

**Volume I**  
**No. 50**



**Thursday**  
**4th March, 1965**

# **PARLIAMMENTARY DEBATES**

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

**OFFICIAL REPORT**

## **CONTENTS**

**ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 6589]**

**EXEMPTED BUSINESS (Motion) [Col. 6595]**

**BILLS—**

**The Finance (Estate Duty) Bill [Col. 6595]**

**The Pioneer Industries (Relief from Tax) (Variation) Bill  
[Col. 6599]**

**MOTION—**

**Refusal of Government to honour the traditional  
obligations to the Civil Service National Whitley  
Council [Col. 6619]**

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

*Official Report*

---

First Session of the Second Dewan Ra'ayat

---

*Thursday, 4th March, 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 Minister of Home Affairs and Minister of Justice, DATO' DR ISMAIL BIN DATO' HAJI ABDUL RAHMAN, P.M.N. (Johor Timor).
- „ the Minister of Finance, ENCHE' TAN SIEW SIN, J.P. (Melaka Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, DATO' V. T. SAMBANTHAN, P.M.N. (Sungei Siput).
- „ the Minister of Transport, DATO' HAJI SARDON BIN HAJI JUBIR, P.M.N. (Pontian Utara).
- „ the Minister of 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 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).
- „ the Minister of Information and Broadcasting, ENCHE' SENU BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Kubang Pasu Barat).
- „ the Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives, TUAN HAJI MOHD. GHAZALI BIN HAJI JAWI (Ulu Perak).
- „ the Minister of Lands and Mines, ENCHE' ABDUL-RAHMAN BIN YA'KUB (Sarawak).

- The Honourable 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,  
 ENSKU MUHSEIN BIN ABDUL KADIR, J.M.N., S.M.T., P.J.K.  
 (Trengganu Tengah).
- .. the Assistant Minister of Education, ENCHE' LEE SIOK YEW,  
 A.M.N., P.J.K. (Sepang).
- .. ENCHE' ABDUL GHANI BIN ISHAK, A.M.N. (Melaka Utara).
- .. 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 SAMAD BIN GUL AHMAD MIANJI  
 (Pasir Mas Hulu).
- .. DATO' ABDULLAH BIN ABDULRAHMAN, Dato' Bijaya di-Raja  
 (Kuala Trengganu Selatan).
- .. 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).
- .. O.K.K. DATU ALIUDDIN BIN DATU HARUN, P.D.K. (Sabah).
- .. DR AWANG BIN HASSAN, S.M.J. (Muar Selatan).
- .. ENCHE' AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Muar Dalam).
- .. ENCHE' JONATHAN BANGAU ANAK RENANG, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- .. PENGARAH BANYANG ANAK JANTING, P.B.S. (Sarawak).
- .. ENCHE' CHAN SIANG SUN (Bentong).
- .. ENCHE' CHEN WING SUM (Damansara).
- .. ENCHE' CHIA CHIN SHIN, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- .. ENCHE' CHIN FOON (Ulu Kinta).
- .. ENCHE' C. V. DEVAN NAIR (Bungsar).
- .. ENCHE' EDWIN ANAK TANGKUN (Sarawak).
- .. TUAN SYED ESA BIN ALWEE, J.M.N., S.M.J., P.I.S.  
 (Batu Pahat Dalam).
- .. DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI ABDUL MAJID  
 (Johore Bahru Timor).
- .. DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI HASHIM, P.M.N.  
 (Jitra-Padang Terap).
- .. ENCHE' GANING BIN JANGKAT (Sabah).

- The Honourable ENCHE' GEH CHONG KEAT, K.M.N. (Penang Utara).
- „ 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 NYUN 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.  
(Johore Tenggara).
- „ ENCHE' JEK YEUN THONG (Singapore).
- „ PENGHULU JINGGUT ANAK ATTAN, Q.M.C., A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' KADAM ANAK KIAI (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' KHOO PENG LOONG (Sarawak).
- „ 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).
- „ ENCHE' LIM PEE HUNG, P.J.K. (Alor Star).
- „ DR MAHATHIR BIN MOHAMAD (Kota Star Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' T. MAHIMA SINGH, J.P. (Port Dickson).
- „ 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).
- „ 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).

- The Honourable 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).
- „ ENCHE' ONG KEE HUI (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN HAJI OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Hilir Perak).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Perlis Utara).
- „ ABANG OTHMAN BIN HAJI MOASILI, P.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN HAJI RAHMAT BIN HAJI DAUD, A.M.N.  
(Johore 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' 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).
- „ ENCHE' YEH PAO TZE (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' YEOH TAT BENG (Bruas).
- „ ENCHE' STEPHEN YONG KUET TZE (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN HAJI ZAKARIA BIN HAJI MOHD. TAIB, P.J.K. (Langat).

ABSENT:

- The Honourable 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 for Sabah Affairs and Civil Defence,  
DATU DONALD ALOYSIUS STEPHENS, P.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ WAN ABDUL KADIR BIN ISMAIL, P.P.T.  
(Kuala Trengganu Utara).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAJI TALIB (Kuantan).
- „ WAN ABDUL RAHMAN BIN DATU TUANKU BUJANG (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAZAK BIN HAJI HUSSIN (Lipis).
- „ ENCHE' ALI BIN HAJI AHMAD (Pontian Selatan).

- The Honourable ENCHE' E. W. BARKER (Singapore).  
 „ ENCHE' CHAN CHONG WEN, A.M.N. (Kluang Selatan).  
 „ ENCHE' CHAN SEONG YOON (Setapak).  
 „ ENCHE' FRANCIS CHIA NYUK TONG (Sabah).  
 „ ENCHE' CHIA THYE POH (Singapore).  
 „ ENCHE' S. FAZUL RAHMAN, A.D.K. (Sabah).  
 „ DATU GANIE GILONG, P.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).  
 „ DR GOH KENG SWEE (Singapore).  
 „ ENCHE' HAMZAH BIN ALANG, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Kapar).  
 „ ENCHE' KAM WOON WAH, J.P. (Sitiawan).  
 „ DATU KHOO SIAK CHIEW, P.D.K. (Sabah).  
 „ ENCHE' KOW KEE SENG (Singapore).  
 „ ENCHE' EDMUND LANGGU ANAK SAGA (Sarawak).  
 „ ENCHE' LEE KUAN YEW (Singapore).  
 „ DATO' LING BENG SIEW, P.N.B.S. (Sarawak).  
 „ ENCHE' LIM HUAN BOON (Singapore).  
 „ DATO' LIM KIM SAN, D.U.T., J.M.K., D.J.M.K. (Singapore).  
 „ ENCHE' PETER LO SU YIN (Sabah).  
 „ ENCHE' JOSEPH DAVID MANJAJI (Sabah).  
 „ ORANG TUA MOHAMMAD DARA BIN LANGPAD (Sabah).  
 „ DR NG KAM POH, J.P. (Telok Anson).  
 „ ENCHE' ONG PANG BOON (Singapore).  
 „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN WOK (Singapore).  
 „ ENCHE' QUEK KAI DONG, J.P. (Seremban Timor).  
 „ ENCHE' S. RAJARATNAM (Singapore).  
 „ ENCHE' SANDOM ANAK NYUAK (Sarawak).  
 „ ENCHE' D. R. SEENIVASAGAM (Ipoh).  
 „ ENCHE' S. P. SEENIVASAGAM (Mengelembu).  
 „ ENCHE' SIM BOON LIANG, A.B.S. (Sarawak).  
 „ ENCHE' SIOW LOONG HIN, P.J.K. (Seremban Barat).  
 „ ENCHE' TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Melaka).  
 „ DR TOH CHIN CHYE (Singapore).  
 „ ENCHE' TOH THEAM HOCK (Kampar).  
 „ PENGHULU FRANCIS UMPAU ANAK EMPAM (Sarawak).  
 „ ENCHE' WEE TOON BOON (Singapore).  
 „ ENCHE' YONG NYUK LIN (Singapore).

## PRAYERS

(Mr Speaker *in the Chair*)

## ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

### WORKERS' REPRESENTATION ON OFFICIAL BODIES

1. Enche' C. V. Devan Nair (Bungsar) asks the Prime Minister to give a list of official bodies on which workers

enjoy representation, the manner in which such appointments are made and the names of workers' representatives currently serving in each body.

**The Minister of Labour (Enche' V. Manickavasagam):** Mr Speaker, Sir, workers do enjoy representation on a number of official and semi-official bodies. If it is considered necessary and useful to provide for worker representation in any such bodies, consultation through the Ministry of Labour is held with the Malaysian Trade Union

Congress for the submission of nominations for appointment to such bodies. I am unable at this juncture to give a full list of the bodies to which workers' representation is given and the names of workers' representatives currently serving in each of these bodies.

**Enche' C. V. Devan Nair:** Would the Honourable Minister undertake to let me have a list of the official bodies on which workers enjoy representation and the list of their names at his convenience?

**Enche' V. Manickavasagam:** Yes, Sir.

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon (Batu):** Mr Speaker, Sir, is the Honourable Minister aware that at least in one workers' representation to one statutory body, that of the Employees' Provident Fund, the Malaysian Trades Union Congress has not been satisfied with the manner in which the workers' representatives have been selected by the Government?

**Enche' V. Manickavasagam:** Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member is two years late.

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** Mr Speaker, Sir, the mistake might have been rectified now; but at least about two years ago, when this happened, is the Honourable Minister aware of that?

**Enche' V. Manickavasagam:** Sir, as I have said just now, representation has already been given to the Malaysian Trades Union Congress.

## WORKERS' REPRESENTATION ON NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

**2. Enche' C. V. Devan Nair** asks the Prime Minister to state if he would favourably consider according to workers' representation on the National Economic Planning Council.

**Enche' V. Manickavasagam:** Mr Speaker, Sir, the National Development and Planning Committee is a committee of officials only. However, an Advisory Committee to the N.D.P.C. is being set up to consider and advise on general development matters and, in particular, matters which concern the development of the private sector of the economy. This Advisory Committee will comprise

of members from industrial, commercial and financial organisations, as well as from the trade union movement.

## PUBLIC HOLIDAY ON MAY 1st

**3. Dr Tan Chee Khoon** asks the Prime Minister if he will declare May 1st a public holiday so that the workers of Malaysia will celebrate it together with their fellow workers the world over.

**The Minister of Home Affairs and Minister of Justice (Dato' Dr Ismail):** Mr Speaker, Sir, in view of the role played by the working class in nation building and on representation from the Malayan Trade Union Council, I am prepared to declare a public holiday for workers on condition that it does not fall on May 1st.

**Enche' Lim Kean Siew:** Has the Honourable Minister in mind the date on which this public holiday will be declared?

**Dato' Dr Ismail:** I am a very democratic person, Sir, and I would welcome any suggestion from the Malayan Trade Union Council.

**Enche' Lim Kean Siew:** Do I take it then that the Honourable Minister has no idea as to the date?

**Dato' Dr Ismail:** I am being generous, Sir, I am prepared to declare a public holiday and if the M.T.U.C., which has made representation, suggests a date that I think is suitable, I shall be very grateful.

**Enche' C. V. Devan Nair:** Without meaning any offence, Sir, can we take it that the Minister is suggesting that May Day may probably be celebrated in August (*Laughter*) or some other month but May?

**Dato' Dr Ismail:** I am amenable to suggestions.

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** Mr Speaker, Sir, in view of the fact that the Government has by this reply made a great concession to the workers of this country, may we know what is the objection of Government to declaring May 1st itself a public holiday?

**Dato' Dr Ismail:** I do not see any magic in the words "1st of May" (*Laughter*).

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** If there is no magic in the "1st of May", then what are the objections to declaring the 1st of May a holiday?

**Dato' Dr Ismail:** Why is he insisting then on May 1st? (*Laughter*).

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** I am not insisting. I am merely asking what are the objections of the Government. I am, like the Honourable Minister, very amenable to suggestions. The Member for Bungsar suggested that it could be some day in August; I am prepared to have it much closer.

**Enche' C. V. Devan Nair:** To put the record straight, I did not suggest that May Day should be celebrated in August. I only enquired whether it was the Minister's intention that May Day should be celebrated in another month, but that should not be equated to my intention.

#### DELAYS IN THE DELIVERY OF LETTERS

**4. Dr Tan Chee Khoon** asks the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications whether he is aware that before the "Go Slow" of the postal workers this year, letters had gone astray and there had been long delays in the delivery of letters; if so, what steps he has taken to remedy this state of affairs.

**The Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications (Dato' V. T. Sambanthan):** Mr Speaker, Sir, I am aware that there have been delays in the delivery of letters even before the "Go Slow" by postal workers this year. I have in fact had occasion to mention to the postal workers my dissatisfaction with such delays. I have already instructed the Postmaster-General to enquire into the whole system of mail service with a view to improving such service and draw up plans for greater speed in the delivery of letters.

#### FINANCIAL AID FOR BLIND STUDENTS

**5. Dr Tan Chee Khoon** asks the Minister for Education to state (a) why the Ministry of Education has decided to stop financial aid for blind students who have qualified to join Form One

this year under the Government system of integrated education for sightless children and whether the Minister will undertake to review this decision; (b) why the financial aid for blind school children has been reduced from \$573 to \$390.

**The Minister of Education (Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari):** Mr Speaker, Sir, (a) The Ministry conducted a three year experimental project in the integrated education for the blind during the years 1962 to 1964. To facilitate this project, certain subsidies were made to pupils in order to encourage them to attend such integrated classes which were attached to certain selected schools only. The project has now been completed and it is found that depending on the circumstances integrated education for the blind is a commendable system and Government intends to extend this form of education so as to benefit many more blind pupils in many more centres. With the expansion of such facilities there is therefore now less need for giving blind children better and special treatment than sighted children except where the special nature and method of blind education demands special treatment and facilities. As a policy my Ministry decided to give these blind children no special treatment but their cases would be more sympathetically considered in the case of application for free school places, hostel facilities, scholarship and assistance of other kinds equally available to all pupils.

(b) The Ministry's financial aid for blind school children was reduced from \$573 to \$390 after further investigation into the pupils individual requirements in relation to the essential needs and also after comparing with the amount granted to pupils in special schools.

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** Is the Minister aware that although he stated that the Government would be prepared to consider the cases of new blind students with sympathy, in the previous press statement from his Ministry it was stated that new blind students would not get aid from the Government? How does he reconcile the previous statement with what he has stated to us in this House?

**Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari:** Sir, I am afraid that I am not aware of the previous statement and if I attempt to answer the Honourable Member's question it will be like the blind leading the blind (*Laughter*).

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** Then, do we in this House have a categorical assurance from the Minister that all new blind students who have entered school this year and in the years to come will receive sympathetic consideration from the Government if they should require financial aid—a simple “Yes” or “No”?

**Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari:** Yes, Sir.

## EXEMPTED BUSINESS

### (MOTION)

**The Minister of Home Affairs (Dato' Dr Ismail):** Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move—

That notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 12, at its rising today at 1 p.m. this House shall stand adjourned until 9.30 a.m. tomorrow.

**The Minister of Finance (Enche' Tan Siew Sin):** Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 12, at its rising today at 1 p.m. this House shall stand adjourned until 9.30 a.m. tomorrow.

## BILLS

### THE FINANCE (ESTATE DUTY) BILL

#### Second Reading

Order read for resumption of debate on the Question, “That the Bill be now read a second time.” (3rd March, 1965).

*Debate resumed.*

**Enche' Ong Kee Hui (Sarawak):** Mr Speaker, Sir, as much of the provisions of the Bill affect Sarawak, I would just like, as a Member from Sarawak, to make a few brief observations on the Bill.

The Finance Minister, in the interest of harmonization of estate duty, has put forward this measure which, I think, in general terms is to the benefit of Sarawak, and whatever the living may say about the Finance Minister, I certainly think that the poor dead in Sarawak, if they are able to speak, would welcome this particular measure. However, I believe it is the intention, on this Bill becoming law, to transfer the administration of estate duty from the courts, which are now administering it, to the office of the Registrar-General—I do not know whether I am correct in assuming this. If this was so, I would like to draw the attention of the Finance Minister to the fact that the Registrar-General's office—I say this without any reflection on the official concerned—is a very much overworked Department as the official has under it a lot of other Departments such as Immigration, Manpower, etc.; and the courts therefore would be able to administer it, as they have done in the past, possibly more efficiently than the Registrar-General's office would be able to do so. This is very important particularly as interest is charged until payment is made on probate duty; and I think the system is that the interest is charged not from the date of application but from the date of payment. One could, therefore, see that the poor people, who are applying for probate, would be put to a lot of disadvantage if there is any delay in the issuing of probate, and therefore the efficient administration of probate is a very important point. I would, therefore, urge the Finance Minister to give this serious consideration.

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** Mr Speaker, Sir, I am aware of the difficulties referred to by the Honourable Member who has just spoken in so far as Sarawak is concerned. We are aware that the staff there is insufficient to deal with the administration of this rather complicated legislation, and that, in fact, is the reason why it has not been found possible to harmonize the law applicable in Sarawak with the legislation applicable in the rest of Malaysia. That, I must admit, is also the reason why the dead

in Sarawak will, for the time being, have a slight edge over the dead over the rest of Malaysia. We will certainly try our best to streamline procedures in Sarawak so that estate duty cases will be dealt with more expeditiously; and that is the reason why I say we have hesitated to harmonize the Sarawak provisions with the provisions applicable to the rest of Malaysia.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House immediately resolves itself into a Committee on the Bill.

(Mr Speaker *in the Chair*)

*Clauses 1 to 3* inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

*Clause 4—*

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** Mr Chairman, Sir, I would like to propose that Clause 4 be amended in the manner indicated in the amendment slip which has already been circulated to Honourable Members, namely—

*Clause 4 (1)*—Substitute for “in any component, the estate duty law of that component” “in any part of Malaysia, the estate duty law of each component”.

*Clause 4 (2), line 3*—Substitute for “outside Sabah” “outside Malaysia”.

*Clause 4 (3)*—Substitute for “outside Sarawak” “outside Malaysia”.

Question put, and agreed to.

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

*Clauses 5 and 6* ordered to stand part of the Bill.

*First Schedule* ordered to stand part of the Bill.

*Second Schedule* ordered to stand part of the Bill.

*Third Schedule—*

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** Mr Chairman, Sir, I would like to move that the Third Schedule be amended in the manner indicated in the amendment

slip which has already been circulated to Honourable Member, namely—

THIRD SCHEDULE—

Commencement Provisions.

Paragraph B—Delete “15.”.

Paragraph C—Insert after “12” “, 15”.

Question put, and agreed to.

*Third Schedule, as amended*, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

FOURTH SCHEDULE—

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** Mr Chairman, Sir, I would like to move that the Fourth Schedule be amended in the manner indicated in the amendment slip already circulated to Honourable Members, namely—

*Fourth Schedule—*

Commencement Provisions.

Paragraph B—Substitute for paragraph B the following—

“B. Paragraphs 2, 5, 6, 8, 10, 16 and 21 shall have effect as regards the estate of any person dying on or after the 1st day of January, 1965.”.

Paragraph C—Substitute for “Paragraph 18” “Paragraphs 17 and 18”.

Question put, and agreed to.

*Fourth Schedule, as amended*, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

*Fifth Schedule* ordered to stand part of the Bill.

*Sixth Schedule—*

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** Mr Chairman, Sir, I would like to move that the sixth Schedule be amended in the manner indicated in the amendment slip already circulated to Honourable Members, namely—

*Sixth Schedule, Title*—Substitute for “NON-DOMICILED” “NON-MALAYSIAN DOMICILED”.

Question put, and agreed to.

*Sixth Schedule, as amended*, ordered to stand part of the Bill. Bill reported with amendments: read the third time and passed.

**THE PIONEER INDUSTRIES  
(RELIEF FROM TAX)  
(VARIATION) BILL**

**Second Reading**

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to vary the laws in force in Malaysia relating to Pioneer Industries" be read a second time.

This Bill is being introduced to implement proposals contained in the White Paper on Tax Changes within Malaysia—Command Paper No. 45 of 1964—and designed to harmonize and in some respects to amend legislation relating to pioneer industries.

It was, and remains, the intention to introduce a single Malaysian enactment to replace the existing laws but this operation will be somewhat complicated. In view of the urgent need to encourage industrialisation, it has therefore been decided to introduce the present Bill which makes various changes within the structure of the existing laws.

The present laws present a pattern of broadly similar provisions in the States of Malaya, Singapore and Sabah and contrasting provisions in Sarawak.

We are, therefore, amending the provisions in the States of Malaya, Singapore and Sabah, and giving power to the Yang di-Pertuan Agong to replace the Sarawak Ordinance by means of an Order which would enact legislation on the lines of that in force in the other regions. The Order will be laid before Parliament and will be subject to its approval or annulment.

The main amendments now proposed are designed to standardise the exemption period—which was previously a maximum of four years in Sabah, but five years elsewhere in Malaysia—and to link the exemption period to expenditure on fixed capital assets in the form of factory and machinery as foreshadowed in the White Paper.

Singapore's pioneer industry legislation is due to expire on 20th April, 1965 and because it is the Government's policy that there should be equal incentives to industrialisation through-

out Malaysia, the Singapore legislation is being extended, with certain amendments, for a further three years. Before the three-year period is over, it is intended that a Malaysian enactment will be introduced to replace all the existing laws.

The main change from the proposals in the White Paper as regards expenditure limits is the removal of a minimum expenditure requirement for the two-year initial exemption period.

The object of pioneer industry legislation is to encourage the manufacture of new products where these are not being manufactured at all, or where present manufacturing capacity is inadequate. This involves the building of factories and the installation of machinery, often on a large scale, and often also involving the investment of foreign capital on a joint venture basis.

The expenditure limits in the White Paper were regarded as more realistic than those prevailing in the existing laws and were intended to ensure that relief was only given where worthwhile investments in new industrial capacity were made. It has, however, been represented that to introduce a sizeable expenditure limit at the initial stage might effectively deprive from any possibility of relief the small business, set up with domestic capital, which though not equipped with a considerable amount of expensive machinery, is making a worthwhile contribution to the desired expansion of manufacturing activity. While the main object is to encourage large-scale manufacture, smaller and in some cases ancillary manufacturing activities also have a part to play in the provision of more employment, and in assisting in the production of manufactured goods for the Malaysian market and for export.

The revised scale of expenditure on factory and machinery is:

Qualification for 2 years' tax exemption	...	no minimum
Qualification for 3 years' tax exemption	...	\$ 250,000
Qualification for 4 years' tax exemption	...	500,000
Qualification for 5 years' tax exemption	...	1,000,000

There is a further point here. As foreshadowed in the White Paper, the Federal Treasury is taking powers in the Modification Order and in this Bill to exercise an overriding authority over the issue of pioneer industry certificates so as to ensure standardisation of practice throughout Malaysia. In general, this power will be exercised at the time of processing the original application, and it is not the intention that further checks will be made when a certificate is extended merely because of the incurring of further fixed capital expenditure.

A somewhat technical proposal in the Bill will make it possible to allow a follow through of exemption where the pioneer company is the subsidiary of a holding company. At present, the exemption of pioneer company profits and the dividends paid out of them is a one-stage exemption.

Where the pioneer company's dividends are received by the holding company and then redistributed as dividends of the holding company, no exemption applies to the second distribution and the pioneer company's exemption is thus frustrated. As in many cases, pioneer industry applicants have been specifically asked to set up a separate company and manufacture only pioneer products, it is considered reasonable to ensure that pioneer industry exemption will be fully effective and the necessary provisions are accordingly proposed.

Another major change proposed in the White Paper is not dealt with in this Bill but will be included in the next batch of legislative amendments. I refer to the proposal for introducing a system of enhanced capital allowances as an alternative to tax exemption. In general, this would be less expensive to the Revenue and in some cases such relief might actually be preferred by the applicant. Such relief might, for example, be allowed in marginal cases which do not appear to justify a tax holiday.

As I have said, this change, which impinges directly on the provisions of the various income tax enactments,

will be introduced on the next occasion that income tax changes are made.

Before I close, I would like to refer to a statement which I made recently in Singapore on the subject of industrialisation and my advice that intending manufacturers there should consult the Central Government before they embark on any undertaking. These were my actual words, and I quote:

"The other point which is causing the Central Government some concern is this. Factories set up in this State have too often proceeded on assumptions which were not checked with the Central Government direct. They consulted only the authorities in Singapore to find later that the assurances given by such authorities had no basis in fact. I would, therefore, advise manufacturers in Singapore to deal direct with the Central Government in matters of this kind. It would save many disappointments and much misunderstanding if they would consult the Central Government even before they decide to establish their plants in Singapore because the ultimate authority in regard to tariff protection even in Singapore lies solely with the Centre. They would also be well advised to study Annex J to the Malaysia Agreement, which governs the relationship between the Central Government and the State Government in these matters."

I gave this advice, Sir, not with the object of stirring up unnecessary public controversy. I gave this advice because actual cases have come to light which have caused those of us in the Central Government who are responsible for industrialisation some concern over past happenings in Singapore. I need quote only two instances to illustrate my point. One manufacturer, whom I shall call "A", has already sunk a considerable sum of money into a major project. Now "A"'s project can only be viable if his products are allowed entry into the State of Malaya. When I informed "A" that this may not be possible for some time more because we have already given an undertaking to an existing manufacturer in the States of Malaya that no other manufacturer will be given similar pioneer status for some time more, in order to avoid creating undue excess capacity and thus endanger the viability of both enterprises, "A" was quite shaken. This undertaking was, of course, given long before Malaysia was thought of. I asked him whether

his factory would be viable if he had to rely on only the Singapore domestic market and export overseas and his reply was in the negative. He, however, admitted that he had blithely assumed, incorrectly, as subsequent events showed, that entry into the States of Malaya was merely a formality, though he had no adequate grounds for such a belief, as he had not consulted anyone in the Central Government, with whom the power really lay. It is this sort of problem which gives us concern because under such circumstances the Central Government has two alternatives before it, and both are unpleasant. The first is to tolerate excessive capacity in the common market by allowing entry into the States of Malaya of a Singapore enterprise assuming there is only one in Singapore. If there are more, the position would, of course, be worse. The other alternative is to disallow entry into the States of Malaya, thereby risking the failure of the Singapore enterprise. Where, however, factories have been set up in Singapore without any regard that their establishment would jeopardise the entire industry in Malaysia, and this has been done without prior consultation with the Central Government, I think it would be too much to expect the Central Government to save such factories from the consequences of their own folly. This was all I meant to say and I do not think I am being unreasonable in advising, under such circumstances, prior consultation with the Central Government.

The second case concerns a manufacturer who was led into believing that his product would qualify for the preferential rate of duty in the States of Malaya. He too was shocked to learn that before his product could so qualify, certain minimum requirements would have to be met. He too admitted that although he did consult what he regarded as authoritative sources in Singapore, he did not consult anyone in the Central Government with whom the power actually lay. A misunderstanding had clearly arisen in both cases. It could well be that in both cases the manufacturers themselves were wholly to blame. It is not, how-

ever, for me to say where the blame should lie, but at the same time I would be failing in my duty if I did not remind other manufacturers of the desirability of prior consultation after cases of this nature had come to my notice.

The Central Government is only too well aware that it is essential, in the interests of Malaysia, that there should be the maximum co-operation and co-ordination between the Centre, on the one hand, and State Governments on the other. Such co-operation and co-ordination, however, can only be achieved if there is a two-way traffic, and appreciation on both sides that there must not only be a spirit of give and take, there must be a full awareness that each has its responsibilities and obligations. You certainly cannot obtain the maximum degree of co-operation and co-ordination by trying, if I may use a colloquial expression, to pull a fast one over the other party, you cannot get it by being too slick, because "the wearer always knows where the shoe pinches". He is not as foolish as all that.

There is one other very minor technical amendment, copies of which have been circulated to Members to correct a cross reference. I propose to move this in Committee.

Sir, I beg to move.

**Dr Lim Swee Aun:** Sir, I beg to second the motion.

**Dr Mahathir bin Mohamad (Kota Star Selatan):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ingin mengucapkan tahniah kepada Kerajaan yang membuat Bill ini supaya kita dapat standardisekan practice berkenaan dengan perusahaan yang mendapat taraf perintis di-seluruh Malaysia. Saperti mana yang kita tahu pada mula<sup>2</sup> kita mengadakan chadangan—mengadakan perusahaan yang mendapat taraf perintis, kita telah meletakkan satu polisi ia-itu benefit atau pun keuntungan<sup>2</sup> yang akan dapat—yang akan keluar daripada perusahaan yang dapat taraf perintis ini mesti-lah di-bahagi<sup>2</sup>kan kepada semua orang<sup>2</sup> atau pun kaum<sup>2</sup> yang ada dalam Malaysia ini. Polisi sedang

di-jalankan di-dalam negeri<sup>2</sup> di-Tanah Melayu ini tetapi polisi ini tidak-lah di-jalankan terutama di-Singapura. Apabila satu<sup>2</sup> company atau industry dibuka pada mula<sup>2</sup>-nya, maka biasanya sa-paroh daripada share capital itu di-khaskan bagi orang<sup>2</sup> bumiputera. Saya tahu, kebanyakan daripada share ini tidak dapat di-ambil dengan kerana kebanyakan orang<sup>2</sup> bumiputera tidak ada wang yang cukup untuk membeli share ini tetapi polisi ini bukan-lah berma'ana patut di-buangkan.

Di-dalam ucapan Menteri, saya tidak dengar di-sebut sama sakali berkenaan dengan polisi ini tetapi saya percaya tentu-lah polisi ini juga akan di-jalankan di-Singapura. Di-Singapura apabila satu<sup>2</sup> perusahaan baharu dibuka, polisi ini tidak di-jalankan sama sa-kali oleh kerana Kerajaan P.A.P. telah mengatakan bahawa P.A.P. bukan-lah satu Kerajaan yang ingin mengadakan satu kaum kapitalis Melayu di-sana. Tetapi Kerajaan P.A.P. ingin supaya pekerja<sup>2</sup> di-dalam factory<sup>2</sup> baharu itu terdiri sa-tengah-nya daripada orang Melayu. Ini berma'ana Kerajaan P.A.P. ini, sunggoh pun suka supaya pekerja<sup>2</sup> yang bergaji murah ini terdiri daripada orang Melayu, tetapi puak kapitalis yang akan dapat keuntungan yang sa-habis besar sa-kali daripada perusahaan<sup>2</sup> baharu ini, chuma di-khaskan kepada yang bukan Melayu sahaja. Ini ada-lah satu keadaan atau pun polisi yang tidak ada timbang rasa—tidak ada sama sa-kali sense of justice.

Saya berharap-lah supaya apabila dikuat kuasakan Bill ini, maka polisi ini juga akan di-jalankan di-Singapura supaya kalau kita mesti ada capital di-dalam negeri ini maka akan terdiri daripada orang<sup>2</sup> daripada semua kaum di-Tanah Melayu—bukan sahaja manual labour—mesti di-bahagi kepada semua kaum tetapi orang<sup>2</sup> yang kaya juga mesti terdiri daripada semua kaum kalau kita ingin kepada keamanan di-dalam negeri ini, terima kasih.

**Enche' Tan Toh Hong (Bukit Bintang):** Mr Speaker, Sir, one of the most challenging needs facing our young

nation is how to foster rapid industrialisation in order to ensure a higher standard of living for our people. As the Honourable Minister of Finance has just explained, there are four separate pioneer Ordinances in Malaysia, each of the component States—Malaya, Singapore, Sarawak and Sabah—has its own industrial programmes and Pioneer Status Ordinance. Sir, under such a state of affairs, the question is how could it be possible to make an overall concerted effort along a broad front to promote rapid industrialisation that would be beneficial to the region as a whole—the emphasis is on the region as a whole. It is obvious in that case that centralised co-ordination is vital if we want to bring about a rapid and balanced growth. As this Bill aims at unanimity in inducements, especially tax relief incentives, it deserves the whole-hearted support of this House.

Centralised co-ordination is all the more necessary, Sir, when we have seen two conflicting policies between the Central Government and the Government of Singapore. The Honourable Minister of Finance has stated time and again that although the Alliance encourages foreign investment, yet we would jealously ensure that foreign capital does not have a stranglehold in our economy; although foreign investment is welcome, especially in regard to foreign exchange, managerial skills and technical know-how, yet such special advantages can only bring maximum benefits to us if such investments are coupled with local capital and participation. Sir, it is heartening to note that the Central Government insists on a joint participation of foreign and local capital where the projects are initiated by foreign interests. (*Hear, Hear*). By this condition, our Malaysian entrepreneurs and managers will have the opportunity to acquire new experience, new skills and new techniques which accompany foreign capital. It is all the more comforting to know that the Government insists on the participation of 50 per cent or so of domestic capital in joint ventures. Enlightened leaders in this country can sleep better knowing full well that the future

interests of our children, as far as the present industrialisation projects are concerned, will not be dominated by foreign interests.

Sir, the picture is entirely different across the Causeway. It may come as a shock to all of us, whether of the rightwing or the leftwing, to learn that the Singapore P.A.P. Government has given special concessions to some \$40 million of foreign interests. In Singapore, Sir, sixteen foreign companies, each of them 100% fully owned by foreign interests, have been given taxation exemption by the P.A.P. Government. In addition, Sir, these 100% foreign-owned interests are also enjoying the subsidised benefits of cheap land and special facilities in the Jurong industrial complex, which have already cost the Singapore people \$48 million to develop.

My humble submission, Sir, is that it is outrageous that these capital resources of our Singapore people have been exploited and perpetrated by the P.A.P. Government to make profits for outsiders, which profits may be promptly remitted abroad. Whereas our businessmen in Singapore have to pay exorbitant prices for land in the commercial areas and have to pay exorbitant assessments to pay for the maintenance of public facilities.

Sir, the P.A.P. calls itself a socialist party out to revolutionalise the social structure of Malaysia; and being a leftwing party, the P.A.P., has achieved a remarkable social retrogradation where foreign economic domination is concerned—a state of affairs which even a rightwing party like the Alliance adhors to do. Perhaps the socio-political thinkers of the P.A.P. have not extended their horizons to survey the past events in Canada where more than 60 per cent of the manufacturing industry is owned by American capital.

Sir, some P.A.P. officials have begged the Central Government not to treat them as minors (*Laughter*). But I put it to them what would they expect the Central Government to do when they indulge in such flagrant disregard of national interests and

aspirations? It is fitting to quote the Honourable Member Dr Goh Keng Swee, the Vice-Chairman of the P.A.P., from the 10th Anniversary P.A.P. Message, where he said, and I quote: "There can be no economic expansion, not to mention socialism in Malaysia, if democracy collapses as a result of foreign domination." These are his own words. Later on he further added that "democratic socialism appears to be the only way out to bring about a just and more equal society where there is no exploitation of man by man." Sir, is this a new kind of democratic socialism through 100% foreign owned companies to bring about a more just and social society? Or is this the P.A.P. contribution to promote the grand Malaysian pattern of national aspirations? (*Applause*).

**Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah (Kelantan Hilir):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mengambil bahagian sedikit dalam Bill yang ada di-hadapan kita ini. Saya bersetuju-lah dengan chadangan Bill ini ia-itu hendak diadakan harmonisation atau hendak di-satukan undang<sup>2</sup> yang bersangkutan dengan perkara Pioneer Industries atau Perusahaan Perintis. Di-sini saya akan mengambil peluang untok berchakap sedikit tentang bahawa sa-bagaimana yang kita tahu bahawa Kerajaan mensharatkan untok menerima satu perusahaan perintis bahawa di-untokkan 50% daripada share-nya kapada warga-negara Tanah Melayu. Jadi, sa-bagaimana pengalaman saya ada-lah 50% yang di-untokkan kapada warga-negara ini tidak-lah di-beri i'lan<sup>2</sup> dan keterangan<sup>2</sup> yang chukup di-dalam surat<sup>2</sup> khabar supaya dapat warga-negara yang terkandung di-dalam-nya bumiputera dan orang<sup>2</sup> Melayu mengambil bahagian juga dengan chergas-nya di-dalam perkara ini. Mengikut pengalaman<sup>2</sup> yang kita tahu apabila 50% share yang di-peruntokkan di-dalam pioneer industries yang tertentu, kata-lah, kilang membuat tayar motor atau lain<sup>2</sup> lagi, nampak-nya share yang 50% yang di-untokkan kapada warga-negara ini chuma puak<sup>2</sup> kapitalis sahaja yang ketahuī, tetapi ra'ayat jelata semuanya tidak dapat ketahuī. Oleh sebab

yang demikian, tidak-lah dapat orang kita bumiputera, lebeh<sup>2</sup> orang Melayu, membeli saham (share) supaya dapat mereka itu mengambil bahagian dalam perkara yang tersebut.

Saya harap masa yang akan datang i'lan yang chukup jelas dan terang bagi tiap<sup>2</sup> pioneer industry yang diterima oleh Kerajaan hendak-lah dimasukkan dalam surat khabar Melayu seperti *Utusan Melayu* dan lain<sup>2</sup> supaya dapat-lah orang Melayu dan bumiputera membeli share yang tertentu.

Yang kedua saya suka hendak menyebutkan di-sini sedikit ia-itu mengikut atoran dan syarat<sup>2</sup> bahawa satu pioneer industry itu di-terima oleh Kerajaan dengan syarat bahawa sa-bahagian besar daripada pekerja<sup>2</sup>-nya mesti-lah di-ambil daripada orang Melayu, tetapi apa yang telah berlaku, sungguh pun banyak daripada kilang<sup>2</sup> ini telah mengambil orang Melayu menjadi buroh, tetapi pada akhir-nya orang<sup>2</sup> ini di-buang atau di-singkirkan dengan berbagai dan bermacam<sup>2</sup> helah yang mengatakan bahawa mereka itu tidak ada mempunyai kelayakan dan sa-terus-nya. Perkara ini selalu-lah kita mendengar rayuan<sup>2</sup> daripada orang<sup>2</sup> Melayu yang telah kena buang oleh kilang<sup>2</sup> itu. Oleh sebab yang demikian, saya harap kepada Menteri yang berkenaan bahawa perkara ini hendak-lah di-kaji dengan halus-nya supaya ke'adilan dapat di-jalankan dan jangan-lah ke-aniayaan itu di-buat ka-atas anak bumiputera yang dapat kerja di-dalam kilang<sup>2</sup> perintis itu.

Sekarang saya suka hendak menarek perhatian Menteri yang berkenaan bahawa bukan-lah sahaja kerja<sup>2</sup> buroh kasar yang patut di-beri kepada anak bumiputera bahkan kerja<sup>2</sup> yang bertanggung-jawab juga hendak-lah di-beri kepada mereka itu. Dengan yang demikian mereka itu dapat-lah belajar perkara<sup>2</sup> yang mustahak di-dalam perusahaan dan lain<sup>2</sup>, dengan tujuan kalau sa-kira-nya mereka itu dapat pengalaman yang mustahak ini dapat-lah mereka itu sendiri mendirikan perusahaan<sup>2</sup> mereka itu sendiri. Sajikan-lah sahaja.

**Tuan Haji Rahmat bin Haji Daud (Johor Bahru Barat):** Yang Berhormat Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun menyokong Rang Undang<sup>2</sup> ini, kerana tujuan Kerajaan memberikan taraf perintis kepada kilang<sup>2</sup> baharu yang hendak berniaga dalam negara kita ini, terutama sa-kali kerana hendak menolong ra'ayat jelata. Yang mendukacitakan hati saya, ada juga kilang<sup>2</sup> yang telah di-beri taraf perintis dalam negara kita ini, kerana dengan ada-nya kilang<sup>2</sup> yang sa-umpama itu, ini memberikan kesusahan kepada ra'ayat jelata, ia-itu umpama-nya, saya suka hendak terangkan berkenaan dengan kilang gula. Dengan ada-nya kilang gula di-Prai sana, oleh kerana Kerajaan hendak menjaga kilang itu supaya jangan sampai banyak gula masok dalam tanah ayer kita ini, maka di-adakan quota. Dengan ini maka harga gula di-sini menjadi mahal, banyak jauh beza-nya dengan harga yang di-jual di-Singapura dan Pulau Pinang.

Baharu sa-malam telah di-bahathkan berkenaan dengan perkara gula ini. Bagi pehak kita di-dalam bandar, tentu-lah tidak berasa harga yang terlampau tinggi. Di-Singapura pada masa ini, kalau kita beli harga runchit, kita boleh dapat dengan harga 25 sen atau 26 sen sa-kati dan di-Pulau Pinang saya dapat tahu harga-nya 30 sen. Ini termasuk chukai—sama juga chukai bagaimana yang di-kenakan di-Persekutuan Tanah Melayu. Di-Johor Bahru, harga gula 40 sen dan 42 sen, dan juga di-Kuala Lumpur harga-nya pun lebeh kurang sama. Jikalau Kerajaan tidak dapat membetulkan perkara ini, saya perchaya ra'ayat jelata, terutama sa-kali orang<sup>2</sup> kampung yang berpendapatan kechil, berasa kechiwa, oleh kerana gula ini satu makanan yang sangat di-kehendaki oleh tuboh badan kita. Gula ini memberi kekuatan kepada kita. Jadi, memang-lah di-gunakan oleh kanak<sup>2</sup> dan orang<sup>2</sup> dewasa juga.

Saya harap kira-nya apabila Kerajaan hendak memberi taraf perintis kepada kilang<sup>2</sup> yang baharu itu, hendak-lah di-siasat supaya sa-kurang<sup>2</sup>-nya harga barang<sup>2</sup> yang masok dari luar negeri dan harga barang<sup>2</sup>

yang di-buat dalam negeri, biar-lah sama, atau pun dapat di-murahkan daripada barang yang kita masukkan dari luar negeri. Saya harap Kerajaan akan menyiasat, supaya dapat harga gula itu di-samakan seperti di-Singapura dan juga di-Pulau Pinang.

Saya tidak hendak berucap panjang, chuma itu-lah rayuan saya kepada Kerajaan supaya dapat menyiasat dan membetulkan di-mana salah-nya. Demikian-lah sahaja di-ucapkan terima kaseh, dan saya ada-lah menyokong di-atas Rang Undang<sup>2</sup> ini.

**Dr Lim Chong Eu (Tanjong):** Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise to make an observation arising from the statement made by the Honourable Minister of Finance over the necessity of preserving two-way consultation in the establishment of pioneer industries, and although in his particular reference he was directing his observations probably to the over-enthusiasm in the South, in the State of Singapore, I would like to take this opportunity to divert his attention to the North, to the State of Penang, where we are also in opposition. We feel that the State Government over there, the Alliance State Government (probably if Singapore suffers from over-enthusiasm) suffers from absolute inertia. This two-way move towards development of industries throughout Malaysia, I think, is a very good idea and certainly we shall take this opportunity in the forthcoming State Assembly meeting to convey the remarks made by the Honourable Minister of Finance to our Chief Minister in the State of Penang. However, I feel that it is proper for us to urge the Central Government to give serious consideration to the question of dispersal of industries and to provide and assist in more rapid development of industries, such as pioneer industries in the State of Penang, and to ensure that industrialisation, if they are going to be taken away from the South, would not necessarily be directed only to the middle, and the North should not be forgotten. And in talking about the State of Penang, we realise that there

is dichotomy there—the problem of harmonisation and the question of the free port status of Penang loom large. If attention is given to the State of Penang, do not forget . . . .

**Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid:** Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification. When the Honourable Member mentioned the State of Penang, I think he was only referring to the Island of Penang. We have got industrial development in the State of Penang—at Butterworth. I think the Honourable Member refers particularly to the Island of Penang and not to the State of Penang, because the State of Penang includes Province Wellesley.

**Dr Lim Chong Eu:** Mr Speaker, Sir, my Honourable friend from Seberang Utara was anticipating what I was going to say. (*Laughter*). I have always maintained that the people in . . . .

**Enche' Ismail bin Idris:** Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification. I represent Penang Selatan, not the other Honourable Member. (*Laughter*).

**Dr Lim Chong Eu:** Well, I am sorry I made that mistake. I am sure the Honourable Member from Penang Selatan will support me. (*Laughter*). We realise that for the people of the State of Penang and the dichotomy in the State those in Province Wellesley have already moved ahead, and we certainly hope that they are not just content with what they have and they may ask for more. But in the State of Penang, we had already had recent promises that after long investigation at last the Central Government and the State Government begin to accept the possibility of opening industrial sites in the Island of Penang. This, to some extent, is a good thing, because as early as only last year, whenever this question was raised in Penang, the downright answer was that there are no possible industrial sites. However, we feel that this change in climate and opinion that there are possible industrial sites in Penang is a good sign, and we hope that the Central Government, in effecting this two-way progress, should probably give the State Government in Penang a little bit of

encouragement, a little bit of a prod, a little bit of a lead to provide for more industries in Butterworth, and for the beginning of industries in Penang Island.

**Enche' Mohamed Yusof bin Mahmud (Temerloh):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mengalu<sup>2</sup>kan Rang Undang<sup>2</sup> yang di-bawa oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan berkenaan dengan hal chukai, atau persamaan taraf perintis yang ada di-hadapan kita ini. Pada pendapat saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tiap<sup>2</sup> Negeri dalam Persekutuan Malaysia ini faham tentang kedudukan mereka, ia-itu mereka ini terta'alok di-bawah Undang<sup>2</sup> Parlimen ini. Jadi, tadi kita telah mendengar, ia-itu ada Negeri<sup>2</sup> yang mengeneipikan kuasa<sup>2</sup> yang ada di-tangan kita. Ini, rasa saya, tidak akan timbul lagi pada masa hadapan.

Yang kedua, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada perhatian saya pada masa yang lampau ini, taraf<sup>2</sup> perintis, atau pun perusahaan<sup>2</sup> yang akan di-buat oleh mereka<sup>2</sup> yang hendak menggunakan taraf perintis ini, yang menjalankan itu tidak-lah mendapat kepuasan hati, terutama sa-kali daripada pehak orang<sup>2</sup> Melayu yang suka mengambil bahagian.

Sebab saya katakan bagitu, satu<sup>2</sup> perusahaan taraf perintis di-adakan, tidak mendapat perundingan<sup>2</sup> daripada segala peringkat terutama sa-kali orang Melayu yang suka mengambil bahagian di-dalam perusahaan<sup>2</sup> ini. Pada masa ini pandangan saya tidak ada satu badan yang boleh menyatu padukan usaha<sup>2</sup> atau pun pehak<sup>2</sup> orang Melayu yang suka—yang ada kemampuan masok mengambil bahagian di-dalam perusahaan taraf perintis ini. Jadi, saya rasa, ada lebeh baik-nya pada masa hadapan ia-itu di-adakan satu badan yang meliputi bukan sahaja orang Melayu tetapi seluroh pemodal<sup>2</sup> tanah ayer kita yang saya sipatkan satu badan kebangsaan, yang mana mereka yang hendak mengadakan perusahaan taraf perintis ini berunding dengan badan<sup>2</sup> ini. Dengan ini tidak-lah timbul salah sangka atau pun churiga terhadap chara<sup>2</sup> hendak menjalankan perusahaan taraf perintis ini.

Pada masa yang lampau saya ada menerima juga perkhabaran daripada Malay Secretariat, tiap<sup>2</sup> negeri perusahaan<sup>2</sup> taraf perintis memberikan peluang kepada orang Melayu membeli share<sup>2</sup> itu tetapi ini susah dapat di-fahamkan oleh orang yang hendak membeli itu. Oleh sebab mereka tentu-lah merasa yang mereka chuma di-suroh membeli tetapi tidak tahu chara<sup>2</sup> atau syarat<sup>2</sup> yang terang supaya mereka yang akan melaborkan modal<sup>2</sup>-nya di-dalam perusahaan<sup>2</sup> ini mendapat kepuasan hati. Jadi, kalau ada satu badan seperti yang saya shorkan tadi tidak-lah timbul lagi mengeneipikan orang Melayu yang suka mengambil bahagian chergas. Sebab sekarang Kementerian Perdagangan telah mengadakan satu badan khas kepada orang<sup>2</sup> Melayu ia-itu memberi peluang kepada orang<sup>2</sup> Melayu mengambil bahagian chergas dalam segala segi perusahaan dan perdagangan. Jadi, elok-lah badan ini di-adakan lagi, satu badan yang boleh meliputi bukan sahaja orang Melayu tetapi pedagang<sup>2</sup> anak negeri atau pun pedagang<sup>2</sup> yang lain daripada bumiputera di-binchangkan satu<sup>2</sup> keputusan yang di-adakan di-negeri ini supaya dapat kepuasan hati, dan saya perchaya tidak-lah timbul lagi soal orang Melayu tidak dapat membeli, soal orang Melayu hendak merampas hak orang lain—tidak timbul lagi. Jadi, saya rasa pada masa hadapan kalau dapat chara yang sa-macham ini ia-itu kita dalam tanah ayer kita ini ada banyak badan<sup>2</sup> perniagaan daripada orang Melayu—Malay Chamber of Commerce dan lain<sup>2</sup> di-satukan, ini akan memberi kebaikan kepada negara ini. Terima kaseh.

**The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Dr Lim Swee Aun):** Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise to reply to a rather interesting point raised by the Honourable Member from Johore, in that he suggested that pioneer certificates should not be issued to any company which wishes to manufacture goods in this country unless the cost to the Malaysian consumer of the locally manufactured product is cheaper or at least not more expensive than its imported equivalent. That, Sir, is an

interesting and important aspect. In fact, the Government does realise and does bring into account the question of the retail price or the cost of production of any locally manufactured product before it approves applications for pioneer status. However, Sir, there are difficulties in that it cannot be applied to every case. If we want to industrialise, we must also be prepared to pay a little more for the locally manufactured product if it is necessary, and that is the point that the Government always considers. Take, for example, the motor-car assembling industry. As we see it, the motor industry is a big engineering industry which can bring a lot of benefit to this country, in that it will create employment and it can start . . . .

**Enche' Lim Kean Siew:** Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification. Surely the Cycle and Carriage Workshop, which the Honourable Minister opened the other day, was just an assembling plant and not an engineering factory?

**Dr Lim Swee Aun:** The Honourable Member is too anxious. I must explain that from assembling, we will proceed then to the manufacture of component parts, which will require engineering skill and which will require a lot of mechanical training of our employees. From there there is this expansion into the new field of industrialisation which is new to this country. However, because our markets here are small—we have got only 10½ million people—and our buying power is not that very high, the production of locally assembled cars and locally manufactured component parts will be small as compared to the large countries like those in Europe and America where cars are produced at the rate of one car per minute, but here we probably assemble one car per month or less. So naturally we have to pay a bit more for the locally assembled cars. However, despite that, we still have to encourage such industries because they create employment. Unless we have employment in this country and there is diversification in our economy, then we will be facing great difficulties. So, Sir, although we do bring in this question of cost, we also must realise

that in certain industries, you cannot produce a locally made product cheaper than its imported equivalent.

Then, again, as I have tried to explain in this House, Malaya has always been a dumping market and because of our being able to permit the free import of goods with minimum restrictions, exporting countries find this a very good market for them to under-cut each other. As I have explained also, the costing of exporting firms in big countries is usually based on the total capacity of the plant. Supposing the total capacity of the plant is 1,000 and the local market can consume only 750, i.e. three-fourths, then there is an excess in the market which can be exported. So, the total cost of that 1,000 is divided by 750 which will be sold in the home market. That will be the sale price of that product in the home market, which means that although 750 units are sold in the local market, it has covered the total cost of the production of the thousand units. The remaining 250 units are exported at any price. That is how they compete, that is how sometimes goods in Malaya are sold below cost. That is why, local manufacturers find it almost impossible to compete in price with imported goods. Despite our dumping legislation, we find it very difficult to control such goods from coming in; hence the necessity of having quota restriction or of licensing of imports as an additional measure to tariff protection.

Sir, that is what I would like to explain to this House why it is not always possible to ensure that the locally manufactured goods must be cheaper or at least be at the same price as that of imported goods.

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** Mr Speaker, Sir, the Government is naturally very grateful for the expressions of support for this Bill, which have come from both sides of the House.

The Honourable Member for Tanjong—he is not in this House at the moment—stated that he was happy that I, on behalf of the Government, had said that co-operation between the Centre on the one hand and the State

Government on the other is a two-way traffic. He thought that was very relevant to the question of industrialisation on Penang Island. The Central Government has, of course, always been very anxious about industrialisation on Penang Island. Unfortunately, it is people like the Honourable Member for Tanjong who has, until very recently, opposed industrialisation on Penang Island on the grounds that it will kill the tourist trade and other delightful things on the Island, but I am glad to say that he has now seen the light of day, and I hope he will be able to persuade other Members, particularly Members of the Opposition Parties, to come round to the obvious premise that without industrialisation there would be no future for the Island, in spite of the tourist trade and other amenities.

**Enche' Lim Kean Siew:** On a point of clarification—I thought the Opposition Parties were not so much concerned with industrialisation on Penang State itself but the feasibility of industrialisation on that Island, in view of the fact that cargo has to be carried across the channel.

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** Mr Speaker, Sir, there is no doubt at all that it is completely practicable or, to add, feasible—these two words mean exactly the same thing—to pursue, I think, successfully a policy of industrialisation on Penang Island. That is not only the viewpoint of the present Government, it is the viewpoint of experts—undisputed experts, like the World Bank Mission which has prepared a report on this subject. I am sorry to disagree with the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat, but it is a fact which can be proved beyond all shadow of doubt that the Rueff Mission which studied Penang Island did recommend, in the most clear and explicit terms, that it is essential that Penang Island should industrialise.

If the Honourable Member will come with me after I have finished my reply, I will show him the report—unfortunately, he is at sea most of the time.

**Enche' Lim Kean Siew:** In camera. (*Laughter*).

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** A number of speakers on both sides of the House have referred to the paramount need to encourage Malay participation in industry. As Honourable Members know, a Section has recently been set up in the Prime Minister's Department to look into this very problem and other problems connected with this general question, and I have no doubt that the observations which have been made in the course of the debate will receive a sympathetic hearing in that quarter.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr Speaker *in the Chair*)

*Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive* ordered to stand part of the Bill.

*First Schedule* ordered to stand part of the Bill.

*Second Schedule*—

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** Mr Chairman, Sir, I beg to move the following amendment to the Second Schedule, as indicated in the amendment slip, which has already been circulated to Honourable Members:

In paragraph 6, new sub-section 18 (9), line 4, to leave out the words “sub-section 6 (a) or (b)” and add the words, “the seventh to eleventh lines, inclusive, of sub-section (6)” instead thereof.

Amendment put, and agreed to.

*Second Schedule*, as amended, ordered to stand part of the Bill.

*Third Schedule* ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported with amendment: read the third time and passed.

## MOTION

### REFUSAL OF GOVERNMENT TO HONOUR THE TRADITIONAL OBLIGATIONS TO THE CIVIL SERVICE NATIONAL WHITLEY COUNCIL

Order read for the resumption of debate on the question,

“(a) This House views with grave concern the conduct of the Alliance Government in refusing to honour the Government traditional obligations to and agreements with the Civil Service National Whitley Council by rejecting *in toto* the award made by the Professor Ungku Aziz, Civil Service Arbitration Tribunal in the recent dispute on salaries between Government as employer and the Union of Post Office Workers representing employees and this House being desirous of preserving the good name of Malaysia and its people and being desirous of upholding the principles of justice to all our people deplores the rejection *in toto* of the Ungku Aziz Award;

(b) In view of the urgent necessity of maintaining industrial peace at this critical juncture this House calls on the Alliance Government to complete the appointments to the Special Commission to review Civil Service Salaries throughout Malaysia as soon as possible in order that all workers in the Civil Service will in future be paid just and fair wages for the work they render the Nation”. (Dr Tan Chee Khoon). (1st March, 1965).

*Debate resumed.*

**Enche' Lim Kean Siew (Dato Kramat):** Mr Speaker, Sir, the motion by my friend from Batu is, in essence, a very simple one. The first part of the motion calls upon the Government to recognise the traditional obligations to an agreement reached with the Civil Service National Whitley Council, and the second part calls upon the Government to complete the appointments to the Special Commission to review Civil Service salaries throughout Malaysia as soon as possible.

Mr Speaker, Sir, it is traditional that when the Government disagrees with the staff the matter is referred to the Arbitration, and it is also traditional that the Tribunal's recommendations are accepted. In this instance it must be noted that the award of the Tribunal was unanimous. But instead of accepting the award of the Tribunal and coming to this House with a straightforward “Yes, we will carry

out the terms of the award, we will accept the terms of the award” or “No, we will not accept it”, the Government has thought fit to come to this House to give certain statements which are misleading, if not, untrue.

It is very odd that this sitting of the House has not only heard the admission of the Honourable Prime Minister that a statement issued in his name was not only false but that the whole meeting as reported by his Political Secretary did not, in fact, take place.

However, we on Monday have heard from the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister himself certain statements with regard to the Tribunal which have been refuted by the Chairman of the Tribunal, namely, a professor—Ungku Aziz. Now, whose statement is correct? On the one hand, we have the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister making certain statements in this House which are contradicted by a professor of our University.

Mr Speaker, Sir, according to the mover of the motion, the arbitration award was rejected *in toto*. The Honourable Deputy Prime Minister said on Monday that it was not correct to say that the Government has rejected or repudiated *in toto* the Tribunal's award. He further goes on to say that in this case the Tribunal made an award which was in excess of what the union itself had claimed and he asserted that it would have extremely serious consequences on the finances of the country and that therefore the Government was in no position to implement the award in the national interest. Surely those statements by themselves mean that the Government has rejected the award *in toto*. But apparently this House understands that what the Government has accepted is two-thirds of all the awards over which there were disagreements. Apparently, as the House was given to understand, if one accepts two-thirds, one does not reject *in toto*. This is an Alice in Wonderlandish sort of argument. Can we imagine the Queen Mother and the rabbit having a conversation in which the rabbit asks the Queen Mother this question, “Do you want to eat me?” “No,” says the

Queen Mother, "I only want to eat half of you; therefore, I am not eating you." It is a similar sort of argument; because the Government is prepared to make a counter offer to accept two-thirds of the award, therefore the Government says that it is not rejecting the award *in toto*.

The second point of the Government's argument is that it is not in the national interest to accept the arbitration award. One wonders whether or not confrontation, again, is being used as an excuse not to carry out the Government's duties towards the citizens of this country.

The Honourable Deputy Prime Minister also said that if the Government accepted the award, it would involve the Government an additional expenditure of \$133 million a year. Mr Speaker, according to the Chairman of the Tribunal, in a statement issued, this figure of \$133 million, based on a 30% increase for whole of the Government Services, is statistically most unrealistic. He is a professor of economics. Are we to say that his calculations are wrong? According to him, there would be 103 clerks who will qualify for the operational allowance at levels above \$90 per month and the total amount would come to \$12,470 under this item. The second item which would bring about an increase is the total cost of the in-charge allowances payable to 222 postmasters, which is estimated to come to \$115,560 per annum. This together with the third item, with regard to the increase of salaries amounting to \$696,324, would make the total sum involved in the award \$1,650,924. Mr Speaker, Sir, \$1,650,924 is a far cry from the \$133 million stated in this House. Is this House to be fed with such misinformation all the time? Are we to be given statements the accuracy of which can be so seriously challenged? Either we have to believe what we are told in this House and say that the professor is completely irresponsible and wrong, or that the professor is correct and that information given to this House is irresponsible.

Mr Speaker, Sir, another point made by the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister is that the Tribunal has made an award which was in excess of what the union itself had claimed. Mr Speaker, Sir, it is a wellknown fact that when a Tribunal sits, it has to consider claims from both sides. According to the duties placed upon the Tribunal, it was required to examine not only the union's claims but the Government's offer and to determine the salary scales and allowances to be applied to postal clerical services. Sir, the union made two claims: a claim for increase in the salaries of postal workers, including the Head Postmaster, Kuala Lumpur, and a claim for increase in in-charge allowances. Under the claim for in-charge allowances, the union put forward seven classes, from Class I to Class VII. Their claims are as follows:

Class	Claim
Class I	\$110.00
Class II	100.00
Class III	90.00
Class IV	80.00
Class V	70.00
Class VI	60.00
Class VII	50.00

Against that, the tribunal made awards as follows:

Class	Award
Class I	\$75.00
Class II	67.00
Class III	60.00
Class IV	52.50
Class V	45.00
Class VI	37.50
Class VII	30.00

I mention these in detail, Mr Speaker, Sir, because we were given to understand in this House that the Government agreed only to the Tribunal's dealing with three classes. Mr Speaker, Sir, it may be quite true that the Government offered to deal with three classes only, but since the union made a claim for all the seven classes, surely it is the Tribunal's duty to deal with all of them.

Mr Speaker, Sir, it was further pointed out that the Tribunal exceeded its scope in awarding a variable rate instead of a fixed rate as offered by the Government. Mr Speaker, Sir, according to the Chairman of the Tribunal, the Union made no claim with regard to postal clerks, because it wanted an enhanced salary scale for them. On the other hand, just before the Union went on strike, the Government offered a special allowance of \$20 a month to all postal clerks serving in the traffic arm of the Postal Administration. Mr Speaker, Sir, this was an offer made by the Government upon which the Union made no claim. It is therefore incorrect to inform this House that the award made was in excess of the claims made by the Union. Since the Government made an offer, it was the duty of the Tribunal to deal with it, and in dealing with it the Tribunal considered that a varying scale ranging from \$30 to \$130 was preferable to a flat rate of \$20 a month.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise not so much to deal with the correctness or the wrongfulness of the Tribunal's award but upon a greater principle, that if the Government wishes this House and this country to deal with matters as seriously, it is incumbent upon itself to make certain that information, which has official backing, should at least have a semblance of responsibility and a semblance of sincerity. It is unfortunate that the Government not only felt that it was not morally bound to carry out the terms of the award but had seen fit to avoid its responsibilities by engaging itself in dialectics and in arguments not strictly pertaining to the truth.

Mr Speaker, Sir, there are two points that we have to discuss in this motion. Number 1: Is the Government bound morally to accept the terms of the award whether or not they are in agreement to its own offer? Number 2: Whether or not the awards made by tribunals should be honoured by the Government? To both of these questions I say "Yes", the Government is morally bound to accept the awards of the tribunal whether or not it agrees

with the awards and it is not right to make a counter offer after the awards had been made when it had itself willingly submitted to arbitration. And, secondly, we feel that the Government must recognise the Whitley Council machinery as long as it recognises the Whitley Council.

**Enche' Mohamed Yusof bin Mahmud (Temerloh):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka hendak mengambil bahagian juga dalam usul yang di-bawa oleh wakil daripada Batu ia-itu usul menchercha Kerajaan terhadap keputusan yang telah di-buat oleh Majlis Orang Tengah berkenaan dengan hal pemberian gaji<sup>2</sup> kepada pegawai<sup>2</sup> post. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Yang Berhormat Timbalan Perdana Menteri, pada tempoh hari yang telah lampau, telah memberikan penjelasan sebab musabab maka keputusan itu tidak dapat diterima oleh Kerajaan. Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya memandang sa-telah Kerajaan memberikan penjelasan dengan jelas ia-itu yang pertama-nya, oleh sebab negara kita berkeadaan dharurat yang menyebabkan penggunaan wang yang begitu banyak terhadap pertahanan negara. Dan juga sa-telah di-beri penerangan<sup>2</sup> yang penoh dan jelas kepada wakil<sup>2</sup> daripada Kesatuan Post ini, saya berpendapat keterangan<sup>2</sup> yang telah di-beri oleh Kerajaan itu sangat penting yang sa-patut-nya di-terima dengan baik oleh wakil<sup>2</sup> daripada Kesatuan Post ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, mana lebih baik, kita menchuaikan pertahanan negara kita dengan mengurangkan perbelanjaan atau pun kita mengene-pikan tanggung-jawab kita terhadap sa-barang kerja untuk menaikkan gaji ia-itu melebehkan kepada perbelanjaan pertahanan. Ini-lah satu point yang saya pandang—saya sifatkan mereka<sup>2</sup> atau pun orang yang bertanggung-jawab dalam Kesatuan Post ini—mereka<sup>2</sup> yang tidak bertanggung-jawab kepada negara ini. Sa-telah Kerajaan memberikan penerangan yang penoh, mengapa dan apa sebab tidak dapat di-persetujukan keputusan yang telah di-buat oleh Majlis Orang Tengah ini. Saya ulang sa-kali lagi sa-patut-nya mereka menerima nasehat daripada

Kerajaan, sa-kurang<sup>2</sup>-nya menanggohkan sampai negara ini dalam keadaan aman.

Yang kedua, saya memandang mereka<sup>2</sup> yang bertanggung-jawab mengusulkan keadaan ini ada-lah mereka<sup>2</sup> yang tidak memandang berat kapada negara kita. Sebab, jikalau negara ini hapus atau pun huru hara, mereka ada tempat lain yang boleh pergi tetapi negeri ini dan bumiputera-nya akan jahanam. Jadi, usul yang dibawa pada hari ini pada pandangan saya ia-lah satu lagi peranan atau satu lagi usaha supaya mengerohkan lagi keadaan negara kita supaya pekerja<sup>2</sup> mendapat galakan daripada wakil Batu yang menjadikan negara ini lebeh<sup>2</sup> lagi berkeadaan dahshat. Jadi, saya rasa bukan sahaja Dewan ini bahkan seluruh ra'ayat di-negara ini memandang berat atas perchubaan yang telah banyak di-buat oleh tokoh<sup>2</sup> daripada parti Socialist untuk menghanchorkan negara kita. Maka ini-lah satu jalan lagi ia-itu supaya perkerja<sup>2</sup> dalam negara kita resah dan boleh menyebabkan pertolongan yang besar kapada ahli<sup>2</sup> subversive dan juga kapada anasir<sup>2</sup> jahat daripada luar negeri.

Jadi, saya harap Kerajaan tidak ragu<sup>2</sup> lagi terhadap usul yang samacham ini daripada mereka yang chuba membawa perkara yang samacham ini supaya keadaan buroh<sup>2</sup> dalam negara ini menjadi gelisah. Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-kali lagi saya harap ia-itu ketua<sup>2</sup> union, pekerja<sup>2</sup> di-tanah ayer kita mesti-lah mahu menerima pandangan<sup>2</sup> yang di-beri oleh Kerajaan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita boleh memberi gaji dan sara hidup kalau kita ada wang. Jadi, umpama dua orang bertelagah dalam perkara ini di-bawa kapada mahkamah, dan mahkamah telah memutuskan yang di-tudoh itu mesti bayar kerugian, tetapi yang di-tudoh itu tidak dapat mem-bayar-nya, maka hukuman-nya tidak lain dan tidak bukan di-hantar yang di-tudoh ka-penjara. Jadi, di-sini saya sifatkan juga persatuan<sup>2</sup> yang membawa perkara ini kapada Orang Tengah supaya Kerajaan di-

paksa, saya rasa tidak ada Kerajaan dalam dunia yang boleh di-paksa oleh ra'ayat-nya yang sa-bilangan kechil. Perkara ini, saya rasa, berat dan saya harap Kerajaan jangan lagi melutut kapada union yang sa-macham itu yang tidak mahu menerima kebenaran dan nasihat<sup>2</sup> daripada Kerajaan kita. Terima kaseh.

**Enche' Abdul Samad bin Gul Ahmad Mianji (Pasir Mas Hulu):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam menyokong usul ini, saya ingin memberi sedikit pandangan bahawa ada sa-tengah pendapat atau fikiran yang di-keluarkan dalam Dewan ini, pada pandangan saya, ada-lah terkeliru saperti pandangan sa-orang Ahli Yang Berhormat dari sa-belah sana yang menyatakan kebimbangan akan wujud-nya impekasi akibat daripada kenaikan gaji pekerja<sup>2</sup>, sebab mengikut lojik-nya dengan kenaikan gaji pekerja<sup>2</sup> itu akan berikutan sama kenaikan harga barang<sup>2</sup> ia-itu kehendak daripada perimbangan ekonomi.

Akan tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kenyataan yang ada dalam negeri kita sekarang ini ia-lah kenaikan harga barang<sup>2</sup> keperluan hari<sup>2</sup>, kenaikan ini timbul dari dua sebab. Yang pertama keadaan politik di-dunia sa-belah sini sekarang dan yang kedua bertambah-nya kenaikan jenis chukai yang di-kenakan oleh Kerajaan, yang mana, sa-chara tidak langsung, terpaksa ditanggung oleh orang ramai termasuk pekerja<sup>2</sup> itu sendiri. Jika sa-kali pun suasana politik akan berubah mengikut pengalaman yang berlaku, harga barang<sup>2</sup> itu akan menurun dengan sendiri-nya. Saya tidak hendak ber-chakap dari segi kenaikan chukai, sebab mungkin chukai juga akan diturunkan apabila suasana ini berubah kapada yang lebeh cherah dan terang, entah-lah kalau mentality chukai itu sendiri sama mentality-nya dengan saudagar<sup>2</sup> yang ada dalam negeri kita ini yang menchari kesempatan menaik-kan harga barang<sup>2</sup> oleh sa-suatu sebab dan keadaan. Sunggoh pun saperti yang ma'alumkan bahawa konferantasi-lah yang menyebabkan kenaikan chukai, erti-nya chukai di-tambah kerana bertambah-nya perbelanjaan per-tahanan, tetapi yang menjadi aspek

ini bersatu hati dan bersatu jiwa. Jadi kaum pekerja terpaksa memikul tanggung-jawab dan bebanan hidup yang pahit itu. Ini-lah satu masalah yang hanya boleh di-pechahkan dengan sa-mata<sup>2</sup> dengan perasaan bertimbang rasa.

Pendapat Yang Berhormat dari sebelah sana menyatakan pula kebimbangan penderitaan yang lebeh hebat dari kalangan kaum tani, sebab mereka bukan pekerja yang makan gaji. Kenaikan harga barang<sup>2</sup> menyempitkan kehidupan mereka, atau dengan lain<sup>2</sup> perkataan, suasana politik dan kenaikan chukai yang berat oleh Kerajaan menambahkan sempit hidup mereka seperti sempit-nya hidup kaum pekerja. Masalah-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, nasib kaum pekerja ada-lah tanggung-jawab Kerajaan sa-chara langsung yang mana sa-belum berlakunya kenaikan chukai ini tuntutan hidup mereka telah-lah di-suarakan dan maseh dalam peringkat pertimbangan, hingga-lah suasana itu berubah seperti keadaan sekarang.

Menerima tuntutan kaum pekerja seperti keputusan Mahamah Orang-Tengah itu tidak-lah melibatkan lebeh daripada 20 peratus sahaja daripada tambahan pendapatan hasil baharu yang mula di-pungut sekarang, erti-nya dengan menerima tuntutan yang demikian tidak-lah menghalang Kerajaan daripada menunaikan tugas besar menghadapi konferantasi ini.

Masalah kaum tani pun merupakan satu masalah yang penting seperti apa yang di-ucapkan oleh Yang Berhormat dari Kuala Kangsar dan Yang Berhormat dari Kota Star Utara bahawa penanam<sup>2</sup> padi di-kawasan-nya berpendapatan hanya \$30.00 sahaja, ia-itu satu pendapatan yang sangat menyedehkan mungkin ini akibat daripada penyakit padi kuncha dan orang<sup>2</sup> tengah. Oleh yang demikian, berkewajipan-lah Kerajaan mengatasi masalah ini dengan sa-berapa segera. Sambil itu sudah pula menasabah nilai harga padi di-naikkan sesuai dengan keadaan-nya.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pembekuan padi di-negeri Kelantan umpama-nya, akibat dari berjalan-nya Undang<sup>2</sup>

Kawalan Makanan itu patut-lah segera di-baiki seperti mana yang pernah di-ucapkan oleh Yang Berhormat dari Pasir Puteh ia-itu supaya padi dan beras dari Kelantan di-benarkan dibawa keluar ka-negeri Pantai Barat ini atau Kerajaan segera mengadakan gudang<sup>2</sup> simpanan padi di-Kelantan dan membeli padi ra'ayat dengan harga kawalan Kerajaan sendiri.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kaum<sup>2</sup> pekerja di-negeri ini, terutama-nya pekerja<sup>2</sup> pos, telah memberi khidmat yang baik dan memuaskan walau pun dalam keadaan yang merbahaya dan dalam suasana apa'jua. Jadi, sudah sepatut-nya Kerajaan memberi pertimbangan kepada tuntutan<sup>2</sup> kaum pekerja ini. Mahkamah Orang-Tengah telah memutuskan tuntutan daripada pehak pekerja pos mesti di-bayar, dan sekarang Kerajaan telah menolak-nya. Jadi, pada siapa lagi kaum pekerja<sup>2</sup> ini akan menuntut atau pun akan meminta timbang rasa?

Saya maseh ingat, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, masalah pekerja<sup>2</sup> pos ini dahulu telah pun menghantar notis mogok kepada Kerajaan, dan Kerajaan telah meminta supaya pehak pekerja pos itu menarek balek notis mogok-nya dan menyerahkan benda itu kepada Mahkamah Orang-Tengah. Mahkamah Orang-Tengah telah pun membuat keputusan bahawa tuntutan kaum pekerja pos ini berpatutan dan Kerajaan hendak-lah memberi-nya, tetapi malang-nya, pehak Kerajaan telah mengabaikan dan menolak langsung keputusan Mahkamah Orang-Tengah ini.

Pihak Kerajaan baharu<sup>2</sup> ini telah berchakap hendak memotong gaji pegawai<sup>2</sup> 'awam. Ini ada-lah satu perkara yang paling burok yang pernah di-ucapkan oleh pehak Kerajaan, sa-olah<sup>2</sup> memberi ugutan kepada pegawai<sup>2</sup> yang menjalankan tugas-nya dengan baik dalam negeri ini supaya mereka jangan membuat tuntutan<sup>2</sup> yang lain.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam masa kebelakangan ini pehak Kerajaan nampak-nya telah menjalankan satu dasar *divide and rule* dalam unions<sup>2</sup> ini dengan mengaku<sup>2</sup> union<sup>2</sup> yang kecil

yang bilangan buroh<sup>2</sup>-nya kechil, pada hal dasar utama atau awal Kerajaan ini ia-lah mengadakan satu persatuan yang besar yang mewakili seluruh kaum pekerja dalam negeri ini.

Dalam soal pertahanan negara, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada-lah tanggung-jawab sa-tiap ra'ayat, bukan hanya tanggung-jawab pekerja<sup>2</sup> sahaja. Dengan kenaikan chukai<sup>2</sup> baharu mithal-nya, saudagar<sup>2</sup> dalam negeri ini menchari kesempatan dan menchari kekayaan dengan lumayan dengan menaikkan harga barang<sup>2</sup> yang tidak berpatutan, dan sudah sa-patut-nya-lah mereka yang menchari dan mendapat kesempatan ini-lah yang mesti menanggung lebeh banyak bebanan pertahanan negara dalam masa keadaan konferantasi ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-kian-lah sahaja.

**Enche' Abu Bakar bin Hamzah:** Dengan izin, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya turut sama berchakap di-dalam usul berkenaan dengan masalah tuntutan gaji oleh Pekerja<sup>2</sup> Pos. Kita telah pun mendengar banyak pendapat dan pandangan, sama ada hujah<sup>2</sup> itu berdasar hujah pendapat dan hujah undang<sup>2</sup>. Maka saya dengan rengkas-nya hendak mengemukakan kepada pehak Kerajaan dua tiga perkara untuk mendapat perhatian.

Yang pertama, sudah-lah menjadi pegangan bagi negara kita dan fahaman berdemokratik kita, ia-itu dalam masaalah<sup>2</sup> yang sa-macam ini, kita mengadakan Mahkamah Orang Tengah, erti-nya itu-lah satu chara penyelesaian di-dalam negara yang demokratik, dan biasa-nya sudah menjadi adat.

Kita tidak-lah pernah menolak pendapat atau pun shor, atau pun keputusan yang di-beri oleh Mahkamah Orang Tengah itu, sa-kali pun dia tidak merupakan Mahkamah biasa, erti-nya kita menerima keputusan dan pandangan Mahkamah itu. Jadi, ini ada-lah pegangan bagi sa-buah negara yang berchorak demokratik, dan dahulu-nya kita mengadakan Mahkamah ini pun dengan penoh kesedaran dan faham bahawa negara kita ini demokratik dan kita memerlukan kapada badan yang sa-macam itu.

Sekarang kita sudah hormati badan itu. Kita wujudkan dengan kehendak kita dan kita hormati, dan kita gunakan badan itu untuk menyelesaikan di-antara pehak Kerajaan dengan pehak ra'ayat. Tiba<sup>2</sup>, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, oleh sa-suatu keadaan, maka Kerajaan tidak dapat menerima keputusan itu, atau pendapat itu. Boleh jadi, ada beberapa sebab, atau pun excuse bagi pehak Kerajaan yang tidak dapat menerima pendapat, atau pun keputusan itu. Saya insaf dan saya merasa ada, tetapi yang menjadi masaalah, sudah-kah sebab<sup>2</sup> itu membawa Kerajaan sa-hingga kapada satu tingkatan yang boleh menolak keputusan Mahkamah ini? Atau pun menolak satu badan yang di-antara dua pehak itu bersetuju menjadi hakim? Sudah-kah sampai kapada murtabat itu, erti-nya sudah-kah sampai yang negara kita ini kita hentikan faham demokrasi itu, kerana hendak menjadikan satu<sup>2</sup> hal itu menjadi excuse di-dalam penolakan Kerajaan ini.

Di-sini-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, yang saya hendak chakapkan dalam perkara ini. Jadi, kebanyakan hujah yang di-berikan oleh pehak Kerajaan ia-lah negara kita di-dalam keadaan confrontasi. Ada pula yang memberikan hujah dari segi ekonomi, ia-itu kalau di-naikkan gaji, akan menyebabkan beberapa keusekan, atau provocation lagi di-dalam keadaan ekonomi kita dan ada yang sa-tengah<sup>2</sup> itu pula mengatakan tuntutan itu terlampau tinggi dan yang lebeh burok—kalau ta' salah saya, kalau salah boleh di-betulkan—pehak Kerajaan mengatakan Mahkamah Orang Tengah ini berat sa-belah. Jadi, hujah<sup>2</sup> ini, saya rasa kalau kita sudah mengadakan Mahkamah Orang Tengah, tentu-lah dalam dispute, dalam pergadohan kita itu, tidak dapat hendak di-samakan keputusannya kapada kedua pehak, dan kalau-lah di-takdirkan keputusan Mahkamah itu menyebelahi satu<sup>2</sup> pehak, tidak-lah dapat pehak yang terkena itu mengatakan yang Mahkamah ini masuk di-sabelah sini. Apa pula kata Professor Ungku Aziz, atau pun orang<sup>2</sup> yang berkenaan dalam hal ini, mengeshorkan satu perkara yang "for the Government", maka Kerajaan pun

akan bersorak-lah—ini-lah yang adil, bila terkena pada sa-belah sini—ini tidak adil dan kalau rendah lagi daripada apa yang di-tuntut oleh pehak yang menuntut ini, Kerajaan akan mengatakan ini-lah Mahkamah yang paling adil dalam dunia ini. Jadi, sudah-kah sampai moral atau jiwa Kerajaan Perikatan itu memainkan badan yang di-anggap-nya lebeh tinggi daripada dia dan dia memandang, memihak kepada satu—sudah-kah sampai masa-nya?

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berkenaan dengan confrontasi, sudah lama saya berchakap di-dalam hal ini—ta' ada siapa pun yang ta' berasa dukachita berkenaan dengan confrontasi ini, tetapi chara berfikir bagi saya sendiri, tidak-lah sama dengan sa-barang hujah yang ada di-dalam Kerajaan kita, di-dalam bangsa kita, negara kita ini—semua-nya menjadikan hujah confrontasi; hendak membuat itu, kerana confrontasi, hendak membuat ini kerana confrontasi—lama<sup>2</sup> Mahkamah biasa pun ta' payah ada hakim. Kita chari-lah siapa<sup>2</sup>, letakkan di-situ, sebab hakim mahal sekarang ini, hendak chari orang qualify ta' ada, orang yang experience ta' ada—oleh sebab confrontasi. Jadi, itu-lah sebab, saya kata lebeh baik negara kita ini di-letakkan di-bawah undang<sup>2</sup> tentera, bukan-lah berma'ana saya mengapi<sup>2</sup>kan negara kita ini menjadi sa-suatu yang tidak patut, tetapi saya memandang, oleh kerana chemas-nya pehak Kerajaan itu menggunakan perkataan confrontasi itu, dan akhir-nya negara kita ini merasa sempit hendak hidup, apa-tah lagi hendak melawan confrontasi itu sendiri, itu-lah yang menjadi hujah kepada saya.

Kemudian, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perbezaan, kesanggupan Kerajaan dengan apa yang di-tuntut oleh pehak yang menuntut dan dengan apa yang di-shorkan oleh pehak orang tengah ini, saya dapati, kalau tidak salah saya, tidak-lah begitu jauh sangat beza-nya, kalau-lah di-dalam 20% atau pun 25% saya rasa masalah pekerja<sup>2</sup> pos ini ada-lah satu perkara yang besar, dan saya rasa kewangan kita tidak akan merusut, kalau sa-kira-nya Kerajaan dapat menimbangkan dalam perkara<sup>2</sup>

itu. Saya rasa, Menteri yang berkenaan dalam perkara ini pun dapat memikirkan bahawa kalau-lah jadi satu anchaman, atau pun satu angkara akibat daripada tuntutan ini, Menteri kita itu sendiri rasa tidak puas hati, atau pun dia berasa malu. Saya bimbang, pada hari yang pertama membahathkan perkara ini, saya pun dudok membacha surat lain—tidak begitu faham sangat apa yang di-katakan oleh sa-orang Ahli Yang Berhormat di-sabelah kiri saya ini, ia-itu Ahli daripada Tanjong, yang kata-nya boleh jadi dengan penolakan Kerajaan ini. akan timbul satu perkara yang besar di-dalam negara kita ini sa-mata<sup>2</sup> kerana menolak keputusan Mahkamah itu. Saya bimbang kalau<sup>2</sup> perkataan ini bukan sahaja sa-bagai mithal, tetapi ada satu<sup>2</sup> hakikat yang ada di-belakang, dan di-masa itu yang akan responsible-nya ia-lah Menteri yang berkenaan di-dalam perkara itu.

Saya bimbang, ada sa-tengah<sup>2</sup> pehak itu meminjam perkataan<sup>2</sup> sa-bagai mithal, tetapi yang sa-benar-nya ada di-belakang-nya itu hakikat yang sa-benar-nya—sa-bagai fact dia ada.

Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya rasa ikut jalan tengah, dan saya rasa Menteri yang ada dua orang ini pun faham, kerana mereka itu faham—zaman hendak masok sini pun, banyak ada zaman confrontasi—ta' payah-lah masok sangat. Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya minta, kalau boleh, jalan tengah, kalau-lah sa-kadar 20% apa kata pehak Kerajaan tundok sadikit dan pehak orang tengah pun kurang sadikit, ia-itu kalau-lah 20% Kerajaan timbangkan sa-mula, buat second offer, beri-lah, naikkan sadikit, ia-itu 10% tambah lagi daripada yang kurang itu. Dengan yang demikian pehak yang menuntut itu pun tidak boleh mengatakan Kerajaan membelakangkan, dan pehak Kerajaan pun membuat sa-suatu yang di-tuntut, kalau ta' penoh pun, memang-lah Kerajaan mana<sup>2</sup> pun, kalau saya sendiri pun, Tuan yang di-Pertua, jadi Kerajaan, saya ta' beri semua juga, tetapi kita tambahkan.

Kemudian, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dengan yang demikian Mahkamah Orang Tengah sendiri pun merasa

diri-nya tidak-lah di-perli oleh Kerajaan. Jadi, sa-kurang<sup>2</sup>-nya ada, dengan kesemua-nya itu, erti-nya tiap<sup>2</sup> pehak itu menyimpan dignity mereka itu. Kalau ini tidak dapat di-beri oleh Kerajaan, saya bimbang apa yang di-tamthilkan oleh Ahli yang menuntut ini, akan menjadi satu fact, dan di-masa itu Kerajaan akan bertanggung-jawab dalam hal ini.

**Dato' Abdullah bin Abdulrahman (Kuala Trengganu Selatan):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya rasa usul ini tidak-lah kena pada masa-nya lagi untuk di-luluskan. Kalau negeri kita berada di-dalam aman damai maka bermacham<sup>2</sup> perubahan dan kelulusan boleh di-buat oleh pehak Kerajaan. Tetapi sekarang kita tahu negeri kita ini berada di-dalam keadaan dharurat; kita sedang menghadapi anchaman besar daripada kuasa asing yang datang daripada luar negeri. Banyak wang yang di-mestikan. Kerajaan pada masa ini membelanjakan untuk mengadakan pertahanan kukuh dan untuk mengelakkan daripada negeri ini di-ta'alok oleh kuasa asing. Tidak-lah ada guna-nya kalau Kerajaan meluluskan sa-penohnya atau pun menaikkan gaji<sup>2</sup> kaki-tangan dan dengan perbuatan sedemikian tidak ada menchukupi wang yang sa-mesti-nya patut di-belanjakan kepada pertahanan dan akibat-nya negeri ini di-ta'alok oleh negeri asing. Pada waktu itu kalau negeri kita ini di-ta'alok oleh negeri lain, boleh jadi banyak gaji kaki-tangan<sup>2</sup> Kerajaan ini akan di-potong oleh kuasa baharu atau Kerajaan baharu itu. Maka dari itu sangat-lah mustahak, buat masa ini, kaki<sup>2</sup>-tangan Post atau Kesatuan<sup>2</sup> Pekerja Post menaruh sabar yang banyak demi untuk kepentingan bangsa dan nosa.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tidak ada Kerajaan yang suka merosakkan perhubungan-nya dengan pekerja<sup>2</sup>-nya. Tetapi Kerajaan mesti bertindak dengan berpatutan dan tegas di-dalam segala<sup>2</sup>-nya—the Goevnrment has got to be very very reasonable and sound in its approach, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Kita lihat ada kala-nya di-dalam sa-tengah<sup>2</sup> negeri kalau negeri itu berada dalam keadaan dharurat atau peperangan, Kerajaan terpaksa bertindak sa-chara

berkekerasan sampai ka-tingkatan kekerasan yang tegas tetapi di-dalam keadaan yang kita hadapi sekarang ini bukan-lah kekerasan lagi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Apa yang saya maksudkan kekerasan, sa-tengah<sup>2</sup> Kerajaan luar negeri di-dalam masa peperangan atau dharurat bertindak mengambil harta orang demi untuk kepentingan negeri dan bangsa, tetapi ini kadar hanya minta menaikkan gaji.

Kerajaan kadang<sup>2</sup> terpaksa menghadapi chachian dan barangkali menyebabkan kemarahan sadikit sa-banyak daripada ra'ayat<sup>2</sup>-nya kerana tindakan tegas dan tindakan berpatutan untuk kepentingan bangsa. Tetapi biar-lah menjadi harapan kita ia-itu orang<sup>2</sup> yang melemparkan chachian itu—orang<sup>2</sup> yang marah kepada Kerajaan pada hari ini—satu masa kelak akan sedar dan insaf ia-itu apa yang di-jalankan oleh Kerajaan sangat-lah berpatutan dan kena sa-kali dengan kehendak suasana dan masa.

Sakian-lah sahaja, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-kali lagi saya menyeru supaya pekerja<sup>2</sup> post menaruh sabar di-dalam menghadapi tuntutan gaji-nya itu.

**Enche' Tajudin bin Ali (Larut Utara):** Dato' Yang di-Pertua, saya berpendapat usul yang di-kemukakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu mengelirukan sangat, kerana kita nampak di-sini dan telah pun di-terangkan dengan jelas oleh Yang Berhormat Timbalan Perdana Menteri, ada-lah keputusan Orang Tengah itu telah diterima oleh Kerajaan—ini telah pun di-persetujui oleh wakil dari Dato Kramat, wakil dari Bachok dan juga wakil dari Pasir Mas Ulu tadi. Dato' Yang di-Pertua, perkara ini kita mesti-lah mendalami kerana dalam suasana negara kita yang bergelora ini tuntutan yang sa-umpama ini kita hendak-lah jangan kechil<sup>2</sup>kan. Menerusi jasa baik Yang Berhormat Menteri Buroh kita dari satu masa ka-satu masa, dapat akuan daripada pehak CUEPACS dan lain<sup>2</sup> union ada-lah dalam masa negara kita menghadapi konfrantasi ini, tuntutan yang tidak di-ingini atau pun ugutan hendak mogok hendak-lah di-ketepikan bagi sementara waktu.

Saya sangat kesal, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, perchakapan<sup>2</sup> yang berdeggar<sup>2</sup> terutama sa-kali daripada salah sa-orang daripada ketua CUEPACS ia-itu Enche' Jesudoss dari satu masa ka-satu masa menunjok kepada Kerajaan, "Saya memberi amaran kepada Kerajaan buat itu dan buat ini." Ini saya sangat kesalkan, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, kerana memikirkan negara kita sedang di-anchami oleh pehak musuh kita. Saya berpendapat, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, masa negara kita ini diperentahi oleh Kerajaan British hampir<sup>2</sup> 100 tahun, chakap mogok itu tidak pernah kita dengar, tetapi kaki-tangan Kerajaan pada masa ini, sa-masa Kerajaan Perikatan memerintah, sudah terlampau manja. Saya katakan kepada mereka itu, kalau saya ada kuasa: buang sa-orang, 500 orang saya akan pileh dalam masa satu hari.

Dato' Yang di-Pertua, saya mendantangkan shor di-sini, pada pendapat saya yang singkat, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, ada-lah berbagai union yang ada dalam tanah ayer kita ini menyatupadukan kekuatan mereka memaksa Kerajaan, bukan hendak lain, hendak gaji lebeh sahaja—kerja kurang, gaji lebeh. Jadi, ini kita hendak jaga-lah dan saya rasa sampai-lah masa-nya bagi pehak Kerajaan memikirkan patut-kah tidak kita memikirkan samula kedudukan Undang<sup>2</sup> Buroh dalam tanah ayer kita ini, kerana saya dapati pendirian sa-tengah daripada sa-tengah union dalam negara kita ini tidak lagi bertanggung-jawab dan tidak lagi mengikut saluran atoran undang<sup>2</sup> yang di-sahkan oleh Kerajaan. Undang<sup>2</sup> Buroh pada pendapatan saya, Dato', ia-lah pertama<sup>2</sup> sa-kali berkenaan dengan hal ehwal kakitangan satu<sup>2</sup> badan itu, kemudian Undang<sup>2</sup> Buroh, pakatan<sup>2</sup> pekerja<sup>2</sup> dalam negara ini dan negara<sup>2</sup> yang berjiran, bukan pula pakatan dengan Indonesia, negara<sup>2</sup> yang bertanggung-jawab dan lain<sup>2</sup> hal berkenaan dengan welfare mereka itu. Ini ugut Kerajaan. Ini-kah menjadi tanggung-jawab mereka? Saya bertanya, Dato' Yang di-Pertua. Memang-lah sudah jadi adat sa-tengah daripada sa-tengah union itu mendantangkan ugutan kepada pehak Kerajaan pada satu sa'at yang sangat penting—masa

ra'ayat jelata hendak berhari Raya Puasa, Raya Haji, Tahun Baru China, Christmas dan lain<sup>2</sup>. Ini-lah masa mereka hendak mendantangkan ugutan.

Saya teringat, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, di-Post Office, Batu Gajah, surat sudah muntah daripada peti surat, berlam-bak<sup>2</sup>. Satu setem hendak di-beli oleh sa-orang wanita—kalau orang laki<sup>2</sup> boleh-lah nanti berhari<sup>2</sup>, tidak apa—satu setem hendak di-beli mengambil masa 3-4 jam, satu bungkusan hendak di-hantar mengambil masa sa-hari atau dua. Apa-kah mereka itu buat? Mereka kata *work-to-rule*. Dia belek sana, dia belek sini, perkara yang tidak masok akal fikiran langsung; mereka pergi daripada satu meja ka-satu meja: "Hullo, how are you, how is your wife? Bloody Hell, . . ." di-situ pula bertanya fasal wife! Chukup sakit hati!

Jadi, saya rasa, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, saya kuat sangat-lah minta kepada pehak Kerajaan memerhatikan dengan teliti-nya supaya Undang<sup>2</sup> Buroh itu di-jalankan dengan baik dan terator. Kalau-lah mereka itu dapat bergabung, saya rasa masa-nya akan tiba bukan saperti ra'ayat jelata Jepun yang di-timpa oleh mala petaka atom bomb, tetapi kalau di-jatoh-nya di-sini satu bomb oleh CUEPACS hanchor lebor-lah kita sakalian.

Dato' Yang di-Pertua, saya suka hendak mendantangkan satu chontoh tauladan di-sini mengatakan mereka itu berikatan<sup>2</sup> di-antara satu sama lain. Chontoh-nya, Railwaymen's Union hari ini pun menjalankan kerja *work-to-rule*. Tidak putus<sup>2</sup>. Jadi pehak atasan ia-itu supervisory staff dengan pehak buroh adakan satu union. Jadi, pehak atasan mengharapkan bantuan daripada pehak bawah supaya masa tuntutan mereka itu—mereka itu tuntutan tidak ada lain—tuntutan union ini chuma satu sahaja ia-itu memaksa Kerajaan memberi gaji lebeh, mengurangkan kerja. Jadi, saya rasa tidak baik, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, kalau mereka itu adakan satu union sahaja.

Saya mendantangkan chontoh di-sini, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, moga<sup>2</sup> perkara ini dapat di-perbaiki pada masa akan datang ia-itu satu jawatan-kuasa hendak-lah di-lantek dan jawatan-kuasa

itu hendak-lah memerhatikan kedudukan mereka ini. Saya berpendapat kebanyakan daripada pejabat<sup>2</sup> ada-lah kakitangan-nya sangat lebeh dan mereka yang tidak berguna itu di-buang kerja—terus-menerus di-buang kerja. Saya sa-bagai orang berniaga memakai kakitangan sa-banyak 50 orang. Saya rasa kalau Kerajaan membuat kerja saya itu sa-bagai orang berniaga sa-kurang<sup>2</sup>-nya memakai 100 orang sa-perti yang ada sekarang. Jadi, pada pendapat saya, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, sa-tengah daripada kakitangan Kerajaan yang tidak bekerja dengan penoh dapat di-berhentikan dengan ada-nya jawatan-kuasa yang di-lantek kelak.

Dato' Yang di-Pertua, berlainan sangat-lah pendirian union<sup>2</sup> kita ini daripada union<sup>2</sup> yang ada di-negeri yang bebas saperti German atau Jepun. Saya berulang kali menyatakan dalam Dewan ini, di-negeri German dan Jepun, union ini di-adakan untok faedah kakitangan dan perkara yang atasan sa-kali ia-lah mereka itu menghormati undang<sup>2</sup> negara, terutama sa-kali apabila kedudukan negara, keselamatan negara di-anchami oleh pehak musuh, tetapi union<sup>2</sup> yang ada di-negeri kita ini, oleh sebab berkehendakkan wang lebeh banyak, masa kita genting dan masa Kerajaan susah, masa itu-lah menuntut wang lebeh banyak daripada Kerajaan. Saya berpendapat, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, tindakan sa-tengah daripada sa-tengah union ini lebeh dahshat lagi daripada kidnapper atau pehak yang memaksa wang daripada towkay di-bandar raya.

Dato' Yang di-Pertua, saya menda-tangkan satu shor lagi oleh sebab kebanyakan tuntutan<sup>2</sup> itu berpusing<sup>2</sup> kerana hendak wang lebeh, bukan hendak apa. Jadi masa-nya sudah tiba saya berpendapat Kerajaan minta sakalian pejabat<sup>2</sup> dan kakitangan-nya mengumpulkan wang sadikit sa-banyak dari masa ka-sama untok kegunaan hari Raya Puasa, Raya Haji, Tahun Baru China, Christmas dan lain<sup>2</sup>, kerana mengelakkan tuntutan union<sup>2</sup> ini pada satu masa genting bagi faedah kakitangan mereka itu—khas-nya hendak menggunakan wang itu kerana Hari Raya masing<sup>2</sup>, kalau tidak ada sebab

Hari Raya, saya rasa tidak berbangkit perkara itu, Dato' Yang di-Pertua.

Saya akan memberi sokongan yang penoh kalau jawatan-kuasa yang di-lantek oleh Kerajaan memerhatikan keseluruhan-nya supaya kedudukan tangga-gaji kakitangan Kerajaan diperhatikan sa-mula. Di-sini saya suka menyatakan ia-itu pada pendapat saya sunggoh pun tidak pula saya suka hendak menyentoh langkah<sup>2</sup> yang akan di-buat oleh jawatan-kuasa itu, pada pendapat saya jawatan Division III dan IV itu-lah patut kita memberi perhatian yang istimewa sadikit oleh sebab mereka sa-lama ini merasa kesempitan yang amat sangat. Sa-kian-lah sahaja. Terima kaseh.

**The Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications (Dato' V. T. Sambanthan):** Mr Speaker, Sir, let me preface whatever I am going to say by stating that, as the Minister in charge of postal services, it has been my effort to try and get whatever we could for the people within this Department. Even so, I feel the other Ministers do try to get what they can for their Departments. But there comes the time for every Minister, whatever portfolio he may have, to get to recognise facts for what they are and consider things in the larger national interest.

In this particular issue, we have had the Arbitration award and we have heard the statement by the Deputy Prime Minister with regard to the motion brought by the Honourable Member for Batu. During the course of the debate, the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat has brought out as a mootpoint this concept, that is, that the Government is morally wrong in not implementing *in toto* the findings of this Arbitration Tribunal. I would like to ask this House to consider another side of this moral coin. Is a Government morally right in accepting what it feels will create by implication, further burdens on the people? I think this is really the mootpoint. If the Government is morally weak, if it does not have the backbone to stand up and face facts, it will accept whatever is awarded, pass it on to the people by more taxation and get a good name for

itself at least where that particular Department is concerned and in terms of the dialectics of the Member for Dato Kramat. But then, we do not live, as the Member for Dato Kramat says, like Alice in Wonderland; we cannot imagine to have more cakes and eat them. If your budget is over-swelled, you have got to get the money by taxation. In this particular context, we have heard from the Deputy Prime Minister in regard to the larger amount involved—\$100 million and over—and how we do not feel happy to pass it on to the people by further taxation. Therefore, I would like to put it to this House that this Government is morally under an obligation to fulfil its duties to the people, the duties to the people being not to let a run away award run away with the economy of the country.

Today, a reference was made by the Member for Dato Kramat to an article in the paper by Ungku Aziz in justification of his award.

**Enche' Lim Kean Siew:** Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of information. I was not referring to an article in the newspaper, but I was referring to a press statement.

**Dato' V. T. Sambanthan:** All right—press statement. I have also had this press statement and have gone through it. Having read through this, I am surprised at the rather fantastic statement made by the learned Professor. With regard to the main contention of the Deputy Prime Minister that he had exceeded his awards, exceeded more than the claim of the Union, the learned Professor says he did not. In his press release he says—and with your permission, I shall read it, Sir:

“Finally there is the matter of operational allowance for clerks in the operational or traffic arm of the postal administration. On this issue the Union made no claim. It wanted a separate enhanced salary scales for postal clerks rather than a special allowance. On the other hand, on the 14th of May, 1964, just before the Union went on strike, apparently on duress, the Government offered a special allowance of \$20 a month to all postal clerks serving in the traffic arm of the postal administration. Since this operational allowance amounting to \$20 per month is based on an offer by Government and not a claim by the Union, it is incorrect to imply that the Tribunal has awarded any

amount in excess of a claim by the Union in this connection.”

This is fantastic logic. However, let me proceed. Then he goes on:

“The Tribunal would have been guided by the second and third ingredients in the terms of reference, namely, to examine the Government offer and to determine the allowances to be applied. Apparently, the Tribunal considered that the varying scales ranging from \$30 to \$130 was preferable to a flat rate of \$20.”

We all speak the same language and this is written in the English language in this particular context. Here, we heard earlier on that the Government offered \$20 allowance, that the Union itself did not make any claim and that they only wanted enhanced rates of allowances, but even in their dreams, I do not think that \$20 would have been bloated up to \$130. This is the logic of this particular Arbitration. Therefore, Sir, can this House then accept that award regardless of whatever the repercussions? Regardless of what it causes the country, we should accept it and implement it *in toto*, simply because the principle is there? Does this House feel that the Cabinet should not have that moral fibre to recognise facts for what they are and to tell the nation, “This is just impossible, we will put the country into more trouble”? It is in this light that I would like my Honourable friend from Batu to kindly consider these facts.

Sir, I do not wish to speak at length on this. Brevity, they say, is the soul of wit and it can also be the essence of truth and, therefore, I would like to ask the Honourable Member for Batu to ponder over these points. If he does ponder, he will recognise that morality is not just one-sided and that there is a larger morality of responsibility to the nation, responsibility to the people and responsibility to the Parliament; and that same responsibility I hand over to the Parliament to decide for itself what shall be done here. (*Applause*).

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon (Batu):** Mr Speaker, Sir, this House has heard a large number of speakers from both sides of the House speaking on this

resolution of mine, ranging from trade unionists and those who are not trade unionists. Mr Speaker, Sir, I presume the main case for the Government was made by the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister. Mr Speaker, Sir, it is significant that until the last moment there was no other Minister speaking on this motion. The penultimate speaker was the Honourable Minister for Works, Post and Telecommunication. But I am really surprised, and I do wish to bring to the attention of this House, that the Minister most concerned with this award, the Minister who was all along persuading the trade unions to be reasonable, to go to arbitration, and promised the trade unions that the Government would implement the award, namely, the Minister for Labour, has not spoken. No further comments are necessary.

**The Minister of Labour (Enche' V. Manickavasagam):** Mr Speaker, Sir, the Alliance Government has a collective responsibility, unlike the Socialist Front! (*Laughter*).

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** That I understand, Mr Speaker, Sir. (*Laughter*). I say no more comments are necessary. If the Press will publish what I say, I will be more than glad and let the public decide.

**Enche' Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman (Seberang Tengah):** If the Honourable Member had taken the trouble to read these Written Answers to Questions on page 18, he would have seen that the Honourable Minister of Labour has replied to his question, or rather his motion now.

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** I do not wish to say anything further. Let the backbenchers defend the Ministers—It does not worry me, Mr Speaker, Sir.

**Enche' V. Manickavasagam:** I think the Honourable Member has nothing else to say, Sir! (*Laughter*).

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** Mr Speaker, Sir, the burden of the Government's case was that the award was in excess of the claims made by the Postal workers and thereby the Tribunal had exceeded its terms of reference. This

argument, Mr Speaker, Sir, has been taken up by most of the speakers on the opposite side and on this side of the House, and like a parrot, Mr Speaker, Sir, they have repeated this thesis: "The award is in excess of the claims made by the Postal workers; therefore, we cannot accept the award". Of course, the Honourable Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications goes on a little further: he says that the Government must have the moral fibre to reject any award. Again, I leave to the country to decide whether the Government was right in having the moral courage to reject any award.

Mr Speaker, Sir, this House heard the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister speak on Monday, and I quote this transcript of his speech:

"The circumstances in this particular case are indeed peculiar, Sir, and I do not know in what spirit the award was made, but certainly it is very unusual, and it has never happened, that the Arbitration Tribunal made an award higher than what the Union itself has claimed. The circumstances are completely peculiar, and the Tribunal itself understands under what spirit it decides to give this award."

Mr Speaker, Sir, apart from this thesis, which is a legitimate thesis, I will grant, the Government and most of the other speakers on the Government side have resorted to insinuations and innuendoes which are, to say the least, most unbecoming of a Government. I grant you that you can say, "We cannot accept this award, because we think you have gone beyond your terms of reference"—but to make insinuations and innuendoes is completely unjustifiable!

Mr Speaker, Sir, the thesis that the award has been in excess of the claim has been put forward by my colleague, the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat. I shall try to refresh the minds of Honourable Members of this House on this particular issue, because the burden of the Government on this thesis is that the award is in excess of the claim.

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, there are three parts in the award. One is on special allowances. Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, the Arbitration Tribunal, is making

that award has, as has been pointed out by the learned professor, merely offered the Postal workers what the Government itself has offered to the Clerical Service according to Service Circular No. 7 of 1964 and that, I am glad to say, has not been refuted by any of the speakers on the Government side. The award is in three parts: one on special allowances, one on in-charge allowances and one on the award of the traffic branch. In the case of the special allowances, the Tribunal has but merely given to the Postal workers that which the Government itself has given to clerical workers in the whole of the Government Service. So, there is no need for me to say that the Tribunal has exceeded its award.

Now, let us come to the question of in-charge allowances which, according to the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister, the Tribunal has exceeded its terms of reference. Now, I need only say, Mr Speaker, Sir, that either the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister was wrongly briefed on this matter or he did not know what he was talking about, although he participated in the negotiations with CUEPACS. Now, what is the truth of the matter? I will talk about these in-charge allowances. As my colleague, the Member for Dato Kramat has pointed out, these in-charge allowances were given to seven categories of Postal clerks, and I read first the award made by the Tribunal and later the claim by the Postal workers:—

<i>Class of Postal worker</i>	<i>Award</i>	<i>Claim</i>
7 ... ..	\$30.00	\$ 50.00
6 ... ..	37.50	60.00
5 ... ..	45.00	70.00
4 ... ..	52.50	80.00
3 ... ..	60.00	90.00
2 ... ..	67.50	100.00
1 ... ..	75.00	110.00

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister has stated that even in the matter of in-charge allowances the Arbitration Tribunal has exceeded its terms of reference. Unless it is disputed that these figures given by the learned professor, the Chairman of the Arbitration Tribunal, are not correct—I noticed that the

Honourable Minister of Works, Post and Telecommunications was reading from this document and he did not challenge the veracity of this document—I can say that even a cursory examination of these figures will show that the award was not in excess of the claim.

Now let us come to the third part of the award regarding the traffic branch of the postal workers. Mr Speaker, Sir, the postal clerks, first of all, wanted an enhanced salary; and I need not tell the Government front-benchers that an enhanced salary is a very serious thing. But during the course of the negotiations, Mr Speaker, Sir, the Government on the 14th of May, 1964 made an offer of a flat rate of \$20 per month. Now, the Tribunal when it sat, in November I believe, already had this offer by the Government and, as has been stated by the learned professor, in adjudicating on this offer by the Government, naturally the Tribunal had to examine the Government offer and also determine the allowances to be applied. Now, the trade union boys are not duffers. I dare say that the trade union boys are as sharp as anyone in the Federation Establishment Office or as sharp as any Minister. Therefore, during the course of the arbitration, naturally the trade unions would have pressed for higher rates. If you make an offer, the union is not going to keep quiet; the union naturally will take advantage of any offer that is made by the Government and exploit the position, in as much as the Government will try to demolish whatever arguments that the unions may make for an enhanced salary or an enhanced in-charge allowance. Consequently, I dare say that during the course of the sitting of the Tribunal, the union must have pressed—although originally they did not make this claim, they must have pressed and exploited this offer made by the Government. Consequently, the Arbitration Tribunal must, of necessity, take cognizance of this offer made by the Government. It stands to reason. Then, Mr Speaker, Sir, the Arbitration Tribunal, instead of making an award of a flat rate of \$20 per month, which

was the offer made by the Government, went on to make an offer of \$30 to \$75 on a sliding scale. Consequently, Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not see where the union has gone wrong in exploiting the situation and where the Tribunal has gone wrong in making this award.

If I may reiterate what the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister said, he said: "The circumstances in this particular case are indeed peculiar, Sir, I do not know in what spirit the award was made, but certainly it is very unusual and it has never happened that an Arbitration Tribunal has made an award higher than what the union itself had claimed." Probably the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister, as I have said before, was wrongly briefed on this, because awards outside of terms of reference are not unusual. In the Singapore Second Arbitration Court, there have been many awards made outside of terms of reference and these awards have been accepted both by the Singapore Government and by the unions concerned. If I may say so, Mr Speaker, Sir, going to arbitration is a calculated risk. You cannot win all the time. Two parties cannot win; one must lose. I speak from experience, Mr Speaker, Sir, because about 10 years ago, I did sit in a few arbitration courts representing the Staff Side, and I do say that not in all cases that I have represented have the workers got what they wanted and, as far as I know, on the occasions that I represented the workers in those arbitration tribunals the workers accepted the adverse, the rejection of the awards with a smiling face and they did not kick up a row.

Mr Speaker, Sir, as I have said before, quite a number of speakers have made insinuations and innuendoes which, to say the least, was most unbecoming and very dangerous, because of the members of this Tribunal the one representing the Government side was none other than Dato' Osman Talib. Mr Speaker, Sir, Dato' Osman Talib, I believe, is held in high regard in Government circles. He was, if I am not mistaken, State Secretary of Perak, Governor of Malacca and now concurrently he is the Chairman of the

Central Electricity Board and is on a host of other public bodies. He is held in high regard in Government circles and it must be noted that this controversial award for the traffic branch was unanimous, as was the whole award. Consequently, to make insinuations and innuendoes, I ask the Government side to think. Are they aware of the repercussions? After this episode and if the press publishes all that transpires in this House, do you think any self-respecting person with integrity and honour will want to serve as Chairman of the Arbitration Tribunal? I think there will be very few people in this country who will be willing to take on this onerous and, if I may say so, very thankless job. I think it will also be very difficult to find people to serve on the panel of the Arbitration Tribunal either representing the Government side or the Staff side. I do hope that these things will be taken cognizance of by the Government and if in future occasions they have to justify their stand against the acceptance of any award they should not pass any more innuendoes and insinuations. But, Mr Speaker, Sir, worse still than the innuendoes and insinuations was the suggestion, I think, by the Honourable Member for Temerloh, that subversive elements are at work. We know that the Internal Security Act has been used for a variety of reasons and for a variety of occasions. But this is the first time I think it has been equated with an unfavourable award by the Arbitration Tribunal. I wonder if the Government benches are trying to postulate that anything that is not in accordance with Government wishes will be equated with subversive activities and therefore come within the purview of the Internal Security Act. This, Mr Speaker, Sir, is a very dangerous trend which I shall speak of in the motion standing in my name, probably tomorrow.

Mr Speaker, Sir, what if there was an award that maintained the *status quo*, that did not favour either the Government or the workers, or an award that rejected the claims of the workers entirely? As I have said, I

have sat on arbitration tribunals where we have rejected outright the claims of the workers. Now, if such an award had been made and in such a case if the workers had rejected that award, what then, Mr Speaker, Sir? I wonder what will be the attitude of Government and, in particular, all those in this House at the moment who have been most vociferous in wanting to throw out this motion of mine. If they are, as they say, representing the people, trying to improve the standard of living of the people, what will be their attitude if the workers had rejected an adverse award?

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, I shall go on very briefly to comment on the points raised by a few of the speakers.

**Mr Speaker:** I would like to point out to the Honourable Member that it is one o'clock.

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** Mr Speaker, Sir, I won't take long—another five minutes, Sir.

**Mr Speaker:** Five minutes—but it is already beyond the time.

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** Mr Speaker, Sir, I am as anxious as anybody to wind up this debate.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for Kota Star Selatan has stated that the income of most of the people in his constituency is \$30 a month. Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, the First Malayan Five-Year Plan has come and gone, the Second Five-Year Plan is on its last legs; we have been told time and again that Utopia is around the corner; that it is \$300 a month that the people, the *ra'ayat*, in this country will get. Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, if all the...

**Dr Mahathir bin Mohamed (Kota Star Selatan):** On a point of clarification. Even the best men cannot be made to work for everybody. There are still areas where people find it quite

impossible to earn \$300 a month; but there are definitely areas where people have earned more than \$300 a month simply because of our Five-Year Plan.

**Dr Tan Chee Khoon:** I will accept it. I won't quibble with the Honourable Member for Kota Star Selatan. (*Laughter*). As I said, Mr Speaker, Sir, if what he says is true and if I remember rightly, the Member for Pontian Selatan also made the thesis that the people in his constituency earn far less than the Government workers, then I ask in all sincerity: "Quo Vadis. Workers of Malaysia, where is that Utopia that is promised to you? What do you want to do with the Operations Room which shows some graphs and charts and all the good things in life that will be yours?"

Mr Speaker, Sir, I will only mention just one more thing. Much has been said about this question of repercussions. I only wish to reiterate that the workers themselves, through CUEPACS, have stated that if this award were implemented in full, there will be no repercussions in the entire Civil Service. So much for this mirage of figures, as has been stated by the Member for Bungsar, concerning this \$133 million red herring that has been thrown up by the Government side.

Finally, Mr Speaker, Sir, the Member for Kuala Trengganu Selatan posed the question that because of confrontation, because of the seriousness of the situation confronting this country, we must not do anything to upset the apple cart where Government expenses are concerned. Mr Speaker, Sir, as the Prime Minister of Singapore has pointed out, many people in this House have a vested interest in keeping confrontation alive.

Question put, and negatived.

**Mr Speaker:** The House is now adjourned till 9.30 a.m. tomorrow.

*Adjourned at 1.05 p.m. o'clock.*