

Volume III
No. 19



Thursday
19th October, 1961

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

OFFICIAL REPORT

CONTENTS

BILL—

The Education Bill [Col. 1927]

ADJOURNMENT SPEECHES—

Royal Federation of Malaya Police (Marine) [Col. 2009]

**Malayan Fishermen Fishing in the Straits of Malacca
[Col. 2011]**

FEDERATION OF MALAYA

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

Official Report

Vol. III

Third Session of the First Dewan Ra'ayat

No. 19

Thursday, 19th October 1961

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

PRESENT:

- The Honourable Mr. Speaker, DATO' HAJI MOHAMED NOAH BIN OMAR, S.P.M.J., D.P.M.B., P.I.S., J.P.
- „ the Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Defence and Minister of Rural Development, TUN HAJI ABDUL RAZAK BIN DATO' HUSSAIN, S.M.N. (Pekan).
- „ the Minister of Internal Security and Minister of the Interior, DATO' DR. ISMAIL BIN DATO' HAJI ABDUL RAHMAN, P.M.N. (Johor Timor).
- „ the Minister of Finance, ENCHE' TAN SIEW SIN, J.P. (Melaka Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, DATO' V. T. SAMBANTHAN, P.M.N. (Sungai Siput).
- „ the Minister of Transport, DATO' SARDON BIN HAJI JUBIR, P.M.N. (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 Labour, ENCHE' BAHAMAN BIN SAMSUDIN (Kuala Pilah).
- „ the Minister of Education, ENCHE' ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAJI TALIB (Kuantan).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Education, ENCHE' ABDUL HAMID KHAN BIN HAJI SAKHAWAT ALI KHAN, J.M.N., J.P. (Batang Padang).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Rural Development, TUAN HAJI ABDUL KHALID BIN AWANG OSMAN (Kota Star Utara).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Commerce and Industry, ENCHE' CHEAH THEAM SWEE (Bukit Bintang).
- „ the Assistant Minister of the Interior, ENCHE' MOHAMED ISMAIL BIN MOHAMED YUSOF (Jerai).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL GHANI BIN ISHAK, A.M.N. (Melaka Utara).

- The Honourable ENCHE' ABDUL RAUF BIN A. RAHMAN (Krian Laut).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL SAMAD BIN OSMAN (Sungai 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. (Johor Bahru Barat).
- „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN SAAID (Seberang Utara).
- „ ENCHE' AHMAD BIN HAJI YUSOF, P.J.K. (Krian Darat).
- „ TUAN HAJI AZAHARI BIN HAJI IBRAHIM (Kubang Pasu Barat).
- „ ENCHE' AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Muar Dalam).
- „ DR. BURHANUDDIN BIN MOHD. NOOR (Besut).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN CHONG WEN, A.M.N. (Kluang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN SIANG SUN (Bentong).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN SWEE HO (Ulu Kinta).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN YOON ONN (Kampar).
- „ ENCHE' CHIN SEE YIN (Seremban Timor).
- „ DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI HASHIM, P.M.N. (Jitra-Padang Terap).
- „ ENCHE' GEH CHONG KEAT (Penang Utara).
- „ ENCHE' HAMZAH BIN ALANG, A.M.N. (Kapar).
- „ ENCHE' HANAFI BIN MOHD. YUNUS, A.M.N. (Kulim Utara).
- „ ENCHE' HARUN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Baling).
- „ ENCHE' HARUN BIN PILUS (Trengganu Tengah).
- „ TUAN HAJI HASAN ADLI BIN HAJI ARSHAD (Kuala Trengganu Utara).
- „ TUAN HAJI HASSAN BIN HAJI AHMAD (Tumpat).
- „ ENCHE' HASSAN BIN MANSOR (Melaka Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN TO' MUDA HASSAN (Raub).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN MOHD. NOORDIN, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Parit).
- „ TUAN HAJI HUSSAIN RAHIMI BIN HAJI SAMAN (Kota Bharu Hulu).
- „ ENCHE' ISMAIL BIN IDRIS (Penang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' KANG KOCK SENG (Batu Pahat).
- „ ENCHE' K. KARAM SINGH (Damansara).
- „ CHE' KHADIJAH BINTI MOHD. SIDEK (Dungun).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SAN CHOON (Kluang Utara).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SECK FUN (Tanjong Malim).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SIOK YEW, A.M.N. (Sepang).

- The Honourable ENCHE' LIM JOO KONG (Alor Star).
- „ ENCHE' LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).
- „ ENCHE' LIU YOONG PENG (Rawang).
- „ ENCHE' T. MAHIMA SINGH, J.P. (Port Dickson).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED BIN UJANG (Jelebu-Jempol).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED ABAS 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).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Tanah Merah).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Perlis Utara).
- „ ENCHE' QUEK KAI DONG, J.P. (Seremban Barat).
- „ TUAN HAJI REDZA BIN HAJI MOHD. SAID (Rembau-Tampin).
- „ ENCHE' SEAH TENG NGIAB (Muar Pantai).
- „ ENCHE' D. R. SEENIVASAGAM (Ipoh).
- „ ENCHE' S. P. SEENIVASAGAM (Menglembu).
- „ TUAN SYED ESA BIN ALWEE, J.M.N., S.M.J., P.I.S. (Batu Pahat Dalam).
- „ TUAN SYED HASHIM BIN SYED AJAM, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Sabak Bernam).
- „ TUAN SYED JA'AFAR BIN HASAN ALBAR, J.M.N. (Johor Tenggara).
- „ ENCHE' TAJUDIN BIN ALI, P.J.K. (Larut Utara).
- „ ENCHE' TAN CHENG BEE, J.P. (Bagan).
- „ ENCHE' TAN PHOCK KIN (Tanjong).
- „ ENCHE' TAN TYE CHEK (Kulim-Bandar Bahru).
- „ TENGKU BESAR INDERA RAJA IBNI AL-MARHUM SULTAN IBRAHIM, D.K., P.M.N. (Ulu Kelantan).
- „ DATO' TEOH CHZE CHONG, D.P.M.J., J.P. (Segamat Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' TOO JOON HING (Telok Anson).
- „ ENCHE' V. VEERAPPEN (Seberang Selatan).
- „ WAN SULAIMAN BIN WAN TAM, P.J.K. (Kota Star Selatan).
- „ WAN YAHYA BIN HAJI WAN MOHAMED (Kemaman).
- „ ENCHE' YAHYA BIN HAJI AHMAD (Bagan Datoh).

- The Honourable ENCHE' YEOH TAT BENG (Bruas).
 „ ENCHE' YONG WOO MING (Sitiawan).
 „ PUAN HAJJAH ZAIN BINTI SULAIMAN, J.M.N., P.I.S. (Pontian Selatan).
 „ TUAN HAJI ZAKARIA BIN HAJI MOHD. TAIB (Langat).
 „ ENCHE' ZULKIFLEE BIN MUHAMMAD (Bachok).

ABSENT:

- The Honourable DATO' SULEIMAN BIN DATO' ABDUL RAHMAN, P.M.N. (Minister without Portfolio) (Muar Selatan) (*On leave*).
 „ the Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs, Y.T.M. TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN PUTRA AL-HAJ, K.O.M. (Kuala Kedah).
 „ the Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives, ENCHE' ABDUL AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Kuala Langat).
 „ the Assistant Minister of Labour, ENCHE' V. MANICKAVASAGAM, J.M.N., P.J.K. (Klang).
 „ ENCHE' V. DAVID (Bungsar).
 „ ENCHE' IBRAHIM BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Seberang Tengah).
 „ ENCHE' KONG KOK YAT (Batu Gajah).
 „ DR. LIM SWEE AUN, J.P. (Larut Selatan).
 „ DATO' ONN BIN JA'AFAR, D.K., D.P.M.J. (Kuala Trengganu Selatan).
 „ ENCHE' TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Melaka).
 „ 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*)

sa-malam saya telah menyentoh dengan serba ringkas sebab² yang penting dalam Rang Undang² ini.

BILL

THE EDUCATION BILL

Second Reading

Order read for resumption of debate on Question, "That the Bill be now read a second time." (18th October, 1961).

Question again proposed.

The Minister of Education (Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-hingga pada petang

Jika Dewan ini bersetuju saya suka memberi pandangan 'am terhadap Dasar Pelajaran yang terkandung di-dalam Rang Undang² ini.

Sa-bagaimana yang tersebut di-dalam permulaan (mukadimah) Rang Undang² ini tujuan-nya ia-lah mengadakan satu sistem pelajaran kebangsaan yang akan memenohi kehendak² negara dan sa-berapa boleh kemahuan² ibu-bapa—satu sistem, khas-nya, yang mengembangkan bahasa kebangsaan dengan maju-nya sa-bagai bahasa pengantar yang utama di-dalam sekolah².

Ini ia-lah asas² penting bagi dasar yang Kerajaan telah jalankan dengan tegas-nya semenjak tahun 1956.

Chara menjalankan-nya ia-lah pada mula-nya mengadakan pelajaran rendah perchuma menerusi empat bahasa yang besar. Yang demikian hampir sakalian kanak² akan mendapat pelajaran permulaan-nya di-dalam bahasa keluarganya. Mereka akan dapat pelajaran ini dengan perchuma dan kanak² daripada kaum² yang terbesar dalam Negeri ini akan menerima layanan yang sama pada masa yang akan datang. Walau bagaimana pun sistem ini tidak merupakan benar² kebangsaan jika perbezaan bahasa itu di-kekalkan terus-menerus di-dalam sistem itu, ia-itu sa-lepas enam tahun di-peringkat rendah. Demi kepentingan perpaduan kebangsaan maka Kerajaan telah memutuskan bahawa pelajaran yang di-belanjakan daripada wang Kerajaan sa-lepas daripada peringkat rendah hendak-lah menerusi salah satu daripada bahasa² rasmi. Ini bukan-lah satu keputusan baharu, bahkan ia ada-lah dasar Kerajaan ini semenjak lima tahun yang lalu.

Oleh itu Kerajaan chuba mengadakan satu sistem pelajaran yang berchorak kebangsaan pada pandangan dan maksud-nya terutama-nya berdasarkan atas bahasa kebangsaan, dalam pada itu memelihara dan mengekalkan bahasa dan kebudayaan yang lain dalam negeri ini.

Tudohan yang mengatakan ia-itu dasar ini menghapuskan sa-suatu kebudayaan yang tertentu itu ada-lah sa-mata² tidak benar.

Sa-tengah orang berkata ia-itu dasar ini mengancham kebudayaan China. Bagaimana-kah ini boleh benar? Mula² dari tahun hadapan Kerajaan memberi pelajaran rendah perchuma dalam bahasa China. Murid² di-dalam sekolah² rendah China mengambil peperiksaan masuk sekolah menengah di-dalam bahasa China. Bahasa China boleh di-pelajari di-dalam mana² Sekolah Lanjutan yang ada 15 orang atau lebeh murid² di-dalam satu darjah

yang di-kehendaki oleh ibu-bapa mempelajari bahasa itu. Murid² daripada sekolah² rendah China di-benarkan sa-tahun lagi belajar dalam DARJAH PERPINDAHAN di-dalam sekolah² menengah kebangsaan atau jenis kebangsaan bagi memahirkan bahasa Melayu atau bahasa Inggeris yang mereka sudah pun belajar sa-lama 6 atau 4 tahun lama-nya. Bahasa China boleh di-pelajari sa-bagai satu mata pelajaran dalam sekolah² menengah kebangsaan dan jenis kebangsaan—dalam sekolah² yang sa-umpama ini akan di-ajar di-dalam bahasa China dan pepereksaan mata pelajaran itu di-jalankan dalam bahasa China; sa-hingga 1/3 daripada waktu kanak² itu di-sekolah² boleh, dengan Undang², di-tumpukan kapada pelajaran bahasa dan ke-susasteraan China. Bahasa China boleh juga di-pelajari di-dalam tingkatan VI dan boleh di-ambil dalam Peperiksaan Sijil Tinggi Persekolahan—semua-nya memerusi bahasa China.

Sa-saorang murid China boleh jika di-kehendaki oleh ibu bapa-nya menerima pelajaran rendah-nya sa-mata² dalam bahasa China dan boleh terus mempelajari bahasa dan ke-susasteraan China di-semua peringkat persekolahan-nya sa-hingga kapada sa-tinggi² peringkat dalam University. Ini boleh di-lakukan-nya di-dalam sekolah² dan University yang di-tanggung oleh Kerajaan.

Sekarang saya berpaling kapada Fasal 136 Rang Undang² ini yang mensharatkan ia-itu bantuan sa-paroh kapada mana² Sekolah² Menengah akan di-berhentikan mulai awal tahun hadapan.

Sekolah² Menengah sa-paroh bantuan ini, semua-nya, kechuali satu, ada-lah Sekolah² Menengah China. Pada masa ini ada 34 sekolah² sa-umpama itu dengan murid² yang berjumlah 27,576 orang. Ini berbanding dengan 48,000 orang murid² China dalam Sekolah² Menengah yang menerima bantuan penuh.

31 Sekolah² Menengah China yang menerima sa-paroh bantuan telah

bertukar menjadi sekolah² yang menerima bantuan penuh semenjak tahun 1957 dan sekarang menjadi sa-bahagian daripada sistem kebangsaan. 34 buah sekolah yang belum mengambil keputusan menukarkan taraf-nya itu boleh lagi berbuat demikian. Jika mereka memutuskan sa-belum akhir tahun ini mereka akan menerima bantuan penuh daripada Kerajaan mulai dari tahun hadapan, jika tidak mereka akan menjadi sekolah bersendiria (private) dengan menanggung perbelanjaan masing².

Kerajaan telah menawarkan satu peratoran gaji khas kepada guru² di-dalam sekolah² yang menjadi Sekolah² Menengah China yang menerima bantuan penuh. Peratoran ini membolehkan semua guru² yang tetap terus menerima tidak kurang daripada gajinya sekarang, dan sa-bagai tambahan, memberi mereka tangga kenaikan gaji, faedah kumpulan wang simpanan, dan jaminan di-dalam pekerjaan-nya. Ini ada-lah bagi menyempurnakan janji yang telah di-buat di-dalam Penyata saya tahun yang lalu bahawa Kerajaan akan melindungi mata pencharian guru² tetap di-dalam Sekolah² Menengah China.

Saya sedar akan satu kesusahan bagi sekolah² sa-paroh bantuan ini, ia-itu sa-tengah daripada-nya sekarang mempunyai murid² yang lebeh umur atau yang kurang kelayakan-nya. Kerajaan tidak memberi bantuan penuh kepada sekolah² dengan murid² demikian itu, yang biasa-nya belajar di-sekolah² bersendiria (private). Walau pun demikian saya mengakui ada-nya kesusahan ini bagi sekolah² yang tidak sanggup hendak membuang murid² yang kurang kelayakan dan lebeh umur yang sudah di-terima masuk belajar itu untuk melayakkan sekolah² itu menerima bantuan penuh.

Saya sedia menimbangkan suatu peratoran khas bagi sekolah² ini ia-itu dengan jalan memberi bantuan penuh untuk sa-bahagian besar sekolah itu yang murid²-nya layak dan umur-nya betul menurut atoran. Ini akan di-beri walau pun manakala sekolah itu, sa-

kira-nya ia suka, mengadakan darjah² bersendiria (private) di-bangunan-nya pada sa-belah petang atau malam untuk murid² yang kurang kelayakan dan lebeh umur yang sudah sedia ada dalam sekolah² itu. Ini ada-lah peratoran dalam peralehan untuk menolong sekolah² berubah kepada menjadi bantuan penuh tahun hadapan. Bangunan² sekolah yang ada itu boleh-lah di-gunakan di-sa-belah petang untuk darjah² bersendiria (private) mengandongi murid² yang kurang kelayakan dan lebeh umur yang sudah ada di-sekolah² itu. Jika sekolah itu berhajat meneruskan bahagian bersendiria (private) itu sa-bagai peratoran tetap dan akan menerima murid² baharu pula kepada bahagian bersendiria (private) ini maka pada fikiran saya patut-lah mereka membuat rancangan dengan mengadakan bangunan baharu atau berasing dengan perbelanjaan sendiri. Saya sedia membenarkan masa yang menasabah untuk perkara ini.

Saya harap sekolah² ini akan bersetuju ia-itu peratoran dalam peralehan, yang baharu saya umumkan sa-bentar, akan mengatasi satu daripada masa'alah² yang besar bagi sekolah² sa-paroh bantuan dan akan memudahkan-nya menerima tawaran Kerajaan untuk menjadi sekolah bantuan penuh pada tahun hadapan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya harap ahli² pelajaran China akan mengambil peratoran yang baharu saya umumkan tadi, berserta dengan peratoran gaji yang di-tawarkan kepada Guru² China itu, sa-bagai bukti kejujoran Kerajaan untuk melichinkan peralehan daripada bantuan sa-paroh kepada bantuan penuh bagi Sekolah² Menengah China dan mengalu²kan sekolah² itu masuk ka-dalam sistem pelajaran kebangsaan kita.

Bukti-nya amat-lah banyak ia-itu ibu-bapa China sudah mengakui bahawa ada-lah bagi fa'edah-nya juga menghantarkan anak² mereka kepada Sekolah² Menengah yang menerima bantuan penuh. Bayaran sekolah-nya kurang dan pelajaran-nya lebeh baik.

Ada-lah juga mendatangkan fa'edah yang besar kepada guru² bagi sekolah²-nya berubah menjadi sekolah bantuan penuh. Dan juga akan mengurangkan bebanan kewangan yang berat serta bertambah bagi pengurus² dan penyokong² sekolah itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dasar Kerajaan ada-lah memberi ke'adilan dan pelajaran yang lebeh baik kepada Sekolah² China dan barang siapa yang berkata sa-balek-nya ada-lah menyestakan warga-negara kita daripada keturunan China serta guru², ibu-bapa dan murid² China.

Hanya satu perkara lagi yang saya hendak nyatakan dalam perkara ini ia-itu Kerajaan tidak berniat hendak menukarkan dasar-nya terhadap Sekolah² Menengah China yang menerima bantuan sa-paroh.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bagaimana yang ternyata di-dalam permulaan Rang Undang² ini maka ada-lah maksud Kerajaan hendak menchapai perkembangan kemajuan bagi satu sistem pelajaran kebangsaan yang menjadikan bahasa kebangsaan bahasa pengantar yang utama.

Tujuan mu'tamad ini telah di-ishtiharkan di-dalam Penyata Razak tahun 1956 dan di-masokkan di-dalam Undang² Pelajaran, 1957.

Kemajuan sudah-lah terchapai kaarah ini. Hampir sa-paroh daripada jumlah murid² sekolah rendah ia-lah di-dalam sekolah² rendah kebangsaan yang menerima bantuan penuh dan bahasa pengantar-nya bahasa Melayu, dan satu daripada keutamaan saya ia-lah memperbaiki darjah pengajaran dan bangunan bagi sekolah² ini. Pelajaran Menengah dalam bahasa Melayu sedang di-perluaskan dengan sa-berapa chepat. Sekolah² Menengah Kebangsaan akan di-dirikan di-dalam daerah² di-mana jumlah murid² lepasan sekolah² rendah di-anggap menasabah bagi mendirikan sekolah² tersebut. Rancangan bagi melateh guru² untuk sekolah² itu sudah pun di-buat dan sekarang sedang di-laksanakan dengan bersungguh². Sijil Rendah Pelajaran

telah di-adakan dalam bahasa Melayu mulai pada tahun yang lalu dan mulai pada tahun hadapan Sijil Pelajaran Persekutuan Tanah Melayu akan di-jalankan dalam bahasa kebangsaan. Pengajaran bahasa kebangsaan ada-lah wajib di-seluruh perengkat sekolah² sama ada yang mendapat bantuan atau tidak. University Malaya telah ber-setuju pada dasar-nya untuk memulakan dengan beransor² bahasa Melayu sa-bagai bahasa pengantar di-kursus² University yang tertentu dengan tujuan yang akhir hendak menjadikan University berbahasa dua (bi-lingual) di-Kuala Lumpur ini. Saya berhajat mengadakan aliran bahasa kebangsaan di-dalam sekolah² rendah Kerajaan jenis kebangsaan, dan di-bawah Fasal 21 (2) dalam Rang Undang² ini saya berkuasa mengarahkan perubahan sekolah rendah jenis kebangsaan kepada sekolah rendah kebangsaan apabila saya puas hati bahawa peratoran ini sesuai di-jalankan.

Dan juga sa-bagai galakan sa-chara langsung dan nyata dalam penggunaan dan pelajaran bahasa kebangsaan maka segala pelajaran menerusi bahasa Melayu akan di-beri dengan perchuma, bukan sahaja dalam Sekolah² Rendah bahkan dalam semua peringkat sistem pelajaran kita.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Dasar Pelajaran Kebangsaan kita ada-lah berasaskan dengan tegoh-nya di-atas bahasa kebangsaan. Sa-lain daripada itu, satu sistem sukatan pelajaran yang sa-rupa yang menggalakkan pandangan berchorak Tanah Melayu dan menimbulkan ta'at setia kepada Tanah Melayu, dan yang mesti di-ikuti oleh semua sekolah². Dalam pada itu, bagaimana yang telah saya terangkan, bahasa² dan kebudayaan² di-Tanah Melayu yang lain ada-lah di-pelihara dan di-kekalkan. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Kerajaan menda'awa bahawa ini ada-lah satu dasar pelajaran mustahak untuk negara kita yang baharu dan satu dasar yang 'adil kepada semua, 'adil kepada ibu-bapa, kepada guru², pembayar² chukai dan kepada murid², suatu dasar yang memenohi chita² yang sah bagi sakalian warga-negara Persekutuan yang benar dan setia.

Barangkali saya boleh juga menda'awa dengan bangga-nya bahawa sistem pelajaran kita, dengan pelajaran rendah perchuma sa-lama enam tahun bagi semua kanak², dengan sa-kurang²-nya pelajaran lapan tahun bagi tiap² kanak², dengan pelajaran menengah teknik dan jurusan akademik, mem-bawa maktab Teknik kita kepada kelayakan "Professional" yang penoh dan kepada kelayakan akademik yang sa-tinggi²-nya di-dalam University kita—sistem pelajaran ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sudah-lah terkemuka di-dalam Asia dan ada-lah juga chita² saya dan hasrat Kerajaan mendirikan-nya di-atas asas yang ada ini sa-hingga boleh berbanding dengan sistem pelajaran di-mana² juga. (*Tepok*).

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, manakala rakan saya Yang Amat Berhormat Timbalan Perdana Menteri mengemukakan Rang Undang² pelajaran yang lalu di-dalam Majlis Undangan Persekutuan dalam tahun 1957, beliau mensifatkan Rang Undang² itu sa-bagai piagam untuk kanak² Malaya yang baharu. Saya kemukakan Rang Undang² ini kepada Dewan ini sa-bagai keturunan yang terakhir sa-kali dan setia kepada piagam itu, suatu piagam bagi perpaduan dan kema'amoran kebangsaan dan sa-bagai piagam yang membuka peluang kepada kanak² kita.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon menhadangkan. (*Tepok*).

The Deputy Prime Minister (Tun Haji Abdul Razak): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon menyokong usul ini.

Enche' V. Veerappen (Seberang Selatan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to express the views of the Socialist Front. But before I do so, I would like to take the opportunity to thank the Minister of Education for, at least this time, having given us greater time to study this Bill. You will remember, Sir, that at the last time when we debated the Rahman Talib Report, we complained of the lack of time that was given to us. Well, since August last year until now,

which is nearly fourteen months, we have had the opportunity of meeting various people and getting their views; responsible organisations also have had the opportunity of saying what they want, and I think today we have a better picture than we had at that time. On this problem of education—I say it is a problem, because if it is not a problem, I do not think that our Prime Minister would have thought it fit at this stage, when he is considering the question of merger, to allow Singapore to retain full autonomy in education—he is quite aware of what is happening in Malaya and therefore he does not want to make the problem more complicated. Only a few days ago, I think, the newly elected President of the Johore State MCA stated on the 11th of October, that there was a genuine unhappiness among the Chinese parents at the fast pace set by the Government. He called on the Government to go slow over the conversion of Chinese Secondary Schools. If that is not a problem, then I do not know what is the problem.

Our Minister of Education has gone to great pains to explain to us the contents of this Bill and the policy, but what it appeared to me was that he was trying to wrangle his way out. This Bill, in my opinion, is not necessary because although at the back you find many clauses purported to be new, but they are just old ones in new clothes.

I think at this stage I must refer to the speech of the Minister of the Interior, when he gave an introductory speech here about culture and the national language. I don't think we here are quarrelling over that. He appreciated the contributions that the Chinese—at least the early Chinese—and the early Indians, who have come to this country and who have been assimilated in this country in the course of time, have made towards the culture of this country. He said, if I remember rightly, that the Malay culture would be used as a nucleus. Well, we all hope

that one day we will have a truly Malayan culture. He also said about the national language. Well, I don't think any of us have refused to accept the Malay language as the National language of this country. We are not quarrelling over that. But at the last meeting when we debated the Rahman Talib Report, we said that it was not enough just to feel proud of the national language, but also in the ultimate, Sir, we must take care of our rice bowl. In other words, we want our education to be such that we may earn a living with it. If you produce that language, if you enrich our national language to such a position as to be able to give the people the bread and butter or the rice and the curry, then we accept it, and there is then no problem in this country.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: *Thosai!* (Laughter).

Enche' V. Veerappen: Mr. Speaker, Sir, let us go to the Bill proper. This Bill is a simple Bill. The Bill is entitled, "An Act to amend and consolidate the law relating to Education." We have seen and we have approved many Bills in this House with just that sort of title. Our Minister has gone to say that there are many things new, though it is actually the old one according to the Explanatory Statement on page 65 where it is stated:—

"The Committee considered that the main features of the 1956 policy (which is expressed in the Education Ordinance, 1957, enacted shortly before Merdeka) are suited to the present needs of the country, and the recommendations of the Committee may properly be regarded as refinements or developments of that policy in the light of experience obtained in the administration of the 1957 Ordinance."

It is just like a lady who is powdering up to go for a dance, may be, or putting on lipstick and make-up. Though there are 140 clauses, the 140 clauses do not bring any radical changes—that is my submission. But the Minister forgot to tell us, or purposely refused to tell us, that the changes are in the preamble and the definitions, and my observations will be almost entirely based on those. If

the definitions can be changed in five years, I do not know how we can call that a Charter. We had the *Magna Carta*—how many centuries back I don't know. The Bill contains several little words and clauses which have been changed and if we read them superficially, we may miss them; however, in actuality, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Bill spells the death of a lot of things. It is, in fact, not based on the Razak policy. It is not a consistent policy. In fact, it is a major operation and it murders the Razak policy of 1957. Before I go into the details, I would just like to refresh the memory of the Honourable Members in this House of what certain people had feared, only last year. I would like to quote from our Parliamentary debates. The Member for Tanjong Utara—he is not here—was all praise for the Rahman Talib Report, but in praising it he asked for certain assurances. He said as follows:—

"The leaders of the Malayan Chinese Association have been able to discuss this matter with my Honourable friend the Minister of Education and we should be satisfied with the assurances that have been given by my Honourable friend the Minister of Education to the effect that, in the implementation of these recommendations, all concerned would be consulted."

I hope they have been consulted and they are satisfied with the assurances. And the Member for Larut Selatan said this:—

"I should, therefore, be very happy if the Minister of Education will tell us whether in 1961 it is possible to have the teachers"—the Member was rather worried about teachers—".....and that in spite of 435 teachers that are graduate teachers that come out from these colleges 2,320 will be still short for all the Government secondary schools. Therefore, I hope the Honourable the Minister of Education would enlighten me as to how and from where he is going to find these teachers to man these 41 partially assisted secondary schools if they all decide to conform."

I hope that the Honourable the Minister has given those assurances or has found the answers to those fears expressed by them. Even the Deputy Prime Minister, when he was the

Minister of Education, had this to say in moving the adoption of the 1957 Ordinance:—

“Sir, If I may humbly but confidently assert that this Bill is one of the most important legislations which have ever been introduced into this Council since it is the constitution, the charter for the children of the new independent Malaya which will emerge into full nation-hood in just over five months’ time. This is, therefore, one of the most important piles upon which, in the shifting sands which have hitherto retarded our development as one nation, the future of this country is to be strongly and securely founded.”

Well, within these five years what has happened?

Since we find that even those people of this country who are members of the Alliance are themselves still not satisfied, or who do not seem to have got the assurances, and also since I do not think that the Minister has found the teachers, what are we to make of his speech? This Bill need not be before us, but it is before us because, though the Minister said that he is consistent with the policy, the people do not believe him to be so. They have lost faith; they cannot trust what the Government sets out to do. This Bill would be superfluous and unnecessary. Let us examine the preamble. It says—

“Whereas the educational policy of the Federation originally declared in the Education Ordinance, 1957, is to establish a national system of education which will satisfy the needs of the nation and promote its cultural, social, economic and political development:”

If you look at the old Ordinance it is one of the clauses, but not the preamble. But if you look at it more closely, the most important word was that it was said to be a “charter”. But let us look at the preamble. What are the words left out? Why are they left out? Is it not the policy? If it is the policy, why do you leave them out—“acceptable to the people as a whole”? Is it because it has been thorny? Is it because it has been pricking too much? Why? If it is the Charter, how do you withdraw those words?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: You will get the answer.

Mr. Speaker: Please proceed.

Enche’ V. Veerappen: Let us now look at the second paragraph. It says towards the end—I won’t bother you by repeating the whole thing—the last part of it says—

“..... to the general principle that pupils are to be educated in accordance with the wishes of their parents:”

“..... wishes of their parents”, that is the catch phrase. Well, I am glad to note that it is almost the same as clause 4 in the original Bill. But is our Government actually fulfilling the wishes of the parents? I don’t think so. And what do you mean by “education”? It says “.....educated in accordance with the wishes of their parents:”—what do you mean by education? Do you mean primary education only? Do you mean secondary education? Do you mean university education? What education? It may be you will tell “primary education”. But education is generally accepted as all that. Is it not? Therefore, these few words “in accordance with the wishes of their parents” is to mislead the people and hoodwink them. But please take a closer look at the words again “wishes of their parents” and see what our Government has done. It actually fulfils the wishes of the parents. It does! Because you can see what our leaders want: they are parents also—what do they want? Do they send their children to the national schools of Malaya? Do they send their children to the English schools of Malaya? No! They want better English schools, not schools in this country. They want schools in foreign countries. That is the wish of the parents. Yes! (*Laughter*). If our leaders show that, what about the other people? Do our leaders themselves have faith in the value of the national language? Do they show it? What does this show? They don’t have faith. And what do the common people do? They naturally follow. If our Ministers and our rulers have no faith in our education, naturally they also would follow. They get the second best. They don’t send their children to

foreign schools and foreign universities, but they take the second best. They send their children to the English schools. Let the Minister tell us today, where is the increase in schools. Is there increase in the Chinese schools? Is there increase in the national schools, or increase in English schools? Definitely the great increase is in the English schools. Therefore, can the people believe what you say? Can they have faith in you? Can they trust you? It is my submission, Sir, that while the Government pretends to build the national language into the position of the sole official language and the main medium of instruction, it is really building the English language. I doubt if the Minister can deny that. Soon there will be more and more English schools than Malay schools, or national schools. There will be thousands more English pupils than national language pupils. In fact, as I said just now "in accordance with the wishes of their parents" cuts both ways. If that is not true, let us look at the answers the Honourable Minister of Education has given to us in this session. I am sure Honourable Members have copies of this—it was distributed on the first day. We have heard how volubly our Ministers have been telling that Malay will be the sole official language, that our national language will be the sole official language in 1967. Let us go through the list of questions and the answers to them. The answer to the first question says—

"Under Article 152 of the Constitution it will be for Parliament to decide the official language or languages of the Federation of Malaya after 1967."

It says ".....it will be for Parliament to decide.....". But today we have everybody going everywhere telling that the national language will be the sole official language after 1967. I think they should have guts in this Parliament also to answer like that.

Again, I asked—

".....if English is not one of the official languages after 1967, will the students who are now studying in fully-assisted English Secondary

Schools be able to utilise with advantage their English education when they join the Government service after 1967, if not why does Government continue to teach students in English in Secondary Schools."

and the Minister's answer is

"Yes Sir. It must be remembered that all pupils in fully-assisted English Secondary Schools already learn the National Language as well as English."

If that is true, Sir.....

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam (Ipoh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise on a point of order. I refer to S.O. 37 where it is stated that—

"No member shall interrupt another member except—

(a) by rising to a point of order,.....;
or

(b) to elucidate some matter raised
....."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I ask that Orders of this House be enforced even to the extreme extent of ordering members out of the House if they don't behave themselves.

Mr. Speaker: Honourable Members, I wish to draw your attention to the provisions of this Standing Order that there should be no interruption while a member is speaking, unless on two points, one on a point of clarification and the other on a point of order. If there is any gross misconduct in the House, I have the power to ask the member to withdraw from the House.

Enche' V. Veerappen: As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that was the answer to my questions, and if that is the answer, then the Minister accepts one principle, and that is—I went at great pains to say in this House at the last session—the principle of the transfer of learning. I said that if you learn in one language and you know another language well enough, you can utilise what you have learned in that language through the other languages you learned. Here, he admits, if you are educated in English, you can still serve

Malaya when the National Language is the sole official language. If it is good for English, why cannot it be good for other languages? Well it appears then, Sir, that the Government's policy is "heads I win tails you lose"—to put it very simply.

Another thing is the future of these English school pupils. We have in our English language schools thousands and thousands of students. They are all learning through the English medium, but if, as he said, in 1967 English is not going to be the sole official language, will they be able to continue? What would be the position of these students when they come out? They pass very well. Would they be able to secure employment? Well, the answer has been given: they will.

Let us look at page 4—that is the definition of a "National Primary School". This is what it says:—

"in which facilities for the teaching of the Chinese or Tamil language (if not the main medium of instruction) shall, if it is reasonable and practicable so to do, be made available if the parents of fifteen children in the school so request".

whereas Clause 35 of the old Ordinance—well, anyway, the wording in the old Ordinance was different, and I do not see why this change should be so.

And when we look at the definition of a secondary school, that is where I find is the unkindest cut of all. A "National Secondary School" previously was given only one definition. The National-type Secondary School—on page 32 of the old Ordinance—means a secondary school providing a five-year course of secondary education in which the national language, the English language, the Chinese language, or the Tamil language, or any two of such languages are used as the media of instruction and with the national language and the English language as compulsory subjects of instruction when such languages are not used as the media of instruction. Well, that was the definition in 1957 but to-day—1961—we have got to

change that definition. If that is a charter and if the words in the charter, and even the definition of the words in the charter, are going to be changed, I do not know why you can call it a charter. But in the new Bill we have before us on page 5, we have two instead of one, where originally we have only National-type Secondary School. We have two—one is "National Secondary School" and the other is "National-type Secondary School"—"sekolah menengah kebangsaan" and "sekolah menengah jenis kebangsaan"—that Malay translation—our national translation—is a new thing. But that is not all the new thing. Let us look at item (b) there—"using the English language as the main medium of instruction". Now, Mr. Speaker, Sir, does the Minister think that we are such duds in this country that we cannot know the difference between that and this? Is that not a change of policy? If that is not a change of policy, then what is it? Sir, two languages are cut off—is that not then a change of policy? I submit, Sir it is definitely a change of policy. It is not just whitewashing, it actually kills the 1957 Ordinance. It destroys this Ordinance. We feel very strongly about this change of definition. And there is something very strange in the definition also. See what has been added. I do not know whether in any country the definition of a school is fixed by the examinations that they have to take—I wonder whether it is true. Here you have a new condition, i.e. "preparing pupils for such examinations as may be prescribed". Was that included in the 1957 Ordinance? It is nowhere to be seen in the 1957 Ordinance, but you have Clause 55 in the 1957 Ordinance, Sir, where it is stated that there will be a Federation of Malaya Examination Syndicate and the Syndicate may, with the approval of the Minister, make by-laws for or in respect of the following matters, examinations and so forth and so on. But it is not a condition and not a part of the definition of a secondary school. But how this clause came to be included as a definition has a very interesting history.

Sir, even in the 1957 Ordinance we do not have any condition requiring what language will be the medium of instruction. Though it is not stated here, it is stated in the policy on which this Ordinance has been based: it is stated there—the Razak Report—in no uncertain terms:—

“.....we can see no reason for altering the practice in Chinese secondary schools of using *Kuo-Yu* as a general medium provided that these Chinese schools fall into line with the conditions mentioned in the two previous paragraphs. We see no educational objection to the learning of three languages in secondary schools or to the use of more than one language in the same school as the medium of instruction.”

Is that not clear enough? From that I submit that the Razak Report envisaged that promotion examinations would be in the Malay, Chinese and Tamil languages: in fact, later on I shall be able to quote the exact words of the Deputy Prime Minister, when he moved the adoption of the 1957 Ordinance. Sir, how did it come about that this condition for examination was included in the definition of a national-type secondary school? Now, Sir, the Report, though it does not meet with all the wishes of the people, it does go a long way to satisfy them—that is my humble opinion. You may have the best of reports, the best law; but the people who implement it mean a lot—they can put you in such a position that it will be impossible for you to get out, and it is in that position that the Federation Government is to-day.

Even the Minister of Finance, who is sitting here to-day, had this to say in 1957:

“One tip I would humbly suggest to my Honourable friend the Minister for Education, and that is, that I hope he will instruct his permanent officials in the implementation of this Bill to implement it in the light of the clarifications, amplifications and explanations contained in his speech.”

Whose speech? I take it that he meant the Deputy Prime Minister's speech. Our Minister of Finance had misgivings about our expatriate officers who were the people going to implement our

policy. He had misgivings and he was right. When it came for the Report to be implemented—this law did not specify the medium of examination—they had that power to manipulate in such a way that the spirit of the Razak Report was lost, was destroyed. They rejected what was envisaged in the Razak Report, that is that the medium of examination for promotion purposes could also be in Chinese and Tamil.

When a certain Member of the previous Legislative Council asked for clarification as to in what medium would the examinations be, the Minister for Education then said:—

“What language will the pupils sit it, if they come from a Chinese medium secondary school, for the Lower Certificate of Education? Well, I have explained in my opening speech that the Lower Certificate of Education Examination Standard serves two purposes. It is basically, as I said, a public examination for entry into Government service and, as such, the examination, except for the languages and literatures, which will be set in the language that was taught, will for the time being be set in Malay and English, and later on in Malay only. But for those pupils who do not wish to enter into Government service but wish only to go for further education, the examination on the same standard will be established in the various media of instruction”—please understand “various media of instruction”—

“so that a pupil from a Chinese medium school can, if he only wants to go for further studies, take that examination and be allowed to be promoted to the higher classes. Of course, as I said, the details of this examination would be examined by the new Board of Education.”—I wonder whether the Board had examined it, who composed the Board and what were the recommendations

Sir, that examination for promotion was never done, and it is one of the biggest tragedies in this country to-day. If it was done, I do not think we will have any trouble over the Education Report—at least in my opinion. What was the motive for doing away with this examination and compelling the pupils to take only the examination in the national language or the English language? Well, officers in the Ministry at that time knew well that nobody was going to be taught at that time in Malay, the national language. They

knew very well what to do; they knew that the only way was for the people to learn English—taking the examination in English means learning in English. If more and more pupils learn English the position of the English language in this country becomes strengthened. Whether they were objective or subjective, I do not know.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid (Seberang Utara): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order—Standing Order 35 (1) which says:

“A member desiring to speak shall rise in his place and if called upon shall stand and address his observations to the Chair.....”

He is all the time addressing this side of the House instead of addressing the Chair. (*Laughter*).

Mr. Speaker: It is a minor point. Please proceed.

Enche' V. Veerappen: From that we can see that not only those who want to learn English but also those who do not want to learn English, or have no desire to learn English at all, are compelled to learn English and our Government has fallen into that trap, and it is now trying to justify itself—and it goes to any extent to justify itself. I hope the Honourable Minister will disprove me. Of course, it is well-known in this House that whatever we say is always twisted round or upside down. However, there is one thing which strikes me at this stage and that is I wonder why that some of the school managers who have got the means have not challenged the Federation Government—I mean challenge it in a court of law. I feel that there is some justification for a challenge, because it is stated so clearly under the definition of a national-type secondary school that you can teach in that language and then at the end you cut out examination. Surely, if you allow one to teach in that language you must allow pupils taught in that language to sit for an examination in that language. What do you expect the pupils to do? According to the 1957 Ordinance, to be a conforming school you got to

prepare pupils for the L.C.E., but it is also stated there that preparation for the L.C.E. means not only preparation in one language medium but any of the four languages. Then I ask, Sir, is it fair to deprive them of a grant if they do not prepare for the examination in the national language? Why did they stop it? That is the primary question that is shaking the country to-day. That is the thing which has brought all this unhappiness. Therefore, Sir, the action to include the clause about examination is intended not to help the Malaysians but the English. Instead of punishing the Malaysians, the Government should give the highest award to that expatriate officer, who has now retired. It is not the spirit of the Razak Report.

Now, Sir, the Government did mention about free education. It has said that this Bill is giving free education. True, Sir, but did not the old Bill also say so—Clause 35 of the 1957 Ordinance? Even for that matter there was a similar provision in the 1952 Ordinance. The International Commission also, I think, made a strong recommendation for compulsory and free education. Sir, section 35 (1) of the 1957 Ordinance says:

“A local education authority may, with the approval of the Minister declare primary education to be obligatory for children in any age category.....”

Therefore, Sir, the law was there, the power was given to the Minister—he has just to declare the age; it can be 15 or even 20. Compulsory to my mind means free also—you cannot compel if you do not give a thing free. Therefore, it is just to hoodwink us, to divert attention, that the Government says, “Oh, we are giving free education.”

Now, Sir, I come to the last point—Clause 136, which is tucked so nicely away towards the very end. I have quoted from speeches of certain Honourable Members in this House so that they could have time to think. They asked for assurances; and if they have the assurances, I would ask them to prevail upon the Minister to amend one little word. If not I would like to

move an amendment, though I may be defeated, to Clause 136. It says here "appointed date", but what is the appointed date? What do you think will be the appointed date, the date when this Bill becomes law? The appointed date could be 1st January, 1962—not very far off. So, could you prevail upon your Minister to have that amended? You wanted assurances and if you have got them by all means..... If you have not got them, that date could be any day—if could be 1967, it could be 1980, could be 1962, could be June, 1962.

From our Deputy Prime Minister's speech, at one time he said that "the task of the Committee must be to plan for the immediate future"—true; "for a transitional period"—true; "of education in this country which must be regarded as the next ten years." That, Sir, was in 1956, but this is 1961. So it is only half the span of life. Could we not then prevail upon our Minister to have it extended, in his own words, "for the next ten years"?

Finally, Sir, from all that I have said, Honourable Members would note two things about this Bill—one is that the 140 clauses do not give anything new or anything wonderful or anything free or compulsory to any of the pupil. They do not build, enrich, or nourish the Malay language. None of the 140 clauses, Sir, help to establish the National Language as the "rice and curry language", you may call it, of the people. Whatever is intended to benefit the people is already in the 1957 Ordinance. The only thing it gives is a strong, vigorous, English language with the broadest base and the strongest foundation which at no time could be shaken by the National Language. That is what this Bill gives, but it does take away from your Chinese and Indian brothers something; it takes away very deceitfully and very cunningly the provision in law for a fair and just system of education with which everyone would have been happy if the expatriates had given it a chance for it to be implemented at least.

Do you think this Bill is fair and just? Can we blame the Chinese for pleading, asking and agitating for something that was promised and agreed to in 1956 in the Razak policy and embodied in the law, in the Education Ordinance of 1957? I don't think Honourable Members would want me to put more bluntly, but please ask yourself this question and answer it.

In my last question at this session, that is question 16 on page 10, I asked the Minister to state whether the Lower Certificate of Education and Federation of Malaya Certificate of Education Examinations will be conducted only in Malay, if and when it becomes the sole official language. And what is the answer of the Minister? It says—

"If and when the National Language becomes the sole official language careful consideration will be given to the ability of school children to take the public examinations through the medium of the National Language. As the House knows steps are being taken to ensure that all children in school learn the National Language at all levels. It can therefore be expected that every year school children will become more and more proficient in this language. As far as lies in by power I would say that children will not be expected to sit for public examinations through the medium only of the National Language before it is fair and reasonable for them to do so."

Sir, if it is not fair for them now, how can you say it is fair for the Chinese medium school children? What is not fair to one, cannot be fair to the other? If we can care for the English medium schools, why cannot we care for the Chinese and Tamil schools? If we can be fair and reasonable to the English medium pupils, cannot we be fair and reasonable to the Chinese medium pupils? After all, it was not the fault of the Chinese or the Tamil secondary schools. The fault was due to the carelessness, or the purposeful manipulation of some people. Therefore, Sir, we of the Socialist Front oppose this Bill, because it is unnecessary, and, to our mind, superfluous. It favours, strengthens and promotes English at the expense of the national language. In fact, Sir, in one word, I would say

this: it destroys the goodwill and harmony that was built up by the Razak Report and the 1957 Ordinance.

Enche' Too Joon Hing (Telok Anson): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Minister last evening told us that this Bill makes no fundamental changes in the present education policy, which is based on the Razak Report. It was intended to correct some of the ambiguities and to tidy up the confusion in the Razak Report. However, having gone through the Bill, I have a lot of misgivings as to what he said. Sir, I now request that this Bill for the implementation of the Report of the Education Committee 1960 be suspended and that another Committee of this House comprising representatives of all parties be appointed to review once again the Razak Report, that is, the Report of the Education Committee, 1956.

Sir, ever since the Report of the Review Committee of 1960 was approved in this House on August 12th 1960, much against the opposition of Members from the Opposition Parties, there has been, in one way or another, constant expressions of general dissatisfaction and strong criticisms from the members of the public. Sir, the Alliance 1960 Review Committee in reviewing the 1956 Report had established altogether a different education policy which has deviated entirely from the fundamental principles of the Razak Report and which is completely contrary to the Alliance 1955 Election Manifesto. The Report of the Razak Committee was based mainly on this. Sir, the Review Committee established another different policy in the Report of 1960, which during the recent elections earlier this year had been rejected and proved unacceptable to the people of this country as a whole. Mr. Speaker, Sir, it had once been expressed in this House that "Education has become a controversial matter in this country, taken against the background of its complex plural society." These were the words spoken by my former colleague Dato' (now Tun) Abdul Razak, the then Minister of Education,

when he moved the motion for the adoption of the 1956 Report on May 16th 1956. He had also taken pains to give us a clear picture of the history of education in this country and the state of turmoil in which education was then existing. Sir, today with the adoption of the 1960 Report, now so well-known as the Rahman Talib Report, by the majority of the Alliance vote in this House on August 12th 1960, the turmoil which the Alliance once tried to calm down, has once again loomed up in the clear horizon like the destructive mushroom from the explosion of an atomic or hydrogen bomb.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, with due respect to the Alliance Government, and in the interests of the welfare and harmony of the people in this country, and indeed, Sir, in all sincerity and good intentions, I beg the Honourable Minister to withdraw this Bill and set up without delay another Committee to review the Razak Report once again. Sir, Honourable Members might ask me, why then had I supported and signed the Razak Report in 1956? And even to-day I have been severely accused and attacked in one way or another by members of the Alliance for attacking the present Alliance Education Policy. Well, Sir, I have always declared my support of the Razak Report and even now when I stand here before all of you in this House I would declare again that I support the Razak Report—only, and only if the true spirit and the real intention of the Razak Report were faithfully interpreted and honestly implemented. But I will not hesitate, and I think and I know the people will not hesitate too, and nothing will in the future stop me or the people from attacking or criticising the Talib Report which is so discriminatory, so obstructive, and even more, so destructive to the cultures of the other people living in this country.

Sir, the fact that I am able to stand here and address the House to-day is very clear and obvious. I have been returned to this House with a clear and distinct mandate not only from the

people of Telok Anson but from the people all over the Federation to demand from the Alliance Government for legitimate rights and equal treatment in the education of the different races living in this country. True, the issue in the by-election of Telok Anson had been fought solely and mainly over the question of the Alliance present education policy; and the people, by their overwhelming majority, had given the Alliance a definite answer in the defeat of their candidate over this problem. That the present Alliance education policy is not acceptable to the people of this country as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have said in the beginning that the education policy recommended in the report of the Education Review Committee, 1960 is completely contrary to the Alliance education pledges contained in the 1955 election manifesto. The Review Committee of 1960 had deviated entirely from the fundamental principles laid down in the Razak Report. Now, Sir, I will bring forth some of the proofs to support my allegations by quoting the Alliance education pledges contained in the manifesto, so that Honourable Members in this House may know the true facts of the Alliance education pledges which formed one of the most important factors which led to the Alliance's overwhelming victory in 1955. Sir, I have got here.....

Enche' Tajudin bin Ali (Larut Utara): On a point of order. Standing Order 35 (b)—“A Member shall not read”. As I see it, the ex-Minister is reading every word.

Mr. Speaker: As long as it is on the table it is quite all right.

Enche' Too Joon Hing: Sir, I have got here a manifesto of the Alliance of 1955.

Sir, under education—paragraph 1 (e):—

“To allow vernacular schools their normal expansion, i.e. to encourage rather than destroy the schools, languages or cultures of the people living in this country.”

Then in paragraph 3:—

“The Alliance is convinced that the introduction of national school features into vernacular schools as envisaged in the Federation Legislative Council Paper No. 67 of 1954 is not acceptable to the people.”

Then, again, in paragraph 5:—

“The Alliance considers that the standardization of text-books is most important. Text-books similar in substance with Malayan outlook should be produced in all languages used in the country, i.e. English, Malay, Chinese and Tamil. Our children should be taught to think as Malaysans.”

Sir, then the last, but not the least, is paragraph 12:—

“In view of the Alliance policy outlined above, the Alliance will make every effort to accord equal treatment to all aided schools within the limits of the federal finances so that more opportunities will be given to all children of school age to receive education.”

Sir, these were the fundamental pledges of the Alliance on education and these pledges had been accepted by all the people in the Federation, and that resulted in the overwhelming victory of the Alliance in 1955—having captured 51 seats out of 52, with the exception of only one opposition in the last Legislative Council.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the Razak Report the 15-man committee did adhere to the Alliance election pledges by declaring in their Report the following recommendations—in paragraphs 17, 71, 72 and 119. Sir, I will not dwell too long on them. I will only give the important points on these paragraphs in order to save time.

Paragraph 17—National Type Primary Schools:—

“Its primary function is to foster and encourage the cultures and languages of the Malayan community, to establish one type of national school where the pupils work towards a common final examination.”

Then paragraph 71 states very clearly that Malay and English shall be compulsory. The object of learning Malay is to make it the national

language of the country, and the reason for learning English is also stated there—for students who wish to go for higher studies and employment, and so forth.

Sir, paragraph 72, which I think the previous speaker had already dwelt on, says: “We can see no reason for altering the practice in Chinese Secondary Schools the use of Kuo-Yu as the general medium and there is no reason why that more than one language cannot be used in a school”.

Then in paragraph 119 which is more important—it says:—

“We cannot over-emphasise our conviction that the introduction of a syllabus common to all schools in the Federation is the crucial requirement of an educational policy in Malaya. It is an essential element in the development of a united Malayan nation. It is the key which will unlock the gates hitherto standing locked and barred against the establishment of an educational system acceptable to the people of Malaya as a whole, a common syllabus.”

And it says here:—

“Once all schools are working to a common content syllabus irrespective of the language medium of instruction, we consider the country will have taken the most important step towards the establishment of a national system of education which will satisfy the needs of the people and promote the cultural, social, economic and political development of a nation.”

Sir, these are the important things that we find in the Razak Report, and these are the fundamental principles contained in the Alliance election pledges which meet the hopes and aspirations of all the races living in this country.

Now, Sir, what are the normal practices, or the normal system of the Chinese schools in those days in 1955 at the time when the Alliance promised the people what they would give during the elections? The normal system of Chinese secondary schools consists of two periods of three years each. The first period of three years is from Junior Middle I to Junior Middle III, and the second period of three years is from Senior Middle I to Senior

Middle III. These schools are maintained and generally aided by Government with annual grants-in-aid. At the end of Junior Middle III and Senior Middle III the students participated in Government conducted examinations held in the medium of instruction. These examinations helped to decide the qualifications of a student for promotion and entry to higher studies and for seeking employment outside. These have been the normal practices, or the normal system of the Chinese schools in the Federation for many, many years.

Now, Sir, I come to the Talib Report. The Review Committee has recommended in paragraph 187 (a) that the present Chinese schools system of Junior Middle I to III and Senior Middle I to III should be discontinued as from 1961 in assisted schools and also that partial assistance should be discontinued; and in (b) it has also recommended that the organisation by the Ministry of examinations in Chinese, that is the Junior Middle III Examinations, the Chinese Secondary Schools Promotion Examination and the Chinese Secondary Schools Leaving Certificate should be discontinued and that all students should in future participate in the public examinations—that is the Lower Certificate of Education and the Federation of Malaya Certificate of Education—which are set in the official languages. Now, these are things that are recommended by the Review Committee; and in paragraph 175 the Committee has clearly set out the reasons for making the recommendation. It also states that, “For the sake of national unity, the objective must be to eliminate communal secondary schools from the national system of assisted schools and to ensure that pupils of all races shall attend both National and National-type secondary schools. An essential requirement of this policy is that public examinations at secondary level should be conducted only in the country’s official languages.”

Therefore, Sir, we can see very clearly the differences between the

Razak Report and the Talib Report and also the differences which the Alliance has made, or the differences which are contained in the Talib Report from those election pledges in 1955.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would now like to take the opportunity to say a few words in Malay concerning these points.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-sini saya suka mengambil peluang ini dan masa sedikit untuk berchakap dalam bahasa kebangsaan. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sunggoh pun saya punya bahasa kebangsaan bukan bijak atau tinggi, tetapi saya suka menchuba hari ini berchakap dalam bahasa kebangsaan supaya Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang ada di-sini yang belum belajar bahasa Inggeris boleh-lah dapat di-terangkan perkara² yang mustahak yang saya telah beruchap tadi.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menentang Rang Undang² Pelajaran ini dan juga saya minta Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran untuk di-tolak undang² ini, sebab Penyata Jawatan-Kuasa Menyemak Dasar Pelajaran tahun 1960 tidak-lah dapat di-terima oleh orang² di-negeri ini. Kenapa penyata ini ia-itu Penyata Rahman tidak dapat di-terima oleh ra'ayat negeri ini ia-lah perkara yang pertama chadangan² penyata itu tidak mengikut chadangan² pelajaran yang telah di-janjikan oleh Perikatan dalam tahun 1955. Perkara yang kedua ia-lah Jawatan-Kuasa Penyata Rahman Talib telah mengubah chadangan² yang di-adakan oleh Penyata Razak tahun 1956.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-sini saya suka memberi kepada Ahli² Yang Berhormat apa-kah chadangan² tentang pelajaran dalam manifesto tahun 1955? Perikatan telah mengaku penduduk² Persekutuan Tanah Melayu apabila Perikatan telah berlawan dalam pilihan raya Persekutuan tahun 1955. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-tangan saya ada-lah sa-buah buku ia-itu manifesto tahun 1955. Sekarang saya suka membacha kepada Ahli² Yang Berhormat

chadangan² yang mustahak dan penting tentang pelajaran. Muka 14 ia-itu perenggan 1 (g) ia-itu "meluaskan perkembangan sekolah² anak negeri. Perkara (h) membenarkan pembukaan sekolah², bahasa² dan kebudayaan tiap² bangsa dalam negeri ini. Perenggan 3—Perikatan yakin bahawa chara memindahkan bentuk sekolah kebangsaan kepada sekolah bahasa anak negeri seperti yang terkandung dalam Kertas Puteh tentang pelajaran Majlis Meshuarat Undangan Federal No. 67 tahun 54 ada-lah tidak dapat di-terima oleh ra'ayat negeri ini.

Perenggan 5—Perikatan berpendapat bahawa satu perkara yang mustahak dalam soal ini ia-lah menyamakan atau menyatukan jenis buku² sekolah. Sekolah yang berchorak Malaya harusnya di-terbitkan dalam bahasa² yang di-pakai dalam negeri ini ia-itu dalam bahasa² Inggeris, China dan Tamil. Dengan chara ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kanak² kita dapat di-arahkan fikiran-nya kepada chara berfikir ra'ayat negeri ini. Perenggan 12—Perikatan akan berusaha memberi layanan kepada sekolah² yang mendapat bantuan Kerajaan sa-lama ini tetapi bantuan itu ada-lah berdasarkan dengan keadaan, bagi membolehkan kanak² mendapat peluang pergi belajar. Ini-lah, perjanjian² oleh Perikatan kepada penduduk² negeri ini. Perenggan 70—Ia-lah mengekal dan menggalakkan kebudayaan dan bahasa² orang Tanah Melayu. Oleh itu kami chadangkan bahawa elok-lah di-adakan suatu jenis sekolah menengah kebangsaan. Di-dalam-nya murid² belajar kerana hendak tammat suatu peperekaaan akhir yang sama bagi semua sekolah² jenis itu tetapi jika boleh di-kendorkan sedikit atoran pelajaran bagi sekolah² jenis itu. Maka hendak-lah di-benarkan sekolah² itu atau sa-bahagian² daripadanya mengambil berat untuk mengajar bahasa² dan kebudayaan.

Perenggan 71 ia-itu bahasa Melayu dan Inggeris wajib di-ajar dan perenggan 72 bahasa pengantar. Kami tidak nampak sa-suatu sebab bagi mengubah

peratoran seperti yang di-buat di-sekolah² menengah China ia-itu menggunakan bahasa China sa-bagai bahasa pengantar. Kami tidak nampak satu sebab yang patut di-tegah murid² belajar tiga bahasa dalam sekolah² menengah atau menggunakan lebih daripada satu bahasa dalam sekolah itu sa-bagai bahasa pengantar, dan perenggan 119 ini-lah satu perkara yang mustahak bagi kemajuan kebangsaan Tanah Melayu yang satu. Ini-lah anak kunchi-nya yang akan membuka pintu yang sa-lama ini sentiasa tertutup yang menghalang akan langkah hendak menubuhkan satu chara pelajaran yang dapat di-terima oleh semua penduduk Tanah Melayu. Sa-telah tiba masa-nya apabila semua sekolah² bergerak menepati satu sukatan pelajaran yang sama tiada-lah di-kirakan walau apa pun bahasa pengantar-nya. Kami rasa negeri ini telah mengambil langkah yang teramat penting ka-arrah maksud menubuhkan satu chara pelajaran kebangsaan yang akan memuaskan kemahuan orang², serta memajukan kebudayaan masharakat, ekonomik dan politik sa-bagai satu bangsa.

Ini ia-lah chadangan² dalam penyata tahun 1956 dan lagi di-tangan saya sini Penyata Jawatan-Kuasa Menyemak Dasar Pelajaran tahun dahulu. Di-sini saya ingat ta' guna saya bachakan perenggan 187 tetapi saya tahu tiap² Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang ada di-sini telah nampak penyata ini tahun dahulu. Perenggan 187 ia-lah di-berhenti system sekolah² menengah China dan di-berhenti oleh bantuan sekolah² China dan pepereksaan untuk sekolah² menengah pun di-berhentikan juga, dan murid² dari sekolah menengah mesti-lah masok pepereksaan ia-itu sijil Lower Certificate of Education dan Sijil Pelajaran Persekutuan Tanah Melayu. Pepereksaan ini ia-lah dalam bahasa rasmi.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untuk ini ia-lah telah ada di-ubahkan oleh Perikatan dan dengan di-berhentikan system sekolah² menengah China adalah menyempang Penyata Razak perenggan 72 dan chadangan manifesto tahun 1956 perenggan 1 (g) dan (h) de-

ngan di-berhentikan bantuan sa-paroh sekolah menengah China ada-lah menyempang chadangan manifesto 1955 perenggan 12 dengan persediaan murid² sekolah menengah China masok pepereksaan Sijil Rendah Pelajaran dan Sijil Pelajaran Persekutuan Tanah Melayu dalam bahasa rasmi sahaja ada-lah menyempang Penyata Razak perenggan 70, 71 dan juga chadangan manifesto tahun 1955, perenggan 1 (h), Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-sini Ahli² Yang Berhormat boleh-lah nampak Penyata Rahman Talib tidak mengikut chadangan² manifesto dan Jawatan-Kuasa itu pun ada-lah di-ubahkan chadangan² Penyata Razak tahun 1956. Oleh itu, saya minta Ahli² Yang Berhormat untuk *di-tendang* undang² ini dan juga saya minta dari Menteri Pelajaran untuk di-tolak undang² ini. Ini-lah ucapan saya dalam bahasa kebangsaan dan juga saya minta ampun dan maaf, sebab saya akan lagi berchakap dalam bahasa Inggeris. Terima kaseh.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, as I have mentioned, these recommendations in the Talib Report are entirely contrary to the 1955 election pledges.

Mr. Speaker: I think it would be better to call it "Rahman Talib Report."

Enche' Too Joon Hing: Rahman Talib Report. Thank you, Sir. As I have already stated just now, by discontinuing the Junior Middle III and the Senior Middle III systems and the respective examinations, the Alliance have evaded their responsibilities of sustaining vernacular education and have failed to fulfil their election pledges of allowing vernacular schools their normal expansion. The Alliance have also gone against paragraph 72 of the Razak Report by altering the practice of Chinese secondary schools. By discontinuing partial assistance, the Alliance have discouraged and hindered the expansion of Chinese secondary schools and have turned back on their promise set out in the 1955 election manifesto of according equal treatment to all schools. By enforcing the students of National-type Secondary

Schools envisaged in the Razak Report to participate in the L.C.E. and the Federation of Malaya Certificate of Education examinations in official languages, the Alliance had discouraged the development of the languages of the other races living in this country, and deviated from the fundamental recommendations laid down in the Razak Report under paragraphs 71, 72 and 119.

Sir, in paragraph 175 of the Talib Report, the Review Committee had boldly declared the reasons for eliminating communal schools from the national system of assisted schools for the sake of unity. But in paragraph 119 of the Razak Report the fifteen men Committee had already emphasised their conviction that the production of a common content syllabus irrespective of language of instruction was the crucial requirement of an educational policy in Malaya and was the essential element in the development of a united Malaya. It is the key to the establishment of an education system acceptable to the people as a whole. Yet the Review Committee saw fit to disregard and deviate from these vital and crucial recommendations, and in doing so, they had again failed to fulfil the pledges stated in paragraph 5 of the Manifesto which says—

“The Alliance considers that the standardization of textbooks is most important. Textbooks similar in substance with a Malayan outlook shall be produced in all languages in this country.”

Sir, we all know, and it is a well-known universal fact that in Switzerland and Canada different languages are being spoken and also used as the medium of instruction in their schools; yet the people in those countries are as united and loyal as in any other nation in the world. This again strongly supports the 15-man Committee recommendation that the adoption of a common content syllabus irrespective of the medium of instruction is the only factor which can establish a national system of education acceptable to the people as a whole and which can lead to permanent and

lasting unity of the people in this country. This does not mean, Sir, that Malay will not achieve its objective of becoming the national language as laid down in the terms of reference; this can be done by making Malay a compulsory subject in all schools. Malay can and shall become the national language of this country.

Now, Sir, I will comment on the actual Bill itself. In the preamble it is stated—

“and whereas further provision is required for securing the effective execution of the said policy, including in particular provision for the progressive development of an educational system in which the national language is the main medium of instruction:”

Sir, the Alliance Education Manifesto and the terms of reference of the Razak Report were to establish a national system of education acceptable to the people, having regard to making or adopting Malay as the national language of the country. To make Malay the national language of the country and to make Malay the main medium of instruction are entirely two different things—the former is political and the latter is educational. This controversial issue of making Malay the main medium of instruction had always been argued and referred to by Honourable Members in the last Legislative Council and in the present Parliament. The Alliance had always maintained that it was laid down in the Razak Report, Chapter II, under the heading of The Committee's Task, in paragraph 12. Sir, paragraph 12 merely expressed its task, or was meant to consider the possibility of adopting such a policy. The 15-man Committee, of which I happened to be one member, and so was the present Minister, after having considered all the aspects of this question and taken into consideration the various unfavourable comments and criticisms from the general public and even from certain sections of the Alliance members, had not found fit to adopt this recommendation. Hence it was never embodied in the draft copy of the 1957 Education Ordinance. Sir,

the Alliance Manifesto had clearly and boldly stated that the national school features as envisaged in Federal Council Paper No. 67/54 was not acceptable to the people of this country. This education White Paper was to implement the 1952 Education Ordinance, which at that time formed the most objectionable and most controversial policy the Colonial Government had ever produced in the history of education in Malaya. The 1952 Education Ordinance was objectionable and unacceptable to the people of the Federation, because it laid down provisions for introducing national school features into vernacular schools, that is, replacing vernacular schools by national schools using as the main medium of instruction the official languages of the Federation, i.e., English and Malay. Now, Sir, paragraph 3 of the preamble distinctly requires legislation of provisions to secure the effective execution of educational system in which the national language is the main medium of instruction and Section 21 of the Bill provides the Minister with the power to direct by order any national-type primary school to be converted into national primary school using the national language as the main medium of instruction. Sir, I would like to define these schools so that Honourable Members may know whether there are any differences between these two types of schools. Section 18 of the 1952 Ordinance says—

“For the purpose of fulfilling the duties imposed under this Ordinance and in accordance with the provisions of the Federation Agreement (the appropriate authority)in so far as moneys voted or provided for the purpose permit—

(i) x x x x

(ii) may continue to maintain and extend or establish and maintain Government vernacular and English schools until, in the case of primary schools, they can be replaced by national schools;”

Now the definition of “national school” is given at Section 21 of the 1952 Ordinance. It says here—

“For the purposes of this Ordinance a ‘national school’ is any school providing

for children of all races a six-year course of free primary education with a Malayan orientation and appropriate for children between the ages of six and twelve and using in the main for this purpose the official languages of the Federation and providing facilities for instruction in *Kuo Yu* and Tamil in accordance with the provisions of this section.”

That is the definition of “national school” under the 1952 Ordinance. Now Section 21 of the Bill reads—

“Where at any time the Minister is satisfied that a national-type primary school may suitably be converted into a national primary school he may by order direct that school shall become a national primary school.”

Now what is the definition of the national primary school? It is in page 4, where it is stated—

“‘national primary school’, or *sekolah kebangsaan*, means a fully assisted primary school—

- (a) providing a six-year course of primary education appropriate for children between the ages of six and eleven years;
- (b) using the national language as the main medium of instruction;
- (c) in which the English language is a compulsory subject of instruction; and
- (d) in which facilities for the teaching of the Chinese or Tamil language shall, if it is reasonable and practicable so to do, be made available if the parents of fifteen children in the school so request;”

Now, what difference do we find between Section 21 of this Bill and Section 18 of the 1952 Education Ordinance? I cannot find any. I honestly cannot find any difference and yet, to-day, we are asked by the Alliance Government to approve and adopt this Bill which is the same as the one which the Alliance themselves had rejected and declared unacceptable to the people of this country in their 1955 election manifesto.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, with the inclusion of the third paragraph in the preamble and Section 21 embodied in the Bill, the Alliance has brought back to the people of this country an educational

policy which actually revives the spirit of the 1952 Education Ordinance. There is an old Chinese proverb which says, borrow the corpse to revive the spirit; but, I say, in this case the Alliance Review Committee has borrowed the corpse to revive the devil by introducing this Bill to-day. Mr. Speaker, Sir, in section 21 the Minister may convert, by order, any national-type Primary schools to National-type Primary schools. Sir, nowadays primary schools are mostly National-type Primary schools. With this power given to the Minister, what guarantee is there that he will not use his power to convert all these schools into National Primary schools. None at all. I cannot see any. There is not even a paragraph or a section in which the manager of a school can make an appeal against this conversion. Sir, to approve and adopt this Bill is to request us to betray the confidence of the people given to us. Sir, speaking on page 5—I think an Honourable Member has spoken and I will not speak very long on this page—“National-type Secondary School using the English language as the main medium of instruction”, this is a clear and distinct deviation from the policy laid down in the Razak Report under the same heading of paragraphs 71 and 72 concerning Chinese Secondary Schools in which the medium of instruction is clearly stated as Kuo-Yu, whilst Malay and English languages are compulsory subjects. Sir, this Bill has totally changed or altered the features of Chinese secondary schools by making English as the main medium of instruction. The 1957 Education Ordinance has clearly laid down in its interpretation that National-type Secondary School means a secondary school providing a five-year course of secondary education in which the National Language, the English language, the Chinese language or the Tamil language, or any two of such languages are used as the media of instruction, where such languages are not used as the media of instruction. Sir, this is a clear and vital change in the National-type Secondary School.

Sir, coming to the cancellation of the registration of teachers, Section 85 (a) says a teacher's registration can be cancelled if he is found “promoting or fostering or is or has been concerned with the promoting or fostering of some unlawful purpose or any purpose prejudicial to or incompatible with peace, welfare or good order of the country”. Sir, when a teacher or a manager promotes or fosters unlawful purpose, prejudicial to the peace of this country, the teacher's registration should be cancelled. I think no reasonable man would object to it; but, Sir, in the past many teachers had been deprived of their registration not because they had committed an infringement of the provisions under Section 85, but because they criticised the Government's education policy. Sir, I had the opportunity of serving as an Assistant Minister under the Alliance Government for two years and in that two years I came across many cases, one of which the teacher concerned was known to the Deputy Prime Minister. His registration as a teacher was cancelled not because of committing an infringement of the provisions under Section 85, but because he criticised the 1952 Education Ordinance. Sir, he was classified as a security risk, a communist and so many other things. Sir, cancellation of a teacher's registration under such circumstances is misusing of authority to suppress the opposition and to intimidate the public from voicing their opinion. Such action would not help to solve the problem but only to aggravate the situation. Take, for instance, the recent cancellation of the registration of Mr. Lim Lian Geok.....

Mr. Speaker: That is *sub judice*, I think, because the matter is still under review.

Enche' Too Joon Hing: I am just mentioning it, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: No, you cannot. Do not refer to that case which is now pending.

Now, I come to the subject of grant-in-aid—Clause 104 of the Bill. Sir, it is stated that grant-in-aid could

only be paid subject to such conditions and limitations as prescribed by regulations. These conditions are clearly laid down in paragraph 187 of the Rahman Talib Report. Here, the Alliance has gone back on the promise of according equal treatment to all schools. The Honourable the Prime Minister had failed to fulfil the promise of giving \$2,000,000 to Chinese schools which he made at a conference of MCA members, teachers' representatives and UMNO members in Malacca on the 12th January, 1955, at the house of the late Tun Cheng Lock Tan. Sir, it is very nice to tell the people that the Alliance has doubled the Chinese education expenditure to about \$40,000,000 as stated in this Digest, but I would add only on such conditions and limitations laid down by the Minister—and these conditions never existed under the normal conditions of Chinese schools in 1955 and before.

Sir, to-day, the Alliance has not only not fulfilled the promise of \$2,000,000 made by the Honourable the Prime Minister, but it has decided that the meagre partial assistance inherited from the colonial Government will be discontinued from next year, if the Chinese secondary schools refuse to conform to fully assisted schools. Sir, I asked on the first day of the meeting whether the Honourable Minister would give assistance to independent schools for the purpose of teaching and learning the national language only, a requirement which the Ministry has laid down in this Digest—page 18, paragraph (d). The answer which we all heard was in the negative. Does the Minister realise that by doing so he has deliberately gone against the intention of making Malay the national language? If so, I would like to refer him to paragraphs 17 and 18 of the Razak Report which reads:

“17. As declared in our terms of reference, it is the intention of the Government to make Malay the national language of the country.

18. It follows from this that Malay must be learnt in all schools, and we recommend that the teaching of Malay to and the learning of Malay by all

pupils shall be a condition of Government assistance in all schools.”

In other words, whether it be assisted schools, conforming schools, or whatever schools, so long as there is the learning and teaching of Malay in those schools, Government must provide them with assistance.

Now, I come to Clause 120 of the Bill in regard to examinations in respect of the Lower Certificate of Education. This matter is the most important and the most controversial issue in the whole of the Razak Report and which had caused students' riots, the crisis in the MCA, the resignation of MCA leaders in 1959—to-day you see three of them here—and last, but not the least, the loss of confidence of the people in the Alliance resulting in a greater number of Opposition members sitting here in this House to-day and in heavy defeats of the Alliance in recent Municipal and Town Council elections. The Alliance has always maintained that these examinations are official and public examinations and, therefore, must be conducted in the official languages as explained in the Digest—and this is also laid down in the Rahman Talib Report. Sir, I find something very interesting in Chapter 8, page 12, where it is stated:

“Nowhere in that Report”—that is the Razak Report—“was it ever said that these examinations would be conducted in any other language except that it was stated that language and literature papers in any language including Chinese would be set and answered in the language concerned.”

That is true, Sir; but it is also equally true that nowhere in the Report was there ever mentioned that these examinations are to be conducted only in the official languages.

Sir, I have as a Member of the last Federal Legislative Council and in this very House brought this to the notice of the past Minister, and I am bringing it now again to the notice of the present Minister—that is that paragraphs 70 and 71 has clearly stated that the official languages (the Malay and English languages) are compulsory

subjects in secondary schools: it is never stated that these should be the media of examinations.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in another paragraph of the Digest—page 12—it tries to dispel the doubt of the people by referring to the Ministers' speeches in the last Legislative Council meeting. Sir, what the previous Ministers had stated concerning the medium of instructions were entirely opinions of their own, but if these opinions were unanimously upheld by every member of the fifteen men Committee, then there should be no cause for argument and dispute and everyone would be happy—and we do not have to circulate this Digest to-day. But unfortunately four members of that Committee have one way or another in the previous Legislative Council, and in the Press, criticised the medium of examination and expressed opinions entirely different from those of the Ministers. Therefore, I think their opinions on this could be challenged—the Ministers' opinions.

Sir, taking into consideration the references which I have quoted from the Razak Report and the Alliance Manifesto, I am sure I have brought to the notice of this House sufficient evidence showing the misinterpretation in the implementation of the Razak Report, deliberate evasion of the Review Committee and the failure of the Alliance in fulfilling the election pledges.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will now quote some of the criticisms from the members of the fifteen men Committee in the last Federal Legislative Council. When the Bill was introduced the late Mr. Goh Chee Yan had some misgivings as to the spirit of implementation of the Razak Report. He said:

“However, there is one thing I wish to emphasise and that is unless the authorities concerned carry out the recommendations of the Report sincerely and conscientiously, I am afraid that though we may repeal and unanimously condemn the Ordinance of 1952, it will be a repeal only on paper, but not in fact.”

That, Sir, is one of the warnings by the late Mr. Goh Chee Yan.

Again, Mr. Lee Thean Hin on the 12th December, 1957, criticised the interpretation and method of implementation: he said—

“One of the outstanding problems is the question of certificates of examination—” “I do suggest that this is far more important than the question of superannuation.....”

I am sorry, Sir, this is not the correct quotation: this is a quotation of a speech by Dr. Lim Chong Eu on the same date:—

“I do suggest that this is far more important than the question of superannuation of school children, and it is one of the outstanding problems that lies ahead in the peaceful integration of Chinese schools in our school system.....”

Sir, again the late Mr. Goh Chee Yan stated on the 7th March, 1957:—

“I would like to ask for enlightenment on one point, that is in what language will boys and girls, who received their education through the medium of instruction in Chinese, be examined when they sit for the Lower Certificate examination.”

I have brought out all that needed mention here in regard to all the various points which I mentioned just now to show the Minister the intention of the fifteen men Committee on the medium of instruction for the Lower Certificate of Education and the National Certificate of Education.

Further, on the 11th December, 1958, Mr. Lee Thean Hin said, on the question of examinations, as follows:—

“My second subject is the question of ‘Examinations’. Until and unless the pupils in non-Malay schools are provided with qualified teachers, as I have said, is it not unfair and unjust to insist that the medium of examination should be held in a medium different from that in which the children have been taught? I would not like to advance my arguments further beyond quoting a common Latin saying: ‘Verbum sat sapienti’”.

On the same date, I also brought up the same issue of examinations. There were also members of the past Federal Legislative Council who criticised the medium of examination and I would like in this connection to quote two persons.

One is Mr. S. M. Yong who said on the 12th December, 1957:—

“In my speech a few days ago, I pointed out how unfair and absurd it is to ask a student to answer his question papers in English on subjects such as history or geography which he has been taught and which he has learned in the Chinese language and all the textbooks are in the Chinese language.”

“.....In fact, some answers were given which were rather evasive.”

Then, also on the same date Mr. Lee Thean Hin, I am sorry, Sir, Mr. Devaser said on the same date.....

Mr. Speaker: You must quote correctly, as this is going on record in the Hansard.

Enche' Too Joon Hing: Yes, Sir. Mr. K. L. Devaser said on the 11th December, 1958:—

“I support my Honourable friend Mr. Too Joon Hing when he says that the language to be used in the examinations should be the language of instruction. That, I thought, is commonsense—what language you are taught in, you must be examined in that language. If I were taught in Tamil, I could only sit for the examination in Tamil;”

These are quotations of criticisms from the various members.

Sir, coming back to the question of independent schools, I have some comments to make on the conditions set for these independent schools. The Minister had already imposed by law that these independent schools must have English and Malay as compulsory subjects, but yet no assistance is being provided for the teaching of Malay though I have pointed out that in the Razak Report one of the conditions to encourage Malay to become the national language is to provide assistance to all schools. By so doing I think he has not taken this into consideration and I, therefore, ask him to reconsider this point again—that the learning and teaching of Malay should be provided with assistance in respect of all schools irrespective of the fact whether they are conforming or non-conforming, private or independent schools, or whatever schools.

Sir, I can only say that to-day the Malayan Chinese and Malayan Indians support Malay as the national language, but they also want their languages to be encouraged, sustained and retained in all schools, and I think the Razak Report had clearly stated that the common content syllabus is the only crucial and vital element that would lead us to unity in this country. Therefore, Sir, in conclusion, once again I request that the Minister whether he would be good enough to withdraw this Bill and set up another Committee to review the Rahman Talib Report. Thank you.

Sitting suspended at 12.40 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 4.30 p.m.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

THE EDUCATION BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Enche' Chin See Yin (Seremban Timor): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Bill before the House when it is adopted becomes the new law on education. This Bill as we all know is introduced to implement the Report of the Education Review Committee, 1960, but, Sir, I must add that this Report of the Education Review Committee cannot be said to be one acceptable, in regard to the policy recommended, by the people as a whole. Why do I say so? First of all, if you go about the town and read the newspapers, you will observe that constant appeals have been made asking the Government to review the Report and asking for a new Committee to be set up. That being the case, I say that the policy recommended by the Committee is not acceptable to the people as a whole.

Now, Sir, I would like to refer to the Preamble of this Bill—in particular I would like to draw attention to paragraph 2, which says:

“And Whereas it is considered desirable that regard shall be had, so far as is compatible with that policy, with the provision of efficient instruction and with the avoidance of unreasonable public

expenditure, to the general principle that pupils are to be educated in accordance with the wishes of their parents:"

I would like to know, Sir, who are these parents—and I presume that these parents are the people living in the Federation. If they are people in the Federation, then I say these are the people who have not accepted the policy recommended in that Report.

Then, Sir, let us look at page 5 of the Bill: paragraph (d) reads:

"in which facilities for the teaching of the Chinese or Tamil language shall, if it is reasonable and practicable so to do, be made available if the parents of fifteen children in the school so request;"

In this case, Sir, I would say that it is against the 1956 Education Report. If you refer to that Report you will find that it is suggested in that Report that if all languages are taught—and in accordance with the syllabus and time tables given by the Education Department—it will be in order. In this case, I would refer to paragraph 119 which reads:

"Once all schools are working to a common content syllabus, irrespective of the language medium of instruction, we consider the country will have taken the most important step towards establishing a national system of education which will satisfy the needs of the people and promote their cultural, social, economic and political development as a nation."

Now, also in this connection, if we read paragraph 9 of the 1956 Report, it will be appreciated that it is stated therein that the educational policy must be *acceptable to the people of the Federation as a whole*. That, Sir, is the sole intention as contained in the 1956 Report, and a Committee was appointed to review this Report to see that those which had not been carried out be put down in writing and implementation be made forthwith. In this case, the Review Committee was told to put up a plan to renovate the building, but instead the Review Committee drew up a plan for the construction of a new building, which is totally different from the existing one. This is exactly what is happening to-day. Therefore, I say that this new plan is not acceptable to the people as a whole.

Sir, before we consider this Bill and before we pass it, we must ask ourselves whether it is in conformity with the 1956 Report, and whether it is in conformity with Article 152 of the Constitution which reads:

"The national language shall be the Malay language and shall be in such script as Parliament may by law provide:—

Provided that—

- (a) no person shall be prohibited or prevented from using (otherwise than for official purposes), or from teaching or learning, any other language; and
- (b) nothing in this clause shall prejudice the right of the Federal Government or of any State Government to preserve and sustain the use and study of the language of any other community in the Federation."

In this Article the words "use and study" are so prominent, or so clearly stated, that no one can deny the clear intention; and if you were to read this in conjunction with the Alliance 1959 Parliamentary Election Manifesto, you will appreciate that a pledge had been made to the people at that time. What is this pledge—what does it say? Here it is, Sir: "to review the present education policy in the light of experience gained since its implementation bearing in mind the declared objective of making Malay the national language, while at the same time encourage and sustain the growth of languages and cultures of other races."

Now, Sir, in this paragraph the word "encourage" is used—that is a promise to encourage and use and to study the languages of the other races in this country. We say that we are going to encourage the study and the use of languages in this country other than making these languages official; if so, then we must not hesitate to allow them to continue education in the Chinese language, in the Indian language, further than the primary school level. If we allow a promise to be broken, and if we do not follow the Constitution that requires us to do certain things, then I say we have done something terribly wrong. And how

can you expect to build a happy united Malayan nation, when you are going to take away something from the people that is very dear to their minds, to their hearts? That is a matter that we must give very careful consideration. If you want a strong nation, then we must give them the thing that is provided for them—everything, and not take away something that they love so much.

Now, Sir, another point which I would like to make is in regard to Clause 136 of the Bill which reads:

“The Minister shall cease to maintain any existing secondary school which was, immediately before the appointed date, in receipt of partial grant-in-aid under the Schools (Financial) Assistance) Regulations, 1958.”

I am sure that this refers to the partially assisted schools; but if we are going to refer to partially assisted schools, then I say, Sir, we are moving ahead of time. I say so, because under the Razak Report it was suggested that a period of ten years be given to find out the actual result of the practice in respect of that policy, or the implementation of that policy contained in the Razak Report. Therefore, I say it is going too far—in fact, not only I but also the President of the MCA, Johore Branch, who did make a suggestion, and this was reported in the newspapers some time last week or the week previous to that.

Sir, these partially assisted schools are conforming with the requirements of the Education Ordinance. They do exactly everything that is required of them and they are not asking Government to give them the money for the total requirements in the maintenance of their schools. They only ask for partial aid—that is to say, Government gives them partial aid and the other half is made up by way of donations or collections from members of the public. The result of this is that we are going to get pupils coming out from these schools who will also render service to the country, because they have that knowledge and that wisdom; and they will qualify to go into Government Service or to go for further

academic studies after which they will come back qualified to render service to the country. That being the case, I would suggest that it is wrong for us so quickly to put an end to giving aid to these assisted secondary schools. The Chinese schools in particular have done a great deal for the country. If there is trouble, it has involved only a handful of children and this is found anywhere, even in Government fully aided schools they have troubles.

Now, Sir, I come to the 1960 Report. Paragraph 89 of the Report—and this Bill contains clauses to carry out that recommendation—deals with primary schools and promotions. It has been suggested in this Report that only 30 per cent can go to secondary schools, the remaining 70 per cent will find places in what is called the “Remove” school or continuation school for another two years. I understand that the number of pupils at the moment in these primary schools is 1.1 million. If you are going to allow only 30 per cent to go to secondary schools, what is going to happen to the 70 per cent? Can you accommodate all the 70 per cent in what you call continuation schools? I doubt you can find places for all of them. Now, assuming you can find places, after two years what are you going to do with them? If we are going to follow the system that is practised in England, I would say that in England they have also failed and, in fact, they are trying to find another system; this is despite the fact that in England they have so many industries, so many factories, which can provide employment to these pupils who leave school. In this country, the position cannot even be compared with Hong Kong where there are 1,300 to 1,400 factories employing something like 300,000 people. We are not able to do so just now. Therefore, in regard to this practice, I would say that in England they have failed—so why are we still pursuing with such a policy?

Then comes the question of finance in this Bill. In this Bill it is suggested that after the passing of this Bill, when it becomes law, the State Governments

or the local authorities will be asked to collect money to supplement the funds required to provide education to the children. Now, Sir, the Honourable Minister of Finance said something on the question of finance when we debated the 1960 Report and before I go further on this question, I wish to recapitulate what he said then. He said that it was painfully clear that the foreseen increases in expenditure could not be financed on existing levels of taxation. By 1962 the net recurrent cost of education would be \$615 million which is more than 3½ times the present figure which represents 69 per cent of the total expenditure in 1960. It was equally obvious that this sort of money could not be sought in loans, because Malaya would never be able to repay them. Furthermore, no country would be willing to grant loans for such purposes. He went on to say that the Government did not undertake to implement the recommendations within the years indicated in the Report because of the huge financial implications. So, even the Honourable Minister of Finance said that the question of getting the money to implement the recommendations contained in the 1960 Report was going to be very difficult and he thought at that time that it would take a few more years, and yet we are going to do it in 1962. We are going to make the State Governments to be responsible for part of this money and I know—we all know—that in most cases the State Governments very often borrow money from the Federal Government, and you still ask them to dig further into the pockets of the people in each State to pay for this. This is something to which we must give very careful consideration.

Sir, looking at it as a whole, there is no doubt that the intention is to make Malay the official language and to make full use of the language for administration, with a view to building up a Malayan nation. Now, coming to the building up of a Malayan nation, yesterday in this very House the Honourable Minister of the Interior said: "For the benefit of the PMIP, the culture of Greater Malaysia would

be based on Malay culture, enriched by the cultures of the other races." It is very true in what he said. We know what it all boils down to. But, Sir, in this case I would suggest that the Chinese language and the English language may contain plenty of material and I would take the opportunity to refer to the Fenn-Wu Report of 1951. Now, these two gentlemen, Doctors Fenn and Wu, were sent here at the request of the British Government from the United Nations Organisation. They are experts on education and this is what they wrote in paragraphs 3 and 13 of their Report, and if I may, I will read it to direct the attention of this House to this Report—

"What can be hoped for is a peaceful and co-operative relationship among diverse elements, in which community of interest rather than differences are naturally stressed. There can be no justification of turning Malaya into a cockpit for aggressive cultures. By virtue of its composite population it should be a land where the developing culture draws its validity from acceptance of the high values of other cultures. The people of Malaya will have to learn to understand and appreciate their cultural differences. They should be proud of their spirit of mutual tolerance."

".....we must remember that Chinese is one of the greatest languages of the world, key to one of the world's great cultures. Its beauty and richness are unquestioned. Nothing is to be gained by trying to deprive any section of the population of what a knowledge of Chinese has to give. Just as many Europeans study Latin, other races in Malaya might well profit from a study of Chinese. However, because of its difficulty and the time involved in mastering it, the study of Chinese is likely to be undertaken largely by Chinese....."

This also applies to the Indian language; the Indian language goes back to many thousands of years.

Sir, it would then be a pity if these two languages should be left out and left behind because it is our intention to create a Malay nation, to create a Malayan culture, as it was so clearly suggested by the Honourable Minister yesterday. I think we should not forget the things he said and should try to find ways and means to work it.

Now, Sir, you have heard these observations of mine concerning this Bill, and I think for the public interest, for the good of this country, it may well be a very good thing if the Honourable Minister of Education will kindly consider the appeal of not only me, but by and large the public in this country, the people, for this Bill to be put aside for the time being and a new Committee appointed to review the whole situation and submit a new report. I am in full agreement with the previous speaker on this subject matter, on the question of appointing a new Committee to go into this education issue.

Tuan Haji Hasan Adli bin Haji Arshad (Kuala Trengganu Utara):

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sekali² dan pada masa²-nya kami melihat pehak anggota Kerajaan terletak dalam keadaan yang serba salah oleh perchubaaan hendak mengkechiwakan Kerajaan daripada gulongan² yang kami anggap tidak suka hendak melihat terchipta-nya satu dasar pelajaran yang tunggal dalam negeri ini. Di-hadapan kita sekarang ini ada satu masaalah ia-itu Undang² Pelajaran. Maka PAS menyokong dan bersetuju dengan sa-bahagian besar daripada Rang Undang² ini walau pun tidak kesemua-nya—(AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear, hear)—Dalam pada itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tentu-lah ada juga tegoran² daripada kami, yang mana kami harapkan bahawa tegoran² itu akan dapat-lah di-sifatkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran sa-bagai tegoran yang membena.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, oleh kerana Rang Undang² ini boleh di-sokong pada dasar-nya, maka kami berharap bahawa Rang Undang² yang sangat besar pengaruh dan guna-nya bagi zaman yang akan datang dan bagi keturunan kita pada masa yang akan datang, dapat di-jalankan dengan semangat yang satu, baik oleh Kerajaan, oleh ra'ayat negeri ini dan oleh pegawai yang bertanggung-jawab. Kami maksudkan dengan semangat yang satu itu ia-lah semangat hendak memperlihatkan kedaulatan bahasa kebangsaan dan pelajaran bahasa kebangsaan di-negeri ini dengan kuat-kuasa Undang² yang ada di-hadapan

kita ini. Chita² yang suchi di-sabalek menggubal Rang Undang² ini tidak akan dapat di-hasilkan kalau sa-kiranya pelaksanaan-nya tidak akan disertai oleh semangat dan tanggung-jawab yang saya sebutkan itu. Kami daripada anggota PAS ini memberi jaminan bahawa kami akan memberi kerjasama kepada Kerajaan atas chita² ini ia-itu chita² hendak mendaulatkan bahasa kebangsaan dan pelajaran kebangsaan di-dalam dan di-luar Dewan ini (*Tepok*). Kami akan sedia menerima apa juga akibat terhadap dasar yang kami pertahankan ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kami terpaksa-lah menegaskan bagitu, ia itu-lah satu ketegasan yang maseh lunak, oleh kerana pada pandangan kami sekarang ini telah timbul gejala yang tidak baik yang boleh mengancham, bukan sahaja mengancham, tetapi menghanchorkan-chita² kita hendak mewujudkan satu dasar pelajaran kebangsaan yang tunggal dalam Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini untuk keturunan pada masa yang akan datang.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sekarang suka-lah saya menarek perhatian Yang Berhormat Menteri, pertama sa-kali kepada muka surat 13, bahagian 4, ia-itu fasal 40. Fasal 40 itu pada pandangan saya, jika-lah undang² ini membolehkan tafsiran-nya bahawa tidak ada galangan di-sebutkan dalam kandungan ini untuk menubuhkan sa-buah University asing dengan berbahasa asing dalam negeri ini, maka tentu-lah ada nanti sa-suatu badan atau kumpulan berusaha untuk menubuhkan University asing dalam negeri kita ini. Kechualilah, kalau silap pada fahaman saya, oleh sebab daripada muka 3, tafsiran kalimah Institute itu nampak-nya tidak menyebutkan dan menerangkan dengan jelas-nya tentang sa-suatu badan atau kumpulan dalam negeri ini hendak menubuhkan University asing.

Saya membangkitkan hal ini, dalam perkara ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, oleh kerana tersiar-nya khabar² bahawa ada suatu badan atau kumpulan dalam negeri kita ini akan menubuhkan sa-buah University China di-Perak dan di-Pulau Pinang sama juga kedudukan-

nya seperti Nanyang University, di-Singapura. Menurut khabar ini bahawa chita² menubuhkan sa-buah University seperti itu sedang di-dalam proses-nya di-dorong oleh beberapa kalangan siasah yang tertentu dalam negeri ini. Kami, tidak-lah memusuhi orang² China sa-bagaimana sudah di-terangkan oleh wakil² PAS dalam Dewan ini. Tetapi walau bagaimana pun kami ada-lah terus menentang sa-barang perusahaan walau siapa pun dalam negeri ini hendak menubuhkan sa-barang University asing dengan bahasa asing sama ada bahasa China atau pun bahasa Russia dalam negeri ini, oleh kerana pada pandangan saya, bukan-lah akan mempunyai kuman sahaja bahkan ada-lah menjadi wabak yang besar dalam negeri ini. Chukup-lah saya katakan sa-bagai menjadi wabak yang besar kepada negeri ini. Oleh sebab itu-lah, kami suka menarek perhatian kepada Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran supaya dapat-lah menjelaskan kepada kami kelak sama ada di-dalam fasal 40 ini mensharatkan juga penubuhan sa-barang University seperti itu dengan kebenaran yang tertentu atau sa-bagai-nya. Kami berharap bahawa sharat² yang tertentu dapat di-adakan dan tafsiran di-atas kalimah Institute itu dapat di-perluaskan lagi.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sekarang baik-lah pula saya arahkan kepada fasal 116, ia-itu berkenaan dengan peratoran² yang akan di-keluarkan oleh Menteri Pelajaran dari masa ka-samasa. Di-dalam fasal ini apa yang saya hendak dzahirkan dalam Dewan ini ia-itu supaya Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran dapat-lah melaksanakan peratoran-nya berkenaan dengan memenohi jawatan² Guru Besar di-Sekolah Kebangsaan. Kami berharap dan meminta supaya jawatan² Guru Besar di-Sekolah² Kebangsaan itu apabila kosong pada masa ini atau masa akan datang hendak-lah di-i'lankan dan di-adakan pemilihan atau pepereksaan atau di-interview atas kelayakan dan pengetahuan dan lain² kepandaian yang khas yang ada pada sa-saorang itu. Dengan ini ada-lah memberikan peluang kepada guru²

yang muda yang ada mempunyai pengetahuan dan kepandaian yang khas untuk memegang jawatan Guru Besar di-Sekolah Kebangsaan itu. Ini ada-lah untuk menjaga taraf dan mutu Sekolah Kebangsaan itu bertambah² lagi elok dari masa ka-samasa. Tetapi, tidak-lah kami bermaksud bahawa guru² tua itu kurang pelajaran atau sa-bagai-nya. Kalau memilih Guru² Besar itu di-dasarkan kepada guru² yang sudah tua sudah dekat hendak bersara maka mereka pun tidak ada semangat hendak bekerja kerana mereka menantikan masa untuk bersara sahaja, atau pun sa-telah beberapa bulan memegang jawatan itu sudah sampai masa-nya untuk bersara, maka keadaan pentadbiran Sekolah² Kebangsaan itu tentu-lah tidak betul dan terator.

Saya perchaya, peratoran² itu harus-lah tidak pernah di-chuba jalankan oleh pehak Kerajaan, tetapi kita berharap perkara ini dapat di-jalankan dengan tegas dan akan memberi fa'edah yang banyak dan memuaskan. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-atas perkara lain suka-lah saya hendak mengemukakan kepada Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran ia-itu suatu perkara lantekan Ahli² Lembaga Pengurus Sekolah² Kebangsaan. Pada pengetahuan saya, terutama-nya di-kampung² bahawa lantekan² bagi Ahli² Lembaga Pengurus itu di-buat oleh Guru² Besar itu sahaja. Saya rasa elok-lah di-keluarkan satu arahan atau directive supaya pembentokan Ahli² Lembaga Pengurus itu tidak-lah berchorak politik. Maksud saya ia-lah supaya sentimen politik atau kepartaian yang ada pada Guru² Besar itu tidak-lah terbawa² dalam masa memilih Ahli² Jema'ah Pengurus Sekolah Kebangsaan itu. Sebab mungkin telah pernah timbul oleh kerana Guru Besar itu menjadi Ahli Pati A atau B, mithal-nya, mereka memilih wakil² Ahli Lembaga Pengurus itu daripada orang² pati-nya. Kami tidak takut sa-barang pati dalam negeri ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua (*Ketawa*). Tetapi sa-barang perchubaaan baik langsung atau tidak langsung di-bawa² dalam memilih Ahli Lembaga Pengurus Sekolah Kebangsaan ini, nyata-lah boleh mengkechiwakan

ranchangan² kemajuan Sekolah Kebangsaan itu.

Sa-lain daripada itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya rasa elok-lah juga Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran, jika boleh membuat satu arahan kepada Pegawai² Pelajaran Negeri masing² supaya di-adakan peluang memberikan kursus atau penerangan berkenaan dengan Undang² Pelajaran dan peratoran² yang bersangkutan dengan dasar pelajaran kepada Ahli² Lembaga Pengurus Sekolah² Kebangsaan itu.

Kursus² itu boleh-lah di-berikan oleh Pegawai² di-Pejabat Pelajaran dan guru² yang faham akan dasar dan Undang² atau peratoran berkaitan dengan pelajaran itu. Saya shorkan guru² yang faham akan dasar² dan peratoran² ini oleh kerana sa-panjang yang saya tahu kadang² tidak-lah semua guru² itu benar² faham akan dasar Undang² serta peratoran² yang di-keluarkan oleh Kementerian Pelajaran ini. Sebab dengan chara ini boleh-lah menjadi jaminan² kepada Anggota² Jema'ah Sekolah Kebangsaan itu terutama di-kampung² boleh bekerja memajukan sekolah² itu dari satu masa ka-satu masa.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, fasal 20 di-dalam Undang² in (b) ia-itu "national-type primary schools". Oleh kerana dasar kami hanya berkehendakkan satu Sekolah Rendah sahaja maka kami menuntut dari fasal itu di-hapuskan.

Fasal 23 (d) "national-type secondary schools", oleh kerana dasar kami juga bahawa kami menghendaki satu jenis Sekolah Kebangsaan itu sahaja maka kami menuntut fasal itu di-hapuskan.

Walau bagaimana pun kami menyambut baik-lah fasal 44 sa-hingga 58 ia-itu berkaitan dengan pendaftaran sekolah. Kami menyambut baik akan fasal² itu dan ini ada-lah sa-bagai menasabah bagi mengawal sekolah² itu daripada menaborkan ajaran² yang boleh berlawanan dengan dasar pendidekan kebangsaan di-negeri ini. Chuma kami berharap bahawa pehak Kerajaan hendak-lah sentiasa ingat bahawa ajaran² yang berlawanan dengan kepentingan kebangsaan negeri

ini bukan-lah sa-mata² dapat di-tabor menerusi buku atau sukatan² pelajaran. Penguasa² sekolah itu boleh-lah di-tunjokkan buku² yang betul dan sukatan² yang betul kepada Pemereksa² yang datang ka-sekolah² itu. Tetapi tidak-lah dapat di-nafikan bahawa gulongan² yang bertanggung-jawab di-dalam sekolah itu sentiasa akan dapat menaborkan risalah² yang boleh memesongkan faham kanak² itu dari satu masa ka-satu masa dan juga mengajar sa-suatu di-luar sukatan pelajaran yang boleh mengajar nyanyi² untok mendewa²kan Dr. San Yat Sen dan sa-bagai-nya. Kita memang menghormati Dr. San Yat Sen penganjor besar tetapi kita tidak-lah boleh mendewa²kan sa-bagai menasabah sa-saorang itu di-ajar di-mana² juga sekolah dalam negeri ini. Jadi, kami berharap chara menjalankan kawalan dan chara menjalankan pemereksaan di-atas berdasarkan fasal 44 sampai 58 ini hendak-lah di-jalankan dengan ketat-nya daripada satu masa ka-satu masa.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid (Seberang Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun hendak menyokong dengan sa-penoh-nya supaya Rang Undang² Pelajaran ini di-luluskan. Ada pun sebab Rang Undang² ini di-bentangkan ia-lah supaya dapat dipersetujukan daripada Dewan Yang Berhormat ini oleh kerana Kerajaan Perikatan dahulu telah berjanji supaya Penyata Pelajaran yang lama itu di-semak maka kita telah tunaikan janji itu dengan mengadakan sa-buah Jawatan-Kuasa Penyemak dalam tahun 1960. Dan shor² daripada beberapa gulongan yang ingin hendak memberikan fikiran telah pun mengemukakan kepada Jawatan-Kuasa ini. Jawatan-Kuasa ini telah membuat satu Penyata yang di-namakan Penyata Jawatan-Kuasa Penyemak Dasar Pelajaran tahun 1960 dan Penyata ini telah pun di-bentangkan dalam Dewan Yang Berhormat ini, supaya dapat persetujuan dan di-terima Penyata ini. Sekarang terulang-lah kepada Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran membuat satu Rang Undang² untok di-laksanakan dasar² yang mengandongi di-dalam Penyata

Pelajaran itu supaya dapat di-beri tugas kepada pehak² yang menjalankan urusan pelajaran dan persekolahan, menyempurnakan kehendak² yang terkandung dalam Penyata ini.

Saya berasa hairan manakala saya dengar Yang Berhormat wakil Seberang Selatan dan juga Yang Berhormat daripada Telok Anson termasuk juga Yang Berhormat wakil Seremban Timor menolak Rang Undang² ini daripada di-persetujukan. Sa-kira-nya Rang Undang² ini di-tolak, bagaimanakah chara-nya dapat di-laksanakan segala recommendation atau pun shor² yang terkandung dalam Penyata Pelajaran ini. Ini ada-lah satu perkara yang sangat ganjil jika di-tolak Rang Undang² ini maka terpaksa di-pakai Rang Undang² yang lama. Rang Undang² ini mengikut Penyata Pelajaran tahun 1956 tentu-lah sa-kali tidak sesuai. Maka oleh itu saya bersetuju dengan penoh-nya supaya Rang Undang² ini di-luluskan.

Bagaimana yang di-tegaskan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran tadi bahawa dasar yang besar yang terkandung dalam Penyata Pelajaran tahun 1956 tidak-lah terkeluar dan semua-nya termasuk di-dalam Penyata Pelajaran tahun 1960 chuma dalam masa pelaksanaan Penyata Pelajaran tahun 1956 itu di-dapati beberapa perkara yang di-fikirkan tidak sesuai dan menasabah. Maka oleh yang demikian di-datangkan beberapa pindaan di-atas chara pentadbiran dan chara² yang lain. Mithal-nya kita telah mengeshorkan dan telah berjanji supaya had umur bagi murid² Sekolah Rendah itu di-lanjutkan sa-hingga 15 tahun sa-lepas lulus di-Sekolah Rendah. Dan yang kedua-nya berkenaan dengan Lembaga Pelajaran Negeri yang pada pendapat saya sendiri tidak sesuai kerana selalu lambat chara mentadbirkan-nya. Apa perintah yang di-datangkan daripada Menteri Pelajaran kenalah melalui Lembaga Pelajaran Negeri dan Lembaga Pelajaran Negeri menurunkan kuasa kepada ketua² pelajaran bagi negeri² dan turunkan lagi kuasa-nya kepada Jawatan-Kuasa Tempatan, dengan ini lambat pelaksanaan-nya dan tugas² Lembaga itu

terpaksa di-gantongkan dan di-gantikan dengan sa-buah Jawatan-Kuasa Penasehat bagi peringkat kebangsaan dan peringkat negeri. Yang ketiga-nya bantuan sa-paroh kepada Sekolah² Jenis Kebangsaan itu di-berhentikan dan di-gantikan dengan bantuan penoh kepada Sekolah² Rendah Jenis Kebangsaan. Juga ada beberapa sebab rasa tidak puas hati dari kalangan guru², oleh itu di-tubuhkan sa-mula sa-buah Majlis Kebangsaan bagi menguruskan hal-ehwal guru², dan dengan ada-nya majlis ini dapat-lah berunding dengan pehak Kerajaan di-atas hal-ehwal perkhidmatan guru² sakalian. Dan Kerajaan akan mengemaskan lagi dalam peratoran dan perjalanan yang telah kita laksanakan dahulu yang di-dapati tidak begitu sa-suai. Lagi satu dalam penyata ini ada satu perubahan, pada masa dahulu kita ada inspectorate atau pun jawatan inspectorate bagi Persekutuan. Sekarang tidak di-adakan, chuma di-adakan satu Juma'ah Nazir Tempatan. Maka dengan ini dapat-lah Juma'ah Nazir itu menjalankan kerja-nya memerhatikan segala hal-ehwal perjalanan sekolah dan memperbaiki tatatertib yang tidak se-suai dan berlawanan dengan perintah di-atas.

Jadi jikalau sudah di-ikut sa-bagaimana kehendak tiga orang wakil tadi supaya Rang Undang² ini di-tolak maka, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berasa dukachita kerana kita telah menhadangkan hendak memberi kejayaan ia-itu pelajaran perchuma kepada murid² di-seluruh sekolah² rendah pada tahun 1962. Jika di-tolak maka harus ta' dapat di-laksanakan tujuan kita hendak memberi pelajaran rendah kepada semua sekolah². Jadi dengan ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang mendengar penerangan daripada wakil² tadi dapat-lah tahu bagaimana-kah pendirian mereka dan mereka ini sengaja hendak melambatkan terlaksana-nya pemberian pelajaran perchuma untok tahun hadapan. Yang sa-benar-nya patut-lah di-tolak penyata dahulu kemudian baharu-lah dapat di-tolak Rang Undang² ini, tetapi waktu itu saya

dapati pehak Socialist Front manakala di-minta persetujuan pada penyata itu, mereka kechuali daripada mengundi berma'ana yang mereka bersetuju diatas penyata itu. Sekarang tidak-lah patut di-tolak Rang Undang² untuk melaksanakan penyata ini.

Mengikut system pelajaran yang ada sekarang ini saya terdengar Ahli Yang Berhormat wakil daripada Seremban Timor mengatakan ia-itu dia membacha Perlembagaan dalam article 152. Jadi kata-nya dengan ada-nya Rang Undang² yang sa-macham ini ta' puas hati. Banyak orang konon-nya ta' puas hati kerana tidak memberi sa-penoh-nya atau bantuan atau galakan kepada sekolah² yang bukan daripada bahasa kebangsaan. Ini barangkali Ahli Yang Berhormat itu ta' kaji dengan halus system pelajaran yang terkandung dalam penyata dan terkandung dalam Rang Undang² ini tentang sekolah rendah yang bahasa kebangsaan-nya ia-lah bahasa Melayu dan bahasa Inggeris mesti di-ajar. Erti-nya orang² yang bukan daripada bangsa Melayu jika ada lebeh daripada 15 orang murid dan warith-nya jika bersetuju supaya di-ajar bahasa Tamil maka Kerajaan adakan guru² mengajar sa-terus-nya daripada sekolah rendah sa-hingga ka-University, juga di-beri peluang belajar bahasa China dengan perchuma dan di-adakan pepereksaan dalam bahasa China. Dengan chara ini konon-nya Kerajaan tidak 'adil. Saya pun hairan. Kerajaan yang macham mana di-katakan 'adil? Saya pun ta' tahu, tetapi kalau ikut dari segi pemerintah di-mana² juga dalam dunia ini di-beri bantuan kepada sekolah² yang bahasa pengantar-nya ia-lah bahasa kebangsaan sahaja. Jadi Kerajaan kita ini chukup 'adil lebeh daripada 'adil dan lebeh daripada patut di-beri bantuan penoh kepada sekolah² ra'ayat dengan di-beri peluang belajar lain daripada bahasa kebangsaan sa-hingga mendapat sijil. Ini di-katakan tidak 'adil. Ini satu perkara yang saya hairan. Chuba mereka itu tinjau dasar pelajaran negara tetangga kita baharu-lah mereka sedar siapa yang 'adil dan siapa yang ta' 'adil dari segi pelajaran.

Jadi pada hari ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, orang² yang menentang supaya jangan di-bawa Rang Undang² ini tidak lain dan tidak bukan hanya sa-nya hendak menegakkan apa yang mereka itu pada masa pilehan raya dahulu menggunakan propaganda yang falsu untuk memusingkan dan memutarbelitkan.....

Mr. Speaker: Jaga sadikit perkataan yang di-keluarkan itu. Ada kalimah yang ta' boleh di-gunakan dalam Parlimen ini—unparliamentary language. Kalau awak buat nanti, saya suroh tarek balek.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid: Terima kaseh, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jadi pada masa pilehan raya ada di-antara orang² yang konon-nya mengatakan mereka itu berjuang kerana bahasa kebangsaan tetapi telah pun memusingkan apa yang sa-benar-nya di-dalam Rang Undang² atau pun penyata pelajaran ini. Maka di-antara warith kanak² dan di-antara Juma'ah Pengurus daripada beberapa buah sekolah China dan beberapa buah sekolah Indian telah menerima bantuan ini yang dahulu-nya telah menolak, tetapi pada masa sekarang, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-tempat saya sendiri bertalu² orang² yang dahulu-nya telah pun di-pengaroh dengan salah-nya meminta supaya di-beri bantuan. Jadi saya berharap kepada Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang lain jangan-lah gunakan dasar pelajaran ini untuk kepentingan parti atau untuk kepentingan diri atau untuk kepentingan hendak dapat kerusi dalam Parlimen ini. Cheritakan yang sa-benar-nya dalam penyata pelajaran ini, dan dengan ini anak² kita tidak teraniaya dalam keadaan-nya yang mengharap bantuan ini dari segi pelajaran dalam persekolahan-nya.

Satu perkara, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ingin menarek perhatian Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran manakala di-laksanakan Rang Undang² ini, tolong-lah ambil perhatian mengenai pelajaran ugama di-sekolah² yang dikuasai oleh pada masa sekarang dan di-laksanakan atau di-uruskan oleh puak² yang beragama lain. Nampak-nya mereka ini ta' setuju sangat tentang

pelajaran agama ini di-ajar di-sekolah² itu. Saya harap Menteri Yang Berhormat mengambil perhatian supaya anak² kita orang² Islam di-ajar agama Islam di-sekolah² Kerajaan dan lain². Jadi sa-takat ini-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, terima kaseh.

Enche' Abdul Ghani bin Ishak (Malacca Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun pada sa'at ini menyokong supaya Dewan ini menerima Rang Undang² Pelajaran yang di-bentangkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran itu. Sa-bagaimana yang kita sama² ma'alum bahawa kalau saya membalek²kan keterangan atau menguchapkan sa-mula apa yang telah di-uchapkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran sa-rupa-lah saya memanjangkan masa dengan perkara yang kurang menafa'at-nya. Tetapi apa yang saya hendak tambah lagi pada hari ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-itu sa-telah kita menerima satu Dasar Pelajaran pada tahun 1960 yang lalu, dan apabila kita mengemukakan dalam Dewan ini kita dapati pada sa'at ini dan pada masa saya berchakap ini telah dapat di-terima lebeh ramai lagi daripada Dewan ini. Ini menandakan dengan sa-sungguh-nya, sa-lain daripada ahli parti kami ia-itu Perikatan, maka hari ini boleh-lah saya menguchapkan tahniah kepada wakil yang dudok di-bangku pembangkang ia-itu PAS hari ini telah mengalu²kan bahawa Undang² Pelajaran ini hendak-lah kita laksanakan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-bagaimana yang kita telah dengar sama daripada pagi tadi maseh lagi sa-bahagian daripada ahli yang berchakap, terutama sa-kali sahabat saya Yang Berhormat dari Seberang Selatan yang tidak nampak langsung akan kemajuan pelajaran yang sedang berjalan dan yang akan kita laksanakan dari sekarang hingga pada masa akan datang. Beliau maseh lagi bertanya kepada kita atau maseh lagi beliau, barangkali tidak mahu memerhatikan perkara yang benar terjadi dalam tanah ayer kita ini berhubung dengan perkembangan pelajaran, kerana ia maseh lagi mengatakan yang Kerajaan kita sekarang ini maseh lagi mem-

banyakkan atau melebuhkan sekolah yang berchorak jenis kebangsaan Inggeris daripada sekolah yang berchorak kebangsaan. Tetapi patut-lah kita sedar kepada perkara yang sa-benar, dan pada masa ini telah banyak perubahan kepada sekolah kebangsaan itu ia-itu daripada chara persekolahan, chara bangunan dan kemudahan² yang telah di-sampaikan oleh Kerajaan itu untuk menjadikan bahawa sekolah kebangsaan itu-lah yang akan kita sama² mempertingkatkan untuk mengambil tempat yang istimewa dalam negara kita ini. Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Seberang Selatan itu tidak mahu sadikit pun mengakui akan kebenaran ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya juga mendengar perchakapan Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Telok Anson pada pagi tadi mengatakan bahawa Perikatan telah lari daripada manifesto-nya tahun 1955. Sa-bagai sa-orang ahli UMNO yang tidak pernah lunchat-melunchat ka-mana² parti, tambahan pula mengamalkan perkara² yang diperbuat atau yang di-semboyankan oleh parti kami, maka saya tidak nampak bahawa Dasar Pelajaran atau pun apa yang di-katakan ia-itu Penyata Pelajaran Rahman Talib ini lari daripada apa yang telah di-sampaikan pada tahun 1955 dengan yang ada sekarang ini. Kerana bagaimana-kah chara, mithal-nya, Yang Berhormat dari Telok Anson itu nampak untuk membentok satu rupa warga-negara yang sama, yang bersatu kalau beliau maseh lagi mengagong²kan perjuangan-nya untuk hendak menuntut sekolah jenis China atau lain² di-dalam ucapan²-nya yang di-keluarkan dalam Dewan ini? Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-bagai negara yang mempunyai berbagai² kaum yang kita akui, yang kita mahu berbaik², mahu faham-memahami di-antara satu dengan lain, maka sa-patut-nya itu-lah kita sekarang ini mengadakan satu undang² untuk mendzahirkan satu keturunan kita dengan satu tujuan, tidak lain dan tidak bukan hanya menerusi sekolah kebangsaan dan bahasa kebangsaan. Maka boleh-kah bahasa kebangsaan itu menjalar kepada tiap² ra'ayat dalam tanah ayer

kita ini kalau tidak di-salorkan kepada sekolah² yang menuju kepada tujuan itu?

Dan lagi saya berasa sedih terhadap sahabat saya dari Seremban Timor, sa-bagaimana yang di-nyatakan oleh sahabat saya tadi, kerana ia maseh lagi mengatakan bahasa China patut di-pelajari, bahasa India patut di-pelajari sa-bagai pelajaran yang mesti, ia membandingkan kepada keadaan manusia yang ada dalam dunia ini ia-itu orang China ramai, orang India ramai dan sa-bagai-nya. Saya susah memikirkan kenapa-kah tidak mahu menumpukan sa-genap tenaga, fikiran dan semangat kepada tanah ayer kita ini? Kerana tujuan itu-lah saya katakan sedih memikirkan ia-itu kita hendak mengarah atau membena satu kebangsaan dalam Tanah Melayu ini dengan mempunyai, barangkali ta'at setia yang tulin kepada negeri ini, tetapi maseh ada lagi orang yang mengkait²kan kepada keadaan sa-dunia atau keadaan² yang lain. Parti Perikatan tidak pernah mengatakan bahawa perkara² bangsa lain itu tidak di-akuï. Tetapi saya suka menyeru pada sa'at ini ia-itu kita patut-lah bersedia daripada hari ini ka-hadapan untuk keturunan kita bersama menuju kepada satu arah membena satu warga-negara yang ta'at setia-nya tidak berbelah-bagi. Dalam Undang² Pelajaran ini tidak ada pula di-sebutkan untuk menghapus atau menchekek bahasa² yang di-laong²kan itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-bagaimana keterangan yang telah di-beri oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran itu ada-lah menjadi satu da'awaan yang sa-benar-nya. Bukan-lah sa-bagaimana yang telah di-ucapkan oleh sahabat saya dari Seremban Timor ia-itu kalau kita berjalan ka-pasar, ka-pekan, kita dapati banyak orang mengadu lagi supaya di-adakan satu jawatan-kuasa untuk mengkaji sa-mula Dasar Pelajaran ini. Tetapi apa yang kita lihat sekarang ini daripada kenyataan yang di-beri oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran kita bahawa jumlah penuntut sekolah menengah yang sudah pun mengubah mahu menerima Dasar Pelajaran ini. Saya rasa kalau di-

bandingkan dengan angka itu pun maka kita sudah sedap hati, barangkali kepada orang yang tidak faham itu kalau kita fahamkan lagi, mereka akan menerima 100 peratus bantuan penoh daripada Kerajaan, kalau benar² mereka itu mahu hidup dan mati dalam Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini. Kerana sa-bagaimana yang saya katakan tadi daripada jumlah lebeh kurang—saya tidak dapat menyebutkan angka yang tepat—31 Sekolah² Menengah China telah menerima bantuan penoh, jumlah murid-nya telah meningkat 48,000 orang; di-bandingkan dengan yang belum menerima walau pun angka sekolah-nya banyak tetapi hanya mempunyai murid 27,576.

Apa-kah da'awaan yang mengatakan jika kita berjalan maseh ada orang bersorak kerana tidak bersetuju dengan dasar pelajaran ini? Pada pandangan saya sendiri mereka yang tidak bersetuju itu ia-lah orang² yang berchakap kerana tujuan-nya sendiri. Oleh itu kalau kita ingin menjadikan ra'ayat dalam tanah ayer kita ini sa-bagaimana yang terkandung dalam dasar pelajaran ia-itu hendak menchipta satu warga-negara yang bersatu, yang berpadu dan mempunyai ta'at setia yang tulin kepada Tanah Melayu ini, maka patut sangat-lah kita hari ini menerima dengan sa-bulat suara Rang Undang² yang di-bentangkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran dalam Dewan ini. Terima kaseh.

Enche' Zulkiffee bin Muhammad (Bachok): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tidak-lah saya sangka bahawa perbahathan pada hari ini lebeh banyak berkenaan dengan dasar pelajaran daripada Rang Undang² ini. Tetapi oleh kerana nampak-nya aliran perbahathan lebeh jauh, dan lebeh suka membahathkan dasar pelajaran yang sudah di-bahathkan dan di-luluskan dalam Dewan ini maka tidak dapat-lah saya melarikan diri di-dalam perkara ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, waktu kita meluluskan dasar pelajaran dahulu, telah di-luluskan dengan menimbang soal² yang ada dalam musharakat kita ini. Sa-tahu saya, belum-lah berubah musharakat ini sa-telah dasar pelajaran itu di-luluskan. Sa-orang Ahli Yang Ber-

hormat dari Telok Anson, mengatakan dia dapat mandat baharu, bukan sahaja daripada kawan-nya bahkan dripada ra'ayat Persekutuan hari ini yang membolehkan membawa chita² baharu yang dahulu sudah bersharah dalam Dewan ini. Tentang kehendak² orang yang memberi mandat kapadanya itu tidak tersebut dan saya dari 13 kawasan yang saya ini menyatakan mandat itu tidak tersebut juga. (*Ketawa*).

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, yang menyusahkan saya bagi orang² yang tidak mahu menjadikan dasar pelajaran kebangsaan ini ada-lah mereka menggunakan modal bahawa kebudayaan China, kebudayaan India, tidak dipelihara, apa lagi di-kembangkan dengan dasar pelajaran yang ada ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kata mereka, pati Perikatan telah mungkir janji dalam hal ini. Banyak-lah syarat² dan nas² yang telah di-berikan. Walau pun pati Perikatan mungkir janji dalam perkara ini maka saya orang yang sangat suka dengan mungkir janji saperti itu. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tidak akan dapat di-dalam negeri ini mewujudkan sa-buah musharakat yang terpelajar, melainkan menerusi saluran yang satu dengan kuat-nya. Sa-waktu membahath apa sahaja yang di-bahathkan di-sini saluran ini-lah yang menjadikan fikiran kita sendiri. Di-hadapan saya ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, entah benar atau tidak, tidak-lah saya ketahu², boleh jadi da'ayah, boleh jadi benar. Sa-benar-nya ini masaalah kechil yang sengaja di-ambil kesempatan oleh Menteri Yang Berhormat menyatakan rasa Kerajaan kepada kebudayaan China, bahasa China, kesusasteraan China dan apa sahaja yang bersangkutan dalam negeri ini. Sa-hinggakan ada gambar² yang menggelikan hati saya, guru² Sekolah China yang tidak mahu mengambil pertolongan terus lagi dan bermacam² lagi, guru² yang mengambil bantuan Kerajaan, duduk di-atas kerusi senang hati sahaja.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, boleh-lah saya sebutkan bahawa Kerajaan Perikatan itu terlalu banyak memberi kelebihan kepada orang²-nya sa-hinggakan Men-

teri Yang Berhormat pula sa-bahagian besar daripada ucapan-nya untuk menyenangkan hati orang² China. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau ini pun tidak chukup lagi, ini pun tidak memuaskan lagi, apa-kah yang di-kehendaki lagi orang itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. (*Ketawa*). Ada-kah mereka itu memikirkan bahawa sudah patut Tanah Melayu itu mempunyai satu kebangsaan, di-namakan bahasa China? Saya susah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya di-dalam memberikan sokongan kepada Kerajaan, memberitahu kepada dua pehak, pehak yang pertama, pehak Kerajaan, chuba-lah jalankan dasar itu dengan berani. Pehak yang kedua yang menentang dasar ini, sila-lah memenangi Pilehan Raya supaya dapat-lah mudah²an mengubah dasar itu jika di-izinkan oleh keadaan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tidak-lah akan dapat di-ujudkan apa yang di-sebut di-sini:

"And whereas it is considered desirable that regard shall be had, so far as is compatible with that policy, with the provision of efficient instruction and with the avoidance of unreasonable public expenditure".

Itu pun, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tidak-lah sanggup Kerajaan hendak menanggung semua bebanan supaya semua masaalah² di-luar tuntutan dasar pelajaran itu boleh di-jawab. Kita ketahu² bahawa hendak memelihara kebudayaan lain ada-lah hak yang patut di-berikan dengan orang yang menjadi sa-bahagian anggota musharakat. United Nation sendiri ada menetakpan dalam Piagam-nya bahawa hak majority dalam memelihara kebudayaan mesti-lah di-pelihara. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, hak itu biar-lah se-suai dengan tuntutan kebangsaan. Kita daripada orang Melayu yang memandang bahawa sudah terlalu banyak memberikan kepada orang lain hak² kita masa yang sudah² dan masa-nya sudah sampai kepada orang² lain untuk menerima dasar² pelajaran ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, apabila hendak mengekalkan kebudayaan² dan bahasa² yang bukan bahasa kebangsaan maka akan hanchor-lah persatuan Kebangsaan Melayu

dalam negeri ini, dan pada ketika itu akan tarek menarek-lah kita antara satu sama lain.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-takat itu saya champor tangan dalam perbahathan dasar pelajaran ini, sebab sa-tahu saya, dasar ini sudah di-bahathkan dan sudah di-luluskan maka tidak-lah ada fasal maka kita hendak bahathkan dalam perkara ini. Jadi, tidak-lah kena kalau hendak mementang Rang Undang² ini, dan serahkan-lah kepada Select Committee saperti pernah di-sebutkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada semua pati, pati PAS menolak Select Committee saperti itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, isi² yang ada di-dalam Undang² ini ada-lah consolidation—memajukan Undang² yang bersangkutan dengan pelajaran. Saya perchaya beberapa perkara yang ada di-dalam Rang Undang² ini ada-lah perkara baharu saperti yang telah di-sebutkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran.

Fasal 17 telah mengatakan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, penubuhan sa-buah badan yang di-namakan National Education Advisory Board. Saya tahu apabila di-sebutkan "Advisory Board" maka perkataan itu "nasehat". Dalam sharahan Digest on the Education Policy Federation of Malaya yang ada di-hadapan saya ini menyatakan bahawa National Education Advisory Board ini terdiri daripada orang² yang ahli di-dalam pelajaran dan taknik. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, oleh kerana orang² ini bukan-lah orang² politik dan saya berharap lantekan orang² ini di-jauhkan daripada sa-barang yang merupakan politik maka saya memandag bahawa fasal 14 daripada Rang Undang² ini patut-lah di-kemaskan lebeh banyak lagi. Sebab "the Minister may refer to the National Education Advisory Board for their advice". Tuan Yang di-Pertua, "may refer", adal ah membolehkan sa-saorang Menteri itu merujokkan perkara itu atau tidak merujokkan menurut fikiran-nya.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, amat-lah benar bahawa kuasa² patut di-berikan kepada sa-orang Menteri sebab dia

Menteri, dia ada-lah bertanggung-jawab kapada Dewan ini sadikit sa-banyak bahkan banyak di-dalam perjalanan pentadbiran pelajaran di-dalam negeri ini. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau terlalu banyak kuasa hingga ada pula perkara² yang berupa teknik yang sa-patut-nya di-rujokkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri itu kapada National Education Board ini tetapi tidak di-tunjokkan maka ini akan menyebabkan pertimbangan² di-dalam pelajaran kita tidak berases.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita tentu-lah mengatakan bahawa tentu-lah waktu di-bentok dan di-gubalkan Undang² ini tujuan-nya yang besar hendak menggunakan Lembaga Penasehat ini, kalau tidak hendak di-gantikan masakan dia itu di-tubuhkan. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau hendak di-gunakan maka tentu-lah di-kemaskan perkataan² supaya menjamin penggunaan² yang lazim yang di-lakukan oleh Menteri. Merujokkan sa-suatu perkara ini amat-lah besar ma'ana-nya. Oleh sebab, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam section Pelajaran dengan Undang² yang ada ini, kita telah tidak ada lagi suatu badan yang boleh memberikan fikiran dan pendapat dan nasehat kapada Menteri Yang Berhormat, Menteri Pelajaran melainkan badan ini. Tetapi kalau badan ini di-longgarkan maka saya perchaya akan berjaya-lah jadi kerja² yang memustahakkan pemikiran yang halus dalam soal ini. Saya memikirkan patut-lah Menteri Yang Berhormat gunakan perkataan "may" itu di-tukarkan kapada "shall" atau perkataan "advisory" itu di-tukarkan dengan "recommendation".

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam fasal 25 kuasa Menteri bagi menubuhkan dan memelihara pertubohan² pelajaran di-nyatakan di-bahagian (2) daripada fasal 25 ini menyatakan:

"The Minister may pay grant-in-aid to schools, not established by him, falling within paragraphs (a) to (e) of the foregoing sub-section".

"Schools not established by him", ada-lah berma'ana sekolah² yang di-tubuhkan sa-chara dan dengan tenaga yang lain daripada pengawalan

dan pentadbiran Kementerian Pelajaran. Saya memikirkan bahawa satu pengawalan yang ketat patut di-lakukan berhubung dengan ada-nya anasir² di-negeri ini yang ingin merosakkan perjalanan aliran pelajaran kebangsaan di-dalam negeri ini. Saya tidak berkata, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Menteri kita Yang Berhormat ini menjadi anasir² seperti itu, tidak. Tetapi di-dalam membuat Undang² tidak-lah boleh kita agakkan, "saya memerintah ini, saya membuat ini ta'kan-lah saya hendak buat-nya pulak", itu tidak boleh menjadi asas kepada Undang² ini. Undang² ini hendak-lah di-kemaskan, saya memikirkan di-dalam Undang² bahagian ini patut-lah di-fikirkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri satu pengetat ia-itu dengan mengatakan sa-lama ia-itu tidak berlawanan dengan Dasar Pelajaran Kebangsaan di-dalam negeri ini, erti-nya tidak boleh Menteri memberi bantuan kepada sa-barang sekolah yang bukan di-tubuhkan; sa-lama kita tahu melainkan kita tahu sekolah² ini ada-lah chara sa-jajar dan sa-laras dengan dasar pelajaran negeri ini. Pelajaran Kebangsaan negeri ini amat-lah penting di-kaitkan dan di-majukan sa-lama itu tidak berlawanan dengan dasar kebangsaan di-dalam pelajaran di-negeri ini. Ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, akan membolehkan Menteri Pelajaran mengawal diri-nya atau siapa pun yang akan menjadi Menteri Pelajaran tidak akan di-benarkan oleh Undang² ini memberi bantuan sa-kira-nya itu di-dapati berlawanan dengan dasar pelajaran.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, fasal 35 saya tidak hendak berchakap berkenaan dengan fasal ini tetapi pada tujuan-nya fasal 35 ini akan memberi kelulusan kepada Menteri di-mana di-fikirkan dan apabila di-fikirkan murid² tidak dapat pelajaran melainkan di-adakan tempat² pelajaran seperti Asrama atau sa-bagai-nya, dan di-ketika itu di-bolehkan Menteri membuat susunan² bagi kepentingan sekolah². Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-sini-lah modal yang besar bagi kemajuan pelajaran² anak² Melayu. Sa-sudah saya menengok perbelanjaan yang di-berikan kepada sekolah² China, belanja yang di-

berikan kepada guru² dan sa-bagai-nya yang di-sharahkan oleh Menteri Yang Berhormat yang tidak di-sharahkan tetapi di-tuliskan di-sini, saya terasa menjadi kewajipan-lah kepada Menteri Pelajaran ini dan kepada sa-barang Menteri Pelajaran supaya memberikan layanan lebeh banyak kepada anak² Melayu di-kampong² yang tidak dapat tempat di-bandar kerana kemiskinan mereka itu. Jadi, perkataan "the Minister may", ini hendak-lah di-ketatkan hingga mengatakan bahawa Menteri itu hendak-lah membuat susunan² supaya anak² yang tidak dapat tempat bagi orang Melayu di-kampong² mendapat bantuan dengan di-adakan Asrama di-bandar².

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tiap² puak dalam negeri ini hendak menjaga hak-nya sendiri dan elok-lah saya bagi pehak PAS di-sini mengatakan dengan tegas-nya bahawa menjadi kewajipan-lah kepada Kerajaan menjaga orang² Melayu dalam soal pelajaran, sebab akan jahanam-lah orang² Melayu sa-kira-nya tidak di-beri peluang² bagi membolehkan mereka itu mendapat pelajaran yang baik dan sempurna dalam negeri ini. Sa-kira-nya orang berkata bahawa telah banyak kami beri kepada orang Melayu, maka saya berkata lebeh banyak hak-nya yang telah hilang daripada apa yang telah di-beri kepada orang Melayu pada hari ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, fasal 36 ini ia-lah berkenaan dengan pelajaran Islam. Dahulu telah saya sampaikan waktu membahathkan dasar pelajaran bahawa apabila Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu mengambil bebanan memberi pelajaran agama di-sekolah² kebangsaan bagi murid² Islam maka hendak-lah di-lakukan dengan sunggoh² dan saya dapati bahawa bahagian (2) dari fasal 36 ini hendak-lah di-betulkan ia-itu perkataan "at least two hours" di-tukarkan dengan perkataan sa-kurang²-nya "at least 4 hours", sebab, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dua jam satu minggu belajar agama harus-lah kita tahu ta' sempat dia mengenal siapa yang patut ia sembah. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, menambah dua jam lagi tidak-lah amat berat bagi Kementerian dalam

soal agama dan soal-nya besar pula dalam negeri ini. Satu daripada soal yang timbul daripada pengajaran yang hendak di-beri kepada penuntut² Islam atau murid² Islam di-sekolah² kebangsaan itu ia-lah dalam ketentuan perbelanjaan-nya bagi memberi pengajaran agama menurut apa yang telah terator dalam Perlembagaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu dalam senarai Negeri dan senarai Persekutuan. Kita mengetahui dengan jelas-nya bahawa pelajaran agama atau urusan agama ada-lah termasuk dalam urusan Negeri. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, benar-lah pelajaran agama di-masokkan dalam urusan negeri dan oleh kerana yang demikian itu, maka fasal 37 menyebutkan bahawa duit bagi pelajaran agama itu di-kenakan juga daripada duit² atau wang² yang diluluskan oleh "Legislature of the State in which the school is situate". Tuan Yang di-Pertua, State banyak dalam negeri ini. Saya fikir kalau Kerajaan Persekutuan benar² hendak menjalankan dasar ini seperti yang telah saya sebutkan dahulu ia-itu memang boleh di-lakukan di-antara Kerajaan Persekutuan dengan Kerajaan Negeri. Dan katakan-lah seperti asal yang di-sebutkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Pelajaran ia-itu asas tujuh ringgit dengan tujuh ringgit ia-itu empat belas ringgit bagi pelajaran agama—tujuh ringgit di-tanggung oleh Kerajaan Negeri dan tujuh ringgit lagi di-tanggung oleh Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu sa-bagai "capitation grant" seperti yang terkandung dalam bahagian (2) dalam fasal 37 itu. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, oleh kerana Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu telah chuba masokkan medan ini dengan jalan apa² pun dan oleh kerana kita waktu membuat satu dasar pelajaran yang bertujuan hendak menjalankan dasar pelajaran ini supaya berlaku dengan baik-nya. Maka saya mengatakan di-mana negeri² yang tidak sanggup memberi sumbangan kewangan-nya yang sempurna maka jangan-lah itu menjadi aleh, menjadi dalil dan menjadi helah melambatkan Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu dari memikul bebanan-nya bagi memberi pelajaran agama kepada

mereka ini. Pelajaran agama kepada anak² Islam amat-lah mustahak. Jangan-lah lupa, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam-nya ini kita telah beri hak orang lain dengan banyak walau pun sa-kali ini, sa-kali ini. Apah-lah lagi yang kita fikirkan, apa-kah lagi yang kita nantikan daripada hendak menjalankan tugas kita bagi memberi pelajaran agama kepada anak² kita.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sungguh pun perkara agama menurut sa-tengah fahaman orang, perkara agama ini hendak-lah mengawal orang—itu sahaja. Apa untong-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua? Tetapi dengan memberi pelajaran agama, katakan-lah bagi lima tahun, atau enam tahun dalam sekolah rendah, maka akan terbentok-lah dalam negeri ini bukan sahaja manusia yang sembahyang, menunaikan puasa dan haji, tetapi manusia yang tahukan Tuhan, dan dengan demikian akan menjadi anggota masyarakat yang baik. Apa-kah lagi yang hendak kita tunggu dalam hidup kita sa-lain daripada menjadikan anak chuchu kita orang yang berguna dalam negeri ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jangan-lah di-fahamkan apabila saya berchakap berkenaan dengan kebaikan anggota² masyarakat, orang berkata "ah bahawa ia hendak menjaga orang² Melayu sahaja. Itu-lah modal-nya sahaja". Saya ta' ingin orang bukan Melayu itu menjadi jahat. Dahulu dalam ucapan saya sa-waktu memberi ulasan pelajaran, saya telah menyebutkan bahawa patut-lah Kerajaan memberi perhatian kepada pelajaran² moral kepada orang bukan Islam, sebab kita tidak mahu, kita sahaja yang baik dalam dunia ini, kita sahaja baik sedangkan orang lain yang menchuri barang kita, membunuh kita dengan tidak berfasal². Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ingin kepada masyarakat yang baik tidak-lah menghadkan diri kita daripada memberi pelajaran kepada anak² Islam, tetapi tidak-lah boleh wang negeri ini walau satu sen pun di-belanjakan bagi kepentingan agama yang lain, malah kita boleh beri bantuan moral kepada mereka itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, fasal 49 berkenaan dengan pendaftaran sekolah.

Dalam mendaftarkan sekolah, banyak syarat makroh di-buat. Banyak-lah perkara yang di-buat. Saya hanya hendak kemukakan satu sahaja dan dalam perkara ini selalu-lah saya akan bergaduh dengan Menteri Pelajaran ini, sebab Menteri Pelajaran nampaknya tidak berapa suka hendak mendaftarkan sekolah² ra'ayat, kerana kata-nya kita mahu-lah buat sekolah Kerajaan yang di-tarek dengan sempurna. Pada fikiran saya daripada menunggu sekolah Kerajaan datang daripada tahun 1969 lebeh baik-lah kita pakai sekolah ra'ayat yang ada pada hari ini, sebab banyak sekolah ra'ayat yang meminta pendaftaran-nya tetapi lambat di-daftarkan, kerana kita hendak sekolah yang sempurna—anak chuchu kita yang sudah berumur 12 tahun mana hendak di-masokkan? Jadi pada fikiran saya dalam fasal 49 daripada undang² ini patut-lah difikirkan satu dasar yang prektek bagi membolehkan anak kita mempelajari-nya—orang Melayu ia-lah dengan sekolah Melayu yang di-tubuhkan oleh mereka itu. Maka dengan ada-nya di-tubuhkan sekolah ra'ayat yang sedikit demi sedikit mengikut kuasanya yang ada pada Menteri dan Pendaftar Sekolah² dalam undang² ini sedikit demi sedikit kita ikhtiarkan bagi membetulkan tandas dan sa-bagai-nya. Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bolehlah anak² kita di-tempat yang jauh belajar di-sekolah ra'ayat.

Ada beberapa tempat yang saya ketahui di-kawasan saya pun sudah dua tahun untuk hendak mendaftarkan sekolah yang sudah ada. Tolong daftarkan! Ta' boleh di-daftarkan. Jadi kerana apa, kerana hendakkan sekolah itu sempurna. Maka berdo'a-lah kita kepada Tuhan sa-hingga dua tahun sa-kurang²-nya sekolah itu tidak sempurna lagi. Maka saya harap Menteri Yang Berhormat ini memikirkan pendaftaran sekolah ra'ayat itu supaya di-longgarkan, sebab kita dalam masa peralihan membolehkan ra'ayat belajar lebeh banyak.

Bahagian 116 ia-lah berkenaan dengan peratoran² yang di-buat, yang di-beri kuat-kuasa kepada Menteri Pelajaran. Peratoran itu, Tuan Yang

di-Pertua, banyak. Saya hendak menarek perhatian Menteri Pelajaran berkenaan dengan peratoran kewangan ia-itu bahagian kecil (*w*) the keeping of books of account and the audit of accounts in assisted schools and assisted educational institutions. Kita tahu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, alhamdulillah tahun 1958 kelmarin banyak meminta kewangan yang tidak dapat kita merasa puas hati. Sa-bahagian daripada sekolah² itu seperti yang dinyatakan oleh Pemeriksa Kira² Negara dalam penyata yang di-kemukakan dalam Dewan ini ia-lah oleh kerana sekolah itu tidak tahu menyusun kewangan-nya. Saya berharap supaya soal² susunan itu di-atorkan dengan baik supaya wang² yang di-beri bagi kepentingan pelajaran ini benar² digunakan bagi kepentingan pelajaran dan dengan chara yang terator supaya boleh-lah kita menjaga wang ra'ayat yang tidak di-gunakan dengan chara yang tidak tentu hala.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya sa-sudah menyebutkan perkara² itu, saya menyatakan di-sini bahawa dasar pelajaran yang sudah kita luluskan itu sudah patut-lah di-jalankan. Dan dalam menjalankan-nya jangan-lah lupa bahawa kalau kita hendak menyukakan hati orang² yang bukan Melayu dengan membuat satu "kertas" yang seperti ini—di-buat dengan terang pula. Apa-kah yang telah di-buat oleh Kerajaan bagi menegakkan kelas² bahasa Melayu, kelas² sekolah menengah Melayu dalam bahasa kebangsaan? Chuba itu tunjukkan pula, berbanding dengan sekolah orang Puteh, berbanding dengan sekolah China. Jangan sampai kalah hak bahasa kebangsaan itu, dan menang yang ini, kerana mereka ini membantah kita dalam Parlimen, maka kita ambil berat. Dan oleh kerana orang kita diam, maka kita biarkan. Terima kasih.

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam (Ipoh):
Mr. Speaker, Sir, the PMIP supports the Government on this Education Bill. It is no surprise to us, and I am sure no surprise to the Government side, because in all matters where differences of opinion arise as between the various

racers that live in this country, it has always been clear that the UMNO, MCA and MIC think alike with the PMIP. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have considered very carefully the suggestion or advice given by the Honourable Member from Bachok that persons like the Honourable Member for Telok Anson and others, who are like-minded and who always speak and ask for educational rights for Chinese and Indians, should not do so. After very careful consideration, I feel I must reject that advice, because that advice comes from a Party which won the confidence of the people in two States and within such a short time is unable to keep that confidence and, therefore, there must be something wrong with that Party and its policies. For that reason, we must reject the advice given to us by the PMIP.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that certain members of the MCA had to leave the Alliance Party due to this question of education. But before I deal with that, there are one or two preliminary matters which I wish to mention. This morning the Honourable Member from Seberang Selatan was speaking, and he said that an education policy should be one which will give education sufficient for those who are educated under that policy to earn their bread and butter, their rice and curry, and somebody shouted *dosai* as well (*Laughter*). Mr. Speaker, Sir, that remark by itself means nothing, but that remark passed in the manner in which it was passed, in the circumstances in which it was passed, tends, and tends very clearly, to show a contempt for those who eat *dosais*. Mr. Speaker, if that is the attitude of Government backbenchers, then I say that education must be sufficient to eat *blachan sambal* as well; otherwise, that is no education. Mr. Speaker, Sir, if we are going to lose the decorum of this House, if one side does it, then the other side will jolly well do it; and I do hope that in the course of this debate, the calm of this House, which has been maintained for some time, will remain maintained. Yesterday somebody, I think my good

friend—if I may refer to him as such—the Honourable Member from Johore somewhere, said that if I get the *angin* then my opinion may be different; what he meant was, I suppose, that if I get annoyed, then my opinions are somewhat different. Frankly, I don't change my opinion, but if unnecessary remarks are made which tend to create a feeling of dissatisfaction and distrust, a feeling of hostility, then the same thing must be expected from the other members sitting on this side of the House.

The promise of free education has been given. That promise is a humbug; there is no free education in 1962, and I will tell you why. I am reading, Mr. Speaker, Sir, from the speech by the Honourable Minister of Education—last evening just before the House was adjourned the Honourable Minister spoke about the mounting cost of education and he said this—

“The mounting cost of education makes it essential that these local contributions should be raised.”

That is, contributions by imposing an education rate on local authorities, or, in other words, collection of money for the Federation Education Plan through States at State level.

“So far the amounts raised by way of Education rates have been negligible in relation to the total cost of education, never yet exceeding about \$3 million in one year, or less than 2% of the recurrent cost of education. In some areas the Federation, for instance, in Johore and Kelantan, no Education rates whatsoever have yet been raised. It has.....”

I am leaving part of it—as I may be accused of reading half and leaving the rest, I better read it through—

“Under Section 105 the Minister has power to require State or rating authorities, or both, to make a contribution towards the cost of education and may recover such contributions as debts to the Federation.

It has so far been an unsatisfactory feature of the system of local contributions that some areas have got away with making no such contribution. This is unfair on other States who have collected substantial sums by way of education rates. In future all areas of the Federation will be in the same boat in

this respect and the Federal Government intends that reasonable contributions shall be made by all areas."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, last year no contributions were called for and no contributions were made towards education rates, at least as far as the State of Perak is concerned, because I know about the State of Perak; and I made enquiries and I understand that nowhere in the country were education rates levied. Now, for years and years, areas in this country have not been called upon to pay an education rate. The Government says, "We are going to give you free primary education." I recall the words of the Honourable Minister of Finance that "nothing in this world is free", but to-day the Governments says—"We are going to give you free education. What are you crying so much for? Free in Chinese, free in Tamil—we give you free primary education." All over we hear emphasis on the word "free". When we say, "Give us free education", what does the Government say? "You get nothing in this world free." I say we are not getting free education 1962. I say that that statement is to pull wool over the eyes of the people. Children may not have to pay their school fees, but the people will be asked to pay an education rate—every house owner, every person who pays an assessment may be asked by a local authority to pay an education rate. It has been in the last, more or less, the practice that where education rate was imposed, it was 2 per cent. There is no statement by the Honourable Minister of Education whether, if an education rate is imposed—there is no assurance—that it will not exceed the standardised 2 per cent; or is it the intention of the Minister of Education to increase that almost standardised figure of 2 per cent? That is an interesting question. Is it intended that local authorities will be asked to impose a rate of, say, 5 per cent or 6 per cent? Has the Minister any statistics, any idea as to how much more would be required, what would be a reasonable figure on percentages that these education rates should be based on? Surely the nation wants to know. And I think it would

be a good thing, if the nation knows now that by "free education" means that you pay an education rate; and I think the nation should know that when they receive their bills next year from local authorities, for example, the Ipoh Town Council, that the Ipoh Town Council is not putting on any education rate, but that the Federation Government wants that 2 per cent from the people. If they know that, then they will realise what a sham, and if I may use the word, what a humbug this promise of free education is.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, now I move to the question of registration of teachers dealt with in the ordinance itself, i.e., clauses 77 and 78. Mr. Speaker, Sir, past experience on the question of registration of teachers has brought to light one very crystal clear fact and that is this that absolute power is given to any person, say, in this case, given to the Registrar-General of Schools, or the Registrar-General of Teachers. It is clear that in very rare cases will he before exercising his discretion investigate the case properly, because he has not got the time; he would not do it, it is not practicable to do it. Therefore, the danger in giving absolute power is a danger that absolute power can be misused; and wherever possible absolute power should never be given into the hands of any individual.

Now, if we look at clause 77, it deals with the Registrar of Teachers—it says, "he may refuse to register a person under this Chapter if he is satisfied that that person....." then it goes on to give a number of grounds on which he may refuse registration. Now, I fully appreciate that. In this country there is a Registration of Teachers Ordinance. I fully appreciate that it is put into this Ordinance for simplicity and unification of education law, but there is one matter of great importance. If we look at (d), for example—sub-clause 1 (d), clause 77—it says, "The Registrar of Teachers may refuse to register a person if he suffers from physical or mental defect or disease rendering him in the opinion of

the Registrar of Teachers”—in the opinion of the Registrar of Teachers—“unsuitable to be a teacher”. Is it not a medical matter? Is it not proper that it should be in the opinion of a medical officer or a Government doctor or whatever you may like to call him? Why is it that the Registrar of Teachers should be the person to decide whether the person suffering from disease is, in his opinion, unfit to be a teacher? I do not know how he is going to do that. If a man coughs ten times, he may say “you are medically unfit, you cannot be a teacher”. Surely in fairness to somebody who wants to be a teacher, it should be the opinion of a man versed in medicine. I know what the answer is going to be from the Minister. He will say, “The Registrar is not a fool, he will send him to a doctor and he will get a doctor’s opinion”. But do not forget the Ordinance says that, “in his opinion” he can do it without looking at any doctor in this country. You may get the same case as the policeman who took a cow for a murder case to the hospital. Those are the dangers of arbitrary powers and, in fairness to those who want to be teachers, there must either be an amendment or an assurance from this House that whoever is the Registrar of Teachers he will be given a directive that in matters of illness and diseases he must get an opinion from a medical man. It is no use saying, “He is not going to be a fool; he is not going to do it. That will not satisfy the House.

Then, if we look at paragraph (e)—what do we get?

“The Registrar of Teachers may refuse to register a person if he has been convicted, in the Federation or elsewhere, of an offence and sentenced to a term of imprisonment, or has been convicted of an offence against this Act, or under any previous written law relating to the registration of teachers or schools, or under any similar law in Singapore.”

Now, the Honourable Minister, in moving this motion, said: “there is very little difference between the 1957 Ordinance and this”. But the very little difference is the most important difference as far as I am concerned

and, here, I quote the Honourable Minister’s own words: “the first point which I want to make perfectly clear to the House and to the nation is that neither the 1960 Report nor this Bill makes any fundamental changes to the education policy of this country which was established by the Razak Report in the 1957 legislation. The Bill modifies certain national and necessary development of the 1956 policy which the House had already agreed to in principle and it also contains clarification which experience has shown to be desirable”. Now, let us compare with one clause of importance which I will read out, “a person who has been convicted in the Federation for an offence and sentenced to a term of imprisonment”. The Registration of Teachers Ordinance, 1957 has a clause which deals or gives power to the Registrar to refuse registration to persons who want to be teachers, and if you refer to that, Mr. Speaker, Sir, you will find that the wording of the new clauses (d) and (e) is entirely different from the old one.

Section 6 (1) of the old Ordinance says:—

“The Registrar may refuse to register a teacher if he is satisfied that such teacher—

- (i) has not made application in the manner prescribed; or
- (ii) is under the age of eighteen years; or
- (iii) has no qualification to be a teacher or qualifications which in the opinion of the Registrar are inadequate for such a purpose; or
- (iv) has made a false or misleading statement in a material particular in the prescribed form of application; or
- (v) suffers from some physical or mental defect or disease rendering him in the opinion of the Registrar unsuitable to be a teacher; or
- (vi) has been convicted by a court of competent jurisdiction in the Federation or elsewhere of an offence punishable with imprisonment or of an offence under this Ordinance or under the Education Ordinance, 1952, or under any written law relating to the registration of teachers or under any similar law in the Colony.”

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the words "convicted by a court" have been left out. In the normal course of event, a conviction must be by a court. Can the Minister tell us why the words "by a court" have been dropped from the wording of Clause 77 (e)? Was it accidental, was it deliberate? If it was deliberate, what is the reason? If you change the law, there must be a reason for changing. If you remove the words "by a court", is it possible that conviction can ensue from any other body? I do not know what the intention is, and I do ask for a very strong explanation when the Minister replies. But I disagree with the clause itself. I disagree with Section 7 of the previous Ordinance itself. This is arbitrary power given to an individual. Now, arbitrary powers given to individuals must be such that the wording must be very specific; it cannot be vague because if it is vague, then he will not know how to enforce such a clause from time to time.

Mr. Speaker: The time is up.

ADJOURNMENT

The Deputy Prime Minister: Sir, I beg to move that the House be adjourned.

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

ADJOURNMENT SPEECH

ROYAL FEDERATION OF MALAYA POLICE (MARINE)

Enche' Ng Ann Teck (Batu): Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is with great regret and a heavy heart that I stand here to-day to make comparison of conditions before Merdeka with those after. During pre-Merdeka days, the Marine Police used to be of great service and help to our fishermen. They used to escort our fishermen on their trips, and they gave advice on weather and storm conditions. Further, when our fishermen were sick, or in need of medical supplies, the Marine Police used to be on hand to render aid; but the greatest service that they shall be remembered for was that they used to protect our fishermen from pirates and other

dangers, and especially to remind our fishermen to be within territorial waters, thereby not giving any chance at all for other authorities to arrest our fishermen. Unfortunately, today our Marine Police are doing nothing of that sort. They seem to have forgotten all the previous good deeds and the fact that they were once the guardians of the fishermen. To-day our Marine Police are no more the angels that our fishermen used to like; instead they have become the very persons the fishermen try to avoid. Why is there such a change? In the British days we had 18 patrol boats and to-day we have the same number of patrol boats patrolling the same area, but what are our Marine Police doing to-day? Our Marine Police to-day are specialists in the art of summoning. Very rarely have our fishermen seen the Marine Police boats in deep waters. All they do is to patrol the coastal areas, and especially sneaking around Pulau Besar and Tanjong Tuan islands, so as to harass those boats that carry worshippers, etc. to these islands. I am not saying that we should condone unseaworthy boats plying the seas, but to a certain extent our Police have been over-zealous in this, thereby forgetting the more important task of being protectors. For example, many boats have been summoned because both side-lights had not been lit. But do the Police realise that when boats are sailing windward, there is every likelihood of the lights facing that way being extinguished by the wind? A set of battery lights costs about \$220 which is definitely beyond their means considering the losses they incur when apprehended by the Indonesian Police, or raided by pirates. The most ridiculous state of affairs is shown when they are summoned for being found lacking in certain requirements, when they are coming back after fishing. In most of the cases, they had their equipment removed by Indonesian patrol boats, but when our Police were told of it, they just turned a deaf ear. What does our Police expect these unfortunate fishermen to do? Buy their equipment in the middle of the sea? For example, on the 14th September,

1961, case No. 1893/61 was heard in the Malacca Magistrate's Court, where a fisherman was fined \$20.00 for not being in possession of a fire extinguisher when his boat came home on the 6th August, 1961—this was in spite of the fact that he had his fire extinguisher removed by the Indonesian Police on his return voyage home. This goes to show how over-anxious our Police are to summon people—I suppose to prove that they are doing their work. Surely, this convinces no one. This utter lack of understanding and co-operation on the part of our Police is beyond comprehension and only denotes that either the Police have not been properly supervised, or that they have been instructed to patrol only the coastal areas—and to prove that they are doing their work they indiscriminately start to summon people.

Sir, further, this form of action only serves to frustrate our fishermen more, as though the menacing actions they are facing from the pirates and the Indonesian Police are not enough. I hope the Honourable Minister shall instruct the Marine Police to go out to help our fishermen as they used to do in pre-Merdeka days. This is the only way that can effectively upkeep their slogan of "Operation Service" and not turn it into a mockery as it is now known to be. By so doing they not only render great service to our fishermen but also indirectly help the economy of our country, as this action will lead to more fishermen going out to sea to bring in large catches.

MALAYAN FISHERMEN FISHING IN THE STRAITS OF MALACCA

Enche' Liu Yoong Peng (Rawang): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am bringing to the attention of this House, and hence the Government, a matter of grave concern to Malayan fishermen fishing in the Straits of Malacca. As is known, Malayan fishermen have been fishing in the Straits of Malacca for generations and have been enjoying comparative peace since the advent of modern civilisation. This, in my opinion, has

given the fishermen the right of usage of the Straits of Malacca for the purpose of fishing, according to international law. However, the peaceful pursuit of fishing by Malayan fishermen has been greatly disturbed during the past few years, on many occasions, by pirates and on some occasions by the Indonesian authorities for alleged entrance into Indonesian territorial waters. As a result, our Malayan fishermen suffer great hardships, for on many occasions the fish catches of our Malayan fishermen were robbed by the pirates, and on some occasions their boats were confiscated by the Indonesian authorities. I have facts to substantiate these, if necessary. Therefore, I urge the Malayan Government to take this matter into serious consideration and to take immediate steps to relieve the plight of our fishermen.

As I see it, three steps which the Government should consider are: (1) the Malayan Government should provide adequate Marine Police for the protection of our fishing fleet by equipping the Marine Police with more and faster boats, in order to hunt down the pirates; (2) at present the Government is merely making a claim of three miles of territorial waters, whereas the Indonesian Government has claimed 12 miles—and unless the Indonesian Government is prepared to come to an agreement with our Government on a common fishing ground in the whole of the Straits of Malacca, then our Government should consider the imposition of more mileage of territorial waters—may be 12 miles—according to the circumstances and also to provide the means to enforce such a claim; (3) our Government should negotiate at once with the Indonesian Government for fishing agreement for fishing in the Straits of Malacca, whereby, I hope, the interests and friendly relationship of our two countries and the people can best be maintained: in this connection I wish to point out that the Indonesian Government already has a fishing agreement with the Singapore Govern-

ment and this can act as a guide for an agreement between Indonesia and Malaya.

The Minister of Internal Security (Dato' Dr. Ismail): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am sure that if the Honourable Member for Batu knew more about the work of the Marine Police, he would not have criticised this Branch and done it a great disservice. The Honourable Member has suggested that the patrol boats of the Marine Police do not give the assistance to fishermen in the Malacca Straits that they used to give in pre-Merdeka days. It is indeed true that the Marine Police patrols do not now have quite the same responsibilities for patrolling on the high seas that they used to discharge while the Royal Malayan Navy was building up its strength. In those days, the Marine Police patrols carried out extra duties on the high seas which our Navy, which is responsible for the protection of our vessels on the high seas, now perform. But I think, Sir, if I will inform you of some of the works of the Marine Police, works which they have already done and which are problems to the Police, you will be able to view the criticisms you have heard in their proper perspective.

First, I need not remind you that our coastline is over one thousand miles in length and much of the small islands abound in our waters. All these waters have to be patrolled by our Police boats. They are manned by Policemen whose duty it is to enforce the law in regard to marine shipping, fisheries, immigration and Customs Ordinance and to prevent the breaches thereof. They have to patrol not only territorial waters but also to land parties on the islands and on the isolated coastal villages as well as to visit and check fish *kelongs*. They have also a duty to do and will readily give assistance to the vessels as well as to the maritime communities or individuals in distress. It is a sad human failing to pick out for criticisms isolated instances when all has not gone well and to forget the good that has been done unobtrusively without a break

throughout the year. I would here like to pay a tribute to the work of our Marine Police who, with less resources than we would like them to have, are on arduous duty patrolling our coastal waters in small crafts for the larger part of each month.

It is a fact that what might be called piratical acts have been committed against our fishing fleets. Pursuing their calling, so far as we know, legitimately and innocently both in territorial waters and on the high seas, our patrols have in some cases arrived in time and intervened successfully. But, Sir, seas are vast and our Marine Police patrols have, as I have already informed you, many tasks to perform. Even on the land, the Police cannot always prevent crimes being committed. It is one of the duties of the Marine Police, and it is an important duty, to protect our fishing fleets in our waters, but they cannot be shepherding fishing vessels all the time. You can, however, be sure that our patrols give protection and have checked wrong doers on many occasions.

I am very sorry that the Honourable Member had thought fit to suggest that the hard-working and hard-pressed Branch of the Police Force, of whom we have every right to be proud, concentrated their attention on summoning poor fishermen to Court for petty irregularities. The Marine Police are, of course, bound, when they detect offences, to enforce the law. I have not received any complaints against the way in which the Marine Police have carried out their duties in enforcing the law. So far as I know, the Marine Police prosecute fishing vessels when they contravene the rules made under the Marine Shipping Ordinance in regard to the carrying out of the right type of life-saving equipment and sea-worthiness of the vessels themselves. These rules are made in the interests of the fishermen themselves and are designed to safeguard their lives and their families. Vessels that have no licences, or vessels that are used in contravention of their terms of licences, are liable to prosecution.

But I have not received complaints that the Marine Police have exercised their powers or carried out their duties in an arbitrary, discourteous or unsympathetic fashion. If I am given details of any such instances of discourtesy and of any irregularity by the Police, I can assure the House that I will be very glad, in order to maintain the good name of the Marine Police, to investigate them and to rectify any fault that there may be in our system of patrols. I can assure the House that "Operation Service" is carried out not only on land but also on the sea and that the Marine Police will do all they can to protect those who derive their livelihood from our seas.

Now, Sir, it is also my pleasure to reply to the adjournment speech of the Honourable Member for Rawang. The difficulties in our fishermen fishing between Malacca and Sumatra have caused us great concern and received our attention as long ago as 1957. This was due to the Indonesian claim to the territorial waters, which extend to 12 miles measured from the base lines connecting the outermost points of the islands of the Republic. Unfortunately, however, if their claim was entertained, then our fishermen would have no place in which to fish. However, in the interests of good relations between the two countries we decided to talk the matter over. We therefore asked the Indonesians to await the decision of the United Nations which was then sitting in conference at Geneva to decide on the extent of territorial waters. In the meantime we also advise our fishermen to refrain from fishing in waters in which they are not certain whether it comes under Malayan jurisdiction or Indonesian.

In April 1959 when Dr. Djuanda, the First Minister of Indonesia, came here one of the subjects which this Government took up with him was on the question of territorial waters and the rights of our fishermen to fish in our traditional fishing ground, which Indonesia now claims as hers. Dr. Djuanda assured the Prime Minister that there should be no difficulty in settling this issue, but that we should take the matter up on diplomatic level and that we could settle this matter with the help of experts from both countries. It was suggested that a joint committee be appointed to go into this matter and the suggestion was agreed to.

On the 21st of August, 1959, our Ambassador reported that he met the Head of the Asia and Pacific Directorate of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia and other officials, including a representative from the Navy, to discuss the incidents affecting Indonesian gun boat activities and interference with Malayan fishermen.

On our side the various Ministries consisting of External Affairs, Agriculture, Defence, Commerce and Industry and the Attorney-General met and made a recommendation to the Government as to what they should do in the matter. On the 26th of April, 1961, the Cabinet approved the Paper prepared by the Ministry of External Affairs on the subject of fishing in the Straits of Malacca. It was recommended that the two Governments should meet to discuss the subject. As a result of the decision of the Cabinet, the Ministry of External Affairs took up the matter with the Indonesian Government and is now waiting for a decision.

Adjourned at 7.00 p.m.