

Volume I
No. 22



Saturday
28th November, 1964

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

OFFICIAL REPORT

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

CONTENTS

BILL:

The Supply Bill, 1965 (Second Reading) [Col. 2925]

MALAYSIA
DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

Official Report

First Session of the Second Dewan Ra'ayat

Saturday, 28th November, 1964

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

PRESENT:

- The Honourable Mr Speaker, DATO' CHIK MOHAMED YUSUF BIN SHEIKH ABDUL RAHMAN, S.P.M.P., J.P., Dato' Bendahara Perak.
- „ 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. (Sungai Siput).
- „ the Minister of Health, ENCHE' BAHAMAN BIN SAMSUDIN (Kuala Pilah).
- „ the Minister of Education, ENCHE' ABDUL RAHMAN EIN HAJI TALIB, P.J.K. (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 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).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Commerce and Industry, TUAN HAJI ABDUL KHALID BIN AWANG OSMAN, (Kota Star Utara).
- „ the Assistant Minister of National and Rural Development and Assistant Minister of Justice, ENCHE' ABDUL-RAHMAN BIN YA'KUB (Sarawak).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives, ENCHE' SULAIMAN BIN BULON (Bagan Datoh).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Culture, Youth and Sports, ENSKU MUHSEIN BIN ABDUL KADIR, J.M.N., S.M.T., P.J.K. (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).

- The Honourable WAN ABDUL KADIR BIN ISMAIL, P.P.T.
(Kuala Trengganu Utara).
- „ 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 AL-MARHUM 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).
- „ ENCHE' ALI BIN HAJI AHMAD (Pontian Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Muar Dalam).
- „ ENCHE' JONATHAN BANGAU ANAK RENANG, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ PENGARAH BANYANG ANAK JANTING, P.B.S. (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, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' CHIN FOON (Ulu Kinta).
- „ ENCHE' EDWIN ANAK TANGKUN (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN SYED ESA BIN ALWEE, J.M.N., S.M.J., P.I.S.
(Batu Pahat Dalam).
- „ DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI ABDUL MAJID
(Johor Bahru Timor).
- „ DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI HASHIM, P.M.N.
(Jitra-Padang Terap).
- „ 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' HUSSEIN BIN TO' MUDA HASSAN, A.M.N. (Raub).
- „ 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).
- „ ENCHE' JEK YEUN THONG (Singapore).
- „ PENGHULU JINGGUT ANAK ATTAN, Q.M.C., A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' KADAM ANAK KIAI (Sarawak).

- The Honourable ENCHE' EDMUND LANGGU ANAK SAGA (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SAN CHOON, K.M.N. (Segamat Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SECK FUN (Tanjong Malim).
- „ DR LIM CHONG EU (Tanjong).
- „ ENCHE' LIM HUAN BOON (Singapore).
- „ DATO' DR HAJI MEGAT KHAS, D.P.M.P., J.P., P.J.K.
(Kuala Kangsar).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED ASRI BIN HAJI MUDA, P.M.K.
(Pasir Puteh).
- „ ORANG TUA MOHAMMAD DARAH BIN LANGPAD (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' MOHD. DAUD BIN ABDUL SAMAD (Besut).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED IDRIS BIN MATSIL, J.M.N., P.J.K., J.P.
(Jejebu-Jempol).
- „ 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, J.M.N. (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,
A.B.S. (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. (Telok Anson).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Perlis Utara).
- „ ABANG OTHMAN BIN HAJI MOASILI (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' QUEK KAI DONG, J.P. (Seremban Timor).
- „ 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, P.J.K., J.P. (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' SNAWI BIN ISMAIL, P.J.K. (Seberang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' SNG CHIN JOO (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' SULEIMAN BIN ALI (Dungun).
- „ ENCHE' TAJUDIN BIN ALI, P.J.K. (Larut Utara).
- „ ENCHE' TAI KUAN YANG (Kulim-Bandar Bharu).

- The Honourable ENCHE' TAMA WENG TINGGANG WAN (Sarawak).
 „ DR TAN CHEE KHOON (Batu).
 „ ENCHE' TAN TOH HONG (Bukit Bintang).
 „ ENCHE' TAN TSAK YU (Sarawak).
 „ ENCHE' TIAH ENG BEE (Kluang Utara).
 „ ENCHE' TOH THEAM HOCK (Kampar).
 „ PENGHULU FRANCIS UMPAU ANAK EMPAM (Sarawak).
 „ ENCHE' YEH PAO TZE (Sabah).
 „ ENCHE' YEOH TAT BENG (Bruas).
 „ TUAN HAJI ZAKARIA BIN HAJI MOHD. TAIB, P.J.K. (Langat).

ABSENT:

- The Honourable the Prime Minister, Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Culture, Youth and Sports, Y.T.M. TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN PUTRA AL-HAJ, K.O.M. (Kuala Kedah).
 „ the Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Defence and Minister of National and Rural Development, TUN HAJI ABDUL RAZAK BIN DATO' HUSSAIN, S.M.N. (Pekan).
 „ 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 JOHARI (Kedah Tengah).
 „ 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 Minister of Lands and Mines, ENCHE' MOHD. GHAZALI BIN HAJI JAWI (Ulu Perak).
 „ the Minister without Portfolio, ENCHE' PETER LO SU YIN (Sabah).
 „ ENCHE' ABDUL KARIM BIN ABU, A.M.N. (Melaka Selatan).
 „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAHIM ISHAK (Singapore).
 „ DATO' ABDULLAH BIN ABDULRAHMAN, Dato' Bijaya di-Raja (Kuala Trengganu Selatan).
 „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN SAAID, J.P. (Seberang Utara).
 „ CHE' AJIBAH BINTI ABOL (Sarawak).
 „ O.K.K. DATU ALIUDDIN BIN DATU HARUN, P.D.K. (Sabah).
 „ DR AWANG BIN HASSAN, S.M.J. (Muar Selatan).
 „ ENCHE' E. W. BARKER (Singapore).
 „ ENCHE' FRANCIS CHIA NYUK TONG (Sabah).
 „ ENCHE' CHIA THYE POH (Singapore).
 „ ENCHE' C. V. DEVAN NAIR (Bungsar).
 „ ENCHE' S. FAZUL RAHMAN, A.D.K. (Sabah).
 „ DATU GANIE GILONG, P.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).
 „ ENCHE' GANING BIN JANGKAT (Sabah).
 „ ENCHE' GEH CHONG KEAT, K.M.N. (Penang Utara).
 „ DR GOH KENG SWEE (Singapore).

- The Honourable ENCHE' HAMZAH BIN ALANG, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Kapar).
 „ ENCHE' STANLEY HO NYUN KHIU, A.D.K. (Sabah).
 „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN MOHD. NOORDIN, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Parit).
 „ ENCHE' ISMAIL BIN IDRIS (Penang Selatan).
 „ DATO' SYED JA'AFAR BIN HASAN ALBAR, P.M.N. (Johor Tenggara).
 „ ENCHE' KAM WOON WAH, J.P. (Sitiawan).
 „ ENCHE' KHOO PENG LOONG (Sarawak).
 „ DATU KHOO SIAK CHIEW, P.D.K. (Sabah).
 „ ENCHE' KOW KEE SENG (Singapore).
 „ ENCHE' LEE KUAN YEW (Singapore).
 „ ENCHE' AMADEUS MATHEW LEONG, A.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).
 „ DATO' LING BENG SIEW, P.N.B.S. (Sarawak).
 „ ENCHE' LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).
 „ DATO' LIM KIM SAN, D.U.T., J.M.K., D.J.M.K. (Singapore).
 „ ENCHE' LIM PEE HUNG, P.J.K. (Alor Star).
 „ DR MAHATHIR BIN MOHAMAD (Kota Star Selatan).
 „ ENCHE' T. MAHIMA SINGH, J.P. (Port Dickson).
 „ ENCHE' JOSEPH DAVID MANJAJI (Sabah).
 „ ENCHE' MOHD. ARIF SALLEH, A.D.K. (Sabah).
 „ DATO' NIK AHMAD KAMIL, D.K., S.P.M.K., S.J.M.K., P.M.N., P.Y.G.P., Dato' Sri Setia Raja (Kota Bharu Hilir).
 „ ENCHE' ONG KEE HUI (Sarawak).
 „ ENCHE' ONG PANG BOON (Singapore).
 „ TUAN HAJI OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Hilir Perak).
 „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN WOK (Singapore).
 „ ENCHE' S. RAJARATNAM (Singapore).
 „ ENCHE' S. P. SEENIVASAGAM (Menglembu).
 „ ENCHE' SOH AH TECK (Batu Pahat).
 „ DATU DONALD ALOYSIUS STEPHENS, P.D.K. (Sabah).
 „ PENGIRAN TAHIR PETRA (Sabah).
 „ ENCHE' TAN CHENG BEE, J.P. (Bagan).
 „ ENCHE' TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Melaka).
 „ DR TOH CHIN CHYE (Singapore).
 „ ENCHE' WEE TOON BOON (Singapore).
 „ ENCHE' STEPHEN YONG KUET TZE (Sarawak).
 „ ENCHE' YONG NYUK LIN (Singapore).

PRAYERS

(Mr Speaker *in the Chair*)

BILL

THE SUPPLY BILL, 1965

Second Reading

Order read for resumption of debate on motion, "That the Bill be now read a second time" (25th November, 1964).

Enche' Mohamed Asri bin Haji Muda (Pasir Puteh): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya lebih dahulu mengucapkan berbilang² terima kasih kepada Tuan Yang di-Pertua sa-telah memberi peluang kepada saya mendahulukan perbahathan berkenaan dengan Anggaran Belanjawan bagi negara kita untuk tahun 1965 ini. Bila kita perhatikan kedudukan Anggaran Belanjawan negara kita yang telah dibentangkan dengan sa-luas²-nya oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan

dan telah di-bayangkan kepada kita bahawa negara kita ini akan menghadapi kekurangan kewangan, atau *deficit* lebeh \$180 million ia-itu satu keadaan kekurangan kewangan yang belum pernah berlaku di-dalam negara kita ini.

Memang, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ini ada-lah perkara biasa bagi sa-sabua negara menghidangkan Anggaran Belanjawan negara yang mengandongi kekurangan kewangan seperti yang kita hadapi pada hari ini. Ini ia-lah di-sebabkan bahawa banyak kerja² pembangunan dan terutama sa-kali oleh kerana belanja pertahanan negara ini besar lebeh daripada 30 peratus daripada peruntukan bagi tahun yang akan datang ini ia-lah belanja² untuk pertahanan negara kita sekarang ini. Dan memang, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, menjadi kebiasaan juga bagi negara mana² pun menutup kekurangan belanjawan negara itu dengan menaikkan cukai. Ini tidak-lah menjadi perkara luar biasa, malah kadang² jalan yang paling mudah, atau short cut bagi menutup kekurangan belanjawan negara itu ia-lah dengan menaikkan cukai, tetapi satu perkara yang sama² kita tahu bahawa tiap² kenaikan cukai dalam sa-sabua negara itu, maka akan terlibat sama-lah harga² barang keperluan hidup sa-hari². Harga barang² keperluan hidup hari² akan berleumpang kangkong sama-lah dengan jumlah cukai itu akan ikut naik sama, dan dengan yang demikian tuntutan hidup dalam masyarakat ini akan ikut sama terlibat.

Saya memerhatikan ada perkara² yang kurang sedikit mendapat perhatian daripada pihak Kerajaan di-dalam menyusun kenaikan cukai ini ia-itu-lah cukai² ka-atas barang² mewah. Sa-bahagian besar daripada senarai cukai yang di-bentangkan di-dalam Rumah yang berbahagia ini ia-lah ka-atas barang² yang menjadi keperluan hidup sa-hari². Barang² mewah di-dalam negeri ini ia-lah terutama-nya sa-kali seperti minuman yang memabokkan. Di-Malaysia ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, minuman mereka itu telah begitu menjadi manja dengan sa-bahagian terbesar

masyarakat atasan di-dalam negeri ini yang jumlah pendapatan cukai mengambil tempat yang tidak kurang istimewa-nya sa-lama ini. Jikalau sa-kira-nya cukai minuman yang memabokkan ini di-naikkan sampai lebeh daripada 100% dari sekarang ini, itu pun tidak-lah menyentoh sama sa-kali kehidupan masyarakat umum, dan saya perchaya jika sa-kira-nya langkah yang seperti itu di-lakukan oleh pihak Kerajaan, maka ini akan menambahkan hasil negara ini dengan banyak-nya.

Kita terpaksa dudok di-antara dua sikap, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sama ada kita haramkan minuman keras, atau minuman memabokkan seperti yang pernah di-lakukan oleh Kerajaan² lain, seperti negara India yang memang tidak pun merasmikan Islam ugama rasmi dalam negeri-nya, dan kalau sikap itu di-lakukan akan mengurangkan hasil negara mengikut pendapat biasa, dan begitu-lah yang kita nampak dan begitu-lah pula alasan² yang di-berikan, atau yang akan di-berikan oleh pihak Kerajaan. Dengan pendapat ini bahawa pendapat² sa-tengah ahli² kewangan kita bahawa pendapatan Kerajaan dan pendapatan Kerajaan sendiri bahawa cukai minuman keras itu ada-lah satu daripada punca yang di-harap untuk kewangan negara kita ini.

Maka chara yang kedua, kalau tidak-lah ada chadangan dari pihak Kerajaan yang akan mengharamkan langsung, kerana memikirkan soal² kewangan negeri ini mithal-nya, maka patut-lah cukai bagi minuman yang memabokkan itu di-naikkan dengan tinggi-nya dan dengan yang demikian dia akan merupakan hasil yang benar² di-harap, saya perchaya mungkin hasil²-nya itu akan menchapai pada anggaran lebeh daripada \$100 juta sa-tahun. Tentu-lah bagi mereka yang sentiasa hidup mewah yang sentiasa berdamping dengan minuman yang menghairahkan ini akan merasa terharu kalau pihak Kerajaan dengan sikap yang berani menaikkan cukai yang berlipat ganda.

Akan tetapi kalau di-bandingkan dengan pendapatan² sa-bahagian besar

daripada mereka yang sentiasa hidup berdamping dengan minuman yang memabokkan ini, maka hal itu tidaklah sangat membimbangkan dan mengesalkan kepada mereka itu, sebab langkah yang seperti ini kalau dijalankan ia tidak-lah sama sa-kali menyentoh kehidupan masyarakat ra'ayat biasa. Kita tahu seperti kata saya tadi, yang memerlukan minuman yang memabokkan ini sa-bahagian besar-nya ia-lah masyarakat² luar biasa, masyarakat atasan dan masyarakat yang pendapatan-nya tinggi yang sudah tentu mampu membayar walau harga-nya melambung tinggi sa-banyak mana sa-kali pun. Ini berlainan dengan masyarakat umum yang hidup-nya memerlukan gula, yang hidup-nya memerlukan garam, beras, ikan kering, telur dan sa-bagai-nya. Ini sa-bagai mitalhan saya kemukakan dan mungkin banyak lagi barang² mewah yang lain yang boleh di-fikirkan oleh pihak Kementerian ini demi untuk menjaga keharmonian Anggaran Belanjawan negara kita dalam menghadapi tahun 1965 ini dan sa-terus-nya.

Saya suka menyatakan baharu² ini mungkin akibat peropaganda yang tidak baik atau mungkin kerana peropaganda saudagar² yang ingin menchari keuntungan yang berlebihan², sa-minggu sa-belum Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan mengishtiharkan kenaikan cukai, maka segala orang ramai telah berkejaran membeli motokar² baharu atau menukar motokar lama-nya dengan motokar baharu, kerana sa-olah² mereka telah diyakinkan bahawa cukai motokar pun akan naik, tetapi apa yang kita dapati bahawa kenaikan cukai itu tidak menyentoh soal motokar. Maka Al-hamdulillah, dengan senyum simpul saudagar² motokar dapat melakukan motokar² dengan kesempatan hendak mengishtiharkan kenaikan cukai baharu² ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya merasa bahawa Sidang Belanjawan pada kali ini ada-lah satu Sidang Belanjawan yang paling hebat dalam sejarah negeri ini. Hebat bukan sahaja kerana jumlah Anggaran Perbelanjaan bagitu besar malah kerana deficit-nya juga

besar, bahkan peratus yang di-beri lebeh daripada 30 peratus untuk pertahanan negara juga besar dan yang lebeh dari itu lagi Sidang Belanjawan ini di-lakukan di-dalam sa'at konferantasi daripada Indonesia bertambah hebat. Walau bagaimana pun, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita mesti-lah sa-bagai anak laki² mengaku² kenyataan. Kita mesti mengaku² bahawa akibat daripada konferantasi Indonesia ini sedikit sa-banyak telah menyentoh kedudukan ekonomi negara kita. Tidak-lah guna kita gagah²kan dan tidak-lah guna kita menipu diri kita sendiri untuk mengaku² kebenaran bahawa konferantasi itu sedikit sa-banyak menyentoh kedudukan ekonomi negara kita. Sa-kurang² untuk di-faham dengan sa-pintas lalu bahawa peruntukan pertahanan kita di-tambah dan Belanjawan negara kita deficit. Lebeh² lagi dari itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, telah menjadi pengetahuan umum bahawa pengaggoran yang berlaku dalam negara kita, terutama-nya di-Singapura dan Pulau Pinang, barangkali Perdana Menteri Singapura lebeh tahu hal ini. Itu ada-lah sa-bahagian besar-nya akibat daripada konferantasi.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, memang agak ganjil juga dan memang menjadi satu pertanyaan kenapa sa-belum Malaysia di-bentok, Indonesia tidak melancarkan konferantasi-nya ka-atas negara kita, dan kita tahu antara kita dan Indonesia pada masa dahulu-nya merupakan negara dua sa-rumpun, jiran dan negara yang paling ikrah, tetapi kini semua-nya telah terberanchai, hanchor dan hilang di-dalam kenangan sejarah. Apa-kah sejarah lama itu tidak mungkin berulang lagi, mari-lah kita sama² serahkan kepada Tuhan, mudah²an sejarah lama itu akan hidup kembali dan biar-lah kejadian ini kejadian buat sementara sahaja.

Sa-bagaimana Dewan yang mulia ini telah ketahu², Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sikap PAS dalam soal ini dahulu sa-belum lagi Malaysia di-wujudkan bahawa PAS menentang konsep Malaysia—menentang gagasan Malaysia yang di-kemukakan oleh Yang Teramat Mulia Perdana Menteri, dan

PAS lebih mengingini satu konsep yang luas ia-itu Maphilindo dan memang konsep itu di-terima oleh Kerajaan Malaysia sekarang ini. Sikap ini tegas. Dan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita memandang masa hadapan negara kita ini ia-lah satu negara yang lebih hamoni dan lebih bahagia. Peluang itu pada pandangan saya maseh belum lenyap. Persidangan negara² Afro-Asia yang akan bersidang mungkin di-Algeria nanti akan memberi kesempatan yang penuh kepada kita Malaysia dan juga kepada pihak Indonesia hendak-nya menchari penyelesaian sa-chara damai.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, apa yang saya katakan tadi bahawa sikap PAS tegas menentang konsep Malaysia, tetapi orang tertanya² kenapa sekarang ini PAS bersama² dengan Kerajaan menentang pencherobohan. Ya, memang, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, satu masa pernah di-dalam Dewan yang mulia ini pihak PAS mengemukakan satu usul atau sa-kurang²-nya mengemukakan satu pendapat bahawa perselisihan, pertikaian, pertelagahan dan perkelahian antara negara kita Malaysia dengan Indonesia itu sa-daya upaya-nya hendak-lah di-selesaikan sa-chara aman dan damai. Akan tetapi kalau pihak yang melakukan pencherobohan, maka terpaksa-lah pihak kita berdiri bagi menghadapi pencherobohan itu. Ini pegangan juga di-asaskan kepada kehendak ugama Islam yang maha suci yang telah menyatakan apabila dua gulungan bertentang dan sama² saudara bertentang, maka hendak-lah engkau damaikan antara dua gulungan itu, tetapi kalau sa-pehak itu mencheroboh maka hendak-lah engkau perang pihak yang mencheroboh. Ini asas Islam dan asas ini di-pegang oleh Parti PAS dan tidak akan kita lepas²kan asas yang mulia dan asas yang benar ini.

Sebab itu tidak-lah hairan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kenapa PAS berdiri sekarang ini dengan tegoh dan tegas berjuang bersama² dengan Kerajaan bagi menghadapi konferantasi daripada Indonesia itu. Tidak-lah hairan bahawa bagaimana Kerajaan PAS Negeri Kelantan mengambil sikap yang tegas menyokong Minggu Per-

paduan dan menyokong Derma Pertahanan Negara dan berbagai sokongan demi untuk menjaga keselamatan dan kedaulatan negara kita. Kita menghadapi suatu kenyataan bahawa negara Malaysia telah di-bentok dan ia telah wujud. Pertentangan PAS terhadap gagasan Malaysia tetap merupakan tentangan, tetapi negara Malaysia yang merupakan sa-bagai satu kedaulatan bagi negeri ini ada-lah hak kita bersama dan kita perlu pertahankan walau pun sampai kepada akhir hayat kita sa-kali pun (*Tepok*). Ini ada-lah asas kita yang benar.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berbalek kepada soal kedudukan ekonomi bagi Malaysia ini. Memang ekonomi Malaysia ini, mengikut pandangan dunia, ada-lah negara yang nombor dua baik-nya di-sabelah Timor ini. Nombor satu-nya ia-lah negara Dainipon atau negara mata hari terbit ia-itu negara Jepun. Saya perchaya ada-lah perhetongan² itu ada-lah dibuat dan di-nilaian daripada jumlah pukul rata daripada nilai ekonomi seluruh-nya. Kita akui ini ada-lah sa-bagai satu kenyataan, akan tetapi kita terpaksa juga mengaku² sa-bagai satu kenyataan juga bahawa perbezaan antara gulungan berada dengan gulungan yang ta' berada amat jauh sa-kali dalam negeri ini ibarat bukit yang tinggi dengan jurang yang dalam. Susunan ekonomi kita maseh merupakan menimbun bukit yang tinggi. Apa-kah satu usaha untuk mendekatkan jarak yang jauh ini dan apa-kah satu ikhtiar bagi mengurangkan perbezaan yang menjolok mata. Ini ada-lah satu chabaran kepada pihak Kerajaan sendiri, terutama-nya kepada pihak Kementerian Perdagangan dan Perusahaan dan yang lebih terutama lagi kepada Menteri Mudanya yang nampak-nya mempunyai tugas yang terang dan nyata dalam soal ini.

Kita tahu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bahawa gulungan terbesar yang ada di-pehak yang kedua yang di-sipatkan sa-bagai dudok di-dalam jurang yang dalam ia-lah gulungan daripada pihak Melayu—bumi putera negeri ini,

teras kebangsaan Malaysia yang di-kasehi ini. Kita akui, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bahawa pehak Kerajaan telah mengadakan ikhtiar mengikut sa-chara-nya sendiri, mengadakan pejabat ia-itu pejabat Setia-usaha bagi menolong orang² Melayu di-lapangan ekonomi dan Menteri Muda kita, Menteri Muda Perdagangan dan Per-usahaan yang menjadi panglima-nya di-dalam perjuangan untuk menolong ekonomi bangsa Melayu ini. Akan tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, semenjak pada tahun² ia di-tubuhkan, sa-jauh mana hasil yang telah kita dapati. Apa-kah dengan memberi penerangan bagi orang Melayu membeli saham² dalam sharikat² bangsa asing itu sudah cukup, sudah lumayan sa-bagai erti kata menolong ekonomi orang Melayu? Ini pun satu chabaran kepada Yang Berhormat itu sendiri, satu chabaran yang tidak perlu di-diamkan begitu sahaja, satu chabaran mesti di-jawab bukan jawab dengan kata² tetapi di-jawab dengan amalan dan perbuatan.

Saya tertarek hati membaca ucapan membena yang di-keluarkan oleh Professor Engku Aziz bahagian ekonomi negeri ini, maka telah di-sipatkan chara² membeli share atau membeli saham—ia-itu menolong orang Melayu membeli saham di-dalam perusahaan² yang besar itu di-sipatkan sa-bagai ekonomi kacang goreng. Professor Engku⁴ Aziz bebas mengeluarkan pendapat-nya dan pehak Kementerian tidak boleh berkecil hati terhadap Professor itu. Dan saya perchaya soal ekonomi kacang goreng ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, telah menjadi persoalan begitu hangat di-dalam masyarakat terutama di-dalam masyarakat bangsa Melayu yang sentiasa menggigit jari bila mengenang nasib-nya dalam lapangan ekonomi. Tetapi yang saya sedeh sa-hingga hari ini Menteri Muda Yang Berhormat itu belum lagi menjawab, gayong belum bersambut, kata belum berjawab. Apa-kah gayong itu di-biarkan menari di-hadapan Menteri Muda kita dan apa-kah sikap itu di-biarkan—di-letak oleh suasana alam yang gegak gempita itu? Memang benar kita hadapi konferantasi tetapi

benar juga kita tidak akan melepaskan tugas² membena negara ini walau pun konferantasi itu berjalan terus. Dan ini satu chabang, satu *juzu'* daripada usaha membena dan membangunkan ekonomi negara.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, patut-lah Menteri Muda Yang Berhormat ini apakala datang sa-suatu tegoran dan kechaman daripada sa-orang Professor walau pun hendak di-akui atau tidak di-akui pendapat-nya, kaji-lah dan terima-lah kechaman itu sa-bagai satu asas untuk kajian sa-lanjut-nya. Dan memang sa-takat usaha² meminta dan memujuk sharikat² asing meluang dan melapangkan perniagaan-nya untuk memberi peluang kepada orang² Melayu membeli share dan usaha² menubuhkan sharikat pemodalan Melayu, kita junjong tinggi dan kita hormati kepada jasa Menteri Muda khas-nya dan jasa Kerajaan-lah mithal-nya kita hormati dan kita junjong tinggi. Akan tetapi jangan-lah pehak Kementerian atau Menteri Muda Yang Berhormat merasa bahawa sudah cukup-lah tugas aku untuk menolong ekonomi orang Melayu, sudah dapat melepas tangan, sudah dapat menyapu tangan-nya daripada abu² dan abok pekerjaan, sudah meletakkan kepala di-bantal dengan lena sahaja, itu hanya baharu langkah pertama, baharu bismillah dalam ikhtiar untuk meninggikan ekonomi bangsa Melayu dan memang saya sa-pendapat dengan Professor Engku Aziz kalau sa-kadar memberi peluang membeli saham dan memberi peluang untuk menubuhkan sharikat saperti itu sahaja belum cukup. Saya tidak tahu-lah ekonomi kacang goreng-kah, kacang kuda-kah, tidak-lah saya tahu tetapi memang belum cukup. Sebab itu-lah saya katakan ini merupakan satu chabaran.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, itu baharu sa-kadar saya berchakap menyentoh sadikit satu sudut daripada soal ekonomi orang² Melayu di-dalam negeri ini. Pertama semua espek yang patut di-sebutkan berhubung dengan nasib orang Melayu. Saya terbaca baharu² ini di-dalam surat khabar bahawa Kerajaan Lee Kuan Yew di-Singapura hendak menubuhkan satu

jabatan khas yang akan di-beri nama Pejabat Hal-ehwal Orang Melayu di-Singapura. Sampai sekarang ini maseh menjadi tanda tanya di-dalam hati saya sendiri. Apa-kah sikap ini yang sa-benar-nya, ada-kah sikap ini di-buat kerana hendak mengubat hati orang² Melayu di-Singapura, satu ketika telah di-halau daripada tempat duduk mereka kerana hendak mendirikan rumah² petak yang tentu-nya tidak bagitu sesuai kapada orang Melayu itu sendiri? Tentu-lah Perdana Menteri Singapura sendiri—Lee Kuan Yew—tidak hadhir pada hari ini, lebeh tahu dengan niat-nya sendiri. Tetapi kita memandang ini satu langkah yang besar justeru oleh kerana bangsa Melayu kita termasuk golongan minority di-Singapura itu sendiri, maka mungkin-lah pehak Kerajaan Lee Kuan Yew akan melayan orang Melayu sa-chara minority juga. Kalau-lah pehak Kerajaan Persekutuan tidak mahu, saya menasihatkan supaya mengambil langkah timbal-balek hasil mengadakan satu pejabat hal-ehwal orang China di-Tanah Melayu ini dan oleh kerana orang² China satu golongan minority maka kita layan sa-chara minority; saya tidak berchadang hendak membuat satu chadangan saperti itu dan saya perchaya pehak Kerajaan pun tidak akan menerima kalau datang chadangan saperti itu.

Langkah yang di-buat oleh Kerajaan Lee Kuan Yew di-Singapura itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya memandang satu langkah politik yang amat di-sangsikan sa-kali. Saya bimbang bahawa nasib orang² Melayu di-Singapura khas-nya akan menerima nasib saperti umat Arab di-Palestine. Apa-kah langkah ini ada kaitan dengan sikap parti Lee Kuan Yew, Perdana Menteri, Singapura, sendiri? Parti PAP bukan parti atas pagar tetapi PETIR—Parti Tindakan Ra'ayat. Khabar-nya baharu² ini telah mengambil sa-orang pakar bangsa Yahudi atau Israil—nama-nya payah saya hendak sebutkan, kalau saya sebutkan tidak betul, tolong-lah sebutkan sendiri—nama-nya *L. B. Evel*. Untuk pengetahuan Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pakar bangsa Yahudi Evel ini

bukan ra'ayat Malaysia. Jadi Lee Kuan Yew telah mengambil dia dengan di-beri tugas; ini khabar saya katakan, di-beri tugas untuk melateh kadar² PETIR kadar² PAP di-Singapura, latehan jenis apa-kah di-jalankan tidak-lah saya tahu sebab kita ketahu² itu ada-lah menjadi rahsia parti-nya sendiri. Apa-kah latehan ini ia-lah merupakan latehan pelajaran tentang bagaimana orang² Yahudi merebut negara Palestine, tidak-lah saya tahu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam (Ipoh): Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise on a point of order, Standing Order 36 (9), and I raise it in respect of references made by the Honourable speaker in reference to Singapore. In view of the situation in Singapore, under Standing Order 36 (9), sub-section (c), I shall leave it to you, Mr Speaker, to decide whether references to communal activities in Singapore are appropriate at this moment when the situation just appears to be settling down.

Mr Speaker: I have been waiting to see whether the Honourable Member was making those references in passing.

Enche' Mohd. Asri bin Haji Muda: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jadi itu-lah sa-sudah kita kaji kedudukan yang saperti itu apa-kah nasib bangsa Melayu pada masa akan datang, apakah dia akan menjadi bangsa yang berjaya, bersama berjaya-nya dengan Malaysia, bangsa yang bahagia bersama² dengan bahagia-nya Malaysia, kita serahkan-lah kapada kegiatan pemimpin² kita bagi menentukan tekad-nya sahaja pada masa yang akan datang. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita maseh ingat bagaimana Perdana Menteri Singapura satu masa dahulu membuat rundingan sa-chara langsung dengan pehak British. Tentu-lah satu daripada perkara yang besar diperbinchangkan.

Mr Speaker: Saya terpaksa mengingatkan Ahli Yang Berhormat jangan-lah panjang²kan kapada perkara yang luar daripada perkara yang kita bahathkan ini.

Enche' Mohd. Asri bin Haji Muda: Terima kaseh, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perkara yang besar dalam rundingan

itu tentu-lah soal kedudukan serta gulongan yang besar daripada ra'ayat Malaysia itu sendiri dengan orang² China. Tentu-lah rundingan itu mendapat lebeh lagi galakan dengan perubahan Kerajaan British sekarang ini, perubahan daripada Kerajaan Conservative kepada Kerajaan Buroh. Dan kalau kita bandingkan dengan kedudukan dasar parti Petir sekarang ini, boleh-lah di-masokkan ia ka-dalam gulongan Socialist, di-dalam gulongan Buroh. Saya tidak kira sama ada ia kanan atau pun kiri. Apa-kah Malaysia akan terbahagi kepada dua dengan dua Perdana Menteri nanti saperti nasib Palestine, kita serahkan-lah kepada perhatian pemimpin² yang memegang tampok pemerintahan sekarang ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, patut-lah hal ini semua kita serahkan terutama sa-kali kepada Yang Teramat Mulia Tunku Perdana Menteri kita, supaya berwaspada dan awasi benar-lah politik lichin Singapura sekarang ini kalau tidak mahu sejarah dunia di-ubah saperti berubah-nya sejarah dunia ka-atas negara Palestine itu sendiri. Politik pechah² kemudian perentah satu daripada ilmu politik penjajah maseh lagi nampak-nya berjalan di-negara kita ini. Tetapi PAS, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tetap-lah berjuang supaya negara kita tetap daulat merdeka dan wibawa, kata orang kita sekarang ini, yang di-dalam-nya bangsa Melayu dapat hidup sa-bagai satu bangsa bumi putera negeri ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya beraleh pandangan saya kepada soal pertahanan bagi Malaysia ini. Tadi saya telah sebutkan bahawa dalam Budget kita ini peruntokan kerana pertahanan negara telah di-tambah dengan banyak dan lebeh daripada 30% daripada jumlah semua peruntokan tahun ini. Satu peruntokan yang besar yang saya pandang ada-lah wajar, sudah lama pehak kami mengusulkan supaya pertahanan negara kita ini di-perkuatkan, dan memang-lah satu daripada chara untok menguatkan pertahanan itu ialah menambahkan wang bagi-nya supaya dapat kekuatan pertahanan negara kita ini di-susun dan di-ator dengan bagitu rupa. Sekarang, Alhamdulillah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, per-

untokan telah di-tambah, maka patut-lah kita menerima kaseh kepada Menteri Kewangan sa-kurang²-nya dengan menambahkan peruntokan bagi pertahanan. Kita berkehendakkan, dalam soal pertahanan ini, kepada satu tujuan ia-itu menuju kepada pertahanan negara yang utoh dan kuat. Ini-lah chita² kita.

Memang benar kita tidak berchadang sadikit pun hendak menyerang negara orang, atau pun hendak mengkonfrantasikan negara orang lain. Dan ini memang sikap tolerance yang tetap sedia di-junjong tinggi, baik oleh pehak Kerajaan sampai-lah kepada pehak ra'ayat, tidak-lah mahu berperang dan tidak mahu menyerang dan tidak mahu konfrantasi dan tidak mahu mengkonfrantasikan orang. Tetapi itu niat kita, niat orang kita tidak tahu, kalau sa-kali pun negara Republik Indonesia tidak konfrantasikan kita, tetapi soal pertahanan negara mesti-lah di-perkuatkan—ini asas pandangan pehak kami di-sini. Kita tidak mahu kekuatan pertahanan itu ter-gopoh-gapah di-susun oleh kerana datang-nya satu² sikap menyerang atau pun konfrantasi, tetapi walau pun persoalan kita, kerana bertambah-nya peruntokan ini, kita hendak-lah sedar bahawa anchaman terhadap negara ini bukan dari satu pehak, anchaman yang sedia kita tahu ia-lah anchaman kominis, satu² anchaman yang paling bahaya kepada keselamatan dan ke-daulatan negara kita. Kemaraan kominis dari utara ada-lah satu² perkara yang tidak boleh di-abai²kan, gerakan kominis dari Utara sekarang ini bertambah dan hebat. Malaysia merupakan benteng utama dan garis belakang. Ini tidak dapat di-abai²kan dan tidak dapat di-nafikkan oleh dunia seluroh-nya, bahkan Amerika sendiri yang merupakan satu sistem negara juara yang menentang kominis. Saya perchaya Amerika juga memandang Malaysia sa-bagai satu benteng mempertahankan kemaraan kominis, kita tahu Amerika telah menchurahkan bantuan bersenjata kepada China Kebangsaan dan kepada Vietnam dan Thai dan negara² bebas yang lain bagi menentang gerakan kominis, dan menentang kemaraan kominis. Champor

tangan Amerika dalam urusan ketenteraan negara itu telah nyata benar kepada kita seluruh-nya dan kepada dunia seluruh-nya—ini satu fact masa sekarang ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Rombongan ketenteraan Amerika telah pun datang berunding dengan kita, dan memang-lah sudah tentu pokok perundingan yang utama ia-lah soal bantuan senjata sa-kurang²-nya, dan kita menyambut baik bantuan² yang di-buat itu.

Soal sekarang ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, apa-kah rundingan bantuan bersenjata itu beredar di-sakitar soal² menghadapi konfrantasi dari Indonesia dan kominis atau pun kepada soal² yang di-hadapi oleh pemimpin sekarang ini, kemaraan kominis utara dan kominis dunia? Sebab dua perkara dan dua soal ini memang berlainan daripada soal menghadapi konfrantasi Indonesia sahaja, tentu-lah lebeh banyak merupakan soal² Malaysia itu sendiri. Tetapi kalau menghadapi soal² kemaraan kominis telah menjadi Malaysia genting menentang kemaraan kominis dan akan menjadi soal besar, dan soal International di-itu soal Antara Bangsa. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berasa kechewa manakala tersiar hasil rundingan antara rombongan ketenteraan Amerika dengan Kerajaan Malaysia itu membuahkan perkara yang terlalu negative, bahawa Amerika akan memberi bantuan senjata kepada Malaysia sa-chara pinjaman sa-mata². Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-patut-nya Kerajaan Amerika hendak-lah sedar bahawa kechuaian mereka, dan kesilapan perhetongan mereka akan mereka bayar dengan harga yang mahal pada masa yang akan datang. Jangan-lah sa-sudah “nasi menjadi bubor” baharu sibok hendak menchari sendok dan kayu api, atau sa-bagai-nya. Kita telah melihat bagaimana kechewa-nya Amerika di-berbagai pelosok dunia tentang soal kegiatan²-nya menghadapi perkembangan kominis. Kedudukan Malaysia saperti yang saya bayangkan tadi menjadikan bantuan sa-chara berhutang atau sa-chara pinjaman dari Kerajaan Amerika itu tidak bernilai. Sebab kita terpaksa memandangi Malaysia bukan dari sudut menghadapi confrantasi Indonesia sahaja, tetapi

memandangi Malaysia dari sudut benteng untuk menentang kemaraan kominis. Kalau itu-lah dudok bentuk-nya Malaysia sa-bagai benteng bagi menentang kemaraan kominis, maka memberi bantuan senjata sa-chara pinjaman tidak bernilai dalam erti kata perjuangan Kerajaan Amerika Sharikat sendiri untuk menentang perkembangan pengaruh kominis.

Saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, meminta supaya di-kaji sa-mula soal ini supaya Kerajaan Malaysia kita ini mengadakan sa-mula rundingan dengan Kerajaan Amerika Sharikat sama ada dia datang ka-mari, atau sama ada kita pergi ka-tempat-nya, dan lebeh² lagi Yang Berhormat Timbalan Perdana Menteri sendiri akan mengetahui rombongan Malaysia

Dato' Dr Ismail: Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification, before the Honourable Member goes further, saya hendak mengetahui, apa-kah ma'ana-nya istilah yang di-pakai itu “pinjaman senjata” supaya saya boleh mengerti apa ma'ana-nya “pinjaman senjata” itu. Di-situ, ada-kah wang di-pinjamkan untuk membeli senjata, atau pun senjata di-pinjamkan. Saya hendak tahu apa ma'ana-nya istilah itu.

Enche' Mohamed Asri bin Haji Muda: Saya mengambil istilah ini mengikut berita yang di-siarkan ya'ani senjata telah di-beri, wang telah di-beri—ta' kira—tetapi di-nilaian atas pinjaman, bukan senjata itu di-pinjamkan, tetapi harga-nya itu-lah. Saya minta-lah kepada pehak Kerajaan Pusat ini sa-mentelahan pula kebetulan Yang Berhormat Timbalan Perdana Menteri akan mengetahui rombongan Malaysia ka-dalam Persidangan Agong Bangsa² Bersatu pada bulan depan ini yang akan di-adakan rundingan yang tersendiri di-antara dua pehak antara Malaysia dengan Amerika supaya soal² bantuan bersenjata dari Amerika itu tidak lagi di-beri sa-chara pinjaman, bukan pinjaman sahaja—pinjaman wang-lah, akan tetapi di-beri bantuan sa-chara langsong.

Kerajaan Amerika Sharikat mestilah mengubah dasar-nya supaya pinjaman yang di-berikan kepada Malaysia itu di-ubah kepada pemberian langsong, sebab ini merupakan

satu asas pokok dalam perjuangan negara² demokrasi di-dunia ini bagi menentang kemaraan, fahaman dan gerakan komunis. Sambil itu jangan-lah kita lupa bahawa pertanggung-jaga pertahanan negara kita ini mesti-lah bulat² di-tangan kita—di-tangan Malaysia sendiri, jangan-lah oleh kerana bantuan senjata datang daripada negara lain, maka dia dapat berluasa menjalankan peranan-nya dalam pertahanan negara kita. Kita mahu kedaulatan pertahanan itu seperti kedaulatan politik yang ada pada negara kita sekarang ini.

Sa-barang champor tangan dari pehak asing ka-atas soal pertahanan negara kita akan memberi erti yang sangat merbahaya. Kedaulatan Malaysia dalam ketenteraan ada-lah satu jaminan pertahanan yang paling utama pada masa sekarang.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Kerajaan British sendiri pada masa sekarang ini telah bagitu lemah, lemah dalam suasana politik-nya, dan lemah dalam soal kesanggupan, walau pun kita dapat jaminan daripada Perdana Menteri British yang baharu ia-itu akan membantu Malaysia ini, walau pun bantuan kepada negara² lain akan di-kurangkan, tetapi itu telah membayangkan dan menggambarkan kepada kita satu kelemahan semangat dalam menghadapi perkembangan dunia pada masa sekarang ini. Kesanggupan British bagi membantu Malaysia dalam persenjataan, walau pun tetap ada sekarang ini, hampir² kepada tingkatan tanda tanya, atau tanda persoalan. Oleh yang demikian, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sudah-lah sampai masa-nya Perjanjian Pertahanan antara Malaysia dengan British itu mesti-lah di-kaji sa-mula, mesti-lah di-kaji sa-mula. Bantuan ketenteraan dari negara² Commonwealth yang kita terima sekarang ini akan lebih memberi kesan, kalau di-ubah kepada chara dan bentuk yang lain.

Ini, semangat seperti ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-mata² hendak di-sesuaikan dengan asas kedaulatan Malaysia di-dalam ketenteraan untuk menjadi pokok jaminan pertahanan Malaysia ini yang sa-benar²-nya. Mesti di-pinda, di-ubah kepada satu bentuk yang

lain—semua bantuan ketenteraan daripada Australia mithal-nya, daripada New Zealand, daripada Canada, atau daripada mana sahaja yang datang sa-bagai negara² sahabat mesti-lah di-ubah—daripada bantuan ketenteraan kepada bantuan persenjataan dan kewangan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, anak negeri ini, warga-negara bagi Malaysia ini, tidak kurang kebolehan mereka dalam ketenteraan. Semangat yang ada sa-bagai baka turun-temurun daripada pahlawan² sejak dari zaman dahulu kala itu maseh tetap bernyala, chuma dia tidak di-beri api, dan tidak di-tambah minyak untuk di-nyalakan, tetapi ada dan maseh hangat lagi pada masa sekarang kebolehan anak negeri ini di-champor dengan rasa setia, ta'at dan kesungguhan untuk mempertahankan negeri ini, lebih besar nilai-nya daripada kesediaan memberi pertolongan daripada negara asing. Itu-lah soal pokok yang kedua—sa-berapa banyak anak negeri ini mesti-lah di-ambil dan di-lateh serta di-lengkapi dengan senjata² modern dari bantuan negara² sahabat termasuk Amerika, bantuan senjata dan bantuan yang chukup dari soal kewangan. Sebab kalau kita kaji, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Australia mithal-nya menghantar tentera²-nya ka-Malaysia; kita bershukor kerana dia bawa senjata yang baik. Kita bershukor, kerana gajinya di-bayar oleh negara Australia sendiri dan kita tidak terlibat dengan soal kewangan itu. Ini satu pertolongan yang baik, akan tetapi, kalau dapat negara Australia itu mithal-nya digantikan oleh tentera² Malaysia sendiri yang senjata-nya Australia tolong dan duit lagi, dan tolong untuk membayar gaji. Itu lebih memberi kesan, bukan untuk faedah Malaysia sahaja, barangkali Australia sendiri akan merasa lebih selamat orang²-nya tidak mati dan tidak bersusah payah, chuma-nya dia mengeluarkan wang dan mengeluarkan senjata² sahaja. Keperluan dan niat pertahanan itu berjalan terus, malah peratus-nya bertambah, kerana anak negeri dapat memegang tanggungjawab sa-chara langsung bagi mempertahankan kemerdekaan dan kedaulatan negara kita ini. Jikalau demikian-lah bentuk-nya bantuan itu

kita akan dapat dan jikalau demikianlah kedudukan semangat pertahanan dan bentuk pertahanan negara kita ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, apa-kah lagi alasan² bagi negara² lain hendak menuduh bahawa kita maseh dudok di-bawah ketiak orang lain.

Apa-kah lagi alasan² bagi negara² lain, kechuali negara bebas, atau negara apa sahaja yang hendak mengatakan bahawa Malaysia yang merdeka, belum merdeka dalam soal ketenteraan. Apa lagi alasan, kalau seluruh tentera sudah menjadi tentera Malaysia, chuma kita menerima bantuan senjata dan wang daripada negara lain—jangan berhutang, jangan beri pinjaman sahaja; jangan Amerika ingat senang, kalau dia beri pinjaman sudah lepas tanggong-jawab, dia beri langsung, beri sa-chara langsung di-atas asas saham, atau share bersama bagi menentang kemaraan komunis dalam dunia sa-belah sini.

Ini-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya perchaya bukan saya sahaja, bahkan Ahli² Yang Berhormat daripada pehak Kerajaan sendiri pun merindui pertahanan negara kita 100 peratus ditangan warga-negara kita sendiri. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau pehak Kerajaan kita hendak mengemukakan alasan bahawa kita kekurangan wang kerana pertahanan negara itu tidak akan berbangkit lagi-lah kalau persetujuan di-dapati dengan negara² Amerika dan negara² sahabat yang lain untuk membantu senjata dan wang sa-chara langsung. Mudah²an akan mendapat perhatian daripada pehak Kerajaan dalam soal yang bagini besar.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita terpaksa memandang kapada satu perkembangan dunia yang baharu—bukan yang baharu tetapi lama—terpaksa kita pandang ia-itu-lah soal komunis. Kita semua tahu pertentangan kita terhadap komunis, dan dunia pun tahu, kita semua telah menentang komunis bertahun², kita telah menentang keganasan komunis dan sekarang pertentangan kita terhadap komunis tetap tidak berganjak dan tidak ada tolak ansor dalam perjuangan kita menentang komunis. Dahulu komunis

mengachau negeri kita, kemudian di-tumpas oleh pasokan keselamatan kita dan mereka sekarang telah beredar ka-sempadan Malaysia di-utara dan selatan negeri Thai menyusun tenaga² baharu untuk memulakan gerakan² baharu walau pun kita merasa bahawa gerakan itu tidak akan berhasil, tetapi ini semua, seperti kata saya tadi, mesti di-kaitkan dengan pergerakan komunis di-sabelah utara. Chuma sekarang ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita patut menjelaskan kapada ra'ayat satu definisi, bukan definisi atas perkataan tetapi definisi atas sikap apa-kah negara Malaysia ini menentang komunis hanya dari segi keganasan dan gerakan² jahat komunis sahaja atau pun menentang komunis termasuk-lah dari segi ideology-nya sa-kali. Ini pada fahaman saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita telah berlawan dengan komunis, bukan sahaja kerana kekerasan dan keganasan-nya, kita berlawan sama dengan ideology, sebab kita tahu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bahawa ideology komunis bukan sahaja merupakan ideology politik, tetapi merupakan ideology keperchayaan—ideology yang menguasai iman. Sa-bagai sa-orang Muslim yang saya perchaya semua Muslim yang faham akan gerakan dan chita² serta dasar komunis bahawa Islam ada-lah bertentangan dengan komunis. Bahawa Islam ada-lah bermusoh dengan komunis. Tidak ada komunis dalam Islam dan tidak ada Islam dalam komunis. Bagini sa-kali ketatnya musoh antara Islam dengan komunis. Sebab itu bagi pehak saya dan pehak Parti PAS memandang bahawa pertentangan kita terhadap komunis bukan sahaja kekerasan-nya tetapi ideology-nya.

Maka, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sangat-lah saya kesalkan jika benar bagaimana berita yang tersiar baharu² ini dalam akhbar bahawa Yang Teramat Mulia Perdana Menteri kita telah menyatakan bahawa kita tidak menentang komunis dari segi ideology-nya tetapi kita menentang pada segi kekerasan-nya. Saya sentiasa berharap mudah²an kenyataan ini tidak benar dan mudah²an Perdana Menteri tidak berchakap bagitu.

Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, janganlah pula kalau benar-lah kenyataan Perdana Menteri itu kita hendak menjadikan Tanah Melayu kita ini sebagai Great Britain atau British yang menghalalkan gerakan komunis. Agak berlainan antara kita dengan dia. Kita melawan komunis dari kulit sampai ka-isi, dari daging sampai kepada darah dan dari jasad sampai kepada rohani.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Persidangan negara² Afro-Asia akan di-langsungkan dalam bulan Mach, 1965 dan tempat-nya mungkin di-Algeria. Timbalan Perdana Menteri kita baharu² ini telah pun mendapat kesempatan melawat Algeria dalam mana beliau telah mendapat sambutan hangat daripada President Ahmed Ben Bella. Ini ada-lah tanda² baik untuk Malaysia bersairing dalam kumpulan negara² Afrika-Asia itu sendiri. Persidangan akan berlangsung tidak lama lagi dan Malaysia telah menyatakan niat dan kehendak-nya untuk menyertai sama dalam persidangan itu.

Soal-nya apa-kah perkara² yang patut menjadi asas perundingan dalam Afro-Asia itu. Yang pertama janganlah kita ambil pusing tentang soal khabar angin yang bertiup bahawa mungkin Malaysia akan di-jadikan Thombe yang kedua dalam Persidangan Afro-Asia yang akan datang itu. Biar-lah kita hendak menjadi Thombe yang kedua atau yang ketiga, tetapi pokok-nya sekarang ini niat dan kehendak kita untuk menyertai Persidangan Afro-Asia atau Afrika-Asia itu mesti-lah di-teruskan dengan sa-jujur²-nya.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bila kita mengingatkan soal ini kita terkenang balek kepada beberapa tahun yang silam bagaimana kechuaian negara kita sendiri di-dalam mendekati negara² Afrika dan Afro-Asia itu salah²-nya kita memandang bahawa negara² itu tidak mempunyai daya penarik dalam soal perhubungan politik dan diplomatik, sa-hingga baharu apakala berbangkit soal konfrantasi dan sa-bagai-nya baharulah kita merasa bahawa peranan negara² Afrika-Asia, terutama negara²

di-Timor Tengah ada-lah merupakan peranan yang terpenting dalam perkembangan satu gulungan yang tertentu yang di-namakan Afrika dan Asia. Dahulu kita telah meminta supaya perhubungan diplomatik antara negara kita ini sa-belum lagi bernama Malaysia, ia maseh bernama Persekutuan Tanah Melayu, telah pun kita meminta supaya perhubungan itu dapat di-laksanakan dan di-lakukan dengan sa-baik²-nya, akan tetapi entah kerana apa-kah sebab-nya, hanya-lah baharu dua perhubungan diplomatik di-adakan, yang pertama Republic Arab Bersatu dan yang kedua-nya dengan negara Saudi Arabia. Kita bergembira benar, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bila kita mendapat khabar baik hasil daripada lawatan Timbalan Perdana Menteri bahawa perhubungan diplomatik akan di-lakukan dengan segera antara Malaysia dan Algeria.

Sekarang, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soal pokok yang mesti di-kaji atau mesti di-kemukakan oleh negara Malaysia ia-lah soal konfrantasi ini sendiri, ini-lah soal yang besar dan memang kena pada tempat-nya kalau Malaysia menyertai Persidangan Afrika-Asia itu, sebab di-fikirkan negara kita sedang menghadapi konfrantasi ini. Soal ini-lah yang mesti di-kemukakan. Saya perchaya Persidangan Afrika atau Afro-Asia itu akan dapat memberi champor tangan, bukan champor tangan sa-chara langsung, tetapi memberi jasa baik—memberi jasa baik mereka dalam mendamaikan atau menyelesaikan pertikaian antara dua negara yang berjiran ini, sebab kita tidak mahu sa-lama²-nya hidup dalam alam konfrantasi. Kita tidak mahu sa-lama²-nya kita di-serang dan tidak pula mahu kita menyerang, sebab itu-lah negara² Afro-Asia merupakan suatu medan atau arena yang paling menasabah bagi menyelesaikan masalah Malaysia dan Indonesia. Kita mahu perdamaian dan perdamaian itu-lah menjadi pokok. Ini-lah. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau pehak negara Malaysia ini pandai memainkan peranan politik kepada dunia Timor Tengah atau negara² di-Timor Tengah, saya perchaya bahawa soal itu akan di-bereskan dengan baik lebeh² lagi

banyak perkara² yang besangkut, termasuklah perkara soal kedudukan negara Israel sendiri, yang pehak Parti PAS telah kerap kali mengemukakan usul—usul yang pertama telah di-gugorkan dengan kalah undi.

Sebab bagi negara² di-Timor Tengah, soal negara Israel ada-lah menjadi soal pokok, soal hidup mati-nya kedudukan negara² Islam di-negara² Arab di-Timor Tengah dan itu sendiri tidak payah di-ulas panjang lebar bagaimana wujud-nya—chara wujud-nya negara Israel itu di-Rumah yang mulia ini. Sa-benar-nya di-churahkan dengan hujah² yang demikian rupa, maka perlu-lah soal pengkajian itu di-timbulkan-lah atau di-kaji kembali walau pun mungkin pehak Kerajaan mengatakan bahawa kita akui atau i'tiraf negara Israel oleh kerana negara Israel menjadi negara anggota Bangsa² Bersatu tetapi kita tidak i'tiraf Kerajaan apa sahaja-lah, itu satu soal yang maseh boleh di-minta dapat di-pertanggung-jawabkan-nya. Dan tidak-lah tugas saya minta di-pertanggung-jawabkan atau apa yang di-kehendaki di-kaji sa-mula.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-belum saya menamatkan ucapan saya pada pagi ini saya hendak menyentoh-lah sedikit soal perkembangan bahasa kebangsaan. Tahun 1967 telah hampir, fajar-nya telah nampak meningkat tetapi bagaimana pula persiapan untuk mata hari terbit 1967, dengan soal bahasa kebangsaan sa-bagai bahasa rasmi dan bahasa kebangsaan yang tunggal di-negeri ini. Kegiatan² pehak Kerajaan tidak begitu nampak ketegasan sa-lain daripada beberapa perkara yang kecil. Walau bagaimana pun saya menyampaikan sa-tinggi² tahniah kepada Pengarah Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka yang telah merupakan panglima dan pengawal bagi memperjuangkan bahasa kebangsaan. Saya tahu beliau sa-orang yang benar² mengambil berat dalam perkara ini dan saya dapat bagi satu mithalan bagaimana sa-buah pertubohan di-negeri Kelantan ia-itu-lah sa-buah pertubohan, saya tidak mahu sebutkan nama-nya, telah mengambil keputusan memberhentikan siaran ulangan-nya yang di-terjemahkan dalam bahasa

kebangsaan kapada bahasa Inggeris sahaja. Dengan langkah yang tegas yang di-ambil oleh tuan Pengarah Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka dan ikut-lah sama bertanggung-jawab bersama champor tangan baharu-lah dapat diberi keinsafan dan kesedaran kapada pertubohan itu sa-hingga pertubohan itu sanggup untuk tahun 1965 akan melaksanakan kembali penterjemahan siaran ulangan di-dalam bahasa kebangsaan, itu sa-bagai satu chontoh. Tetapi ketegasan dalam sudut² yang lain, saya mithalkan sahaja Dewan Ra'ayat ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, memang benar-lah mengikut Standing Orders Dewan Ra'ayat, bahasa yang di-gunakan di-sini ia-lah bahasa Melayu dan Inggeris dan semua Bill² di-kemukakan dalam bahasa Inggeris tetapi apa salah-nya kalau dari sekarang ini kita chuba bertateh sa-belum kita dapat berjalan lebeh tegap, apa salah-nya kalau Bill² itu di-kembarkan bersama dengan terjemahan-nya, terjemahan-nya itu tidak di-gunakan—tidak di-jadikan asas, bahasa Inggeris ini juga sementara tahun 1967, apa salah-nya di-kembarkan terjemahan-nya sama sa-bagai satu langkah progressive, satu langkah yang menuju ka-arah mendaulatkan bahasa kebangsaan sa-bagai bahasa rasmi yang tunggal. Saya perchaya ini pun akan dapat perhatian hendak-nya menjejak tahun 1965 akan ada-lah perubahan sa-kurang²-nya dalam Rumah yang mulia ini, demikian juga dengan jabatan² yang lain.

Di-negeri Kelantan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, memang bahasa kebangsaan itu telah di-pakai semenjak berlama, akan tetapi sekarang perkembangan² baharu kadang² yang dahulu-nya di-gunakan bahasa kebangsaan pun sudah ada terasa sedap dengan bahasa asing itu, terpakai juga bahasa asing sa-hingga terpaksa Kerajaan negeri Kelantan mengambil keputusan baharu² ini tidak akan menerima sa-barang surat yang di-tulis sa-lain daripada bahasa kebangsaan (*Tepok*).

Sungguh pun begitu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau surat itu datang-nya daripada Kementerian terpaksa-lah Kerajaan terima walau pun dalam bahasa Inggeris, terpaksa di-terima,

tetapi sa-bahagian besar-nya itu-lah dia terpaksa di-terima, ya! terpaksa terima, itu soal perhubungan, memang terpaksa terima. Sekarang ini saya nampak ada perubahan, Kementerian pun kalau si-anu bin si-anu, dengan hormat-nya tuan, sudah di-mulai dengan kepala-nya dengan bahasa kebangsaan, kemudian di-bawah-nya itu semua-nya cherita² dalam bahasa lain-lah, yang akhir sa-kali, ada-lah saya dengan hormat-nya (*Ketawa*). Ini pun alhamdulillah-lah, itu ada kesedaran, tetapi apa salah-nya di-mulai, tuan ada-lah saya, bahawa baharu-lah sedap benda itu, tidak tersangkut dengan Undang² dapat juga di-gunakan.

Itu-lah dia, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soal kedudukan bahasa kebangsaan, Kerajaan tidak begitu tegas, tolong-lah tegaskan sedikit supaya kita tidak ketinggalan keretapi bila sampai tahun 1967, chita² Kerajaan dapat dilaksanakan. Saya bimbang sampai tahun 1967 serba kekok, biar-lah kita belajar² dahulu sa-kurang²-nya masuk sekolah untuk chara hidup berumah tangga, bila sudah kahwin dapat-lah kita tahu, jangan salah, itu tidak kena, ini tidak kena akhir-nya kita kalam-kabut sa-sudah kahwin hendak nanti 5/6 bulan dapat certificate satu, sa-tahun kemudian baharu-lah reti hendak hidup berumah tangga. Demikian juga soal bahasa kebangsaan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, terpaksa-lah kita mesti lath dari sekarang sa-belum sampai masa-nya lebeh² lagi serangan² yang terlalu berat, anasir² chuba hendak menghanchorkan bahasa kebangsaan itu terlalu banyak-nya. Anasir² sa-chara terang, anasir sa-chara senyap², gerakan subversive, bukan sahaja hendak menghanchor negara tetapi menghanchorkan chita² hendak menjadikan bahasa kebangsaan bahasa rasmi yang tunggal.

Baharu² ini sa-buah surat khabar China nama-nya saya telah lupa, telah menulis bahawa persatuan guru² China sanggup masuk jail demi untuk memperjuang menjadikan bahasa China sa-bagai satu daripada bahasa rasmi dalam negeri ini. Alang-kah hebat tekad mulia-nya bagi mereka dengan tekad saperti itu. Ini saya tidak salah-

kan mereka sebab mereka hendak, tetapi ini satu chabaran-lah kepada kita, kepada Kerajaan sendiri, chabaran untuk menunjukkan kehendakan dan kekuatan lebeh² lagi bagi menghadapi anchaman ini. Mereka berjuang dengan chita² dan kita berjuang dengan chita² juga. Kalau mereka yang tidak mempunyai kuasa sanggup berbuat apa yang kita buat, kenapa kuasa yang kita buat, ini yang menjadi pokok persoalan kita sekarang. Lebeh² lagi kalau kita tengok banyak lagi sa-lain daripada kesatuan² guru China yang kadang² saya terdengar entah betul entah tidak, kalangan M.C.A. sendiri pun ada juga, alang-kah sedeh-nya hati kita sama² dengan UMNO mendirikan Kerajaan dan mengasaskan chita² untuk menjadikan bahasa kebangsaan bahasa rasmi yang tunggal menjelang tahun 1967 akhir-nya ada sendiri chuba hendak menggunting dalam lipatan. Saya dengar M.C.A. di-Pulau Pinang pun demikian, apa-kah ini sa-bagai satu perchekan daripada yang tersembunyi yang hanya main² gula di-bibir sahaja dalam chita² hendak melaksanakan chita² bahasa kebangsaan. Ini pun saya harap Yang Teramat Mulia Tunku Perdana Menteri sendiri dapat mengawasi hal ini dan dapat melaksanakan chita² menjadikan bahasa kebangsaan ini. Lafadz, ishtihar, ucapan berapi² untuk menjadikan bahasa kebangsaan tahun 1967 ini sa-bagai bahasa rasmi yang tunggal tidak chukup kalau tidak di-teruskan dengan amalan. Saya harap mudahan² pehak Kerajaan Persekutuan daripada semua Kementerian hendak-nya mulai dari sekarang kalau hendak buat surat dengan ra'ayat pun tulis-lah dalam bahasa kebangsaan. Buat surat perhubungan antara Kerajaan² Negeri dalam bahasa kebangsaan, kalau kalamah tidak berjumpa taroh-lah bahasa Inggeris sa-patah dua dalam itu sa-bagai hendak menggantikan kalamah Melayu tetapi bahasa kebangsaan.

Soal Mahkamah itu soal lain-lah, kita serahkan kepada Menteri Ke-adilan itu sendiri bagaimana hendak mewujudkan-nya asal boleh melahirkan bahasa kebangsaan itu sa-bagai bahasa Mahkamah pada masa akan

datang. Sesuai-lah kita serahkan kepada Menteri Pelajaran mewujudkan tingkatan pelajaran daripada rendah sampai ka-Universiti dengan menggunakan bahasa kebangsaan sa-bagai bahasa penghantar-nya. Ini juga satu masalah yang saya terkenang bagaimana rancangan Sekolah Aneka Jurusan dan sa-bagai-nya yang dua tahun sahaja lagi kita hendak sampai kepada bahasa kebangsaan itu dijadikan bahasa rasmi yang tunggal. Kita maseh lagi menggalakkan jurusan Inggeris-nya, kita tahu bahawa bahasa Inggeris itu bahasa yang penting dalam dunia, kenapa kita tidak dapat jadikan bahasa itu sa-bagai satu mata pelajaran dalam sekolah², kenapa kita tidak dapat mengadakan satu sekolah jurusan yang khusus mempelajari bahasa Inggeris daripada kita menjahnmakan keseluruhan pergerakan untuk mewujudkan lahir-nya bahasa kebangsaan pada tahun 1967 ini. Itu saya serahkan-lah kepada Menteri Yang Berhormat. Saya terkenang sedikit sahaja lagi dalam Minggu Berjaya baharu² ini, di-namakan Minggu Perpaduan. Minggu Perpaduan itu ada satu lagu khas yang di-karang oleh Suria Buana, siapa orang-nya saya tidak tahu-lah. Dalam kalimah rangkap pantun lagu berjaya itu satu bahasa satu negara, satu bangsa satu bahasa, itu menunjukkan tekad seluruh bangsa melagukan, sa-patut-nya sa-barang siaran yang baik Radio atau Talivision dalam Minggu itu utamakan-lah bahasa kebangsaan. Sa-kurang²-nya Minggu itu sa-bagai persediaan Ahli² Yang Berhormat Menteri Muda Pertanian kita sendiri beruchap dalam talivision dalam Minggu Perpaduan menggunakan bahasa Inggeris, yang kadang² menggelikan hati (*Ketawa*), Yang Berhormat Menteri Kerajaan Tempatan beruchap dalam bahasa China, Yang Berhormat Menteri Buroh beruchap dalam bahasa Tamil (*Ketawa*), oleh kerana kebetulan mereka orang yang menggunakan bahasa ibu-nya, bukan itu sa-bagai logik-nya, beruchap-lah dalam bahasa kebangsaan, kalau tidak tahu belajar-lah!

Enche' V. Manickavasagam: On a point of information, Sir, I also spoke in the national language.

Enche' Mohd. Asri bin Haji Muda: Saya tahu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, yang katakana beruchap-lah dalam bahasa kebangsaan, terutama dalam Minggu Perpaduan itu, kalau ada juga bahasa Tamil yang sa-baik²-nya Menteri Buroh itu sendiri tidak payah-lah beruchap dalam bahasa Tamil, suroh-lah Secretary dia sa-bagai terjemahan daripada ucapan Menteri Buroh yang di-ucapkan dalam bahasa kebangsaan, demikian juga Menteri Kerajaan Tempatan dan Perumahan, alang-kah manis-nya pada pandangan warga negara negeri ini dan bagitu-lah bentok-nya, saya tidak marah, ini cheritakan sahaja (*Ketawa*). Jadi itu-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-bagai mithal-nya, habis-lah cherita itu. Sa-benar-nya banyak lagi Menteri lain yang beruchap tidak dalam bahasa kebangsaan itu sa-bagai chontoh sahaja.

Saya masok, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perkara yang akhir ia-lah perkara Kementerian Kebajikan Masharakat kita ini, ini satu Kementerian yang paling penting pada pandangan saya. Sebab masharakat kita ini maseh memerlukan banyak kebajikan, itu-lah di-adakan khusus-nya perkara ini satu Kementerian yang bernama Kementerian Kebajikan Masharakat. Sa-belum saya sentoh tugas² yang lebeh besar saya hendak menyentoh ucapan baharu² ini, beliau beruchap dalam masaalah loteri kebajikan masharakat. Beliau beruchap tentang soal duit loteri kebajikan masharakat yang di-gunakan untuk kebajikan dalam negeri ini, pada hal kita tahu, ada dua masaalah yang timbul dalam perkara ini. Majlis Ugama Tetap, Majlis Raja² Melayu memutuskan dua pokok, yang pertama loteri itu judi, dan judi itu haram. Yang kedua duit daripada loteri itu, hasil itu di-masokkan sa-bagai hasil mahsul negara dan boleh di-gunakan. Jadi menimbulkan satu kekeliruan dan silap faham, daripada ucapan Yang Berhormat Menteri ini dengan menyatakan sekarang ini loteri telah berjasa, duit banyak dapat di-gunakan untuk kebajikan masharakat, masaalah yang timbul sekarang bukan-nya duit loteri lagi di-buat kebajikan masharakat, tetapi duit Kerajaan, sebab wang itu sudah

di-masokkan dalam Revenue, kalau itu di-bangkitkan erti-nya tidak-lah ikhlas dan tidak-lah jujur pehak Kerajaan ini memindahkan wang itu, sebab itu persoalan ugama, persoalan ini ia-lah berbangkit sa-hingga menimbulkan tuduhan bahawa Kerajaan PAS dahulu tidak mahu wang loteri, sekarang mahu wang loteri. Ini perkara pokok, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau sekarang ini juga maseh merupakan wang loteri, demi Allah, Kerajaan Kelantan tidak akan menerima duit itu, tetapi dia tidak lagi wang loteri, yang di-terima wang negara, bukan wang loteri, wang loteri itu sudah di-masokkan ka-dalam wang negara sudah berchampur. Jika di-bangkitkan wang loteri itu lagi tidak sudah²-lah cerita itu, saya harap-lah kapada Menteri Yang Berhormat itu jangan-lah bangkitkan lagi perkara ini, kalau hendak pergi buka istiadat tabong loteri itu, buka-lah itu Yang Berhormat itu sendiri punya hal, tetapi jangan mengkaitkan dasar yang dilakukan oleh Kerajaan.

Soal yang kedua soal loteri itu sendiri saya maseh menunggu², bilakah bahawa keputusan Raja² Melayu itu akan di-amalkan oleh Kerajaan ini, yang menyatakan loteri itu judi, dan judi itu haram. Kalau yang haram duit loteri itu dapat di-jadikan harus atau makroh dengan takdir di-masokkan ka-dalam hasil mahsul negara bila juga hendak di-selesaikan masaalah haram-nya itu, itu terserah-lah kapada Kerajaan. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tugas Menteri Kebajikan Masyarakat ini jangan-lah memandang dalam satu sudut, sa-benar-nya pehak Kementerian yang lain juga mempunyai perhubungan yang rapat dengan Kementerian ini. Saya kasehan kapada Menteri Kebajikan Masyarakat ini dengan tidak dapat kerjasama, terutama-nya daripada Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan itu sendiri. Negara kita maseh memerlukan bantuan, sistem ekonomi yang ada dalam negeri ini belum lagi dapat menaikkan darjah kehidupan masyarakat sa-hingga tidak memerlukan lagi kapada bantuan Kementerian Kebajikan Masyarakat ini, walau pun ekonomi No. 2 di-sabelah Asia ini, ini perkara bukan mesti di-serahkan kapada

Menteri Kebajikan itu sahaja, saya berharap tugas² Menteri ini pada masa akan datang tidak sahaja tugas dalam soal yang di-sebut-nya tadi, atau pun tugas mengadakan undang², tetapi tugas² pelaksanaan², tugas melakukan amalan dalam menaikkan darjah hidup ra'ayat daripada penderitaan kapada hidup yang lumayan, sa-bagai anggota masyarakat yang sama² berhak menekmati hasil mahsul negara, menikmati kema'amoran negara kita yang bahagia, itu-lah sahaja, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, yang dapat saya kemukakan dan pada akhir-nya saya ucapkan tahniah kapada Menteri kita ini yang telah menggunakan Rang Undang² ini bagi kelulusan perbelanjaan bagi negara Malaysia kita ini dengan berani menghadapi deficit lebeh daripada 180 million ringgit ini, terima kaseh.

Dr Lim Chong Eu (Tanjong): Mr Speaker, Sir, we live in times of change, and to a large extent the Budget that has been presented reflects this change. Everyone who loves Malaysia—and in the past few weeks through Berjaya Week and National Solidarity Week, we have had a demonstration of the overwhelming desire of the people in this country to stand shoulder to shoulder in the building of this new nation—and everyone who professes this sense of loyalty and solidarity and who expresses the desire to sustain the spirit of our Constitution which embodies the concept of freedom and democracy, cannot permit himself at the present time to underestimate the implications of Indonesian confrontation against ourselves and the unwarranted aggression on the part of Soekarno and his regime against our sovereign territory. Therefore, we all realise very well that there is an enormous task that the Government has to meet in order not only just to build up our nation to defend ourselves against this Indonesian confrontation but at the same time to carry on the processes of consolidating the development of our nation which began in 1957 and which has now extended itself with the inclusion of the territories of Singapore, Sabah and Sarawak. This, I think, to a large extent is reflected by the Budget because our problem is not only the problem of meeting confrontation, of

gearing ourselves into a position of defence against the ambitions of Indonesia, but we also have to carry on with this much more arduous and much more important task of making ourselves truly into one united nation.

Under the circumstances, Sir, it is not our intention to carp on the Budget and to harp back on a political note on what had happened in the past. We would like to adopt the attitude which the Minister of Finance has adopted, namely, we would like, to a large extent, to put the past behind us and look forward to the future. We understand that much of the provisions of our development into the future has been patterned by what has happened in the States of Malaya, in the old Federation of Malaya. Many of the problems, that were important when we were only the Federation of Malaya, and the methods and the ways whereby we met those challenges have become also methods which are carried forward when we meet this new concept of Malaysia. However, Sir, right from the very outset, I would like to urge not only the Government but also fellow Members on this side of the Opposition, and the people and the country at large, to remember once and for all that we are a new nation, and the new nation is Malaysia. We must begin to think and continue to think in terms of Malaysia. It is not enough that any one part of our territory remains secure; we are fighting for the security of our entire nation and of all the four territories which constitute this nation. Under the circumstances, Sir, we feel that this Budget should not be described, as has been described by some of the papers, as a "shock" Budget or a "more and more shock" Budget or a Budget that soaks the rich and so on. We feel that this Budget essentially is a Budget of crucial testing, it is a testing of our people, it is a testing of the institutions that our Constitution has provided for; it is a testing of our will. It tests first the real strength and the real determination of the people who voted the Alliance Government in power. It is in the nature of the democratic processes of our country that in the

last elections, the Alliance Party went out to tell the people that Malaysia would mean greater prosperity. It was also in the nature of our democratic processes that we in the Opposition went out to warn the people to be more careful about listening to the blandishments of the Alliance programme. The people made their choice, we accept the people's choice. Now, the people must learn to accept the Government and the decisions and the policies of the Government whom they have elected. I do hope that the people will learn to accept these, because we believe that the question of prosperity does not immediately arise; the question today is the question of survival, survival of our nation and, therefore, whilst we sincerely hope that the future will bring us prosperity and happiness, this is the time when we must all tighten our belts and be prepared to make sacrifices in order to keep this new nation alive. That, Sir, is the spirit and the manner whereby we wish to approach the Budget as presented by the Honourable Minister of Finance. (*Applause*).

Sir, at the last meeting of this House, I thought that the Honourable Minister of Finance would break the \$2,000 million mark in his budgeting this year. He has not done so, but it would not be long. Therefore, it is not a shock to us that the Budget is presented in the manner that it has been. However, Sir, in trying to look for new sources of revenue, the Honourable Minister of Finance has brought in some novel institutions, novel methods, of tax collection, and I want to touch only on two of his new introductions and refer to the turnover tax.

Sir, from the point of view of the turnover tax, we feel that the Government itself is in a stage of experiment and in a stage of testing. The speech of the Honourable Minister of Finance has clearly indicated that the Government is finding its way about. However, we feel, Sir, that one of the important factors apparently, which Government had in mind, was the desire to keep down the cost of building up new administrative machinery

and, therefore, cutting the recurrent cost in future for the introduction of the new tax. However, in regard to this turnover tax, Sir, I feel that there are two points which the Honourable Minister of Finance can well bear in mind. Firstly, a tax of this nature might be difficult to be administered from the point of view that it lends itself to evasion, and we hope that if the country will respond well to the call of Government, evasion on the part of the public will be kept to a minimum by the public themselves. However, Sir, we feel that a tax of this nature must and can necessarily lead to great evasions. Now, Sir, we feel also that to levy a tax on gross profits without giving consideration as to whether these profits are marginal or even whether in fact the businesses concerned were running at a loss is a matter which can stand further investigation. We notice that the Minister of Finance has provided for certain exemptions on the question of taxation. However, we feel that he could have gone further to provide for tax exemption to those businesses and trades where the profits are marginal and also where the business has shown a loss. Although there may be high gross turnover, I am told that in businesses large turnovers do not necessarily always mean a sound financial position, nor does it necessarily mean the end result of a profit. The other factor is that in providing for these exemptions for the smaller businesses, for the sale of goods which do not exceed \$36,000, and professions or businesses which do not exceed \$20,000, Sir, I hope that the Minister of Finance will look into the provisions for the administrative machinery whereby he could handle these exemptions to make it easier and less inconvenient for those who have to apply for these exemptions.

The other taxation is the question of the payroll tax. We only have one comment to make on this payroll tax, and that is, we hope that this payroll tax will not make it difficult in future for trade unions representing employees in their negotiations for better wage schemes on the basis that increase of

wage schemes for the employees will necessarily mean a higher resultant tax to the employer. However, in these difficult circumstances it would be interesting to see whether Government, under these conditions, for the benefit of the future revenues of this country would find itself more on the side of the employees rather than on the side of the employers, because obviously the higher the payroll the higher the tax and the greater the revenue to this nation. So the position of Government has become even more delicate.

Sir, we are told also that one of the basic factors and reasons for the compilation of our revenue and the tax structure is the development of Malaysia and the decision of the Government to slowly harmonise the tax structure in our new four territories. I would like at this stage to talk on harmonisation with, I am afraid, special reference to the State of Penang. Harmonisation involving the establishment of the Tariff Board and the Common Market has created a great sense of uncertainty in the State of Penang, particularly in that part of the State which is Penang Island, which is still a free port. Sir, I do hope that the Government will be sympathetic to the situation in Penang and not leave the people in a state of uncertainty. Whereas there is definite provision, and there has been definite planning as provided for in Annex J of the Constitution for the relationship between Singapore and the rest of Malaysia, in the harmonisation and in the slow integration of Singapore into the Federation, we in the State of Penang have no real, tangible policy or plan to help to provide for the happy integration and harmonisation of Penang Island into the Common Market. Under those circumstances, Sir, I hope the Government will provide some scheme whereby investigations and surveys can be made to indicate clearly to the people in the Penang Island whether they would stand to benefit if they retain their free port status or whether they would benefit if they join the Common Malaysian Market, and how this process

of integration and harmonisation can be carried out in graduated stages.

Sir, here I would like to refer to a very minor point. We hope that the Government in future when it appoints members to serve on the panel of the Tariff Board to represent the State of Penang would give closer attention to the appointment of men who have greater experience and who enjoy a wider confidence from the people, the businesses, to represent business interests in the State of Penang. The representatives from the Island of Penang and the representatives from Province Wellesley whatever their personal qualifications may be, at the present time, I must say, do not enjoy that widespread confidence which would have been far better if somebody else were considered.

Sir, I would touch now on this question of confrontation in terms of the provision for defence, internal security and external affairs. Sir, I feel that the whole problem of meeting confrontation cannot be just confined to the function of the Ministries of Defence and Internal Security. That that is the point of view of our Government or that is how the Government feels is indicated to some extent by the fact that the Minister of Finance had referred largely to the increases that we will have to bear from the point of view of defence in combining defence and internal security expenditures together. Sir, we feel that in the question of trying to solve Indonesian confrontation, the matter of external affairs, the matter of foreign policy, is of great importance. Sir, apart from the need for defending ourselves there is also I think a much more important and greater need for us to try to avoid having to be plunged into a state of war. Sir, I understand that Government must be in a very difficult position, because we today not only have to provide for defence against aggression but we have to provide for the probability of open aggression and open war. Sir, I hope that the Government may well consider a proposition which is on the Order Paper, a proposition to review its foreign policy and to bring up its

foreign policy for further discussion in this House. We feel that in foreign policy the Government can do much not only to help to solve the problem of confrontation but also do much to help solve the question of our budgeting. We consider that up to the present time Government has carried out its function in external affairs with a considerable measure of success. However, we feel that the Government should not be content to leave matters as they are but should consider extending its activities. Basically we have agreed with this wise policy, which has been expressed by the Honourable the Prime Minister in his capacity as Foreign Minister, that we will always keep our door open for peaceful negotiations with Indonesia and that the terms for those negotiations have been clearly laid down and every other nation in the world would have known where we stand with regard to this desire of our own to maintain the door open for further consultation. However, Sir, we must be aware also that should our efforts along this line fail and war actually takes place in this area, then war is not only going to involve ourselves but it may well precipitate another world war and precipitate another crisis not only for the people of Malaysia but for the whole of mankind. We should not too lightly put aside the claim by Soekarno that the Indonesian people are ready to make an atomic bomb next year. Sir, physically and financially, I myself think that the question of whether Indonesia can on her own make an atomic bomb is highly questionable and probably a mere boast. However, the danger is that Indonesia can and may be able to receive the assistance whereby it can conjure up its military potential by being supplied with atomic war-heads; and if we on our part will also place ourselves in a position where we can acquire for our defence the necessary weaponry, then I think the danger to ourselves and the danger to the world is very great. So, I urge and implore the Honourable Prime Minister, who is known for his wide humanistic view, to think in terms of the peace of the world and

the dangers confronting not only ourselves but the dangers confronting the rest of the world. We have in the last ten years progressed step by step by consolidating our position with our friends, extending our position and our relationship with new friends; and we note that this activity is still progressing as the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister is now on his way home: he is attempting to consolidate our relationship with new nations.

Sir, we have to recognise the fact that in this present world there are five major powers armed with the potentialities to destroy the whole of human kind. We have on our part made contact with Great Britain. We have on our part made contact with the United States of America, and lately we have also at last made contact with France. I feel, Sir, that there is every reason for us to consider that, perhaps, the question of confrontation and the question of the danger to the world can to some extent be eased and even solved if the Government can reconsider its foreign policy and review it to permit itself to try now to sell the idea of Malaysia to countries whom we have previously believed to be antagonistic towards ourselves. Therefore, we feel that if the Foreign Minister, or the Honourable the Prime Minister, would try to "sell" Malaysia and explain away the idea of Malaysia to the Russian people or to the Chinese people, the position may well be that the present attitude and the present support that they give to Indonesia and the present hostility they show towards Malaysia may be to some extent lessened and thus their understanding of Malaysia may become clearer. We should make this effort to let these two big nations understand what Malaysia really means. We should try our very best to clear up this charge of neo-colonialism which Indonesia has made against us, and I believe that direct contact and direct explanation which has proved so successful in the past, in so far as one part of the world is concerned, may yet also produce results where we have never previously thought could be

fruitful. Therefore, I do suggest that the Government should seriously consider selling the idea of Malaysia and explain to that part of the world which is hostile towards us, but not yet directly involved in attacking us, over the question of Malaysia.

Sir, next I would like to touch on a very delicate subject—I have already said that the Budget represented an attempt to meet the realities of confrontation and the attempt to weld the nation into a single nation—the question of national language and education. Sir, the Honourable Member who spoke before me has touched on the question of education. This is a matter which is highly charged with emotion for the question of the national language naturally is a matter which can become a matter of schism in this country. Not only is the question of national language a problem, it is a major problem with us and also throughout the world in other countries. Such a problem is always a major problem and a problem fraught with dangers if not tackled wisely and well.

Sir, we are fortunate in this country that all the diverse races in this country have accepted in principle that the Malay language shall be the only national language. That, I think, everybody in this country accepts and nobody has any quarrel over it. The difficulty and the real potential danger that arises is the question of how we are going to make the diverse population adjust themselves and learn the national language.

With regard to the present States of Malaya, I feel that we had tackled the problem with some foresight and as long ago as 1956/57. I maintain the view that within ten years we in this part of the new Malaysian nation can make the Malay language the National language. However, Sir, unfortunately the tensions and the emotions that are already highly charged over this extremely controversial matter were further enlarged and further charged because of the unfortunate apposition of the education problem with the language problem. If language itself is

already a highly inflammatory problem, the question of education—the provision of a common system of education, the provision of a unified system of education—is also a very big and very difficult problem.

Sir, I feel that today, with the introduction of the comprehensive school system, for example—two days ago when we talked on the Bill amending the Education Act to provide for the introduction of the comprehensive school system—I deliberately did not attempt to talk over the question of basic policies on education, because the implementation of the comprehensive school system is a good one. However, provision must be made whereby that system will bring benefit, in the very words of the Minister of Education, to everyone. Under the circumstances, Sir, in view also of the fact that the Government, by declared statements of policy, intends to make, in so far as the States of Malaya are concerned, Malay the only National language by 1967, I suggest that we should tackle this problem slowly and wisely so that it does not rise into a crucial and critical stage by 1967. So, we should look into the matter now. And I suggest, Sir, that the stand which I took some four years back, a stand which I still take today, a stand which made it necessary for me to sever my relationship with friends with whom I had worked for many years, because what I believe is that unless we carry out the problem of development of the National language and the problem of the development of education as two separate subjects, then we meet the future with very great dangers. I believe that the danger arose from the very fact that, unfortunately, Government in 1960, in reviewing the Education policy, made an anomalous decision. In the 1960 Education Review, the Minister of Education must agree with this, it was stated that although there were many requests that the medium of examination should be the medium of instruction, however, the decision taken was that in spite of the fact that such a recommendation was academically and educationally sound, Government

nevertheless insisted that the medium of examination should be in the medium of the official language. Sir, it is this combination, it is at this area where the two large, highly charged emotional problems of language and education combine into one, that has become a matter of great confusion. Sir, I am not trying to stir up emotions. I am not trying to stir up old issues. I have said, let us forget the past and let us move on ahead. But, unfortunately, there are still many skeletons in our cupboard. The members in the M.C.A., during the next few months, will have to meet challenges that are made within the M.C.A. itself and challenges coming from the Chinese educational section, whom the M.C.A. try to represent; and they must meet them wisely and well, for the sake not only of the community which they seek to represent but also for the sake of the nation as a whole. I do suggest, Sir, that from the national point of view, Government can well consider that this is a time where we must divorce the question of education from the question of the national language.

Sir, over the problem of education I would like to pose it in this manner. I would like to frame it under new terms so that the old feelings about the Chinese language or the Chinese school system, *vis-à-vis* the national language and the provision for instruction in the national language, should not be brought into direct apposition again. I would like to pose the question in terms of education in the English medium so that, I hope, to some extent, the racial feelings that might be stirred up can be put aside.

Sir, if we take the position as it stands today that examinations are to be conducted only in the official language, and if Government is to make the national language the only official language by 1967, then, by the nature of things—the examinations that are provided for in 1967 just at the end of the three years of privilege, which you have given to our children for extended comprehensive school system at the end of that three-year period—those school-children who have gone into the English medium

schools today will have to sit in the medium of the official language, namely, only in the national language. That, Sir, I say, is impossible to carry out. So it is best now, right now, to say that the medium of examination should be in the medium of instruction.

Sir, you can well understand the fears and the anxieties of a very important section of our national community—those whose origin come from China, those who are Malaysians of Chinese origin. Sir, their anxieties in education are very clear; they are no more different from the anxieties which the members of the Malay community had in the past. In the past, under the colonial regime, there was opportunity for the Malays to study English. As a matter of fact, the colonial masters made it easy for them: any Malay student wanting to transfer from the Malay school to the English school could do so free. The same thing is being applied today. If you want to transfer from one medium of instruction to the official medium of instruction, you can do so free. As a matter of fact, a directive has already gone out that if parents of children who wish to allow their children to go into the comprehensive school system but studying in a medium of the national language, they can do so without any school fees at all. That is a great inducement. But, nevertheless, with all this kind of inducements, the old colonial system failed, and it created a problem which we today have to overcome. And one of the major problems was the fact that the Malays felt that they were a repressed group and a suppressed group in so far as education was concerned, because they were never permitted to go beyond Standard Six in their own school system. Today, Sir, with the introduction of the comprehensive school system, the Chinese community, to a large extent, in this country feels this same anxiety. Is it true or is it not true? Sir, I tell you that it is true. If it were not true, the M.C.A. today within itself would not have so much anxiety and so much squabbling. If it were not true, the Chinese School

Teachers Associations would not be in the turmoil and in the process of resurgence again today. Where does the truth come in? Under the old educational system, under even the present educational system, children going into the primary schools can go into the four major language streams—they can go into the National language stream, the English stream, the Chinese stream and the Tamil stream. That is for six years. At the end of six years, they will have to go into the comprehensive school system.

Sir, during the debate over the amendment to the Education Bill I suggested the necessity, administratively, for the provision of a Remove Form. We notice under the provision for the Budget increased budgeting to provide for more teachers in order to carry out the implementation of the comprehensive school system.

Sir, there is still need whereby children going from the Chinese primary schools can have a secondary education and enjoy a secondary education in the medium of Chinese. Under our Constitution, it is so provided that they could form private schools for that type of education not involving the public budget. However, Sir, the question of equality of opportunity of employment involves the question of getting a national certificate. Under those circumstances, there are sections in this country which feel that in future their children will have only six years of education, whereas others would have nine years of education. It is because of this disparity and this sense of inequality and this sense of being made a minority group, that you find the agitation that exists today. Sir, it is not my intention to go into the more fundamental questions or issues involved. I only bring this matter up in order to urge the Government to immediately separate the education issue from the national language issue, and it can do that quickly and rapidly by not tying up the question of examinations to the question of official language. Secondly, I feel that there is need today for us to review the educational policy, to

review it not only with regard to the needs and the difficulties that are already created today but to review it so that we can, as soon as possible, have a really common, nationally integrated, educational system that would involve not only the States of Malaya but the whole of the territories of Malaysia, and we would really have a truly Malaysian national education system. It is time for us to set up a Committee for this review, and this Committee can well take the brunt and can well buffer much of the expressions that are made today, so that anxieties can be channelled to a proper Committee of Review and not necessarily infringe upon the body of the national community; so that we can put aside to the Committee of Review the problems of education and thereby the problems of education would not instigate issues which could destroy the harmony of our people and thereby weaken the solidarity which we must have in order to confront and meet Indonesian confrontation. This, Sir, I urge the Government to give serious consideration to, because if you delay this, the situation will become more and more acute and it may well become explosive by 1967.

Sir, I would like, with your permission, to wind up and only refer to two matters. One is the question of health. We understand that the question of health of the nation is an important one. The requirement for more and more doctors is a very urgent one. The need for more doctors will be made even more dire if confrontation becomes worse and if war develops, because your military requirements will take away more men from the medical services. Under the circumstances, Sir, I suggest that the Government could well look into the question of revising or establishing a truly new national policy for medical educational development. I, therefore, urge the Government to consider helping the establishment of a Medical Research Council which could raise the general standards of the work that is done in this country, establishment of an Academy of Medicine, which will help us to

heighten and improve the status of medicine as it is expected today. The Government should look also into the question of bringing up to the Colombo Plan countries further extension to the Colombo Plan provision for post-graduate training which we have already established with Australia. Here, I would like to indicate that the Government seems not to have been aware of the facilities that are provided for whereby our own local graduates can take post-graduate training at Singapore with the help of experts from Australia and it had not availed itself of the opportunity of sending its own staff from the Medical Services to take the courses that are carried out in Singapore. I suggest that these courses can also be extended to the University of Malaya, so that in future the extension for post-graduate training and the preparation of our own doctors for higher qualifications can be made locally without first sending them abroad.

Sir, I am coming back to my own constituency in Penang. I would like to ask the Government to bear in mind that for many years the Government has talked about the provision of a new block for the Penang Hospital. The time has come when, with all the difficulties that are confronting the people of Penang, more and more people are going to the General Hospital for treatment and, therefore, there is every urgency now for this new block to be established.

Lastly, Sir, I would like to talk on this question of subventions which provided for the funds for the University of Malaya. I wonder whether the Government would carefully go into the question also of provision of education at University level and integrate the position of the University of Singapore within the general framework of a national University level of education, because this question is posed: is the University of Singapore a State University or is it a national University? We feel, Sir, that if the University products or the graduates of the University are to provide the country with the best and the cream of its natural human resources, then

Government can well consider the integration of the University of Singapore within the national scheme, and we should not further put aside a decision about making the University of Singapore part and parcel of a national University. It will make our provisions for further education at University level easier, and I think it would make for also a closer integration of our educational system in the future.

The question of Nanyang University has been touched upon in the press locally and the Minister for Home Affairs has suggested that with further improvements in the Nanyang University, the Government will reconsider its attitude towards the Nanyang University. We hope that with the Government's implementation of the amendments to the Internal Security Act, it can thoroughly achieve the objective it has of clearing up the mess in the Nanyang University. But having cleared it up, and having raised its standards, I feel that the Government should integrate the Nanyang University also within the national framework of the University education as a whole.

Sir, our intention is to draw the Government's attention to only certain aspects of the financial provisions. We feel, however, that if Members of the Government and Members on the Opposition Side and the people at large decide now to accept the challenges ahead of us, first with tolerance, goodwill and understanding amongst ourselves, to create ourselves into a strong nation, and at the same time, having created ourselves into a position of unity and strength, gear ourselves by making national, social and individual sacrifices in order to meet the challenge of Indonesian aggression then we can well consolidate our position as a nation and we shall meet this challenge of confrontation successfully. And if we carry and extend our foreign policies further, we may yet contribute to the peace of the world.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon (Batu): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-belum saya memberi ucapan saya, saya ingin meng-

ambil kesempatan untuk menyentoh sedikit perkara² yang berbangkit daripada ucapan wakil Pasir Puteh dan ucapan wakil dari Tanjong. Yang pertama, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya hendak menyentoh tentang perkara Bahasa Kebangsaan. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-bulan Oktober saya hendak mengambil peperiksaan Bahasa Kebangsaan bagi pegawai² kerajaan per-sendirian yang kedua dan yang ketiga, tetapi malang-nya sa-orang Pegawai Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka tidak memberi kebenaran kapada saya untuk mengambil kedua² peperiksaan tersebut. Bernasib baik, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berhubung dengan Menteri Pelajaran dan beliau telah memberi kebenaran kapada saya untuk mengambil kedua² peperiksaan itu dan saya ada mengambil kedua² peperiksaan itu. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka dan Kerajaan hendak meninggikan, menggunakan dan mengutamakan Bahasa Kebangsaan saya berharap-lah Kerajaan dan Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka mesti-lah menolong ra'ayat mengambil peperiksaan dalam Bahasa Kebangsaan (*Tepok*).

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya sekarang hendak meminta keizinan untuk mengambil ucapan saya di-dalam bahasa Inggeris (*Ketawa*).

Mr Speaker, Sir, I have already touched on the problem of the national language and before I come to my speech proper I just want to touch very briefly on one or two other things that have arisen as a result of the speeches of the Members from Pasir Puteh and Tanjong. First, the Member from Pasir Puteh touched on the comparatively light duty imposed on cigarettes and then he wondered why drinks should be exempted. Mr Speaker, Sir, here I wish to support him in full. We all know that the Islamic religion forbids the Muslims from taking drinks. Being a good Methodist myself, Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not take drinks—this is not only because I am a good Methodist but I am allergic to drinks (*interruption*). I have found out from painful experience that if I take a drink five minutes later I start to scratch.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Dr Lim Swee Aun): May we know whether it is due to his allergy or due to his religious belief that he does not drink (*Laughter*)?

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Both to my religious belief and my being allergic to drinks (*Laughter*). Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not know the reason why liquor has been exempted from any new imposition of taxes. Perhaps the Minister of Finance may well say that this is due to the law of diminishing returns—that if you impose more duty you get less liquor sold and therefore you get less revenue from liquor. That is a premise that I do not accept, because I think a hard drinker will drink however much the liquor tax goes up, and the capitalist by the very nature of his business must entertain lavishly—with what? with drinks! Consequently, I think any new imposition of duty on liquor will not result in this law of diminishing returns.

On the question of cigarettes, Mr Speaker, Sir—not because I am a non-smoker—I do not see any reason why the imposition of tax on cigarettes is so low. Cigarettes are wellknown in this country to be very much cheaper than in other countries and, as such, I would have thought that the Minister concerned would have imposed a far higher tax on cigarettes, and again I think this law of diminishing returns will not result in smaller revenue from cigarettes.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I now wish to touch very briefly on what the Member from Pasir Puteh called the “*kachang puteh* economic policy” of the Government, as described I think by the learned Professor Ungku Aziz. That is a matter which I think the Government should pay particular attention to.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I now come to the speech by the Member from Tanjong. He said that he had thought that the Honourable Minister of Finance would break the \$2,000 million mark and he was happy that this did not occur. I can assure the Honourable Member from Tanjong—although he is not here now—that before the end of 1965 I

have no doubt that we will break the \$2,000 million barrier. Already yesterday we were asked to approve of a petty cash of a mere \$50 million. That means it goes up by \$50 million. Already we have heard the Prime Minister say that the expenditure on defence while today it is \$1 million a day may well go up to \$2 million a day. If it goes up to \$2 million a day, you can imagine that it will add another \$350 million to the Budget. That added to this “petty cash” of \$50 million will add up to \$400 million and consequently will bring the current Budget to near the \$2,000 million mark and taking into consideration that the Government is in the habit of bringing supplementary supply bills to this House I definitely venture to predict that we will break the \$2,000 million barrier before the end of 1965.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I wish now to touch briefly on what the Member from Tanjong has said about education and the national language. In general, I think I will agree with most of what he has said and here I hope that Honourable Members on my right will not accuse me of being chauvinistic because I have proved to them that I am a student of the national language, that I have studied the national language and am still studying and have taken examinations in the national language, which cannot be said of many members on the opposite side of the benches who are not Malays.

Mr Speaker, Sir, for the past few days I have been browsing through some of the budget debates of the past years, some dating as far back as 1953, and I shall quote from some of those sources. I find that during the debates on the Budgets in the past some members have been making speeches on anything under the sun but touching very little on the Budget itself. Of course, there were many exceptions, in particular the former member for Tanjong, who I believe used to give the Minister of Finance a torrid time whenever the Budget was debated. For my part, I shall in the course of my speech today confine myself

strictly to the fiscal policy of the Government and if I stray from this path it is because I am compelled to do so.

Mr Speaker, Sir, as I sat opposite the Minister of Finance listening intently to his speech, I was tempted to say that here at long last this country has a Minister of Finance who is *brani* enough to adopt progressive and socialistic measures for a more equitable redistribution of the wealth of this country. Here at last, I thought, we have a leopard who has changed his spots—to pink perhaps. But as I listened further and as the Minister of Finance heaped one indirect tax after another on the poor *ra'ayat*, I had to change my mind and I said to myself that the Budget, although containing several innovations, is not one that will cure the financial ills of this country.

However, I still congratulate him for his very able and careful diagnosis of the economic situation in the country, but I must say that his prescription will not solve the financial ills of this country.

Although one paper calls it a “soak the rich” Budget and another labels it a “shock Budget”, the *Malay Mail* guessed it right when it said it is a “share the burden Budget”. However, if the Budget is examined closely and compared with the previous Budgets and those of other countries, it will be found that the pattern and character of the Budget is the same. It follows the structure of our old colonial masters who designed their Budgets to protect and stimulate their expanding business enterprises in this country.

The Alliance Government in its ten years of power since 1954, goes even further to develop and protect a capitalistic society and leaves the mass to face the vicissitudes of nature unprotected and uncared for. This policy has actually widened the gap between the rich and the poor and between the “haves” and the “have-nots”.

Several independent commissions and wellknown economists, both local

and foreign, have advocated a more socialist policy to ensure that the rural folks and the down-trodden masses get their due share of wealth of this country. But all this has gone unheeded and the Government keeps on trumpeting with satisfaction the fact that Malaysia has the highest per capita income in Asia, next to Japan, as if that is all that was wanted in this country.

But the Government does not use the Budget and its power to deliberately redistribute this income in such a way that the “have-nots”, the peasants in the kampongs, the workers in the estates, the farmers in the new villages and the rising mass of industrial workers in the urban areas, can be enabled to get a decent living. It is a shame that after 7 years of independence, there are people who have still to go hungry and large sections of the people are still finding it difficult to subsist.

The Acting Minister of Agriculture on 22-11-1964 in a radio talk on “Freedom from Hunger Week” admitted that hidden hunger or malnutrition still exists among the people in the rural areas. This is an indictment against the Government itself. It shows how badly the “have-nots” have been neglected. If there are people in this country who suffer from hunger, then there must be millions more who are poor. While thousands go hungry and live in shacks and five-foot-ways and roam about looking for jobs to eke out a living, the Government gives all forms of assistance and inducements to the big capitalists to exploit further the down-trodden.

This sad and sorry state of affairs is evident from an examination of the Budgets of the previous years and also this one which appears at first sight to be a radical one designed to soak the rich and meet the challenge of confrontation.

It appears to introduce large increases in existing taxes as well. But an analysis of the taxes introduced does not reveal anything spectacular as has been said in the editorial of the

Straits Times on Thursday which I quote:

"He (the Minister of Finance) is introducing a turn-over tax on business, commerce and professions of one-half of one per cent, and a pay roll tax of two per cent. Neither is perhaps quite as fierce as it looks."

To me, the new proposals are nothing unusual. In 1959, when the Alliance proposed large increases in taxes, after the huge majority in the first general elections, the increased revenue from new taxation was only 7.2 per cent. Today, in spite of confrontation and in spite of preparedness and a worsening in the economy and balance of payments, the increase in taxation amounts to no more than 7.2 per cent. In 1959 there was a deficit in ordinary expenditure of \$63 million. Today the deficit is nearly \$200 million. As I pointed out before, Mr Speaker, Sir, if we add on the petty cash that we approved yesterday and the hint given by the Honourable Prime Minister that another million dollars a day in defence is required, this deficit of nearly \$200,000,000 may well go up to more than \$600,000,000.

Furthermore, the increase in indirect taxation is 13.9 per cent and that on direct taxation is 14.2 per cent. Therefore, the increases are almost the same, and it confirms the fact that the pattern of taxation is essentially capitalistic. It shows that the proposals affect both the poor and the rich alike and it does not soak the rich as the business community is now howling about. It further proves that the burden of confrontation is shared equally by the rich and the poor. It shows absolutely no regard for capacity to bear the burden. In this the assessment by the *Malay Mail* was right.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the turnover tax exempts the rubber industry and other business engaged in export. It is another form of indirect taxation as the tax will be pushed on to the consumer with snowball effect. Besides, this is a tax which is used in highly capitalistic countries like the U.S.A. and, therefore, adds to the burden of the poor by way of indirect taxation

whereas the amount derived from direct taxation, i.e. taxes on those best able to pay is still very small.

The amount of revenue derived from direct taxation, i.e. from income tax and death duties in this country, was 13.9% in 1960 and 17.5% in 1963, and in 1965 it will be 22%. The bulk of the revenue is from indirect taxation, that is from taxes on such articles used by everybody be he rich or poor, for example, cloth, sugar, matches, salt, etc. For 1965 sugar—I do not know why it is singled out for particular attention by the Minister of Finance—alone is expected to produce about \$49 million which is about 15% of the total revenue from income tax and is an increase of 90% on previous year's revenue from sugar alone. In other countries, even those which are based on a capitalistic system, it is the other way round. This is shown by the following figures culled from the United Nations Year Book for 1963:

In India direct taxes accounted for 44.8% of the total revenue.

In Canada direct taxes accounted for 56.5% of the total revenue.

In U.S.A. direct taxes accounted for 65.3% of the total revenue.

In France direct taxes accounted for 64% of the total revenue.

In Indonesia direct taxes accounted for 73.3% of the total revenue.

But in Malaya it was 17.5% in 1963. Before I go further, Mr Speaker, Sir, if I may I would like to dwell a little on this low taxation on death duty, which again I shall touch later. The Minister the other day talked of evasion of duties, as I looked through the previous revenue of this Government I find that perhaps for the last five years the revenue from death duty has remained steadily at \$4 million per year. I really do not see how that can be so. If you have an expanding economy presumably there must have been more capitalists in this country, and presumably they must depart from this mundane world and, therefore, their property must be taxed; and as such I do not see why the death duty revenue should remain static. That is a matter that I wish

to draw the attention of the Honourable Minister of Finance, because, for example, this year if you take the death duty from a business tycoon who died in an air crash, I think his death duty alone will amount to perhaps more than \$10 million and it will be very interesting to see whether the revenue for this year still remains at \$4 million.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the ratio in the case of this country is one of the lowest in the world, as I have shown just now. The well-to-do, who have all the money pay very little comparatively towards the defence and upkeep of the nation. Almost every other country gets a large share of the revenue from the well-to-do—from those best qualified to pay. But income tax has never been used as an instrument for the redistribution of wealth in this country.

The Report of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development ten years ago, describing the situation in Malaya, said on page 195, and I quote:

“We think that the Government can no longer afford its present relatively low effective rates of tax on individual incomes. A married man with two children and an income of \$10,000, for instance, pays tax at an effective rate of less than 5% while one with an income of \$100,000 pays only 22% in tax. We accordingly recommend that the tax on individuals be raised so as to bring substantially more revenue than is yielded by the present rates. In our view the maximum rate should be higher than 30% and the scale should be made steeper in the higher income brackets.”

And I am quoting these figures of ten years ago.

Dato' V. T. Sambanthan: May we know from where?

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: This book is the Economic Development of Malaya, and these figures are for ten years ago. It is on page 195.

Dato' V. T. Sambanthan: The author?

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: It is the report of a mission organised by the International Bank of Reconstruction and Development at the request of the Governments of the Federation of

Malaya, the Crown Colony of Singapore and the United Kingdom. If the Honourable Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications wishes to have this book after my speech, I shall very gratefully lend it to him for his perusal. (*Laughter*). It also recommended a profits tax of 10% over and above the then existing company tax. But today, ten years later, the profits tax has been introduced for the first time and that too only for the tin industry. Why not for all business including businesses enjoying pioneer status?

Instead of increasing the rate of tax on the higher incomes, the Minister of Finance in 1959 raised the taxes on the lower income groups. He brought the base lower down from \$250 to about \$150 to bring the lower income groups into his net. The latest tax proposals too affect the lower income groups as only those earning below \$375 per month escape the new increases. On the other hand, for the higher income brackets the rise is not steep enough and the burden is comparatively light. In the case of Singapore, there is a reduction from 55% to 50%. This is an absolutely fantastic and unheard of thing. A reduction of 5% can mean millions for the rich people. Maybe this has been done in the interest of harmonization to attract the rich Singapore towkays in Singapore to the M.C.A. The result is that the overall increase in taxation from income tax is only 14% not a dramatic increase or an increase calculated to redistribute income or pay a fair share of the country's defences.

On the other hand, taxes on inheritance have been reduced and the exemption given is increased. Now estates under \$25,000 in value would be exempted whereas previously \$10,000 was the limit. Does the Minister want the people to believe that the prosperity under the Alliance is such that the vast majority of the people in this country have estates of \$25,000 and above? If so, would he give us figures? Today people are even poorer than they were because of the much reduced prices for their primary produce. This relief helps only

the propertied class. All this shows that the taxation policies have been used not as an instrument to redistribute income.

The only taxes that can be said to affect the propertied class are the payroll tax and the capital gains tax. Even those merely skim the surface, and the Government itself cannot know how much revenue the capital gains tax produce. All these show where the sympathies of the Minister of Finance lie. Is he here to protect and enrich the rich or is he here to raise the income and living standards of the "have-nots"? His actions have proved that he is here to protect and sustain the capitalists and further squeeze the workers, the clerks and the peasants.

He grudges increases in income for the workers. He abhors demands for rise in wages by clerks. Let me quote him from the then Federal Legislative Council debates on 20th March, 1953, where he said, and I quote:

"We cannot deny . . ."—these are the words of the Honourable Minister of Finance, but he was not the Minister of Finance then, and I wish to recall to him the past— . . . "that personal emoluments are largely unproductive expenditure. (*Laughter*) and unless we can either reduce the emoluments or reduce the staff, I do not see how funds can be diverted to other and more useful purposes. What strikes me as rather odd is that Government officers, of all people, should now be clamouring for more pay."

These are the words of Mr Tan Siew Sin in the then Federal Legislative Council—today, of course, he is the Minister of Finance. If such a Minister of Finance who, as is clearly seen from the foregoing quotation, is anti-labour and is pro-capital, is permitted to continue to manage the finances of the country, then what can the mass of the people expect? As has been asked in this House last year, can he be expected to legislate away his own wealth? Can he be expected to legislate away the wealth of his fellow capitalists in the M.C.A. and the M.I.C. or that of the feudalists in the UMNO? It is clearly evident that instead of doing that, he will do his utmost not only to preserve but to increase their wealth. The people

should know by now what the Alliance and its Ministers really stand for.

If the Alliance Government is sincere about eradicating rural poverty and caring for the unprivileged workers in the fields and in the offices, then it should introduce a radical change in its fiscal policies. It should, as a measure of first importance, introduce more progressive taxation and reduce indirect taxation to a minimum.

India, the United States of America and the United Kingdom have income tax rates as high as 90%. Here I am not advocating that the Honourable Minister of Finance should, from the lowly 10% in Sarawak, jump to 90% as it might well cost a revolution down there if it is done; and I merely show what is the practice in the countries that I have mentioned. In addition, many countries have excess profits tax, property tax, gift tax, undeveloped land tax, capital tax, and in Switzerland there is a capital tax specially for defence.

Therefore, herein lies the opportunity for the Alliance Government to prove its sincerity and its honesty to the mass of the people in this country. If the Government is honest, it must introduce progressive taxes in order that the wealth of the country may be redistributed to those who sweat and produce that wealth.

But economic and rural development has been played as a panacea for the poverty of the rural people and the ills of the country. But this has failed to achieve the long term objective and Malaysia, with all the inherent weaknesses, was brought in to divert the attention of the hungry dissatisfied millions in this country.

Today, we have to spend large sums on defence, when only a few years ago, the Deputy Prime Minister promised a glorious era, without the emergency, where the savings would flow to the people for schools, hospitals and food. But till this new emergency arose, money was hard to get. Very little money could be found or raised for public assistance to the poor and the needy, the underprivileged, the

blind and the invalid. Sending children to school today is still a nightmare. Finding jobs is an endless problem. Feeding the hungry children is a heart-breaking job and getting a roof over one's head is very often a wellnigh impossibility.

But Indonesian confrontation has made the job of finding money very easy indeed. These new proposals might never have been introduced had it not been for Azahari and his gang. Today, we budget for an expenditure of a million a day in defence. The Prime Minister, as I have pointed out before, has stated that we may have to spend even \$2 million a day. But if such vast sums had been spent on direct Government participation in projects for the upliftment of the people, when there was no crisis, then this Government would have been justified in calling on the people to tighten their belts this time. But all the while the Government has consistently, ignored the people and concentrated in helping the rich get richer. Let us examine and see how this is true.

The Government's declared aim is to build a property-owning democracy. Towards that, it has assisted and given protection to capitalists, both local and foreign, to set up companies and the local people have been induced to subscribe to shares in these companies. The shares have been many times over subscribed, but how much of the shares were bought by people in the rural areas? Was it the money from the local peasantry, or the workers of this country, or was it Indonesian money that has come over during the last few years? I am sure that only 10% of the people of this country subscribed to these shares—perhaps, the percentage is even less that I have mentioned. The remaining 90% could never think of shares at all even if they understood them, for how can they buy shares when they have to struggle to subsist. This is a failure and it was with the intention of covering up this failure that the Government set up the Sharikat Pemodalán Kebangsaan ostensibly to reserve shares for Malays. But this has been proved by the previous Member for Tanjong

in the last Parliament that the people who are benefiting from this are not the ordinary Malays in the kampongs but the top civil servants who draw more than \$10,000 a year and the big feudal landlords who soak the poor farmers.

Then again, generous incentives have been given to new companies which do not help in the production of new goods but duplicate the old. Protective are given, but prices are not fixed. Tax reliefs and tax holidays have been given with great profit to the companies and little benefit to the country or the people. These new companies have not even been able to reduce unemployment to any great extent. In fact, the number of people employed by these pioneer firms is negligible. This is because of the capital intensive nature of their operation. So, the purpose is defeated. Pioneer status is abused. It is ridiculous that companies like Par, Metal Box and Malayan Containers enjoying pioneer status in Singapore should have another branch in Kuala Lumpur claiming pioneer status also. Are the companies concerned with the sale of their goods in this country, or are they concerned with the savings from tax holidays and tax reliefs?

The Rueff Report has this to say on pioneer status—I quote from page 28 of the Report—

“The scope of present industrial promotion policies and institutions is still quite limited. . . All Governments have made loan or equity capital available to private firms through autonomous or semi-autonomous institutions, but have avoided direct ownership and control of enterprises. Typically, one or two firms with pioneer status dominate the market in each pioneer industry and only in a few industries, such as paints and varnishes, are there three or more firms.”

Further, on employment I quote from page 27 of the same report—

“The rate of growth in employment appears, however, to be considerably lower at around 4%, and it cannot be said that the present rate of progress in industrial employment is adequate to meet the problems of a growing labour force and progressive urbanization.”

This is from the Rueff Report on the Economic Aspects of Malaysia dated July, 1963.

From the above quotations, it should be evident that industrial development and pioneer status is a ruse by the Alliance Government to cheat the people and help their fellow capitalists to rob this country of its wealth. Pioneer status has been given to companies to establish branches here and produce the goods that have been produced elsewhere and exported to this country in bulk. They have been given further protection by protective tariffs and have created a monopoly whereby they can and have exploited the market. There is little or no competition and as such prices have been kept high and the local population have been forced to pay through the nose. They have in several instances squeezed the local capitalist out of the market. They have not relieved unemployment to any great extent and, as such, the policy of granting pioneer status should be reviewed.

In fact, pioneer status should never have been introduced at all. The British introduced this in order to help their own companies to establish branches to take over the economy of the country when the British Government left. The Alliance Government has fallen flat for it with the object of using pioneer status as a means of helping its own capitalists. To substantiate my statement allow me to quote the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development Report for 1954, page 436—

“Several underdeveloped countries, including some British colonies, have adopted what is often called ‘Pioneer industry’ legislation, under which new industries may be granted exemption from income tax on the profits for a period of years, special concessions in depreciation allowances and other tax privileges.

In Malaya all enterprises are allowed to offset losses over the previous six years against current profits in the assessment of taxable income.

We believe that concessions along the lines now followed are likely to be more effective in Malaya in encouraging industrial development than any attempt to distinguish ‘new’ industries as such under ‘Pioneer industry’ legislation. New Malayan industries should mostly grow out of the wide range of existing enterprises, and special tax concessions to ‘new’ industries would, in our

opinion, involve invidious comparisons of a very difficult and unnecessary kind.”

Dr Lim Swee Aun: May I request him to read it again slowly?

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: I quoted from the book “The Economic Development of Malaya”. If the Honourable Minister of Commerce and Industry finds it too difficult to find it in the Library of the Parliament, I will willingly lend it to him or get another copy for him.

Mr Speaker: Perhaps the Honourable Member would like to read that at the resumption of the sitting. It is now 1 o’clock.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: I have been looking at my watch all the time, Mr Speaker, Sir.

Sitting suspended at 1 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 4.30 p.m.

(Mr Speaker in the Chair)

THE SUPPLY BILL, 1965

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, may I continue? I think the Minister of Commerce and Industry does not require me now to read the passage that I have read out before the sitting was suspended at 1 p.m.

Dr Lim Swee Aun: I think he should—for record purposes. I shall be pleased if the Honourable Member will read it again slowly.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Do you want me to read it again?

Dr Lim Swee Aun: Yes, that is the important part.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, I will repeat the relevant quotations from this book very slowly:

“Several underdeveloped countries, including some British colonies, have adopted what is often called ‘Pioneer industry’ legislation, under which new industries may be granted exemption from income tax on the profits for a period of years, special concessions in depreciation allowances and other tax privileges.

In Malaya all enterprises are allowed to offset losses over the previous six years against current profits in the assessment of taxable income.

We believe that concessions along the lines now followed are likely to be more effective in Malaya in encouraging industrial development than any attempt to distinguish 'new' industries as such under 'Pioneer industry' legislation. New Malayan industries should mostly grow out of the wide range of existing enterprises, and special tax concessions to 'new' industries would, in our opinion, involve invidious comparisons of a very difficult and unnecessary kind."

Mr Speaker, Sir, I now come to the Commission of Inquiry. That was a clear recommendation by the World Bank Mission ten years ago against pioneer status. But the Alliance Government has gone on with it and has given both kinds of protection to new industries. Nevertheless, it has been found that pioneer status has not produced the desired results and is being abused. As such I call upon the Prime Minister to initiate an inquiry into the granting of pioneer status and whether such status has in any way benefited the country and whether it has been abused.

I deem it imperative that the Prime Minister should agree to this as pioneer status has created monopolistic enterprises enjoying Government patronage and protection. Secondly, pioneer status has robbed other local companies from being formed and operated to the advantage of the people and, thirdly, pioneer status has robbed the co-operatives of their role in working for the common good of the people of this country.

A few years ago, Mr Speaker, Sir, the Malayan Co-operative Union sought assistance to start a paper mill and a fertiliser factory. The Government rejected their request stating that the fertiliser factory would not be an economic proposition. Today, I.C.I. has been given pioneer status to operate a fertiliser plant and another fertiliser plant is to be started by ESSO. As such, you can see how this Government discriminates against its own citizens. When the Malayan Co-operative Union wanted to start its fertiliser plant, it was told, "No, it is not economical for you; you will

lose". But when the big companies like the I.C.I. and ESSO come in, you say, "Oh, you have enough technical know-how. Come in, come in, the more the merrier!" That seems, Sir, to be the attitude of the Government. As for the paper factory, the co-operatives have been cheated, as a pioneer certificate has been given to a Japanese firm to operate a mill here. The people are wondering why foreign companies should be given such generous treatment at the expense of co-operatives, and I am sure the Commission of Inquiry will clear all this up. The necessity

Dr Lim Swee Aun: Mr Speaker, Sir, no pioneer status has been given to any firm to make paper as yet. I wonder where the Honourable Member got the information from.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: If I have erred, I think it is in the process of being given. (*Laughter*). If I have erred, I stand corrected on this.

The necessity for a Commission is further evidenced from the quotation from "The Political Economy of Independent Malaya" by Silcock and Fisk. On page 271 it says:

"Monopoly and monopsony are such important influences throughout the economy that there should be at least a permanent public commission to keep them under constant review. Legislative control would, however, be extraordinarily difficult, simply because so many economic activities are at present dependent on some monopoly or monopsony."

Mr Speaker, Sir, the above quotation further strengthens the need for a Commission of Inquiry immediately, and I would like the Prime Minister—although he is not present here this evening—to state categorically whether he agrees to this Commission or not and if not I hope he would give the reasons for rejecting this suggestion of mine.

I now come to the M.I.D.F.L., Mr Speaker, Sir. Besides being given pioneer status, capitalists have been given many other forms of assistance. M.I.D.F.L. gets public money from Government and other international bodies to help capitalists establish more firms in this country. This year

the Government is giving \$11 million to the M.I.D.F.L., making a total of nearly \$40 million advanced so far. This is an organ for channelling public money for private gain. The policy of the M.I.D.F.L. is a classic example of the Alliance policy of helping the "haves" and not the "have-nots". Let me quote Professor Silcock again. On page 218, in the same book, he says:

"The policy has been to invest first mainly in first-class securities and later devote the resulting revenue to new development. This implies investment in large successful companies, often those with overseas connections. This traditional paradox of lending 'to those who have' is also found in the public subscriptions so far handled by M.I.D.F.L."

Here you have a prominent Professor of Economics who said that this Government is helping the "haves", the capitalists, for their private gains.

Mr Speaker, Sir, on the other hand, feeble efforts have been made to assist the poor farmers and the peasantry. The Alliance promised in their manifesto of 1959 that they would establish a Bank Ra'ayat or People's Bank, to give short and long-term credits to farmers. To date this has never been done and the "middlemen" have been permitted to exploit the farmers as they have done throughout the ages. This is permitted purely to appease the M.C.A. at the expense of the rural population.

The needs of the peasants fall into two categories: seasonal credit and long-term credit. Generally speaking, the provision of either form of credit from purely private sources is unsatisfactory and liable to abuse. For long-term credit the peasants are dependent mainly on the activities of private moneylenders. Short-term credit is mainly provided by local shopkeepers and produce dealers, based on monopolistic constraints and associated with opportunities for exploitation and the imposition of restrictive practices and controls. As such a Bank Ra'ayat should be established to cater for the needs of the farmers.

APEX BANK

The Minister of Finance may jump up and say that there is the Apex

Bank to look after this. But, honestly, what has the Apex Bank done? How much is its capital? Where are the branches? How many branches are there? Are there branches in every village in the country? I hope the Minister will answer these questions. Nevertheless, it is a fact that the Apex Bank is hampered by capital and proper management and Government's lack of interest. It has a mere pittance of \$1 million to \$2 million whereas very much more is needed. To be effective it must have branches in every village. But I think that Malayan Banking Ltd alone has more branches in the country than the Apex Bank.

Mr Speaker, Sir, you can see from these two examples that I have quoted the policy of the Alliance Government. On the one hand, it has lent and has allowed the M.I.D.F.L. to borrow up to \$40 million—to help not the poor ra'ayat but to help the capitalists to make more money for their private gain out of public funds. On the other hand, where credit is needed by the ra'ayat in the villages, the padi planters, the rubber growers and tappers, you have the Apex Bank, which has a paltry \$1 million to \$2 million and which has done perhaps very negligible good for the ra'ayat of this country. There you can see very clearly these two examples: the M.I.D.F.L. and the Apex Bank.

CO-OPERATIVES

Furthermore, this same concern which is being shown to help capitalists has not been shown to the co-operatives. We have a large number of co-operatives with insufficient capital. The co-operatives attempted to get into big business but they were pushed aside. The co-operatives wanted to take over the buying of padi but they were again prevented from doing so. No adequate financial assistance in the form of loans is given to the co-operatives. The co-operatives sector has never been encouraged to play a useful and important role in the economy of the country. They are kept mainly at the kampong level and are not helped to develop. However, they are now encouraged to buy

shares from private companies. This is indeed a mockery of the co-operative system, buying shares from the bigger capitalist firms that are being set up. What sort of co-operatives are these?

I condemn the Alliance Government for paying lip service to the co-operative system to keep it alive but not kicking. The Government should not fail the co-operative system and should give every assistance for the training of sufficient number of officers for the supervision of the co-operatives. The standard of the officers selected and trained at present is very low indeed. Highly qualified and dedicated people, who can command the respect of the people and live with the people, are required to man the co-operative movement so as to make it able to compete with the capitalistic system. It should be as powerful, if not more powerful than the capitalistic system to be able to compete with it for the good of the country. In fact, co-operatives should be given better protection and assistance than industries to withstand the onslaught of big capital on their infant endeavours.

Co-operatives should also be organised to group parcels of smallholdings to form big viable units, to ensure efficient management, effective use of capital, machinery and labour, to ensure a more reasonable income from their holdings. At present many rural farmers, be they rubber growers or padi growers, cannot get more than 10% of the potential income from their smallholdings. This is a very, very low income indeed considering the potential output from the land and the amount of labour involved. Therefore, radical steps must be taken to assist farmers to improve the output. What is required is not props for the system that is responsible for its backwardness, but change that will replace backwardness with advancement and efficiency. Some means must be found to combine estate-type efficiency with advantage to the present peasant population. If not, the professions of the Alliance Government to improve the economy of the country will be bogged down by following a capitalist

structure and more so will be defeated by the policies of a Minister of Finance who is more interested in perpetuating that system and safeguarding the wealth of the rich moguls. This is further evidenced by an examination of the expenditure for next year.

DEFENCE

We find that the expenditure on defence has increased tremendously. From \$5 million in 1958 it went up to \$20 million in 1961 and today it is \$158 million on capital expenditure alone. This represents an increase of 3600% over the amount spent on defence in 1958. This does not take into account the expenditure on personal emoluments and the increased expenditure voted by supplementary estimates. As stated before, the Prime Minister has said that he will not hesitate to spend \$2 million a day. That would be more than \$700 million. But where does this lead to? Will we be able to defend ourselves adequately even if we spend a great deal of money of this sort. Why has not the Minister of Finance, persuaded his Ministerial colleagues to seek financial assistance from those friends who have all the time cheered us from the sidelines? May I ask what contribution has been made by the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand and the U.S.A.? All these countries have given us moral support and made promises. Australia has claimed that her northern frontier lies in Malaya and the Alliance Government has shamelessly admitted this by their silence.

However, what direct contribution has Australia made for the defence of her front line? Should it not be proper for Australia to pay the whole cost of defence if this is her front line of defence, or is she having second thoughts just like the United Kingdom which is contemplating reducing her forces in Malaysia? We have repeatedly warned the Government not to be led astray by foreign countries in pursuit of their own interests. However, it will not be long, before the Government realises the folly of its blind policy. We urge the Government to challenge the sincerity of the so-called friends to give direct financial

assistance to assist us to build our own defences, so that our own people will get employment and the thorn in the settlement of the dispute with Indonesia will be removed.

BRITISH SOLUTION

We also call on the Labour Government in Britain, which is now considering reduction in its armed forces in this area, to do all it can to settle the costly dispute with Indonesia in a peaceful manner. We urge this because there can be no denial that the Alliance Government was actively encouraged to hasten the formation of Malaysia, by the Conservative Government and more especially by Mr Duncan Sandys. As such, it is the moral duty of the British and, especially, the Labour Government, which is more in sympathy with the former colonies to use all its influence to pull Malaysia out of the quandry created by the folly of the arrogant Alliance leaders and the hard hearted conservatives of Great Britain. Only such a course would be of mutual benefit to both the British people and the Malaysian people including those in Brunei. Only then can the people of this country devote their thought and energies to the economic and social problems that confront them.

SOCIAL EXPENDITURE

I stated earlier that very little is spent on Social Services other than on education. Now, I shall deal with this more fully and show how neglected this important sector is.

This year the Government has budgeted 27.9% of its expenditure for Social Services, i.e. Education, Health, Labour and Welfare Services. The main increase in expenditure is, of course, on Education as is to be expected in a country which has a majority of the population which is under twenty years old. But other services like Health and Social Welfare have received paltry sums, and the increase of 7.8% for Health and a meagre 1.2% for Welfare are hardly able to cover the normal increases in the personal emoluments of the officials who man these Ministries.

As far as the development expenditure on the social side is concerned, the expenditure is nothing to be proud of. In 1961, only 17.6% was spent on this. In 1962, 20.2%—the highest so far. In 1963, 17% and in 1964 18.9%. Next year it is down to 18.8% also. This may appear very high indeed to a Minister who is not sensitive to the welfare of the people. But when we compare these percentages with those in other countries, we should indeed be ashamed of what we do for social services. The total expenditure on development and current expenditure on social services does not amount to more than 6.6% of the Gross National Product of Malaya alone.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Whereas the United Kingdom spent more than 50% of its total expenditure on social services in social security in 1952, we spend hardly any appreciable amount on social security. The expenditure of just \$10.3 million, which is less than 10% of the budget on Labour and Welfare Services, is an indication of how much this country spends on public assistance and social security for the people.

Before I go further, Mr Speaker, Sir, if I may be permitted, I would like to dwell a little on Health which, as I have told the former Minister of Health, is always at the end of the queue where the Treasury is concerned. It is unfortunate that the Minister of Health is not here now, but at a previous meeting of the Dewan Ra'ayat, when I made a statement that there was a definite shortage of drugs and other medical stores in this country, he made a categorical denial, although I urged him to visit the Kuala Lumpur Hospital with me and also to visit some other Hospitals—he has visited the General Hospital, Kuala Lumpur, but he has not thought it fit to ask me to go along with him—so that I might have been able to satisfy him in showing some of the deficiencies that exist.

Mr Speaker, Sir, none other than the C.M.H.O., Perak, has made statements in the press that there are

shortages of drugs and medical stores in Perak. The Member for Teluk Anson, who is not here today, sent a telegram to the Minister concerned imploring him to quickly come to the aid of the Hospital at Teluk Anson because there are no drugs and there are no medical stores. Today, I read a statement from the Ministry of Health saying that, "Now there is no money and if you have cold cases, i.e. if you have a hernia or if you have a hydrocele or other cases that are not urgent, why bother? These people who are, after all, ordinary people; they can carry on with their hernia, with their hydrocele; and it does not matter too much to the Government." That, Sir, is a very callous attitude to take, to say, that these cold cases can be postponed. That there is a shortage of drugs is very perturbing, and I would not say that the Minister of Health is insensitive to the needs of the people, but it does show conclusively now to this House that what I stated was correct, because both the C.M.H.O. and a Government backbencher, the Member for Teluk Anson, have implored him about these shortages.

The Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications (Dato' V. T. Sambanthan): On a point of clarification, Mr Speaker, Sir. May I know what is the type of drug used to cure hydrocele?

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Sir, I was talking of cold cases in operation, where you need medical stores, where you need spirit, where you need cotton wool, where you need gloves. Perhaps, the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, who has now left his former Ministry, has forgotten that you need other things than drugs to deal with cold cases.

Dato' V. T. Sambanthan: Sir, on a point of information, as I was interested in it, I asked the question, and I thought when he mentioned about hernia and hydrocele, that there were, perhaps, new drugs to cure these. Merely, on a point of interest, I wanted to know this.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: I hope that I have cleared up the doubt in the mind of the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I quote some figures from the book "The Economic and Financial Aspects of Social Security" by J. Henry Richardson to show what percentage of the national income is spent by other countries on social security alone for the year 1953. These are the latest figures that I can get.

German Federal Republic	19.2%
France	18.5%
Australia	17.0%
Sweden	11.5%
United Kingdom	10.7%
Japan	6.7%
Israel	6.2%
Ceylon	3.2%

There are lots of other figures which I will not bother the House with.

I believe that Singapore alone—a State of the 14 component States of Malaysia—spends very much more on this aspect of social service than the Central Government itself.

Enche' Jek Yeun Thong (Singapore): \$12 million.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: We heard it—\$12 million and that is far more than what we have budgetted for the whole of Malaysia next year. As such, a very important method of re-distributing the very high incomes earned by the few have not been properly used in this country. Instead the Government goes on trumpeting the fact that we have the highest per capita income in Asia, next to Japan. But very little is being done to see that this high income is fairly distributed. There is no programme for social insurance for old age, unemployment, sickness or invalidity. There is no system of adequate public assistance to the underprivileged, the handicapped and the needy. No universal system of family allowances has yet been thought out even and every family big or small is treated in the same way. No universal free supply of text books—I am not

advocating that, Mr Speaker, Sir, but I am merely saying that this does not exist—or school meals for the needy—again this has been thrashed out and the Minister of Finance has said that we cannot afford it—have ever been contemplated. There is no free legal aid in this country. This is a blot on Malaysia. Singapore has free legal aid. Why can't Malaysia provide free legal aid? This is another aspect of social service which I would like to commend both to the Minister of Justice—who is not here today—and to the Minister of Finance.

HEALTH

In the field of health services, not very much has been done to relieve the acute shortage of doctors and staff to man even the existing hospitals. A look at the amounts voted for health during the last few years confirms this. In 1964 the amount voted was \$107.6 million. This year only \$115 million is requested. This is an increase of a beggarly 7.8%. The proposed sickness insurance scheme appears never to come and a national health scheme is, of course, a pipe dream.

HOUSING

In the matter of housing, the Government appears to have suddenly awakened. In the last Budget much play was given to this presumably on the remarkable success achieved by the P.A.P. Government in Singapore in this field. But a year has passed and no tangible action has been taken by the Ministry so far, except that the Honourable Minister of Housing made a prolonged trip to some European countries. Unfortunately he is not here today. I am told that because of one of the occupational hazards of Ministers, he is now warded in the V.I.P. Ward, in Ward 25, of the General Hospital and that perhaps he may not be able to attend the whole Budget session. In fact, it is another aspect of the health of his colleagues which the Minister of Health should seriously look into.

The Development Estimates make provision for a mere \$1.1 million direct expenditure and \$8.5 million

in loans to other housing authorities. This is a drop in the ocean when we realise that something like 35,000 to 40,000 units are required each year to keep abreast with the annual increase in population alone, not to mention of the millions of shacks and squatter homes which have to be replaced if any semblance of a housing scheme is to be achieved.

SMUGGLING AND TAX EVASION

Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to refer to the astonishing statement by the Minister of Finance on the extent of smuggling of gold. In paragraph 157 of the mimeographed speech, he says,

“With the closing of the Raub Australian Gold Mine there has been a sharp decline in the volume of domestic production of gold which is consequently now inadequate to meet the legitimate domestic demand from goldsmiths. The present duty of 25% a.v. in the States of Malaya provides a strong incentive for smuggling and I am therefore reducing the rate to 10% a.v.”

Mr Speaker, Sir, I cannot understand that there is a large demand for gold in this country when we know that Malaya exports gold to other countries, notably to India, and I am sure that should the Minister of Finance enquire from the Customs he will find that some of the Alliance leaders are engaged in this trade (*Laughter*). So it is not a shortage of gold that this country is suffering from. We are exporting gold to India. Consequently I do not see how this reduction of 25% to 10% is necessary.

However, more serious is the confession made by the Honourable Minister of Finance that this Government is unable to govern this country effectively. It amounts to that. He himself confesses that the only way he is left with to check the smuggling of gold into this country is to reduce the duty on gold, so that it becomes unprofitable to smuggle gold into the country. This is an admission of incompetence and may I ask the Government if this is their way of preventing smuggling and tax evasion? Or is it their way to assist people to import gold into this country and then smuggle it out to other countries at greater profits? I do not wish to

labour this point further, but I wish to request the Minister of Finance to devote more concern to the abolishing of poverty and hunger in this country than aiding the smuggling in gold for dubious purposes by doubtful methods.

Mr Speaker, Sir, let us examine the premise that the Minister of Finance has taken. He says that because of the shortage of gold in this country to meet domestic demand, there is smuggling and we—he admitted openly—are unable to contain smuggling, to check smuggling, in particular of gold, consequently he is going to reduce the duty on gold from 25% to 10%. Mr Speaker, Sir, yesterday or on Wednesday he has announced this increase of tax in this country. It is from 45 per cent to 50 per cent. In Sarawak it is from 10 per cent to 50 per cent. Consequently, should in the course of the next year the Income Tax Department finds that there is tax evasion, perhaps on a large scale, will the Government on the same premise next year tell this House that it is going to reduce the income tax from 50 per cent to 25 per cent because it is no longer profitable for the big capitalists to evade income tax. On the same analogy I will be very grateful to the Honourable Minister of Finance if he will enlighten this House on this matter when his time comes to reply to this very, very important question, because the Government when it finds that it is unable to contain smuggling is reducing the tax on it. Because of the same analogy that the Government cannot fight evasion of income tax, consequently, from my point of view perhaps, it may well want to reduce income tax. That I do not know. Perhaps he may well enlighten this House on this matter.

Mr Speaker, Sir, at the beginning of my speech I stated that I would confine myself very strictly to the fiscal policy as enunciated by the Government, and so far I hope I have done so. Now, I am compelled to deviate a little from it. Before I do so, Mr Speaker, Sir, I wish to correct an error of omission on my part. This morning when I spoke of my being allowed to take the two examinations

in the national language I did not thank the Honourable Minister of Education for his good services in allowing me to take those two examinations. Now, I wish to publicly acknowledge the assistance that he has been given me and I say, "Ber-tinggi² terima kaseh". I wish also to say, Mr Speaker, Sir, that it is not only the Minister of Education who has been helpful to me on this occasion, but also other Ministers when I have had on occasions to bring up matters affecting their Ministries. The Minister of Labour, for example, has been very helpful in going out of his way to help me. So has the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, whenever I have the occasion to ring him up, and also some officials of the Ministry of Home Affairs who have been very helpful. I have mentioned these Ministers because these are the people whom I have had the occasion to make contact, and here I wish to put on record my grateful thanks to them.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I reiterate, again, that my purpose in this House is not to oppose for opposition's sake nor to criticise just for the sake of criticism. I am prepared to acknowledge and support any good measure of the Government, and I am prepared to give credit to the Ministers where credit is due. I hope I have in a small way acknowledged the assistance that I have received from the Ministries that I have mentioned.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the other important matter that I wish to bring up today before this House is that standing in my name since July are three motions. Mr Speaker, Sir, in the October session of the Dewan Ra'ayat the P.A.P. also tabled a motion and that preceded my motion and, if I remember rightly, the whole troop of eleven Ministers from Singapore came up to this House for five days—doing nothing in Singapore—and never heard, although always hoping, their motion would be debated. Mr Speaker, Sir, if they may pardon me for telling them, they are probably new to Federation politics and they have yet a lot to learn about the mechanics of the

Dewan Ra'ayat. Probably they did not take the trouble to find out that the late Dato' Onn had his motion on *Tanah Melayu* aborted for more than a year before it finally came to be debated in this House. I am not sanguine enough to think that my three motions will be debated for a long time to come. Mr Speaker, Sir, if I am correct, there has been a gentleman's agreement, which I think was worked out by the late Enche' Zulkiflee in the Standing Orders Committee, that when the House meets for a period of five days or so some time must be given for discussion of matters brought up by the Opposition. Otherwise, what is the purpose of our coming here? It seems that we are coming here all the time to discuss Government business only. I agree that Government business should take precedence over Opposition matters, but do let us have a chance to discuss the matters that we bring up—otherwise our electorate will think that we are all dumb fools here and serve no useful purpose. (*Laughter*). As such, Mr Speaker, Sir, I hope this matter will be brought up to the attention of the Standing Orders Committee, so that some arrangement will be made whereby matters brought up by the Opposition parties will be given a chance to be debated in this House. I am giving fair warning to the Government that this is a Budget session and under the Budget session I can bring up all the three motions that I have brought up. I give fair warning to the Minister of External Affairs that I am going to propose a cut of \$1 in his salary, so that I can have my motion on foreign affairs debated. I give fair warning also to the Minister of Local Government and Housing—he is not here today—that I am going to propose a cut of \$10 in his salary, because I am not satisfied with the manner that Kuala Lumpur is being run by the *Pesuroh Jaya Ibu Kota*. Since Kuala Lumpur comes under his Ministry, or his portfolio, I have no alternative but to propose that cut. Mr Speaker, Sir, again, I say that I have no alternative but to give this warning to the Government and to take appropriate

action, because unless I do so I will have to wait till 1969 for my motions to be debated. Such is the tyranny of the massive majority of the Alliance Government on the opposite side.

Mr Speaker, Sir, in conclusion, I wish to say that I emphasised poverty because poverty was described by Plato 2,300 years ago as the parent of meanness and viciousness and he urged that society declare war on it. He said:

"It would be strange 'indeed' in a state even liberally ordered if the poverty stricken were to be utterly neglected or allowed to fall into utter destitution."

In our country, still today we have what has become fashionable to call pockets of poverty. Our society is ashamed and weakened by their existence, whether they be pockets of outright human misery, or whether they be cases where prosperity is a fragile thing because there simply are not enough jobs to go round. As such, when we realise what is being done in some countries we come to but one conclusion that this Government is fooling the people and pretending to do a great deal for them, when in reality it is only carrying out a colonial structure to exploit the resources of the people of this country.

I, therefore, urge the Government to wake up from its slumber and work honestly for the advancement of the people of this country as a whole instead of bringing in extraneous issues like racialism and narrow nationalism to confuse and divide the people so that they can rule cosily from their air-conditioned rooms in the Federal Capital and let foreign and local capitalists plunder this country. The only way for this country, we reiterate, is to follow a socialist path to build a nation truly independent based on equality and tolerance as the cornerstones of our unity and where the wealth is produced by the farmers, the fishermen and the workers will be fairly shared and used for the good of all and not for the enrichment of a few.

Enche' Mohamed Yusof bin Mahmud (Temerloh): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun untuk mengambil bahagian dalam usul perbelanjaan tahun

hadapan yang di-bentangkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan kita. Baharu sa-kejap tadi saya berasa kasehan kepada Yang Berhormat yang telah beruchap panjang lebar untuk memberi penerangan bagi pehak parti-nya. oleh sebab kekurangan² bilangannya dalam Dewan ini berbanding pada masa yang lampau. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam perbelanjaan yang telah di-bentangkan ini kita telah di-beri tahu oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri mengapa sebab²-nya yang perbelanjaan meningkat pada tahun hadapan. Jadi dalam usaha Yang Berhormat Menteri ini, ia-lah satu usaha yang betul², saya pandang, usaha yang tidak mendapat terima kaseh. Sebab usaha-nya mahu mengadakan kewangan dan dalam usaha itu menyebabkan mengadakan berbagai² chara mendapatkan wang. Jadi pada satu masa, kita sangat suka membanyakkan wang kerana perkhidmatan² yang akan di-adakan itu, sa-balek-nya ada orang ramai terutama sa-kali pehak Ahli Yang Berhormat yang baharu berchakap tadi, atas chara² mendapatkan wang beliau tidak puas hati. Jadi di-dalam hal ini-lah saya rasa satu tugas yang betul² pahit—yang susah, yang di-jalankan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri tadi.

Sungguh pun begitu dalam chara mendapatkan wang yang saya pandang, ada beberapa banyak chara, satu charanya ia-lah menaikkan chukai. Dalam menaikkan chukai itu, saya rasa itu-lah satu chara semenjak berapa tahun yang telah lampau. Dengan chukai², semua sa-kali ra'ayat negeri ini mengambil bahagian dan memikul. Pada masa yang lampau saya telah menyuarakan juga betapa tidak puas hati saya terhadap chukai² pada mereka yang mampu membayar. Terutama sa-kali kepada mereka² menggunakan negeri kita tempat mendapat laba dan mereka² ini bukan daripada ra'ayat Malaysia ini. Chara yang di-bentangkan oleh Menteri tadi, sungguh memuaskan hati dan langkah itu langkah yang sangat baik. Langkah itu akan memberi tanggong-jawab yang besar kepada mereka², terutama sa-kali kepada kita. Pada masa sekarang kita sedang menghadapi anchaman² dan pencherobohan² daripada luar, ter-

hadap negeri kita, menyebabkan sekarang lebeh kurang satu million satu hari di-belanjakan. Jadi sa-telah Yang Berhormat itu mengumumkan kenaikan chukai² daripada chukai modal, chukai keuntungan dan sa-bagai-nya, saya perhatikan soal² ini-lah yang lantang di-suarakan oleh surat-khabar atas kemushkilan daripada pehak² yang tertentu terhadap kenaikan chukai² ini. Jadi rasa saya begitu juga kita ra'ayat Persekutuan patut memberi amaran kepada mereka² yang mendapat untong yang banyak, supaya patoh kepada segala kehendak pemimpin² ra'ayat negeri ini, ia-itu meminta memberi keuntungan yang lebeh banyak itu kepada negara kita. Mereka² yang bukan ra'ayat Persekutuan tidak memahami atau tidak mahu memahami chara mengambil sa-bahagian keuntungan-nya, kerana pertahanan negara kita. Jadi itu-lah rasa saya, yang saya katakan tadi, banyak yang ta' puas hati dari sa-bilangan besar ra'ayat Malaysia terhadap chukai dari keuntungan yang di-dapati daripada orang² yang bukan ra'ayat Persekutuan dan juga Sharikat² yang di-punya'i oleh pemodal² dari luar negeri.

Chara yang kedua ia-lah menaikkan chukai besar, terhadap segala barang² yang tidak perlu pada negeri ini yang mana pada masa 3-4 tahun dahulu kita, dalam Dewan ini, telah menyuarakan bukan sahaja perlu di-sekat kemasokan barang² yang ta' perlu sa-bagaimana yang telah di-jalankan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri, tetapi menaikkan chukai² sa-umpama buah apple dan buah²an yang tidak mustahak. Dengan sebab tersekat buah²an yang tidak mustahak dan menggunakan buah²an yang boleh kita dapat di-negeri ini, maka itu-lah chara memajukan lagi perusahaan buah²an dan barang² yang dapat kita adakan dalam negeri kita ini. Umpamanya lagi, kita ada, dalam negeri kita, banyak barang yang boleh di-adakan di-negeri ini yang tidak payah kita bawa dari luar negeri. Umpamanya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jagong. Pada tahun 1963 sahaja kita telah membawa ka-dalam negeri ini 14 million ringgit. Pada hal jagong boleh di-tanam dalam negeri ini, dan boleh di-keluarkan

dalam negeri ini. Jadi rasa saya chukai ka-atas barang² ini pun patut di-naikkan lebeh tinggi supaya, tidak di-galakkan lagi barang ini masuk ka-dalam negeri kita, kerana ra'ayat negeri ini boleh memajukan-nya. Lagi satu chara ia-itu mengenakan chukai pengangkutan. Ini pun saya pandang boleh di-katakan memuaskan hati kerana bagi pehak orang² yang rendah pendapatan-nya tidak di-kenakan, tetapi mereka² yang mendapat pendapatan yang lebeh di-kenakan chukai, sangat sesuai.

Saya suka hendak menyuarakan sadikit fasal chukai pendapatan itu. Bagi pehak orang yang di-kenakan chukai pendapatan, anak²-nya yang hanya chuma sampai 5 orang sahaja di-bebaskan. Saya banyak benar-lah menerima rayuan² untuk di-sampaikan kapada Menteri, supaya dapat ditambah lagi chukai² tidak di-kenakan kapada anak² sampai kapada 8 orang. Tetapi nampak-nya rayuan² itu yang di-buat pada tiap² Meshuarat Belanjawan belum lagi dapat perhatian, atau pun termasuk ka-dalam hati Yang Berhormat Menteri.

Lagi satu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-telah saya mencheritakan chara² mendapat wang, bagitu juga, ia-itu segala perbelanjaan yang di-anggarkan pada tahun hadapan ini dapat dibelanjakan dengan jimat-chermat, saya perchaya dengan chara² ini dapat dikurangkan lagi perbelanjaan² yang telah di-anggarkan itu. Bagaimana ucapan Yang Berhormat tadi, kapada satu para, yang mengatakan, anggaran membuat Sekolah Anika Jurusan di-anggarkan lebeh kurang 270 million dapat di-kurangkan sampai 90 million akibat daripada penyelidekan yang boleh menguntongkan atau menurunkan perbelanjaan itu. Rasa saya usaha yang sa-macham ini satu usaha yang sangat besar, yang patut mendapat perhatian yang berat. Jadi, pada masa yang lampau, sa-bagaimana yang telah di-ucapkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri tadi, berkenaan dengan bangunan², sunggoh pun kita berkehendakan bangunan yang chantek, tetapi kita mesti sesuaikan keadaan negara kita pada masa ini. Pada masa yang lampau—boleh, saya bersetuju, kita

mengadakan bangunan² yang endah yang berharga tinggi, dan menggunakan barang² itu bukan daripada barang² yang di-keluarkan oleh negeri ini, pada masa dahulu lojik-lah, kerana apa, kalau kita ada duit, kita belanja-lah, tetapi rasa saya, pada masa ka-hadapan, bangunan² yang besar dan mahal ini tidak lagi mustahak, kerana kita boleh menggunakan bahan² yang ada dalam negeri kita, ia-itu kita kaya dengan kayu-kayan, yang boleh kita buat rumah² dengan menggunakan kayu-kayan kita. Dan bagitu juga saterus-nya perbelanjaan² yang lain, umpama-nya berjimat² supaya kerja² di-tiap² pejabat itu di-jalankan untuk mendapatkan nilai-nilai sa-bagaimana wang—wang yang telah di-beri-nya. Saya ma'anakan, kalau kita beri wang \$100 kita mahu kerja itu di-buat berharga \$100 juga. Jadi, ini-lah yang saya katakan jimat-chermat. Jadi, dengan ada-nya wang yang banyak di-untukkan ini, saya berharap kita tidak lagi melihat pegawai² Kerajaan yang banyak berada di-dalam kantin² pada masa bekerja. Bagitu juga kita tidak mahu melihat lagi pegawai² Kerajaan yang menjalankan tugas² ini, sa-masa bekerja, membacha surat khabar. Ini satu perkara yang menghabiskan masa dan merugikan wang kita.

Jadi, ini-lah rasa saya perkara yang mustahak sa-lain daripada kita menchari wang, kita hendak-lah berchermat. Kalau sa-kira-nya pejabat² itu di-fikirkan ta' ada kerja, patut-lah kita mengurangkan pegawai di-situ. Ini saya berchakap atas pengalaman saya sendiri yang banyak kali saya mendapati hal itu. Bagitu juga layanan² pegawai² Kerajaan terhadap orang ramai, tetapi ini tidak-lah sa-ratus peratus; ada pejabat yang bertungkus-lumus, tetapi ada pejabat yang tidak. Maka ini saya katakan tadi, patut-lah Kerajaan mengurangkan perbelanjaan yang di-dapati tidak mustahak.

Sa-lain daripada itu, chara² kita menjalankan kerja² bagi membuat bangunan² dan sa-bagai-nya, kita boleh berchermat supaya architect itu sesuaikan dan betul kerja²-nya. Kita tengok sahaja bangunan² yang di-buat pada masa ini, ta' sampai sa-tahun—saya tunjukkan dalam Dewan ini, ini pun

kita tengok di-sabelah sana—ini akibatnya yang saya perchaya akibat architect² yang tidak sesuai, yang tidak bertanggung-jawab yang menyebabkan kita berbelanja lebeh banyak.

Sa-lain daripada itu juga kita patut berchermat dalam lain² hal, saperti banyak pejabat² yang dahulu-nya diketuai oleh Expatriate Officers dan sekarang pegawai² dari anak negeri telah di-naikkan pangkat ka-tempat² itu. Banyak yang berasa kalau tidak dapat air-condition, mereka² ini ta' boleh bekerja; kalau ta' dapat Setia-usaha Wanita, ta' dapat menjalankan kerja-nya. Maka ini-lah rasa saya perkara² yang patut di-pandang berat.

Di-Dewan kita ini, kalau pada masa tidak ada Dewan ini bersidang, air-condition itu berjalan. Ini rasa saya membazir. Jadi, bukan-lah salah daripada kita dahulu, kerana kita ma'alum-lah kita, berharapkan kepada pegawai² expatriate ini, akibat daripada itu, kita tengok Dewan ini, air-condition-nya berjalan terus, walau pun tidak ada Parlimen bersidang. Saya selalu datang ka-mari, dan saya perchaya perbelanjaan, air-condition di-Parlimen ini bukan \$100 atau \$200. Maka ini-lah perkara²-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya rasa patut di-jimatkan dalam chara² membelanjakan wang yang di-jalankan oleh pejabat² Kerajaan ini. Jadi, dari apa Yang Berhormat Menteri membentangkan tadi, rasa saya itu-lah pandangan² yang patut, dan di-harap dapat, apa yang saya bentangkan kepada Dewan ini mendapat perhatian.

Sa-lain daripada itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berjangkit kepada wang² yang di-beri kepada Kementerian² yang lain, yang saya akan menyentoh dasar²-nya, sebab apa, tentu-lah dalam masa kita membinchangkan dalam Jawatan-kuasa besok, saya tidak dibenarkan menyentoh dasar²-nya. Jadi, saya membangkitkan tentang masaalah Kementerian Buroh. Saya rasa Kementerian yang telah menjalankan tugas-nya sejak lepas pilihan raya ini, suatu tugas yang besar dan boleh di-katakan memuaskan hati, kerana Kementerian Buroh ini dapat menyelesaikan bebe-

rapa masaalah² buroh dalam negara kita. Dalam pada itu, saya berharap Menteri, atau pun Kementerian ini menambahkan lagi usaha² supaya merapatkan lagi antara majikan² dengan wakil² buroh melalui Trade Union. Pada masa ini, saya rasa patut-lah kita beri pujian yang besar terhadap pergerakan Trade Union dalam negeri ini, yang telah mendapat sa-fahaman dengan usaha daripada Yang Berhormat Menteri Buroh kita. Jadi, usaha yang saya minta ini, ia-itu kita mesti-lah, kalau boleh, wakil² dari buroh² mengambil bahagian yang chergas dalam segala usaha² dalam perusahaan² atau pun dalam segala segi yang lain yang berkenaan supaya mereka² ini faham, bagaimana-kah satu² perusahaan itu menjalankan untong rugi-nya dan boleh menyebabkan buroh² berpuas hati, sebab chara macham ini, yang telah saya dapat melihat sendiri, dalam sa-buah negara yang saya telah melawat, di-mana negeri itu tidak ada langsung mogok, atau sa-bagai-nya, kerana majikan²-nya mengambil mereka dalam keperchayaan-nya. Saya tengok dalam perusahaan² itu buroh² datang bekerja dengan tidak payah lagi di-jaga, chuma ada perkakas dengan lengkap-nya bagi memasokkan card² dalam mesin untok menetapkan masa buroh² bekerja. Bagitu juga kerja² yang di-jalankan dalam perusahaan² itu—buroh² di-beri kerja yang khas dengan masa yang tertentu, gaji yang telah di-persetujui, dan kalau lebeh daripada itu, kalau mereka berusaha lagi, mereka akan di-beri over-time, atau pun di-bayar kerja² yang lebeh daripada mereka buat.

Dalam perusahaan itu ada dua pehak—majikan dan juga wakil buroh yang melihat perusahaan itu bagaimana di-jalankan, bagaimana untong rugi dan bagitu juga dalam perkhidmatan² buroh—perkhidmatan buroh² pun dapat di-binchangkan dengan baik antara majikan dengan mereka² ini, sa-umpama-nya di-sini kita mengadakan satu chara yang telah di-chipta oleh penjajah ia-itu Employees Provident Fund; ini baik usaha-nya, tetapi tujuan-nya itu belum lagi mendapat, bagaimana yang saya pandang, memberi kepuasan hati kepada buroh²,

jas daripada mereka² yang anti-bahasa kebangsaan. Jadi itu-lah, diharapkan perhatian yang berat di-ambil oleh Kerajaan terhadap mereka yang menentang usaha memajukan bahasa kebangsaan ini. Saya puji kebanyakan ra'ayat Malaysia yang berketurunan lain daripada orang Melayu, sangat berusaha² memajukan bahasa kebangsaan. Tetapi yang saya mushkilkan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, daripada orang² Melayu sendiri. Ini-lah kalau sa-kiranya kita orang Melayu tidak hendak menggunakan bahasa kebangsaan bagaimana kita mengharapkan orang² yang bukan keturunan daripada Melayu hendak menggunakan bahasa kebangsaan?

Ada sa-paroh-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kerana terlampau ka-Inggerisan dia menggunakan bahasa Melayu itu ka-Inggeris. Umpama-nya bekalan kata-nya "bekelan" lampu kata-nya "lempu" ini-lah benda yang saya harap, terutama sa-kali mereka² daripada bangsa Melayu berjawatan tinggi, dapat memahamkan hasrat Kerajaan Perikatan, hendak menjadikan bahasa kebangsaan bahasa yang tunggal dalam tahun 1967. Jangan-lah kita menjadi ketam yang hendak mengajar anak-nya berjalan betul, kalau kita sendiri tidak tahu buat. Jadi itu-lah yang saya harap supaya usul² Kerajaan di-terima oleh pegawai² tinggi bagaimana hendak mengiratkan, bagaimana bahasa kebangsaan dapat di-jalankan dengan elok. Ini ada-lah pengalaman yang saya terima, bukan-lah satu cherita dongeng yang saya berchakap dalam Dewan ini, tidak sa-kali².

Pagi tadi kita mendengar wakil daripada Tanjong yang chuba hendak mengelirukan kita, yang mengatakan belum lagi sampai masa-nya ra'ayat negeri ini menggunakan 100% bahasa kebangsaan. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berfikir usaha Kerajaan supaya bahasa kebangsaan di-jadikan bahasa yang tunggal dalam negara ini sudah menjadikan kenyataan yang penoh. Kapada mereka² yang sayangkan negara ini, ia-itu ketetapan 10 tahun menjadikan bahasa kebangsaan itu bahasa yang tunggal di-dalam negeri ini ia-lah ketetapan yang lojik. Bagi

anak mereka yang belajar dalam sekolah yang telah betul berusaha menggunakan bahasa kebangsaan dalam masa 10 tahun itu maka ia telah dewasa dalam bahasa kebangsaan. Jadi tidak ada lagi sebab mengapa ada ragu² lagi kapada mereka² yang betul² chintakan kapada negara ini merasmikan Bahasa Kebangsaan sa-bagai bahasa yang tunggal pada tahun 1967. Kita bukan menghalang, bahkan kita memberi peluang dan memberikan wang yang banyak, kapada sekolah² yang bukan bahasa kebangsaan, untuk menggalakkan bangsa² asing, Inggeris, China dan Tamil mempelajari bahasa-nya dengan elok. Kita tidak menyekat bangsa asing. Rasa saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berpeluang melawat banyak negara² luar daripada negeri ini di-mana tidak ada satu negara yang memberikan peluang bahasa asing sa-lain daripada bahasa negara itu sendiri. Jadi, saya harap wakil dari Tanjong boleh lihat-lah negara yang lain ada-kah peluang² itu di-beri?

Kalau pun ada peluang² di-beri, chuma sa-bahagian kechil sahaja. Saya perchaya semua kita sayang kapada Perlembagaan yang telah kita chiptakan di-mana telah kita tetapkan bahasa kebangsaan menjadi bahasa yang tunggal pada tahun 1967. Sa-lain daripada itu, dalam mengusahakan bahasa kebangsaan ini, sa-kali lagi saya minta, terutama sa-kali terhadap para² intellectual dan Ahli² yang bijak pandai, daripada keturunan Melayu, mengambil peranan yang penting, tidak-lah jadi lagi bagaimana yang saya ucapkan tadi. Bagitu juga, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, terhadap sa-bilangan manusia yang antikan bahasa kebangsaan, yang terdiri juga daripada Pegawai² Kerajaan yang bukan Melayu yang terang² menunjukkan kebenchian-nya terhadap bahasa kebangsaan. Ada satu chontoh saya hendak cheritakan, timbul dalam masa memilih pegawai² Kerajaan yang akan memegang jawatan Kerajaan. Ada Pegawai² Kerajaan tidak mahu orang² yang lulus Sekolah Kebangsaan, kata-nya saya mahu orang yang berkelulusan Inggeris. Pada hal arahan² telah di-berikan untok menggunakan

bahasa kebangsaan dengan sa-boleh-nya. Ini satu helah menyingkirkan peserta² yang chuma berkelulusan Melayu. Saya tidak hendak sebutkan mana pegawai yang bersangkutan-paut itu tetapi kalau berkehendakkan juga nama pegawai itu boleh juga saya beri. Rasa saya tidak elok saya menerangkan siapa, dan mana Pejabat itu. Ini satu lagi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, mengakibatkan Kementerian ini mendapat halangan² dari orang yang sa-macam ini.

Jadi rasa saya sa-patut-nya-lah daripada tarikh ini mereka² yang sa-macam ini tidak lagi di-beri peluang bermaharajalela. Dalam kawasan saya apabila ada kerja kosong, datang-lah peminta² itu meminta sokongan daripada saya, supaya saya menerangkan yang peminta² itu anak si-polan² dan jua keadaan kelakuan-nya, tetapi dia tidak berkelulusan Inggeris. Hasil dari pemilehan oleh Jawatan-kuasa Pemilih itu ia-lah terang² mengatakan berkehendakkan orang yang tahu berbahasa Inggeris, pada hal dalam surat² panggilan daripada Pejabat Buroh, ada menerangkan ia-itu satu kelayakan mesti-lah lulus Sekolah Kebangsaan, dan mengerti bahasa kebangsaan. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jawatan² itu bukan-lah berkehendakkan pelajaran yang tinggi. Pekerjaan itu ada-lah pekerjaan yang biasa di-buat sa-hari². Kita tahu Tanah Melayu ini menggunakan bahasa kebangsaan, itu-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-bilangan penghalang² kapada usaha² kita hendak menjalankan atau hendak menjadikan bahasa kebangsaan bahasa yang tunggal di-dalam negeri ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berjangkit kapada Kementerian Kesihatan. Kita telah mendengar kechaman² yang telah di-buat oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu, yang juga sa-orang daripada sa-bilangan daripada Ahli yang pakar dalam perubatan mengatakan kekurangan ubat dan sa-bagai-nya. Ini pada anggapan saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-lah hasil daripada rungutan daripada orang yang tidak mengetahui akan keadaan yang sa-benar di-dalam perubatan, sebab selalu

saya dengar, orang ramai tidak puas hati, kerana tidak di-beri satu ubat yang mustahak kata-nya, yang boleh mengubati penyakit-nya. Pada pendapat ahli², atau doktor² dalam mana² hospital dengan segala penyelidikannya terhadap satu² penyakit, maka ubat yang tertentu di-berikan, tetapi layanan ini tidak mendapat kepuasan hati daripada mereka² yang mendapat rawatan, kerana dia telah menjadi doktor. Dia mahu ubat² injection penicilin dan mahu auriomycen, pada hal penyakit² itu boleh di-ubat sa-bagaimana yang telah di-pereksa dan telah di-tetapkan oleh doktor itu dengan ubat yang ada dalam hospital itu, yang boleh membaiki yang tidak mustahak kapada lain² ubat. Tetapi kerana jahil-nya dan kerana propaganda ubat² yang di-terima oleh orang² yang mendapat rawatan ini daripada surat² khabar, dan kenalan²-nya, merasa yang ubat di-berikan oleh tuan doktor dalam hospital itu tidak boleh mengubat penyakit-nya. Ini-lah yang timbul yang mengatakan ubat itu tidak chukup. Saya berpeluang bekerja lama dalam hospital—dalam perubatan, saya suka memberitahu bagaimana perasaan² dari orang² yang tidak mengerti terdiri orang² luar terhadap perubatan, yang sa-paroh-nya pergi ka-hospital, dia mahu chuchok—itu sahaja. Dia tidak menimbangankan bagaimana penyakit itu di-ubati setelah di-pereksa oleh doktor². Ini, rasa saya, tuduhan yang sa-macam ini tidak-lah dapat kita layan, dan saya tahu perkhidmatan² yang telah di-jalankan oleh pegawai Perubatan ini dalam segi perubatan, rasa saya sangat memuaskan hati, sunggoh pun bagitu, barangkali ada rungutan² yang lain terhadap pegawai² itu tidak-lah menjadi rusing, kerana sifat kita sa-bagai manusia ini tentu-lah ada yang lemah, ada yang tidak sa-ratus peratus baik.

Dalam usaha ini, satu perkara lagi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya minta pandangan yang berat ia-itu pegawai² yang bekerja, biar-lah mereka bekerja bersunggoh² biar-lah mereka berasa yang mereka mahu bekerja dan tidak jemu dalam tempat² itu. Kita tahu, bagi negeri saya, sa-buah negeri yang jauh daripada Kuala Lumpur—ada

pegawai² yang memikirkan—kalau di-hantar ka-Pahang untok bekerja, mereka berasa sa-olah² di-hantar ka-dalam satu tempat buangan. Inilah perasaan yang ada pada tiap² doktor, atau pun specialist. Jadi, pada masa yang lampau, saya telah mengeshorkan supaya tiap² doktor, specialist² di-hantar ka-tempat yang jauh dengan giliran², dan dalam masa yang tertentu supaya tidak menjemukan mereka dan hilang-lah perasaan memberontak oleh sebab mereka itu terpaksa meninggalkan bandar² besar. Yang menghairankan saya ada doktor² yang telah bertahun² bekerja di-Kuala Lumpur ini yang tidak pernah beraleh. Ini-lah perasaan yang menyebabkan kadang² doktor² berkhidmat di-luar bandar itu boleh ada perasaan marah, atau memberi layanan² yang tidak di-ingini.

Bagitu juga, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, menghantar bidan², atau pun pegawai² ka-hulu² sungai—macam negeri Pahang ini, ada tempat macham Ulu Tembeling yang terpaksa berjalan dengan perahu lebeh kurang memakan masa satu hari satu malam. Jadi, pegawai² yang sa-macham ini patut di-gilirkan, di-tetapkan yang mereka ini mesti berkhidmat sa-lama sa-tahun, dan kemudian itu di-gilirkan ka-tempat lain, dan saya perchaya dengan jalan ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tidak lagi timbul layanan², atau pun rungutan² yang mengatakan itu dan ini terhadap mereka² ini. Dan ini akan memberi kebaikan kapada perkhidmatan kita dan juga dengan selalu-nya mereka² di-tukarkan, tidak-lah boleh menjadikan pegawai² ini jemu berada di-satu² tempat itu. Macham yang saya cheritakan tadi, satu tempat yang bernama Kampong Bantal, Ulu Tembeling sana tempat yang tidak ada benda² boleh menyukakan mereka² itu, kalau kita simpan dia tiga atau empat tahun, boleh jadi mereka bosan dan tidak menjalankan kerja, tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau mereka² ini telah kita tukar²kan atau kita gilir²kan satu² tempat dalam masa² yang tertentu dan maseh di-dapati tidak menjalankan kerja mereka, saya minta, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dengan tegas, di-ambil tindakan yang keras dan di-

singkirkan mereka² ini daripada jawatan-nya supaya menjadi tauladan kapada pegawai² lain.

Pada masa yang lampau, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau sa-kira-nya ada pegawai² yang sa-macham ini yang terang² menjalankan tugas-nya bertentangan dengan tugas rasmi-nya apa-kah tindakan telah di-ambil? Ah! chuma tukar dia ka-tempat lain. Ini tidak boleh membaiki dan tidak menjadi tauladan kapada pegawai² lain. Ini rasa saya satu perkara yang besar. Kalau pegawai² ini telah kita berikan segala perkhidmatan, kesenangan, tetapi maseh menjalankan kerja²-nya yang bertentangan dengan kehendak kita—tindakan yang tegas hendak-lah di-ambil, singkirkan mereka, buangkan mereka daripada jawatan²-nya supaya menjadi chontoh kapada pegawai² yang lain.

Jadi, rasa saya dalam perkhidmatan ini, kerana Perkhidmatan Perubatan-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, satu perkhidmatan yang mesti, yang tidak boleh tidak pada satu² negara. Jadi, ini-lah yang rasa saya perkara yang saya bayangkan pada Kementerian ini supaya dapat di-pertimbangkan, sunggoh pun rasa saya Kementerian Kewangan akan bergaduh—oh! banyak kali tukar banyak belanja, tetapi rasa saya belanja yang di-gunakan untok pertukaran pegawai² akan memberi faedah yang besar kapada kita, akan memberi layanan yang baik oleh perkhidmatan ini terhadap ra'ayat negara kita.

Sekarang, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya masok kapada Kementerian Perdagangan. Pagi tadi kita ada mendengar ucapan daripada sa-orang wakil ia-itu wakil dari Parti Islam sa-Tanah Melayu yang mengatakan yang Kementerian Perdagangan ini, tidak berusaha sunggoh dan usaha²-nya tidak ada memberi faedah langsung terhadap orang² Melayu, bagi mengambil bahagian yang chergas dalam lapangan perdagangan dan sa-bagai-nya. Dan jua jabatan², yang telah di-adakan itu tidak memberi faedah. Jadi, saya tidak hendak berchakap bagi kawasan lain, tetapi bagi negeri Pahang, saya sa-bagai mewakili

sa-bahagian besar perniaga² Melayu berasa puas hati, atas usaha² yang telah di-jalankan oleh bahagian dalam Jabatan Setia-usaha Negeri Pahang ia-itu bahagian orang Melayu mengambil bahagian chergas dalam perniagaan. Usaha² ini sangat memberi faedah, satu daripada usaha-nya yang saya suka menerangkan ia-itu usaha Kerajaan ini mendapatkan perusahaan² besar menguntokkan saham²-nya kepada perniaga² orang Melayu.

Sungguh pun kechaman yang kita terima mengatakan ini ekonomi "kachang goreng" dan sa-bagai-nya, tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, usaha dalam perdagangan ini bukan-lah macham kita masak nasi, dalam tempoh 15 minit kita boleh makan, usaha ini mahu kepada pengalaman, usaha ini mahu kepada modal dan usaha ini mahu kepada kemahuan yang kuat dari tiap² orang yang menjalankan tugas. Saya tahu panggilan saham daripada berpuluh kampeni² yang ada di-Kuala Lumpur telah di-edarkan oleh Setia-usaha Kerajaan Negeri Pahang kepada konterektor Melayu, kepada perniaga² Melayu supaya membeli-nya, jadi saya rasa ini-lah satu usaha yang besar. Sungguh pun usaha²-nya tidak-lah meliputi keseluruhan apa yang di-kehendaki, tetapi langkah menapak dari tangga ka-tangga telah di-usahakan. Jadi kalau di-sifatkan itu-lah sahaja usaha Kerajaan menyuruh orang Melayu membeli share sahaja saya tidak perchaya sa-kali², dan saya tahu Kerajaan kita, banyak lagi usaha²-nya akan di-jalankan dan sedang di-jalankan. Satu usaha yang saya puji yang di-buat oleh bahagian ini ia-itu mendapatkan agency daripada sharikat² besar. Ini satu usaha yang besar, tetapi hendak lekas maju, menjalankan perniagaan maka itu terpulang kepada kemahuan orang berkehendakkan, terutama ia-lah kepada orang Melayu. Dalam perusahaan ini, usaha dari Kerajaan supaya orang Melayu yang suka dan chenderong mengambil bahagian dalam perniagaan konterek dan sa-bagai-nya, maka di-istimewakan khas bagi orang² Melayu mendapat kerja borongan yang kechil². Sekarang banyak telah berjalan dalam negeri

Pahang. Saya tidak tahu bagaimana di-negeri lain, tetapi di-Pahang tuduhan yang sa-macham itu tidak-lah betul dan benar. Saya tahu, bahagian ini, sangat memberi faedah kepada orang Melayu, tetapi bukan-lah berma'ana pertolongan itu sa-takat itu sahaja, tidak, ada lagi. Saya tahu usaha² daripada bahagian itu memanggil semua pedagang yang suka hendak mengambil bahagian dalam perniagaan dan sa-bagai-nya bermeshuarat tiap masa yang di-fikirkan mustahak. Ini satu daripada usaha-nya. Kita tidak dengar, ada chadangan² dari pihak yang mengecham dan membena chuma yang kita dengar kechaman² sahaja.

Jadi chara macham itu, bukan-lah tegoran membena, yang tidak akan memberi faedah kepada negara kita. Jadi sa-kali lagi saya ucapkan terima kaseh kepada usaha Kementerian ini yang bersungguh² walau pun mendapat kechaman yang hebat daripada sabilangan yang tidak mengerti dalam perkara ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau kita berkehendakkan satu perkara itu elok dan baik akan mengambil masa dan meningkat dari masa ka-masa dengan pengalaman. Kita manusia sendiri, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untok hendak sampai ka-peringkat kesempurnaan mengambil masa dekat 50 tahun. Sungguh pun begitu, saya berharap Kementerian ini juga tidak jemu menjalankan usaha² yang ada di-bentangkan dalam dasar Kerajaan Perikatan bagaimana hendak melaksanakan, supaya orang Melayu dapat mengambil bahagian yang chergas dalam perdagangan dan sa-bagai-nya. Jadi saya rasa kesulitan² yang kita terima, dapat kita atasi, berdasarkan kesulitan² yang di-alami oleh mereka yang mengambil bahagian yang chergas dalam perdagangan ini. Umpamanya, bahagian RIDA juga ada-lah satu² usaha Kerajaan untok memberi peluang kepada orang Melayu mengambil bahagian yang chergas dalam lapangan berniaga, tetapi yang selalu kita terima dan bacha dalam surat-khabar kebanyakan orang² yang kechiwa ia-lah terdiri dari orang² hendak menyalah-gunakan perkhidmatan ini.

Satu chara-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, umpama-nya dia tidak biasa

bekerja atau tidak ada pengalaman dalam membuat kerja konterek, tetapi dia nampak orang lain boleh buat kerja dan mendapat keuntongan, dia pun turut masuk dan sama menjadi sa-orang pemborong tanpa pengalaman meletakkan, kata-lah, tender membuat Dewan ini harga-nya \$100,000 dia sanggup meletakkan \$80,000 tujuan-nya bila aku dapat konterek \$80,000 aku boleh pinjam daripada RIDA dengan tidak mengira bagaimana dia menjalankan kerja, dia kira apa yang dia boleh dapat. Inilah orang yang selalu membesar²kan tohmah terhadap Kerajaan. Jadi kita tidak boleh menerima bulat² segala tuduhan² yang di-lemparkan kepada Kerajaan atau pun berita² yang kita dapat daripada bualan kaki lima atau pun daripada surat-khabar.

Perkara ini bagi negeri Pahang memang terator. Kita tahu tiap² konterektor itu bagaimana pengalamannya dan mereka² sahaja yang dapat perkhidmatan² kita. Saya puji usaha² Kerajaan untuk menjaga, supaya tujuan yang di-chadangkan oleh Kerajaan berjalan dengan baik-nya. Kita tidak mahu menerima segala kechaman² yang tidak bertanggung-jawab terhadap usaha Kerajaan Perikatan membolehkan orang Melayu mengambil bahagian yang chergas

dalam perusahaan dan perdagangan. Saya berasa puas hati apa yang telah di-buat, tetapi kita berharap Menteri Perdagangan sentiasa berhubung rapat dengan segala pertubohan² orang Melayu yang mengambil bahagian yang chergas dalam perdagangan. Pada satu masa Yang Berhormat Menteri Perdagangan telah mengadakan pertemuan dengan segala ketua² persatuan daripada bahagian² perdagangan, konterektor dan sa-bagai-nya, dan ini telah menghasilkan beberapa benda yang sangat baik. Jadi, usaha ini saya pandang patut di-adakan lebeh banyak lagi supaya boleh Menteri ini menjalankan dasar yang di-tetapkan sesuai bagaimana kehendak² daripada orang Melayu yang suka mengambil bahagian chergas dalam segi perdagangan.

Sekarang saya hendak berchakap berkenaan dengan Kementerian Pembangunan

Mr Speaker: Kalau Ahli Yang Berhormat hendak berchakap panjang lagi boleh-lah berchakap pada hari Ithnin besok, sebab saya hendak tanggohkan meshuarat ini. Meshuarat ini di-tanggohkan kapada hari Ithnin, 30 haribulan, pukul 10.00 pagi.

Adjourned at 6.30 p.m.