

Volume II
No. 3



Monday
31st May, 1965

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

OFFICIAL REPORT

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

CONTENTS

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 657]

MOTION:

**The Yang di-Pertuan Agong's Speech—Address of Thanks
[Col. 670]**

ADJOURNMENT SPEECHES—

**Pelajaran Bahasa Melayu di-dalam Huruf Jawi [Col. 785]
Free Legal Aid [Col. 790]**

MALAYSIA

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

Official Report

Second Session of the Second Dewan Ra'ayat

Monday, 31st May, 1965

The House met at Ten o'clock

PRESENT:

- The Honourable Mr Speaker, DATO' CHIK MOHAMED YUSUF BIN SHEIKH ABDUL RAHMAN, S.P.M.P., J.P., Dato' Bendahara, Perak.
- „ the Prime Minister, Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Culture, Youth and Sports, Y.T.M. TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN PUTRA AL-HAJ, K.O.M. (Kuala Kedah).
- „ the Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Defence and Minister of National and Rural Development, TUN HAJI ABDUL RAZAK BIN DATO' HUSSAIN, S.M.N. (Pekan).
- „ the Minister of Home Affairs and Minister of Justice, DATO' DR ISMAIL BIN DATO' HAJI ABDUL RAHMAN, P.M.N. (Johor Timor).
- „ the Minister of Finance, ENCHE' TAN SIEW SIN, J.P. (Melaka Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, DATO' V. T. SAMBANTHAN, P.M.N. (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 of Information and Broadcasting, ENCHE' SENU BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Kubang Pasu Barat).
- „ the Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives, ENCHE' MOHD. GHAZALI BIN HAJI JAWI (Ulu Perak).
- „ the Minister for Sabah Affairs and Civil Defence, DATU DONALD ALOYSIUS STEPHENS, P.D.K. (Sabah).

The Honourable the Minister of Lands and Mines, ENCHE' ABDUL-RAHMAN BIN YA'AKUB (Sarawak).

„ the Assistant Minister of Commerce and Industry,
TUAN HAJI ABDUL KHALID BIN AWANG OSMAN
(Kota Star Utara).

„ the Assistant Minister of National and Rural Development,
ENCHE' SULAIMAN BIN BULON (Bagan Dato).

„ the Assistant Minister of Culture, Youth and Sports,
ENGKU 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).

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

„ TUAN HAJI ABDUL RASHID BIN HAJI JAIS (Sabah).

„ ENCHE' ABDUL RAUF BIN A. RAHMAN, K.M.N., P.J.K.
(Krian Laut).

„ ENCHE' ABDUL RAZAK BIN HAJI HUSSIN (Lipis).

„ ENCHE' ABDUL SAMAD BIN GUL AHMAD MIANJI
(Pasir Mas Hulu).

„ Y.A.M. TUNKU ABDULLAH IBNI AL-MARHUM TUANKU ABDUL
RAHMAN, P.P.T. (Rawang).

„ TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI MOHD. SALLEH, A.M.N.,
S.M.J., P.I.S. (Segamat Utara).

„ ENCHE' ABU BAKAR BIN HAMZAH (Bachok).

„ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN ABDULLAH (Kelantan Hilir).

„ ENCHE' AHMAD BIN ARSHAD, A.M.N. (Muar Utara).

„ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN SAAID, J.P. (Seberang Utara).

„ CHE' AJIBAH BINTI ABOL (Sarawak).

„ ENCHE' ALI BIN HAJI AHMAD (Pontian Selatan).

„ DR AWANG BIN HASSAN, S.M.J. (Muar Selatan).

„ ENCHE' AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Muar Dalam).

„ ENCHE' E. W. BARKER (Singapore).

„ ENCHE' CHAN CHONG WEN, A.M.N. (Kluang Selatan).

„ ENCHE' CHAN SEONG YOON (Setapak).

„ ENCHE' CHAN SIANG SUN (Bentong).

„ ENCHE' CHEN WING SUM (Damansara).

„ ENCHE' CHIA CHIN SHIN, A.B.S. (Sarawak).

„ ENCHE' FRANCIS CHIA NYUK TONG (Sabah).

„ ENCHE' CHIA THYE POH (Singapore).

„ ENCHE' CHIN FOON (Ulu Kinta).

„ ENCHE' C. V. DEVAN NAIR (Bungsar).

„ TUAN SYED ESA BIN ALWEE, J.M.N., S.M.J., P.I.S.
(Batu Pahat Dalam).

The Honourable DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI ABDUL MAJID
(Johor Bahru Timor).

- „ DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI HASHIM, P.M.N.
(Jitra-Padang Terap).
- „ ENCHE' S. FAZUL RAHMAN, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ DATU GANIE GILONG, P.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' GANING BIN JANGKAT (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' GEH CHONG KEAT, K.M.N. (Penang Utara).
- „ ENCHE' HAMZAH BIN ALANG, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Kapar).
- „ ENCHE' HANAFI BIN MOHD. YUNUS, A.M.N., J.P.
(Kulim Utara).
- „ ENCHE' HANAFIAH BIN HUSSAIN, A.M.N. (Jerai).
- „ ENCHE' HARUN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Baling).
- „ WAN HASSAN BIN WAN DAUD (Tumpat).
- „ ENCHE' STANLEY HO 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.
(Johor Tenggara).
- „ ENCHE' JEK YEUN THONG (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' KAM WOON WAH, J.P. (Sitiawan).
- „ ENCHE' KHOO PENG LOONG (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' KOW KEE SENG (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' LEE KUAN YEW (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SAN CHOON, K.M.N. (Segamat Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SECK FUN (Tanjong Malim).
- „ ENCHE' AMADEUS MATHEW LEONG, A.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).
- „ DR LIM CHONG EU (Tanjong).
- „ DATO' LIM KIM SAN, D.U.T., J.M.K., D.J.M.K. (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' LIM PEE HUNG, P.J.K. (Alor Star).
- „ ENCHE' T. MAHIMA SINGH, J.P. (Port Dickson).
- „ ENCHE' JOSEPH DAVID MANJAJI (Sabah).
- „ DATO' DR HAJI MEGAT KHAS, D.P.M.P., J.P., P.J.K.
(Kuala Kangsar).
- „ ENCHE' MOHD. ARIF SALLEH, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED ASRI BIN HAJI MUDA, P.M.K. (Pasir Puteh).
- „ ENCHE' MOHD. DAUD BIN ABDUL SAMAD (Besut).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED IDRIS BIN MATSIL, J.M.N., P.J.K., J.P.
(Jejebu-Jempol).

The Honourable ENCHE' MOHD. TAHIR BIN ABDUL MAJID, S.M.S., P.J.K.
(Kuala Langat).

- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED YUSOF BIN MAHMUD, A.M.N. (Temerloh).
- „ ENCHE' MOHD. ZAHIR BIN HAJI ISMAIL, 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).
- „ DATO' HAJI MUSTAPHA BIN HAJI ABDUL JABAR, D.P.M.S., A.M.N.,
J.P. (Sabak Bernam).
- „ ENCHE' MUSTAPHA BIN AHMAD (Tanah Merah).
- „ DATO' NIK AHMAD KAMIL, D.K., S.P.M.K., S.J.M.K., P.M.N.,
P.Y.G.P., Dato' Sri Setia Raja (Kota Bharu Hilir).
- „ ENCHE' NG FAH YAM (Batu Gajah).
- „ DR NG KAM POH, J.P. (Telok Anson).
- „ ENCHE' ONG KEE HUI (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' ONG PANG BOON (Singapore).
- „ TUAN HAJI OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Hilir Perak).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Perlis Utara).
- „ ABANG OTHMAN BIN HAJI MOASIL, P.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN WOK (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' QUEK KAI DONG, J.P. (Seremban Timor).
- „ ENCHE' S. RAJARATNAM (Singapore).
- „ TUAN HAJI RAHMAT BIN HAJI DAUD, A.M.N.
(Johor Bahru Barat).
- „ ENCHE' RAMLI BIN OMAR (Krian Darat).
- „ TUAN HAJI REDZA BIN HAJI MOHD. SAID, P.J.K., J.P.
(Rembau-Tampin).
- „ RAJA ROME BIN RAJA MA'AMOR, P.J.K., J.P. (Kuala Selangor).
- „ ENCHE' SEAH TENG NGIAB, P.I.S. (Muar Pantai).
- „ ENCHE' SIM BOON LIANG (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' SIOW LOONG HIN, P.J.K. (Seremban Barat).
- „ ENCHE' SNAWI BIN ISMAIL, P.J.K. (Seberang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' SNG CHIN JOO (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' SOH AH TECK (Batu Pahat).
- „ ENCHE' SULEIMAN BIN ALI (Dungun).
- „ PENGIRAN TAHIR PETRA (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' TAJUDIN BIN ALI, P.J.K. (Larut Utara).
- „ ENCHE' TAI KUAN YANG (Kulim-Bandar Bharu).
- „ ENCHE' TAMA WENG TINGGANG WAN (Sarawak).
- „ DR TAN CHEE KHOON (Batu).
- „ ENCHE' TAN CHENG BEE, J.P. (Bagan).
- „ ENCHE' TAN TOH HONG (Bukit Bintang).
- „ ENCHE' TAN TSAK YU (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' TIAH ENG BEE (Kluang Utara).
- „ ENCHE' TOH THEAM HOCK (Kampar).
- „ ENCHE' WEE TOON BOON (Singapore).

- The Honourable ENCHE' YEH PAO TZE (Sabah).
 „ ENCHE' YEOH TAT BENG (Bruas).
 „ ENCHE' STEPHEN YONG KUET TZE (Sarawak).
 „ ENCHE' YONG NYUK LIN (Singapore).
 „ TUAN HAJI ZAKARIA BIN HAJI MOHD. TAIB, P.J.K. (Langat).

ABSENT:

- The Honourable the Minister for Sarawak Affairs, DATO' TEMENGGONG JUGAH ANAK BARIENG, P.M.N., P.D.K. (Sarawak).
 „ the Minister of Labour, ENCHE' V. MANICKAVASAGAM, J.M.N., P.J.K. (Klang).
 „ WAN ABDUL KADIR BIN ISMAIL, P.P.T. (Kuala Trengganu Utara).
 „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAJI TALIB, P.J.K. (Kuantan).
 „ DATO' ABDULLAH BIN ABDULRAHMAN, Dato' Bijaya di-Raja (Kuala Trengganu Selatan).
 „ O.K.K. DATU ALIUDDIN BIN DATU HARUN, P.D.K. (Sabah).
 „ ENCHE' JONATHAN BANGAU ANAK RENANG, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
 „ PENGARAH BANYANG ANAK JANTING, P.B.S. (Sarawak).
 „ ENCHE' EDWIN ANAK TANGKUN (Sarawak).
 „ DR GOH KENG SWEE (Singapore).
 „ PENGHULU JINGGUT ANAK ATTAN, Q.M.C., A.B.S. (Sarawak).
 „ ENCHE' KADAM ANAK KIAI (Sarawak).
 „ DATU KHOO SIAK CHIEW, P.D.K. (Sabah).
 „ ENCHE' EDMUND LANGGU ANAK SAGA (Sarawak).
 „ DATO' LING BENG SIEW, P.N.B.S. (Sarawak).
 „ ENCHE' LIM HUAN BOON (Singapore).
 „ ENCHE' LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).
 „ ENCHE' PETER LO SU YIN (Sabah).
 „ DR MAHATHIR BIN MOHAMAD (Kota Star Selatan).
 „ ORANG TUA MOHAMMAD DARA BIN LANGPAD (Sabah).
 „ ENCHE' SANDOM ANAK NYUAK (Sarawak).
 „ ENCHE' D. R. SEENIVASAGAM (Ipoh).
 „ ENCHE' S. P. SEENIVASAGAM (Menglembu).
 „ ENCHE' TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Melaka).
 „ DR TOH CHIN CHYE (Singapore).
 „ PENGHULU FRANCIS UMPAU ANAK EMPAM (Sarawak).

PRAYERS

(Mr Speaker in the Chair)

ORAL ANSWERS TO
QUESTIONS

MENUBOHKAN EMPLOYMENT
BUREAU DI-SARAWAK
(ESTABLISHMENT OF EMPLOY-
MENT BUREAU IN SARAWAK)

1. Abang Othman bin Haji Moasili (Sarawak) bertanya kepada Menteri

Buruh ada-kah di-fikir perlu untuk menubuhkan Jabatan Employment Bureau di-Sarawak supaya soal penganggoran itu dapat di-atasi.

The Minister of Lands and Mines (Enche' Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-Sarawak didalam Jabatan Buruh ada satu section yang di-gelarkan "Employment Exchange Service."

MENGADAKAN "SYSTEM" MEMBAHAGI KONTREK² BAGI PEMBORONG² BUMIPUTERA SARAWAK

2. Abang Othman bin Haji Moasili bertanya kepada Menteri Kerja Raya, Pos dan Talikom sama ada Kementerian-nya akan menimbangkan memberi peluang kepada pemborong² bumiputra dengan mengadakan "system" membahagi tender itu dengan menghadkan sakan banyak untuk orang² bukan bumiputra dan sakan banyak untuk bumiputra. Mithalannya tender yang di-bawah \$50,000 itu hendak-lah di-berikan kepada pemborong² bumiputra supaya dapat mereka bernafas.

**Menteri Kerja Raya, Pos dan Tali-
kom (Dato' V. T. Sambanthan):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya akan menyiasat atas perkara ini.

KURSUS LATEHAN DALAM PERGURUAN DAN LATEHAN DI-MAKTAB PERGURUAN DI- KUALA LUMPUR UNTUK BUMIPUTERA SARAWAK

3. Abang Othman bin Haji Moasili bertanya kepada Menteri Pelajaran sama ada kursus latehan untuk anak² bumiputera dalam jurusan perguruan akan di-perbanyakkan dan kalau dapat di-hantarkan ka-Maktab Perguruan di-Ibu Negara.

**Menteri Pelajaran (Enche' Mohamed
Khir Johari):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya akan memberikan segala pertimbangan untuk memberi peluang berlateh menjadi guru kepada pemuda² bumiputra. Di-bawah Ranchangan Pembangunan bagi negeri Sarawak sa-buah Maktab Latehan Guru akan di-dirikan dan akan mula mengambil pelateh² pada bulan Januari, 1966. Maktab ini berserta dengan Maktab di-Batu Lindang dan juga kemudahan² berlateh menjadi Guru² Ilmu khas yang ada di-Kuala Lumpur ini akan memberi chukup tempat bagi chalun² yang berkelayakan termasuk-lah pemuda² bumiputra.

CENTRAL TRADE UNION REGISTRY

4. Enche' C. V. Devan Nair (Bungsar) asks the Minister of Labour whether

the Central Trade Union Registry is a private agency or a Government Department established under the Trade Unions Ordinance, No. 23 of 1959.

Enche' Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Trade Union Registry is a Government Department within the Ministry of Labour.

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: Is the Minister aware that at a press conference given about some two months ago the Honourable the Minister of Labour stated, in reply to a question, that a matter between the Registrar and a trade union was a private matter; and would the Minister care to explain what these private dealings were between the Registrar and a particular trade union?

Enche' Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub: I am fully aware of that. In fact, I have got a cutting of that press report here. The only explanation I can give—and that was the assurance given to me by the substantive Minister of Labour—is that by a slip of the tongue he had used the word "private". In fact, what he intended to convey was that the Registrar has specific statutory functions to perform under the Trade Union Ordinance. So he intended to tell the reporters that he could not at that stage interfere with the decision of the Registrar until an appeal had been lodged and sent to him. The word "private" does not mean that it is in his private capacity and not as the Registrar of Trade Unions.

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: I am grateful for the explanation, but can we have the assurance that it will be conveyed to the Registrar that he is not a private agency but a public servant?

Enche' Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub: The Registrar is fully aware of that, but I will give the Honourable Member the assurance.

INDUSTRIAL HEALTH HYGIENE UNIT—ESTABLISHMENT

5. Enche' C. V. Devan Nair asks the Minister of Labour if he has initiated

action to set up an Industrial Health Hygiene Unit.

Enche' Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub: The answer is Yes, Sir.

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: Would the Minister care to state exactly what action has been taken, and how soon we may expect this Industrial Health Hygiene Unit to be set up?

Enche' Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub: It will be set up very soon, Sir. The Establishment Office has already given its opinion and we are now consulting the Treasury and it is a question of financial arrangements involved. We are fully aware of the need to have such a Hygiene Unit in this country, and the first Unit will be in the form of a small pilot project.

“GO-SLOW” AND “WORK-TO-RULE”

6. Enche' C. V. Devan Nair asks the Minister of Labour to confirm or deny whether go-slow and work-to-rule are internationally accepted weapons in the Trade Unions Armoury.

Enche' Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub: Mr Speaker, Sir, there is no consensus of opinion in this respect.

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: Mr Speaker, Sir, would not the Minister agree that, in fact, in so far as the free and democratic countries are concerned, there is a consensus and that in countries like India, Ceylon, the United Kingdom and various Western European countries, there is this consensus?

Enche' Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub: Mr Speaker, Sir, it is not so. Here, I would like to quote to the Honourable Member an extract from the Trade Union Handbook by the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, Educational Series No. 6, page 134, and it says among other things:

“Slow down strikes”—the go-slow and other things are included in these—“ are resorted to at times although they are ethically questionable. Workers remain on their jobs and demand the regular pay, yet they work so slowly that the employer soon fears the lessening of production.”

Sir, I was talking to a few trade union leaders in this respect, but they would not like to express their views categorically and some members said that as far as they were concerned they would like to see the workers earn their earnings morally and they did not feel that it was quite justifiable to ask the employer to pay the full fees when the employee does not do the full job according to the terms and conditions of service.

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: Surely, the question, Mr Speaker, Sir, is whether the weapon is a legitimate weapon though a weapon can be used or abused. The I.C.F.T.U. statement read out by the Honourable Minister just now was a judgment on the abuse of that weapon. My question is this: whether there is, in fact, not a consensus among free democratic trade union movements in free democratic countries that these are legitimate weapons?

Enche' Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub: Mr Speaker, Sir, I view this question from this angle—what flaws from the so-called legitimate weapon; and we view it in this way that if an employee does not perform his duties according to the terms and conditions of service, then an employer is entitled under one of the terms of the contract of service to resort to that term. For example, if he does not do full time work, then the employer is entitled to take disciplinary action.

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: But could the Minister state whether there is any international authority on the basis of which the Government can claim that “go-slows” and so forth are not acceptable weapons in the Trade Union Armoury in free democratic countries? That is all that I ask, Sir.

Enche' Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub: Mr Speaker, Sir, I have not been able to find any consensus of opinion which backs the other opinion which says that it is an internationally accepted weapon in the Trade Union Armoury. I have been trying to rack my brain in the past few days to study the things, so

that I could supply the right answer, and the one that I could get is this Trade Union Handbook. I have had also discussions with a few Trade Union leaders. There appears to be no consensus of opinion in this respect. It is really a test of strength.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon (Batu): Mr Speaker, Sir, will the Honourable Acting Minister of Labour not agree that it is generally agreed, although there may not be a consensus of opinion, that “go-slow” and “work-to-rule” are legitimate weapons in the armoury of trade unions?

Enche’ Abdul-Rahman bin Ya’kub: It is not so, Mr Speaker, Sir.

Dr Lim Chong Eu (Tanjong): Mr Speaker, Sir, will the Honourable Acting Minister of Labour then accept the fact that this principal of “go-slow” and “work-to-rule” is practised by other nations and, therefore, accepted among several other nations?

Enche’ Abdul-Rahman bin Ya’kub: There may be a few countries where workers do resort to that—in fact, we know that. But to say that it is an internationally accepted practice as is stated in the question is another matter entirely.

PELUANG BAGI PEMBORONG² BUMIPUTERA UNTOK MENG- USAHAKAN KERJA PEMBORONG DI-KAWASAN PEMBANGUNAN LUAR BANDAR

7. Che’ Ajibah binti Abol (Sarawak) bertanya kepada Menteri Pembangunan Negara dan Luar Bandar adakah peluang² akan di-beri juga kepada pemborong² bumiputera bagi mengusahakan kerja pemborongan di-kawasan Pembangunan Luar Bandar.

The Assistant Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives (Enche’ Sulaiman bin Bulon): Dato’ Yang di-Pertua, peluang² akan di-beri juga kepada pemborong² bumiputera bagi mengusahakan kerja² pemborongan di-kawasan² pembangunan sa-bagaimana yang di-jalankan di-Negeri² Tanah Melayu ini.

OVERSEAS SERVICE IN MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—RECRUITMENT

8. Dr Tan Chee Khoon asks the Prime Minister whether he is aware that the recent advertisement for the recruitment of Malaysians only for overseas service in the Ministry of External Affairs has caused a great deal of dissatisfaction and is contrary to the spirit of the Constitution of Malaysia and, if so, whether he will take steps to change the Service Regulations so that Malaysians from Singapore, Sabah and Sarawak can be eligible for entry into this service.

The Prime Minister: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am quite aware of the recent controversy over the advertisement which appeared in the press asking for recruitment of Branch “A” officers in the External Affairs Service. But I think the Honourable Member is wrong in suggesting that the advertisement which appeared was to recruit Malaysians because, according to my knowledge, it says “Federal Citizens” and the term “Federal Citizens” includes those in Sabah, Sarawak and Singapore. However, in respect of Sabah, Sarawak and Singapore, I think, it is decided on the merits of each application.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, is the Honourable Prime Minister aware that there was a query from a citizen of Singapore who, presumably now, is a Malaysian citizen and who has the requisite qualifications, asking whether he could be considered for selection for entry into the External Affairs Service and that the answer given in print by the External Affairs Ministry was a categorical “No”?

The Prime Minister: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am not aware of that. I am only aware of the rule or the policy which is obtaining now in respect of recruitment of officers from Sabah, Sarawak and Singapore. For this purpose, I would like to refer the Honourable Member to paragraph 4 of Chapter “A” of the General Orders, which requires a candidate on the first appointment to the Public Service to

be a Federal Citizen or, if he is a minor, on attaining the age of majority, and so on. In so far as recruitment to the Federal Public Service is concerned, the Malayanisation Committee of Cabinet decided on June 4, 1964, that for the time being the recruitment of Singapore citizens for permanent appointments to the Federal Public Service should be considered on the merits of each case. This applies to others from Sabah and Sarawak.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, in view of the dissatisfaction that has appeared, will the Honourable Prime Minister give an assurance to this House that whatever hindrances that may now still prevail will be removed as expeditiously as possible, so that Malaysians from Sabah and Sarawak and Singapore will have a chance to enter the External Affairs Service?

The Prime Minister: Sir, I am not able to give any assurance now, because we have not yet quite finalised the arrangements in regard to the recruitment of officers from the other States yet. In the same way, they have not quite agreed to recruit anybody from the States of Malaya. Therefore, this is a matter that requires study, and it is difficult for me to give an assurance here.

EMPLOYMENT OF PRIVATE MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS ON PART-TIME BASIS TO RELIEVE SHORTAGE OF DOCTORS IN GOVERNMENT SERVICE

9. Dr Tan Chee Khoon asks the Minister of Health to state whether he would consider obtaining part-time services of private practitioners to relieve the overall shortage of doctors in government hospital, if so, how does he propose to harness their services?

The Minister of Health (Enche' Bahaman bin Samsudin): The Ministry of Health is considering employing private medical practitioners on a part-time basis in out-patient departments in hospitals in the larger towns. The

proposal is to employ them for two hours a day, every day of the week, except Sundays and holidays, at an all-inclusive remuneration of about \$400 per mensem. Other details are still under consideration. The assistance and the co-operation of the Malayan Medical Association would be required in this matter. When details of this scheme have been worked out, Government approval for the scheme would be sought. It is hoped that many private practitioners would volunteer for this service.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, is the Minister of Health aware that possibly about six years ago, there was such a scheme in operation? Then, for reasons best known to itself, the Government suddenly stopped this practice. May I know, Mr Speaker, Sir, why was it that the Government stopped that practice? It was in operation about six years ago.

Enche' Bahaman bin Samsudin: I am aware of that, Sir, but I do not know for what reasons. *(Laughter)*.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, I regret to say that the Honourable Minister does not know what is going on in his Ministry. *(Laughter)*. Is the Honourable Minister of Health aware that since then the Malayan Medical Association has been offering its services almost year in and year out to the Government to relieve the shortage of doctors in the urban and rural areas? If so, why should the Government still be "considering" this scheme instead of having implemented it long ago.

Enche' Bahaman bin Samsudin: The matter is under consideration, as I said just now. *(Laughter)*.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, may I know how much longer will it be under consideration? Will there be more cases of coronary infarct as the one which resulted in death in the Malacca Hospital and which caused an inquiry which showed that there was an acknowledged dereliction of duty? If these private practitioners were engaged, will the Honourable Minister not agree that such cases may well be obviated?

Enche' Bahaman bin Samsudin: I will settle it as early as possible. *(Laughter).*

USE OF INDEX NUMBERS INSTEAD OF NAMES IN EXAMINATIONS

10. Dr Tan Chee Khoon asks the Minister of Education what measures his Ministry has taken to preserve the anonymity of students sitting for the L.C.E., the Senior Cambridge/F.M.C., H.S.C. examinations; whether he is aware that in some examinations the students have to write down their names in the examination papers and whether he will direct that this bad practice should be stopped forthwith.

Enche' Mohd. Khir Johari: Sir, the Ministry of Education, Malaysia, is aware of the increasing pressure from the public for the abolition of names to be written to the answer scripts for the various levels of examination sponsored by it. As far as the internal examinations are concerned, namely the Lower Certificate of Education, the Sixth Form Entrance, the Combined Scholarship and the Graduate Teachers Examinations, etc., the Ministry has already taken action from the beginning that only index numbers are used. This is possible primarily because they are local examinations—set, marked and processed in the country itself, and they are not handicapped by distance.

As regards the Cambridge School Certificate, Malaysia Certificate of Education and the Higher School Certificate examinations, the extension of such procedure has not yet been successful as the Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate has, for various reasons of their own, found such introduction administratively difficult. This is chiefly because prompt checking of some 250,000 answer scripts from many countries, of which our country is only one, could not be carried out if there should be a mistake in entering the index numbers in the work sheets by examination officials or on answer scripts by the examinees themselves. To avoid delays, and this has a direct effect on the

prompt issue of the examination results, the writing of both the index number and the name of the candidate is, through force of circumstances, necessary.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, if I heard the Honourable Minister correctly, he said that in all examinations conducted locally index numbers are used and no names are used. Do I hear it correctly, Sir? If that is so, my information is that, for example, in the Lower Certificate of Examination, a candidate is required to write down his name. That is at variance with the statement made by the Honourable Minister of Education. Can he give us clarification on this point?

Enche' Mohd. Khir Johari: Sir, in my reply, I included the Lower Certificate of Examination.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Surely the Lower Certificate of Examination is conducted locally; it has nothing to do with Cambridge. Consequently, only index numbers must be used and candidates need not be required to write their names on the examination scripts.

Enche' Mohd. Khir Johari: In the case of the Lower Certificate of Examination only the index number is required.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Regarding the Senior Cambridge examinations, etc., Mr Speaker, Sir, is the Honourable Minister aware that, at least for the year 1936 when I sat for the Senior Cambridge examination, I need not have to write my name on it? It was just an index number. Is the Honourable Minister also aware that whatever difficulties posed by the Cambridge University, these are not insurmountable? For example, you can always chop on the examination scripts of those candidates from Malaysia—"Malaysia, Index Number 1, 2, 3 . . .". It is not too difficult. Will the Minister of Education give an assurance to this House that he will pursue this matter and to see to it that whatever difficulties there may be will be removed, so that only the index number is required and no more?

Enche' Mohd. Khir Johari: I shall convey the Honourable Member's views to the Examination Syndicate.

SARAWAK TRUNK ROADS— INCREASED PACE OF CONSTRUCTION

11. Enche' Chia Chin Shin (Sarawak) asks the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications whether it is possible to increase the pace of construction of the Sarawak Trunk Roads in order that the date of completion may be kept within the target date in the Development Plan.

Dato' V. T. Sambanthan: Mr Speaker, Sir, every effort will be made to increase the pace of construction of these roads. This is partly conditioned by the arrival of mechanical equipment in good time.

PROMOTION AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF LOCAL INDUSTRIES IN SARAWAK

12. Enche' Chia Chin Shin asks the Minister of Commerce and Industry whether it is planned to promote and encourage Local Industries in Sarawak to meet the growing demand for jobs by the people.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Dr Lim Swee Aun): Mr Speaker, Sir, the answer is "Yes".

ISSUE OF TRAVEL DOCUMENTS TO PERSONS WITHIN NATIONAL SERVICE AGE GROUP

13. Enche' Chia Chin Shin asks the Minister of Home Affairs whether he will reconsider the advisability of allowing those who are within the National Service Registration Age Group to obtain travel documents and thereby having them available and ready for use at any moment so that they need only to apply for Exit Permits before travelling.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Dato' Dr Ismail): Mr Speaker, Sir, I regret I cannot accede to the request by the Honourable Member for Sarawak. I consider that the present arrangement prohibiting the issue of travel documents to those within National Service

Age Group unless they have first obtained the necessary Exit Permits, is the best means of preventing them from dodging the call-up.

MOTION

THE YANG DI-PERTUAN AGONG'S SPEECH

Address of Thanks

Order read for resumption of Debate on Question—

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

"Your Majesty,

We, the Speaker and Members of the Dewan Ra'ayat of Malaysia in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer Your Majesty our humble thanks for the Gracious Speech with which the Second Session of the Second Parliament has been opened",

to which the following amendment moved by Enche' Lee Kuan Yew was to add at the end thereof:

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

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Mr Speaker, Sir, before I continue with my speech, may I seek your guidance? I understand, Sir, that we are debating both the amendment to the motion as well as the original motion at the same time, or, are we debating the amendment at the present time, Sir?

Mr Speaker: We are debating both at the same time.

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Sir, in view of this fact, I crave your indulgence to permit me to take a little time to dwell on particularly the aspect of the original motion as it was introduced,

because, as all of us understand, the manner whereby the motion was introduced was highly charged with extreme emotionalism, and although I would take this occasion to rebut it, I would wish to do so, deliberately and solely, with every intention to provide constructive criticism and not to further inflame the situation.

Sir, I hope that the Honourable Members who were present just before recess would have taken the opportunity during recess to have studied the text of the two very long speeches that were made by the original Mover of the motion and also by the Mover of the amendment; and I would like to take this opportunity also to refer to the fact that although the Honourable Prime Minister did give me an answer to a written question on the subject of the *Hansard*, it is a pity that although we have had a three-day recess, we have not had real, actual *Hansard* record of the proceedings in this House, which were extremely interesting and important, as what was reported in the Press was a bit, I think, off from what actually happened and transpired in the House. Sir, right from the very beginning, I would like to say that we ourselves have studied this matter and we feel, even more strongly than before, that we must support the amendment moved by the Prime Minister of Singapore, and we must also reply to the manner whereby the original motion was presented. We feel that it is a matter of great regret that the Honourable Mover of the original motion should choose this particular occasion to introduce a subject which, in the last analysis, must be considered to be virtually challenging Members of the Opposition as being extreme racialists, anti-Malay and communists.

Sir, I realise that the Mover of the original motion confined his criticisms particularly to the P.A.P. and to the Socialist Front. However, in the course of the debate, it was quite clear that those Opposition Parties, who have found themselves in accord with the P.A.P., had also been included in the attempt to tar and smear Opposition Parties who have now come together

to sponsor a convention. We have been wondering why the Alliance Party should have chosen this manner of extreme violence in moving a motion of thanks to His Majesty's Gracious Speech, and we have also been wondering whether this attack was a deliberately calculated one because certain Opposition Parties have found it possible to come together—at least on a common ground in accepting the concept of a "Malaysian Malaysia"—and will be sponsoring, in the next few days, a convention in Singapore called "The Malaysian Solidarity Convention". Is the Alliance, right from the very beginning, showing symptoms of fear that such a rapport among Opposition Parties already presents them with a threat of the future, and that even before Opposition Parties have gathered to form a Consolidated Opposition, the Alliance are not wasting much time, and have begun to attack the Opposition Parties. And by using the old tactic of "divide and rule" they have separated the issue of internal threats to the country to those which are confined to the P.A.P. and those confined to the Socialist Front. Sir, there is quite a clear-cut evidence that in the recent utterances by responsible leaders of the Alliance such is the view. Even before the announcement of the "coming together" of certain Opposition Parties to sponsor a Convention whereby the people of this country can get together to discuss amicably the dangers and threats that are facing us today, the responsible leaders of the Alliance Government have already started using words like "Grand Opposition" and "United Opposition Front".

However, Sir, amidst all these battering attacks, we can find only one or two hopeful criticisms and it is on this rather hopeful, more promising and constructive type of criticisms that I would like to touch upon.

The Honourable Prime Minister first introduced this idea of a "Grand Opposition" to the public of this country when he made a speech at Tapah on April 24th. In the course of his speech, he said he would welcome

the formation of a Loyal Opposition, "if indeed the Opposition were loyal". It is unfortunate, Sir, that this stipulation "if indeed the Opposition were loyal" has been made quite a play of by the far more enthusiastic and less restrained members of his Party to immediately insinuate that the for-gathering of Opposition Parties is already disloyal, is already of an undesirable character.

Sir, I think another hopeful pointer to the future was the fact that during the UMNO General Assembly, which was held recently amidst great hatred towards the P.A.P., the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs very clearly reiterated the need for our country to sustain the principles of democracy and he withstood the pressure of the much more unrestrained members of his Party to detain the Honourable Prime Minister of Singapore, who is also the Secretary-General of the P.A.P.

Sir, what other reasons can we think of for the manner whereby the Alliance chose to move this motion? Is the Alliance beginning to create a new bogey because it is now bankrupt of ideas on how further to convince the people of this country to their side—creating a new bogey of new dangers, new threats, within the country, in order to divert the people's attention from all the inept failures which the Alliance have demonstrated in the last few months and in the course of last year—or, is this, in fact, an expression of the innate feeling that still simmer within the ranks of the Alliance, that in fact this feeling of communalism is still not yet over?

Sir, before the recess, I said that it is a rather saddening and chastening thought for those of us, who have participated and co-operated together to establish Merdeka, first, for the Federation of Malaya and then later for Malaysia without bloodshed, should realise that the controversy which prevails with such vehemence ten years ago is still today carried as an undertone and undercurrent with the same degree of potential violence, that racialism and ultra-chauvinism is still

a dominant feature amongst the so-called united partners of the Alliance Party.

Sir, is this attack on the Grand Opposition part of a pattern of the Alliance manner and method of preserving themselves in a position of power?

Sir, it is along these lines that I wish to take today's arguments, and I do so, Sir, realising fully well that these are delicate issues which can be extremely sensitive and, probably to those who are already allergic, will create an enormous reaction. However, Sir, I feel that since the occasion has presented itself, we should make use of it and, with good faith and good intentions, attempt to analyse it and seek some solution. Sir, in our opinion, probably it is a combination of all these four potential reasons whereby the Alliance Party decided that the Honourable Member from Kota Star Selatan, who was chosen to be given the privilege of moving the motion to thank His Majesty for his Gracious Speech, should also be permitted by the party whip to come forth with such delicate issues. Sir, all this was made far worse when statements were made to further insinuations. For example, if I can only read from what appeared in the local press, and I hope I am quoting correctly, the Honourable mover of the original motion said that the P.A.P. propaganda makes Goebbels seem like an amateur. Sir let us be a little bit more humorous over this situation and accept it for a fact that the UMNO and the Alliance, who have in the last few months been trying to create an image in the public that in every direction and in every field they are far better than the P.A.P., are also perhaps being too modest when they say that the P.A.P. makes Goebbels seem like an amateur, because their own brand of propaganda to some extent even exceeds the capabilities and abilities of the P.A.P. So I really do not know how we are going to escalate such propaganda in the future. To our mind, it is important for all of us quickly to come to some agreement to restrain ourselves and eschew

this particular type of propaganda because it will do us no good and probably bring us great harm.

Sir, today when we open our daily newspaper we obviously come to the conclusion that certain members of this House have not made use of this wonderful recess given to us to again think over what has been said. At least, some have already started to double-talk and it is a matter of great concern to all of us to realise that a Minister from the Alliance Government should now choose to come forward to bring in the question of personality cult. We have had this concept of Malaysian Malaysia being put forward and it is now transmuted into a Lee Kuan Yew Malaysia with all its insinuations and all its implications and those of you who already had a chance to read this morning's papers can form your own opinions over this. I only make mention of this, first of all, to indicate that already what has been transpired in this House, in spite of the anxiety which it created amongst all of us, has extended outside this House even as our debate was proceeding. Sir, if we went to such a situation we could very easily postulate the difference of opinions that lie between those of us in the Opposition here from those who spread tales about us to support the Alliance concept. It is easier for us, perhaps, to accept that we are now trying to debate as to whether a Lee Kuan Yew Malaysia is better than a Tunku Abdul Rahman Malaysia, but, Sir, I think it is highly objectionable politically to bring in this personality cult; although I must say that it was the Alliance who first realised the enormous potentiality of its leader and in all the Alliance campaigns and election victories they had always projected the image of the Tunku and everybody else had gone behind the image of this rather unique and generous man, and hiding behind that image had kept hidden this innate feeling of racialism which has been exposed today. The P.A.P. in Singapore, realising that this technique of election propaganda was a correct one, during the last elections in Singapore also projected the concept of Mr Lee

Kuan Yew, the leader of the P.A.P. as the leader of an organisation and it worked. Sir, I hope Honourable Members of this House and those of our people who are keenly interested in the problems of political advancement in our country will quickly deny this type of propaganda and try to begin to look further than the image of the leaders, go further than the question of the symbol of the parties, go further than even the names of the parties and begin to examine what the parties actually stand for. That I think is a matter of political advancement of our country. It is in this context, Sir, that we in the Opposition feel that if the people of this country are not diverted by this undue and highly emotionally charged racial type of propaganda to express hate instead of calm, deliberate assessment of the situation, then perhaps the people of the country, examining what the Alliance policy actually is and what the Alliance has actually achieved and in what direction it has failed to carry out its policies, and looking at the Opposition parties, examining their platforms and their policies, will begin to slowly accept a change in the manner whereby our nation can continue its progress socially and economically by constitutional and peaceful political means.

Sir, it is natural that if the Government accepts the concept of a loyal Opposition, accepts the concept of parliamentary democracy, which means that there should be a Government on one side and an Opposition on the other side, both the Government as well as the Opposition should be loyal to the Constitution of the country, loyal to the nation as a whole, loyal to the Yang di-Pertuan Agong as a symbol of that nation, but we the Opposition do not have to be loyal to the party in power—just the Alliance. It is only under these circumstances that a favourable climate for actual democratic advancement and progress can be created for our nation.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we say this with a sense of responsibility and also a sense of rebuttal to the statements that were made by members from the Alliance

Benches, because quite clearly in this House during the course of the debate and outside this House not only the P.A.P. and the Socialist Front have been attacked but we of the United Democratic Party have also been labelled. We have been labelled as being communal by no less a person than the Honourable the Deputy Prime Minister himself. We have been labelled as anti-Malaysia, not really a pro-Malaysia party, but only a party which accepted Malaysia as a *fait accompli* and this was put forward by no less a person than the Secretary-General of the UMNO and we today have also been labelled as anti-Malay. Sir, it is in this light that I wish to take some time to try to place exactly what our Party stands for.

Sir, last year at the opening session of the Second Dewan Ra'ayat, I did not take much of the time of this House, and I said that we would have plenty of opportunity in the course of the next five years slowly to elaborate our points of view. However, political events seem to have moved so fast that we would like to take this opportunity to lay our political ideology on the table.

Sir, in what way is the United Democratic Party a communal party except by the charges that are being made against us, or levelled against us, by Members of the Alliance and even by extremely responsible leaders of the Alliance. Are we communal by our constitution, which is registered? Are we communal by any of the utterances that we have made and by any of the statements on policies that our Party has made since our Party was established in the Easter of 1962? Was our General Election platform in any way communal? Sir, this is a very important issue, because it so happens that the Chairman of our Party used to be, for five years, the former Secretary-General of the UMNO itself and I, who happen to be the Secretary-General of my Party today, used at one time to be the President of the M.C.A. itself. But when the Alliance comes out to attack us, they go to the Malay community in our country and say that the U.D.P. is being led by a

man who left the M.C.A. on extreme pro-Chinese views. I will deal with that in due course.

Mr Speaker: May I remind the Honourable Member not to delve too deeply into party politics but deal with the Speech of His Majesty—more on the speech than on party politics?

Dr Lim Chong Eu: I accept that, Sir. I am not dealing with party politics. I am trying, Sir, to indicate that if, in fact, Honourable Members can understand that we are not communal and if they do not ever again use this charge of communalism against us, it will help to abate this rising tension in this country. That is my purpose, Sir, and I have asked your indulgence, because this is very important. Sir, I am not trying to sell my party platform across in this House. (*Laughter*). All I am trying to say is what the Alliance Members, who charge us for being racialists, practise, and I am trying to analyse why they practise this. As I said earlier, these symptoms, which are brought up today, are not new, and they go all the way back, for ten years, from the very beginning of our political struggle for independence, and I wish, Sir, to make this point very clearly.

Sir, as I was saying, then the M.C.A. Members of the Alliance go to the Chinese sections of our population and say an absolute falsehood: they say that the U.D.P. is communal, because it is led by a man who used to support the Party Negara and was Dato' Onn's right-hand man. Now, Sir, everybody knows that the President of the U.D.P. was the Secretary-General of the UMNO, but he was never associated with the Party Negara. During the course of the debate, Sir, a certain Member from the Alliance Bench asked, "Why do you exclude the P.M.I.P.?" I can tell you that during the last elections, in Kedah and particularly around the Sungei Patani area, just because the U.D.P. found it proper and correct and possible to come to some understanding and rapport with the P.M.I.P., we had the most violent and the most *ultra* racial and religious type of

propaganda hurled against us: we were condemned for having "sold" the Chinese down the drain. It is this type of propaganda which disturbs us all. So, I wish to conclude by saying, "Look into your own house, search into your own heart, read your own mind, before you start hurling this type of condemnations against the Opposition."

Sir, this matter of labelling, for example, myself as an *ultra* Chinese chauvinist arose from the fact that I decided to leave the Alliance and come across here. As I said last year, in a similar debate, that the winds of change might have blown last year for people in Singapore but, as far as I was concerned, they blew many years ago and took me across here. As a matter of fact, if you examine every single opposition party, except the Barisan Sosialis and the Socialist Front, you will see that every major leader of every other opposition party had at one time or other been closely associated with the UMNO or the M.C.A. or the Alliance—that was the time when neither the UMNO nor the M.C.A. found it necessary to form the Alliance. Why, Sir, does this kind of situation take place? I wish, again, to make use of this opportunity, because it is important, to clarify certain issues.

It is said, for example, by no less a person than the Honourable Prime Minister himself, leader of the Alliance, that I, in my personal capacity—Lim Chong Eu—left the M.C.A. because of a quarrel over a few seats, that I wanted more seats for the Chinese, always discontented and always wanting to create trouble about Chinese education. What actually is the real matter? Sir, there was a crisis in the Alliance at the time when I was the President of the M.C.A. But I think my former colleagues in the M.C.A., who are now sitting on the other side of this House, will bear me out on this point that I did not resign from the M.C.A. or the Alliance during the time of the crisis. I did not resign in 1959, but I resigned in December, 1960, and the reasons whereby I resigned are different entirely from what has

been purported and distributed around the country, an attempt. . . .

Enche' Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman (Seberang Tengah): Mr Speaker, Sir, we are not debating the past quarrels. We are now debating the King's Speech.

Mr Speaker: I would like to draw the attention of the Honourable Member again that he is deviating from the subject.

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member obviously had not followed the opening remarks which I made in this House prior to the recess, because, as we all know, the crux of this debate lies over the definition of the twin threats which face our country. We are now facing threats to our security from outside, in addition we are also facing threats from within the country, and it is quite clear, Sir, from the manner whereby the Honourable Mover of the original motion made it, racialism and communalism are threats; therefore, in dealing with this question of communalism, I am trying to resolve it. I think, Sir, I am debating the issues that have been brought up.

Mr Speaker: I must point out that you have been speaking of your Party, or whatever Party it was, too much. (*Laughter*).

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Sir, I have been speaking of my experience of the political situation in this country.

Mr Speaker: You can touch on your Party—a few words here and there will be all right.

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Sir, I have already made references to my Party; I am now discussing a situation which prevailed in 1959.

Mr Speaker: Arising out of your Party? (*Laughter*).

Dr Lim Chong Eu: No, Sir—from my experience.

Mr Speaker: You may continue, but try and get away from the party matter as much as possible.

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Thank you, Sir. I said, Sir, it is a matter which will

take a little time and which is made with no intention to inflame feelings.

Sir, at the time of the crisis in the Alliance Party itself, there were two conditions which restored the M.C.A. into the fold of the Alliance, and these two conditions—it has a very great reference as we go on in the debate, Sir—were that there would be no changes made to the Constitution of our country. It was a promise that was made by the leader of the Alliance, the Honourable the Prime Minister himself. We could refer to history—I think it was July 20th, 1959, or thereabouts.

The other condition, Sir, was that, over the question of Education, it was accepted that the principle whereby the education policy should advance would be that the medium of instruction should be the medium of examination. That, Sir, was announced to the country by no less a person than the Honourable Member who is now our Ambassador to the United States, on behalf of no less a person than the Honourable the Deputy Prime Minister. Sir, it was under those conditions that the rift in the Alliance was solved.

Sir, these are very important issues, because it indicated that although racial feelings were strong, with goodwill, with understanding, they can be overcome. But, on the other hand, if promises that are made in good faith are not kept, then this country will face great dangers. And it was because of the fact that in 1960 the Alliance Government chose to revise its educational policy, from what was then called the Razak Education policy to the Rahman Talib Education policy, and in 1960 the Alliance also chose to begin the first of its whittling, nibbling amendments to the Constitution that I felt that the promises that were made to cement the Alliance had been broken, and therefore I, on my part, as the person responsible for transmitting those promises, could not in all honesty remain where I stood. Sir, this is a very important issue, because if the Alliance Party presents the fact in its

proper perspective, I do not think the charge of communalism against my Party or ourselves in the Opposition can hold.

Sir, I would like to say that the feelings that have been expressed here today and the commentaries that one reads in the newspapers which give us concern today can be traced all the way back to 1956-1959—the last ten years. It would be interesting for me, Sir, to prove this, because, although the Alliance tell us that their method is the one method of bringing our diverse communities into a unified Malaysian nation, theirs is the best method: a party representing the interests of the Malay community, a party representing the interests of the Chinese community, and so on, combining in alliance is the way, the best way; and we query this, because it is quite clear, Sir, that after 10 years latent feelings are still extremely highly charged. And, Sir, what has been expressed by the Member for Johore Tenggara I accept, because if it is expressed openly, we can at least understand and accommodate, try to reason and challenge. It is vicious if it is not expressed openly, if it is by insinuation, by implication, and privately.

Sir, if we think today that all is well amongst the Alliance, and this is the way whereby a Malaysian Malaysia, a Malaysian unity, is best created, I would like to read an abstract—this is from the Malayan Chinese Association Headquarters—and the words, Sir, are extremely interesting:

“We must face the fact that communalism exists in a big way. Even the Malays, with their overwhelming voting strength, want their special rights written into the Constitution. Some of them are not satisfied with their present plums—the majority of posts, and the best of them, too, in the Public Service. They want to extend this highly discriminatory form of legislation into industry and commerce.

A certain newspaper talks about the necessity for making the Malays the master race of Malaya. This presumably means that non-Malays are to be reduced to the status of hewers of wood and drawers of water—shades of Hitler! Others want

to join up with Indonesia. I myself have heard this from the lips of one or two UMNO officials. It is not necessary for me to tell you what this idea if seriously pursued will lead to. It is difficult to assess the strength of these various forms of racial fanaticism, but at the same time one cannot blame the Chinese and other non-Malays for being slightly nervous, to say the least. The non-Malays, therefore, have to be communal merely to ensure their survival."

Sir, these opinions obviously made after very great deliberation indicate the kind of feeling which prevailed at the time. However, Sir, the chastening factor is that those statements which I had made were made with absolute intention to build this country up by clear-cut examination of the situation and they were made in 1956. Sir, do we not see how terrible this internal threat is to our country, terms that were made and used way back ten years ago are being revived? Why? Sir, I have gone that far and you, Mr Speaker, have been very kind to allow me to deal with this matter, because I want to try to advance some solution as to why this feeling still prevails.

Sir, to a large extent, we in the Opposition believe that the method whereby the Alliance have developed the unity of the country has a tendency to petrify, to ossify, probably for certain periods, to dampen the hidden emotional feelings of the various communities, but they do not in any way promote the progressive acceptance of the idea of being equal and friendly citizens of this country.

Sir, there is a great distinction between these two ideas: the concept of, what I would say, an Alliance Malaysia and a Malaysian Malaysia. Sir, the terrible danger that we face today is that if any one of us openly say we are Malaysians and eschew a political organisation which is working entirely in the interest of one particular community, we are charged as being communal, racial hypocrites. Sir, that is the danger, and I suggest to the Government that the Alliance Party in power has as much

a responsibility and a duty to discharge, as we in the Opposition, to promote the healthy development of an Opposition; and one of the ways the Government can discharge its duties properly is not to permit its rank and file to unnecessarily exploit situations and condemn those who have left the stage of Alliance development for a newer stage of finding brotherhood and equality amongst ourselves, no matter what our racial origin may be.

Sir, what is an Alliance Malaysia? An Alliance Malaysia is one where a Malaysian says, "I am a Malaysian of Chinese origin" or "I am a Malaysian of Malay origin" or "I am a Malaysian of Indian origin." Whereas, a Malaysian Malaysia is one where a Malaysian says, "I am a Malaysian—full stop!" An Alliance Malaysia continues to think in terms of the States of Malaya, Singapore, Sabah and Sarawak. We, on the other hand, think in terms of the entire new nation as a whole. Sir, is this statement correct or is this statement an exaggeration?

Sir, I now refer to His Majesty's Gracious Speech, particularly to those sections which deal with education and language. I will quote one particular section on education:

"In respect of National Schools, I am indeed very happy to note that the first batch of candidates has entered the University of Malaya a few days ago in the new academic year. This is the first time in our history that students from schools using the National Language as a medium of instruction are able to enter a University."

Sir, last year over a similar context, Education, I have cause to remark that extravagance of praise was given to the educational policy and to the education system in our country, which amounted almost to Hollywood style. It may apply with some pertinence to the States of Malaya but certainly it indicated an unawareness that we are now Malaysia. Sir, all the references to comprehensive schools and so on are pertinent only to the States of Malaya but not to the Federation of Malaysia as a whole.

If we look at the Special Appendix, paragraph 210 on page 32 refers to the entry of students from Malay medium

Sixth Form to the University of Malaya:

"The special selection examination for their entry to the University of Malaya has been held and thirty-one candidates have entered the University as under-graduates from the Malay Medium teaching stream..."

Sir, what is this special selection examination? We would like to know. As far as I understand with regard to this special selection examination, the facilities are certainly extended to students from one medium schools only. Whatever it is, this is another sign of the petrified ideas the the Alliance Government still carries with it. They are still calculating in terms of the old *Persekutuan Tanah Melayu*, whereas today we are all urged to come forth to defend Malaysia.

Now, as I am on the subject of education, I must, however, give praise where praise is due. The Alliance Government, I think, must be congratulated also. Paragraph 209 of the Special Appendix states that primary education for the Malays in the Malay-medium schools has increased. That, I think, is a good sign. Sir, actually, paragraph 209 says:—

"It will be recalled from a modest beginning of 600 pupils in 1959, Malay medium secondary education has expanded very rapidly to reaching an enrolment of nearly 30,000 in 1964."

That is a very good sign. Sir, we have always urged the Alliance Government to do more. This is 1965, and the first time the Alliance Government put up its own educational policy was in 1956. Those who are still counting in terms of racial origin can well calculate what 30,000 students per year is in relation to the size of their own community, and I am sure Honourable Members will agree with me that there is every need for us, while praising the Government, to ask them to do more; in so saying, we will rebut the fact that we in the Opposition are against the interest of the Malays, that we are always attacking Malay interests. We wish to see this type of development done much more extensively.

Sir, whilst still on this subject of education, I would like to refer to the Special Appendix, paragraph 206,

where the launching of the new Comprehensive Education System is touched upon; and in so doing, I would also draw the attention of the Honourable Members of this House to the remarks made by the Honourable Minister of Education only two days ago, when he opened a publishing firm, on the question of textbooks. I feel that we in this country today, while appreciating the Government's effort to provide the so-called free comprehensive secondary education to all our children, in actual fact realise that when our children go to school they have to pay for more expensive textbooks, they have to pay extramural fees for games and all sorts of peculiar curricula in the schools. We have advocated, Sir, that one of the ways whereby Government can help make education less expensive is if the Government were to, not consider as the Minister of Education has stated recently, not consider the question of setting up a textbook bureau, but right now establish such a bureau and right now implement a policy whereby the same textbooks can be used for several years. What does it mean? Those of us who have children at school realise that very often a younger brother going up from a lower form to an upper form cannot use the textbooks which his elder brother had been using only one year previously. The same title, practically the same text, different edition! Sometimes merely different shades of colour in the illustrations, sometimes mere minor alterations in the text and the school insists that the pupils must buy the new textbooks. Sir, if the Government can establish a text and make its use uniform throughout the schools for several years, then children within one family can enjoy what they used to enjoy before and make education relatively less expensive, that is to say, the older children of the family will be able to pass on their own textbooks for the younger ones to use. And if in the past that system has managed to produce such eminent leaders as we have on the Government Benches, I see no reason why we should not go back to this old system if it means a saving to our people.

Sir, before I leave this question of education, I admit that for years I have strongly challenged the validity of the Alliance educational system and it is interesting to me to read in His Majesty's Gracious Speech that "There is no better way to achieve this (referring to national unity) than to have one common language and one national education policy." Sir, last year when we debated His Majesty's previous Gracious Speech I indicated that it was time that the Government reviewed the entire situation of education in our country and build up a truly Malaysian educational system, a truly Malaysian educational policy, and not just have a hotch-potch of the States of Malaya educational policy, Singapore educational policy, Sabah educational policy and Sarawak educational policy. It is necessary for us to have just one national educational policy. Sir, all along one of the reasons why we had opposed the Alliance concept of Malaysia was that we foresaw that the constitutional provisions we now have would make it difficult for us to establish one national education policy, because all of us know that the State of Singapore has autonomy in education and today the people in the State of Singapore and, naturally, the Singapore State Government, wish to stick by and abide by the constitutional provisions and they want to preserve their own educational policy. The very mention of the fact that we want one national education policy immediately suggests that the Central Government is planning to make fundamental constitutional changes which will affect the relations between the State and the Central Governments. So, Sir, although we support this concept, we immediately find that the Alliance is hoist by its own petard. The manner whereby they set about establishing Malaysia is now giving them trouble and we, on our side, although happy to be proven right, will endeavour to help them solve this problem on the basis of the concept of Malaysian Malaysia. If, however, they still try to perpetuate this concept of an Alliance Malaysia, namely, just use what is now prevailing in the States of Malaya as their education policy and foist it

on to the other States—Singapore, Sabah and Sarawak—I am quite certain that the public reaction and the rejection of the Alliance educational policy will be intense indeed. Why so, Sir? After all, for all the glorification the Alliance may give to their own educational system, for all the propaganda about the tremendous advances the Alliance have made in their own educational system, it is not good enough, it does not satisfy the Minister of Education himself and he has to send his own children abroad to get better education. Sir, even the high dignitaries of our country—the Head of State himself—have sent their children abroad, because every parent, if they had the same facilities, would want to give their children the best in education. So, no matter how good the Alliance propaganda may be over education, the very fact that it does not receive support from their own Ministers already shows clearly what its demerits are. And I suggest, Sir, that in this establishment of a common uniform Malaysian education policy it pays as well to set up a Select Committee which can thoroughly go into the question of education and it will be very interesting indeed for us to find out what that survey would produce, because I would not be surprised if there are large sections in our country who would subscribe to the type of educational policy which prevails now in the State of Singapore as compared to the type of educational policy that exists in the States of Malaya.

Sir, it was one of those curious situations in the development of Malaysia that any person in the States of Malaya advocating facilities for Chinese education not amounting to what is now given to the Chinese medium stream in the State of Singapore would be immediately suppressed by the Alliance Government in the same dictatorial manner which the P.A.P. has been accused of in Singapore; and those who fervently believed in a slightly different system of education, giving a little bit more ease and bias towards the Chinese system of education in the States of Malaya, have been severely treated, whereas

the Alliance Government could find it possible to accept the State of Singapore into the Federation and give it autonomy under the Constitution for education. Sir, that is one of the reasons why the present controversy between the P.A.P. and the Alliance is so vehement. This is not a question of the suitor who has lost the object of this pursuit. This is a question of the two of them never ever having a common, similar intent. So, Sir, it is easy perhaps for Alliance backbenchers to immediately jump down on the manner whereby the P.A.P. Government conducts its policies in Singapore, but, as I said earlier, let us look deep into our own hearts.

Sir, over this question of one common language, the National Language Month began a few weeks ago, on the 28th of April, 1965. Nearly eight years have passed since we decided that the 31st of August of 1967 is our objective for the National Language to be the only official language. The Government has given every encouragement and facilities to every citizen to learn the National Language. Sir, I have no objection to this clause if it applies entirely and only to the States of Malaya—it will be absolutely one hundred per cent correct. But if it is applied in the context of this new Constitution and not the older one, then I think it is completely irrelevant.

Sir, if the Government combines this question of the development of the National Language as the only official language with the concept of its educational policy, we are bound to have a lot of trouble. Previously, in the debates in this House, Sir, I have suggested to the Alliance Government that it is time for it to separate these two entirely separate issues, divide them and treat them in their own separate field: the question of the establishment of the National Language or the progress of the National Language and the question of the use of the National Language as the medium of instruction are two separate subjects.

Sir, in the past, it was true that those of us who wholly dared to come forward and put forward the predicament

of the Chinese medium schools were accused of being “too pro-Chinese”, because our interests were to try some common ground, common status, whereby the pupils in the Chinese medium schools can find equal opportunities for employment after a similar length of period of a primary or secondary education. One factor which made it difficult and impossible for the Chinese medium schools to carry on in the States of Malaya was the decision made by the Alliance Government to reverse the policy established by the Razak Report and accept the Rahman Talib Report or the Rahman Talib education policy because, whereas it was silent in the Razak Report and over the crisis by directive acceptable to the Government that the medium of examination should be in the medium of instruction, the Rahman Talib Report completely reversed the situation and placed it on record that “although academically it is, perhaps, incorrect for us to insist that a child being trained in one medium of instruction should sit for the examination in another medium, however, we nevertheless recommend that the medium of examination shall be only in the official languages.”

Sir, in 1967, Bahasa Kebangsaan will be, or may be, the only National Language—I use these words “may be” with very great deliberation that I wish to touch on. But, if by 1967 the National Language has become the only official language, and the Government has not yet revised its present educational policy, what will happen will be that the children who are now going into the English medium schools will not be able to take a publicly acceptable examination; and I ask this question, as I asked it seven years ago: Can you expect any child, who has been studying in one medium for nine years, suddenly, by a change of policy, to take an examination at the end of nine years only in the medium of Malay? Sir, with every good intention of promoting the use and the development of Malay as the National Language, I must say that, from an educational point of view, this is impossible, and we all know that not a few years ago it was naturally quite popular for a

Malay parent or, in the Alliance way of saying things, for Malaysians of Malay origin to send their children to English medium school and there are large numbers of Malay children in English medium schools. Sir, what will happen to them in 1967?

So, the Government will be faced with one or two alternatives: either temper this constant attempt of establishing a firm target date or change now, begin to review, its educational policy—it cannot be right in both instances, one has got to give way. Sir, I say this, and I do not wish to touch on the strong Malay sensitivities over the question of the National Language because there is a little misunderstanding over the provision for making Malay the National Language in 1967, that politically it has been stated that we want to do it. As a matter of Government policy, it has been stated that we are trying to do it. However, Sir, if the provisions of the Constitution are read properly, namely, Article 152, it will indicate clearly to everybody that, although we should try to make Malay the National Language by 1967, we cannot make it the only official language earlier than 1967, but we may make it the only official language later than 1967. That is the latitude that is provided for in our Constitution, and in our recent debate in the State Assembly in Penang, I have had the advantage of the State Legal Adviser elucidating this particular aspect not on my behalf but on behalf of the Alliance back-benchers because, as Members on the Government benches will realise, I did contribute to some small measure to the framing of Article 152. Sir, in view of the fact that the new States of Malaysia, under the provisions of the Constitution also, have a later date for the implementation of the National Language as the only official language, I feel that if everyone in this country were to accept the question of language as a matter of deep-seated determination but not necessarily as one which will create a communal, racial animosity, then, perhaps, Sir, the problem of eventually the country being bound and united together by a common

language, can be achieved peacefully. Let us look around our neighbouring countries in the newly emergent nations; and even in some nations which have obtained their independence much earlier than ourselves the question of language is a highly charged one. Therefore, Sir, I urge Members from the Alliance side to consider seriously that it is not an attempt to discredit Malay as an important language. We have all accepted the Constitution. It is not an attempt to try to delay the achievement of heartfelt desires of large sections of the Malay community. But now that we are Malaysians, I urge you to seriously go through our Constitution, and whilst endeavouring all we can to achieve what we have set out to do, let us restrain ourselves in the achievement of our objectives. Otherwise, if we pressurise too much this question of a fixed date, the very nature of the problem, not only in our country but the very nature of this problem as a fundamental human problem anywhere in the world, can well set this country into terrible times.

Sir, I would like to refer to a matter, which is also contained in His Majesty's Gracious Speech, namely, the question of the banning of strikes. Various Members who are better versed than myself over the question of trade unions have already expressed their views to this House. All that I wish to say is that I associate myself with the views that have been put by the Honourable Member for Batu and the Honourable Member for Bungsar. I think that we should, at this time of Emergency, try our very best not to use powers of decree but by constitutional and parliamentary means, and that after parliamentary debate and after thorough consultations with the unions come to some kind of working arrangement, rather than resort to the fact that because an Emergency exists therefore we must curtail the liberties of the workers in our nation. We strongly sympathise with the workers of our nation. We in the Opposition have carefully restrained ourselves from getting involved in the political aspects of the discontent of the workers, and I think the Government can well realise

that in this area there is a very highly charged potential mass anti-Government reaction. And even with every type of suppression we have this common law in politics to contend with: the greater the suppression the greater the eventual explosion. I hope the Government will well pay heed to the opinions and the cries of 300,000,000 workers in our country.

Dr Ng Kam Poh (Telok Anson): Sir, on a point of clarification. Did the Honourable Member say 300,000,000 workers?

Dr Lim Chong Eu: I stand corrected—3 million.

Dr Ng Kam Poh: Thank you very much.

Dr Lim Chong Eu: I do not wish to be involved in international controversy. I accept this correction with great modesty; it was a slip of the tongue. In view of the fact that the Government can give answers which satisfy us which are created by a slip of their tongue, I hope the Honourable Members will accept my apology.

Sir, it has been the practice, and lately it has become intensified, to try and attack the P.A.P., and in particular to attack this National Malaysian Solidarity Convention, and various Members from the Alliance benches have referred to the speech that was made by the Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore in the only *Hansard* than we have of last year's parliamentary proceedings, where he differentiated the chasm that lay between his Party and those of us on this side of the Opposition and they have tried to belittle his objectives of putting a "Causeway" across this floor because of the greater affinity of interests, whereas the difference of views between us were apparently unbridgeable at that time. And so, today, the Alliance immediately picked up on this and charged the Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore and the P.A.P. for being opportunistic in their attempts to form this Convention of Opposition parties. But I would like to refer Honourable Members, who have had time to look through the *Hansard* which was pre-

sented to us from Volume I, No. 1 to Volume I, No. 4, to the earlier volume, Volume I, No. 3, with particular reference to the speech made by the Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore, and if they could only give further attention and work a little bit harder and read further from page 482 onwards dealing with the speech which I myself made at that time which appears on pages 526 and onwards in Volume I, No. 4, perhaps they will understand that this present rapprochement between the Opposition parties did not entirely emanate from the P.A.P. They should not go about the country trying to belittle Members of the Opposition in the States of the Federation, who were admittedly squashed in the last elections by the Alliance but who have, in some instances, presented the thin end of the wedge to show what would happen in the future. Sir, this rapport cannot entirely be credited to the account of the P.A.P.

Enche' Chen Wing Sum (Damansara): On a point of clarification, Sir. What I spoke in this House was that the Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore accused the S.U.P.P. of being a Communist organisation. Now that they have joined together, the only conclusion we can draw from the statement and the subsequent combination is that either the P.A.P. has invited a Communist organisation, i.e. the S.U.P.P., to come to this House against the Central Government or the P.A.P. has itself become Communist. I have no any intention whatsoever to belittle the P.A.P. I only draw the conclusion from the statement by the Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore and the subsequent combination. If that is not correct, this House and the people of this country would judge.

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Mr Speaker, Sir, I thank the Honourable Member for his clear elucidation, but his elucidation makes matter worse, (*Laughter*) if we were to take that type of logic as the way whereby we are to help our country advance. Here you are accusing the P.M.I.P. for being ultra-religious and ultra-communal and yet you take in a former P.M.I.P. Member to join your Alliance. Are we now to say that

the Alliance is ultra-religious, ultra-communal? You labelled members of the U.D.P. at one time as being communists, because we opposed the Alliance's plan and yet you take in your quietest member, who is now the President of the M.C.A. in Seremban—he sits [referring to Enche' Quek Kai Dong (Seremban Barat)] over there—and are we, therefore, to assume that the M.C.A. has become anti-Malaysia and pro-Communist? Sir, that type of logic is nonsensical. (*Laughter*). However, Sir, I only brought this matter up because the Honourable Member for Johor Tenggara raises a very important issue. He says that Malaysia was only established two years ago, or about two years ago—we will not quarrel over a few months—on 16th September, 1963, but is the Malaysia which was created then, which we all had welcomed, different from the Malaysia of today? If not, why should the Honourable Prime Minister of Singapore, who at one time helped to form Malaysia, now begins to talk about a Malaysian Malaysia? Sir, I say to the Honourable Members on the opposite side that Malaysia in fact has changed in this one year and that is why political Opposition Parties with slightly different ideologies can come together.

I will take this occasion, Sir, again, to touch upon my Party, with your permission. It is important because the Honourable Member for Johor Tenggara accuses our Party of being an anti-Malaysia Party, whereas we were only against the Alliance's method of forming Malaysia. We say we only accept Malaysia as a *fait accompli*. Well, naturally, being a constitutional Party, what comes under the new Constitution we accept. Sir, it is surprising that we should now draw so much criticisms. My friends from the Socialist Front and the Barisan Sosialis came forward with open cries of "Crush Malaysia!" on Malaysia Day, but the Government has taken no action against them. Sir, we only asked the Alliance Government to "go slow" with the formation of Malaysia. We said, "Let us consult with one another, let us consult our own people.

Do not let us be influenced by opinions that emanate from Whitehall. If it is necessary to establish Malaysia, let us consult with our immediate neighbour, Indonesia" I have noted that up to September 16th or even up to July 16th we were very good friends. We even intended to become closer friends under the Agreement signed in Manila and we wanted to form Maphilindo. So, Sir, you cannot blame large sections of the population of our own citizens to be bewildered when the Government came up and said, "Soekarno is our big best friend" and three months later to say, "We will burn the effigy of Soekarno". It takes time for people to understand that type of policy. Sir, we were not against Malaysia but we cautioned the Alliance about its method of going about the formation of Malaysia, and I think all the present difficulties which this country faces today can, in the final analysis, be attributed to the urgency whereby the Alliance and its partners in the other States of Malaysia came about building the Malaysia which I now call, "The Alliance Malaysia".

The problems today and the dissatisfactions today are not much more different from the dissatisfactions that were felt in 1956/1959. That was why I quoted a very important message dated way back 1956 from a very important man because the words are almost the same as those used today. Why? Because, first, since the opening of the First Session of Parliament, the Alliance Government has started its old habit of playing around with the Constitution—nibbling at it, making amendments to the Constitution, bit by bit, more and more.

We had a very important debate over the question of the introduction of Political Secretaries and their relationship with the Senate and the election of Speaker—these were the very important Constitutional amendments.

Even before us, in this Session, we have a Bill in two versions: one version in one week and a second version on the second week making amendments to our Constitution. We know of a projected further amendment

which will deal with the question of right of appeal to the Privy Council. Sir, this habit which the Alliance has in making amendments to the Constitution makes all of us "nervous"—I use the words used in 1956. This is justly so, because each time the Prime Minister of our country comes forward with a statement that the Constitution is a sacred document he adds, "Although we have the power to amend the Constitution, we shall not change the Constitution". This amounts to a threat to all of us. Mind you, this is not a statement of the Alliance probity. This is a threat to all of us to behave: "If you do not behave, we will change against you". I see the Minister for Sarawak Affairs and the Minister for Sabah Affairs are not here. Sir, each time the Prime Minister of our country makes a statement that he will not change the Constitution, not soon later, within a matter of a few weeks, we get a big volume of amendments to our Constitution. Is this not so? At the very well-advertised, well-propagandized "Grand Alliance Assembly", where there were about 28 delegates and 500 guests attending, the Prime Minister made a statement saying that the Constitution is sacred and that he would not amend it. I will not bother this House to read through this report in the *Straits Times*. Now we face two Bills making changes to our Constitution, and in His Majesty's Speech there is a reference to one delicate issue, the national education policy. Sir, I do not blame the Honourable Prime Minister of Singapore for feeling "nervous" and reacting to it; he has the courage to say what is coming. Next, since last year we have had amendments to the Internal Security Act; we have had the declaration of a state of Emergency; we have had new tax laws increasing the burden on the taxpayers.

Dr Ng Kam Poh: The tax law changes, new Bills and so on and so forth are not changes to the Constitution. He mentioned the Internal Security Act and so forth—they are not constitutional changes.

Mr Speaker: Are you interrupting under the Standing Orders?

Dr Ng Kam Poh: No, Sir, just on a point of clarification.

Mr Speaker: You have a chance to make your reply afterwards.

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Thank you, Sir. You have replied to the Honourable Member. However, I am always very obliging to new Members of the backbenches in the Alliance. After all, they have to find some way of achieving prominence, I said, Sir, that certain things have happened: (i) amendments to the Constitution; (ii) amendments to the Internal Security Act; and (iii) promulgation of an Emergency. And if you tell me that the promulgation of the Emergency was not made through the provisions of the Constitution, then you are accusing your own Government of having acted *ultra vires* the Constitution. Take your time. (Laughter). Again, by decree the Government has suspended the grass roots of parliamentary democracy in our country. We have suspended local elections, and suspended local elections in a very dangerous manner creating a precedent, which I hope the Government will take the opportunity to immediately forestall. Why? Sir, at the time when the local council elections were suspended there was a by-election which had been gazetted in the Seremban Town Council. Election campaigns had actually gone forward for two weeks almost reaching the polling day. We cannot predict what the results of that election would have been. It would have been for the electorate to tell us on the election day. But we on our side were just as confident as the Alliance that in that particular by-election; although crushed as we were in the 1964 general elections, we had regained public confidence and in this first by-election to the Town Council we were going to show the Alliance that we were probably the running favourites. However, Sir, the danger of this precedent is this. What happens if in the course of a general election the Alliance by decree, not by parliamentary debate, but by decree suddenly suspends the elections? That is the danger of this decree. There are no provisions in this Constitution to say what are the minimum times.

Virtually, the Government, using such a precedent, could suspend an election even after voting has been held and as the results are being returned—if it were unfavourable, apparently unfavourable, it could at that moment, using this precedent, suspend such an election. That is a matter which I hope the Government will assure us will never take place. But the precedent has been set.

Mr Speaker, Sir, then we have the question of the banning of the legitimate activities of the trade unions and now we have this question touching on the fundamental liberties of our citizens—i.e., the question of the right of appeal to the Privy Council has been brought up. All these things have happened in the past 12 months. All these things have shown the people of Singapore, and I hope the people of Sabah and also the people in Sarawak, what we in the Opposition in the States of Malaya at the time of the formation of Malaysia had cautioned them, “Think twice about the provisions that you are writing into the Constitution, and how they will affect you eventually. Don’t take too much on trust, don’t make too much of promises, because our experience has been so.” Today because their experience has become akin to that of ours in the past, they, being realistic politicians, pragmatic in their approach, clearcut in their decisions, naturally now find that the chasm that lies between us is bridgeable and the causeway which they hoped to extend over to the other side had no engineering possibilities. So do not let us be distracted from the issue by witty comments from the Socialist Front about this Convention—the coming together of political parties in the Opposition whose ideals of establishing a Malaysian Malaysia which could provide for the ultimate emergence of a more free, equitable society for our people is a challenge which the Alliance may well consider at this present time.

Sir, I would like to conclude by referring to the little sensibilities which make it clear why those of us in the Opposition manifest great concern over the manner whereby the situation in our

country has slowly deteriorated, I had the opportunity of the three days recess, and His Majesty in his Gracious Speech referred to the economic drive, or what is called the austerity drive—Sir, I feel rather embarrassed about this issue. However, I would not touch on it, chiefly because the Honourable Minister of Finance had the opportunity of being given high academic honour during the recess, and we take this occasion to congratulate him. (*Laughter*). Sir, I felt that for the House to recess in order that we could hold a University Convocation in the Parliament House during a time when the House is debating His Majesty’s Gracious Speech is something well worth considering. What comes first? What are the priorities in our country? There are many other halls in Kuala Lumpur which can be used. After all, the Alliance had used the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka. Why not the University? If the Alliance can use it for their big meeting, why not the University? Or at least the date could be changed. But to bring us from the far ends of this new Malaysia, some coming as far as from Sandakan and others from Perlis, to spend three days here shaking our legs—mind you, earning \$35 a day shaking legs (*Laughter*), it is a very easy way of making money—is hardly contributing to the Government’s austerity drive. I feel I must make this sad remark.

But I wish to conclude on this note, because the recess gave me a little opportunity. My Honourable friend the Member for Johore Tenggara when he talked about the sacred Constitution of Malaysia had said, “We were the people who put in Section 2, the question of the fundamental liberties, and who is the Prime Minister of Singapore to come and teach us about fundamental liberties?” Sir, I also in my own little, quiet way played some part with Section 2 of the old Constitution. And he asked us, what part of it has been changed? So I remembered this old Constitution (*holds up a copy of the Constitution*)—it looks quite old and well used—and I had occasion during the recess to send for it from Penang. And what is the difference?

But what is the difference? It is not just in the cover. The interesting difference and a very important difference is that in this publication which is also official—I would not go through the melodrama and the Honourable Prime Minister of Singapore carries it very well when reading it through and saying that this is a Government publication—and which is an official Government publication, there is a very little foreword which reads, if I may be permitted:

“It must be remembered that the freedom to which we aspire is the freedom to govern ourselves under a system in which parliamentary institutions shall be exclusively representative of the people’s will”—Tunku Abdul Rahman, subsequently the first Prime Minister of the Federation, moving the second reading of the Federal Constitution Bill, August 15, 1957.”

Sir, these words are amongst some of the finest words that have been uttered and made by our distinguished Prime Minister. But in the Constitution of Malaysia there is no such foreword. Are we to imply, Sir, that this very fundamental threat is carried in the Appendix in the name, under the section of the Ministry of Home Affairs, of subversion and communism? The Appendix says:

“Communism and subversion continue to pose a threat The Government is aware of the threats of Communism and subversion and is adequately equipped to counter and contain these threats. The Government staunchly believes in parliamentary democracy and will defend these institutions and beliefs to the last”

I say it is a great credit to the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs that he has actually by act demonstrated his belief and we hope that his example will be not only emulated but will be sustained by his fellow members of his Party.

Sir, don’t let us in these times of great trials and of threats ever do anything which will diminish these words which were contained in the foreword which I have quoted to you from our former Constitution. Don’t let us ever try to meddle with the freedoms which parliamentary democracy and the institutions of such parliamentary democracy mean to us. Sir, it is because of our extreme concern and our extreme determination that not only does this

country prevail, but it must prevail in an equitable manner, in a democratic manner that those of us in the Opposition who subscribe to the idea of a democratic Malaysian Malaysia have come together. I hope that although the Alliance Members may feel that this is a threat to their eventual positions of power, don’t ever insinuate that we are moving towards this ideal of achieving a democratic Malaysian Malaysia because we are hypocrites. Understand, as I began my speech, Sir, that every single Member of this House must be treated and accepted as a loyal Member and a loyal citizen expressing ideas and criticisms in good faith so long as the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs has not taken action upon him. Sir, it is under these circumstances that we feel very strongly that we must associate ourselves in support of the amendment to the motion as moved by the Honourable Prime Minister of Singapore.

Sir, although you have been very kind enough to give me so much time, I feel that Honourable Members should carefully study the words of this amendment and in the light of your professed determination to uphold democracy in this country to maintain this Constitution as our sacred document, don’t permit your whips to threaten you, don’t permit even the obvious opportunities for advancement in the Alliance Bench cloud your own vision of the potential glorious future which our country has, and if you believe and earnestly believe that the Opposition is correct in moving this amendment, I do not ask you to cross across the floor (*Laughter*) but at least do not accuse and insinuate our intentions. That, Sir, I think, will contribute a great deal to ease off the tensions, which have been created by the press and the propaganda, leading not to the enmity but the rivalry between the Opposition parties and the Government. Thank you.

Mr Speaker: The sitting is suspended for ten minutes!

Sitting suspended at 12.17 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 12.32 p.m.

(Mr Speaker in the Chair)

Dato' Dr Ismail: Mr Speaker, Sir, when the Honourable Member for Tanjong's speech passed the half-hour mark, I thought he was playing the game of "follow the leader", because the Honourable Enche' Lee Kuan Yew of Singapore took one-and-a-half hours; but when he passed the two-hour mark, then I knew it was a competition for the leadership of the Malaysian Solidarity Convention. *(Laughter)*. Sir, today we have witnessed the winner.

Now, Sir, when the future generations read the history of this Parliament, their attention will surely be drawn to what is written about this session. It is a remarkable session in many ways. It is made remarkable by the fact that the P.A.P., after a period of hesitation which was spent in wooing the Alliance, and, flirting with the Opposition, has finally made up its mind. Rejected by the Alliance, it has decided to settle down with the Opposition. (HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!) Sir, it is a marriage, so to speak, of political parties on the rebound out of political expediency. When the time comes, I am sure the P.A.P. will have no compunction to annul the marriage, if we can judge from past experience.

This session, Sir, is also remarkable because His Majesty's Speech is debated in this House at a time when the focus of attention on the Malaysian political scene is on the slogan "Malaysian Malaysia". I said "slogan", Sir, because the concept of "Malaysian Malaysia" was accepted even before Malaysia was launched. *(Applause)*. (HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!) When it was formed, of course the concept was spelt out in the Constitution. None of the constituent States, except Singapore, voiced dissatisfaction. There are, of course, disagreement of views between the Governments of the new constituent States and the Central Government, but these agreements have always been quietly discussed and amicable settlement reached. This is possible because the Central Government and the

State Governments know their respective status. Singapore, however, was unable to reconcile to the fact that it was one of the constituent States. It insists on a special status beside that which was put down in the Constitution, a special status amounting to elevating the State Government on a par with the Central Government. When agreement cannot be reached on this, the Party in power in Singapore started to embark on a campaign against the Central Government. That, in brief is the background against which the P.A.P. invented the slogan "Malaysian Malaysia". As can be seen, both the Alliance and the P.A.P. subscribe to the concept of a "Malaysian Malaysia", but they differ in their approach to make it a living entity. It is this difference in approach which generates a great deal of heat, and which disturbs the hitherto comparative tranquil political scene in Malaysia.

Sir, there are two ways of establishing a Malaysian Malaysia. One is the platform of the P.A.P., that is to impose non-communalism straightaway. The other is the method adopted by the Alliance which requires two steps: first, inter-racial harmony and, second, the ultimate stage of non-communalism. Now, Sir, the Honourable Member for Tanjong—of course, after having spoken for $2\frac{1}{2}$ hours he is not interested to hear other people speak—said that in the Alliance Malaysia, as he would like to call it, there would be Malay Malaysians, there would be Indian Malaysians, and there would be Chinese Malaysians. Well, Sir, at this stage of inter-racial harmony, in a Malaysian Malaysia as we conceive it, there must be these Indian Malaysians, Chinese Malaysians and Malay Malaysians. What, may I ask, is the Malaysian Solidarity Convention's concept of non-communalism? Do they, or does the Honourable Member, mean to say that the Malaysians—if I am not contravening Standing Orders—are all bastards? Surely they must have their origins which they cannot forget. We may be Malaysian Malaysians, but the fact remains that in the inter-racial stage in which we are in the Alliance believe that that is the right step towards achieving a

Malaysian Malaysia as well as a non-communalistic Malaysia. Sir, the Alliance success in promoting inter-racial harmony is too wellknown to elaborate. Suffice it to say that through inter-racial harmony it has brought Independence to Malaya, promoted political stability which generated confidence and, if I may say so, that attracted the new constituent States to join Malaya to form Malaysia. (*Applause*).

As I analysed the P.A.P. method of introducing non-communalism straight-away, it reminded me as if we are all chemicals—the Malay is a chemical, the Chinese is a chemical, the Indian is a chemical—put all of these chemicals in the crucible, heat up the crucible and amidst the turbulence inside the crucible a new compound is formed called Malaysian Malaysia. You can see, Sir, that by that method you have to generate heat, you have to cause a lot of upheavals, you have got to get smoke coming out of the crucible. But our method, if I may say so, is based on the natural tendency of human beings who live together and share a common quality and that quality is tolerance, that quality which has bound us together for generations. Now that we are independent we are trying to cut down all the lines that were imposed on us by the colonial power. Try as hard as we can, the ordinary person cannot forget that he is a Malay, he is a Chinese and he is an Indian. Of course, among the intellectuals we forget. In the Cabinet we have Chinese Malaysian Ministers and Indian Malaysian Ministers and when I discuss things with them, I am never conscious of their racial origin except when my Honourable colleague, the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, insists on drawing my attention when he wears his dothi (*Laughter*). Otherwise, we never think of those things.

Now, Sir, as I analysed the P.A.P. methods, then I began to understand why it is necessary for it to destroy the well-established inter-racial harmony which has been a feature in the former Federation of Malaya and also I believe in the former States of

Sabah and Sarawak. Singapore, of course, has no inter-racial harmony because, to all intents and purposes, Singapore society was homogeneous with some racial minorities. The P.A.P., if I may say so, Sir, has therefore no experience of politics in a multi-racial society, let alone governing such a society. Probably, like medieval men, it is easier to destroy rather than to understand a new phenomenon which is strange to them. The methods adopted by P.A.P. in trying to destroy this inter-racial harmony are subtle, unscrupulous and ruthless (*Applause*). Lest I be accused of being a demagogue as the Honourable Member for Johore Tenggara, let me illustrate what I mean by making this strong statement.

The P.A.P. resurrects the question of who are the indigenous people of this country. The P.A.P. knows, as well as the people of the former Federation of Malaya know, that although this is an academic question in a satisfied multi-racial society, it is at the same time an effective political weapon to stir communal strife. The Alliance of course wisely managed to bury this question and concentrated on building inter-racial harmony. By resurrecting this controversial question the P.A.P. is stirring again the communal feelings in Malaya. It is this action of the P.A.P. which has started the chain of communal vituperations which now exist in this country.

Sir, the P.A.P. claims openly that it supports the special position of the Malays as spelled out in the Constitution, but I say politically and practically it does all it can to illustrate that its support is only in principle necessitated by political expediency (*Applause*). The P.A.P. mock at the Malays, by saying that the special position of the Malays is a mockery and only benefits the reactionary capitalistic Malays, whereas in fact, this is not true. Even if the Malays strive hard to become millionaires, I don't think they will succeed. The odds are against them. They are not endowed, as other Malaysians are, with the instinct to acquire and accumulate wealth. The special position of the

Malays in regard to the land benefits the peasants, and in regard to ratio in Government service, benefits all sections of the Malays who are qualified. Further, in sponsoring the Malaysian Solidarity Convention, the P.A.P. has specifically included the Peoples Progressive Party whose stand in regard to the special position of the Malays as provided in the Constitution is too wellknown even to be mentioned and was even repeated in this House the other day by the Honourable Member for Ipoh.

I have so far spoken frankly and, I am afraid, brutally described the methods used by the P.A.P.—but I am always a blunt and frank man. Now I would like to describe the manner in which these methods are put into practice. The intellectuals among the P.A.P., who I admit are all brilliant men, when they speak to the sophisticated section of Malaysians pose as moderate, reasonable men. We have heard the speech of the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew, the Secretary-General of P.A.P., the Honourable Dr Toh Chin Chye, the Chairman of the P.A.P., Mr Devan Nair, a prominent member of P.A.P. I cannot quarrel with their plea when they said all they ask for is that the Constitution should be respected. We may not agree with their allegations that the Constitution has been, or will be, amended, without adequate notice or that the provisions of the Constitution have been violated, but we cannot accuse them of not being democrats and parliamentarians just because they disagree with us. This image of P.A.P., that of a party consisting of moderate, reasonable, brilliant men has been ably projected abroad by its Secretary-General on his visits to Australia, New Zealand and, lately, India, Burma, Thailand and Cambodia and Laos as well. He also succeeded, Sir, in projecting this image to the credulous foreign correspondents, (HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!) thanks to the eloquence of the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew. However, there is the other image of P.A.P., which is only revealed to selected sections of our society, which is revealed abroad in the guise of respectable image, which is

revealed to foreign correspondents in off the record session. (*Laughter*). This is the image, which surreptitiously and cunningly twists facts and arguments to blacken and smear political opponents. This is the side of P.A.P., which cunningly foster communalism. This is the image that spreads the rumours that the Central Government is foisting a Malay Malaysia on the entrapped peoples of Singapore, Sabah and Sarawak. This is the image that cunningly tells the foreign correspondents and countries abroad of a fairy tale of how the gentle, economically backward, Malay giants are planning to dominate the robust, economically advanced Chinese in Malaysia and that if Malaysia breaks up, it is because the communal Alliance Party is treating the new States as inferior to the Malay States and, therefore, pressure must be put on the Alliance Government that they must be more accommodating, that they must form a coalition Government. Some of the foreign correspondents wrote to their home countries insisting that this fairy tale is indeed a true story. (*Laughter*).

Sir, this is the image which entertains imaginary resentment and reads into every statement what is not there; hence the amendment to the motion thanking His Majesty's Speech. Sir, no one, except those subscribing to this image of P.A.P., can imagine that there is any other Malaysia than Malaysian Malaysia. The success of the Alliance in rural development, which benefits, I admit, mainly the Malays but also the non-Malays in rural areas, the acceptance by the people of Sarawak, Sabah, Malacca and Penang of Malaysian Governors of Malay descent, the ceremonial functions which, in the main, follow Malay custom—all these, I am sure, are imagined by P.A.P. to be signs of Malay dominance in Malaysia. But are they? If not, why did not the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew in his long, eloquent, speech spell out examples or signs of Malay domination instead of making vague, oblique, general statements?

Sir, listening to the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew's speech the only indication

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew (Singapore): Sir, on a point of clarification. I wonder whether the Minister heard the scripted speech by the Member for Kota Star Selatan, Dr Mahathir, in which he accused Chinese and others who do not live in the East Coast and other places like Kedah of being unaccustomed to the Malay rule. What is the implication of that statement?

Dato' Dr Ismail: I must thank the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew, but I was speaking about his speech where, I said, he was just making general, vague statements about this Malay Malaysia

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew: Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of elucidation. Would it help the matter, or would it be a solution to these problems if I list and categorize all the examples in which domination was attempted in the last twenty months since Malaysia in Sabah, in Sarawak and in Singapore because, if it will, I am quite prepared to list them.

Dato' Dr Ismail: it will help a great deal, Sir, because, after all, we are in this Parliament and now we say that we are in the open society. We want to adopt democratic principles, as I promised. Let us have all these things aired and then, probably, we may come to an agreement or, if we must disagree with them, we must disagree on some common ground. If he starts being oblique and vague on this matter, it makes matter worse.

Sir, listening to the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew's speech, the only indication we have as to why he fears that Malaysia is drifting towards Malay Malaysia is when he says that there must be political equality and when he expresses his imaginary fears that the Alliance will scrap the Constitution and rule by force. Sir, if the Malaysians in Singapore do not have political equality with the Malaysians in the rest of this country, the blame must surely be on the P.A.P., who agreed that in return for autonomy in Education and Labour and the retention of 60% of the revenue accrued in

Singapore, Singapore should have only fifteen seats in Parliament. Surely, the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew and his colleagues cannot blame the Alliance for this political inequality in this respect. After all, it is said that P.A.P. has the monopoly of wisdom, its Premier having a double First at Cambridge, its Finance Minister, a well-known international economist, its Deputy Prime Minister, a well-known scientific research worker. Surely, these eminent gentlemen could not have been outwitted by the mediocre Alliance Ministers, whose only qualification for leadership is sincerity, who are devoid of double face and incapable of tongue-twisting. (*Applause*)

As to his fears that the Alliance would scrap the Constitution, they are based entirely on false premises. It is true that constitutional changes have taken place in the past, but, as the Honourable Prime Minister had repeatedly stated, changes in the Constitution would only take place if they were considered to be beneficial to the country and that he would never change those provisions of the Constitution affecting fundamental rights and liberties. Further, Sir, amendments to the Constitution in the past have always been passed after exhaustive debates had taken place in the House.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Sir, on a point of clarification. I beg to differ from the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs. Constitutional amendments have been tabled in this House and debated and passed through all three stages, despite the protest of all the Opposition, without notice. That is for the purpose of record of what is exactly the truth.

Dato' Dr Ismail: Sir, the Honourable Member is talking of the notice that is given about the Bills, but if he reads the proceedings of the House, exhaustive debates, if I may say so, take place whenever there is any amendment to the Constitution—that he cannot deny. He may complain of the short notice, and I would like to explain later as to why that is so.

Mr Speaker: Time is up! The Sitting is suspended until 4.00 p.m.

Sitting suspended at 1.00 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 4.00 p.m.

(Mr (Deputy) Speaker in the Chair)

THE YANG DI-PERTUAN AGONG'S SPEECH

ADDRESS OF THANKS

Debate resumed on Original Question and Amendment.

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

“Your Majesty,

We, the Speaker and Members of the Dewan Ra'ayat of Malaysia in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer Your Majesty our humble thanks for the Gracious Speech with which the Second Session of the Second Parliament has been opened”,

to which the following amendment moved by Enche' Lee Kuan Yew was to add at the end thereof:

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

Dato' Dr Ismail: Mr Speaker, Sir, just before we broke off for lunch and recess, I was telling the House that instead of making oblique, vague, references, the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew, Member for Singapore, should be more specific and illustrate his accusations of Malay dominance in Malaysia. On a point of clarification, he asked whether it would help if he were to spell out. I said certainly, since we all subscribed to democratic principles and further it might help to demarcate our areas of differences

and agreement. I would like to add, Sir, that it would be better to air these differences or agreement in this House rather than outside, for example, in street alleys or open grounds, where not only is there no Speaker to see that we adhere to Standing Orders but we may expose ourselves to Indonesian bombs and also the risk of assassination. I then went on to say that if there is no political equality between Singapore and Malaysia, then the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew, Member for Singapore, and his colleagues in the P.A.P. must shoulder the blame and I was told that I should say P.A.P. in case many people may not understand P.A.P., then I say he and his colleagues must shoulder the blame. I was just going to say that his fears that the Alliance would scrap the Constitution were based entirely on false premises when we broke off.

I would like to begin, Sir, where we left off. I said that his fears that the Alliance would scrap the Constitution are based entirely on false premises. It is true, I said, that constitutional changes have taken place in the past, but as the Honourable Prime Minister had repeatedly stated changes in the Constitution would only take place if they were considered to be beneficial to the country and that he would never change those provisions of the Constitution affecting fundamental rights and liberties. Further, amendments to the Constitution in the past have always been passed after exhaustive debates had taken place in the House.

In regard to the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew's observation, and I quote him, “We are still faced with Standing Orders, which entitle the Government to bring about radical and fundamental changes in the Constitution all within one day—the intention of the first, second and third readings, if the Government so chooses”. Sir, when the Honourable Member made this statement he must be, I am afraid, suffering from lapse of memory. I am sure, Mr Speaker, if you go through the proceedings of the House there is no such thing. Further, it would be contrary to Standing Orders to have any Bill, let alone the

Constitution Amendment Bill, to be passed in one day. I would like to draw the Honourable Member's attention to the fact that the Committee on Standing Orders consist of Members of both sides of the House with you, Mr Speaker, as Chairman. The Honourable Dr Toh Chin Chye represents P.A.P. on the Committee. In fact, Government itself is not satisfied with the way Bills have been rushed through the House before Members have ample time to study them. It has been suggested and agreed that instead of waiting for the First Reading, before any Bill can be published, the Bill should be printed and gazetted in the White Gazette and passed to Honourable Members well before the time Parliament meets to hear the first reading.

It is therefore, Sir, childish, if I may say so, for the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew to draw the inference that because constitutional changes have taken place in the past for reasons stated by me Government is going to keep on changing it just for the purpose to down the Opposition. We on this side of the House don't give the Opposition that much credit. (*Applause*) Sir, we, Malay Malaysians, as the Honourable Member would like to call us, are not afraid of the truth. Surely in evolving a Malaysian tradition and Malaysian Malaysia we should borrow and use sometimes fully, sometimes in part, the cultures and talents of every race which Malaysians are drawn. When P.A.P. accuses the Malays of dominating Malaysia, let it not forget the subordinate role played by the Malays in commerce and industry, the comparatively small number of Malays in our scholastic institutions, and here I would draw the Honourable Member's attention to the frank speech by my colleague, Mr Tan Siew Sin, at the Convocation of the University, whereby he appealed to all Malaysians to help the Malays "so that in future you would see more Malays graduating in the sciences and as professional men." (*Applause*).

Let us not forget also the comparative small number of Malays in professional and technical services and in

trade unions which, after all, are the things that count a great deal in a modern State.

If the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew who likes to calculate every human endeavour according to arithmetic, adds up the strength and weakness of the Malays, he cannot accuse the Malays of dominating Malaysia. With the example of Indonesia before us, the Malays do not wish to dominate a ruined Malaysia, which would certainly result if communal differences are pressed to the extreme.

Now, Sir, at long last, like Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde, the two images of the P.A.P. cannot be kept separate for long; (*Applause*) the two must come together and appear as one. The time for merging has come. The public now knows, and the world will soon know, that the P.A.P. is a party which shouts, "Fire! Fire!" while committing arson. (*Applause*). Sir, now that the mask has been removed and the P.A.P.'s stand has been made clear, it is easier for us to fight openly to win the hearts and minds of true, loyal Malaysians which, I am glad to say, form the majority in Malaysia. If I may, Sir, in the words of Abraham Lincoln, the P.A.P. can deceive some of the Malaysians some of the time, all of the Malaysians some of the time, but not all of the Malaysians all the time. (*Applause*).

We, Sir, in the Alliance, through our policy of promoting and sustaining inter-racial harmony, have fought and won many political battles by constitutional means. We have won the battle for Merdeka. We have won the battle for independence for our brothers in Singapore, Sabah and Sarawak, (*Applause*) and surely it is within our capacity to win this battle against the P.A.P. and its colleagues (*Applause*) in winning the hearts and minds of our countrymen. We will abide by democratic principles as long as our opponents do likewise.

The Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew challenges the Alliance Government to compete in uplifting the economic standard of the Malays. Naturally, he

can with confidence offer this challenge since the competition will be unequal. The number of Malays compared with the rest of the population in Singapore is negligible. Beside, there are no other indigenous population in Singapore; in the rest of Malaysia the Malays, the Ibans and the Kadazans form the majority. On top of this, Singapore contributes only 40 per cent of its revenue to the Central Government. I think, Sir, it would be a fairer competition if Singapore contributes more of its revenue to the Central Government (*Applause*) and not be so stingy with loans for economic development to Sabah and Sarawak.

In answer to the criticism by one Honourable Member from this side of the House that the Singapore Legislative Assembly met only once this year, the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew said that the Barisan Sosialis knows how to take care of itself. I wonder how the newly acquired colleagues of the P.A.P. view this attitude of their leader towards a parliamentary institution. After all, whatever it is, the Singapore Legislative Assembly is a parliamentary institution. As far as the Government on this side of the House is concerned, we view this attitude of the Honourable Member, who is also the Prime Minister of Singapore, as very reprehensible and quite disrespectful towards the Assembly. I am sure the public at large could imagine what respect the Honourable Member would have for this House if the Malaysian Solidarity Convention should command a two-third majority of the House as the Alliance now possesses. Judging from its attitude towards the Singapore State Assembly, he would probably hold it once a year, and to any question asked he would reply, "The Alliance could take care of itself".

The Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew also said, and I quote him:

"Public meetings are prohibited in danger areas."

Sir, the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew knows very well the security position of this country before Malaysia and after Malaysia. I was associated with him in the Singapore

Security Council and now, in Malaysia, as the Chief Executive of the Singapore Government, he is kept informed of the threat to the security of our country. Surely, the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew does not think that the Police is biased in granting permits to hold rallies. Sir, the fact remains that there is no total prohibition. There is prohibition of holding rallies in the open spaces and in the alleys, because of this confrontation. We do not want ourselves and our opponents, how much we may dislike them, to be bombed by the Indonesians, to be assassinated by the Indonesians; and we ourselves also value our lives. We do not discriminate between our opponents and our own Party. This partial prohibition applies to all.

Then the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew said, I quote him:

"There is still, Mr Speaker, Sir, perhaps no difference between him"—referring to the Honourable Member for Batu—"personally and us because he is not really what his Party represents. Parties like the Socialist Front"—says Mr Lee Kuan Yew—"and the PAS, parties which have over a series of elections spread over 10/15 years have almost abandoned all hope of ever achieving what they want to constitutionally; it is only those parties that then begin to become disloyal."

Sir, I do not know why Mr Lee Kuan Yew should take interest on the PAS and the Socialist Front. The Honourable Member for Batu has categorically rejected his advances. Now, Sir, the Honourable Member for Pasir Puteh, who is the Menteri Besar of Kelantan, was keeping quiet because he is also as shrewd as Mr Lee Kuan Yew, because, if it is characteristic of the P.A.P. to divorce those whom they no longer have any use for, divorce is not uncommon in Kelantan (*Laughter*). They too know how to play the game. They also know when they want to divorce those whom they have no use for. Now, Sir, are we to blame if the Socialist Front and the PAS have never achieved success in the elections in the past 10/15 years? After all, they fought the elections according to rules. There was free election in this country. There was ample time given, not nine days as in Singapore (*Applause*). Is that the reason, Sir, why these people should

abandon constitutional means and resort to violence? I am really surprised with the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew.

Sekarang saya mengambil peluang sedikit hendak menjawab tegoran yang di-datangkan oleh Ahli daripada Pasir Puteh. Soal yang di-bangkitkannya berkenaan dengan perhimpunan dan rapat umum di-Kuantan, Kelantan dan Kedah.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perhimpunan untuk meraikan Hari Muharram di-Kelantan itu telah tidak di-benarkan kerana dua sebab: sebab yang pertama, hari itu telah jatuh dalam tempoh bila orang² yang telah di-tahan bersangkutan dengan ketua kafir-mengkafir telah di-bebasikan. Soal pembebasan orang² tahanan tersebut telah di-jadikan satu soal politik di-negeri Kelantan dan perkara ini ada-lah satu soal yang hangat di-negeri Kelantan. Oleh sebab itu kebenaran tidak-lah di-beri sebagai satu langkah untuk menjauhkan berlakunya pertelingkahan di-antara ahli² UMNO dengan ahli² PAS.

Sebab yang kedua, pehak yang berkenaan ada ma'lumat² yang mengatakan pehak pengkhianat Indonesia akan chuba hendak menakutkan peserta yang hadir ka-perhimpunan² am dengan meletupkan bom². Oleh sebab yang saya sebutkan tadi, maka kebenaran tidak-lah di-beri untuk meraikan Hari Muharram di-Kelantan itu. Bukan tidak di-beri tahu boleh buat di-dalam masjid. Kalau tidak banyak masjid di-sabelah Kelantan bukan-lah salah kita, tempat lain banyak masjid², surau² semua.

Mengikut keterangan yang telah di-beri kepada saya, perhimpunan telah di-adakan di-Kuantan bila Yang Teramat Mulia Perdana Menteri melawat Kuantan baharu² ini. Perhimpunan itu telah di-chadangkan untuk di-langsungkan dalam bangunan dengan peserta² telah berkumpul dalam bangunan yang berkenaan. Tetapi terlebih ma'alum-lah Yang Teramat Mulia Tunku kita ini telah lambat sampai dan peserta² telah keluar dari bangunan tersebut untuk mengambil angin dan menunggu Yang Teramat Mulia Perdana Menteri.

Kedua, apabila Yang Teramat Mulia sampai dia melihat orang² telah berhimpun di-luar bangunan, Yang Teramat Mulia pun terus berserah di-luar kerana Yang Teramat Mulia, bagaimana tuan² tahu, selalu lupa, perhimpunan itu mesti di-adakan dalam bangunan. Saya pun sendiri juga tidak hadir, kalau saya hadir pada hari itu, tentu-lah saya ingatkan Perdana Menteri kita.

Mengikut siasatan² Ketua Pegawai Polis, Kedah, tidak ada apa² perhimpunan di-luar bangunan yang di-adakan dalam negeri Kedah semenjak 1 Mei 1965, oleh sebab banyak parti² politik yang tidak puas hati dengan keputusan tidak memberi kebenaran mengadakan rapat umum. Kita timbangan dalam segi keselamatan dalam negeri mengikut keadaan tempat² yang berkenaan.

Enche' Mohd. Asri bin Haji Muda (Pasir Puteh): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, penjelasan kepada keterangan Yang Berhormat Menteri tadi. Yang saya bangkitkan berkenaan dengan rapat umum di-Kelantan itu bukan-lah permohonan daripada Parti tetapi permohonan daripada pehak Kerajaan sendiri. Parti PAS sedar bahawa larangan untuk mengadakan rapat umum itu ada-lah di-atas muslihat keselamatan dan kita tidak pernah-lah meminta kebenaran bila mana peratoran² baharu di-keluarkan tidak di-benarkan rapat² umum pada masa sekarang, tetapi yang memohon permohonan kerana rapat umum dan berarak itu bukan-lah Parti tetapi Kerajaan dan dalam perhimpunan seperti itu tidak ada soal politik, chuma parti perhimpunan, bahkan saya dapat tahu pehak Parti UMNO dan pemuda² UMNO sendiri telah bersedia untuk datang beramai dan mengadakan perarakan pada Awal Muharram itu. Jadi itu-lah yang saya bangkitkan di-bandingkan dengan soal di-Kuantan, sebab di-Kuantan bukan Kerajaan membuat-nya tetapi Parti Perikatan yang membuat-nya.

Dato' Dr Ismail: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Yang Berhormat itu betul tetapi yang saya katakan, itu-lah sebab keselamatan-lah. Saya memikirkan

patut tidak usah di-adakan, di-adakan di-masjid² supaya senang di-kawal, itu-lah sahaja.

Satu perkara lagi berkenaan dengan pembebasan orang² tahanan kafir-mengkafir, sa-chara besar, sebab dalam perintah pertahanan telah di-kenakan terhadap Nik Abdullah satu perkara lagi yang telah di-bangkitkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Pasir Puteh.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, keputusan mu'tamad untuk membatalkan perintah pertahanan yang telah di-kenakan terhadap Nik Abdullah dengan tidak bersyarat telah di-putuskan sa-belum ia-nya di-bebasan di-tempat Pertahanan Khas, Batu Gajah, dan sa-belum ia di-hantar balek ka-Kelantan.

Berkenaan dengan ia di-minta menanda tangani beberapa syarat itu, ia-lah oleh sebab salah faham pehak Polis tentang arahan yang telah di-keluarkan oleh pehak Kementerian saya. Perintah pertahanan yang telah di-kenakan terhadap rakan² orang tahanan tersebut yang telah di-bebasan terlebih dahulu daripada-nya, telah di-gantung mengikut fasal 10 Undang² Keselamatan Dalam Negeri, 1960. Perintah tahanan terhadap mereka tidak di-batalkan seperti yang telah di-buat terhadap Nik Abdullah kerana dari segi keselamatan gerakan² mereka maseh mustahak di-kawal. Walau bagaimana pun syarat² yang telah di-kenakan terhadap mereka itu akan di-semak sa-mula dari samasa ka-samasa.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I have now come to the second last of my replies to the observations by the members of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Batu, Dr Tan Chee Khoo, in his adjournment speech in the Dewan Ra'ayat on 27th May, 1965, regarding the detention of Tan Kai Hee stated that he had personally written to the Ministry for permission to visit Enche' Tan Kai Hee when he was held in detention in Kuala Lumpur and that he did not even have an acknowledgment. The Honourable Member stated that he did not even have an acknowledgment from the Ministry. Sir, if I may give a reply here, the explanation is as follows.

In a letter dated 7th April, 1965, the Honourable Member for Batu asked for permission to visit 13 detainees in Taiping and 27 detainees at the Special Detention Camp, Batu Gajah on 29th April, 1965. Enche' Tan Kai Hee's name was not included in this particular list. On 19th April, 1965, the Ministry of Home Affairs conveyed my permission to the Honourable Member to visit all the 40 detainees on 29th April, 1965. On 5th April, 1965, the Honourable Member for Batu asked for permission to visit Enche' Tan Kai Hee. While action was being taken to consider his request to visit Enche' Tan Kai Hee, the Ministry received another letter from the Honourable Member dated 14th April, 1965, asking for the original date, i.e. 29th April, 1965, to visit the 40 detainees to be amended to 6th May, 1965. He also stated that he intends to visit Enche' Tan Kai Hee on this new date as well. On 23rd April, 1965, the Ministry of Home Affairs conveyed my approval for the visit to be made on 6th May, 1965. The Honourable Member for Batu was also informed that permission has been granted to him to visit Enche' Tan Kai Hee as well. By this time, Enche Tan Kai Hee had been moved to the Special Detention Camp at Batu Gajah. So if there is any misunderstanding, it must be due to the Honourable Member for Batu, who keeps on changing his mind as often as any woman (*Laughter*).

My last reply is to the observation of the Honourable Mr D. R. Seenivasagam, the Member for Ipoh. He complained that there was a case under the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance in which, he says, counsel was told by the reviewing officer that the Police had ruled that counsel had no right to appear for a detained person in Alor Star. Now, let me give the facts, Sir.

On 26th April, 1965, an enquiry under Section 9 of the Prevention of Crimes Ordinance was held in Alor Star, Kedah. Two persons, namely, Bangaroo Subraya Reddi and Maniam Ratnam, were the subject of the enquiry. The enquiry officer was the District Officer, Baling. The Honourable Mr S. P. Seenivasagam was the

counsel for the two persons. When he appeared before the enquiry officer he requested that the witnesses who had made statements against his clients be produced for cross-examination by him. The Police objected on the ground of public interest under Section 9 (3) (d) of the Ordinance. The enquiry officer agreed with the Police. The Honourable Mr S. P. Seenivasagam told the enquiry officer that he would be writing to the Ministry of Home Affairs on the subject and then walked out of the enquiry. The enquiry has therefore been postponed *sine die*.

Sir, I would like to thank the House for bearing with me; I think I spoke for not longer than half-an-hour, at least not half as long as the Honourable Member for Tanjong. Thank you (*Applause*).

Enche' Chia Thye Poh (Singapore): Mr Speaker, I would like to touch on the motion itself and the amendment to it.

Sir, Malaysia was formed only one and a half years ago. Yet, within this short period of time, political developments, both inside and outside Malaysia, have shown that Malaysia does not serve the interests of the people of Malaya and North Borneo.

Sir, the promoters of Malaysia, in order to deceive the people into supporting Malaysia, have shouted from the roof-tops that Malaysia would bring independence, prosperity, happiness, peace and security to the country. There has even been a talk of making Singapore the "New York" of Malaysia. But, Sir, all these have not come through. In fact, the opposite is the case. Thus, Malaysia has not brought the people any independence. We are still subject to foreign control. Foreign troops are still stationed on our soil and more troops are coming in. Foreign bases still infringe on our national sovereignty and territorial integrity, and more bases are being built in Malaya. Then, there is no prosperity in the land. For hundreds and thousands of people, there is a loss of trade and business, loss of job and livelihood. The people are suffering

more and more hardships with the extra new taxes. More and more people are finding the heavy burdens more and more unbearable. In the circumstances, needless to say, there can be no happiness in the country. Sir, there is no unity in the country.

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: Sir, on a point of clarification, if he will give way?

Enche' Chia Thye Poh: No (*Laughter*).

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: Proceed!

Enche' Chia Thye Poh: Sir, mounting communal tensions daily give rise to anxiety and fears that fresh racial clashes might at any time break out not only in Singapore but also throughout Malaya.

As regards peace and security, all can see that Malaysia has brought not only Indonesian confrontation but also conscription, arms expansion and the concentration of huge British forces in South East Asia. This poses a great threat to peace in South East Asia and brings insecurity to all the people in this region.

Sir, we in the Barisan have pointed out these long ago, and today events have proved us to be correct in every way. Malaysia is meeting with increasing difficulties. Why is this so? (AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Because you are helping the Indonesians!) It is because, contrary to what the deceptive propaganda of the promoters of Malaysia wants us to believe, it was not formed on the wishes of the people and, without the support of the vast majority of the people, Malaysia cannot work and cannot succeed—it must inevitably fail.

Malaysia exists today simply because of the presence of British and U.S. bayonets helped by Australian and New Zealand bayonets. Without such British and U.S. bayonets, Malaysia would not be able to survive for one single day. Sir, is it any wonder that His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong's Address should thank these so-called Commonwealth Forces? Sir, let us understand this clearly: these

British, Australian and New Zealand forces are in Malaysia not because they like our people, but they are here to protect imperialists' interests in tin, rubber, oil and other investments to the tune of \$400 million. They are here not to protect the people but to deny them their freedom, to oppress them and to exploit them. These foreign troops and foreign bases should be withdrawn immediately and the Mutual Defence Treaty must be immediately scrapped. No self-respecting country will allow foreign troops on its soil. It is not without reasons that President Nkrumah called for the withdrawal of the imperialists' presence from South East Asia.

Sir, in the international sphere, Malaysia is still largely isolated from Afro-Asia. The Philippines still does not recognise Malaysia. Indonesia is daily mounting the "Crush Malaysia" campaign. In spite of the efforts of Britain, the United States, India and a couple of pro-western countries, in spite of the fact that Malaysia has been made a member of the United Nations and even of the United Nations Security Council, in spite of all the truth and goodwill missions to Asian and African countries in the last two years, in spite of all the efforts made by the Government to ingratiate itself with Asian and African countries, and in spite of the theatrical humbug rejection of the U.S. loan aid, and in spite of the gesture of condemnation of South African apartheid and even of the banning of imports from South Africa, the Malaysian delegation had not been able to gain entry into the Afro-Asian Solidarity Organisation Conference in Winneba. Sir, feverish efforts are still being made to get Malaysia into the Afro-Asian Heads of States Conference at Algiers this month; and in the next few weeks the British and U.S. and several pro-western countries like India, Japan and Nigeria, may yet re-double their efforts on Malaysia's behalf. But all indications are that Malaysia's chances are very slim indeed. It is still debarred from the Algiers Conference. In spite of the Embassy at Cairo and the setting up of the Missions in Lagos and Addis Ababa, Malaysia is still

isolated from the main stream of Afro-Asia.

Sir, the P.A.P. naturally tries to make political capital out of the present isolation of the Alliance from Afro-Asia; and thus it blames the Winneba slap in the face for the Malaysian delegation on the foolishness of the Alliance leaders in their open support of United States aggression in Vietnam. But what of the P.A.P.? How much less foolish is the P.A.P. on the question of American aggression in South Vietnam and American air attacks on North Vietnam? Did not the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew similarly support United States aggression in Vietnam in his speeches and comments during his travel in Australia, India and Bangkok? Is this not a case of the pot calling the kettle black?

Sir, there is nothing new in this type of P.A.P. underhand tricks. In the past, the P.A.P. had blamed all its failures and unpopular actions on the Communists and on the Barisan. Today, the P.A.P. blames everything on the Alliance. In this way the P.A.P. hopes to gain political capital at the expense of the Alliance, and for this very reason the P.A.P. blames all the present hardships of the people on the Alliance, which has become the sole scapegoat for all the unpopular things which both the UMNO and the P.A.P. are jointly responsible. Today, the struggle for power between the Alliance and the P.A.P. is getting more and more acute—that the P.A.P. had hoped to make Malaysia a P.A.P. domain and Mr Lee Kuan Yew as Prime Minister is now well known.

Sir, in its madness for power the opportunistic P.A.P. had twisted and turned at every stage of history. It first tried to become a partner of the Alliance; then it tried to take the place of the M.C.A. in the Alliance; then it tried to pressure the UMNO into accepting it as a partner through a show of strength in the Federal elections in 1964. All these attempts failed. So, its British masters were called in to help (*Laughter*); and when even they failed to make P.A.P.

leaders Ministers in the Government in Kuala Lumpur, the P.A.P. threatened imminent disintegration of Malaysia.

Sir, of course we have stated that Malaysia will fail, and it is already failing, not because of anything that the P.A.P. can do, but because of the rising opposition of the people to this neo-colonialist creation. The P.A.P. has seen the writing on the wall—hence, its yappings. The P.A.P. mainly hopes to gain credit for the break-up of Malaysia, caused by the mounting opposition of the people.

Sir, realising that alone it cannot put up much of a fight against the Alliance, the P.A.P. now collects around it a few so-called like-minded allies to form a so-called Grand Opposition or Convention. Sir, the P.A.P. says this Grand Opposition is intended to fight for parliamentary democracy, to oppose communal chauvinism, and to fight for a Malaysian Malaysia.

Sir, let us see if this is true. To defend parliamentary democracy—how high sounding an objective—the P.A.P. talks as if it were so concerned about the trend towards total fascist rule under the Alliance Government. Of course, this is an inevitable trend. We have said this many times before. The arbitrary arrests and detention of anti-colonial patriots for as long as nine years, the denial of the basic rights and freedom of speech and publication, association and assembly, study and travel, the banning of May Day rallies and the banning of strikes, etc., all these are conclusive proof that Malaysia is already a Police state; and we strongly condemn the Alliance Government, including the P.A.P., for its fascist rule and its violation of all the basic democratic rights of the people. But in the vain hope of gaining political capital the sly P.A.P. hypocrites, who are just as fascists if not more so in their own rule over Singapore, now come out to complain about “where and in what direction we are drifting”.

Sir, can the P.A.P. cover its own fascist actions in this way? Let us ask these questions. Does the P.A.P. think that the people have such a short memory? Does the P.A.P. think that it

will be able to deceive the people? Did the P.A.P. not similarly refuse to register the Singapore S.A.T.U., i.e. the Singapore Association of Trade Unions? Can the workers ever forget how the P.A.P. used Police and troops to brutally arrest them? Did the P.A.P. not prevent the Barisan from holding public rallies? What sort of parliamentary democracy did we have in Singapore? Did the P.A.P. not withdraw the Sembawang by-election for more than a year for fear of losing the seat? (*Laughter*) Had not the P.A.P. not held Assembly meetings for ten months at a stretch (HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear! hear!) in spite of repeated calls by the people for such meetings? (*Laughter*) What of the dishonest, sham, referendum that did not allow the people to know? What of the unfair Singapore snap general election of nine days? (AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Shame!) Sir, it is disgusting that the devil himself should now pose as the angel in this House. (*Laughter*) (*Applause*) Sir, the P.A.P. itself has been the very devil himself in all these years in Singapore, yet the P.A.P. hypocrites have the cheek to talk of democracy. Of course, the P.A.P. is now receiving a dose of the same medicine from the Alliance, (*Laughter*) which the P.A.P. itself gave to the Barisan only a short while ago. (*Laughter*).

Therefore, Sir, there is no need to take fresh stock of the position now, as suggested by the Prime Minister of Singapore. The position, whether under the P.A.P. or under the U.M.N.O., is the same—it is a Police State. That is the position now. The people knows this only too well.

Sir, the P.A.P. now says that they want to fight communal chauvinism. What does the P.A.P. really do? The P.A.P. has always loved to delve in communal arithmetic. Its political analyses have always emphasised communal percentages in the country. This type of racial analyses immediately expose the P.A.P. leaders as bogus socialists. But the danger is that such talk of racial percentages inevitably arouses communal feelings among the various races in the country.

Sir, during the Federal Elections, in an attempt to gain votes, the P.A.P. openly resorted to communal politics. It postured as the champions of the urban Chinese. This posture immediately aroused the antagonism of the rural Malays. The present emphasis of the P.A.P. on a "Malaysian Malaysia" is an attempt to win the urban non-Malay support. We tell the P.A.P. and also the U.M.N.O. to stop playing with fire. We condemn all forms of communalism. No politician should ever use communalism for selfish ends. Stop stressing communal percentages; instead start stressing on the huge percentages of the oppressed and the exploited as against the tiny percentage of the oppressors and the exploiters. If they keep on playing communalism, they will have to shoulder all the responsibilities for the loss to our people.

Sir, let me here, also, call on the Chinese to remain vigilant, because the P.A.P. is trying to create a false impression that it is pro-Chinese, because the P.A.P. wants Chinese support against the U.M.N.O. It wants them to believe that the P.A.P. looks after Chinese interest. But this is not true. The P.A.P. merely wants to make use of the Chinese for selfish ends. History has already shown that the P.A.P. has sold out the rights of the people in Singapore, the population of which is mostly Chinese. The P.A.P. accepted second-class citizenship for Singapore and also suppressed Chinese education for Singapore. Sir, this is enough to show that the P.A.P. is not protecting the Chinese. The P.A.P. is merely twisting and turning for selfish ends. So, let us not fall into the P.A.P.'s trap.

Sir, the latest slogan of the P.A.P. is "Malaysian Malaysia". What is this "Malaysian Malaysia", if not another form of "Neo-colonist Malaysia"? (Laughter) Whether this Malaysian Malaysia is in the present form of the Federation, or in the form of a Confederation as suggested by the P.A.P. (with the various autonomous units which may be separated into the Federation of Malaya as one unit, Singapore as one unit and Sabah and

Sarawak as another unit) it will still be Malaysia. Of course the P.A.P. does not want Singapore to secede from Malaysia. The P.A.P. has to reconcile the present concept, which is the original support and promotion of Malaysia; nevertheless it is a form of secession from Malaysia. Sir, this call for a "Malaysian Malaysia" is of course

Enche' S. Rajaratnam (Singapore): Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: (To Enche' Chia Thye Poh) Do you wish to give way?

Enche' Chia Thye Poh: I think the Honourable Member can reply later.

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: (To Enche' S. Rajaratnam) He does not give way. (Laughter).

Enche' Chia Thye Poh: Sir, this call for a "Malaysian Malaysia" is of course intended to serve the P.A.P. and, most important of all, the British interest. Completely contrary to what the P.A.P. had promised, Malaysia had brought about terrible hardships to the people of Malaya and especially of Singapore, as I have already mentioned. The P.A.P., therefore, now tries to pass the buck, tries to put all the blame for the people's hardships brought about by Malaysia on the Alliance, its new rival and enemy. The P.A.P. really wants the people to believe that Malaysia, if promoted, would have brought prosperity and happiness, but for the "ultras" in the U.M.N.O.; hence the call for a new Malaysia, that is, the so-called "Malaysian Malaysia". In this way, the P.A.P. hopes to confuse the people and sidetrack those who oppose Malaysia into unwittingly supporting this new form of Malaysia, thus helping the British and the United States imperialists, to hoodwink the people and to preserve Malaysia for the interest of the British and the United States imperialists.

Sir, I would like to make use of this opportunity to tell its allies a bit of the P.A.P.—a bit of its history. (Laughter) Sir, in the past the P.A.P.

made use of the workers and the students in order to gain power! (HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Shame! Shame!) However, after gaining power, the P.A.P. discarded and imprisoned the workers and the students. In the past, the P.A.P. made use of the Alliance to deal with its political opponents in the unions and in the Barisan Sosialis, but having dealt with its opponents the P.A.P. is now going against the Alliance. Sir, today the P.A.P. hopes to make use of the allies in the Grand Opposition. But what will be their fate if the P.A.P. should gain power? The lesson is clear.

Sir, from all this, we see therefore that the P.A.P. is insincere in everything it says. All this shouting about democracy and a "Malaysian Malaysia" is intended to serve imperialist interest and its own interest and not the interest of the people. Now, because the P.A.P. has the tacit acquiescence and even active support of the British for its new slogan of a "Malaysian Malaysia", its leaders thumped their chests and throw challenges at the Alliance leaders and shout, "If there is to be trouble, let's have it now!" Why such bellicosity, because it has the backing of the British? (*Laughter*). Why now and not wait five or ten years? Because now it is more advantageous to the P.A.P., because now the P.A.P. has control of the Singapore propaganda apparatus and can usually confuse the people and mislead them (HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!) into believing that the P.A.P. is fighting for their rights, (*Laughter*) because now, whether its differences with the Alliance are settled by so-called democratic methods or by military forces, the P.A.P. stands to gain, because Western opinion favours Mr Lee Kuan Yew as against UMNO. Why not fight ten years later? Because, then, the P.A.P. would be thoroughly exposed by political developments, both local and international, which the P.A.P. would no longer be able to cover, because then the Opposition in Singapore will grow and become stronger because, contrary to the P.A.P.'s claims, time is not on its side—time is on the side of the people.

The P.A.P. has also talked big about civil strife, if the P.A.P. leaders should be arrested. We tell the P.A.P.—stop trying to give yourself airs (*Laughter*). The P.A.P. leaders are defending the interests of the imperialists. The people will not fight for the interests of the imperialists. The people will see through the P.A.P. sly talks and they will not fight for P.A.P. interests. So, stop bragging as if you represent the people.

Sir, from what I have just said, it is clear that the amendment of the Prime Minister of Singapore and the motion itself cannot be supported in any way. (*Laughter*).

Mr Speaker, Sir, let me now give the Barisan's solution to peace with honour. His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong has spoken of peace with honour. We in the Barisan have opposed Malaysia from the very beginning. (SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Shame!) In spite of malicious smears and foolish vilifications against us, we remain firm and unwavering. We oppose all forms of imperialist oppression and exploitation and we still oppose Malaysia. But, Sir, this does not mean that we are disloyal. On the contrary, we have always been loyal to our country and our people, (ONE HONOURABLE MEMBER: Which country?) and out of this loyalty to our country and our people, we suggest the following solution to the present hour of peril, which is the one and only correct road to peace in Malaya and North Kalimantan.

First, regarding Malaya, we want a genuinely united, independent democratic Malaya, including Singapore, with the release of all political detainees (*Laughter*), normalisation of all political activities and restoration of the rights and freedoms of speech and publication, association and assembly, study and travel to the people. All foreign bases and troops must be completely withdrawn as they violate our territorial integrity and national integrity and as they are used as springboards for aggression against the emerging forces in the whole region.

Secondly, regarding North Borneo, immediate ceasefire and withdrawal of all foreign troops from North Borneo—namely, British, Australian, New Zealand, Indonesian as well as Malayan troops. Malayan troops should not fight battles to preserve British neo-colonialism in South-East Asia. We support the right of the people of North Borneo to self-determination.

Enche' Abdul Rahim Ishak (Singapore): On a point of order.

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: What order?

Enche' Abdul Rahim Ishak: Well, he has been referring to our country as Malaya. Now, it is Malaysia and he is sworn to uphold the Constitution of Malaysia. But he is referring to North Kalimantan, Singapore and Malaya—is there such a place?

Enche' Chia Thye Poh: Sir, what point of order?

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: Please proceed! (*Laughter*).

Enche' Chia Thye Poh: Sir, we support the right of the people of North Borneo for self-determination. The future of North Borneo must be decided by the people of North Borneo themselves. There must be no outside interference whatsoever.

Enche' Lee San Choon (Segamat Selatan) rises.

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: Do you give way?

Enche' Chia Thye Poh: No, I think he can wait.

Enche' Lee San Choon: I just want to know whether he copies from Indonesia or Indonesia copies from him (*Laughter*).

Enche' Chia Thye Poh: Sir, the withdrawal of foreign troops will immediately remove the possibility of military clashes in this area. Relaxation of international tension in South-East Asia follows and immediately the threats to peace in our part of the world will be removed. All outstanding questions between Malaya and Indonesia can then be peacefully settled

between the two countries. This is the correct road to peace with honour. Prosperity shared by all will then follow. United as one, irrespective of race, colour or religion, the people of Malaya can then together build a new nation with no exploitation of man by man.

Sir, the Government austerity drive, defence bonds and increase of foreign borrowings, etc., will only add to the burdens of the people and so increase their opposition to Malaysia. There is no mention of heavier burdens from taxes, but we can confidently say that it is only a matter of time before more taxes will be imposed on the people.

Sir, the Alliance Government may seek all sorts of military support from the imperialist countries and embark on the most unprecedented arms expansion, but this will not be able to help, because there are two important reasons. First, the British and United States imperialists no longer have the capacity or the stamina to suppress the national liberation struggles all over the world. The U.S. imperialists with all their most modern weapons are still losing the war against the people of Vietnam. Second, the resistance of the people to Malaysia is mounting. Where there is oppression, there is bound to be resistance, and the heavier the oppression the greater is the resistance. Thus, again, we confidently predict Malaysia is doomed. The will and determination of the people to be free cannot be suppressed by whatever forces. The final victory must belong to the people. That is all what I want to say. Thank you.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Dr Lim Swee Aun): Mr Speaker, Sir, I am indeed very glad that the Honourable Member from Singapore, Mr Lee Kuan Yew, has at last seen the light when he said, "I will oppose a Chinese Malaysia, because it is wrong. An appeal to a Chinese Malaysia cannot attract majority support. There are only 42 per cent. Chinese in Malaysia—a permanent minority."

Sir, we in the M.C.A. have known this fact long before Malaya got its

independence. Even the UMNO knew that it would not be healthy to have a Malay Malaya. That was why the UMNO and the M.C.A. joined together to form the Alliance to build a Malayan Malaya out of a multi-racial society. That was why the Constitution was drawn in such a way that in it were written safeguards for the individual, the racial groups and the minorities. The Constitution was specially tailored for our multi-racial society so that we could build one nation out of many. It was recognised that every citizen, no matter what his racial origin, was equal. Every citizen has an equal voice and equal vote and an equal share in the country. Every citizen is an owner and not a guest in this country.

The Constitution was so fair, so workable and so just, that the peoples of Sabah, Sarawak and Singapore welcomed the extension of the Constitution to the newly formed Malaysia. They knew that this Constitution, although drawn up by the Alliance, could and would create a Malaysia where all citizens are Malaysians.

It is, therefore, the height of impudence for the Honourable Mr Lee to now say that the P.A.P. will honour the Constitution because it believes that it can provide a solution to the problems of multi-racial society in Malaysia. Sir, this is not something that the P.A.P. can claim credit for. It was the Alliance that drew up this Constitution a very long time ago—many years before the formation of the P.A.P.

Since its conception before 1957, the Alliance had preached and practised racial harmony and understanding. We do not believe in a Malay Malaysia or a Chinese Malaysia. We believe in building one nation out of a multi-racial society. I am, therefore, very glad that the P.A.P. has at last given up the idea of a Chinese Malaysia which is bound to create racial tensions wherein the Chinese in the rural areas would be the first to suffer. At last, Sir, the Honourable Mr Lee has come

out in the open to confess his ambitions. As a citizen of Malaysia, he is entitled to such ambitions, and I quote:

“If the Prime Minister ceases to command the confidence of the majority of the Members of the House, he shall tender his resignation. We have not the slightest doubt that the Prime Minister would continue to command and, in fact, we like him to continue to command.”

Sir, what hypocrisy! Can you believe this man who in his speech has stated that the P.A.P. has already made calculations carefully and methodically? Sir, the truth is to be found in the other part of his speech, and I quote:

“But in accordance with the right, it is open to us to demonstrate that we can do as much, if not more, for the Malays and the indigenous people. We are posing to the Alliance Government now the fundamental challenge—implement and honour the Constitution. Let us go one step further and see how you can make a more equal society. Give us a chance to put forward an alternative, for we have an alternative.”

Sir, that shows clearly that they want to have the opportunity to be the Government. They have every right, but they have got to wait for the next Elections!

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Alliance Government certainly accepts this challenge. This is not a new challenge. It is a challenge we have accepted since the day the Alliance was formed. The citizens of the nation are the judges. If the Alliance had not implemented and honoured the Constitution, we would have been thrown out long ago. The fact that the Alliance had been returned to power at every election and at the last national election where we were returned with more than an overwhelming majority, when every P.A.P. candidate, except the Honourable Member for Bungsar, lost even his deposit (*Applause*), should convince the nation and the world that we have implemented and honoured the Constitution.

In issuing this challenge, the Honourable Mr Lee wants us to go one step further. Why only one step further?

With the revolving fund of \$50 million the Trade Division has to:

- (i) buy padi produced in Malaya at the guaranteed minimum price,
- (ii) buy local rice at prices calculated in relation to the guaranteed minimum price for padi,
- (iii) operate Government rice mills and rice godowns,
- (iv) import rice to supplement the rice stockpile when necessary,
- (v) sell rice to importers of rice,
- (vi) pay for the administration of this system.

Although it is run on a commercial basis, it is not run as a profit making venture.

Every padi planter can sell his padi to whomsoever he likes and at whatsoever price he likes; but today the Government guarantees that if good dry padi is delivered to the door of any rice mill—whether owned by Government, co-operative or private—the minimum price will be \$16 per pikul.

After taking into account that one and a half ($1\frac{1}{2}$) tons of padi is required to produce one ton of rice, the cost of milling, bagging and overheads plus a profit margin of \$12 per ton, the Government offers to buy milled local rice from these rice mills at the basic price of \$430 per ton ex mill.

Government pays for the cost of transporting this rice from the mill to the Government rice godown at the rate of 24 cents per ton mile. As the distance from the mill to the Government godown varies from mill to mill, the final cost to the Government for rice delivered to Government's godown varies from \$433-\$454 per ton.

As the Trade Division has to finance this system on a commercial basis, rice from Government godowns is sold to the rice importers at \$27.20 per pikul or \$456.96 per ton. This difference is necessary to pay for the administration of the system.

Because of Government's control on

the Government godowns. The proportion today is that for every one ton of rice imported, the importer must buy one ton of rice from the Government. In this way, there is circulation of Government's rice stockpile, thus ensuring that the rice does not run bad and the revolving fund is replenished.

Although the free market price of local rice is between \$21 and \$22 per pikul, that is to say, any one can go to a rice retailer shop and buy local rice at that price, the Government sells to the rice importer the same type and quality of local rice to the importer at \$27.20 per pikul. This means that the rice importer must lose at least \$5 per pikul or \$84 per ton on every ton of rice he buys from the Government.

How does the importer make up his loss? The importer is compelled to add this loss to the cost of his imported rice and sells the imported rice at a higher rate.

In the other words, the urban population who eat imported rice are subsidising \$5 per pikul of local rice, so that the rural population that plant padi can receive \$16 per pikul of padi they sell, which is almost twice the amount padi planters across the border get.

Does the Honourable Member, Mr Lee, still maintain the Alliance Government has not taken any steps to increase the cash earnings of the rural padi planter? At the guaranteed minimum price of \$16 per pikul and with double-cropping, the Malayan padi planters should have tripled if not quadrupled his cash income per annum.

The Honourable Member for Melaka Selatan, however, made a serious statement. He stated that the Government was helping private mills to destroy the Malay Co-operative Rice Mills. I am confident this House will find that the Honourable Member was more emotional than factual.

I would like to explain that from 1959 the Tanjong Karang Co-operative

This Mill had exclusive rights and was situated close to the padi fields in Tanjong Karang, Selangor. It could, therefore, buy padi very easily.

In 1959, the guaranteed minimum price of padi was \$15 per pikul and the price for milled rice bought by the Government was \$406 per ton ex mill, plus allowance for transport from the mill to the Government godown at 25 cents per ton mile.

The correct price payable for rice delivered at the Government Rice Godown, Klang, by the Tanjong Karang Co-operative Mill should, therefore, be \$414 per ton, made up of \$406 basic price plus \$8 transport allowance for the 32 miles from Tanjong Karang to Klang at 25 cents per ton mile.

As it was the Selangor State Government's policy not to permit any other rice mill to be set up in the padi areas of Selangor, private rice mills were only allowed to be built in Petaling Jaya. These private mills had to buy padi from Sebak Bernam and other padi growing areas of Selangor to feed their mills. The distance one way from the padi fields to the mills in Petaling Jaya range from 50 to 85 miles.

In 1959 and since, the Trade Division felt it fair and necessary to pay to these private millers of Petaling Jaya a special transport allowance for hauling the padi for such long distances from the field to the mill. No other mill in the whole of Malaya was given this special transport allowance, as they were all built in padi areas.

The special allowance was considered fair because it was the Selangor State Government's policy not to allow these mills to be built in the padi areas of Selangor, where they should have been built.

It was considered necessary because without this special allowance these private millers would not be able to buy padi at the guaranteed minimum price—they would have had to deduct the cost of transport from the guaranteed minimum price and the padi

planters would have been the losers. If they were forced to absorb the cost of transport, they would have to close down.

If these private mills closed down, the Selangor Co-operative Mill from 1959 up to today, would not be able to deal with more than one quarter of the Selangor padi crop available for milling. The Trade Division, being required to honour the guaranteed minimum price for padi, would then have to set up a padi-buying organisation in the padi areas. Having done this the problem would have been what to do with the padi. The alternatives for the Trade Division would have been:

- (i) to transport the padi to Petaling Jaya and sell to those private mills at the mill door price of \$15 per pikul. This would enable the millers to sell the rice back to the Government at \$406 per ton plus \$2.50 as transport allowance for delivery at the Government godown at Ampang, Batu Caves—an average distance of 10 miles at 25 cents per ton mile, making a total of \$408.50 per ton. In this case the Trade Division would have to bear all the cost of padi purchase, including extra staff, storage and equipment, plus the cost of transport of padi from the rice fields to Petaling Jaya rice mills;
- (ii) retain ownership of the padi but deliver it to these private millers in Petaling Jaya for milling at a fixed charge per ton. Such an arrangement has been found to be unsatisfactory in several ways, particularly with regard to keeping control over the padi and the rice as both would all the time be the property of the Government; or
- (iii) transport the padi to the nearest Government Rice Mill, which in 1959 was in Kedah.

Sir, under any of these three alternatives, the Government would incur greater expense than it did by giving the private millers of Petaling Jaya a special transport allowance and

the ruling party. That is the purpose of the King's Speech. It is a cover for the Government to talk about what it has done. It can talk about the wonderful things that it has done in the past year or, if that is unwise, then it can talk of the wonderful things that it is going to do in the coming year. The whole idea of the King's Speech is to focus the attention on the Government and its policies. Its purpose is to get everyone including the Opposition to talk about the ruling party. That is why, Sir, I am grateful to the Member for Kota Star Selatan for showing discernment in deciding what is the most important subject worth talking about since the past year.

He opened out not about the Government's policies, not about the King's Speech: the only thing worth talking about is what the P.A.P. has said and done, and this is the most important topic worth discussing. It is not an assessment by the Opposition, it is an assessment by a Member of the Government, by a man who has been entrusted with the task of moving a resolution to thank His Majesty for His Speech. Mind you, Sir, we are not complaining about this assessment because it is a true assessment. It is not the Alliance Government's doings which are worth talking about, telling the nation to think about, to discuss in the coffee-shops, over the radio, in the newspapers, but it is what the P.A.P. has said and done; and every Member of the Alliance and the Ministers have talked about us, about the Opposition, about the P.A.P., S.U.P.P., U.D.P., and the P.P.P. I think the only exception was the Minister of Commerce and Industry who tried his best to veer the course of discussion back to the Alliance, but even he could not contain himself and had to revert back to what Mr Lee Kuan Yew has said; to what the P.A.P. has done. Sir, even the Member for Johore Tenggara, a wise, shrewd and cautious politician, was trapped by one of his colleagues into talking about the P.A.P. Sir, in this, I think, unwittingly the Alliance leaders are showing greater political perception

and understanding than is normally the case. But I suspect, Sir, listening to their speeches that this is an assessment of what is the force worth talking about. In this assessment, they have come to it not by logic, reason, regard to facts, but by intuition, by political feel, by feel of the political atmosphere. A lot of the things that have been said about the P.A.P. are based on fantasy, hysteria, fear, panic, by threats to arrest Mr Lee Kuan Yew, P.A.P. leaders, to "proscribe the Party", to "Join with Indonesia"—these are not logical arguments of men who are confident of themselves. All these are not signs of strength, confidence in the future. Therefore, Sir, perhaps, I should reciprocate by talking, for a change, about the Alliance instead of the P.A.P.

The first question they should ask themselves is why are they panicky about the P.A.P. and the Opposition in general. Why, for the best part of more than a year, every week, every day, the Alliance leaders have stormed up and down the country talking about the P.A.P.? We are grateful to them, because we spend a lot of money trying to get our party's name known throughout the length and breadth of Malaya, but we concentrate only in a few constituencies. We are grateful to the Alliance leaders for getting the P.A.P.'s name known through the length and breadth of Malaya and in little villages to which we probably will never go. Today, I think, the P.A.P. is known, for better or for worse, throughout Malaysia. (*Laughter*) One, two, three, four million dollars worth of publicity, free, is given by the liberal, generous, Alliance leaders, and they are doing us a favour for free.

Mr Speaker: If the Honourable Member would once in a way stick to His Majesty's Speech, it will be better for all of us! Don't you think?

Enche' Senu bin Abdul Rahman: Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification. I wish to mention that the P.A.P. is doing the greatest favour to the Alliance in Australia, in New Zealand and in other countries too. I think that is worth more than million dollars. (*Laughter*)

Enche' S. Rajaratnam: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am trying to reply to a sustained discussion of the P.A.P. which has been going on for the last two or three days, but not because they discussed it but they have said certain things about the P.A.P. which need to be clarified. Our policies, our attitude

Mr Speaker: If you will intersperse it with some reference to His Majesty's Speech, it might sound better. *(Laughter)*.

Enche S. Rajaratnam: As you please, Sir. I shall try to talk about the King's Speech because by convention the King's Speech is a boost for the Alliance Government. It is by convention a way of presenting the Alliance's advancements and policies, past, future and present. I shall, therefore, discuss the King's Speech and, therefore, the Alliance policy.

Now, Sir, the Minister of Commerce and Industry, as he concluded his speech, referred to the Opposition, in particular the P.A.P., saying that they were rejected and that there is only one P.A.P. Member—true. According to the *Utusan* political analyst, there is only one P.A.P. Member, and that because the Indian electorate in Bungsar were communally minded—that was the explanation. Sir, these are the electorates; these are the opposition; that is the Government with an overwhelming majority. Why are they afraid of us? Why is there the need to demand the arrest, detention, and even the proscribing of the Opposition parties? Why? What are you frightened of? *(Laughter)* Why, if you are frightened, is it necessary to demand the arrest of Mr Lee Kuan Yew, to proscribe the Party. The Minister of Information and Broadcasting went even further: he said, "No. One voice." So, Sir, I would say that these are the symptoms of something much more fundamental.

Sir, the reasons given for criticising the P.A.P. in uniting what they call the Grand Opposition is that we constitute, as laid down in the King's Speech, part of the internal threat to Malaysia. We are the internal threat

to Malaysia; we, a handful of Opposition Members, one only from the P.A.P., we are a threat to the security of Malaysia? They are not quite clear, Sir, at least to me as I was listening to the speeches as to who is the threat. Sometimes it is the P.A.P., sometimes it is the united opposition—the S.U.P.P., P.P.P., U.D.P.; but they keep on saying one thing and that is that Mr Lee Kuan Yew is a threat to the security of Malaysia. One man—a threat to the security of Malaysia? Sir, if that is true, then the Alliance Government is even shakier than I thought it was. Can one man constitute a threat to a Government which represents 10 million people, which has the Army, Navy and the Police at its command, which has vast machinery for publicity? After all, the Minister of Information and Broadcasting controls a more powerful radio, a more powerful television than Mr Lee Kuan Yew has at his disposal. Are they afraid of Mr Lee Kuan Yew—one man in 10 million? (AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Nobody is saying it.) Mr Speaker, Sir, yet his colleagues or the Members to whom he whispers have been saying that Mr Lee Kuan Yew is a threat to the security of Malaysia. I understand, Sir, that the Honourable Member for Johore Tenggara addressed a meeting in Penang, I think, just over a week ago, where his disciples said: "Arrest Mr Lee Kuan Yew, put his entrails in pickle"; and according to the *Utusan* report, which is a very reliable paper, he was reported to have smiled and requested the audience to shout louder so that the Minister over there could hear it. In fact, Sir, perhaps I should read out the particular report, unless he wants to denounce the *Utusan Melayu* in this Chamber. It says:

"Several voices shouted: 'Arrest Lee and preserve his entrails in pickle.' Dato' Albar smiled—*(Laughter)*—for a moment and then replied: 'Shout louder so that Dr Ismail can hear the people's anger.'"

The Member for Johore Tenggara himself has claimed earlier that Mr Lee Kuan Yew is the threat. I shall quote from the *Berita Harian* of May 11th. This is what he was supposed to have said, at least—I am making a

distinction between the *Utusan Melayu* and *Berita Harian*, which is a colonial paper. Anyway, according to the report, this is what it says:

"Before relations between the Central Government and the Singapore Government become more acute, it is better for the people of Singapore to consider choosing a sincere leader to replace Lee Kuan Yew. The important thing to be remembered by everybody now, he said, is the reminder given by Tun Abdul Razak urging the people of Singapore to find another leader to replace Mr Lee Kuan Yew."

So, Sir, are we seriously to believe that this Government, returned by an overwhelming majority, with all the Army, Navy, Air Force, and whatever else they have at their disposal, is afraid of one man? He is not a very big man either, Sir. (Laughter) His only art of self-defence which he learnt, I am told, is how to use a golf club. If the Navy and the Air Force of the Malaysian Government cannot contend with Mr Lee Kuan Yew, then I say I will be afraid for my future. I do not think they really seriously believe it, but that for some reason they want

perhaps telling us and revealing how more Malaysian they are than many people would believe.

Now Sir, the other thing they say is that the P.A.P. is a threat and yet, on the other hand, they keep on saying that the people do not want the P.A.P., that they reject the P.A.P. in Malaya. I think the Minister of Finance has got evidence which he has not yet produced to show that the P.A.P., in particular Mr Lee Kuan Yew, are so unpopular that we have to rule by terror. Of course there are terrified people in Singapore who have sent him letters but these letters have been posted in Johore Bahru so that we cannot trace the complainants. This is not a compliment to the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, and unless he co-operates with us we can never know who posted those letters and where. Nevertheless, the Minister of Finance said that we rule by terror, that the people of Singapore are only waiting for the next election to get rid of us.

suitable, necessary and inevitable in Malaysia. I quite believe some of the Alliance leaders—not all of them but, I believe, most of them—when they say that they too want a Malaysian Malaysia as a concept but, in practice, they must resist it, because a Malaysian Malaysia implies, as I said, a support of non-communally organised parties. Let me give instances. This is not a theory on my part. The Alliance, maybe for very valid reasons, started its career and probably it had no choice but to build itself from the present organisational basis—three communal parties working together as an Alliance. Perhaps there was no choice. But that was in the Federation of Malaya. Now that we have Malaysia you find new forces emerging—non-communally organised parties, multi-racial parties and one such party was associated with the Alliance in Sabah. Their own partner, the SANAP, was a multi-racial party. And yet the Alliance leaders had to bring pressure to get the SANAP to become a communally

parties but that they would be forgiven if they returned to the Chinese party." Obviously it was a sin to remain in a multi-racial party. Why so, Sir? Why has the Alliance to force one of its partners to discard its multi-racial character to become a communal party? Because it is in the logic. It is not that they want it. I remember, Sir, the fable of the fox. There was a fox which lost its tail and it was a bit embarrassing for the fox because every other fox had a tail. So he went out one day and called all the others foxes and standing against a tree gave a learned discourse on why it was good for the foxes not to have a tail, "because, he said, if you have a tail, you get caught in traps" and so on until one bright, young fox said, "Well, it is all very interesting and very logical. But would you please turn around?" So for the same reason, the Alliance has to get every other of its partners to cut its tail.

However, in Singapore, Sir, traditionally over a long period

for being communal, but now for some reason or other he has joined the new outfit called the SAP—it sounds like cap but I think it is SAP (*Laughter*)—and the secretary of that party some time ago came out with a statement. Perhaps I should quote the statement lest I should do this new party an injustice. In February the secretary of what was then called the Singapore Alliance, but now called Malaysian Alliance, Singapura, came out with a statement, which when I read it in February I said was political death for the Singapore Alliance. The statement said, “The Alliance leaders, being practical and realistic, are proud to have urged the Chinese to unite, the Malays to unite and the Indians to unite and to co-operate and thus achieve greater unity.” Sure enough, Sir, a few months later the Singapore Alliance was no more, because it is disastrous in Singapore, where the electorate have consistently rejected communal parties, to get people to make statements like this. And yet the Alliance leaders have to force their partners in Singapore, even if it means political death to them, to proclaim doctrines like this.

Sir, I think the Member for Johor Tenggara himself in the course of the debate said “Yes, why not shout Chinese unite, Malays unite, what is wrong with it?” All right, Sir, I would like to put for his real, serious consideration the consequences of that advice. If everybody goes around shouting Chinese unite, Malays unite Indians unite, Ceylonese unite, Arabs unite (*Laughter*), everybody unite, the first question—apply this to Singapore with over 80% Chinese. Let us say that if tomorrow we follow the good advice of the Member for Johor Tenggara or his colleagues or his mentors or the political secretaries who lay down this philosophy of the Alliance—sometimes in poetry (*Laughter*)—what would be the consequence? Not immediately, but in five years, ten years or fifteen years’ time. It will mean, if the Chinese follow seriously a “Chinese unite” policy, that the Malays, Indians, Ceylonese, Eurasians, etc., will be out because of the perma-

nent domination of Singapore by the Chinese. Unite! First, for what? Second question: against whom? Let us take this seriously. And if it is seriously put forward, let us take it further—Chinese unite in Malaysia. I know some of the Alliance Members do not like statistics. But I suggest in this case that they take a look at statistics. On the basis of Chinese unite, Malays unite, what is going to be the consequences? Let them think it over. What would be the consequences? Somebody said something, but I will not repeat it, Sir. I do not think personally that this advice is seriously meant. So long as the M.C.A.—they know—cannot unite the Chinese, they can afford to say, “Yes, please shout ‘Chinese unite’.” But, one day, it is possible (if you keep on repeating this), that there might arise a group of Chinese. Then where are we? But, Sir, if the P.A.P. has followed the advice given—and, in fact, it was put to us during the last elections and, perhaps, I can reveal the story now—during the battle for Malaysia when things were difficult for us. . . .

Mr Speaker: Is it a long story? (*Laughter*).

Enche’ S. Rajaratnam: Very short story, Sir (*Laughter*), but it can ensure a long life for the Alliance. They said, “If you want to win an election in Singapore—simple—shout ‘Chinese unite’; fight for an independent Singapore; talk terms with Malaya”—very feasible, easy way out. Yet, on the other hand, they keep on saying. “The P.A.P. is communal because they refuse to shout ‘Chinese unite’”.

Sir, I am trying to say that all the reasons that they give are either foolish, impractical or dangerous. What then are the real reason? First, Sir, as long as they are communally organised, they must resist non-communal parties—and therefore a Malaysian Malaysia. For example, Sir, one of the Ministers said, and, perhaps, I see his point, that the difference is one of approach, that communalism is a reality and racialism is a reality—I concede. He said that especially among the Malays they are not yet prepared

to make the jump to non-communalism. Possibly so. All right, if that is true, then you concede that the ultimate aim should be that the Malays, the Chinese and the Indians should join multi-racial parties, but because of deficiencies, weaknesses, prejudices, that cannot be so now. All right. But every time a Malay is sophisticated enough to leave a communally organised party to join

what Mr Lee Kuan Yew said was to the credit of Malaysia and possibly even to the Alliance Government. So, there was silence and no report was made public from the High Commissioner, Australia, but yet the thing is repeated outside that Mr Lee Kuan Yew went to Australia and New Zealand to do the Alliance Government in. Therefore, Sir, very often when I listen to

must build the theory, to explain that away—the Malays are oppressed.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is right—in Singapore.

Enche' S. Rajaratnam: That's right in Singapore. That is why, Sir, the gentleman here, I think, should think very carefully, especially of things that are going to get reported in the *Utusan*, because a few days ago, one gentleman said: "Oh, the Malays are oppressed, because if you are a P.A.P. member in the Southern Islands you get \$30; if you are not, you get \$5." Apparently the people in the Southern Islands read that and said: "Is this what the UMNO really believe? Is this what a respectful, truthful newspaper publishes for its readers?" As far as the people of the Southern Islands are concerned their faith in the credibility of UMNO and *Utusan* has considerably weakened—maybe the Member is not interested in the Southern Islands, and he is probably thinking of other places outside of Singapore where the things said might be believed. Anyway, Sir, the other reason why they cannot give the real reasons for opposing non-communal parties, in particular the P.A.P., is the economic basis on which the Alliance operates. They work on the basis that the problem of poverty is simply one of "all Malays are poor, all non-Malays are rich; therefore, battle of adjustment." But, in fact, they know that there are poor Malays, rich Malays, poor Indians, rich Indians, poor Chinese, rich Chinese. They know that. I know in this Chamber that there are very few rich UMNO Members, directors and so on; and there are others who are not Members of UMNO, who are not so rich. Well,

away this theory, this fallacy. I think the Alliance has openly said, "We are a right-wing party." The leadership of UMNO, certainly of M.C.A., is in the hands of very well-to-do men, or those who are aspiring to be well-to-do. They are a party of the "haves". There is nothing wrong with a party of the "haves" coming together to protect their interests, but the only difficulty is that they cannot say that publicly. The party of the "haves" cannot go to the electorate and say, "Yes, we are a party of rich men, please vote for us." So, therefore, they have to put forward this theory: Chinese can advance their economic interest only by voting for the Chinese towkays or those who want to be towkays. Then you can get the poor Chinese also to join it, as against the normal political line-up of parties which stand for the under-privileged and parties which stand for the privileged. Non-communal parties will organise the under-privileged of all races, especially in the urban areas. Workers who are in trade unions will naturally react with, what we call, class bias. They vote for political parties which are prepared to fight for the under-privileged. So, the parties of the well-to-do have to confuse them, "No, this is not right. You just vote for the Chinese and everything is okay", or "You vote for the Malays, they will look after you", or "You vote for the Indians, they will look after you". If that is true, then in a homogenous country like Indonesia where everybody is Indonesian there should be no poor Indonesians, or in Japan there should be no poor Japanese. If you think in term of "So long as you have the men of the right race being in the Government, you have solved the economic problem."

politics, parties, voting and so on. If you will cut that out, then we will get on with the business in hand.

Enche' S. Rajaratnam: Yes, Sir. Well, Sir, I should like to refer to a statement made by the Minister of Information and Broadcasting in the course of the debate, when he said that his ideal is to have, as he said, "We are seriously thinking of having only one voice—we want only one voice. I think I did mention to the Honourable Prime Minister of Singapore that instead of having so many voices from Malaysia, we should have only one voice from Malaysia. That is what we are thinking now". One idea, one voice! I would like to comment on this, because I have a personal vested interest in this little revelation. Because I am also in competition with the Minister of Information and Broadcasting, it would appear to suggest, first, that the Minister is unduly pessimistic and unduly defeatist, for the reason that his portfolio deals with ideas—not just one idea, but ideas—and yet he indicates that in a democratic society he is going to specialise in one idea. Now, Sir, ideas, like living things, if they are to breed there must be at least two, but if we have one idea it would be like a mule which has neither pride of ancestry nor hope of posterity, because you cannot do anything with one idea: it cannot generate, it cannot perpetuate. I understand the Minister of Information and Broadcasting is a student of history, and I would therefore advise him to look at history, because usually the one-idea politicians have never got very far in their careers.

Another thing I would like to point out is that his statement would seem to imply that he is not contented with just one idea for Radio Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur but also one idea for Radio Malaysia, Singapura and one idea for Television Malaysia, Singapura. I do not see how this is possible because we in Singapore believe in more than one idea, believe in the conflict of ideas. I do not know how he intends to realise that objective of one idea for ten million people, especially in view of the constitutional arrangement,

but he can realise the concept of one idea only by first tearing up the Constitution. That is a logical step, because I cannot see any other way this can be accomplished. However, if he does that, the matter becomes not just a question of taking over Radio and Television, Singapura alone. You cannot start by just biting at the tail of the lion; you must tackle the lion too. One has to do more than that. You have also to root out ideas—ideas, like a "Malaysian Malaysia"—not in the mind of the Minister of Culture or in the minds of the Singapore Cabinet or the P.A.P. but in the minds of ten million people, and that, I say Sir, is an enterprise which even I would hesitate to embark upon. You cannot implant one idea in the minds of ten million people, and especially if the idea is not a good one I think it would be even more difficult.

So, Sir, it really boils down to this: I said earlier that what the Alliance is afraid of is not just the P.A.P., nor Mr Lee Kuan Yew, nor the U.D.P., nor the P.P.P. What they fear is an idea, the idea of a Malaysian Malaysia, the idea of a nation building without regard to race or religion or creed. That is what they fear. It is an idea incompatible with the way in which their political parties are organised; the concept on which they were voted. The Minister of Information and Broadcasting vaguely fears that. So, he says, "Well, the best thing is to have one idea for Malaysia". I say this is an impossible task, a dangerous task. Therefore, may I suggest to the Alliance that they should pay regard to the "winds of change". So far, Sir, what has happened is that we in the P.A.P., in the Opposition, has kept on emphasising: "Change the Alliance!" But whatever it is, I hope that they will realise that with Malaysia things have changed. They must change. Political parties must change. The methods of organisation must change. Membership must change. The character of their Party must change. Then, perhaps, if they do, the "winds of change" will help them along and maybe the Alliance, far from being depressed, feeling unsafe and feeling a

bit insecure, may have a longer lease of life in a Malaysian Malaysia—if they are prepared genuinely, not as a concept but in practice, to follow the concept of a Malaysian Malaysia.

Dr Ng Kam Poh (Telok Anson): Mr Speaker, Sir, allow me at this moment to say a few words regarding His Majesty's speech in support of the motion. First of all, I must congratulate the Member for Batu for his speech, not all of it but all that he said about the P.A.P. In this short span of one year he has risen from the status of that of a virgin to that of a professional—I am sorry, Sir, I forgot to say from a political virgin to a political professional. However, it is my duty to warn him that he has still a great deal to learn. His party is Indonesian backed and Communist inspired and he has still a great deal to do before he can get rid of these elements. This is evidenced by the placards displayed during the Kuala Lumpur riots and the confessions of his fellow conspirators. The placards, to mention some of them, read "British Imperialists Go Home", "Down with the United States and Great Britain" and so on. Sir, this is peculiar, because one has only to go back to the speech of the Honourable Member for Batu during the last Budget session, when he was practically pleading with the Alliance to ask Britain, Australia and New Zealand to send their troops here to defend Malaysia. Now his party and the Barisan Sosialis ask them to go back. In the language of the Red Indians of America, Sir, I will say this, "Thou speaketh with a fork tongue". I have always maintained that there is collusion between the Socialist Front on the one hand and the Barisan Sosialis on the other and my words have been proved right. May I ask what was the Member from Singapore, Mr Kow Kee Seng, doing in the Socialist Front Headquarters during the riots in Kuala Lumpur which led to his arrest? If he was not a party member, was he a guest? Or was he a director of operations for rioting, so wellknown in Singapore? I leave this question for the House to ponder.

Now for the P.A.P. Mr Speaker, Sir, a few days ago we were treated to a spectacle which in motion picture language could be classified as colossal, stupendous and dynamic. The Prime Minister of Singapore was at its best. He lifted the Federal Constitution this way (*indicates*) no less than seven times. Mr Speaker, Sir, he buttoned and unbuttoned his coat no less than four times. Here was that gifted lawyer politician arguing his case; here was Harry Lee of Singapore wooing and making overtures even to the Minister of Sabah Affairs and to the Minister of Sarawak Affairs. His praise for the dignified manner and bearing of the Minister of Sarawak Affairs was warm and affectionate. But let me remind this House that a species of the spider called the Tarantula also woos and after mating kills its mate. A good example, Sir, is that of a certain Mr Lim Chin Siong of Singapore. After his two hours of argument and oratory and the statement that he will abide by the Constitution, especially Articles 152 and 153, the Prime Minister of Singapore has yet to define what he means by a Malaysian Malaysia. We on this side of the House have always considered ourselves Malaysians one and all, and we certainly would like to know in which part of the Constitution does it say to the contrary. His veiled threat of an alternative arrangement is, to say the least, chauvinistic, and coming from a Malaysian of the third generation is worse than deplorable. His bitter attack on the Member for Johor Tenggara with the object of creating communal unrest is really unwarranted. If the P.A.P. is unhappy with the UMNO, I dare the P.A.P. to fight in the UMNO constituencies, in the predominantly Malay constituencies. With the M.C.A. they will make no headway.

Sir, let us not forget that we are fighting an undeclared war with Indonesia and a speech of this nature at this time is surely uncalled for. Let us unite, put an end to confrontation and when that is over, the Prime Minister of Singapore can then play power politics. He must not forget, Sir that the lives of ten million Malaysians are

at stake and the only way to peace is unity in Malaysia. If the P.A.P. wants to fight in the elections, I am sure the Alliance would be willing to oblige. But making statements and speeches like this in this House will not do the Malaysians as a whole any good.

The Member for Pasir Puteh has condemned the Government's policy of allowing the study of Chinese and Tamil in the English schools. Let me remind him that we are Malaysians and the Constitution, under Article 152, allows the teaching and learning of any language. Indeed, Sir, I would like to call on the Minister of Education to make Chinese and Tamil compulsory subjects in non-Malay secondary schools. It is only fair, Sir, that it be so, because without it no non-Malay will study his mother tongue with proper incentive if it were not made compulsory in addition to Malay and English.

On the subject of education, Sir, I must congratulate the Minister of Education for his farsighted policy over the National Language and in building more National Schools and the Alam Shah College from where the Malays can go to the University through the Malay medium. This is an admirable step, since all political parties here have agreed that Malay be the National Language. However, Sir, what is also required are more Colleges of this type to allow more non-Malays and Chinese, who are not so proficient in English, to go to the universities to study the Arts and Sciences and also to study in a university where there is a chair for Chinese Studies. At present, Sir, a boy in a Chinese secondary school with his poorer command of English can scarcely hope for a place in the Higher School Certificate class, but with these junior colleges, a boy from a Chinese school has every hope.

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew: Mr Speaker, Sir, may I interrupt on a question of privilege? Sir, this has nothing to do with the speaker.

Mr Speaker: I beg your pardon?

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew: I rise on a question of a breach of the privilege of

this House, and it has nothing to do with the speaker. Mr Speaker, Sir, I would seek your guidance on that.

Mr Speaker: But if it has nothing to do with the speaker

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew: It is a question of what is happening in this Chamber at this moment.

Mr Speaker: I do not think it is the time for that!

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am not aware whether music and other entertainments are generally allowed in this Parliament building, and you might be astonished to hear, Sir, that not only is this building used for other purposes when not in session but also whilst we are in session a musical party is in progress outside. I rise to draw this matter to your attention under Standing Order 80 of this House.

Mr Speaker: I may be very hard of hearing. I cannot hear any music!

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew: There is music going on, Mr Speaker, Sir.

Dr Ng Kam Poh: Mr Speaker, Sir, whether music is going on or not, I have to finish my speech. (*Laughter*). Will you please ask the Prime Minister of Singapore not to interrupt me because of the music? (*Laughter*).

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew: Sir, this is a matter which touches upon a very fundamental question—the privilege and dignity of this Chamber

Mr Speaker: I agree with you, but . .

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew: At this very moment it would appear that some party is going on in the Restaurant or some part of this building with music emanating at considerable volume, and I would like to ask you to rule, Mr Speaker, Sir, whether it is in keeping with the propriety and dignity of this House. I know that from time to time we have to adjourn in order that Convocations and other jubiliations can go on, but not whilst we are at the same time listening to the Honourable Members of this House, even though sometimes their speeches seem to compete for amusement.

Mr Speaker: I shall ask the Clerk to the House to go and investigate if there is music, first of all, because I cannot hear any. (*Laughter*).

Enche' Lee Kuan Yew: You have the advantage of a wig, Mr Speaker, Sir. (*Laughter*).

Mr Speaker: Will you carry on!

Dr Ng Kam Poh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I take this as a calculated attempt by the Prime Minister of Singapore to interrupt my speech (*Laughter*).

Mr Speaker: It would better if you presume the best of intention!

Dr Ng Kam Poh: At present a boy in a Chinese secondary school with his poorer command of English can scarcely hope for a place in the Higher School Certificate class. But with these junior colleges, the boy from the Chinese school has every hope of going to the university for higher Chinese education. In time to come, these boys will become doctors, engineers, architects, lawyers, etc.—people who are vitally needed in a developing country like ours. So, let us be farsighted, let our horizons be wide, so that in time to come surely there will be a place for every Malaysian in the sun.

Mr Speaker, Sir, in His Majesty's Speech, it is mentioned that a sugar refinery is established. I know that there are at least two more to be built: one in Singapore and one in Selangor, but I contend, Sir, that it is putting the cart before the horse. I refer, Sir, to the question of quotas on the import of sugar. The world market price of sugar today is about \$25 to \$27 per pikul including all charges. And what is sold by the refinery is at about \$35 to the wholesaler and to the consumer at about forty cents a *kati* and, at one stage, at forty-five cents. The price differs from ten to twelve cents per *kati*. In other words, to protect one refinery in Prai, we have caused the people of Malaya to pay more for their sugar which is one of the products that the people cannot do away with. I maintain, Sir, that this is wrong. The Government should have started that a factory for the manufacture of raw sugar in conjunction with the refinery

and should have investigated into the possibility of whether sugarcane can be planted on a wide scale, sufficient for the factory, before starting this venture. A year has gone by and yet there is no sign of a factory manufacturing raw sugar and no sign from the Ministry as to whether sugarcane can be planted on a wide scale. As such, I hope the Ministry will increase the quota, so that, with competition, the price of sugar will be lowered; and the people, especially the poor, spared the unnecessary waste of money in order to protect one refinery owned by a handful of people who are becoming increasingly rich as a result of the quota system. Since we believe in free enterprise, then let it be so until such time as we can produce our own cane fields and our own sugar factories to feed these refineries.

As to the Member for Tanjong, the lone Member for the U.D.P., I understand that he is not physically well; and I shall, therefore, leave him alone. All that I want to say is in regard to his comment that I am a new Member here seeking prominence. Sir, I would like to return that compliment to him. After all, Sir, this is his first session in Parliament regardless of what he has done in the Federal Legislature, during the colonial period, when he was a nominated Member. There is ample time, Sir, and I shall be waiting for him in verbal debate when the time comes. Thank you.

Enche' Ong Kee Hui (Sarawak):

Mr Speaker, Sir, several Honourable Members have expressed concern and regret at the heat which had been generated by the debate on the motion by the Honourable Member for Kota Star Selatan. If I may say so, Sir, the fire was sparked off by the Honourable Member, proposing the motion of thanks, launching an attack on the P.A.P. and the Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore, a procedure which is unprecedented in normal parliamentary practice, as the Honourable Member for Ipoh has rightly pointed out. To his credit, Sir, the Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore ignored the personal attack, and his stimulating contribution to the

debate, which held the House spell-bound for one and a half hours, should receive our approbation.

Reference was made, Sir, in the course of the debate to the Malaysian Solidarity Convention and to the participation of the S.U.P.P. in this Convention. The insinuation was made that the association of the S.U.P.P. gives the Convention a false front because the S.U.P.P. was anti-Malaysia. It is true, Sir, that we in the S.U.P.P. has very strong reservations about the formation of Malaysia, but so had many others. If this was a sin, Sir, we sin in good company, as many others, such as the Honourable the Minister for Sarawak Affairs and the Honourable the Minister for Sabah Affairs and many others now holding high office in the Alliance Government, were also at the outset against the formation of Malaysia. The only criticism that we are prepared to accept, Sir, is that we are, perhaps, more obstinate, less agile and not so skilled in political acrobatics as the others who were also anti-Malaysia. However, as firm believers in democracy and in achieving our objectives through constitutional means, we have reconciled ourselves to Malaysia as an accomplished fact, although we might still have reservations as to the wisdom of its formation and we question the methods by which this formation was achieved.

The important point which I wish to make, Sir, is that as men of honour, who have taken the oath of allegiance to Malaysia in this House before you, our loyalty and credentials as loyal Malaysians should not be called in question. I had made the stand of the S.U.P.P. quite clear in this respect on my first appearance in this House, and again in the debate in May last year, and lest there should be any doubts in the minds of the Honourable Member for Kota Star Selatan and the Honourable Member for Damansara, I will refer them to pages 482 to 486 of our *Hansard*

Enche' Chen Wing Sum: On a point of clarification, Mr Speaker, Sir. Is the Honourable Member suggesting that the

statement made by Mr Lee Kuan Yew was not true, was false, on page 410?

Enche' Ong Kee Hui: I am coming to that, Sir, if the Honourable Member will let me. The concluding remarks which I made in addressing the House on the occasion are relevant and I quote:

"Now that Malaysia is an accomplished fact, I say in all sincerity that we are here to make it work."

Reference has also been made, Sir, by my Honourable friend, who is in front of me, the Honourable Member for Batu, to remarks made by the Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore at the same meeting last year when he referred to the wind of change and the chasm which exists between the P.A.P. and the other Opposition parties. I think this answers the point raised by the Honourable Member for Damansara.

Enche' Chen Wing Sum: I think if the Honourable Member is to look at the *Hansard*, page 410, he would see that it was in no uncertain terms that the Honourable Mr Lee Kuan Yew has accused, in fact termed the S.U.P.P. as one of the communist organisations. He seems now to say that the allegation was false, that it was malicious and unethical. Was it not?

Enche' Ong Kee Hui: I am coming to that, too, Sir. To those remarks, I replied as follows, and with your indulgence, Sir, I quote from our *Hansard* beginning at the bottom of page 482:

"With due respect, may I suggest that changes constantly take place around us in nature in an unstatic world. As movements on the earth's crust create these chasms, so can further movements and convulsions remove them. In any case, chasms can be bridged and should be bridged or filled up, if we wish to build a road in Malaysia that will bring us to the promised land, where we can find happiness and prosperity for our people. To that end, it behoves us to find common ground and areas of agreement instead of finding faults and looking for differences."

I hope, Sir, that this quotation will provide an adequate answer to my Honourable friend and to others who cannot understand how—after all that has been said—it is possible for the parties such as the P.A.P., U.D.P.,

P.P.P., Machinda and S.U.P.P. to come together to sponsor this Malaysian Solidarity Convention. (*Applause*). The Convention, Sir, is inspired by . . .

Enche' Chen Wing Sum: Sir, I am sorry to interrupt the Honourable Member so many times. May we know who has changed—the P.A.P. or the S.U.P.P.?

Enche' Ong Kee Hui: I think the Honourable Member must be very hard of perception after all that I have said about the fact that this is an unstatic world and we all change. (*Laughter*).

Enche' Chen Wing Sum: Does the Honourable Member mean “change from a non-communist party to a communist party”? (*Laughter*).

Enche' Ong Kee Hui: Anything can happen, Sir. (*Laughter*). Even the M.C.A. may change. Who knows? (*Laughter*). The Convention, as I have said, Sir, is inspired by no less than a common desire now to serve the interests of our people in the survival of this new nation based on a negotiated agreement and Constitution to which we are all pledged to uphold. That the Honourable the Prime Minister of Singapore has found it possible to lead such a movement is a measure of his statesmanship and an indication of his pragmatic approach to the problems of the day, and, if I may say so, to his sensitivity to the winds of change, and his ability to react to movements and changes that take place on the earth which he stands. But, Sir, there are many others who, unlike him, have eyes but they see not.

It seems to me, Sir, that, after sitting through the debate in this House over the past two days and listening to speeches, some of which were acrimonious and charged with emotions, if we calmly and dispassionately analyse it, the area of conflict is circumscribed by several factors or issues. In the first place, Sir, the primary cause is the multi-racial character of our people; secondly, our unequal society and the imbalance in wealth between our urban and our rural areas which follows broadly although it does not coincide exactly with our racial boundaries; thirdly,

mutual suspicion and fear and a sense of insecurity among certain sections of our people; and fourthly, a desire on the part of certain sections of the people, who have tasted power and the fruits of office, to maintain their position by playing on the fears and sensitivity of their community. All these areas of conflict, all these difficulties were recognised by the founding fathers, who were responsible for the formation of the Federation of Malaya, and the Constitution of the Federation of Malaya took cognizance of these factors.

We in the Borneo territories, struggling for independence, have followed the political developments in Singapore and Malaya very closely. We have followed with interest the birth pangs of the formation of the Federation of Malaya by the moulding together a multi-racial community into a nation. We have watched with sympathy the internal disputes within the Alliance Government, between the UMNO and the M.C.A., which led to the break-away of some of the leadership of the M.C.A. from that organisation. We have seen the undue emphasis placed by the major and more powerful partner in the Alliance on the privileges and rights guaranteed to them and their community under the Constitution and the denial or erosion by them of the fundamental rights and liberties given to others. What is even more of concern is the fact that two major amendments had been made to the Constitution itself within a matter of five years after the Federation was formed, and these amendments concern what are generally considered as entrenched clauses, such as qualifications for citizenship and even how the Constitution may be changed from a two third majority to a simple majority. It is surprising then that people like us, in the S.U.P.P., who were struggling for independence see not only our aims and objectives thwarted but also, much to our dismay, being mixed up with the political set-up here which we have followed with so much concern. Other fears and reasons might have inspired other leaders, like the Honourable Minister for Sarawak Affairs and the

Honourable Minister for Sabah Affairs and Civil Defence, their colleagues and followers to join Malaysia. Whatever these fears or reasons were, they were allayed by the London Agreement which gave certain safeguards to the people of Singapore, Sabah and Sarawak. This London Agreement is embodied in the Constitution, and as a signatory to it, presumably, the British Government is pledged to ensure that this Agreement is honoured.

Let us see what else has transpired since Malaysia Day as far as Singapore, Sabah and Sarawak are concerned. As far as Singapore is concerned, we see, soon after Malaysia Day, suggestions made by people in the ruling party in the Federation and, even today, Sir, that the apportionment of revenue should be reversed from 60-40 per cent to 40-60 per cent.

We also see a campaign of hate being fostered by UMNO against the ruling party in Singapore and against its Prime Minister and appeals being made to communal feelings likely to spark off riots or civil commotion which would shake the very foundation of our new nation, based as it is on a multi-racial society. We know that a multi-racial society can only exist if there is racial harmony.

We see in Sabah pressures being brought to bear on the Sabah Government to get rid of officials, despite the terms of the London Agreement which provide for their retention over a specified period. We see a crisis sparked off by intrigues against the then Chief Minister of the State, inspired, as everyone knows, by UMNO. Lest I be misunderstood, let me say this: I hold no brief for the expatriate officers; I merely cite this as an example of the interference in what are primary State matters by the ruling party in the Federation Government.

In Sarawak more recently, we see another crisis brought about, again, by intrigues and manipulations, which emanated from UMNO, which nearly toppled the Sarawak Government. As my Honourable colleague from Sarawak has already spoken on this and has given the House the whole story with

all its lurid and sordid details, I will not repeat. I will, however, say this: Malaysia has been represented to the people as a promised land—a land flowing with milk and honey—and yet two years after Malaysia Day that promised land is not yet in sight.

With Indonesian confrontation as a result of our entry into Malaysia, it seems to us that we have gone astray and arrived at Sodom and Gomorrah. What is there to show to the people of Sarawak, even allowing for handicaps to development posed by confrontation? To all intents and purposes, we are still an underprivileged people. As my Honourable colleague from Sarawak has pointed out, we do not even have fees waived in our primary schools, whereas students in the Malayan States and in Singapore enjoy free primary education with additional three years of post-primary education for all.

We have had great hopes at one stage that the Honourable Minister of Education will arrive in April with an “Easter egg” in the form of free primary education. We cherished the thought that, perhaps, he is keeping it as a gesture of goodwill to our Iban friends on Dayaks’ New Year on June 1st. We are likely to be disappointed again, Sir, and it looks as if we can only pray that he will arrive in the role of a “Father Christmas” with a post-dated cheque for 1966.

In Sarawak, Sir, the recent crisis of the Sarawak Alliance was the result of the introduction of the Land Bills. Measures for these Bills have been the subject of careful consideration over a number of years by experts, both before and after Malaysia, and have been discussed in the Local and Divisional Councils and have been made the subject of political intrigues and manipulations. I am told that we even have the Federal Minister of Lands and Mines, who is a Sarawakian, appearing on Television Malaysia criticising the State Government for these measures. What right has the Federal Minister of Lands and Mines to do this, as land is a State matter according to the Constitution? This, Sir, is a sordid picture in which Malaysia appears to

the people of Sarawak today. It gives us no pleasure, Sir—in the S.U.P.P.—to be vindicated as “Prophets of doom”, for we are now in the same boat and if the boat sinks we all sink together. Malaysia will survive only if all the solemn promises made, and undertakings given, by all the partners to the Agreement as embodied in the Constitution and the London Agreement are honoured in the spirit as well as in the letter of these documents. It is because many of us in the Opposition benches are deeply conscious of this that we have come together to ensure that if Malaysia is to survive it would be a Malaysia in which, as one Honourable Member has put it, “everyone has a rightful place under the sun”; and not only most fundamental rights and liberties be preserved for all, but also such rights and privileges as are laid down in Article 153 of the Constitution.

We in the S.U.P.P. believe in a more equal or egalitarian society and, in so far as Article 153 is designed to remedy the imbalance between the Malays and other indigenous races and the migrant people economically, we accept and uphold it. In fact, in a small way, we in the S.U.P.P., who are in charge of the city administration of Kuching, have done our utmost for the Malays within the limits of our resources. In Kuching, Sir, the houses in the kampong areas are low in rateable values and differential rates are also charged for houses in such areas. Although these rates are low, and the percentages are low compared with other areas, the people who pay these rates are even allowed a waiver of payment of rates whenever they can prove that they are poor; and although the rates obtained from the kampong areas barely even pay for the street lights, we have over a period of years spent almost a third of our allocation of money for works in those areas. Therefore, to us Article 153 of the Constitution is not in dispute or an issue, and it seems to us that there is no need at all to go into anthropology to determine who is more Malaysian. The qualification for citizenship, after all, is laid down in the Constitution and the term “Malay” is

also defined in the Constitution. What is important to us is that, having accepted and agreed to the Constitution through negotiations, no one should lightheartedly change the provisions thereof or interpret them to suit any partner in the Federation, or a section of the people. Nor should the Government exercise its power in such a manner as to deny to the people the rights and liberties accorded to them under the Constitution.

In this respect, Sir, I would like to refer to the fact that under the rules made under the Preservation of Public Security Ordinance, a gathering of more than 25 persons requires a permit from the Government. However, the Government has seen fit to make an order under the Preservation of Public Security Regulations specifically prohibiting any meeting or rally of more than 20 persons organised or called by the S.U.P.P. In one case, Sir, we have under the Regulations discretionary powers given to those responsible for law and order to determine whether permits for a meeting can be issued under the circumstances then existing. But in the case of the S.U.P.P. such discretion seems to have been taken away. It would, therefore, appear that the Government by putting such restrictions on us, who genuinely wish to procure our political ends by constitutional means, is creating conditions or suggesting that we can only carry out our political activities, such as meetings of more than 20 persons in secret and therefore contravene the law. It would appear from what I say, Sir, that the Alliance Government has lost its sense of proportion. Laws and regulations should be such that they can be reasonably complied with. Otherwise the people are driven by frustration to seek their objectives outside the law. It is bad policy for any Government to make laws and regulations which they may be entitled to do which smacks of abuse of power. Under such circumstances, democracy must suffer a setback and the confidence of our people in this system of government badly shaken, for even under the colonial rule such restrictions did not exist.

Finally, Sir, I would like to refer to a report—this appeared in the *Straits Times*—that the Alliance Government has closed down a sub-branch of the S.U.P.P. at the 24th Mile Semanggang Road, Kuching, Sarawak, on the ground that the branch officials there are guilty of subversion and Communist activities. We have in that sub-branch many Land Dayaks, and the relationships between the different races in that area have been most cordial and good. Therefore, it seems to us that the closing of this sub-branch would, if the allegations are true, have a very adverse effect from a security point of view. If the officials are guilty, then there are other provisions under the security regulations for dealing with such people. The report also says that these officials have been holding office since 1960. I would like to point out that it is our practice, whenever officials are elected in any branch office, to submit a list of such officials to the security people so that we may be advised as to whether or not they are security risks. This does not seem to have been the case with the 24th Mile Sub-Branch which has been closed, because nobody has pointed out as to desirability or otherwise of such officials. I only say this, Sir, to point out the extent to which we, as a political organisation, go out of our way to co-operate with the Government in these times of confrontation.

We are all here, Sir, to uphold the Constitution. In doing so, all we ask for is that the fundamental rights given to us under the Constitution are accorded us. But since Malaysia Day measures which have been taken by the Alliance Government, as has been pointed out by the various speakers, such as, amendments to the Constitution, the promulgation of a decree against industrial action by workers in certain essential services and industries and the proposal to abolish appeal in constitutional and criminal matters and certain types of civil cases to the Privy Council, have given us cause for concern and reasons to believe that the fundamental rights and liberties of our people are gradually being eroded away. It is for these reasons, Sir, that

I support the amendment to the motion of thanks to His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong as proposed by the Honourable Prime Minister of Singapore.

Mr Speaker: I have to inform the House that the noise that was heard by the Honourable Enche' Lee Kuan Yew just now was the testing of the loudspeaker system somewhere in this building for the dinner tonight. That has since been stopped.

Enche' Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman (Seberang Tengah): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak berhajat hendak membuat marathon speech, oleh sebab masa tidak mengizinkan. Saya akan chuba membuat 100 yards dash—10 minit sahaja.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak tahu apa-kah sebab-nya Yang Berhormat Enche' Lee Kuan Yew, Perdana Menteri Singapura membuat pindaan ka-atas chadangan yang asal, tetapi pada pendapat saya, Ahli Yang Berhormat itu dengan gaya dan ucapan²-nya sa-bagai sa-orang Frenchman—full of gesture and flamboyance. Jadi, saya nampak beliau hanya menchari publicity sahaja dan hendak menegakkan dalam Dewan ini yang beliau-lah sa-orang yang bijak dan pandai untuk memimpin ra'ayat Malaysia ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita bersetuju dan saya rasa banyak juga orang dalam Malaysia ini yang bersetuju mengatakan, ia-itu Yang Berhormat Enche' Lee Kuan Yew memang bijak, petah berchakap, tetapi sa-saorang yang pandai berchakap tidak berma'ana yang dia pandai dan bijak memimpin dan memerintah. Saya pernah membacha satu nasihat daripada sa-orang ahli falsafah yang mengatakan:

A man who talks much is not a sign of genius and a man who keeps quiet and talks little is not a fool.

Jadi, saya berpendapat Yang Berhormat Enche' Lee Kuan Yew itu dan juga Yang Berhormat Enche' Rahim Ishak. Yang Berhormat Enche' Rajaratnam, menudoh mengatakan yang Parti Perikatan takut dan gentar kapada P.A.P. Saya mengatakan disini, kami tidak sa-kali² takut dan gentar, walau sedikit pun kapada parti

P.A.P. Kalau sa-kira-nya mereka benar² berjuang di-atas lunas² democracy untuk menjadi Perdana Menteri, atau pun memerintah negeri ini, apa yang Parti Perikatan takut ia-lah telatah yang dibuat oleh pemimpin² Petir, membangkitkan perasaan perkauman di-antara satu kaum dengan kaum yang lain. Itu-lah yang kami takut. Itu-lah yang kami menahan. Itu yang kami mahu menerangkan kepada ra'ayat supaya ra'ayat sedar di-atas telatah Ahli² Yang Berhormat dan pemimpin² P.A.P. itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka menasihatkan kepada parti² yang telah pun bergabung dengan parti P.A.P. seperti Parti U.D.P.—pemimpin U.D.P., pemimpin P.P.P. dan pemimpin S.U.P.P. kerana Yang Berhormat Enche' Lee Kuan Yew ini sa-bagai nasihat Abraham Lincoln yang mengatakan jaga² orang yang suka urut belakang—stroke you on the back, for he is finding a weak spot to thrust his dagger. Ini satu masa akan terjadi. Dia chuba menggosok belakang untuk menchari tempat yang lemah untuk merejamkan senjata-nya yang tajam. Jadi, ini saya rasa Yang Berhormat Enche' Lee Kuan Yew akan membuat kepada pemimpin² U.D.P. dan S.U.P.P., kerana dia telah pun melakukan kepada Ong Eng Guan dan lain² lagi.

Apa yang di-ucapkan oleh Yang Berhormat Enche' Lee Kuan Yew dan penyokong²-nya mengadakan satu Malaysian Malaysia. Ini telah pun di-ucapkan oleh Ahli² Yang Berhormat sahabat saya sa-belah sini, ia-itu Perikatan memang berjuang mati²an untuk menegakkan satu bangsa, bangsa Malaysian Malaysia; menegakkan satu bahasa kebangsaan dan menegakkan satu negara, ia-itu negara Malaysia. Ini-lah dia yang Perikatan berjuang, bukan berjuang untuk kepentingan orang² Melayu, berjuang untuk kepentingan orang² China, berjuang untuk kepentingan orang² India, tetapi kami berjuang sa-benar-nya ia-lah untuk Malaysian Malaysia juga.

Kami dari UMNO tidak pernah berniat hendak mengadakan satu front orang² Melayu, dan orang² Melayu tidak pernah menghasut orang² bumi-

putera, orang² Iban, Kadadzan, Murut, Melanau dan lain² bagi mengadakan satu front bumiputera untuk menentang orang² yang bukan Melayu yang ekonomi-nya, pelajaran-nya lebeh dan tinggi jauh beza-nya dengan bumiputera yang ada dalam Malaysia ini. Kita tidak berniat, sungguh pun kami tahu 60% daripada bumiputera ini ia-lah Melayu Kadadzan dan lain²—60%, kami tidak ada peratus apabila beruchap, mengatakan 40% orang China, 42% itu, 45% orang Melayu—tidak.

Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perkara ini, saya rasa patut-lah Ahli² Yang Berhormat daripada P.A.P. ini sedar yang Perikatan ini benar² dan jujur berjuang untuk mengadakan Malaysian Malaysia; barangkali ada 20 ela lagi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untuk menyampaikan tempat-nya dalam ucapan saya ini.

Saya berbalek kepada Uchapan Titah di-Raja, ia-itu chadangan asal. Saya berasa terharu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, apabila mendengar dan membacha—saya bachakan isi kandungan-nya:

Penggal Parlimen ini ada-lah mempunyai ma'ana yang istimewa kepada Beta kerana tahun ini ia-lah tahun yang kelima ia-itu tahun yang menghabiskan Beta memerintah di-atas takhta Kerajaan sa-bagai Yang di-Pertuan Agong.

Jadi, ini-lah yang mengharukan saya dan saya yang mewakili ra'ayat dan penduduk di-kawasan saya yang lebeh daripada 80,000 orang menguchapkan terima kaseh kepada Duli² Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong dan Raja Permaisuri Agong, kerana telah pun sudi melawat ka-kawasan saya, dan penduduk² dalam kawasan saya berasa megah juga, kerana telah kami memberikan sambutan yang luar biasa. Jadi, penduduk² di-kawasan saya, Seberang Tengah, Bukit Mertajam, menguchapkan selamat memerintah di-atas takhta Kerajaan Negeri Perlis sa-kali lagi.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Uchapan Titah di-Raja pada kali ini ada-lah sangat penting dan merupakan satu amanat—satu amanah kepada seluroh ra'ayat Malaysia, ia-itu semua Malaysian yang ada di-dalam Malaysia ini yang ta'at setia kepada Kerajaan supaya berdiri

tegoh di-belakang Kerajaan, di-sa'at kita menghadapi ancaman daripada Indonesia, tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berasa dukachita, oleh sebab—ini saya berharap Yang Berhormat Menteri Hal Ehwal Dalam Negeri akan mengambil ingatan, ia-itu kita harus bertanya, kenapa-kah perkara² yang ta' di-ingini telah berlaku dalam Malaysia ini. Di-dalam sa'at kita menghadapi pencherobohan daripada Indonesia, pemimpin², atau tokoh² kesatuan, telah mengecam Kerajaan, Parti² Pembangkang selalu membuat, menghasut kaum² lain dalam negeri ini dan berbagai² lagi. Ini saya mengatakan, ia-itu democracy yang kita amalkan hari ini ia-lah satu democracy yang sangat² liberal, terlalu longgar. Kalau democracy ini diperketatkan lagi, saya tidak bermaksud untuk Perlembagaan ini—fundamental liberties, freedom dan lain² itu dihapuskan in toto sama sa-kali. Saya tidak bermaksud—saya tidak bermaksud bagitu, tetapi apa yang saya maksudkan ia-lah kebebasan yang diberi kepada ra'ayat itu telah di-salahgunakan. Kerajaan tidak berniat sama sa-kali hendak menekan kebebasan ra'ayat, hendak menekan, atau menindas orang² yang miskin, hina atau buroh², dan Kerajaan sedang berikhtiar untuk meninggikan taraf hidup ra'ayat yang berma'ana termasuk kaum² buroh dan lain² lagi. Jadi, . . .

Mr Speaker: Masa sudah sampai.

ADJOURNMENT

Dato' Dr Ismail: Tuan Speaker, saya bangun menhadapkan supaya mesuarat ini di-tangguhkan sekarang.

Dato' V. T. Sambanthan: Saya sokong.

UCHAPAN PENANGGOHAN

PELAJARAN BAHASA MELAYU DI-DALAM HURUF JAWI

Dato' Dr Haji Megat Khas (Kuala Kangsar): Dato' Yang di-Pertua dan Ahli² Yang Berhormat, pada kali ini saya berhajat hendak membawa perhatian kepada satu perkara yang pada anggapan saya di-dalam tahun yang sudah ini belum lagi di-buka di-dalam

Dewan yang berbahagia ini. Di-dalam beberapa tahun yang lalu saya dan juga beberapa banyak lagi orang² Melayu di-kampong² yang beragama Islam telah merasa bimbang dan juga kechiwa oleh kerana pertama-nya ia-itu pelajaran bahasa dan dalam susunan yang ada pada masa ini di-jalankan oleh Kerajaan tidak-lah menggunakan lagi huruf Jawi. Saya telah pun di-beri faham ia-itu tiap² sekolah yang kelas-nya mempunyai lebih daripada 15 kanak² Melayu yang beragama Islam ada-lah di-ajar perkara ugama—satu daripada mata pelajaran yang di-hantar kepada mereka itu di-dalam kelas-nya. Tetapi malang-nya dengan tidak ada mereka itu mengetahui membaca dan menulis dengan huruf Jawi apa yang di-chatitkan oleh guru ugama-nya di-papan hitam tidak dapat di-bacha-nya. Mithal-nya, kalau sa-kira-nya guru ugama itu menchatitkan alif lam lam ha—Allah, budak² sekarang tidak boleh bacha kerana alif tidak di-kenali-nya, lam tidak di-kenali-nya, ha tidak di-kenali-nya, tetapi kalau di-chatitkan dengan huruf rumi Allah—Allah boleh dia bacha—tetapi had bacha sahaja.

Sa-sungguh-nya, di-dalam menjalankan ikhtiar dan usaha kita menjayakan bahasa kebangsaan dengan huruf Rumi, kita telah tidak memandangkan bagaimana-kah penting-nya kita menjalankan bersama² ikhtiar pelajaran dalam Jawi itu dengan huruf Jawi, kerana kaitannya dengan ugama Islam sangat-lah penting dan sangat-lah rapat dan kita sa-bagai sa-buah negara yang beragama Islam yang di-katakan Ugama Rasmi, dan pada tiap² tahun kita mengadakan Pertandingan Membacha Quran di-dalam bulan Puasa di-mana kita jemput orang² dari luar negeri yang beragama Islam mengambil bahagian dalam pertandingan itu supaya kita dapat mendirikan sha'ar Islam dan membesarkan Qurannul Karim, tetapi di-dalam kalangan kita sendiri dalam hal pelajarannya tidak-lah anak² kita ingin kita hendak suroh bacha Quran. Sa-benarnya, sa-bagaimana yang telah pun terma'alum kepada ramai ia-itu di-kampong² dan di-pondok² sa-memanglah ada pelajaran bahasa dengan chara menggunakan huruf Jawi dan dengan ini juga menyampaikan pelajaran ugama

Islam di-jalankan dengan chara ber-sendirian, dan tidak pula saya nafikan ia-itu ada-lah Kementerian dan Kerajaan kita memberi beberapa banyak galakan kepada Sekolah² Ra'ayat yang ada bertaboran di-dalam negara kita ini kerana menjalankan tugas² yang demikian, tetapi perasaan saya di-dalam kawasan bandar² khas-nya dan juga di-dalam kawasan kampung² 'am-nya adalah pelajaran ugama yang di-kehendaki itu tidak mencukupi. Mithal-nya, kalau sa-kira-nya kita ambil kanak² yang dudok di-bangku sekolah dalam kawasan bandar pada hari ini, sungguh pun mereka itu telah di-suroh belajar ugama di-dalam sekolah-nya sa-bagai satu mata-pelajaran dan di-dalam masa itu juga guru ugama itu di-suroh mengajar mereka itu membacha dan menulis di-dalam huruf Jawi, tetapi saya per-chaya ia-itu Ahli² Yang Berhormat semua-nya akan bersetuju dengan saya ada-lah pelajaran itu tidak meninggalkan kesan, kerana tidak ada zahir-nya mereka itu boleh membacha Jawi dan juga membacha Quran. Dan mengajar kanak² kita di-dalam kawasan bandar di-dalam segi pelajaran ugama itu adalah guru² ugama itu sendiri telah menyatakan ia-itu satu tugas yang sukar sa-kali hendak di-jalankan.

Satu lagi perkara yang saya rasa patut juga-lah saya kenangkan di-sini kerana ini satu sudah terjadi sengaja amalan dalam sekolah² kita di-kawasan bandar ia-itu anak Melayu itu tidak di-suroh belajar bahasa-nya sendiri. Tat-kala dia pergi belajar ugama, mithal-nya, anak² yang lain belajar bahasa kebangsaan, kerana dia di-anggap sa-bagai anak orang Melayu tidak payah belajar bahasa kebangsaan, tetapi apakala menghadapi peperiksaan, mithal-nya, Sijil Rendah Pelajaran (L.C.E.), di-dapati anak Melayu yang kurang dan lemah dalam bahasa-nya sendiri, dan dengan itu kalau sa-kira-nya meninggi macham mana pun markah² yang di-dapati dalam mata-pelajaran² yang lain, tetapi dalam bahasa kebangsaan dia sudah jatuh semua sa-kali jadi bom jatuh. Jadi dengan sebab itu barangkali pada masa hadapan kelak boleh juga ia-itu anak Melayu kita akan jadi mangsa dalam peperiksaan dan anak² orang² bukan Melayu lebih pandai

dalam bahasa kebangsaan dan lulus dalam peperiksaan itu.

Mr Speaker: Masa-nya telah sampai.

Dato' Dr Haji Megat Khas: Sadikit lagi. Saya rasa menunggu sampai dinner boleh-lah saya habiskan

Mr Speaker: Tujuh minit sa-tengah.

Dato' Dr Haji Megat Khas: kalau tidak saya minta perkara ini di-sambong besok pun boleh.

Mr Speaker: Uchapan Penanggohan sa-lama 7½ minit dan tidak boleh di-sambong.

Dato' Dr Haji Megat Khas: Kalau begitu biar saya habiskan dengan sa-berapa chepat yang mungkin, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Jadi, memutuskan perkara yang sa-macham ini saya dan Ahli² Yang Berhormat sendiri mengerti ia-itu ada-lah tugas pelajaran itu ia-lah di-kawal oleh Kementerian Pelajaran dan perkara ugama mengikut susunan-nya lembaga pada hari ini ia-lah bertanggung kepada Raja² Melayu di-negeri masing², tetapi saya rasa perkara ini elok-lah di-semak dan di-kaji samula, kerana ugama kita berkehendakkan ia-itu anak² kita di-beri pelajaran ugama yang sempurna. Dan kalau boleh kita dirikan satu lembaga yang berlainan yang boleh mengkaji dan menchantumkan ia-itu yang di-kawal oleh Kementerian Pelajaran dan yang di-kawal oleh Pejabat Ugama Negeri di-jadikan satu, di-jalankan saperti macham biasa. Kalau tidak saya takut ia-itu pada hari yang kemudian, pada akhir zaman yang di-katakan Quran pun jadi Quran burok, di-simpan siapa pun tidak erti.

Jadi, mari-lah kita bersama² menongkan perkara ini dan kalau dapat jalankan ikhtiar membaiki perkara yang tidak berapa elok ini. Demikian-lah sahaja, Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untok kepentingan murid² yang berugama Islam, tulisan dan bacaan Jawi ada-lah di-ajarkan, bukan sahaja sa-bagai sa-bahagian daripada isi kandungan pelajaran ugama Islam, tetapi juga sa-bagai satu

mata pelajaran yang bersendirian di-sekolah² kebangsaan. Juga tidak-lah benar sa-bagaimana kata Yang Berhormat itu bahawa pelajaran tulisan dan bacaan Jawi itu hanya di-ajar daripada Darjah III sahaja. Keadaan yang sa-benar-nya ia-lah pelajaran, tulisan dan bacaan Jawi itu ada-lah menjadi satu² mata pelajaran yang tertentu sa-bagai mata pelajaran, dan di-ajar pula oleh guru² biasa yang terlately, ya'ani bukan di-ajar oleh guru² agama sahaja sa-bagaimana yang di-fahamkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat itu.

Dengan ada-nya masa² yang tertentu dan guru² yang terlately pula bagi mengajar pelajaran tulisan dan bacaan Jawi itu, maka saya rasa Ahli Yang Berhormat itu akan bersetuju dengan saya bahawa kedudukan tulisan Jawi ada-lah terkawal dan tidak akan luput dalam susunan pelajaran kebangsaan kita.

Ahli Yang Berhormat telah juga mengatakan murid² di-bandar tidak dapat belajar bahasa kebangsaan kerana terpaksa mempelajari agama Islam.

Kementerian saya telah mengarahkan supaya sa-orang guru besar dalam usaha mengator Jadual Waktu hendak-lah mengelakkan kedua² mata pelajaran itu daripada bertembong masa. Jikalau sa-kira-nya tidak ada jalan lagi bagi mengelakkan itu, maka guru besar itu di-beri kebenaran bagi mengadakan pelajaran bahasa kebangsaan kepada murid² itu di-bawah Rancangan Mengajar Bahasa Ibunda, ia-itu di-luar waktu pelajaran sekolah. Dengan chara yang demikian murid² akan dapat menebus waktu pelajaran-nya yang hilang itu.

Berkenaan dengan tegoran Yang Berhormat tentang pelajaran agama sa-bagai tidak memberi kesan, saya suka menyatakan bahawa ini ada-lah tidak benar sama sa-kali. Saya mengaku ada kelemahan² dan kekurangan dalam usaha² menyampaikan pelajaran ini, akan tetapi tidak-lah boleh di-katakan bahawa pelajaran agama itu tidak ber-kesan kepada murid². Harus-lah saya ma'alumkan di-sini bahawa pegawai² Kementerian saya ada mengadakan perundingan dan perbincangan dengan pehak Kerajaan—Kerajaan² Negeri dan

juga Penyimpan Mohar Raja², bahkan beberapa Jawatan-kuasa telah pun di-tubuhkan untuk mengkaji sa-mula di-antara lain sukatan pelajaran bagi waktu mengajar dan kaedah pengajaran bahagian² pelajaran agama, saperti Tajwid, Tauhid dan sa-bagai-nya, dengan maksud mengemas dan memperbaiki lagi pelajaran agama yang di-sampaikan kepada murid² itu.

Akhir-nya suka-lah saya menjawab shor Ahli Yang Berhormat itu bahawa tidak-lah di-fikirkan mustahak menu-bohkan satu lembaga yang di-asingkan saperti mana yang di-chadangkan itu, kerana memandangkan telah sedia ada sekarang ini lembaga dan jabatan yang bertugas dalam hal yang bersangkutan dengan pelajaran agama dan tambahan pula ada-nya berbagai² usaha dan ikhtiar yang di-atorkan oleh jabatan² itu bersama² Kementerian saya untuk memperbaiki pelajaran dan pengajaran agama Islam di-sekolah². Saya berpendapat demikian, oleh kerana masaalah sekarang ini bukan masaalah tiada-nya pentadbir, tetapi masaalah lebeh mustahak di-baiki dan di-perkemaskan chara² mengajar, tujuan dan isi pengajaran agama itu dan ini-lah perkara² yang sedang di-uruskan oleh Kementerian saya.

FREE LEGAL AID

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise to appeal that free legal aid and advice be instituted for the benefit of the poor persons who need such help but cannot afford to pay legal fees.

Our Federal Constitution provides equality before the law. Clause 8 (1) of the Constitution states:

"All persons are equal before the law and entitled to the equal protection of the law." Unfortunately, nowhere it is provided in the Constitution that persons of moderate means, or persons who are poor shall be entitled to free legal aid and advice at the expense of the State.

The Supreme Court Rules provide that any person before commencing or defending any action, or instituting any other proceeding in the Court in his own right or becoming poor during the process thereof may apply for leave to sue or defend or proceed as a pauper.

To be entitled for this aid, the applicant must prove that he is not possessed of property (excluding wearing apparel and the subject matter of the proceedings) exceeding five hundred dollars in value.

In the subordinate Courts (Courts of Magistrate and President) a litigant can apply to sue *in forma pauperis*, if he can prove that he cannot afford to pay court fees which range between \$6.50 and \$22.50.

In civil proceedings, the qualifying limit to be a pauper is \$500 worth of possession.

In criminal matters involving capital punishment, there have been, and continue to be, adequate arrangements to get counsel assigned to defend prisoners at State expense. But this is only where persons are accused of murder, or similar offences, such as under the emergency, possession of arms and/or ammunition without licence, where the punishment is death.

However, these provisions are utterly inadequate and unsatisfactory, as at present free legal aid is given to a pauper only by exempting him from the court fee payable on the plaint, which is a comparatively small fraction of the total expenses to be incurred by him. There is no provision for providing a lawyer to conduct the cases of a pauper either under the Civil Procedure Code, or under the rules made or circulars issued by the courts. At any rate, only a small class of people satisfy the strict definition of the word "pauper" to get the doubtful benefit of deferring payment of the court fee payable on the plaint.

In view of the high cost of litigation, and the difficulties experienced by those of humble means, it is imperative that legal aid and advice should be made available where the financial position of a person is below of a particular level by adopting what is known as the "means test" as is done in England and other enlightened countries.

Here, I wish to brush aside apprehensions that free legal aid and advice rendered to the poor would tend to

increase frivolous and vexatious litigations. In practice, in countries where free legal aid and advice is given, this tended to decrease litigation and led to a speedy settlement out of court.

Mr Speaker, Sir, under the existing circumstances, when our Government has assumed very wide power, indeed much wider than any democratic government has assumed anywhere, there is greater need for a free legal aid and advice in this country; and unless free legal aid and advice is properly organised and provided, you cannot blame the poor if they begin to dread the law and begin to believe that the law merely punishes them and does not protect them, as it ought to in a democratic society. Ready access to justice for a poor man will enable him to realise the blessing of liberty and will make him desist from a life of fraud and dishonesty. There may be a few hardened criminals, but, by and large, a great number of erring human beings can be won over, if they are made to realise that the society has a place for them.

Mr Speaker, Sir, most of the countries of the Commonwealth have adopted legal aid and advice schemes for the benefit of their people. Coming nearer home, Singapore started a free Bureau for Legal Aid in 1958. They have a state financed free legal aid scheme, whereby persons of limited means can apply for legal representation in civil matters in all the courts there. It will be hard to reconcile that, here, the Central Government, boasting of its democratic institution, should find itself lagging behind one of its member States.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I shall end my appeal by quoting from the Magna Carta:

"To no one will we sell, to no one will we refuse or delay right or justice."

Free legal aid and advice is one of the best ways to achieve this ideal. Thank you.

Dato' Dr Ismail: Mr Speaker, Sir, at the expense of being repetitious, I would like to summarise the present legal aid in this country. Sir, at present

legal aid on a limited scale is being afforded in the following cases:

- (1) In civil proceedings it is possible for the litigants to apply *informa pauperis*.
- (2) In criminal matters involving capital punishment, counsel will be assigned for the defence of the accused and will be paid from Government funds.
- (3) Government servants who are proceeded against either civilly or criminally in respect of acts performed in the course of their official duties, upon application made, may be granted legal aid.

Sir, it is true that some members of the Bar have expressed support for a scheme of legal aid, but there has been no clamour for the early introduction of a scheme similar to that in Singapore, as it is fully appreciated that there should be a detailed examination of the mechanics of the scheme in the context of a wider area, the cost of implementing such a scheme, the practicality of obtaining lawyers to deal with clients in remote areas involving thereby the additional cost in transport and loss of time hardly commensurate with the amount of fees that they would earn.

As a prerequisite to the grant of legal aid, it would be necessary to set up departments not only to handle the cases but to examine the validity of the applications. For example, whether the applicant qualifies for aid on the grounds of limited means and, secondly, whether there are merits in his case. Before setting up the scheme it would be necessary also to classify the type of cases which it would be appropriate for the Legal Aid Department to undertake or handle.

A Committee has been appointed and no doubt will report on the need for such a scheme after consultation with the relevant Bar Council and Committees. In the States of Malaya at the present time there is little evidence, if at all on record, that the people have suffered any real or grave injustice by reason of lack of means.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: On a point of clarification—I can assure the Honourable Minister of Justice that every

month I get on an average of five to ten cases where people come to me—even long before I became a parliamentarian—asking me how they could get these things settled and they are really paupers.

Dato' Dr Ismail: I think probably that is because the people might think the Honourable Member, although at that time not a Member of Parliament, was a very successful practitioner and could afford to give them help. *(Laughter)*.

Sir, this is a most important thing. I am not disagreeing with the principle—it is a very desirable principle. But the cost of implementing such a scheme would be in the region of \$2 million annually and the Government, in the light of the foregoing, does not contemplate the introduction of such a scheme, especially at this time when, as the Honourable Member knows, we are suffering from the *confrontasi* from Indonesia. Sir, it is admitted that most advanced countries have such a service, because they can afford it. I mentioned Singapore because of the area; and because Singapore contributes only 40 per cent they could afford this legal aid. Probably if they give us a greater percentage we may be able to spread legal aid to the poor people of the rest of Malaysia.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: I hate to interrupt the Honourable Minister of Justice, but he is saying that because of confrontation there are no funds available. Is the Minister not aware that in terms of cutlery alone, in the Supplementary Bill which we are going to debate in the next few days, this Government is asking this House to approve a sum of \$1 million-plus?

Dato' Dr Ismail: But that \$1 million-plus is, at the most, once in every five years. But this is \$2 million annually. Sir, it is very likely—I am not saying that our lawyers here are not public spirited—but it is very likely that the participation of local lawyers in such a scheme would be necessary if and when the scheme is introduced. Thank you.

Question put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at 8.30 p.m.