

Volume II  
No. 4



Tuesday  
1st June, 1965

# PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

DEWAN RA'AYAT  
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

OFFICIAL REPORT

SECOND SESSION OF THE SECOND PARLIAMENT  
OF MALAYSIA

## CONTENTS

**ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 809]**

**ADJOURNMENT TO A LATER DATE (MOTION)  
[Col. 817]**

**MOTION—**

**THE YANG DI-PERTUAN AGONG'S SPEECH  
(Address of Thanks) [Col. 818]**

**ADJOURNMENT SPEECHES—**

**Pemberian Bantuan Kapada Ra'ayat Malaysia Untuk  
Perusahaan di-Wilayah<sup>2</sup> Borneo [Col. 964]**

**H.S.C. Examination—Private Candidates [Col. 969]**

MALAYSIA

**DEWAN RA'AYAT**  
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

*Official Report*

---

Second Session of the Second Dewan Ra'ayat

---

*Tuesday, 1st June, 1965*

*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 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, Minister of National and Rural Development, TUN HAJI ABDUL RAZAK BIN DATO' HUSSAIN, S.M.N. (Pekan).
- „ the Minister of Home Affairs and Minister of Justice, DATO' DR ISMAIL BIN DATO' HAJI ABDUL RAHMAN, P.M.N. (Johor Timor).
- „ the Minister of Finance, ENCHE' TAN SIEW SIN, J.P. (Melaka Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, DATO' V. T. SAMBANTHAN, P.M.N. (Sungai Siput).
- „ the Minister of Transport, DATO' HAJI SARDON BIN HAJI JUBIR, P.M.N. (Pontian Utara).
- „ the Minister of Education, ENCHE' MOHAMED KHIR JOHARI (Kedah Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Health, ENCHE' BAHAMAN BIN SAMSUDIN (Kuala Pilah).
- „ the Minister of Commerce and Industry, DR LIM SWEE AUN, J.P. (Larut Selatan).
- „ the Minister for Welfare Services, TUAN HAJI ABDUL HAMID KHAN BIN HAJI SAKHAWAT ALI KHAN, J.M.N., J.P. (Batang Padang).
- „ the Minister for Local Government and Housing, ENCHE' KHAW KAI-BOH, P.J.K. (Ulu Selangor).
- „ the Minister of Information and Broadcasting, ENCHE' SENU BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Kubang Pasu Barat).
- „ the Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives, ENCHE' MOHAMED GHAZALI BIN HAJI JAWI (Ulu Perak).
- „ the Minister for Sabah Affairs and Civil Defence, DATU DONALD ALOYSIUS STEPHENS, P.D.K. (Sabah).

- The Honourable the Minister of Lands and Mines, ENCHE' ABDUL-RAHMAN BIN YA'KUB (Sarawak).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Commerce and Industry, TUAN HAJI ABDUL KHALID BIN AWANG OSMAN (Kota Star Utara).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives, ENCHE' SULAIMAN BIN BULON (Bagan Datoh).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Culture, Youth and Sports, ENCKU 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. (Malaka Utara).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL KARIM BIN ABU, A.M.N. (Melaka Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAHIM ISHAK (Singapore).
- „ 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).
- „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN SAAID, J.P. (Seberang Utara).
- „ CHE' AJIBAH BINTI ABOL (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' ALI BIN HAJI AHMAD (Pontian Selatan).
- „ DR AWANG BIN HASSAN, S.M.J. (Muar Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Muar Dalam).
- „ ENCHE' E. W. BARKER (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN CHONG WEN, A.M.N. (Kluang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN SIANG SUN (Bentong).
- „ ENCHE' CHEN WING SUM (Damansara).
- „ ENCHE' CHIA CHIN SHIN, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' FRANCIS CHIA NYUK TONG (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' CHIA THYE POH (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' CHIN FOON (Ulu Kinta).
- „ ENCHE' C. V. DEVAN NAIR (Bungsar).
- „ TUAN SYED ESA BIN ALWEE, J.M.N., S.M.J., P.I.S. (Batu Pahat Dalam).
- „ DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI ABDUL MAJID (Johore Bahru Timor).
- „ DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI HASHIM, P.M.N. (Jitra-Padang Terap).
- „ ENCHE' S. FAZUL RAHMAN, A.D.K. (Sabah).

- The Honourable DATU GANIE GILONG, P.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).
- .. ENCHE' GANING BIN JANGKAT (Sabah).
- .. ENCHE' GEH CHONG KEAT, K.M.N. (Penang Utara).
- .. ENCHE' HAMZAH BIN ALANG, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Kapar).
- .. ENCHE' HANAFI BIN MOHD. YUNUS, A.M.N., J.P.  
(Kulim Utara).
- .. ENCHE' HANAFIAH BIN HUSSAIN, A.M.N. (Jerai).
- .. ENCHE' HARUN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Baling).
- .. WAN HASSAN BIN WAN DAUD (Tumpat).
- .. ENCHE' STANLEY HO NGUN KHIU, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- .. ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN TO' MUDA HASSAN, A.M.N. (Raub).
- .. ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN MOHD. NOORDIN, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Parit).
- .. ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN SULAIMAN (Ulu Kelantan).
- .. TUAN HAJI HUSSAIN RAHIMI BIN HAJI SAMAN  
(Kota Bharu Hulu).
- .. ENCHE' IKHWAN ZAINI (Sarawak).
- .. ENCHE' IBRAHIM BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Seberang Tengah).
- .. ENCHE' ISMAIL BIN IDRIS (Penang Selatan).
- .. DATO' SYED JA'AFAR BIN HASAN ALBAR, P.M.N.  
(Johor Tenggara).
- .. ENCHE' JEK YEUN THONG (Singapore).
- .. ENCHE' KAM WOON WAH, J.P. (Sitiawan).
- .. ENCHE' KHOO PENG LOONG (Sarawak).
- .. ENCHE' KOW KEE SENG (Singapore).
- .. ENCHE' LEE KUAN YEW (Singapore).
- .. ENCHE' LEE SAN CHOON, K.M.N. (Segamat Selatan).
- .. ENCHE' LEE SECK FUN (Tanjong Malim).
- .. ENCHE' AMADEUS MATHEW LEONG, A.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).
- .. DR LIM CHONG EU (Tanjong).
- .. 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).
- .. DATO' DR HAJI MEGAT KHAS, D.P.M.P., J.P., P.J.K.  
(Kuala Kangsar).
- .. ENCHE' MOHD. ARIF SALLEH, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- .. ENCHE' MOHAMED ASRI BIN HAJI MUDA, P.M.K. (Pasir Puteh).
- .. ENCHE' MOHD. DAUD BIN ABDUL SAMAD (Besut).
- .. ENCHE' MOHAMED IDRIS BIN MATSIL, J.M.N., P.J.K., J.P.  
(Jelebu-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. (Sungai Patani).
- .. WAN MOKHTAR BIN AHMAD (Kemaman).

- The Honourable 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).
- „ 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' NG FAH YAM (Batu Gajah).
- „ DR NG KAM POH, J.P. (Telok Anson).
- „ ENCHE' ONG KEE HUI (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' ONG PANG BOON (Singapore).
- „ TUAN HAJI OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Hilir Perak).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Perlis Utara).
- „ ENCHE' ABANG OTHMAN BIN ABANG HAJI MOASILI, P.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN WOK (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' QUEK KAI DONG, J.P. (Seremban Timor).
- „ ENCHE' S. RAJARATNAM (Singapore).
- „ TUAN HAJI RAHMAT BIN HAJI DAUD, A.M.N. (Johor Bahru Barat).
- „ ENCHE' RAMLI BIN OMAR (Krian Darat).
- „ TUAN HAJI REDZA BIN HAJI MOHD. SAID, P.J.K., J.P. (Rembau-Tampin).
- „ RAJA ROME BIN RAJA MA'AMOR, P.J.K., J.P. (Kuala Selangor).
- „ ENCHE' SEAH TENG NGIAB, P.I.S. (Muar Pantai).
- „ 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' SOH AH TECK (Batu Pahat).
- „ ENCHE' SULEIMAN BIN ALI (Dungun).
- „ PENGIRAN TAHIR PETRA (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' TAJUDIN BIN ALI, P.J.K. (Larut Utara).
- „ ENCHE' TAI KUAN YANG (Kulim Bandar Bharu).
- „ ENCHE' TAMA WENG TINGGANG WAN (Sarawak).
- „ DR TAN CHEE KHOON (Batu).
- „ ENCHE' TAN CHENG BEE, J.P. (Bagan).
- „ ENCHE' TAN TOH HONG (Bukit Bintang).
- „ ENCHE' TAN TSAK YU (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' TIAH ENG BEE (Kluang Utara).
- „ DR TOH CHIN CHYE (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' TOH THEAM HOCK (Kampar).
- „ ENCHE' WEE TOON BOON (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' YEH PAO TZE (Sabah).

The Honourable ENCHE' YEOH TAT BENG (Bruas).

.. ENCHE' STEPHEN YONG KUET TZE (Sarawak).

.. ENCHE' YONG NYUK LIN (Singapore).

.. TUAN HAJI ZAKARIA BIN HAJI MOHD. TAIB, P.J.K. (Langat).

ABSENT:

The Honourable the Minister for Sarawak Affairs, DATO' TEMENGGONG JUGAH ANAK BARIENG, P.M.N., P.D.K. (Sarawak).

.. the Minister of Labour, ENCHE' V. MANICKAVASAGAM, J.M.N., P.J.K. (Klang).

.. WAN ABDUL KADIR BIN ISMAIL, P.P.T. (Kuala Trengganu Utara).

.. ENCHE' ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAJI TALIB, P.J.K. (Kuantan).

.. WAN ABDUL RAHMAN BIN DATU TUANKU BUJANG (Sarawak).

.. DATO' ABDULLAH BIN ABDULRAHMAN, Dato' Bijaya di-Raja (Kuala Trengganu Selatan).

.. O.K.K. DATU ALIUDDIN BIN DATU HARUN, P.D.K. (Sabah).

.. ENCHE' JONATHAN BANGAU ANAK RENANG, A.B.S. (Sarawak).

.. PENGARAH BANYANG ANAK JANTING, P.B.S. (Sarawak).

.. ENCHE' CHAN SEONG YOON (Setapak).

.. ENCHE' EDWIN ANAK TANGKUN (Sarawak).

.. DR GOH KENG SWEE (Singapore).

.. PENGHULU JINGGUT ANAK ATTAN, Q.M.C., A.B.S. (Sarawak).

.. ENCHE' KADAM ANAK KIAI (Sarawak).

.. DATU KHOO SIAK CHIEW, P.D.K. (Sabah).

.. ENCHE' EDMUND LANGGU ANAK SAGA (Sarawak).

.. DATO' LING BENG SIEW, P.N.B.S. (Sarawak).

.. ENCHE' LIM HUAN BOON (Singapore).

.. ENCHE' PETER LO SU YIN (Sabah).

.. ORANG TUA MOHAMMAD DARAH BIN LANGPAD (Sabah).

.. ENCHE' SANDOM ANAK NYUAK (Sarawak).

.. ENCHE' D. R. SEENIVASAGAM (Ipoh).

.. ENCHE' S. P. SEENIVASAGAM (Menglembu).

.. ENCHE' TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Melaka).

.. PENGHULU FRANCIS UMPAU ANAK EMPAM (Sarawak).

PRAYERS

(Mr Speaker *in the Chair*)

whether he will extend low-cost housing schemes similar to those in Malaya to Sarawak.

ORAL ANSWERS TO  
QUESTIONS

LOW-COST HOUSING SCHEMES  
IN SARAWAK

1. Enche' Abang Othman bin Haji Moasili (Sarawak) asks the Minister of Local Government and Housing

**The Minister of Local Government and Housing (Enche' Khaw Kai-Boh):**

Mr Speaker, Sir, as I have already stated in the past in the House, I will consider the expansion of low-cost housing schemes to the State of Sarawak on receipt of application for such schemes from the State. The State

Government has already been acquainted with the procedure and the details required during my visit to Sarawak in October, 1964.

## **MENYAMAKAN GAJI BUROH DI-SARAWAK DENGAN GAJI BUROH DI-NEGERI<sup>2</sup> DALAM MALAYA**

**2. Enche' Abang Othman bin Haji Moasili** bertanya kepada Perdana Menteri sama ada tindakan akan diambil bagi menyamakan bayaran gaji buroh di-Sarawak dengan buroh di-lain<sup>2</sup> negeri dalam Malaya.

**The Assistant Minister of Culture, Youth and Sports (Engku Muhsein bin Abdul Kadir):** Tuan Speaker, jawabnya tidak. Buroh<sup>2</sup> dalam Negeri Sarawak ada-lah kaki-tangan Kerajaan Sarawak. Apa<sup>2</sup> pindaan kepada gaji atau syarat<sup>2</sup> perkhidmatan kaki-tangan Kerajaan Negeri ada-lah tanggungan Kerajaan itu mengikut Clause 2 Article 132 Perlembagaan Malaysia.

## **NUMBER OF TEACHERS FROM MALAYA STUDYING IN UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA AND UNIVERSITY OF SINGAPORE UNDER STUDY LEAVE**

**3. Enche' C. V. Devan Nair (Bungsar)** asks the Minister of Education to state the number of teachers from Malaya studying in the University of Malaya and the University of Singapore under fully-paid or partially-paid study leave by the Government.

**The Minister of Education (Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari):** Mr Speaker, Sir, there are eight serving teachers from Malaya studying at the University of Malaya on partially-paid study leave. There are no teachers studying at either the University of Malaya or the University of Singapore on fully-paid study leave.

## **TEACHERS STUDYING IN UNIVERSITY OF MALAYA AND UNIVERSITY OF SINGAPORE UNDER STUDY LEAVE—TAKING UP OF APPROVED COURSES FOR TEACHING CAREER**

**4. Enche' C. V. Devan Nair** asks the Minister of Education to state whether the teachers in the above category are

taking up approved courses that would fit them to a teaching career.

**Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari:** Mr Speaker, Sir, the answer is "yes". The teachers under the above category are taking courses which are considered to be useful to their career as teachers.

## **NATIONAL TYPE SCHOOL BUILDINGS—UTILISATION OF**

**5. Enche' C. V. Devan Nair** asks the Minister of Education whether he is aware that a number of National Type School Buildings are not fully utilised for National Type Schools, that such buildings are used by Private Schools in the afternoons and if the answer to the above is in the affirmative, would he give an assurance that such buildings will be utilised only for National and National Type Schools in view of the fact that there is a great shortage of school buildings.

**Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari:** Yes, my Ministry is aware of the situation, but this state of affairs is limited to only some mission schools and former private Chinese Medium Schools which have since conformed. This arrangement is temporary. With the Government's own comprehensive education programme and the limitation of the use of such premises up to 1966, it is envisaged that Government will have at its disposal the full use of these school buildings both in the mornings and in the afternoons.

## **KURSUS TERNAK MENTERNAK AYAM DI-BERI KAPADA PELADANG<sup>2</sup> MUDA, SARAWAK**

**6. Che' Ajibah binti Abol (Sarawak)** bertanya kepada Menteri Pertanian dan Sharikat<sup>2</sup> Kerjasama ada-kah kemudahan<sup>2</sup> untok mengambil kursus ternak menternak ayam di-Pusat<sup>2</sup> Ternakan di-Malaya akan di-beri kepada peladang<sup>2</sup> muda dari Sarawak.

**The Minister of Agriculture and Cooperatives (Enche' Mohamed Ghazali bin Haji Jawi):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Bahagian Perkhidmatan Haiwan Kementerian Pertanian dan Sharikat Kerjasama selalu mengadakan kursus latihan praktik yang rapi bagi sa-lama lebeh kurang lima sampai enam minggu

untuk melatehkan ra'ayat<sup>2</sup> yang muda dari merata<sup>2</sup> Negeri di-Tanah Melayu di-Pusat Latehan Ternakan Ayam di-Port Swettenham. Bakal pelateh<sup>2</sup> itu di-pileh oleh Pegawai<sup>2</sup> Haiwan Negeri masing<sup>2</sup>, kerana hendak menentukan bahawa mereka<sup>2</sup> yang sa-benar-nya boleh mendapat faedah dari latehan itu di-pileh.

Bahagian Perkhidmatan Haiwan Kementerian ini bersedia menerima peladang<sup>2</sup> muda dari Sarawak untuk di-lateh di-Pusat itu kalau di-minta oleh Kerajaan Negeri Sarawak dan juga sanggup memikul perbelanjaan tambang pergi dan balek bagi pelateh<sup>2</sup> itu.

### MENGELUARKAN ISTILAH<sup>2</sup> DI-DALAM BAHASA KEBANGSAAN

7. **Che' Ajibah binti Abol** bertanya kepada Menteri Pelajaran memandang kepada usaha Kerajaan hendak meluaskan penggunaan Bahasa Kebangsaan ada-kah beliau akan meminta Pengarah Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka mengeluarkan risalah<sup>2</sup> istilah baharu di-beri perchuma kepada orang ramai tiap<sup>2</sup> bulan bagi menambahkan lagi per-bendaharaan kata mereka.

**Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari:** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, memang ada rancangan hendak menerbitkan sa-buah buku yang mengandongi istilah<sup>2</sup> didalam segala ilmu, tetapi perkara mengeluarkan istilah<sup>2</sup> baharu dan di-beri perchuma kepada orang ramai tiap<sup>2</sup> bulan tidak-lah upaya hendak diselenggarakan kerana perkara ini memerlukan perbelanjaan yang banyak serta juga kakitangan yang lebeh. Sungguh pun bagitu, Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka ada mengirinkan senarai istilah<sup>2</sup> dengan perchuma kepada sekolah<sup>2</sup>, maktab<sup>2</sup> dan universiti. Untuk pengetahuan orang ramai Dewan Bahasa juga menyiarkan istilah<sup>2</sup> baharu yang di-kumpulkan dalam tiap<sup>2</sup> keluaran Majallah Bulanan "Dewan Bahasa" yang boleh di-beli oleh sa-siapa juga.

### SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS TEACHERS IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS, MALAYA—SHORTAGE

8. **Dr Tan Chee Khoon** asks the Minister of Education whether he is

aware of the shortage of Science and Mathematics teachers in the secondary schools in the States of Malaya, and if so, what steps has his Ministry taken to overcome this shortage.

**Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari:** Mr Speaker, Sir, the Ministry is aware of this shortage which incidentally exists not only in the States of Malaya but also in the whole of Malaysia and indeed in so many other countries as well, including the developed ones.

The Ministry has taken the following measures to meet the problem:

- (a) Reorganization of the Malayan Teachers' College in Penang with effect from this year to provide two year pre-service and one year in-service specialist training courses for Mathematics and Science Teachers.
- (b) Holding of in-service vacation courses and seminars, etc. for teachers on the teaching of Mathematics and Science.
- (c) More attractive offers of scholarships and bursaries for academic degree courses, both locally and overseas.
- (d) As a temporary measure increase of bids and employment of more graduates under foreign technical assistance schemes.
- (e) Offer of employment under contract terms to qualified foreign graduates.

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** Mr Speaker, Sir, if I heard the Minister correctly, he said more opportunities for academic studies in the University of Malaya and abroad. Do I hear it correctly, Sir?

**Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari:** I said more attractive offers of scholarships and bursaries.

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** Is the Minister aware that there are serving officers in the various National Type schools who, having passed the H.S.C. or who having served for a number of years and passed the H.S.C., have now applied for courses in the University of Malaya on no pay leave but, for reasons best known to the Ministry of

Education, their requests have been turned down? If so, Mr Speaker, Sir, may we know the reasons why?

**Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari:** Sir, I am not aware of any particular case of any teacher applying for scholarship to study Science having been turned down by the Ministry.

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** Mr Speaker, Sir, if I bring them to the attention of the Minister will he take immediate action to rectify such an anomaly?

**Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari:** Sir, to me there is no anomaly.

### PRICES OF SALT FISH IN KUALA TRENGGANU AND KUALA LUMPUR—DISPARITY OF

**9. Dr Tan Chee Khoon** bertanya kepada Menteri Pertanian dan Sharikat Kerjasama ada-kah beliau sedar akan sangat jauh-nya perbezaan harga ikan kering dan ikan bilis di-antara Kuala Trengganu dengan Kuala Lumpur dan jika sedar, apa-kah langkah<sup>2</sup> yang telah beliau jalankan untuk memberi keuntongan yang berpatutan kapada nelayan<sup>2</sup> di-Kuala Trengganu.

**Enche' Mohamed Ghazali bin Haji Jawi:** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, satu kajian pasaran ikan untuk mengetahui antara lain-nya akan harga<sup>2</sup> ikan ia-itu ikan basah dan ikan kering yang di-terima oleh nelayan<sup>2</sup> di-dalam kawasan<sup>2</sup> perikanan yang besar dan juga untuk mengetahui harga<sup>2</sup> ikan yang di-jual di-pasar<sup>2</sup> besar itu pada waktu ini sedang berjalan. Keputusan dari kajian tersebut yang di-agakkan boleh didapati pada penghujung tahun ini akan memberi keterangan yang lengkap bagi membolehkan satu pertimbangan dibuat untuk menubuhkan satu ranchangan pasaran ikan yang akan menentukan yang nelayan<sup>2</sup> di-seluruh negeri mendapat layanan yang 'adil.

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** Mr Speaker, Sir, while the Ministry of Agriculture and Co-operatives is no doubt taking steps to set up marketing boards, is the Minister aware that—about four weeks ago, when I was in Kuala Trengganu I was told, and we all know, that *ikan bilis* is being sold at

\$1 to \$1.30 per kati—in Trengganu not the fishermen but the middlemen are being asked to sell their *ikan bilis* at \$30 per pikul to the Kuala Lumpur market? Is the Minister aware that \$30 per pikul is below the cost of production and therefore the fishermen and the middlemen there are completely at the mercy of the big tycoons who are presumably members of the M.C.A.? If so, Mr Speaker, Sir, what immediate steps, not *semua bersedia*, will he take to rectify such exploitation of the fishermen in Kuala Trengganu?

**Enche' Mohamed Ghazali bin Haji Jawi:** Mr Speaker, Sir, I am aware of the difference of the price of fish in Kuala Trengganu and Kuala Lumpur, but I do not know whether the middlemen in Kuala Trengganu are from the M.C.A. or from the Socialist Front or from any other party. (*Laughter*). The bad situation in the fishing market adds more to the reason that the Federal Agricultural Marketing Authority Bill should be passed, and I hope that the Member for Batu would support the Bill fully when it comes up for discussion in this House later. (*Applause*).

**Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah (Kelantan Hilir):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, boleh-kah saya dapat keterangan daripada Yang Berhormat Menteri ia-itu apa-kah yang telah berlaku kapada sharikat kerjasama pemasaran ikan di-Pantai Timor yang bilangan-nya lebeh daripada dua puluh? Sa-bagaimana yang saya tahu ada-lah sharikat kerjasama itu telah bertahun<sup>2</sup> didirikan, tetapi sharikat kerjasama ini tidak berjalan sama sa-kali, apa-kah yang telah berlaku kapada sharikat kerjasama itu? Kerana mengikut keterangan yang telah di-terangkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri tadi bahawa sekarang Kerajaan sedang mengadakan satu kajian untuk mengadakan satu ranchangan bagi pemasaran ikan, kalau begitu boleh-kah Yang Berhormat Menteri menerangkan kedudukan sharikat<sup>2</sup> kerjasama yang saya terangkan tadi?

**Enche' Mohamed Ghazali bin Haji Jawi:** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya rasa soalan itu tidak ada kena-mengena dengan yang asal ini (*Tepok*).

**Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah:** Saya fikir di-dalam jawapan Yang Berhormat Menteri tadi dia ada menerangkan bahawa sekarang ini Kerajaan sedang mengkaji tentang pemasaran ikan dan dengan tujuan hendak mengadakan satu ranchangan supaya harga<sup>2</sup> ikan dan pemasaran ini dapat di-baiki. Oleh sebab demikian, soal saya ia-lah apa-kah yang telah berlaku kepada sharikat kerjasama yang di-dirikan untuk pemasaran ikan di-sana? Saya fikir soalan saya ada-lah bersangkutan-paut dengan soalan yang ada di-hadapan kita ini.

**Enche' Mohamed Ghazali bin Haji Jawi:** Saya berharap Ahli Yang Berhormat dapat membuat soalan berkenaan dengan ini, dan saya dengan sukachita-nya akan memberi jawab-nya.

**Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah:** Boleh-kah saya memahamkan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bahawa Yang Berhormat Menteri itu tidak dapat memberi keterangan dalam soalan saya ini?

## ADJOURNMENT TO A LATER DATE (MOTION)

**The Minister of Finance (Enche' Tan Siew Sin):** Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 12 (2) at its rising this day this House do stand adjourned to Thursday, 3rd June, 1965 at 10 a.m.

As Honourable Members are aware, we have to suspend our sitting tomorrow because it will be the birthday of His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong. I, therefore, do not think I need elaborate further.

**The Deputy Prime Minister (Tun Haji Abdul Razak bin Dato' Hussain):** Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That, notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 12 (2) at its rising this day this House do stand adjourned to Thursday, 3rd June, 1965 at 10 a.m.

## MOTION

### THE YANG DI-PERTUAN AGONG'S SPEECH

#### Address of Thanks

Order read for resumption of debate on Question,

That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong as follows:

"Your Majesty,

We, the Speaker and Members of the Dewan Ra'ayat of Malaysia in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer Your Majesty our humble thanks for the Gracious Speech with which the Second Session of the Second Parliament has been opened", to which the following amendment moved by Enche' Lee Kuan Yew was to add at the end thereof:

"but regrets that the Address by His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong did not reassure the nation that Malaysia will continue to progress in accord with its democratic constitution towards a Malaysian Malaysia, but on the contrary the Address has added to the doubts over the intentions of the present Alliance Government and over the measures it will adopt when faced with the loss of majority popular support."

**Mr Speaker:** I would like to inform the House that the debate on the King's Speech will probably end today and, therefore, I would like Honourable Members to be as brief as possible in their speeches. The last speaker, I believe, was the Member for Seberang Tengah who has not finished.

**Enche' Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman (Seberang Tengah):** Dalam 10 minit lagi. Saya sa-malam chuba hendak pendekkan, tidak dapat (*Ketawa*). Tuan Yang di-Pertua, menyambong ucapan saya sa-malam, saya telah merayu kepada Kerajaan supaya menyemak sa-mula Perlembagaan Malaysia ini di-dalam Article berkenaan dengan fundamental liberty dan kebebasan ia-itu freedom, kerana saya dapati ra'ayat Malaysia yang mengaku mereka itu pemimpin<sup>2</sup> parti dan tokoh<sup>2</sup> parti

siasah telah menyalah-gunakan kebebasan yang di-beri oleh Kerajaan. Semua negara, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sama ada negara<sup>2</sup> yang kecil atau negara<sup>2</sup> yang besar dalam dunia ini ada mempunyai kebebasan-nya yang tersendiri, saya percaya barangkali orang<sup>2</sup> Indonesia sendiri berpendapat yang mereka ada kebebasan dalam negeri-nya, bagitu juga Russia dan Communist China. Jadi tujuan saya supaya Kerajaan menyemak bukanlah berma'ana supaya meminda berkenaan dengan kebebasan—liberty dan freedom ini in toto—semua sa-kali.

Saya memang hormatkan berkenaan dengan kebebasan wartawan. Wartawan<sup>2</sup> dalam negeri ini boleh dikatakan memainkan peranan mereka sangat<sup>2</sup> baik terutama-nya *Utusan Melayu* yang telah mencherminkan hasrat dan tujuan Kerajaan dalam negeri ini, sungguh pun tulisan Jawi tetapi tidak-lah *Utusan Melayu* ini memainkan sentiment perkauman. Yang saya harap ia-itu berkenaan dengan peranan wartawan<sup>2</sup> asing. Dalam ucapan saya, saya rasa satu atau dua tahun dahulu saya telah mendesak Kerajaan supaya memandang berat kepada sa-tengah<sup>2</sup> telatah wartawan<sup>2</sup> asing—wartawan<sup>2</sup> luar negeri supaya mengishtiharkan *persona-nongrata* terutama Alex Josey, Dennis Bloodworth dan lain<sup>2</sup> lagi yang bersangkutan paut dengan karangan<sup>2</sup> mereka di-dalam Majallah<sup>2</sup>, *The Times*, *Scotsman*, *Sunday Telegraph* dan lain<sup>2</sup> lagi. Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, peranan surat khabar ada-lah peranan besar. Saya sendiri takut dan Napoleon sendiri pun takut, dia telah mengatakan dia tidak takut kepada sa-ratus atau sa-ribu tombak tetapi dia takut dua surat khabar. Jadi, memang-lah surat khabar ini bukan-lah saya jack atau hendak puji<sup>2</sup>, tetapi memang peranan mereka ada-lah lebeh penting, dan Kerajaan harus mengambil perhatian berkenaan dengan surat khabar atau satu sharikat berita kebangsaan di-luar negeri sa-bagaimana Tass, Antara, Reuter, AP, UPI dan lain<sup>2</sup> lagi. Kerana, chuba kita lihat, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berkenaan dengan telatah Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri Singapura, Enche' Lee Kuan Yew, apa

yang di-uchapkan-nya di-New Zealand, Australia dan lain<sup>2</sup> tempat lagi dalam *Sunday Telegraph* pada 28 haribulan Mach, tetapi malang-nya tiada siapa juga wartawan<sup>2</sup> kita yang ada di-luar negeri untuk menjawab. Kalau sa-kiranya ada sharikat<sup>2</sup> berita kebangsaan yang di-punya'i oleh Kerajaan Malaysia maka dapat-lah wartawan<sup>2</sup> ini menangkis segala tuduhan<sup>2</sup> yang tidak bertanggung-jawab oleh Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri—Lee Kuan Yew atau siapa<sup>2</sup> juga.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya hanya hendak berchakap dalam dua soal yang penting ia-itu soal dalam negeri dan luar negeri. Apa yang saya chakapkan ini ia-lah sa-bahagian daripada soal<sup>2</sup> dalam negeri. Hari ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada pula surat khabar keluaran *Sunday Times*—“Lee Gives a Hint”: “Last night spoke of the possibility of partition as an alternative arrangement”—partition, pula. Jadi, saya tidak tahu-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berkenaan dengan telatah Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri Singapura itu. Saya anggap beliau ini sa-bagai belut—eel, bukan belut laut tetapi belut darat. Belut darat yang kita tahu mempunyai dua kepala, chukup lichin. Jadi, apa yang di-uchapkan di-dalam Dewan ini, apa yang di-uchapkan di-luar Dewan, di-dalam pertubohan<sup>2</sup> atau jamuan<sup>2</sup> yang di-buat oleh persatuan<sup>2</sup> di-luar Dewan ini berlainan. Kalau kita membuat analisa yang halus, sa-benar<sup>2</sup>-nya Yang Berhormat Enche' Lee Kuan Yew ini ada-lah sa-orang yang tidak tahu-lah saya hendak mengatakan, dia terlampau ambitious—over ambitious—dan saya takut satu hari beliau akan jadi Julius Caesar (*Ketawa*). Siapa hendak jadi Brutus, saya tidak tahu. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau Yang Berhormat Enche' Lee Kuan Yew itu berpekek di-dalam Dewan ini atau di-luar mengatakan yang beliau benar<sup>2</sup> memperjuangkan soal Malaysian Malaysia, ini saya rasa, ra'ayat sendiri faham dan ra'ayat sendiri tahu tujuannya yang sa-benar. Bukan-lah tujuannya Malaysian Malaysia tetapi tujuannya ia-lah satu masaalah perkauman. Kerana, bukan-lah saya sa-bagai UMNO atau orang Melayu menudoh tetapi parti Socialist Front sendiri

menudoh—Yang Berhormat daripada Dato Kramat, Setia-usaha Socialist Front, Enche' Lim Kean Siew, telah menudoh dalam surat khabar beberapa lama dahulu mengatakan Parti Perkauman, Enche' Lee Kuan Yew, membawa soal<sup>2</sup> perkauman. Bagitu juga Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Batu, Barisan Socialist, semua menudoh adakah Yang Berhormat dari Batu itu orang Melayu, ada-kah Ahli daripada Dato Kramat orang Melayu dan Barisan Socialist orang Melayu? Mereka sendiri mengatakan yang Enche' Lee Kuan Yew ia-lah sa-orang yang memperjuangkan Socialism China.

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** Untok penjelasan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kami menudoh Enche' Lee Kuan Yew oleh sebab kami bukan communal.

**Enche' Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman:** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, siasah ini memang kotor, kotor politik ini, saya mithalkan bagi telur busok. Busok itu akan melibatkan bukan sahaja partinya tetapi semua parti. Jadi saya berharap, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kepada Yang Berhormat Enche' Lee Kuan Yew jangan-lah terlalu menganggap yang beliau itu sa-bagai ayam jantan. Ayam jantan kerana dia selalu berkokok<sup>2</sup> berderai<sup>2</sup> tetapi dia tidak tahu apa yang jadi pada ekor-nya berlumoran dengan tahi. Dia hendak lihat-kah, dia suka-kah ekor-nya berlumoran dengan tahi kerana ayam jantan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, selalu mengangkat kepala-nya di-atas bila dia berkokok. Jadi dia suka berkokok di-sana sini untok menchari satu modal politik.

**Mr Speaker:** Perkara Yang Berhormat kata belakang-nya ada kotor itu, lebeh baik terek balek daripada menggunakan perkataan yang tidak sesuai.

**Enche' Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman:** Terima kaseh, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya terek balek, tetapi kotor.

Berkenaan dengan Yang Berhormat itu, tidak payah-lah saya berchakap panjang kerana pehak Ahli boleh di-katakan di-dalam Dewan ini telah pun berchakap panjang lebar berkenaan Ahli Yang Berhormat. Tetapi satu sahaja sa-bagai Parliamenterian dan

beliau juga Ahli Parliamenterian, saya menasihatkan supaya beliau itu buat sa-bagai rasmi padi—padi ini makin berat makin berisi, makin dia tundok. Jangan, sa-bagai orang tua<sup>2</sup> kata, sa-bagai babi. Babi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, makin gemok, makin tegap badan-nya, mata-nya makin kechil. Jadi tidak melihat kesenangan, kemewahan yang di-beri. Jadi kemewahan yang di-beri dia tidak nampak, mata-nya sa-makin kechil. Ini-lah rasmi babi jangan di-bawa. Itu yang akhir sa-kali nasihat saya kepada Yang Berhormat.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita sedar hari ini ia-itu Kerajaan sedang membelanjakan \$1.6 juta untok pertahanan dalam sa-hari dan lebeh kurang \$575 juta sa-tahun untok mempertahankan sa-tiap inchi negara dari pencherobohan. Adakah ini berma'ana, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, yang Kerajaan membelanjakan wang sa-bagini banyak untok menjaga kepentingan Wakil<sup>2</sup> Ra'ayat. Ini mesti satu soal yang kita harus tanya. Sa-benar<sup>2</sup>-nya wang ini di-belanjakan untok kepentingan semua kaum, semua bangsa dan semua lapisan masharakat yang ada dalam Malaysia ini termasuk tokoh<sup>2</sup> dalam Kesatuan<sup>2</sup> Sa-kerja sa-bagai M.T.U.C. dan CUEPACS. Saya dapati, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bulletin<sup>2</sup> daripada CUEPACS boleh di-katakan tiap<sup>2</sup> dua minggu sa-kali pada tiap<sup>2</sup> kali. Tetapi pada kali ini saya lihat berbagai<sup>2</sup> kechaman yang di-buat oleh CUEPACS terhadap Kerajaan—"The Black Day" konon-nya. Habis! Jadi kalau-lah tokoh<sup>2</sup> ini ambil perhatian, dengar radio atau lihat T.V. apabila askar<sup>2</sup> kita bernyanyi, di-situ kita akan dengar rayuan daripada askar<sup>2</sup> itu, apa bunyi-nya: "Berdo'a-lah agar Malaysia berjaya dan jikalau kami terkorban, taborkan bunga di-pusara." Jadi ini patut-lah kita kenangkan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Mereka berdo'a, berharap supaya kita berdo'a Malaysia berjaya dan kalau mereka gugor di-medan peperangan tolong taborkan bunga. Mereka sanggup berjuang mempertahankan negara, tidak kira siang, tidak kira malam, panas terek atau halilintar, petir untok menjaga kita semua meninggalkan anak isteri, ibu bapa yang mereka kasehi. Patut tokoh<sup>2</sup> ini sedar yang negara kita sedang di-ancham,

perajurit<sup>2</sup> sedang mempertahankan, patut mereka ini menggesa Kerajaan membela nasib mereka ini, tetapi kita tidak dengar sa-orang daripada askar atau polis mendesak Kerajaan meminta overtime, meminta itu, meminta ini, tetapi hanya \$2,000 atau \$3,000 apabila mereka terkorban.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita ada 4 pengorbanan yang patut kita buat tiap<sup>2</sup> sa-orang manusia ia-itu fikiran, tenaga, wang ringgit dan nyawa. Patut tokoh<sup>2</sup> Kesatuan atau Pemimpin<sup>2</sup> Kesatuan Sa-kerja ini tanya balek pada diri mereka sendiri apa-kah pengorbanan yang mereka telah buat? Chuba lihat di-Pusat<sup>2</sup> Pendaftaran Buroh yang ada, tidak kurang daripada 80,000 orang yang menganggor dan pada akhir tahun ini tidak dapat tidak 100,000 orang yang menganggor. Patut tokoh<sup>2</sup> itu berunding, memberi fikiran dan kerjasama dengan Kerajaan supaya mengatasi soal penganggoran dan berjuang. Saya akan sokong kalau sa-kira-nya mereka berjuang benar<sup>2</sup> untok kaum buroh yang Division IV atau buroh<sup>2</sup> yang bergaji hari. Jangan-lah hanya lihat kepada orang<sup>2</sup> tingkat atasan sahaja.

Sekarang, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya rasa tentu-lah ra'ayat dalam negeri ini akan sambut baik berkenaan dengan Bond Pertahanan. Kerana kita akan mendapat sambutan yang baik, oleh sebab mereka berharap kepada faedah, tetapi apa yang mengharukan saya ia-lah sebab sa-lama sa-tahun lebeh yang Kerajaan telah menganjorkan Derma Pertahanan Negara, kita hanya dapat mengumpul \$5 juta sahaja. Wal-hal beratus<sup>2</sup> jutawan ada dalam negeri ini. Kalau benar<sup>2</sup> kita kenangkan nasib negara kita pada hari ini, patut di-dalam tempoh satu bulan, kita boleh dapat Derma Pertahanan \$500,000 atau \$1 juta dengan senang sahaja dan saya berharap-lah kepada segala jutawan yang ada di-dalam Malaysia supaya menghulurkan derma yang banyak lagi tidak payah kita mengharapkan pegawai<sup>2</sup> Kerajaan mengeluarkan 10 peratus atau 5 peratus kerana mereka juga telah pun berkorban untok fikiran dan tenaga mereka dalam pekerjaan.

Sekarang, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka juga menyentoh sedikit sahaja

soal luar negeri. Dalam soal luar negeri ini, saya menguchapkan tahniah dan terima kaseh kepada Yang Amat Berhormat Tun Abdul Razak dan rombongan-nya yang telah pun mendapat kejayaan besar dalam kunjongannya ka-negara<sup>2</sup> Afrika dan Timor Tengah dan saya perchaya rombongan Yang Berhormat Menteri Buroh, Enche' Manickavasagam juga akan mendapat kejayaan yang besar. Tetapi soal sekarang ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam sa'at negara kita di-cherobohi, kita berharap supaya dapat kita menchari kawan lebeh banyak. Kita tidak boleh mengharapkan sa-mata<sup>2</sup> kepada negara Commonwealth sahaja. Jadi kalau-lah keadaan dalam negeri kita, sa-bagai telatah Yang Berhormat tadi. "Partition" itu dan ini, jadi di-mana-kah sambutan yang akan kita dapat.

Daripada mana-kah, kerana kalau negeri kita berkuchar-kachir, tentu-lah orang<sup>2</sup> yang hendak berkawan dengan kita rasa lemah. Negeri Malaysia yang belum lagi aman di-antara satu kaum dengan yang lain, bertengkar dan membuat itu dan ini. Jadi, apa-kah guna-nya kita champor tangan, atau menyebelahi pada Malaysia supaya dapat hadir dalam persidangan di-Algeria pada bulan Jun ini.

Ini-lah saya rasa Yang Berhormat itu patut tutup mulut-nya dan perhatikan soal<sup>2</sup> dan masaalah yang kita hadapi sekarang.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, apa yang saya katakan tadi pergolakan siasah hari ini sudah patut bagi kesedaran kepada kita berkenaan dengan peranan yang lebeh penting yang patut kita ambil dalam negara<sup>2</sup> Afrika dan Timor Tengah. Saya rasa patut-lah Bangsa<sup>2</sup> Bersatu, ia-itu Piagam Bangsa<sup>2</sup> Bersatu di-semak sa-mula oleh Court International—Mahkamah Antara Bangsa supaya dapat mengadakan satu pasokan polis, atau Askar Antara Bangsa supaya dapat kita merayu kepada Bangsa<sup>2</sup> Bersatu menghantar askar<sup>2</sup> orang Afrika yang berada di-dalam Commonwealth, umpama-nya seperti Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania, Tanganyika supaya dapat menghantar askar<sup>2</sup> mereka dan kita tempatkan di-sempadan Sarawak dan Sabah, kerana ini dengan sendiri-nya,

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, askar<sup>2</sup> ini akan menjadi saksi, kerana kalau askar<sup>2</sup> British sahaja, atau New Zealand, atau Australia di-tempatkan di-sini, walau bagaimana sa-kali pun kita merayu, kita beritahu kepada negara<sup>2</sup> di-Afrika, atau di-luar negeri, mereka mengatakan yang kita ada-lah sa-buah negara neo-colonialist, kerana askar<sup>2</sup> British, sunggoh pun kita ada Pakatan Pertahanan atau Perjanjian Pertahanan dengan British, tetapi kenapa-kah kita tidak boleh merayu kepada negara<sup>2</sup> Afrika yang ada di-dalam Commonwealth itu sendiri, di-dalam negeri Commonwealth sa-bagaimana yang saya katakan tadi negeri<sup>2</sup> Uganda, Kenya, atau pun negara<sup>2</sup> Asia, seperti Pakistan, India, Ceylon supaya menghantar askar<sup>2</sup> mereka untuk mengambil tempat dan di-undorkan askar<sup>2</sup> British itu ka-belakang. Jadi, kita dapat tahu dan mereka ini dapat tahu dengan menjadi saksi siapa yang mencheroboh, ada-kah kita yang mencheroboh, atau Indonesia yang mencheroboh negara kita.

Indonesia ini memang degil dan kunchu<sup>2</sup>-nya atau pun orang<sup>2</sup> yang berkomplot dengan-nya itu degil, ta' mahu perchaya yang kita ini sa-benar<sup>2</sup>-nya sa-buah negara yang merdeka dan berdaulat, ia-itu Malaysia.

Pada akhir-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka menguchapkan tahniah kepada Yang Amat Berhormat Perdana Menteri Malaysia yang telah pun menchadangkan supaya di-adakan satu Pertubohan Setia Kawan Negara<sup>2</sup> Asia. Saya rasa perkara ini akan di-sambut baik oleh negara<sup>2</sup> Asia, dan juga saya harap supaya Yang Amat Berhormat Perdana Menteri Malaysia akan mengambil initiative sa-kali lagi untuk menubuhkan satu Pertubohan Commonwealth Negara<sup>2</sup> Islam, kerana pada pendapat saya apabila 450 juta umat Islam ini bersatu, maka dengan sendirinya Indonesia akan dapat membenamkan segala pertikaian politik-nya demi kepentingan persaudaraan orang<sup>2</sup> Islam. Jadi, dengan sendiri-nya kita akan dapat sa-kali lagi, dengan takdir Tuhan, akan merapatkan perhubungan kita dengan Indonesia. Sekian.

**The Minister of Finance (Enche' Tan Siew Sin):** Mr Speaker, Sir, I was not present in this House when the Honour-

able Mr Lee Kuan Yew spoke. I came towards the end, and so I thought I would get a full copy of his speech in order to distil from it the profound words of wisdom which he uttered. When I got this speech, I noticed that it ran to about thirty or so pages. I, therefore, took a red pencil and felt that, as he always urges that we should try to convince others by the force of reason and argument, I should try to reciprocate the compliment.

Mr Speaker, Sir, as a result, I underlined the points which I felt needed a reply, and I would like to assure this House that wherever possible, I have tried my best, although probably the Honourable Members of the P.A.P. benches will not believe it, to give them the benefit of the doubt whenever such a doubt should occur.

The sad conclusion to which I have come is that very rarely in my life have I heard, if I may paraphrase a famous phrase of Churchill, "so little thought compressed into so many words". Very briefly, I think we can say that Mr Lee Kuan Yew's thirty-page speech boils down to two points. In the first place, he says that the Alliance has failed to project the concept or to practise the policy of a Malaysian Malaysia. The second major point which he made is that this Government has not done enough, or has not provided sufficient funds for rural uplift. In regard to the latter point, that is, the failure of the Government's policy on the subject of rural uplift, I believe my Honourable friend and colleague, the Minister of Commerce and Industry, has dealt adequately with this point. In any case, Mr Lee has confined only a very small portion of his speech to this particular item.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I hope the Honourable Members of this House will bear with me. I would like to confine the first part of my speech to dealing with the points which have been raised by the Honourable Prime Minister of Singapore. The first point which he makes is that we, the Alliance Government, should abide by the Constitution and should preserve the fundamental rights which are enshrined in the Constitution of Malaysia. He hastens to

assure us that he accepts, I think, without any reservation, Article 153 of the Constitution, that is the Article which deals with the special position of the Malays. While on this subject, I would like to emphasise again that this Article is not a creation of the Alliance Government. This Article did not come into force on 31st August, 1957, that is the date on which we achieved independence for the Federation of Malaya. This, in fact, was a carry over not only from the 1948 Federation Agreement, it was the policy of the Government even pre-war and was embodied in the 1948 Federation of Malaya Agreement in much more comprehensive terms. Anyway, I will not dwell further on this because Mr Lee has assured us that he accepts this provision. If we set aside this particular subject, I really wonder in what way this Government can be accused of not accepting the concept of a Malaysian Malaysia, because this is the only Article in the entire Constitution, which stipulates that Malays will be in any way different from the other races inhabiting Malaysia.

Mr Lee, however, made the other point that we have prohibited strikes, but he conveniently forgets that all that we have done at the moment is to put the States of Malaya in roughly the same position as Singapore. As Honourable Members are aware—and I think as many people outside this House are aware—the position in Singapore is that—I am open to correction, and Honourable Members on the P.A.P. benches can correct me if I am wrong—the general position in Singapore is that the Government is in a position to defer a strike by submitting an industrial dispute to arbitration, and when a dispute is submitted to arbitration then the parties to the dispute will have to defer any industrial action, which they may contemplate, refer the matter to arbitration, and then accept the findings of the arbitration court which has been set up under the relevant Ordinance. In the States of Malaya, I agree, the position is slightly different, in the sense that this ruling in regard to arbitration only applies to private industrial disputes. In so far as Government disputes with

its own unions are concerned, we have set up this Salaries Commission, and I think it is reasonable to lay down that where a Salaries Commission is already in session, it would be in the interest of the country to defer any threat of industrial action for the time being, particularly in view of the fact that this country is now passing through a most serious emergency.

He also, I think, castigates the Government—that is Mr Lee—for limiting the right of appeal to the Privy Council. I have, Mr Speaker, Sir, deliberately used the word “limited”, because what the Government intends is a very limited exercise. All that we have proposed in the Bill which, I think, has come up for first reading but which is not likely to proceed further until the next meeting of Parliament in July or thereabouts, is that as a first stage, criminal appeals and the appeals in constitutional cases will not go to the Privy Council. In this matter, Mr Speaker, Sir, I think it is well to recall that we in Malaysia, previously in the States of Malaya and Singapore, have had thousands, literally thousands, of our students passing law and subsequently practising either as advocates and solicitors or as judges in recent years. I, therefore, say that we have in this country itself a fairly adequate reservoir, to put it no higher, of local talent; and one cannot escape the conclusion that the reason why there is such vociferous opposition to this very limited restriction is that those who are opposing it basically have no faith in the calibre of the lawyers in our country. That, I think, is the real reason, and I suggest also with very great sorrow . . . .

**Enche' E. W. Barker (Singapore):** On a point of clarification, Sir. Is the Minister aware that all the Bar Committees throughout Malaysia are against the proposed amendment?

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** Mr Speaker, Sir, that, I think, is not really indicative of the situation in this country. Firstly, I am not sure that all the lawyers in this country are against it. We know that certain resolutions have been passed by certain committees, but that really means nothing if we know how

things work in this country but I think it must be accepted that those who are against this proposal basically have no faith in our people. It is very illuminating, if I can recall a bit, that these were the very same people, who were against independence in 1957 for the Federation of Malaya. I can recall, only too vividly, when we wanted independence before 1957, we had the same arguments: "We are not ready. There will be clashes between the Malays and Chinese, and so on." We hear the same reasons now, and to me it is extremely surprising that this should come from, of all people, those who pretend to be ardent nationalists. To me it is also very extraordinary that those—in particular Mr Lee Kuan Yew—who accuse us of being inclined to be undemocratic should be the worst offenders in this respect. My Honourable friend and colleague the Minister of Home Affairs has already pointed out that since September 1963, and this is about nearly 18 months ago, the Singapore Government has held something like two meetings of the Singapore Legislative Assembly. That is their idea of democracy. These are the democrats, who talk so loudly about democracy. (HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Shame!). One would have thought that when you yourselves incline to this sort of practice you would at least have kept quiet on this point—but I suppose as my Honourable colleague the Minister of Home Affairs has told this House, that Honourable Members of the P.A.P. benches are under the impression that the rest of Malaysia are so stupid that whatever they say will be accepted as gospel truth. I do not want to use strong language, but I think that statement about democracy is about the most nauseating hypocrisy I have ever heard in my life. (HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!). In this speech, the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew talks about "the basis on which solemnly and in good faith we came to Malaysia." Now, this is an exact quotation from his speech. Has anything changed then? Has the Central Government during these first 18 months of Malaysia done anything which can be construed with good reason as chang-

ing the concept of or the basis on which Malaysia was formed less than two years ago?

It is very significant that in his 1½-hour long speech, in which he repeated himself times without number, he did not give one single instance, did not quote any evidence to substantiate his charge that the Central Government does not believe in what he chooses to call a Malaysian Malaysia. He rambles all over the place: he makes charges, innuendoes, insinuations, but there was not one specific instance to substantiate his charge. In this connection, Mr Speaker, Sir, I hope you will allow me if I quote from some of his speeches in the past. This is very relevant because he specifically accused us of not having kept our word since he entered Malaysia. On the 29th September, 1963, addressing a huge rally to introduce the new Assemblymen and defining the tasks ahead, Premier Lee Kuan Yew said, according to the *Straits Times* of this date, "Our intention and our purpose is to work together with the Central Government for the benefit of Singapore and Malaysia."

Well, this is even more interesting. This was just one year ago on the 24th April, 1964, when the election campaign for the States of Malaya was about the end. When the P.A.P. announced that its two P.A.P. candidates for the Johore Bahru Parliamentary and State elections were being withdrawn from the contest, as they were facing UMNO candidates in these two constituencies, Mr Lee, according to the *Straits Times* of 25th April, 1964, said as follows:

"The rational choice in this election was to vote for the UMNO"—

this was only thirteen months ago.

On the 19th August, 1964, Mr Lee Kuan Yew, who accompanied the Honourable Prime Minister on his visit to Geylang Serai said, according to the *Straits Times* of 20th August, 1964:

"The Tengku was the only man with the capacity to solve the problems now confronting Malaysia. We trust him; that's the reason we joined Malaysia." (*Applause*).

Mr Speaker, Sir, 20th August, 1964 is only nine months ago. I think all of us will agree that although the Tengku is older since then (*Laughter*) he has not changed very much—at least not basically (*Laughter*)—and yet we see from Mr Lee Kuan Yew's utterances that his attitude towards the Tengku and the UMNO today is vastly and radically different from what it was only nine months ago, or less than nine months ago. In fact, there are indications—I will not quote them—that when Mr Lee visited Australia he said something quite different; anyway I will not quote what he said there, although I have got a copy here.

Now, we come to his favourite subject of percentages, and this is where, I think, the trouble started. Mr Lee, according to the *Sin Chew Jit Poh* of 5th May, 1965, said as follows:

“The Malays in the whole of Malaysia, including Singapore, Sarawak and Sabah, consist of 39 per cent of the total population; Chinese comprise 42 per cent of the Malaysian population.”

Then—this is the final one—in a Singapore Government Press Statement, Mr Lee said as follows on the 20th September, 1964, when speaking at the opening of the new building of the Singapore Chinese Chamber of Commerce—

“This symmetry of concrete and green glazed tiles tilting elegantly at the eaves and with two lions standing guard over its entrance speak of the security of the Chinese in Malaysia”—mind you, security of the Chinese in Malaysia—“It is a symbol of a great and proud heritage. It speaks of security for it is concrete proof of the qualities of thrift and industry of the people who have come to the South Seas and made good and settled with the indigenous people here.”

Now, this is again eight or nine months ago, and in this statement, which I presume must be a considered statement, because it is part of a Singapore Government Press Statement, Mr Lee speaks of the security of the Chinese in Malaysia. We would like to know on this side of the House what has happened in the intervening period to indicate that the Chinese or, for that matter, any people in Malaysia are less secure.

My Honourable friend, the Member for Johor Tenggara, has asked, “Why

has Mr Lee regretted joining Malaysia?” I did not wish to say so, but I think it is patently clear to anybody who studies the situation that the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew is frustrated, simply because he finds his avenues to power too effectively blocked for his liking and, therefore, he feels that something must be done to clear the obstacles in his path; and hence, as my Honourable friend, the Minister of Education said only a few days ago, “What Mr Lee wants is not so much a “Malaysian Malaysia” or a “Chinese Malaysia”, because I am not sure the Chinese will be happy under Mr Lee, even though he himself may think otherwise. What he wants is a “Lee Kuan Yew Malaysia”. (*Applause*). That, I think, is nearer the mark.

Mr Lee also that it is essential that nobody should be left in any doubt as to where we stand. I take it that in this case “we” refers to the Singapore Government and the P.A.P. I cannot say how much we appreciate that statement that it is very essential to know where we stand with each other—where the P.A.P. stand with us and where we stand with the P.A.P. However, we are certain of one thing: that not even his Party probably knows where he himself sometimes stand. (*Applause*) (*Laughter*). We certainly would like to know where he stands on some basic issues. He always tells us—he never ceases to remind us—that it (the P.A.P.) is a loyal Opposition, that the P.A.P. can be regarded as a loyal Opposition and yet we remember, because it does not take much effort to remember, that Mr Lee Kuan Yew went to Moscow even when the Tengku advised him not to go. He communicated with the Chinese Prime Minister, Mr Chou En Lai, and recently he went overseas to secure support for himself and his Government against the Central Government. Mr Speaker, Sir, this may not sound very reprehensible. You can say, “What is wrong with going overseas on a tour?”—though admittedly, he also got a little holiday in the process—to propagate the concept of Malaysia, to speak about Singapore and speak about Malaysia. But it is clear from the utterances which Mr Lee made

when he was in Australia and New Zealand, for example, that his purpose in going overseas was not so much to propagate the concept of Malaysia; it was not so much to propagate the image of Singapore, or Malaysia, to the world, it was to attract support for Singapore, particularly for himself, against the Central Government. I suggest that that was an act of disloyalty. (HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear! hear!) (SEVERAL HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Traitor!) We do not dispute Mr Lee's right to go overseas. We do not dispute Mr Lee's right to have his own opinion, however much that opinion may be different from ours. But we say—and I think we are on good ground here—that if you have a disagreement with the Central Government, that if any state disagrees with the Central Government, it should talk it over with the Central Government; it should try to resolve its differences in private instead of telling those differences to the rest of the world, instead of shouting at the top of its voice to the rest of the world, particularly in a foreign country. After all, we have received Members of the Opposition of other countries and one thing we know is that whenever Members of such Opposition come to this country they do not talk against their Government; they have not even talked privately against their Government. We knew they could not agree, otherwise they will not be in the Opposition *vis-a-vis* their own Government. However, they do not go to the housetops, and shout every day against the Central Government. That certainly is not democracy. It may be the P.A.P.'s brand of democracy, but it certainly is not Parliamentary democracy as practised in the oldest democracies of the world. (HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear! hear!) (*Applause*). It is, I think, very significant that the entire career of the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew does not bear very close examination. I do not wish to be personal, but I think generally speaking it is fair to say that his bitterest enemies are those who were once his closest friends. I shall not say more than that. I think that speaks volumes and that very fact is far more eloquent than any words. I have got

any number of instances, but I do not wish to be personal. But we should remember that just before Malaysia he came practically crawling to the Tunku asking the Tunku to help him against the Barisan Sosialis. He was with the Tunku night and day wriggling golf invitations, and so on in order to show to the people of Singapore how close he was to the Tunku, and yet now with Malaysia things have taken an entirely different turn.

The Honourable Member for Tanjong asked us—I think this point was also made by Mr Lee Kuan Yew—why we have suspended local elections and he deduces from that fact, or because of that, that we do not believe in democracy. We also remember that not so long ago the P.A.P. Government suspended City Council elections in Singapore. . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Abolished!

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** Abolished—that is right. In any case, we have suspended local elections only for the time being as a temporary measure because of the Emergency. In the case of the P.A.P., City Council elections in Singapore have been permanently abolished. Now, if you compare the two, I think certainly the action of the P.A.P. Government is far less democratic than that of our own.

**Enche' Wee Toon Boon (Singapore):** On a point of clarification, Mr Speaker, Sir, just now the Minister of Finance said that the State of Singapore abolished local council elections, but there is a difference there. That was an item in our Party Manifesto which was put to the public. It was only after we had won the elections that we carried out the peoples' mandate; whereas in the case of the Central Government, this was done even without the courtesy of tabling a motion or a Bill for members of this House to discuss it (*Applause*).

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** The Honourable Member need not worry. We have no intention of abolishing elections to Federal and State Legislatures and in the forthcoming elections we can debate

this point and see whether or not we have the support of the electorate on this issue.

Mr Lee Kuan Yew also stated that we have not done enough for the rural areas. As I have said, my Honourable friend, the Minister of Commerce and Industry has already answered that point, but I wish to make one more point. When Mr Lee Kuan Yew quoted only the estimates of the Ministry of Agriculture and Co-operatives of only \$18 million for 1964, he conveniently forgot that we have poured about ten times that amount into the rural areas through the Ministry of Rural and National Development. He is aware, as well as anyone of us, of the vast land development schemes we have already initiated—the vast F.L.D.A. schemes, the group settlement schemes, the irrigation schemes and others—but he conveniently forgets all that and concentrates only on one point. If I may say so, he is a pastmaster of half-truth (*Laughter*).

It is also very significant that at the time of the 1964 general election, his accusation was the exact opposite. He said then, in order to win what might be called urban support i.e. the support of the people in the urban areas, i.e., the Chinese section of the population, that the Alliance Government had done too much for the rural areas and not enough for the urban areas. That was only one year ago. In fact, he campaigned very strongly on this point and yet one year later he reverses himself completely.

The other point which he made was that we were taxing the poor to pay for the defence of this country. I suggest, Sir, that it is sheer effrontery for him to talk like this, and I will say why. Up to about 18 months ago the Central Provident Fund in Singapore paid only 2½ per cent per annum to its contributors. Now, all of us know that the Provident Fund caters for the poorest section of the population. It certainly does not cater for the millionaires or for the rich because they do not have any need for a provident fund, and yet the Singapore Government, which must have received between 5½ per cent to 5¾ per cent for

its investments, returned only 2½ per cent to the workers. This, I think, is reprehensible by any standard. In the first place, this money belongs to the workers, it is theirs by right because you use their money to invest and it is clear that by any standard of justice you should return practically the whole lot back to them less the cost of administration. In the case of the States of Malaya, we returned about 4 per cent. I think my figure of 5½ per cent is roughly correct unless the Singapore Government is grossly inefficient, which they always claim they are not, for not having got their investments. In any case, even if you are moderately efficient you should get 5½ per cent for a long term loan, and yet they returned only 2½ per cent to their workers. It was only after constant proddings by Kuala Lumpur, that recently they bumped up the rate to 5 or 5¼ per cent. That is an example of the solicitude of the P.A.P. for the poor in Singapore. I say, Mr Speaker, Sir, that this act of theirs, and this involves not one million dollars, it involves hundreds of millions of dollars, was I think the grossest act of deception on the part of the Singapore Government towards the workers of Singapore (*Applause*)—thousands of them.

Another even better instance of P.A.P. double talk was their attitude towards the pioneer companies. In the States of Malaya, for example, we have always urged, though it is not in the legislation, that pioneer firms, especially pioneer firms based on foreign capital, should at least invite domestic capital to participate in its equity. This I think needs no elaboration, because it is so obvious. In the case of the States of Malaya, I think we can say that the vast majority, if not all the firms, which have been granted pioneer status, have complied with this advice from the Government. In the case of the so-called socialist Government of Singapore, we have noted any number of cases where pioneer certificates have been handed to firms in which 100 per cent of the equity was owned by foreign nationals. That is an example again of the P.A.P. attitude towards big business and foreign big business to boot.

Mr Lee Kuan Yew in his speech says, I quote—

“We never run away from the open confrontation as our friends from the Barisan Sosialis can testify. We love it; we relish the prospect of a meeting of minds, a conflict of ideas, not of force. We are gentle people who believe very firmly in ideas.”

Now, this I think is even a better statement and yet it is probably the most untrue of the lot. (*Laughter*). I think if Mr Lee is afraid of anybody, he certainly is afraid of the Barisan Sosialis. A few months before Malaysia, he suggested to us that two things should be done in order to secure what he called the stability of Singapore. He suggested that where a person had been elected to the Legislative Assembly as the candidate of a political party, he will vacate his seat if he resigns from the party, or he is expelled from the party. Now, what is the implication of this statement? That means that if today you are elected to the Singapore State Legislative Assembly on a P.A.P. ticket and for some reason or other, say three months later, Mr Lee does not like your face—as happened in the case of Mr Ong Eng Guan—he says, “You leave the party, or I will expel you”. Then that person automatically vacates his seat in the Singapore Legislative Assembly. That I think is certainly undemocratic, we have got to be very charitable to describe that as democracy. But Mr Lee went even further. He suggested that, starting from that, if under such circumstances a seat is vacated, there should be no election at all but the party concerned will nominate someone to fill that vacancy without a by-election. That is the P.A.P. idea of democracy (HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Shame! shame!). I must admit that when this proposal was put forward to the Central Government we were horrified. We could not believe that the P.A.P. could even consider this sort of proposal, and that is P.A.P. democracy for you. That is what Mr Lee calls “the prospect of a meeting of minds, a conflict of ideas.” (*Laughter*) (*interruption*).

**Dr Lim Chong Eu (Tanjong):** Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification. In fact, on who influenced whom, the P.A.P. Government influenced the

Central Government, or the Central Government prevailed in its better concept of democracy, if I remember correctly, the terms, whereby the Local Authorities Elections were suspended, provided for an almost identical situation as recommended by Mr Lee nine months ago.

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** The Honourable Member for Tanjong is barking up the wrong tree. (*Laughter*). There was no question of the Singapore State Government influencing the Central Government. This proposal was put forward in all seriousness to the Central Government, and we rejected it—and that was where the matter lay, but I would like to make it clear that this proposal concerned elections to the Singapore Legislative Assembly, which has nothing to do with the elections in the States of Malaya.

Mr Speaker, Sir, having said all these, I would like to make it clear that we in the Central Government, whatever our differences with the Singapore Government might be, have no quarrel with the people of Singapore. (*Applause*). Not only do we wish them well, we also want them to progress as they should progress bearing in mind some of the great qualities which they possess in so marked a degree. When our Honourable Prime Minister, our beloved Tunku, stated that he wanted Singapore to become the New York of Malaysia, I knew he meant every word of what he said. Let us admit, however, that with the best will in the world it is not so easy to co-operate with a State Government, which clearly has no intention of co-operating with the Central Government, except in so far as it suits it to do so. I do not make this statement without good reason and, in fact, I can substantiate what I say. I can give examples, but I do not wish to waste the time of this House. It, however, has to be conceded that, and I am sorry to say this, so long as Mr Lee Kuan Yew is the Prime Minister of Singapore, one can almost say that it will be far easier for the camel to go through the proverbial needle's eye than for the Central Government to

co-operate with the Government of Singapore.

Mr Speaker, Sir, Mr Lee's real masterpiece fortunately appeared only this morning. I regard this as his real masterpiece. If the newspapers are to be believed, in a speech which he made, I think, in Singapore last night, he suggested that there should be partition if the Central Government refuses to accept his concept of a Malaysian Malaysia. As I have said already, the concept of a Malaysian Malaysia was thought of by the Central Government and was put into practice long before Mr Lee came into politics. (*Applause*). I say that there would have been no Alliance at all if we had not believed in a Malaysian Malaysia. (*Applause*). The concept of a Malaysian Malaysia was born on the day the Alliance was born. If there is to be a Malaysian Malaysia at all, and if any credit is to be given, it is to be given to the Alliance and not to the P.A.P. (*Applause*). Now, what is the trouble with the P.A.P.? I can assure Honourable Members on the P.A.P. benches that we are not worried when they say they want to fight us. We do not worry if they say they are more efficient than the Central Government. Even that is debatable. Time will show whether we or they are more efficient. In fact, I am not even sure that their financial policies are right, but we will not discuss it now. I think eighteen months from now we will see who has got the better policies. We do not worry when Mr Lee Kuan Yew says either by implication or explicitly that he wants to become the Prime Minister of Malaysia. Let us see. We, like him, are prepared for the meeting of minds and for the open contest, otherwise we will not be where we are today. We do not even worry if Mr Lee Kuan Yew is over-ambitious. After all, there is no harm in being over-ambitious. It is probably a sign that he has got talent, some of which is, probably fairly desirable.

Now, what is our greatest worry about the P.A.P.? I think the greatest danger about the P.A.P. and, particularly, its leader, that is the Secretary-General and the Prime Minister of

Singapore, is that it is the greatest disruptive force in the entire history of Malaya and Malaysia. This proposal which was made last night proves it beyond all shadow of doubt. Now, Mr Lee Kuan Yew, if the newspaper is correct, proposed last night that if Malaysia cannot succeed from his standpoint, not from the standpoint of the people of Malaysia, then we should do this: take away Singapore—I think he says—Malacca (*Laughter*) . . .

**Dato' Dr Ismail:** Take him away with it! (*Laughter*).

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** . . . Penang, Sabah and Sarawak and let these five States form a separate federation. Now, in order to do this, you clearly must have a vote, a referendum, and there are many States—I think probably Perak, Johore and Selangor are the best examples—where the numbers of the Malays and the Chinese are roughly about equal.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: More Chinese!

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** It does not matter whether they are more or less: roughly they are equal—it may be 55 to 45; 47 to 53—but roughly they are equal. If today a suggestion is made that Perak should go to Singapore and Johore to Kuala Lumpur, obviously, there will be many people, hundreds and thousands of people, who will not be happy with the decision. If that were to be implemented, either you have a wholesale removal of families or those who are dissatisfied will have to remain there by force. One does not have to be a political genius to, I think, guess that this sort of exercise can only be undertaken at the point of the sword. We have seen it done in India. India was much easier, because that was before independence, where things had not settled down. It was done in Cyprus, but even in India, it led to bloodshed and millions of people there were displaced. What it did was to create millions of refugees, and the bitterness which partition created in India nearly twenty years ago, has still not died down. In the case of Cyprus, of course, you know what has happened, but in the case

of Malaysia, it would be utterly impracticable, the country is too small. It is pretty clear that if you want to partition Malaysia, I think that exercise must produce not only complete chaos but civil war as well. Then what I think is very disturbing to us is that we know, and Mr Lee himself has confirmed it, that he is the last man in Malaysia to act impulsively—he always boasts to us that he takes pen and pencil and calculates carefully. So, the very fact that he has mentioned this in a speech, I think, must force us to the conclusion that this is no new-fangled idea, this is not an idea which he has thought up in order to best the Honourable Member for Johore Tenggara. This was clearly an idea which he must have conceived months, if not years, ago after very careful and serious deliberation. We must, therefore, conclude that this is a serious idea which he means to pursue seriously, and I think we on our part should take him seriously too. He always boasts that he calculates coldly and logically, unlike the Alliance which probably has not got very much brains to think carefully and, therefore, I think, we must assume this is a very serious proposal.

I would also like to say, Sir, and I think it is not an unfair statement, that any man who can make this kind of proposal, coldly and deliberately has a boundless capacity for mischief. In my nineteen years of public service, I have heard many mischievous statements, I have heard many dangerous statements, but I would like to say that this statement which Mr Lee made last night is probably the most mischievous and vicious of the lot. (HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!). I say this in sorrow rather than in anger. I say it is only a warped mind which is frustrated in its thirst of power that can conceive this idea. It is not only a warped mind, it is clearly a warped mind which is prepared to sacrifice, if necessary, thousands of lives. It is prepared to shed blood in order to ensure that the owner of the mind achieves supreme power. I think that is the measure of Mr Lee Kuan Yew.

All indications, I am sorry to say, Sir, point to one thing: that if Mr Lee

Kuan Yew has his way on his partition proposal, if he succeeds by any chance, or mischance, into convincing enough people in this country that partition is the answer to our differences, then I also say, and I am prepared to stake my reputation on these words, that it will inevitably bring Malays and Chinese into conflict as surely as night follows the day.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I think it is a pity that I have had to make this speech. I can assure this House that I spoke in sorrow rather than in anger. In fact, it is a terrible pity that this is so, that these differences should become so acute and so serious, that is the differences between Kuala Lumpur and Singapore, because I am convinced that not only should Malaysia be one, the human race itself should be one. In the last analysis, the interests of Malaysia are far more important than the interests of any political party (*Applause*), or even the interests of a single State. If this truth, if this vital principle is borne in mind, it might yet be possible to see through the shadows of today the light of hope which could be the reward of tomorrow. (*Applause*).

**Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah (Kelantan Hilir):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya telah berhari<sup>2</sup> menchuba hendak mendapat peluang berchakap, tetapi Alhamdulillah pada hari ini saya telah dapat peluang ini dan saya ucapkan terima kaseh kepada Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Sa-lama 3 hari ini kita telah membahathkan usul yang telah dikemukakan oleh wakil dari Kota Star Selatan ia-itu usul untuk memberi tahniah kepada Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong. Di-dalam sharahan<sup>2</sup> yang kita telah mendengar sa-lama 3 hari ini perkara konferantasi, sama ada dari dalam atau pun dari luar, telah mengambil bahagian yang paling besar sa-kali. Nampak-nya konferantasi sedang berjalan sama ada dari luar mahu pun dari dalam makin hari makin besar dan harus konferantasi ini kalau tidak di-jaga akibat-nya akan meruntuhkan Malaysia sendiri.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Persatuan Islam sa-Tanah Melayu telah menerangkan kedudukan dan pendapat-nya

apabila chadangan Malaysia telah timbul untuk hendak di-adakan satu negara baharu nama-nya Malaysia. Di-dalam keterangan<sup>2</sup> itu kami telah terangkan dengan chukup jelas bahawa Malaysia ini akan mendatangkan huru-hara, porak-peranda kepada tanah ayer kita. Nampak-nya apa yang telah kami terangkan itu sekarang ini sedang berlaku dengan chukup giat, tetapi kalau perkara konferantasi ini datang dari luar sahaja tidak-lah menghairankan kita tetapi sekarang ini konferantasi telah datang dari dalam pula dengan sa-chara yang hebat dan yang paling merbahaya. Sa-lama 3 hari perbahathan ini telah berlaku di-dalam Dewan yang mulia ini dan perkataan<sup>2</sup> yang paling merbahaya telah di-keluarkan. P.A.P. telah menchabar Kerajaan Perikatan, demikian juga Kerajaan dan penyokong<sup>2</sup> Perikatan telah membuat chabaran<sup>2</sup> yang merbahaya belaka, sahingga pada pagi ini, sa-bagaimana yang kita sakalian telah dengar Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan telah membuat satu kenyataan, bahawa kenyataan itu ia-lah di-buat oleh Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri Singapura bahawa dia berchadang hendak membuat partition atau hendak di-belah bahagi Malaysia ini kepada dua bahagi. Satu bahagi Malaya ini sahaja yang di-perintah oleh Perikatan dan satu bahagi lagi yang terkandung di-dalam-nya Pulau Singapura, Melaka, Pulau Pinang, Sabah dan Sarawak akan di-perintah oleh Mr Lee Kuan Yew. Ini-lah akhir-nya dan akibat-nya yang telah atau pun akan tiba kepada Malaysia yang kita agong<sup>2</sup>kan itu.

Saya yakin, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perkataan yang telah di-keluarkan oleh Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri Singapura sa-malam itu kalau di-keluarkan oleh orang PAS, maka sudah yakin orang PAS itu telah di-tangkap dengan sa-berapa chepat. . .

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** Sa-rupa Socialist Front!

**Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah:** . . . tetapi malang-nya Kerajaan tidak mengambil atau pun tidak berani mengambil tindakan kepada orang yang sa-lain daripada Persatuan Islam sa-Tanah Melayu atau Socialist Front.

Di-sini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka-lah terangkan sadikit sa-banyak di-atas tindasan<sup>2</sup> yang di-buat oleh Kerajaan Pusat kepada orang<sup>2</sup> PAS. Orang<sup>2</sup> PAS telah di-tangkap dan telah di-tahan bertahun<sup>2</sup> lama-nya dalam tahanan. Apa-kah kesalahan mereka itu? Tidak ada sadikit pun kesalahan mereka. Tetapi sa-bagaimana yang kita dengar perkhabaran daripada Kerajaan mengatakan tangkapan dan tahanan mereka telah di-jalankan kerana mereka menggunakan agama untuk hendak menchapai kejayaan bagi Persatuan Islam sa-Tanah Melayu.

Tetapi baharu<sup>2</sup> ini di-dalam per-sidangan UMNO di-Kuala Lumpur sendiri, kita telah dapat mendengar dan membacha satu siaran dan perbahathan yang telah di-kemukakan oleh wakil dari Melaka dan juga dari Trengganu bahawa sa-nya ada-lah senjata agama yang telah di-kemukakan oleh Parti Islam sa-Tanah Melayu tidak ada berjaya kerana Parti Islam sa-Tanah Melayu tidak dapat menang di-dalam pilihan raya yang baharu di-Melaka dan juga di-Trengganu. Keterangan ini menunjokkan-lah kepada kita dengan terang dan jelas, bahawa sa-nya Kerajaan Perikatan chuma berani menangkap orang PAS sahaja.

Pada masa sekarang ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tangkapan maseh sedang di-jalankan di-negeri Kelantan. Beberapa hari yang lalu sa-orang penjual kopi di-Jalan Satu Batu Sa-tengah jalan Pengkalan Chempa, padang Kapal Terbang, telah di-tahan oleh polis kerana hamba Allah ini ia-lah sa-orang penyokong PAS yang kuat dan ada orang<sup>2</sup> Perikatan yang selalu berbahath<sup>2</sup> dengan-nya di-dalam perkara politik dan tidak dapat menang dan orang ini telah mengadu kepada pehak polis yang bahawasa-nya orang PAS ini telah menjalankan perbuatan subversive dan sa-terus-nya, maka hamba Allah itu telah di-tahan sekarang ini. Bahkan orang<sup>2</sup> yang kuat<sup>2</sup> di-dalam kawasan saya sendiri telah di-panggil oleh S.B. atau pun Special Branch dan di-ugut mereka itu. Ini-lah tindasan yang sedang di-jalankan oleh Kerajaan Perikatan ka-atas orang PAS.

Tetapi sa-bagaimana yang saya terangkan tadi, kepada parti yang besar sedikit seperti P.A.P., Perikatan tidak berani membuat demikian. Walau pun Enche' Lee Kuan Yew sa-bagaimana yang telah di-terangkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan bahawa sa-nya Enche' Lee Kuan Yew pergi ka-Moscow walau pun Tunku tidak bersetuju dengan lawatan itu dan juga dia telah menulis surat berulang<sup>2</sup> kali kepada Perdana Menteri Chou En-Lai. Perbuatan ini ada-lah perbuatan yang paling merbahaya kepada keselamatan negara tetapi kenapa-kah Kerajaan Perikatan berdiam diri sahaja?

**Enche' Lee Kuan Yew:** Mr Speaker, Sir, is the Honourable Member suggesting that to write in reply to a letter from the Prime Minister of the People's Republic of China is an act of subversion which undermines the security of Malaysia? Is he seriously suggesting that?

**Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah:** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tidak-lah saya memberi fahaman yang begitu tetapi perbuatan menulis surat ka-Communist China, dan tegoran yang telah diberikan oleh Perdana Menteri sa-bagaimana yang telah di-terangkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan, jangan pergi ka-Moscow dan ia pergi juga, ini menunjukkan perbuatan pertentangan dengan kemahuan dan policy Kerajaan Pusat.

**Enche' Lee Kuan Yew:** Mr Speaker, Sir, is the Honourable Member seriously suggesting that any man who goes to Moscow is a threat to this country? Is he aware that the Federation Government sponsored a delegation of rubber merchants to visit Moscow, Warsaw, and other Eastern European capitals only a few months ago?

**Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah:** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita dapat faham, bukan-lah kita ini orang yang bodoh. Kalau sa-orang ahli politik yang besar pergi melawat ka-Moscow, tentu-lah ada perkara yang penting yang hendak di-bahathkan di-dalam perkara politik. Kalau ahli perdagangan pergi ka-sana, maka tentu-lah kita tahu orang perdagangan itu ka-sana

untuk membahathkan perkara perdagangan. Tuan Yang di-Pertua . . .

**Enche' Lee Kuan Yew:** Mr Speaker, Sir, is it suggested that if one went as a tourist and went on sight seeing, all is well?

**Mr Speaker:** I really hope that the two Honourable Members understand each other: one speaks in English and the other in Malay. (*Laughter*).

**Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah:** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya telah memberi peluang kepada Yang Berhormat sudah banyak kali, dan saya sekarang ini sa-bagaimana Tuan Yang di-Pertua kata, pada pukul 2 ini akan di-tutup peluang berbahath, jadi saya tidak-lah dapat memberi peluang, saya harap jangan-lah dia marah kepada saya. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya sambungkan lagi. Tindakan Kerajaan Perikatan kepada ahli<sup>2</sup> PAS begitu hebat dan begitu giat bukan sahaja di-dalam segi politik bahkan di-dalam segi perdagangan pun begitu juga.

Di-sini ada sa-orang ahli PAS telah mendapat lesen menjalankan satu jentera memberi api leterek di-Pekan Langgar, Alor Star, di-Kedah sana. Oleh sebab hamba Allah ini terdiri daripada orang PAS, maka orang UMNO di-sana di-dalam satu persidangan tahunan 1964—Pertubohan Melayu Bersatu chawangan Langgar telah membuat berbagai<sup>2</sup> keputusan dan satu daripada keputusan itu bagini bunyi-nya :

#### AJENDA YANG KELIMA

Lain<sup>2</sup> hal.

Majlis bersetuju menerima chadangan bersama dari Pergerakan Kaum Ibu dan Pergerakan Pemuda<sup>2</sup> UMNO supaya UMNO chawangan ini mendesak Kerajaan supaya mengambil alih perbekalan api leterek di-Pekan Langgar sa-chepat mungkin.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ini-lah minit meshuarat parti UMNO chawangan Langgar Alor Star, Kedah, pada tahun 1964. Oleh sebab desakan ini daripada pehak kaum ibu UMNO dan pemuda UMNO maka satu surat daripada Central Electricity Board bertarikh 18 haribulan December, 1964 telah mengambil tindakan menarek balek lesen itu daripada orang PAS. Kerana apabila hamba Allah ini dengar

Kerajaan hendak tarek balek lesen-nya ia telah menulis surat kepada Central Electricity Board mengadukan hal di atas perkara ini dan ini-lah jawapan yang telah di-terima daripada Raja Zainal bin Raja Sulaiman, Timbalan Pengerusi dan Pengurus Besar Lembaga Leterek Pusat, ini-lah kandungan surat-nya :

“Di-ma’alomkan bahawa surat tuan bertarikh 10 haribulan December, 1964, telah di-terima dan faham-lah saya atas apa<sup>2</sup> yang tersebut di-dalam-nya. Dukachita saya memberi tahu kepada tuan, bahawa lesen itu telah di-baharui hanya sa-lama sa-tahun sahaja, maka ini ada-lah mengikut arahan daripada Kementerian Perdagangan dan Perusahaan oleh sebab bekalan leterek Kampong Langgar sa-lepas itu akan di-jalankan oleh Lembaga Leterek Pusat.”

Di-sini dapat kita fahamkan bahawa sa-nya Lembaga Bekalan Leterek Pusat ini telah menarek lesen yang telah di-berikan kepada sa-orang PAS yang telah menjalankan jentera ini beberapa tahun lama-nya. Ini satu tanda yang paling terang yang bahawa sa-nya orang UMNO dan Perikatan bukan sahaja menindas orang PAS di-dalam segi politik bahkan juga di-dalam segi ekonomi.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam masaalah yang akhir ini, nampak-nya Kerajaan Perikatan telah mengambil langkah<sup>2</sup> yang mengharukan perasaan ra’ayat jelata. Baharu<sup>2</sup> ini pada 13 haribulan Mei, Kerajaan telah meng-haramkan mogok. Kita tahu mogok ini ia-lah satu senjata sahaja bagi kaum buroh untok membela kedudukan dan kepentingan mereka, itu pun telah di-tarek oleh Kerajaan. Saya fikir perbuatan ini bukan-lah akan menguntongkan Parti Perikatan dan Kerajaan Perikatan, bahkan akan menguntongkan kepada Parti P.A.P. Kerana Parti P.A.P. boleh berkata kepada kaum buroh bahawa “kami aku hak dan kepentingan kaum buroh. Oleh sebab yang demikian kami tidak mengharamkan mogok ka-atas kaum buroh”. Mr Lee Kuan Yew boleh kata dan juga P.A.P. boleh kata dengan terang dan jelas, “tengok-lah perbuatan Perikatan hingga sampai mogok, ia-itu chuma satu senjata bagi orang kaum buroh itu pun telah di-hapuskan”.

Perkataan yang bagini, dan da’awaan yang bagini tidak-lah sa-kali<sup>2</sup> akan

menguntongkan Parti Perikatan dan Kerajaan Perikatan bahkan akan merugikan sa-besar<sup>2</sup> kerugian dan kita dengar baharu<sup>2</sup> ini bahawa Labour Union dan CUEPACS dan lain<sup>2</sup> per-tubohan lagi telah membuat chadangan bahawa mereka akan mendirikan sa-buah Parti Siasah untok membela ke-pentingan mereka. Saya fikir kalau sa-kira-nya ada pilehan raya di-dalam perengkat masa yang sengkat di-Tanah Melayu ini tetap P.A.P. akan menda-pat satu senjata yang besar sa-kali untok mengalahkan Parti Perikatan di-dalam pilehan raya itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, lawatan yang telah di-buat oleh Yang Amat Berhor-mat Timbalan Perdana Menteri dan yang akhir<sup>2</sup> ini pula oleh Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong ka-negara<sup>2</sup> Arab sangat-lah baik dan kena pada tempat-nya. Di-harapkan moga<sup>2</sup> dengan lawatan yang telah di-buat oleh Duli Yang Maha Mulia itu ka-sana akan dapat merapatkan lagi perhubungan dan fahaman di-antara Kerajaan Pusat dengan Kerajaan Arab. Tetapi satu perkara yang saya suka hendak menegor dan menasihatkan kepada Kerajaan Perikatan, bahawa lawatan yang telah di-buat oleh Timbalan Perdana Menteri ka-Afrika baharu<sup>2</sup> ini dan keterangan<sup>2</sup> yang telah di-berikan oleh Yang Amat Berhormat Timbalan Perdana Menteri kepada ketua<sup>2</sup> dan penganjor<sup>2</sup> Afrika itu semua-nya di-terima dengan baik, tetapi ada satu perkara yang mereka tidak dapat memuaskan hati mereka ia-itu dua tiga perkara yang sedang di-jalankan oleh Kerajaan Tanah Melayu. Pertama-nya ia-lah perkara akuan Kerajaan Malaysia kepada Kerajaan Israel. Lagu mana sa-kali pun kita menchuba hendak memperbaiki per-hubungan diplomatik kita dengan orang<sup>2</sup> Arab supaya dapat-lah mereka itu menyokong kita bagi kemasokan kita ka-dalam Persidangan Afro-Asia yang akan datang ini, tidak-lah akan mem-beri kejayaan yang penoh sa-lama kita tidak tarek balek akuan kita kepada Kerajaan Israel itu. Maseh orang<sup>2</sup> Arab dan negara Arab bertanya<sup>2</sup> kerana apa-kah, kalau sunggoh Kerajaan Malaysia jujur dan bersunggoh<sup>2</sup> hendak memper-baiki perhubungan di-antara dunia

Arab dengan Kerajaan Malaysia, kerana apa-kah maseh lagi akuan yang di-beri kapada Kerajaan Israel itu tidak ditarek balek. Ini satu soal yang paling penting.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, yang kedua-nya ia-lah kedudukan tentera Inggeris di-dalam tanah ayer kita. Ini satu masalah yang tidak dapat di-telan oleh penganjur<sup>2</sup> Afrika dengan senang dan mudah. Ada berita dari sa-orang wartawan yang telah pergi bersama<sup>2</sup> dengan Yang Berhormat Timbalan Perdana Menteri, di-dalam lawatan-nya ka-negeri Afrika di-sana, sa-telah balek-nya daripada lawatan itu ia telah membuat kenyataan di-dalam surat khabar Inggeris, juga di-dalam *Utusan Melayu*, wartawan daripada *Utusan Melayu* sendiri pun telah menulis di-dalam surat khabar-nya yang berkata, walau pun lawatan itu telah memberi satu keterangan yang paling jelas di atas kedudukan Malaysia di-dalam perkara konfrantasi dengan Indonesia tetapi mereka itu tidak dapat terima dengan senang-nya kedudukan tentera Inggeris di-dalam tanah ayer kita dan juga sokongan Yang Amat Berhormat Tunku Abdul Rahman, Perdana Menteri, kapada perbuatan Kerajaan Amerika menggugorkan bom<sup>2</sup> ka-atas orang dan penduduk<sup>2</sup> di-negeri Vietnam Utara. Oleh sebab yang demikian saya harap-lah kapada Kerajaan, ulang kaji balek polisi<sup>2</sup> yang telah menyusahkan kedudukan Kerajaan bagi kemasokan kita ka-dalam Persidangan Afro-Asia yang akan datang ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ucapan saya dalam 10 minit lagi akan habis. Di-sini suka-lah saya hendak menyentoh sedikit di-dalam soal kedudukan orang<sup>2</sup> Melayu di-dalam tanah ayer kita sendiri. Sa-bagaimana kenyataan yang telah kita dengar di-dalam Rumah ini dua tiga hari yang lalu, bahawa orang<sup>2</sup> Melayu sekarang ini sudah menjadi 39% di-dalam tanah ayer kita sendiri. Dahulu-nya kita-lah yang menjadi major community atau pun bangsa yang mempunyai majority, sekarang ini kita telah menjadi 39% sahaja. Siapa-kah yang telah menjadikan kedudukan kita makin sa-hari makin burok sa-hingga kita, orang Melayu, yang tuan rumah bagi negeri ini. menjadi satu kaum sahaja

di-dalam tanah ayer kita yang mempunyai bilangan 39% sahaja dan sa-bagaimana yang telah di-terangkan oleh Menteri Kewangan bahawa orang China telah lebeh dari 40%. Siapa-kah yang telah menjalankan polisi<sup>2</sup> ini? Tidak lain dan tidak bukan ia-lah Perikatan dan UMNO yang pengkhianat kapada bangsa kita.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, barangkali orang akan berkata bahawa P.A.S. ini ia-lah satu Parti perkauman. Tetapi saya harap-lah kapada saudara<sup>2</sup> kita memikirkan apa-kah akan jadi kapada orang Melayu di-dalam masa 25 tahun yang akan datang dengan polisi<sup>2</sup> yang sedang di-jalankan oleh Kerajaan Perikatan di-dalam tanah ayer kita. Lihat dalam Universiti, berapa peratus sahaja orang Melayu di-sana, 15 peratus. Lihat-lah kapada Jabatan<sup>2</sup> yang penting<sup>2</sup> . . . .

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untok penjelasan, bukan 15% tetapi 28%.

**Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah:** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, lihat-lah kapada Jabatan<sup>2</sup> Kerajaan, di-atas sahaja orang Melayu dan di-bawah-nya kesemua-nya bukan orang Melayu. Perbuatan siapa-kah ini ka-atas orang<sup>2</sup> Melayu? Mr Speaker, Sir, Malays will be reduced to the status of beggars in their own country in 20 years time to come.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sekarang biar saya sentoh sedikit tentang perkara ekonomi. Di-dalam Titah di-Raja ada terkandung bahawa satu Kongres Ekonomi Bumiputera akan di-adakan pada 5, 6 dan 7 haribulan ini. Ini memang satu chadangan yang baik dan tenaga yang elok, yang orang<sup>2</sup> Melayu sudah menanti<sup>2</sup>, tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita jemput orang<sup>2</sup> Melayu yang sudah lama menderita dan mendapat tekanan dan tindasan di-dalam ekonomi ini yang tidak pula mempunyai pengalaman yang tinggi dan di-dalam perkara perdagangan untok mereka itu bertemu dan bertukar<sup>2</sup> fikiran. Apa-kah yang dapat kita harapkan? Kalau orang<sup>2</sup> ini terdiri daripada orang<sup>2</sup> yang mempunyai pengalaman yang tinggi di-dalam perdagangan dan perusahaan, harus barangkali mereka itu dapat menunjukkan ubat<sup>2</sup>-nya, dapat memberi

keterangan<sup>2</sup>, atau pun penjelasan<sup>2</sup> supaya Kerajaan mengambil tindakan untuk memperbaiki kedudukan ekonomi mereka, tetapi petty businessmen sahaja—yang kita jemputkan dan kita suruh mereka itu berbath di-antara mereka itu. Apa-kah yang akan dapat dan timbul daripada perbathahan mereka itu? Pendapat<sup>2</sup> mereka itu tidak-lah akan dapat mengubah kedudukan ekonomi orang<sup>2</sup> Melayu sekarang ini yang makin hari makin burok. Kongres ini chuma-nya sa-bagai satu langkah yang boleh di-katakan dalam bahasa Melayu kita sa-bagai “batok di-tangga” sahaja, kerana orang<sup>2</sup> kampung sekarang ini sudah menggelisah dan mengadu hal-nya ka-sana ka-sini di-atas kedudukan mereka itu yang sa-makin hari sa-makin burok supaya Kerajaan mengambil tindakan. Jadi, di-jemput mereka itu datang ka-sini supaya dapat mengeluarkan perasaan marah mereka itu bersama<sup>2</sup>, kemudian mereka itu pun akan di-beri satu jaman dan lepas itu pulang-lah mereka itu ka-kampung masing<sup>2</sup> di-dalam keadaan puas hati.

Di-dalam Jabatan<sup>2</sup> Kerajaan sendiri pun belum dapat lagi Kerajaan mengubati penyakit<sup>2</sup>-nya. Saya akan bachakan satu potongan akhbar *Utusan Melayu* yang bertarikh 7 haribulan Februari, 1965. Ini tajok-nya :

Hati kita bertanya, apa-kah dalam kawasan yang jarak-nya 20 batu, kita mempunyai 2 buah perusahaan membuat Kilang Kertas.

Dan mengikut keterangan ini bahawa sa-nya Yang Berhormat Menteri Pertanian dan Sharikat Kerjasama pada masa itu ia-lah Yang Berhormat Enche<sup>2</sup> Mohamed Khir Johari kita, telah membuat satu siaran bahawa sa-nya Kerajaan akan mendirikan satu Kilang Kertas di-Seberang Prai Utara dan ia telah memberi jaminan. Ini bunyi jaminan-nya di-dalam Surat Nombor 15 keluaran October, 1964. Bunyi-nya :

Hal ini menambah mengembirakan lagi dengan Jaminan Menteri Pertanian dan Sharikat Kerjasama menegaskan Kerajaan Persekutuan tidak akan membenarkan sa-barang ranchangan untuk membena Kilang Kertas yang lain dalam negeri ini, sa-hingga Kilang Kertas Sharikat Kerjasama yang di-ranchangkan untuk di-dirikan di-Lahad Tiang, Seberang Prai itu di-dirikan.

Jaminan ini di-buat oleh Menteri Pertanian kita di-dalam Surat Berita Kerjasama, Nombor 15, bulan Oktober, 1964, yang telah di-edarkan kepada seluruh ahli<sup>2</sup> sharikat kerjasama. Apakah yang telah berlaku kepada Kilang Kertas yang di-chadangkan itu? Bahkan surat khabar ini ada menerang dan menyiarkan bahawa satu bangunan Kilang Kertas telah di-bangunkan oleh orang bersendirian, tetapi Kilang Kertas sharikat kerjasama yang telah di-chadangkan oleh Menteri sendiri sa-hingga sampai sekarang ini belum dapat di-dirikan lagi.

Ini ada-lah satu penyakit kerana Kerajaan sendiri telah memberikan jaminan kepada ra'ayat jelata untuk mendirikan-nya kenapa-kah Kerajaan sendiri tidak dapat berbuat demikian. Banyak lagi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, keterangan<sup>2</sup> yang boleh kita tunjukkan kepada ra'ayat jelata yang Kerajaan tidak dapat memperbaiki ekonomi orang<sup>2</sup> Melayu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, orang<sup>2</sup> Melayu kita sekarang di-dalam kampung, di-dalam segi pertanian ada-lah *per capita* productivity—penghasilan-nya bagi tiap<sup>2</sup> sa-orang tidak bertambah, bahkan berkurangan. Kenapa? Dahulu-nya, kalau di-dalam satu ekar sa-orang sahaja yang bekerja, sekarang kerana anak<sup>2</sup>-nya tidak mendapat kerja di-dalam perusahaan, dan terpaksa-lah mereka itu bekerjasama dengan bapanya di-dalam satu ekar tanah yang pendapatannya chuma \$300 juga. Jadi, ada-kah *per capita* productivity itu sudah lebeh? Tentu tidak, bahkan berkurang.

Yang pelek-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, harga barang<sup>2</sup> kampung ada-lah murah, kerana tidak ada pasaran yang terator dan tidak ada satu atoran yang di-buat oleh Kerajaan Perikatan sa-lama Kerajaan Perikatan memerintah 8 tahun lama-nya, untuk membela nasib orang<sup>2</sup> kampung ini bagi menjual barang<sup>2</sup> hasil mereka dengan harga yang baik.

Perkara Kilang Getah RIDA. Di-Kelantan chuma ada satu Kilang Getah sahaja untuk menolong pekebun<sup>2</sup> kechil. Ini-kah policy Kerajaan Perikatan yang berkata hendak memperbaiki

kedudukan orang<sup>2</sup> Melayu dalam segi ekonomi? Sedangkan barang<sup>2</sup> keluaran mereka itu tidak mendapat harga yang tinggi, bahkan harga yang paling murah. Pisang, sa-bagaimana yang saya telah terangkan dahulu, ia-itu di-Pahang di-jual satu kati dengan harga 2 sen. Di-bandar<sup>2</sup> di-sini berapa sen harga-nya? Dua puluh sen satu kati di-jual. Adakah Kerajaan Perikatan telah bertindak untuk membela orang<sup>2</sup> ini, orang<sup>2</sup> kampong ini yang terpaksa menjual pisang mereka itu dengan harga 2 sen satu kati?

Chuba tuan<sup>2</sup> berjalan dari sini ka-Pahang, melalui Temerloh—di-tepi<sup>2</sup> jalan Temerloh, tuan<sup>2</sup> akan dapati bahawa ada orang yang menjual papaya—buah betek—dengan harga 5 sen satu biji—buah-nya besar. Di-sini berapa sen harga-nya satu biji? Apakah langkah<sup>2</sup> yang Kerajaan Perikatan telah buat untuk memperbaiki kedudukan mereka itu supaya dapat mereka itu menjual barang<sup>2</sup>-nya dengan harga yang lebeh tinggi. Di-dalam Titah di-Raja di-sebutkan bahawa sa-nya kenaikan pengeluaran bagi tiap<sup>2</sup> tahun sudah meningkat 5% tetapi apa-kah satu keterangan yang Kerajaan dapat mengemukakan kepada orang ramai sa-bagai satu alasan bagi Kerajaan yang berkata bahawa sa-nya penghasilan pengeluaran barang<sup>2</sup> sudah bertambah 5%. Sa-kurang<sup>2</sup>-nya hendak-lah Kerajaan menunjukkan gross national productivity bagi tahun 1964, dan tahun 1965 dengan bilangan penduduk Malaysia, maka di-situ dapat-lah di-ukur betul-kah, atau tidak bahawa keluaran barang<sup>2</sup> itu telah bertambah 5% atau berapa persen-kah. Semua orang boleh agak belaka tetapi kedudukan di-kampong sangat-lah menyedihkan. Barang<sup>2</sup> yang mereka beli saperti gula dan segala<sup>2</sup>-nya harga-nya menengkat ka-langit, tetapi harga barang<sup>2</sup> mereka itu sendiri makin sa-hari sa-makin kurang. Harga padi yang di-jamin oleh Kerajaan ia-lah \$16 tetapi petani Melayu tidak dapat menjual dengan harga \$16 yang di-jamin oleh Kerajaan itu, kerana tipu daya dengan bermacam helah yang di-buatkan ka-atas petani Melayu itu. Apa-kah tindakan yang Kerajaan telah ambil untuk menyekat middleman

supaya mereka tidak dapat menghisap darah petani<sup>2</sup> itu lagi?

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya hendak berchakap tentang pindaan yang di-chadangkan oleh Perdana Menteri Singapura . . . .

**Mr Speaker:** I think you have spoken before.

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** But we are on the amendment by the Honourable Prime Minister of Singapore. Surely, Sir, I am entitled to speak on it. I shall not take long, Sir.

**Mr Speaker:** Will you please sit down. I think I have to give a chance to the others.

**The Minister of Agriculture and Cooperatives (Enche' Mohamed Ghazali bin Haji Jawi):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mengambil peluang di-sini menyokong chadangan yang di-bawa oleh Ahli dari Kota Star Selatan memberi ucapan terima kaseh dan tahniah kepada Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agung di-atas ucapan-nya itu. Di-dalam ucapan<sup>2</sup> daripada Ahli<sup>2</sup> Dewan, saya suka mengambil peluang di-sini menerangkan sedikit berkenaan dengan ucapan yang di-buat oleh Perdana Menteri Singapura, Enche' Lee Kuan Yew.

Di-dalam ucapan Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri Singapura, Enche' Lee Kuan Yew di-Dewan Ra'ayat pada 27hb Mei, 1965, beliau mengatakan yang Kerajaan Perikatan telah tidak membuat apa<sup>2</sup> berkenaan dengan kemajuan pertanian di-dalam negeri ini, khas-nya di-dalam bidang menambakan pendapatan ra'ayat di-dalam kawasan luar bandar. Beliau telah berkata bukan sahaja di-dalam Dewan ini bahkan di-dalam mana<sup>2</sup> forum, hatta di-luar negeri, ia-itu hanya wang sa-banyak \$18 juta sahaja telah dibelanjakan di-dalam bidang pertanian dan sa-bahagian besar daripada peruntukan itu di-gunakan untuk membayar gaji<sup>2</sup> Menteri dan pegawai<sup>2</sup> di-Kementerian Pertanian dan Sharikat Kerjasama sahaja. Saya ingin menafikan pendapat yang tidak benar yang di-keluarkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat itu tentang peranan yang di-mainkan

oleh Kerajaan Perikatan di-dalam perkembangan ekonomi pertanian Malaysia. Wang sa-jumlah \$18 juta yang dikatakan oleh Yang Berhormat itu hanya-lah merupai perbelanjaan untuk mengendali pentadbiran Kerajaan Pusat bagi Kementerian Pertanian dan Sharikat Kerjasama di-dalam Bahagian Teknikal, dan di-antara-nya sa-banyak 60 peratus untuk membayar gaji<sup>2</sup>. Peruntukan sa-banyak itu tidak-lah boleh sedikit pun di-kaitkan sa-bagai peruntukan Kerajaan Pusat di-dalam bidang ekonomi pertanian.

Saperti yang telah di-sedari oleh Yang Berhormat itu bahawa pertanian adalah sangat mustahak di-dalam ekonomi kebangsaan Malaysia. Hampir<sup>2</sup> setengah daripada pengeluaran kebangsaan terbit-nya dari pertanian dan hampir<sup>2</sup> 60 peratus daripada penduduk<sup>2</sup> negeri ini terdiri dari kaum tani. Sa-lain dari itu, elok-lah di-tegaskan bahawa  $\frac{3}{4}$  hasil yang di-dapati daripada ekseptot terdiri dari pengeluaran pertanian. Tidak shak lagi yang perkembangan pertanian menjadi satu daripada unsur<sup>2</sup> yang penting dalam bidang perekonomian negara dan oleh sebab itu-lah pertanian di-letakkan pada tempat yang istimewa di-dalam Rancangan Pembangunan Negara ini. Sa-sungguh-nya satu daripada tujuan yang besar di-dalam Peringkat Kedua Rancangan Kemajuan Lima Tahun itu di-dapati berbunyi demikian:

“Mengadakan kemudahan<sup>2</sup> dan memberi peluang kepada penduduk<sup>2</sup> di-kawasan luar bandar bagi meninggikan ekonomi dan taraf hidup mereka.”

dan tujuan lain yang sama sahaja mustahak-nya ia-lah “membanyakkan jenis<sup>2</sup> pengeluaran Malaysia dengan menitek-beratkan di-dalam bidang kemajuan pengeluaran pertanian yang sesuai sa-lain daripada tanaman getah.” Bagi menchapai tujuan itu maka Kerajaan Perikatan telah menumpukan sa-bahagian besar daripada peruntukan kemajuan-nya di-dalam Rancangan Kemajuan Lima Tahun Yang Pertama (1956-1960) dan Rancangan Lima Tahun Yang Kedua (1961-1965) kepada tujuan<sup>2</sup> untuk memberi faedah kepada penduduk<sup>2</sup> di-luar bandar.

Kemajuan<sup>2</sup> di-dalam bidang<sup>2</sup> yang berikut menyuarakan lebeh bergema

lagi daripada apa yang boleh di-chakapkan. Di-dalam Rancangan Kemajuan Lima Tahun Yang Pertama wang sa-jumlah \$227.5 juta merupai sa-banyak 23.4 peratus daripada penanaman modal ‘am ada-lah berkisar di-dalam bidang pertanian. Di-dalam Rancangan Kemajuan Lima Tahun Yang Kedua pula matalamat yang telah di-kaji sa-mula menunjukkan bahawa sa-banyak \$549.8 juta telah di-peruntukkan di-dalam bidang pertanian ia-itu merupai 21.1 peratus daripada jumlah penanaman modal ‘am sa-banyak \$2,606,000. Sa-kira-nya kalau kita memandang kapada peranan yang sa-benar yang di-jalankan di-dalam Rancangan Kemajuan Lima Tahun Yang Kedua dan kalau di-sedutkan dari butir<sup>2</sup> perbelanjaan yang besar, boleh-lah kita dapati bahawa bidang Parit dan Taliayer sahaja telah menggunakan sa-banyak \$76.4 juta sehingga tahun 1964. Hasil yang sa-benar di-chapai di-dalam masa tiga tahun rancangan itu di-mulakan di-dalam bidang pembenaan sahaja, sa-banyak 27 projek taliayer bagi mengayeri kawasan sa-luas lebeh kurang 109,000 ekar sawah dan sa-banyak 13 projek lagi bagi mengayeri sawah sa-banyak 106,000 ekar telah pun siap di-bena. Di-dalam bidang<sup>2</sup> lain yang tidak kurang mustahak-nya di-dalam Rancangan Lima Tahun Yang Kedua itu termasuk-lah peruntukan sa-banyak \$20 juta bagi pinjaman kerjasama, \$15 juta Pemulehan Sa-mula dan Menanam Kelapa; sa-banyak \$20 juta lagi di-peruntukkan kapada penyelidekan dan kerja<sup>2</sup> extension dalam bidang pertanian; bagitu juga sa-banyak \$10 juta di-untukkan kapada ternakan serta \$7.2 juta untuk perikanan. Angka<sup>2</sup> yang tersebut itu tidak-lah termasuk dua lagi unsur<sup>2</sup> perbelanjaan yang besar yang terkeluar dari portfolio saya, tetapi dapat di-katakan perkara ini termasuk di-dalam bidang perkembangan pertanian. Apa yang saya maksudkan ia-lah sa-banyak \$140.8 juta telah di-untukkan di-dalam bidang menanam getah sa-mula dan sa-banyak \$156.9 juta untuk kemajuan tanah.

Angka<sup>2</sup> yang telah saya nyatakan itu boleh di-dapati daripada laporan “Interim Review of Development in Malaya under the Second Five-Year

Plan” dan Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri Singapura sa-bagai sa-orang Ahli Dewan ini telah pun di-beri satu salinan pada tahun lepas. Kalau-lah beliau semak pada muka 7 laporan tersebut, beliau tidak shak lagi boleh nampak yang sa-bahagian besar daripada peruntukan untuk pertanian dan kemajuan luar bandar telah di-chadangkan sa-banyak \$712 juta bagi tempoh dari tahun 1961 sa-hingga tahun 1965. Dari jumlah itu sa-banyak \$75 juta telah pun di-belanjakan di-dalam tahun 1961, \$166 juta di-dalam tahun 1962 dan \$163 juta di-dalam tahun 1963. Perbelanjaan bagi tahun 1964 ada-lah lebeh tinggi lagi. Sa-kira-nya kalau di-pukul rata dari ketiga<sup>2</sup> tahun itu, dapatlah di-lihat yang pada tiap<sup>2</sup> tahun sa-banyak \$100 juta telah di-belanjakan oleh Kerajaan Pusat bagi perkembangan ekonomi kawasan luar bandar di-dalam negeri<sup>2</sup> di-Tanah Melayu sahaja. Perbelanjaan itu tidak pula di-kira peruntukan biasa dan peruntukan kemajuan yang di-belanjakan oleh Kerajaan Negeri.

Sa-bagaimana Ahli<sup>2</sup> Dewan sedia ma'alum tiga daripada jabatan di-bawah Kementerian Pertanian dan Sharikat Kerjasama ada-lah perkara<sup>2</sup> yang termasuk dalam State List atau pun di-bawah jagaan Negeri ia-itu Pertanian, Parit dan Tali Ayer dan juga Jabatan Haiwan. Kalau pula di-kirakan perbelanjaan di-dalam tahun 1963 sahaja bagi 10 buah negeri dengan tidak termasuk Kelantan, maka jumlah bagi semua bidang perbelanjaan untuk Jabatan<sup>2</sup> Pertanian Negeri ada-lah sa-banyak \$5.6 juta, sa-banyak \$2.5 juta untuk Jabatan<sup>2</sup> Haiwan Negeri dan sa-banyak \$19 juta untuk Jabatan<sup>2</sup> Parit dan Tali Ayer Negeri. Sa-kira-nya kita jumlahkan semua sa-kali angka<sup>2</sup> itu kita akan dapati jumlah-nya hampir benar kapada perbelanjaan Kerajaan Perikatan yang telah di-belanjakan untuk ekonomi pertanian di-dalam Tanah Melayu pada tiap<sup>2</sup> tahun. Saya telah hitong angka<sup>2</sup> itu dan di-dapati jumlah-nya ada-lah lebeh kurang \$150 juta bagi perbelanjaan tiap<sup>2</sup> tahun ia-itu lebeh daripada 8 kali ganda daripada angka \$18 juta sahaja yang selalu dinyanyi<sup>2</sup>kan oleh Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri itu. Angka<sup>2</sup> ini, walau

bagaimana pun, hanya merupai penanaman modal dalam sector orang ramai sahaja.

Perkara yang mesti di-sedari benar ia-itu bahagian yang penting di-dalam usaha<sup>2</sup> Kerajaan di-dalam bidang pertanian ia-lah memberi kemudahan<sup>2</sup> dan memberi peluang bagi membolehkan perkembangan pertanian terlaksana di-kalangan sector orang persaoangan. Kita semua sedar bahawa sementara penanaman modal orang ramai atau “public investment” itu ada-lah ditentukan oleh Kerajaan Pusat dan Kerajaan<sup>2</sup> Negeri dan boleh jadi sedikit perbadanan<sup>2</sup>, penanaman modal itu ada-lah hasil dari beribu<sup>2</sup> bahkan berjuta<sup>2</sup> unit pengeluaran persaoangan. Manakala penanaman modal orang ramai itu bertujuan mengadakan bahan<sup>2</sup> dan kemudahan<sup>2</sup> untuk pengeluaran maka boleh-lah kita dapati kebanyakan daripada bahan<sup>2</sup> yang perlu lagi di-kehendaki dengan segera itu menambahkan pengeluaran dan pendapatan di-kalangan sector persaoangan atau “private sector”. Bidang ini ada-lah membayangkan bertambah-nya hasil pengeluaran pertanian Tanah Melayu, perikanan, kayuan<sup>2</sup> dan juga bahan<sup>2</sup> makanan pertanian.

Perkara yang mesti di-tegaskan ia-itu sunggoh pun peruntukan bagi menambahkan kemudahan<sup>2</sup> tali ayer dan chara ternakan yang elok termasuk menggunakan biji<sup>2</sup> benih yang boleh mengeluarkan hasil yang lumayan atau pun yang baik serta menggunakan baja<sup>2</sup> itu boleh memberikan pengeluaran yang di-chita<sup>2</sup>kan, tetapi kemahuan petani<sup>2</sup> hendak menambahkan pengeluaran-nya sendiri itu tidak-lah boleh di-pisahkan daripada ranchangan ini. Kemahuan yang berbentuk kemahuan ekonomi yang di-sebutkan itu ada-lah bergantung di-atas keadaan di-sekitar kesanggupan petani<sup>2</sup> itu boleh memasarkan hasil<sup>2</sup> pengeluaran-nya, sa-bagaimana yang telah di-terangkan oleh Yang Berhormat daripada Kelantan. Oleh yang demikian Kerajaan Perikatan ada-lah memandang berat ia-itu peranan yang tidak kurang penting-nya yang di-mainkan oleh Kerajaan ia-lah supaya petani<sup>2</sup>, pekebun<sup>2</sup> getah kechil, kelapa, pengeluar<sup>2</sup> nanas serta juga nelayan<sup>2</sup> dapat mengechap pendapatan yang besar dari aliran

ekonomi negeri ini. Tetapi malang-nya pada hari ini chara<sup>2</sup> pemasaran didalam bidang pertanian yang ada itu boleh di-sifatkan sa-bagai chara pemasaran lapok. Sebab<sup>2</sup> perkara ini terjadi ada-lah di-sebutkan di-dalam penerangan Rang Undang<sup>2</sup> Pemasaran yang saya akan bawa ka-dalam Majlis ini di-dalam meshuarat ini juga.

Wakil daripada Kelantan telah menyuarakan perkara berkenaan dengan pemasaran ini dan telah berkata, mengapa-kah di-Kelantan barang<sup>2</sup> pengeluaran hasil tanaman tidak mendapat harga yang baik terutama-nya padi, sungguh pun Kerajaan telah menetapkan \$16 sa-pikul tetapi ra'ayat tidak mendapat \$16 bahkan ada yang mendapat \$10 atau kurang daripada itu. Jadi dalam masalah ini banyak faktor atau perkara<sup>2</sup> yang bersangkutan dengan-nya patut di-kaji dan juga di-baiki. Salah satu daripadanya, sa-bagaimana Ahli Yang Berhormat Dewan sedia ma'alum, ia-lah berkenaan dengan peranan yang di-permainkan oleh orang<sup>2</sup> tengah ia-itu menurunkan harga<sup>2</sup> yang telah di-tetapkan oleh Kerajaan. Tetapi di-dalam negeri Kelantan ada lain faktor daripada orang tengah itu, ia-itu sebab-nya ia-lah ketiadaan mendapat kerjasama yang sa-penoh daripada Kerajaan Negeri itu berhubung dengan kilang<sup>2</sup> padi yang ada di-dalam negeri itu. Sungguh pun pehak Kementerian Pertanian dan Sharikat Kerjasama telah merayu dan mendesak supaya kilang<sup>2</sup> padi di-dalam negeri itu di-khaskan kepada Sharikat<sup>2</sup> Kerjasama, tetapi di-dalam negeri Kelantan boleh di-katakan hari ini lebeh banyak kilang padi yang haram daripada kilang padi yang halal.

**Enche' Abdul Samad bin Gul Ahmad Mianji (Pasir Mas Hilir):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untuk penjelasan Yang Berhormat Menteri yang berkenaan, bukan Kerajaan Kelantan yang membawa masok kilang<sup>2</sup> kechil ini, di-benarkan oleh Kerajaan Persekutuan sendiri dan masaalah yang di-chakapkan oleh Wakil Kelantan Hilir tadi bukan harga padi di-Kelantan, harga padi umum diseluruh Tanah Melayu ini—bagitu-lah gaya-nya.

**Enche' Mohamed Ghazali bin Haji Jawi:** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-bagai-

mana kita sedia ma'alum, kuasa memberi lesen berkenaan dengan kilang padi ada-lah dudok-nya di-Kementerian Perdagangan dan Perusahaan, tetapi kuasa itu telah pun di-serahkan atau di-wakilikan kepada Kerajaan Negeri dan Kerajaan Negeri-lah berkuasa hari ini mendaftarkan atau mengeluarkan lesen<sup>2</sup> berkenaan dengan kilang<sup>2</sup> padi dan sa-bagaimana yang saya sebut di-dalam negeri Kelantan lebeh banyak kilang<sup>2</sup> padi yang haram daripada kilang<sup>2</sup> padi yang mempunyai lesen atau pun yang di-benarkan dan perkara ini saya telah rundingkan dengan Kerajaan Kelantan dan Kerajaan itu tidak sanggup mengambil langkahan bagi menutup kilang<sup>2</sup> yang haram yang ada itu.

Oleh sebab petani<sup>2</sup> dan nelayan<sup>2</sup> kita hanya dapat bergerak di-dalam usaha<sup>2</sup> yang terhad dan tidak chukup modal, maka tidak-lah mereka mempunyai kuasa<sup>2</sup> untuk membanyakkan hasil<sup>2</sup> pengeluaran mereka bagitu juga tidak berupaya mendapat harga yang patut dan akhir-nya mereka terpedaya oleh orang<sup>2</sup> tengah, langkah<sup>2</sup> telah di-jalankan untuk mengatasi kelemahan<sup>2</sup> itu, chontoh-nya Kerajaan telah menetapkan harga padi dan menjalankan Sharikat<sup>2</sup> Kerjasama untuk memperbaiki atau memberi kepada petani<sup>2</sup> itu hak atas hasil<sup>2</sup> pengeluaran-nya tetapi chara itu tidak menchukupi. Oleh yang demikian satu chara yang di-kehendaki dilakukan dengan tidak boleh di-lengah<sup>2</sup>-kan lagi, satu chara memusatkan semua usaha<sup>2</sup> yang akan boleh memberi, di-antara lain<sup>2</sup>, kemudahan<sup>2</sup> yang sesuai dan chukup bagi melichinkan perjalanan pemasaran hasil<sup>2</sup> pertanian dan bagi menjaminkan harga<sup>2</sup> yang tetap atas hasil<sup>2</sup> pertanian itu supaya petani<sup>2</sup> kita boleh mendapat harga yang berpatutan atas hasil<sup>2</sup> pengeluaran mereka itu. Masaalah ini, saya sukachita menyebutkan, ada-lah usaha<sup>2</sup> yang akan di-mainkan oleh Lembaga Pemasaran Pertanian Persekutuan atau "Federal Agricultural Marketing Authority" dan saya perchaya Ahli<sup>2</sup> Yang Berhormat dalam Dewan ini dan Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri Singapura sendiri tentu sedar bahawa satu Rang Undang<sup>2</sup> mengenai pembentokan-nya akan dibawa di-dalam sidang Dewan penggal

ini dan saya berharap akan dapat saya menerangkan lebeh panjang lagi di-dalam masaalah ini bila saya kemukakan Rang Undang<sup>2</sup> itu sa-bagai bacaan kali yang kedua-nya kelak.

Daripada keterangan<sup>2</sup> dan juga angka<sup>2</sup> atau jumlah peruntokan yang saya telah terangkan di-dalam Majlis ini, nampak-lah bagaimana Yang Berhormat Enche' Lee Kuan Yew telah memberi keterangan<sup>2</sup> dan penjelasan yang mengelirukan dan chuba menipu ra'ayat. Kalau-lah di-dalam masaalah yang sa-bagini kechil berkenaan dengan perbelanjaan Kementerian Pertanian dan Sharikat Kerjasama yang mana boleh di-dapati, bukan sahaja daripada Anggaran Perbelanjaan, tetapi juga kita telah pun mengeluarkan risalah berkenaan dengan itu ini pun ia hendak mengelirukan ra'ayat, hendak menipu ra'ayat, kemudian bagaimana-kah kita hendak memperchaya'i kapada pemimpin yang demikian itu di-dalam masaalah<sup>2</sup> lain yang besar.

Uchapan telah juga di-buat oleh sa-orang lagi Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Singapura ia-itu Enche' Rahim bin Ishak, bahawa P.A.P. mempunyai ranchangan<sup>2</sup> kerja bagi meninggikan kedudukan ekonomi peladang<sup>2</sup>. Saya terpaksa mengatakan di-sini bahawa sementara P.A.P. maseh di-dalam perengkat menyediakan ranchangan, Kerajaan Perikatan telah pun memungut hasil perladangan daripada beberapa banyak ranchangan<sup>2</sup> Kerajaan untuk faedah paladang<sup>2</sup> dan nelayan<sup>2</sup> kita. Memada'i-lah jika kita berkata sa-chara ringkas, bahawa daripada sa-tahun ka-satahun kawasan penanaman padi dua kali sa-tahun sa-makin bertambah luas dan kita telah mengedarkan atau mengadakan dua jenis benih padi yang boleh mengeluarkan hasil yang tinggi di-dalam masa yang sengkat, ia-itu Padi Malinja dan Padi Mahsuri. Sa-lain daripada itu, Ahli<sup>2</sup> Yang Berhormat itu boleh jadi barangkali telah mendengar berkenaan dengan perojek empangan dan taliayer yang besar di-Kedah dan di-Perlis bernama Perojek Sungai Muda yang apabila siap kira<sup>2</sup> dalam tahun 1968/1969 akan mengayurkan suku juta ekar sawah padi di-bawah Ranchangan Menanam Padi dua kali sa-tahun.

Kita juga telah mengeluarkan lagi Ranchangan Bantuan Baja, Ranchangan Pemulehan Dusun Buah<sup>2</sup>an, Ranchangan Pemulehan Kelapa dan Ranchangan Menjenterai Pekebun<sup>2</sup> Kechil. Semua-nya ini akan di-lanjutkan lagi dan di-perhebatkan lagi di-dalam Ranchangan Malaysia Yang Pertama kelak.

**Enche' Lim Kean Siew (Dato Kramat):** Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise in this House first of all to support the sentiments and the statement which the Honourable the Minister of Finance made this morning. We also, however, support the words of the amendment, that we must attempt to establish Malaysian unity. But I rise, Mr Speaker, Sir, to register our abstention in this amendment.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we have decided to abstain, because we question the motives of this amendment. We cannot quarrel with the words, and that is the danger of this amendment. We all know that today our biggest enemy is the division of our races. It is a time-honoured tactics of imperialism to divide and rule a country. Yet today it is shocking to find people using racialism in order to achieve support and power for themselves. Mr Speaker, Sir, the people of our country want to know how we can progress. We owe them that duty. The people in this country are also afraid of racialism. By the people of this country, I do not mean the people of only one race, but other races as well—what about the Eurasians, the Indians and the other minority races in the Bornean States? Surely we cannot only speak for the Chinese and we cannot only speak of the Malays. But before I continue, I must first deal with the statement by the Honourable Member from Singapore that the Socialist Front is not a force to be contended with.

In 1959, the Socialist Front had 12.9% votes. In 1964 we had 16.1% votes, i.e., 330,898 people voted for us. At the same time, the P.P.P. had 3.4% votes, the U.D.P. had 4.3% votes and the P.A.P. in Malaya had 2% votes. Now it might be argued that the P.A.P. had majority in Singapore.

Well, Mr Speaker, Sir, let me straighten the Honourable Prime Minister of Singapore's memory on this. The Barisan Sosialis had 33% of the votes in Singapore in spite of a nine-day trial, in spite of the fact that 130 of its leaders were arrested a few months before the elections and of the fact that all, who could have become candidates for the Barisan Sosialis, were taken into custody like James Puthuchery whom we all know in this House and outside this House is not a communist and has never been a communist.

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** On a point of clarification, Mr Speaker, Sir. He is now a *persona grata* to the Government. (Laughter).

**Enche' Lim Kean Siew:** The only reason why such people like him were arrested was not because the P.A.P. was not afraid of an open confrontation and "a conflict of minds" but because it was afraid of them. Mr Speaker, Sir, if the P.A.P. is not afraid of confrontation, if the P.A.P. claims to represent a sizeable proportion of the people in Malaysia, I ask its leader this: let him move to have the Barisan Sosialis members released from detention, and we will fight him and we can see who will become the next State Government of Singapore. We all know very well how, as far as the P.A.P. is concerned, the banning of newspapers is nothing new; the banning of trade unions is nothing new. We all know how it supported the Security Council in the detention of its erstwhile friends, and I say this: let the P.A.P., if it wishes to come into Malaysia to represent the people, come at least with clean hands, and if its hands cannot be cleaned, let them at least try to wash their hands.

Mr Speaker, Sir, what does the amendment say? It says that "it regrets that the Address by His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong did not reassure the nation that Malaysia will continue to progress in accord with its democratic constitution towards a Malaysian Malaysia . . ." In the first place, is the P.A.P. admitting that there is a democracy which has been in practice and that its only

hope is that it should continue it, or that it has not ever started on the path towards a Malaysian Malaysia? The second point is this: what does the P.A.P. mean by a "Malaysian Malaysia"? Can we, by dividing the people, create a Malaysian Malaysia?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is time for us to weigh our words carefully and not let our emotions run away with us, and let us face the facts squarely. There is no doubt that this country, whatever may be the professions of a great number of our political leaders, is being slowly split into two big factions: Malays and non-Malays. Whilst we all should be proud of our heritage, whilst we all should be proud of our traditions, is this split the solution for Malaysia communalism? Sir, the problems confronting Malaysia were, in fact, in the situation itself and must have been quite clear before Malaysia was formed. For example, there was the inequality of economic development in the States of Malaya as opposed to Singapore and in comparison to the Borneo States. There was a difference even in the cultural levels not only between the people of the rural areas in Malaya and the people of the urban areas but also as between Singapore and Malaya and as between Malaya and the Borneo States. It was also obvious that as long as Malaysia was formed in the way it was formed, Indonesia would become hostile. Knowing this, the P.A.P. joined the Federation of Malaysia; knowing this the P.A.P. signed the Malaysia Agreement; knowing this, the P.A.P. willingly and consciously co-operated in the formation of Malaysia, praising our Prime Minister in the meantime; knowing this and knowing our Constitution, the P.A.P. also agreed to come in thus helping to create a Malaysia that will provoke Indonesia. When the Malaysia Agreement was signed, it was clear that Singapore citizenship would be not synonymous with Malayan citizenship, although they both were Malaysian citizenships. It was also clear that immigration would be under the control of the respective State Governments as far as the Borneo States were concerned and, therefore, Singapore's problem of

overgrowing unemployment could not be solved by a mass emigration of the Singapore workers to the under-populated Borneo States. It was also clear at that time that if Singapore citizens wanted to apply for jobs in Malaya, they could be discriminated against. Mr Speaker, Sir, it was also clear that, as far as Singapore was concerned, there were four official languages—and there are still four official languages—and they did not ask to do away with other official languages in order to use Malay. And, as far as the Borneo States were concerned, English would be the main language and would remain the main language under the Federation Agreement and, therefore, Malay cannot be practised to that extent as it can be practised in Malaya, so that there is a more likelihood of Malaya using Malay as the National Language than there is for the Borneo States using it as the National Language. It was also clear from the Honourable Prime Minister's statement at the time that Singapore would be the "New York" of the new Federation—in other words, the economic and industrial wealth would be poured into Singapore. This would drain the rural areas of their economy; this would continually serve as a drain not only as regards money but also as regards population. There would be a drift from the rural areas into the industrial areas to get jobs. So, if it is true that the rural areas are suffering under Malaysia, who is to blame, who conspired with this? It is the P.A.P. itself and the Honourable Mover of the amendment. If we think that Malaysia is being split and there is inequality, who is to be blamed? Should not the Honourable Mover of the amendment accept part of the responsibility? If there is discrimination in our service as regards Malays and non-Malays to the proportion of four Malays to one non-Malay, who is to be blamed, except the P.A.P.?

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, we have however the P.A.P., who supported Malaysia, coming into this House and asking that we should now reconsider our position, at the same time stating that he would not secede from Malaysia. Mr Speaker, Sir, if I may use a

colloquial language, this is all a lot of tripe; this is just a humbug.

Mr Speaker, Sir, if I may say so, the Honourable Mover of the amendment cannot have his cake and eat it. Surely under the present structure, under our present Constitution, there is no doubt that the wealth of this country is being slowly partitioned between the rural people and the industrial people. The industrial people get most of the benefit of this division of wealth. The industrial people live in towns. The industrial people who live in the towns are mostly non-Malays, and therefore the economic wealth would continue to be held by the non-Malays. Whilst it is true that in the Government service there is a 4-1 ratio in favour of the Malays, it cannot be denied that as far as the private sector is concerned, the percentage is at the least 4-1 against the Malay population. We cannot, therefore, say at this stage that the Malays must give up whatever political rights they have. On the other hand, Mr Speaker, Sir, they cannot tell the non-Malays that they must give up their economic position, because, as much as it would be a disadvantage to the Malays to give up their political power, it is just as equally impossible to ask non-Malay to give up his economic power with no safeguards and no guarantees. Surely the line to be drawn is somewhere in the middle. And the middle line would be found only in a time socialist economy and in Socialism—not Malaysian Malaysia!

Mr Speaker, Sir, if the P.A.P. is sincere, surely this is the line it should adopt. If the P.A.P. is honest, surely this must be the policy that it must follow. The P.A.P. said that they were socialists long ago and the reason why they said that they were socialists was because they believe that there must be parring away of inequity, so that we could get a more egalitarian society, so that one group cannot have the economic power and use that economic power to suppress another group, as, similarly, we do not expect the other group to use its political power to suppress its opponents. But the P.A.P. does not really take that line. The P.A.P. takes the line that

unless more power is given to the non-Malays, they will secede. They know very well that this will only strengthen the Opposition into racial group thus making us easy meat for the wolves of Western domination and be unable to tackle the real problems of economic progress.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I think it is most contemptible to say that everything has already been worked out and that British troops would not interfere if there was civil strife in this country. I say it is despicable to say that, because it assumes two things: (1) There will be civil strife, in which case there will be bloodshed. (2) That it has been calculated, very carefully, that during a civil strife there will be no interference by foreign troops, and therefore there will be more bloodshed.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we must regret that the situation in Malaysia has come to this position. We must regret that the situation in Malaysia has come to the point where we begin to look at one another not as persons any more but as racial beings. We begin to look at each other by the colour of one's face. And, Mr Speaker, Sir, if it is a question of interference by foreign troops, let me put the P.A.P. right. If there is a clash between the Chinese and the Malays, I doubt if the British troops will support the Chinese people.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I said that when the P.A.P. came to Malaya, it should at least come with clean hands. Now, I think, these are few questions which the P.A.P. must straighten:

1. Does the Honourable Mover of the amendment fully support the Internal Security Act and its present application?
2. What has he got to say about the 130-odd ex-colleagues who were with him and who are now in goal? They are, I think, mostly non-Malays.
3. Had the Honourable Mover of the amendment anything to do with the banning of the publications in Singapore? Does he say that that is democratic? If he does not say that that is democratic, then, surely, his amendment is hypocritical.
4. Will the Honourable Mover of the amendment give an assurance in this House that the licence of *Fajar*, which is an organ of the University of Singapore Socialist Club, be renewed if they apply for it again?

5. What about the renewal of the licences of the printing presses that were banned just before the elections of Singapore, so that the P.A.P. could win the elections?
6. What of the cancellation of the registration of the five largest trade unions in Singapore because their members did not toe the P.A.P. line?
7. How many times has the Singapore State Legislative Assembly met since Merdeka Day, 16th September, 1963, and how many times will it hold its meetings in the next coming year?
8. What has the Honourable Mover of the amendment got to say about the banning of the S.U.P.P. Branch at the 24th mile, Simanggang Road?

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Prime Minister of Singapore will have to answer these questions to the satisfaction of the whole country, if he wishes even to exploit the most dangerous thing of all, the racialism of this country.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise also to put it on record that we share the views of the Honourable Minister of Finance that on the question of national unity and on the question of building one nation, we do not stand as a political party, but that we stand as a national of our country. (*Applause*).

Mr Speaker, Sir, today the Honourable Mover of the amendment said that an alternative could be the splitting up of Malaysia into a formation of two Federations, one consisting of Penang, Malacca, Singapore and the Borneo States and the other consisting of the Federation of Malaya, without Penang and Malacca. Surely that is completely and entirely contradictory to the reasons he had given for the formation of Malaysia, because, if I remember correctly, at that time he said, "Let us be 10 million strong; let us all be united, because if we are in pieces, we will not be able to withstand the onslaught of modern times; and the only way for us to succeed is that we should all come together as one". Mr Speaker, Sir, in making that statement he has now declared himself quite clearly to be an anti-Malaysian element. . . .

**Mr Speaker:** The time is up. You may continue when the House resumes.

**Enche' Lim Kean Siew:** Yes, Sir.

**Mr Speaker:** The sitting is suspended until 4 o'clock today.

*Sitting suspended at 1 p.m.*

*Sitting resumed at 4 p.m.*

(Mr Deputy Speaker in the Chair).

## EXEMPTED BUSINESS

### MOTION

**Tun Haji Abdul Razak:** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menhadangkan supaya perbahathan Dewan ini bagi membincangkan Uchapan di-Raja dikechualikan daripada Fasal 2 (1) dalam Atoran Peratoran<sup>2</sup> Meshuarat sa-hingga pukul 9 malam ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sebab kita telah berbath sudah lebih tiga hari lama-nya, dan banyak urusan<sup>2</sup> Kerajaan yang hendak di-jalankan di-dalam persidangan ini, mustahak-lah perbahathan ini di-tamatkan juga pada hari ini. Chadangan Kerajaan dahulu, ia-lah hendak memberi peluang satu hari kepada Ahli<sup>2</sup> pehak Pembangkang supaya usul<sup>2</sup> atau motion<sup>2</sup> mereka itu dapat di-bincangkan. Akan tetapi sekarang ini nampak-nya masa telah suntok dan sebab itu-lah mustahak di-tamatkan perbahathan ini supaya dapat urusan<sup>2</sup> yang lain itu termasuk juga usul<sup>2</sup> daripada pehak Pembangkang itu di-bahathkan di-dalam persidangan ini. Saya menhadangkan.

**Dato' V. T. Sambanthan:** Saya menyokong.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 12 (1) this House shall not adjourn today until 9 p.m.

### MOTION

## THE YANG DI-PERTUAN AGONG'S SPEECH

### Address of Thanks

Question that an humble address be presented to His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong as follows:

"Your Majesty,

We, the Speaker and Members of the Dewan Ra'ayat of Malaysia in

Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer Your Majesty our humble thanks for the Gracious Speech with which the Second Session of the Second Parliament has been opened."

Which amendment was to add, at the end thereof, the words,—“but regrets that the Address by His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong did not reassure the nation that Malaysia will continue to progress in accord with its democratic constitution towards a Malaysian Malaysia, but on the contrary the Address has added to the doubts over the intentions of the present Alliance Government and over the measures it will adopt when faced with the loss of majority popular support.”

**Mr (Deputy) Speaker:** Ahli<sup>2</sup> Yang Berhormat, oleh kerana ini ia-lah hari yang keempat perbahathan Uchapan di-Raja di-jalankan dan banyak lagi urusan<sup>2</sup> Kerajaan yang lain, terpaksa-lah saya menghadkan perbahathan hingga pukul 9 malam ini. Uchapan gulungan yang penghabisan, pehak Kerajaan akan berbuat pada pukul 10 pagi 3 haribulan Jun. Sa-hingga pukul 9 malam ini, saya akan memberi peluang kepada Menteri<sup>2</sup> Kerajaan Pusat membuat ucapan mereka. Dalam pada itu jika ada masa, saya akan memberi juga peluang kepada Ahli<sup>2</sup> Berhormat lain mengambil bahagian. Oleh kerana itu, saya merayu kepada Ahli<sup>2</sup> Yang Berhormat yang dapat peluang berbath pada malam ini supaya merengaskan ucapan<sup>2</sup> mereka itu dan menjauhkan daripada berulang<sup>2</sup>. Ahli<sup>2</sup>, lain daripada Menteri<sup>2</sup>, di-minta-lah berchakap tidak lebih daripada 15 minit pada sa-orang.

**Enche' Lim Kean Siew:** Mr Speaker, Sir, as I said this morning, the statement of the Honourable Mover of this amendment motion, that we could have an alternative arrangement by the formation of a new federation by splitting the present federation into two parts, is a curious admission in two ways. Firstly, it is an admission that his flirtation with the UMNO is at an end and that he has a last decided that he should no longer make eyes' at the Alliance. It is an admission that he has been rejected by the Government and, therefore, cannot take part

in the Government of Malaysia and, therefore, to him, Malaysia is bad, because of this. The second point is also curious: By his statement he has now become an anti-Malaysia element and, therefore, agrees today with the very people in whose arrest he took part and put into detention camp in 1963. By and large they should either be released or he should rightly belong with them and yet, curiously enough, he has now put himself up to be the most loyal of us all. Mr Speaker, Sir, his statement today and his amendment, I say, is an admission that Malaysia is not going to be a bed of roses after all and that in fact perhaps our Government was stampeded into the formation of this Federation. It is bad on two grounds. Internally, it is bad because of its competing and conflicting State, economic, cultural, language and racial interests, which are manifesting themselves in the greater demands from the Bornean States and in the racial demands within the various States of Malaysia. Externally, it is bad because of Indonesian antagonism. The Indonesian antagonism has also isolated us from the Afro-Asian bloc. Mr Speaker, Sir, curiously enough, the Honourable Member from Bungsar has stated that the rebuff of the Malaysian delegation in Winneba was due to the support of the American bombing of North Vietnam. Whilst I do not wish to contradict him, I think he is confusing between the root causes and the results of our Malaysian policy. The present Malaysian policy would inevitably lead us towards support for America and therefore isolate us even further from the Afro-Asian bloc. In other words Malaysia is the cause of Indonesian antagonism, not its result. It has played us into British and Western hands. Mr Speaker, Sir, alternatively it might be questioned that if it is not that the ability of the amendment to solve the problem, what then should it be? Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not think that racialism ever solved anything. One bowl of rice taken from A and given to B will satisfy B, but will make A dissatisfied. One bowl of rice taken from the Malay and given to the Chinese will make the Malay dissatisfied. The same bowl of rice taken from

the Chinese and given to the Malay will make the Chinese dissatisfied. The answer is in the greater production of rice; the answer is in the greater and more equal distribution of the wealth. The answer, of course, is in the overhaul of our social and economic structure to bring in socialism.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we have always said Malaysia was bad, but as long as Malaysia exists we must try our best not to emphasise its differences but to emphasise its points of unity. Racial equality must be our first aim. Without racial equality, there can never be an eradication of race differences. The Constitution has loaded the rural people with greater political powers, but that political power must be used rationally and not abused, nor provoked like it has been provoked by the Honourable Member from Kota Star Selatan who had the audacity to state in this House, thus displaying his complete ignorance, that the Socialist Front has never stood for nationalisation and has not stood for social benefits. I have in my possession a free copy of the Socialist Front policy statement called "Towards a New Malyasia" which I will give to him if he wants to read it—that is, if he is capable of doing so (*Laughter*).

The second principle upon which Malaysia should be developed is that it should be based upon a reorientation of minds. It is true that we all have different origins. I can't say I am a Malay; I cannot deny I am a Chinese. That is my racial origin as much as every one of us have racial origins, and these racial origins have cultural characteristics and we are quite rightly proud of our cultural heritage as well. But we cannot keep on repeating that we are Malays or Chinese. We are Malaysians—that is fundamental—not that you want to create a Malaysian Malaysia at all. But we are Malaysians pure and simple and we hope that racialism will die not only in Malaysia but elsewhere in the world. Even the term "Chinese" is not a racial term. It is a political/cultural term—there are Chinese of many races. The term "American" or "British" or "Russian" is also not a racial term and we cannot turn these terms into racial terms.

Neither should we look upon the Malaysian society from its purely racial angle. But, Mr Speaker, Sir, unfortunately Malaya has its people divided into the rural and urban areas. Urban areas are mostly Chinese, people of Chinese origin. People in the rural areas are mostly Malays. As long as there is this inequality of social structure, as long as there is inequality in the economic structure and as long as the towns are being developed, the Malay economy will be drained, but as long as the industrial population is increasing the Chinese industrial worker want land to go into the rural areas. How are you going to solve this problem? That is the point. But not by means of racialism. Differences exist, but should they be exploited and inflamed?

Mr Speaker, Sir, I have said that externally Malaysia is also bad. Why is it bad? Because we are anti-Indonesia. Even if the government is anti-Indonesia and anti-Communist, it does not necessarily follow that we must be pro-West, pro-imperialists and pro-America, but so often we fall into that kind of error—i.e., I am anti-Communist and therefore I must be pro-Capitalist, or he is anti-Capitalist, therefore he must be pro-Communist. This is the sort of psychology that made us fail in Winneba. Therefore, as far as we are concerned, irrelevant of the confrontation of Indonesia, we must not extend the area of conflict, we must still fight for neutrality and for peace and we cannot be imperialists and we support the principles of *Pancha Sila* although it may have been inspired by Indonesia. Malaysia is in fact designed as part of a pro-Western bloc.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I say this: as long as Malaysia lasts its ills will continue until its economic and social structure is changed, and unless we have a completely different orientation to our problems and as long as Malaysia lasts, it will become sicker and sicker. Nothing is going to solve this problem and as it gets sicker and sicker and danger threatens, as His Majesty put it, from outside and from inside, there would be more and more excuse for dictatorship, more and more excuse

for the use of the bayonets until finally we must succumb to a dictatorship. But, as I have said, the words themselves are attractive in this amendment, and so also are the words of everybody in this House who stands for non-racialism.

The question is what is the motive behind the words, and the sincerity of it. And can it solve the real problem? We do not think so. Therefore, my party cannot accept the sweet words of this amendment at its face value. The Honourable mover of the motion wants to live in a glass house and throw stones, but this amendment focuses on communal antagonism which unfortunately the foolish speech from the Honourable Member from Kota Star Selatan has not helped. My Party has steadfastly refused to be involved in communal tactics and only a communal bigot will not realise the dangers of such a policy. Because of this, Mr Speaker, Sir, we have to abstain from this amendment.

**Dr Mahathir bin Mohamad (Kota Star Selatan):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ingin membuat penjelasan sedikit berkenaan dengan ucapan saya waktu membawa usul menguchap terima kaseh kepada Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda. Saya telah sebut di-dalam ucapan saya, "They (the P.A.P.) have never known Malay rule and couldn't bear the idea that the people they have so long kept under their heels should now be in a position to rule them." Saya maksudkan di-sini ia-lah oleh kerana pada masa sekarang Party Perikatan, party yang di-sukai ramai, di-ketuai oleh sa-orang orang Melayu, dan Party Perikatan menjadi Kerajaan Pusat, maka sa-orang orang Melayu telah jumpa diri-nya—i.e., "found himself in a position to rule."

Ini-lah "Malay rule" yang saya maksudkan dan bukan saya maksudkan ia-itu Kerajaan Malaysia ini ia-lah Kerajaan Melayu. Terima kaseh.

**The Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications (Dato' V. T. Sambanthan):** Mr Speaker, Sir, this morning when I scanned the paper, I asked myself this question: what sort of a man is this; what sort of a

man is this that can calmly and quietly propose the cutting up of our country; what megalomania is it that is driving him forth; and what is his fevered mind driving at? And, as I looked further, I found that he has one reason for suggesting that this country should be cut up, and that is that he is against Malay rule here—Malay rule in Malaysia. Before accepting his definition, let us for a moment go back into the past.

I could do no worse than draw Members in this House to think of the year 1955 when we had our first elections. Before that, this country of ours was very much like a political backwater; we had not had much of elections and in 1955 we were going to have nation-wide elections. At that time, the Alliance, forming UMNO, M.C.A. and M.I.C., decided to contest the elections on the basis of freedom in four years. When one looked at the electorate at that time, one observed that 4% of the electorate was Indian, 8% was Chinese and 88% was Malay. Now, there were 52 seats to be contested at that time. Yet, how were the seats allocated? Roughly 40% of the seats were allocated to the non-Malays and, mark you, at that occasion, because of the large majority of Malay voters—barring one constituency, I think, all the others had Malay majority. And so, if anybody wanted to stand up for the elections at that time and win, he had to have the Malay electorate with him. 88% of the Malay electorate—what does it mean? It means that politically the Malays were really powerful. It also means that even though they were so powerful, the leadership of the UMNO comprising mainly of the Tunku, Tun Razak, Dr Ismail and others felt that they had to be large hearted enough to concede to fellow races, brother races in this country, a larger measure of seats than their numbers warranted, and so we had it. In 1955, as I said, the people had not yet been into elections. Before that, the backwash of British rule here had left within the country various communities, each settled within itself, fairly cordial no doubt, but still without much opportunity for intermingling, apart from in

the social sphere. And so, we had the Malay electorate having to vote for non-Malays.

I was one of those in 1955 who had the good fortune of having been chosen to stand for elections. At that time, in my own constituency, the majority of the voters were Malays. Two of my opponents were Malays, locally based, men of good reputation. One of them, strangely enough, was the present Speaker of the House. However, the Malay people in the kampongs were told of the objectives that we had, of the necessity for us to be non-racial in our outlook, of the need for them to vote for the policy, the policy of freedom and all the consequential improvements that the country would have because of freedom; and so it was in many of the other constituencies. The Malay kampong folk came out in thousands, and they voted us in.

Around that time, one of the men who had to go from village to village, kampong to kampong, wading in water, going by boat, living in the jungle, sometimes at the threat of being shot by Malay extremists, is one who is today being branded by the P.A.P. character assassins, as ultra racialist. I refer to no less a man than Tuan Syed Ja'afar Albar. (*Applause*) Tuan Syed Ja'afar Albar at that time had a very important task of going from village to village to tell the Malays, "This is not the right thing, we have got to think of Malaya, we have got to think of the people as one, we cannot say that Malays should vote for Malays, we should vote for anybody, whomever the party puts in and we should vote on non-racial lines. That, Mr Speaker, Sir, is Tuan Syed Ja'afar Albar. (*Applause*) If record of a man can speak for himself, that record, I think, is vivid enough to cast aside all these aspersions that have been thrown at the door of Tuan Syed Ja'afar Albar. I have myself deep respect for him. However, that is the past.

Now, in 1955, we won the elections with a great majority. Then we obtained freedom in two years time. During this period, we had to discuss citizenship and various other things. Now, what

did the Malays do—since we are speaking on racial lines—what did the Malay leadership do? They had 88% of the electorate still with them. What did they do with citizenship? If we look around in Asia and in East Asia, particularly, you will find that my race, the Indian race, is not welcomed in Ceylon, is not welcomed in Burma. Look at my brother Chinese race, it is not welcomed in Thailand, in Vietnam, in Cambodia, in all the other areas. What help do they get for citizenship in all these territories? In Burma, as we know, Indians have been sent packing, in Ceylon they refused them citizenship and in Burma it is likewise. I know it, you know it. And yet in Malaya what happened? Here, we found that the Malay leadership said, “We shall take them unto ourselves as brothers, we shall give them full opportunity to live in this country, we shall give them every opportunity to become citizens.” And so, in 1957, for the whole year, we waived language qualifications, and tens of thousands of Indians, Chinese, Ceylonese and others became citizens. Why did the Malays do this? Is it to propitiate Malay rule in this country? Is it to keep themselves all the time in power that they watered down their own authority? It would be stupid, utterly stupid, for them to do that, if they wanted to control this country for all time. They could have done it by the simple expedient that one observed in Ceylon, Burma and other countries—deny the opportunity of citizenship to these people. They can never take this country from you. Then why did they do it and are these the people today who are trying to foist Malay rule?

In all my life I haven't seen such mendacity as that put in by Mr Lee Kuan Yew of the P.A.P. (*Applause*). Such vicious, utterly vicious mendacity against a race with whom it is our great fortune to live. A race who have throughout their time have been hospitable, been polite, been respectable and yet this race, believe me, is the poorest in this country. The other races have come here, they are by far richer. Even my own race, mostly made up of labourers today have a monthly

earning much better than the ordinary kampong dweller; I know it. The towns—who owns the towns in our country? Who owns the cities? Who owns the estates? Do the Malays own these? Then what is it that we are trying to shout at them for? This in fact, Mr Speaker, is the essence of the whole question. We have got to recognise this fundamental fact.

In 1957, I said, in the whole year, hundreds of thousands of non-Malays became citizens, by a voluntary act. By a voluntary act the Malay leadership itself watered down their own political power. Can you see it anywhere else? Even the huge nations of the West—the United States. Can 100,000 Malaysians go to the United States tomorrow and become citizens there? Could you do it in Germany, in Turkey, in Albania, in Russia, or in any part of the world, I ask. The answer is “No”. In the United States they have got a quota, in Australia you cannot put your foot down and step into it, and yet here, we find the course of history changed. A different pattern—a different pattern of brotherhood, of understanding, of goodwill—a different pattern based upon morals, ethics;—a good decent, humanistic pattern. And so in 1957, we had freedom. We had more and more become citizens. In 1959 we had another election. We won this election again. Despite the fact that in the intervening period, some parties came out, openly chauvinistic because in some towns they found that there were Chinese citizens and they thought they could play them up for their own ends; chief amongst them, of course, was the P.P.P. But then, in 1964 they were beaten roundly and soundly, simply because the people came to know of their wiles. They were trying to play upon race.

The imperialist game, once the imperialists left, was taken up by the local politician, simply because he thinks that in a country where there are many races, people of many religions, speaking many languages, it would be easy to divide them. That they have failed. Between 1955 and 1963 we found the Federation of

Malaya a very stable, a very democratic and very well run country in this region.

We found that in the United Nations, that we had a fairly good reputation; our stand against apartheid was quite sound and applauded everywhere except of course by the South African fascists.

But apart from that, we had our own plans for the development of the country. We had the Second Five-Year Plan, which was going ahead. We had large land schemes which gave not only to the Malays but to all the races—tens of thousands of acres of land. We had roads, water supply schemes, all these going ahead in an Asia of trouble and turmoil.

This one country was an oasis of happiness, of a happy people living together, not asking themselves, "Am I a Malayan Malayan?" They were all Malaysians. There was no question of their being anybody else. They were all together as one. Nobody came around with any clichés those days. We all felt we were Malaysians; we lived as Malaysians. Our land schemes were for the Malaysians and we had them in plentiful supply. And even at that time the Deputy Prime Minister, who was in charge of the schemes—even then, he was thinking of a huge land scheme of 200,000 acres. And was it only for the Malays? No. It was for many races—for all the races, for the underprivileged, for those without land, without work.

We do not think that we want to impoverish the Chinese and enrich the Malays; we want everybody to be well off in this country. That is what the Father of the nation wants.

Then, around 1960, things changed. We had, as I said, in the Federation of Malaya, a tranquil, happy, peaceful country with the people quite happy. They had something to look forward to, an era of peace and happiness. The Communist menace had been broken. We were happy.

In Singapore, on the other hand, there had been trouble. Different Governments, different set-ups. Then we heard of one Mr Ong Eng Guan and how he was doing certain things and how latterly the P.A.P. came into power in

Singapore. Then there came about a P.A.P. strutting about; speaking much about itself. But, no sooner had they come into office then the party broke into two. This was around 1961. Before that, it would interest Honourable Members to know that this same P.A.P., which a year later was to go round day after day and stand at the door-steps of the Prime Minister of Malaysia, of Malaya then, to ask him to agree to take in Singapore, of their own volition, wrote to me a letter as Minister of Telecommunications to tell me that they want to break up the Pan-Malayan set up of the Telecommunications Department.

That was their thinking in 1960. But when the Barisan party came up and the P.A.P. broke up, mark you, not because all of them were Communists—and that is what Mr Lee Kuan Yew wants us to believe, but I don't believe it. It was a clash of personalities. They just could not stand up to this man's arrogance. It was just that, and so the party had to break up. Then what happened? A Lim Yew Hock had to come in to keep that party in power, or it would have been thrown out. That was the situation. A Lim Yew Hock, a lone man had to throw his vote to keep that party going. Then they thought of something. "Ah, there is Kuala Lumpur, a monolithic, powerful, strong Government there and a mild, kind hearted man who is the Prime Minister there; may be, he will agree; may be, I can run to him for succour." Which, in fact, was what he did.

Mr Lee Kuan Yew a couple of days ago said that he calculated—yes he calculated very much or schemed over and over again. A word he did not use was that he normally calculated on the basis of what they call "dialectical materialism." But whatever his dialectical materialism means, he found the dialectic of incense burning could come in useful—you can puji somebody now and then—and so incense burning went feverishly at a hot pace at the feet of the Prime Minister of Malaya. Day after day, week after week, month after month, his wooing to get Singapore in. To get the Prime Minister to say, "Yes, we will accept Singapore." Otherwise the whole edifice was going to crumble

round the P.A.P. That is history and I don't think anybody can question it.

After that, the Prime Minister said, "Yes, we shall have Malaysia." These were quiet spoken words. But what a reaction they had! Immediately after that, somebody had to make some capital out of it. "Why should I not do it," said Mr Lee Kuan Yew. So he had a referendum armed with the strength that the Tunku's name should carry him through the referendum, which he did. But no sooner had the referendum been through and Tunku had committed ourselves into Malaysia, then Mr Lee Kuan Yew felt he could start bargaining. If you went through his speeches you would find a subtle change in tone. The old tone of abject plea was no more present; we now find it replaced by an arrogance towards Kuala Lumpur.

Then we had the Malaysia Agreement signed in London. No sooner was this Agreement signed and the ink was hardly dry, a meeting of students by Mr Lee was held in England. At this meeting Mr Lee, who likes to say that he wants—to analyse in public, went to the students and said, "You know, I cannot become the Prime Minister simply because there is an army—and you know who is the chief of it?" The insinuation being that Tunku's nephew was the chief of the army and, therefore, he would prevent anybody else from becoming the Prime Minister. Mr Lee spoke about this hardly before the ink had dried on the Malaysia Agreement. This, Mr Speaker, Sir, is one of the examples of signs for the future. We could hardly believe when we were told of such things. We thought, "Surely this man talks so nicely and is ever so open in what he says". We did not think that his words were glib words that were uttered only by one who calculated with an abacus mind, moment after moment, using various types of dialectics for various purposes. Thereafter, Mr Speaker, Sir, what happened is known to all of us. However, stage by stage, we found conditions changing.

Around the time of referendum, the Singapore Ministers would go round and say, "We are all Malaysians". But after the referendum and the second

elections, they said, "Oh, we are Singaporeans. Singapore shall show Malaysia." So you can see how Malaysian Malaysians become Singapore Malaysians sometimes. So, this ding-dong has been going on.

Just recently in the last elections of 1964 this gentleman, Mr Lee Kuan Yew, spoke of Malay leadership. You see, Mr Lee Kuan Yew is one of those who thinks that he walks against the backdrop of history, that he strides with history, that history must follow him and so all he writes must be put into books, all his speeches must come into a book form, that his words must always exist, for he is part of history. However, let me read. This is what he says around the time of the last elections, at Seremban where he had gone to play up Chinese chauvinism:

"The implication is, first, that we are deceitful people who say one thing in Chinese and a different thing in English and Malay; and, second, that I have often said in public that the Malay leadership of UMNO is irreplaceable. Off the record, in Chinese, I have contradicted this by saying that this leadership is not of the right calibre."

If you compare this to what he says today, you will realise that what he said in Chinese that day was quite correct. He was being deceitful.

"In the last three weeks, two weeks before nomination day and one week after it, I have been explaining why the UMNO leadership is irreplaceable in order to safeguard the integrity of Malaysia as a separate and distinct unit from Indonesia."

All this happened barely a year ago—all these things about the UMNO leadership. "The UMNO leadership is an important leadership, it is a necessary leadership, and nobody should be able to overthrow this leadership". Here again you have it:

"For Malaysia to succeed we must help the Tunku's leadership to succeed."

What has happened between then and now that there should be a complete change of attitude? What have we done, what has this country done, what has the Cabinet done? Has the Minister of Home affairs been arresting Chinese and letting off the Malays, or has he been arresting Indians and letting off the Malays? No. Where is the line that this Government has taken which

shows that it is Malay and not Malaysian? Where have we said anything like that? Nowhere as far as I can see. Our policy has been distinctly Malaysian. Our attitude to problems has been distinctly Malaysian.

So, Mr Speaker, Sir, these are some of the things which I should mention here, simply because we have to place on record that we in this country are at a peculiar juncture. We are faced, after Malaysia, with a danger of Indonesian confrontation. One would have thought that all sensible, intelligent, patriotic citizens of this country would rally round and keep a single house and not divide that house. We should have thought that at this moment our main task is unity and not division. We should have thought that disunity would be the last thing for us to speak of. But yet why should a man of intelligence as Mr Lee Kuan Yew do all these things? This is the question I ask, because it is a vital question. I feel that he does these things because, among other things, he is a very disappointed man. If earlier on he had praised the UMNO leadership, if earlier on he had said he trusted the UMNO leadership, it was perhaps because it was caused by a certain amount of ardour, ardour at the anticipated love of living together. But, unfortunately, the passionate embrace never came forth and like a rejected suitor he must hit back—bit back and destroy if he can, this young nation of ours. That is what it amounts to.

Let us look more closely at what he said. Some days ago, this same gentleman said that Singapore is necessary to safeguard the minorities here. The minorities here have been able to be happy without Mr Lee Kuan Yew to look after them. (HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!) When we were made citizens, it was not Mr Lee Kuan Yew who made us citizens; it was Tunku and his brother comrades who made the country as it is today. It was the brotherhood that we had amongst ourselves, that complete brotherhood we had, that complete goodwill we had amongst ourselves, which made it possible for everyone here to become citizens. Where are the distinctions?

Then we had this “wonderful!” concept of a United Front, expounded in cliché form of “Malaysian Malaysia”. What was more surprising and more laughable is that we had the Member for Ipoh, utterly, completely, contemptibly, a racial chauvinist, getting up and saying, “Oh, we will join the United Front if it is not communal.” I would ask him to tell it to the marines—that is, without insulting the marines. The P.P.P. is openly chauvinistic. The P.A.P. is chauvinistic but in a more subtle form. That is the only difference. If the P.A.P. is not chauvinistic, why should it try to play up communal feelings? Who was it who started analysing publicly about the Malay base in politics? It was not we. We have been getting together; we have been living together, living together for a long time. The Malays have been for a very long time. I do not question that they have not been living long here. But why should this great gentleman come in and say, “Oh, the Malays here are as much immigrant as anybody else”? Surely that, excuse me Mr Speaker, Sir, is beyond the realm of stupidity, because that is precisely what it is. No leader of any reputation would try to rouse communal feelings, and this is precisely what he is trying to do.

So, Mr Speaker, I fear that we are passing through an extremely dangerous phase in the life of our country. Externally, we have Indonesia; internally, we have Lee Kuan Yew and his brand of politics (*Applause*). In his megalomania he tells us to break up this country into Malacca, Penang, Singapore and other places. Can we live like that? What madness is this; what utter, absolute and complete madness is this? Surely we in this country will never permit such madness to rule this country. That is what we have to face. The situation is serious, extremely serious, I tell you. Have we not got the example of Pakistan and India before us? Don't we know the millions that were killed there—the ordinary people? Of course, people like him would be in hiding. They would not get involved. It is the women, the children, the girls—they are the

people who will suffer. But thank God, we do not equate Chinese sentiments with Mr Lee Kuan Yew. He is trying to equate and say that he is Chinese sentiments, which he is not. The Chinese race is a great and noble race. It will never give way to such nonsense; neither will the Malay race. As I said, it has been my great good fortune to have been born in this country. Where else can you find a more charitable, a more polite, a more decent race than the Malay race? Where else can you get such politically decent treatment for any immigrant race? Where else in the history of the world?—I ask you. These are the facts.

A famous political philosopher once said: "When you want to adjudge what a man says, ask this question, 'What are your principles? What are your practices? What is your record?'" The record of the Federation of Malaya and the Alliance has been a record of peace; a record of brotherhood, a record of unity and amity within this nation. We will not permit anything to mar this unity and this amity.

Simply because a party has got as its primary membership Chinese, Malays and Indians, it does not mean that it is non-communal, when every word they mouth is communal. Every time the Member for Ipoh opens his mouth, it is communal. Everybody knows that. I know in my own constituency his party tried to do a fantastic trick. They went to the Malays and said, "You know the Chinese are squeezing the blood out of you"; and they went to the Chinese and said, "You know, the Malays are taking all the land away from you"—the same party, the same constituency, different villages. That is a non-communal party according to the P.A.P. and the people of their thinking. But we in the Alliance, what do we say at every platform? We are brothers, we should live together, we want to make this country a happy country, we want to build this country up, we want land schemes and other schemes for the well-being of our people. History, Sir, shall record what we have done. It shall record that we have been highly ethical in our motives,

highly ethical in our attitude, and highly humanistic in all that we have done. That same history shall record that a man with some megalomania tried to break up this country in all his megalomania. He even propounds the theory of hostage—he says, and I quote, "we in Singapore must be there to safeguard the minorities of Malaya." Who are you to safeguard us? I am a 10 per cent minority race here, but I am happy here. I do not want anybody to safeguard me. This is my country. Surely the estate labourer, the new village dweller, he does not need Lee Kuan Yew to come and look after him (HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!). He has been there all along.

In 1948 when the Emergency started, when villages were being burnt by the army in their attempt to supplement the Briggs Scheme and some of them were asked to pack and get out, sometimes rather rudely, who stood by them? Was it the P.A.P.? It was not even born then. It was Tan Cheng Lock and the M.C.A. (*Applause*). These people stood by them during those turbulent times. They stood by them at a time when no question could be asked. The Chinese were on question then. The whole Chinese community was at the court-house, the whole Chinese community was questionable. Their loyalty was questionable. But who stood by them? It was the M.C.A. in those days. They have a record of suffering, they have a record of service for the people. These are things that we cannot deny, and has the M.C.A. gone round and said—"We are Chinese, you are Malays, let us fight"? We have never said any such things. At every platform we say, "We will unite, we will safeguard this country, we will defend this country." And so, by God, we shall, Mr Speaker (*Applause*).

**Enche' Abdul Ghani bin Ishak (Malacca Utara):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mengambil peluang sama<sup>2</sup> menguchapkan tahniah kepada Titah di-Raja yang sama<sup>2</sup> kita bahatkan sekarang. Dalam hal masaalah apa yang telah di-titahkan oleh Seri Paduka Baginda dapat-lah kita kaji daripada perbahathan<sup>2</sup> yang sedang berjalan

ini. Tidak ada tempat atau kurang tempat yang hendak di-jadikan perbahathan terutama sa-kali bagi pehak<sup>2</sup> pembangkang. Oleh sebab itu-lah dalam perbahathan kita hari ini, yang sampai hari ini, banyak soal<sup>2</sup> kepartian, soal<sup>2</sup> yang bersangkutan-paut dengan parti<sup>2</sup> politik sahaja timbul dan hari ini harus-lah kita bersama<sup>2</sup> barangkali menerima kaseh kerana apa yang timbul pada masa perbahathan ini tidak lain dan tidak bukan ia-lah membukakan tembelang atau pun bahawa yang tidak benar itu akhir<sup>2</sup>-nya dapat juga di-lihat, dapat di-ketahui oleh ra'ayat seluroh-nya.

Mithalan-nya di-dalam perbahathan yang kita dengar, wakil daripada Singapura Yang Berhormat Enche' Lee Kuan Yew sendiri, selalu mengulang<sup>2</sup> entah beberapa kali di-dalam Dewan ini mengatakan yang ta'at setia-nya tidak-lah boleh di-persoalkan, tanggung-jawab-nya terhadap Malaysia ini tidak dapat di-soal orang lain. Tetapi apa yang ada dan apa yang diperjuangkan, apa yang kita ikuti, daripada perbuatan<sup>2</sup> atau tindak-tandok yang di-lakukan oleh Perdana Menteri Singapura, Enche' Lee Kuan Yew itu, ada-lah sangat berlainan daripada apa yang di-katakan-nya kepada kita. Ini benar-lah sa-bagaimana yang telah di-katakan atau pun bagi pehak kami Perikatan mengatakan sa-lama ini bahawa P.A.P. sa-buah parti yang tidak dapat betul meletakkan kedudukan yang sa-benar dalam masa kita memperjuangkan atau menghentam kominis, dia mengatakan dia non-communist.

Kemudian, dalam masa kita menyokong, barangkali tindakan atau pun tindakan negara bebas Vietnam Selatan, dia pula mengatakan kita ini terikat dengan Barat. Wal-hasil apa yang di-katakan oleh pehak<sup>2</sup> pembangkang terhadap P.A.P. sendiri, umpama Singapura, kadang<sup>2</sup> saya sendiri pun harus memikirkan benar.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya daripada dahulu lagi memang P.A.P. ini langsung<sup>2</sup> saya tidak percaya, kerana saya ikuti tiap<sup>2</sup> pemimpin, mithal-nya yang hendak memimpin kami, yang hendak memimpin ra'ayat hendak-lah mereka mempunyai kata satu, kata

putus dan tidak boleh di-telan balek ludah<sup>2</sup> yang sudah di-keluarkan. Tetapi pemimpin<sup>2</sup> yang ada dalam P.A.P. hari ini boleh dia berchakap "A", tetapi sa-kejap masa lagi mereka akan berchakap "B" dan sa-kejap masa lagi barangkali berubah entah apa yang akan di-ucapkan-nya. Dan sa-tengah<sup>2</sup> pemimpin, ini saya tahu, kerja-nya daripada dahulu menjalankan jarum, kadang<sup>2</sup> bukan tanggung-jawab-nya mereka masok champor dan memporak-perandakan satu perkara.

Saya teringat dalam satu cherita, sahabat saya Enche' Rahim Ishak, dia tidak ada di-dalam Dewan ini, saya ingat cherita beliau sendiri—ini dia tokoh yang hendak mengatakan pemimpin Melayu yang ada dalam P.A.P., yang hendak memperjuangkan orang Melayu mithal-nya di-Singapura itu bersama<sup>2</sup> dengan P.A.P. Satu masa dahulu tahun 1958 di-bilek No. 2 di-New Hotel bahawa saudara Rahim Ishak yang masa itu menjadi Pengarah Utusan Melayu telah dapat memasokkan satu jarum yang paling merbahaya ketika itu hendak memecahkan atau mendatangkan satu chadangan supaya guru<sup>2</sup> seluroh yang bergabung dengan P.G.M.S. masa itu keluar menentang Kerajaan yang ada pada masa itu. Faedah-nya bila menang sahaja pilihan raya P.A.P., Rahim Ishak yang ada di-Malaya, tidak ada kerja apa<sup>2</sup>, kerana boleh di-jadikan muka depan, boleh di-jadikan barangkali jarum atau boleh di-jadikan topeng, maka dia dapat Setia-usaha Politik kepada salah sa-buah Kementerian. Ini-lah dia tokoh yang ada dalam P.A.P. dan di-dalam kajian Ahli<sup>2</sup> P.A.P. daripada Singapura ini, pada sa'at ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Saya rasa patut kita sedarkan, kita sedarkan pandangan atau pendapatan mereka ini, kadang<sup>2</sup> mereka lupa dan mereka menyamakan taraf bahawa Perdana Menteri Singapura itu agak-nya sama-lah taraf-nya dengan Perdana Menteri Malaysia.

Oleh tersangat besar nafsu-nya dan apa yang ada di-dalam dada-nya yang telah salah perbandingan-nya tadi, maka ini-lah tadi kadang<sup>2</sup> kita di-katakan tidak betul, tetapi apa yang di-jalankan oleh P.A.P., kalau kita ikuti

daripada satu masa ka-satu masa, maka P.A.P.-lah yang salah, kerana tadi baharu saya mendengar ucapan dari Menteri Penerangan dan Penyiaran yang memberikan satu pandangan, akan di-kaji untuk mengambil, untuk menyamakan penyiaran radio yang ada, atau pun talivishen yang ada di-Singapura itu yang sa-tengah<sup>2</sup> daripada wakil atau pun Ahli<sup>2</sup> daripada P.A.P. telah takut, atau telah pun khuatir, takut<sup>2</sup> kalau bagi pehak kita menyalahgunakan Perlembagaan yang ada. Tetapi, pemimpin besar-nya—kalau dia kata besar, tetapi bagi pehak saya, saya belum lagi nampak Mr Lee Kuan Yew ini sangat besar—pemimpin besar-nya sendiri pun tidak tahu kedudukan-nya yang sa-benar. Sapatut-nya sa-bagai sa-buah negeri yang memimpin sa-buah Negeri, sa-bahagian Negeri di-dalam Malaysia ini, apabila keluar daripada negeri ini, dia mestilah mematohi Perlembagaan. Sa-bagai ra'ayat yang chintakan Malaysia, dia tidak boleh membuat analisa<sup>2</sup> berkenaan dengan Kerajaan sendiri yang ada, tetapi kalau dia menghadapi kapada parti, atau kapada orang ramai di-dalam kempen<sup>2</sup>, di-dalam penerangan—kita tidak gadoh mengatakan kami ini tidak betul, dia tidak betul—mengatakan bagi pehak Perikatan tidak layak, P.A.P. layak—itu tidaklah barangkali kita ragukan, atau pun kita susahkan, tetapi dalam soal ini, saya nampak di-dalam pemuatan fikiran saya, maka P.A.P. sekarang sunggoh<sup>2</sup> merasa takut, berasa diri-nya, barangkali kurang kuat, dan harus pada tahun 1969 akan datang, barangkali berubah chorak pemerentahan di-Singapura. Oleh sebab itu-lah terbukti yang dia sendiri sudah tahu dengan keadaan P.A.P. sendiri sahaja menentang Perikatan, atau pun barangkali hendak berjalan dalam masa yang akan datang, harus tidak berjaya. Mereka telah mengumpulkan semua parti<sup>2</sup> yang pro-Malaysia—keadaan yang sama bagi parti ini, sama ada dasar socialist-kah, atau dasar perkauman—tidak kira, asal boleh di-jadikan perkakas, umpama-nya yang di-pilih-nya macham Rahim Ishak dahulu yang boleh menjadi perkakas mereka, maka parti<sup>2</sup> itu, atau orang<sup>2</sup> yang saperti itu di-ambil, tetapi ini pun memboktikan

bahawa Enche' Lee Kuan Yew sendiri, dia berchapak, dia tidak pakai.

Pada satu masa dahulu di-dalam Uchapan Titah di-Raja juga, tahun lepas, dia mengatakan bahawa kedudukan parti, P.A.P. ini terang, dia bukan-lah sa-bagai muka hadapan barisan kominis umpama-nya, Parti Barisan Sosialis umpama-nya, Parti S.U.P.P. daripada Sarawak, sekarang tanya dengan "saudara" Lee Kuan Yew, kalau orang Singupra kata dia "saudara" Lee Kuan Yew ini, apakah S.U.P.P. yang sudah sama penting anasir<sup>2</sup> yang di-belakang S.U.P.P. ini? Apa-kah chapak dahulu, bukan chapak Lee Kuan Yew sekarang? Apa yang di-buat-nya di-sini yang sampai hari ini, itu juga tape yang di-ulang<sup>2</sup>-nya dan S.U.P.P. kita terang<sup>2</sup> mengatakan bahawa parti ini dahulu menentang Malaysia dan ada di-selaputi, atau pun barangkali diseludupi oleh kominis dan baharu dua hari yang lepas, kita dapat tahu bahawa Kerajaan bertindak mengharamkan sa-buah Chawangan S.U.P.P., barangkali 14 batu-kah, atau berapa batu-kah daripada bandar Kuching—daripada pekan Kuching. Ini terang, tetapi kapada P.A.P. sa-bagaimana yang di-ucapkan oleh Menteri<sup>2</sup> sa-bagaimana yang di-buat oleh Ahli<sup>2</sup> Yang Berhormat pemimpin<sup>2</sup> Perikatan—ini orang yang boleh, atau pun parti yang boleh di-gunakan-nya: ah! mari di-gunakan, tetapi bila sampai masa-nya, dia akan membuat guna, atau pun membuat analisa-nya sendiri, barangkali entah apa yang dia hendak buat-nya yang akan datang.

Akhir-nya, pada sa'at ini, yang di-hadapan saya ini, paling senang Enche' Lee Kuan Yew ini mengatakan termasok pula tempat saya negeri Melaka yang harus<sup>2</sup> salah agak akan membuat satu fikiran baharu hendak menyokong dengan idea<sup>2</sup> yang mengatakan chara yang di-fikirkan, atau yang di-analisa-kan oleh P.A.P. dengan apa yang timbul pada masa sekarang. Ini saya rasa patut-lah bagi pehak pemimpin P.A.P. ini, kalau mithal-nya hendak membelah-bagi pun, kalau dia-lah mahu pada masa akan datang, biar-lah betul<sup>2</sup> sedikit.

Ini, kami di-Melaka kalau hendak pergi di-Singapura pun lalu di-Johor dahulu, dan sangat-lah bodoh rasa-nya bagi pehak kami, terutama sa-kali ra'ayat negeri Melaka, kalau tidak mengkaji sa-benar<sup>2</sup>-nya, atau tidak bergerak dengan sa-benar<sup>2</sup>-nya dengan chara terang, dengan chara jaga, dengan chara hidup, bukan dengan chara mimpi, kerana P.A.P. sendiri pun tahu di-Melaka, saya rasa P.A.P. sendiri pun belum laku—belum laku. Ada chalun<sup>2</sup> yang bertanding di-Melaka dahulu, tentu-lah saudara Othman Wok boleh memberi jawapan, menang-kah atau tidak—kalah! dan sungguh bagi pehak kami di-Melaka sekarang, kenal tindak-tandok P.A.P. ini, memang-lah sudah terang sekarang ini, dia hendak mengikat, atau pun hendak mempengaruhi, atau hendak menipu orang<sup>2</sup> China pada mula-nya untok menyokong P.A.P. dan satu masa, saya percaya, kalau kekuasaan ada di-tangan P.A.P. nanti, maka Malaysia kita ini akan jadi salah satu ta'alok negara komunis.

Jadi, sa-lain daripada itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mengambil masa sedikit sahaja berkenaan dengan langkah Kerajaan yang memutuskan bahawa pekerja<sup>2</sup> tidak-lah boleh menjalankan mogok pada masa sekarang ini. Jadi, saya bagi pehak Perikatan pun, saya rasa bukan-lah tidak, atau pun tidak mahu bekerja bagi pehak pekerja<sup>2</sup>—memang kita sedar bahawa kita bagi pehak Perikatan, atau Kerajaan sendiri memang sa-lama-nya memberi keutamaan yang baik, atau pun yang elok kepada pekerja<sup>2</sup>, saya ingat lebeh daripada keadaan<sup>2</sup> yang telah lalu, tetapi apa yang saya hendak suarakan pada hari ini bahawa sahabat<sup>2</sup> kita, pemimpin<sup>2</sup> Trade Union ini hendak-lah berfikir masak di-dalam hal<sup>2</sup> yang bersangkutan dengan keadaan negara kita sekarang. Jangan menggunakan ugutan dan memakai barangkali fikiran<sup>2</sup> yang amrah ketika memikirkan keputusan bagi pehak Kerajaan.

Ada kita mendengar sekarang sehingga mereka mahu menubuhkan parti<sup>2</sup> politik, atau pun mahu menyoal politik bersama sa-bagai orang persorang, atau pun sa-bagai kita ra'ayat yang hidup di-dalam negara

demokrasi, tidak-lah terlarang, tidak di-beri sekatan di-dalam soalan<sup>2</sup> ini, tetapi mari-lah kita insaf sa-mula bahawa bukan sahaja bagi pehak pekerja<sup>2</sup> yang hendak kita lindongi dalam kehidupan kita bahkan seluruh pekerja yang bukan kaki-tangan Kerajaan yang bekerja kepada perusahaan pun ada-lah patut sama<sup>2</sup> kita fikirkan sekarang ini. Dan dalam masa keadaan negara kita yang sedang di-dalam dharurat ini, atau pun menghadapi konferansi daripada Indonesia ini, patut-lah kita memikirkan bersama<sup>2</sup>—dengan sa-sungguh-nya memikirkan perkara ini dan bukan-lah boleh kita alehkan niat Kerajaan Perikatan ini menjalankan satu dasar hendak menchari kebaikan yang boleh pula kita pesongkan kepada tujuan<sup>2</sup> yang lain. Sakian-lah sahaja. Terima kaseh.

**Enche' Geh Chong Keat (Penang Utara):** Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the original motion before the House and, on behalf of my constituents, thank Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong for the Gracious Speech, for ruling our nation wisely and justly. During Their Majesties' reign they have received and reciprocated goodwill and friendship from nations far and wide. Our Malaysian citizens and people, young and old, from all races, religions and creeds, love Their Majesties and owe much to them for the big leap in our national progress, prosperity and happiness. Under the able leadership of Yang Teramat Mulia Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra Al-Haj and his Cabinet, the economy of the nation is expanding in step with a growing population and successfully meeting the challenge of building a better life and a happier society for all true Malaysians, and particularly for the underprivileged. Under the various rural development schemes and rural economic upliftment, the use of modern techniques to increase production in the factories and in the fields has forged ahead the dedication to the goal of ensuring that the gap between the haves and the have-nots is steadily narrowed, so that the labourers and the lower income group can have a fair share of the fruits of their labour. Big land development

schemes are making wider settlement possible, and fulfilling the Alliance policy of land for the landless, and this will maintain a proper balance between land and population for any length of time; this would prove to be very successful and would claim national achievement in land reform, if distribution or allocation is made on a more general basis, i.e. Malaysian basis, at this latter part of our Malaysian programme.

We are most grateful to our beloved Prime Minister for leading us forward together with hope and confidence to the future. We have very good reasons to rejoice in our overall advance in Malaysia and also for maintaining the policy we adopted at the time of our independence. We have and will remain consistent and loyal to our ideals of freedom and democracy in accordance with the Constitution, and to our desire to maintain friendship and co-operation with other nations, particularly our immediate neighbours.

The firm steps taken by our Perdana Menteri and the Minister for Home Affairs to protect the integrity and prestige of the Malaysians of Chinese origin against the Philippines' discrimination has brought added pride to our Malaysian heritage. This is not the first time that they have taken action to defend Malaysians of Chinese origin. This action speaks volume of their assurances of building a truly Malaysian Malaysia—and this has again been endorsed by our Honourable Minister for Home Affairs. Such action deserves the praise and support of all loyal and true Malaysians.

Our Prime Minister has time and again told the people that there is a place under the Malaysian sun for everyone, a place for every loyal citizen and those who consider Malaysia their home, and that the country belongs to loyal and true Malaysians. Here, I would like to say in *Bahasa Kebangsaan*:

Kita ra'ayat Malaysia, bukan China bukan Melayu atau orang India. Tiga bangsa dan asing bersatu bangsa Malaysia. Tanah ayer pun hak ra'ayat Malaysia.

Our Honourable Minister of Finance, Enche' Tan Siew Sin, has often

appealed to all Malaysians to live together harmoniously with tolerance for a better and happier society. As the National President of the Malay Chinese Association, he has pledged the forging of the Chinese cultural identity into a Malaysian culture, which will enrich and which is the logical outcome of the Malaysian nation, which we all are striving to build. With his guidance and our citizens' high sense of responsibility and loyalty in regarding ourselves as Malaysians, we therefore deem it our duty to defend our nation against all aggressors at the cost of our lives, in order to protect our Malaysian heritage.

I would like to remind this House of the warnings given by the many leaders about enemies within and without our country. These warnings have to be taken in all seriousness in the consolidation of our preparedness to meet our common enemy. We should not allow politicking to split us apart—the traitors and disloyal elements must be seriously dealt with without reservation.

Sir, the Members of the Socialist Front have in this House pledged their loyalty to our King and country and the Member for Dato Kramat has supported the call from the Honourable Minister of Finance for unity. He has also informed us that there are copies of statements by the Socialist Front, Malaysia. I am very worried as to what type of statements or booklets he is going to show. However, I have got here some quotations, which I would like to quote, from the suggestions proposed in discussions by the Penang Divisional Branch at a representative meeting on whether or not the Party should issue illegal statements dated the 7th March, 1965:

"The Socialist Front discussed the term 'illegal'. It must be more clearly defined among their Party. Does it mean unconstitutional, or unlawful, or non-constitutional and unlawful statements? If 'illegal' means unconstitutional or unlawful because it is constitutional, then, obviously, the Party must not make such statements as we are a constitutional party and owe a responsibility as such to all members and the people whom we represent."

This is a little bit of tongue twisting, Sir, by the Socialist Front—and this I have got to practise.

“If it means purely unlawful but constitutional statements, then the national executive must decide according to each case, that is, to call for a demonstration banned by the Police may sometimes be necessary when the members are prepared to face the consequences. In such instances, it would be ridiculous for the Party not to take appropriate action as a calculated risk.”

“The party also decided that it should, bearing the above two contradictions in mind, use its powers to oppose the call-up within all constitutional means, provided we do not jeopardise the national interest and the sovereign integrity of our country and provided we do not by these means become an anti-national organisation, and these contradictions are: ‘We are anti-Malaysia but neither do we support illegal struggle.’ Bearing in mind all the points, the Branches feel that they cannot support the National call-up as it might heighten the danger of war with Indonesia. At the same time we realise that if we do not support the National call-up and strengthen our defences we will become victims of foreign powers and might end up in an anti-national position.”

Here, we have in the same breath members from the Socialist Front declaring their loyalty and support to their King and country. What appears more dangerous of all, Sir, I would like to read again from the extracts of the Socialist Front’s minutes :

“Not to act unconstitutionally does not mean to oppose. To attack such laws we can attack the fundamental basis of such laws and we do that constitutionally and legally. For example, this is not a good example, but we might as well deal with it. Malaysia was formed with the signatures of the various Governments concerned. It is a constitutional reality. Do we, in opposing Malaysia, deny that it exists for its citizens? To deny its existence must seem to deny its citizenship too.”

As it is, they proclaim themselves anti-Malaysia and yet we have not heard both Members of the Socialist Front here renouncing their citizenships.

“But should we not oppose it? Of course, we must. But how? Do we say we do not accept Malaysia, or do we admit that Malaysia exist, but maintain that it is repugnant to our concept of democracy, and that it would lead to disaster and that it should be dissolved and a new discussion should begin?”

Sir, they are trying to dissolve what is undissolvable! That is what I know of the views of the Socialist Front, and they are trying to do things behind the

back of the Government; the most dangerous of all is that they are trying to dissolve the undissolvable and which, I am sure, Members of Parliament and the citizens of this country will gladly invite them to do.

Sir, it is very necessary that I also echo in this august House the warning of the Honourable Minister of Education on the 18th March, 1958, delivered at the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka. I quote :

“Fanatics and opportunists will create disorder. We have heard of what had happened in India and Ceylon, where riots had resulted in bloodshed, just because of the impossible action of a minority group.”

He added further, and I quote :

“We must not let this happen here. We must not allow anyone to exploit language or religion for their own ends.”

How right he was in warning the nation to beware of the fanatics. As we know, there are some people who would like to tell us what to do—what they themselves do not believe or have faith in. I ask these few people, why exploit our people, our citizens and above all, why exploit other people’s children? Sir, we must look forward; we must not look backward. The country has progressed and has borne fruits and has shown results. Whether the policy is right or wrong, there is a democratic provision for parties to fight it out and make it their business to take over the Government. But exploitation of this type must not be tolerated by any member of any party.

Sir, I would like to state specifically that I support the National language and associate myself specifically with the remarks made by the Minister of Education. I quote :

“Language should be a unifying factor. If we are to have this, we should be broad-minded and show tolerance, as we believe in democracy.”

Arising out of this, I am sure the Honourable Minister of Education has shown a lot of tolerance and understanding, and he has also shown that the National language as a binding factor can be achieved, if we are practical and sensible. He has also shown great tolerance by allowing Chinese schools to have Chinese sign

boards. It may be a small matter, but little things will give rise to fear. However, I am glad to say that his broad-mindedness has corrected the wrong instructions carried out by the State Chief Education Officer.

**Mr (Deputy) Speaker:** May I know how long more it will take you to finish?

**Enche' Geh Chong Keat:** I will take only another five minutes, Sir. Now, Sir, I would like to touch on Commerce and Industry. I am sure that the public fully realise that it is the Government's policy to protect local industries. If in protecting each and every industry, Government has to drastically curtail the importation of goods from abroad, surely, the nation's cost of living would rise considerably sooner or later. It is therefore, incumbent upon the Government to try to strike a suitable medium of maintaining a healthy competition until such time as the country's requirements in the various commodities and essential products can be really met by our local pioneer-status factories. To give protection in order for the factories to monopolise would not be a healthy policy of the Government.

Sir, the people of Penang Island feel that they have been strangled very slowly and steadily. Import restriction has been imposed "for only Penang consumption". The Government has controlled export to the Mainland; it has made it very complicating and difficult for the Islanders. Goods can be imported by the residents, or the traders, residing in Butterworth, and they can apply for import permits at the local Penang office. But the Penang Island traders cannot export goods to Butterworth or the Mainland, unless they apply to Kuala Lumpur, the Headquarters, direct. This is really, shall I say, "passing the buck from one Department to another". I request the Honourable Minister of Commerce and Industry to study the situation and I hope that he will ease the restriction, because a lot of traders in Penang Island have their business on the Mainland, Butterworth, and they would like to move their articles to Butterworth,

but under the present restriction, they are not allowed to ship or transport over whatever remaining products they may have in Penang. For example, a contractor may need some of his materials at Butterworth, or the Mainland, to fulfil his contracts. Now, to bring the old planks and materials over to Butterworth, he has got to apply to Kuala Lumpur rather than the Penang office.

Sir, another point that I would like to bring forth is in regard to partition mentioned by Mr Lee Kuan Yew, the P.A.P. leader. Sir, he spoke of partitioning and in that he has included Penang. Sir, we may have our quarrels with the Minister of Finance (Mr Tan Siew Sin); we may not see eye to eye with him; we may also not agree with the Minister of Commerce and Industry. Penang may have a record for secession before the formation of the Federation of Malaya, but as time passes we also have changed our views. We have been very annoyed with the Minister of Finance for committing Penang Island into the Common Market. We have heard, time and again, of statements and representations made to him. He has at one time made himself very unpopular, but then, as time marches on, we have progressed. Above all, we have faith in Malaysia and we have faith in the Prime Minister, Tunku Abdul Rahman Putra Al-Haj, and we are sure that whatever grievances and frustrations we may have in Penang over the free port status, he would look into them. We have made known our decisions and he has reciprocated saying that the free port status shall be until such time as the people desire it. But then we are very worried because the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Commerce and Industry may not agree with that view, and as the result of that, with all these restrictions, we, the Penang people, are suffering in trade and other businesses. However, in spite of these, we will not agree to go in alignment with the P.A.P. to secede or form another union with Singapore. It is up to the P.A.P. to convince the people. It is up to them to capture the State Government. They did try. Mr Lee Kuan Yew marched along

Beach Street towards a public rally one afternoon. He tried to gather a crowd or a mass behind him. Unfortunately, the people, who came out, just wanted to have a look to see what Lee Kuan Yew looks like. The P.A.P. closed down its branch, took down its signboard and, in the last three months, the P.A.P. has been making another effort to establish themselves in another new building. Sir, as one party to another, as one politician to another, we say, "Welcome to Penang Island. We can fight it out all over again." (*Applause*).

Sir, when debating on the King's Speech it is natural for Members of Parliament to touch on certain aspects of economy. Since time is very pressing and as the Yang di-Pertuan Agong has mentioned, "With regard to the economic development, one unfortunate factor is the downward trend in the price of rubber, one of our two main products, because of competition from synthetic rubber", I would not like to go through what I have here. However, I would like to bring forth this to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture. Under diversification, I request for Government support and subsidy for nutmeg and cloves cultivation on the Island of Penang—in the national language it is *bunga chengkeh* and *buah pala*. Sir, the history of Penang is linked with the cultivation of nutmeg and cloves as economic crops. Before the turn of this century there were approximately 14,000 acres under the cultivation of nutmeg, but this crop was replaced by rubber, and today we have about 400 acres of grown nutmeg plantation. Sir, if the Minister can establish an experimental station to study the growing of these crops, I am sure this diversification of crops will bring more income to our cultivators in Penang and the country, as both nutmegs and cloves are in very great demand in the European countries and America. Incidentally, they have been trying to grow these crops in Mexico, in the Philippines, and even in India, but have failed. Given the right opportunity at the right time, I shall go into details.

Sir, the next point is in regard to trawler fishing, because the Yang di-Pertuan Agong . . . .

**Mr (Deputy) Speaker:** I would remind you that you have already taken up 10 minutes.

**Enche' Geh Chong Keat:** I will make it short.

**Mr (Deputy) Speaker:** I will give you one more minute.

**Enche' Geh Chong Keat:** Yes, Sir. The Yang di-Pertuan Agong in paragraph 404 mentioned trawler fishing. Sir, we agree to progress, but in making progress we must safeguard the livelihood of the inshore fishermen. The Minister has allowed trawler fishing with conditions, but very unfortunately a 15 fathom limit has been agreed upon as a common fishing ground of the offshore fishermen, and I would request that he look into this question of depth and the question of supervision. As it is, a statement was made by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture on a certain date—the heading was something like "Trawler fishing ban lifted." This statement and heading had brought about a lot of misunderstanding and even the police were misled by this statement. They thought that the ban on trawler fishing was lifted and they could trawl anywhere they liked—and even today they have been trawling. To make matters worse, the Northern Regional Fisheries Officer said, "Why not, what can we do? What can the Minister do?" And it was said at that meeting; he admitted openly that there was illegal trawling all over the shores on the eastern side, and the Department could not do anything against this illegal trawling. Therefore, I request the Honourable Minister to be very cautious in granting licences to trawler fishing. He must stick to the conditions that he has imposed and also see that there is proper control and supervision; and unless he can control and supervise and eliminate this illegal trawling, then I say that the permitting of trawler fishing would turn out to be a failure and would bring trouble between the fishermen and trawlers. Thank you.

**Dato' Dr Haji Megat Khas (Kuala Kangsar):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya

suka-lah berdiri di-sini, petang ini, mengambil sedikit peluang beruchap di-dalam perkara Titah Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong dan menyokong dengan sa-penoh-nya ia-itu di-dalam Rumah yang berbahagia ini menyampaikan junjong kaseh kepada Duli Yang Maha Mulia itu di-atas limpah kurnia memberi kita Uchapan yang bagitu baik dan bagitu penoh dan dengan yang demikian juga, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka-lah membangkang dengan sa-penoh<sup>2</sup>-nya di-atas pindaan yang telah di-bawa oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Singapura dua hari yang lalu. Kemudian daripada itu apabila saya memikirkan di-atas ucapan<sup>2</sup> yang telah di-dengar di-dalam Rumah yang berbahagia ini sa-lama tiga hari yang telah lalu, teringat-lah saya akan ucapan "Edmund Burke" tatkala menuntut kemerdekaan bagi negeri Amerika di-dalam tahun 1768 dahulu, kerana ada-lah ucapan<sup>2</sup>-nya itu sangat-lah lancar, sangat-lah penoh dan penoh juga dengan segala sengat<sup>2</sup> dan penyakit<sup>2</sup> yang di-tujukan kepada Kerajaan kita. Pendek kata-nya semua-lah kita di-sini teringat hari 27 haribulan dahulu, bagaimana saperti satu orang memainkan wayang, Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri Singapura, telah mengangkat buku Perlembagaan Malaysia dan mengatakan ia-itu tiap<sup>2</sup> Ahli di-dalam Rumah Yang Berbahagia ini hendak-lah mengekalkan Perlembagaan itu dan juga mengingatkan kita ia-itu tiap<sup>2</sup> satu orang daripada kita yang dudok di-sini telah mengangkat sumpah yang Perlembagaan itu hendak-lah di-kawal, hendak-lah di-churiga, hendak-lah dipertahankan. Maka pada hari ini, pada pagi tadi, kita semua terbacha di-dalam surat khabar "*Straits Times*" mengatakan ia-itu beliau telah pun membayang<sup>2</sup>-kan soalan Malaysia di-depan kita ini. Kalau sa-kira-nya tidak dapat di-selesaikan dengan jalan yang lain, hendak-lah Malaysia ini di-rombak balek menjadikan sa-umpama sa-helai kain yang hendak di-charek<sup>2</sup>. Jadi tidak ada berma'ana kepada beliau itu yang Malaysia yang kita idami dan kita agong<sup>2</sup>-kan pembangunan-nya sa-telah dua tahun lalu di-panjangkan usia-nya.

Jadi, perkara itu biar-lah saya tinggalkan dahulu, kerana dengan pesanan Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tadi, ia-itu tiap<sup>2</sup> orang itu boleh berchakap chuma dalam 10 minit dan saya berpandu juga dengan sa-berapa boleh untuk mengetatkan isi-nya. Sa-telah Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Singapura itu berchakap, berdiri-lah pula Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh yang telah mengatakan, ia-itu dengan adanya clause, atau pun Article 153 di-dalam Perlembagaan itu, dia juga-lah mengatakan yang dia tidak bersetuju daripada mula-nya di-adakan dan ditubuhkan Malaysia ini, dan sa-olah<sup>2</sup> chakap-nya sekarang, awak telah dapat mengalami kerumitan<sup>2</sup> daripada Malaysia di-dirikan, apa kata kami? Bak kata orang tua<sup>2</sup>: Ah! kami sudah chakap dahulu, sekarang awak sudah rasa betul-kah atau tidak. Jadi, dia juga, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada-lah satu daripada parti yang tidak memelihara dan mengawal Perlembagaan Malaysia ini dan sumpah yang diangkat-nya di-dalam Rumah yang berbahagia ini tidak ada berma'ana kepada Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ipoh itu, kerana tiap<sup>2</sup> sa-orang mestilah mewakili, atau pun mengawal dan menahankan Perlembagaan itu, tetapi di-dalam Perlembagaan itu apa yang di-pechat oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat itu ia-lah "Bahasa", dan "Hak Istimewa Orang<sup>2</sup> Melayu". Sungguh pun lagu itu ia-lah lagu lama dan kita semua sudah puas mendengar-nya, tetapi sakit juga hati kita mendengar-nya lagi sa-kali. Sa-telah itu, berdiri pula wakil daripada U.D.P. mengatakan kenapa pula Parti Perikatan takut kepada Parti P.A.P. yang ada di-Singapura dan menudoh kita, barangkali ia-lah kerana kita telah silap dan dia telah mengemukakan empat factor yang mengatakan ia-lah kita ini takut dan dengan sebab itu telah mengadakan chara<sup>2</sup> dan usaha<sup>2</sup> yang boleh mengejutkan raya<sup>2</sup> jelata dan yang kedua-nya ketakutan kita itu ia-lah dengan sebab kita telah membuat salah dan tahu ia-itu perasaan perkauman belum habis dan belum selesai, dan yang ketiga katanya ini-lah satu chara Parti Perikatan hendak mengekalkan kuasa-nya. Demikian-lah kata beliau di-dalam ucapan-nya yang panjang lebar yang telah

mengambil masa lebih daripada dua jam pada hari itu juga.

Kemudian berdiri pula Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Barisan Sosialis Singapura yang telah menerangkan kepada kita di-dalam Rumah yang berbahagia ini macham mana pendirian Parti-nya, ia-itu dia juga sa-rupa dengan P.A.P. mengatakan pada masa yang lalu, kami dahulu ta' suka di-adakan Malaysia dan kesusahan<sup>2</sup>-nya timbul sekarang, rasa-lah sendiri. Apa kata kami hari itu, kami juga ta' suka tentera<sup>2</sup> daripada negeri<sup>2</sup> asing berada di-sini, pendek kata Parti Barisan Sosialis itu ia-lah dudok di-dalam mimpi sampai pada hari ini. Kalau sa-kira-nya tidak bagitu, tentu-lah dia tidak berkata demikian, kerana kalau tidak ada tentera<sup>2</sup> daripada sahabat<sup>2</sup> kita di-dalam Commonwealth dudok bersama<sup>2</sup> kita di-sini, besok pun boleh di-masoki oleh kominis, malam ini boleh di-masoki oleh Indonesia. Pendek kata, kalau sa-kira-nya boleh, saya sendiri mengi'tirafkan Barisan Sosialis ini ia-lah suka dia kepada kominis dan boleh-lah kita katakan, kalau ta' silap saya, dia "tali barut" kominis di-dalam negeri ini—saya ulang lagi tali barut kominis di-dalam negeri ini. Dan dia tidak bersetuju dengan parti P.A.P. kerana ia-lah kalau dua orang menjadi penchuri itu, dua<sup>2</sup> orang penchuri juga, tetapi sa-orang boleh mengatakan dia ta' menchuri bila dia sudah mendapati kawan itu salah. Jadi, kata pepatah orang puteh: "There is no honour among the thieves, and both of them are thieves".

Jadi, daripada situ saya berbalek-lah sa-mula, kerana masa hanya ada lima minit pada saya. Berbalek saya kepada soal Parti P.A.P., khusus-nya ia-itu Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Singapura, Enche' Lee Kuan Yew yang telah mengemukakan ia-itu patut-lah kita bercherai sa-lepas kita berkahwin dahulu. Belum lagi kita berbulan madu dan tengah dua tahun kita di-Malaysia ini belum lagi berbulan madu, Ahli<sup>2</sup> Yang Berhormat, tetapi sudah hendak bercherai. Jadi, cherai itu, barangkali talak satu-kah, talak dua-kah, atau talak tiga-kah—wallah hua'lam, tetapi saya berharap ia-itu kepentingan negara hendak-lah kita

jaga dengan sa-boleh<sup>2</sup>-nya dan kami bagi Parti Perikatan di-dalam Negeri ini, atau pun Negeri<sup>2</sup> di-dalam Semenanjong ini telah berkata berkali<sup>2</sup>, berulang<sup>2</sup> kali, bukan sahaja tenaga, usaha wang ringgit, bahkan nyawa dan titisan darah yang akhir, kami sedia mengorbankan untuk negara kami, kerana tidak ada negara lain yang kami anggap sa-bagai tempat dudok kami, dan kami biar-lah bermati dengan-nya. Maka dengan adanya gambaran yang telah di-bawa oleh akhbar *Straits Times* pagi tadi menjadikan terkejut kepada kami orang<sup>2</sup> Perikatan di-sini dan juga kepada orang<sup>2</sup> Melayu 'am-nya, walau parti apa sa-kali pun, saya perchaya sahabat saya di-sabelah sana daripada orang<sup>2</sup> Melayu, barangkali ta' bersetuju—dia telah mengatakan bertalu<sup>2</sup> ia-itu di-sini dia tidak bersetuju sa-mata<sup>2</sup> dengan kerana kita, tetapi saya rasa kalau sa-kira-nya negeri kita di-ancham, tentu sa-kali dia pun masok pada sa-belah kita.

Jadi, dengan sebab itu, saya berharap jangan-lah lidah itu berchakap dengan mudah, dengan chara berchabang—di-sini berchakap bagini, di-sini berchakap bagini.

Yang Berhormat Enche' Lee Kuan Yew pada pagi yang pertama mengatakan: "Kami ia-lah loyal Opposition—Pembangkang yang ta'at setia kepada Negara". Hari ini hendak merombak Malaysia. Saya rasa ini-lah dua perkara yang berlainan. Dia boleh di-anggap tidak setia, dan kalau sa-kira-nya hendak memakai perkataan yang lebih keras boleh di-katakan treason dalam bahasa Inggeris. Barangkali juga beliau itu tidak tahu macham mana bagi kami orang<sup>2</sup> Melayu khusus-nya berasa pada tentang negeri ini. Kalau sa-kira-nya hendak di-pechah<sup>2</sup>kan Malaysia ini untuk di-bahagi kepada kominis, saya perchaya dengan perpechahan itu ini besok Indonesia boleh masok ka-Sabah mengikut Pulau Sebatek, lusa Indonesia boleh ka-Sibu dari Limbangan di-dalam Sarawak dan tulat barangkali boleh masok ka-Singapura daripada Rhio. Jadi, tidak-lah ada ma'ana-nya kita mengadakan satu batasan hendak menchegeh kemajuan daripada satu parti yang besar di-dunia ini ia-itu

parti kominis. Maka dengan sebab itu hendak-lah kita semua memandang kepentingan negara dan tidak ada lain jalan kepentingan itu di-kawal melainkan dengan bersatu-padu.

Maka saya rasa dengan sebab banyak lagi kawan saya yang hendak berchakap kalau di-biarkan saya berchakap barangkali sa-tengah jam lagi pun boleh, tetapi tentu-lah Tuan Yang di-Pertua akan menegor dan kerana kita telah berjanji, kita ikut-lah janji. Biar-lah saya minta diri dahulu. Terima kasih.

**Enche' E. W. Barker (Singapore):** Mr Speaker, Sir, the motion before this House is a motion on the Speech graciously delivered by His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong. We have heard several speakers, Government Ministers and backbenchers, who have hardly touched upon the contents of His Majesty's Address. Instead, they have chosen the People's Action Party as the target for their attacks. We have heard no constructive suggestions; instead, one after another of the speakers have done nothing else but speak of the People's Action Party and the Prime Minister of Singapore.

On behalf of my colleagues and myself I would like to thank the Government for the valuable publicity which they have given us—publicity given continuously over four days, and publicity which we consider worth its weight in gold. This continuous attack against the Singapore Government might make some people think that it is the Singapore Government which is the Government of Malaysia. (*Laughter*). But, as a few speakers have pointed out, Mr Speaker, we are being confronted by the Indonesians. They have landed paratroops; they have made incursions into Kota Tinggi and even Pontian; they have from time to time exploded bombs in Singapore. But hardly any of the Government speakers have touched upon the question of confrontation. Instead, they talked about their internal enemy, and as one of the Ministers pointed out just now, externally, they say, Soekarno, internally Lee Kuan Yew. But which is worse? To come to the truth, Mr Speaker, I think I should quote part

of a speech made by the Honourable Member for Johore Tenggara—this was a speech he was alleged to have made in Malacca on 5th April this year and he is reported in the *Utusan Melayu* to have said this:

“Dato' Albar added:—and I quote—‘The Alliance, particularly UMNO, is not so much worried about Indonesia's confrontation, because we know how far they can take action. But we are very afraid of internal elements.’”

Mr Speaker, Sir, that little part of the speech, I think, explains the whole tone of this debate on the King's Address. Right from the beginning, starting from the Mover of the motion right up to today, there has been nothing else but the alleged evils of Lee Kuan Yew and the Singapore Ministers.

**Enche' Tan Toh Hong:** On a point of clarification, Sir. When I made the speech on Friday, I think the Honourable Member who is speaking now was not here. I spoke quite long on confrontation, not merely in terms of Malaysia's survival but in terms of a wider context and a threat to world peace. Unfortunately, some papers have not bothered to publish it. But there are some papers which have published it in the language which the Honourable Member, who spoke just now, probably cannot read.

**Enche' E. W. Barker:** I can assure the Honourable Member from Bukit Bintang that I was here part of the time when he spoke, but I am not to blame if the newspapers do not carry his speech. (*Laughter*).

Mr Speaker, Sir, our Constitution provides for a democratic Malaysia but, unfortunately, recent legislation already passed and legislation intended to be passed by the Central Government has encroached upon the fundamental concepts of democracy upon which our Constitution is based. Mention has been made in this debate about the postponing of local government elections and the banning in essential services of strikes and industrial actions. But, Mr Speaker, Sir, what is more disconcerting is the proposed legislation by the Ministry of Justice. I refer, firstly, to the Criminal Procedure Code (Amendment) Act, 1965,

and secondly, to the Court of Judicature Act (Amendment) Bill. Little has been said about the first Act in this House, but judging from the newspapers that Act is causing much public concern. And, Mr Speaker, I think I cannot do better than bring the attention of the House to an editorial in the *Straits Times* of yesterday, on page 10, headed "Accusation and Trial".

Mr Speaker, Sir, if you will bear with me, I will quote very shortly from this editorial.

"Although the proposed changes in the criminal Procedure Code (Amendment) Bill are not as drastic in at least one important respect as was first reported, they are far reaching and on the whole regressive. They are not attracting anywhere near the attention they deserve. The two major changes proposed are the abolition of preliminary enquiry before committal for trial in the High Court, and the restriction of the right of trial by jury to offences punishable by death."

The editorial ends, Mr Speaker, Sir, in this way:

"It is very difficult not to question these amendments to the code when the explanatory statement solemnly asserts that all the existing safeguards of the present system are preserved. They are not."

Mr Speaker, Sir, we in Singapore are not affected by this proposed Bill, which, I understand, is being confined to the States of Malaya and the Borneo territories. What we are more concerned with is the proposed amendment to the Court of Judicature Act (Amendment) Bill which has also attracted sufficient public attention to merit comments in the *Straits Times* of today. The *Straits Times* today gave a whole editorial to this proposed Bill, an editorial under the heading "Privy Council".

**Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid (Seberang Utara):** Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of order—Standing Order 39 (1) states:

"It shall be out of order to anticipate the discussion of a Bill standing on the Order of Business by discussion upon a substantive motion . . . ."

I think the Honourable Member is speaking on the Bill that is coming up for discussion. I appeal to you for your ruling, Mr Speaker, Sir.

**Mr (Deputy) Speaker:** Yes, the Bill will be discussed tomorrow.

**Enche' E. W. Barker:** Mr Speaker, Sir, though the Bill will be discussed tomorrow, may I point out that several Honourable Members from the Government side have made reference to this Bill this morning, and the Minister of Finance has also supported the Bill by saying that the only argument against the Bill is that our Bar and our Bench are not fit enough to sit at the final Court of Appeal. It was on that that I ask the Honourable Minister questions. However, I shall abide by your ruling, Mr Speaker. If you think you should rule me out, that I would not say anything on the Bill, I will sit down.

**Mr (Deputy) Speaker:** Yes, that Bill will be discussed tomorrow.

**Dato' Dr Ismail:** Sir, the Bill is not going to be read a second time in this session. In moving the Bill for the first time, I did mention that the second reading will be at the subsequent session and not at this session. This is just a point of information.

**Enche' E. W. Barker:** I thank the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs for his explanation. I understand the position as was stated: the Bill is not coming up tomorrow—and it might never come up at all. However, this is a debate on the King's Speech and on the King's Speech a Member can range over all sorts of matters. Shall I proceed, Mr Speaker, Sir? (*Mr Deputy Speaker assents*).

**Dato' Dr Ismail:** Sir, on behalf of the Government, I have no objection.

**Enche' E. W. Barker:** Sir, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is a unique body which still serves a very important purpose in the Commonwealth of today. No one can deny its invaluable contribution to the administration of justice in those countries which have at one time or other allowed appeals to the Privy Council. It has been our final Court of Appeal for many years and has served us well. Why then should we dispense with its services so quickly after the formation of Malaysia? Why, Mr Speaker, Sir, I ask, should there be a cloud of secrecy under which the Bill

was tabled? In a democratic country it is usual for any responsible government to consult not only the Bench but also the Bar when proposing to make important changes in the law.

We have three High Courts in Malaysia: one in Kuala Lumpur, one in Singapore and one in Kuching to serve the Borneo territories. I do not know, Mr Speaker, Sir, whether the Chief Justice of Malaya was consulted. But I am reliably informed that neither the Chief Justice of Singapore nor the Chief Justice of North Borneo was officially consulted, or even shown drafts of the Bill, which I, myself, only saw this morning. What is even worse is the fact that the Bar was not consulted at any stage. In fact, it was only after several meetings of the various Bar Committees throughout the country that the Draft Bill and the contents thereof were made available to them.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Singapore Bar Committee has passed certain drastic resolutions which I intended to read to this House, but in view of the short time we have left I am afraid I will not.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the methods used by the Government in shrouding its intentions by almost complete secrecy cannot certainly be described in any sense as "democratic". The only excuse the Government can have for abolishing this right of appeal is that after Independence we should not submit ourselves to the dictates of an English Court. But if this view is held, it is of course erroneous, for the Privy Council is not an English Court. The Privy Council consists of judges from all over the Commonwealth. At one time it consisted of judges from India, Sinhalese judges, judges from Australia, judges from New Zealand, judges from Canada. So, to say that we are following the dictates of an English Court is completely wrong. It is true, Mr Speaker, that in theory the system of appeals to the Privy Council is still formally associated with the British monarch as the foundation of justice. But in practice when the Judicial Committee sits to hear an overseas appeal, it is, to all intents and purposes, sitting as a final Court of Appeal for that

particular country from which the appeal came. The law it applies is the law of that country and not English law.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the retention of old forms may be objectionable to nationalistic sentiments, but any objection on that score is not reasonable. In Malaysia, His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong is interposed between the Federal Court and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Appeals do not lie direct from our Court to England. Appeals lie from the Federal Court to the Yang di-Pertuan Agong. He then refers the appeals, or applications for special leave to appeal, to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. But when the Judicial Committee delivers judgment, it usually ends by saying that "Their Lordships will report to the Head of the Federation to allow or dismiss the appeal", as the case may be. This clearly shows, Mr Speaker, Sir, that the Yang di-Pertuan Agong and not the British monarch is the foundation of justice in Malaysia.

It is apparent, Mr Speaker, Sir, that the Government has no excuse, except perhaps a political one, for the abolition or restriction of appeals to the Privy Council. With regard to constitutional matters, this is very apparent as the Constitution provides that only the Federal Court can deal with constitutional matters. Mr Speaker, Sir, I would refer to Article 128 of our Constitution, which reads—

"The Federal Court shall, to the exclusion of any other court, have jurisdiction to determine—

- (a) any question whether a law made by Parliament or by the Legislature of a State is invalid on the ground that it makes provision with respect to a matter with respect to which Parliament or, as the case may be, the Legislature of the State has no power to make laws; and
- (b) disputes on any other question between States or between the Federation and any State."

So, Sir, if a dispute arises, not necessarily between Singapore and Kuala Lumpur (*pause*) (*Mr Speaker takes over the Chair from Mr (Deputy) Speaker*). Mr Speaker, Sir, I have just referred to Article 128 of the Constitution which deals with constitutional matters. What

I was going to say was that it is only the Federal Court that can deal with constitutional matters and if we are to get rid of the Privy Council in respect of constitutional matters, then our Federal Court not only becomes the court of first instance but it is also the court of the last instance where any dispute on the Constitution lies.

Mr Speaker, Sir, before I conclude, may I say that we note with satisfaction that the Government has postponed the second and third readings of this Bill. We hope that the protests of the Bar and the public, and I include the Bench, will be considered by the Government seriously and that the Bill will not be proceeded with further in this House. Before I close, Mr Speaker, Sir, may I thank the Honourable Minister . . . .

**Dato' Dr Ismail:** On a point of clarification, it has not been the intention of the Government to bring the Bill for the second and third readings at this meeting. So there is no question of postponement as the Honourable Member said.

**Enche' E. W. Barker:** Before I close, I want to thank the Honourable Minister on the other bench for giving me this opportunity to say my little piece, and thank you Mr Speaker.

**Enche' Lee San Choon (Segamat Selatan):** Mr Speaker, Sir, the last speaker from the P.A.P. has said that we from the Government backbenches have so far not offered any constructive suggestion. I would like to offer one, if I may. Let me advise the P.A.P. to look after Singapore properly. I can assure the Honourable Members from the P.A.P. that this time there would not be another Tunku or the Alliance coming to the rescue of the P.A.P. I would tell you why.

Mr Speaker, Sir, in this multi-racial society of ours, if one studies the history of the political figures of the recent past of this country, one cannot miss a distinguishing feature among them. That is, they tend to play a communal line, when they find that they are losing the support of the people. Now, let me give you a few examples.

First, let me take the late great Dato' Onn. At the beginning of his political career, he was a great friend of the Chinese. Later when the UMNO preferred the Tunku to Dato' Onn, he left the UMNO and formed Party Negara, which initially claimed to be non-communal. However, when Dato' Onn realised that he had no Chinese support, he played the Malay line and he became the champion of the Malays. He went everywhere and championed the Malay cause, and Party Negara became the most anti-Chinese party. That resulted in the liquidation of Party Negara.

Next, we have the Honourable Member for Tanjong, Dr Lim Chong Eu and his friends—so many friends, like Mr Too Joon Hing, and his cliques—who used to champion the Alliance cause also at a time when Dr Lim was the president of the M.C.A. Then there was a crisis. What happened? The Alliance is no good, UMNO too dominating, Chinese interests are not protected! Now what has become of Dr Lim today? The U.D.P., a so-called national party, with only one lonely member in the Parliament.

Then we come to Enche' Aziz Ishak, who is now in detention. Similarly, he used to be a champion of the Alliance and a friend of the Chinese. When he was sacked, he formed the National Convention Party and he accused, just like Enche' Rahim Ishak of the P.A.P. did, that the Chinese are blood-suckers, the Malays were exploited, all the rural development programmes did not benefit the Malays. What happened? He was rejected by the people. That is why he went to the extent of getting Indonesian help.

Now, we come to the arrogant and conceited Prime Minister of Singapore. What did he say a year or two ago? He seems to think that we are all fools and that he can lie to us all the time. We all know that at the beginning the P.A.P. wanted to replace the M.C.A. and work with the UMNO. The Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew, perhaps, at that time also wanted to be in the Cabinet. So, he thought that by pleasing the leaders of the UMNO he could succeed in his manoeuvre. He

tried very hard to please the Tunku, to please Tun Razak and to please Dr Ismail, and at the same time condemned the M.C.A. I know quite a number of speakers have quoted what Mr Lee Kuan Yew said in the past, but let me make a few others. This one is from the *Malay Mail* dated the 26th of March, 1964, and what did Mr Lee say? He said, and I quote—

“Whatever could be said about the Tunku’s policy, basically he, Tun Razak and Dr Ismail want to keep this country harmonious.” He also said, “In the rural areas the Malays were united under the UMNO leadership and they should be grateful, for the leaders were pragmatic men.”

Now, on the 6th of April, 1964, Mr Lee had this to say:

“The Tunku’s contribution to our success as a harmonious and prosperous society is unique. His warm and human approach to problems has generated confidence in the tolerance of the Government in racial and religious matter . . . .”—

and this is more important— . . . .  
“I hope that the Tunku will carry on for as long as he can. When the time comes, I am sure Tun Razak will carry on this policy of inter-racial harmony and co-operation which alone will produce a prosperous and happy Malaysia.”

This appeared in the *Straits Times*.

Mr Lee also informed us then that the masses in the rural areas were all right, that they were taken care of, that only the towns, the urban areas, were in a mess, and that the M.C.A. was no good as it could not take care of the urban people. Now, let me quote him again:

“The Government of Malaysia combining the strength of UMNO with its rural Malay mass base with effectiveness of the P.A.P.’s policies in countering communist subversive activities in the towns, was the best answer to the challenge which communalism poses to us.”

Now, we begin to seek Mr Lee’s real intention. He wanted to join hands with the UMNO and have a say in the running of the Central Government, but he realised the grave consequences of creating communal trouble. This is what he has to say:

“The situation will deteriorate to a point where it is unlikely that the country can be governed through the democratic system, and then it is doubtful whether elections will be held in 1969 or ever again.”

Sir, these speeches were made during the Election campaign held last year.

Even after the General Election, after the P.A.P. suffered a very humiliating defeat, which resulted in the forfeiture of eight deposits out of nine, Mr Lee still felt that he had still a chance to work with the UMNO, and he said this:

“The people decided to back the Tunku in the fight . . . . .”

**Enche’ Jek Yuen Thong (Singapore):** Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of order. I would suggest that the Honourable Member read his own speech instead of other people’s speeches! (*Laughter*).

**Enche’ Lee San Choon: What Order?** Mr Speaker, Sir, time is very precious.

**Mr Speaker:** Will you carry on?

**Enche’ Lee San Choon:** He can do that in the Singapore Legislative Assembly but not here, Sir!

Sir, after the General Election, he still felt that he could work with the UMNO and he had this to say:

“The people decided to back the Tunku in the fight for Malaysia’s survival. All the other problems of economic and social change will come back to the fold later when Indonesian confrontation has been resolved or contained.”

Now, compare this with what he said few days ago: “If we must have trouble, let us have it now instead of waiting for another five or ten years.” Has Indonesian confrontation been resolved or contained? Has it been stopped? What was his advice to the people just a year ago? Has he forgotten all that he has said? Mr Lee says now. “Oh! The towns are prosperous, they are better off people, only the Malay masses in the rural areas are poor.” In only one year, Mr Speaker, Sir, have things changed so quickly and so suddenly? In Mr Lee’s own words, only 0.3% of the population are employers. What about the rest of 99.7% of the urban people? What did he say a year ago?— “Oh! Tunku must lead and I hope he will lead as long as he can, and Tun Razak must take over and he will do likewise. There was no alternative.” Mr Speaker, Sir, he has uttered so many sweet words about Tunku, but only is short of telling the Tunku, “Oh! Tunku, I am very pretty, please love me.”—only short of that. (*Laughter*).

To Mr Lee, everything has been changed today. There is an alternative to Tunku's leadership now. "The urban people are prosperous, they are blood suckers"—in the words of Enche' Rahim Ishak of the P.A.P. "The confrontation can be put aside. .", Mr Lee tells us, "so as to push our alternative first, hence if we must have trouble, let us have it now instead of waiting for five or ten years."

Sir, all of us agree that the Prime Minister of Singapore is a clever man and an eloquent speaker. But he is not a sincere man. He tries to impress upon us that Singapore is a paradise. He talks a lot about democracy, but he has not answered the charge that there has been no meeting of the Singapore Legislative Assembly so far this year. He uses the most undemocratic methods to suppress the people. There are hundreds of examples, but I just like to quote one. Sir, after the General Election in Singapore last year, there were thousands of Chinese school teachers opposing the P.A.P's policy. What happened when the P.A.P. came into power? They sacked them, hundreds of them were sacked. The papers dared not publish this, because they were suppressed. Sir, if you do not believe this, you can ask the Members from the Barisan Sosialis of Singapore—this is what they told me. (*Laughter*). The Member from the Barisan Sosialis of Singapore said, "We cannot air our views in Singapore because there is no meeting of the Legislative Assembly. We try to put it across to the papers but the papers dare not publish it because the papers are suppressed." Now, Mr Lee Kuan Yew has the cheek to come to this House and talk about democracy.

Sir, since we are short of time, I do not wish to waste the valuable time of this House, and I will go on with other matters. I think there is not much use for me to dwell any longer on the P.A.P. because the people all over Malaysia know now what is the P.A.P. Hence my advice to them is: Better look after Singapore properly, otherwise there won't be any Tunku or the Alliance Party to come to the rescue of P.A.P.

Sir, in the Royal Speech, a large part has been devoted to foreign affairs. Perhaps, this is because the Alliance Government has been over-enthusiastic in promoting the welfare of the people that we have in the past been too much "inward looking". This new change, therefore, is an encouraging one. Being an Asian nation, we must live with the Afro-Asian world, whether we like it or not. It is also encouraging to note that an increasing number of Afro-Asian nations are beginning to appreciate our position in connection with the Indonesian confrontation. The Royal Tour of the Arab world and the tours made by the Deputy Prime Minister to the African countries have contributed to a large extent in this respect. I would, therefore, urge the Government to intensify this campaign abroad, particularly the Afro-Asian countries.

Our independent foreign policy has been exemplified by our performance in the United Nations Security Council recently in connection with Southern Rhodesia. The British Government has been, I regret to say, dilly-dallying on this issue. The lame excuse that this is an internal problem of Southern Rhodesia and, therefore, the British Government should not interfere is, I submit, no excuse at all. Britain has the power to suspend the constitution of Southern Rhodesia. In the interest of good relations and justice of mankind Britain should be more positive in this crucial issue. I take this opportunity to urge our beloved Prime Minister to take the lead in supporting the freedom fighters of Southern Rhodesia in the coming Commonwealth Prime Minister's Conference.

Sir, while on foreign affairs, a lot has been said about the Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Conference in Winneba. Sir, I would not like to say more to confuse the issue, if possible, but truth must be told. It is true that many organisations represented in the Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Conference were sponsored by the Communist bloc. It is also true that many organisations represented the view of their own governments. The question of National Committee of A.A.P.S.O. (Malaysia)

was not brought up, because it was felt by the non-aligned bloc that if the issue was brought up at the meeting, there might be a split. Indonesia would take the opportunity to quit the organisation. So, under such circumstances, those organisations which were sponsored by either China or Russia would back out from the organisation.

**Dr Lim Chong Eu:** On a point of clarification. In view of the fact that the Honourable the Prime Minister in a press release said that he himself knew nothing of the Malaysian delegation to Winneba, I would like to know whether this delegation was an official one representing Malaysia, or what its standing was?

**Enche' Lee San Choon:** It is a private organisation. It is the National Committee of Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Conference Organisation—and I have said so. I was saying that the question of the Malaysian organisation was not brought up for discussion because they feared that there might be a split. Ghana, for example, being the host country and which also supported us, have such a fear. They want the Conference to be a success. So, that is the case.

As regards the Barisan Sosialis, the Socialist Front and Party Rakyat, the decision was that they would not consider their application unless they came back together and then put up another application. So, I think, it is very misleading indeed if the Socialist Front or the Barisan Sosialis or, for that matter, the Party Rakyat were to claim that they have been accepted by the Organisation. They have not been accepted. In this respect, Sir, I regret to note that the foreign controlled press, the *Straits Times*, saw fit to attack this Organisation. I know that the *Straits Times* has cause to be unhappy about this Organisation, because we made clear our stand—we are basically against military bases. We appreciate the military assistance given to us at this juncture when we are facing confrontation, but one day when confrontation stops, we will advocate for the elimination of military bases. This has caused uneasiness or

unpleasantness for the *Straits Times*, because it has a duty to protect the interests of those who give the monopoly of advertisement to the *Straits Times*.

Sir, in the Royal speech, His Majesty announced:

“One important feature introduced last year in the field of education is in respect of the teaching of Chinese and Tamil languages in English Medium Schools. This is in keeping with the aim of My Government to preserve and sustain the use and study of the languages of the various communities in this country.”

As a member of the M.C.A. I am very grateful to His Majesty, for this is in accordance with the spirit of the M.C.A. constitution—to preserve and sustain the study and use of the Chinese language.

The Honourable Member from the P.M.I.P.—the Menteri Besar of Kelantan—took strong objection to this in his speech delivered a few days ago. It must be clearly understood, once and for all, that the M.C.A. stand by the Constitution of the country. It also means that the M.C.A. has no reservation in supporting the National language, but in so doing, it does not mean that we are not allowed to learn other languages. The Honourable Member from P.M.I.P. seems to tell us that the only way to promote the National language is to suppress the teaching of other languages. This is not the aim of the Alliance Government, and neither is it in accordance with the spirit of the Constitution of the nation. Mr Speaker, Sir, as a Member of the M.C.A., I wish to inform the Honourable Member that we will, and all the time, stand by our Constitution.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Government has made its desire clear of an “economy drive”. In this respect, may I point out that we should endeavour to explore into every possibility of using our local products. For example, today, we in this country have an over-production of eggs, which could be utilised in the making of *kaya* and other products. I am shocked to learn the other day that *kaya*, a speciality of the Malaysian delicacy, has to be imported in large quantity from China. This makes us a laughing stock, Sir. We grow coconuts,

we have an over-production of eggs, we have refine our sugar, and yet we have got to import this special *kaya* from China! It seems to me that no one in the Ministry of Agriculture and Co-operatives, or in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, seems to have taken the initiative in this matter. I know, Mr Speaker, Sir, that the Ministers are very busy—they have many policy-making jobs to do—but surely the staff in either Ministry could have taken the initiative. In my view, Sir, not only should we produce enough *kaya* for our home consumption, but we should also export *kaya*. I was informed that because of the “dumping” policy of China, many of our *kaya* manufacturers have closed shops. This I urge the Government to rectify immediately.

Sir, time does not allow me to quote many cases of a similar nature in this debate. However, Sir, the point I wish to say is this: It is not enough for our planners, our administrators and our civil servants to just carry out instructions only; they should use their initiative and keep up with the spirit of nation-building.

Sir, there are one or two more points I wish to raise, and this is that Malaysia . . . .

**Mr Speaker:** May I point out that you have already spoken for half-an-hour!

**Enche' Lee San Choon:** I will take another five minutes, Sir. There are one or two more points I wish to raise. Sir, Malaysia is one of the few countries in the world which is without a National News Agency. A National News Agency is very important, and I do not wish to say more. I hope our able Minister of Information and Broadcasting will take this matter up immediately.

Another point I wish to raise is that it is a shame and disgrace for everyone of us to see the Union Jack emblem on the Malaysian Airways' planes. This makes people to believe that we are really neo-colonialist. (*Laughter*). I also urge our hard-working Minister of Transport to buy our own planes, if possible, with our own emblem.

Finally, Sir, on behalf of the people of Segamat Selatan, I wish to associate myself with the feelings expressed in the Royal Address that we should express our gratitude to members of the Security Forces for the fine manner in which they have discharged their duties in the defence of this country. To all those members of the Security Forces who have fallen, let us all pray that God's blessings be with them. To their families let us extend our condolences for their irreparable loss. Thank you.

**Dato' Haji Sardon bin Haji Jubir:**

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya hendak berchakap rengkas sahaja. Sunggoh pun saya tidak mahu berchakap panjang tentang perbahathan yang hebat tiga hari tiga malam ini berkenaan dengan dasar politik P.A.P. dan Perikatan, tetapi saya sa-bagai Menteri Pengangkutan ada di-sentuh juga. Mengikut Perlembagaan Artikul 153 ia-itu berkenaan dengan Tanah Melayu, Sabah dan Sarawak hak istimewa orang<sup>2</sup> Melayu atau pun di-bahagikan keutamaan tentang membahagikan kebenaran kereta<sup>2</sup> sewa dan juga bas<sup>2</sup>, nampak-nya bagi pehak Yang Berhormat Enche' Lee Kuan Yew memperkecil<sup>2</sup>kan konon-nya dia buat chontoh, kalau-lah ada sa-buah kompani bas ahli sharikat-nya 20 orang; barangkali ini Private Limited Company, boleh jadi ini di-Singapura di-katakan-nya 2,000 orang yang bekerja. Ini hanya bilangan yang kecil daripada orang<sup>2</sup> Melayu atau pun orang bumiputera dalam Malaysia ini yang bilangan-nya lebeh 4½ juta yang lain, mana dapat kerja, dapat ke-untungan dan dapat mengambil bahagian saham<sup>2</sup> dalam sharikat bas itu.

Saya suka-lah menerangkan kepada pehak Yang Berhormat, terutama sa-kali parti P.A.P., saya tahu dalam Perlembagaan Singapura hak istimewa dalam segi kenderaan tidak ada, tetapi mereka mahu menolong orang Melayu dari segala segi supaya mereka dapat menarafkan orang Melayu dengan orang yang lain. Tetapi saya suka hendak dengar juga, berapa-kah bilangan orang Melayu yang mempunyai taxi, berapa-kah bilangan orang Melayu yang mempunyai pangkat<sup>2</sup> yang tinggi<sup>2</sup>

dan memegang jawatan yang tinggi<sup>2</sup> di-Singapura itu. Di-Tanah Melayu dengan sebab ada-nya hak istimewa ini yang termaktub di-dalam Perlembagaan saya suka menerangkan, sa-bagai orang Melayu yang hanya berapa tahun sahaja baharu di-jalankan tentang mengambil bahagian dalam saham, tidak kurang \$6 juta daripada \$30 juta modal<sup>2</sup> dalam sharikat bas telah di-punyaï oleh orang Melayu. Kita berasa sombong sa-buah sharikat bas Melayu yang terkenal—Seri Jaya—yang mempunyai bas lebih 100 buah dan mempunyai modal hampir<sup>2</sup> \$2 million yang 100 peratus modal orang Melayu, dan ini juga memberi peluang bekerja bukan sahaja kepada orang Melayu bahkan banyak bangsa juga. Begitu juga Sharikat Bas Nets di-Kelantan yang mempunyai juga hampir ratusan bus yang membahagi kerja boleh di-katakan 99 peratus modal-nya daripada orang Melayu juga.

Dan banyak juga dari segi kenderaan, umpama-nya mengikut had quota penduduk<sup>2</sup> orang Melayu dalam tiap<sup>2</sup> buah negeri hari ini di-seluruh Tanah Melayu, jumlah paratus 47.9 yang hari ini hampir penoh quota itu. Ini berm'ana kalau ada 4,000 lebih taxi yang ada di-Tanah Melayu ini, orang Melayu ada mempunyai tidak kurang daripada \$7 juta. Modal di-dalam perniagaan<sup>2</sup> bas<sup>2</sup> jumlah lebih kurang 32 juta ringgit. Tetapi saya suka bertanya kepada P.A.P. yang suka hendak menolong orang Melayu, dan orang Melayu hari ini di-Pulau Singapura telah mendesak saya tiap<sup>2</sup> kali saya turun dan bagi keterangan, kenapa hak istimewa di-Tanah Melayu dan bumiputera di-Sabah dan Sarawak tidak di-panjangkan ka-Singapura. Saya sedang bertanya dengan Kerajaan P.A.P. dan saya sedang berunding bagaimana hendak memberi peluang kepada orang<sup>2</sup> Melayu di-Singapura—sedang berunding dengan Kerajaan P.A.P.—Kerajaan Singapura. Saya harap Yang Berhormat, terutama Perdana Menteri-nya dan lain<sup>2</sup>, supaya memberi kerjasama dengan saya supaya memberi peluang kepada orang<sup>2</sup> Melayu yang mereka katakan hendak menolong dari segi ekonomi-nya dan dari segi perniagaan supaya mereka itu akan dapat sama maju di-dalam per-

niagaan terutama-nya dari segi pengangkutan.

Maka, dengan rengkas-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perkara hak istimewa orang bumiputera dari segi kenderaan terutama sa-kali di-Tanah Melayu, Sarawak dan Sabah ini, saya harap tidak-lah hanya di-perkecil<sup>2</sup>kan bahkan orang bumiputera akan mendapat banyak peluang lagi pada masa hadapan sa-kira-nya orang yang bukan bumiputera banyak lagi memberi peluang dalam segi pengangkutan yang besar<sup>2</sup>. Mereka sedang atorkan lagi Uudang<sup>2</sup> sharikat<sup>2</sup>-nya dan akan menerima beberapa banyak lagi modal<sup>2</sup> dan mengambil bahagian yang tepat di-dalam sharikat<sup>2</sup> kenderaan ini.

Sa-lain daripada itu saya suka menjawab dengan rengkas-nya berkenaan dengan tegoran dari Yang Berhormat Wakil Melaka Selatan berkenaan dengan sharikat kerjasama yang menjalankan bas antara Merlimau dengan Sungai Rambai. Yang sa-benar-nya sharikat bas itu berkehendakkan jalan yang baharu, maka tentu-lah hak istimewa atau pun keutamaan diberikan kepada sharikat Melayu, sama ada rugi dan untung dalam daerah itu tentu-lah pehak<sup>2</sup> yang menjalankan sharikat ini telah memereksa lebih dahulu. Beliau mengatakan daripada Merlimau hendak pergi Melaka tidak boleh pungut orang tepi<sup>2</sup> jalan itu. Memang ada atoran yang ada sekarang ini mana jalan yang lama<sup>2</sup> yang mana sharikat<sup>2</sup> bas itu berjalan di-situ dan mereka membayar chukai yang banyak. Maka kita tidak-lah sementara ini membenarkan banyak sharikat<sup>2</sup> bas itu berlawan satu dengan lain akhir-nya sa-kali semua rugi, semua sa-kali akan tutup. Tetapi walau sa-kali macham itu pun, saya akan menyiasat perkara ini kerana pehak yang berkenaan belum lagi bertemu dengan saya. Perkara ini boleh berunding dengan Sharikat China yang menjalankan jalan antara Merlimau dengan Melaka atau pun di-antara Muar dengan Melaka. Maka saya minta-lah kepada Yang Berhormat Wakil Melaka Selatan supaya dapat berhubung dengan pehak Sharikat itu dan satu waktu dapat berunding dengan saya sendiri supaya saya dapat

menasihati supaya tidak akan rugi dan akan tutup Sharikat<sup>2</sup> Melayu dan kita memang hendak, bukan di-tutup dan bukan rugi tetapi akan maju, mara dan untung bertambah<sup>2</sup> lagi.

Berkenaan dengan tegoran sahabat saya tadi, Malaysian Airways kerana apa menggunakan bendera Union Jack. Ini berkenaan undang<sup>2</sup> antara bangsa—International Law. Hari ini Malaysian Airways maseh lagi menyewa comet<sup>2</sup> yang ada pada hari ini. Maka kapal terbang jet comet ini di-punyai oleh B.O.A.C. dan di-daftarkan di-London. Maka mengikut Undang<sup>2</sup> Antara Bangsa, di-mana kapal terbang itu di-daftarkan maka kapal terbang itu kena-lah menggunakan bendera atau pun tanda kepunyaan negeri sana—nationality, kerana kapal terbang ini terbang keliling dunia atau menyeberang daripada sa-buah negara ka-sa-buah negara yang lain. Tetapi terima kasih atas galakan itu, memang Malaysian Airways telah berunding dan akan membeli 5 buah jet comet yang ada pada hari ini dalam bulan Oktober ini. Kelima<sup>2</sup> buah comet itu akan menjadi kepunyaan Sharikat Malaysian Airways dan tentu-lah kita akan daftarkan di-Kuala Lumpur, di-pejabat-nya, dan akan menggunakan bendera Malaysia. Maka ini bukan-lah kami tidak mahu membuat dan menukar bendera tetapi ini di-kehendaki mengikut Undang<sup>2</sup> International. Maka saya harap rakan<sup>2</sup> saya Yang Berhormat sama<sup>2</sup>-lah berdo'a dan menggunakan banyak Malaysian Airways ini supaya banyak dapat hasil-nya, supaya lekas lagi banyak kita akan membeli kapal<sup>2</sup> terbang sendiri dan mempunyai bendera Malaysia sendiri.

**Enche' T. Mahima Singh (Port Dickson):** Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to support the original motion to thank His Majesty the King for his Gracious Speech. In the last three days, from the way the debate has gone, one would have wondered whether we are debating on the speech of His Majesty or on the speech of the Prime Minister of Singapore.

Mr Speaker, Sir, in his speech, His Majesty has stated that our very existence is being threatened by a

dictator, i.e., Indonesia, and that is sufficient cause for the people of this country to worry, because a divided Malaysia cannot face the enemy and the first concern of the people of this country should be that we are united at home. In this respect, the speech made by the Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore did not give any indication of trying to bring the people of this country into unity. In fact, it created doubts in the minds of the people as to whether he really represented a loyal opposition. Looking at today's newspaper, page 1 of the *Straits Times*, one would read about the 24 hours curfew in Johore. That is what we are getting from the enemy. But on the same page we have this "Lee Gives a Hint—It could be Partition." Now, that definitely is not loyal opposition. As we sit in this House, Sir, we have paid mercenaries of the enemy who are bombing our bridges and bombing our towns, and on the borders of Malaysia hundreds of our youths are defending the cause of the country and we are grateful to these young men who are giving undivided loyalty—that is undivided loyalty. I would appeal to the Opposition that in this hour of need, they should be contributing their ideas and their political strength, if they have any.

Reading through His Majesty's speech and the appendix, this nation can be proud that we have at the helm of our nation leaders who are really loyal and dedicated and with proper experience, so that in spite of this attack from the enemy the country is still able to make progress. Our economy has made tremendous progress during the course of the year. New schemes have been started for housing the poor and those of the low income group. In the field of foreign affairs, our Government has done whatever it can to get assistance from where we can. Naturally, when we are attacked by a more powerful foe ten times our strength, we have to get assistance from abroad and we have to go to the Commonwealth for assistance and, being forced to get this assistance, for the enemy to turn round and say that we are neo-colonialists because we are

getting assistance from the Commonwealth, I think, is absurd. We realise that with the coming of independence the nations of Asia and Africa will get closer and closer. With that view, our Deputy Prime Minister and our King had made trips to that part of the world. As we sit here today, one of our Ministers is touring those countries. All this is done to show that we are one and together and we are nearer the Afro-Asian countries.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I have one more item to speak on. I note that the Honourable Minister of Transport has already spoken, but I hope he will bear in mind what I have to say. We have a lot of pilgrims who go from this country to Mecca and I think their needs are fairly well looked after. We have also thousands of Malaysians of Indian descent who make frequent visits to India and it is very unfortunate that these people, who are the poorest of our citizens, have sometimes to wait for months because the only two ships plying between Malaya and India—I believe there are only two—have their bookings months ahead. I hope the Minister of Transport will be able to find some way out, so that these poor labourers do not have to travel in such congested and unhygienic conditions.

Mr Speaker, Sir, before I sit down, I would like to tender my thanks to those loyal young men who are helping to defend our country, to the Police Force, and last but not least, I am sure the House would join me in telling His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong how proud and how grateful we are for his term of service to the nation. Tomorrow is the birthday of His Majesty and I am sure you will all join me in wishing him many happy returns. Thank you, Sir (*Applause*).

**Enche' Abdul Samad bin Gul Ahmad Mianji (Pasir Mas Hulu):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, akhir-nya sa-telah menunggu lima hari, dapat-lah saya berchakap pada petang ini dan apa yang menjadi soal sekarang ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-lah peperangan di-antara pehak sa-belah sana dengan pehak sa-belah sini yang sudah berpindah dengan pehak sa-belah lagi. Jadi,

dahulu kalau tiga empat bulan dahulu peperangan ini berlaku di-antara pehak Kerajaan dengan pehak PAS, terok-lah PAS ini kena godam tetapi alhamdullillah, kenal rupa-nya tuan<sup>2</sup>—siapa sekarang ini musoh yang sa-benar-nya dan berpindah peperangan itu daripada PAS kepada Petir.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bagi saya, peperangan ini kita tidak champor. Kita tidak champor di-dalam perbalahan ini, dan kita tidak mahu menyalahkan sa-siapa pun. Sa-belum daripada Yang Berhormat Lee Kuan Yew mengatakan orang Melayu ini bukan bumiputera negeri ini, sudah ada orang lain mengatakan bahawa orang Melayu ini keturunan lanun, dan banyak lagi orang<sup>2</sup> lain yang telah menghina bangsa Melayu ini, tetapi malang-nya belum ada pernah dan belum terniat oleh pehak Kerajaan hendak mengambil apa<sup>2</sup> tindakan.

Apabila di-katakan orang Melayu ini keturunan lanun—bukan saya, tetapi tuan<sup>2</sup>, termasuk Tuan Yang di-Pertua sendiri pun keturunan lanun, dan bagitu-lah juga Duli<sup>2</sup> Yang Maha Mulia Raja<sup>2</sup>. Jadi, kami ini semua sampai bagitu di-hinakan. Apa-kah orang Melayu ini sudah bachol? Apakah dalam tuboh orang Melayu ini sudah tidak ada darah yang mengalir dan sekarang Yang Berhormat Lee Kuan Yew mengatakan orang Melayu ini bukan bumiputera; hanya orang yang tidak berbudi sahaja sanggup mengatakan bagini. Sa-puloh tahun dahulu telah kami ingatkan kepada saudara<sup>2</sup> orang UMNO—sa-puloh tahun dahulu, bukan kelmarin dan sa-belum merdeka telah kami ingatkan sa-kali lagi, kami bagi pehak Persatuan Islam sa-Tanah Melayu telah menghantar satu memorandum kepada pehak Kerajaan supaya menchatitkan dalam Perlembagaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini bahawa Melayu ada-lah menjadi hak dan menjadi tuan Tanah Melayu ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bagi PAS—saya dan kawan<sup>2</sup> saya dan seluroh penyokong<sup>2</sup> PAS—kami tetap bertegas dalam soal ini, dalam soal kebangsaan, dalam soal Tanah Melayu ini hak orang Melayu, walau apa tuan<sup>2</sup> berkata, tetapi kami tetap tegas dalam

soal ini. Saudara<sup>2</sup> boleh mengatakan, kami ini perkauman, fahaman kami ini sempit, kami ini kolot dan sebagainya, tetapi biar-lah apa yang tuan<sup>2</sup> katakan itu tetap hilang oleh angin, tetapi kami tetap memperjuangkan chita<sup>2</sup> bahawa Tanah Melayu ini hak pertuanan orang Melayu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ini ada-lah di-harap mendapat perhatian, bukan sahaja daripada Petir, malah daripada siapa sahaja—daripada M.C.A., daripada U.D.P., daripada S.U.P.P., Socialist Front—siapa sahaja yang menentang hak<sup>2</sup> kami, hak<sup>2</sup> bangsa Melayu di-atas bumi Melayu ini, hanya satu sahaja ingatan yang dapat kami katakan, boleh jadi ada satu gulungan Melayu yang dapat tuan<sup>2</sup> jadikan kuda, tetapi ada lagi satu gulungan Melayu yang ta' dapat tuan<sup>2</sup> jadikan kuda.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak mahu menerangkan sejarah bangsa Melayu di-Rumah yang mulia ini. Sa-benar-nya saudara daripada Singapura, daripada P.A.P. bukan tidak tahu sejarah Melayu ini. Dia lebeh kenal sejarah Melayu ini, sejarah Temasek, sejarah Rumah Temasek yang ada di-Kuala Lumpur ini, dan bagi mereka sendiri, kalau mereka mahu mengakui sejarah bangsa Melayu, tidak-lah keluar perkataan bahawa Melayu ini bukan bumiputera negeri ini. Saya bersetuju dengan apa yang di-ucapkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Kerja Raya, Pos dan Talikom—tidak ada di-dalam dunia ini sa-buah negara yang bagini murah hati memberikan hak-nya kepada orang<sup>2</sup> lain, tidak ada. Kalau-lah dunia ini sudah berada dua ribu tahun, chari-lah di-dalam sejarah dua ribu tahun itu tidak pernah berlaku adanya sa-buah negara, satu bangsa yang memberikan hak-nya kepada orang<sup>2</sup> lain sampai bagini—tidak ada. Apa lagi yang tinggal pada orang<sup>2</sup> Melayu sekarang? Chuba saudara<sup>2</sup> orang<sup>2</sup> UMNO mencheritakan dalam Dewan ini, apa lagi yang tinggal pada orang Melayu sa-lain daripada songkok-nya, songkok ini pun sudah di-hadiah kepada Yang di-Pertua M.C.A. Apa lagi yang tinggal pada orang Melayu ini? Tidak ada, tidak ada. Ini-lah

soal-nya tuan<sup>2</sup>—ini-lah soal-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

Jadi, kalau-lah yang tidak ada ini pun mahu di-sentoh<sup>2</sup> lagi—saya tidak tahu apa yang akan berlaku, dan kalau-lah Perdana Menteri Singapura boleh, seperti akhbar hari ini mengatakan "*Partition*" Sabah, Sarawak, Singapura, Melaka dan Pulau Pinang—saya pun boleh buat. Bagi PAS—saya boleh buat partition—Kelantan, Trengganu, Kedah dan Perlis, dan biar-lah kita ini berperang selalu. Kita kumpulkan orang<sup>2</sup> Melayu satu pehak, kita kumpulkan orang<sup>2</sup> lain satu pehak—kita perang dan biar sejarah kita mengutok kita di-kemudian hari. Ini-lah kesilapan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, satu kesilapan yang di-lakukan—saya tidak menyesal dan saya tidak mahu menyalahkan orang lain, boleh jadi orang<sup>2</sup> M.C.A. dan orang<sup>2</sup> M.I.C. menyatakan saya ini orang Melayu—saya bukan orang Melayu. Saya di-lahirkan di-Tanah Melayu ini, ditakdirkan oleh Tuhan di-lahirkan di-sini, tetapi saya bukan orang Melayu. Tiap<sup>2</sup> sa-titek darah yang ada pada tuboh saya ini bukan orang Melayu, dengan di-takdirkan oleh Tuhan bapa saya datang daripada India—saya di-lahirkan di-bumi Melayu ini, semenjak saya di-lahirkan di-dunia, saya makan beras Melayu, saya hisap udara Melayu. Negeri Melayu ini-lah yang memberi saya sekolah dan semenjak saya pandai, saya belajar di-sekolah Melayu—chari-lah sa-orang yang ta'at setia pada Tanah Melayu ini sa-rupa dengan saya. Tuan<sup>2</sup> mengakui ta'at setia kepada Tanah Melayu, tetapi bahasa China hendak di-daulatkan, tuan<sup>2</sup> mengaku ta'at setia pada Tanah Melayu, bahasa Tamil hendak di-daulatkan. Saya tidak tahu bahasa ibunda saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dan kalau boleh, biar-lah saya mati di-Tanah Melayu ini. Fasal apa yang masuk PAS, kalau saya hendak memperjuangkan hak saya—lebeh baik saya masuk M.I.C., tetapi kerana ta'at setia saya pada Tanah Melayu ini tidak berbelah bagi, saya masuk dalam Persatuan Islam sa-Tanah Melayu dan menapikan bahawa PAS ini perkauman, kalau perkauman PAS ini, saya tidak masuk PAS. Saya harap

perkataan perkauman ini chukup-lah jangan di-timbulkan lagi.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, mungkin peperangan ini bermula di-antara pehak Kerajaan dengan pehak P.A.P., macham mana dahulu juga—dahulu PAS ini kena terok, kena tangkap, kena macham<sup>2</sup>—ta' payah-lah kita ulang lagi, kerana PAS dekat pilehan raya itu nampak kuat sadikit, tangkap dahulu dan sekarang sudah nampak P.A.P. ini kuat, ah! ka-sana pergi berperang. Kita tahu satu tujuan Perdana Menteri Singapura—Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri Singapura, dia berchita<sup>2</sup> mahu menjadi Perdana Menteri Malaysia. Menteri Kesihatan Singapura, dia berchita<sup>2</sup> mahu menjadi Menteri Kesihatan Malaysia—siapa boleh lawan, siapa boleh menahan dia daripada menjadi Perdana Menteri Malaysia? Sedangkan dalam Perlembagaan Malaysia ini membenarkan dia menjadi Perdana Menteri Malaysia—ta' usah kita chakap, kita yang membuat Perlembagaan itu membenarkan orang itu menjadi Perdana Menteri dan bila dia sudah kuat, hendak sampai ka-tingkatan jadi Perdana Menteri, kita hendak marah, why?

Apa fasal kita hendak marah? Sebab itu PAS menentang dalam soal ini. Sa-puloh tahun dahulu kita sudah menentang jangan memberi hak ini kepada orang lain—terlampau murah hati hingga bila orang kuat kita jatoh. Ada-kah kerana kita berchakap ini maka tuan<sup>2</sup> mahu menudoh bahawa PAS ini anti—tidak. Kalau kami dengan chita<sup>2</sup> kami ini anti bangsa lain, Kerajaan Amerika juga sa-buah Kerajaan perkauman, kerana dia tidak membenarkan orang kulit hitam menjadi President. Kalau kami ini salah, salah-lah dunia ini semua. Ini yang benda-nya, tetapi malang-nya memorandum yang di-hantar oleh PAS itu telah di-bakul-sampahkan. Apa yang di-chakap oleh PAS ini dengan sombong dan megah-nya Menteri<sup>2</sup> ini akan bangun, akan menjawab—ah! soal PAS ini, tetapi sekarang merah muka bila Lee Kuan Yew berchakap, why? Apa fasal kita hendak marah? Bagi saya, saya tidak marah. Awak ada hak jadi Perdana Menteri, sila

dudok sana. Betul-lah PAS ini tidak kuat hendak memerintah Malaysia ini, tetapi orang yang lebeh kuat, sila. Kami tidak boleh membangkang, kalau kami hendak ubah Perlembagaan ini pun kami 9 orang, tidak boleh mengubah Perlembagaan itu. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kerana tidak bersetuju dengan jalan itu kami mempunyai niat suchi untuk menjatuhkan Kerajaan Perikatan dengan sa-chara Perlembagaan—saya ulangi dengan sa-chara Perlembagaan. Kalau tidak-lah kerana hendak menjatuhkan Kerajaan Perikatan ini kami tidak tubuhkan Parti PAS dan lebeh baik kami masok ka-UMNO. Apa yang di-lakukan oleh Kerajaan itu kami tidak bersetuju dan apa yang ada dalam Perlembagaan itu menjahanamkan dan mengkhianati hak bangsa Melayu di-bumi Melayu ini dan kami mahu mengubah-nya. Ini-lah soal-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Boleh jadi ada orang UMNO bila kita berchakap macham ini muka-nya sudah rupa marah, tetapi biar-lah. Bagi saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ini-lah soal-nya.

Ada orang memikirkan bahawa kalau PAS memerintah akan timbul-lah saperti faham Nazi German, membesarkan bangsa-nya—tidak. Walau pun dalam chita<sup>2</sup> dan polisi ia-itu mahu menulis dalam Perlembagaan syarat tuan punya negeri ini bangsa Melayu, bukan-lah berma'ana orang lain itu akan di-zalimi, tetapi semua kaum mesti mengakui bahawa Tanah Melayu ini tuan-nya Melayu baharu-lah tidak ada bergaduh, tidak ada Malaysian Malaysia, tidak ada Chinese Malaysia, tidak ada Malay Malaysia, semua sa-kali mengakui hak pertuanan yang asal ia-lah bangsa Melayu dan orang lain boleh hidup saperti biasa, tetapi tuan-nya yang asal mesti di-tulis. Ini-lah soal-nya. Itu sebab saya menggesa dan menuntut Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini memikirkan sa-mula dan menchatitkan dalam Perlembagaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini hak pertuanan itu bangsa Melayu, baharu-lah kita tidak ada gaduh. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ini-lah soal yang sekarang ini hebat di-binchangkan dan kalau soal pergaduhan ini tidak di-selesaikan

dengan segera saya tidak tahu apa yang akan berlaku.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka menyentoh sedikit sahaja soal luar negeri. Dalam soal ini tidak-lah saya mahu mengatakan konferantasi itu memberi rahmat, tetapi dapat-lah saya mengatakan semenjak konferantasi ini ada tahu-lah Kerajaan kita ini mahu pergi berjumpa dengan orang<sup>2</sup> kulit hitam dan sudah kenal-lah orang<sup>2</sup> kulit hitam. Kalau dahulu bukan main sombong, tetapi sekarang ini tahu bahawa kuasa orang<sup>2</sup> kulit hitam itu besar. Kita tengok wayang gambar sa-malam semua orang kulit hitam yang kita pergi jumpa, pada hal dahulu kita sudah chakap ia-itu kurangkan rapat-nya kita dengan negara<sup>2</sup> barat, negara<sup>2</sup> British, Amerika, New Zealand dan Australia dan berdamping-lah diri kita ini dengan orang kulit hitam—kerana kita ini orang kulit hitam bukan orang barat, sa-puluh kali kita chelup dalam ayer barat kita tidak jadi barat. Tidak usah-lah kita berlagak. Saperti pengakuan yang telah di-buat oleh Yang Berhormat Timbalan Perdana Menteri sanggup yang pertama sa-kali kesanggupan yang di-beri kepada Kerajaan United Arab Republic ia-itu sanggup memikirkan sa-mula penarekan pengakuan-nya terhadap negara Isreal—negara bangsat Yahudi yang di-dirikan dengan kemahuan Amerika dan British. Dan kita menanti, bagi saya dan bagi seluruh umat Islam negeri ini tengah menanti, bila-kah pengakuan yang di-buat oleh Timbalan Perdana Menteri itu akan di-laksanakan—bilakah lagi? Sidang Algeria akan diadakan pada bulan hadapan. Yang Berhormat dari Pontian Selatan marah Kerajaan P.A.P. mengambil 3 professor Yahudi mengajar di-Singapura, tetapi Kerajaan Malaysia ini akui Kerajaan Yahudi. Mana lebeh besar, kerana Jerman Barat mahu mengakui Isreal sahaja pun sudah negara<sup>2</sup> Arab putuskan perhubungan diplomat habis semua hendak perang, kita akui sudah? Mengakui negara Isreal itu saperti memberi tamparan kepada muka umat Islam dan kepada muka umat Arab. Tarek balek pengakuan itu, insha Allah kita akan dapat sokongan.

**Mr Speaker:** Saya suka mengingatkan masa sudah lebeh.

**Enche' Abdul Samad bin Gul Ahmad Mianji:** Sadikit lagi. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pertahanan. Saya tidak ber-setuju dan kami tetap mengatakan ada-nya tentera<sup>2</sup> asing di-bumi kita ini. Orang<sup>2</sup> puteh, Australia dan New Zealand bukan satu bangsa yang bodoh ka-mari mati kerana mempertahankan orang lain. Kami tidak setuju dengan tentera mana pun, dan kami maseh perchaya dan yakin bahawa anak negeri ini sendiri-lah yang lebeh kaseh dan ta'at dalam mempertahankan negeri-nya. Kalau orang puteh betul<sup>2</sup> jujur hendak menolong kita mempertahankan tanah ayer ini, kita sedia dia menolong dengan syarat dia menghantar wang dan senjata, dan biar-lah anak negeri ini yang kaseh-nya kepada tanah ayer ini tidak tumpah, biar mereka ini mempertahankan negeri ini, lain daripada askar upahan yang datang daripada negara luar. Orang puteh datang mempertahankan negeri ini dengan surohan daripada Kerajaan-nya bukan dengan rasa kaseh atau sayang kepada Malaysia. Bagitu juga Australia, New Zealand, Amerika dan dain<sup>2</sup>.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Sidang Algeria akan di-adakan bulan hadapan. Dalam masa sa-bulan ini-lah segala benda yang tidak betul ini mesti di-betulkan, dan kita maseh sangsi sa-juah mana-kah pengakuan negara<sup>2</sup> Asia-Afrika hendak menerima kita ka-dalam Sidang Algeria itu menjadi satu tanda tanya yang besar. Bagitu juga sikap yang di-ambil oleh kita satu kesilapan besar dengan menyokong tindakan liar Kerajaan Amerika di-Vietnam Utara. Chuba kita bertanya dan fikir hak apa-kah Amerika ini bagi menchampori dan pergi bom negeri orang. Jawab-nya senang. Kita hendak menahan kemaraan yang kita tahu tentera<sup>2</sup> pemberontakan Vietcong ini berpusat di-Vietnam Utara. Ini-lah kata Amerika, kerana tidak membenarkan kemaraan tentera Vietcong ini mereka bom. Kalau ini-lah lojik Amerika, Indonesia juga benar. Tudohan Amerika dengan tudohan Indonesia ini sama. Amerika menudoh datang-nya pemberontakan

Vietcong ini daripada Vietnam Utara, sebab itu kita mesti bom. Indonesia menuduh datang-nya subversive dan neo-colonialist hendak menghanchorkan Indonesia itu datang-nya daripada Malaysia. Siapa yang akan menghormati United Nations. Siapa yang akan menghormati negara<sup>2</sup> besar kalau negara Amerika, sa-buah negara besar atau gergasi, sanggup dengan perbuatan liar-nya pergi bom negara<sup>2</sup> kecil dan tindakan Amerika di-Congo, di-Dominican Republic, dan kita sa-buah negara kerdel menyokong negara besar seperti Amerika, sedang kita tahu negara India sa-buah negara Commonwealth membantah; Pakistan sa-buah negara Commonwealth membantah, apa-tah lagi negara<sup>2</sup> Asia-Afrika yang lain semua-nya membantah tindakan yang di-ambil oleh Amerika itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, satu perkara lagi yang akhir . . . . .

**Mr Speaker:** Saya suka hendak mengingatkan masa yang di-hadkan lagi 15 minit sahaja, sekarang sudah 20 minit. Tolong rengkaskan sedikit.

**Enche' Abdul Samad bin Gul Ahmad Mianji:** Ta' sampai lima minit. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, satu perkara yang selalu terjadi ia-itu perbuatan orang<sup>2</sup> dalam negara ini dengan kelakuan yang merosakkan persahabatan kita dengan negara luar. Satu perkara kita sekarang dengan Jepun baik—tidak ada perselisihan faham, dan Jepun dengan murah hati chuba mengikhtikarkan perdamaian di-antara Indonesia dengan Malaysia. Tetapi, ada pehak dan puak yang tidak suka melihat Jepun dengan Malaysia ini baik dan dengan baik-nya itu, maka akan di-usahakan perdamaian kita dengan Indonesia, maka di-timbulkan suatu benda supaya Jepun itu merasa sangsi terhadap negeri ini. Timbul-nya masalah Hutang Darah. Baharu<sup>2</sup> ini saya berpeluang bertanya Yang Berhormat Perdana Menteri tentang tuntutan Hutang Darah ini. Jawapan daripada Yang Amat Berhormat Perdana Menteri ia-lah mula<sup>2</sup> di-minta tuntutan Hutang Darah apabila Jepun sanggup hendak mendirikan sa-buah kolej di-Pulau Pinang kalau saya tidak silap sa-bagai ganti-

rugi Hutang Darah itu, maka jawapan daripada Yang Amat Berhormat Perdana Menteri ia-lah pehak<sup>2</sup> yang menuntut itu menaikkan harga-nya.

Maka ini-lah jawab Tunku Perdana Menteri, ia-lah pehak<sup>2</sup> orang yang menuntut menaikkan harga-nya, maka ini-lah menjokkan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, satu benda yang di-lakukan oleh sa-golongan ra'ayat dalam negeri ini hendak merosakkan perhubungan kita dengan negara luar. Saya suka hendak menyeru kepada Yang Amat Berhormat Perdana Menteri, kalau-lah sudah nampak terang—orang<sup>2</sup> yang menuntut ini hendak menaikkan harga dengan tidak tentu fasal, saya menhadangkan berhentikan tuntutan darah ini. Dan kalau-lah hendak di-kira orang yang mati dalam peperangan ini, tidak kurang orang Kelantan—orang Kelantan-lah yang terok sa-kali kerana Jepun mula<sup>2</sup> mendarat di-Kelantan, dan hampir<sup>2</sup> beratus<sup>2</sup> ribu pemuda<sup>2</sup> Kelantan di-bawa ka-Burma kerana mendirikan jalan keretapi maut. Jadi, kalau yang itu kita tidak tuntutan, dan kalau tutup pun sudah di-adakan pasokan bekas buroh paksa menuntut, dan jawapan daripada Kerajaan Jepun ia-lah kita sudah bayar dan masa itu pemerentahan kita ia-lah British dan telah di-ambil wang itu di-bawa ka-England. Dan sekarang ada satu puak lagi yang meminta tuntutan darah. Saya chadangkan kepada Kerajaan, berhentikan tuntutan darah ini dan jangan layan semua sa-kali. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kerana masa di-beri kepada saya, itu-lah sahaja yang dapat saya sampaikan, terima kaseh.

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon (Batu):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun untuk berchakap sedikit tentang pindaan yang di-chadangkan oleh Enche' Lee Kuan Yew. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Enche' Lee Kuan Yew tidak puas hati oleh kerana di-dalam Titah Uchapan Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong ada ayat ini:

“Dan lagi negara kita sedang menghadapi juga anchaman dari dalam negeri.”

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Enche' Lee Kuan Yew bertanya, siapa-kah sekarang menjadi anchaman di-dalam

negeri kita, dan beliau memandang ka-sini, beliau bertanya, ada-kah PAS sekarang menjadi anchaman di-dalam negeri? PAS tidak guna, kerana PAS tidak berapa berjaya di-dalam dua pilihan raya dalam tahun 1959 dan tahun 1964. Dan beliau memandang ka-sini dan bertanya, apa guna Socialist Front itu, sekarang ada dua orang wakil sahaja di-Rumah yang berhormat ini, mana boleh menjadi anchaman . . . . .

**Dr Awang bin Hassan (Muar Selatan):** Sir, on a point of order—the Honourable Member for Batu has already spoken once before and has taken nearly two hours of our time. Standing Order 35 (3) says:

“No member shall speak more than once to any question except—

(a) in Committee; or

(b) in explanation as prescribed in . . . .”

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya hendak berchakap tentang . . . . .

**Mr Speaker:** (*To Dr Awang bin Hassan*) The Honourable Member for Batu is speaking on the amendment and I think he has the right to make a few points clear, but I will only allow him a limited time to do so.

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** Terima kaseh, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Apabila beliau memandang ka-sini beliau berkata, mana boleh *Socialist Front* menjadi anchaman di-dalam negeri kita. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pagi ini rakan saya dari. . . . .

**Dr Awang bin Hassan:** I think the Honourable Member has spoken on the amendment.

**Mr Speaker:** I am not aware.

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** Mr Speaker, Sir, how can I have spoken on the amendment when I spoke before the Prime Minister of Singapore. I hope the Honourable Member for Muar Selatan will allow me to speak in peace. I am sure he can have his chance later.

**Mr Speaker:** The Honourable Member has spoken on the substantive motion and not on the amendment. I

think that is the case. (*To Dr Tan Chee Khoon*) Have you spoken on the amendment?

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** I have not, Sir.

**Mr Speaker:** In that case, you may carry on, but not for too long. (*Laughter*).

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, mari-lah kita lihat akibat<sup>2</sup> pilihan raya tahun 1959 dan tahun 1964. Dalam pilihan raya tahun 1959 Socialist Front mendapat 12.9 peratus undi. Di-dalam pilihan raya tahun 1964, kami mendapat 16.1 peratus undi. Ini boleh di-katakan Socialist Front makin lama makin kuat; Socialist Front bukan makin lama makin lemah. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, mari kita lihat partai P.P.P., U.D.P. dan P.A.P. U.D.P. mendapat 4.3 peratus, P.P.P. mendapat 3.4 peratus dan P.A.P. 2 peratus dan jumlah-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, 9.7 peratus. Bagaimana partai<sup>2</sup> kachang puteh ini boleh menjadi anchaman dalam negeri kita (*ketawa*).

**Dr Lim Chong Eu (Tanjong):** Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification. I think, is it a matter of looking backward or looking forward? The Socialist Front, I understand, is a progressive party and I am surprised that they are always looking backward.

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** Mr Speaker, Sir, when I spoke on Wednesday afternoon, I said that at our session last year the curtain went up on Act 1, Scene 1: the Prime Minister of Singapore was openly “making eyes” at the Government benches. It reminded me of the song in those days: “Ma, he is making eyes at me!” (*Laughter*) I predicted, Mr Speaker, Sir, in my speech, now that the curtain has gone up to Act II, Scene II, that the events that will unfold before us will be dramatically different from those of Act I, Scene I; and as the House has now seen, this “making eyes” gesture no longer prevails; you have seen words amounting to abuses being hurled at at each other not only from this side to the other side but vice versa.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the present public exchange of polemics on communal

questions between the UMNO and the P.A.P are inflaming public opinion. Are the rest of us in this country to sit quietly whilst communal elements in the Alliance and the P.A.P. compete for communal support? Are we to sit by quietly whilst the peace and harmony of this country is endangered by unscrupulous arguments? Until recently the wild men in the UMNO growled but accepting the P.A.P., as no one has challenged them except the P.P.P. However, now the P.A.P. has joined in the game. Mr Speaker, Sir, this is a deadly game of communal politics which can bring bloodshed and destruction to this country. Let us not avoid open discussions of what is public knowledge. A forum at the University of Malaya on Friday, 27th May was cancelled because there was an attempt to have a communal demonstration, and I gathered that there were other attempts to have communal demonstrations in Kuala Lumpur last Sunday night. Let no one undertake such an adventure, because he will have to face the consequences. "Mob action" is no answer to parliamentary debates and the sooner the Alliance backbenchers realise this the better.

Touching on the amendment to the motion of thanks to the King's speech, let me say that I, on behalf of my party, the Socialist Front, have time and again protested at the erosion of fundamental liberties and the march towards totalitarianism. Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, to my surprise I find an unaccustomed voice articulating unfamiliar words about democracy. It must be a long time since the Prime Minister of Singapore has talked in the defence of democracy. As my colleague the Member for Dato Kramat has said, the Prime Minister of Singapore will have to answer many questions to the whole of this country if he wants to convince the country that the Malaysian Solidarity Convention is the party of the future.

As for the second part of the amendment to the motion, it is nothing new to us in the Socialist Front. Time and again, in the past we have stated that the Alliance Party will practise

democracy so long as there is no danger of their losing at the ballot box. We have time and again stated that should there be the slightest danger of their losing, there will be dictatorship of the right propped up by bayonets and by the military forces. Mr Speaker, Sir, dictatorship of one section of the community is too horrible to contemplate. The Prime Minister of Singapore has dwelt at length about this and I do not wish to waste the time of this House on enlarging on it. Therefore, the Socialist Front cannot accept the sweet words of this amendment at its face value. The Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore wants to live in a glass house and throw stones. The amendment focuses on communal antagonism. The foolish speech of the Honourable Member for Kota Star Selatan must not be compounded by a provocative resolution. My party has steadfastly refused to use communal tactics. Only a communal bigot would say that we are communally inclined. We do not intend to start communal politics now or ever. The communal attacks on us will be treated with the contempt that they deserve. The first part of the amendment piously calls for a Malaysian Malaysia whilst the second part talks even more piously on democracy, which has been raped time and again in Singapore.

Mr Speaker, Sir, lastly shall I ask, what has been asked already by my colleague the Member for Dato Kramat, what has the P.A.P. got to say about the banning of the S.U.P.P. Branch on the 24th Mile Semanggang Road, Kuching? Does the P.A.P. support the action of the Government in that, it has stated that this branch is infiltrated by communists and that it should be banned? Or does the P.A.P. in defence of the fundamental liberties that are threatened in this country protest against the banning of that branch? The Prime Minister of Singapore is a master of invectives. He is also a master of equivocation. I am a very simple minded person, Mr Speaker, Sir, and I demand a simple answer—does he support or does he not support that action of the

Government? Let it not be said that the P.A.P. is a *partai atas pagar*.

As such, Mr Speaker, we cannot support this motion and to show that we do not want to join in this scramble for power I, on behalf of my party, will say that we will abstain from voting on this amendment.

**Dr Awang bin Hassan:** Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise to join in supporting the motion moved by the Honourable Member for Kota Star Selatan thanking His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong for his Gracious Address, and I would like also to pay my humble tribute to His Majesty for his dedication to duty and the able and dignified manner in which he has conducted himself in fulfilling the functions of his high office as Head of State. The impact His Majesty has made on all the countries he visited has contributed enormously to the prestige of our young nation.

I regret to find, Sir, that the Opposition has found it fit to introduce an amendment to the motion, which reads—

“but regrets that the Address by His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong did not reassure the nation that Malaysia will continue to progress in accord with its democratic constitution towards a Malaysian Malaysia, but on the contrary the Address has added to the doubts over the intentions of the present Alliance Government and over the measures it will adopt when faced with the loss of majority popular support.”

Mr Speaker, Sir, judging from the freedom of criticism which has been lengthy and unsparing from the Opposition and the free access given to all the members of the Press, both home and foreign, it does not appear to me that the end of parliamentary democracy is in sight as feared by the Opposition. That alone, Sir, is proof enough that parliamentary democracy in this country is flourishing. We on this side of the House fully realise that the very essence of parliamentary democracy is the presence of an Opposition. There is no democracy without an Opposition and we fully realise too that the presence of an Opposition poses the possibility of an alternative Government brought about by democratic and constitutional

methods. We are not in the least perturbed by the formation of a Grand Opposition, a step which is as it should be in our democratic set up. In fact, our Prime Minister has expressed his welcome to the move. I do not see any justification for the fears which prompted the Opposition to move this amendment. I think almost all of us here who were living during the Japanese military occupation experienced and knew what living in fear was like in a totalitarian and tyrannical regime, and so we are in an advantageous position to compare and contrast the conditions of living in a free democratic society and in a totalitarian and tyrannical regime. Can we honestly say to ourselves that we are living in fear today under the Alliance Government? Can we honestly say to ourselves that we are living in fear today under the Alliance Government, and can we also say honestly that our sports-loving Prime Minister with his forever disarming smile is a ruthless dictator? If anything, Sir, our Honourable Prime Minister is much too much of a democrat. Admittedly, the Alliance Government has taken certain restrictive measures like the Internal Security Act, but they are to counter subversion and preserve democracy itself, and the Opposition cannot deny that subversion exists in this country and in a dangerous form too.

As for the allegation that the fundamental liberties are being eroded, Sir, there is absolutely no truth. We have been living with those liberties as part and parcel of our life. I think, Sir, the Alliance Government can look with pride on its record of preserving democracy in this country. Unlike some African countries, the Alliance Government has not deported any foreign correspondent however hostile and unfriendly his criticism of the Government is, nor has Government relieved any judge of his post. We have preserved the freedom of the press and the independence of the judiciary. There is no doubt, Sir, that the Alliance Party will see to it that the flame of democracy will burn in this country and will burn brightly too. I say, therefore, that there is no

justification for this amendment, and I call upon this House to reject it.

Now, Sir, to come to the concept of Malaysia. The Honourable Prime Minister of Singapore made a two-and-a-half-hour flight into the sky of rhetorics just to fly the banner of "Malaysian Malaysia" and "Malaysia for Malaysians". There is absolutely no necessity for that. We have agreed to it both in theory and in practice. The Alliance Government passed the Malaysia Act and embodied it in the Malaysian Constitution, and it is following a policy to put Malaysian concept into practice. Of course, Rome was not built in a day and so we must allow time, Sir, for this concept to sink into the minds of the people. It might take a decade or two for the Malaysian consciousness to be aroused to the full. This concept must be taught in the home, in the classroom, in the office, in the workshop and, in fact, in every walk of life; and it is the duty and responsibility of all of us, Members of this House, to see that nothing that we do will delay or arrest the growth of this Malaysian consciousness.

At the last session of this Parliament, Sir, I had the privilege of seconding the motion thanking His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong on his Address. The whole theme of my speech then was on racial harmony which I likened to a plant which we all in this House should nourish with constant attention and tender care. But, lately, Sir, utterance of certain politicians have given cause for concern. Talk of one race dominating another can hardly be calculated to promote racial harmony. In the struggle for power, Sir, no politician should gamble with racial harmony: the price is much too high and no community can afford it.

Sir, I am not going to join in the barrage against the Honourable Prime Minister of Singapore. In fact, if anything, I am going to praise him. But I hope he is not worried, because I am not attacking him. Why I say that, Sir, perhaps, I may just explain. We all may have heard of the fiery stormy petrel of English politics, the

late Anuerin Bevan, that fiery Welshman, the debating genius, with whom even Sir Winston Churchill was afraid to have an argument. Well, he used to be attacked from all sides of the House—from Opposition benches and from the Members of his party—and he used to relish these attacks and he used to say, "If they stop attacking me, then I am really worried." As I said just now, I am not going to join in the barrage against the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew.

There is no denying of the fact that the Honourable Prime Minister of Singapore is a brilliant and outstanding politician. He has mastered the correct political technique in having his own press agents, who project his desired image both at home and abroad. We really have no objection, nor do we see any harm at all to his going on overseas trips, for example, provided of course he enlists support and sympathy for Malaysia during this confrontation. Well, after all, Sir, we have read of Harold Wilson and Patrick Gordon Walker. Before they came into power, they used to go to Washington, they used to go to Moscow, as Opposition Members, and there is nothing wrong in that. But, of course, they went there to talk on international issues like disarmament, Berlin crisis, but I do not think they told Lyndon Johnson or Khrushchev that Sir Alec Home then was a cretin or an imbecile. Well it is a pity, Sir, if the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew can only give us his constructive co-operation, and be more accommodating, I think he can be an enormous asset to the country as his skill and talent can well be harnessed to the good of the country and the people.

**Mr Speaker:** Will the Honourable Member speak a little louder, please?

**Dr Awang bin Hassan:** Yes. I am afraid that is the loudest I can speak, Sir. (*Laughter*).

But, unfortunately, Sir, the record of the People's Action Party, as led by Mr Lee Kuan Yew, in its struggle for power cannot exactly be described as wholesome, and also can hardly inspire confidence and trust in the people.

Here, perhaps, it is better for me to quote from a Barisan Sosialis newsletter on the People's Action Party's methods. I quote:

"With the P.A.P.'s past record of brutal repressions against its political opponents and its frequent use of threats and intimidation in order to compel non-supporters to support P.A.P. machinations still fresh in the people's mind, there cannot be anything democratic about such a concept. Therefore, this P.A.P. concept should be properly called 'a concept of fascist P.A.P.'"

There you are, Sir, the Barisan Sosialis was talking from bitter experience, and I do not think one can improve on that. Well, I do not want to speak any further on that, Sir.

Here, Sir, we have the Alliance Party, led by our Prime Minister the Tunku, and on the other side we have the People's Action Party, led by the brilliant Mr Lee Kuan Yew. But I have no doubt, Sir, that if the people of the country are given a chance to choose between the two, I am quite sure of the answer. The answer will be, with all Mr Lee Kuan Yew's brilliant gifts the people will say to the Opposition, "You can have one thousand Lee Kuan Yews with all his brilliance, but let us have our Tunku here with us." (*Applause*).

**The Minister for Sabah Affairs and Civil Defence (Dato' Donald A. Stephens):** Mr Speaker, Sir, yesterday I listened to the speech of the Honourable Barisan Sosialis Member from Singapore, and I was for a moment angry—angry that someone who has sworn to be loyal and true to Malaysia and to defend the Constitution should speak such disloyal and false words. And yet I felt that he has served his purpose in shewing that if democracy must not only be in existence but be clearly seen to exist, then the Honourable Member has indeed done his bit towards this end—and clearly shewed that contrary to what he says democracy is very much alive in Malaysia.

There are few countries, especially newly independent democracies, in the world where words like those used by the Barisan Sosialis Member would be tolerated—and yet here in this House the false mouthings of someone who

is clearly a puppet of the enemies of the nation are not only tolerated but even accepted in good humour!

The Honourable Enche' Chia Thye Poh spoke the now familiar propaganda cry of Jakarta and Peking in his denunciation of the Government: We are neo-colonialists; we are already breaking up, we are a fascist state and are only able to exist by virtue of British and American bayonets, and so on. And in almost the same breath the Honourable Member says that he and his party are loyal to the country! What does his Party really want? From the words used by him yesterday, it is easy to see what they want because, when the Honourable Member spoke gloatingly of Malaysia breaking up, he made known to us the sort of wishful thinking which his party here had all this while.

The Honourable Member spoke of his Party as non-communal and yet again in the same breath he calls on the Chinese to be vigilant and spoke of second class citizenship for them. Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member, when taking his oath, swore that he would be loyal to Malaysia and will protect, uphold and defend the Constitution of Malaysia. And yet here in this House we have heard him say "We have always opposed Malaysia and we still oppose Malaysia."

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member and also the Honourable Member for Batu referred to Sabah and the elections held in Sabah before Malaysia. The Honourable Members spoke of self-determination for the people and said that the people of Sabah had not been allowed self-determination. I cannot allow such falsehood to go uncorrected. The Honourable Member for Batu, who seems to be a very methodical person, must have known that the first elections held in Sabah before Malaysia were completely democratic, and that in fact everyone above twenty-one years of age, men and women, who had resided for seven out of ten years in Sabah were given the franchise. There was no other qualification.

This is now history but the issue before the people of Sabah at the time

of the election was Malaysia. Had the people then voted for those who were against Sabah's entry into Malaysia, Sabah would not have become a part of Malaysia. The district councillors elected would have been anti-Malaysia, and they in turn would have elected to the Assembly an anti-Malaysian group who certainly would have kept Sabah out of Malaysia. But the people voted into power those who were for Malaysia, shewing that Malaysia was what they wanted and Malaysia was in their best interest. They had determined for themselves and they chose Malaysia.

The Honourable Member for Batu could have easily found out that about 85 per cent of the electorate went to the polls in the first elections held in Sabah, and this was enough to convince the United Nations team sent to Sabah by the U.N. Secretary-General that the people had been allowed to determine for themselves the future they want for themselves, and that they had decided on Malaysia. The U.N. team also found the elections to have been properly and democratically held. I would have thought that the Honourable Member for Batu would have read the U Thant Report; if he had read the Report then he should not have tried to rehash the old Soekarno lie about the people of North Borneo not having been given self-determination.

The State and the Federal Governments have had problems—there have been disagreements—but all these, Sir, I believe, are a natural consequence of a young democratic Federation. Nothing has happened which has not been solved, or could not be solved, by goodwill and give and take. In fact, if there had been no disagreements at all, we should have been much more worried since this could have meant domination of the State by the Centre.

In the early years of our nation, a Federation comprising as it does of 14 component parts, there are bound to be stresses and strains, changes and readjustments which are necessary. No one need take delight in thinking that these stresses and strains will be of such magnitude that they would break

Malaysia. I say this because I know that the people of Sabah, nay I think I can say the vast majority of the people of Malaysia, know that they are Malaysians, and come what may, they must work together to make Malaysia stick. (*Applause*). Over and over again we have heard it said that all of us in Malaysia should swim together or we shall sink together. The swim is not easy. The tide of Indonesian confrontation, domestic political problems, 12 years of fighting the Communists before Malaysia, all these make the swimming tough, but we shall make it if we swim together. Unity for any nation facing big cruel enemies is a must—it is only if we allow ourselves to be disunited that we can be broken.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we all know in our heart of hearts that if we allow racialism to get out of hand in our country, then indeed Soekarno will win.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the words "Secession" and "Partition" have been used by the Honourable Members of the Opposition in this House. It is a matter of great regret to me that these words should have been used at all.

I will not be so bold as to speak for other States, but I think I can take it on myself to speak for Sabah. The people of Sabah, as I said earlier, had chosen freely to become a part of Malaysia, knowing that the decision once taken, was irrevocable. (*Applause*) Sabah will never secede. (*Applause*) Sabah will never support any move to partition Malaysia. (*Applause*) We have chosen; we have freely determined to become a part of Malaysia. We are very proud to be Malaysians and come what may Malaysians we shall remain.

Sir, this is a beautiful country, our mother Malaysia—dari Perlis sampai-lah ka-Sabah, as it says in the Berjaya song. We who love her must do all we can to strengthen her, make her even more beautiful, more prosperous. I am sure we can do it. There is no doubt about it. But Malaysia can only remain strong and beautiful if all her children are willing to work together, stand united. We have to be patient, to forego ambition, to be

less suspicious of our brothers of whatever colour or creed; in short, we must always put the country before ourselves.

Racial name calling, no matter how cleverly they are disguised, will certainly not help solve any of the problems which we are now facing, because racial name calling merely breeds more name calling and, if this is allowed to go on unchecked, instead of name calling someone may start throwing a bottle or a brick and this will be followed by more bottles and more bricks—and escalation will follow. What then? I do not think it is necessary for me to say more.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I have said enough. What I have said comes from the bottom of my heart, and it is my hope that those who would play with racial politics will think again, because they will be playing with an atom bomb. A wrong move and a switch is sparked off—whoof—that could easily be the end of all that we hold most near and dear to our hearts. Our leader, the Prime Minister, the Tunku, has shown what a non-communal person he is. He is a Malay and a prince, but does any of us ever think of him as such? To us he is just the Tunku.

He is very worthy of emulation, and I would ask Members of the Opposition to emulate him—his big heartedness, his love for all Malaysians—even for the members of the Opposition. He is always fair and non-communal in outlook. To him Malaysians are Malaysians—not Malays, Chinese, Indians, Ibans, Kadazans, and what have you. Mr Speaker, Sir, he is, in fact, the original Malaysia Malaysian. If all of us will follow the Tunku's example, there will be no need for all this hot talk about "Malaysian Malaysia". We will all be what we are—Malaysians. *(Applause)*.

**Enche' Kam Woon Wah (Sitiawan):**

Mr Speaker, Sir, I will only take just a few minutes. Sir, we have heard the Honourable Member for Tanjong two days ago, when he said that previously he was in the Alliance but the "wind of change" had begun to blow and

eventually he was blown over to the Opposition. *(Laughter)*. I hope the "wind of change" has now stopped; otherwise he might be blown back again.

Sir, we have heard so much about the term "Malaysian Malaysia". Sir, before Malaysia was formed, all the terms and conditions were agreed upon by all the parties to the Agreement. Singapore, like a new bride, insisted on her dowry of autonomy in education and labour. Those conditions were agreed to by the Central Government. Finally, the marriage took place. All went very well, when they went for honeymoon. Now, the honeymoon is over and the bride comes home and finds a new life facing her. All the sweetness, all the bliss of the honeymoon period, is over. She now finds herself in a very difficult position to adjust, or readjust, so that she can face the realities of the world. This is the stage where the P.A.P. has come to. She now finds that life is too difficult for her to be a new wife. She now recalls how happy she was when she was under the wings of her father and mother, but that is wrong. That idea should be off her head, because once she had agreed to marry into Malaysia she must take it and face the world—whether it be for better or for worse does not matter. To go back to the parents is too late. That is why lately we have heard so much howling, screaming and tearing of hair by Singapore.

Sir, Singapore is predominantly a Chinese island. The way of life in Singapore is, I would say, more a Chinese than a Malaysian way of life. We, Chinese, in the Mainland of the Peninsula do not feel so much that we are Chinese, nor do our Malay brothers feel that they are Malays. We feel that we are all Malaysians, we are together. To the Singapore Chinese, it is a new way of life to them, and they feel it very badly because suddenly, as I said, they have awakened from their bliss of honeymoon and they feel, "Well, this husband of mine is not exactly what I thought him to be." Sir, in Malaya, or in the Mainland of the Peninsula, as I said, we

are all Malaysians. There is no this nonsense of a "master race" over other races. So, let us hope that the P.A.P. will now drop that melodious song entitled "Malaysian Malaysia".

Sir, lately there is the quarrel between the Prime Minister of Singapore and the Honourable Member for Johore Tenggara. This is quite a difficult matter actually, because it is like a quarrel between a couple because both do not want to give way, and the earlier they stop it the better it is for all of us in this country. These two are just like two grindstones trying to clash with one another, but do they realise that when they clash they must be trying to crush something in between? And what is that something, or the people, in between? The poor, innocent and peace-loving citizens of this country. Sir, our social and cultural plurality in this country adds colour, personality and strength to our own Malaysian way of life. So, let us forget the new theme "Malaysian Malaysia". We are all Malaysians.

Sir, coming to the next point, we all heard the Honourable Member for Batu, Dr Tan Chee Khoo, say two days ago that the P.A.P. is a party of double-talk, double-thinking, double-crossing, etc., and that the Alliance Party is autocratic, communalistic and all the other nonsense. Sir, when I heard him speak in this vein, it reminds me of a story of the old British colonial days in India before the partition of that country—that was if a Pakistani killed an Indian, it was manslaughter, if an Indian killed a Pakistani, it was murder, but if a Britisher killed a Pakistani plus an Indian, it was preservation of law and order (*Laughter*). However, eventually the British had to give away. I hope that will also apply to the Socialist Front.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to touch briefly on our foreign policy. Sir, it is good that we believe in democracy and in our way of life, but that does not mean that our foreign policy cannot be a bit more flexible. We have rightly, I think, got all the assistance from the Commonwealth

countries and now I hope our Government will go a step further and instead of sending delegations only to the Commonwealth countries, we should try even sending delegations to the Communist countries. There is no harm in going and talking to them and explaining to them the senseless Indonesian confrontation against us—whether this suggestion will meet with approval or not I do not know.

Sir, lastly, about the learning of our national language, I think there is a consensus of opinion in this country that everybody must and should learn Bahasa Kebangsaan, but I feel that the methods being used at the moment are wrong. The methods used should be such that the people are made interested in the subject and the people love the subject—but not speeches made by a certain civil servant in the Dewan Bahasa as though by 1967 hell is going to break loose on Malaysia.

**Mr Speaker:** At the closing stages of the debate, I am afraid I have to announce to the House that two Honourable Ministers would like to speak first and then I think I would allow the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew to make his reply.

**The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Enche' Senu bin Abdul Rahman):** Mr Speaker, Sir, for the last few days we have been hearing in this House, for the first time in the history of this country, speeches which will go down in our history as a tragedy. As a newcomer to this House, I do feel that, if this sort of talks should go on, the future of our democracy has indeed got to be very bleak and gloomy.

Sir, in regard to the P.A.P., we do not like and I personally do not like to touch on the P.A.P. I do not like to speak of the P.A.P.; we do not want to give so much importance to the P.A.P. But what the P.A.P. has done? The speeches by the leaders of the P.A.P., and the speech made by the Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore, Mr Lee Kuan Yew, all these give us concern and all these will give the impression, in this country and outside this country, that Malaysia is really going to pieces. I do not have

to go into detail in this and deal with it at length, as my colleagues the Ministers and the Government back-benchers have spoken at length and they have replied to the speeches from the P.A.P. bench. However, I would like to describe one thing. The P.A.P. has described its policy as democratic socialism. The P.A.P. members call themselves democratic socialists, but I would like to call them not democratic socialists, but futurists—futurism (HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear hear!). Futurism is an attempt to escape the present by a leap into the darkness of an unknown future. It involves the scrapping of traditional links with the past. That is futurism, and that is what they are doing. I would like to read to the House so many things. In fact, I have many documents here, and I can show to this House what the P.A.P. Government has been doing in Singapore by abusing television, radio and everything else for the interests of the P.A.P. and for the interests of the Government of Singapore.

They talk about Malaysia for Malaysians. Here, Sir, I do not have to repeat what has been said in respect of “Malaysia for Malaysians”, because my colleagues in the Cabinet have already spoken at length. However, it reminds me of one thing—“Malaysia for Malaysians” has been stressed and stressed. We must give credit to the P.A.P. leaders. They really know how to coin phrases. It reminds me of the Communists, and I am not accusing them of being Communists or using Communist tactics, but Communists use the same tactics. Peace—they talk about peace. Everybody is for peace. Who would go against peace? They would talk about “peaceful co-existence”. Who would go against peaceful co-existence? Who would dare to go against peaceful co-existence? The same thing with Malaysia for Malaysians. They know it. Who would dare to go against Malaysia for Malaysians? The Communists speak about peace, talk about peaceful co-existence, but what do they do? They subvert at the same time, infiltrate, make every attempt and every endeavour to destroy the neighbouring country or the Government which is not to their

liking. Is not the P.A.P. doing the same? Honourable Members can see that. The evidence is clear. In the last few days, in the last few weeks . . . I am going to read some of the statements made by the Prime Minister of Singapore which were not mentioned in the *Straits Times*. This morning you have read about the partition. He spoke about the partition, but there is another phrase which was reported by the U.P.I. and which was not mentioned, I think, in the *Straits Times*. Mr Lee said, when he was speaking at the Delta constituency:

“From the ashes of that fire we are building a new community, and this is a forerunner of what is possible in the rest of Singapore and, indeed, in the rest of Malaysia, if we are prepared to be forbearing with each other to build a Malaysian Malaysia, a Malaysia in which all Malaysians regardless of race, language or religion, share equally in the opportunities of life.”

**Enche' Lee Kuan Yew:** Sir, on a point of clarification.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Sit down!

**Enche' Senu bin Abdul Rahman:** You will have your time!

**Enche' Lee Kuan Yew:** Before the Honourable Minister goes further, I would like to say that I was speaking at the Delta Community Centre . . .

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Sit down! Sit down!!

**Enche' Lee Kuan Yew:** As you wish!

**Enche' Senu bin Abdul Rahman:** Sir, the Honourable Prime Minister of Singapore would say that he was speaking at the Delta constituency, and that there was a big fire, and that these people were to build up the community. But the phrase itself was worded in such a way . . . (*Interruption*) Well, if I was wrong, the reporting here was wrong. However, you can see from the phrase here, “From the ashes of the fire” (*Interruption*), that if you want to build the nation, you must destroy this nation first, in order to build a new one. (*Laughter*) The Prime Minister of Singapore may laugh, but this is the conclusion we can draw from his

speech, from what the P.A.P. has been doing in the past few weeks and few months.

Sir, we should speak, as I said two days ago, with only one voice and my statement was wrongly interpreted to mean "one idea". I did not say "one idea", and I deny it now. I did not say "one idea", as it is wrong to say that we must have only one idea in the country. I said "one voice". What I mean by "one voice" is—I think everybody will agree with it—how can we speak with several voices in our country? We must have only one voice either inside the country or, particularly, outside the country. We must have only one foreign policy. Once we accept Malaysia, we agree that Malaysia is for Malaysians; we accept the Central Government; and the Central Government should speak as the voice of all. There should be only one voice. But how many voices have we heard so far? Many.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I would now quote what Mr Lee Kuan Yew said in Australia recently. The politics which should be confined to this country, which should be fought out in this country, was taken to Australia, was taken to New Zealand, was presented to the Australians and New Zealanders, and many others. I would like to quote here, and I would like the House to judge whether this is the right thing to do to build a Malaysian nation. On the 28th March, 1963, in the *Sunday Telegraph*, this is what Mr Lee Kuan Yew said:

"He demands—that means Mr Lee demands—'Let me say this: the Tunku gave forty seats in the Government of Malaysia to 1.2 million people in Borneo and only fifteen seats to 1.8 million Chinese in Singapore'—this is in Australia. Now the reason he gives: 'So many more seats to Borneo were given because he thought they were all Malays there like him, but now he has just found out that he was wrong, that there are several races in Borneo and it is too late for him to do anything about it. Lee's eyes narrowed at the thought'—and I quote again—'He made a simple, stupid, naive, mistake about Borneo of all places, My God'—that is his expression—'My God' . . ."

**Enche' Lee Kuan Yew:** Sir, on a point of clarification.

**Enche' Senu bin Abdul Rahman:** Sir, let me finish!

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Sit down! Sit down!! (*Interruption*).

**Enche' Lee Kuan Yew:** The Malaysian Commission has issued a denial . . . (*Interruption*).

**Enche' Senu bin Abdul Rahman:** Sir, he can deny that later on. (*Interruption*). The papers are here!

**Mr Speaker:** Will Honourable Members stop shouting and behaving in an unparliamentary way, please?

**Enche' Senu bin Abdul Rahman:** I continue, Sir.

" . . . 'No wonder there is trouble in Sarawak and Sabah. So the Tunku was a fool. Don't ask me why.'"

Those are some of Mr Lee's remarks in Australia, and there are more.

**Enche' Lee Kuan Yew:** Read them!

**Enche' Senu bin Abdul Rahman:** In fact, it will take three days to read all these things, but I will read some part of it. Sir, there is another one of Mr Lee's statements on the 18th of March. This is a comment from Peter Smart in Canberra. Sir, I just want to show to this House how the internal politics of Malaysia was brought to Australia, and how the Australians were so much interested or had shown interest in our internal politics:

"The Central Malaysian Government, headed by Tunku Abdul Rahman, is said to be concerned at the effects that the visit of the Singapore Prime Minister, Mr Lee Kuan Yew, may have on Australian opinion. It is considering sending a delegation to Australia to counter Mr Lee's energetic campaigning. Mr Lee, whose socialist People's Action Party is the main Opposition Party in Malaysia, is busily building a good image for himself in Australia. He wants Australia to switch from the support for Tunku Abdul Rahman as a person and the Head of the Government to the support of the country itself. Mr Lee is sounding warnings of the dangers of racial strife, if the Malays continue to assume a stronger hold over the new Federation."

This has been the theme of Mr Lee since months and it has, of course, culminated in this House and in his speech in Delta. I quote—and I do not know whether the *Straits Times* did mention it—what he said in Delta:

"The Singapore Prime Minister, Mr Lee Kuan Yew, has declared that Singapore had

never agreed to Malay rule when she joined Malaysia. What she had agreed to was Malaysian rule. He stressed their thoughts that the people of Singapore were not accustomed to the Malay rule like the people of Kelantan and Trengganu, and he added 'Somebody is making a grave error of judgment if he thinks that the people agreed to Malay rule in joining Malaysia,'—I am sure you said it.

Why did he say all these? He knows very well that the Alliance Government is not a Malay Government, that it is not Malay rule. Why is it necessary to make these statements? There must be ulterior motives. Sir, I say that they are out to destroy. So, whether the Honourable the Prime Minister denies it or not, but by what he said at the Delta, when describing the fire and the ashes, he is out to destroy this country—they will destroy this country first. (AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Traitor!) I had seen, Mr Speaker, Sir, how the Communist Party worked in Indonesia, how they split the leaders, how they destroyed the political parties, how they made the economy of the country suffer—and we can see what is Indonesia today. That was the work of the Communists. I am not blaming the P.A.P., I am not accusing the P.A.P. as a Communist party, but the tactics are, I think, not far different from the tactics of the Communists.

Sir, we live in this country. It is such a beautiful country and, as has been described by my colleague just now from Sabah, it is such a peaceful country, and it is the reason why the people of Sabah decided to join Malaysia. So, why is it now that some people, because they are so impatient, because they are so obsessed by their own thoughts, think that they are the only clever and intelligent ones, and not anybody else, who can rule and govern this country? Why? This is a unique country. You cannot bring any idea or any philosophy into this country. I must say this again to the P.A.P. Members here: You cannot bring a foreign ideology into this country. This is the reason. If you insist in bringing into and planting foreign ideology in this country, the result will be that there is going to be bloodshed in this country, because the

soil, the atmosphere are not suitable for foreign ideologies.

**Enche' Lee Kuan Yew:** What kind of ideology?

**Enche' Senu bin Abdul Rahman:** Well, socialism (*Laughter*)—the way you describe those foreign ideologies.

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification—Does not Saberkas in Kedah believe in socialism?

**Enche' Senu bin Abdul Rahman:** It is not clarification. I won't answer that. I must mention, Mr Speaker, Sir, that this country is unique, unique in every sense of the word. There is no country in the world which you can compare with our country—Malaysia. Look at the people in this House—Malays, Chinese, Indians, Eurasians.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Ceylonese!

**Enche' Senu bin Abdul Rahman:** Yes, Ceylonese and Pakistanis. (*Laughter*) (*Interruption*).

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Mr Speaker, Sir, isn't there a Speaker in this House?

**Mr Speaker:** I am afraid there is, and I must warn Honourable Members not to interrupt in an unruly fashion, because I have the means at my disposal to deal with it.

**Enche' Senu bin Abdul Rahman:** As I said, Mr Speaker, Sir, this country is unique—unique in every sense of the word. Therefore, any ideology, any belief, must be from this country. It must originate from here. That is the only sure and secure way for peace and security in this country. The P.A.P. has brought in an ideology which is strange and foreign to this country. And I would like to remind the P.A.P. Members again that they are going to destroy this country. (*Laughter*). They are laughing, they are smiling, Mr Speaker, Sir, but by the way they are doing things now they are going to destroy this country.

Mr Speaker, Sir, there are many dialecticians in the P.A.P. They believe in the dialectical idealism of heckling,

in the dialectical mechanism in thought, of Marx, in everything—in thesis, anti-thesis, synthesis. And all these theoreticians, do they think that the 11 million Malaysians are guinea pigs? We are not guinea pigs, who are going to be destroyed by their theories, by their dialectics. What I want to tell them is that we are not guinea pigs—Malaysians are not guinea pigs—to be destroyed, to be tested. In your ambitions, do not attempt to make Malaysians guinea pigs. You can do what you like, but do not destroy Malaysia and the Malaysians. Sir, I want to repeat again that this country is unique—remember that. No ideology or foreign ideology can save this country. You must build up from the soil in this country. As Malaysians, we must get together, we must work together. This is our country. We must build up our country for our posterity, for our future generations.

I am sure that the statement of the Prime Minister of Singapore this morning about partition will be received with jubilation in Indonesia. I am sure Subandrio will be saying tonight, “Well, look at Malaysia. Malaysia is going to pieces.” He will say to the Indonesian people that the Prime Minister of Singapore is talking about partition now. Is that what he wants really? When our country is facing an external threat, when we are fighting for survival, he talks of Malay rule, he talks of partition, he talks about this and that. I would like to make this appeal to the leaders of the People’s Action Party: at this moment, we have got to concentrate on facing the external threat; we have got to face the external enemy, and we have got to be united. Only unity is our strength. (*Applause*).

**The Minister of Lands and Mines and Acting Minister of Labour (Enche’ Abdul-Rahman bin Ya’kub):** Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to come straight to the point. First, let me deal with the speeches made by the Honourable Member for Batu. He alleges that the Alliance Government is anti-labour and has chosen to use the mailed fist in its dealing with its employees. Sir, I need only say that

the record behind the Alliance Government, as far as the encouragement of free trade unions is concerned, speaks volumes to refute the allegation of the Honourable Member. The Alliance Government, Mr Speaker, Sir, has never attempted to stifle the growth of free democratic trade unions in this country.

The Honourable Member has rightly quoted the Address of His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong in 1961 showing clearly our belief in this connection. The Honourable Prime Minister has time and again reiterated the stand of the Alliance Party in this respect. Has the Alliance Party ever attempted to gain control of any trade union in this country? No, we have not. Why? Because we know that trade unions must protect, fight and work for the workers. Trade unions should not become the tools of any organisation for the organisation’s interest.

The Honourable Member quoted “work-to-rule” and “go-slow” campaigns, which he alleges have been banned by the Government, together with the recent promulgation of the strike regulations and the essential arbitration regulations, as a clear indication that the Alliance Government is anti-labour, that we are taking away the legitimate rights of the workers of this country. However, Sir, in connection with “work-to-rule” and “go-slow” and other irritation strikes, I have quoted a passage from the Trade Union Handbook issued by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions which I would like to read again for the benefit of the Honourable Member here. Passage 134 says—

“Slow-down strikes are resorted to at times, although they are strictly questionable.”

The Honourable Member for Bungsar argued that that refers to the abuse of those rights. Mr Speaker, Sir, it is in no way mentioned in that Handbook that that opinion in that Trade Union Handbook refers specifically to the abuse of strikes. Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member quoted . . . .

**Enche' C. V. Devan Nair (Bungsar):** On a point of clarification—I hope the Honourable acting Minister of Labour is not suggesting that the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions is against strikes?

**Enche' Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub:** Not at all. He was coming in when I was talking about “go-slow” and this other form of “irritation” strike. I am not suggesting that the I.C.F.T.U. is against strikes, nor does the Alliance Government for that matter.

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** On a point of clarification—If the Government is not against strikes, why has it promulgated those two Emergency regulations?

**Enche' Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub:** I am coming to that, Mr Speaker, Sir. He has quoted several passages which he alleges were statements made by the Honourable Minister of Labour—the substantive Minister of Labour—and I must say that those passages quoted were taken completely out of context; for example, he quoted that the Minister of Labour said that trade unions have tried to disrupt the machinery of the Government and endanger the economy and stability of the nation. I have here a copy of the speech made by the Honourable Minister of Labour. He said “certain unions”. He did not say that “all the trade unions” are behaving as alleged in this country, and, in fact, the Honourable Member has conveniently left out one very important statement by the Honourable Minister of Labour, which reads thus—

“Let me make it quite clear that there are amongst the working population, both in the Government sector as well as in the private sector, people whose loyalty is completely vindicated in every way, people who put the overall interest of the nation above their personal interests, people who are prepared to play their part, including personal sacrifices, so long as the economy, stability and security of the country can be attained and indeed advanced.”

I need not refer to other passages quoted by the Honourable Member. It is sufficient to say that he has learned a very expert way of twisting facts.

Mr Speaker, Sir, these two regulations—the prohibition of strikes and the Essential Services—are measures to deal with the situation prevailing in our country; and I need hardly remind the House that the emergency is going on and we are facing an external threat.

Some time this month, before the promulgation of the prohibition of strike regulations, the Fire Services served notice to go on strike, the Railway Services, the Division IV, and the N.I.M.G. threatened to resort to strike action at a time when we have to exert all our efforts to fight a very powerful external enemy. The Government was left with no alternative but to promulgate those regulations. I need not in fact go to any other explanation, because the explanation has been given by the Honourable Minister of Labour on the 13th of this month.

Sir, as I said just now, the Alliance Government believes that the workers have the right to go on strike. It is clearly stated, it is recognised, in our relevant Ordinances in this country. The promulgation of the Emergency regulations in question do not mean that we completely deny, as from the date the regulations came into force, the right of all workers to resort to strike. Even in the Government sector, which we must distinguish from the private sector, we have only prohibited strikes in respect of certain Essential Services. The Fire Services, for example, can we afford to have the men in the Fire Services to go on strike? In the Telecommunications, Postal Services, and other Essential Services, can we afford to have men to go on strike, when they must be running at the highest pitch at this time of national emergency?

In the private sector, Sir, it is clearly shown in the Essential Services Regulations of 1965 that we have not banned strikes completely. We have adopted a method to ensure that disputes between the employees and the employers should be settled as expeditiously as possible. In fact, it is

stated in these Regulations—Regulation 5 reads as follows—

“An employer shall not declare or take part in a lockout and a workman shall not take part in a strike that proscribes industrial action in connection with a trade dispute in any Essential Services, as defined in the Regulations, unless the dispute has been reported to the Minister of Labour in accordance with the provisions of Regulation 4, and 21 days have elapsed since the date of the report and the dispute has not during that time been referred by the Minister of Labour for settlement in accordance with the provisions of those Regulations.”

Sir, a period of twenty-one days only is given to the Minister of Labour to try his very best to get settlement of a dispute. If he does not do that, then the workers can go on strike in the private sector in connection with the Essential Services as defined in those Regulations.

I maintain, Sir, that these regulations do not contravene the Geneva Conventions. Convention 98, which deals with the application of the principles of the right to organise and to bargain collectively, says, among other things—

“Machinery appropriate to national conditions shall be established, where necessary, for the purpose of ensuring respect for the right to organise as defined in the preceding Article.”

Mr Speaker, Sir, it says “machinery appropriate to national conditions”. And Article 6 says—

“This Convention does not deal with the position of public servants engaged in the administration of the State, nor shall it be construed as prejudicing their rights or status in any way.”

Now, before this period of Emergency, before we had all these threats to resort to strike, what did our Prime Minister say? He said, “Let us talk, let us try to settle the claims, let us not threaten to take any industrial actions which might jeopardise the security of our country.”, but certain—I am not saying all—union leaders ignored that advice and, as I have said just now, we have had no alternative but to promulgate, much reluctantly, those Regulations.

Sir, it is still not conclusively settled whether or not civil servants should have the right to strike. It is stated so in the International Labour

Office Workers Educational Manual. Among other things, it says—

“Then there is the question of whether civil servants have the right to strike. In some countries they have not, in others they may strike, but because of their long term engagements and conditions of service they would commit a breach of contract by going on strike and would run the risk of loss of seniority or even dismissal.”

Be that as it may, Sir, before the promulgation of these Regulations we recognised the civil servants’ right to go on strike. If they wanted to go on strike, all they needed to do was to serve the proper notice and they could go on strike.

Mr Speaker, Sir, there are many other things in connection with labour to which I would like to reply. Unfortunately, however, time is rather short and I need only say this in respect of the observation made by the Honourable Dr Toh Chin Chye in connection with the labour legislation. Dr Toh said, and I quote, “Was this, Mr Speaker, Sir, a matter of life and death for the country that the Minister of Labour could not wait for Parliament to meet, or was it not a growing tendency for the Government to avoid Parliament and to fall into the habits of guided democracy?” Sir, when you deal with an Emergency, you have got to act expeditiously, quickly, to deal with that situation right away. You cannot wait for two weeks, three weeks or four weeks. As to the allegation that we are falling into the habits of guided democracy, I think, the cap fits the P.A.P. more than the Alliance Party (*Applause*).

Sir, coming to the S.U.P.P. from Sarawak congratulations to that Party, which now appears to be discarding their old comrades, the Front Socialis and the Barisan Socialis. If I remember correctly, last year the Honourable Enche’ Lee Kuan Yew spoke something about the S.U.P.P. in Sarawak, likening the S.U.P.P. in Sarawak to the Barisan Socialis and the Front Socialis. Now, it appears that the S.U.P.P. has found a new comrade. The allegation by the S.U.P.P. is that the crisis in the Sarawak Alliance was all engineered by myself and by

Enche' Taib Mahmud—(ONE HONOURABLE MEMBER: UMNO). Be patient, I will come to that—and manipulated by UMNO, forgetting the fact, Sir, that when the crisis started on the 11th I was still flying from Hongkong back to Kuala Lumpur, after visiting Korea and Japan accompanying the Honourable the Prime Minister. I can produce documents to show, if need be in the future, that neither myself, nor Enche' Taib, nor UMNO initiated the crisis. Let me read the Memorandum from Party Pesaka, Sarawak, to the Honourable Chief Minister of Sarawak in connection with the Land Bills. The Memorandum is dated 8th April, cancelling a former Memorandum dated 23rd March, 1965, and is signed by the Honourable Dato' Temenggong Jugah anak Barieng as Chairman of Party Pesaka. It says here, among other things, referring to the Land (Native Dealings) Bill—

“For the above reasons, it is submitted that the Bill must be scrapped.”

Again, it says, in connection with the native area land—

“It is submitted that land classified under this category shall be absolutely inalienable to non-natives. It is alienable as between natives themselves, as in the present position. Only natives may hold title to and occupy this class of land, which is only 2,600 acres. Every assistance must be given to the natives themselves to work on this land through the introduction of the F.L.D.A. and the RIDA schemes.”

Then Dato' Temenggong Jugah says in his Memorandum, paragraph 6—

“It is vital that the protection legitimately due to the natives of Sarawak and enshrined in the existing Land Code must not be whittled down in the name of development and that their rights in land must be preserved at all costs.”

He goes further to say—

“It is appreciated there is an urgent need of landless people, of whom a good number are Sarawakians and Malaysians of Chinese origin, for more land and it is acknowledged that generally they make the best possible use of it, but the native must be prevented from disposing of his land until he has been better educated in how to use it properly.

This Memorandum supersedes the one submitted to you on 23rd March, 1965.”

I say, Mr Speaker, Sir, it is an insult to the intelligence of the Pesaka leaders in Sarawak and other political leaders in Sarawak, the Alliance

leaders in Sarawak, to say that they could be manipulated anyhow by the UMNO in Kuala Lumpur.

Some of the observations made by the Honourable Member from the S.U.P.P. concerning my joining the UMNO here is no concern, in fact, of this Dewan, but I am proud to say that I am a member of the UMNO and have been elected to the Majlis Kerja Tertinggi of the UMNO, and am at the same time a member of the Berjasa. But if there is a branch of the Berjasa here, I do not have to be a member of the UMNO; and if there is a branch of the UMNO in Sarawak, I do not have to be a member of the Berjasa or Berjasa might be closed down or *vice versa*. The two Parties have the same approach. The S.U.P.P. chaps, as proved by the closing down of the 24th Mile Branch, Simanggang Road—Wen Meng Chong, Poh Choo Man and the others—appear outwardly to be democrats but at the same time three-quarters of their body, if not 99.9%, are with the C.C.O. in Sarawak.

**Mr Speaker:** Order, order! May I point out to the Minister that the time is up.

**Enche' Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub:** I think, Sir, because the time is up, I need only say that and thank you very much (*Applause*).

## ADJOURNMENT

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

**Enche' Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub:** Sir, I beg to second the motion.

## ADJOURNMENT SPEECHES

### PEMBERIAN BANTUAN KAPADA RA'AYAT MALAYSIA UNTOK PERUSAHAAN DI-WILAYAH<sup>2</sup> BORNEO

**Enche' Tama Weng Tinggang Wan (Sarawak):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, banyak penerangan telah di-keluarkan di-dalam surat<sup>2</sup> khabar di-Malaysia dan Sarawak berhubung dengan tujuan Kerajaan Pusat memberi bantuan kepada ra'ayat Malaysia, khasnya

orang<sup>2</sup> Asli, mengambil bahagian di-dalam perusahaan agent<sup>2</sup> seperti RIDA dan F.L.D.A. dan ada-lah di-perchayai melebarkan ranchangan mereka ka-wilayah<sup>2</sup> Borneo yang boleh mendatangkan kemajuan di-wilayah<sup>2</sup> itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, malang-nya bantuan<sup>2</sup> yang di-beri sa-takat ini nampak-nya ada-lah terhad kepada kumpulan orang<sup>2</sup> yang terpilih khas sahaja dan tidak sama sa-kali mendatangkan faedah kepada umum.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, baharu<sup>2</sup> ini Kerajaan Sarawak telah membagi area<sup>2</sup> dan kawasan<sup>2</sup> hutan yang besar kepada orang<sup>2</sup> tertentu dan di-dalam daerah daripada mana saya datang, maka satu area kawasan besar telah di-bagi kepada sa-bilangan ketua<sup>2</sup> kaum sahaja dan sa-bilangan besar ra'ayat yang tinggal berhampiran. Area kawasan besar ini tidak di-ambil perlu kira-nya tujuan membantu ra'ayat bumiputera itu berbentok satu kelas baharu sahaja, meninggi dan mementingkan keperluan-nya sendiri.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya perchaya ia hanya-lah menimbulkan perasaan tidak puas hati di-kalangan ra'ayat, kerana tidak ada jalan di-dalam sa-barang apa pun yang boleh menolong ekonomi masyarakat, atau meninggikan taraf hidup mereka.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, oleh yang demikian, saya bersungguh<sup>2</sup> meminta Kerajaan Pusat bila mana meranchangkan sa-barang sekim untok faedah ra'ayat bumiputera, hendak-lah ia-nya benar<sup>2</sup> memberi bantuan kepada ra'ayat jelata, dan bukan satu sekim yang hanya membesarkan hak<sup>2</sup> utama kepada sa-bilangan orang<sup>2</sup> yang tertentu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ingin menerangkan di-dalam Dewan ini, fasal banyak ra'ayat bumiputera di-tempat kami tidak puas hati tentang hal<sup>2</sup> hutan yang di-kuasai oleh mereka yang di-ambil pemakai tendar oleh Jawatan-kuasa perentah Sarawak, dan hutan<sup>2</sup> itu di-beri kepada siapa<sup>2</sup> yang ada modal besar, pada hal bumiputera Sarawak perchaya yang hutan<sup>2</sup>

itu ia-lah hak<sup>2</sup> mereka yang boleh mendatangkan kemajuan ka-arrah hidup mereka di-masa hadapan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya sendiri ada bertanya dengan pehak yang berkuasa mengenai perkara ini dan jawapan yang di-beri seperti bagini:

Hutan<sup>2</sup> semua ada-lah kepunyaan Kerajaan dan tidak sa-orang pun ada kuasa atas-nya.

Kalau-lah ini benar, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, seperti Malaysia ini, kemerdekaan untok ketua<sup>2</sup> sahaja dan bukan-lah kemerdekaan bumiputera yang ada hak<sup>2</sup> di-Malaysia ini, maka dari jawapan pehak yang berkuasa Malaysia di-Sarawak yang seperti itu. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jadi ra'ayat jelata dengan dukachita tentu sahaja tidak puas hati dengan chara<sup>2</sup> memakai tendar di-tempat tanah ayer mereka sendiri, ia-itu tempat turun-menurun datok nenek mereka ia-lah hutan<sup>2</sup> yang di-beri oleh Tuhan untok meninggikan taraf hidup penduduk<sup>2</sup> di-kawasan itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya dengan besar harapan Perdana Menteri, Tunku Abdul Rahman memberi ubat, kerana penyakit<sup>2</sup> yang seperti saya telah katakan di-sini tadi. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, oleh kerana sebab orang<sup>2</sup> yang kena sakit itu telah dengan suara besar<sup>2</sup>an, jadi-nya yang berteriak itu di-tudoh oleh pehak yang berkuasa—kominis, tetapi penyakit<sup>2</sup> itu tidak di-ubat dengan chara<sup>2</sup> yang menyenangkan hati mereka. Perchaya-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bila orang<sup>2</sup> ini mendapat tudohan bagitu, pada hal mereka ada-lah benar<sup>2</sup> bukan kominis, maka tentu sahaja mereka jadi panas hati, bila panas hati, makin kuat, jadi orang<sup>2</sup> ini tentu boleh buat macham<sup>2</sup> perkara burok yang akhir dengan kachau-bilau di-Malaysia ini. Kalau orang<sup>2</sup> ini di-tangkap, di-penjarakan, atau di-bunuh, kerana melawan undang<sup>2</sup> keselamatan—itu juga, saya perchaya bukan menguntongkan Malaysia, tetapi ada-lah merugikan dan nama baik Malaysia pun jadi gelap.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya . . .

**Mr Speaker:** Masa sudah lampau—sudah lebeh! Tolong pendekkan sadikit!

**Enche' Tama Weng Tinggang Wan:** Sadikit, tidak panjang. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berkata demikian ia-lah sa-belum Malaysia kita itu hari terjadi atau di-tubuhkan, tidak ada di-tanah ayer kami berlaku perkara bagini hingga di-kenal oleh dunia yang Sarawak ia-lah satu negeri yang aman dan sentosa, tetapi bila masuk Malaysia sudah timbul bermacam<sup>2</sup> soalan dan perkara<sup>2</sup>.

Buat menutup chakapan saya ini saya menyeru Kerajaan Federal, demi kepentingan ra'ayat jelata, supaya menyiasat perkara yang saya kemukakan ini sa-dalam<sup>2</sup>-nya supaya dapat kita aman, damai tidak di-mulut sahaja, tetapi pada kehidupan ra'ayat jelata seluroh Malaysia. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bukan sa-takat mulut sahaja. Ini-lah chakap kami sa-belum Malaysia, maka ini kertas sudah garisan merah di-beri oleh Forest dan— yang tender ini pun garisan juga dan pakai perintah Malaysia menutup kertas yang garisan merah yang di-beri oleh Section Forest Officer, akan tetapi dalam kuasa Malaysia dia buat pindaan bagini benda ini dia pakai tender tutup permintaan kami dan satu pindaan lagi dia tutup. Saya lawan masuk tender sama orang yang kaya maka mana kami dapat di-buat oleh pehak yang berkuasa Malaysia di-Sarawak ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya beritahu bukan di-mulut sahaja ia orang dari Korea yang dapat area kayu<sup>2</sup> dan bumiputera tengok dengan mata sahaja, dan luas-nya area itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, 74,750 ekar. Ini orang pehak berkuasa menjaga orang kaya, dan tidak peduli orang miskin. Perkara ini sampai ka-Dewan Ra'ayat, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kerana perkara ini tidak dapat di-bawa di-Kuching oleh sebab dia juga suroh meeting. Dia chuma ator dia sendiri dan minta sembahyang, maka dia juga hantu. Maka oleh kerana hantu ini-lah yang menutup kemajuan ra'ayat bumiputera dan kerana hantu ini juga ra'ayat bumiputera ada mendapat pergadohan kepada yang pekerjaan Malaysia dan hantu ini juga yang menudoh serta membuat perkiraan ra'ayat bumiputera.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya perchaya jikalau hantu ini tidak di-sembahyang dengan sa-benar<sup>2</sup>-nya saya perchaya ra'ayat bumiputera jadi rosak di-Malaysia dan nama baik Malaysia ini tidak di-perchayai oleh ra'ayat bumiputera seluroh negeri Borneo, Sarawak dan hantu ini di-Borneo, Sarawak.

**The Assistant Minister of Commerce and Industry (Tuan Haji Abdul Khalid bin Awang Osman):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli Yang Berhormat itu telah berchakap panjang lebar di-dalam ucapan penanggohan-nya berkenaan dengan soalan perusahaan kayu. Dalam perkara ini saya sukachita mengatakan soalan kayu dan juga soalan<sup>2</sup> yang berkenaan dengan Pembahagian hutan, lesen dan permit ia-lah kuasa Negeri masing<sup>2</sup>, dan saya dengan segala hormat-nya menasihatkan kepada Yang Berhormat itu supaya merayu perkara ini kepada Kerajaan-nya sendiri. Walau pun bagitu, saya suka menegaskan bahawa dasar kerajaan Perikatan ia-lah hendak meninggikan taraf hidup ra'ayat pada seluroh-nya maka sebab itu-lah Kerajaan telah melancharkan Rancangan Pembangunan Luar Bandar dan Alhamdulillah rancangan ini telah menchapai kejayaan yang gemilang. Bagitu juga-lah Kerajaan harap dengan ada-nya Malaysia, Rancangan Pembangunan Luar Bandar dapat-lah di-sampaikan juga kepada bumiputera di-Sarawak dan Sabah dengan harapan pada satu masa akan datang ra'ayat dan bumiputera Sabah dan Sarawak khas-nya akan hidup bahagia seperti penduduk<sup>2</sup> di-dalam tanah besar Malaya . . . . .

**Enche' Tama Weng Tinggang Wan:** *Rises.*

**Tuan Haji Abdul Khalid bin Awang Osman:** . . . . . memang-lah dasar Kerajaan hendak memberi segala pertolongan kepada ra'ayat Malaysia supaya maju di-dalam lapangan ini dan pehak Kerajaan telah pun menjadikan dasar bagi membantu anak bumiputera supaya maju di-dalam perusahaan dan sebab itu-lah Kerajaan Perikatan akan mengadakan satu konggres yang di-namakan Konggres Ekonomi Bumiputera pada 5, 6 dan

7hb. Jun tahun ini. Kerajaan harap ramai anak<sup>2</sup> bumiputera dari Sarawak dan Sabah akan mengambil bahagian di-dalam konggres itu supaya dapat-lah kita bersama<sup>2</sup> membinchangkan soalan yang rumit ini supaya dengan kerjasama yang di-beri kepada Kerajaan Persekutuan dan juga Kerajaan<sup>2</sup> Sarawak dan Sabah dapat-lah kita bersama<sup>2</sup> memajukan tugas yang sangat rumit ini. Dalam pada itu saya suka menerangkan kepada Yang Berhormat bahawa Kerajaan Persekutuan telah pun menubuhkan pejabat<sup>2</sup> RIDA dan F.L.D.A. di-Jesselton dan Kuching, usaha<sup>2</sup> sedang di-jalankan untuk menjalankan kewajipan kedua<sup>2</sup> jabatan ini, dan saya perchaya manakala kedua<sup>2</sup> pejabat ini menjalankan usaha<sup>2</sup>-nya dapat-lah pejabat<sup>2</sup> ini, bagi pehak Kerajaan, menyempurnakan kehendak<sup>2</sup> bumiputera di-Sarawak dan Sabah itu Sekian-lah sahaja. Terima kaseh.

### H.S.C. EXAMINATION—PRIVATE CANDIDATES

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise to speak on the question of the taking of H.S.C. Examination by private candidates. The recent H.S.C. Examination ruling, which requires candidates to follow a two-year post-school certificate course organised by the Ministry before they are permitted to take the full examination, is plainly stupid and senseless. The restriction has aroused so much controversy and misgivings that even the *Straits Times* has thought it fit to brand the move as a senseless ban. In its editorial on the 19th March, 1965 it says:

"It is difficult not to suspect that the ban has been imposed because the catering for private students involves more administrative trouble than the Ministry feels it is worth. A case of public interest is being sacrificed to bureaucratic convenience.

Recent statements placing responsibility for the new regulation on the Cambridge Examination Syndicate are hard to credit. The Syndicate does not usually take this kind of initiative and certainly does not have the last word."

The press statement made by the Minister of Education on the 26th March, 1965 obliquely confirms the accuracy of this observation. It is apparent that the Cambridge Authority has conferred on the

Ministry of Education the power to make the necessary arrangement.

The revised list of entry requirements for the said Examination and announced by the Minister of Education on 26th March, 1965 does not fully meet the needs of those who wish to improve themselves by sheer industry and sacrifice. The so-called revised ruling has only added more restrictions on prospective candidates and it completely bars private candidates who do not follow fall within the four categories, as listed by the Ministry, from sitting the full H.S.C. Examination. The requirement of having to undergo a full two-year course, in one form or another, still remains. This would exclude all those who could not afford the expensive correspondence courses and those who are unable to secure a place in the Sixth Form classes.

Further the Government has not provided adequate facilities to cater for the needs of those who are *ipso facto* qualified to sit for the Examination. In particular, with the increase in the number of school leavers and the diminishing opportunities in employment, the need for Sixth Form classes is becoming more and more pressing; but the Government has been slow in its effort to provide more of these classes.

If the Government wants to impose this unreasonable restriction, then I would suggest that the alternative is to provide more classes in the major towns throughout the country; otherwise it would mean closing the only avenue available to those who seek self-development.

For the time being, I hope the Minister would reconsider his decision and relax the restriction so that mature and industrious candidates who, because they cannot attend further education classes or take up expensive correspondence courses, are not prevented from taking the full H.S.C. Examination. The removal of this restriction would prove a boost to many candidates in this category.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I do know that the Minister of Education is very

sympathetic and fully realises the plight of those whom I would call the underdogs, and no doubt in his reply I am sure he will give full consideration for the improvement of these underdogs.

Thank you.

**The Minister of Education (Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari):** Mr Speaker, Sir, I must say that I am surprised that the Honourable Member has brought up this matter again even before this almost empty House.

Sir, anyone having read my press statement, which was issued on the 26th March this year, would have realised that, except in one instance, every opportunity is given to private candidates to sit for the full H.S.C. Examination. The one instance where private candidates are denied concern those who are not considered *bona fide* under the Local Examination Syndicate regulations which require candidates sitting for the H.S.C. Examination for the first time and on a full certificate basis to have undergone a two-year approved post-school certificate course. This, I must point out to the Honourable Member, is not a regulation laid down by the Ministry but it is laid down by the Examination Authority concerned. I can, however, assure the Honourable Member that this is down purely in the interest of raising the examination standard. I should further explain that even those

non-*bona fide* candidates may still sit for their full H.S.C. Examination if they prove themselves qualified by first sitting for part of the H.S.C. Examination. If, by doing so, they obtain such passes totalling only four units, they may sit for the full H.S.C. Examination even though they have not undertaken any correspondence courses.

I am sure the Honourable Member will agree with me that the assumption generally made by the public that private candidates are banned from sitting for the H.S.C. Examination is a total misconception.

Finally, Sir, I would like to assure the Honourable Member, and also the country at large, that I have every sympathy with those who aspire to sit for the H.S.C. Examination. I myself did not have the opportunity when I was young, but I can assure the Honourable Member that I would do everything in my power to see that every person who aspires to sit for the H.S.C. Examination should be given every opportunity and facility to do so, and I shall go out, even out of my way, to do what I can in order to enable this to be achieved. Thank you, Sir.

**Mr Speaker:** The House is now adjourned till 10.00 a.m. on Thursday, 3rd June, 1965.

*Adjourned at 9.27 p.m.*