge. It is true that we do not have it around our necks, but we have to carry it in our pockets. We are free citizens and we are entitled to live in this country without having to carry

any badge—that is our birthright, a right conferred on us by the Constitution.

Dato' Suleiman: What about the P.P.P. badge?

Mr. S. P. Seenivasagam: I will have the P.P.P. badge or any badge as I please. That is my privilege as a citizen of this country. The Honourable Minister should not interrupt me. Sir.

During the Emergency we were prepared to put up with inconvenience for the sake of security, for the sake of easier detection of so-called undesirables—and perhaps they were really undesirables. Any way, we had to put up with a lot of things connected with the Emergency. Now, the Emergency we are assured is almost over from die towns right up to the border. We find that what was originally intended to be a temporary measure is going to be a part of the permanent law of this country—and we knew that all along.

The citizens and inhabitants of this land in whose interests our deliberations are held, they are going to be divided up into three sections. The new system of identity cards is going to split up the inhabitants of the country into three sections—(i) non-citizens, who are red; (ii) citizens, who are blue; and (iii) unconvicted persons, who are chocolate. I believe that it is one of the principles of our Constitution, that there should be no discrimination between citizens.

In my view, a man not convicted in a Court of Law is no more a criminal than any other man, that is, those who are not convicted are not criminals in the eyes of the law. Why then should the law discriminate? This Bill is attempting to discriminate between citizens. Just because some police officer has decided certain things a man is branded under the Public Security Ordinance, and by the proposal of this Bill he is to be issued with a chocolate identity card. What are the consequences of that?

Sir, one of the fundamental principles in the administration of justice in this country is that a presiding officer should not know the character of a man he is trying in ordinary criminal cases. Now, would those responsible for the Bill consider what the effects of the issue of a chocolate identity card would be? A man is produced in Court; he produces his identity card; he is charged with a certain offence that has nothing to do with security; he comes up for trial and it is known that, here is a man with a chocolate identity card. Does not that prejudice his trial? Does not that bring to the notice of the Judge that the man is regarded as a criminal—because he carries a chocolate identity card? Those are factors which those responsible for this Bill did not consider. If they are responsible enough, perhaps they will consider it and do away with the issue of chocolate identity cards. Sir, I would urge upon those responsible for dividing up the inhabitants of this country into three sections to consider what happened in other countries, consider the evils which ensued in those countries—and we do not have to look far back.

because we have examples of what happened in Germany.

The citizens of Germany were divided into two main sections—the Jews and the Aryans. The Jews were issued with yellow identity cards and they had to carry them on their clothes—a yellow six-pointed star of David as a badge intended by the Nazis to be a badge of shame. How did they turn out in the end? That badge was regarded as the badge of martyrdom. I urge upon those responsible for introducing the Bill to consider what would be the effects of issuing indiscriminately on suspicion a large mass of chocolate identity cards. I invite them to consider the possibility that these chocolate identity cards if issued at random may cease to be a badge of shame and the holders of chocolate identity cards might be regarded as the martyrs of this country.

Cnche' Mohamed Yosof bin Mahmud (Temerloh): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berasa hairan, kita ada, di-tengah kita ini, ra'ayat yang ta'at sfitia-nya kapada negSri ini, chuba me'mpe'rtahankan hak² atau pun kSmewahan² yang dinikmati oleh orang yang bukan daripada ra'ayat Persfikutuan Tanah Melayu dfingan lain kata menjadi champion for the Alliance. Saya muskil berk'naan dSngan hal ini, satu puak daripada p&nbangkang chuba membebaskan atau pun mSmb narkan orang² luar, orang yang bukan ra'ayat PSrsfikutuan Tanah Mglayu dudok dalam n'egSri ini bersama' dSngan kita d'ngan tidak ada perbezaan. Saya rasa dalam hal ini satu' ra'ayat yang ta'at s&ia bagi nSgSri ini ta' patut dan ta' mungkin buat sa-d'fmikian. Bagitu juga daripada pehak p mbangkang yang mnggatakan freedom of movemen t. freedom of speech, tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pg'rtua, bebas kita, bebas satu Kgrajaan yang demokrasi, bebas dalam p&undangan, bukan-lah boleh bebas kShSndak hati kita, maka ini satu point patut pehak p&nbangkang ingat.

Tiap² satu buah nSgeri yang merdeka, maka ada undang²-nya, untok kSbaikan n'figiri-nya. Kalau nSggri itu tidak ada undang², bebas segala-nya, maka saya rasa bukan-lah satu negSri yang bSrta-maddun dan satu negeri yang kSmanusiaan. Dalam hal ini, saya suka-hh

mgnarek pgrhatian kapada puak pgmbangkang yang baharu kgluar inj mngngambil pgrhatian dari ucapan² saya dalam mgma'anakan kgebasan. Saya umpamakan, kita boleh bebas bgrtglangang di-khalayak orang ramai dan bebas sfgala²-nya, kalau mfingikut tafsiran daripada pehak pgmbangkang itu tadi. Maka bebas kita ia-lah dngan Pgrlmbagaan, bebas dalam undang², dan ini undang² ia-lah satu undang² manjaga nggSri kita. Kita tahu ngggri kita sa-lama ini, dalam masa pgnjajah, maka orang² asing tglah di-bukakan pintu masuk sa-luas²-nya kapada mgreka ka-ngggri kita ini. Maka dngan hal ini, maka saya sa-bagai ra'ayat jglata ngggri ini tidak bfirkfihSndakkan mgreka² itu tadi bebas dalam ngggri kita, bebas mendapat nikmat. dapat mngngluarkan harta kgkayaan ngggri ini unok ngggri masing² di-luar Tanah Mglayu. Maka saya rasa ini-lah satu chara-nya yang dapat kita mSmerhantikan mgreka² itu. Yang lagi satu, Tuan Yang di-Pgtrua, sgmgnjak kita mrdaka dan sgmgnjak kita telah mngadakan Undang² Kgra'ayatan, banyak orang² asing yang patut boleh jadi ra'ayat ngggri ini, tgtapi tidak suka mngngambil kera'ayatan ngggri ini. Maka di-sini-lah tanda² yang patut kita² adakan pada mgreka² itu, jika mgreka² ini di-biarkan bgrsuka hati tidak mngngambil kgra'ayatan Pgrsgkutuan Tanah Mglayu, apa akan jadi kapada ngggri kita? Kita tidak dapat tdnaga-nya. Umpama-nya, pada masa yang sudah kita hgndak mgnchari t&naga manusia, maka mSreka² ini pun mfngambil p^luang mngngatakan mgreka bukan ra'ayat Pgrsgkutuan Tanah Mglayu, bahkan kgluar daripada ngggri ini, tgtapi mereka² ini mgndapat nikmat sfgala kgkayaan ngggri ini dngan tidak payah hgndak mngumpulkan atau mgmbgri tgnaga-nya kapada ngggri ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, maka usul ini saya fikir mustahak di-jalankan dngan sSrta-mgrta, tgrima kaseh.

finche* Hamzah bin Alang (Kapw):

Tuan Yang di-Pgtrua, sgmgnjak pagi tadi kita mgndngar berhubung dngan pgrbahathan Identity Card ini sa-hingga pptang ini pun ta' habis lagi, pada hal bila kita mgshuarat dalam mmah Yang Bgrhormat ini, kita tglah bSrd'a, bgrunding, bgrpakat pgrkara yang baik.

Dalam Bill ini banyak puak pehak pgmbangkang tglah menyatakan pindapat-nya tentang ta* baik-nya, yang baik-nya tidak ada. Jadi saya bfirngndapat, kita hams mgmbandingKan tngtang kgadaan pgndudok² di-Pfirsdkutuan Tanah Mglayu nan ini, di-Pgrsgkutuan Tanah Mglayu sa-bagaimana yang kita tahu pgndudok²-nya tgrdu-i dari sgmua bangsa. Jadi kita tidak-lah boleh mgnyamakan Pgrsgkutuan Tanah Mglayu ini sa-bagai ngggri² asing yang banyak pgndudok bangsa itu sendiri dalam-nya. Bukan pula Srti-nya kita bgnchikan kapada pgndudok² bangsa asing yang datang ka-tanah ayer kita ini, malah kita juga sayang dngan bangsa² asing itu yang datang ka-tanah ayer kita ini, maka itu-lah sgbab-nya kita beri kad, tanda mngngnalkan pada orang² yang datang ka-tanah ayer kita, kgrana kasehkan orang itu (*Tepok*).

Dari jumlah pgndudok Tanah Mglayu ini, sa-tengah daripada pgndudok²-nya, saya ta* suka-lah mgnygbutkan siapa², tgtapi sa-tengah pgndudok itu ada yang mngnganis dan ada yang mngnjgri, kgrana tgrhimpit yang macham² datang-nya, ada yang sa-tengah-nya gglak-kgtawa. Tgtapi dngan ada-nya Bill ini, kalau ada 4 macham, bukan-lah grti-nya, kalau orang itu warna kad-nya me rah, orang-nya pun merah—tidak—atau kalau dia choklat pun chuma kad-nya, ini ia-lah unok mgnyngnangkan dan unok mgnyglngnggarkan satu pgratoran pgndudok² Pgrsgkutuan Tanah Mglayu ini yang banyak tgrdiri daripada bangsa² asing yang ada dalam Tanah Mglayu ini.

Sa-bagaimana yang saya tahu. dikampong saya ia-itu di-kawasan saya sgkarang ini, sgmgnjak kgluar-nya binta hgndak mngngadakan kad Pngngnalan yang baharu, orang kampong chukup suka. bila lagi masa-nya KSrajan hgndak mngngluarkan-nya (*TipoK*). Dan sgkarang di-tgmpat saya, orang sudah sgdia mngngambil gambar masing², ada yang 3 kping 80 sen—sudah sgdia (*K&awft*). Itu-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pgtrua, saya mgnyokong Bill ini dngan sa-pgnoh-nya. tgrima kaseh.

finche* Abdul Ranf bin Abdul Rahman (Krian Lant): Tuan Yang di-Pgtrua, saya bSrdiri di-dalam Majlis ini ia-lah unok mgnyokong chadangan

daripada Yang BSRhormat Dalam yang tfilah mgmbgtangkan National Registration mi. Saya tidak hgndak berchakap panjang bahawa saya bgrasa hairan dan pfilek mgmikirkan sa-tgngah daripada Ahli² Yang Bgrhor-mat di sabglah sana mgmbangkang dan mgmpgrtahirkan supaya Undang² National Registration Bill ini jangan diluluskan oleh Majlis ini. Kita semua tahu baik² ia itu tiap² sa-orang yang ada mgmpunyai Kad pgnngnalan ia itu orang² yang tflah di-akul oleh P&mg-rentah negfiri ini bebas dud ok dalam Tanah Mfilayu ini. Tgtapi sa-tengah dari sa-tengah-nya pula pgluang² yang di-beri oleh Kgrajaan kapada orang² ini tidak pula di-sfimpurnakan-nya. atau di-tunaikan kgwajipan² mgnunjokkan ta'at scitia dalam nSgri ini bahkan ada pula yang k&uar dari hutan dan masok ka-dalam hutan. Selalu kita t&rbacha dalam Surat² Khabar sakian² orang mati kSna tembak. D&ngan² mgmpunyai Kad Penggnalan bgrsrta dngan nama-nya sakali, jadi dngan ada-nya Undang² itu dapat di-bezakan. Kapada penduduk² yang tSlah ada Kad Penggnalan ta' dapat tidak di-situ tgntu-lah kita tahu ada-kah orang itu orang baik atau pun orang yang tidak baik. Kita bgrharap tiap² sa-orang pgndudok di-Tanah Melayu sarna ada orang Melayu, orang China dan orang India kita berkShendakkan biar-lah dudok dalam aman dalam n^ggri ini, Dan bagi pehak Kfirajaan sfidang mSmikirkan-nya. Pada fikiran saya dengan sa-luas²-nya bSrkenaan mSngadakan Kad yang bSRchorak 3 warna itu ia-lah untuk fa'edah bagi nggeri kita ini, untuk fa'edah penduduk² nggri ini. Bag itu juga saya sa-bagaimana yang tfilah di-tSrangkan sa-orang daripada sahabat saya tadi bgrkngnan d^ngan bdrsangkutan Kad PSngSnalan bukan sahaja kapada orang MSlayu tetapi juga kapada orang China dan orang India. Di-dalam kawasan saya juga orang sudah bgrsedia m&ngambil gambar 3 kdping. Tiga k^ping untuk gambar Kad PSnggnalan baharu. BSrfirti orang ini ada-lah orang yang ta'at s tia kapada Tanah MSlayu yang tidak b&rbSlah bagi (Tepok). Jadi di-sini saya bSRpSndapat kapada pehak pSmbangkang itu kalau ta* Wrse'tuju daripada Ahli² Yang BeVhormat di-sgblah sana, saya takut²

bSrangkali ada udang di-sabalek batu, sakan sahaja yang boleh saya b&ri pandangan. Saya ucapkan t^rima kaseh.

finche¹ Mohamed bin Ujang (Jelebu-Jempol): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pagi ini kita tglah mendngar b&b6rapa hujah daripada Ahli Yang Be'rhormat dari Dato' Kramat menSrangkan dari s&gi Undang² yang Bill ini tidak s&uai dengan spirit constitution kita yang ada sSkarang ini. Pada fikiran saya Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau-lab tidak s^suai constitution itu, dan kita b&r-setuju chadangan itu baik, tambahan pula saya fikir chadangan itu baik, Ahli² Yang Berhormat di-sini tentulah bers^taju mengambil kgtetapan mgminda constitution itu bagi k&baikan kita jika mustahak.

Tuan Yang di-P&rtua, wakil dari Ipoh tadi t&lah berchakap panjang lebar mulai daripada pagi sampai pula ka-iCngah hari ini mgmpgnahkan pehak sa-bglah sana tetapi apa yang sangat muskikan sa-kali ia-lah wakil dari Ipoh itu chuba h&ndak mempe'rtahankan sa-saorang yang tidak ada ta'at setia kapada neggri ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya fikir pgrkara ini ia-lah satu pgrkara yang tidak di-ingini orang² yang mgngaku ta'at s&tia kapada nggfiri ini dan pehak di-sana harus mgn&ntang-nya dSngan sa-berapa boleh. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tgringat-lah pada masa dahulu k&te-rangan² dalam surat² k ha bar mengata-kan dalam Majlis Federal ini dahulu ada orang chuba hendak me'mpgr-ta hank an gangster dan sa-bagai-nya. Maka pada meshuarat pada hari
mi

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr, Speaker, Sir, on a point of order. I would ask the Honourable Speaker to ask the Honourable Member to withdraw his remark that somebody is championing the cause of the gangsters. If not, I would like to know who is.

Mr. Speaker: I did not hear that.

£nche* **Mohamed bin Ujang:** Tuan Yang di-Pgrtua, saya tSlah t^rbacha dalam surat khabar pada masa dahulu ada pula dalam Majlis ini

Mr. Speaker: Tolong tinggalkan-lah pSkara itu.

Enche* Mohamed bin Ujang: Ada orang dalam Majlis ini dahulu tglah mempertahankan orang yang tidak sabgnar²-nya mngaku Kerajaan di-sini. Maka pada pgtang ini saya tglah mnyaksikan pula ada sa-tengah pehak hgndak mempertahankan hak yang saya fikir tidak sa-kali² boleh dipgrtambahkan kgrana mfireka itu bukan la'at setia kapada nggri ini. Pada fikiran saya Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ta'at sStia itu ia-itu kmgggahan yang kita tglah bagi kapada mereka itu.

Bgrknaan dgngan Kad Penggualan bgrmacham warna tadi Tuan Yang di-PSrtua, saya fikir ini-lah satu jalan yang baik kgrana kalau-lah Kad Penggualan bgrupa ini untuk orang yang kurang baik dan warna ini untuk orang yang chukup baik, orang yang tidak baik itu akan bgrkhtiar dgngan sa-boleh²-nya mgminta Kad yang Igbeh baik itu. Saya rasa dgngan mnggadakan Kad Penggualan bgrmacham² warna itu tidak mgnjadikan mnggchap sa-saorang itu sampai bila² mgnjadi jahat tgtapi boleh mEnjadi satu sgmanngat dan bgrkehndak mgnjadi sa-orang yang bgrguna kapada negeii ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak lagi hSndak Wrchakap panjang me'lainkan bgrknaaan sgruan dari Ahli Bukit Kramat tadi ia-itu kita mSsti-lah tidak mnggikut party whip dan mfingikut fikiran² yang bebas. Jadi, sa-sudah saya fikirkan sa-b8nar²-nya dan sa-halus²-nya saya tfrpaksa mgnfintang pehak yang di-sab6 lah sana. tSrima kaseh.

Dato' Onn bin Jaafar: Tuan rusi, saya mfinumpang bfirtanya siapa-kah Ahli Yang Bgrhormat Bukit Kramat itu?

Mr. Speaker: Dato' Kramat. Dia kata Bukit. (*KStawa*).

Enche* Tajudin bin Ali (Larot Utara): Dato' Yang di-Pfirtua, Dato', saya bangun mnyokong Bill yang tSlah dikgmukakan oleh KSrajaan. Dato' Yang di-Pgrtua. SSmngnanjong kita ini kghil dan mgmpunya! satu Kerajaao yang tggap dan kuat. Di-keliling negeri kita pula, ada bSrmacham² nfigSri yang mSmpunya! bCrlainan ideology. Kita

hendak mgmpertahankan keamanan kita dengan mnggadakan Kad PngngJ-nalan bagi orang² yang ta'at s tia dan patoh kapada nggri ini. Maka sfbab ini-lah kita takut orang² luar masuk k- nggri ini. Dfngan ada-nya Kad Penggualan dapat-lah kita bezakan. Kalau di-tanya saya sfndiri, saya tntu bgrkata bahawa itu patut kita baharui—Kad PSnggualan tiap² lima tahun, kerana kalau di-pgrhatikan tiap² orang kita di-sini ada mmpunya! Kad Pnggualan. Dan ada sa-tgngah-nya pula la' dapat di-bacha kgrana kotor dan burok. Jadi. patut-lah sangat bagi 4-5 tahun kita baharui s- kali. Kgrajaan kita sangat² baik dgngan bangsa² asing. Chuba kita tengok Singapura, nggri jiran kita, boleh kgluar masok—ta' ada nggri didalam dunia ini yang Igbeh baik daripada Tanah Mglayu ini dgngan didiami oleh bSRbagai² bangsa kulit puteh, hitam, kuning, maka sSmua-nya itu boleh kgluar masok, tStapi orang yang dudok di-nggri ini ta' tahu mgnikmati yang Kgrajaan ini baik— Igbeh daripada baik.

Dato' Yang di-Pgrtua, ada-lah Kad² baru itu bSrmacham² chorak yang disgbutkan oleh Yang Bgrhormat wakil dari Ipoh. Ini bukan-lah bSRma'ana yang puteh di-beri kapada orang Mglayu, merah kapada orang India— tidak bagitu, bahkan sSmua bangsa sa-rupa juga. Ahli Yang BSrhorat itu baik dgngan saya, tgtapi saya ta' sStuju sedikit dSngan-nya, kSRaoa kita di-sini mgsti-lah bgrdiri sa-bagai satu bangsa Malayan.

Bgrknaan dgngan Polis pula, saya fikir kalau di-tanya fikiran saya sgndiri. saya mgsti bgri kuasa istimewa kapada Polis. Sg bab kalau orang jahat patut-lah tfrus kita hantar ka-dalam jail. Kita ta' mahu yang Kgrajaan kita tgrlalu bgrtimbang rasa sa-hinggakan ta* ada Kgrajaan yang Igbeh baik disgluroh dunia ini. Polis tSlah pun mS- chuba mgnjalankan pEntadbiran-nya yang 'adil tgtapi ta' sunyi daripada tudohan—yang itu ta* baik dan ini ta* baik, tftapi saya rasa Polis itu mgn- dapat latehan yang tgrator dan ada yang sa-tgngah-nya pula mgndapat latehan di-luar nggri. Dgngan yang

demikian mereka sangat² bertanggung-jawab. Kalau kita perhatikan negeri yang berjiran, maka tentu kita dapati bahawa kalau salah sedikit sahaja—3 bulan tfrus di-hantar masuk jail.

Dato' Yang di-Pertua, dua tahun yang lepas saya telah pun beruchap di-dalam Majlis Meshuarat negeri Perak mSnyatakan bahawa orang² yang ta' baik mahu pun Wakil Ra'ayat atau orang² awam patut kita simpan di-sabuah pulau, tetapi Kgrajaan kita terlalu bSrtimbang rasa ta' setuju dengan pgndapat saya itu. Sa-balek-nya Kerajaan adakan Kad Pengenalan yang berwarna². Yang warna coklat diberi kepada orang² yang kurang baik kelakuan-nya. Sunggoh pun di-kalangan kita banyak juga orang² yang demikian Kerajaan maseh memberi peluang kepada mreka itu ber-champor gaul dengan baik-nya dalam negeri kita ini. Dengan yang de'mikian, maka dapat-lah kita dengan pimpinan Yang Teramat Mulia Tfungku, kita boleh mernbentok satu bangsa yang berchorak Malayan yang sa-bf'nar-nya.

Tuan Syed Ja'afar bin Hasan Albar:

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada bSbeYapa fikiran dan ucapan daripada Ahli² Party Pgmbangkang tadi yang mana saya bSrasa perlu mene'gor-nya dan tidak boleh di-biarkan bexlalu bagitu sahaja. Wakil dari Ipoh dalam ucapan-nya daripada hari sa-malam lagi m mbawa-lah ka-hari ini telah mengulang² me'nye'but peYkataan Demokrasi TeYpimpin atau Guided Democracy. Kita di-dalam neggri ini tidak kSnal Guided Democracy dan kalau di-dalam nSgeri ini ada Guided Democracy, maka Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh itu tidak ada di-dalam Dewan ini.

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification. I sit here by the voice of the people and you cannot send me out of here.

The Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order. That is democracy—not guided democracy—and by that you are here (*Applause*).

Tuan Syed Ja'afar bin Hasan Albar:

Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, lagi satu

perkara yang di-ongkit²kan, di-mithal²kan, di-chontoh²kan ia-lah keadaan dan Pemerintahn negeri ini d ngan mSng-ambing perbandingan daripada KSrajaan Kuku Besi Hitler. Perbandingan ini ada-lah satu peYbandingan yang tidak bSrasas dan kalau Pgmerintahan negSri ini benar² bfirchorak Pfm6rentahan Hitler, barangkali yang mula² hndak m&rasa p6nangan-nya ia-lah Ahli Yang BSRhormat dari Ipoh dan Mfnglfmbu—nasib mereka bertuah kerana mereka mendapat KeYajaan PSrikatan yang chukup bertimbang rasa.

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise on a point of order, because the Honourable Member made a personal remark relating to me although my name was not mentioned.

Mr. Speaker: That was out of your speech.

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: It also applies to the Minister of Finance.

Tuan Syed Ja'afar bin Hasan Albar:

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, lagi satu perkara yang sangat menghairankan saya ia-lah ada di-antara Ahli² Socialist Front, juga People's Progressive Party yang beYasa terlampau berat berkenaan dgngan Undang² Dharurat. Saya hairan sunggoh kerana Ahli Yang Berhormat itu menye'butkan sambil mfingongkit² motive Kerajaan British yang mengadkan Undang² Dharurat itu. Konon-nya, untok menySkat orang ramai di-dalam negeri ini daripada mSmpe'r-juangkan kemerdekaan.

Saya berdiri di-sini, Tuan Yang di-Pf'rtua, tidak bSRhajat hendak membela dan mSmpertahankan Kf'rajaan P6n-jajah yang kita telah harabat keluar daripada n6g'gri ini, tStapi sa-perkara yang patut saya sebutkan di-dalam Dewan ini dengan tegas ia-itu walau bagaimana pun motive dari Kerajaan British berkenaan dengan Undang² Dharurat itu namun kita telah men-chapai kemerdekaan dan kedaulatan. Ini-lah yang menjadi soal. Tujuan Undang² Dharurat, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bukan untok hSndak menyekat—bukan untok hendak menyempitkan perjalanan orang yang sStia dan siuman di-dalam neggri ini, tetapi Undang² Dharurat ada-lah di-tujukan

kapada anasir², element² yang chuba hSndak meruntuhkan dan merosakkan Rfirajaan dan kSselamatan negeri ini.

Saya hajran bSnar kenapa ada diantara Ahli² P&nbangkang yang be"rasa ograt bfrkfinaa dnngan Undang² Dharurat ini, d&ngan ada-nya

Enche* Ahmad Boestamam: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya minta p njelasan.

Mr. Speaker: HSndak di-sfibtukan dibawah mana? Boleh minta kgtgrangan itu sahaja.

Mr. Tan Slew Sin: If he can't produce the point of order

Mr. Speaker: I know. Boleh menggor dua sahaja. On a point of clarification dan on a point of order.

Cache* Ahmad Boestamam: Tuan Yang di-P2rtua, saya ta' mfcnyebut perkataan order, kfirana itu bukan bahasa saya.

Mr. Speaker: Di-bawah mana?

Enche' Ahmad Boestamam: Di-bawah Pgratoran 36, soal yang kita binchangkan ia-lah soal National Registration. Yang Bgrhormat MSntSri Muda PSnfirangan kita teiah m&mbabitkan soal Dharurat—Dharurat. Kgnapa? T&tapi itu ta' bersangkutan dSngan National Registration dan National Registration sSkarang ini hSndak di-buat di-luar daripada Undang² Dharurat. Jadi, kenapa dibangkitkan.

Mr. Speaker: Saya bSnarkan ini oleh sgbab Undang² Dharurat itu telah berbangkit tgriebeh dahulu oleh pehak yang bSrchakap tadi (*Tepok*). Itu saya b narkan, jikalau dia sendiri b&rchakap salah dSngan tidak mSngikut Pfiratoran, saya sSndiri mcnahan-nya (*Tepok*).

Tuan Syed Ja'afar bin Hasan Alban Tuan Yang di-P&rtua, saya tgrpaksa m5nyfibtukan bfrkSnaan dfingan Undang² Dzarurat dan kalau Ahli Yang B&rhor- mat daripada Sfitapak m&nganggap pSrchakapan saya ini tgrkfiluar, maka mfireka-lah yang sa-b&fnar-nya kfiluar, dan saya hanya ikut dari belakang sahaja. Berkfinaa dSngan Undang² Dzarurat yang di-b&ratkan sangat, di- sungutkan sangat, di-tangis dan di-

ratapkan sangat oleh Ahli² Yang B&r- hormat daripada People's Progressive Party, Socialist Front tadi tSlah pun m5ny61amatkan nyawa bSrmilhon² manusia yang ada dalam n&geri ini dan sungguh pun Undang² Dzarurat ini ada. t tapi banyak kawasan hitam dalam nggSri ini yang tfilah mfinjadi puteh. Apa gfirangan-nya Ahli² Yang BSrhormat itu bimbangkan sangat bfrkfinaa d ngan Undang² Dzarurat ini, kalau kawasan² hitam dalam neg&ri ini sa- makin banyak, umpama-nya dahulu ada satu kampong sahaja yang hitam dan s&karang 100 kampong tetah jadt hitam, barangkali kita bgrsimpati, bSr- timbang rasa juga kapada pgnadat yang di-bawa oleh Ahli² Yang Bgr- honnat dari sa-bSlah pSmbangkang sana.

Tujuan mengadakan Bill ini dan kad² yang baharu ini ia-lah untuk memelihara dan untuk mSmbezakan ra'ayat, pgnudok² yang ada dalam ngeri. KSrana bagatmana yang kita sSndiri sSmua ketahuf, banyak tSlah bSrlaku agak-nya kCpalsuan dalam Identity Card, dan juga maseh ada orang yang mSnchuri masok ka-Tanah Melayu daripada nfigeri² yang b r- jiran, oleh kerana pantai Tanah Melayu ini dan pSrayeran-nya tSrlm- pau panjang, ta' dapat-lah hSndak di- adakan satu kawalan yang chukup rapi menahan orang² luar daripada masok ka-Tanah Melayu ini dSngan jalan haram. Ini-lah orang² yang kita h&ndak chari dan ini-lah orang² yang kita hSndak tapis dan s&kat g&frakan mgreka supaya tidak m&mbahayakan kgamanan dan kesSlamatan ne'ge'ri ini (*Tepok*).

Tuan Yang di-P6rtua, Ahli Yang B&rhormat daripada Bungsar m&ngata- kan, apakala m^ngulas b&rksnaan dfingan warna² kad tadi, ia mSminta supaya tidak akan mgrababitkan ra'ayat yang baik dan s tia. Yang sa-b&fnar- nya, Tuan Yang di-P2rtua, tujuan mngadakan kad bgrwarna², ini ia-lah untuk mgmileh antah daripada bSras. Tuan Yang di-P&rtua, saya tompang bSrasa dukachita, k&rana nampak-nya ahli² daripada Persatuan Islam sa- Tanah MSlayu atau pun PAS, ada gaya² hgndak m&mbangkang dan

sudah pun ada suara-nya tadi hendak mSminta supaya perkara ini di-tang-gohkan bila di-usulkan satu pindaan kepada usul yang ada di-hadapan kita ini. Saya b2rasa k sal dan duka-chita.....

Wan Mustapha bin Haji All: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would refer to Standing Order 35, which states that all observations should be addressed to the Chair—not to this side.

Mr. Speaker: That is a very small point.

Ioan Syed Ja'afar bin Hasan Albar: Boleh saya pandang tetapi saya hendak menerima kaseh (*Ketawa*) yang saya berasa hairan dan kesal ia-lah kgrana sa-lama ini saya telah mSn-dnggar, Tuan Yang di-Pfirtua, bahawa ugama Islam yang konon-nya di-wakili oleh Persatuan Islam ini atau pun yang rafcngaku pembela ugama itu mengata-kan bahawa ugama Islam bertSntangan dengan Komunizem. Jadi, sa-kira-nya bgnar apa yang PAS katakan itu

Mr. V. David: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about Communism but about this Bill.

Mr. Speaker: He is not touching on Communism.

Mr. David: He is referring back—he is making unwarranted references to the past.

Mr. Speaker: No, he is talking about the P.M.J.P.'s objectives.

Mr. David: There is nothing in the Bill about Communism.

Dato* Suleiman: Mr. Speaker, if you give a ruling to that point—I must point out that I myself said that I did not bring forward this Bill under the Emergency Regulations, and I repeated it just now, but the Members on the other side keep on talking about the Emergency Regulations. Now, surely, we can bring up other things which other parties bring forward.

Mr. David: On a point of information, we only said that certain aspects of the Emergency Regulations are being brought into this Bill.

Mr. Speaker: Proceed.

Tuan Syed Ja'afar bin Hasan Albar:
Tuan Yang di-Pertua

Mr. Speaker: Jangan sSbutkan fasal komunizem.

Tuan Syed Ja'afar bin Hasan Albar:
. . . yang menjadi tujuan Undang²—Rang Undang² ini ia-lah hendak mSme²li-hara negeri ini daripada gerakan² subversive. Jadi, apabila sa-buah parti yang mengaku diri-nya Parti Islam dia tidak me²nyokong Undang² atau Rang Undang² yang hSndak mSng²hambat atau hgndak menghapus gS²rakan² subversive dalam negeri ini, maka ini satu perkara yang saya ta* dapat firti dan ta' dapat fahamkan. Sa-patut-nya Rang Undang² ini di-sokong kuat bukan sahaja oleh Government bench tetapi sa-patut-nya daripada rakan² Yang Berhormat di-hadapan saya ini, Tuan Yang di-Pg²tua, terima kaseh.

fnche* Zulkiflee bin Muhammad (Ba-chok): Tuan Yang di-Pertua

Mr. Speaker: Saya nampak yang sana.

fnche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad:
Terima kaseh.

Mr. Speaker: Lain kali kalau hendak bangun, tengok-lah saya dulu.

Mr. K. Kantm Singh: Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the Honourable the Assistant Minister who spoke with such fire is not present in this Chamber at the moment

Tuan Haji Abdul Khalid: He is hearing in the Lobby.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Mr. Karam Singh: Mr. Speaker, we presume he has retreated to a safe place out of the range of fire.

Tuan Haji Abdul Khalid: Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification, he has gone to have a drink.

Mr. Karam Singh: Mr. Speaker, that Assistant Minister said he drove out colonialism from Malaya.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS : No, no!

Mr. Karam Singh: He said he is against colonialism, but to-day, Mr. Speaker, I charge the entire Alliance Government with being fully in love with colonialism, Mr. Speaker, the two

most repressive, the two most destructive instruments of colonialism: the Emergency Regulations and the British Army, are still retained by the Alliance. (HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear.) Malaya will not be free

The Prime Minister: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: as I understand it, the debate is on the second reading of the National Registration Bill. It has nothing to do with the British Army or colonialism. The matter before the House would not have taken so much time for discussion if Members had confined themselves to discussing this Bill.

finche* Ahmad Boestamam: On a point of order juga Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya rasa MSnteri Muda itu tidak sangkut-mSnyangkut dengan dasar PAS atau tujuan PAS tetapi dipanjangkan bSrkenaan itu juga. Kalau hendak di-bangkit² mfinyfintoh kasana, me'nye'ntoh ka-mari.....

Mr. Speaker: I must give a ruling on that Saya boleh bSri dia-nya perentah. Saya kata Ahli² Yang Bgrhonnat ini boleh mfimbahathkan principle—dasar Rang Undang² yang ada di-hadapan Majlis ini. Apa juga dasar bfirkait dEngan Rang Undang² ini saya boleh bfinarkan tiap² Ahli bfrchakap dalam hal itu tE tapi dia tidak boleh keluar daripada dasar-nya a. T& tapi jikalau pada sa-saorang Ahli sudah me'nye'butkan satu² pSrka atau dasar-nya dan bagi pehak Ahli yang lain boleh mSnjawab pula atas pSrka itu. Bagitu-lah biasa-nya di-jalankan di-mana- Parli- men dalam dunia ini.

Enche' Ahmad Boestamam: Ada-kah tidak soal yang di-s ntah oleh saudara dari Damansara tadi mfny2ntah apa yang di-chakapkan oleh M&nteri Muda tadi?

Mr. Speaker: Dia mSnygbutkan tSn- tang "colonialism" pgrkara ini yang di- sSntah tadi. itu yang di-tahan oleh pehak di-sabfilah sini.

Mr. Speaker: Will you confine yourself to the principles only?

Mr. Karam Singh: The Honourable Assistant Minister made certain slanders.....

Dato* Suleiman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, may I ask that the Honourable Member confine his speech to the Bill instead of answering one another.

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member must speak on the principle of the Bill, but he can answer on any matter or point raised by any other Member.

Enche' Ahmad Boestamam: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya minta Tuan Yang di-P&rtua sSkarang mgmpaskan satu ruling, kalau Majlis ini mgmbSnarkan jawab-mgnjawab, ya! mari kita jawab-me'njawab. Kalau Majlis ini hendak mgmbinchangkan Bill ini, man kita m&mbinchangkan-nya.

Mr. Speaker: Tiap² Bill bfrjalan di-Parlimen ini ada-lah dalam jagaan Tuan Yang di-PSrtua ia-itu saya s&ndiri. Saya tidak boleh mSmb^narkan Ahli² ini mSnudoh sa-saorang yang lain dan me'njawab atau pun mdng- ganggu perjalanan pSrbahathan di-atas satu² p^rkara t rhadap Majlis ini. Saya tidak boleh b narkan bagitu, jikalau b^rlaku bagitu saya s&ndiri ada berkuasa boleh menahan dan sa-hingga sampai ada kuasa boleh mfingeluarkan sa-saorang daripada Majlis ini. Adalah yang kita bahathkan di-hadapan Majlis ini ia-itu satu Rang Undang² National Registration yang di-bahathkan pada dasar-nya sahaja. Jadi saya minta-lah Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang b^rchakap dalam mSngambil bahagian dalam p&rbahathan ini supaya mSnum- pukan pSrbahathan-nya kapada dasar-nya supaya tidak lari atau t&rkfiluar daripada dasar itu. Jikalau Ahli² Yang Berhormat maseh h&ndak berchakap luar daripada dasar-nya saya akan menahan dia dan jika susah juga lagi mahu m&ngikut, saya akan perhatikan p&rbahathan ini s&rnfintara.

Mr. Karam Singh, will you confine yourself to the principles of the Bill. Do not go beyond that—we are now discussing the principles of the Bill.

Mr. Karam Singh: Mr. Speaker. I would like to point out to this House and to the entire country that in introducing this BUI the Government is following the inglorious example

of the Union of South Africa, which it only recently condemned. (Honourable Members: No, no!). In the Union of South Africa you have identity cards for people. Mr. Speaker, in Kenya the British have imposed identity cards, and the people are struggling to free themselves from that inglorious imposition on them.

These identity cards are outmoded. They are not in keeping with the spirit of independence. In this respect the past colonial practice is being followed, continued, perpetuated by the Alliance. There are Honourable Ministers on the Government Bench who preach today a doctrine regarding subversion. But, Sir, I charge to-day these preachers of this same doctrine that they themselves are committing subversion of the ordinary law of this land. They are smuggling provisions of the Emergency Regulations piecemeal into separate permanent legislation. This is an attempt that is taking place here, that is subverting the ordinary law of the land, and such being the case, the House must reject this Bill.

Sir, it is regrettable that reference has been made to America as the source of these identity cards. We hope that the American F.B.I. is not having.....

Dato' Suleiman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order: does the Honourable Member want me to lie and say that I don't know where they came from?

Mr. Speaker: It is all right, I think you can say that. You are quite in order. You are relevant.

Mr. Karam Singh: Thank you, Sir.

Sir, we do not know—the American F.B.I. may have a hand in this. (*Laughter*). This may be inspired by the strange doctrine of the late Mr. McCarthy in America. How do we know that this is not an indigenous idea, Sir. (*Laughter*).

finche' Mohamed Asri bin Haji Moda (Pasir Potefa): Tuan Yang di-Pgtrua, saya tidak-lah hSndak berchakap banyak dalam pSr kara ini, dan jangan-lah ada di-antara Ahli² yang

hadhir di-Majlis ini menyangka yang saya hndak mSmbangkan dan hSndak mfnjawab pertanyaan salah sa-orang Yang Bgrhormat Mnteri Muda tadi. Sa-bfinar-nya sa-panjang pfrbahathan ini be*rjalan, kami dari pehak Party PAS belum lagi mSnyatakan pada Yang Berhormat Menteri apa yang di-katakan sokongan pindaan, I eta pi ia-lah sa-kadar pfrbahathan bagi kali yang kedua bfrhubung dengan Bill ini.

Maka sSkarang, Tuan Yang di-Pgtrua, saya bfrdiri di-sini untuk menyampaikan sedikit pSndirian kami terhadap Bill ini. Pada dasar-nya bahawa Pendaftaran KSbangsaan itu ada-lah baik, dan ini kami teiah menimbangkan dengan chermat; disamping itu kami rngmandang apa yang telah berjalan sekarang ini, o^-ngan ada-nya Kad² chara yang biasa² ini ada-lah mengpati bagi kehndak² mengadakan PSndaftaran Ke"bangsaan itu. Kalau sa-kira-nya kita mengikut chara² ptSndaftaran daripada Bill yang di-kemukakan di-Dewan ini pada hari ini rasa-nya ada-lah mSnyusahkan kapada ra'ayat.

Kami mSmandang dari sudut ra'ayat negeri ini yang mana hendak mS-nukar satu Kad Penggnaan yang lama kepada yang baharu itu mfistilah ia menyiapkan gambar dSngan mngnySdiakan wang sa-banyak 50 sen. Walau pun ada sahabat saya Ahli YangBerhormat yang bSrchakap dahulu yang mana orang² di-kawasan dia telah bgrsedia tSrlebeh dahulu m^mbuat gambar sa-bSIum Bill ini dikSmukakan tetapi orang² di-kawasan saya khas-nya b6lum-lah b rs dia lagi bagi membuat gambar²-nya itu (*Ketawa*). Tuan Yang di-P2rtua, dalam pnggalaman saya, yang saya perhatikan sa-lama ini bahawa sa-saorang yang kShilangan satu Kad PSogSnalan, maka chukup-lah sulit hndak di-buat Kad Pengenalan yang baharu, kfrana prtama-nya duit ta' ada. Entah-lah kalau orang² di-Pantai Barat barangkali banyak duit, tStapi saya pfrchaya orang² di-Pantai Timor itu ta* ada. Jadi, apa yang kami hSndak terangkan bahawa sa-takat yang bfrjalan dgngan

Kad PSngenalani ini ya'ani yang bSr-jalan sSkarang ini, kami rasa tidak-lah mustahak bagi pindaan baharu.

Sa-pSr-kara lagi bgrhubong dSngan soal warna warni rasa-nya t&ringat juga saya h&ndak bSr-chakap di-Majlis ini ia-itu saya bukan-lah hgndak b&r-chakap atas warna merah, biru dan hijau. Tftitapi yang menarek pgrhatian saya ia-lah warna coklat. Orang² yang nanti mgndapat warna coklat itu, rasa saya p luang hidup-nya adalah tgrlalu tipis pada masa yang akan datang. Pertama sa-kali yang m&sti di-kaji ia-lah di-atas pfertimbangan dan dasar mana-kah yang tiap² sa-orang itu dapat di-hukum, sa-hingga dia itu m&ti di-b ri kad coklat.

Kedua. apabila sa-saorang itu telah m&ndapat kad coklat bagaimanakah proses bagi membolehkan dia m&ngubah kad coklat-nya kapada kad yang biasa-nya, mithal-nya warna merah atau biru. Jadi, sa-lama itu-lah jika dia tftitap m&mggang kad coklat yang ada di-tangan-nya, maka buat sa-lama itu pula p&luang bagi mfin-chari p&ek&fjaan hidup agak t&r-kandas. Maka ini-lah. Tuan Yang di-P&rtua, saya m&ngatakan bahawa kalau-lah pehak kami yang mgnyatakan pada p&Stang ini m&nbangkang Bill ini atau me'ne'ntang Bill ini bukan-lah kgrana tujuan-nya ta' baik, t&tapi maksud atau tujuan p&glaksanaan-nya itu tftitah pun s&suai d&ngan yang ada pada hari ini. Itu-lah sahaja pgn&Srgan saya, t&Srima kaseh.

Dato* Soleinui: Tuan Speaker, saya mgmbawa Rang Undang² ini bagi bacaan kali yang k&Sdua. Sa-tglah saya katakan pada pagi tadi ada-lah tujuan yang sa-bagus-nya—tujuan bagi hgndak m&Snolqng ra'ayat j&Slata—ra'ayat di-kampong yang susah kalau hfindak p&rgi ka-bandar, maka m&Sstilah ada m&mpunyai Kad P&ng&Snalan. Pada hari ini banyak Kad Penggnalan yang ada salah k&nyata'an dan oleh k&Srana t&Slah t&rbiar atau d&Sngan lain² s&Sbab maka yang s&ngan sa-kali ia-lah 'alamat-nya, tgmpat k&Iiaman yang ta' di-tukar, umur yang ta' di-tukar dan s&^rba serbi-nya. Banyak k&nyataan-nya itu—k&^nyataan yang ada

di-situ, barangkali Ahli² Yang B&R-hormat sgndiri tabu bahawa pada masa saya mgnjadi Hakim dahulu telah pun ada banyak orang² yang di-bawa ka-hadapan Magistrate—di-tudoh dan di-hukum. Dan yang susah pada hari ini ia-lah h&ndak mgmbe'tulkan bahawa banyak Kad Penggnalan PS&skutuan ini ada di-punyai oleh orang² yang duduk di-Hongkong, Indonesia, Singapura, India, Ceylon dan lain² lagi. K&Ssusahan yang besar sa-kali bagi Kad P&ng&Snalan ini, ia-lah k&Srana m&ndapat citizenship—k&Sra'ayatan dan boleh pula mgndapat passport. Barangkali kalau saya tirangan di-sini kapada Ahli² Yang B&R-hormat bahawa ada orang yang ta' ada passport yang b rani m&^mbayar sampai \$10,000 k&Srana Wrkeh&ndak kao passport dan passport itu boleh di-dapati dengan jalan ini.

Kad PSng&Snalan dan k&Sra'ayatan ini-lah yang mustahak b&Snar hfindak di-adakan bagi Undang² baharu. Pada masa saya p rgi ka-Hongkong, 'saya tahu bahawa banyak orang² di-sana ada yang m&mpunyai Kad P&nggnalan PS&rsekutuan. Di-Singapura pada hari ini, n&g&Sri Colonial Territory yang mana banyak orang² di-Singapura ada m&mpunyai kad ini. Jadi, d&Sngan s bab itu-lah kita h&ndak mgngadakan Kad PSng&Snalan baharu. Saya fikir jawapan ini t&Sntu-lah m&Sngnai s&Smua s&kali kapada Ahli² Yang Berhonnat yang b&Sr-chakap tadi. Ini ia-lah p&Sngfi-tahuan yang ada di-K&Snterian yang saya tahu, t&^tapi kalau h&ndak di-bawa ka-Mahkamah—di-tudoh bukan-nya sfinang. Sa-lain daripada itu biar saya t&Srgan kan kapada Ahli Yang B&R-hormat dari Pasir Puteh dahulu yang mana kata-nya dia b&S&S&tuju dengan tujuan Rang Undang² ini. Saya mngguchapkan b&Srbanyak t&Srima kaseh, t>api bagi menangohkan p&Srkara ini ada-kah Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Pasir Puteh itu s&Kdar bahawa jikalau di-tanggohkan sa-tahun maka b&Srapa banyak lagi k&^ra'ayatan boleh di-dapati dgngan jalan ini yang kita ta* dapat h&ndak mgmpe'rtahankan Kad PSng&Snalan yang ada pada hari ini.

PSnggtahuan yang di-beYi ini barangkali saya fikir tentu-lah Ahli Yang BSRhonnat dari Pasir Puteh tidak tabu—ini tfr'6beh ma'alom. Dan bfr-kngnaan dgngan Ahli² Yang BSRhonnat yang lain yang bSrchakap dalam bahasa Inggris tadi biar saya t&rangkan dalam bahasa Inggris.

Turning to the Honourable Member from Dato Kramat, I would refer him to Article 74 of the Malayan Constitution, which says:

"O) Without prejudice to any power to make laws conferred on it by any other Article, Parliament may make laws with respect to any of the matters enumerated in the Federal List or the Concurrent List (that is to say, the First or Third List set out in the Ninth Schedule)."

In that Ninth Schedule, First List, one of the subjects is: National Registration.

I have no intention of underrating the intelligence or the vast knowledge which Honourable Members in this House possess. That is why I began my introduction of this Bill with a very innocuous statement, a very simple statement, hoping fully well that Honourable Members would surely know that the object of these identity cards is to help the people from the rural areas.

Of course the Honourable Member from Ipoh quoted Hitler's views and so on, but I will give him the benefit of the doubt and assume that he merely wants to use his rhetoric. In any case, I gather that he objected to the colour red. Mr. Speaker, only this afternoon, coming up here, did I realise that my Honourable friend's car is red. I hope that he did not think that I suggested red because I already knew the colour of his car. I did not mean the red colour for him—it is a very nice car (*Laughter*),

With regard to the other objection put up by the Honourable Member from Ipoh, I need not reply because, as I say, though the origin of the cards might have been from the Emergency Regulations, since then it has been found from experience that these cards are of great help to the people. And if what the Honourable Member from Ipoh says is true—that the Police keep

on calling people to the Police Station—then these cards will help them immeasurably. The trouble is that, as I have found from my experience as a legal practitioner, I have to depend on these identity cards a great deal, and there are also many departments which require them,

Sir, the Honourable Member from Bungsar was carried away by his rhetoric. As a Minister, I can assure him that I am proud to have expatriate Secretaries serving under me. They are very loyal. But they have never influenced me. On the other hand, they have done their work loyally to the Government of this country, and I can assure the House that I would be the last Minister to be influenced by anybody, let alone Secretaries. Here again, the Honourable Member unfortunately hasn't got a car, but I gather his objection is only to the chocolate colour. Now, I used the word "chocolate" in Malay, but the colour actually is brown. I have been asking everybody, but there is no word in Malay for brown so it is "chocolate" (*Laughter*).

Sir, the Member for Bungsar has attributed sinister motives to me in bringing this Bill, and yet he keeps on appealing to me. I don't know what to do actually (*Laughter*). Sir, I would prefer to give him the benefit of the doubt—that he doesn't mean I have got sinister motives, but that I personally look sinister.

With regard to the remarks of the Honourable Member from Menglembu, it is not the intention of this Bill to divide people into three sections but to make the administrative work easier—all these different colours. Sir, under a law passed by Parliament, an Order can be made after an inquiry for a cross to be put on a person's identity card. Now, if at the present time a white card carries a cross, does it matter very much that it is changed to a card of a brown colour? The only thing I can say here is that I hope that the Member from Menglembu will bear kindly towards the "chocolate" colour.

On one thing I am afraid I must disagree with the Honourable Member from Menglembu, and that is when he

says that these chocolate cards, when produced in court, may influence the decisions of the judges. I have great faith in the impartiality of the judges. I hope that by that criticism the Honourable Member does not imply that judges are of so low a calibre that they can be prejudiced so easily by this.....

Mr. S. P. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, on a point of explanation, what I meant is that it is contrary to the law of evidence for a judge to know of the character of an accused person.

Dato* Suleiman: Thank you. But, Sir, as I say, that also cannot be helped under the conditions as existing in this country. I still feel that the judges in this country will not take that into account when making their decisions.

I now come, Sir, to the Honourable Member from Damansara. He has gone very far indeed—to South Africa (*Laughter*). But I understand that in Singapore they have a permanent registration system, and I also understand that they have issued permanent identity cards in Singapore. Now, when I say that, I don't mean here that we love colonialism, nor do we want to follow colonialism. What I mean is that we have found from experience that there are great uses for these cards to the people in rural areas. But if I may be -so bold as to make this remark in this very anti-colonialistic House, sometimes there may be good things that are handed over to us by colonialism. Why should we then throw these good things away? My whole idea is this: Even if there is colonialism in this country, if the spirit of the people is free, then we can fight it; but even if we have driven away colonialism, if the spirit of the people in this country is faint in the way of colonialism, then that independence is empty.

Sir, it is with that spirit that I move this Bill, and I am sorry to hear from the various parties in opposition that they attribute all the very worst motives that can be thought of to this Bill. I can assure them that there are very many good reasons for it, and even if colonialism were one of the reasons, I submit that it is not the main reason.

Mr. Lira Kean Star: On a point of information—I did not want to interrupt the Minister just now, but there is a fundamental misinterpretation of the law in his speech, and I thought I might point out the mistake. I don't think Members of this House should walk away from this Chamber with a misinterpretation of the law.

Mr. Speaker: You should have stood up just now when he made that utterance. Since he has already completed his speech, I can see no reason why I should allow you any more opportunity.

Mr. Lim Kean Siew: Under Standing Orders, Sir, on a point of information a speaker need not give way, and anyone wishing to make the point must wait until the speaker has finished. Only on a point of order can we interrupt a speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Even on a point of information or explanation, a speaker can give way.

Original question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker in *the Chair*)

Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported without amendment: read the third time and passed.

THE INCOME TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to amend the Income Tax Ordinance, 1947" be read a second time.

This Bill stems from the Government's decision, which is basic to the Budget which I presented two days ago, to expand the revenue. At least I will not weary the House by recapitulating the reasons for that decision.

nor will I waste its time—in all conscience, Honourable Members are hearing more than enough of my voice in this meeting—by shedding crocodile tears over the unpleasant tasks which are the lot of a Minister of Finance at this session.

The enactment of this Bill will mean that a single person will begin to pay income tax when his income exceeds 52,000 a year; a married person without children when it exceeds \$3,000; a married person with, for example, 2 children, when it exceeds \$4,250; and a married person with 5 or more children when it exceeds \$5,350. There are at present some 45,000 taxpayers and it is anticipated that as a result of this Bill the figure will be increased by not less than 50 per cent. The amounts of tax payable will be determined by the Schedule in Clause 3 of the Bill. The rates in that Schedule run from 6% to 45% as compared with 5% to 40% in the corresponding present Schedule. I do not wish to burden Honourable Members with too many figures, but let me take a few examples to illustrate what the Government's proposals involve for taxpayers—in this connection. Sir, I hope I will be permitted to refer more frequently to my notes because of the number of figures involved. A person with an income of \$3,000 a year is not at present taxed. He will remain untaxed if he is married or married with children. If he is single, he will pay \$60 a year or at the rate of \$5 a month out of his monthly income of \$250. An income of \$4,000 will attract tax of \$120 a year if the taxpayer is single, \$70 more than at present; a tax of \$60 if the taxpayer is married without children, whereas no tax is payable at present; and no tax if the recipient is married with children. A taxpayer with an income of \$6,000 a year will pay \$39 a year, or just over \$3 a month, if he has 5 children, as compared with nothing at present. He will pay \$190, or \$140 more than at present, if he is married without children; and \$270—per year, of course—or \$95 more than at present, if he is single. On an income of \$9,000

a year a single man will pay \$550, \$115 more than at present; a married man without children \$450, \$195 more than at present; a married man with 5 children \$242, or \$158 more than at present. It will therefore be noted from the figures I have given that the burden should be an acceptable one and that it cannot honestly be said that it is unfairly distributed or that it will cause hardship. Honourable Members will recall that in the course of my Budget Speech, I referred to the necessity to combat evasion. I wish to make it clear that this was not meant to reflect on either the competence or the integrity of the Department of Inland Revenue as a whole. One of the handicaps under which it has been labouring for some time is shortage of experienced staff. Renewed efforts will be made to overcome this difficulty, but, in the meantime, I would like to take this opportunity in this House to acknowledge the excellent work which the Department has always done and I have no doubt will continue to do in the future. (*Applause*).

Sir, I beg to move.

Tun Abdul Razak: Sir. I beg to second the motion,

Mr. Liu Yoong Peng: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Bill is the confirmation of the belief of the ra'ayat that this Government is the guardian of the rich. This taxation is imposing a heavier burden on the poor, as in the past \$3,000 a year was the lowest bracket. Now it is proposed that it should be reduced to \$2,000, and in this way we can see that the Government, in attempting to have a more balanced budget, is trying to squeeze the poorer section of the population more than it is attempting to get the revenue from the richer classes of the population, for we can see that the highest figure in the rate of taxation is 45 per cent. This is a very mild figure compared, for instance, to that imposed in Great Britain. If the Government needs more revenue, why not put up the percentage on the higher income bracket instead of having to squeeze the poor so much more. Thank you.

Mr. Yeoh T*t Beng (Braas): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose this Income Tax Bill which amends the Income Tax Ordinance of 1947, and in doing so, I do not oppose simply for the sake of opposing, but I strongly feel that my learned friend the Honourable Minister of Finance in his zest to find funds for our development schemes has resorted to the measure of introducing the Customs Duties (Amendment) (No. 6) Order, 1959, and also the introduction of this Bill now to tax directly. We have been merciless to impose duty under the Customs Ordinance yesterday and by that very measure we have indirectly taxed the consumer because, as you know, businessmen will pass the tax to the buyers. Added to this misery, a bachelor with an income of \$170 per month, or a daily wage of slightly less than \$6, or a married man without children with an income of over \$250 per month or a daily rate of \$8.33, will come within the tax net of this amended Act. Under such circumstances I would request Honourable Members of this House to ponder whether it is possible for a bachelor, who has to support his aged parents or sometimes his brothers or sisters, to live on \$6 per day, and a married man with \$8.33 per day, to support a wife and in some cases he has to support his in-laws and his aged parents. Now, here we have no relief for house keeping allowance. The only allowance that we have here is \$3,000 and the children's allowance. I therefore ask Honourable Members of this House to think carefully whether it is possible for our fellow citizens to live on so small an income. I therefore hope that the Honourable Finance Minister will not permit the allowances to be cut. However, the purpose of this Ordinance is to raise income to meet our expenditure. I may be questioned from where are we going to finance our development schemes? Well, we must have our development schemes; we must have our projects. First of all, I would support wholeheartedly the Honourable Minister's vigorous action against tax dodgers, let

us also scrutinise our expenditure as vigorous as in hauling in tax evaders and budget our revenue in a more realistic manner, i.e., by increasing the Rubber revenue under the First Schedule by \$22 million. By increasing another \$22 million, the estimate for 1960 would be \$119,500,000 as against the 1959 estimate of \$181,500,000, i.e., our estimate basing on my new figure would be \$62 million less than in 1959. And this estimate, I consider, is not excessive in view of paragraph 8 of the Honourable Finance Minister's speech on the 25th November, which reads:

"The expansionary phase of the trade cycle in the economies of the industrialised countries should continue at least until the latter part of 1960 and the prospects for a continuing firm demand for rubber and tin are good. The economic outlook for the Federation in 1960 is therefore favourable."

Therefore, I think what I suggest is not very inaccurate. However, if I am accused of endorsing the Honourable Finance Minister's optimism, my alternative suggestion would be that we finance our development schemes from new loans because, strictly speaking, the burden of capital projects should be spread over a number of years and then recouped from the Consolidated Fund by annual loan charges—because our projects are for the good of posterity and they should share the burden. The Honourable Finance Minister also said under paragraph 60 that the Federation of Malaya funded debt is only 15% per capita national income per annum basing on the period 1952/1954. I have every reason to believe that Government would give my alternative suggestion due consideration.

Mr. Tan Phock Kin (Tujons): Mr. Speaker, Sir, my opposition to this particular Bill is motivated by my feeling that this Bill is inequitable. Everybody realises that direct taxation by income tax is one of the most equitable forms of taxation, but it is based on the assumption that the basis of taxation is on a progressive scale so that you take money from those who can best afford to pay. The proposal submitted by the Honourable Minister of Finance is, in my view, a departure from this

generally accepted principle. He has, as we notice here, by reducing allowances for single and married people, included quite a lot of people who are earning barely sufficient to make ends meet into his net, as he calls it. I believe it is the policy of this Government to increase the standard of living of the people. We are trying to do what we can to help the rural people, so that the people can earn more money, but I am afraid this particular Bill is going to take away from the rural people with one hand what Government is trying to give with the other. Any person, whether he lives in the town or in the rural district, will have to pay tax—there is no differentiation as far as this Bill is concerned. So, a poor fanner who may be earning barely enough now—for example, he may be earning \$2,400 a year, which is about \$200 a month—under the present Ordinance he need not pay. But with the introduction of this Bill, he will have to pay tax, however small the amount may be. One must realise that \$10 or \$20 to a person with an income of \$200 a month is valued very much more than to a person who earns \$500. So the idea of progressive taxation is that one must, first of all, exempt people who earn barely enough; and it is my submission that the \$3,000 level under the present Ordinance for a bachelor and \$5,000 for a married couple is just sufficient for a person to live, and any amendment in that direction is a retrograde step which is turning our taxation into a retrogressive tax. When I turn round to have a look at the rates, it amuses me to find that the Honourable Finance Minister sees it fit to stop at 45 per cent. It is contrary to his idea of trying to get more money. If he is trying to get more money, why does he stop at 45 per cent for people whose earnings exceed \$55,000? He should carry on and tax the people in accordance with their income, because the more money a person earns the more he can afford to pay. A person earning \$200,000 can afford to pay as much as 75 per cent, not 45 per cent. So, I submit, Sir, that the amendment to the Income Tax Ordinance is contrary to any sense of equity. Let us have a look at this particular Bill and try to

analyse the policy of the Government. What is Government trying to do with this particular Bill on income tax? Whom are they trying to help, and from whom are they trying to get money?

From our analysis of this amendment, we find that Government is trying to grab as much money from the poor people—people earning \$200, \$300 and \$400.....

Mr. Speaker: There have been so many repetitions on that point.

Mr. Tan Phock Kin: I am trying to draw.....

Mr. Speaker: Don't do too much.

Mr. Tan Phock Kin: on this by mentioning that they are the working classes of Malaya—the working classes, whether they work in the rural areas or in the towns. And who are the people who are going to benefit from this? I submit, Sir, that they are very few, and I think there may be some good reason why the Government is endeavouring to carry out this policy of assisting the upper strata of Malayan society. Perhaps it is an election promise—I don't know—Hon'ble members will recollect that on the days prior to election, there were reports in the newspapers that various people are contributing huge sums to the Alliance—and surely this must be the group of people whom the Alliance are trying to help—people who are earning above the \$55,000 bracket and who are able to contribute figures such as that to the political fund of the Alliance Party.

So, in view of the inequity of the whole Bill, Sir, I would like to move, under Standing Order 53 (4) that the words after the word "that" be deleted and the following words substituted:

"In view of the inequitable nature of this Bill in that it spreads the incidence and increases the rates of taxation in a manner which is inconsistent with the accepted principle of relating taxation to one's ability to pay, this Bill be rejected."

Mr. V. David: Mr. Speaker, I second the motion. I reserve the right to speak at a later stage, but if there are no speakers I will speak now.

Mr. Tan Slew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I naturally ask the House to reject this amendment. A lot of play has been made of the allegation that this Bill causes undue hardship to the poor while discriminating unduly in favour of the rich and the well-to-do. Nothing, I suggest, could be further from the truth. I agree that the principal aim of the Government in bringing forward these proposals is to widen the net, so to speak, and the reasons are very simple, as an examination of a few figures will indicate. I have with me here a report of the Department of Inland Revenue giving details of assessments up to 31st December, 1958, and I believe it is the latest report available. For the period under review, the total amount of tax collected was \$142 million, leaving out the odd little thousands. Out of this \$142 million, 75 per cent approximately was paid by limited liability companies numbering 1,241, whereas the remaining 25 per cent were paid by 35,000 individuals. That, surely, does not suggest that the individual taxpayer in this country is excessively taxed.

Another point we might remember is this. There are in this country only 45,000 taxpayers, but there are 75,000 car owners. I suggest that if you are sufficiently well-off to own a car, it is surely not too much to expect you to contribute your due to the country's revenue—and it is not a very large due either at that level. In the highly industrialised countries of the West, income tax is in fact a major source of revenue, and one Honourable Member conceded that it is, by and large, an equitable form of taxation because it is based on the principle of ability to pay. Now, in the highly industrialised countries of the West, nearly everybody has to pay tax, and in fact the floor, shall we say, is much lower than the floor which would be applicable should the present proposals be approved by this House. That is the only way in which income tax can be made to yield any appreciable amount of revenue.

The other complaint is that the well-to-do or the rich have not been "soaked" enough, shall we say. Now, in the United Kingdom, which is probably one of the highest taxed countries

in the world, the company rate is only 38-3/4 per cent. In this country it is 40% -1±% more. And if the United Kingdom charges only 38½%, I suggest that 40% is surely not too low, especially when you consider that Malaya is not a highly industrialised country. Most of our revenue, as Honourable Members know, not only from income tax but most of our general revenue comes from the two main industries of rubber and tin. Now, let us look at the taxation paid by the rubber industry.

Now, a good deal of the rubber acreage in this country is in the form of limited liability companies, so by and large you can say that the rubber companies pay not only this tax of 40%, but something else. But what is that "something else"? That is export duty, and if you add export duty to Income tax, you will find, by and large, that rubber estates organised as companies pay something like 60% of their gross proceeds to Government in the form of income tax and export duty, in addition to import duties which they may have to pay on their supplies, and as a result of the motion passed yesterday, they will have to pay in future import duties on fertilisers, on sodium arsenite, and things like that. In fact, if anything, the rubber industry has a just claim for saying that it is overtaxed in the context of Malayan circumstances.

The same thing also applies to the tin industry. The tin industry, if organised as limited liability companies, pays 40% in addition to the export duty, and the two together come to more than 50% of the gross proceeds. That, Sir, I suggest is something, even when compared to the United Kingdom, which is regarded as one of the most highly industrialised countries in the world.

There is another point we should bear in mind, and that is the question of our foreign investment. As Honourable Members are aware, we have for the last two years been encouraging foreign capital to invest in this country, and, if I may humbly suggest, our

success has been little short of spectacular. Malaya to-day has a reputation which is unequalled anywhere in Asia—probably anywhere in the under-developed sections of the world (*Applause*), and that is due to our far-sighted and liberal policy in playing fair by foreign capital. But if we were to penalise foreign capital unduly and they have to operate as limited liability companies in order to get "pioneer industry" status, we will find that things will be quite different. Honourable Members on the other side will probably challenge my statement. I can give them one example. A few days ago, they will have noted that two world-famous oil companies . . .

Mr. Tan Phock Kin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker: I think the Honourable Member is irrelevant. We are discussing my amendment.

Mr. Speaker: It is quite relevant. Please proceed.

Mr. Tan Slew Sin: A few days ago, two companies of world-wide repute announced their intention to build oil refineries in this country—this country of six million people and 50,000 square miles. That, I think, is a unique tribute to the standing which this country has throughout the world (*ipplause*).

Let us remember one thing: we are trying to build not only a united but a prosperous Malaya, but that prosperity can only be achieved by a certain amount of sacrifice. I agree that this is painful. I agree these proposals will involve some sacrifice on the part of the small man. But I suggest that if we accept the sacrifice in the spirit in which the Government has put these proposals forward, the time may come one day when all of us who are citizens of Malaya will say: "I am proud to be a citizen of Malaya". (*Applause*).

Mr. V. David: Mr. Speaker, I am not debating on the Bill itself, but I am debating on the amendment, so that I will have the opportunity to speak on the Bill later.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable the Finance Minister made several

observations and defended himself in opposing the amendment proposed by my colleague. He has said that the present Bill will not bring any undue hardship to the poor people. May I call the attention of this House to the fact that the present rates imposed by the Finance Minister will definitely bring tremendous hardship on the ordinary working man of this country, if we take into consideration the average income of the working man in this country. It is merely about \$200—not 5250—per month, and out of this—the man who works in an office with \$250 a month—has so many commitments. The first thing is his house; second his clothing, and food. To take housing—the Honourable the Minister of the Interior will bear with me how low cost houses which have been built cost \$39 to \$48 per house, and a man who earns \$250 having to pay about \$48 for a house, will have to run a family with the remaining money.

Data' Suleiman: On a point of information. Sir—on low-cost housing in Penang the rent is \$15; in Johore about \$18. Not necessarily \$48.

Mr. V. David: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am referring to the Suleiman Court, Kuala Lumpur.

The Honourable the Minister of Finance has said that there are nearly 75,000 car owners to be found in Malaya. Even at \$250 per month a man can own a car, as he can get a loan from the Government which is repayable by monthly deduction from his salary, and the question of owning a car should not be the reason for he having to be imposed with a heavy tax.

The Minister of Finance has also referred to the number of people paying income tax, saying that there are only 45,000 persons who are paying income tax in this country. And as my colleague previously admitted, the only source of income is direct taxation, but when we say direct taxation we mean that it should not punch the ordinary workers below the belt—such punches should be directed on people like the Dunlop Company.

Shaw Brothers and the Cathay Organisation, but these people, I find, have been relieved to a large extent as per the proposed scheme by the Finance Minister. I do not think that they will be affected very much. The only people who are going to be affected are the working-class.

Mr. Tan Siew Sin: Sir, on a point of clarification. The Honourable Member has distorted facts. As I have tried to show, it is the big people who are paying more income tax in this country.

Mr. V. David: Sir, I cannot believe that, because there are companies in this country which are running away without having to pay tax. In the Minister's speech in connection with the Budget, he was referring to evasion of income tax. I say that evasion is not by the small men, the ordinary men, who cannot employ clerks, accountants, etc., to dodge paying income tax. Only big people are in a position to employ accountants

Mr. Speaker: We are not concerned with the evasion of income tax. We are concerned with the increased rate of taxation.

Mr. V. David: Sir, the Minister of Finance also referred to the United Kingdom, United Kingdom is an industrialised country, and when you take United Kingdom as an example, you must also consider the earnings of the ordinary worker in the United Kingdom.

You cannot compare the United Kingdom or America with the Federation of Malaya. In America there is a minimum wage—there a man is provided by law with a minimum wage which is sufficient for him and his family to lead a normally decent life in society, which we do not find in this country. So we cannot compare England or America with Malaya in respect of the wage structure.

Usually, I hear from the Government Bench about sacrifice. Every time I hear of the Government calling for sacrifices to be made, I wonder how much the Ministers are sacrificing

and how many rich people are sacrificing in this country. Sir, when you make a call on the ordinary man earning \$250 a month to make a sacrifice, why cannot we call upon the richer people, who can bear the burden, to make more sacrifices? I think that there is a lot of people in this country who are in a better position to make sacrifices than the ordinary working people.

Now, in regard to foreign capital, we appreciate that Malaya should be industrialised. But when we invite foreign capital, we should see that the foreign capital is not detrimental to the interests of local capital. I read a few days back in the newspapers that a Japanese shoe factory is going to be established in Malaya. By allowing that shoe factory from Japan to be set up here, it is going to affect the local shoe industry. There are hundreds of shoe factories in this country which are going to be affected by this. So the principle is that while we appreciate foreign investment in this country, we must not tolerate investments which are detrimental to local capital. I say, Sir, that by allowing foreign investments from other countries, which will affect local industries, I do not think that Malaya will prosper economically.

Mr. Speaker: That is not quite relevant.

Mr. V. David; I am only making observations. Mr. Speaker, Sir, yesterday we were hearing speeches—and so many things were mentioned—about local industries and local products. But here the emphasis is on foreign investment in this country which is really driving me to conclude that the Ministers are conflicting and inconsistent in their policies.

Sir, when we talk about prosperity in Malaya, to obtain prosperity we will have to go a long way to reach that goal. And it should not be our aim and object to penalise the ordinary working class of this country. There are people in a better position whom we can penalise and they will not be over-burdened.

To-day in Malaya there are so many concerns in respect of which the ceiling of the tax could be raised. Now, I find here that the ceiling is only 45%—that can be raised to 80% or even 90%. It is quite all right, because I feel that those people who are drawing more than what is prescribed here can bear the burden—they will have to forgo luxurious items not the essentials, as in the case of a man drawing \$250 a month to comply with this has to forgo some essential requirements of life—food, and clothes. I repeat that those who are going to draw more than \$60,000 a year, there is no essentiality involved—merely luxuries, and I think luxuries can be penalised.

I wonder, Sir, why the Honourable the Minister of Finance has been so sympathetic with that group of people—may be it is for the reason that financial aid could be obtained from time to time for elections? I will not say anything further on this.

Mr. Speaker: You cannot. It is not relevant.

Mr. V. David: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would request that the Honourable Minister reconsider this Bill in view of the observations I have made. I strongly deplore this Bill as I feel that it is aimed to penalise the ordinary working class of this country, who are already finding it difficult to make both ends meet.

Therefore, in conclusion. Sir, I request once again this House to give serious consideration to this amendment. If this amendment is accepted, then there will be relief for the ordinary wage earner of this country.

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, from the day this proposal was mentioned in this House and this Bill was published, it has been said that this is a Bill which soaks the poor to protect the rich. After hearing the Honourable the Minister of Finance, I have no doubt whatsoever that it was conceived in that manner and presented to this House with that very objective. I say that because in

a certain speech very significant things were said.

Reference was made to 75,000 car owners but only 45,000 taxpayers in this country. Reference was also made to companies established here; and justifying the failure to increase the tax on companies in this country, the Honourable Minister has said that the companies have to pay export tax, import tax, they have to pay this and that. What about car owners? Don't they pay road tax; don't they pay driving licence fees; don't they have to pay tax on tyres for their cars and petrol for their cars? It is significant that the Honourable Minister should have given the reasons at great length—at great pains too—as to why company tax should not be raised—he has gone to great pains to justify the failure to raise company tax. In the case of the 75,000 car owners, they pay taxes too and they have to pay income tax.

Mr. Tan Slew Sin: Sir, on a point of information, I was referring to direct taxation. Export duty is direct taxation; import duty is indirect taxation which everybody pays.

Mr. D. R. Seenivasagam: Direct or indirect taxation, it comes out of the pocket. I thought it strange, very strange, that in one case an attempt to justify it was made, while in another case a blank statement was made.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the suspicions or fears of the people, if you read the responsible newspapers this morning, that it is the case of taxing the poor and protecting the rich, is confirmed by the speech of the Honourable the Minister of Finance. He has said that the people must make sacrifices for a united and prosperous nation. Whom are we calling on to make the sacrifice—the rich man? He is not sacrificing anything more than what he has been doing in the past—if at all very little. As has been suggested by previous speakers, taxation on the rich could have gone up, company tax could have gone up. Why broaden the base? What we complain of—even if we have not much to complain of on

the increase in the percentage of the tax—is that we have a justifiable case to complain about in respect of the broadening of the base. What is the need to broaden the base? What is the need to squeeze every ounce from the poor men in this country today? Is that the way a Government should carry on? Is that the form, the manner, in which the country can progress to prosperity? Is that the way a poor Government servant should be allowed to live in this country? Is that the way a small trader should be allowed to live, making it almost impossible for him to live from hand to mouth? Had anyone thought of the effects, even on the Government servants of this country? Would you not throw wide open the door to corruption in this land? Will people not try to pick up or make a few dollars, so that they can live without paying tax on that corrupt money? How do you expect them to live without being corrupted, if you are trying to take away their meagre subsistence? For that reason, I support the proposed amendment wholeheartedly.

Mr. Lim Kean Slew: Mr. Speaker, Sir, there has been a lot of eloquence over very few principles. Therefore, I shall not dwell too much on these things such as soaking the poor to protect the rich and so on. However, I want to bring out two points.

There is a lot of talk about broadening the base. There are two ways of broadening the base: one is to reach down and down, lower and lower to the lower income groups; and the other is to bring the lower income group up and up to the higher income group, so that more people will earn more money and therefore will pay more tax. In this Bill it is broadening the base by making more and more poor people to pay more tax—not that of bringing more and more people into the higher income group to pay more tax. Therefore that argument is not logical.

Another point is that, according to the Honourable the Minister of Finance, in the United Kingdom

companies pay more tax; but in the U.K. we also know that some people pay 19s. 6d. in the pound, which is over 90 per cent of their income. Therefore, this ceiling of 45 per cent is not really very high. It is only half of that in the United Kingdom.

Dr. Lim Swee Aon (Lanrt Selatan): Sir, on a point of clarification, may we know in the United Kingdom 19s. 6d. is paid at what level of income?

Mr. Lim Kean Siew: According to U.K. money I believe it is £5,000 a month, that is £60,000 a year—according to our money, it is \$45,000 a month—but our rate of income is less. (*Interruption*). It is the question of the principle of the limit. And, of course, if I am to be interrupted on rates of income, then I have to say that the workers in England earn 10 times as much as the workers in Malaya. A driver of a motor vehicle may earn £12 a week which is over a hundred dollars a week, or \$500 a month, compared with the \$40-60 a month which a Malay fisherman earns in Beserah, according to Ungku Aziz's statistics.

Now, let us proceed to another point. It has been ruled by the Speaker that it is relevant to talk of tax free pioneer industries in Malaya. We were given two examples by the Honourable the Minister of Finance of two oil refineries coming here to set up tax free industries. However, we must not forget two other points relating to this. There is at present in Malaya no means of stopping or preventing profit from being taken away from Malaya. Therefore, you can set up a big company here, make profit, send it out to India—any person can make a lot of profit and send it out to India—and from India apply to Malaya for a tax free pioneer industry. Then the Government will say "If you are bringing money from abroad to Malaya, we will give you 5 years of tax free period." So the profit one makes here, and which is sent out to India, is sent back again to Malaya to make more profit which in turn will again be sent back to India in order to be sent back again to Malaya to open a further new pioneer industry.

Profit exported is profit loss. Profit invested is turned into capital. Therefore when we talk of these people who have faith in Malaya and are investing in Malaya—in fact according to the Honourable the Minister of Finance, we are the most stable Government in South-east Asia

Entire* Tajndin bin Haji Ali: Sir, on a point of clarification. What I want to say is this: most of the companies that are applying for pioneer industry status, before we grant that status to them, we always make them to conform to our rules and regulations by which 50 per cent of the shares must be held by local people, not entirely by aliens.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: No.

Mr. Speaker: That is entirely irrelevant. Proceed.

Mr. Lim Kean Slew: Therefore, when we say that we are a stable country and people are investing in Malaya because they have confidence in us, it may not be true and might in fact mean something else—that it is not that people have confidence in us but that people feel that they can make more money here, but pay less tax and that they can send profits earned abroad. Therefore, as all business people want to make profit, wherever they can make more money they will invest in that particular country. So the Honourable the Minister of Finance, perhaps, would like to clarify that point. I would like to say, Sir, that this Bill is really inequitable because there is a big leakage of profit from one source of revenue that is not being touched. I say this: if you want to fill your rice bag, you must first make certain that there are no holes in the bag. Because if you put in your rice and there are holes in the bag, the rice will run out of the bag, so that your bag will be forever empty and the Minister of Finance will have to continue to increase the income tax.

Question, That the words proposed to be left out be left out of the Question, put, and negatived.

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. Chra See Yin: Sir, the Honourable the Finance Minister has reduced the personal allowances of a married

man from \$5,000 to \$3,000 and he has also reduced the children's allowance of \$200 for each child by limiting the number to five only which means I presume that the remaining four have got to be cast away somewhere. Now in doing so the Honourable the Finance Minister has brought into this group of tax payers a larger field than 45,000—as he has said that there will be an increase of 50 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, you will appreciate, when comparing the present rate with the proposed new rate, you will find that a person having an income of \$4,500, which carries a taxation of 5 per cent, will have to pay only \$75; but now with this reduction in allowances from \$5,000 to \$3,000 he will have to pay at the new rate \$150. An increase from \$75 in the old rate to \$150 in the new rate is really an increase of 100 per cent. Again, Sir, you will see that where a person who has an income of \$7,000—now he is allowed to deduct \$5,000 and he will have to pay \$75 + 30 that is \$105 under the old rate—at the new rate he will have to pay something like \$290. Thus, Sir, you will see that this increase has brought in a large group of taxpayers, who are from the lower income group. Sir, it can be seen that from this new taxation, we are going to get in 1960—according to the Minister's estimate—an additional sum of something like \$14 million. And from this \$14 million. Sir, if you work it out on the old rate and the new rate, you will find that about \$11.2 million will be tax from the lower income group. This taxation, as it is such an increase from the lower income group, will have to be given consideration, particularly in view of the fact that we have passed the Customs Bill yesterday, from which we will get an estimated revenue of \$29 million from duty on diesel oil. Incidentally, this duty on diesel oil for the time being will affect the bus companies, the Railway, the C.E.B., the mining industry and the fishing industry; how long can they bear this burden? Eventually, I am sure they will have to find a way to get it from

the lower income group. Therefore, Sir, you will see the danger that this is going to create, because under this new group of taxation you are going to take it out from the lower income group and they in turn will be forced to ask their employers to pay them more. Sir, to get this additional revenue, which will be from the lower income group mainly, you will appreciate what the Honourable Minister of Finance has said—the Government will have got to use more men; and it will cost more money. I suggest that it would be easier if he were to take this extra money, so necessarily required for future development and for progress, from the higher income group; and how to get that, my Honourable friend from Bruas has given a suggestion which, I think, is more appropriate than what we are proposing just now.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah (Kofa Bharo HUir): Tuan Yang dipertua, saya mngbangkangkan chadangan ia-itu hgndak mgnurun atau mngurangkan daripada \$3,000 kepada \$2,000 sa-bagaimana rakan² saya yang lain t&lah mgn&rangkan bahawa yang kgna berat di-dalam income tax ini ialah orang di-lapisan yang di-bawah, orang yang churaa mSndapat income atau p&ndapatan yang sedikit dalam kawasan \$2,000. TStapi saya sokong direct taxation, kSrana di-dalam direct taxation ini tax payer ta* boleh melarikan diri ya'ani ta¹ boleh ditanggohkan kepada consumer, ini saya mngyokong. TStapi yang saya bangkang income tax ini ia-lah kSrana orang yang di-dalam lower income group ini-lah orang yang susah, mereka mempunyai standard of living yang sangat rfindah, sa-kira-nya kita chukai dan kurangkan daripada \$3,000 ini m&njadi \$2,000 maka di-sana pfrkara ini akan mSrosakkan atau miniburokkan standard of living atau taraf k&hidupan mSreka. Oleh yang d&mikian, di-England sa-bagaimana yang tfilah di-tSrangkan oleh saudara kita tadi mfingatakan bahawa di-England sana orang yang di-dalam higher income group ada-lah taxation-nya sampai 75 pS ratus, wal-hal kita di-sini

chuma 45 pS ratus sahaja; ini ia-lah Wrm'ana bahawa Bill ini hfindak mfc-nolong orang yang kaya. tStapi kfcbfcratan atau burden of taxation ini jatuh bfirat-nya ISbeh lagi kepada orang yang mfndapat pgndapatan yang rgndah (lower income group).

Kalau sa-kira-nya Kgrajaan hfodak mSnchari wang supaya dapat dijalankan project² dan development² sgkim yang banyak, maka ini-lah masa-nya bagi KSrajaan untuk milfi-behkan chukai yang 45 pS ratus tadi sampai 50, 60 atau 70 pgratus. KSrana orang yang di-dalam higher income group ini m&reka itu hidup dalam kSs&nangan yang sangat, kuching m&reka itu pun di-bSri makanan yang orang kampung kita tidak dapat m&makan-nya.

Maka di-sini mSngikut democracy, maka hgndak-lah incident of taxation itu mfsti jatuh ISbeh sedikit atau l&beb ringan kepada orang yang susah m&nggong-nya (miskin), tftapi s&karang ini apabila kita kurangkan daripada \$3,000 hingga sampai \$2,000, maka di-sana sampai-lah had atau limit yang di-namakan taxable capacity dan sudah mele'behi taxable capacity bagi orang yang di-dalam lower income group.

Oleh yang dSmikian itu-lah s&bab-nya saya m&mbangkang untok mfingurangkan pgndapatan yang \$3,000 itu mgnjadi \$2,000 dan saya chadangkan supaya income tax yang 45 p&ratus itu di-angkat sa-hingga m&njadi 75 peratus.

Mr. Kang Kok Seng (Batu Fahat): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to support the Income Tax (Amendment) Bill strongly, because we who live in this country enjoy a stable Government because of taxation. When we come to other arguments or other views we talk of democracy, we talk of protection of human rights under the United Nations Charter, etc. but when we come to taxation. Sir, we try to differentiate between the business people and the average man. In my opinion, Sir, I think we who ask for everything to be provided, should also try and contribute back in a small way. I know that my few words here this evening will be

disadvantageous to me in my political career, but what I am here today is not to express the feelings of the rich but also the feelings of the poor. I am the representative of the people in Batu Pahat; therefore, I speak on behalf of the rich and the poor. Our Opposition Members here champion, or they profess to champion, for the benefit of the poor, but they forget that it is the business people in this country who put up most of the capital for investment in estates and various other businesses. They contribute the greater part of the revenue, and I think it is only fair that we should accept them as human beings. Besides the business people take risks in carrying out their business activities.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*).

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive ordered to stand part of the BUI.

Bill reported without amendment: read the third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Speaker: As it is now past 4.30 p.m., I shall call upon the Prime Minister to move the adjournment.

The Prime Minister: I beg to move that the House do now adjourn,

Ton Abdul Razak: I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT SPEECH

FRENCH ATOMIC TESTS IN THE SAHARA

Mr. Speaker: Honourable Members, I shall now call upon Mr. Karam Singh to make his adjournment speech.

Mr. K. Karam Singh: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the subject on which I wish to speak at this adjournment to-day is the proposed holding of atomic tests by the French Government on African territory.

Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying for us to note that after I have sent in this topic as an adjournment speech, our country has voted against the holding of these proposed tests in the Sahara desert. But, Mr. Speaker, we must go further and add not only our vote but also our voice; we must join world opinion to condemn the holding of atomic tests on another people's continent. The effect of these atomic tests in the Sahara would be to poison the African continent, perhaps to deform the unborn generations that will rise in a free and independent Africa. We would ask the French colonial powers, at this parting of ways of colonialism in Africa, not to deal any parting blows to the people of Africa. Within the next few years the people of Africa will take then- rightful places in the United Nations, and to-day, Sir, we have the great example of Mr. Sekou Toure of Guinea adding the voice of Africa in the councils of the world.

Mr. Speaker, we must arouse the public opinion of our country to the danger of holding these proposed tests so that to-morrow our own public opinion may react against war-like tests being held anywhere. By doing this, we would be strengthening the cause of world peace and the public opinion that would have been informed against these nuclear tests would remain as a lasting pillar of world peace,

Mr. Speaker, whatever may be the ideological conflict in this world, there is one issue that is above ideologies and that is the issue of peace; and it would be a great contribution of Malaya to the world if she can consciously and consistently propagate, where she is able, against the holding of these proposed tests. Thank you, Sir.

Tun Abdul Razak: Mr. Speaker, Sir, as the Honourable Member himself has admitted that Government has already played its part in the United Nations by voting against the holding of these

atomic tests, perhaps there is no need for me to reply. But I should like to explain that on the 12th of November, 1959, the first meeting of the United Nations General Assembly adopted a 22-power resolution calling upon France to refrain from carrying out the proposed nuclear tests in the Sahara and the Federation of Malaya was one of the Co-sponsors of the resolution. Subsequent to that, another resolution

was placed before the General Assembly and our country voted in favour of the resolution. So, Sir, we have definitely played our part in endeavouring to stop these tests. (*Applause*).

Mr. Speaker: Honourable Members, the House is adjourned to 10.00 a.m. to-morrow, 28th November, 1959.

Adjourned at 6.26 p.m.