

Volume I
No. 10



Monday
13th July, 1964

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

OFFICIAL REPORT

**FIRST SESSION OF THE SECOND PARLIAMENT
OF MALAYSIA**

CONTENTS

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 1281]

WAKTU PERSIDANGAN MESHUARAT (USUL)
[Col. 1286]

BILL:

The Internal Security (Amendment) Bill [Col. 1287]

ADJOURNMENT SPEECHES:

Low Cost Housing Schemes—Ulu Kinta [Col. 1407]

Socio-Economic Ills of Teluk Anson [Col. 1408]

MALAYSIA
DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

Official Report

First Session of the Second Dewan Ra'ayat

Monday, 13th July, 1964

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

PRESENT:

- The Honourable Mr Speaker, TUAN SYED ESA BIN ALWEE, J.M.N., S.M.J., P.I.S. (Batu Pahat Dalam).
- ” the Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Defence, Minister of National and Rural Development and Minister of Lands and Mines, TUN HAJI ABDUL RAZAK BIN DATO' HUSSAIN, S.M.N. (Pekan).
- ” the Minister of Home Affairs and Minister of Justice, 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. (Sungei Siput).
- ” the Minister of Transport, DATO' HAJI SARDON BIN HAJI JUBIR, P.M.N. (Pontian Utara).
- ” the Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives, ENCHE' MOHAMED KHIR BIN JOHARI (Kedah Tengah).
- ” the Minister of Health, ENCHE' BAHAMAN BIN SAMSUDIN (Kuala Pilah).
- ” the Minister of Education, ENCHE' ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAJI TALIB (Kuantan).
- ” the Minister of Commerce and Industry, DR LIM SWEE AUN, J.P. (Larut Selatan).
- ” the Minister for Welfare Services, TUAN HAJI ABDUL HAMID KHAN BIN HAJI SAKHAWAT ALI KHAN, J.M.N., J.P. (Batang Padang).
- ” the Minister for Local Government and Housing, ENCHE' KHAW KAI-BOH, P.J.K. (Ulu Selangor).
- ” the Minister for Sarawak Affairs, DATO' TEMENGGONG JUGAH ANAK BARIENG, P.M.N., P.D.K. (Sarawak).
- ” the Assistant Minister of Commerce and Industry, TUAN HAJI ABDUL KHALID BIN AWANG OSMAN (Kota Star Utara).
- ” the Assistant Minister of Lands and Mines, ENCHE' MOHD. GHAZALI BIN HAJI JAWI (Ulu Perak).
- ” the Assistant Minister of National and Rural Development and Assistant Minister of Justice, ENCHE' ABDUL-RAHMAN BIN YA'KUB (Sarawak).

- The Honourable the Assistant Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives,
ENCHE' SULAIMAN BIN BULON (Bagan Datoh).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Youth, Culture and Sports,
ENGKU MUHSEIN BIN ABDUL KADIR (Trengganu Tengah).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Education,
ENCHE' LEE SIOK YEW, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Sepang).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL GHANI BIN ISHAK, A.M.N. (Melaka Utara).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL KARIM BIN ABU, A.M.N. (Melaka Selatan).
- „ WAN ABDUL KADIR BIN ISMAIL (Kuala Trengganu Utara).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAHIM ISHAK (Singapore).
- „ WAN ABDUL RAHMAN BIN DATU TUANKU BUJANG (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDUL RASHID BIN HAJI JAIS (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAUF BIN A. RAHMAN, K.M.N., P.J.K.
(Krian Laut).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAZAK BIN HAJI HUSSIN (Lipis).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL SAMAD BIN GUL AHMAD MIANJI (Pasir Mas Hulu).
- „ Y.A.M. TUNKU ABDULLAH IBNI ALMARHUM TUANKU ABDUL
RAHMAN, P.P.T. (Rawang).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI MOHD. SALLEH, A.M.N.,
S.M.J., P.I.S. (Segamat Utara).
- „ ENCHE' ABU BAKAR BIN HAMZAH (Bachok).
- „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN ABDULLAH (Kelantan Hilir).
- „ ENCHE' AHMAD BIN ARSHAD, A.M.N. (Muar Utara).
- „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN SAAID (Seberang Utara).
- „ CHE' AJIBAH BINTI ABOL (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' ALI BIN HAJI AHMAD (Pontian Selatan).
- „ O.K.K. DATU ALIUDDIN BIN DATU HARUN, P.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ DR AWANG BIN HASSAN, S.M.J. (Muar Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Muar Dalam).
- „ ENCHE' JONATHAN BANGAU ANAK RENANG (Sarawak).
- „ PENGARAH BANYANG ANAK JANTING (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN CHONG WEN, A.M.N. (Kluang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN SEONG YOON (Setapak).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN SIANG SUN (Bentong).
- „ ENCHE' CHEN WING SUM (Damansara).
- „ ENCHE' CHIA CHIN SHIN (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' FRANCIS CHIA NYUK TONG (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' CHIA THYE POH (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' CHIN FOON (Ulu Kinta).
- „ ENCHE' C. V. DEVAN NAIR (Bungsar).
- „ ENCHE' EDWIN ANAK TANGKUN (Sarawak).
- „ DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI ABDUL MAJID
(Johor Bahru Timor).
- „ DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI HASHIM, P.M.N.
(Jitra-Padang Terap).
- „ ENCHE' S. FAZUL RAHMAN, A.D.K. (Sabah).

- The Honourable ENCHE' GANING BIN JANGKAT (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' GEH CHONG KEAT, K.M.N. (Penang Utara).
- „ DR GOH KENG SWEE (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' HAMZAH BIN ALANG, A.M.N. (Kapar).
- „ ENCHE' HANAFI BIN MOHD. YUNUS, A.M.N., J.P. (Kulim Utara).
- „ ENCHE' HANAFIAH BIN HUSSAIN, A.M.N. (Jerai).
- „ ENCHE' HARUN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Baling).
- „ WAN HASSAN BIN WAN DAUD (Tumpat).
- „ ENCHE' HO SEE BENG (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' STANLEY HO NGUN KHIU, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN TO' MUDA HASSAN, A.M.N. (Raub).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN MOHD. NOORDIN, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Parit).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN SULAIMAN (Ulu Kelantan).
- „ TUAN HAJI HUSSAIN RAHIMI BIN HAJI SAMAN
(Kota Bharu Hulu).
- „ ENCHE' IKHWAN ZAINI (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' IBRAHIM BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Seberang Tengah).
- „ DATO' SYED JA'AFAR BIN HASAN ALBAR, P.M.N.
(Johor Tenggara).
- „ ENCHE' JEK YEUN THONG (Singapore).
- „ PENGHULU JINGGUT ANAK ATTAN (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' KADAM ANAK KIAI (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' KAM WOON WAH, J.P. (Sitiawan).
- „ ENCHE' EDMUND LANGGU ANAK SAGA (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' LEE KUAN YEW (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SAN CHOON, K.M.N. (Segamat Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SECK FUN (Tanjong Malim).
- „ ENCHE' AMADEUS MATHEW LEONG, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' LING BENG SIEW (Sarawak).
- „ DR LIM CHONG EU (Tanjong).
- „ ENCHE' LIM PEE HUNG (Alor Star).
- „ ENCHE' PETER LO SU YIN (Sabah).
- „ DR MAHATHIR BIN MOHAMAD (Kota Star Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' T. MAHIMA SINGH, J.P. (Port Dickson).
- „ ENCHE' JOE MANJAJI (Sabah).
- „ DR HAJI MEGAT KHAS, J.P., P.J.K. (Kuala Kangsar).
- „ ENCHE' MOHD. ARIF SALLEH, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED ASRI BIN HAJI MUDA, P.M.K.
(Pasir Puteh).
- „ ORANG TUA MOHAMMAD DARA BIN LANGPAD (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' MOHD. DAUD BIN ABDUL SAMAD (Besut).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED IDRIS BIN MATSIL, J.M.N., P.J.K., J.P.
(Jelebu-Jempol).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED NOORDIN BIN MASTAN, A.M.N., P.J.K.
(Seberang Selatan).

- The Honourable ENCHE' MOHD. TAHIR BIN ABDUL MAJID, S.M.S., P.J.K.
(Kuala Langat).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED YUSOF BIN MAHMUD, A.M.N. (Temerloh).
- „ ENCHE' MOHD. ZAHIR BIN HAJI ISMAIL (Sungei Patani).
- „ WAN MOKHTAR BIN AHMAD (Kemaman).
- „ TUAN HAJI MOKHTAR BIN HAJI ISMAIL (Perlis Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' MUHAMMAD FAKHRUDDIN BIN HAJI ABDULLAH
(Pasir Mas Hilir).
- „ TUAN HAJI MUHAMMAD SU'AUT BIN HAJI MUHD. TAHIR
(Sarawak).
- „ DATO' HAJI MUSTAPHA BIN HAJI ABDUL JABAR, D.P.M.S.,
A.M.N., J.P. (Sabak Bernam).
- „ ENCHE' MUSTAPHA BIN AHMAD (Tanah Merah).
- „ ENCHE' NG FAH YAM (Batu Gajah).
- „ DR NG KAM POH, J.P. (Teluk Anson).
- „ ENCHE' ONG KEE HUI (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN HAJI OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Hilir Perak).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Perlis Utara).
- „ ABANG OTHMAN BIN HAJI MOASILI (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN WOK (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' QUEK KAI DONG, J.P. (Seremban Timor).
- „ ENCHE' S. RAJARATNAM (Singapore).
- „ TUAN HAJI RAHMAT BIN HAJI DAUD, A.M.N.
(Johor Bahru Barat).
- „ ENCHE' RAMLI BIN OMAR (Krian Darat).
- „ TUAN HAJI REDZA BIN HAJI MOHD. SAID, P.J.K., J.P.
(Rembau-Tampin).
- „ RAJA ROME BIN RAJA MA'AMOR (Kuala Selangor).
- „ ENCHE' SANDOM ANAK NYUAK (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' SEAH TENG NGIAB, P.I.S. (Muar Pantai).
- „ ENCHE' D.R. SEENIVASAGAM (Ipoh).
- „ ENCHE' SIM BOON LIANG (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' SIOW LOONG HIN, P.J.K. (Seremban Barat).
- „ ENCHE' SNG CHIN JOO (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' SOH AH TECK (Batu Pahat).
- „ ENCHE' SULEIMAN BIN ALI (Dungun).
- „ PENGIRAN TAHIR PETRA (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' TAJUDIN BIN ALI, P.J.K. (Larut Utara).
- „ ENCHE' TAI KUAN YANG (Kulim Bandar Bharu).
- „ ENCHE' TAMA WENG TINGGANG WAN (Sarawak).
- „ DR TAN CHEE KHOON (Batu).
- „ ENCHE' TAN CHENG BEE, J.P. (Bagan).
- „ ENCHE' TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Melaka).
- „ ENCHE' TAN TSAK YU (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' TIAH ENG BEE (Kluang Utara).
- „ ENCHE' TOH THEAM HOCK (Kampar).

The Honourable PENGHULU FRANCIS UMPAU ANAK EMPAM (Sarawak).
 „ ENCHE' YEH PAO TZE (Sabah).
 „ ENCHE' YEOH TAT BENG (Bruas).
 „ ENCHE' STEPHEN YONG KUET TZE (Sarawak).
 „ TUAN HAJI ZAKARIA BIN HAJI MOHD. TAIB (Langat).

ABSENT:

The Honourable the Prime Minister, Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Youth, Culture and Sports, Y.T.M. TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN PUTRA AL-HAJ, K.O.M. (Kuala Kedah).
 „ the Minister of Labour, ENCHE' V. MANICKAVASAGAM, J.M.N., P.J.K. (Klang).
 „ the Minister of Information and Broadcasting, ENCHE' SENU BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Kubang Pasu Barat).
 „ DATO' ABDULLAH BIN ABDULRAHMAN, Dato' Bijaya di-Raja (Kuala Trengganu Selatan).
 „ DATU GANIE GILONG, P.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).
 „ ENCHE' ISMAIL BIN IDRIS (Penang Selatan).
 „ ENCHE' KHOO PENG LOONG (Sarawak).
 „ DATU KHOO SIAK CHIEW, P.D.K. (Sabah).
 „ ENCHE' KOW KEE SENG (Singapore).
 „ ENCHE' LIM HUAN BOON (Singapore).
 „ ENCHE' LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).
 „ DATO' LIM KIM SAN, D.U.T. (Singapore).
 „ DATO' NIK AHMAD KAMIL, D.K., S.P.M.K., S.M.J.K., P.M.N., P.Y.G.P., Dato' Sri Setia Raja (Kota Bharu Hilir).
 „ ENCHE' ONG PANG BOON (Singapore).
 „ ENCHE' S. P. SEENIVASAGAM (Menglembu).
 „ DATU DONALD ALOYSIUS STEPHENS, P.D.K. (Sabah).
 „ ENCHE' TAN TOH HONG (Bukit Bintang).
 „ DR TOH CHIN CHYE (Singapore).
 „ ENCHE' WEE TOON BOON (Singapore).
 „ ENCHE' YONG NYUK LIN (Singapore).

PRAYERS

(Mr Speaker *in the Chair*)

ORAL ANSWERS TO
 QUESTIONS

**STRIKE AT THE 3½ MILE,
 GOMBAK, KUALA LUMPUR**

1. **Dr Tan Chee Khoon (Batu)** asks the Minister of Labour to state whether he is aware of the strike at 3½ mile Gombak, Kuala Lumpur, which has lasted for almost 5 months and that the management has still refused to accept the strikers back in spite of

the fact that all the workers have agreed to drop their move to form a union for the time being.

The Minister of Health (Enche' Bahaman bin Samsudin): Mr Speaker, Sir, I am aware of the strike at 3½ mile Gombak.

With regard to the second part of the question, the matter does not arise any more as the strike has since been settled.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, may I ask the Honourable Minister whether he can enlighten this House as to the terms of the settlement arrived at.

Enche' Bahaman bin Samsudin: Mr Speaker, Sir, one of the terms of settlement includes a clause in respect of the question of recognition of the trade union, but the employers would be discussing this later on with a view to reaching agreement. The terms of the settlement are not known to me actually—they are known to the Ministry of Labour.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: That is not a very enlightening answer. I do not wish to press the Honourable Acting Minister of Labour too closely, but I do hope that he will tell us whether he is aware that in this case, in the national interest, the workers have made a great deal of sacrifice: they have been made to crawl on their feet and to crawl back to work. Will the Acting Minister of Labour look into this question and give an assurance that the workers will not in this case be exploited and made to crawl back to work?

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair (Bungsar): Arising from this case, would the Minister consider instituting measures enforcing the right of labour to join trade unions. It is obvious from what the Honourable Minister has told us that the right to join trade unions has not yet been settled and that it is still a matter for discussion. Should not this basic right be enforced under the law? Every worker has a right to join a trade union.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, that is begging the question. Will the Government consider passing legislation to force management to recognise trade unions when they are legitimately formed? I think this is the question posed by the Honourable Member for Bungsar.

Enche' Bahaman bin Samsudin: It is a matter entirely between the trade union and the employers concerned. We do not use any force.

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: Mr Speaker, Sir, what we were driving at was, would the Government consider taking legislative measures to oblige employers to recognise the right of labour to form trade unions?

Enche' Bahaman bin Samsudin: This is entirely a matter between the employers and the trade union. We do not use any force.

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: The question remains unanswered.

RESTRICTED RESIDENCE ORDINANCE AND PREVENTION OF CRIME ORDINANCE (RESTRICTEES IN RURAL AREAS)

2. Dr Tan Chee Khoon asks the Minister of Home Affairs to state whether he is aware that the present policy of restricting persons to rural areas under the Restricted Residence Ordinance and the Prevention of Crime Ordinance does not help such restricted persons to reform and lead a normal life but on the contrary leads them to frustration and further anti-social activities and the corruption of rural youth owing to the unavailability of employment or even accommodation in the areas to which they are restricted, and, if so, what action the Minister intends to take to remedy this situation.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Dato' Dr Ismail): The question submitted by the Honourable Member for Batu would seem to convey the sense that all restrictees are restricted to rural areas. This is not so. The criterion on the choice of an area to which a person is restricted lies in his trade or profession. Thus, precaution is always taken to see that restrictees could gain useful employment in the places to which they are restricted, if they want to.

The Police makes every endeavour to assist and look for employment for restrictees and, if it need be, makes recommendation for variations to Orders. Hence variations have been made to Orders to enable restrictees to move from one area to another to help them to gain employment.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, at least I am very glad of this assurance from the Minister that every effort will be made to find employment for the restrictees. Is the Minister aware that although he has given

this assurance, very little is being done with regard to the assurance, i.e. to find employment for the restrictees?

Dato' Dr Ismail: So far as I am aware, in the case of the Variation Orders that have come up to me I have always given consideration in favour of the restrictees. However, if the Honourable Member knows of any restrictees who would like to have Variation Orders, I would always be willing, subject always to the need of the security of this country, to entertain his petition.

Enche' Abu Bakar bin Hamzah (Bachok): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soalan tambahan. Ada-kah Yang Berhormat Menteri akan menimbang soal orang yang di-buang daerah supaya mereka itu di-tempatkan di-satu tempat supaya mereka mudah mencari makan untuk hidup?

Dato' Dr Ismail: I will always consider such cases and wherever possible, if it is not contrary to the interests of the security of the country, I will try to do it.

NATIONAL UNION OF PLANTATION WORKERS OFFICIALS TO SEE DIRECTORS OF ESTATES (M.P.I.E.A. GROUP) IN LONDON

3. Dr Tan Chee Khoon asks the Prime Minister to state his reasons for telling recently Officials of N.U.P.W. to go to London to see the directors of the Estates in the M.P.I.E.A. group for their wage claims.

The Deputy Prime Minister (Tun Haji Abdul Razak): The Prime Minister has asked me to state that the reason why he made the suggestion was that if the Union did not wish to negotiate with the M.P.I.E.A., then they might like to negotiate direct with the owners in London. It was only the Prime Minister's personal advice to the Union—that he would be happy to arrange for such a meeting.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: May I ask the Acting Prime Minister, was the Prime Minister aware that this piece

of advice had caused a great deal of concern not only in the Civil Service but also amongst the trade union circles. This is not neo-colonialism; this piece of advice was pure colonialism—*colonialism tulin* in the national language. May I ask the Acting Prime Minister, rather than asking the N.U.P.W. to go to London, should not the Prime Minister have asked the Rubber Growers Association to come from London to Kuala Lumpur to settle this dispute, rather than *vice versa*.

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: As I have said, this was the advice given by the Prime Minister at the time and as the Prime Minister is now in London, if the Honourable Member wishes to know more, I would suggest that he ask the Prime Minister in London (*Laughter*).

WAKTU PERSIDANGAN MESHUARAT (USUL)

Tun Haji Abdul Razak: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menhadangkan:

“Bahawa Majlis ini memerentahkan ia-itu mulai daripada hari ini sa-hingga tamat meshuarat yang ada sekarang, tiap² persidangan Majlis ini sa-belah petang hendaklah di-mulakan pada pukul 4.00 petang dan di-lanjutkan sampai pukul 8.00 malam kecuali jika Majlis membuat ketetapan yang lain.”

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, oleh sebab Meshuarat ini di-tetapkan tamat-nya pada 15hb ini dan di-sebabkan banyak lagi perkara² yang hendak di-bincangkan, maka saya menhadangkan Persidangan ini di-lanjutkan ia-itu daripada pukul 4 petang sa-hingga pukul 8 malam, tiap² petang.

Dato' Dr Ismail: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun menyokong chadangan ini.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

Bahawa Majlis ini memerentahkan ia-itu mulai daripada hari ini sa-hingga tamat meshuarat yang ada sekarang, tiap² persidangan Majlis ini sa-belah petang hendaklah di-mulakan pada pukul 4.00 petang dan di-lanjutkan sampai pukul 8.00 malam kecuali jika Majlis membuat ketetapan yang lain.

BILL

THE INTERNAL SECURITY (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

The Minister of Home Affairs and Minister of Justice (Dato' Dr Ismail):

Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that "an Act to amend the Internal Security Act, 1960" be read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to regulate the admission of students into specified institutions of higher education in the States of Malaya and Singapore in order to prevent those students who are likely to promote or participate in action prejudicial to the interest or security of Malaysia from being admitted as students into such institutions.

Honourable Members of this House are asked to support this Bill in the interest of the security of our nation. It is known that the communists have always aimed at the Universities and institutions of higher education as their targets for subversion. They have succeeded in doing so in the Nanyang University. Honourable Members will recall that had it not been for the prompt counter action taken by the Police in September and October, 1963, certain Communist groups in the Nanyang University would have posed a real threat to the security of Singapore. Despite this action by the Police, certain hard-core Communist supporters managed to remain at the Nanyang University and recently it has been necessary for the Police to arrest certain student leaders and agitators in order to break the Communist control over the Nanyang University. In this connection, Honourable Members would recall my press statement concerning these arrests made a few days ago.

The Nanyang University is a serious security problem because it provides the training ground for the Communists, and furthermore the issue of Chinese education and culture for which this University stands can easily be exploited by the Communists for their own ends. The Communist groups in the Nanyang University have been

actively engaged in subversive activities and in the subversion of other students through the medium of student organisations and other group activities. Communist influence is particularly noticeable in the Nanyang University Students' Union, the largest of the students bodies and it would seem likely that Communist infiltration of this Union would have continued if not for the action taken by the Police recently. Communist groups in the Nanyang University Students' Union have successfully established links with student organisations in Communist countries and are continuing to strengthen friendship with other important student bodies in Singapore and in the States of Malaya. It is known that about 50 per cent of the undergraduates of the Nanyang University come from the various States of Malaya. Although certain students from the various States of Malaya have some experience in clandestine Communist activities in Schools, it is known that on entering the Nanyang University they are initiated into a more advanced form of united front type of Communist work in legal student bodies in the University.

Now that action has been taken against the Communist groups in the Nanyang University, it is now considered necessary that legislation should be introduced to weed out the subversive elements from the prospective undergraduates seeking entry into all specified institutions of higher education including the Nanyang University both in Singapore and in the States of Malaya, in order that subversive elements may, in future, be not permitted to enter these institutions of higher education and use them for disseminating Communist ideologies and promoting activities prejudicial to the security of Malaysia. It is essential that subversive elements must be prevented from entering institutions of higher education in this country in order that the students may pursue their academic studies without lowering of scholastic standards and without being harassed by groups of Communist agitators in their midst, whose one and only aim is to use the Nanyang

University or other institutions of higher education and the students for their own evil ends.

This Bill provides that any specified institution in the States of Malaya and/ or Singapore shall not admit a student into such institution of higher education unless the student concerned has first obtained a certificate of suitability for admission in writing from the Chief Education Officer or Director of Education of the respective State in which he ordinarily resides or from the Chief Education Adviser, Ministry of Education, Kuala Lumpur, if he ordinarily resides outside the Federation of Malaysia. The Chief Education Officer, Director of Education or Chief Education Adviser shall issue the required certificate of suitability to the student on application unless, after making the necessary enquiries, they have reasonable grounds to believe that the applicant, if admitted to the said institution, would promote or is likely to promote or otherwise participate in action prejudicial to the interest or security of this country.

In effect any student wishing to join any specified institution of higher learning in the States of Malaya or Singapore will have to apply for a certificate of suitability to the Chief Education Officer or Director of Education of the respective State in which he ordinarily resides. The Chief Education Officer or Director of Education would then forward the application to the Security Authorities who will screen the student concerned against records kept by the Security Authorities in respect of persons of security interest. If the student concerned is not on security record, the Chief Education Officer or Director of Education will be accordingly informed by the Security Authorities and the student will be issued with a certificate of suitability for admission into the specified institution. If the student concerned is on adverse record with the Security Authorities then he will be refused a certificate of suitability by the Chief Education Officer or Director of Education, as the case may be. Let me make it quite clear that a certificate

of suitability will be refused only in the case of a student with a very bad security record. A certificate of suitability will not be withheld from a student because a member of his family or close relative is on adverse security record with the Security Authorities.

The Bill also provides that any student who fails to receive a certificate of suitability for admission into any specified institution may appeal to the Minister of Home Affairs. I cannot do more than assure all Hon'ble Members of the House that when an appeal is made to me, I shall examine each case very carefully before giving my decision. If there is any case of doubt regarding his suitability then I shall decide in his favour.

I would like to mention here that there will be no delay on the part of the Security Authorities in carrying out the necessary enquiries before advising the Education Authorities to issue the certificate of suitability to the students seeking admission into specified institutions of higher education. The Security Authorities will be given a certain time to complete their enquiries in order that students could be issued with their certificates of suitability or informed otherwise before the beginning of the University session each academic year. If the enquiries could not be completed within the specified time then certificates of suitability will be issued to the remaining applicants.

Hon'ble Members of this House will no doubt remember that in appreciation of the great dangers to this country arising from communist subversion, this House approved the Internal Security Act in 1960. Today Hon'ble Members are asked to support this Bill as an amendment to the Internal Security Act. It may be argued by some why this objective was not achieved by the introduction of a similar amendment to the Education Act. This amendment is being made to the Internal Security Act because the weeding out of subversive elements from the prospective undergraduates seeking entry into all specified institutions of higher education in Singapore and the States of Malaya is considered

a security problem rather than an educational problem.

I am aware that this Bill has encroached on the autonomy of the Universities regarding admission of students, but as Hon'ble Members of this House are aware, the Malaysian Government is strongly opposed to communism and communism is outlawed in all the States comprising Malaysia. It would, therefore, be erroneous to take the view that Universities and institutions of higher learning in this country, because of their jealous defence of their autonomy, should not be concerned with the security of the country, especially when there are clear indications that the communists are taking the Universities and other institutions of higher learning as the targets of subversion.

It is a well established fact that the Communist United Front Organisations make use of University premises as a breeding ground for the recruitment of potential converts and the dissemination of communist ideologies detrimental to the survival of our young nation. In order to ensure the peace and security of our young nation against communist subversion, it is essential that there should be some form of government control which will be relinquished when the country is free from communist subversion. This is necessary in order to ensure that Universities are not used as sanctuaries for political subversion, or as a cover for communist activities under the banner of academic freedom. It is, therefore, considered desirable that students who are known to have participated in communist activities are prevented from entering the Universities in order that subversive activities may not be perpetuated in Universities. Youths and students are priority targets of international communism and the Communist Party of Malaya has since its inception placed special emphasis on this aspect of its work. It was Lenin who said that "He who has the Youth has the Future".

Now that action has been taken in the case of the Nanyang University, the communists will to some extent

find it more difficult to recruit and build up their cadres in that University. The Communist Party of Malaya has exploited the Nanyang University and will try to continue to do so, but because of the obstacle placed in their way, they are likely from now on to increase their efforts to influence and control students and their organisations in the other Universities. Thus these other Universities will become more vulnerable to communism. This Bill, which I am asking Hon'ble Members of this House to support, seeks to prevent such a situation from taking place. We are proud of our young Universities and the academic standards reached at these Universities. We should, therefore, strive to prevent these institutions from being exploited by the communists in order that they may take their rightful places in our democratic society and produce graduates whose academic standing in the community will be unquestioned.

Before I formally move the motion I would like to inform the House the method used by communists to control students' activities in the Nanyang University.

Prior to 1960/61 elections to Nanyang University Students' Union the outgoing Secretariat of the Nanyang University Students' Union, which was communist controlled, planned their campaign at a meeting held under cover of a picnic.

On 13th April, 1960, the Secretariat convened a meeting of all class representatives in order to select an Elections Committee which would organise the forthcoming Nanyang University Students' Union elections. The meeting was presided over by two leading communists who succeeded in getting eight communist supporters selected to the Elections Committee.

On 25th April, 1960, this Communist controlled Elections Committee announced a ruling that all canvassing for the forthcoming elections would be carried out by the Canvassing Section of the Elections Committee and that no uncontrolled canvassing would be permitted. Non-communist students

objected to this ruling but were summarily overruled. As a result of this ruling, of the 158 candidates who had submitted their names for election, 34 opposition candidates withdrew as they knew their case was hopeless if they could not conduct free canvassing and a further 59 candidates were approached individually by the pro-communist faction and persuaded to withdraw. Thus, only 65 candidates, all of whom were acceptable to the pro-communist leaders, stood for the 47 places on the Executive Committee of the Nanyang University Students' Union. All of these 65 students had been carefully "vetted" by the communists.

During the election in March this year, pro-communist control over the Executive Committee of the Nanyang University Students' Union was threatened by a non-communist opposition group who called themselves the Nanyang University Students Fellowship Association. This was the first occasion that the communist faction had been faced by an organised opposition in an election campaign.

To offset this opposition, the outgoing communist dominated Executive Committee set up an 11-man Election Committee to organise the election. This Committee contained, of course, persons acceptable to the communists.

126 candidates submitted their names for the 47 seats on the Executive Committee; 65 of whom were supporters of the pro-communist faction, 53 candidates were members of the non-communist opposition and 8 were non-aligned.

In the first instance, the Elections Committee published a pamphlet which was supposed to contain a glossary of all candidates for the forthcoming elections. However, only candidates who were acceptable to the communists were included in this glossary. Thus, the Elections Committee made clear to all students which candidates were acceptable. On polling day itself, a new system was introduced when ballot papers were distributed to students. Each student was required to sign for the receipt of his ballot paper and each

paper was serially numbered. Therefore, each student was made aware that after the election it would be possible to check to see for which candidate each student voted. By implication, the Elections Committee had made it clear that students were expected to vote for those candidates listed in the glossary. With this hint of intimidation, it is not surprising that all 47 seats were captured by candidates acceptable to the communist faction.

Similar methods were used by the pro-communist faction to capture control of the Executive bodies of other student organisations in the University and in particular the Nanyang University Political Science Society, the Dramatic Research Society, the Chinese Language and Literature Society and the Nanyang University History and Geography Society.

Sir, I beg to move.

Enche' S. Rajaratnam (Singapore):
Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, may I move an amendment to this Bill under Standing Order 53 (4):

"That the Bill be read a second time on this day six months."

Mr Speaker, Sir, this House will no doubt be aware of the serious demeanour that the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs put on when he introduced this Bill. I am very glad he did not adopt the flipant attitude he did when he introduced the Constitution (Amendment) Bill.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I think, perhaps three-quarters of the speech of the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs was devoted to communism, prevention of communism, international communism; and he stated that communism is outlawed in this country. Mr Speaker, Sir, perhaps, I think, the Minister of Home Affairs, who is also the Minister of Justice, is a little confused. May I ask him, when the time comes for him to reply, under what law is communism outlawed in this country? As far as I know, subversion is outlawed in this

country. But communism *per se*—again not being a lawyer, I stand to be corrected—is not outlawed in this country.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Minister of Home Affairs also dwelled at great length on communism in the Nanyang University, and he talked about the ways the students in the Nanyang University had been intimidated, the way elections had been rigged—that, Mr Speaker, Sir, is not the prerogative of the Nanyang University: it is the prerogative of all political parties in this country. But, may I add, the fact that the recent swoop in the Nanyang University was, in the words of the Minister of Home Affairs, to clean up communist subversion in that University is an eloquent testimony that the Government has adequate powers under the present legislation to prevent and to kill any subversion, communist or otherwise, in any of our higher seats of learning.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I was astonished to hear the Minister so lightly saying that this Bill has no doubt encroached on the autonomy of the Universities. Now, although this Bill on paper has nothing to do with the university education, it comes under the guise of an amendment to the Internal Security Act. No doubt the Minister is aware that this Bill strikes at the very root of the autonomy of the universities, and I am surprised that the Minister has seen fit

Dato' Dr Ismail: On a point of order. The Honourable Member is moving an amendment, but he is opposing the Bill, which he can very well do in the debate on this Bill. So far he has not given any reason as to why this Bill should be postponed to “on this day six months”. I am still waiting for his explanation as to why he wants this Bill postponed for six months. His remarks so far have been to oppose the Bill, which he can very well do in the debate on the second reading of this Bill.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, may I beg to differ. In asking for an amendment that this Bill be postponed to “six months this day”, I can

show how justified it is, and one of my points of justification is my opposition to the Bill. Surely that is legitimate.

Mr Speaker: You should give the reasons for the postponement.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Yes, I will do so in the course of my speech. But surely it is in order for me to comment on the speech of the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs before I do so.

Dato' Dr Ismail: Mr Speaker, Sir, I want your ruling on Standing Order 53 (4), because it is stated therein:

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

So far the Honourable Member is going to debate the Bill as it stands in the second reading. He has given no reason why he wants this Bill to be postponed “this day six months” if he is going to continue like this, then when his amendment is defeated he will repeat the same speech.

Mr Speaker: According to Standing Order 53 (4) as mentioned by the Honourable Minister, you should only mention “why” you want to postpone the Bill for six months, and the Minister has further said that you would repeat the same thing when we come to the original Bill.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: With your permission, I shall in the course of my speech show why I am asking for this amendment. As to the fear that I will be speaking twice, Mr Speaker, Sir, I have no desire to do so, nor have I the time to burden the House with a monologue on my part. If I may continue, Mr Speaker . . .

Mr Speaker: Yes, you can continue strictly on your amendment, but not on the general policy.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: I will now try to justify this amendment of postponing the Bill "on this day six months".

Mr Speaker: You have time to speak on the general policy when we come to the original Bill. You just mention now as to why the Bill should be postponed to "on this day six months".

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: In view of the storm of protests that have arisen since the Bill has been published and made known to the public, that to me is adequate testimony that this Bill should be read this day six months. If that does not satisfy the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs, I do not know what does.

Mr Speaker, Sir, no Bill in recent times, not even the infamous Internal Security Act itself, has aroused so much opposition in so short a time. Since it was published there has been a steady stream of protests against this Bill. No democratic Government would even consider introducing such a Bill. Not even a Communist Government has ever thought it fit to prevent students from pursuing higher studies. But here is a party, the Alliance Party, which prides itself as the model of democracy in this part of the world . . .

Dato' Dr Ismail: If the Honourable Member is going to continue on that tenor, may I get a promise from him that he will not repeat that speech when the Bill is read a second time? May I get a promise from him that after his amendment is taken through he will not repeat that speech in this House, because it is very boring to hear the same monotonous voice in this House.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Perhaps the Minister did not hear me just now. I have already said that neither have I the time nor the energy to repeat the speech a second time; nor do I wish to burden this House with my monologue. Is not that assurance enough, Mr Speaker, Sir?

May I repeat here again that the Alliance Party which prides itself as

the model of democracy in this part of the world has the audacity to introduce this Bill. Why can this be done? Because the 12 years of the Emergency and the Internal Security Act have cowed the people to such an extent that to oppose this Bill would be to invite trouble. The Minister of Home Affairs shamelessly tells this House that the Internal Security Act was fully endorsed by the people when they returned the Alliance to power. It was Soekarno and the Peoples Action Party which helped the Alliance to get such a large majority. It was fear which won the election for the Alliance Party. It is only through fear that the Alliance can continue to rule. Be that as it may, even endorsement of the Internal Security Act at the recent elections does not empower the Alliance Government to put the youth of our country in chains.

However, the infamous Internal Security Act is now being amended to frighten millions unborn. Is this what one can expect of a democratic Government? For the essence of democracy is the amount of freedom left to the individual and its organisations. But the Alliance Government has seriously undermined the Constitution and has eaten away the fundamental rights of the citizens that have been guaranteed in the Constitution. The Press is hamstrung, speech is controlled, movement is restricted, people are detained arbitrarily without trial and the right to association has been made a mockery. The laws of citizenship solemnly agreed to have been trampled upon. What were supposed to be Emergency Regulations, owing their existence to annual approval of the legislature, have been made a part of the permanent laws of the country to keep the Alliance permanently in power by stifling any opposition.

Now with this monstrous and preposterous piece of legislation the Government aims to usurp the traditional powers of the seats of learning. This is a most scandalous state of affairs. It will only create more bitterness, hatred and frustration. It

will drive the people to the wall and is the defeatist way of fighting international Communism.

Let us now examine the implications of this Bill amongst the secondary school students particularly those in the post senior classes. For the Chief Education Officers to write letters of suitability, they must have evidence and this evidence can only be furnished by the Special Branch. Now, for the Special Branch to do so they must move amongst the students. This is impracticable since being adults they will at once be spotted out and exposed. Hence the only way they can do so is by recruiting stool pigeons from amongst the students populations. This is what Mr P. P. Narayanan on Saturday described as Gestapoism with a vengeance.

What type of students will invite the Special Branch's attention? Students with political ideologies, students critical of the Government, students critical of the existing system, social, political or otherwise.

Hence there will be widespread fear among secondary school students, parents and teachers to discuss freely politics, ideologies, current affairs and to air views that are not in agreement with the Government. To many students and parents no ticket to the university means the shattering of their long cherished dreams to pieces. The price of no university education is too high and the risk is not worth taking. The danger to this country is not that there are too many questionable ideas. The danger is that there are too little ideas and ideals. In fact, almost complete absence of liberal thinking of our youth. There is a lack of organised and independent thought and critical views. The absence of political activities and thinking in the University of Malaya is a clear indication of the tragic failure of our educational system.

I am reliably informed that recently a group of the students of the University of Malaya tried to form the *Pantai Forum* to discuss current affairs. The Government not only frowned on this but called up some

of the students concerned and warned them that it was not healthy for them to do so. Such is the extent of Government interference with student activity in the University of Malaya. Revolutionary steps to rescind this trend in education is long overdue. And now this Bill will close further the windows to freedom and ideals. This short-sightedness and utter lack of understanding of merits of our youth cannot but be more deeply regretted by all.

The electorate has given the Alliance Party such a huge majority. The voters must rue the day they did so. For the Alliance Government has been emboldened to present such an obnoxious Bill which if passed will restrict the inalienable right of our children to get an education commensurate with their mental capacity. The restriction is not based on merits or attainments or character but on the report of an officer of the Special Branch. Chief Education Officers are going to be the scapegoats for the unpopular decision of barring our children from university education.

Mr Speaker, Sir, essentially I am a simple-minded man (*Laughter*) and I must confess that I am unable to follow the tortuous way of the Alliance Government in their presentation of this Bill.

Chief Education Officers are one of the most hard pressed people in this country. Imagine the voluminous amount of work they have to do with the extremely high school population. Now with the Comprehensive Secondary Schools it would be impossible for them to spare any time to play the role of a Special Branch officer. Furthermore, the Chief Education Officers are in no way qualified to take on such added responsibilities. Hence to my simple mind it is obvious that the dirty work will have to be done by the Special Branch.

Mr Speaker, Sir, in addition to being simple-minded, I also believe in calling a spade a spade. Why should not the Government direct that such letters of suitability be obtained from

the Director of the Special Branch in each State? That should put things in their proper perspective and relieve the overburdened Chief Education Officers from such an obnoxious task. We, therefore, call on the Government to have the honesty to put the Director of the Special Branch in each State to do this dirty work and not hide under the Chief Education Officers if at all this law is necessary. The Government should not be so cowardly to hide behind the Chief Education Officers. It should have the strength, conviction and the honesty to put the Minister of Home Affairs himself do the dirty work. Or, is the Minister so tired of signing detention orders that he wants to pass the buck on to the Chief Education Officers? At this stage, Mr Speaker, Sir, may I say that God moves in a mysterious way his wonders to perform. In this connection, Sir, the Alliance Government moves in a mysterious way its evils to perform.

Mr Speaker, Sir, despite the fact that the Alliance Party has been in power since 1955 they must be realistic enough to know that parties come and go, that governments rise and fall, but the universities and colleges as seats of higher learning will, we hope, remain forever when all of us in this House will have departed from this mundane world.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I have been a member of the Council of the University of Malaya from 1959 to 1963 and it is a well-known fact that not only the University of Malaya, but indeed all the universities all over the world, are very jealous of their autonomy even though they may be fully supported from the Government funds. At one of the early meetings of the Council of the University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur Division, the Council piously expressed its affirmation that its autonomy and, in particular, its academic freedom of the University of Malaya would be respected by the Government. At that time there was no cause for alarm, nor had the University of Malaya then had any inkling of the shape of things to come.

Mr Speaker, Sir, academic freedom is the very cornerstone of university education and this matter is the prerogative of the Senate of any university and the Senate is very jealous of this right. On this matter, even the Council of the university which is the executive arm of the university cannot interfere with the working of the Senate on matters academic, e.g. admission of students to the university is solely a matter for the Senate to decide.

The first inkling of Government interference with the autonomy of the University of Malaya was when the Government sought the views of the Council of the University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur Division, on the University of Malaya Act, 1961. It is no secret that when that matter came up for discussion in the University Council the members of the Senate to the University Council together with other Council members at that time expressed grave concern over this inroad into the autonomy of the University of Malaya.

May I now, Mr Speaker, Sir, with your permission, read Article 47 of the Constitution which says:

“Provided that, except with the agreement of the Minister, students who have been awarded Federal or State scholarships or other similar financial assistance from public funds for University degree courses, shall not be refused admission if they satisfy such requirement.”

Mr Speaker, Sir, the University of Malaya Graduates' Society has also expressed concern over this matter and has made representation to the Government. Thus it will be seen that the University of Malaya and its Graduates' Society have been alarmed over this erosion of University autonomy.

Then, last year I need hardly remind this House about the furore over the last Vice-Chancellor of the University of Singapore. There you have the case of a Vice-Chancellor who was in the first instance *persona grata* to the Party in power, was later, in the words of a distinguished academic personality in the present University of Malaya, hounded out of the University of Singapore by that same

party. And this was aided and abetted by the Alliance Government. This event has clearly shown how governments can and have interfered with the autonomy of the University of Singapore.

This event has also caused grave concern to the Guild of Graduates of the University of Malaya. For the first time in the history of that Guild it called an extraordinary meeting on 12th November, 1963, and by an overwhelming majority of those present expressed concern over events in Singapore and finally passed the following resolution. With your permission, Mr Speaker, Sir, may I read the resolution:

"That this house views with grave concern the events which led to the resignation of the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Singapore and recommends to the Council that the Council shall seek an assurance from the Government of Malaysia that it will take steps to ensure respect for the autonomy and academic freedom of the universities of our country."

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Council of the University of Malaya referred this resolution back to the Guild to draw their attention to the fact that the resolution, as it stood, was *ultra vires* of section 4 (R) of the University Constitution which does not permit the University of Malaya to deal with matters not concerning the University.

At the adjourned meeting of the Guild of Graduates of the University of Malaya held on 18th December, 1963, by an overwhelming majority the Guild passed this resolution. May I, with your permission, Mr Speaker, Sir, read this resolution:

"That this house views with grave concern the events which led to the resignation of the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Singapore and recommends to the Council that the Council shall seek an assurance from the Government of Malaysia that it will take steps to ensure respect for the autonomy and academic freedom of the University so that what has happened recently in the University of Singapore will not happen here."

Thus it will be seen that in December, 1961, some members of the Senate of the University Council of the University of Malaya, together with other members as well, expressed

concern over this inroad into the autonomy and academic freedom of the University of Malaya. The University of Malaya Graduates Society also showed concern. Further the resignation of the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Singapore caused grave concern to the Guild of Graduates of the University of Malaya.

No Bill introduced by the Alliance Government, not even the Internal Security Act itself, has drawn so much controversy and condemnation from such a wide cross section of the public. With your permission, Sir, may I quote some of these protests?

On the 10th Anniversary of the University of Singapore Graduates Society, Dr S. Kumarapathy, the President, said:

"We cannot accept such a move as we are apprehensive of the implications and consequences of such a measure."

This comes from the Graduates Society of the University of Singapore.

At an emergency meeting of the University of Malaya Graduates Society held on 7-7-64, the President, Mr Peter D. Mayo, said, and I quote, as follows:

"The Society strongly objected to the Bill in principle although the intention of the Government might have been well meant. The Society felt that a citizen with suitable qualifications was entitled to the higher level of education that he was capable of achieving. The Society felt that it was up to the University to decide whom it should admit and that freedom of expression is the right of every individual in a democratic society."

He declared:

"The Society is convinced that the Bill, if passed, will completely destroy these principles. The Bill will prevent a qualified student from receiving further education for reasons other than lack of academic qualifications. The University will be prevented from exercising one of its fundamental rights of selecting the most qualified students in the country."

Mr Mayo said that it was clear that the only manner in which a student might be judged unsuitable was by the expression of opinion regarded by the Government as disloyal or subversive in nature. He further said:

"It is obvious to the Society that the inevitable result of the Bill will be (a) to push young citizens into subversion from

sheer frustration by being denied the education they seek and (b) to remove the last possible chance of converting into loyal and useful citizens young people who have already suffered the disadvantages of an unfortunate background."

Mr Speaker, Sir, on Friday, 3rd July, 1964, the President of the Congress of Unions of Employees in the Public and Civil Services, Mr V. E. Jesudoss, said:

"We agree that disloyal students are a menace to society and should be put in their places, but the necessary screening work should be left entirely in the hands of experts who are charged with the responsibility.

The Bill does not mention those who are in the civil services and industries.

Perhaps, the intention is to pass the buck to the heads of Government Departments and employers.

We live in a democratic society and we do not want gestapos among the rank and file of the civil service.

If this Bill is passed, it can have a demoralising effect on the civil service."

Then, Mr Speaker, Sir, on 4th July, 1964, 150 members of the Students Union of the University of Singapore turned up at an emergency meeting "to voice fears of miscarriage of justice if such a law was promulgated."

Even the newly formed Democratic Socialist Club which is a pro-P.A.P. Government Club in a statement on 4th July, 1964, stated:

"Bearing in mind that it is intrinsically undesirable for the Government to screen students, we hold that this later move by the Central Government is manifestly worse.

We voice our objection to such an amendment which would only be another step towards making a mockery of democracy.

We emphasise that to accept students on the basis of a 'suitability certificate' is repugnant, for we believe that in principle no student should be rejected on grounds other than academic qualifications."

The Club asked for the criteria on which such certificates would be issued and if a student's pro-government sentiments meant automatic suitability. The Club also asked:

"How can we ensure that children of Opposition Party members and leaders are given a fair deal? Discretion is now in the hands of the Chief Education Officers. What assurance have we that such arbitrary power will not give rise to abuse?"

The Club further said:

"We strongly urge the Central Government to re-assess its thinking regarding the proposed amendment which, if implemented, can deprive students of the basic right of a higher education."

Mr Speaker, Sir, then, on the 5th July, 1964, the National Union of Malayan Students, one of the largest student bodies in this country, in a statement expressed:

"Deep concern over newspaper reports that a law, which required students to produce 'suitability certificates' from Chief Education Officers before they were admitted to higher institutions of learning, is to be introduced in the Parliament."

It further says:

"We believe in the fundamental rights of students in Malaysia to higher education irrespective of political convictions. The Malaysian Government has the responsibility to consult and discuss this issue with representative student organisation.

We believe that University admission is prerogative the individual constitution of higher learning and, if any student goes beyond the campus with his political convictions, then a law should be passed to charge him in Court."

On the 5th July, 1964, again, the National Union of Teachers, Selangor Branch, at its Annual General Meeting passed this resolution:

"The Union strongly support academic freedom in this country and is very gravely concerned over the amendment to Internal Security Act regarding higher education.

However, this Annual General Meeting feels that the Internal Security Act is more than sufficient to safeguard the country from subversive elements. The appointment of Chief Education Officers is morally unjustified and is irreconcilable with the basic principles of democracy. Besides putting academic freedom in a straight jacket, the Union feels that the amendment would place powers of selection in the hands of the dominant political party in the country or other partisan groups through pressure on various Chief Education Officers."

In addition, the President said that,

"The Government should, therefore, reconsider its decision. The right to the freedom of learning is one of the basic human rights enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. This right should, therefore, be upheld if our democracy is to survive."

On Monday, 6th July, 1964, the executive committee of the 17th Student Council, University of Singapore

Students' Union, met and resolved as follows:

"We note with serious apprehension the news of the Internal Security (Amendment) Bill proposed to be enacted during the current sitting of the Malaysian Parliament.

"And believing firstly that the principal of the proposed Internal Security (Amendment) Bill is incompatible with the concept of the right of every citizen to an education in a democracy.

"Secondly, that admission to institutions of higher learning should be dependent solely on academic merit,

"And thirdly, that the Bill if enacted is open to abuse.

"Hereby strongly urge the Central Government to withdraw the proposed Bill in the interests of democracy,

"And further urge all Members of the Parliament and Senate to prevent such a Bill from being enacted."

On 8th July, 1964, the University of Malaya Students' Union resolved to urge the Government to withdraw the Internal Security Act (Amendment) Bill, 1964, which requires students to produce "suitability certificates" from the Chief Education Officers before being admitted to institutions of higher learning.

The Union further stated:

"We believe that the arbitrary denial of the fundamental constitutional right to higher education for all the young citizens of this nation will be detrimental to the progress and future well-being of our country.

"We believe that the provisions in the Internal Security (Amendment) Bill infringe upon university autonomy and violate the principle of academic freedom.

"The Union also protested that the Bill was not a correct answer to counter subversive activities and would not serve to eradicate anti-national elements existing in the country."

It urged the Government to take more positive and democratic measures to counter and eradicate subversion in the country and to withdraw the Bill.

Mr Speaker, Sir, on Friday, 10th July, Mr Chin Chee Meow, Chairman of the United Chinese Schools Management Committee stated that,

"It would be unfair to deny them higher education or make things difficult for them just because among their lot there are students whose ideology is questionable.

"Such unsound and misguided ideology can always be rectified if given the right type of education.

"The Internal Security Act (Amendment) Bill served no useful purpose for the simple reason that students of bad character can always be expelled, and those found to engage in subversive activities can be dealt with under the laws of this land.

"On the contrary its enforcement would only bring adverse effect on the students' mind and would also bring down enrolment figures to higher educational institutions."

He then appealed to the Government to reconsider its decision to amend the Act so that the right to freedom of learning in this country can prevail.

Even the Malayan Trades' Union Congress in a statement issued on Friday, 10th July, expressed, "grave concern over the proposed move which would strike at the very root of freedom of educational pursuits", and stated:

"This move is a threat to fundamental freedom.

"The gradual nibbling away of our limited freedoms would surely lead to setting up of a police state."

Mr Speaker, Sir, these are not my words. These are the words of the Malayan Trades' Union Congress.

The Statement further stated that on the one hand we were fighting Soekarno's guided democracy and on the other "our own government is attempting to introduce a camouflaged form of guided democracy."

Even the *Straits Times* has been awakened to express its opposition to this Bill, though in language couched with great care lest it should incur the displeasure of the Government. Again, in today's editorial of the *Straits Times*, you can see that the *Straits Times* also expressed concern over this Bill.

Mr Speaker, Sir, on Saturday, 11th July, 1964, addressing a mass rally organised by the Malaysian Trades Union Congress to protest against the Bill, Mr P. P. Narayanan, one of the Malaya's leading trade unionists, declared:

"If this Bill is passed, then the door to higher learning will be closed to many, not because they are unintelligent but because they are subjected to *Gestapoism*.

Good students will be branded as bad ones, because they read Karl, Marx, Lenin, Khrushchev, Mao Tse Tung, and also they sport a Castro beard instead of having a clean shave."

On the proposal in the Bill to grant Chief Education Officers the power to screen students, Mr Narayanan said:

"The Chief Education Officers will have the right to say 'No' and with that one word seal the fate of a good student."

Mr Narayanan said the Government was "too hasty" in granting absolute powers to Chief Education Officers to award good or bad conduct certificates to students seeking to enter institutions of higher learning. He added:

"The Bill, if passed, will make a mockery of our Parliamentary Democracy and a shame of our free and democratic way of life."

The Government with its overwhelming majority can pass anything it likes, but it should not adopt *Totalitarian* methods to defend our parliamentary democracy.

"This Bill is a knockout blow to freedom and liberty, it will give Soekarno more ammunition to fire at us."

Mr Speaker, Sir, on that same day a resolution calling on the Minister of Home Affairs to withdraw the Bill was passed at a meeting of professional associations called by the Malayan Teachers' National Congress. Five delegates were elected to see the Minister. They are Mr Teerath Ram, President of the Malayan Teachers' National Congress, Mr Peter Mayo, President of the University of Malaya Graduate Society, Mrs F. R. Bhupalan, President of the Women Teachers' Union, Mr Heng Cheng Swee of the Hong Kong University Alumni Association and Dr S. Parampalam.

The Malayan Trades' Union Congress tonight sent a telegram to the Acting Prime Minister, Tun Haji Abdul Razak, urging the Government to withdraw the Bill which is due for debate on Monday.

Mr Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members of this House will, I hope, notice that I have exercised great restraint in my language today. But other bodies and institutions have not been

so temperate in their language. Let me recall very briefly to this House excerpts of what I have already quoted. The President of C.U.E.P.A.C.S., Mr V. E. Jesudoss said:

"We believe in a democratic society and we do not want *Gestapoes* among the rank and file of the civil service."

Mr P. P. Narayanan has also said that this Bill if passed will subject our students to *Gestapoism*. He also asked the Government not to adopt *Totalitarian* methods to defend our parliamentary democracy.

Mr Speaker, Sir, it will thus be seen from the foregoing that this Internal Security (Amendment) Bill has been vehemently condemned and opposed by a wide cross section of our society involving graduates societies, students and teacher unions, the President of C.U.E.P.A.C.S. and the M.T.U.C. and no one in his right senses will label them as communist inspired or communist front organisations.

Hence, the Socialist Front calls on this House to discuss this Bill six months hence.

As I mentioned before, I have been a member of the Council of the University of Malaya from 1959 to 1963. As such, I am conscious and afraid of the academic consequences of the passage of this Bill. Again, as I have stated before, the resignation of the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Singapore has caused grave concern in academic circles and that University will find it difficult to recruit men of calibre to fill that post and man its staff.

If this Bill is passed by this House, then second rate professors and lecturers will come to teach our third rate students. No self-respecting academic man will consider coming to teach in our universities and colleges. A person who has breathed of the free air of academic freedom, say, in Oxford and Cambridge, would not condescend to come to the stultified and nauseating atmosphere of our universities. Moreover, our local men of calibre too may not consider taking jobs with our universities and may consider going abroad to teach.

Thus inevitably academic standards will fall. Besides, the passage of this Bill will have a demoralising effect on the present staff and students of our universities and colleges.

I stand corrected, but I have searched my mind and have consulted many academic people and all are agreed that nowhere else in this world—not even in Moscow—is such a letter of suitability required as a prerequisite for entrance to higher seats of learning. Hence the passage of this Bill will make us the laughing stock in the academic world. Foreign men of distinction, men of scholarship with an international reputation, will look on us with the contempt that we deserve and, of course, will not touch our universities with a barge pole. No learned man worthy of his salt would want to be a professor or a lecturer in our universities. Recruitment of staff without this Bill is, as Honourable Members know, difficult enough; with the passage of this Bill, it may be virtually impossible to do so.

Our universities will become a tool of the Government if this Bill is passed. There will be political control over our seats of higher learning and the ancient and sacred rights of the universities will be a mockery. Our universities will fall into disrepute and their standing in the academic world will be seriously undermined.

To make matters worse for our rising generation, although it is not stated specifically in the Bill, such letters of suitability will also be applied to students going abroad—I stand corrected on this. Thus, if a student in a misguided moment during a school debate has railed against the Government and this gets to the ears of the Special Branch or is heard by a Special Branch stool pigeon, then he is for ever condemned to being denied higher education not only in Malaysia but also abroad as well. Such a monstrosity I have never heard of and if such a letter of suitability is ever issued to a student going abroad, I know other universities will treat it with the contempt it deserves, i.e., throw it into a waste paper basket.

The Bill also casts a serious slur on the teaching profession. The traditionally accepted fact that teachers mould the character and outlook of their pupils is brushed aside and the secret evidence of a policeman would put an end to the ambitions and aspirations of our future leaders. Education will be stultified and we would be making monsters of our young ones.

Some may say that this Bill is necessary—as the Honourable Minister has said—in the interests of the security of the nation. I do not agree that students who go to a university can be a threat to the security of the nation. I do not agree that ideas and knowledge can be a threat. If any country is afraid of ideas and knowledge, then I say woe betide that country. You cannot muzzle knowledge and you cannot shut out ideas. Since the university is the highest seat of learning and the fountain of knowledge you have to preserve the freedom enjoyed by the universities. After all, the cream of the country are gathered there and are guided by men of eminence and scholarship, respected and highly regarded in the international world.

Mr Speaker: I do not like to interrupt you, but I would like to know how long are you going to take.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Ten to fifteen minutes more, Sir.

Mr Speaker: You have been speaking for a long time now.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: I would'nt take much longer. It is only through the rough and tumble of university life and the free and frank interchange of ideas of all sorts will our children be able to see the difference between the chaff and the grain. It is only through this intermingling of ideas and personalities can we hope to get cultured and reasonable people to assume the leadership of this country in the multifarious fields of endeavour.

In view of its academic implications, we, the Socialist Front, have asked this House to postpone the debate on this Bill so that the Government can

consult the universities and colleges concerned. It is ironical that at a time when our Prime Minister and Chancellor of the University of Malaya is in London at the Commonwealth Conference trying to convince the Commonwealth that we are a democratic country, the Alliance Government at home is seeking to destroy the autonomy and academic freedom of our universities and colleges. It also seeks to condemn the youth of our country with progressive ideas and ideals from having higher education either at home or abroad. Most of the leaders of the Commonwealth have had a liberal education and they will revolt at the idea of such a Bill being enacted.

But this Bill cannot be passed. It is *ultra vires* the Constitution. May I read Article 12, clause (1) of the Constitution, which reads as follows:

"With out prejudice to the generality of Article 8, there shall be no discrimination against any citizens on the grounds only of religion, race, descent or place of birth:

- (a) in the administration of any educational institution maintained by a public authority, and, in particular, the admission of pupils or students or the payment of fees; or
- (b) in providing out of the funds of a public authority financial aid for the maintenance or education of pupils or students in any educational institution (whether or not maintained by a public authority and whether within or outside the Federation)."

Article 8 which exempts the application of this clause only prohibits this in matters connected with religion or religious institutions and aborigines and enlistment in the Malay Regiment.

Therefore, this amendment to the Internal Security Act is definitely inconsistent with the letter and spirit of the Constitution and is also *ultra vires* of the Constitution. Therefore, if in spite of all the opposition and in spite of all the criticisms the Honourable Members should think fit to pass this Bill, then we have no alternative but to challenge the right of the Government to force this Bill through, with all the legal avenues open to us. I myself have been assured of both moral and financial assistance in this matter as can be seen from the stream of criti-

cisms in the press and the letters I have received from responsible people and organisations in this country.

Mr Speaker, Sir, may I quote the words of Cardinal Newman "A university is according to the usual definition, an Alma Mater, knowing her children one by one, not a foundry or a mint or a treadmill". He should have also added that the university should not be a pawn or a plaything for politicians. Mr Speaker, Sir, I have many more cogent quotations like that of Cardinal Newman but I shall not quote them in this House.

Mr Speaker, Sir, on Friday last the Minister for Home Affairs in winding-up the debate on the Constitution (Amendment) Bill said that he had dangled a jewel before us on this side of the House but we were foolish enough not to accept it. May I remind the Honourable Minister concerned that I have many pearls in my pockets but I am not in the habit of throwing pearls . . . Mr Speaker, Sir, I think I have better leave that unsaid.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I think I have said enough on these things. I beg leave of this House to leave this House now but lest Members on opposite benches accuse me of cowardice, I wish to explain that my presence is required at the Selangor State Assembly which is now currently in session, where my presence is required. But I can assure Honourable Members that as soon as my presence there is not required, I shall come back to this House. Thank you.

Enche' Stephen Yong Kuet Tze (Sarawak): Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to support . . .

Mr Speaker: You second this motion?

Enche' Stephen Yong Kuet Tze: Yes, Sir. In seconding this motion I merely wish to say a few words—my reasons for seconding it.

Sir, I think this Bill will have far-reaching implications because it is obvious that it will adversely and seriously affect the autonomy of the seat of learning and also will cut into

the academic freedom of the Universities which, I think, we all accept as a bulwark of democracy. The Honourable Minister mentioned about communist subversion in the higher institutions and this Bill sought to prevent that happening, and I think he mentioned the Nanyang University and from what he told us this morning apparently it was only that University which was so affected. But he also told us that steps have been taken—I think rather drastic action has been taken—to remove the elements which he thought to be subversive; and from what he told us, apparently he was satisfied that the campaign was successful. That being so, Sir, I do not see the urgency to rush through this Bill. Therefore, I feel that in the public interest, particularly when there are sections of the public who would like to know more of the implications of this Bill, we must give time and also opportunity for the public to examine this Bill much more carefully and much more closely in order that the public and the people here will know that this Bill is very necessary for the purpose of removing these subversive elements. Since the purpose for which this Bill was intended was the removal of subversive elements in the Nanyang University, I do not see any necessity for rushing through this Bill.

Mr Speaker: There is an amendment moved by the Honourable Member for Batu that this Bill be read a second time on this day six months. It is now open for debate.

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam (Ipoh): Mr Speaker, Sir, before I commence, may I seek clarification from the Chair? The Honourable Member who moved the amendment in fact spoke on the whole Bill and gave an undertaking that he would not speak again. Would it be permissible for other Members to speak on the whole Bill at this stage?

Mr Speaker: The Honourable Member just now promised not to repeat it again when we come to the general debate on the Bill.

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam: May I give a similar promise?

Mr Speaker: Yes, if you promise the same thing.

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam: I solemnly promise, Sir. Mr Speaker, Sir, the first question which all people in this country will be asking themselves, and have been asking, is this. This Bill has been introduced in an attempt, it is said, to save the democratic institutions of higher learning in this country from subversive elements. Mr Speaker, Sir, we also know that there are a number of democratic countries in the world and that several of these democratic countries have been fighting the evils of communism and subversion. One question which I would like very much to ask, and which perhaps may be asked or not, I do not know, is this: can the Honourable Minister tell this House and this country whether anywhere, in any part of the democratic world, there is legislation similar to the one this House is now asked to approve, where there is going to be screening of students before entry into universities for this purpose?

Mr Speaker, Sir, I have tried to make research into that and as far as my research goes, and I am subject to correction, there is no similar legislation touching anywhere near this in any other democratic country.

Mr Speaker, Sir, however, the question of whether this Bill is justified, or whether this Bill should be condemned outright, cannot be decided by merely reading this Bill or looking at its contents as they stand in this paper itself. There are a number of factors to be taken into consideration. First and foremost, let it be clearly understood that my Party stands for the destruction of subversion wherever it may be found, Mr Speaker, Sir, but my Party also says this: "In trying to destroy subversion, let us not destroy democracy itself, let us not destroy the confidence and the trust which the people have, by votes, given to the party in power in this country."

What is the Bill aimed at? The Bill is aimed at screening students, who want to enter certain specified Universities which can be enlarged from time to time. Let us assume that there are numbers of students who are given the "black" certificates and thereby refused admission. Is it realised that what you are going to create is a body of intellectual revolutionaries, a body of intellectual rebels, a body of persons who will be revengeful, spiteful and so hostile for the rest of their life that they will form the nucleus, perhaps, of a more terrifying form of subversion or revolution, the basis of further disturbances in this country? Mr Speaker, Sir, I ask the Government. "Is that the proper way to deal with this problem and is that the only way in which you can deal with this problem?"

Now, it is known that in Singapore this question of subversion at the Universities was raised and dealt with—and I emphasise the words "dealt with"—by Singapore without legislation of this kind. We all know that the troubles in the Nanyang University were attended to in Singapore without this type of legislation. We have today been told by the Honourable Minister that the communist hold on Nanyang University has been broken to such an extent that they now have to look to other fields to start operations—and that is where the danger lies and that is one of the main reasons why this legislation has been introduced. Now, I ask, "If Nanyang University could have been cleaned up, or attended to, to that extent, then why can't the Federal Government now safeguard the Universities with the existing laws that are already on our statute books?" I know the answer to that may be that under our present law we cannot stop possible subversives entering the Universities. But my answer to that is this: I do not think it is justifiable to have our young men screened by security forces before their entry into Universities, because obviously the percentage of subversives amongst them must be very,

very low on a comparative basis, and I do not think the means justify the ends. It causes more resentment than the benefit on a long-term policy which this nation can get.

Mr Speaker, Sir, what is more important than that is this: there has been opposition to this Bill from politicians—"Yes, Opposition politicians," you may say, "are doing it for the sake of capitalising on an obvious issue." But what about other organisations, what about other bodies, not connected with politics—what about educational bodies, what about trade unions? Why are they opposing it? They do so because they honestly believe that, as the Bill stands, the provisions are such that the room for abuse and misuse and victimisation is so great that the dangers attendant on this Bill far supersede and far outweigh the benefits this Bill can bring to the nation as a whole.

Mr Speaker, Sir, a man now dealt with under the Internal Security Act has a right of appeal or a right of hearing before a Board. Although that is not a satisfactory method, yet he has at least that right of being heard before a Board. But what right has a student, when he is branded a subversive, when he is told, "You are a bad fellow, you have no right to learn in this country any more, you have no right even though the United Nations Charter gives you that under Article 26, and we are taking away that right from you."? What do you give him, what remedy has he got under this Act? Nothing at all, not a single remedy, I say. The remedy which says "appeal to the Minister"—if I may use the word and I do not think it has been ruled unparliamentary—is bunkum, because that appeal is utter rubbish with no consequences whatsoever.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I would say this that if this Bill is going to be supported by this House, then the Honourable Minister, with a clear conscience, should make necessary amendments at any stage now to put in proper protection for a person who

may be branded as a subversive under this Amendment. Give him, at least, audience before an independent body of persons to argue the refusal of a clean certificate. There should be no difficulty in that, there should be absolutely no difficulty in making a small amendment, at least, to satisfy the fundamental requirement of a democratic right of a person not to be condemned without the right of being heard. Here, he has no right to appear anywhere under this Amendment. He will not even be asked any question by any authority who is going to give him that certificate. He is not required to appear before any person before his fate is decided for the rest of his life. If that is what you call preserving democracy, by that method, then, indeed, I say that democracy is a cock-eyed democracy which people, who believe in democracy, cannot understand.

Where there is subversion, there must be laws to control subversion. If we do not do that, then we are stupid indeed. But those laws must be laws according to well established principles. It cannot be denied that this Amendment strikes at the fundamental right of a person, and it strikes at the fundamental right of a very important class of persons—the youth of the nation, the intelligentsia of the nation and of the people, who are going to take over from us, who are today part of the Government of the day: and surely they are entitled to ask us to see that their rights are not taken away without proper protection.

Mr Speaker, Sir, if the necessity for this Amendment has arisen in this country—and obviously, according to the Government, it has arisen, otherwise this would not be before us—then, I ask, why has the Government not thought it proper to declare an emergency situation? I ask that, because if you think subversion has gone to such an extent, then, indeed, the Government has failed to control subversion, the Government has failed to put down communism and the spread of communism in this country, because it is a plea of guilty to abject failure on the part of the Govern-

ment—otherwise, there will be no need for this Bill to come before this House. Therefore, I ask this question: Why is it that this Government has failed in its avowed duty, in its witch-hunt to crush subversion. This House itself said, “Good luck to you” and passed the Internal Security Act; and yet, with all those powers, you have failed to control it; you have let it spread to such an extent that you have to come to this House today and ask for more brutal, more savage powers to be given to the Minister of Internal Security. Why? Have you ever thought for a moment about this with all your grandeur, with all your votes of so many seats in the parliamentary elections? Have you asked yourself, “What is wrong, why have we failed to control subversion, why is it that the youths of the country have now become subversive?” The answer is very simple, because in actual practical politics, you have done nothing to satisfy the people of this nation, to satisfy them to the extent of being able to resist the obvious “gem” which the communists are putting before the youths of this nation. They say: “Your Government cannot give you an economic programme which will give you benefits, an economic programme which will improve your standard of living, an economic programme to improve you, your wife, your children, your parents, your generations in this land.” They also say, “We can give you them.” Then the youths turn round and say, “We have had ten years or more of Alliance rule. What is our improvement? Where are we going to? Where is the road taking us?” All that is the breeding place of communism, that is the breeding place of subversion. I say to this Government this: where you have a fundamental cause, look for the remedy of that fundamental cause; you can never suppress subversion or communism by heaping one law upon another law. I have no doubt in a short time you have to come back to this House, asking for more powers under the Internal Security Act to deal, perhaps, with another form of subversion. But that does not solve the problem. It only destroys

democracy itself; it destroys the belief of people in democracy itself. It is the fundamental cause that must be removed, and I suggest that if that is possible—and it is indeed possible for the Government responsible to the people—then it should, without this Amendment, remove the basic cause for the spread of communism.

Now, the Honourable Minister mentioned about the issue of Chinese education and culture, for which the Nanyang University stood, and the situation which was exploited at Nanyang University. Now, it is true that no issue should be exploited for the purpose of being exploited, and it is regrettable that the Honourable Minister should have chosen to say that the issue of Chinese language, Chinese education and Chinese culture was exploited. What was the Honourable Member for Johor Tenggara doing in Singapore the day before yesterday, or yesterday? What was he exploiting, if not racialistic feelings in Singapore—in trying to inflame the Malay racial feeling in Singapore? That was not mentioned in this House. Why? And I say this: if one side exploits something, the other side will exploit it—perhaps with double force. I, therefore, ask the Honourable Minister of Internal Security, in the interest of peace and Malaysia, to stop that Honourable Member from trying to exploit racial feeling in any part of Malaysia. If there is no law to stop him, then I ask that an emergency laws be introduced at this meeting of Parliament to stop that Honourable Member from going on further to any part of Malaysia on his campaign of vengeance and hate.

Mr Speaker, Sir, it has been suggested that the Honourable Minister of Internal Security, in dealing with an appeal under this Bill, will adopt the policy of saying “I will issue a good certificate, or order the issue of a good certificate, unless the record is very bad”. Now, how will the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs, or Internal Security—or whatever it is—ever be able to find out what are the records of those persons concerned? Obviously, like all persons,

he will have to depend on reports, reports from the “security boys”. It is a fact, and it is a fact known throughout this country, not only to lawyers but known to all citizens, that if the security boys want to fix somebody they can fix him; and I say if there is one case out of a hundred or a thousand, then the danger to democracy itself exists, and that is where the safeguards given in this Bill are insufficient for anybody to stand up and conscientiously say, “We can give full support to this Bill as it stands.” I say to this House: “If you put sufficient safeguards, I will be the first to stand up and say that we will support the Bill to suppress and kill subversion in this country”. But, you have submitted a Bill of this nature, without any protection, and how can you ask anybody, as the Honourable Minister has said, “in the interest of the security of the nation” to support this Bill? I suggest that people like P. P. Narayanan, people like the teachers of this country, are the people who want to preserve the interest and the security of the nation—and yet they are not prepared to support it.

There is also one misconception, I think, and that is that Education Officers are going to do the dirty work. Now, Education Officers certainly are not going to do the dirty work as I understand it from this Bill. The dirty work will be done by the security boys. The Education Officers will only be, perhaps, rubber stamps: if they are advised to issue a certificate, they will issue it; if they are advised not to issue it, they will not issue it. Now, the question which poses itself is this: what is the motive of the Government? Why is it that the Government chose Education Officers to be the rubber stamps? Is there a sinister motive? Is there any reason why it could not be done by the Security Department itself? I hope the Honourable Minister can give us an answer. If they can investigate, why cannot they issue? Why should it be the Education Officers? Is it not wrong to place one more burden on the Education Officers? You can already see the public impression is

that the Education Officer is going to be the chief gestapo man, whilst clearly he is not. He is only going to be an executive to issue the certificate in accordance with the advice given to him, and yet the public think that he is the boss, he is the king, he is the man who will investigate and say "Yes" or "No". Already there is a misconception that an educationist is going to become a security man, that at least he is going to condemn somebody for the rest of his life. Now, do you think that this misconception should be allowed to carry on? Is it not possible to alter it to some other officer-in-charge to issue the certificate, if it must indeed be issued at all? I ask the Honourable Minister to consider that and bring in the necessary amendment at Committee stage.

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, if this Amendment Bill is passed, it will become part of the law of the land. Now, that is wrong. I say it should never become part of the ordinary law of the land, because if it is part of the ordinary law of the land then it is a permanent law—it is a permanent law which, like any other permanent law, cannot of course be taken away except by Parliament; but it is most unlikely, once a law goes on the statute book, that it is ever removed from the statute book. On the other hand, if it comes in as an emergency law, or a special law, renewable yearly, then we, as representatives of the people sitting here to do our duty, will have the opportunity, each time it comes up for renewal, to make our comments, to make our observations, to see how the provisions have been enforced—whether they have been justly and fairly done, whether there has been room for abuse in this regulation, whether there is room for improvement in the law, both to protect democracy and to protect the innocents, who may be victims of a distasteful law in itself. So, I ask, why was it not introduced as a special legislation, renewable from time to time; or is it that this Government already admits defeat? It admits defeat that subversion and communism will continue to thrive in this

country from time to time in greater force and with greater strength? If that is so, then I think it is time that the Government abdicates and hands over to others, who can control subversion in a proper manner with more efficiency than has been done by the Alliance Government.

Mr Speaker, Sir, even if the Honourable Minister is not prepared to say that a person who gets a black certificate under this Amendment should have a right to appear before a Board, as it may cause delay, then I ask that a Clause be inserted that where final refusal is made by the Honourable Minister of Internal Security—and I assume that the refusal, according to the statement given just now, will be comparatively few—the policy will be that unless it is 100 per cent bad, give him the chance to go to a university. Then, or course, the number of bad certificates will be very limited. Then, what on earth is the objection to giving him the right to challenge that refusal in a court of law? What is the objection to give him that right to challenge a refusal in a court of law? You say there will be very few such certificates issued. Now, what is the objection to allowing a person to challenge that certificate, allowing him to prove that he is of good character, that he should get certificate "A" and not certificate "B"? It is a fundamental basic principle that where you take away a basic right, then the basic remedy of challenging the removal of that right should be preserved to that person. Now, if the Honourable Minister had said "Well, there will be so many such cases", then, perhaps, it will be too cumbersome, too delaying, for it to be challenged in courts. But however cumbersome it may be, however troublesome it may be, a special court—or even a special judge—should be set up, because here the whole future of a young man is at stake, and hence surely he must have the right by judicial authority, the fountain of justice, to have a final decision on his character issued in this country and for this country. I ask the Honourable Minister to consider

this: if necessary, to refer this Bill to a Select Committee, so that a Bill of this nature will be passed by a Select Committee; and for this purpose, I say, "Include Members of the Opposition in that Select Committee", because, if we are a part in this, I, for one, would like to see this Bill passed unanimously by this House; and I say it is possible to pass such a Bill with the unanimous support of this House, provided you have safeguards, provided you have sufficient safeguards where there can be no room for abuse. If you do not do that, then of course you can pass it—it is your majority.

Today, the people who are shouting, and who are they? People like Mr Teerath Ram, people who went round during the elections saying: "Vote for the Alliance Government, just Government, fair Government!" "O.K., go and reap what you have asked for!"—this is my answer to those people. We do not require your telegrams to us to say Oppose this Bill. We will oppose it all right, but not because you have asked us to oppose it. You were the fools who put this Government into power. Now, you reap what you have asked for. You answer to the people for what you were speaking about.

Mr Speaker, Sir, to sum up, as the Bill stands it is repugnant to democratic principles for the following reasons:—

- (i) It has no safeguards.
- (ii) It is condemned because there is no right of appeal to any responsible bodies by any person affected by this Bill.
- (iii) It strikes at the root of democracy and it takes away a fundamental right given by the United Nations' Charter itself to students all over the world, in all parts of the world, and therefore it stands condemned.

It is going to become a permanent law of the land, which again is something which should be frowned upon, and I ask the Honourable Minister to consider seriously the

comments which have been made by the Opposition on this Bill.

I reiterate that we stand solidly for the suppression of subversion, but we stand equally solidly for the protection of the innocent citizens of this country and for the protection of democracy in this country. We will not lend our support to destroy democracy in the name of suppressing communism. The word Communism has been bandied in this House by the Government side not only to intimidate the people of this country but also to intimidate the members of this House. For example, when the Honourable Minister introduced this Bill, what did he say? He said: "In the interests of the security of this nation, all support this Bill." Is there an implication that if we do not support this Bill, we are not loyal, that we do not want the security of this nation? If that is so, as I have always said, to intimidate us, it will take more than the Minister of Home Affairs. Thank you.

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew (Singapore):

Mr Speaker, Sir, as the debate on the Amendment has been allowed to cover the second reading of this Bill, I rise to take the opportunity to support this Bill in principle, and to suggest to the Minister concerned that, at the end of the second reading of this Bill, he consider sending it to Select Committee. I am not as sanguine as the Member for Ipoh in believing that it is ever possible to get unanimity in this House. It is not in the nature of things. There are those amongst us, who represent abiding Communist interests, who must, however genuine, however sincere, however much in good faith this Bill may have been introduced, however scrupulously and honestly it may be implemented, they are against the very principle of Communists being excluded from higher institutions of learning as centres for talent scouting and recruitment.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I am not concerned with broad principles of human rights, fundamental rights guaranteed under the United Nations, or under this Constitution. The Member for Batu

has suggested that should he fail in this Chamber, as undoubtedly he will, he would exercise his multifold talents in other fields. He has given an exercise in this House of his eloquence in so many languages and, no doubt, when the time comes, he will prove that this provision is *ultra vires* the Constitution. But I am concerned that honest men, and there are large numbers of honest men, should be reasonably satisfied in their minds that what is to be done is, first, necessary, second, that there is no lesser and obnoxious way of doing it, and third, that all proper precautions against abuse have been taken.

The problem arises because no governments are perfect, no Minister is infallible, no Special Branch or intelligence organisation is beyond reproach and, therefore, the dangers of abuse or misuse loom very large in the public mind.

Sir, as with the Internal Security Act itself, whether this Bill will succeed in its objective of minimising the Communist use of Universities as centres for breeding and spawning and recruitment, or whether it succeeds, as the Member for Ipoh has suggested in augmenting the already frustrated, both in numbers and in intensity of frustration, depends upon its implementation. I suggest that we first ask ourselves whether it is necessary and is there no other way. If I had believed that there was some other way, then I would have been reluctant to support what is undoubtedly an encroachment on established practice. Unfortunately, my view is, knowing the complexities of this problem, that as at this given moment there is no other way. I shall explain.

We are not dealing, Mr Speaker, Sir, with a society in which all our students are young men in their teens seeking knowledge in secondary schools, going on to Universities, wishing to seek the wisdom which will make them worthy and valuable citizens. That may be so in the majority of students. Over the last 40 years, the Malayan Communist Party

has successfully established a caucus in the Chinese Middle Schools of this country, using first, the teachers who were originally employed from China, next the converts that they made in the schools, and finally establishing a self-perpetuating core of trained communist dedictees in the schools. It is one of the hard facts of life. True, perhaps, sound economic policies, progressive social legislation, will slowly dissolve the grounds of discontent and render sterile all further breeding in the schools. But, unfortunately, very far from that happening, as I see the problem, we are going to be faced in the next five to ten years with more massive involvement in military expenditure, military adventures, all carefully interlocked to bring down not just Malaysia, but the whole of South East Asia, into a quagmire of economic stagnation—breeding revolution. The ultimate answer to the Communist challenge is a better life without the Communist methods. Whether finally we achieve that answer depends on so many imponderables, one of them being how we survive confrontation, and the other being whether we have the will and capacity to integrate our peoples into one Malaysian nation. But for the time being this is a sector of Communist recruitment that must be contained.

It may sound something quite outside this world, Mr Speaker, Sir, to those of us who have not had the experience, as some of our friends in the Barisan Sosialis in Singapore undoubtedly have, of the intensity with which revolution is being pursued by young men. I cannot but concede their dedication. I am convinced that they must be met with equal resolve, and I am convinced that they should not be let loose amongst the innocent.

The problem is this. In one pocket of secondary schools there is already, as I have said, a self-generating hard core. We have now embarked on an education policy which will remove the barriers between the language streams. The Chinese educated is now being given refresher courses to enter English language universities to

give them a way out—to be doctors, dentists, engineers, scientists, teachers, men of arts, science, the humanities—to fulfil themselves, to seek consumption for their talent in our society. As we lift these barriers, so the Communist caucus cross the barriers. I don't think it is possible to stop it altogether, nor do I think it desirable. Communism, like so many other things, is best met when one knows it and gets immune to it. I believe the policy of complete isolation from Communist thought, tactics, thinking, policy, is a dangerous thing. One day the windows will come open and like the South Sea islanders, when they first meet the tuberculus bacilli, we will all perish. I believe it is better to let these things come in gradual doses, containable enough to generate a counter toxin in our wholesome society. This is a calculated exercise. Whether it fails, or it succeeds depends upon the sensitivity with which the policy is implemented.

Let me give an illustration as part of our policy to encourage intelligent, able, and ambitious Chinese Middle school graduates to seek fulfilment. Many sought to study law in the University of Singapore. One of them was the sister of Mr Lim Chin Siong, a distinguished family, distinguished unfortunately by their devotion to a wrong cause—a cause which I do not share. Several of his brothers have been similarly incarcerated. The girl applied for a bursary. The girl herself, in spite of her background, had not shown active participation in Communist activities, and a bursary was granted, a careful watch is kept of the consequences, and so far all has gone well. Another girl known to be a perennial student sought, first, to read as an undergraduate; then having graduated, she sought to remain as a research student. Her security record left nobody in any doubts as to the professional purposes for which she was left in the University. She gathered around her a coterie of young, innocent girls, who were finally going around recruiting free teachers to teach detainees the law—so much were they convinced by a professional

dedicate. The young lady, not so very long ago, has recanted—no doubt as a result of enforced solitude, and the results of the referendum, the elections in Singapore and the elections in Malaya. These are the persons the Bill must seek to exclude.

The admixture between the highly politically conscious and organised from the Chinese Middle schools together with the not-so-highly politically conscious and organised in the English language stream must go on. They will find their own level. It is part of the inevitable process of living in one society that as one sector generates a great deal of dedication, drive, for purposes which are not agreed to by other sectors, so similarly dedication and drive is generated in the other sectors to counter the direction in which the first intend to take the country.

Sir, we have tried in the last few years to anticipate some of these problems but, unfortunately, there is a prevailing attitude in our society that security, the survival of the nation, is a matter for the government alone. If we dislike such laws which empowers the executive to check what normally should be the preserve of semi-autonomous bodies, then those in responsible positions must discharge their share of responsibility.

Let me explain. The Member for Batu made great play of the resignation of the former Vice-Chancellor of the University of Singapore. I don't regret his resignation. I gave instructions to our Government representative that his resignation be accepted, for these reasons. It was at the suggestion of the Singapore Government that a special pre-university course was set up in the University of Singapore to take in Chinese Middle school graduates—give them a refresher course, let them go on to medicine, the law, the sciences, the humanities. Before his assumption of the Vice-Chancellorship, I took the trouble to explain to him at dinner, informally, and to point out to him, why, first, this is in the long-term interests of the country—offering outlets for talents and ability

and drive and ambition. But at the same time I pointed out to him the dangers of the wrong people, who will also be wanting to get in and expand their breeding ground. Unfortunately, subsequently, he with the full support of the Senate, who consisted largely of expatriate professors—no doubt, men of learning and scholarship who have been properly recommended by the Inter-University Council to occupy these important positions in our seat of learning—they refused to consider security objections, and the first infection commenced some three years, perhaps nearly four years ago. I am not saying that all of them were dangerous men, but I do suggest that the fact that subsequently, in very little time, the Students Union and the Socialist Club were all being manipulated by this small group that got through—this was eloquent testimony of the fact that our appraisal of their drive and dedication was not misplaced. These facts have to be faced.

I do not believe, Mr Speaker Sir, when I had this argument with the Vice-Chancellor, that the business of the Government is just to give money to the University for it to do whatever it deems proper. I suggested to him, for instance, that if the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge was on the one hand asking for grants and on the other hand harbouring a Pontecorve, things must come to a head. The fact that there is no certain acceptance of the responsibility by those in high position, to play their part in the preservation of the State, make it impossible to work within the rules. This, unfortunately, is the position.

The easier and better way would be conscious checks by the University authorities working in the national interests to see that the University is not undermined. Who can know better than they, the staff, who have to supervise the students day in and day out, about the security risks of the individuals involved. But when they abdicate their responsibility, and they say, "No, it has nothing to do with us, if you wish you pass legislation to this effect", there the matter rested.

And that was where the Minister for Home Affairs came in.

I would myself not have used the words "Suitability Certificate". The problem has now arisen in that many people who are not fellow travellers, who are honest, who are concerned about the future of this country, who do not wish to see the Communists succeed, are doubtful in their minds as to the integrity with which the provisions of this amendment will be implemented. That is the crux of the matter. Will the Minister be infallible, and his instruments be beyond reproach? If the targets that this amendment sought to achieve are clearly defined, then there may not have been the same degree of concern. I think the concern arises because of the ambiguity of the terms used: "Suitability". For what purpose? It has even been suggested to me that this makes it possible now for Chief Education Officers to get rich. I am astounded to believe that there prevails among the populace at large a cynicism as to the integrity with which amendments of this nature will be implemented. I do not believe this for one moment, knowing the Minister for Home Affairs, and having had knowledge and experience of the instruments through which he is working and has to work. But I do suggest to him that nothing is to be lost by taking this Bill into Select Committee, meeting all the objections, all the God-fearing and public spirited gentlemen who have been quoted at great length by the Member for Batu, Cuepacs, M.T.U.C., United Chinese Schools Association, the Graduate Society, the Guild of Graduates, all under the umbrella of Cardinal Newman's illustrious principles of a University.

The argument must be joined. Is it necessary that first they must be convinced? Are there all the safeguards to prevent abuse? I suggest to the Minister for Home Affairs, ask the Member for Ipoh, instead of standing up and in this Chamber and airily mentioning the possibility of an appeal to somebody other than the Minister, which appeal he regards

with contempt, that he ought to put in a specific amendment and indeed, should spend the time and energy to make it worth his while to put in a sound amendment which the Minister may find hard to resist. Then, perhaps, the country will be indebted to the Member for Ipoh. But if the Member for Ipoh has really not given this matter the thought that it deserves, that it is one thing *en passant* to tar so many nice clean sheets on the wall, but it is a different thing putting pen to paper on specific amendments, then the Minister for Home Affairs would have scored his point.

I would like to see this Bill go to Select Committee for two reasons. First, because I disagree with the terminology in the Bill. The terminology in the Bill is not in accord with the speech made by the Minister for Home Affairs. He was specific. This was directed at Communists, at Communist subversion going on in the University and they do go on. It is nowhere so recited in the Bill, it talks of a "certificate of suitability" and the clause defining whether or not a person should get such "certificate of suitability", in my submission, could be more accurately defined. Unless there appeared to him that this is the ultimate limb of Clause 41 (c) (2), unless there appeared to him to be reasonable grounds for believing that the applicant if admitted to the institution in question would be likely to promote or otherwise participate in actions prejudicial to the interests of security of the Federation or any part thereof, I am not myself prepared, Mr Speaker, Sir, to put in an amendment at this stage as something which could be considered an improvement to this. This is more or less a paraphrase from the main Security Act itself, which has been couched in very wide terms to cover not only Communist subversion, but subversion of any other nature, either by misuse of religion, racialism, communalism and so on. The target that the Minister wants to achieve is a restricted one. I suggest to him that the country will breathe a sigh of relief—and be with him on

the Bill, never mind whether we get unanimity in this Chamber or not. I do not expect unanimity even if the Member for Ipoh believes it is possible, but I do believe that we can carry with us large body of responsible opinion who want to be satisfied that what is done is necessary in the public interest.

I, therefore, propose, Mr Speaker, Sir, at the end of the second reading of this Bill, under Standing Order 54, to move that the Bill be sent to a Select Committee. My reasons are as follows:

First, a good case cannot suffer as a result of public debate;

Second, I believe improvements can be made in the Bill to sharpen the definition both in the Bill and as a guide to its implementation, the Communist subversion; and

Third, provided the machinery for it could stand the strain, that the student so excluded should have the right to put up his case to an advisory body akin to that which already exists for those detained under the Internal Security Act.

I do not believe the matter can go before an independent judicial tribunal which will be asked to make a decision which is really an executive one. No judge can in all fairness be asked to exercise what is ultimately an executive discretion.

One cannot prove that a specific individual, if let into a particular University, would in the course of two or three years generate that degree of harm as to cause a lowering of the standards of discipline of the University. But the executive having studied a systematic pattern of behaviour over the years can be fairly certain that if a fair proportion of such students are gathered together in one institution, then in no time at all they would have usurped the authority of the University. It is unfortunate but it is true. It has happened in Nanyang. It may happen again. At this moment the University authority is in good heart. The professors have breathed a sigh of relief.

Earlier the Minister recounted how the students union was manipulated, how the communists achieved a perpetual dominance. But let me give an example of the length to which the control of a small group of students had led them. Professors are even asked why so many students have failed. Graduates who are themselves top security risks have made a point of staying on in lowly paid jobs as assistant administrators in order to increase the grip they have on the institution—regrettable but true. This is not something that could be flushed away with one purgative. Castor-oil, however efficacious, cannot fight something which is endemic. It is a continuous and continuing process, a battle in which too much of the heavy hand means one loses out on the neutrals and the liberals, in which case the objective, namely to deny a mass following to the communists is lost. On the other hand an absence of all control and complete democratic free play, in a situation where the Government is unable to intimidate with the ultimate, but the other side can, leads to unfair competition.

Let me again give an illustration: One can find any number of persons standing up, denouncing, formerly, the Singapore Government whenever it had to take unpleasant decisions; now the same persons are a bit more wary about denouncing the Central Government. What is the reason? I suggest because they understand that denouncing a group of liberal—inclined intellectuals, products of Western education, is a fairly safe practice. But to open fire, denigrating and decrying a group of not such open-minded persons, people prone to act on the basis of an eye for an eye, presents these people with occupational hazards. So they do not embark on wild and often unfounded allegations. But, however, ominous and terrifying the organs of oppression open to the Government, it is nothing compared to what the communists have got. Theirs is the ultimate. You challenge me then you die, and you die painfully. In that situation who stands up to challenge them? This is

the problem, why for a long time in Singapore very few stood up to challenge them, and why, as it appeared, that they were not going to inflict painful deaths so easily, more and more people made their stands. This is part of the problem the S.U.P.P. Member for Sarawak faces. I noticed in supporting the Member for Batu, he was extremely brief and concise. And indeed, he has good reasons to be. He must know the ultimate that we are faced with. But nobody in this Chamber really knows what is the ultimate answer to all these cross currents of forces that will decide our fate in Malaysia.

I thank the Member for Ipoh for bringing in the Member for Johor Tenggara. He wanted the Minister of Home Affairs to take action against the Member for Johor Tenggara; the Member for Johor Tenggara wants to take action against me. And whilst so many of these things are now being said in jest—and I hope they are still said in jest—one could so easily cross over the point of no return—then these things are no longer so jocular. The survival of the Malaysia that we want, of the good things in Malaysia, its tolerance, harmonious relationship, the sense of practical accommodation, must ultimately depend upon the leaders that have been thrown up in Malaysia, how they exercise their positions of authority, how they exercise the discretion vested in their hands.

If the Minister of Home Affairs were to be brain grafted and the thinking and the feeling of some other members of the Alliance side were to be put in, then, of course, different considerations apply. But we have to start on the basis of good faith, in this case, good faith, which I can personally testify to, having had a period of working together, over security problems of Malaysia. We have divergent points of view—we had very much, five years ago—but at least we conceded each other one basic common factor: a desire to see a non-communist Malaya, as it then was, now a non-communist Malaysia.

An openness of mind to investigate other means of checking communist growth and expansion, of a combination of both the intellectual argument, the social and economic programme, together with the prohibitive prescriptions. So we must keep on experimenting with combinations and permutations to reach at any one time what is considered the best in the circumstances. It is, therefore, my hope, although I know the Minister was not so originally disposed, that the Bill be processed in Select Committee, and let those who have issued statements, public-spirited men, let them come forward, let them be convinced or let them be exposed if they are not sincere. I say this because I know that the clauses of the Bill, the provisions that it incorporates, will not be required for use for quite a number of months, both the University of Singapore, the University of Malaya, Nanyang, Ngee Ann or the Polytechnic. The last batch, from the last year's graduates of Higher School Certificate have already got in. We are concerned with the next batch, and every batch after that, and I suggest that with gestation, fears can be allayed, the Bill can be sharpened as a better instrument for meeting the purposes which the Minister himself has so clearly defined in his speech.

Dr Lim Chong Eu (Tanjong): Mr Speaker, Sir, I had no intention to participate in this particular part of the debate in its amended form, but in view of the very wise suggestion put forward by the Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore, I feel that we could have a better perspective of what lies ahead in this debate if I raised one or two questions, which I had previously intended so to do.

Firstly, when the Minister of Home Affairs introduced the motion, he did refer to the fact that the intention of this Bill would be to screen off those elements among the potential students in institutions of higher studies who may create subversion and trouble. He also referred to the fact that if such a manoeuvre was successful, then it could lead eventually to the recognition of the academic freedom of

these institutions. Therefore, the question that arises is whether, if in fact the Bill were implemented and the powers given to Government are also successfully implemented, it will ultimately lead to the recognition of institutions like the Nanyang University and the Ngee Ann College. That obviously is one point deep in our minds.

Another issue is that during the course of his introduction of the Bill the Minister of Home Affairs referred to the fact that in the implementation of the Bill, the security checking of the students, the checking of the suitability of the students, would be referred to security officers. Sir, in view of the fact that I had given intimation of a proposed amendment earlier, I would like to obtain confirmation from the Minister of Home Affairs as to whether in the normal implementation of the Internal Security Act, when the Minister acts on information to detain or to prevent or restrict the movement of a subversive element, he acts under the instructions of the security officers—advice rather than instruction. That, I think, is a relevant point.

The other issue that has been brought up, but which I do not wish to elaborate on is the question of suitability, and it raises certain definite constitutional overtones. The point that is uppermost in my mind is, if such a person were refused a certificate of suitability for admission into a university, whether this refusal will jeopardise the position of the person concerned in his attempts to secure employment in other fields. I would like in the debate proper to enlarge upon this, but I am sure the reply from the Minister of Home Affairs will greatly influence the trend of the debate, and certainly, on our part, we have come to this debate with an open mind, with every intention to secure and help in every way to promote the security of our nation.

Mr Speaker: Saya suka mengingatkan kepada Ahli² Yang Berhormat, masalah yang kita bincangkan pada pagi ini ia-lah pindaan di-atas usul

yang pertama tadi. Saya benarkan tadi dua atau tiga orang termasuk Ahli² Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh dan Perdana Menteri Singapura itu kerana dia minta kebenaran supaya membahathkan di-atas asas 'am dan dia tidak akan berchakap lagi pada masa membinchangkan Rang Undang² ini—sebab itu saya benarkan. Sekarang di-hadapan kita ini ada-lah satu pindaan ia-itu menemphokkan Usul ini enam bulan lagi—chadangan dari Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu—dan sekarang saya bawa pindaan ini kepada Ahli² Yang Berhormat.

Dato' Dr Ismail: On a point of explanation, Sir. You have heard only one side of the observations in the debate on the amendment. The House has not even heard a single member from the Government side and how could you, Mr Speaker, ask the House to take a decision on an amendment on which only the views of one side of the House have been heard.

Mr Speaker: Order, order! The time is now 1 o'clock. The meeting is suspended to 4 p.m. this evening.

Sitting suspended at 1.00 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 4.00 p.m.

(Mr Speaker in the Chair)

THE INTERNAL SECURITY (AMENDMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed on amendment, "That the Bill be read a second time on this day six months."

Mr Speaker: Ahli² Yang Berhormat, saya suka menyatakan kepada Ahli² Yang Berhormat ia-itu pada pagi ini tadi saya telah benarkan yang membawa usul tadi berchakap atas kesemua sa-kali; dan saya sudah benarkan juga pehak² yang lain berchakap begitu juga. Jadi, pada kali ini, saya benarkan-lah Ahli² Yang Berhormat berchakap dalam perkara 'am, dan saya sifatkan-lah perbahathan itu bahathan kali yang kedua, dan pada akhir-nya saya minta

Menteri menjawab, kemudian saya akan chadangkan supaya perbahathan itu di-kemukakan dan pada kali yang kedua saya kemukakan juga pada masa itu.

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew: Mr Speaker, Sir, may I rise to make a personal explanation of my speech on the Bill.

During the luncheon adjournment, I had discussed with the Minister of Home Affairs the question of sending this Bill to Select Committee. Before this Bill was tabled in this House I had been asked for my views and I had told him that my colleagues and I supported such a Bill.

This morning I had suggested sending the Bill to Select Committee after the second reading, as this appeared to me the best way of allaying the anxieties of sincere liberals and non-Communists, and of exposing the sham lamentations of pro-Communists.

Now it seems that my proposal to send this Bill to Select Committee may be misconstrued as an attempt to qualify our support for the Bill, since quite a number of persons opposed to the Bill on principle and not just in details have similarly suggested that it be sent to Select Committee.

Since my proposal to send this Bill to Select Committee is for completely different reasons, and in order that there can be no misunderstanding of the position of my colleagues and I in support of the Bill, I withdraw my proposal to send this Bill to Select Committee.

Enche' Chia Thye Poh (Singapore): Mr Speaker, Sir, the Amendment to the Internal Security Ordinance, which the Government is proposing, is merely adding some more undemocratic clauses to an Act which is notorious and much detested by the people. The Alliance Government had in the past turned the Emergency Regulations into the Internal Security Ordinance, so as to carry on the dictatorial repression that had been done by the British colonialists. Under

this Ordinance, the Minister is empowered to arrest people without charge or trial. Under the regime of the Alliance, countless innocent people have been arbitrarily arrested, but the Government has not been able to charge or try them in court; hence there is nothing of safeguard the right of the people who are living under the constant intimidation of that Ordinance. The Amendment is only adding more undemocratic clauses to such a notorious Ordinance. By this Amendment, students entering universities and colleges have to be screened. No one can enter a university or college without the written approval of the Chief Education Officer or the Director of Education.

Mr Speaker, Sir, it is most unreasonable to empower education officials with such absolute authority. The Amendment deprives the individual of his right to receive a university education. The right of one to receive an education in the highest institutions of learning should not be in the hands of a few education officials, or the ruling party. Under normal conditions, one can enter a university or college if he is willing to work hard, has the qualifications, and if he is not an idiot. Mr Speaker, Sir, we are now amazed at the ruling that an education official is to decide who should and who should not enter the universities. Under this condition the ruling party is able to prevent all the people whom it does not like from entering universities. With this Bill, the wisdom of the people is to be suppressed. The creative talents of those who are brave enough to resist any unreasonable measures are to be suppressed by the dictatorial and political prejudice of the Government. By this provision any person whose application to enter the universities has been rejected may appeal to the Minister, but the decision of the Minister is final and no appeal can be made to a court. Mr Speaker, Sir, I ask, how can the decision of the Minister be final? Why can't the Government let open to the public as to why a person should not be accepted to further

his studies? Why can't the Government allow the rejected to defend himself in public? Moreover, the courts are in the hands of the Government. It is because the Government is not able to provide the public with satisfactory reason. What is the use of appealing to the Minister when one is rejected by the education officials? The education officials are acting under the instruction of the Minister who in turn acts in accordance with the information given to him by his Gestapo Special Branch; hence we see that the appeal to the Minister is just a cause of putting up a show.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Government has incessantly boasted that our country is a constitutional State, a democratic State and is governed by law. But what we see is that the Government is acting most dictatorially through all these undemocratic Ordinances. What we can see is not democracy or law but that the country has been brought into the compass of a Police state and dictatorship.

Mr Speaker, Sir, just now, when we were debating this dirty Amendment Bill, we saw once again the Prime Minister of Singapore building new castles in the air—his usual habit which he used to boast about in order to show himself as a great story-teller. With the help of the Special Branch, he has put in different kinds of information and made them into a long, long tale. The people of Singapore know him and his tricks pretty well. Now, he has come to blast the people in the Federation. We are not surprised to hear that the P.A.P. supports this Amendment Bill. The P.A.P. has sold the rights of the people of Singapore. Although the P.A.P. belongs to the Opposition, it has always sought the co-operation of the Alliance Government to get rid of political opposition in Singapore.

Enche' Ali bin Haji Ahmad (Pontian Selatan): On a point of order, Mr Speaker, Sir—S.O. 35 (6) which says that a Member shall not read his speech.

Mr Speaker: The Honourable Member is not holding the paper in his hands. It is in order. Please proceed!

Enche' Chia Thye Poh: Thank you, Sir. In spite of the fact that the basic rights of the people will be deprived and the university autonomy and academic freedom will be destroyed, the P.A.P. has always paved the way for the Alliance Government to misuse its position to further suppress the people. The Prime Minister of Singapore says "Yes" to the Amendment Bill on the one hand, and he shows all his talent to deal with the so-called communists better than the foolish Alliance Government on the other. By suggesting to pass this Bill to a Select Committee after the second reading, the Prime Minister of Singapore hopes to wash his hands off the presentation of this dirty Bill. We, as well as the people, are aware of the trickery of the so-called "open to the public" or the so-called "open debate". The Prime Minister of Singapore has said that a good case cannot suffer from debate in the public. Then, why does the Government still arrest innocent people without charge and trial in Court? He has not even the guts to let the detainees defend themselves in Court in spite of the fact that propaganda machinery is in the hands of the Government. I say that it is another big, big bluff of the P.A.P.

Mr Speaker, Sir, as a matter of fact, long before the Government made these amendments to the Internal Security Ordinance, it has been exercising pressure on the universities to reject the acceptance of certain students, though those students may have excellent academic standards or qualifications of a university education. Prior to the resignation of the former Vice-Chancellor of the University of Singapore, the Governments of Singapore and the Federation of Malaya had exercised certain pressures to prevent him from accepting some students into the University. The same pressure was also applied to the Nanyang University. But the action of the Governments

received the strongest protest from the Universities concerned who maintained that there should be university autonomy in a democratic country. Now, the Government, realising that this arbitrary action is being resisted by more and more youths, realising that intellectuals are more and more conscious of the surrounding situation, realising that nothing that is done could cow those who stand for university autonomy, unashamedly tears down its mask of democracy, openly making legislations to prevent qualified individuals from entering the universities. The action of the Government has thus openly infringed upon the universities' autonomy. The acceptance of students has been the right of the university authority, but the provision in this Bill is a challenge to the rights of the university authority.

Mr Speaker, Sir, from the exchange of letters between the former Vice-Chancellor of the University of Singapore, Dr Sreenivasan and the Prime Minister of Singapore—these letters had been published in the *Nanyang Siang Pau*—we can easily see that what the academic bodies are worrying about is that preventing students from entering universities will allow university autonomy to be seriously interfered with. In his letter to the Prime Minister, Dr Sreenivasan said that the decision of employing staffs and accepting students should be based upon their academic standards and not their political point of view. But, now, this Amendment Bill has allowed the Government to disregard the decision of the University and to reject students for admission into the higher institutions of learning.

Mr Speaker, Sir, furthermore, this Bill will turn academic freedom of the universities into a laughing stock; and students, fearing that their opportunity of learning in the university will be taken away by the Government, will not dare to make proper and energetic study and research into the different schools of thought and learning. The flower of academic study in the university will soon be withered as the

Government only allows students to study academic theories which are agreeable to its interests. The main characteristic of a university is to provide students with an opportunity to study and make research on different schools of thought, otherwise it is not worthy to be called a university. If the Government is today entitled to make a legislation to restrict admission of students to universities and to obstruct university authority to employ staffs, tomorrow the value of a university will then be reduced to its limited extent; the progress and the future of the university will then be hampered by the party in power.

Sir, as a matter of fact, the Government has already taken a series of destructive measures against university autonomy and academic freedom before this Bill is proposed. The Vice-Chancellor of the University of Singapore has been forced to resign, and now the Vice-Chancellor of the Nanyang University is receiving the same unreasonable treatment. When a special order imposed by the Government was rejected by the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Singapore, the Government had purposely adopted an unco-operative attitude towards the Vice-Chancellor concerning the financial problem of the University. As a result, he was unable to carry on with the administration of the University. Similarly, arbitrary action had been taken against the Nanyang University students, University councillors and Nanyang University graduates, when the Government decided to control and reorganise NANTA. The Vice-Chancellor of NANTA had been secretly pressed by the Government to resign. The citizenship of Mr Tan Lark Sye had been withdrawn. All these were only some of the actions taken by the Government to destroy the University's autonomy. Furthermore, academic publications which reflect the academic standard of the University have been unreasonably banned, and Government bursary has also become a tool to restrict students from participating in healthy activities in

the campus. Government bursary to more active students can be withdrawn at any time. Students having graduated from the University do not have the opportunity to work in the Government service, unless the Special Branch gives its approval. Hence, it is obvious that even before this Bill is proposed to this House, very little academic freedom has been available in our country.

Sir, the Special Branch has all along asserted a certain kind of control on the students who intend to study abroad. The Security Authority in our country always secretly gives notice to the Immigration Department of the foreign country where a student has been admitted by the University which he intends to further his study. As a result the student applicant has been refused visa. This did not happen once or twice but many times. The Government has deprived students of their basic rights to receive university education not only at home but also abroad.

Sir, the Government has claimed that the sole purpose of this Bill is to act against the so-called communists and so-called elements whose actions are prejudicial to the security of the nation. However, the Government has already been endowed with absolute power by the P.P.S.O. to move against any citizens, but the Alliance Government still does not seem to feel that the P.P.S.O. is sufficient to suppress the general dissatisfaction of the people. In fact, the present Government is just harping on the same old string of the so-called bogey of communism. The people has been greatly annoyed by such kind of propaganda. In the colonial era when the British Government arrested anti-colonial patriots, they were unable to produce any reason to charge them. They had to resort to all kinds of smearing against them. The way by which the present Government finds her excuse is just the same as that used by the British colonial rulers. What we have seen is that all those, who have devoted themselves to fight for freedom, justice, and the interest of the people, have been dealt with

under the same pretext—for instance, the cases of Mr Lim Lean Geok, Dr Yen Yen Chang, and many others. They had done nothing but criticised the present unjust educational policy of the Government. Is this not the basic right of a citizen to point out the mistakes of the Government? But the Government by branding them as elements whose actions are prejudicial to the nation has taken relentless action against them. All these can only induce the people to believe that the so-called elements whose actions are prejudicial to the security of the nation are those who serve the interest of the people, and those who dare to stand up and criticise the errors of the Government.

Mr Speaker, Sir, this Amendment Bill was instantly met with strong and stormy opposition of the people. We have read many angry statements made by civic organisations in the daily press accusing the Government to prevent such an Amendment Bill. It is most intolerable if the Government continues to exploit its majority position in Parliament to pass this dictatorial and fascist Bill. Sir, this Bill is due to be effective on the 1st of August. The dictatorship of the Party in power can only open the eyes of the people to the rotten tyranny of the Alliance. All that this fascist legislation can do is to harden the hearts of the young people whom it is intended to intimidate and to increase their determination to bring to an end the present period of suppression. Thank you.

Dr Haji Megat Khas (Kuala Kangsar): Mr Speaker, Sir, since most of the speeches have been made in English for the whole of today, I would continue in the same vein, if I may. Whether the Honourable Member for Batu or the Honourable Member from Barisan Sosialis in Singapore realises it or not, there is no question that communism of the subversive type is with us, and there is no question also that Malaysians as a whole have no use for any form of communism—subversive, belligerent or military type. It is, therefore, the duty

of all true Malaysians—true in the sense that they owe allegiance to this country and that they love this country as their own—to give their hearty and fullest support to this Amendment brought forward in this House by the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs. This amendment to the Internal Security Act, we have to remember, is a preventive. One must remember the old English saying, which says that one stitch in time is worth nine out of time, and the object of this amendment is no more and no less.

A lot has been said about the infringement of the freedom of university, academic freedom and the autonomy of the universities that we have with us; and a lot has also been said about the humiliation that is meted out to the young people by the Amendment that has been brought in. As a member of the University Council since 1953—that is, eleven years now—I am well aware of the great value placed by the University on its autonomy and academic freedom, and as a member of the University Council also I agree that it should be so, but times have changed and changed for the worse. With Soekarno's confrontation, which is nothing but an expression of the orders that he has received from Peking and perhaps, from other communist countries, we should have the freedom to design certain measures to protect ourselves; and if it is true that prevention is better than cure and that it is not only a truism and not a senseless platitude, then I think we have justification for the Amendment that is brought in by the Honourable Minister.

I also realise, Mr Speaker, Sir, the continuous stream of opposition that keeps pouring in from all quarters—not only from the Socialist Front but from other quarters throughout the country; but I do feel, as I said before, that times have justified this Amendment and I take it that it is not impossible to reconcile the measures taken in this amendment to the Internal Security Act with the declared desire of the University to preserve its autonomy and academic freedom.

I disagree with the Honourable Member for Ipoh, who said that university students cannot pose a threat to the country and to its internal security, because they do and can, if we are not careful about the material that gets into the university. The recent case of the Nanyang students is a plain one, and too recent to be forgotten. I do agree of course with the Member for Ipoh that the number of young men who will become subversive or who have tendencies to subversiveness will form only a minor portion or a very small fraction of the whole—and this is just the point. We have got to look after the security of the country as a whole and the object of this amendment to the Internal Security Act is to nip in the bud the focus, the small focus that may arise, of subversiveness among the young people, who may aspire to higher education in the higher institutions of learning that we have. I say this advisably, because the purpose of education in the real sense of the word would be to enable us to learn to live together in a complex world, a world of varied components, and to cultivate a proper sense of value in the running of our own lives. It is necessary, therefore, in this particular instance to cultivate a sense of proportion as to the *pros* and *cons* of the present amendment to the Internal Security Act that has been brought forward by the Honourable Minister.

I do not wish to take much time, because this is the first time that we on the Government Benches have been given an opportunity to rise up to speak, and I am sure my colleagues on this side of the House have their points to bring forward. But, finally, Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to give my fullest support to the amendment brought forward by the Minister of Home Affairs to the Internal Security Act (*Applause*).

Enche' S. Rajaratnam (Singapore): Mr Speaker, Sir, I am well aware, we are all well aware, of the unhappiness the provisions of this Bill have caused among student bodies, trade unions, teachers unions and among liberals who see in the provisions of

this Bill encroachments on traditional concepts of academic freedom. Similar misgivings, we also know, were voiced when, because of the exigencies of the situation, it became necessary to pass laws to safeguard the security of the country from communist subversion. These laws have been with us for nearly 10 years and despite the rather pessimistic pronouncement made by our colleague from Barisan Sosialis, Singapore, by and large, despite the misgivings, these laws to safeguard internal security have ensured that this country remains today a democratic country, and these laws have helped to counter communist subversion. So, to those in whom these misgivings arose from a genuine desire to preserve democracy, to safeguard democracy and to ensure academic freedom, may I say that it is a healthy sign, in a democracy, that these liberal elements should voice their protests vigorously at any encroachment of traditional concepts of liberty, because if in a democratic society when a Government finds it necessary to constrict liberty and freedom and if those who really believe in democracy do not lodge protests and if they accept these changes supinely, then democracy will die. So long as there are elements in a democratic society who are prepared to voice their protest and voice their fears, then the effect would be to restrain the despotic tendencies which are inherently present in all governments.

However, to those who have voiced concern over this Bill out of a genuine desire to preserve academic freedom, to preserve democracy, I shall try to show that this Amendment is intended primarily to safeguard democracy, to safeguard academic freedom, and this Amendment is against those who are out to destroy both. Here, I would like to distinguish between this group and another group, who will also voice dismay, who will also protest loudly about transgression of democracy, but for different reasons—they want to destroy democracy: these are the

pro-communists and their front men, who are not interested in democratic freedom. They are not interested in academic freedom, but they want to ensure the achievement of their ultimate goal which, as they themselves say in private, is the establishment of a communist dictatorship, a dictatorship of the proletariat. They would, therefore, find it more convenient to mingle with the liberals—people who really want to safeguard democracy—in the hope that by mingling with the innocent people they will also escape attention and probably also escape detention. Sir, this second group of people who profess to be supporters of democracy, who profess to be defenders of academic freedom, do not care one jot either for democracy or for academic freedom. Sir, there is one thing we must accept—despite what my colleague from Singapore has been saying about “so-called communists”—and that is that there are communists, and if he is not quite convinced of that, let me remind him of statements by gentlemen who have seen the light—people like Soon Loh Boon, Leong Keng Seng, James Puthuchery, Woodhull. When they were in detention, these were the people of whom communists outside said, “These are innocent men; they are not communists”, and yet when Mr Soon Loh Boon, after eight years of detention, came out, he said that when he was a student he was working for the cause of the communists—and yet there are some people who say that they are only “so-called” communists. I have no doubt, Sir, that for the communists, the fact that some people the liberals, are genuinely concerned, about academic freedom, is a good opportunity to revive their flagging morale, because the communist morale is today at its lowest ebb—and my authority for this evaluation is none other than the anti-Lee Siew Choh faction in the Barisan Sosialis of which we have a representative here. They themselves have said that the communists are at their lowest ebb. They do not know what issue to plug. So here is a good issue. They can join with the liberals,

the democrats, and say: “Yes, let us defend democracy.”—and we would have noticed one thing, Sir, that in the speech of the Barisan Sosialis Member he never mentioned one word about how this law would conscribe the communists; he was not interested in that. He did not say how this Amendment would make it difficult for his colleagues, both inside and outside the Nanyang University, to re-establish the hold that they have lost. He or even the Member for Batu had never mentioned throughout his speech, how this law would conscribe the communists. All that both said was, “How it was going to make things difficult for the democrats.” Why is that? Why didn’t the Barisan Sosialis Member make a distinction and say, “Yes, in so far as this law would conscribe the communists I support it, but in so far as it conscribes the democrats, I will criticise it.” He never said so. He knows there are communists and his colleagues know there are communists; and detainees who have come out and recanted know there are communists. And yet in all their speeches, if they are real defenders of democracy, they should, at least in so far as it conscribe the enemies of democracy, say they will support it, but they never said it. In fact, Sir, earlier in his speech, the Barisan Sosialis Member has also said how terribly reactionary these Governments are—they consider the Singapore Government and the Central Government reactionary Governments—because in Nanyang University they have banned all publications which are academic publications of a high intellectual order.

Well, Sir, recently there was a publication published by the Government called “Communism in Nanyang University” and there is a quotation from an academic publication of a very high order, having been published by the Historical Society of Nanyang University. They decided to make their contribution to Malayan nationalism. I think it is called “A research on the history of Malayan nationalism. I think it is called “A

Brief History of the Malaya National Movement" published by the Nanyang Historical and Geographical Society—and I quote from paragraph 22, page 11:

"The history starts with the Communists Peoples' Councils, an objective democratic history of Malayan Nationalism"

and it starts off with "The Communists Peoples' Councils which were established 'amidst the cheers of the people.'" A democratic society, Sir? A booklet to help strengthen democracy, an academic publication, to help strengthen democracy when they themselves say that these Communists Peoples Councils were established amidst the cheers of the people? Which people—Peking, Indonesia or Malaya? Then it goes on to say, "These Councils have been unreasonably dissolved"—the Communist Councils have been unreasonably dissolved? Similarly, it also complains that the P.P.S.O. and this Amendment are also unreasonable—obviously for the same reason. Because it concribes the communists, therefore, it is unreasonable. Then it goes on to say, "The emergency is described as the story of the gallant resistance of the communist armed forces." Is this a publication in defence of democracy, or in defence of communism? What this Amendment will do is that in future when the Nanyang Historical and Geographical Society does write another booklet on the brief history of the Malayan Nationalist Movement, I think, the history will not start off with "the Communist People's Council" but will start off with political parties which are loyal to this country, which have really won independence and freedom and democracy, the same democracy that allows the Barisan Socialist Member to speak here to denounce the established order of things—and in a people's democracy, I am quite sure, these benches would be empty, Sir, and only the Member for Barisan would be allowed to speak. (*Laughter*) So, I think we should distinguish between such things and also those of us outside this Assembly, who may have reasonable doubts about this Bill or fears, they should not lend cover for communists,

who want to destroy democracy by plugging any issue—whether it be this Bill or any other Bill. In so far as this Bill can prevent communist infiltration of universities, I think any reasonable man must endow the Government with those powers to keep out communist subversion. It is my submission, Sir, that in essence I do not think this Bill is being directed against people that the Government does not like. There are other ways, if the Government is very clever, of keeping people whom it does not like out of universities; they do not have to bring this Amendment, as there are other ways of doing it. But what the Bill really and primarily seeks to do is to keep out professional students, professional political students, who do not go into a university to acquire a degree such as B.Sc., Ph.D., LL.B.—they go there to squat there, to build up cadres for the communist movement; and it is the professional students, who are going to be kept out—not the ordinary student who goes there, who might have his own political views. What the Bill seeks to do—and it is quite clear from the speech of the Minister of Home Affairs—is to keep out professional students, as part of the communist strategy we only need to look at their manual—is to train professional students to go into universities as they go into trade unions and political parties. It is quite clear that the Barisan Socialist Member comes from Nanyang, and he knows who were controlling Nanyang. He himself was trained there and he ended up in this Assembly—Sir, I understand that he was even an Assistant Lecturer, a professional lecturer, a professional student. And it is quite clear that because of this calculated infiltration—Nanyang was a good example—the result was, as is made quite clear in this Report, that they have exploited the ineffective leadership and administrative defects of the Nanyang University—"they" the communists because the effective masters of its policy and administration, including appointments to and control of the academic staff. Students, Sir, are

running a university, and does this prove his contention that the students are going there to get a Ph.D., LL.B., when they control staff? In fact, I understand, they even appoint canteen staff, so that strong-arm boys could be there in the university to deal with recalcitrant students.

Sir, it is necessary in view of this to accept the proposition that the communist threat is real—we have got to accept that proposition. Anybody who does not accept that proposition is either living in a dream-world, or is deliberately closing his eyes to it: communist threat is real, and communist determination to overthrow this democratic system by any means is also real. In fact, one of the injunctions of Lenin, which is followed by every good communist, is that a good communist must be prepared to resort to any falsehood, deceit and evasion (a very important word “evasion”) to infiltrate non-communist organisation, whether it is a trade union, school, or university, and communists should be prepared to resort to falsehood, deceit and evasion—that is to pretend that you are not a communist. So long as you have the communists, who are prepared to resort to deceit, lies, evasion plus dedication, then if democracy is to survive, we must make it clear that democracy does not mean giving freedom for people, who do not believe in democracy, to destroy democracy. I think it is about time that democrats made it quite clear that the right to disagree, and that the right to even overthrow a ruling Government by constitutional means is only granted to those political groups which believe in democracy, but not to those who are going to use democratic machinery, so that once they come into power they are going to destroy democracy. Therefore, any law which concedes the freedom of action of communists to destroy democracy must, in the situation which we are in, be accepted as a necessary evil, if you like, but it is a necessary instrument to be able to fight communists. Once the democrats show that determination, that they

are prepared to use any legitimate method, but tough method, to fight communists, then their tide of morale would be even at a lower ebb than it is today.

Secondly, we must also accept the fact that, in view of confrontation, in view of the fact that the Communists today are acting as agents for Indonesian “Crush Malaysia” policy, and in view of the fact that this confrontation is going to be with us for a long, long time, it is necessary to ensure that the Communists and their friends are not given any new opportunities to rebuild their cadres, to recruit intelligent men, because obviously from the university you can, by and large—not necessarily always—recruit more intelligent men in the university than you could elsewhere, and it is quite clear that with the restraint put on the Communists in Nanyang they are going to make great efforts to try and recruit in other universities and institutions of higher education. So, therefore, Sir, in so far as there are others who are not interested in giving cover to the Communists, to them I would say this: True, a Bill like this can be abused. But then, Sir, any law which confers power on a government can always be abused by a government; and if we work on the assumption “do not give power to a government because it will be abused”, then the logical course, of course, is not to give the government any power. But if we are reasonably satisfied that they have a problem—the government has a responsibility to deal with the Communist problem, Communist subversion—then we have to give this power on the basis of trust and, more important, on the basis of performance, because if it is found for some reason or other that the power has been abused or administered badly, then it will be the responsibility of this Opposition to call the Government to account when there is an abuse of powers of this nature. But in the present position where Communism is a threat—we are also threatened by confrontation by Indonesia and subversion—where obviously the Communists are going to make a determined

effort to subvert our universities, to get more recruits from our universities, to infiltrate our universities, it would be wrong for us at this juncture, even if we have this fear that the Bill might be abused, to deprive the Government of what they consider at the moment a necessary power without which they cannot deal with the problem of Communist subversion in schools and, in particular, universities. If the university authorities themselves could have exercised their responsibility to society and weeded out the Communists and checked the Communists, then, perhaps, the need for this law would not have arisen, but, unfortunately, for one reason or other under the mantle of academic freedom they say that they are not going to interfere with the students in regard to, what they consider, expressions of exuberance on the part of the youths and, therefore, they are not going to be involved in what they consider security matters. But as you know, Sir, as a result of their rather negative attitude, at least in Singapore, in the last elections, universities, which are supposed to be academic institutions, above politics, in fact entered the political arena. Members of the Nanyang University and some from the University of Singapore Socialist Club went out canvassing. In fact, they organised a poll just before the Referendum—Nanyang University students and some members from the Socialist Club—purely, they told us, as an “academic exercise”. They went to Kereta Ayer and Tanjong Pagar, the two constituencies from which my colleagues (sitting in front of me) here come, to conduct an independent gallop poll to find out what the people of Kereta Ayer and what the people of Tanjong Pagar thought about Malaysia and merger, and astonishingly the results were unforeseen—95 per cent of the people of Tanjong Pagar and Kereta Ayer were against Malaysia and merger—95 per cent! Yet when a proper Referendum was carried out, the result was just about the reverse. So, here is a good instance of Communists perverting youths to the point where they can cook up polls, can rig referendums.

Obviously, I cannot understand how they got 95 per cent of the people of Tanjong Pagar and Kereta Ayer to say that they are against Malaysia and merger, when the actual referendum, which they themselves supervised, was so unlike. This referendum was not supervised by us: it was all carried out by them. So, you see the results were different. But it shows how the Communists can manipulate students, even compel them to do things which are obviously dishonest—teach the young not to be upright, courageous men, but to be crooks and manipulators and people who can rig things. But even more important was that they entered the political arena with a view of taking issue with the Government. How then can universities remain academic institutions when their pupils come into the political arena? Naturally, the Government must react. So, since the university authorities themselves are incapable of ensuring that their institutions remain centres of academic discussion, learning, even political discussion, if they are not prepared to do that, then obviously it becomes the responsibility of the Government to make things easier for the university authorities to discharge their responsibilities, and to ensure that our universities remain truly centres of academic discussion and freedom. Thank you, Sir.

Enche' Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman (Seberang Tengah): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ra'ayat telah memberi mandat kepada Kerajaan ini untuk menjaga keamanan, dan siapa juga yang ada dalam Malaysia ini atau pun penduduk² sa-ramai tujuh ratus empat puluh juta dalam Commonwealth atau pun tiga ribu enam ratus juta manusia yang ada dalam dunia ini semua mahukan keamanan. Jadi saya rasa satu perkara yang pada hari ini kita dengar daripada parti² Pembangkang ia-itu daripada Barisan Socialist, daripada Socialist Front semuanya menitek-beratkan dalam soal kebebasan—freedom. Mereka mengatakan Kerajaan telah menyekat soal freedom ini. Tetapi kebebasan itu mesti ada batasan, mesti ada boundary-nya.

Freedom means so many things to so many people. Barisan Socialist berkehendakkan freedom atau pun kebebasan untuk subvert, itu kebebasan bagi fahaman Barisan Socialist, tetapi bagi pihak Kerajaan Perikatan yang mengamalkan demokrasi, kita mahu kebebasan yang berlainan. Semua orang mahu kebebasan; wakil Batu pun mahu, Barisan Socialist pun mahu kebebasan, U.S.S.R. Russia dalam tabir besi-nya—tabir bambu pun ada kebebasan tetapi berlainan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Jika kita berkehendakkan kebebasan hari ini, maka patutlah kita adakan Undang² ini. Kerajaan ini patut di-puji kerana telah mengadakan satu Rang Undang² yang tegas, oleh sebab banyak yang kita dapat tahu Kerajaan Perikatan ini mengamalkan demokrasi yang sangat² liberal ia-itu longgar. Sa-kira-nya kalau ada Rang Undang² ini baharu-lah tidak di-katakan pemimpin² Perikatan ini tidak ada bercalibre besar tetapi baharu-lah dynamic. Kalau tidak, terlalu longgar—terlalu liberal maka sebab itu di-salah gunakan oleh sa-tengah² pihak—sa-tengah² orang di-dalam negeri ini.

Untuk hendak menjaga demokrasi dan untuk menjaga keamanan negeri ini, maka Undang² ini di-adakan, tetapi dalam ucapan yang kita dengar pada hari ini daripada pagi tadi, mereka mengatakan yang Kerajaan ini telah pun menjalankan kuku besi atau dictator dengan menggunakan Ketua² Pegawai Pelajaran dan lain² lagi sa-bagai gestapo, tetapi dalam Rang Undang² ini bukan kita beri kuasa itu 100% kepada C.E.O., kerana ada di-sini, saya baca "The Chief Education Officer and the Chief Education Adviser after making such inquiries " ini berm'ana sa-telah mereka berpendapat "suitability" yang kita katakan tadi, kebolehan atau pun keadaan sa-sa-orang penuntut. Bukan-nya menggunakan kuasa-nya 100%, tetapi kena-lah menyasat dan menghalusi dengan Pegawai Polis dan sa-bagai-nya. Saya rasa C.E.O. sendiri pun tidak mahu kuasa itu di-beri kepada mereka itu 100%. Dalam surat khabar hari ini dan dua tiga hari yang lalu, kita

telah baca, dan pagi ini lagu itu juga di-mainkan oleh wakil dari Batu mengatakan M.T.U.C. dan International Federation of Teachers Union dan banyak lagi pertubohan yang membangkang dengan keras-nya Bill ini. Tujuan mengadakan Bill ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bukan-lah untuk menyekatkan penuntut² yang ada "beatle hair", berseluar yangkee atau pun topless dress, itu tidak, sa-benar²-nya pindaan ini menyekatkan penuntut² yang menghasut berkenaan dengan fahaman komunis di-dalam sa-sabuah University. Jadi, saya rasa tentu-lah semua ibu bapa dan ra'ayat yang chintakan keamanan akan menyokong penoh Undang² ini, kerana kita mahu keamanan yang saya katakan tadi. Semua ra'ayat mahukan keamanan, tetapi itu-lah soal pokok keamanan, dan kita tidak menyekat kebebasan, chuma kita mahu keamanan. Jadi itu-lah sebab-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong penoh usul yang di-bawa oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Dalam Negeri itu.

The Minister of Finance (Enche' Tan Siew Sin): Mr Speaker, Sir, this Bill provides a perfect field day for demagogues. It provides wonderful opportunities for those people who wish to wax eloquent on the virtues of democracy, freedom, liberty, and the like. Broadly speaking, I would say that the opposition to this Bill can be divided into two categories.

The first category consists of those who oppose the Bill for the reason that it is an affront to democracy and so on, but who we know, and many right-thinking people in this country know, are either Communists, pro-Communists or fellow-travellers. The second category opposes this Bill on the ground that the powers it hands over to the Government are so wide that they could easily be abused. I shall try to deal with these categories one by one.

I wonder how many Honourable Members in this House have read books on the story of the Russian revolution. If they have not, it is my humble view that, provided they are prepared to keep an open mind, these

books are worth reading. Certainly, my own personal experience has been that books of this nature can not only be extremely entertaining, more important they can be extremely revealing. Let us see how Communism started in the cradle of Communism, i.e. the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. I will not bother this House with the story from the beginning, from the birth of Lenin, but round about 1917, towards the end of the First World War, a situation had been reached in which the first elections had been held in Russia. The Communists, or Bolsheviks as they were then known, campaigned as vigorously as the others but contrary to their expectations they did not win the elections. In fact, they came out second best, and it was a very poor second best. They had, therefore, no hope of winning power by constitutional means, and yet the same Bolsheviks who were in a hopeless minority captured power a few months later and we have seen since that they have never been pushed out—and they are not likely, I think, ever to be pushed out, except by force. Now, the history of Communism in other countries shows broadly a similar pattern. The details may differ, but the main trend is the same. We see the spectacle of a small but determined, ruthless and highly disciplined minority seizing power in the face of an apathetic majority and sometimes even in the face of a hostile majority when the majority is not so determined, not so ruthless and not so highly disciplined. That is the lesson of Communism.

In the context of the former Federation of Malaya and in the context of Malaysia today, the position, if anything, is slightly more ominous, because here—although there is no question that the Communists are in a minority, and I think in a very small minority—the majority and, perhaps, the majority of the majority, are even more apathetic than the peoples of, say, Europe and the Americas. So, if anything, the position here is even more dangerous. When I seconded the Bill which established the independent Federation of Malaya in 1957 I used

this phrase in the context of the then Federation of Malaya, “that under no circumstances can we permit people who would be prepared in the holy name of democracy to subvert the process of democracy in order to kill democracy itself,” a completely free aim. Today, seven years later, that maxim still holds good, and that is the principle which I would ask those who oppose this Bill, and who are not Communists but who may be genuine liberals, to bear in mind. But, I say, as I have said previously, to those who are Communists, pro-Communists, or fellow-travellers, that we understand their reasons, but we obviously cannot subscribe to their motives.

Now, let us look at the position in this country, and particularly that in the Nanyang University—and this, I think, holds a lesson for those who feel that the Government in introducing this Bill has gone farther than it should. I personally know some of the products of Nanyang University, who have been expelled from the University, who have been hounded out of the University for no other crime than that they were opposed to the Communists, who were running things there their own way, who felt that the University should have its academic freedom, and in fact quite a few of them are in the M.C.A.

Now, we therefore see that in the Nanyang University it is not so much a question of preserving academic freedom. It is these very elements who shout loudest, who shout from the housetops, who shout from the rooftops about the virtues of democracy, who are perverting the very processes of democracy in order to kill democracy itself. These are the people who are abusing academic freedom and, in fact, turning an institution, which should be a credit to this country, into something which certainly, if I may put it mildly, requires certain improvements. It is, therefore, clear that there is at least one section of those who oppose this Bill, whose views, I think, we need not take too seriously. As for the other section, who oppose this Bill on more honest

grounds, I would say that it is not the intention of this Government, through this Bill, to go for what you might call armchair socialists or doctrinaire Communists—those who, in airconditioned comfort, or in comfort not airconditioned, are prepared to believe that, in theory, socialism and even Communism is not too bad. This is not the intention of this Bill. After all, all of us were young once, and I remember the saying, “that those who are not socialists at 20 have no heart but those who are socialists at 40 have no head.” It is not the intention of the Government—I think my Honourable colleague the Minister of Home Affairs will confirm it—to go for a socialist of this ilk. We know that when we were young we have got to go through certain phases—one became rather exuberant, idealistic, and socialism then seemed a very attractive, a very dynamic political philosophy. But, of course, as one grows older, one learns to face the facts of life and, I think, one tends to grow wiser—at least, I hope, many of us do.

It has also been asked why, if the intention of this Bill is only to take care of a few, you should use such drastic measures. As has been pointed out, it is the practice of any Government to take unto itself fairly wide powers, not because it wants to use or even to misuse these powers, but because they are necessary and simply also because one can never foretell the future. It is not possible for mere mortals like ourselves to foresee with any degree of certainty what future conditions may be like, what circumstances may be like, and as a prudent Government, you have to take into account all possible contingencies, but that, of course, does not mean that these powers, these very wide powers, will be abused. For example, the Internal Security Act itself, if you are to look at it very logically, is an infringement of the basic principles of democracy, and I agree that if we were living in a perfect democracy we should not require the Internal Security Act. In fact, if we are living in a perfect democracy, we do not even require prisons; we can even

abolish prisons, but we are not living in a perfect democracy, we are not living in a heaven upon earth—though sometimes we try to make it a heaven upon earth—and, therefore, we have got to be content with the fact that we have got to face the facts of life, the realities of life. Hence these very wide powers. We have got at present the Internal Security Act, which empowers the Minister of Home Affairs to arrest anyone of us now, tomorrow morning, the day after, but all of us know that so long as the present Government remains in power these powers will be used, I think, judiciously, sensibly, moderately and with restraint.

I can quote other cases and, I think, in my own portfolio there is the Income Tax Act. Here again, the Comptroller-General has got power to insist that before a person is allowed to appeal against his assessment he must pay what he has been assessed at. In theory, the Comptroller-General could, if he does not like the shape of a particular person's nose, make an unreasonable assessment, one which is obviously beyond his means to pay, make him bankrupt, and when he has gone into bankruptcy say: “I am sorry, it has all been a bad mistake. Well, we will try to refund,” and by that time, of course, it will be too late. I remember when I introduced the amending Bill for the purpose of reducing the evasion of income tax I had an uproar, even from my own backbenchers, saying that this was Gestapoism, I had turned this country into a police state, the Minister of Finance would be able to do the most terrible things to everybody, personal enemies, political enemies, and the like, but so far, nothing has happened. In fact, since the enactment of that Act, I have not had a single case of any abuse of these admittedly very wide powers. So it is with this Bill. I think that we are now at the crossroads and all of us in this House, all of us who regard ourselves as the representatives of the people, as the torch bearers of democracy, must make up our minds on one thing, and that is that this Bill far from trying

to extinguish academic freedom in this country will, in the end, preserve the very academic freedom which its detractors say it seeks to destroy. That is really the significance, that is the goal of this Bill, and if we are honest, if today we come and look at this Bill with open minds, there can be no other conclusion. Thank you.

Datin Fatimah binti Haji Hashim (Jitra-Padang Terap): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya hendak berchakap sedikit berkenaan dengan usul menanggohkan Rang Undang² ini sa-lama enam bulan. Berkenaan dengan perkara dasar, saya akan berchakap apakala Rang Undang² ini di-bahathkan kelak, tetapi kalau Tuan Yang di-Pertua benarkan saya berchakap terus, saya akan teruskan ucapan saya sa-kali.

Mr Speaker: Memang di-benarkan. Saya sudah berchakap tadi ia-itu boleh di-benarkan sa-kali dalam perbahathan.

Datin Fatimah binti Haji Hashim: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak bersetuju Undang² ini di-tanggohkan sa-lama enam bulan dengan alasan² yang telah di-berikan oleh Yang Berhormat wakil dari Batu. Nampaknya Yang Berhormat ini lupa sa-kiranya Undang² ini di-tanggohkan sa-lama enam bulan, ini berm'ana memberi peluang kepada penuntut² yang patut di-sekat, dengan sebab mereka itu merbahaya kepada keselamatan negeri kita ini masuk belajar ka-Universiti Nanyang apakala universiti itu di-buka dan menerima penuntut² baharu dalam tiga empat bulan akan datang.

Saya tidak mengatakan Yang Berhormat dari Batu itu agent penuntut² yang berfahaman kominis, tetapi sa-kira-nya usul-nya di-luluskan, maka sia²-lah tindakan Kerajaan kita yang telah menahan penuntut² Nanyang dan juga tujuan Rang Undang² kita ini yang hendak menyelamatkan universiti itu daripada menjadi sarang pergerakan kominis.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-balek-nya saya bangun menyokong atas Rang Undang² Pindaan Keselamatan yang

di-kemukakan ini, dengan kerana saya dapati memandangkan kapada keadaan negara kita yang sedang di-ancham oleh Indonesia dan juga oleh pehak kominis yang sedang sentiasa menjalakan jarum-nya dengan berbagai chara dan satu daripadanya ia-lah melalui penuntut² yang sedang dan akan belajar di-universiti dan di-kolej. Sa-bagaimana apa yang telah dilihat berlaku di-Universiti Nanyang di-mana hingga pentadbiran universiti itu pun telah di-pengaruh dan di-kuasai oleh sa-bahagian penuntut² yang telah masuk faham semangat kominis.

Pada fikiran saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pindaan Rang Undang² ini telah pun terlambat di-bawa ka-Dewan ini, sa-patut-nya sa-tahun dahulu Kerajaan telah mengambil langkah yang saperti ini. Dengan ada-nya tapisan dari segi keselamatan negara saperti ini dapat-lah Kerajaan mengelakkan daripada mengambil langkah menutup universiti² yang penuntut² telah di-pengaruh oleh penuntut² yang berfahaman kominis. Dan lagi dengan ada-nya undang² saperti ini ibu-bapa tidak lagi khuatir atau bimbang menghantar anak² mereka masuk belajar di-universiti atau di-kolej di-negeri ini, kerana mereka tahu yang anak²-nya tidak akan di-pengaruh oleh mereka yang tidak bertanggung-jawab. Boleh jadi ada sa-tengah² berfikir mengapa pula di-kenakan juga kapada penuntut² yang hendak masuk ka-universiti sa-lain daripada Universiti Nanyang, pada hal kata-nya universiti yang lain itu berseh daripada penyeludupan kominis. Pada fikiran saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, lebeh baik kita "sediakan payong sa-belum hujan" atau di-adakan pagar sa-belum tanaman kita rosak.

Pengalaman kita daripada apa yang berlaku di-Nanyang itu sudah chukup bukti-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Kita sedar dan tahu yang agent kominis sa-memang sedia hendak memasokkan agent-nya melalui penuntut kapada universiti² yang lain dan kapada kolej² yang lain. Kalau hendak di-tunggu "nasi menjadi bubor" tidak guna lagi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

Kita jangan bimbang yang undang² ini ia-lah undang² menyekat kebebasan menuntut ilmu atau menyekat pemuda dan pemudi kita daripada menuntut ilmu tinggi; ini ada-lah mustahil sa-kali kerana Kerajaan telah ada dan akan membelanjakan berjuta² ringgit untuk hendak mengadakan dan membesarkan universiti² dan kolej² untuk anak kita supaya dapat pelajaran tinggi dan yang berguna kepada negeri ini.

Kita sa-memang berkehendakkan banyak lagi ra'ayat negeri ini menjadi pandai dan pakar dalam serba serbi untuk pembangunan dan pembenaan negara kita yang maseh muda ini, tetapi kita tidak sa-kali² berkehendakkan mereka itu kelak akan menjadi pembinasa dan pengguling negara kita yang berchorak demokrasi. Pemuda dan pemudi yang ta'at setia kepada negeri ini dan tidak di-pengaruh oleh kominis tidak akan bimbang undang² ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Demikian-lah pandangan saya di-atas sokongan pindaan Rang Undang² ini. Terima kaseh.

Dato' Syed Ja'afar bin Hasan Albar (Johor Tenggara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, apakala Bill ini atau pun Rang Undang² (Pindaan) atas Undang² Keselamatan di-keluarkan saya tertanya² diri saya akan guna dan faedah-nya, sa-hingga untuk hendak memuaskan hati saya terpaksa saya berbinchang panjang dengan kawan² untuk hendak mengambil satu kesimpulan atas faedah dan guna-nya Rang Undang² ini. Kita semua sedar akan keadaan negeri kita gerakan² subversive yang sedang menjadi² di-kalangan penuntut². Ini semua-nya saya ketahui dan sedar, tetapi saya berpendapat bahawa Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri agak-nya memadai untuk mengatasi soal subversive yang ada dalam negeri ini, jadi tidak-lah memerlukan lagi tambahan dan pindaan yang ada di-hadapan Dewan ini. Saya telah mendengar dengan chukup teliti dan dengan minat kenyataan Yang Berhormat Menteri Hal Ehwal Dalam Negeri apakala mengemukakan Rang Undang² ini kepada Dewan ini. Saya

puas hati dengan kenyataan-nya, tetapi ragu² atas usefulness pindaan ini maseh ada lagi saki-baki-nya di-dalam hati saya.

Apakala saya dengar hujah², alasan² daripada puak Pembangkang yang telah berchakap dengan panjang lebar dalam Dewan ini minta supaya Rang Undang² ini di-tanggohkan selama 6 bulan, baharu di-bawa kembali ka-sini, maka perasaan ragu² saya terhadap pindaan ini sa-makin menjadi². Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, apakala bangun Yang Berhormat Enche' Lee Kuan Yew berchakap menyokong Bill ini—Rang Undang² ini saya telah di-yakinkan-nya—di-convincekan-nya bahawa Rang Undang² ini ada-lah sangat² perlu. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jangan ada yang salah faham lalu mengatakan bahawa saya di-convincekan oleh Yang Berhormat Enche' Lee Kuan Yew kerana petah-nya dia berchakap, kerana alasan² yang di-kemukakan-nya di-dalam Dewan ini, bukan itu yang menyakinkan saya atas kegunaan dan faedah Bill ini. Saya biasa dengar pensharah² lebeh petah daripada dia. Sa-bagai politician bukan mudah bagi saya terpengaruh dengan kepetahan Enche' Lee Kuan Yew itu. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tahu-kah kenapa saya di-convincekan oleh Yang Berhormat Enche' Lee Kuan Yew apakala beliau berchakap berkenaan dengan Rang Undang² ini, kerana saya tahu background Ahli Yang Berhormat ini, Ahli Yang Berhormat ini-lah yang bertanggung-jawab menggalakkan, dia yang memberi perlindungan kepada penuntut² Sekolah Secondary China dalam masa Singapura gelap, dalam masa pemerintahan Yang Berhormat Lee Kuan Yew. Jadi dia tahu betul² keadaan yang ada dalam Singapura dan dia tahu benar² apa yang sa-benar-nya berlaku di-sana kerana dia-lah sa-orang yang memegang role utama atau peranan yang penting dalam gerakan student yang di-gerakkan-nya untuk membangkitkan huru-hara melawan Kerajaan Lim Yew Hock pada masa itu. Jadi kalau pada hari ini dia datang menyokong Rang

Undang² ini sa-bagai mustahak dan penting kapada kita maka the danger is real; orang yang mula² membangkitkan keadaan itu di-Singapura hari ini menyokong kuat Bill atau Rang Undang² ini. Dia tidak dapat menafikan bahawa dia-lah manusia-nya yang bertanggung-jawab memberi semangat, memberi galakan dan memperlindungan student yang membuat kachau dalam Singapura dan kedudukan politik pada hari ini Yang Berhormat Enche' Lee Kuan Yew sudah sedar bahawa perkara yang di-bangkit²kan dan di-ungkit²kan-nya dalam masa beberapa tahun dahulu sekarang sedang hendak memakan dia. Jadi, di-sini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, melihatkan sokongan yang kuat daripada P.A.P. terhadap Undang² ini, saya tidak dapat hendak mengelakkan diri melainkan terpaksa yakin bahawa Undang² ini perlu. Kalau Barisan Sosialis yang ada di-Singapura atau Socialist Front yang ada di-Malaya ini tidak perchaya usefulness Undang² ini, lebeh baik pergi mengaji dengan Yang Berhormat Lee Kuan Yew dia banyak boleh menceritakan berkenaan dengan penuntut yang ada di-Singapura. Baharu sa-bentar tadi Dewan ini telah mendengar ucapan Yang Berhormat Enche' S. Rajaratnam menceritakan segala perkara yang di-belakang tabir yang berlaku dalam Nanyang Universiti, kenapa dia tidak tahu—mesti tahu dia-lah orang-nya yang start problem itu, dia-lah orang-nya yang mulakan, dia-lah orang yang membangkitkan. Sekarang apabila sudah makan tangan-nya datang kamari, kita terima kaseh walau pun sa-bagai politician—sa-bagai gentleman saya mengalu²kan sokongan daripada Yang Berhormat Enche' Lee Kuan Yew dan Enche' S. Rajaratnam dan beberapa orang teman-nya lagi daripada P.A.P. yang akan bangun menyokong Rang Undang² yang ada di-hadapan Dewan ini, terima kaseh.

Enche' Abdul Rahim Ishak (Singapore): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya sa-harus-nya menguchapkan terima kaseh kapada Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Johore Tenggara kerana dengan sa-bagitu terus terang mengetahui bahawa dia telah banyak mempelajari

daripada Perdana Menteri Singapura rakan sa-perjuangan saya.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Bill to amend the Internal Security Act, 1960. Sir, after listening to the Honourable Member for Batu and, to a certain extent, the Honourable Member for Ipoh's case for precautionary action against subversive elements among students in our country, one cannot help feeling that the Member for Batu was treating the problem of Communist subversion as a very hypothetical problem. He and, I think, many outside this Chamber would like us to believe that all this talk of subversion is a red herring, if not a bogey raised in a society which, but for the distant sound of shelling on the borders with Indonesia, is all peace and tranquility, rosy and bright.

Sir, the Member for Ipoh this morning mentioned the case of a President of a Graduate Teachers' Union voicing anxiety against this Bill after so recently supporting the Government. I have read of a trade unionist, who had in no uncertain terms in the very recent past warned workers in this country against the evils of Communism, now referring to this Bill as being a threat not only to academic freedom but also to the freedom to grow beards. How frivolous some people can get in trying to put on appearances in anticipation of what they imagine will bring them a point or two, as against the grave problems, and equally the grave dangers, that we are facing within the country while outsiders are trying to blow down our house as can be seen in the antics of some trade union sergeant-majors trying to outdo others in their capacity to yell louder than the other chaps. Sir, this is no time for a yelling competition. This is a serious business of preventing our sons and daughters from coming under the influence of professional Communist agitators—not bogeys. They are not bogeys; they are real life bodies breathing oxygen as you and I, Sir (*Laughter*) walking about

in our towns and villages dressed probably not as you do, Sir, in your gown and wig, but probably as I in my lounge suit and necktie. We can find them right in our midst. They do not go about wearing a badge bearing the hammer and sickle. That would be very un-Communitic. On the other hand they always greet us with a polite smile and, inwardly, ask how is the world treating the bourgeois democrats—meaning all others, except themselves.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we are dealing with a real problem not an imaginary one. Ever since Marx said that religions and philosophers have only succeeded in interpreting the world and that it was the sworn duty of the Communists not only to interpret the world but to change it, many a young and impressionable mind has been trapped into believing that he was going to change the world into a better place—better i.e. than the one he or she is accustomed to; and headlong into the cause of “world revolution” has the young and innocent mind stumbled into other equally, if not more, attractive and more inspiring cliches.

As he or she gathers more of them, repeats them and feels that he believes in their meaning, the near-victim is introduced to even more and more of them until the student is lost in a maze of cliches and slogans. The faithful slogan shouter now thinks he is a great revolutionary with a great cause. He is by now firmly convinced that all those who do not support Communism are either ignorant of the existence of the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, and Mao, or, if they have heard of them, they are imperialist lackeys and colonial stooges of some kind. For how could, he argues, a man know about Communism and Marxism and yet not support this so-called scientific socialism, the 19th century revelation which he believes has been proved to be correct time and again in the 20th century, more than a hundred years afterwards?

Sir, a couple of weeks ago an ex-detainee named Linda Chen—whom

my colleague, the Prime Minister of Singapore, had referred to without naming this morning—confessed that in working for a more just society, she had believed in any number of cliches and slogans, which she knew little about until she discovered she was by then committed to the cause of world revolution. Like many others, she had started off in what she thought was a crusade against the old society in a school—that is where she began. She helped to blaze the trail for a communist society in another institution of higher learning—and that was in the university. We know that the former Women’s Federation and the Anti-Yellow Culture Movement in Singapore, in which Linda Chen took active and leading parts when she was still a young student, are adjuncts of the Communist United Front Organisations. Linda Chen now tells us all this, as someone who is disillusioned and sick of Communism. It is reported, Sir, that she now stands by Malaysia.

Mr Speaker, Sir, Linda Chen typifies hundreds who had their first taste of Communism while still at school, and that is why I brought her case up. She became convinced of the righteousness of this strange creed while at the university. She has spent many months in prison for what she now believes to be wrong.

The question that arises from this single illustration is whether, having been subjected to subversive communist influences while at school, a newly emerging society like ours should allow such a sick student to be a carrier to contaminate others who are not yet infected by the disease. Should not a patient suffering from the disease of Communism who is not even aware of the dangerous nature of the attack, and not knowing exactly how she contracted it, should not she be quarantined until the patient recovers from the malady?

The political innocents who talk of the threat to academic freedom have to remember that ours is a democracy still in its infancy, having to face the incessant onslaughts of the organised forces of totalitarianism, which started

about forty years ago. They need to be reminded of the armed insurrection of the Communist Party of Malaya before and after we achieved independence. They must be constantly told about the murder, arson, the brutalities and tyranny imposed on the people of this country by the bloodthirsty soldiers of the Malayan Communist Party.

Where the threat to the very foundations of democracy is real, as we are now experiencing today, then it is our duty as representatives of the people who cherish democracy to do all in our power to safeguard all the institutions which constitute our system. In countries where the democratic system has been firmly established over the centuries as in the United Kingdom, academic freedom cannot mean quite the same thing as it does in Malaysia, where there is more than enough evidence to show that certain institutions of learning are used as bases of operation by subversive elements determined to help set up a one-party dictatorship they have learnt to admire from afar.

In Malaysia today many issues, which are not strictly political, are fully exploited by the ruthless agents of Communism. Educational and cultural issues are not spared in the general strategy of the Communist Party of Malaya to stir and agitate against the freely elected government in the various component States in the Federation. Students and non-students alike are selected as targets. Student organisations, particularly those in the universities, are used for contacts with international Communist student groups in Communist as well as in non-Communist countries the world over.

Sir, the Bill is in fact does more than seek to issue certificates of suitability to prospective candidates into our institutions of higher learning. It should constitute a fair warning to students and parents that while at school they should never allow themselves or their wards to fall prey to the sinister activities of recruiting agents of the open-front organisations of the Communist Party of Malaya. Students should henceforth seek the advice of

their principals, teachers and parents before joining societies and other organisations in their schools invariably formed by students to promote extramural and recreational activities but which may have come under the silent influence of anti-national subversive Communist elements and these elements emerge in various forms. We have heard this morning various people from the Government side, as well as those from the Opposition, mentioning cases of real and dangerous types of subversion perpetrated in Nanyang University. I shall not recount them, Sir, except to say that in the interests of their children's education and future careers, parents and wards should never hesitate to make the necessary inquiries regarding the general progress and welfare of their children at school with the passing of this Bill.

The question will be asked about the thousands of Malaysian students who go abroad for higher education: Will they not be made the targets for subversion by Malaysian as well as foreign agents preying in centres of higher learning outside Malaysia? The answer, Sir, presumably is that in as much as this amendment Bill seeks to prevent and hinder the spread of the disease, so will our students abroad be closely watched and their association with pro-Communist, Communist and anti-national elements noted. But in the course of the debate, possibly when the Minister of Home Affairs finally winds up, we should like to hear what measures will be taken and what measures are being considered to deal with Malaysian students who go by the tens of thousands to England, Australia, Japan and other countries abroad.

National security and, ultimately, the security of our lives demand correspondingly tight vigilance against those who have no qualms about dragging our sons and daughters into the evils of a ruthless totalitarian system. In the final analysis, the security of the State as a whole must be given priority over individual careers of its citizens. The basic right to higher education must be seen against the broader canvass of the basic and

fundamental conditions under which our democratic state can survive. If the loss of the right to higher education for a few misguided youths helps to prevent the erosion of the basic of our state, then the country and the nation would have benefited in the long run with the passing of this Bill. Those who fondly believe themselves to be liberals need only look around them in Asia and Africa where in the last twenty years democracy has had to struggle very hard indeed to safeguard its sum total of basic rights and freedom.

Mr Speaker, Sir, Malaysia is now passing through that phase which others have undergone earlier. It is determined to succeed and remain within the comity of democratic nations even if a few other nations have failed. If the price of liberty is eternal vigilance, then eternal vigilance it will have to be. The Bill is no more than an act of vigilance in the field of subversion and perversion in educational institutions.

The control of admission to institutions of higher learning sought for in this Bill is the direct result of the abuse of the rights of higher education perpetrated by students and non-students in the last ten years or so. Six or seven months ago the government in a neighbouring country in Asia—in Burma, to be exact—was forced to close down a university in its desire to halt the nefarious anti-national activities of a section of the student body in the university mentioned.

How do the exponents of absolutism in the rights of education propose to deal with students who enter institutions of higher education with a hidden purpose of carrying out anti-democratic and anti-national activities? Do they deny that there are elements who make their way into institutions of higher learning with the dual intention of spreading their totalitarian ideology as well as to study? These, I am afraid, Sir, were not mentioned by Members of the Opposition who had opposed the Bill this morning and this afternoon.

We of the P.A.P. will support the Bill to the extent that applicants who are refused admission originate from students with a clear record of association and involvement in pro-communist and anti-national activities.

In the face of interference and acts of aggression by certain foreign countries, it is equally necessary to keep out students from these countries who may seek admission to our institutions of higher education for purposes which may go beyond the desire to further their education into the pursuit of the racial and ideological policies of the governments of the countries they come from.

However, it is hoped that a student, whose application for admission to any of the institutions concerned has been refused, will have every opportunity to make a fresh application after the period of twenty-eight days and after the final decision by the Minister concerned has been made. It will indeed be a mockery of democracy if no allowance whatsoever is made for a student who, having innocently been involved in undesirable activities and after a period of time recovers and makes a clear stand against his former associations, is still debarred from pursuing his or her studies in the five institutions mentioned in the Bill.

Lastly, Mr Speaker, Sir, there were cases cited this morning of heads of institutions of higher learning who have been involved, in one way or another, with pro-communists and anti-national elements. About two weeks ago, Sir, I had the occasion to have met the head of another institution of higher learning in our country, in fact one of the five institutions mentioned in the Bill, who had, probably very innocently, told me that he knew of a student leader in his institution who is completely free, or whom he thought to be completely free, from subversive and anti-national activities. It so happened that two days earlier I heard from a very reliable source, from the Government, that this very student had been involved, in the country as well as

abroad, in anti-national and anti-patriotic activities, which all goes to show that the present lax system of admittance of students to our institutions of higher learning is not enough and that the Bill, in the light of all the circumstances considered, is necessary. The question is, of course, how it will be implemented and whether students will be given the utmost investigation before their applications are refused. Thank you, Sir.

Mr Speaker: The sitting is suspended for 15 minutes.

Sitting suspended at 6.05 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 6.25 p.m.

(Mr Speaker in the Chair)

Mr Speaker: The debate on the amended motion will now resume.

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Mr Speaker, Sir, I wonder whether you will rule and allow me to speak at this stage of the Bill in view of the fact that you have earlier announced that you are going to take a division of the Bill on the amendment. I have earlier this morning said quite clearly that I have previously no intention to take part in the debate at this stage where there is an amendment to this motion. Can I proceed, Sir?

Mr Speaker: Yes.

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Mr Speaker, Sir, this morning I have very clearly indicated that it is our intention to assist the Government in every way to develop whatever precautions, and whatever measures the Government thinks necessary, to ensure the security of our nation. However, Sir, I come to this debate with an open mind to try and find, in the course of the debate, any valid reasons why we should not just let whatever powers the Government now possesses under the Internal Security Act remain as they are, and whether we should accept our Government's views and support this Bill to give the Government more powers.

Throughout the debate this morning and this afternoon, I have steadily

come to the point of view that all the arguments so far brought forward have not clearly indicated the issue whereby a legitimate loyal Opposition can take up the issue of deficiencies and the dangers of the provisions of the intended Amendment. We have talked about academic freedom, and we have talked about the various aspects of countering communist subversion but, in actual fact, the intention of the Bill as laid down in the Explanatory Statement—and also as expounded by the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs—clearly indicates that the intention of the Bill is to prevent the admission of applicants who would be likely to promote or participate in action prejudicial to the interest or security of the Federation, and so on. So, we are dealing, Sir, with a group, or section, of our nation, who have finished their secondary education and who intend to go to the university but have not yet gone to the university.

Sir, earlier today for one hour or more we listened, with great hopes rising, to the extreme eloquence of the Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore. Our hopes soared to the extent when he wisely counselled the Government to refer the Bill to a Select Committee. Unfortunately, after lunch, whatever better counsels prevailed during the lunch period between the Minister of Home Affairs and the Honourable Prime Minister of Singapore which we are not privileged to enjoy, we now know that the one hour's expression of what one sincerely believes to be a plea of a man highly eminent in his own field—of course as a member of the learned profession as well as a political leader—a plea which stemmed not only from the heart but also from the head, a plea which carried with it the stamp of intellectual honesty, which should suddenly be dashed after lunch; and he now indicates he no longer intends to ask the Government to refer this Bill to a Select Committee. Sir, all the arguments put forward by the Honourable Prime Minister of Singapore in urging the Government to refer the Bill to Select

Committee are valid, honest and sincere. We have heard tributes, since his announcement this afternoon, from the Government benches that he is the man best to decide and that shows that obviously there are no queries, no categories, no classifications of the type of democracy that he expounds and believes in. But the caution and the wisdom of his advice lies in the fact that whilst we are keenly and obviously dedicated to the idea of preserving the security of the nation, still there are doubts whether in so doing we will not cut into the fundamental rights of our citizens. Sir, it is admitted, and everybody admits in this House, that the Internal Security Act is an Act which has to be taken under emergency conditions and everybody professes that were it not for the present circumstances we would remove it in the interests of democracy—everybody agrees on that.

Sir, the Honourable speakers in this House who come from the learned profession have referred to this Bill in terms of medical application, in terms of medical allusions—they talk of immunity, they talk of quarantine, they talk about disease, they talk about rendering the body of our nation immune to the dangers of communist subversion—so naturally the arguments have a direct appeal to me. However, Sir, I do maintain still that whilst we try to inject some immune condition, some antibiotic to try and prevent the whole nation being corrupted or a large section of the student body being corrupted, we should not try to kill the patient himself. Here we have a situation where it is quite possible, in interpretation, that we are destroying democracy, killing democracy, in order to preserve it. Sir, why do I say that? I say it in all sincerity. The Internal Security Act has its obnoxious aspects with regard to the Constitution, particularly with those parts of the Constitution dealing with the fundamental rights of our citizens, because we have given to the Government powers of detention and arrest of people without bringing them to trial. The obnoxiousness of the Internal Security Act is that it

negates the fundamental concept of the rule of law. Sir, those powers are still with the Minister of Internal Security. If the Minister of Internal Security so feels that any group of students, or any person amongst the student body is likely to spread the disease of communist subversion into the academic streams or is in an higher institution, he can invoke his powers under the Internal Security Act and so detain him. That does not mean that we in spirit condone and accept the principles of the Internal Security Act. We accept them, however, under the existing circumstances. We maintain that having detained these people, you should give them a fair trial and it is the only way whereby we can bring subversion and undercover communism into the open. However, the provisions of this Amendment to the Internal Security Act carries the powers one step further. It makes the entire student population prior to entry into university suspect; they are suspect until they apply to enter an institution of higher study.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I notice that the Minister has immediately taken note of this, because it is very important for us to make it sure that whilst we intend clearly to take preventive measures, we should not cast a black mark and we should not cast undue suspicion over the student body. Sir, what is happening now? We have a situation under the Internal Security Act where a man has committed certain errors which are not admissible in the court of law. The man is detained and kept detained and not brought to trial because there is insufficient evidence for this person to be brought to a court of law to enjoy the justice which we all presume every citizen is entitled to have. Now we have a situation where a man has not committed any crime or any error which makes him liable to be detained, but he is discriminated against and he cannot even go to an institution for higher learning. Sir, where does this discrimination between where a man should be detained or where a man should be prevented from going into

higher learning began and where does it end?

Earlier on today I have also indicated that the certificate of suitability is a very difficult certificate to award, and certainly from the statement made by the Minister of Home Affairs the final arbiter as to whether a person is suitable or not suitable is clearly to be made by the security officers. Sir, I raised one other point. If any student, and obviously this student would have already clearly indicated that he has achieved scholastic achievement higher than the general average in this country because he would have gone through School Certificate and Higher School Certificate before he applied to enter the university, if such a student were refused entry into a university, there are two problems that arise. That is to say, if a certificate of suitability is not accorded to such a student, suspicion of that student immediately begins. First, the great problem is—can such a person who has been refused a certificate of suitability for admission to higher education find employment in the normal walks of life? We all know that the qualifications he has as a student would normally have entitled him even to become a teacher in the secondary schools. Will this denial of a certificate of suitability then curtail his right for employment? That is the first point.

The second point has been ably brought up as a tailpiece by the Honourable Member from Singapore, Enche' Abdul Rahim Ishak, who spoke just before me, and that is, has the Government any intention to give these students a second chance. Sir, I realise that here we have a situation where we are fighting and we are engaged in a battle not only for the minds but also for the hearts of our students. Earlier on today, the Honourable Minister for Home Affairs referred to a quotation by Lenin. I am not conversant with Lenin, so I hope I quote him rightly. He said that Lenin said that if whoever wins control over the youth, will win control over the political situation, or whatever it is.

Dato' Dr Ismail: He who has the youth has the future.

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Sir, I admit I am less conversant with Lenin than the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs. "He who has the youth"—Sir, the question is, how can we have the youth on our side? How can we win them? And I speak with some reference to the context of the pre-Education of Malaya era, that is to say, the end of the colonial period, and also of the Federation of Malaya context referred to by the Honourable Minister of Finance. During those years—the last ten years—we had considerable trouble in our secondary schools. The battle against subversion was conducted in the secondary schools and in trying to win over our students, Government was forced to adopt measures which very necessarily took away the rights and the liberties of larger numbers of persons than those who are really subversive. Sir, this is quite clearly proven, because once a student by any misfortune, whether by conscious contact with a communist group or by unconscious, indirect contact with a communist group, gets his name into the list of the Security Police, that mark against him is kept without his knowledge, without the knowledge of the parents, and held against him for all time. Sir, this is one of the iniquities, one of the dangers of having a Bill of this type, because we, who believe firmly that in the end democracy must triumph and shall prevail in our country, are not quite so frightened of the challenges that are made by the overt or subvert communist elements. But we must provide an alternative to this challenge. Sir, it would be, to my mind, an alternative method, and I mention this alternative method because earlier in the day when the Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore was making his very eloquent speech he referred to the fact that we have had to accept the Bill because under the present circumstances and under the present context there was no other way. However, he advised the Government that we should refer the Bill to a Select Committee, so that the other

bodies outside this House, who are protesting against the democratic spirit of this Bill, will at least have a chance to get explanations and at least contribute some measure to provide some less drastic method than the method that is provided for by the the Bill, Sir, wouldn't it be to the interest of the nation at large, wouldn't it be to the interest of the spirit of democracy in our country, that should any student by any chance, during the course of his secondary school career, long before the time comes for him to apply for entry into institutions of higher studies, should his name ever come under the scrutiny of the Security Branch, wouldn't it be better, Sir, under those circumstances, for us to provide some instrument or some measure whereby the Minister for Home Affairs or the Minister for Internal Security can act under those circumstances to contact not only the school board but contact the parent of the student involved, and contact the student himself, confront him with the position that he is faced with and try, under those circumstances, to teach him and win him and develop him from the views that he professes? Sir, that type of preventive measure, I feel, at least is more liberal. But accepting the fact that we have conceded this point of view, we still have the situation that once you deny a student a certificate of suitability, then the future of this student is involved to an extent that he cannot truly and earnestly say to himself that he is enjoying the full rights of a citizen as provided by our Constitution. But, Sir, in regard to the influence on the student, the Minister for Home Affairs may well say—it is natural—"If he wants to enjoy the full rights, do not get involved." Sir, that inference may be of importance to the individual. But the influence to other students who are not involved, the fact that a close friend of theirs, who is known to them as a good friend, known to them as an ordinary person, known to them as a person of good character, is not known to them as a subversive element, for such a person to be denied a certificate of suitability will create eddies of doubt—increasing doubt—amongst the

student bodies as a whole. It is because of this fear, that the student bodies as a whole will have the Sword of Damocles hung over them, that I suggest that this Bill, in its final analysis, for all the good that it seeks to achieve, is unnecessary, because the powers are already with the Minister for Home Affairs to act under the Internal Security Act itself, and this Bill carries with it again overtones of constitutional restriction.

Sir, that is one problem which we have to face, and I hope that when the Minister gives his reply he can give us further assurance that, as he has already tried to, the denial of a certificate of suitability of a student will not mean the curtailment, will not mean the end, of the life of the student, either as a useful citizen or as a potential academic talent in this country; and that having denied the student a certificate of suitability proper steps will be taken to win him over and to give him another chance in his life.

Sir, it is because of these intangible, imponderable, circumstances that student bodies, trade unions and responsible bodies throughout the country have expressed great concern over the passage of this Bill.

Sir, I have given notice, under S.O. 57, when the House goes into Committee, to make certain amendments to certain Clauses of this Bill, because I realise now quite clearly that there is no possibility that this Bill will be referred to a Select Committee. Therefore, the other issues that we have to consider are the issues of how this Bill is to be implemented.

Earlier, in this sitting of the House (last Friday) when we were discussing the amendments to the Constitution, and also earlier today, members from the Government benches have reiterated that the Alliance Party is a party which wants to do things openly, clearly and without hoodwinking anybody. But, Sir, the provisions of the amendments under Clause 2 (2) refer to the fact that the certificate of suitability will be issued by the Chief Education Officer, Director of Education or Chief

Education Adviser, as the case may be. Sir, earlier on, when the Minister of Home Affairs initiated this debate, he clearly indicated that the case of whether a student should be given the certificate of suitability or not, will only arise when a security officer points out that the student has his name in the security list. Sir, under the circumstances, if the security officer, with all the special amenities of the Special Branch, finds it difficult to investigate over the suitability of a student, how, I wonder, can the Chief Education Officer or other Government officers, who are not so equipped, examine the suitability of the student! We have had some assurance in the statement by the Minister of Home Affairs that if an appeal were to be sent to him and if he were in doubt, he will give the benefit of doubt to the student. That is one assurance given to this House. But the assurance would read better and would sound better and would give the country a feeling of greater security if it is incorporated in the Bill itself. However, Sir, I do say that, even from the explanation by the Minister of Home Affairs, it is quite clear that the Chief Education Officer and the Chief Education Adviser should not properly be the persons who should investigate into the suitability of the students. If any person and if any member in the Government Service should be so entrusted with this unpleasant business, it should be the security officer. However, Sir, in view of the fact that the Bill seeks to thrust a very unpleasant job to the Ministry of Education, and in view of the fact that the Government servants involve the Chief Education Officer and the Director of Education who are not answerable to this House, I believe that it would be useful for us to consider whether or not the certificate of suitability should not be entrusted to the Minister charged with the responsibility for education. I presume that the words "Minister charged with the responsibility for education" are used with the specific idea that Singapore enjoys autonomy in education and that the Minister charged with responsibility for education would,

therefore, cover both the Minister in the Central Government as well as the Minister of Education in the State of Singapore.

The other point is one which arises from a question to which I have not yet had an answer, namely, whether in the normal implementation of the Internal Security Act, security officers, before taking action, report to the Minister of Internal Security and obtain his approval before they so act. If that were the position, then it is quite clear that the denial of a student with a certificate of suitability must stem to some extent from the Minister of Internal Security or the Minister of Home Affairs directly. Therefore, it would be invidious in the case of an appeal to appeal to the very body which has ruled against the acceptability or the suitability of the student. Under those circumstances and without any opportunity for discussion in any Select Committee, I consider that it will be a good thing if the appeal were directed to the Honourable Prime Minister. Sir, everybody knows in this country that when there is any quarrel anywhere in this country, even amongst the Alliance members and even amongst the Cabinet Ministers themselves, eventually it is the Prime Minister himself who has got to give the last word and his blessing. It is true, Sir, that this country is happily in a position where we have Tunku as the Prime Minister, and everybody generally agrees that whatever the difficulties he presents as the leader of the Alliance, nobody has anything to say about his leadership as the Prime Minister of this country.

Sir, the other point which I have raised earlier today is that if this Bill, which deals with the five institutions named in the Bill and, in particular, with the Nanyang University and the Ngee Ann College, goes through—and the Minister of Home Affairs and the Government feel that they now have the power really to control, direct and guide the student bodies in this country—whether or not, under those conditions, subject necessarily to the improvement of standards in these two

institutions of Nanyang University and the Ngee Ann College, the Government has any intention to recognise these institutions at a later date. If the Government so has that intention and therefore has mentioned them in the Bill, at least to some extent the bitterness of the Bill will be ameliorated.

I repeat, Sir, that our objections to the Bill stem directly from the fact that the rule of law, which Government advocates that our citizens should follow, is further encroached upon people who are detained against their rights under the Constitution. It has already provided us with sufficient fears that the rule of law does not properly prevail in our country. The fact that we are now going to discriminate against students whose activities do not qualify them for detention further gives us great fear that steadily the Government by amendments to the Internal Security Act is impinging upon the rights embodied in our Constitution and cutting into the meaning of the rule of law.

Secondly, we feel that the administrative procedure provided makes it invidious for a Government officer not directly responsible for the investigation to be held responsible, and invidious from the point of view of Parliament that an officer not answerable to this House should be chosen to enact or carry out the implementation of this Bill; and thirdly, that appeal of the students should be given to a body which certainly will make every opportunity to give the students a second chance, a second lease in life.

sistem University dan lain² pusat pengajian tinggi di-negeri kita ini hendak di-hanchorkan oleh Kerajaan. Ini-lah yang chuba di-gambarkan oleh Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang tersebut itu. Pada hal Pindaan Rang Perlembagaan ini ya'ani an Act to amend the Internal Security Act, 1960 ini yang sa-benar-nya ia-lah hendak menyelamatkan University² dan juga hendak menyelamatkan pusat² pengajian tinggi daripada menjadi pusat gerakan subversive oleh gulungan kominis. Ini sudah jelas di-nyatakan oleh Menteri yang berkenaan pada masa mengemukakan Rang Undang² ini tadi. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-belum saya melanjutkan bahathan saya, izinkanlah saya menegor atau menunjukkan kejahilan Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu yang pagi tadi menda'awa bahawa beliau lama menjadi Anggota Council University Malaya dan menda'awa bahawa beliau tahu banyak tentang University Malaya. Jangan-lah di-sangkakan orang lain tidak tahu sampai tidak dapat menunjukkan kejahilan-nya. Dan sekarang saya akan tunjukkan kejahilan Ahli Yang Berhormat itu.

Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu menyebutkan bahawa Kerajaan memaksa University menerima mahasiswa². Saya ingin merujokkan Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu itu kepada University of Malaya Act ya'ani Federation of Malaya Act of Parliament No. 44 of 1961. Di-sini ada di-nyatakan bahawa dalam sekshen 47, kalau hendak tahu lagi di-muka 307:

"47. A student shall not be admitted to the University to a course of study for a degree unless he shall have satisfied such requirements as may be

Yang Berhormat itu hendak mengatakan, kawasan Batu itu lebih luas daripada bumi ini tidak ada orang hendak menangkap-nya juga. Jadi yang menjadi soal sekarang, sejarah perkembangan University² di-Eropa atau sejarah tertuboh-nya University² di-Italy, Peranchis, di-England dengan University Oxford dan University Cambridge berlainan keadaan-nya. Di-sana ketika itu masa mula² penubohan ini ia-lah kebebasan ilmiah dibatasi sebab itu mereka menagalkan

Kerajaan Perikatan sudah mendapat mandat sa-besar²-nya daripada ra'ayat negeri ini, maka sudah sa-patut-nya-lah berhak mengawal University² itu, berhak mengawal kebebasan ilmiah di-University² daripada di-peralatkan, daripada di-perkuda²kan oleh gulungan² yang anti-national, kalau mengikut istilah P.A.P. Jadi pada hakikat-nya pindaan yang di-kemukakan di-hadapan kita ini ia-lah untuk menyelamatkan University² dan juga pusat² pengajian kita. Ini adalah

pelajaran kanak² Sekolah Menengah China di-Singapura itu rendah, tetapi oleh kerana tekanan dari golongan kominis kepada Guru Besar itu, maka di-luluskan. Itu-lah bukti Nanyang University, as-tengah²-nya. Dan apabila sampai kepada policy Nanyang University itu, bagitu-lah juga, bukan-lah academic standard yang di-perlukan benar². Kalau kita fikirkan benar², tidak pernah kita berjumpa sa-suatu University dalam mana 99% penuntut yang masok peperiksaan itu lulus. Saya belum pernah mendengar lagi, kalau 100% tidak lulus itu ada, ia-itu Sekolah Menengah Melayu di-Singapura. Tetapi 99% lulus dalam satu peperiksaan, saya belum pernah dengar lagi. Ini membayangkan hakikat yang sa-benar-nya di-dalam Nanyang University.

Tetapi, di-sabalek itu apa-kah yang menyebabkan hakikat itu berlaku? Tidak lain ia-lah manoeuvre dan gerakan kiri anasir kominis dalam University itu-lah. Itu-lah yang di-pertahankan oleh Ahli Barisan Socialis. Bukan itu sahaja. Untuk menjadi Penserah di-University Nanyang, soal ilmiah dan soal ilmu pengetahuan tidak kira. Lulus dalam ilmu kimia boleh menjadi Penserah dalam Bahasa Melayu. Kalau di-University Malaya atau di-University di-Singapura, hendak menjadi guru di-dalam Jabatan Pengajian Melayu, mesti lulus M.A.; itu pun di-katakan tidak layak itu, dan tidak layak ini. Lulus dalam ilmu chemistry boleh menjadi pencerah dalam Bahasa ini membayangkan taraf pengajian di-University Nanyang. Ini-lah dia yang di-pertahankan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Barisan Socialis. Jadi, kita nampak-lah belang perjuangan beliau itu dan kunchu²-nya Socialis Front di-Malaya ini. (*Tepok*).

Kalau Ahli Yang Berhormat itu berkehendakkan lebeh banyak lagi ketenangan², nanti satu masa kita berbicara dan berdebat lebeh panjang lagi. Saya boleh membongkar lebeh banyak lagi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Jadi pada hakikat-nya Undang² ini ia-lah hendak menyelamatkan University² dan juga pusat² pengajian kita daripada menjadi pusat gerakan subversive yang akan

menghanchorkan negara kita, dan yang akan menghanchorkan system pemerintahan demokrasi berparlimen sa-bagaimana yang ada pada hari ini.

Saya tahu bahawa Ahli² Yang Berhormat daripada Barisan Socialis dan juga daripada Socialist Front, pada hakikat-nya bukan-lah mereka itu memperjuangkan system pemerintahan democracy berparlimen. Mereka hanya-lah menjadi dalang kepada gerakan kominis. Mereka memainkan lagu, mereka bertingkah laku berlakun dipentas Dewan Ra'ayat ini sa-bagai perkakas, atau bonika kepada kominis yang berdiri di-belakang mereka itu.

Sa-lain daripada itu, saya ingin menarek perhatian Kerajaan ia-itu bukan sahaja bakal² pelajar dan juga pelajar² di-university itu yang harus di-awasi, tetapi pencerah², penolong² pencerah dan juga professor² perlu di-awasi, sebab saya tahu di-dalam University Malaya, ada sa-tengah² professor dan juga pencerah² di-dalam kuliah-nya memberikan ilmu pengetahuan bahwa apa juga yang di-buat oleh Kerajaan Perikatan itu semua-nya salah. Itu salah, ini salah, itu salah, ini salah—erti-nya sa-chara ta' langsung pencerah² atau professor² itu meng-indoctrinate-kan mahasiswa² supaya menentang Kerajaan. Ini sa-benar-nya berlaku dalam university kita. Jadi, ini pun perlu di-ambil perhatian dan dalam masa hendak mengambil tenaga² baharu untuk menjadi guru di-university pun, perlu soal ini kita ambil perhatian. Kita ta' dapat—kalau saya di-benarkan memberi pendapat—kita ta' dapat memberi kebebasan sa-penoh²-nya kepada pehak university untuk mengambil tenaga² guru yang sudah pasti menentang kepentingan kita.

Di-dalam University Malaya, ada sa-tengah² pelajar yang membuat post graduate studies, bertahun² ta' tamat² kursus M.A.-nya, pada hal biasa-nya kursus M.A. sudah tamat dalam dua tahun, tetapi ada sa-tengah² pelajar daripada golongan yang tertentu, khas-nya golongan Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu, ta' tamat² M.A.-nya sampai hari ini. Jadi, apa yang sa-benar-nya yang di-buat oleh orang ini di-dalam

university, belajar? Menamatkan kursus M.A.-nya yang ta' tamat²? Sudah tentu-lah ada udang di-sabalek batu. Mengapa mereka mahu dudok lama² di-university menjadi professional students? Ini juga saya perlu menarek perhatian pehak Kerajaan, bukan sahaja sa-takat Undang² ini yang saya sokong, tetapi ayoh! kita maju ka-hadapan lagi untuk menyelamatkan negara kita. Jadi, sa-benar-nya ini-lah juga masaalah-nya. Sekarang dalam recruitment staff² baharu di-university kita, kita perlu perhatikan. Apa-tah lagi mungkin sa-tengah² orang yang baharu balek dari Negara Kominis yang konon-nya dahulu hendak lari ka-negara kominis, balek ka-mari mengajar di-university kita. Bagitu juga komplot² Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu itu dudok di-university bertahun² ta' tamat² M.A.-nya. Kursus M.A. apa, sampai berpuluh² tahun? Ini-lah dia yang harus kita ambil perhatian. Elok-lah saya tambah lagi ia-itu sa-masa mereka dudok di-university menamatkan kursus M.A. itu, penyelidekan untuk M.A. itu tidak-lah di-buat-nya sangat, tetapi dudok di-canteen, dudok di-sana, dudok di-sini, berbual dengan mahasiswa²—chuba indoctrinate sana, chuba pujok sana, chuba pujok sini, pengaruh sana, pengaruh sini dengan perlindungan guru², atau professor² yang tertentu.

Kemudian, saya pergi kapada satu soal lagi. Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Tanjong yang berchakap sa-belum saya tadi, mengatakan kita mengorbankan anak² kita, kalau kita jalankan undang² ini. Tetapi sekarang ini keadaan sudah mengemukakan sa-macham ultimatum kapada kita—mana kita mahu, mana kita kehendaki? Kita korbakan, atau kita tahan beberapa orang yang sudah pasti kominis, yang sudah pasti akan menghancurkan, yang sudah pasti akan berbuat sa-suatu untuk menghancurkan system negeri ini, atau pun kita akan di-korbankan, seluroh negara akan di-korbankan. Kalau saya di-benarkan memilih: “Saya kata 10-15 orang kominis ini, biar mereka ta' dapat pergi ka-university, kalau mereka hendak balek, balek-lah ka-negeri kominis—Communist China,

Communist Russia—balek-lah, tetapi kita harus mempertahankan system pemerentahan democracy di-negara kita ini”. Biar 10-15 orang itu ta' dapat masuk di-university, biar mereka menjadi “disgruntled group in this country”—kita ta' peduli, tetapi soal yang penting sa-kali ia-lah kita hendak menyelamatkan bangsa kita, kita hendak menyelamatkan negara kita—bukan soal 10-15 orang yang sudah tidak dapat kita berbuat apa² sa-bagai kominis di-negeri kita ini. Jadi, kesimpulan-nya, saya menyokong Bill ini dengan conscience, dengan perasaan dan fikiran yang tenang dan saya perchaya akan kebenaran ini. Bill ini ia-lah di-kemukakan untuk menyelamatkan—saya tegaskan, untuk menyelamatkan bangsa dan negara kita.

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: Mr Speaker, Sir, first of all, I would like to take issue on this question of academic freedom about which there has been a great deal of claptrap talked in this House. Sir, as I understand it, academic freedom is the freedom to study, to learn and to conduct research without being inhibited by any doctrinaire or dogmatic presumptions or assumptions or pre-conceptions. I fail to see, Mr Speaker, Sir, what legislation, like the internal security legislation, so far has had anything to do with academic freedom. There would be aspects of security Bills and laws which would be obnoxious to many people, but one must confess that it is difficult to see what connections these aspects have with academic freedom. The real danger to academic freedom in this country would come—if I may take up some hypothetical cases—if, for instance, one of these days the University was ordered by the Alliance Government saying that the only book on Shakespeare, which would be permitted in the University, would be one on the correct interpretation of Shakespeare by, let us say, Enche' Ja'afar Albar (*Laughter*); or—God forbid that such a day should come—or, say, if the Vice-Chancellor and the Council of the University were told that the only text-book on Economics which would be permitted would be one by Enche' Tan Siew Sin

(*Laughter*) and that no other text-book would be permitted—that would be a sad day for academic freedom in this country. But to date I think every man, who is intellectually honest must concede that there is basic freedom to study, to learn, to teach, and to conduct research without Stalins behind the professors and the University instructing chaps how Shakespeare ought to be interpreted, how to interpret Hamlet, and so on—that has not taken place. So all this prattle about academic freedom, Mr Speaker, Sir, must be dismissed as quite utter rubbish. (AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear, hear!).

Sir, the critics of the Bill would come under a wide spectrum. At one end of the spectrum, the extreme end of the spectrum, we would have the liberal libertines the lunatic fringe of the liberal group. One of the ironies of our struggle against the communists in Singapore has been that, at every step of our struggle against the communists, we had to be inhibited by liberals, who were not at all co-operative, who did not understand what the issues at stake were, who talked a lot of liberal nonsense; and the irony of the situation was that we had to fight and to take unpleasant steps and actions, in order to make Singapore safe for these liberals to liberalise in.

Then, at that end of the spectrum, you would also have opportunistic players up to the gallery. But in the middle, Sir, there is a fairly wide group of people who are patriotic citizens of Malaysia, who are genuinely perturbed that this Bill might be abused. I will come to this group of people, and I would submit, with all respect to the Government and to the Minister of Home Affairs, that they should consider with respect and sympathy the genuine fears that this group of people entertain about the implementation of this Bill.

At the other end of the spectrum, Sir, before I come to the middle group, the genuine group, would be the communists. Sir, to those in this House and the country at large, who have associated themselves with pro-com-

munist agitation in the past and who today quite naturally oppose the Bill prating about academic freedom and so forth, I would say this: the communists and their allies have the least to grouse about against the curtailment of democratic liberties for, if they had their way, the people of this country would be given up lock, stock and barrel to their Indonesian friends. Sir, the bitterest indictment against the communists and their Indonesian-loving allies in this country comes from the democratic socialist camp. The responsibility for every piece of repressive legislation in this country must be laid at the door of our communists. The challenge that they have made to our democratic way of life and the treasonable challenges they offer today to the security, the sovereignty and the territorial integrity of the Malaysian nation, on behalf of the aggressive policies of the Indonesian confrontationists, are the basic cause of the grim laws that this House has been asked to enact from time to time. But let us take care, Sir, that we do not fall completely into the communist trap while arming ourselves with all the necessary instruments and weapons of protection. Let us not, Sir, unwittingly and unconsciously appear to don totalitarian uniform ourselves and this is where we come to the middle group of people—patriotic, responsible, sober Malaysian citizens—who have got genuine qualms about this Bill.

No one will quarrel with the proposition that the preservation of national security is the paramount concern of any Government. Malaysia today has a Government which undoubtedly enjoys the overwhelming mandate of the people. We have a hostile neighbour who continues to pursue relentlessly and without abatement his "Crush Malaysia" policy. We also have internal enemies who, for all practical purposes, act as "fifth column" agents of a hostile foreign power. In the circumstances, any Government, anywhere in the world, must necessarily be obliged to enforce stern action against the internal enemies of the State.

But, be all that as it may, it must be pointed out that laws designed to protect the State against internal subversion may also lend themselves to abuse. I do not say that the Internal Security (Amendment) Bill, if passed, will be consciously and deliberately abused by the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs. But many of us on this side of the House are painfully aware that not everybody on the Government benches comes up to the same high standard of public conduct as is shown by some of the Ministers and that not everybody on the Government benches are equally men of vision and enlightenment. There are those, Sir, unfortunately, who appear to fall considerably below the high standards of public conduct which we would expect from a ruling party. In these circumstances, responsible members of the Opposition, who support the Bill, must feel obliged to bring to the attention of the leaders of the Government the genuine fears, real, honest and sincere fears, that exist among large sections of the people, that the Bill if passed into law may conceivably lend itself to abuse. I might enumerate some of these genuine fears which have been expressed to me personally by several responsible and patriotic citizens of Malaysia. Parents, especially, are genuinely concerned as to what it would mean in terms of the educational future of their children. I am stating their fears, and I am not putting them forward as an argument. So, I hope that the Government will take into serious consideration this general background of opinion against which this Bill will be enacted.

Here is a law which claims and which no doubt has been formulated on security grounds; and it is intended to keep out undesirable elements from infiltration into our institutions of higher learning. Sir, there can be little doubt that if greater care had been taken in the selection of students in the Nanyang University, that University would not have become, as it did, the happy hunting ground of vicious anti-national forces, who unashamedly espoused the cause of external enemies of Malaysia. However, Sir, the fear

exists that in the name of national security, the law may be used against patriotic citizens of the State, for no other reason than that they may have, for a variety of reasons, incurred the displeasure of the powers-that-be. And the argument goes, Sir, that it would be the simplest thing in the world for the Government to disallow, by the stroke of a pen, educational opportunities in our universities on the grounds of narrow, petty, non-security considerations. In that event, which I hope is extremely unlikely, democratic liberties would suffer serious harm in the name of national security. The paradoxical consequence, Sir, would be that in seeking to protect our national security and democratic way of life, we would have succeeded in shaping ourselves in the image of our totalitarian enemies. One question may be as to how far it is really possible to fight the enemies of democracy by using indiscriminately weapons from the totalitarian armoury. These are the arguments which exist in the minds of several decent, honest, citizens of this country, which will have to be met by this Government.

Stern action against the anti-social criminal can easily be justified. And so can stern action against those who endanger national security. But, Sir, the argument goes that legislative repression of anti-national elements, security risks, is also subject, beyond a certain point, to a law of diminishing returns. Much more than that, it is argued that it will also be subject to the law, probably, of boomerang returns.

Sir, great powers are asked for under this Bill, and the powers that are asked for can usefully be employed—I have little doubt about that—to strengthen national security. They can also—and it must be granted at least theoretically—they can also be grossly abused if those who are responsible for enforcing the law do not take the trouble to maintain a very high standard of dedication to the democratic ideals of this nation. Offensive weapons can do great damage to society as a whole in the hands of the wrong people. A gun in the hands of a good

(*Laughter*) and that no other text-book would be permitted—that would be a sad day for academic freedom in this country. But to date I think every man, who is intellectually honest must concede that there is basic freedom to study, to learn, to teach, and to conduct research without Stalins behind the professors and the University instructing chaps how Shakespeare ought to be interpreted, how to interpret Hamlet, and so on—that has not taken place. So all this prattle about academic freedom, Mr Speaker, Sir, must be dismissed as quite utter rubbish. (AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear, hear!).

Sir, the critics of the Bill would come under a wide spectrum. At one end of the spectrum, the extreme end of the spectrum, we would have the liberal libertines the lunatic fringe of the liberal group. One of the ironies of our struggle against the communists in Singapore has been that, at every step of our struggle against the communists, we had to be inhibited by liberals, who were not at all co-operative, who did not understand what the issues at stake were, who talked a lot of liberal nonsense; and the irony of the situation was that we had to fight and to take unpleasant steps and actions, in order to make Singapore safe for these liberals to liberalise in.

Then, at that end of the spectrum, you would also have opportunistic players up to the gallery. But in the middle, Sir, there is a fairly wide group of people who are patriotic citizens of Malaysia, who are genuinely perturbed that this Bill might be abused. I will come to this group of people, and I would submit, with all respect to the Government and to the Minister of Home Affairs, that they should consider with respect and sympathy the genuine fears that this group of people entertain about the implementation of this Bill.

At the other end of the spectrum, Sir, before I come to the middle group, the genuine group, would be the communists. Sir, to those in this House and the country at large, who have associated themselves with pro-com-

munist agitation in the past and who today quite naturally oppose the Bill prating about academic freedom and so forth, I would say this: the communists and their allies have the least to grouse about against the curtailment of democratic liberties for, if they had their way, the people of this country would be given up lock, stock and barrel to their Indonesian friends. Sir, the bitterest indictment against the communists and their Indonesian-loving allies in this country comes from the democratic socialist camp. The responsibility for every piece of repressive legislation in this country must be laid at the door of our communists. The challenge that they have made to our democratic way of life and the treasonable challenges they offer today to the security, the sovereignty and the territorial integrity of the Malaysian nation, on behalf of the aggressive policies of the Indonesian confrontationists, are the basic cause of the grim laws that this House has been asked to enact from time to time. But let us take care, Sir, that we do not fall completely into the communist trap while arming ourselves with all the necessary instruments and weapons of protection. Let us not, Sir, unwittingly and unconsciously appear to don totalitarian uniform ourselves and this is where we come to the middle group of people—patriotic, responsible, sober Malaysian citizens—who have got genuine qualms about this Bill.

No one will quarrel with the proposition that the preservation of national security is the paramount concern of any Government. Malaysia today has a Government which undoubtedly enjoys the overwhelming mandate of the people. We have a hostile neighbour who continues to pursue relentlessly and without abatement his "Crush Malaysia" policy. We also have internal enemies who, for all practical purposes, act as "fifth column" agents of a hostile foreign power. In the circumstances, any Government, anywhere in the world, must necessarily be obliged to enforce stern action against the internal enemies of the State.

But, be all that as it may, it must be pointed out that laws designed to protect the State against internal subversion may also lend themselves to abuse. I do not say that the Internal Security (Amendment) Bill, if passed, will be consciously and deliberately abused by the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs. But many of us on this side of the House are painfully aware that not everybody on the Government benches comes up to the same high standard of public conduct as is shown by some of the Ministers and that not everybody on the Government benches are equally men of vision and enlightenment. There are those, Sir, unfortunately, who appear to fall considerably below the high standards of public conduct which we would expect from a ruling party. In these circumstances, responsible members of the Opposition, who support the Bill, must feel obliged to bring to the attention of the leaders of the Government the genuine fears, real, honest and sincere fears, that exist among large sections of the people, that the Bill if passed into law may conceivably lend itself to abuse. I might enumerate some of these genuine fears which have been expressed to me personally by several responsible and patriotic citizens of Malaysia. Parents, especially, are genuinely concerned as to what it would mean in terms of the educational future of their children. I am stating their fears, and I am not putting them forward as an argument. So, I hope that the Government will take into serious consideration this general background of opinion against which this Bill will be enacted.

Here is a law which claims and which no doubt has been formulated on security grounds; and it is intended to keep out undesirable elements from infiltration into our institutions of higher learning. Sir, there can be little doubt that if greater care had been taken in the selection of students in the Nanyang University, that University would not have become, as it did, the happy hunting ground of vicious anti-national forces, who unashamedly espoused the cause of external enemies of Malaysia. However, Sir, the fear

exists that in the name of national security, the law may be used against patriotic citizens of the State, for no other reason than that they may have, for a variety of reasons, incurred the displeasure of the powers-that-be. And the argument goes, Sir, that it would be the simplest thing in the world for the Government to disallow, by the stroke of a pen, educational opportunities in our universities on the grounds of narrow, petty, non-security considerations. In that event, which I hope is extremely unlikely, democratic liberties would suffer serious harm in the name of national security. The paradoxical consequence, Sir, would be that in seeking to protect our national security and democratic way of life, we would have succeeded in shaping ourselves in the image of our totalitarian enemies. One question may be as to how far it is really possible to fight the enemies of democracy by using indiscriminately weapons from the totalitarian armoury. These are the arguments which exist in the minds of several decent, honest, citizens of this country, which will have to be met by this Government.

Stern action against the anti-social criminal can easily be justified. And so can stern action against those who endanger national security. But, Sir, the argument goes that legislative repression of anti-national elements, security risks, is also subject, beyond a certain point, to a law of diminishing returns. Much more than that, it is argued that it will also be subject to the law, probably, of boomerang returns.

Sir, great powers are asked for under this Bill, and the powers that are asked for can usefully be employed—I have little doubt about that—to strengthen national security. They can also—and it must be granted at least theoretically—they can also be grossly abused if those who are responsible for enforcing the law do not take the trouble to maintain a very high standard of dedication to the democratic ideals of this nation. Offensive weapons can do great damage to society as a whole in the hands of the wrong people. A gun in the hands of a good

yang lebih merbahaya sa-kali. Saya katakan pehak subversive yang saya telah nyatakan terlebih dahulu bertahun² yang lampau barangkali mereka itu ada bersama² kita di-dalam Dewan ini. Itu-lah pehak yang kita takut sangat dan Rang Undang² ini apabila telah menjadi Undang² negara kelak kepada mereka itu-lah yang akan kita hadapkan. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tidak menjadi takut atau pun bimbang pada mana² pehak kerana Undang² ini, kerana kita maseh ingat apabila Rang Undang² berkenaan dengan keselamatan negara telah dikemukakan dalam Dewan ini, heboh sangat-lah dalam Dewan ini apabila divide. Tuduhan kepada Kerajaan akan mempunyai kuasa gestapo, akan menjadi polis state dan sa-bagai-nya, tetapi apabila Undang² itu berjalan, kita hendak menangkap Enche' Ahmad Bustamam itu pun, kita ikuti jejak langkah dia baharu kita tangkap, berbulan² dan bertahun² apabila buktinya telah nyata, baharu-lah kita tangkap. Bagini-lah juga Undang² ini pehak yang bersalah sahaja kita akan tahan bagi melanjutkan pelajaran mereka itu ka-Universiti kita.

Barang di-ingat, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, negara kita ini kecil dan baharu sahaja mendapat taraf kemerdekaan, kita ada hanya dua Universiti. Nanyang Universiti tidak tentu lagi sama ada kita i'tiraf atau tidak. Jadi, kita mesti jaga baik² kedua² Universiti ini, kerana untong nasib negara kita pada masa akan datang ia-lah kepada orang² yang akan mendapat kelulusan menerusi pintu depan dalam kedua² Universiti itu. Kalau mereka itu akan menerima hasutan atau pun ajaran komunis, maka negara kita akan menjadi hanchor lebor-lah. Jadi, saya rasa molek-lah sangat kita jaga sa-bagaimana pepatah Melayu, "sa-ekor kerbau membawa lumpur, habis-lah semua terpalit". Jadi, kita mesti jaga sangat-lah orang² yang akan masuk ka-Universiti² itu, dan lagi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua belanja sangat banyak untuk kita hendak mendidik anak² kita dari tangga yang bawah sa-kali sampai mereka hendak masuk ka-Universiti. Jadi, kalau sudah masuk ka-Universiti, manakala lulus mereka

menjadi orang² yang tidak berguna, maka wang ra'ayat menjadi hampa sahaja.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pagi tadi saya dengar soal daripada rakan saya dari Ipoh, bertanya ada-kah Undang² ini di-jalankan di-mana² negara di-dalam Commonwealth, atau pun di-Russia? Memang Undang² ini sudah berjalan di-Russia, kerana orang² Russia itu semua-nya komunis. Jadi, pertanyaan itu tidak-lah besar ma'ana-nya kepada saya. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, wakil daripada Ipoh itu sikap-nya berlainan sangat. Saya tidak suka hendak menuduh dia ka-barat sangat, terpaksa-lah saya berchakap sedikit kerana dia tidak ada di-sini, kalau dia ada di-sini, saya akan buat tuduhan yang berat. Dia itu berani bila ada abang-nya, jadi dia itu macham "Siamese twins". ada abang-nya dia berani (*Ketawa*). Jadi, apa² fikiran, dia menentang Kerajaan tidak ada keluar daripada hati-nya yang suchi, apabila abang dia ada berani-lah dia bahath kuat² sedikit. Apa² perkara yang di-keluar-kan itu atau apa² Undang² yang akan di-bahathkan atau di-kemukakan oleh Kerajaan (*Ketawa*).

Mr Speaker: Saya beri awak berchakap dalam masa satu minit sahaja lagi.

Enche' Tajudin bin Ali: Jadi, bagi penutup-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, orang² yang bertanggung-jawab pada negara itu tidak heboh seperti orang yang di-katakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Ipoh dan sa-bagai-nya. Kita Kerajaan Perikatan ada-lah satu Kerajaan yang bertanggung-jawab pada beliau, dan kepada rakan² sa-jawat-nya itu, pandai bertanggung-jawab terhadap negara dan bangsa buat-lah rombongan terus pergi berjumpa dengan Menteri yang berkenaan, perkara itu binchang-lah didalam²-nya, dan saya tidak suka-lah kerana hendak mendapat tidak lain bahkan publicity sahaja. Jadi, saya mengambil peluang bagi mengingatkan pada hari akan datang jangan-lah chari cheap publicity, tetapi keselamatan negara dan bangsa itu perlu-lah di-jaga.

ADJOURNMENT

Dato' Dr Ismail: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that this House do now adjourn.

Dato' V. T. Sambanthan: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

ADJOURNMENT SPEECHES

LOW COST HOUSING SCHEMES— ULU KINTA

Enche' Chin Foon (Ulu Kinta): Mr Speaker, Sir, my constituency comprises of farmers engaged in various types of cultivation and they have been residents of that area for generations. During the Emergency, Sir, these residents were resettled from their traditional place of abode to resettlement areas which are congested and with no prospect of increasing their standard of living and improvement in their condition of health. I wish to enquire from the Honourable Minister concerned what allocation or what provision has already been made for my constituency so as to enable me to get details to submit my quota for allocation for such low cost housing schemes in my area. Thank you.

The Minister for Local Government and Housing (Enche' Khaw Kai-Boh): Mr Speaker, Sir, in reply to the Honourable Member for Ulu Kinta, it is not the procedure under existing policy for my Ministry to make an allocation of funds for any particular constituency or town or place. Under the existing procedure carried over from the former Ministry of Interior, State Governments are requested to submit bids for low cost housing schemes in their respective States. These bids are listed in order of priority. The Ministry then considers all these bids in the context of the financial provision available, fair distribution of funds, past performance by State Governments in low cost housing projects, the economic and social need for a housing scheme and so on. If the need for a low cost housing scheme in the Honourable Member's constituency is a vital social need, then I would request him to

submit his request with details such as availability of land, prevailing social conditions, number of units required, etc., to the State Government of Perak. If the State Government considers the scheme worthy of implementation it would forward a request to my Ministry for consideration.

I would like to add, however, the new Ministry of Local Government and Housing has been created to intensify Government's efforts in the fields of low cost housing. In the past other priorities enabled Government only to provide housing on a scale which gave relief rather than alleviate the housing shortage. It is Government's intention to carry out a survey so as to define more accurately the proportions of the housing shortage throughout the country and then to plan a programme geared to actual needs. Action is being taken to procure the services of two experts who, among other things, will conduct a housing survey. The Ministry and the Housing Trust as organised at present will not be able to cope with a programme which we envisage will be completely out of proportion to the existing programme. Serious thought is being given to the centralisation of all low cost housing activities in a strong Federal Housing Authority. In view of the magnitude of the problem, the attendant complexities, and the need for careful planning the future housing programme will take sometime to implement. I should perhaps mention that the need for housing is greatest in the larger urban centres and therefore these centres will receive highest priority. It is not intended that semi-urban and rural areas should be left out but as the housing need will not be so pressing in these areas they will merit lower priority—the pace of housing development in such areas will be more leisurely. I hope what I have said gives a broad picture of the future low cost housing development.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC ILLS OF TELUK ANSON, PERAK

Dr Ng Kam Poh (Teluk Anson): Mr Speaker, Sir, I crave the indulgence of

and trusted man is not likely to cause unease to his neighbours and to his fellow citizens. But the gun in the hands of an irresponsible, wild man can cause considerable unease to his fellow citizens.

Sir, my appeal to the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs is that the Government should, as a matter of wisdom, go out of its way to give categorical assurances now, and concrete assurances in practice, that these fears, which exist genuinely in the minds of decent citizens, have got no grounds whatsoever. Parents, Sir, will have to be assured, and, no doubt as time goes on in the implementation of the Bill, they will have to be completely assured that this Bill is directed solely against enemies of the nation and not indiscriminately against the educational future of their children.

Other assurances, Sir, would also have to be given. Administrative processes for the securing of suitability certificates by students must be smooth and should never be subject to bureaucratic delays. Certificates should not be withheld for longer than necessary. I am aware that we have the assurance to this effect from the Minister, but great vigilance must be exercised to ensure that corrupt practices do not arise in connection with the issue of such certificates. Again, Sir, once a certificate of suitability is issued, there must be no question of subsequent withdrawal of that certificate.

I do not wish to touch on the other measures which have been suggested by other Members of the House but I would submit, Sir, respectfully to the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs that there would be a greater sense of security all round if he could consider making provisions for appeals to a disinterested and impartial tribunal against any decision to withhold certificates of suitability. It is quite possible, Sir, and no doubt it happens with distressing frequency, that Special Branch reports on particular individuals are wrong. Like the rest of us frail human beings, Sir, the Special Branch officers are also fallible and prone to making wrong judgments. The provi-

sion of an Appeal Committee would afford some protection against such eventualities which are bound to arise in some cases.

Lastly, Sir, the vital assurance must be given that this necessary but essentially obnoxious piece of legislation will be repealed the moment the security situation facing the country diminishes to a safe degree. Let it never be forgotten, Sir, that we in this House, as elected representatives of the people, are the ultimate guardians of the democratic liberties of our people. Let the leaders of the Government, Sir—let all of us remember—that we would be betraying the trust of the nation and the democratic basis of the nation's life if the grim powers with which we are vested are not used with circumspection and a sense of high responsibility. Let it never be said by historians of the future that the net result of our fight against the communist enemies of democracy was, as I said earlier, to shape ourselves in the image of our totalitarian enemies. Thank you, Sir. (*Applause*).

Enche' Tajudin bin Ali (Larut Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ucapkan terima kasih kepada Tuan Yang di-Pertua kerana memberi saya peluang berchakap. Hari sudah hampir jauh malam maka saya mengambil peluang di-sini mengucapkan banyak terima kasih kepada pehak Pembangkang—P.A.P. ia-itu Petir yang menyokong di-atas chadangan yang telah di-majukan oleh Menteri Dalam Negeri. Terima kasih juga kepada U.D.P. tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ternanti² bukan main lama lagi mengapa PAS tidak dapat berchakap. Jadi saya ternanti² juga, chadangan saya hendak berchakap lama tetapi nanti²kan PAS tidak berchakap saya pun bangun berchakap. Saya rasa perkara ini kepada saya sangat-lah penting-nya tetapi apa pula kata bagi pehak PAS. Apa pendirian mereka itu ada-kah mereka suka sa-kira-nya Bill ini tidak di-kemukakan—di-terima menjadi Undang² negara kalau sa-kira-nya pehak kominis datang di-sini boleh-kah mereka berlindung di-bawah sayap kominis?—saya bertanya kepada diri saya sendiri, Tuan Yang

di-Pertua. Saya tengok dahulu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, apabila kita binchangkan Rang Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri, PAS telah menentang dengan hebat-nya, pindaan ini juga saya sangat terkejut daripada mula tadi lagi

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah (Kota Bharu Hilir): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, on a point of explanation. PAS menyokong—bukan menentang—dahulu, tetapi dia terlupa.

Enche' Mohamed Asri bin Haji Muda (Pasir Puteh): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untuk penjelasan.

Mr Speaker: Dia minta penjelasan.

Enche' Tajudin bin Ali: Boleh, silakan.

Enche' Mohamed Asri bin Haji Muda: Saya telah katakan tadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua—PAS ini menentang waktu membahath Internal Security Act, itu tidak betul—PAS menyokong dahulu.

Enche' Tajudin bin Ali: Jadi saya silap (*Ketawa*); saya minta ma'af-lah. Tetapi apa pula, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-atas satu Rang Undang² yang sangat penting bagini juga sedang di-binchangkan hebat di-luar dan di-dalam Dewan ini. Jadi saya tengok daripada pagi tadi Yang Berhormat wakil Bachok dia berdiri sa-kerat sahaja kemudian terus hilang tidak nampak sampai sekarang. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tetapi sa-malam kita dengar Yang Berhormat dari Besut kata, "saya di-lantek oleh ra'ayat dan saya datang di-sini hendak berchakap bagi pehak ra'ayat". Hari ini dia senyap sunyi demam kura-kah (*Ketawa*). Jadi ini-lah yang kita hendak tahu.

Enche' Muhammad Fakhuruddin bin Haji Abdullah (Pasir Mas Hilir): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untuk penjelasan.

Mr Speaker: Yang itu jangan-lah di-kuit²kan, biar-lah dia diam sahaja.

Enche' Tajudin bin Ali: Bagus, Tuan Yang di-Pertua (*Ketawa*). Mereka mengambil resmi penyu bertelor berkali². Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bagi pehak saya, Rang Undang² ini sangat-lah

penting dan saya ibaratkan sa-bagai kita sediakan payong sa-belum hujan turun.

Kita tahu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, menerusi akhbar² dan cherita² yang boleh di-harapkan di-Singapura, apabila wakil Kerajaan Indonesia ia-itu General Jatikosomo, tidak putus² beliau berhubung dengan mahasiswa Universiti Malaya dan Singapura. Jadi, saya rasa Kerajaan kita sangat-lah baik budi terlampau berfikir di-atas Undang², maka selalu Kerajaan menyatakan kita ini berkerajaan berchorak demokrasi, dan saya rasa terlampau baik. Perkara ini saya telah nyatakan di-dalam Dewan ini terlebih dahulu. Kita tengok pergaduhan dan hampir bertumpah darah di-Nanyang Universiti. Kita telah tengok "the writing is on the wall." Kita mesti-lah mengambil pandangan yang jauh yang Undang² ini sangat-lah baik. Baik-nya pada negara kita, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita patut berterima kaseh yang tidak terhingga pada pehak Colonial Government ia-itu dahulu dengan ada-nya Universiti Malaya dan Universiti Singapura, Universiti² itu telah pun mengeluarkan orang² yang terkemuka, dan mentadbirkan negara kita ini. Hasil-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita dapat satu pentadbiran negara kita mencapai taraf kemerdekaan yang sangat memuaskan ra'ayat jelata sakalian dan telah menjadikan sakit hati kapada negara yang berjiran dengan kita. Kapada mereka, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, senang sahaja manakala masuk Universiti itu, maka senang-lah mendapat ijazah. Pergi ka-India balek dapat jadi doktor, pergi ka-Netherlands balek dapat menjadi doktor. Jadi, senang sahaja doktor² yang sa-macam itu saya katakan doktor chelup, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tidak memberi faedah kapada negara, tetapi kita mesti jaga baik² kedudukan Universiti kita, oleh sebab itu-lah saya memberi sokongan yang penoh kapada Rang Undang² yang ada di-hadapan kita ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ingat organisation komunis ada dua pehak yang tertentu ia-itu pehak Russia dan pehak subversive. Kalau di-tanya saya sendiri. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, mana

this House for prolonging this meeting and I hope you will excuse me for bringing up this matter at this late hour.

Sir, the object of this adjournment speech is to bring to the notice of this august House the socio-economic ills that confront my constituency, Teluk Anson. To obtain first hand knowledge of my constituency, one must go back into the history of Teluk Anson. The town itself was the centre of trade and commerce for the whole of Lower Perak and a part of Selangor. It is the third largest town in Perak, and before Merdeka it was the main, if not the only, port, through which the produce of Perak was channelled. Now with Merdeka, the produce of Perak need not be channelled through Teluk Anson, and as a consequence only a few ships now call at this port. With the resultant loss of trade, the livelihood of not only the port workers but that of the whole town is affected. So, as you see, Sir, Teluk Anson, once a prosperous and happy trading centre, is now stagnating in the doldrums.

Teluk Anson was famous for its oranges, but with the root disease that struck the orange groves, the export trade from Teluk Anson ceased and a million-dollar industry ground to a halt. Sir, in those days, an acre of oranges cost a thousand dollars more than the best acre of rubber, even when rubber was in boom. It is also one of the centres for tobacco growing, and while the farmers still plant tobacco, the price of tobacco is poof, and the farmers there barely eke out a living.

We also have a pineapple industry in Teluk Anson but with the closing down of the cannery in Jenderata, just outside my constituency, there is no market for the produce, resulting in the people there finding it extremely difficult to make both ends meet.

Mr Speaker, Sir, to add to the ills, the town itself suffers from soil erosion which brings to the people of Teluk Anson fear, and anxiety of losing their homes. This, Sir, is the condition of the town in which I live. If there is a place in Malaysia where there is a gap between the "haves" and "have-nots", Sir, Teluk Anson must surely rank

among the first. Only last month, Sir, we had two hundred applicants for two vacancies for temporary clerks in the Town Council. Unemployment is rampant and the youths are leaving Teluk Anson to look for jobs elsewhere. Industrialisation might be the answer, but then, Sir, we are off the beaten track. Perhaps the Minister for Commerce and Industry can give us some valuable advice. I do understand, of course, that, as he says, industrialisation must come from the bottom, and he will provide the funds.

Sir, housing is another problem, but I have already had the assurance of the Minister for Local Government and Housing that he will try his best to do what he can for us. By comparison, Sir, Taiping, which is said to be a dying town, Teluk Anson is dead.

The Hospital there is about fifty years old, and was built beside the river. There are not enough beds to serve the whole of Lower Perak with a population of one hundred and fifty thousand. Though there are estate hospitals we need a new hospital. The Hospital Attendants quarters are frequently flooded during the tidal season up to a level of three feet, and faecal matters from the nearby river often flow into the quarters. We are really a neglected lot.

My constituency also includes four new villages with a number of rubber estates and kampongs. The New Village of Chuichak, Sir, needs a grant-in-aid for its primary school which has only six classrooms and all of them are in a dilapidated condition—they were not repaired since twelve years ago; and the school has recently sent an appeal to the Minister of Education. I hope he will listen to our appeal. Also to serve the four new villages, Sir, we need a Chinese secondary school in Langkap, the centre, as these villages are situated between Kampar and Teluk Anson, sixteen miles either way, and the cost of bringing the children to a secondary school is extremely high.

Under these circumstances, Sir, I will appeal to the Minister of Finance for the abolition of tax on local tobacco

to encourage local industry. The tax, though light, is nevertheless a strain on the farmers who live from hand to mouth. I will also appeal to the other Ministers concerned to lend a helping hand to Teluk Anson, so that the people in my constituency might live again, and their future assured. Sir, fate has decreed that Teluk Anson must suffer, but surely the destiny of Teluk Anson lies in the hands of the Central Government and the State Government. Thank you, Sir.

The Minister of Education (Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib): Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to reply, particularly, to the request of the Honourable Member for a Secondary School at Langkap. Under the Comprehensive Schools Programme, one secondary school will be set up in 1964, under the Supplementary Estimates, comprising eight classrooms at Langkap. The Chinese pupils from the Chinese Primary Schools in that area will be directed to this school once it is set up.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Dr Lim Swee Aun): Mr Speaker, Sir, I must congratulate the Honourable Member for Teluk Anson who, in a short speech of less than ten minutes, has been able to pin down his fire on so many Ministers who have to reply to his points. (*Laughter*).

Coming from a constituency such as mine, which has been described by the Honourable Member as a "dying town", I fully sympathise with him, and I can fully appreciate the socio-economic ills of his constituency which he has described as "dead". However, he has appealed to the Central Government to revive the dead. (*Laughter*). Sir, physicians can only give life when there is still life, but if it is already dead, it is just too bad! But, knowing the difficulties that are existent in Teluk Anson, I do not think the socio-economic position is really that bad. There is still hope for Teluk Anson, in that it can still—perhaps, some day—regain its importance as one of the main trading centres of Perak.

Teluk Anson has a port, which is still functional. But, unfortunately, the

industries that were flourishing there at one time, have, through the fortunes of commerce, been in the doldrums. It is true that due to the poor marketing conditions during 1958, the pineapple industry met its worst crisis ending in the closing down of the pineapple cannery there. But to compensate for that, the expansion in the rice industry has attracted the Government's attention such that we have now put in a Government Rice Mill to create new employment for that area.

There is hope for Teluk Anson to become an industrial area, simply because it has the advantage of that little port, small though it may be, and perhaps most of us in Malaysia do not realise that in Teluk Anson there is a match factory—something which Teluk Anson can boast whereas in Taiping we still do not have a factory. Be that as it may, I would ask the Honourable Member not to be too pessimistic. There is a future for Teluk Anson. But the important thing is that the Local Government and the people in that area must do something themselves and not expect too much from the Central Government.

The Minister for Welfare Services (Tuan Haji Abdul Hamid Khan bin Haji Sakhawat Ali Khan): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Yang Berhormat dari Teluk Anson di-dalam Uchapan Penang-gohan-nya telah juga menarek perhatian pada penderitaan petani² akibat daripada kerosakan tanaman limau manis yang di-serang oleh penyakit. Dengan arahan saya perkara ini telah pun di-siasat oleh Pegawai Kebajikan Masyarakat Negeri Perak dan hasil daripada penyiasat itu nampak-nya petani² yang menanam limau manis itu tidak-lah menganggor sama sa-kali atau pun menderita. Mereka chuma telah mengalami pendapat yang kurang. Tidak sa-orang pun daripada mereka telah membuat permohonan kepada Pejabat Kebajikan Masyarakat untuk mendapat bantuan. Saya juga diberitahu ia-itu sa-tengah² daripada petani yang lebeh berusaha telah pun mengubah mata pencharian mereka kepada pekerjaan² yang lain yang lebeh mendatangkan hasil dan telah berjaya mendapat pendapatan yang

lebih baik untuk penghidupan mereka. Sungguh pun begitu, jika ada yang lain² yang memerlukan bantuan bolehlah mereka membuat permohonan kepada Pejabat Kebajikan Masyarakat dan saya memberi jaminan kepada Yang Berhormat itu bahawa permohonan² mereka itu akan ditimbang berdasarkan kepada kedudukan dan keperluan masing².

Mengikut apa yang saya tahu masaalah ini telah timbul semenjak tahun 1958 dan Pejabat Pertanian telah pun memberitahu kepada petani² itu yang Jabatan Pertanian tersebut tidak dapat mengubati penyakit pokok limau manis dengan serta-merta dan telah menasihatkan mereka supaya menanam lain² jenis tanaman.

Kedegilan petani itu yang maseh meneruskan tanaman limau manis adalah menunjukkan sikap yang negative oleh kerana mereka sedar yang perusahaan itu tidak mempunyai harapan yang baik pada masa akan datang. Saya

perchaya Ahli Yang Berhormat itu tentu bersetuju dengan sa-mata² memberi bantuan wang dalam keadaan yang tidak boleh di-atasi merupakan satu tindakan yang negative. Apa yang di-kehendaki ia-lah satu chara yang lebih membena daripada petani itu untuk mengatasi masaalah ini dengan mengikut nasihat² yang telah di-beri oleh Jabatan Pertanian.

The Minister of Health (Enche' Bahaman bin Samsudin): Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member ropes in my Ministry also. (*Laughter*). He has mentioned that he would like to have a new hospital and some Attendants' Quarters for Teluk Anson. Sir, I wish to inform the Honourable Member that I shall be visiting Teluk Anson on the 17th of July, and I shall see for myself whether there is any need for such a hospital and the Attendants' Quarters.

Question put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at 8.28 p.m.