



PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

DEWAN RA'AYAT (HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES) OFFICIAL REPORT

CONTENTS

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY Mr. SPEAKER:

The Yang di-Pertuan Agong's Reply to Addresses [Col. 1039]

Reply from D. Y. M. M. Tengku Kurshiah, Tengku Puan Besar to message of Condolence [Col. 1041]

Message from the Senate [Col. 1042]

Assent to Bills Passed [Col. 1043]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 1043]

STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER (Action taken on the subject of Apartheid in South Africa at the Conference of Commonwealth Prime Ministers) [Col. 1058]

BILL—

The Income Tax (Amendment) Bill [Col. 1073]

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 1131]

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

Official Report

Second Session of the First Dewan Ra'ayat

Monday, 20th June, 1960

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

PRESENT:

- The Honourable Mr. Speaker, DATO' HAJI MOHAMED NOAH BIN OMAR, S.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 External Affairs, DATO' DR. ISMAIL BIN DATO' ABDUL RAHMAN, P.M.N. (Johore Timor).
- „ the Minister of Finance, ENCHE' 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 and Co-operatives, 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 Commerce and Industry, ENCHE' MOHAMED KHIR BIN JOHARI (Kedah Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Education, ENCHE' ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAJI TALIB (Kuantan).
- „ TUAN SYED JA'AFAR BIN HASAN ALBAR, J.M.N., Assistant Minister (Johore Tenggara).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL HAMID KHAN BIN HAJI SAKHAWAT ALI KHAN, J.M.N., J.P., Assistant Minister (Batang Padang).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDUL KHALID BIN AWANG OSMAN, Assistant Minister (Kota Star Utara).
- „ ENCHE' CHEAH THEAM SWEE, Assistant Minister (Bukit Bintang).
- „ ENCHE' V. MANICKAVASAGAM, J.M.N., P.J.K., Assistant Minister (Klang).

The Honourable ENCHE' MOHAMED ISMAIL BIN MOHAMED YUSOF, Assistant Minister (Jerei).

- „ 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).
- „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN ABDULLAH (Kota Bharu Hilir).
- „ ENCHE' AHMAD BIN ARSHAD, A.M.N. (Muar Utara).
- „ ENCHE' AHMAD BOESTAMAM (Setapak).
- „ ENCHE' AHMAD BIN MOHAMED SHAH, S.M.J. (Johore Bharu Barat).
- „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN SAAID (Seberang Utara).
- „ ENCHE' AHMAD BIN HAJI YUSOF, P.J.K. (Krian Darat).
- „ TUAN HAJI AZAHARI BIN HAJI IBRAHIM (Kubang Pasu Barat).
- „ ENCHE' AZIZ BIN ISHAK (MUAR Dalam).
- „ DR. BURHANUDDIN BIN MOHD. NOOR (Besut).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN CHONG WEN (Kluang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN SIANG SUN (Bentong).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN SWEE HO (Ulu Kinta).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN YOON ONN (Kampar).
- „ ENCHE' CHIN SEE YIN (Seremban Timor).
- „ ENCHE' V. DAVID (Bungsar).
- „ DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI HASHIM, P.M.N. (Jitra-Padang Terap).
- „ ENCHE' GEH CHONG KEAT (Penang Utara).
- „ ENCHE' HAMZAH BIN ALANG, A.M.N. (Kapar).
- „ ENCHE' HANAFI BIN MOHD. YUNUS, A.M.N. (Kulim Utara).
- „ ENCHE' HARUN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Baling).
- „ ENCHE' HARUN BIN PILUS (Trengganu Tengah).
- „ TUAN HAJI HASAN ADLI BIN HAJI ARSHAD (Kuala Trengganu Utara).
- „ TUAN HAJI HASSAN BIN HAJI AHMAD (Tumpat).
- „ ENCHE' HASSAN BIN MANSOR (Malacca Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN TO' MUDA HASSAN (Raub).
- „ TUAN HAJI HUSSAIN RAHIMI BIN HAJI SAMAN (Kota Bharu Hulu).
- „ ENCHE' IBRAHIM BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Seberang Tengah).
- „ ENCHE' ISMAIL BIN IDRIS (Penang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' KANG KOCK SENG (Batu Pahat).
- „ ENCHE' K. KARAM SINGH (Damansara).
- „ ENCHE' KHONG KOK YAT (Batu Gajah).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SECK FUN (Tanjong Malim).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SIOK YEW (Sepang).
- „ ENCHE' LIM JOO KONG (Alor Star).

The Honourable ENCHE' LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).

- „ DR. LIM SWEE AUN, J.P. (Larut Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' LIU YOONG PENG (Rawang).
- „ 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).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED NOR BIN MOHD. DAHAN (Ulu Perak).
- „ DATO' MOHAMED HANIFAH BIN HAJI ABDUL GHANI, P.J.K. (Pasir Mas Hulu).
- „ 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).
- „ ENCHE' NG ANN TECK (Batu).
- „ DATO' ONN BIN JA'AFAR, D.K., D.P.M.J. (Kuala Trengganu Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Tanah Merah).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Perlis Utara).
- „ ENCHE' QUEK KAI DONG (Seremban Barat).
- „ TUAN HAJI REDZA BIN HAJI MOHD. SAID (Rembau-Tampin).
- „ ENCHE' SEAH TENG NGIAB (Muar Pantai).
- „ ENCHE' D. R. SEENIVASAGAM (Ipoh).
- „ ENCHE' S. P. SEENIVASAGAM (Menglembu).
- „ TUAN SYED ESA BIN ALWEE, S.M.J., P.I.S. (Batu Pahat Dalam).
- „ TUAN SYED HASHIM BIN SYED AJAM, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Sabak Bernam).
- „ ENCHE' TAJUDIN BIN ALI, P.J.K. (Larut Utara).
- „ ENCHE' TAN CHENG BEE, J.P. (Bagan).
- „ ENCHE' TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Malacca).
- „ ENCHE' TAN PHOCK KIN (Tanjong).
- „ ENCHE' TAN TYE CHEK (Kulim-Bandar Bahru).
- „ TENGKU INDRA PETRA IBNI SULTAN IBRAHIM, J.M.N. (Ulu Kelantan).
- „ DATO' TEOH CHZE CHONG, D.P.M.J., J.P. (Segamat Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' V. VEERAPPEN, (Seberang Selatan).
- „ WAN SULAIMAN BIN WAN TAM (Kota Star Selatan).
- „ WAN YAHYA BIN HAJI WAN MOHAMED, P.J.K. (Kemaman).
- „ ENCHE' WOO SAIK HONG, J.P. (Telok Anson).
- „ ENCHE' YAHYA BIN HAJI AHMAD (Bagan Datoh).
- „ ENCHE' YEOH TAT BENG (Bruas).
- „ ENCHE' YONG WOO MING (Sitiawan).
- „ PUAN HAJJAH ZAIN BINTI SULAIMAN, J.M.N., P.I.S. (Pontian Selatan).

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

„ ENCHE' ZULKIFLEE BIN MOHAMMAD (Bachok).

ABSENT:

The Honourable the Minister of Labour ENCHE' BAHAMAN BIN SAMSUDIN (Kuala Pilah).

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

„ CHE' KHADIJAH BINTI MOHD. SIDEK (Dungun).

„ ENCHE' LEE SAN CHOON (Kluang Utara).

„ ENCHE' T. MAHIMA SINGH, J.P. (Port Dickson).

„ WAN MUSTAPHA BIN HAJI ALI (Kelantan Hilir).

IN ATTENDANCE:

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

PRAYERS

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

The following Member made and subscribed the Affirmation required by Law:

Enche' Chan Yoon Onn, for Kampar.

Wa ba'adah, ehwal Beta ma'alumkan bahawa warkah Dato' itu telah selamatlah Beta terima, Beta mengucapkan terima kaseh banyak² kepada Dato' dan sekalian Ahli Dewan Ra'ayat kerana sembah tahniah yang ikhlas di atas perlantekan Beta menjadi Yang di-Pertuan Agong Persekutuan Tanah Melayu dan amat-lah sukachita Beta di atas ikrar ta'at setia Dato' dan sekalian Ahli Dewan Ra'ayat kepada Beta.

Termaktub di-Istana Negara, pada 19 haribulan May tahun 1960."

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. Speaker:

THE YANG DI-PERTUAN AGONG'S REPLY TO ADDRESSES

Ahli² Yang Berhormat, saya telah menerima satu perutusan yang bertarikh 19 haribulan May, 1960 daripada Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong, demikian bunyi-nya:

"Warakatul-ikhlas daripada Beta Sultan Hishamuddin Alam Shah ibni Almarhum Sultan Ala-iddin Sulaiman Shah, Yang di-Pertuan Agong, Persekutuan Tanah Melayu.

Mudah-mudahan barang di-wasalkan oleh rabbul 'alamin ka-majlis Yang Berhormat Dato' Haji Mohamed Noah bin Omar, Yang di-Pertua Dewan Ra'ayat, Persekutuan Tanah Melayu.

Ahli² Yang Berhormat, saya telah menerima satu perutusan lagi daripada Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong yang bertarikh 17 haribulan June, 1960 demikian bunyi-nya:

"Warakatul-ikhlas daripada Beta Sultan Hishamuddin Alam Shah ibni Almarhum Sultan Ala-iddin Sulaiman Shah, Yang di-Pertuan Agong, Persekutuan Tanah Melayu.

Mudah-mudahan barang di-wasalkan oleh Tohan seru sekalian alam kamajlis Yang Berhormat Dato' Haji Mohamed Noah bin Omar, Yang di-Pertua Dewan Ra'ayat, Persekutuan Tanah Melayu, dengan beberapa selamat kesejahteraan-nya.

Wa ba'adah, ehwal Beta ma'alumkan ia-itu Beta telah menerima dengan

sukachita-nya sembah kebaktian ta'at setia yang di-nyatakan di-dalam warkah menyembah terima kaseh Dato' Ahli² Dewan Ra'ayat di-atas Titah ucapan yang telah Beta lafadzkan di-dalam istiadat pembukaan Penggal Kedua Persidangan Parlimen itu.

Demikian-lah sahaja Beta ma'alumkan, ada-nya.

Termaktub pada 17 hari-bulan June tahun 1960."

REPLY FROM D.Y.M.M. TENGKU KURSHIAH, TENGKU PUAN BESAR, TO MESSAGE OF CONDOLENCE

Ahli² Yang Berhormat, saya telah menerima sa-puchok surat yang bertarikh 31 haribulan May, 1960 daripada Yang Maha Mulia Tunku Kurshiah, Tunku Puan Besar, demikianlah bunyi-nya :

"Ka-majlis Yang Berhormat Dato' Haji Mohamed Noah bin Omar, Yang di-Pertua Dewan Ra'ayat, Persekutuan Tanah Melayu yang ada pada masa ini di-Jabatan Parlimen, Kuala Lumpur, ada-lah dengan beberapa selamat dan kesejahteraan-nya.

Ehwal saya ma'alumkan, surat Dato' kapada saya sa-bagai Yang di-Pertua Dewan Ra'ayat Persekutuan Tanah Melayu yang bertarikh pada 14 haribulan May, 1960 peri ia-itu Majlis Dewan Ra'ayat menguchapkan perasaan kesedehan di-atas kemangkatan Almarhum Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda serta juga mendo'akan moga² di-chuchori rahmat di-atas roh Almarhum Seri Paduka Baginda itu telah selamat-lah saya terima dengan sempurna-nya.

Maka ini-lah saya ma'alumkan, bahawa saya menguchapkan beranyak² terima kaseh kapada Dato' dan juga Majlis Dewan Ra'ayat di-atas ingatan dan kenang²an muhibbah yang tulus ikhlas itu.

Hal demikian-lah saya ma'alumkan di-sudahi dengan ingatan selamat jua ada-nya.

Tertulis di-Istana Hinggap Seremban, pada 31 hari-bulan May, 1960."

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Honourable Members, I have received a message dated 11th May, 1960, from the President of the Senate relating to certain Bills submitted by this House for the concurrence of the other House. I will now direct the Clerk to read the message to the House.

(The Clerk reads the message).

"Mr. Speaker,

The Senate has agreed to the following Bills, without amendment :

- (1) A Bill to amend the Service Commissions Ordinance, 1957,
- (2) A Bill to amend the Constitution of the Federation,
- (3) A Bill for the purpose of ensuring uniformity of law and policy in respect of local government elections throughout the Federation and for matters incidental thereto,
- (4) A Bill to amend the Employees Provident Fund Ordinance, 1951,
- (5) A Bill for the purpose of ensuring uniformity of law and policy in respect of the establishment of group settlement areas and the conditions of alienation and occupation of land in such areas and for other matters incidental thereto,
- (6) A Bill to amend the Notaries Public Ordinance, 1959,
- (7) A Bill to apply a sum out of the Consolidated Fund for additional expenditure for the service of the year 1960, to appropriate such a sum for certain purposes and to provide for the replacement of amounts advanced from the Contingencies Fund,
- (8) A Bill to provide for the issue and management by the Central Bank of Malaya of loans raised under the provisions of certain laws.

(Sd.) Dato' Haji Abdul Rahman bin Mohd. Yasin."

ASSENT TO BILLS PASSED

Honourable Members, I wish to inform the House that His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong has on the 26th May, 1960, signified his assent to the following Bills which were passed recently by both Houses of Parliament:

The Service Commissions (Amendment) Bill, 1960.

The Constitution (Amendment) Bill 1960.

The Local Government Elections Bill, 1960.

The Employees Provident Fund (Amendment) Bill, 1960.

The Land (Group Settlement Areas) Bill, 1960.

The Notaries Public (Amendment) Bill, 1960.

The Supplementary Supply (1960) Bill, 1960.

The Loans (Central Bank of Malaya) Bill, 1960.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Pilgrimage to Mecca—Financial Assistance for Government Officers

1. Tuan Syed Esa bin Alwee minta kepada Perdana Menteri menerangkan ia-itu oleh sebab ugama Islam ugama resmi dalam Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini, ada-kah Kerajaan berchadang hendak menurut langkah yang telah di-ambil oleh Kerajaan Johor ia-itu memberi pertolongan kepada pegawai² Kerajaan menyempurnakan fardzu haji dengan syarat² yang tertentu,

The Prime Minister: Dato' Yang di-Pertua, berkenaan dengan soal ini, saya suka memberi tahu bahawa pada masa sekarang ini Kerajaan benarkan berchuti sa-lama 6 bulan untuk pegawai² Kerajaan pergi ka-Mekah di-bawah General Orders. Tetapi berkenaan dengan soal ada-kah chadangan kita ini hendak menurut apa yang di-buat di-Johor itu, saya suka memberi tahu, perkara ini dalam timbangan kerana wang berkenaan dengan menghantar pegawai² Kerajaan pergi ka-Mekah itu ada-lah banyak sangat.

Subscriptions for National Mosque

2. Tuan Syed Esa bin Alwee minta kepada Perdana Menteri menerangkan berapa banyak wang telah di-pungut daripada tiap² negeri hingga masa ini kerana mendirikan Mesjid Negara, dan berapa lama lagi pungutan itu di-jalankan.

The Prime Minister: Dato' Yang di-Pertua, kutipan sekarang ini daripada orang ramai ia-itu daripada Johor \$15,980.40. Daripada Kedah \$37,637.97 dan daripada Selangor \$24,643.88. Inilah sahaja kutipan yang dapat daripada orang ramai.

Police Inspectors, Subordinate Police Officers and Constables—Strength

3. Enche' Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman minta kepada Menteri Pertahanan menerangkan berapa-kah banyak bilangan ahli² Pasokan Polis di-Raja Tanah Melayu mengikut tajok² yang tersebut di-bawah ini.

(i) Pegawai² Rendah dan Ahli² Biasa.

(ii) Merinyu.

The Deputy Prime Minister (Tun Abdul Razak): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada 1hb. June tahun 1960, bilangan Pegawai² Rendah Polis dan juga ahli Polis Biasa ia-lah 19,229 orang dan bilangan Inspector ia-lah 1,097 orang.

Promotion of Subordinate Police Officers

4. Enche' Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman minta kepada Menteri Pertahanan menerangkan boleh-kah sa-saorang Pegawai Rendah atau ahli biasa menjawat jawatan Inspector dengan hanya berkebolehan dalam bahasa kebangsaan.

Tun Abdul Razak: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jawapan-nya, ia. Akan tetapi saya dapat faham oleh sebab undang² dalam negeri ini dalam bahasa Inggeris, orang² yang hendak menjadi Inspector itu mustahak-lah ada mempunyai pengetahuan dalam bahasa Inggeris chukup bagi mereka itu untuk mendapat kululusan dalam pepereksaan² yang tertentu menurut tingkatan jawatan-nya.

Dato' Onn bin Ja'afar: Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jawapan yang sa-benar-nya "tidak".

Tidak shak lagi bahawa hukoman² yang berat yang di-jatuhkan kepada mereka² yang melanggar undang² ini akan mengurangkan jumlah mereka² yang menjalankan kereta dengan merbahaya.

Pihak Polis sedang menjalankan perhubungan menggunakan radar ia-itu satu pesawat untuk boleh mengukur beberapa laju-nya sa-sabuah kereta itu berjalan, sama ada lori atau pun apa juga kenderaan, di-jalan² yang besar itu. Kerajaan ada beberapa lagi rancangan yang sedang dalam timbangan. Mengenai lori² saya telah memberi ucapan² di-perjumpaan² perusahaan lori dalam masa lawatan² saya dan akan terus berbuat demikian meminta mereka mengatorkan jadual² supaya dapat menghapuskan pembawa lori daripada menjalankan lori mereka dengan laju-nya. Saya merayu kepada perusahaan² itu dan perusahaan ber-sendirian juga untuk bekerjasama dalam hal ini.

Saya telah juga membuat perbin-changan dengan Majlis Keselamatan Jalan Raya Persekutuan dan juga dengan pertubuhan keselamatan jalan raya Negeri²; ini ada-lah dasar Kera-jaan untuk menggalakkan dengan sedaya upaya tugas² mereka dari segi keselamatan berkenaan dengan lalu-lintas dalam negeri ini.

Penawar yang baik sekali untuk menjauhkan bahaya² jalan raya ia-lah tergantung kepada pemandu² kereta itu sendiri, ia-itu, membawa kereta dengan bertimbang rasa dan dengan keadaan perasaan yang baik. Dan saya minta kepada sekalian pemandu² kereta termasuk-lah Ahli Yang Berhormat dalam Dewan ini yang juga barangkali membawa kereta, mempunyai sa-buah buku Panduan Jalan Raya yang harga-nya tidak mahal hanya lima puluh sen sahaja.

Employment of Malays in Commerce and Industry

12. Tuan Haji Mokhtar bin Haji Ismail minta kepada Menteri Per-dagangan dan Perusahaan menerangkan ada-kah Kerajaan berchadang meng-ambil langkah dengan tujuan meng-galakkan gudang² perniagaan, supaya mengambil pemuda² dan pemudi²

Melayu bekerja, sama ada boroh kasar atau boroh terpelajar di-gudang² perniagaan mereka.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Enche' Mohd. Khir Johari):

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jawab-nya ya. Sedikit masa lagi Kerajaan akan men-jalankan shor-nya yang di-buat oleh Jawatan-Kuasa yang telah di-lantek oleh Kerajaan bagi menimbangkan sechara mana dapat di-beri peluang kepada orang Melayu dalam lapangan Perniagaan dan Perusahaan. Butir² shor itu akan di-umumkan tidak berapa lama lagi.

Technical and Vocational Schools

13. Enche' Geh Chong Keat asks the Minister of Education what are the objects and purposes of Technical and Vocational Schools in the Federation of Malaya.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Mr. Speaker, Sir, there are three types of Technical and Vocational Schools:

- (i) *Technical Institutes:* Objects—To train pupils to sit for the Overseas School Certificate and the Federation of Malaya Certificate of Education with a bias on technical subjects, and to fit pupils to enter industry to receive further practical training to become technicians.
- (ii) *Junior Technical Trade Schools:* To give a suitable training leading up to City and Guilds Examinations and to fit pupils to go into industry as 3rd year apprentices.
- (iii) *Sekolah Lanjutan Kampong:* To give a practical training with a bias on local needs and environment, particularly in agriculture and handicrafts subjects.

Dato' Onn bin Ja'afar: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Minister has not replied to the question. The question is what are the objects and purposes of Technical and Vocational Schools.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Sir, perhaps the Honourable

Member does not understand. I have already replied. I have covered the whole question.

Dato' Onn bin Ja'afar: I perfectly understand. The Minister is very evasive.

14. Enche' Geh Chong Keat asks the Minister of Education how far do these institutions meet the needs of our new country.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Mr. Speaker, Sir, as regards the Technical Institutes, the demand has shown that the present schools to be inadequate and additional Institutes will have to be built. With regard to Junior Technical Trade Schools, the demand has shown that the present schools to be inadequate and additional schools will have to be built. As regards the Sekolah Lanjutan Kampong, the demands have shown that more schools are needed.

Enche' Geh Chong Keat: Mr. Speaker, Sir, what are the future plans for the development and expansion of schools of this nature in order to meet the demands of the rapidly increasing needs of our new industries in our country?

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: The Honourable Member will have the opportunity to see that in the Second Five Year Development Plan.

15. Enche' Geh Chong Keat asks the Minister of Education what are the minimum qualifications for entry into these institutions.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the entry qualification into the Technical Institute is Lower Certificate of Education, with Credit in Mathematics, Science and English. With regard to the minimum qualification for entry into the Junior Technical Trade School, (a) for Building and Mechanical Courses, the entry qualification is Malayan Secondary Schools Entrance Examination, but it is hoped to raise this to "completion of three years post-primary"; (b) for Electrical Courses: preferably Lower Certificate of Education. As regards Sekolah Lanjutan Kampong, the entry qualification is

completion of primary education and the Malayan Secondary Schools Entrance Examination.

Dato' Onn bin Ja'afar: May I ask the Honourable the Minister what has happened to the National Language?

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: The medium of instruction at Sekolah Lanjutan Kampong is National Language and the National Language is taught in all other Institutes.

Suicides and Accidents on Penang Ferries

16. Enche' Abdul Samad bin Osman minta kapada Menteri Pengangkutan menerangkan berapa-kah bilangan orang²:

(a) yang terjun daripada feri Pulau Pinang dalam tahun 1959, dengan niat hendak membunuh diri atau kerana lain² sebab; dan

(b) yang terjatoh daripada feri tersebut dalam tahun 1959.

Enche' Sardon bin Haji Jubir:

(a) mengikut kenyataan 12 orang telah terjun daripada feri Pulau Pinang di-dalam tahun 1959, dan daripada bilangan orang yang terjun itu 9 orang telah dapat di-selamatkan sebelum ia tenggelam;

(b) tidak ada kenyataan² orang yang tidak sengaja terjatoh daripada feri itu.

17. Enche' Abdul Samad minta kapada Menteri Pengangkutan menerangkan apa-kah langkah yang telah atau akan di-ambil oleh Kerajaan untuk menyelamatkan penumpang² daripada kejadian ini.

Enche' Sardon: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, undang² berkenaan dengan menjaga keselamatan penumpang² feri Pulau Pinang ini juga di-kuat kuasakan bagaimana Undang² Passengers Boat yang lain² juga, dan juga saya puas hati dengan persediaan² yang di-adakan ia itu di-keliling-nya ada railing atau pagar tiga kaki sa-tengah tinggi-nya. Kalau orang hendak melompat kenalah memanjat baharu dapat melompat dan tidak boleh terjun terus daripada feri itu.

Sungguh pun dalam surat² khabar ada selalu tersiar orang² jatuh daripada feri itu, yang sa-benar-nya sa-bagaimana jawapan saya yang akhir tadi barang kali dia terjun sendiri bukan jatuh dengan tidak sengaja. Bagaimana pun kita juga mengadakan sa-buah sampan kecil pada tiap² feri yang baharu ini supaya dapat di-selamatkan orang yang terjun yang saya katakan tadi.

Schools Operated by Non-Federal Citizens

18. Enche' Mohd. Asri bin Haji Muda minta kepada Menteri Pelajaran menyatakan :

- (a) bilangan dan jenis sekolah² yang di-jalankan pada masa ini oleh orang² yang bukan ra'ayat negeri ini;
- (b) sama ada bantuan penoh atau tidak penoh di-beri kepada sekolah² demikian dan jika ada, berapa banyak-nya.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya dukachita bahawa keterangan yang di-minta pada bahagian yang pertama pertanyaan itu tidak-lah dapat di-adakan dan oleh yang demikian maka bahagian yang kedua pertanyaan itu tidak-lah dapat di-jawab.

Children of Non-Federal Citizens Studying in Government Schools

19. Enche' Mohd. Asri bin Haji Muda minta kepada Menteri Pelajaran menerangkan berapa orang-kah murid² sekolah yang telah mendapat tempat di-sekolah² Kerajaan pada masa ini yang ibu bapa mereka bukan-nya ra'ayat Persekutuan Tanah Melayu.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya juga dukachita bahawa keterangan ini tidak ada. Pertanyaan² berkenaan dengan taraf kera'ayatan ibu bapa tidak-lah di-kemukakan sa-belum murid² di-terima masuk ka-sekolah² Kerajaan.

Dato' Onn bin Ja'afar (Kuala Trengganu Selatan): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, apa-kah soalan yang boleh di-jawab oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri itu? (*Ketawa*).

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soalan yang menasabah (*Ketawa*).

Books Produced by Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka

20. Enche' Mohd. Asri bin Haji Muda minta kepada Menteri Pelajaran menerangkan apa-kah buku² yang telah dan yang sedang di-dalam ranchangan untok di-terbitkan oleh Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka semenjak di-tubuhkan hingga sekarang.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, buku² yang telah di-terbitkan oleh Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka dari semenjak di-tubuhkan hingga sekarang terbahagi kepada dua bahagian besar:

- (i) Buku² pelajaran sekolah dan buku² bacaan tambahan bagi sekolah²;
- (ii) Buku² bahasa dan bacaan umum.

Buku² pelajaran dan buku² bacaan tambahan sekolah yang telah di-terbitkan termasuk-lah buku² pelajaran sekolah menengah yang di-mulakan semenjak Kerajaan mula mengadakan kelas² menengah dalam bahasa Melayu.

Dalam bahagian penerbitan² umum ia-itu ranchangan untok bacaan orang ramai, buku² yang di-utamakan ia-lah buku² yang mengenai bahasa atau kesusasteraan Melayu, terutama jenis² yang di-fikirkan perlu di-ketahui oleh orang ramai dan buku² cherita yang di-fikirkan menasabah sa-bagai menambah himpunan sastera dalam bahasa kebangsaan ini.

Pada masa ini Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka sedang mengusahakan buku² sekolah rendah yang lebih sesuai untok pelajaran dalam sekolah² mengikut dasar pelajaran yang akan datang, dan sementara itu terus juga berusaha buku² untok semua mata pelajaran di-sekolah² hingga ka-tingkatan Sijil Pelajaran Rendah dan Sijil Persekutuan.

Dalam bahagian umum usaha sedang di-jalankan untok mengadakan sa-buah Kamus Kebangsaan dan menyiasat sastera² lama yang harus di-timbulkan sa-mula, serta melengkapi istilah² bagi perkataan² baharu. Kesemua-nya ini akan di-jadikan buku untok bacaan orang ramai. Sementara itu di-teruskan juga penerbitan buku² mengenai bahasa dan sastera.

Detainees Held under Emergency Regulations

21. Enche' Ahmad Boestamam minta kapada Menteri Pertahanan menerangkan ada-kah pemerintah bermaksud hendak membebaskan semua orang yang di-tahan di-bawah kuat-kuasa Undang² Dharurat bila keadaan dan Undang² itu di-tamatkan kelak pada 31 July yang akan datang ini.

Tun Abdul Razak: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-hingga 31 July, 1960, Surohanjaya Penyiasat atau pun Review Commission akan melepaskan orang² tahanan yang di-fikirkan tidak merbahaya lagi kapada keselamatan negeri dan yang di-fikirkan ta'at setia kapada negeri ini. Sa-lepas tarikh itu orang² yang ada dalam tahanan akan di-timbangkan, dan chadangan Kerajaan ia-lah orang² yang ada dalam tahanan itu akan di-bebaskan; apabila Kerajaan puas hati yang mereka itu ta'at setia kapada negeri ini dan tidak lagi merbahaya kapada keselamatan negeri.

Enche' Ahmad Boestamam: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soalan tambahan, adakah orang² yang tidak akan di-bebaskan itu akan di-tahan ia-itu merupakan lanjutan daripada Undang² Dharurat ini?

Tun Abdul Razak: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, itu akan di-timbangkan apabila undang² yang baharu ini di-luluskan oleh Parlimen.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam: Mr. Speaker, Sir, for the purpose of Government deciding as to whether a person is loyal or not, will the Government be prescribing any loyalty tests?

Tun Abdul Razak: The Government will have to decide each case on its merits depending on the evidence available. The Government has all the available sources at its command to assess a man's loyalty to this country.

Enche' V. David: Then, those persons under detention are disloyal. What happens to those people who have been released in the past? Are they disloyal to this Country?

Tun Abdul Razak: With regard to the persons who have been released, the Government is satisfied that those persons are loyal to this country—that is why they are released.

22. Enche' Ahmad Boestamam minta kapada Menteri Pertahanan menerangkan ada-kah shor² Committee of Review terhadap orang² yang sedang di-tahan di-bawah kuat-kuasa Undang² Dharurat sekarang akan terbatal dengan sendirinya bila keadaan dan Undang² Dharurat di-tamatkan kelak pada 31 July yang akan datang ini.

Tun Abdul Razak: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, apabila Undang² Dharurat dibatalkan sa-lepas 31 July, 1960, Jawatan-Kuasa Penyiasat atau pun Review Commission habis-lah kuat-kuasa-nya. Tetapi Jema'ah Penasehat yang akan di-tubuhkan menurut Fasal 151 (2) Perlembagaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu akan di-beri kuasa mendatangkan shor² yang berthabit dengan tahanan yang akan di-buat dalam Undang² Keselamatan yang baharu ini.

Enche' Ahmad Boestamam: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau Committee of Review yang ada itu tamat kewajibannya; apa-kah shor² mereka itu tidak tamat bersama² dengan tamat-nya kewajipan mereka itu?

Tun Abdul Razak: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kuat-kuasa itu tamat, akan tetapi keputusan² sa-belum masa itu tidak-lah tamat.

Enche' V. David: Mr. Speaker, Sir, is it not necessary that detainees arrested under the Emergency Regulations should be released and, if necessary, they should be arrested under the Internal Security Bill if it is passed?

Tun Abdul Razak: That, Sir, is a matter for the Government to decide.

Police Personnel Retired on Medical Grounds

23. Enche' V. Veerappen asks the Minister of Defence to state why no notice of termination of service is given or a month's salary in lieu paid to a member of the Police Force if he is boarded out on medical grounds, whether such members who are boarded out are given any gratuity or compensation; and if not whether he will consider doing so.

Tun Abdul Razak: Members of the Police Force are treated in the same way as other members of the Public

Service. When an officer is required to retire on medical ground he proceeds on earned vacation leave prior to retirement. If an officer on the pensionable establishment has had more than ten years' service, he is eligible for a pension and, if less than ten years' service, he is eligible for a gratuity.

Enche' V. Veerappen: Would the Minister say whether it is not a fact that a member, who is boarded out, is dismissed from the service on the day the Medical Board decides?

Tun Abdul Razak: An officer will normally have had sick leave for some time before he is required to retire.

Violation of Russian Air Space by the United States of America

24. Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam asks the Minister of External Affairs whether the Government has made any representations to the Government of the United States of America against the reported violation of air space over Russian territory.

Dato' Dr. Ismail bin Dato' Abdul Rahman: The answer is no.

Enche S. P. Seenivasagam: Could the Minister give reasons?

Dato' Dr. Ismail: I will do that when I answer the next question.

25. Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam asks the Minister of External Affairs in view of the threat to peace which a violation of the air space over other countries involves, whether Government will urge the Government of the United States to refrain from such violation.

Dato' Dr. Ismail: Sir, the subject matter which the Honourable Member refers to has been discussed in the security Council in the United Nations, an organ which is specifically given the task to preserve international peace. The Security Council had adopted a resolution which this Government endorses in keeping with the policy of making the United Nations as the instrument for expressing its foreign policy. In view of this it is unnecessary to do what is suggested by the Honourable Member in his question.

Malay Officers in the Malayan Civil Service

26. Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad minta kapada Perdana Menteri menearangkan berapa bilangan pegawai² yang di-lantek masok M.C.S. mengikut kadar empat Melayu dan satu bukan Melayu, semenjak Merdeka.

The Prime Minister: Tuan Yang dipertua, bilangan pegawai² Melayu yang telah di-lantek masok M.C.S. mengikut kadar empat Melayu dan satu bukan Melayu semenjak Merdeka ada-lah sabanyak 96 orang Melayu.

27. Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad minta kapada Perdana Menteri menearangkan berapa bilangan pegawai² Melayu dalam M.C.S. yang telah keluar daripada M.C.S. dan masok perkhidmatan² lain saperti Khidmatan Luar Negeri, dan ada-kah kadar 4:1 ini maseh terpelihara sa-telah Pegawai² ini keluar.

The Prime Minister: Tuan Yang dipertua, bilangan pegawai² Melayu dalam M.C.S. yang telah keluar terus daripada M.C.S. dan masok perkhidmatan² lain saperti Khidmatan Luar Negeri ada-lah sabanyak 17 orang dan kadar atau pun quota 4:1 itu ada-lah terpelihara sa-telah pegawai² ini bertukar.

STATEMENT BY THE PRIME MINISTER

Action taken on the subject of apartheid in South Africa at the Conference of Commonwealth Prime Ministers

The Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg leave to report to this House on the Conference of the Prime Ministers held in London on the subject of apartheid which the House has given me full mandate to bring it before the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference. Armed with this mandate I went to the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference and I was lucky in the sense that I was asked to reply on behalf of the other Prime Ministers to the address of welcome from the Chairman of the Conference—the Prime Minister of England. In the course of my reply I touched on the subject of apartheid and I would like to quote, for the information of this House, the

relevant parts of my speech. I said at the opening of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference, touching on the subject of apartheid, as follows:

"We believe in the Commonwealth as an organisation which stands for the best in man, adhering to moral principles and standards of conduct. For us the Commonwealth organisation stands for equality of men, be they white, red or yellow. It stands for justice and fair play. This is the principle, and the more we make this principle clear, the more the people will appreciate the benefits of being a member of this great brotherhood of Nations.

Recently the trouble in South Africa has posed a very difficult question for my Government. For the first time, there are some doubts as to the benefit of being members of this association of the Commonwealth, where the policy in some quarters is so much at variance with the concept of brotherhood and comradeship in the Commonwealth and with the United Nations Declarations of Human Rights—the principles which we are pledged to uphold.

I have come away from Parliament almost directly, armed with a resolution which compels me to speak about it here. I must say that for the first time all the parties in our Parliament were united and unanimous in giving me the mandate to take up the issue of apartheid, first in South Africa's relations to the coloured people in that country, secondly in her relations with the non-white members of the Commonwealth."

The House must appreciate the question which I posed at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference is two-fold: one is the aspect of apartheid as practised within the territory of South Africa itself, and the other aspect is the implication of the apartheid, or its relation which extends beyond the borders of South Africa, which affected the other Members of Commonwealth like Asia. I continued:

"I know that it is convention at these meetings domestic or internal matters are not formally discussed, but it seems to me that any rule must be related to circumstances. I think it is fair to say that the whole world expects that this subject will be discussed here, whether formally or informally. I maintain that this is a matter which must be discussed some time, somewhere, sooner or later, but I feel very strongly that discuss it we must.

It is not my intention, and it has never been our policy, to interfere in affairs which are regarded as internal or domestic in another country. But what happened in South Africa has gone beyond the barriers of domestic and has shocked the world. Would we not therefore appear small in the eyes of men if we evade this issue at

a place and time most conducive for it—the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference? Otherwise might it not have the effect of reducing the importance of this Conference of Commonwealth Prime Ministers where matters of common concern of us all are passed over out of consideration for the feeling of just one nation.

There is no doubt at all that world reaction to events in South Africa has had the effect of focussing special attention on this particular meeting of Prime Ministers, the first we have had for three years. It is a fair thing to say that people everywhere are expecting us to do something about it, certainly some of the countries we represent expect us to take the matter up at this Conference.

For me it is quite definite that I cannot go back to my country—it is unthinkable—and tell my people that I am persuaded not to bring this matter up."

Here I would like to report to this House that I had been nearly persuaded, but I refused to give in, because I felt that I had the right there to speak without fear and without feeling that I was under any obligation, as I come from a country which is free in every sense, that is, I will not hitch up with any particular country through money or through any other things and therefore I could speak up with all the courage that is in me. I continued:

"Therefore I hope that you will make it possible to discuss this matter some time in a spirit of goodwill and in the hope that we may be able to contribute something or make an honest attempt towards settling South Africa's problem or at least come to some understanding as between South Africa and the other countries in the Commonwealth which are not white.

If South Africa persists in this policy of white supremacy it will always be a cause of suspicion and distrust among us. And such an atmosphere is not conducive to good relations between members of the Commonwealth as a family of nations.

It is my view that this subject should be on the agenda, for discussion either formally or informally, be it as you wish, so that by the time this Conference comes to an end we will have some firm statement made which the world will appreciate.

I have now said what I have come to say in this simple way, and I am sure you will understand that it is right and necessary for me to do so. Let me assure you Mr. Prime Minister that it is not my intention to embarrass you in any way by bringing up this matter as I am in duty bound to do so."

Then I went on to say that I had great faith in the Commonwealth and that I was confident that this association

of nations could find a way out of this conflict of ideologies. Having made my statement, I think the air of uneasiness which at first manifested itself eased quite a lot, because most of the members, I think, appreciated my intentions and my sincerity on the matter which I had brought up. As a result of that, it was suggested at the Conference that the South African Representative should discuss this matter with the members of the Commonwealth in an informal manner. I was quite prepared to accept that, and it was suggested that we should reserve one room in the same building for the discussion of this particular matter of apartheid.

The representative of South Africa—you have probably learnt that I have come to know the nature and the character of the man—seems to be rather obstinate about discussing this matter with us, as he suggested that the South African apartheid is a matter for South Africa and that he does not want us to interfere in it or for it to be discussed by any other persons. This is what he said. After all, he said, the policy of South Africa had been a long-standing one, without any change from the time of General Smuts, but the matter was never discussed before. However, in respect of the recent events in South Africa, he submitted that it was a different issue. He stated that the Police had clashed with a group of people, and to discuss the matter here would therefore make the Conference into a United Nations and it would thereby lose much of its value. He reminded the Conference that Mr. Attlee, when he was Prime Minister, had refused to allow discussion on the problem of Kashmir, and Mr. St. Laurent once said that such a Conference should not exercise any supra-national function. He quoted the incident where Mr. Nehru was prepared to participate in the informal discussions in relation to the dispute between India and Pakistan. He however agreed with the suggestion made by Mr. MacMillan, the Chairman, that we should meet in small groups of Prime Ministers. He assured the Conference that he had nothing to hide. I of course raised some objection to it, but under the unanimity rule the

decision of the Conference had to be adhered to. That is, we had to split into two groups, and the discussion in the first group was between the Prime Minister of India, the President of Pakistan, the Prime Minister of Ghana, the Prime Minister of Australia, the Prime Minister of New Zealand, and myself. We therefore adjourned to the room upstairs. The informal meeting began at about 11 o'clock, and I would here like to refer to the record made at that meeting.

“On the 4th, at 12 noon, the first informal session with Mr. Louw took place in one of the Committee Rooms. Mr Louw started the talk by explaining how much the Union Government was doing for the good of the Bantu people. He said they were given education, land, houses in which to live, and all the amenities within the area; and he went on to talk about what South Africa was trying to do for the Bantu people. But on being questioned as to whether they made any attempt to treat the Bantu people and those other coloured people living within the Cape, he turned round and said that that was apartheid and nothing to do with this. All along, his attitude has been one of obstinacy, resentment and non-co-operation. He went on to say that the intention was for the Government to develop the Bantu people according to their way of life.”

That is almost nothing. The whole morning session was occupied with Mr. Louw's explanation as to the aims of the Union Government in respect of the Bantu people. He made no mention actually of those people living in the Cape. The Bantu people which he had in mind are those living next door to South Africa, who came in to work within the mines and farms and in other places, and so on. In fact, they are not the native people at all. And when I drew his attention to two points: first, his discrimination of non-White races in the Union of South Africa itself, second, the position of non-White Commonwealth members vis-a-vis South Africa. And I told him quite frankly that he was not to treat us like a lot of school-boys, giving us lectures on how he runs South Africa and what the South African Government was trying to do for the Bantu people; we might as well stop here. There was no point in going further. He promised, however, that in the afternoon he would try and meet my point.

In the meantime, in the afternoon, he went to a Press Conference, and at the Press Conference he had this to say. This is what he had to say at the Press Conference. He made the following points—that he had come to London to attend the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference neither as an accused nor as a penitent or a suppliant. That must be clearly understood. The purpose of his visit was to discuss with the other member-States of the Commonwealth matters which were of common concern to all of us. Domestic policies were not such matters—they were South Africa's own. As a member of the Commonwealth, South Africa was anxious to maintain good relations with its fellow members and discuss matters of common concern. Good relations and co-operation between members of the Commonwealth must necessarily be disturbed when a fellow member was subjected to attacks and misrepresentations in respect of its own domestic policy. In considering South Africa's racial policy, the following basic facts must be borne in mind: South Africans of European extraction and origin were a permanent part of the population, many of whose ancestors came to South Africa 300 years ago. They had as much right to South Africa as the Bantu, whereas the Bantu had no rights at all. The forebears of the present South African population of European origin—Dutch, French and British—developed and built up South Africa to what it is today. South Africa was for the European descended population their only home. Not only were the South Africans of European descent entitled to protection of their own nationhood, but the Bantu people were equally entitled to the fullest development of their nationhood, because they too were an essential part of the Union policy. Then he went on to touch on the recent riots in South Africa. He said the recent riots were confined to three urban centres, and were caused by two subversive Bantu organisations: the National African Congress, and the very extremist Pan-African Congress. The N.A.C. was at the root of the trouble in Nyasaland last year. As in

the case of Nyasaland, where 51 Bantus were killed and 99 wounded by the Police for the purpose of maintaining law and order, so for the same reason Police action was necessary at Sharpeville and Nyanga. The declared aim—and he went on to say what the aims of the Bantu people were. Then he went on to explain the reasons for separate development. Then, the last paragraph, he went on to say that the Government had no fear that there would be a slowing down of the inflow of capital. Trade boycott was a double-edged weapon, and South Africa could turn to France or Germany if the United Kingdom refused to buy her goods. Then he also stressed the point that South Africa does not remain within the Commonwealth purely for economic reasons.

All this to my mind was a flagrant mistake which Mr. Louw made at the Press Conference—by giving out in no uncertain terms as to the stand of the South African Government in connection with apartheid. When we met in the afternoon, I did not of course know what he had told the Press. It was not until next morning, when I saw the splash in the headlines in most newspapers in England that all the Prime Ministers had been bitten into silence, and naturally that annoyed me so much—because I was not beaten to silence. I knew what I had to do, armed, as I said, with the mandate from this House. When the Prime Minister met that morning, I naturally brought some of the headlines with me, and tackled Mr. Louw with these. He refused to answer me directly, but he said that this Press Conference had been arranged by the Prime Minister of South Africa about six weeks earlier. But he would not commit himself to explaining the reasons for the things he said when the Conference was still going on. The Chairman, the Prime Minister of England, wanted to quieten the parties, and suggested that we could discuss this some time at the end of the morning session. When we came to the end of the morning session, nothing very much was discussed about this, and I naturally got very annoyed. So I went back to

my hotel and sacrificed my afternoon sleep and wrote this thing, and this in fact had turned the whole affair of the Prime Minister's Conference into a regular battlefield.

This is what I issued. I think most of the Members here had seen an account of this, but if it would please the House, I would read this release which had, as I said, at that time annoyed Mr. Louw very much. I said:

"The South African representative has re-enacted Pearl Harbour by giving a press statement while his talks with the Commonwealth Prime Ministers on the question of apartheid was going on. It is cold, calculated and downright unfair for him to forestall the possible results of this talk in this manner. It is obvious his character is uncompromising and his attitude unyielding on this question of apartheid which he takes to the extreme limit of unreasonableness."

When we met after lunch, this Press release had already been given out to all the members at the Conference and when we met, before the Chairman could open his mouth, Mr. Louw waved before everybody else the thing and said that was what I had done to him—he said I called him calculated, downright unfair and various other things. And I went on to say—and this is the point—I went on to say that he did not reckon with the determination of the people with whom he was supposed to confer so as to reach a firm understanding on this question. I in particular, as I have said, had gone out of my way to try and work with him to find a solution in the state of affairs existing in South Africa and while it exists it remains a threat to the peace and harmony of the Commonwealth. I can, I think, claim to know something about racial problems, seeing that Malaya itself is a multi-racial state. But unlike South Africa, the way we solve our racial difficulties is an example to the world. Australia and New Zealand are dealing with their racial questions in a proper manner which does not create concern to the other parts of the world.

It must be remembered that there are two aspects to the question of apartheid. The first is with respect to South Africa's relations with her own black people settled there—that is what we call racial domination. The second

is in regard to South Africa's relations with other Commonwealth countries which are not white—this is racial discrimination. There are two points—one is racial domination which is South Africa's dealings with their own people and the other is in their dealing with other Commonwealth countries which are not white. This is what I said racial discrimination. On the first question, the South African representative was unyielding in his reaction to anything put forward by the Prime Ministers present at the talks with him at No. 10, Downing Street. On the second question, he denied there was any discrimination, and when confronted with facts he would reply: "Why pick on me?" That was his whole attitude throughout the Conference, "Why pick on me?" and so on. But as I said here, I am determined to pursue this policy, this issue, to the end and, if necessary, to a bitter conclusion. Of course, the Prime Minister of England, who was the Chairman, then suggested that we might perhaps calm down during the week-end and take this matter up on Monday—he said that would give us a chance to think over this—and on Monday the Prime Ministers should meet in conference without their advisers to discuss this statement of mine and also to discuss the statement of Mr. Louw.

On Monday we met with only the Prime Ministers present. As it turned out at that Conference, Mr. Louw opened up by charging me with an offence, so he said, an offence against all the best traditions of meetings of Commonwealth Prime Ministers, and suggested that I had said something out of turn with regard to South Africa. He himself felt that I had attacked his character by saying that he was cold, calculating and various other things. When it came to my turn to reply, I said that I was not sorry for what I said and I refused to withdraw because of what he did; in fact he was the main culprit because he started by giving out his Press statement when the meeting was going on. At the end of the whole thing the other Prime Ministers were supposed to give their opinion but, as it turned out, everyone instead of speaking on the statement which I had

issued started to speak on the apartheid itself. So, you see, a matter which was supposed to be relegated to the back-room, so to speak, had all of a sudden taken the attention and became the central topic of discussion among the Commonwealth Prime Ministers in the official room, and I would like to read the record made at this particular meeting. If I may be permitted, I would like to read the whole lot here:

"On the morning of Monday the 9th, the Prime Ministers went into an informal meeting without their advisers. The meeting started with Mr. Louw quoting the minutes of the Conference which referred to the interview. He went on to explain that the interview was arranged not for him but for his Prime Minister. When he went for this interview he was deputising for his Prime Minister. He had done no more than to explain to the pressmen the stand of South Africa. He assured the Prime Ministers that by his interviewing the Press he had no ulterior motive.

Having dealt with that Conference, he saw no reason for the attack made on him by the Prime Minister of the Federation of Malaya in the statement released on 5th May. The discussion which took place at No. 10, Downing Street, between him and the other Prime Ministers was intended to be private and no decision was intended to be taken: that was in keeping with the procedure of Commonwealth Prime Ministers Conferences. It was wrong, therefore, for the Prime Minister of the Federation of Malaya to say that he was expecting a firm statement on the question of apartheid. It was never his intention to come to any understanding. He resented the attack made by the Prime Minister of the Federation of Malaya on his character, that he was cold, calculating, downright unfair and also that he was uncompromising and unyielding. He also drew attention to the statement made by the Prime Minister of the Federation of Malaya that he left the meeting."

He thought the talk had ended abruptly because I had some appointment. The man is obviously senseless. When a person left abruptly and on leaving said "I have got no time to talk any more with you," he said I left because I had an appointment somewhere else. To continue with the record,

"There was no reason for the Prime Minister of the Federation of Malaya to issue the threat contained in the last paragraph of the Press release against South Africa."

Then I replied, as I said just now, and asked Mr. Louw to put himself in my place in similar circumstances and say what he would have done if

the Press had said he gave them a "rough house"—that is exactly what the Press said, that Mr. Louw gave all the Prime Ministers a "rough house" and beat them to silence. What would you do, I said, if the papers were to say that against you. And as I have reported, I refused to withdraw the statement I made against Mr. Louw, and then, as I said just now, all the Prime Ministers had taken up this question of apartheid at that meeting.

I would like to say here that at the Commonwealth Prime Minister's Conference many things were discussed, but the main topic of discussion turned out to be this apartheid issue. Time and time again it turned to the apartheid policy, and at the end of the last meeting it was decided to issue a communique. There was a great deal of difficulty to try and get the South African representative to agree to a communique. As a result, the meeting had to sit one whole afternoon to consider the draft communique which I would like to read to the House. This was the communique which was handed round for the consideration of the meeting:

"At the outset of the meeting the Prime Minister of the Federation of Malaya raised the problem of racial discrimination in South Africa and its effects on relations between South Africa and other Commonwealth countries. The representative of South Africa, Mr. Eric Louw, emphasised that the sole responsibility for domestic policies of South Africa rested with the Union Government. The meeting re-affirmed the traditional practice that Commonwealth Conferences do not discuss internal affairs of member countries. Mr. Louw expressed, however, his readiness to meet other heads of delegations informally outside the Conference for discussion of this problem and during the past two weeks a number of meetings have been held for this purpose. In the discussion, Mr. Louw gave factual information about the situation in South Africa and explained the policy of the Union Government. The other Prime Ministers emphasised that the Commonwealth itself is a multi-racial association and expressed their grave concern at the effect of the racial discrimination of South Africa on the relations of the Union with other countries in the Commonwealth. Mr Louw undertook to report these views to the Union Government."

Mr. Louw said he had no objection to the release of the first part of the communique but that the rest of the

paragraph described what had taken place outside the Conference and therefore was not the concern of the Conference. He said that this meeting had been called at his request in order to give him an opportunity to discuss the statement made by one of the Prime Ministers outside the Conference and that he could not therefore agree that any reference to this discussion should appear in the communique. As a result, we could not issue this communique. We had to leave it overnight so that every member could work out what he thought would meet with Mr. Louw's agreement because, as the House must appreciate, under the rules of Commonwealth Conference every press release and every statement must be unanimous. If one member disagrees, nothing can be issued, and that unanimity rule made it very, very difficult indeed. The Press were unable to get a full report of what took place at the Conference and as a result there had been a lot of conjectures on what had occurred inside the Conference Room. Some of them were to a large extent correct; others were completely wrong. But they are not to be blamed because the attention of the whole country was focussed on this meeting of the Commonwealth Prime Ministers—I would say not only the country but the whole nation, because the question of apartheid had become a very, very important issue. But since they could not get the communique, which would give the public some information of what took place inside, they had to do a lot of writing and they had to guess quite a lot of things they had written. And this annoyed Mr. Louw terribly and at every meeting he had something to say about these papers. On one occasion he said he only read papers like *The Times* and *The Telegraph*, at which the Chairman of the meeting, Mr. Macmillan, said: "Oh, I only read *The Daily Mirror*", and that annoyed Mr. Louw the more.

The last communique which was finally agreed—and I might tell you that we had taken the best part of the afternoon and the whole of next morning and not until Mr. Louw had time to ring up his Prime Minister to seek his agreement had he agreed to this

communique—and when it came to the Press it proved of no value whatsoever and became a subject of severe criticism from all parts of the Press in England. And here it is:

"While re-affirming the traditional practice of Commonwealth Conferences, which do not discuss the internal affairs of member countries, the Ministers availed themselves of Mr. Louw's presence in London to have an informal discussion with him about the racial situation in South Africa. During this informal discussion Mr. Louw gave information and answered questions on the Union's policies, and the other Prime Ministers conveyed to him their views on South African problems. The Ministers emphasised that the Commonwealth itself is a multi-racial association and expressed the need to ensure good relations between all member states and the peoples of the Commonwealth."

This was the only communique to which Mr. Louw subscribed and as a result this was all that had gone out on the subject of apartheid which had taken so much of the time of the meeting.

I personally felt that there was no doubt that the meeting had provided those who are against apartheid with something to talk about and as a result at the Conference a lot of attention was given to this question. The Honourable Members of this House will no doubt realise that the whole public of England took this matter up. I myself received quite a number of letters—in fact hundreds of letters—and only two of them asked me to clear out of England as soon as I could, but the rest had something to say about this stand. I also received telegrams from all those Unions which Mr. Louw had said were trying to foment trouble in South Africa. They said they were grateful for the stand which Malaya had taken on this issue of apartheid.

The question arises as to what we should do in order to pursue this matter further. The House will, of course, remember that the resolution which was passed here was to the effect that I should carry out the mandate given to the Government which I represent—whatever action I considered appropriate to pursue this issue, I think, to a conclusion. It is difficult for me at this stage to say what I should do because Honourable Members must appreciate the fact that most of the

leaders in this world are very touchy about their own personal prestige and dignity. I do not think they will welcome any suggestion emanating from this country which would bind them to any positive action. My feeling in this matter, if the House would approve, is that I should be given the mandate to carry on and to take whatever step I think is correct. All I propose to do at this stage is to write to the Prime Ministers of all the countries in the democratic world and ask them what I should do in this matter and how they propose to subscribe to whatever action we take, because if we go any further than that I do not think we will have their support. I do not think this matter should be confined to countries only in Asia or in Africa because to the best of my knowledge one of the European countries has taken a really definite action—the Government of Sweden has passed a resolution to boycott South African goods. The Dutch Government has taken a resolution in their Parliament to condemn apartheid and most of the countries populated by the white people have taken some steps to show their dislike and abhorrence of this apartheid. Therefore, whatever I do it would be a mistake just to confine it to countries in Asia and Africa. I think it should extend beyond these two continents and it should go out to other countries which dislike and abhor this policy of apartheid which sets up one race to be superior to the others. As much as we dislike it. I think, in fairness to all, whatever action we propose to take should be done in consultation with the other countries.

Well, Mr. Speaker and Honourable Members, that is as much as I could report at this stage and I would ask you to agree that I should take the action I proposed just now and I will report to this House from time to time. I think this matter should be taken up as quickly as is possible.

I think Honourable Members may like to have this report written and submitted to the House and that I can do and you should have it in your possession by the next meeting of this House. *(Applause)*.

Sitting suspended at 11.30 a.m.

Sitting resumed at 11.50 a.m.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

BILLS PRESENTED

THE CURRENCY BILL

Bill to implement an Agreement between the Governments of the Federation of Malaya, the States of Singapore and Brunei and the Colonies of Sarawak and North Borneo relating to currency and for matters incidental thereto; presented by the Minister of Finance; read the First time; to be read a Second time on Thursday, 23rd June, 1960.

THE PREVENTION OF CRIME (AMENDMENT) BILL

Bill to amend the Prevention of Crime Ordinance; presented by the Minister of the Interior; read the First time; to be read a Second time on Wednesday, 22nd June, 1960.

THE RACING (TOTALIZATOR AGENCY BOARD) BILL

Bill to provide for the establishment of a Totalizator Agency Board, the conduct of betting by agencies of such Board and by racing clubs, and for matters incidental thereto; presented by the Minister of Finance; read the First time; to be read a Second time at a subsequent meeting of this House.

THE SPECIFIC RELIEF (EXTENSION) BILL

Bill to extend the operation of the Specific Relief (Malay States) Ordinance, 1950, to the States of Malacca and Penang; presented by the Minister of the Interior; read the First time; to be read a Second time at a subsequent meeting of this House.

THE BETTING (AMENDMENT) BILL

Bill to amend the Betting Ordinance, 1953; presented by the Minister of Finance; read the First time; to be read a Second time at a subsequent meeting of this House.

THE CONTRACT (EXTENSION) BILL

Bill to extend the operation of the Contracts (Malay States) Ordinance, 1950, to the States of Malacca and Penang; presented by the Minister of the Interior; read the First time; to be read a Second time at a subsequent meeting of this House.

THE BETTING AND SWEEPSTAKE DUTIES (AMENDMENT) BILL

Bill to amend the Betting and Sweepstake Duties Ordinance, 1948; presented by the Minister of Finance; read the First time; to be read a Second time at a subsequent meeting of this House.

THE SPECIAL PENSION (HER HIGHNESS TUNKU PUAN BESAR KURSHIAH) BILL

Bill to make special provisions for the grant of a pension and allowances to Her Highness Tunku Puan Besar Kurshiah, the Consort of His late Majesty Tuanku Abdul Rahman ibni Al-Marhum Tuanku Muhammad; presented by the Deputy Prime Minister; read the First time; to be read a Second time at a subsequent meeting of this House.

THE LAND ACQUISITION (AMENDMENT) BILL

Bill to consolidate the law relating to the acquisition of land, the assessment of compensation to be made on account of such acquisition and other matters relating thereto; presented by the Deputy Prime Minister; read the First time; to be read a Second time at a subsequent meeting of this House.

BILL

THE INCOME TAX (AMEND- MENT) BILL

Second Reading

The Minister of Finance (Enche' 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.

The Bill proposes a number of amendments to the Income Tax Ordinance. These amendments have been carefully considered and they have been the subject of full consultation with the Singapore Government, which has, as you know, already presented parallel legislation to the Singapore Legislative Assembly, and an identical Bill has been duly passed by that Assembly. In this connection, I would like to take this opportunity to reciprocate the generous tribute paid to me by my opposite number in Singapore, the Honourable Dr. Goh Keng Swee, when he moved the second reading of this Bill in their Legislative Assembly. Complete agreement on legislation which is as complicated and controversial as this could not have been achieved in the way it has been achieved without the fullest measure of understanding and goodwill on both sides, and I need hardly add that Dr. Goh was largely instrumental in making this happy result possible.

At the outset I wish to assure Honourable Members that the Bill is aimed principally at those who are evading income tax. I am convinced that evasion is practised on a considerable scale in the Federation and I have given an assurance to my colleagues in the Government that, in my capacity as the Minister responsible for the administration of the Income Tax Department, I shall do everything in my power to stamp it out. Tax which is lost through evasion is money which is urgently required to assist the Government in carrying out its many schemes for improving social, industrial and economic conditions in this country of ours, and the honest taxpayer will pay with better grace when he knows that the burden is being evenly shared. It is also worth remembering that, if tax evasion cannot be reduced in a big way, the tax thus lost would have to be borne by such honest taxpayers who would thereby have to pay more than they otherwise would.

Detection and eradication of evasion should not present an unduly difficult task for any income tax administration provided that it is given adequate statutory weapons and a sufficient number of honest, experienced and

competent staff, and such staff are in deadly earnest about their work. With regard to staffing, I wish to say that Government has decided to avail itself of the generous offer of assistance under the Colombo Plan made by the United Kingdom and it is hoped that a team of 14 United Kingdom officers, 8 of whom will be under the Colombo Plan, will be engaged full-time on investigation work in the very near future. It is fitting that I should take this occasion to record the grateful appreciation of the Federation Government for the extremely valuable help which we have received from the United Kingdom in this respect.

Efforts are also being made to recruit officers under the Colombo Plan in other Commonwealth territories. The officers recruited will be required to examine a large number of cases where evasion has been practised or is suspected, and to impart to Malayan officers the technique of investigation work. They will not fill established posts and they will not, therefore, interfere in any way with Malayanisation policy or with the promotion prospects of such officers. When the team of investigation officers arrives, it will find ready for use the statutory weapons which are included in this Bill before the House. The new weapons are powerful: they are meant to be powerful since they are to be used against unscrupulous people. For that reason they are likely to attract criticism. So be it. Evasion cannot be fought with kid gloves, and Government considers that the measures in the Bill are essential if the dishonest persons in our midst are to be taught that dishonesty in income tax matters and defrauding one's fellow citizens are crimes which do not pay.

Sir, it is against this background of Government's determination to root out evasion and to make evaders pay their full share of tax that I turn to say a few words about each of the proposed amendments to the Income Tax Ordinance. In addition to remarks about the Bill as originally printed, I intend to refer also to the amendments to the Bill which have been inserted in the copies of the Bill which are now before Honourable Members.

Clause 2 introduces a new section. Section 4 of the Income Tax Ordinance states that the Comptroller and all officers appointed under the Ordinance shall be subject to the supervision and direction of the Comptroller-General but nowhere in the Ordinance is it stated that the Comptroller-General or the Comptroller shall act under the general directions of, and in accordance with whatever policy is laid down by, the Minister of Finance, who is responsible for the administration of the Income Tax Department. It is considered desirable that the responsibility of the Minister of Finance for the overall administration of the Ordinance should be clearly written into the Ordinance itself. Clause 2 accordingly states that the Minister of Finance may give directions of a general character with regard to the exercise by the Comptroller-General or the Comptroller of their powers, duties and discretions under the Ordinance.

Clause 3, which corresponds to a similar provision in the Singapore Legislation, is designed to assist the Comptroller in dealing with those who are evading tax, by ensuring that the Federation Comptroller may request from his colleague in Singapore, and may use in any appeal or other proceedings, any information concerning a Federation taxpayer which is in the possession of the Singapore Comptroller.

It has been said on many occasions by learned judges that taxpayers are entitled to make use of all lawful means to reduce the amount of their tax bill. Such devices go under the name of legal avoidance but they are not to be confused with illegal or dishonest devices which go under the name of evasion. Those who resort to legal avoidance must not, however, be surprised if, when their activities lead to a substantial loss of revenue, Government steps in to plug the loopholes in the law of which they have been availing themselves. Clause 4 is a measure designed to put an end to a practice whereby taxpayers have been able to reduce their tax liability by the device of transferring assets or income to other persons, normally relatives,

while at the same time they continue to enjoy the income alleged to be transferred. The first part of the clause provides that any income of which a settlor divests himself during his lifetime in favour of a relative who, at the commencement of the year of assessment, is under 21 years of age or is unmarried, shall be assessed, not on the relative, but on the settlor himself. The second part is aimed at those who transfer income or income-producing assets to other persons, not necessarily relatives, but who continue to enjoy the income therefrom, or retain for themselves the power to enjoy the income. In their case, the same consequences apply—the income will be assessed on the settlor and not on the person to whom the income is, or is alleged to have been, transferred. The provisions of the clause are not applicable to settlements which, in the opinion of the Comptroller, are made for valuable and adequate consideration, settlements arising from an order of a Court, or an agreement by an employer for the payment of remuneration to an employee or a pension or lump sum to the relative or dependant of an employee. In the case of settlements made prior to 1st January, 1960, which are caught under the provisions of this clause, the income will be deemed to be the income of the settlor with effect from 1st January, 1960, i.e., the income of such settlement will be included in the income of the settlor for the current year of assessment, i.e., 1960. In other words, the assessments for years of assessment prior to 1960 will not be re-opened.

It has been suggested that the clause is an example of retrospective legislation. I do not agree. When a Government decides to put an end to such a device, a point of time must be adopted after which the particular device ceases to be effective, otherwise there would be the undesirable situation where those who first thought of the device would be permitted to reduce their tax liability in perpetuity. When the United Kingdom and East African Governments decided to tackle the loss of revenue through settlements, they used practically the same statutory language as is found in Clause 4—the

new legislation applied to every settlement “whether made or entered into before or after this section came into force”. I am quoting the exact words of the legislation referred to.

It has been represented to me that, as sub-clause (1) now stands, the income of a settlement in favour of an unmarried relative will be “caught”, regardless of the age of the relative. It is not the intention that the income of an unmarried relative should be caught under sub-clause (1) after the year of assessment in which the relative attained the age of 21, or in case such a relative married before attaining the age of 21, and accordingly it has been decided to amend the word “or” in line 6 of sub-clause (1) to “and”.

I note that the Chairman of the Penang Branch of the M.C.A. has seen fit to castigate this particular provision, among others, in strong and violent language. I understand also that this view is shared by the members of his Committee. It should be borne in mind that this device can only be used by wealthy persons who thereby manage to pay less tax than they would otherwise have to pay, had they not resorted to such a device. One would think that there would be no dispute as to the necessity to plug this loophole, as those making use of it could well afford to pay at the rate properly applicable to them.

I would like to pause for a moment and explain to the House how this method of legal avoidance is actually operated. Let us say that a man has a chargeable income of \$100,000. On that income the highest rate, 45%, would apply and the tax payable would be \$33,400. If, however, he could find 20 relatives upon whom he could make settlements of the kind referred to in Clause 4 of the Bill, the relatives in question would pay only \$7,000, assuming they had no other source of income. This would mean a saving of \$26,400. If, to take an extreme case, he could find an even greater number of relatives so that the income of each would not be large enough to make them liable to tax, it would be possible for him to pay no tax at all in spite of his large income. In other words, this

means of tax avoidance would enable all such persons to pay tax, if they pay at all, at the rate applicable to those of their fellowmen who are not so fortunately placed as they.

Even more significant is the fact that the Committee of the Penang Branch of the M.C.A. has seen fit to oppose the principle of the Bill itself by asking for its total withdrawal. This attitude clearly indicates that they think it is wrong for the Government to try and stop income tax evasion. They think it is right for rich people to escape paying taxes in order that the poor may pay more heavily. It is this type of openly greedy and predatory capitalism, which has resulted in the system of free enterprise being rejected in many parts of Asia and has, in some countries, paved the way for Communism. I would remind the Committee members of the Penang Branch of the M.C.A. that this mentality of exploitation of the poor by the rich might have been appropriate for the 19th century, but it cannot survive for long in the second half of the 20th century.

So long as this type of avoidance is practised, and it is becoming clear that it is now being practised on an ever-increasing scale, there is not much point in raising the maximum rates of income tax if most of those properly liable could avoid paying at these maximum rates, and this is also the reason why the number of persons in the top tax brackets in this country is so ridiculously small; for example, according to the latest statistics of the Income Tax Department, there are only 90 individuals resident in the whole of the Federation who have incomes exceeding \$100,000. Incidentally, I sincerely hope that the strong opposition of these gentlemen in Penang to this particular provision is not stimulated by the fact that they themselves will be unfortunate enough to be caught at last in the net.

Clause 5, which is based on a measure presently in force in Australia, gives the Comptroller free access to all buildings, places, books, documents or other records which in his opinion may supply information with regard to the nature or extent of any person's

liability to tax. The clause also enables the Comptroller to require any person to give orally or in writing all such information concerning the income tax affairs of himself and of any other person as the Comptroller considers necessary for the proper administration of the Ordinance. The powers given to the Comptroller are admittedly far-reaching, but I suggest that the powers need not be feared by honest taxpayers; only those who are evading their income tax responsibilities or who are associated with persons who are defrauding the Government need fear the new powers. In my opinion, those powers are necessary if we are to limit and discourage evasion, and I feel sure that all Hon'ble Members who support the Government in its drive against evaders will support the new measure.

This is not a novel provision for, as I have already informed Hon'ble Members, there is a similar provision in the Australian income tax law. In fact, there is a similar provision in the legislation of other countries as well, apart from Australia. One English-language newspaper tried to frighten its readers by painting a picture of officers of the Department of Inland Revenue going round the countryside ransacking respectable homes, prying into people's private affairs unnecessarily, and generally behaving like gangsters who have suddenly been armed with all the powers of a Police State. The answer to this exaggerated and highly-coloured picture is that none of these things has happened in Australia, where these powers have existed for many years.

Further, Hon'ble Members will see that in sub-clause (1) the words used are "The Comptroller". "Comptroller" is defined in Section 2 of the Income Tax Ordinance as the Comptroller himself, the Deputy Comptroller and any Assistant Comptroller. This means that no officer below the rank of Assistant Comptroller may use the powers under Clause 5. It has also been said that citizens will from now on live in fear of a visitation from the Comptroller or an Assistant Comptroller at any hour of the day or night. Hon'ble Members have my assurance that I shall give directions to the effect that

officers of the Income Tax Department may use the new powers only during the hours of daylight. Furthermore, it has been said that unscrupulous individuals will seek to impersonate officers of the Income Tax Department and that citizens will find themselves compelled to open their doors to rogues and blackmailers. As an added safeguard, therefore, I will give directions that officers of the Income Tax Department making use of the powers in Clause 5 will be provided with, and will be expected to show, a document containing a recent photograph of the officer, his national identity card number and the authority under which he is acting, written in all appropriate languages. The fullest possible publicity will be given to this arrangement.

Lastly, it has been said that the Comptroller can make use of the powers in the clause in any arbitrary manner he sees fit. In this connection, I repeat what I said a few minutes ago—that the provisions of the clause will only be used in cases of evasion or of suspected evasion or where the Comptroller has good reason to believe that evidence of evasion will be found. To ensure that the powers are not used in an indiscriminate way, the opening words of sub-clause (1) “The Comptroller” will be deleted and the following words substituted: “Where the Comptroller considers it necessary in the exercise of his duties under this Ordinance, the Comptroller”.

Those who seek to evade tax, generally speaking, do not keep proper records of their business transactions and prefer to have no written records of their business receipts. Government is determined that such persons will no longer be assisted in their fraud merely by refusing to keep records or to give receipts. Clause 6 now requires every person carrying on any business or profession, firstly, to keep full records of all his business transactions and, additionally, where such transactions exceed certain specified financial limits, to give a printed, serially-numbered, receipt for every payment of money for goods sold or services rendered, and to keep a duplicate thereof. The nature of the records to be kept and the manner in which they will be kept will not

necessarily be left to the discretion of the individual business man, because the Comptroller is given power, in any case where he is dissatisfied with such records, to give a direction in writing to an individual, or by *Gazette* notification to any class of individuals, as to the manner in which records shall be kept and receipts shall be issued. Hon'ble Members will note that, although every person carrying on a business or profession is required to keep proper records, only those whose gross takings in the previous calendar year exceeded \$18,000 from the sale of goods, or \$12,000 from the performance of services, need issue receipts and keep duplicates thereof. It is not the intention of Government to compel traders and others to keep records and to issue and keep receipts unnecessarily, that is, where such persons are unlikely to be liable to income tax. I have carefully considered whether it might be possible to free certain classes of taxpayers from the provisions of this clause, and have decided, in consequence of this intention, that receipts need not be issued and kept in the following cases:

- (i) hawkers, except where specifically directed by the Comptroller;
- (ii) road-side stall holders and retail stall holders in markets, except where specifically directed by the Comptroller;
- (iii) taxi drivers, trishaw riders and self-employed boatmen;
- (iv) where in 1959 the gross receipts from any trade, business or profession did not exceed \$24,000;
- (v) any other cases in which the Comptroller specifically directs that receipts need not be issued and kept.

Here again, I would like to say that only those who are defrauding the revenue will find the new provisions onerous; honest tax-payers already keep proper business records in their own interests and this new measure will not affect them in any way. It may not be inappropriate, at this stage, for me to issue a word of warning or advice. If it is found that taxpayers ignore the requirements of the clause and refuse to

keep proper records or to issue receipts for all business takings, they must be prepared to accept the consequences of their actions, since the Comptroller will be entitled to assume that their failure is deliberate and for the purpose of concealing their true profits. Moreover, if it is found that taxpayers are failing to issue and to retain receipts in respect of all their business takings, I am prepared to ask Government to consider the introduction of a much more stringent system for the issue of receipts.

It has been represented to me that, to ensure uniformity in the exercise of the powers under the clause, only the Comptroller himself should be permitted to issue a notice under Sub-clause (2) and to waive any provision under Sub-clause (3). I see no objection to meeting this point, and it is proposed that the definition of "Comptroller" in Section 2 of the Income Tax Ordinance should be amended by inserting Section 63 as one of the sections whose powers may be exercised only by the Comptroller in person. Moreover, in view of the delay that has taken place in regard to this second reading, it is considered that the new provision relating to the issue of printed receipts should take effect from 1st September, and not 1st July, of this year.

Clauses 7, 11 and 15 are linked, and for convenience I shall deal with them together. Briefly, they are designed to ensure that employees do not leave Malaya without paying their full tax. Clause 7 forbids an employer who has in his possession any monies payable to any employee to pay over such monies to an employee who is leaving his service until the expiry of 30 days after the Comptroller has been notified of the employee's departure. The giving of such notice will enable the Comptroller to take steps to assess and collect any tax due by the employee but will cause no hardship to the employer or employee. Where the tax is paid within the 30-day period the Comptroller will gladly furnish an appropriate certificate of clearance to the employer or to the employee to enable the employee to leave the country without delay. By virtue of

Clause 15, an employer who fails to give the required notice to the Comptroller will be liable to pay any tax which cannot be recovered from the employee, but he is given power to recover from the employee the tax so paid. Clause 11, which is not confined to employees, merely extends the power which the Comptroller already has under Section 83 of the Income Tax Ordinance. At present, he can issue a direction only to the Commissioner of Police, Federation, or to the Controller of Immigration, Federation, or both, to prevent any person from leaving the Federation. Clause 11 now enables the Comptroller to request the Comptroller, Singapore, to issue a direction on his behalf to the Commissioner of Police, Singapore, or to the Controller of Immigration, Singapore, or to both. In other words, the Federation Comptroller will now be able to reach beyond the Causeway to prevent any person from leaving the country without paying his tax. There is a reciprocal provision in the Singapore legislation.

At present, when the Comptroller discovers any income which has not been assessed or which has been insufficiently assessed, he is prevented from making any additional assessment after the expiry of 6 years from the end of the relevant year of assessment, except in cases of fraud. In the identical Bill recently passed in Singapore the Singapore Government took the view that 12 years was more reasonable than the present 6 years as the period within which the Comptroller should be free to make additional assessments. Government is prepared to keep the provisions of the Federation Ordinance in line with those of the Singapore Ordinance in this respect, and accordingly it is proposed that the amendment to Section 69 of the Income Tax Ordinance should take the form of substituting 12 years for the present 6 years. The main reason for this amendment is the difficulty of proving fraud or wilful default, as required by the proviso to the existing Sub-section (1) of Section 69. As the law stands at present, the Comptroller would have to prove such fraud or wilful default in order to go beyond the 6-year limit, and this is

never easy. It is not, however, the intention of the Government to take advantage of this amendment except in exceptional cases or in cases where the Comptroller has good reason to suspect fraud or wilful default.

The present proviso to Sub-section (1) of Section 69 of the Income Tax Ordinance will be retained to enable the Comptroller to make additional assessments at any time where any form of fraud or wilful default has been committed. The substitution of a 12-year limit for the present 6-year limit does not affect the provisions of Section 54 of the Income Tax Ordinance whereby, in the case of deceased persons, an assessment or additional assessment requires to be made not later than 3 years after the end of the year of assessment in which the individual dies. It would be unreasonable if executors of the estates of deceased persons were prevented from winding up estates through fear that the Comptroller might make an additional assessment at any time within 12 years of the death of the person concerned.

Broadly speaking, the collection of tax on any assessment cannot proceed so long as there is a valid objection or appeal against the assessment. In many cases, however, taxpayers lodge an objection or appeal merely to delay the payment of the tax. Even one of the strongest critics of this Bill, a lawyer, who wrote a letter to me, admits that the present Section 81 "did give rise to a number of appeals which were brought purely as a matter of delaying tactics", to use his exact words. I can assure the House that even in the past many of these appeals were frivolous. In the future, assuming that our anti-evasion drive is successful, the number of such appeals will rise steeply and without the provision proposed, the Department would be swamped with an unmanageable list of appeals which would take many years to settle. It is obvious that the more successful the drive, the greater the number of appeals, and hence it would be impossible in practice to deter evaders without this provision. Thus, in cases where the tax is substantial, it has been found

that taxpayers have deliberately delayed the settlement of their appeals in order to have the use of the money which should have been paid as tax. Clause 10 now requires that the tax charged in any assessment may have to be paid, regardless of any objection or appeal against the assessment. It is not intended, however, that payment of the full amount of the tax shall be demanded in every case where an objection or appeal is lodged. The Comptroller is given discretion to extend the period within which payment of tax may be made in any particular case, and Hon'ble Members may be assured that he will exercise his discretion in a reasonable and responsible manner. Where, for example, it is necessary for the Comptroller to make a protective additional assessment in any case where the 12-year limit in Clause 8 is about to expire, he will not necessarily demand payment of the full amount of the tax in question if the taxpayer and his agent are genuinely co-operating in an effort to bring out the full facts of the case. Similarly, the provisions of Clause 10 will not normally be applied to employees who will, as at present, be able to pay their tax out of their remuneration over the whole of the year of assessment, or within such further period as the Comptroller may determine. In view of the fact that we are now half-way through the year, Government takes the view that the date "1st July, 1960" in proviso (a) should be amended to read "1st September, 1960", as in the case of Clause 6. This amendment will obviate any hardship in meeting the tax due on assessments made prior to 1st January, 1960. This clause, again, is not novel and is based on a similar provision which has been in force in Australia, New Zealand and several other countries for many years.

Clause 12 is aimed at those who deliberately evade service of notices under the Ordinance by alleging a change of address or by slipping out of the back door when an officer of the Income Tax Department calls at the front door. Every person is now required to notify the Comptroller in writing of any change in his address, and any notice or process shall be deemed to have been effectively served

when it or a copy thereof has been sent by registered post to the taxpayer's last known address.

Clause 13 is designed to make the procedure presently in force for the recovery of tax in any Court applicable to the recovery of any penalty imposed under the Ordinance.

The aim of Clause 14 is to ensure that facts about which there should be no dispute do not require to be proved before a Court, i.e. facts such as the quantum of an assessment, the tax payable, the nature of the income assessed. The provisions of the clause will be used in cases of prosecution for failure to lodge a return of income or for the recovery of tax which has not been in dispute. It is considered that Court proceedings can be expedited to the advantage of the taxpayer and the Comptroller if, as the clause requires, statements of fact made by the Comptroller, are admitted as *prima facie* evidence without further proof. Hon'ble Members will note that the provisions of the clause do not apply in proceedings for an offence which is punishable by imprisonment.

At present the Comptroller has power to compound major offences under the Ordinance but no power to compound minor offences, such as failure to make a return of income or failure to give notice of chargeability. Clause 16 now enables the Comptroller to compound such minor offences, and obviates the need to take all such offences to the Courts.

Clause 17 clarifies the provisions of section 91 of the Income Tax Ordinance which deals with incorrect returns of income and the penalties which may be imposed therefor. The opening words of the clause "Subject to the provisions of Part XII of this Ordinance" ensure that taxpayers retain their right of appeal to the Board of Review and to the Courts on a question whether income has or has not been omitted from a return of income before the provisions of Clause 17 come into play. Once it is established that income has been omitted, or that incorrect information has been given to the Comptroller, the penalty which may be

demand is the amount of the tax undercharged by reason of the omission or the incorrect information given. Where, however, the omission or incorrect information arises through negligence or without reasonable excuse, the taxpayer, if convicted in a Court, is liable to a penalty of double the tax undercharged, and, in addition, to a fine of not less than \$5,000, or to imprisonment of not less than 6 months and not more than 3 years, or to both such fine and imprisonment. There may be cases in which it would be unduly harsh to insist on the full penalty in all such cases; the Comptroller is accordingly given the discretionary power to compound offences under this section before judgment is given in any legal proceedings. I am advised that sub-clause (3), as presently drafted, gives the Comptroller power to accept a mitigated penalty under sub-clause (1) as well as to compound an offence under sub-clause (2).

Fears have been expressed that this may not be so and Government is accordingly prepared to make its intention clear beyond doubt. It is proposed, therefore, in sub-clause (3) to substitute the words "abate any penalty or compound any offence" for the present words "may compound any offence punishable".

Clause 18, among other things, provides that the period of imprisonment which may be imposed by the Court is not less than six months and not more than three years. Apart from this, it introduces no new provision into the Income Tax Ordinance. It merely removes the existing ambiguity with regard to the penalty which may be imposed under section 92 of the Ordinance, i.e. the section dealing with penal provisions for fraud.

I have already commented on the wide powers conferred on the Comptroller by Clause 5 of the Bill, i.e. the power to enter any premises for the purpose of obtaining any information considered necessary for the purpose of the Ordinance. Honourable Members will appreciate that such powers could be nullified if, in the exercise of his duties, the Comptroller or any officer in his Department were to be obstructed

in any way. Clause 19 accordingly makes it an offence under the Ordinance for any person to obstruct or hinder any officer acting in the discharge of his duties under the Ordinance.

Clause 20 provides that any penalty paid under the Ordinance shall not be deemed to be tax paid, for the purpose of claiming relief under the Ordinance.

The final clause in the Bill, Clause 21, seeks to expedite proceedings where the Comptroller is advised to prosecute in the Courts for offences under sections 91 and 92 of the Ordinance. The Comptroller is given the discretionary power to compound offences under those sections, that is, to accept a monetary settlement in lieu of instituting legal proceedings. Where income has been omitted, or incorrect information is given through negligence or without reasonable excuse, or where there has been fraud, the Comptroller may not be able to give a binding undertaking to any taxpayer that he will accept a monetary settlement and refrain from instituting criminal proceedings even if the case is one in which the taxpayer has made a full disclosure and has given the Comptroller full facilities for investigation. The Comptroller must reserve to himself complete discretion in all cases as to the course he will pursue. In practice, however, he will be influenced by the fact that the taxpayer has made a full disclosure and has co-operated with the Comptroller in the examination of such books, papers, documents or information as the Comptroller may consider necessary. There may be cases in which the Comptroller accepts a disclosure as full and complete and is on the point of agreeing to a monetary penalty only to discover that the taxpayer's disclosure of his misdeeds is incomplete. In those circumstances, the Comptroller is amply justified in withdrawing any undertaking to refrain from legal proceedings. Clause 21 is designed to meet such circumstances and to ensure that any statements made by the taxpayer at a time when the Comptroller was likely to accept a monetary penalty should be capable of being used as evidence in

any legal proceedings instituted thereafter.

I would like to qualify to some extent what I have just said about the provisions of Clause 21 and about the practice of the Comptroller in accepting monetary settlements. But before I do so, let me say a few words about the policy of Government towards informers and the payment of rewards for information.

I do not need to remind Honourable Members about the success of Government's policy in paying rewards to those who provided information to the Security Forces, and about the large contribution which those rewards made to the virtual ending of the Emergency in the Federation. I am convinced that a similar policy would be equally successful in detecting those who are evading tax. It has accordingly been decided that any person who furnishes information to the Income Tax Department which leads to the discovery of evaders and to the recovery of tax will be paid generously for this information. In future a reward of 10 per cent of the tax actually recovered plus penalty imposed will be paid, subject to a maximum payment of \$100,000. Where this rate, i.e. the 10 per cent rate, will result in a reward which is regarded by the Comptroller as inadequate, and this could happen when the tax recovered is small, a higher rate will be paid, but the 10 per cent rate will normally obtain. In determining the amount of any reward the Department will be guided by the following considerations: any risks run by the informer; any expenses incurred or loss sustained, e.g. dismissal of the informer from his employment, and so on; the accuracy and details of the information given; the potential value to the Department of a large pecuniary settlement or prosecution in the case of any particular taxpayer; the amount of work, intelligence, and initiative needed to provide the information, and the value of the information in terms of tax recovered plus penalty imposed.

I am sure that there are many individuals who are aware of the precise manner in which other taxpayers are evading tax; I am equally sure that

there are many employees who are compelled by unscrupulous employers to keep two or even three sets of books or insert false entries in their employers' records. Let those individuals come forward as public-spirited citizens with their information and the Government will pay generously for it. It is important that the information should be as specific as possible. Vague statements about a taxpayer's prosperity or the mere repetition of rumours should be avoided since the Department does not have sufficient resources to pursue every wild allegation or rumour. There are some further points which I would like to emphasise in connection with Government's policy in paying rewards to informers. The Income Tax Department must be the sole judge as to whether or not it will investigate any given information, it will not disclose to the informer any information concerning the affairs of any taxpayer, and it will not give the informer periodic reports about the progress of any investigation undertaken. Generally speaking, rewards will be paid only on completion of the investigation when the full amount recovered is known but there may be exceptional cases in which an interim reward may be paid pending completion of the investigation.

Another point concerns secrecy. The Department is well aware of the risks and dangers to informers. It is aware that absolute secrecy is essential for the protection of informers, and I can give an assurance that every effort will be made to preserve the strictest secrecy, both with regard to the information given and the identity of the informer. Any informer who wishes to give information, and who has any fears whatsoever on this score, need only write to me at the Treasury or write to, or call upon, the Comptroller at Suleiman Building, Kuala Lumpur. Such letters should be marked "Personal and Secret" or "To be opened by the addressee personally" or words to that effect, and should preferably be enclosed in a double cover, the inner one of which should be sealed.

I now come to an important point and to the qualification which I said I

wished to place on my remarks on Clause 21 of the Bill. What about the evader who is prepared to co-operate with the Income Tax Department? Is there any way in which he can escape the full consequences of his evasion? The answer is—yes, provided he is quick about it.

The intensification of the anti-evasion drive will be coupled with an amnesty or, more correctly, an indemnity against criminal proceedings to all evaders who voluntarily come to the Income Tax Department and make a clean breast of their misdeeds. I want it to be clearly understood that the initiative must come from the evader himself, and that his disclosure must be complete. It will not do for the evader to wait until the Department sets an enquiry in motion.

The amnesty will be for a limited period only, up to 31st March, 1961, and it will not be repeated or extended. It will be no use for any evader to leave his approach until the last moment, because the period from now until 31st March, 1961, provides ample time for every evader to approach the Department and make a full confession. Furthermore, the benefit of the amnesty will apply only if there is a complete disclosure of all omitted income. A partial disclosure is not good enough and any evader who is subsequently discovered to have made only a partial disclosure will be treated as if he had made no disclosure at all. He will forfeit all rights or leniency he may have gained under the amnesty.

So that there may be no misunderstanding whatsoever about the meaning of the offer let me state clearly what the offer means:

- (1) the offer will remain open only until 31st March, 1961;
- (2) the evader must, before 31st March, 1961, take the initiative in making a *full* disclosure to the Comptroller of all omitted income and must co-operate fully with the Comptroller in the investigation of his affairs;
- (3) at the end of the investigation he must sign a certificate to

- the effect that he has made a full and complete disclosure of all his income;
- (4) he must pay the full amount of tax lost together with any monetary penalty imposed by the Comptroller within such period as the Comptroller may determine;
 - (5) the monetary penalty which will be imposed on any evader who takes advantage of the offer will be substantially less than that for those who do not avail themselves of the offer and who are discovered after 31st March, 1961;
 - (6) criminal proceedings will not be instituted against any evader who takes advantage of the offer in respect of any offence against the Income Tax Ordinance committed up to the date on which his disclosure is made;
 - (7) the offer is not available to any taxpayer whose affairs are at present under investigation by the Income Tax Department from the point of view of omissions of income.

The offer of amnesty is generous and I trust, therefore, that all those who up to now have failed to disclose their true income will think seriously before rejecting the offer.

One of the arguments advanced by the critics of this Bill is that tax evasion is not so substantial or widespread as to make it necessary to give these greatly increased powers to the Comptroller. In order to give the House some indication of the extent of evasion, the following example is illuminating.

For the year 1957 the assessments raised (net income before personal reliefs) for all professions amounted to \$13.5 million. The only conclusion which can be drawn from this is that if each of the individuals in the professions made a return, the average income reported was somewhat less than \$10,000 per year, or about \$800 per month. In other words, we are asked to believe that professional men in this country, on the whole, have the

same amount of earnings as Division II officers in the Public Service! If we compare this income with the average income reported by all resident individuals (\$12,700), it would appear too low considering that these are highly remunerative professions earning well above the average personal income. I am sure that the House will agree with me that those of the professional class, e.g., lawyers, doctors, dentists, architects, etc., do not generally earn less than the average of other residents—by nature of their qualifications they can command a higher salary or higher level of earnings than other persons. The comparative figures of average annual income for the United States of America (given in Malayan dollars) are: doctors \$46,500, dentists \$27,000 lawyers \$30,600, while average personal income of all individual taxpayers is \$16,500. I can find no reason to support any argument that the income of professional men as a class is markedly less in Malaya than the income of other residents.

It has also been argued that if some of these powers are abused, they could lead to grave injustices. I submit, Sir, that that is not a fair way of looking at this difficult problem. Under the Emergency Regulations it is possible for a completely innocent person to be detained without trial for years on end, but the majority of the people of this country have accepted that these Regulations are necessary in the national interest and did not refrain from giving them to the Government on the ground that they could cause grave injustices if grossly abused. Similar powers have been inserted in the proposed Internal Security Bill which will be coming up for debate later on in the present session of Parliament, and I have no doubt at all that these powers will be given to the Government by this House. We are today facing another emergency, though of a different kind. If the collection of income tax cannot be put on a satisfactory basis in the sense that everybody who is liable pays his fair share, this system of taxation could not be made an important and major source of revenue in the years to come and the people of this country, especially those

in the fixed and lower income brackets, would be the first to suffer. Nearly every piece of legislation gives the Government wide powers but the fact has not to date been held as an excuse for not giving such powers to the Government on the ground that they might be abused. I submit, Sir, that the powers asked for in this Bill are subject to safeguards: in the first place, the Minister has been given power, in Clause 2 of the Bill, to give directions of a general character to the Comptroller-General and the Comptroller who, in the main, will exercise the powers provided for in this Bill. In case the Minister proves unreasonable, there could be an appeal to Parliament itself. I also think it is safe to guess that the Press would be willing to give adequate publicity to any miscarriage of justice arising out of an abuse of the powers asked for in this Bill.

There is no place for tax evasion in a democratic and independent Malaya and I look to all taxpayers to pay their full share of the cost of meeting the many demands which the Government's far-reaching plans for the betterment of the country will require. To deal with those who are not prepared to play their part in this respect, I ask the House to arm the Comptroller of Income Tax with the new powers included in the Bill. Alternatively, as I have already indicated earlier, income tax rates might, in the not too distant future, have to be greatly stepped up in order that the honest taxpayer can make up for the loss caused by evasion on the part of those who are not so honest. It is my earnest hope that this will not be necessary, but it is for this House to decide whether we should allow a large proportion of dishonest persons in this country to avoid paying their fair share of its taxes with the result that a heavier burden has to be imposed on the honest ones, or whether justice should be done to those who have for so long defrauded the Government of revenue, and who will continue to do so unless something is done about it, so that honest and decent people need not bear the kind of burden that they would otherwise have to bear.

Sir, I beg to move. (*Applause*).

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

Sitting suspended at 1.00 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 2.30 p.m.

(*Mr. Speaker in the Chair*)

THE INCOME TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL

Debate resumed on Question, "That the Bill be now read a second time".

Question again proposed.

Enche' Zulkiflee bin Mohamed (Bachok): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun di-sini memberikan sokongan kapada Rang Undang² yang di-kemukakan oleh Kerajaan ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soal lari daripada membayar cukai hasil pendapatan ada-lah suatu soal yang penting kita ambil langkah² menchegeh-nya; dan di-dalam melakukan ini pada asas-nya saya merasa langkah² yang diambil oleh Kerajaan ini ada-lah sesuai dengan keadaan orang² yang tidak bertanggung-jawab yang melarikan cukai di-dalam negeri ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-ketika negeri ini menghadapi pembangunan dan di-ketika ra'ayat negeri ini dikenakan berbagai² beban cukai maka amat-lah salah-nya ada beberapa pehak yang mendapat peluang melarikan diri mereka itu daripada membayar cukai pendapatan mereka dengan helah² yang di-chari² oleh mereka itu menerusi chelah² undang² yang di-kemaskan dahulu daripada ini. Di-dalam memberikan sokongan ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya akan mengemukakan beberapa pandangan yang saya rasa ada yang tidak berapa tepat-nya di-dalam undang² ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, satu daripada perkara yang tidak dapat saya diamkan ia-lah bahawa undang² ini telah ditarek buat sementara dahulu oleh Menteri Kewangan sa-telah di-kemukakan di-persidangan kita yang lalu. Apabila saya bangkitkan perkara ini maka Menteri Kewangan telah memberi jawapan mengatakan sebab pun ditangguhkan perbahathan-nya ia-lah

kerana hendak memberi peluang kepada back benchers untuk memikirkan lebih panjang dalam hal ini. Hasil fikiran ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, agak saya inilah dia pindaan atas pindaan yang dikemukakan. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ini satu kelambatan yang saya sesalkan kerana dengan kelambatan ini telah berubah pula haribulan berjalan-nya kuat kuasa undang² ini dan haribulan yang dahulu-nya di-tuliskan di-dalam Fasal 10 pada hari yang pertama bulan January tahun 1960 telah di-tukar kepada bulan September. Saya harap, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, hal ini di-ambil perhatian oleh Kerajaan, terutama di-dalam mengemukakan soal² yang bersangkutan dengan chukai sebab kalau-lah undang² ini di-buat untuk menchegeh pelarian daripada membayar hasil pendapatan maka tahu-lah kita yang undang² ini saperti kata Menteri Kewangan tadi di-hadapkan kepada orang² yang tidak bertanggung-jawab hendak mempermainkan Kerajaan. Maka kelambatan yang di-lakukan ini telah dengan langsung-nya membolehkan orang² ini melakukan apa yang difikirkan-nya boleh di-lakukan untuk mengelakkan diri-nya daripada di-chengkam oleh kuat kuasa undang² ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, satu daripada perkara yang ada di-dalam undang² ini ialah soal chara² menahan orang² melarikan tanggong jawab-nya membayar chukai dengan mengadakan kerjasama dengan pihak Kerajaan Singapura dalam hal ini. Saya suka bahawa Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ada mempunyai susunan² yang membolehkan Kerajaan ini mengambil langkah atas orang² yang lari daripada Persekutuan Tanah Melayu pergi ka-Singapura. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam dia hendak melarikan diri itu, dan pada masa kita hendak menahan orang itu daripada melakukan pelarian undang² ini, maseh saya rasa boleh di-permainkan oleh sa-tengah daripada orang² yang tidak bertanggung-jawab itu. Apa sebab-nya saya berkata demikian, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, menurut peratoran undang² ini Comptroller Persekutuan Tanah Melayu di-ketika dia mengetahui bahawa sa-saorang yang berniat hendak meninggalkan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini di-mana ia

mengetahui bahawa orang itu di-agakkan belum lagi membayar chukai ini, maka dia hendak-lah dan boleh menyampaikan hal ini kepada Comptroller di-Singapura. Comptroller itu pula akan berhubung dengan pihak Immigration di-Singapura atau pihak Polis supaya dapat menchegeh daripada lari-nya orang itu daripada negeri Singapura, umpama-nya. Dalam section 11 ada menyatakan—

“ or a request to the Comptroller of Income Tax, Singapore, to prevent such person from leaving Malaya without paying the tax or furnishing security to the satisfaction of the Comptroller for payment thereof.”

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita berhadapan dengan orang jahat, bukan-lah kita berhadapan dengan orang biasa. Saya hairan kenapa-kah undang² ini tidak melakukan satu chara yang lebih chepat, sebab Singapura dengan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu walau pun nama-nya negeri Singapura, tetapi kalau hendak pergi ka-Singapura itu tidak-lah jauh daripada Johor Bharu. Kalau sakira-nya Comptroller Persekutuan Tanah Melayu yang menurut undang² ini membuat satu “request” kepada Comptroller of Income Tax, Singapore, apa yang akan berlaku bahawa soal hendak menahan orang ini akan tundok kepada routine Kerajaan yang berma’ana akan di-lakukan menurut peratoran² biasa ia-itu daripada sa-orang Pegawai Comptroller, Singapore, kepada Polis Singapura, atau kepada Immigration. Sementelah-nya Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu sudah membuat susunan ini dengan Kerajaan Singapura, apa-kah salah-nya undang² ini membenarkannya mengadakan perhubungan terus dengan Polis? Sebab, kata-lah orang itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, hilang daripada Kuala Lumpur pada hari Sabtu pukul 12 tengah hari, dan dia naik kapal terbang dari Kuala Lumpur sampai di-Singapura—saya pun tak pernah naik kapal terbang—apabila sampai di-sana jam sudah pukul satu. Maka menurut undang² ini “request of the Comptroller” hendak-lah di-hantar-kan kepada Comptroller, Singapore. Kebetulan pula hari Sabtu di-Singapura pukul dua tengah hari orang² di-sana tidak bekerja. Hari Ahad, Comptroller

pergi makan angin atau picnic. Keesokan hari-nya apabila dia sampai sudah hari Ithnin. Pukul 9 pagi Comptroller sampai di-pejabat, kemudian baharu-lah dia tengok-nya "request" itu; kata-lah dengan telegram lekas sampai, semantara hendak disampaikan kepada Polis, jam sudah pukul 10 pagi. Kapal terbang B.O.A.C. hari Ahad hingga hari pagi Ithnin sudah boleh membawa sahabat kita itu, atau musuh kita itu, kapada negeri yang tak dapat kita ganggu dalam erti kata Income tax. Ini satu perkara yang saya rasa dalam undang² ini patut di-ketatkan, dan tentu-lah Menteri akan menjawab bahawa soal ini akan kita atorkan dengan sebaik²-nya, tetapi kita akan ator dengan baik-nya sedang di-samping itu tukang lari itu pun akan mengatorkan hal-nya dengan sebaik²-nya supaya jangan dapat di-tangkap maka dia pun hilang-lah. Erti-nya ini satu chara yang saya rasa kita atau Kerajaan meminda yang mana perlu berhubung dengan pindaan peratoran ini supaya membolehkan chengkaman itu dengan lebeh kuat lagi.

Saya berbalek kebelakang pula ia-itu dalam section 10. Di-sini sunggoh pun Menteri kita tadi telah menyebutkan bahawa istilah atau ma'na Comptroller dalam section ini ia-lah Comptroller in person, atau kapada Deputy Comptroller, atau Assistant Comptroller, yang tak boleh lebeh dari itu, tetapi dalam section (b) ini ia-itu—

"10. (b) the Comptroller in his discretion may extend the time limit within which payment is to be made."

Di-sini nampak-nya satu discretion yang di-berikan kapada sa-orang pegawai yang saya perchaya kita bersetuju bahawa pegawai itu kita perchaya, sebab kalau kita tidak perchaya kapada pegawai itu maka kita tidak akan lantek dia; walau pun kita perchaya pekerjaan itu, tetapi time limit yang boleh dipanjangkan oleh Comptroller itu adalah satu perkara yang besar. Kalau kita tidak membuat peratoran dalam undang² ini, satu perkara yang sampai jauh mana umpama-nya penanggoahan ini dapat di-lakukan maka tentu-lah Comptroller ini akan dapat dengan discretion melakukan sa-suatu yang mungkin berlawanan dengan kepentingan ini.

Berbalek pula pada asas-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, undang² ini di-hadapkan bak kata Menteri Kewangan tadi kapada "inscrupulous people". Kelambatan itu di-chari-nya, sebab dia adalah saudagar besar, dan saya perchaya orang yang hendak bayar Income Tax sa-banyak \$7.50 tentu-lah tak sampai ka-Comptroller mithal-nya. Jadi, soal yang akan tiba kapada Comptroller itu ia-lah orang² yang mempunyai kepentingan besar dalam kewangan. Tax yang di-bayar itu ada-lah hak negeri. Apabila dia engkar pembayaran sa-suatu chukai maka itu ada-lah hak ra'ayat. Orang berniaga tentu-lah dengan melambatkan sa-bulan yang mana dia akan mendapat ke-untungan yang lebeh banyak di-samping mendapat fa'edah-nya daripada wang itu. Oleh itu, saya rasa dalam section 10 ini patut-lah Kerajaan mengadakan satu time limit kapada discretion yang dia boleh memberi pertimbangan. Dengan terhad dalam undang² ini yang pada satu masa-nya tidak boleh lebeh daripada itu supaya dapat-lah kita kawal soal longgar-nya dalam satu undang² berhubung dengan Income Tax ini. Kuasa Comptroller dalam melakukan discretion ini juga di-sebutkan dalam section 6, pechahan (3) ia-itu—

"6. (3) The Comptroller may waive all or any of the provisions of sub-section (1) of this section in respect of any person or records or any class or description of persons or records."

Di-sini pun saya terima bahawa Comptroller yang di-maksudkan di-sini tentu-lah Comptroller's discretion, sebab perkara itu ia-lah undang² yang di-buat-nya peratoran-nya. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dengan ada-nya perkataan: "... may waive all ..." ini adalah terlalu luas kapada sa-saorang Comptroller. Biar-lah umpama-nya, any provisions or some of the provision rather than all provisions under this Section. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, hal ini, hal income tax, saya tahu bahawa orang yang menjadi Comptroller itu kita perchaya, tetapi undang² ini lebeh besar daripada Comptroller, biar-lah Comptroller itu terasa banyak kala-nya, kalau tidak pun semua, dia membuat discretion di-dalam had undang². Saya perchaya dalam pentadbiran yang baik sa-kali ia-lah kita membuat undang²

yang di-dalam lengkungan undang² itu dapat di-lakukan discretion, bukan kita membuat discretion atau membolehkan discretion yang boleh mengeneikan kehendak undang² seperti "... waive all or any of the provisions ..."

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam section 6 ini, saya tertarik hati dengan pengistiharan yang di-buat oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan yang mengatakan sudah ada perkecualian-nya di-dalam hal ini. Yang di-sebut-nya tadi ia-lah hawker, orang yang mempunyai gerai di-tepi² jalan, driver taxi dan beberapa jenis orang yang lain. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya harap di-dalam hal memberi perkecualian ini hendak-lah kita lakukan satu perkecualian yang di-dasarkan atas kebiasaan sa-suatu chara hidup bagi satu² golongan manusia. Boleh jadi Tuan Menteri kita telah mendapat representation atau telah mendapat rombongan yang datang daripada pehak hawker, orang yang mempunyai gerai di-tepi² jalan dan driver taxi. Tetapi orang kampung, smallholders, oleh kerana tidak ada susunan, maka tidak-lah dapat mereka menemui Menteri dan dalam perkara ini Menteri lupa memasukkan nama² mereka dalam jenis orang² yang di-bebaskan daripada peratoran ini. Saya berharap dalam soal orang kampung seperti penoreh getah, penjual ikan atau pedagang² kecil dan perah, kita chadangkan hendak menchukai mereka itu, jangan-lah di-beratkan peratoran² seperti itu, sebab ini tidak menjadi satu chara hidup bagi mereka itu dalam melakukan perdagangan atau melakukan usaha hidup mereka pada masa ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, hal² pendapatan keluar masuk orang² di-kampung kadang² banyak duit yang memang selalu-nya tidak di-tulis; jadi orang² yang sa-macam ini pun saya harap akan masuk dalam jenis orang yang tidak di-beratkan menurut peratoran ini. Sebab-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, orang ini bukan-lah orang yang jahat sangat yang hendak melarikan diri-nya daripada membayar income tax. Berbalek saya kepada Fasal 5 ia-itu berkenaan dengan kuasa Comptroller. Yang sa-benar-nya, amat menyukakan saya sendiri, kerana

Menteri Kewangan telah dapat membayangkan beberapa kaedah dan chara² Comptroller di-dalam hal 61b. (1) ini, dengan menyebutkan chara peratoran-nya bahawa hal ini tidak-lah di-lakukan, ya'ani, memeriksa rumah sa-saorang itu atau sa-bagai-nya, melainkan di-waktu siang, melainkan bahawa pegawai² yang demikian itu ada mempunyai documents dalam bahasa² yang tertentu, dan melainkan, menurut amendment ini, bahawa di-tempat yang di-sembojikan itu telah ada tanda² yang mewajibkan sa-saorang itu membayar income tax. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tiap² sa-orang daripada kita di-sini, walau pun kita ingin menunaikan kewajiban kita hendak membayar chukai pendapatan, tetapi kita suka-lah bahawa ra'ayat negeri ini mendapat sedikit sa-banyak kebebasan peribadi yang dapat mengawal hidup mereka daripada di-cherobohi. Saya tidak mengatakan bahawa Comptroller ini akan mencherobohi, tetapi dalam hendak menghadkan kaedah Comptroller in kepada diri-nya sendiri sahaja, tentu-lah pada perektik-nya akan menyebabkan Jabatan Hasil dalam negeri ini akan tidak dapat melakukan-nya dengan sempurna. Dan di-akhir-nya kita akan jumpa satu hakikat bahawa ramai pegawai² yang akan di-bolehkan melaku dan menggunakan hak-nya seperti yang di-nyatakan oleh 61b ini, dan saya takut pada ketika itu akan terjadi satu hakikat yang berlebihan sangat melakukan hak-nya. Maka saya merasa Kerajaan patut-lah melakukan chara² yang boleh menjamin benar² bahawa hal ini tidak di-lebeh gunakan oleh pehak yang bersangkutan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam Fasal 4, ada satu perkara yang berkenaan dengan "settlements law". Di-sini kalau-lah sa-orang itu ada mempunyai harta dan dia hendak melarikan daripada chukai, maka di-adakan-lah settlements menurut istilah undang² seperti yang di-terangkan dalam No. 7. Dalam fasal ini saya hendak mengingatkan satu perkara, walau pun pada asas-nya saya setuju, bahawa orang yang kaya mempunyai wang berpuluh ribu seperti kata Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan ada mempunyai

'akal juga, dalam ber'akal itu di-pechah²kan harta-nya kepada adek-beradek dan sanak saudara-nya. Saya tidak tahu dari mana datang-nya penterjemahan undang² ini, "relative" di-dalam bahagian (7) ini kata-nya:

"'relative' means any person who is a wife, grandchild, child, brother, sister, uncle, aunt, nephew, niece or cousin of the settlor"

boleh jadi ini kebudayaan barat, ini bukan kebudayaan orang² Melayu. Sebab pada orang Melayu, kalau harta itu di-beri kepada cousin suroh simpan sa-kejap—sudah bertumbok, kalau di-beri kepada cousin akan hilang-lah. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jadi, boleh jadi undang² ini memasokkan hal ini dengan kebudayaan lain dari kebudayaan negeri ini.

Saya rasa, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, patut-lah sangat seperti nephew, niece dan cousin itu di-kaji semula supaya jangan menjadi satu sebab entah umpama-nya dengan chara sayangkan kerana sepupu maka sa-saorang Islam dalam negeri ini umpama-nya memberi satu kompeni-nya kepada sepupu yang menurut peratoran Islam ada-lah lain dan asing semua sakali. Kalau mengikut undang² ini, kalau di-berikan kepada sepupu dan akhir-nya kena pegang juga, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Dan ini amat-lah berbahaya kepada orang² berkebudayaan yang lain daripada orang yang membuat undang² ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, hal mengene-pikan harta kepada saudara mara bagi melarikan chukai ini boleh jadi satu perkara yang telah terjadi bukan kepada orang yang mengamalkan ka-edah cousin, niece dan nephew yang saya sebutkan tadi, dan ta' usah-lah saya risaukan umpama-nya, kata orang, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Tetapi ini undang². Undang² waktu membuat-nya kita boleh kata "jangan risau," tetapi bila dia berjalan di-chengkam-nya sama ada kita risau atau tidak risau, sama ada kita di-beri jaminan atau kita di-beri umpama-nya ingatan bahawa kita ta' kena; sebab undang² ini akan kekal. Maka, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, merenongkan kebudayaan kita dalam negeri ini sa-kurang²-nya bagi orang² Melayu patut-lah soal itu di-kaji dan di-halusi, di-betulkan oleh Menteri.

Sebab jika saya hendak meminda di-sini dia tidak berapa hendak, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Ini memang 'adat Menteri; dia ta' mahu di-pinda lang-song, melainkan dia meminda sendiri. Jadi, biar-lah dia memikirkan sendiri perkara ini dengan beberapa lama di-buat ka-edah² yang boleh menyelamatkan orang² yang saya sebutkan tadi.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam undang² ini kita telah dengar daripada Menteri Kewangan, kita ada satu chara baharu atau chara yang hendak di-lakukan oleh Kerajaan ia-itu chara menggalakkan orang membayar chukai pendapatan. Dengan sebab itu, maka timbul-lah seperti kata Menteri Yang Berhormat tadi, dasar hadiah yang mahal hendak di-berikan itu. Saya risau satu sebab musim hadiah. Zaman emergency, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita menunggu² ma'lumat daripada orang siapa yang boleh mereport hal kawan-nya kepada Kerajaan maka kita berilah duit supaya boleh orang itu kita tangkap. Dan Kerajaan telah berkata di-sini bahawa kejayaan telah di-dapati di-dalam perkara ini. Yang saya risaukan dalam perkara chukai ini ia-lah belum tahu saya sama ada masharakat negeri ini sudah sampai kepada apa yang saya hendak sebutkan ini tetapi saya yakin perkara ini mesti di-terangkan, ia-itu pekara ugut—Black mail umpama-nya. Kata-lah sa-orang daripada kita toke besar ada kuli atau orang sa-belah rumah yang tahu kepada perniagaan kita itu sedikit sa-banyak. Dia tahu kalau di-bawa-nya perkara ini kepada Pejabat Income Tax, di-reportkan-nya sa-telah perkara itu di-siasat dan di-dapati chukai-nya dan berdasar kepada beberapa perkara yang di-sebutkan oleh Menteri tadi maka dia dapat-lah hadiah. Tetapi kita telah membuat asas Black mail dan di-hantar-nya-lah surat kepada Enche' Samsudin, kata-nya, dia tahu Enche' Samsudin ada buku nombor 3 semunyi dalam save No. 8, kunchi-nya ada di-sini. Saya hendak mereport kepada Kerajaan. Saya mahu tuan bayar \$1000; Ini akan menggalakan Black mail itu di-dalam soal ini. Saya tentu-lah yakin bahawa Menteri kita akan beriktirar supaya perkara ini ta' akan jadi. Tetapi dalam masharakat yang

ada secret society, gangster dan sebagainya ini, saya rasa tidak-lah berapa jauh undang² atau dasar memberi hadiah ini, Tuan Yang di-pertua, daripada orang² yang tidak bertanggung jawab akan membolehkan gangster ini hidup dan kita tidak dapat melawannya. Ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya harap Menteri yang bersangkutan memikirkan perkara ini di-dalam kaseluruhan-nya. Saperti yang sudah saya katakan, saya sokong undang² ini dan saya berjanji kepada Tuan Yang di-Pertua tadi sa-tengah jam sahaja maka saya akhirkkan dengan menyokong undang² ini.

Enche' Chin See Yin (Seremban Timor): Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Bill is no doubt intended to plug the holes in the Income Tax law on the question of evasion of tax. Certain allegations regarding certain people having two or three sets of account books are no doubt made towards a section of the population. It is important for us to consider this Bill in many aspects.

Firstly, I would like to call the attention of this House to clause 5. Clause 5 gives the Comptroller at all times free access to all places, buildings, land and all books and documents in order to obtain certain information. Sir, I say that this power is an infringement of human rights and liberties. We are a member of the United Nations Organisation and we supported the Universal Declaration of Human Rights Charter that had been adopted by the United Nations Organisation on the 10th December, 1948, in Paris. We have subscribed to that, and in Article 12 it says that no one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference in his privacy, family, home or correspondence. That being the case, Sir, we have this morning heard of the condemnation which has been made against the policy adopted by the South African Government. We are looking into something wrong done by others, but at the same time we will have to see whether the thing we are doing is right or wrong. That is one aspect of it.

Another aspect in providing such power is, no doubt, to get information. But, Sir, that power, or that law, is likely to create a possible danger, and

that danger can mean that some person may impersonate the officer of that Department.

We have identity cards, currency notes, and in all these we have forgeries. What is there to prevent some of these thugs possessing credentials with photographs made, signatures produced, in the same manner as those which have been produced by the Income Tax Department for these Tax officers who go into the house of the business people, the merchants, the small business people, or anybody, for that matter, to get information? Now, this law will also give the thug an opportunity to go into anybody's house. All he has got to do is to watch the movements of the house-owner thus knowing the times when he leaves the house and returns; and with only a few women in the house, what is there to prevent him from producing a card to the innocent women folks in the house and saying, "I am a Tax officer and I would like to search your house." The moment he gets in, he will tie everybody up and carry away possibly the lifetime savings of the person. On the other hand there is the other danger of blackmailing. We all know that certain people care so much for their reputation that they would not like to go to the Court, as, although they are innocent, by going to the Court, this creates a slur on their names. So somebody, knowing well that he is a man of that nature, can easily go to that man and say, "Look here, I know you are making a lot of money, and I know too that you have not submitted your income Tax Return properly". Now knowing that he has made a mistake the man concerned has got to pay a large sum of money to the other man just for nothing. We are going to make a law that is going to create many loopholes. On the one hand it is good in some respects, but on the other it has many evils.

Again, there is the question of search. Search, Sir, by an officer can also create temptation—temptation in that there is the element of human weakness, and he can easily give way. Who is to know, except God, whether he has taken something or not in a very quiet

way? This is another form of black-mailing, another form of extortion.

Now, Sir, I am coming to Clause 6 of this Bill. Clause 6 says:

“ in the preceding calender year exceeded eighteen thousand dollars from the sale of goods, or twelve thousand dollars from the performance of services, issue a printed receipt serially numbered for every sum received in respect of goods sold or services performed in the course of or in connection with such trade, business, profession or vocation, and shall retain a duplicate of every such receipt:”

There is no doubt that there is a proviso saying that, if the Comptroller is satisfied, he can dispense with the issue of receipts in certain cases. We have heard this morning the speech of the Honourable the Minister of Finance setting out certain types of business people or traders like hawkers, stall-holders, and people doing business of less than \$24,000. Sir, this is only an assurance and an assurance is not a law. Why don't we amend the Bill and put it in the manner he suggested so that we all know there it is—if that is what is required?

Now, I come to the question of receipts exceeding \$18,000. It means that a stall-holder or a hawker, with to-day's cost of living, can easily sell for \$50 and over a day. A small trader in a kampong, in a New Village, can easily get a hundred dollars and above: it is not difficult because of the high cost of living. Does it mean that all these small traders must go to the extent, in the case of a person buying five cents chilly or ten cents *belachan*, of issuing a receipt and keeping a duplicate and to produce all these to the Income Tax officer at the end of the year? He must have a big room set aside in his small hut for the purpose of keeping all these receipts and bills. We are going to make things difficult and we are going to increase the cost of purchases. We are going to make the shopkeepers to tell their customers, “I am afraid, I have to charge you a few cents more because I have to issue receipts”. Further he has got to go to an expert to prepare his accounts. All this means money, all this means work, and work means labour and labour means more money. Do you think that such a thing is good? Receipts are

issued usually by the big firms, but for years and years, for over centuries, the small traders have been carrying on business without issuing receipts. Now suddenly if you call upon them to do so, it is going to create hardship.

Now, let us come to the account books. The law on limitation provides for six years—first it started with three; then we progressed further, stepping it up to six; now we are going back, stepping it up to twelve years. Somebody has got to keep the books for twelve years. Twelve years is a long time. Every year, to keep one set of books will require a lot of space; you have got to keep your books safe for twelve years, as it is difficult to remember the accounts—not to say for five years, even for three years it is difficult. Suddenly, to be called upon by the Income Tax officer or through information given by some informer, that man has got to go back and dig up his books. We know the amount of time that is necessary for him to get all those information and particulars required by the officer. What amount of space will be required to keep all these documents? What is there to prevent rats from destroying all these documents, and when he says that the documents were destroyed by rats, you would say that it is impossible. It will take a very long time and it will be very difficult for him to explain to the Tax officer and convince him. When we make a law, we have got to be very careful that we are making that law which is practical; when we are making a law, we have to find out whether that will bring us a reasonable extra income, and whether it is worth that income to introduce this law which will create so much of hardships, so much of danger and insecurity to certain sections of the people.

Therefore, I say, Sir, that unless one has tasted the bitter pills, one would not know the taste of the pills, and I would suggest that where it has been suggested that directives will be given and assurance made, that should be made in writing. In other words, we should amend the Bill. Sir, I say that this Bill is not a good one and I hope, in his later address, the Minister will make amendments to this Bill.

Enche' Tan Phock Kin (Tanjong): Mr. Speaker, Sir, when the Honourable the Minister of Finance introduced the Bill this morning, he stated at great length that he would do everything in his power to stamp out evasion. I cannot agree more with him in expressing that sentiment. However, in fighting evasion, one must first of all know how to fight it; one must adopt a method that is consistent with the ideals which we cherish. I cannot help feeling that even the Hon'ble the Minister of Finance is having second thoughts about the Bill as can be seen from the amendments he is introducing. However, I am sorry to say that some of the amendments fail to appreciate the actual problem that is involved. As the Honourable Minister has pointed out, to eradicate evasion there are two main problems: firstly, there must be adequate statutory powers and, secondly, there must be a honest staff. I take it that the Honourable Minister is quite satisfied that as far as the Income Tax Department is concerned the staff are quite honest. So we come to the problem of statutory powers. He has put forward various suggestions and I will deal specifically with each clause later on.

In introducing the subject, he said that the weapons used must be very powerful, because they are to be used against unscrupulous people, who are actually evading income tax. However, I must point out here that the measures introduced by this Bill are not to be used specifically against unscrupulous people, but that they are going to be applied to the citizens of this country generally whether they are scrupulous or unscrupulous. It is my submission that there are provisions in this Bill which are inconsistent with the very utterance of the Honourable Minister.

Coming to the Bill itself, Clause 2 of the Bill will give power to the Minister to issue directions. The Minister in the course of his speech to-day has not told the House what sort of directions he is going to give. According to the Bill, the directions are going to be of a general character. I do not know what that actually means and the Minister made no attempt whatsoever to elaborate on what those

general directions will be. Later on, he pointed out that there might be direction to the Comptroller of Income Tax to grant exemptions to certain categories of taxpayers. But I must say here that in the absence of specific provision in this Bill with regard to what the directions will be, it will be within the power of the Minister to issue directives which may be inconsistent with the wishes of this House. We may have, for example, a very important person, or perhaps a relative of an important person, who may be found to be evading taxation, and what is going to prevent the Minister from issuing instructions to the Comptroller of Income Tax asking him to give more time to this particular person, or perhaps to ask the Comptroller of Income Tax to be less stringent on him. I submit, Sir, that this is a very important power which the Minister is asking from this House, and we cannot agree to giving the Minister such a blanket power which can be abused.

The Honourable Minister spoke of one important person—the President of the Penang branch of the Malayan Chinese Association—and he condemned him in no uncertain terms for advocating certain taxation measures which are contrary to the very concept of fair play. However it must be appreciated that there is a possibility that in the not too distant future, perhaps, this particular person may succeed him as the Minister of Finance, and what is going to happen if we give the Honourable Minister such wide powers? I submit, Sir, that this is undesirable, and I would appeal to the Minister to amend the Bill accordingly when it comes before the Committee—that is, to delete such powers. Income Tax Ordinances are meant to set up rules and procedures by which the Comptroller can act and it is most undesirable for Honourable Ministers to be in a position to give directives. If that is done, the Income Tax Ordinance will be coloured with political objectives. Ministers are, as you know, politicians and it is most undesirable that a Minister should meddle with the day-to-day running of the Income Tax Department.

As regards Clause 4 of the Bill, I have nothing to add. I agree entirely with the Minister in taking such steps.

Coming now to Clause 5, as Honourable Members are aware, it gives powers to the Comptroller to obtain information. It is my submission, Sir, that the crux of the problem in preventing the evasion of income tax is for the Comptroller to have adequate power to obtain information, accounts, etc. I quite agree with the section in so far as it says that the Comptroller should have access to all books and documents, but I see no reason whatsoever why the Comptroller should have free access to all lands, buildings and places: if we look at the original provision in the Income Tax Ordinance, Section 60 gives powers to the Comptroller to call for returns—it is stated there:

“60. The Comptroller may give notice in writing to any person when and as often as he thinks necessary requiring him to furnish within a reasonable time limited by such notice fuller or further returns respecting any matter as to which a return is required by or under this Ordinance.”

Further Section 61 gives power to call for returns and books and that Section reads:

“61. For the purpose of obtaining full information in respect of any person's income the Comptroller may give notice to such person requiring him within the time limited by such notice, which time shall not be less than thirty days from the date of service of such notice, to complete and deliver to the Comptroller any return specified in such notice and in addition or alternatively requiring him to attend personally before him and to produce for examination any books, documents, accounts and returns which the Comptroller may deem necessary.”

Sir, it is my submission that the Ordinance as it stands has provided adequate powers to the Comptroller to ask for books, etc., and I see no reason whatsoever why the Comptroller should be given power of access to lands, buildings and places. If he wants books to be produced, he can obtain them under Section 61 of the Ordinance.

It will be seen that with Clause 6 of the Bill, which provides for more stringent accounting and the provision of receipts, the Comptroller will be in a very good position to ascertain the exact income of any person concerned.

So, I submit, Sir, that the requirements of Clause 5 is quite unnecessary, because it will give rise to abuse as has been pointed out by other Honourable Members.

Coming now to the next Clause—Clause 6—which makes provision for the keeping of books of accounts and of giving receipts, we find here that, in accordance with the speech of the Honourable the Minister of Finance, he went beyond the provision as stated in the Bill which provides for \$12,000 with respect to the performance of services and \$18,000 with respect to the sale of goods. In his speech he has mentioned that those drawing \$24,000 and less a year will be exempted. I suppose that by directives he can also over-rule the provisions of the Bill itself. He also went on to tell us about the various categories of people that would be exempted. On this particular point, I would like to stress on the principle of granting exemptions. It is a well-known fact taxi drivers, trishaw riders, street stallholders, petty retail stallholders are usually people without education and are unable to write—and as such it is rather difficult to except this category of people to issue receipts and in view of that, I think, exemption should be granted to them. I personally feel that exemption granted generally to this category of people should be supported.

I notice that as far as the Income Tax Ordinance for Singapore is concerned, it gives exemption to those people listed and, in addition, to all traders whose gross sales do not exceed \$36,000 in the previous year. Here the Minister is only prepared to grant it to people in trade whose turnover is less than \$24,000. I say that even for no other reason than that of uniformity, the Honourable Minister should consider increasing that sum to \$36,000—the figures deal with actual sales and I submit that a lot of petty traders do exceed that particular sum of \$24,000. Therefore, I would urge the Honourable Minister to amend this particular clause to the Singapore figure.

I notice also that so far as the proposal is concerned the sum of \$24,000 applies not only to petty traders but

also to professional men. So, my submission is that if the exemption is for people not capable of writing receipts, then this particular exemption should not apply to professional men, because even if a professional man were to draw less than \$12,000 gross earnings, there is absolutely no difficulty whatsoever for the professional man to issue receipts; and as such I feel that professional men should not be included in this category who enjoys exemption.

Coming now to his statement on informers, Mr. Speaker, I have this to say. I agree entirely with the Honourable Member from Bachok with regard to the sentiments expressed on the use of informers. I personally feel, Sir, that in a country like ours, accepting the ideals of democracy, we should not in any way encourage the emergence of a group of people who will derive income purely from informing, and I feel, Sir, that this very move by the Honourable the Minister of Finance will encourage a group of people who will do nothing but informing for a living, because, looking at the scale of fees which he is prepared to pay, I must submit, Sir, that it is a very lucrative profession, and I feel sure that a lot of people will consider very seriously to join this group of professional men in doing nothing but informing. Because if a man can get as much as 10 per cent on tax recovered, it will be worth his while doing nothing but prying in the private affairs of his friends and, perhaps, his relatives. In a country like ours, I submit, Sir, that it should be our duty to educate our citizens to be more conscious of their responsibility, and I would much prefer a person who lodged a complaint to the Income Tax Department because he feels that he is doing his duty to report the matter rather than because he will be able to get a reward because once we have our people conscious of this, there is no necessity whatsoever to give rewards. In fact, I should say that I am ashamed of my fellow countryman who gives information purely because he can get a reward, and I would like to urge the Minister concerned to give very serious consideration to this particular point, because the whole moral tone of our country

is dependent on what is being done by Government, and we do not want our Government to encourage this most undesirable practice. So, Sir, it will be seen from what I have said that though we on this side of the House are quite in agreement with the principles of the Bill, with the objectives of fighting evasion of income tax, of eradicating evasion, we feel that the methods utilised should not be of such an arbitrary nature. It should be consistent with the very concepts we believe in. It should not encourage informers, it should not play any part in reducing the morals of the people of this country. We do not want the people of this country to live in fear. We have seen in the course of this year various changes in legislation, and most of the changes are designed to instill fear into the people—fear of being arrested, and fear of even criticising the Government because of certain provisions in the law. And now, even on a matter like income tax, we are still using this method of trying to get result by instilling fear. That, I submit, Sir, is most undesirable, and I would earnestly hope that the Minister will agree to making necessary amendments to this particular Bill. To enable him to do so, I would like to move that this Bill be referred to a Select Committee at the appropriate moment, and I hope the Honourable the Minister of Finance will support me in this so that we can remove all the undesirable features in this particular Bill, because in amending an ordinance one must be sure that the Ordinance will serve its purpose at all times. We must not think that because So-and-So is the Honourable the Minister of Finance, So-and-So is a very good man, he will give directives to make things as reasonable as possible for the people that we should agree to the amendment. We must make provision for all time, and as such I hope that the Honourable the Minister of Finance will agree to refer this to a Select Committee.

Enche' S. P. Seenivasagam (Meng-lembu): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to make a few observations on the proposed amendments.

Those who defraud the Government of income tax, those who cook up

account books, they are but common cheats and forgers, and I think they should be treated as such, and naturally we would welcome any move to combat them. Our comment on this Bill is that while on its principle we can have no quarrel, we do feel that the methods adopted are too drastic—rather, the method—I refer to one method, and that is the very extensive and sweeping powers given to the Collector. It may be effective in the end, it may be completely effective, but then we must not overlook the dangers which are present: when anybody is entrusted with arbitrary powers, that opens the door to corruption. Obviously, the Collector himself cannot go into every shop and every business and investigate the books himself. He will have to delegate his duties to somebody. Now, there are, as the Honourable Minister has pointed out, many tax dodgers in this country, and if it is so profitable for them to dodge being taxed, they would not think very much of paying a retainer every month to an unscrupulous investigator to keep his silence. That would be a very strong and very tempting attraction to any tax investigator, and that is the greatest danger in conferring these extensive powers on the Comptroller. The pity of it is that this Ordinance itself does not provide any safeguard against misuse of that power. Perhaps, if, as suggested, and I am not moving this but I am just suggesting it, if, as suggested by the last Honourable Member who spoke, this matter is referred to a Select Committee, then perhaps some consideration could be given to embodying some safeguards against abuse of power. For example, it could be provided that if any investigator goes to investigate the books of a business, it should be his duty within 24 hours to report the results of his search to the Comptroller so that he cannot make frivolous visits just for the purpose of annoying people. It should be his duty, after visiting a place, within a specified period, to make a report of the result, otherwise it would be open to the investigator to keep on pestering others, and it would be a check on him so that he cannot be able to make unnecessary visits on

people. Perhaps the Comptroller could take action for it to be done departmentally, but if the Ordinance does not provide for it, it would be open for people to be pestered persistently and unnecessarily.

Now, regarding the question of informers, that, I feel, is a very undesirable provision in this Ordinance. Again, I say it may be effective, but then the advantages are not such as would justify this encouragement of informers who are treated as a class of despicable persons in any decent society. While they may do some service to the Government, it should not be something which should be encouraged by offering rewards, and this again would spread distrust between employers and employees. Every businessman will suspect his accountant. Every employer will suspect his employee of wanting to inform. Maybe the employee will be justified in going and informing, maybe the employer is a crook, and in that case the employee will get a reward, but then is it advisable to create distrust between employers and employees in this country? I think that again requires reconsideration, and on these two matters I would ask further consideration from the Government.

Enche' Geh Chong Keat (Penang Utara): Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is most unfortunate that the Honourable the Minister of Finance has seen fit to condemn the President of the Penang Malayan Chinese Association in no uncertain terms in this House. Surely, the Penang Malayan Chinese Association President is entitled to voice his opinion against any misgivings he finds in any proposed law that is to be enacted by this Parliament. The Honourable the Minister of Finance seems to have taken the view that whoever opposes the Bill is himself an evader. This view appears to be personal rather than political.

Dato' Onn bin Ja'afar: Hear, hear!

Enche' Geh Chong Keat: I am sure everyone in this House supports the principle of fighting tax evasion, and what the Penang Malayan Chinese Association President has protested

against is the wide powers given to the Comptroller. The Minister may look upon his tax collectors as above suspicion; however, the Penang Malayan Chinese Association only express the fears of the people. But since we have got clarification, and an explanation has been given by the Honourable the Minister of Finance as to how the implementation of the Bill will be effected, the Penang Malayan Chinese Association protest must receive satisfaction, and I sincerely hope that Honourable the Minister of Finance will construe the Penang Malayan Chinese Association protest in the light of the explanation I have given. Thank you, Sir.

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very grateful to Honourable Members of the opposite benches, who have supported this Bill in principle. It is very gratifying to the Government to find that all Parties are united in the endeavour to reduce substantially, if not stamp out altogether, the income tax evasion in this country. I have already covered a lot of ground in the second reading of the Bill and it is therefore not my intention to go over the same ground again, even though in the course of the debate a number of Honourable Members have referred to points which I have already dealt with in my main speech. But I shall attempt to deal with those points which probably require further clarification.

The Honourable Member for Bachok in his remark on clause 11 of the Bill feels that this provision will not achieve the purpose it sets out to achieve. He suggests that we might possibly consider taking direct action in Singapore—I think that is what he meant; I do not think we can do that, because Singapore is not part of the territory of the Federation, and I do not see how we can take direct action without going through the proper authorities in Singapore itself. I agree that this involves delay, but I can see no other alternative. However, it should be remembered that even if Singapore were to agree to our taking direct action—and I think it is most unlikely—I think we will have to give reciprocal powers to the Singapore authorities, and I do not think the

House will agree to that. I think this is the best we can do, and I hope it will prove sufficient.

The Honourable Member for Bachok in his comments on clause 10 of the Bill suggested that we could limit the discretion given to the Comptroller to extend the time limit within which the payment of tax is to be made. I am, of course, gratified that he should feel that I have not gone far enough, because many people think that the Government has gone too far, but I think this is a rather difficult question, because it may well happen that there is a genuine case for appeal. It may well happen that a taxpayer feels that his return is correct and that the assessment upon it by the Comptroller is not correct; and we all know that it takes time for the law to take its course, and if we were to suggest a limit, say, of 2 months or even 6 months' grace, it may happen that that would not be sufficient for the case to be heard in Court. Besides, I tried to make it clear in my speech that it is not the intention of the Comptroller to make use of this power in all cases. It is the intention to make use of this power only in exceptional cases, where it is felt that this concession is resorted to as a delaying tactic, and where it is felt that the person resorting to this concession is an evader on a big scale. It is not the intention to resort to this power on the part of this Government where there is a genuine difference of opinion and, in such a case, it may well be that it would take a long time for the matter to be settled, especially if the tax payer decided to go to Court. I, therefore, think that this proviso as at present worded is sufficiently flexible; it does not go too far and it is not too restrictive, and I think we may leave it at that.

The Honourable Member from Bachok also referred to sub-clause 3 of clause 6 which deals with the power of the Comptroller to waive or to exempt any person or class of persons from the need to issue receipts. Again, he feels here that this power is too wide and that it should not be used lavishly in the granting of exemption. Here again I think it is very difficult to generalise, because if we do so, we might find that we inflict unnecessary hardship

upon the small man and, as I tried to make clear in my speech, it is not the intention of the Government to cause unnecessary hardship to the small man. I think we have got to make it fairly flexible, so that the Comptroller will have sufficient room for manoeuvring in this matter. He suggests we should extend this exemption to rubber tappers, fishermen and others. As far as rubber tappers are concerned, I do not think they will come into this category at all. I do not think that the takings of any rubber tapper exceeds \$2,000 a month, or \$70 a day. I know that even during the Korean war boom they did not earn more than \$10 a day. So, they are well outside this category. With regard to fishermen, the Government is prepared to consider whether it may be necessary, in the light of experience, to add or amend the list which I have already announced. This is quite easy because it is an administrative direction, and if it is found necessary to extend the list, the Government will be certainly prepared to do so.

With regard to another Honourable Member—I think the Honourable Member for Tanjong—he suggested that we should raise the level from \$24,000 to \$36,000. I am not very happy about this, because, as I have already tried to inform this House, many people who are really in that tax bracket may say they are not in the tax bracket, simply by stating that their income is \$1,000 or so much less than that. If to-day we are to raise the limit too high, it may well be that even those earning \$40,000 a year would say they are only earning \$36,000 and it is not so easy to prove, if a person were to contradict you, whether he earns \$36,000 or \$40,000 a year. It can be done, but you require a lot of investigation. You cannot even make an arbitrary guess, because you must remember that they can always appeal to the Courts, apart from the Board of Appeal. We have got to be very careful in raising this limit.

The Honourable Member for Bachok also referred to clause 4, which deals with the income from settlements. I believe that the definition of “relative” is arbitrary. You can say that the list should be further extended; you can

also say that the list is too large. It is all a matter of opinion, but as far as we are concerned, we have based the list on our own experience and the experience of the Department. These are the relatives, who have been made use of by persons with large incomes in order to reduce their tax liability. It is just a matter of knowledge gained in the light of experience, and I do not know how we can do better than that.

A number of Honourable Members touched on the question of rewards and the undesirability of encouraging people to inform on evaders. To begin with, I should like to inform Honourable Members how this system works exactly without revealing any details. The Department does not investigate, if to-day it were to receive a letter saying that Mr. “A” is evading tax to the tune of so many dollars without giving any details. Obviously that sort of letter is not worth worrying about, and probably I would not be betraying any secrets when I say that many of such letters go straight into the waste-paper basket. I mean, we know as well as anybody that a large percentage of the information is really motivated by a desire to settle personal score, and, unless there are details to substantiate the allegations made, the chances are that most of the allegations will not go beyond the desk of the person receiving it. In many cases they end up in the waste paper basket. Very little in fact of the information given is of real value, and that is why I took care to explain in my speech that unless the information given is accompanied by sufficient details and does have a ring of truth, it is not possible to give a reward. I do not think it is so easy to earn this reward, because the information given must be of a specific character and must have facts, figures, names, places, dates, and so on. As I tried to make it clear, it is no use making vague and wild allegations, because, to begin with it is not much use. It is obviously impossible for officers of the Income Tax Department to say that so and so earns so much, on the basis of uncorroborated evidence. In such cases, I do not think the possibility of blackmail is as great as that. I, myself, in the course of the last

few months, have received a fairly large number of letters, and I do not mind saying that in the majority of cases I have had no hesitation in throwing them straight into the waste paper basket. We do get the odd case where a person knows what he is talking about, and only in such a case would the Department take the trouble to follow up the information given. Obviously the Department must be receiving any number of letters every day and unless they are of any value, it would be a complete waste of time to follow every one of them up. So, I think Honourable Members can rest assured that it is not as easy as that to blackmail. The same thing happened in the Emergency, and I think it is no secret again that, during the Emergency, thousands upon thousands of letters were received, and I think many of the letters found their way to the waste paper basket because, obviously, you cannot accuse a man on the basis of one line if it is not supported by any evidence whatsoever.

The Honourable Member for Seremban Timor suggested that clause 5 was a negation of human rights. I do not quite agree, because I have tried to explain in my speech that it is not exactly a very novel provision. In fact, I have with me here the laws of Australia, Ceylon, Canada, India and even of South Africa; I thought it was not so very wise to mention South Africa but, anyway, it would be seen that this provision is in the Income Tax Laws of five countries, apart from Singapore and Malaya. It is, therefore, not such an unusual provision. In fact our provision is most unusual because, as far as I know, it is probably only found in the Income Tax Laws of England. The Honourable Member for Seremban Timor also spoke of the necessity for safeguards. I entirely agree and that was why I took the trouble in my speech to elaborate the safeguards, which we intended to set up in order to prevent, as far as possible, any abuse of the wide powers given in clause 5 of the Bill. The Honourable Member for Seremban Timor also referred to the exemption under clause 6 in regard to the need to issue receipts. I have already read out the list of persons, who would

be exempted from the need of issuing receipts, and I do not know why he brought up this matter again. He referred to hawkers and stall-holders. They have already been exempted, and I do not know what he is worried about.

He referred also to clause 8 which deals with the possibility that the Comptroller might issue assessments which go back to a period of 12 years. I have tried to make it clear in my speech that, in the ordinary course of events, we will not go beyond 6 years, and that it was only our intention to go beyond the 6-year period provided there were reasons to suspect evasion. Obviously it is a physical impossibility, with the human resources at the command of the Income Tax Department, to reopen the assessment of 35,000 people for six years running to a period of 12 years, even if we wanted to do so. I think it is physically impossible for us to do so. Even at the moment I should say that Section 69 of the Ordinance does in fact give the Comptroller power to go back on an unlimited period in case of fraud or wilful default. So, this provision is in fact not as revolutionary as that since, in fact, it is only a slight extension of the existing provision in the law.

The Honourable Member for Tanjong thinks that clause 2 is wrong and should not be inserted—i.e., clause 2 gives the Minister the power to give directions of a general character to the Comptroller. Well, this is a very difficult issue. I think the Honourable Member for Menglembu suggested that the powers given to the Comptroller were too wide. It is obvious that in a Bill of this nature wide powers must be given. The question is: to whom should it be given? If, on the other hand, I suggested giving more powers to the Minister I think a number of Honourable Members would have said "it is too dangerous because the Minister may make use of these powers to embarrass his political enemies". So I thought it was safer and wiser to give greater powers to the Comptroller, so that it could be said that the Comptroller would not be subject to political interference, and the reason in fact why this Bill has been so worded is to prevent

political interference on the part of the Minister. It should be remembered that, even without such a power, as the Minister responsible for the administration of the Income Tax Department, I can always give instructions to the Comptroller even on points of detail, and this will make it clear that in future the Minister's powers would only extend to directions of a general character.

With regard to the suggestion of favouritism—which I do not think is very worthy—anyhow, I do not mind telling the Honourable Member that one of the first acts I did, when I took office, was to direct the Income Tax Department that no favouritism should be shown at all to persons in positions of power and privilege.

The Honourable Member for Tanjong also suggested that professional men should be excluded from the exemption given to those whose gross takings were \$24,000 in 1959. I think there is some merit in this suggestion, but since I have already announced that this exemption will include professional men we will see how it works. If it does not work, we can change it. For the moment, we will see how it works.

I am afraid I cannot agree with the suggestion to refer the Bill to a Select Committee, because this Bill has been very carefully considered, in the first place, by a Government Committee which studied this Bill very carefully and which, in fact, devoted a lot of its time to ensure:

- (a) that the wide powers given to the Comptroller will not be abused; and
- (b) that in the administration of this Ordinance no undue hardship will be caused to the small man.

Further as an added safeguard, we had a joint meeting, as Honourable Members would be aware, with a similar committee set up by the Singapore Government, and as a result, the two Bills in both territories are identical. In fact, I can say that the Singapore Bill is word for word similar to the Bill, which you see before you to-day. I, therefore, think that it would be a

breach of faith to the Singapore Government to try to mess around with this Bill now. The Government is also satisfied that this Bill is the best that can be produced under the circumstances.

I do not wish to reply to another Honourable Member on the question of Penang. It was in fact painful to me to refer to Penang, but I thought whatever else the Penang Branch did, they should not have attacked the Government publicly on this matter. I think there is no question of that, because I have got an actual copy of the report in front of me, and it does say that the Penang M.C.A. protests in the strongest term against the reintroduction of the Income Tax (Amendment) Bill. I take it that this means they are against the principle of the Bill. Honourable Members of the Opposition Parties who spoke made it clear that they supported the principle of the Bill, although they did not agree with the details. But the Penang Branch asked for the total withdrawal of the Bill and, therefore, I think I have some justification in coming to the conclusion I did. (*Applause.*)

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.

Clause 4—

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: I beg to move that clause 4 be amended as follows:

In line 6 of sub-section (1) of new section 29A—

- (i) to leave out "or"; and
- (ii) insert "and"

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause 4, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 5—

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: I beg to move that clause 5 be amended as follows:

In line 1 of sub-section (1) of new section 61B—

- (i) to leave out "The Comptroller"; and
- (ii) insert "Where the Comptroller considers it necessary in the execution of his duties under this Ordinance, the Comptroller".

Enche' Tan Phock Kin (Tanjong):

On clause 5, I am afraid the Honourable Minister of Finance did not reply fully to me in the course of his speech. I was suggesting that the existing Income Tax Ordinance will serve the purpose, with the exception of giving free access to all lands, buildings and places. So, in the light of that explanation, I wonder whether the Minister will consider deleting the words "to all lands, buildings and places".

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: As I have tried to explain, Sir, this clause has been very carefully considered and the Government feels that it is vitally necessary for this clause to be included in the law in order to be able to cope up with the work properly. There is a safeguard in fact, because it will be amended to the effect that this power will only be available if the Comptroller is satisfied that evasion exists.

Enche' Chin See Yin (Seremban Timor): Mr. Speaker, Sir, this morning, the Minister of Finance said that he would give directions to the Comptroller that "free access to all lands, buildings and places shall be made during daylight." I suggest that "at all times" be amended to "day time." I wonder whether the Minister of Finance will agree to the amendment—instead of a directive, let it be amended in this Bill.

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Sir, the assurance I gave, after all, is a public assurance, and it is good enough. Obviously, if I give an assurance that this inspection will be only carried out during daylight, of course, it will be carried out accordingly. It may not be carried out if the Alliance is not

returned to power in the next election but, as far as the Alliance Government is concerned, this undertaking is binding even though it may not be in the law.

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam (Ipoh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on this question of the hours of daylight, I request that it be amended as suggested, because assurances given are sometimes assurances never kept, and sometimes completely broken, even by the Alliance Ministers. I can recall an instance which has not been contradicted and which cannot be contradicted. On the question of the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance, we were given an assurance by the Minister of the Interior that the Presidents appointed to these Committees would be judicial men—qualified men, members of the Bench—but from the debate in this House it has been clear that that assurance was not carried out. I am not blaming the Minister, but that assurance was not carried out in Penang for one reason or another. Therefore, assurances given from the ministerial bench are broken whether they are from the Alliance or any other Party.

Mr. Speaker: If you wish to move an amendment, let me have it.

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam: I am supporting the amendment.

Mr. Speaker: I have not got the amendment yet.

Enche' Chin See Yin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move an amendment—delete the words "all times" in the first line of section 61B. (1), and substitute the word "daylight" therefor.

Mr. Speaker: Your amendment is to substitute the words "at daylight" for "at all times"?

Enche' Chin See Yin indicates assent.

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: May I be permitted to make one comment? I am not a lawyer, but I think that it would be difficult to define "daylight", because what is daylight to the Comptroller may not be daylight to the person who is to be examined. If we accept the amendment, we have to insert a definition for "daylight". Further, I think

"daylight" is really a point in time; so, when it may be daylight in Ipoh, say, in March, when daylight takes place at seven o'clock, in Penang it is at another time; therefore this is a complicated amendment.

Enche' Chin See Yin: "Daylight" is time between sunrise and sunset.

Mr. Speaker: Do you wish to proceed with your amendment?

Enche' Chin See Yin: Yes, Sir. I am sticking to it.

Mr. Speaker: Your amendment is to delete the words "at all times" and substitute therefor the words "at daylight"?

Enche' Chin See Yin: Yes.

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Government opposes the amendment.

Amendment put, and negatived.

Original amendment put, and agreed to.

Clause 5, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 6—

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Sir, I beg to move that Clause 6 be amended in the manner shown in the amendment slip circulated to Hon'ble Members, viz.:

In line 3 of sub-section (5) of new section 63, to leave out "July" and insert therefor "September".

Amendment put, and agreed to.

Clause 6, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 7—

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Sir, I beg to move that Clause 7 be amended in the manner shown in the amendment slip circulated to Honourable Members, viz.:

In line 1 of new sub-section (7) of section 64, to leave out "Where" and insert therefor the words "Notwithstanding the provisions of any written law to the contrary, where."

Amendment put, and agreed to.

Clause 7, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 8—

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Sir, I beg to move, that the Committee doth disagree with Clause 8.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause 8 accordingly disagreed to.

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: I beg to move that the following new Clause 8, of which notice has been given, be inserted in place of the clause just disagreed to:

"Amendment of section 69.

8. Sub-section (i) of section 69 of the Principal Ordinance is hereby amended by substitution for the word "six" appearing therein the word "twelve".

Brought up, and read a first time.

Question, That the clause be read a second time, put, and agreed to.

Clause read a second time, and added to the Bill.

Clause 9 ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 10—

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Sir, I beg to move that Clause 10 be amended in the manner shown in the amendment slip circulated to Honourable Members, viz.:

In the last line of the first proviso [proviso (a)] to new section 82—to leave out "July" and insert therefor "September".

Amendment put, and agreed to.

Clause 10, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 11 to 16 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clause 17—

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Sir, I beg to move that Clause 17 be amended as shown in the amendment slip, viz.:

In lines 1 and 2 of sub-section (3) of new section 91 to leave out "compound any offence punishable" and insert therefor "abate any penalty or compound any offence".

Amendment put, and agreed to.

Clause 17, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Clauses 18 to 21 inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

New Clause 2—

Enche' Tan Siew Sin: Sir, I beg to move that the following new Clause 2 as shown in the notice of amendments circulated to Honourable Members be inserted in the Bill immediately after Clause 1 with consequential re-numbering of the subsequent clauses of the Bill:

"Amend-
ment of
section 2.

2. Section 2 of the Income Tax Ordinance, 1947 (in this Act referred to as "the Principal Ordinance") is hereby amended

by inserting immediately before the figure "91" appearing in the definition of "Comptroller" the figure and comma "63,".

Brought up, and read a first time.

Question, That the clause be read a second time, put, and agreed to.

Clause read a second time, and added to the Bill.

Bill, reported with amendments: read the third time and passed.

Adjourned at 4.25 p.m.

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND CO-OPERATIVES

Grants to Padi Planters

1. Enche' Lee Seck Fun asks the Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives, whether at the moment the Government is considering grants to individual padi planters.

The Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives (Enche' Abdul Aziz bin Ishak): The Government is not considering grants to individual padi planters.

Clerical Staff to District Agricultural Offices

2. Enche' Lee Seck Fun asks the Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives, whether his Ministry is considering recruiting clerical staff to District Agricultural Offices so as to allow the officers to do more field work.

Enche' Abdul Aziz: Agricultural Offices at District level come within the jurisdiction of the State Governments. The provision of clerical staff at District Agricultural Offices therefore rests with the State Governments.

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

Security Fencing and Freedom of Movement of Villagers after end of Emergency

3. Dato' Teoh Chze Chong asks the Minister of Defence, now that the Emergency will be declared officially over on the 31st July, whether

- (a) security fencing around New Villages will be removed, and normal freedom of movement restored to villagers;
- (b) smallholders will be allowed to return to live on their own holdings.

The Minister of Defence (Tun Abdul Razak):

- (a) Except in a security area proclaimed under the proposed Internal Security Act the

removal of security fencing round new villages may be permitted by the appropriate local authority. For the second part of the question, *see* reply to (b).

- (b) Except in a security area it is not Government's intention to restrict the normal freedom of movement of individuals by legislation. Administrative arrangements will, however, be made by the Ministry of Rural Development to discourage as far as possible smallholders returning to settle on holdings which are remote and which will entail their living in isolation and their being deprived of the benefit of such amenities as schools, roads, health centres, etc.

Tape-recording of Speeches by Police

4. Enche' Ahmad Boestamam minta kapada Menteri Pertahanan menerangkan jika beliau sedar ia-itu Polis ada merakam dengan tape-recorder ucapan² yang di-buat dalam rapat² umum sa-lain daripada rapat² umum kerana pilihan raya, dan jika demikian, nyatakan Undang² mana-kah membenarkan mereka berbuat demikian; dan jika mereka tidak di-beri kuasa mengikut mana² Undang², nyatakan langkah² yang beliau berchadang hendak jalankan untuk merentikan perbuatan ini.

Tun Abdul Razak: Menteri Pertahanan ada-lah sedar ia-itu pihak Polis ada merakamkan ucapan² dalam rapat² umum sa-lain daripada rapat² umum kerana pilihan raya. Semua rapat² umum, sama ada berhubung dengan pilihan raya atau tidak, ada-lah di-kehendaki menurut seksen 39 (2) dalam Undang² Polis tahun 1952, mendapat surat kebenaran, dan surat kebenaran ini boleh menentukan syarat² di-keluarkan dia. Ada-lah menurut syarat² Undang² ia-itu surat kebenaran demikian itu membenarkan Polis boleh hadir, jika mereka suka, dalam meshuarat² demikian dan merakamkan perjalanan-nya.

Federation Armed Forces—Duties of Senior Officers

5. Enche' Ahmad Boestamam minta kepada Menteri Pertahanan menerangkan ada-kah benar bahawa Timbalan Turus Agong Tentera Persekutuan Tanah Melayu yang dari anak negeri sendiri hanya di-beri bertanggung-jawab dalam urusan² yang bersangkutan dengan Ugama, Pelajaran dan Penempatan sa-mula (resettlement) sahaja dan tidak dalam bahagian² lain yang lebih penting seperti Pengangkutan, Perbekalan dan lain².

Tun Abdul Razak: Pegawai yang dimaksudkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat itu ia-lah Timbalan Pemerintah Tentera Persekutuan, Pegawai ini sa-lain daripada tanggungan-nya sa-bagai Timbalan Pemerintah, ia-lah ahli Majlis Pasokan Bersenjata dan beliau mempunyai tanggung-jawab khas terhadap Pasokan Bersenjata 'am-nya dalam hal ehwal ugama, pelajaran dan penempatan sa-mula.

6. Enche' Ahmad Boestamam minta kepada Menteri Pertahanan menerangkan ada-kah benar Pegawai² Tinggi Tentera yang di-beri bertanggung-jawab dalam urusan Pengangkutan, Perbekalan dan lain² yang penting adalah berbangsa Inggeris. Jika benar kenapa-kah tanggung-jawab ini tidak di-serahkan kepada Pegawai² Tinggi dari anak negeri.

Tun Abdul Razak: Ketua Chawangan Perbekalan dan Pengangkutan Kementerian Pertahanan ia-lah sa-orang Leftenan Kolonel yang di-pinjamkan. Chawangan ini mengandungi 4 bahagian yang besar dan 3 bahagian yang kecil. Depôt Perbekalan, ia-itu satu daripada bahagian yang besar diketuakan oleh sa-orang Major anak Tanah Melayu, dan satu daripada pasokan pengangkutan akan di-ketuakan oleh sa-orang anak Tanah Melayu juga pada awal tahun hadapan. Ketiga² bahagian kecil di-ketuakan oleh Pegawai² anak Tanah Melayu. Apabila di-fikirkan ia-itu tidak ada chawangan² seperti ini dalam Pasokan Bersenjata Persekutuan Tanah Melayu dahulu daripada tahun 1957, kederasan menggantikan pegawai² Europa dengan pegawai² anak Tanah Melayu boleh lah di-katakan memuaskan hati.

7. Enche' Ahmad Boestamam minta kepada Menteri Pertahanan menerangkan ada-kah benar Penolong Setia-Usaha Kementerian Pertahanan yang dari anak negeri sendiri hanya di-beri bertanggung jawab dalam urusan² yang mengenai pertadbiran sa-hari² sahaja dan tidak dalam urusan² lain yang penting dan rahsia, jika benar apa-kah sebab-nya demikian.

Tun Abdul Razak: Ahli Yang Berhormat nampak-nya telah mendapat keterangan daripada puncha yang tidak boleh di-perchayai. Tidak-lah benar yang Timbalan Setia-Usaha Pertahanan itu di-beri tanggung jawab hanya didalam urusan pentadbiran pejabat hari² sahaja. Sa-bagai sa-orang ahli Majlis Angkatan Bersenjata dan Timbalan kepada Setia-Usaha Pertahanan, kewajipan² dan tanggungan²-nya meliputi semua perkara yang berkaitan dengan pertahanan dan Pasokan² Bersenjata.

Expatriate Officers

8. Enche' V. David asks the Minister of Defence to state the number of expatriate officers in the Federation Armed Forces, the number of expatriate other ranks in the Federation Armed Forces and by what year will the Federation Army be commanded by a Malayan.

Tun Abdul Razak: The number of seconded personnel in the Federation Armed Forces on 1st May, 1960, was:

	Army	Navy	Air Force
Officers ...	191	27	24
Other Ranks ...	141	30	18

No definite date has been fixed for the assumption of command of the Federation Army by a Malayan officer. As I have already announced, it is the intention of the Government that a Malayan officer should succeed the present General Officer Commanding when he relinquishes his command.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Hostel for Malayan Students at Mecca

9. Tuan Syed Esa bin Alwee minta Yang Berhormat Menteri Luar menerangkan ada-kah Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu berchadang hendak

mengadakan sa-buah Asrama untuk penuntut² yang datang dari Persekutuan Tanah Melayu di-Mekah sa-bagaimana yang telah di-adakan di-Masir, London dan di-Australia.

The Minister of External Affairs (Dato' Dr. Ismail bin Dato' Abdul Rahman): Pada masa ini Kerajaan tidak ada chadangan hendak membuka sa-buah Asrama untuk penuntut² Persekutuan Tanah Melayu di-Mekah.

American Supersonic Planes for South East Asia

10. Enche' V. David asks the Minister of External Affairs, to state the stand of the Federation Government on the intention of the United States of America to send 120 supersonic planes to South East Asia at the present critical Cold War Phase in the world.

Dato' Dr. Ismail bin Dato' Abdul Rahman: The Government of the Federation of Malaya is not aware of any such intention of the Government of the United States of America. No comment therefore arises.

Federation Embassy in West Germany

11. Enche' V. David asks the Minister of External Affairs when the Federation will establish an Embassy in West Germany.

Dato' Dr. Ismail bin Dato' Abdul Rahman: Active consideration has been given to establish a diplomatic mission in West Germany, and a mission will be established there as soon as is feasible.

MINISTRY OF INTERIOR

Permits to publish newspapers and magazines

12. Enche' Ng Ann Teck asks the Minister of the Interior, to state the number and the names of applicants who have applied for permits to publish (i) newspapers (ii) magazines in the Federation of Malaya since Merdeka, the number and the names of those who have been refused and the reasons for refusal.

The Minister of the Interior (Dato' Suleiman bin Dato' Abdul Rahman):

Information regarding applicants who since Merdeka have applied for and have been granted permits under section 7 of the Printing Presses Ordinance, 1948, is available in the *Gazette*.

The number of persons who since Merdeka have applied for such permits and have been refused is 18. Their names are:

1. Enche' K. G. Dharan
2. Enche' Cheong Seng Yap
3. Enche' Chong Yew Chuen
4. Enche' Eng Soon Long
5. Enche' Chua Leong Kian
6. Enche' Chiew Swee Peow
7. The Manager, Khung Wah Printers
8. Enche' Tan Hong Choon
9. The Director, Cultural Enterprises Ltd.
10. Enche' Yap Inn Poh
11. Enche' Ong Yew Chiang
12. Enche' K. Annamalai
13. Enche' A. Kannappa Chettiar
14. Enche' Tan Ching
15. Enche' A. Sivasdas
16. Enche' Foo Chie Fu
17. Enche' R. Madhavan
18. Enche' Foo Khoon Kiew.

It is not the practice to disclose the reasons for refusing permits, since these are of a confidential nature.

13. Enche' Ng Ann Teck asks the Minister of the Interior, to state the newspapers which have applied for permission to sell, circulate or otherwise distribute their papers in the Federation since Merdeka, giving the dates of their applications, the number which have been refused, and the reasons for each refusal.

Dato' Suleiman bin Dato' Abdul Rahman: Information regarding the persons who have since Merdeka applied for permits under section 7A of the Printing Presses Ordinance, 1948, including notice of the grant, refusal or revocation of permits, is available in the *Gazette*.

It is not the practice to disclose the reasons for refusing permits, since these are of a confidential nature.

State Nationality Certificates

14. Enche' Chin See Yin asks the Minister of the Interior, to give the number of Certificates of State Nationality issued in each State after Merdeka.

Dato' Suleiman bin Dato' Abdul Rahman: This is entirely a matter for the various State Governments and the figures sought are not therefore available.

Aborigines

15. Che' Khadijah binti Mohd. Sidek minta kepada Menteri Dalam menerangkan:

- (a) berapa-kah jumlah orang² asli dalam Persekutuan.
- (b) apa-kah usaha² yang telah dijalankan oleh Kerajaan bagi memajukan mereka.

Dato' Suleiman bin Dato' Abdul Rahman: Jumlah orang² asli di-Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ada-lah lebih sedikit daripada 45,000 orang. Kebanyakan daripada mereka di-dapati di-Utara Tanah Melayu, tetapi tiap² Negeri melainkan Perlis dan Pulau Pinang ada penduduk² orang asli-nya.

(b) *Kebajikan 'Am:* (i) *Kesihatan*—Jabatan Orang Asli ada 2 orang Pegawai Perubatan yang tetap. Pegawai ini sentiasa melawat kumpulan² orang asli itu. Dalam tempoh tiga bulan yang lampau lebih daripada 700 orang asli telah mendapat rawatan perubatan dan 150 orang daripada mereka telah masuk rumah sakit. Jabatan ini juga menjalankan kursus² untuk bomo orang² asli dan membekalkan mereka dengan ubat² yang moden. Satu penyiasatan berkenaan dengan penyakit batok kering di-kalangan orang² asli sedang di-jalankan di-negeri Kelantan.

(ii) *Pelajaran*—1,500 orang kanak² orang² asli sedang menerima pelajaran. 12 buah daripada sekolah² untuk orang² asli di-jalankan oleh Jabatan Pelajaran, 7 buah daripada-nya oleh Lembaga Pelajaran Dewasa dan 3 buah oleh Jabatan Orang Asli. Sa-lain daripada itu lebih kurang 100 orang kanak²

orang asli sedang belajar di-sekolah² Melayu dan 20 orang di-sekolah² Inggeris.

(iii) *Lain² Hal*—Semua Pembantu Luar Jabatan Orang Asli ada memberi pertolongan dan nasihat² berkenaan dengan chara² pertanian. Beneh², bina-tang ternak dan barang² lain, jika boleh, ada juga di-beri kepada orang² asli. Untuk mengelakkan supaya mereka jangan di-aniaya, barang² hutan yang di-jual oleh mereka ada-lah di-awasi oleh Jabatan ini. Nasihat 'am di-dalam perkara² ini dan juga perkara² lain ada juga di-beri kepada mereka menerusi siaran Radio yang di-khaskan kepada mereka.

MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL WELFARE

Social and Welfare Services Lotteries

16. Enche' Quek Kai Dong asks the Minister of Health and Social Welfare to give the following information:

- (i) The appointed agent(s) in each State for the sale of the Social and Welfare Services Lotteries showing in each case—
 - (a) the date each such agent was appointed;
 - (b) his average sale of tickets per draw;
 - (c) the percentage commission paid to him for the sale of such tickets;
 - (d) the further commissions paid to him on the winning tickets sold by him, by percentage.
- (ii) The total amount collected up to 31-12-1959 on the sale of the Social and Welfare Services Lotteries since its inception, stating—
 - (a) the total amount of profit made by the Social and Welfare Services Lotteries Board up to 31-12-1959;
 - (b) the total amount by way of commission for the sale of such lotteries paid to the appointed agent(s) up to 31-12-1959 in each State;

(c) the total amount by way of commission on the winning tickets paid to the appointed agent(s) up to 31-12-1959 in each State.

(iii) As the Social and Welfare Services Lotteries are public lotteries, whether the members of the public are allowed to buy such lotteries, with or without the same concessions as provided to the appointed agents, direct from the Social and Welfare Services Lotteries Board, if not, to state the reasons.

(iv) The total amount paid to each State from the funds raised by such lotteries and for what specific welfare works up to 31-12-1959 since its inception, particularly, in each State.

The Minister of Health and Social Welfare (Dato' Ong Yoke Lin):

(i) (a) The following Agents were appointed at the meeting of the Board on 10th May, 1952:

(a) Penang, Kedah and Perlis—

Aw Tong Kai (decd.) replaced by Chan Chee Kheong & Bros., on 15th February, 1954.

(b) Selangor—

Kwang Teow Sang Yeong Kee.

(c) Pahang (West)—

Dato A. Mohamed Shariff, J.P.

(d) Pahang (East)—

Hock Bee Brothers Ltd.

(e) Taiping—

Taik Ho & Co.

The following were appointed at the meeting of the Board on 20th June, 1952:

(f) Negri Sembilan—

Ng Chee Yew.

(g) Johore—

Tong Fook & Co.

(h) Malacca—

K. T. Wong.

(i) Perak—

Chan Chee Kheong & Brothers.

The following was appointed at the meeting of the Board on 15th April, 1953:

(j) Trengganu—

I. G. Lopez.

The following was appointed at a meeting of the Board on December, 1952:

(k) Kelantan—

AR. A. Nachiappan, A.M.N., J.P., S.M.K.

(i) (b)—

Name of Agent	Average sale of tickets per draw
Chan Chee Kheong & Bros., Perak	230,039
Chan Chee Kheong & Bros., Penang, Kedah and Perlis ...	150,413
Ng Chee Yew, Negri Sembilan ...	164,582
Taik Ho & Co., Taiping ...	30,908
I. G. Lopez, Trengganu ...	18,713
Dato A. Mohamed Shariff (West Pahang) ...	51,237
Aw Tong Kai, Penang, Kedah and Perlis ...	110,725
Kwang Teow Sang Yeong Kee, Selangor ...	245,566
Tong Fook & Co., Johore ...	586,910
K.T. Wong, Malacca ...	162,482
Hock Bee Bros., East Pahang ...	20,723
AR. A. Nachiappan, Kelantan ...	55,238

(i) (c) 5% on sale of tickets to the Agents.

(i) (d) 10% is paid on winning tickets to the respective agents through whom such winning tickets are sold.

(ii) \$122,331,843.00.

(a) \$32,487,770.00.

State	Total Commission on sales paid to appointed agents
(b)	\$
Perak ...	897,400
Penang, Kedah and Perlis ...	486,985
Negri Sembilan ...	559,658
Trengganu ...	55,201
Pahang ...	247,743
Selangor ...	845,742
Johore ...	1,984,099
Malacca ...	549,787
Kelantan ...	170,120

State	Total Commission on the winning tickets paid to appointed agents
(c)	\$
Perak	989,040
Penang, Kedah and Perlis ...	447,440
Negri Sembilan ...	593,930
Trengganu ...	37,705
Pahang	244,040
Selangor	775,565
Johore	2,376,315
Malacca	598,610
Kelantan	137,090

(iii) The public are not allowed to buy lottery tickets direct from the Social and Welfare Services Lotteries Board. The Board is prohibited by law from selling them direct to the public.

(iv) It is not possible in the time available to produce the detailed information which the Honourable Member requires, but the required information will be supplied to the Honourable Member when it is available.

Health Sisters for Tanjong Malim district

17. Enche' Lee Seck Fun asks the Minister of Health and Social Welfare, whether he will consider increasing the number of Health Sisters in the Tanjong Malim district so as to enable the kampongs in Sungkai and Bidor to be visited by them at least once a week.

Dato' Ong Yoke Lin: There is no Health Sister in Tanjong Malim sub-district. There are, however, two Health Nurses working in the area between Tapah and Tanjong Malim and consideration is being given to increase the number of Health Nurses so that more frequent visits can be made to the kampongs in the area.

Hospital Ambulances at Tanjong Malim

18. Enche' Lee Seck Fun asks the Minister of Health and Social Welfare, in view of the great distances which Hospital Ambulances operating from the District Hospital, Tanjong Malim, have to cover in emergency cases, whether his Ministry will consider

giving top priority to replacing these Ambulances with more comfortable and reliable vehicles.

Dato' Ong Yoke Lin: The present ambulances are reported to be still in good condition.

Dispensary at Bagan Datoh

19. Tuan Haji Hassan Adli bin Haji Arshad minta kapada Menteri Kesihatan dan Kebajikan Masharakat menerangkan benar-kah atau tidak ia-itu Gudang Ubat Kerajaan di-Bagan Datoh sekarang pada mula-nya dahulu telah di-buka sa-bagai sa-buah Rumah Sakit yang mempunyai doktor dan lain² kelengkapan Rumah Sakit seperti ward orang sakit.

Dato' Ong Yoke Lin: Benar. Rumah Sakit ini telah di-buka dalam tahun 1917 dan di-tutup dalam tahun 1924.

20. Tuan Haji Hassan Adli bin Haji Arshad minta kapada Menteri Kesihatan dan Kebajikan Masharakat menerangkan ada-kah Kerajaan telah menerima rayuan orang ramai dari daerah itu supaya pusat perubatan itu di-jadikan sa-buah Rumah Sakit Umum sa-mula, jika ada bila-kah yang demikian itu dapat di-laksanakan.

Dato' Ong Yoke Lin: Kementerian saya ada menerima rayuan yang disebutkan itu, ia-itu Rumah Ubat ini di-jadikan Rumah Sakit sa-mula. Mengadakan kemudahan perubatan dan kesihatan Kerajaan mesti-lah memutuskan mana tempat yang hendak di-dahului dan mana tempat yang hendak di-kemudiankan, dengan di-timbangkan ada tidak-nya duit hendak mengadakannya itu dan ada tidak-nya kaki tangan kerana itu.

Motor boats as Floating Dispensaries

21. Tuan Haji Hassan Adli bin Haji Arshad minta kapada Menteri Kesihatan dan Kebajikan Masharakat menerangkan berapa buah-kah motor-boat² yang di-gunakan sa-bagai Traveling Dispensary yang di-miliki Kerajaan sendiri yang ada di-gunakan sekarang bagi pulau² dalam jajahan Kuala Trengganu dan terangkan di-mana² di-gunakan motor-boat itu.

Dato' Ong Yoke Lin: Tidak ada.

Medical facilities for people in Kuala Trengganu

22. Tuan Haji Hassan Adli bin Haji Arshad minta kepada Menteri Kesihatan dan Kebajikan Masyarakat menerangkan ada-kah Kerajaan sedar ia-itu penduduk² pulau² yang berselerak dalam jajahan Trengganu sangat-lah susah hendak mendapat kemudahan² perubatan, dan ada-kah Kerajaan sedar ada-nya rasa tidak puas hati di-kalangan penduduk² pulau² itu terhadap pemberian perubatan mereka sekarang, dan jika demikian, ada-kah Kerajaan sudah menimbangkan sendiri bagi menggunakan sa-bagai Travelling Dispensary yang mengunjongi penduduk² pulau itu daripada sa-masa ka-semasa.

Dato' Ong Yoke Lin: Saya sedar akan kepayahan untuk mendapat kemudahan Perubatan dalam kawasan² yang terpenchil tetapi ada-lah tujuan Kerajaan hendak memberikan banyak lagi kemudahan² dalam kawasan seperti itu. Pulau Redang di-dalam daerah Kuala Trengganu ada di-lawati oleh Pegawai² Kementerian saya sa-kali dalam tempoh tiga bulan dengan pertolongan Jabatan Laut.

MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT

Town Bus Service connections to Railway stations

23. Enche' Lee Sek Fun asks the Minister of Transport, whether he will take up with the town internal-bus companies the question of providing services to convey railway passengers to or from any railway station.

The Minister of Transport (Enche' Sardon bin Haji Jubir): In a number of towns bus companies operate services connecting with the railway stations. Whenever evidence of need for connections is forthcoming from the public or the bus companies or the Railway authorities, such need is looked into. If the Hon'ble Member has in mind any particular place where there is a deficiency and will let me know, I will gladly cause it to be investigated. He may have seen notice in the Press of the arrangements recently made in Kuala Lumpur.

MINISTRY OF WORKS, POSTS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS

New Tanjong Malim/Slim River Road

24. Enche' Lee Sek Fun asks the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, when his Ministry is going to commence work on the construction of the new Tanjong Malim/Slim River Road.

The Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications (Dato' V. T. Sambanthan): This proposed deviation is included for consideration under the 5-Year Plan (1961-1965).

PRIME MINISTER'S DEPARTMENT

Radio Sets

25. Enche' Lee Sek Fun asks the Prime Minister, what percentage of the population of the Persekutuan Tanah Melayu own radio sets.

The Prime Minister: The percentage of the population of the Persekutuan Tanah Melayu who owned licensed radio sets as on 31st March, 1960, was 3.36%.

Film Unit

26. Enche' V. David asks the Prime Minister what is the present position with regard to the building of modern Film Unit Studios.

The Prime Minister: A site of 8 acres in Petaling Jaya has already been acquired, and the preparation of plans will start shortly.

27. Enche' V. David asks the Prime Minister to state whether there is any plan to send more Film Unit officers for overseas study and experience.

The Prime Minister: There is no scheme for overseas training but it is the intention, whenever opportunities offer and the staffing situation permits, to send members of the Unit overseas for training and to gain experience.

South Africans in Govt. Service

28. Enche' V. David asks the Prime Minister whether there are any white South Africans employed in Federation Government service.

The Prime Minister: The answer cannot be given in the time available.

Considerable research would be required to ascertain whether there are any white South Africans employed in the Federation Government service.

Presents to Princess Margaret

29. Enche' V. David asks the Prime Minister to state what presents were made to Mr. Anthony Armstrong Jones and Princess Margaret on behalf of H.M. the Yang di-Pertuan Agong and the Federation Government.

The Prime Minister: They were presented with a pair of silver candle sticks by His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong. There was no present from the Federation Government.

30. Enche' V. David asks the Prime Minister whether it is the policy to present gifts to the sisters of reigning monarchs who get married.

The Prime Minister: No.

Indonesia and West Irian

31. Enche' V. David asks the Prime Minister if he discussed any matter regarding Indonesia and whether he reiterated the Federation's stand on the West Irian problem during his visit to the Netherlands.

The Prime Minister: I did not bring up the matter of West Irian, nor for that matter did I reiterate the Federation's stand on the West Irian problem as that stands on record at the United Nations. The Dutch Government, however, indicated their intention towards West Irian which in effect suggests independence for West Irian as soon as the people and the country are ready for it. But I did ask the Dutch Government for the assurance that nothing must be done to provoke Indonesia to acts of retaliation and that every effort should be made to maintain peace in this part of the world.

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

Additional Customs Revenue if no Commonwealth Preferences

32. Enche' Tan Kee Gak asks the Minister of Finance, how much additional revenue would have been collected by the Customs Department in the year 1959 if no Commonwealth Preferences had been allowed and duty had been collected at the full rate.

The Minister of Finance (Enche' Tan Siew Sin): It is not possible to give an answer to a hypothetical question. If Commonwealth Preference were withdrawn in all cases, it is clear that the pattern of trade would be different, as changes would be bound to occur. It should also be remembered that there are reciprocal benefits involved. Even if it is decided to whittle down or withdraw altogether all or any of these preferences, such an operation should only be conducted as a means of obtaining reciprocal concessions from third countries in trade negotiations, and this, in fact, is the policy of the Government.

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka

33. Tuan Syed Esa bin Alwee meminta Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran menerangkan ia-itu "Dari semenjak Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka di-tubuhkan hingga pada masa ini, apa²-kah langkah yang telah di-jalankan untuk melaksanakan tugas yang telah di-tentukan, dan berapa banyak buku² bagi bacaan 'am dan berapa banyak buku² yang di-gunakan kerana sekolah²".

The Minister of Education (Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib): So'alan ini sa-benar-nya mempunyai dua bahagian. *Pertama* ia-lah mengenai apa langkah² yang telah di-jalankan untuk melaksanakan tugas yang telah di-tentukan; *yang kedua* ia-lah mengenai berapa banyak buku² yang telah di-terbitkan oleh Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka bagi bacaan 'am dan bagi penggunaan sekolah².

I

Bagi menjawab bahagian pertama perlu-lah di-terangkan dahulu apa dia tugas² yang tertentu bagi Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka. Sa-belum itu elok-lah di-ingatkan bahawa dalam menyatakan tugas² ini saya hanya akan menyebut tugas² yang telah di-tetapkan dan dengan itu tidak-lah pula di-nafikan ada-nya tugas² istimewa yang lain yang berkehendakkan tenaga dan kerjasama Dewan Bahasa mengenai bahasa dan persuratan.

Pada garis² kasar-nya tugas² yang telah di-tentukan untuk Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka ia-lah :

- (1) Menggalakkan pertumbuhan bahasa kebangsaan dan memperkayakan-nya.
- (2) Menggalakkan pertumbuhan bakat² dalam 'alam persuratan, terutama dalam bahasa kebangsaan.
- (3) Membanyakkan penerbitan², terutama dalam bahasa kebangsaan.
- (4) Membaiki dan menetapkan kaedah ejaan, menyatukan bunyi sebutan, dan penggunaan perkataan dan mengadakan kata² istilah yang menasabah dalam bahasa kebangsaan.
- (5) Menyiap dan menerbitkan sa-buah Kamus bahasa kebangsaan.

Keterangan Lanjut Tiap² Satu itu

1. Dalam masa'alah menggalakkan pertumbuhan bahasa kebangsaan yang di-akuⁱ sa-bagai bahasa rasmi Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini patut-lah di-sebut bahawa sa-suatu bahasa itu hanya dapat di-galakkan pertumbuhannya dengan jalan meluaskan penggunaan-nya dalam tiap² peringkat warga negara, ia-itu dari peringkat Kerajaan membawa kepada peringkat ra'ayat jelata.

Dalam tugas-nya mengenai perkara ini Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka telah mengambil sikap yang tegas pada tahun 1960 ini. Ia telah menyusun rancangan Minggu Bahasa Kebangsaan yang telah di-anjorkan oleh Kerajaan pada awal tahun 1960 ini.

Berikutan dengan itu pula Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka telah menyusun rancangan mengadakan kursus untuk pegawai² dan kakitangan Kerajaan, terutama yang bukan Melayu, mengenai penggunaan bahasa kebangsaan dalam pekerjaan mereka sa-hari². Kursus ini akan di-mulakan tidak berapa lama lagi dan akan memakan masa dua tahun. Sementara itu sa-bagai pendorong yang tetap maka Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka telah menhadangkan pula, dan chadangan itu sedang dalam

pertimbangan Kerajaan, untuk mengadakan "Bulan Bahasa Kebangsaan" pada tahun 1961.

Dari segi tugas memperkayakan bahasa kebangsaan ini usaha² yang telah di-jalankan oleh Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka ada-lah perkara yang telah sedia di-ketahui oleh orang ramai. Pada masa ini Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka telah mengadakan 14 Jawatan-kuasa Istilah bagi lapangan² yang tertentu, dan bilangan ini akan bertambah dari sa-masa ka-samasa. Kerja Jawatan-kuasa² Istilah ini pada 'am-nya ia-lah menchari kata² istilah bagi perkataan² yang di-dapati belum ada dalam bahasa kebangsaan, terutama yang mengenai lapangan Teknik dan ilmu pengetahuan tinggi. Pada masa ini tidak kurang dari 12,816 perkataan istilah itu telah di-chiptakan, dan perkataan² yang telah mu'tamad penggunaan-nya sudah pun di-chetak jadi buku.

2. Mengenai tugas menggalakkan pertumbuhan bakat² dalam 'alam persuratan atau kesusasteraan usaha Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka semenjak di-tubuhkan ada-lah sa-bagai usaha mengadakan sa-orang bagi penulis² dan bakal² penulis membentangkan fikiran dan pendapat dalam lapangan bahasa dan kesusasteraan. Dengan ada-nya saloran ini terbuka-lah medan bagi mereka menunjokkan (*menguji dan menanding*) kebolehan dalam lapangan itu.

Usaha ini di-lakukan (a) menerusi majallah bulanan-nya, dan (b) menerusi peraduan² karang-mengarang. Hasil usaha ini ternyata baik, dan orang² yang kerap menulis renchana² untuk majallah Dewan Bahasa bukan-lah sahaja daripada orang² Melayu, bahkan banyak juga orang² bangsa lain.

Semenjak di-tubuhkan hingga sekarang ini Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka telah mengadakan tiga jenis pertandingan, ia-itu pertandingan mengarang cherita pendek, pertandingan menulis cherita novel, dan pada tahun 1960 ini telah di-adakan pula pertandingan mengarang cherita kanak².

3. Berkenaan tugas membanyakkan penerbitan sa-yogia di-sebutkan bahawa tugas ini bukan-lah membanyakkan

sa-barang penerbitan sahaja, tetapi ia-lah membanyakkan penerbitan² yang di-fikirkan menasabah dan baik untuk bacaan 'am dari segi kebersehan bahasa, fa'edah isi-nya untuk makanan jiwa, dan tinggi mutu-nya penerbitan² itu sendiri.

Dari mula² di-tubuhkan Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka dalam tahun 1956 sa-hingga bulan August 1959 penerbitan² yang berupa majallah, risalat dan buku² tidak begitu pesat perjalanannya. Tetapi dalam bulan August 1959 itu Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka telah mencapai taraf baharu-nya menjadi sa-buah perbadanan. Semenjak itu banyak-lah buku² yang telah di-terbitkan, sama ada buku² bacaan 'am atau pun buku² sekolah. Pada tahun 1960 ini jumlah buku² yang telah di-terbitkan dan yang sedang di-chetak, sama ada karangan baharu atau pun penchetakan sa-mula mahu pun terjemahan, ada-lah berjumlah:

- (a) sudah terbit 2 buah,
- (b) dalam perchetakan 7 buah,
- (c) hendak di-hantar ka-perchetakan 4 buah, dan
- (d) sudah siap dan sedang di-sediakan untuk penchetakan 5 buah.

Rancangan penerbitan ini akan bertambah lancar dari sa-masa ka-samasa hingga untuk tahun 1961 kelak telah sedia rancangan mengadakan penerbitan dua buah buku pada sa-bulan.

4. Mas'alah membaiki dan menetapkan kaedah ejaan, menyatukan bunyi sebutan dan penggunaan kata² dalam bahasa kebangsaan itu ia-lah suatu mas'alah yang agak rumit dan tentu memakan masa yang panjang. Semenjak di-tubuhkan Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka usaha² ka-jurusan ini tidak putus²-nya di-jalankan.

Sementara itu sa-belum di-ambil sa-suatu keputusan yang mu'tamad, maka tentang ejaan ada-lah kaedah yang menjadi dasar di-ikut oleh Dewan Bahasa ia-lah ejaan yang di-sebut "ejaan sekolah", ia-itu ejaan yang telah di-rasmikan di-pakai dalam segala buku² untuk sekolah Melayu dan dalam Kamus² Melayu-Inggeris dan Inggeris-Melayu semenjak zaman tuan Wilkinson (di-tetapkan dalam tahun

1902-1904). Tentang bunyi sebutan pula, sebutan yang di-jadikan panduan ia-lah sebutan mengikut loghat Melayu Riau atau di-gelar juga loghat "Riau-Johor".

Dewan Bahasa mengambil bahagian besar dalam usaha Kerajaan hendak mengadakan persatuan ejaan dan bahasa dengan Indonesia, dan peranan yang mustahak dalam usaha ini dipegang oleh Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Tugas mengadakan istilah² telah sedia di-kaji dalam keterangan memperkayakan bahasa kebangsaan (No. 1) di-atas.

5. Kamus yang di-chadangkan dan sedang di-usahakan oleh Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka ia-lah kamus yang di-maksudkan lebih lengkap daripada kamus² Melayu yang sudah ada, serta di-harap mempunyai mutu yang tinggi dan layak di-beri nama "Kamus Kebangsaan".

Sa-hingga ini usaha Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka mengenai tugas membuat Kamus ini baharu siap dalam peringkat pertama-nya, ia-itu mengumpulkan perkataan² untuk menjadi isi Kamus itu. Usaha dalam peringkat yang kedua baharu di-mulakan dalam tahun ini, ia-itu peringkat menchari dan menentukan ma'ana atau tafsir yang tepat dan menasabah bagi perkataan² itu.

II

Bagi menjawab so'al dalam bahagian yang kedua ada-lah di-nyatakan bahawa sungguh pun Dewan ini telah di-tubuhkan pada penghujung tahun 1956, tetapi kerja menerbitkan buku² hanya mulai dapat berjalan pada kira² pertengahan tahun 1957, dan hanya dapat berjalan lancar pada permulaan tahun 1958. Sa-belum pertengahan 1957 dan permulaan tahun 1958 itu kerja² Dewan berbelah-bahagi antara usaha menyusun pentadbiran Dewan itu dengan usaha membuat dan mengatorkan rancangan² bagi melaksanakan tugas²-nya.

Di-bawah ini ada-lah di-beri angka² banyak-nya buku² pada masing² jenis-nya, termasuk risalat², yang telah di-terbitkan oleh Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka dari satu tahun ka-satu tahun.

Jenis² penerbitan yang di-beri ini tidak termasuk majallah bulanan Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka. Majallah ini mula di-terbitkan pada bulan September, 1957, sa-banyak 3,000 naskhah, dan pada masa ini telah menchapai jumlah 10,000 naskhah tiap² bulan.

Tahun	Untok bacaan 'Am		Buku ² untok Sekolah	
	Risalat**	Buku ²	Rendah	Menengah/ dan naskhah guru
1956	...	1	0	12
1957	...	1	0	15
1958	...	0	1	17
1959	...	3	10	16
1960	...	0	2	1

(hingga bulan May)

* Yang di-katakan "risalat" itu ia-lah buku² kecil yang di-terbitkan sa-tebal 50 hingga 60 muka, mengandongi suatu cheramah atau menerangkan hasil sa-suatu penyelidikan oleh ahli² Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Buku² yang di-dalam perchetakan atau pun dalam urusan untok pen-
chetakan dan di-jangka akan terbit dalam tahun 1960 ini, ada-lah ber-
jumlah:

Buku² Bacaan 'Am—

- | | | | |
|----------------------|-----|-----|----|
| 1. Risalat | ... | ... | 0 |
| 2. Buku ² | ... | ... | 18 |

Buku² Sekolah—

- | | | | |
|------------------|-----|-----|---|
| 1. Rendah | ... | ... | 9 |
| 2. Menengah/Guru | | | 3 |

Tun Fatimah School, Malacca

34. Enche' Ahmad Boestamam minta kapada Menteri Pelajaran menerangkan berapa-kah jumlah wang mula yang harus di-sediakan oleh sa-saorang bapa yang anak perempuan-nya di-terima masok belajar dalam Sekolah Tun Fatimah, Melaka dan ada-kah bayaran itu bersifat tahunan atau sa-kali gus sahaja. Dan ada-kah bayaran ini serupa dengan yang di-kenakan pada pelajar² di-Sekolah Tuanku Abdul Rahman, Ipoh dan di-Sekolah Tun Abdul Razak, Tanjong Malim.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Sa-saorang penuntut yang masok Sekolah Tun Fatimah, Melaka, dalam bulan January, tahun 1960, membayar kerana perkara² yang ter-sebut di-bawah ini bagi tahun 1960:

Makanan dengan kiraan	\$66.66	pada satu penggal	\$200.00
Chadar tilam dengan kiraan ...	1.50	pada satu penggal	4.50
Kerana Sains, Sains rumah tangga, sukan dan Khutub Khanah dengan kiraan ...	6.00	pada satu penggal	18.00
Dhobi dengan kiraan	14.50	pada satu penggal	25.00

Semua murid² membayar wang pertaroh sa-banyak \$10.00 anggaran belanja mengganti kalau ada pinggan mangkok yang pechah. Wang pertarohan ini akan di-kembalikan kapada murid.

Sa-lain daripada itu, murid² yang bukan anak pegawai Kerajaan, membayar wang pertarohan sa-banyak \$100, sa-kira-nya mereka berkehendakan rawatan perubatan yang ta' dapat tidak kena bayar ia-lah sementara tinggal di-sekolah.

Ibu bapa telah di-minta mengirinkan bayaran ini dengan ansuran saperti yang tersebut di-bawah ini:

Bagi penggal pertama:

\$160 ia-lah lebeh kurang satu pertiga daripada bayaran yang di-sebutkan di-atas tadi, bagi harga buku dan pakaian seragam sekolah. \$100 kerana belanja ubat (yang \$100 ini telah di-bayar balek kapada murid² anak pegawai Kerajaan).

Bagi penggal yang kedua dan ketiga: \$100 pada satu penggal.

Bayaran Sekolah Tuanku Abdul Rahman dan Sekolah Tun Abdul Razak lebeh kurang sama tetapi tidak serupa. Mithal-nya di-Sekolah Tuanku

Abdul Rahman bayaran tahun² ia-lah seperti di-bawah ini:

Makanan dengan kiraan 60			
sen sa-hari	...	...	\$170.00
Permainan	...	...	3.00
Alat pelukis dan kerja			
tangan	...	...	1.50
Sains	...	...	3.00
Khutub Khanah	...	...	2.00
Kain chadar	...	...	9.00
Majallah	...	...	2.50
Jumlah	...	...	291.00

Budak² di-sekolah ini mesti-lah mengadakan chadar sendiri dan menanggung belanja dhobi.

Membandingkan bayaran² dalam dua sekolah ini hendak-lah di-ingatkan ia-itu masing² sekolah ini ia-lah di-bawah jagaan Lembaga Pentadbir. Sekolah Tun Fatimah itu ia-lah sekolah bagi kanak² perempuan tetapi sekolah Tuanku Abdul Rahman ia-lah sekolah budak laki².

35. Enche' Ahmad Boestamam minta kepada Menteri Pelajaran menerangkan ada-kah bayaran yang lain lagi yang di-kehendaki daripada-nya selain dari wang mula tadi itu dan ada-kah bayaran ini, kalau ada, bersifat bulanan, tiga bulan atau lain-nya.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Semua bayaran ada-lah di-sebutkan di-atas tadi. Tetapi hendak-lah di-ingatkan ia-itu berkenaan dengan bayaran Sekolah Tun Fatimah, sa-tengah daripada bayaran itu ia-lah dengan di-agak sahaja ia-itu seperti belanja dhobi, belanja buku dan belanja pakaian seragam. Pada akhir tahun, sekolah ini barangkali tidak berkehendakkan di-tambah belanja untuk belanja² perkara yang tersebut ini.

36. Enche' Ahmad Boestamam minta kepada Menteri Pelajaran menerangkan benar-kah Kerajaan telah mengeluarkan surat keliling kepada ibu bapa yang anak² mereka ada belajar di-Sekolah Tun Fatimah, Melaka itu bahawa mula² dari awal tahun ini (1-1-60) ubat perchuma dan layanan rumah sakit perchuma tidak lagi diberikan kepada pelajar² di-sekolah itu.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Kementerian Pelajaran dalam

tahun 1959 telah mengeluarkan suatu surat perkeliling menerangkan kepada ketua² sekolah berapa banyak Kerajaan mengenakan bayaran perubatan kepada murid² sekolah. Surat perkeliling ini yang sa-benar-nya mengandongi keterangan yang di-sebutkan dalam General Order Bab F Hujongan F3 (11).

Nampak-nya murid² Sekolah Tun Fatimah telah mendapat layanan perubatan dengan perchuma sa-hingga bulan November, 1959. Dengan sebab itu guru besar sekolah ini telah mengeluarkan suatu kenyataan kepada ibu bapa memberi tahu ibu bapa mengatakan kanak² kena bayar belanja yang di-kenakan oleh rumah sakit dan harus kena bayar belanja kerana mengambil ubat atau sa-bagai-nya di-rumah² sakit Kerajaan atau Kelinik Kerajaan (ya'ani menurut General Order Bab F Hujongan F (11) 3.

37. Enche' Ahmad Boestamam minta kepada Menteri Pelajaran menerangkan apa-kah jenis pekerjaan yang di-jamin oleh Kerajaan boleh di-dapat oleh pelajar² lepasan Sekolah Tun Fatimah, Sekolah Tuanku Abdul Rahman dan Sekolah Tun Abdul Razak itu.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Siapa pun murid dalam mana² jua sekolah dalam Persekutuan Tanah Melayu tidak di-beri jaminan boleh dapat kerja.

38. Enche' Ahmad Boestamam minta kepada Menteri Pelajaran menerangkan benar-kah pelajar² di-Sekolah Tun Fatimah, Melaka yang ta'tamat dalam peperiksaan sekolah-nya terus di-buang dari Sekolah.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Dalam semua sekolah menengah yang mendapat bantuan penoh, termasuk Sekolah Tun Fatimah, murid²nya masuk pereksa Sejil Rendah Pelajaran dalam Form III. Hanya murid² yang lulus pemereksaan ini dengan mendapat markah boleh melayakkan naik darjah, di-naikkan ka-Form IV. Murid² yang lain itu kena berhenti sekolah kechuali jika umornya rendah boleh masuk pereksa sa-kali lagi.

39. Enche' Ahmad Boestamam minta kapada Menteri Pelajaran menerangkan apa-kah bahasa penghantar yang di-gunakan dalam Sekolah Tun Fatimah, Melaka itu.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Bahasa Penghantar dalam pelajaran Melayu dan pelajaran Agama ia-lah bahasa Melayu, dalam pelajaran lain kebanyakan bahasa Inggeris.

40. Enche' Ahmad Boestamam minta kapada Menteri Pelajaran menerangkan pelajar² lepasan sekolah² bahasa apa-kah yang di-terima masok belajar dalam Sekolah Tun Fatimah, Melaka itu. Ada-kah pelajar² lepasan sekolah yang bahasa penghantar-nya Melayu di-terima masok belajar di-dalam-nya.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Murid² di-Sekolah Tun Fatimah ia-lah di-ambil daripada sekolah² rendah Melayu yang memakai bahasa Melayu sa-bagai bahasa penghantar.

Malayan Secondary Schools Promotion Examination

41. Enche' Tan Kee Gak asks the Minister of Education, if he is aware that more than 10,000 students placed in category "C" in the Malayan Secondary Schools Promotion Examination, 1959, have been unable to find places in secondary schools, and, if so, to state what steps are being taken to satisfy the educational requirements of these students.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: In reply to a question by the Honourable Member at the April meeting I stated that 18,000 pupils placed in category "C" in the Malayan Secondary Schools Promotion Examination 1959 had obtained places in secondary schools and that an additional 2,140 had been admitted to secondary courses in further education centres in January, 1960.

2. Any pupils unable to find a place in a secondary school can be admitted to a full secondary course in a further education centre. Such centres are set up by my Ministry in accordance with the demand. The pupils referred to in the question could have been so dealt with if they

had applied to Chief Education Officers.

Strike by Students at Women Training College, Malacca

42. Tuan Haji Hassan Adli bin Haji Arshad minta kapada Menteri Pelajaran menerangkan ada-kah Kementerian Pelajaran telah menghantar sa-barang anggota penyiasat pemogokan pada 25 April oleh pelajar² Maktab Latehan Guru² Wanita Melayu, Melaka itu, sa-kira-nya ada, terangkan nama² dan jawatan² mereka.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Sudah. Pegawai² yang berikut telah di-hantar ka-Maktab Latehan Guru² Wanita Melayu, Melaka, bersabit dengan rasa tidak puas hati di kalangan penuntut² di-situ:

- (a) Enche' Abdullah bin Sahat—Timbalan Setia-Usaha Kementerian Pelajaran.
- (b) Enche' K. Arianayagam—Pengerah Latehan Guru².
- (c) Che' Hindon binti Din—Penyelia Wanita, Sekolah Kebangsaan Negri Sembilan.

43. Tuan Haji Hassan Adli bin Haji Arshad minta kapada Menteri Pelajaran menerangkan berdasarkan laporan anggota penyiasat itu, sebab² maka di-jalankan pemogokan itu.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Pelajar² itu telah mengadu akan hal tiada puas hati dengan sa-tengah² chara pentadbiran di-dalam Maktab itu.

44. Tuan Haji Hassan Adli bin Haji Arshad minta kapada Menteri Pelajaran menerangkan apa-kah perkara besar yang telah di-terangkan oleh penuntut² itu kapada anggota penyiasat, satu persatu, dan ada-kah termasuk perkara tidak puas hati kapada sa-orang bangsa Inggeris yang menjadi Pengetua Maktab itu sekarang.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Sa-bagaimana yang tersebut diatas, termasuk-lah rasa tidak puas hati dengan Pengetua Maktab itu.

45. Tuan Haji Hassan Adli bin Haji Arshad minta kapada Menteri Pelajaran menerangkan sama ada Kementerian beliau sedang memikirkan hendak di-tukar Pengetua itu.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Tidak.

46. Tuan Haji Hassan Adli bin Haji Arshad minta kepada Menteri Pelajaran menerangkan sama ada Kementerian-nya berchadang mengambil tindakan terhadap Ketua Pelajar² Maktab itu atau terhadap sa-barang pelajar yang mengetuai pemogokan itu.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Dukachita tidak dapat dikeluarkan keterangan di-dalam hal ini kerana maseh lagi di-dalam timbangan.

47. Tuan Haji Hassan Adli bin Haji Arshad minta kepada Menteri Pelajaran menerangkan sudah berapa lamakah Pengetua yang ada pada hari ini telah menjadi Pengetua Maktab sekarang.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Pengetua sekarang telah jadi Pengetua Maktab ini semenjak bulan October, tahun 1957.

Teachers Training College of Domestic Science

48. Che' Khadijah binti Mohd. Sidek minta Menteri Pelajaran menyatakan sebab² mengapa Kerajaan tidak mengadakan Maktab Latehan Guru Khas bagi pelajaran Urusan Rumah Tangga supaya Sekolah Urusan Rumah Tangga dapat di-tubuhkan dalam tiap² negeri seperti yang di-buat di-negeri² lain.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Guru² "Urusan Rumah Tangga" sedang di-lateh di-Maktab Perguruan Ilmu Khas yang telah di-buka pada tahun ini. Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ada-lah lebih jauh maju di-dalam latehan yang seperti itu daripada negara² yang berhampiran dengan negeri kita.

Trade Schools for Girls

49. Che' Khadijah binti Mohd. Sidek minta Menteri Pelajaran menyatakan ada-kah Kerajaan berchadang hendak mendirikan Sekolah Pertukangan bagi perempuan, dan sa-kira-nya ada, bilakah masa-nya.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Ada-lah di-chadangkan bahawa sebanyak 15 buah Sekolah Lanjutan Kampong bagi murid² perempuan akan

di-dirikan dalam masa 5 tahun yang akan datang, mulai pada tahun 1962 jika dapat.

School at Parit 5/7, Mukim Labu Kubong, Telok Anson

50. Tuan Haji Hassan Adli bin Haji Arshad minta kepada Menteri Pelajaran menerangkan ada-kah Kerajaan telah menerima rayuan orang ramai supaya Kerajaan membuka dengan sa-berapa segera sa-buah sekolah yang di-chadangkan sa-bagai Sekolah Kebangsaan yang telah siap di-bena sejak dua tahun yang lalu yang telah di-dirikan oleh orang ramai dengan bantuan Kerajaan di-Parit 5/7, Mukim Labu Kubong, Telok Anson, Perak.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Ada.

51. Tuan Haji Hassan Adli bin Haji Arshad minta kepada Menteri Pelajaran menerangkan ia-itu memandang kepada jaminan yang di-beri oleh Pegawai² yang tertentu daripada negeri Perak kepada orang² kampong di-situ ia-itu sekolah ini akan di-buka dengan sa-berapa segera-nya apabila siap kelak, nyatakan bila-kah sekolah itu dapat di-buka.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Sekolah itu akan di-buka dengan rasmi-nya kira² dalam bulan August, 1960, ia-itu pada awal penggal yang ketiga.

52. Tuan Haji Hassan Adli bin Haji Arshad minta kepada Menteri Pelajaran menerangkan apa-kah sebab-nya menghalang sekolah itu di-buka selama ini.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Apabila bangunan itu sudah siap maka di-dapati mustahak di-betulkan sa-tengah² tempat supaya sesuai dengan kehendak² kesihatan. Sekarang sudah di-betulkan. Satu lagi sebab maka lewat di-buka sekolah ini ia-lah kerana tidak ada wang hendak membeli alat² kesiapan yang di-kehendaki bagi sekolah itu.

National Library

53. Tuan Syed Esa bin Alwee minta kepada Menteri Pelajaran menerangkan ia-itu ada-kah apa² langkah atau

chadangan Kerajaan untuk mengadakan sa-buah Khutub Khanah (National Library) Negara sa-bagaimana negeri² lain yang telah Merdeka.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib: Menteri Pelajaran menguchapkan terima kaseh kapada Ahli Yang Berhormat kerana menarek perhatian beliau kapada chadangan hendak mengadakan sa-buah Khutub Khanah Negara. Perkara ini ada-lah di-dalam timbangan.

Chinese Medium Secondary Schools

54. Enche' Chin See Yin asks the Minister of Education to state the number of Chinese Medium Secondary Schools in each State as follows:

- (a) Partially Assisted;
- (b) Fully Assisted;
- (c) Independent.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Hj. Talib: The number of pupils in these types of Chinese Medium Secondary Schools in each State is as follows:

(a) Partially Assisted—

	Schools
Johore	6
Kedah	1
Kelantan	1
Malacca	2
Negri Sembilan	—
Pahang	3
Penang	5
Perak	8
Selangor	9
Trengganu	1
	36

(b) Fully Assisted—

	Schools
Johore	2
Kedah	—
Kelantan	—
Malacca	2
Negri Sembilan	1
Pahang	2
Penang	3
Perak	2
Selangor	1
Trengganu	—
	13

(c) Independent—

	Schools
Johore	4
Kedah	4
Kelantan	1
Malacca	—
Negri Sembilan	2
Pahang	5
Penang	4
Perak	11
Selangor	12
Trengganu	—
	43*

* Including 13 Night Independent Schools.

55. Enche' Chin See Yin asks the Minister of Education to state the number of pupils in these types of Chinese Medium Secondary Schools in each State.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Hj. Talib:

*(a) Partially Assisted—*The number of pupils in these types of schools in each State is as follows:

	Pupils
Johore	5,997
Kedah	853
Kelantan	512
Malacca	2,106
Negri Sembilan	967
Pahang	985
Penang	4,596
Perak	8,184
Selangor	7,189
Trengganu	154
	31,543

(b) Fully Assisted—

	Pupils
Johore	1,069
Kedah	—
Kelantan	—
Malacca	296
Negri Sembilan	910
Pahang	357
Penang	2,826
Perak	908
Selangor	464
Trengganu	—
	6,830

(c) *Independent—*

	Pupils
Johore	2,215
Kedah	2,303
Kelantan	74
Malacca	—
Negri Sembilan	406
Pahang	580
Penang	2,738
Perak	3,231
Selangor	1,726
Trengganu	—

13,273*

* Including 13 Night Independent Schools with 881 pupils.

Chinese Secondary School—Promotion Examination

56. Enche' Chin See Yin asks the Minister of Education, with reference to the Regulations for the Chinese Secondary Schools Promotion Examination, 1960 [F.E.S. 4 (2) dated 2nd April, 1960], wherein it is laid down that the examination will be compulsory for promotion of Third Year pupils to the Fourth Year (Junior Middle III to Senior Middle I) in Partially-Assisted Chinese Medium Secondary Schools, to state the approximate number of pupils of such schools in each State who have applied to sit this examination in 1960.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Hj. Talib: The number of pupils in partially assisted Chinese Medium Secondary Schools who have applied to sit this examination in 1960 is:

	Pupils
Johore	812
Kedah	225
Kelantan	50
Malacca	385
Negri Sembilan	311
Pahang	217
Penang	688
Perak	1,433
Selangor	1,120
Trengganu	42
	5,283

57. Enche' Chin See Yin asks the Minister of Education, with reference to the same Regulations but as applied to Fully-Assisted Chinese Medium Secondary Schools and laying down that the basis of promotion for all fully assisted schools is now the Lower Certificate of Education as provided for in the Agreement signed between the Minister and the school concerned, to state the approximate number of pupils of such schools in each State who have applied to sit this examination in 1960.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Hj. Talib: The number of pupils in fully-assisted schools in each State sitting for the Promotion Examination and Lower Certificate of Education are as follows:

State	Promotion Examination	L.C.E. Pupils
Johore	—	20
Kedah	—	—
Kelantan	—	—
Malacca	—	—
Negri Sembilan	—	200
Pahang	27	15
Penang	66	476
Perak	100	163
Selangor	—	74
Trengganu	—	—
	193	948

58. Enche' Chin See Yin asks the Minister of Education to state, with reference to the provision of the Regulations for Chinese Secondary Schools Promotion Examination, 1960 [F.E.S. 4 (2) dated 2nd April, 1960], that Private candidates and pupils from Independent Schools will not be accepted for this examination:

- the number of private candidates and pupils from Independent schools in each State who applied for permission to take this examination;
- the reasons why such candidates will not be accepted for this examination;

- (c) whether consideration will be given to allowing private candidates and pupils from Independent schools to make late entries to take this examination under clause 12 of these Regulations, and if not, whether Government has any scheme or schemes to accommodate them in other forms of education and/or employment.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Hj. Talib:

- (a) The only record we have in my Ministry of the number of private candidates and pupils from Independent schools in each State who have applied

for permission to take this examination is:

- (1) Perak ... 217 pupils
(2) Johore ... 38 „

- (b) I shall be giving the reason why such candidates will not be admitted in my reply to the Motion on this matter which is being presented to the House by the Hon'ble Enche' Chin See Yin.

- (c) The Regulations do not permit private candidates to sit for the Promotion Examination. The second part of this question is being dealt with in my reply to the Hon'ble Enche' Chin See Yin's Motion on this matter.