

**Volume II
No. 18**



**Thursday
18th November, 1965**

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

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

OFFICIAL REPORT

CONTENTS

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 2949]

**ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE (Standing Order 18)
(Motion) [Col. 2964]**

BILLS PRESENTED [Col. 2969]

BILL:

The Supplementary Supply (No. 2) Bill [Col. 2970]

Committee—

**Heads S. 1, S. 4, S. 5, S. 6, S. 7, S. 8, S. 11 and S. 12
[Col. 3064]**

Head S. 14 [Col. 3064]

Head S. 15 [Col. 3065]

Head S. 17 [Col. 3066]

Head S. 19 [Col. 3066]

MALAYSIA
DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

Official Report

Second Session of the Second Dewan Ra'ayat

Thursday, 18th November, 1965

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

PRESENT:

- The Honourable Mr Speaker, DATO' CHIK MOHAMED YUSUF BIN SHEIKH ABDUL RAHMAN, S.P.M.P., J.P., Dato' Bendahara, Perak.
- „ the Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Defence, Minister of National and Rural Development, TUN HAJI ABDUL RAZAK BIN DATO' HUSSAIN, S.M.N. (Pekan).
- „ the Minister of Home Affairs and Minister of Justice, DATO' DR ISMAIL BIN DATO' HAJI ABDUL RAHMAN, P.M.N. (Johor Timor).
- „ the Minister of Finance, ENCHE' TAN SIEW SIN, J.P. (Melaka Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, DATO' V. T. SAMBANTHAN, P.M.N. (Sungei Siput).
- „ the Minister of Transport, DATO' HAJI SARDON BIN HAJI JUBIR, P.M.N. (Pontian Utara).
- „ the Minister of Health, ENCHE' BAHAMAN BIN SAMSUDIN (Kuala Pilah).
- „ the Minister of Commerce and Industry, DR LIM SWEE AUN, J.P. (Larut Selatan).
- „ the Minister for Welfare Services, TUAN HAJI ABDUL HAMID KHAN BIN HAJI SAKHAWAT ALI KHAN, J.M.N., J.P. (Batang Padang).
- „ the Minister for Local Government and Housing, ENCHE' KHAW KAI-BOH, P.J.K. (Ulu Selangor).
- „ the Minister for Sarawak Affairs, DATO' TEMENGGONG JUGAH ANAK BARIANG, P.M.N., P.D.K. (Sarawak).
- „ the Minister of Labour, ENCHE' V. MANICKAVASAGAM, J.M.N., P.J.K. (Klang).
- „ the Minister of Information and Broadcasting, ENCHE' SENU BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Kubang Pasu Barat).
- „ the Minister of Lands and Mines, ENCHE' ABDUL-RAHMAN BIN YA'KUB (Sarawak).
- „ the Assistant Minister of National and Rural Development, ENCHE' SULAIMAN BIN BULON (Bagan Datoh).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Culture, Youth and Sports, ENSKU MUHSEIN BIN ABDUL KADIR, J.M.N., S.M.T., P.J.K. (Trengganu Tengah).

The Honourable the Assistant Minister of Education, ENCHE' LEE SIOK YEW, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Sepang).

„ the Assistant Minister of Finance, DR NG KAM POH, J.P. (Telok Anson).

„ the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, ENCHE' IBRAHIM BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Seberang Tengah).

„ the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour, ENCHE' LEE SAN CHOON, K.M.N. (Segamat Selatan).

„ the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, ENCHE' ALI BIN HAJI AHMAD (Pontian Selatan).

„ the Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister, ENCHE' CHEN WING SUN (Damansara).

„ ENCHE' ABDUL GHANI BIN ISHAK, A.M.N. (Melaka Utara).

„ ENCHE' ABDUL KARIM BIN ABU, A.M.N. (Melaka Selatan).

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

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

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

„ ENCHE' ABDUL RAZAK BIN HUSSIN (Lipis).

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

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

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

„ ENCHE' ABU BAKAR BIN HAMZAH (Bachok).

„ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN ABDULLAH (Kelantan Hilir).

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

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

„ CHE' AJIBAH BINTI ABOL (Sarawak).

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

„ ENCHE' AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Muar Dalam).

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

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

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

„ ENCHE' CHAN SEONG YOON (Setapak).

„ ENCHE' CHAN SIANG SUN (Bentong).

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

„ ENCHE' FRANCIS CHIA NYUK TONG (Sabah).

„ ENCHE' CHIN FOON (Ulu Kinta).

„ ENCHE' D. A. DAGO ANAK RANDAN *alias* DAGOK ANAK RANDEN (Sarawak).

„ ENCHE' C. V. DEVAN NAIR (Bungsar).

„ ENCHE' EDWIN ANAK TANGKUN (Sarawak).

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

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).
- „ ENCHE' GANING BIN JANGKAT (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' GEH CHONG KEAT, K.M.N. (Penang Utara).
- „ TUAN HAJI 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. (Jeraf).
- „ ENCHE' HARUN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Baling).
- „ WAN HASSAN BIN WAN DAUD (Tumpat).
- „ ENCHE' STANLEY HO NGUN KHIU, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN To' MUDA HASSAN, A.M.N. (Raub).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN MOHD. NOORDIN, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Parit).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN SULAIMAN (Ulu Kelantan).
- „ TUAN HAJI HUSSAIN RAHIMI BIN HAJI SAMAN
(Kota Bharu Hulu).
- „ ENCHE' IKHWAN ZAINI (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' ISMAIL BIN IDRIS (Penang Selatan).
- „ PENGHULU JINGGUT ANAK ATTAN, Q.M.C., A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' KADAM ANAK KIAI (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' THOMAS KANA (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' KHOO PENG LOONG (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SECK FUN (Tanjong Malim).
- „ ENCHE' AMADEUS MATHEW LEONG, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ DR LIM CHONG EU (Tanjong).
- „ ENCHE' LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).
- „ DR MAHATHIR BIN MOHAMAD (Kota Star Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' T. MAHIMA SINGH, J.P. (Port Dickson).
- „ ENCHE' JOSEPH DAVID MANJAJI (Sabah).
- „ DATO' DR HAJI MEGAT KHAS, D.P.M.P., J.P., P.J.K.
(Kuala Kangsar).
- „ ENCHE, MOHD. ARIF SALLEH, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ ORANG TUA MOHAMMAD DARA BIN LANGPAD (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' MOHD. DAUD BIN ABDUL SAMAD (Besut).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED IDRIS BIN MATSIL, J.M.N., P.J.K., J.P.
(Jelebu-Jempol).
- „ ENCHE' MOHD. TAHIR BIN ABDUL MAJID, S.M.S., P.J.K.
(Kuala Langat).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED YUSOF BIN MAHMUD, A.M.N. (Temerloh).
- „ WAN MOKHTAR BIN AHMAD (Kemaman).
- „ TUAN HAJI MOKHTAR BIN HAJI ISMAIL (Perlis Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' MUHAMMAD FAKHRUDDIN BIN HAJI ABDULLAH
(Pasir Mas Hilir).

- The Honourable 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).
- „ ENCHE' ONG KEE HUI (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN HAJI OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Hilir Perak).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Perlis Utara).
- „ ENCHE' QUEK KAI DONG, J.P. (Seremban Timor).
- „ TUAN HAJI RAHMAT BIN HAJI DAUD, A.M.N. (Johor Bahru Barat).
- „ ENCHE' RAMLI BIN OMAR (Krian Darat).
- „ TUAN HAJI REDZA BIN HAJI MOHD. SAID, P.J.K., J.P. (Rembau-Tampin).
- „ RAJA ROME BIN RAJA MA'AMOR, P.J.K., J.P. (Kuala Selangor).
- „ ENCHE' SEAH TENG NGIAB, P.I.S. (Muar Pantai).
- „ ENCHE' SIM BOON LIANG (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' SIOW LOONG HIN, P.J.K. (Seremban Barat).
- „ ENCHE' SENAWI 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' TAJUDDIN 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 TSEK YU (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' TIAH ENG BEE (Kluang Utara).
- „ ENCHE' TOH THEAM HOCK (Kampar).
- „ ENCHE' YEOH TAT BENG (Bruas).
- „ ENCHE' STEPHEN YONG KUET TZE (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN HAJI ZAKARIA BIN HAJI MOHD. TAIB, P.J.K. (Langat).

ABSENT:

- The Honourable the Prime Minister, Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Culture, Youth and Sports, Y.T.M. TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN PUTRA AL-HAJ, K.O.M. (Kuala Kedah).
- „ the Minister of Education, ENCHE' MOHAMED KHIR JOHARI (Kedah Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives, TUAN HAJI MOHD. GHAZALI BIN HAJI JAWI (Ulu Perak).

- The Honourable the Assistant Minister without Portfolio, TUAN HAJI ABDUL KHALID BIN AWANG OSMAN (Kota Star Utara).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAJI TALIB, P.J.K. (Kuantan).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAUF BIN A. RAHMAN, K.M.N., P.J.K. (Krian Laut).
- „ Y.A.M. TUNKU ABDULLAH IBNI AL-MARHUM TUANKU ABDUL RAHMAN, P.P.T. (Rawang).
- „ DR AWANG BIN HASSAN, S.M.J. (Muar Selatan).
- „ DATU GANIE GILONG, P.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).
- „ DATO' SYED JA'AFAR BIN HASAN ALBAR, P.M.N. (Johor Tenggara).
- „ ENCHE' KAM WOON WAH, J.P. (Sitiawan).
- „ 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 PEE HUNG, P.J.K. (Alor Star).
- „ DATO' MOHAMED ASRI BIN HAJI MUDA, P.M.K. (Pasir Puteh).
- „ ENCHE' MOHD. ZAHIR BIN HAJI ISMAIL, J.M.N. (Sungai Patani).
- „ ENCHE' SANDOM ANAK NYUAK (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' D. R. SEENIVASAGAM (Ipoh).
- „ DATO' S. P. SEENIVASAGAM, D.P.M.P., P.M.P., J.P. (Menglembu).
- „ ENCHE' TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Melaka).
- „ ENCHE' YEH PAO TZE (Sabah).

PRAYERS

(Mr Speaker *in the Chair*)

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

SAFETY PRECAUTIONS IN INDUSTRY

1. Enche' C. V. Devan Nair asks the Minister of Labour, in view of the very high incidence of injury and fatal cases (1,184 injury and 31 fatal cases reviewed in August, 1965, involving payment of compensation amounting to \$390,322.88), whether he would favourably consider launching an intensive campaign to secure the implementation and the observance of safety precautions in industry, in conjunction with trade unions and employers' organisations.

The Minister of Labour (Enche' V. Manickavasagam): Mr Speaker, Sir, my Ministry is considering ways and means of reducing occupational hazards generally which result in injury or

death. In this respect, I am now studying the possibility of introducing a Factory Act to cover all places of employment which employ manual labour. A proposal to establish an industrial health unit in my Ministry is also being studied. A safety campaign can also be undertaken, if necessary, as suggested by the Honourable Member.

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: The industrial health unit was mooted quite some time ago, and it is depressing to hear that it is still under study. Could we have some indication as to how much longer it will continue to be under study?

Enche' V. Manickavasagam: Before the Government introduces any new measures, it will have to see that all aspects are carefully looked into, and I can assure the Honourable Member that we could do it as soon as possible.

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: One more supplementary question, Sir, I am glad to hear from the Minister that he would consider introducing a campaign

for the observance of security precautions in industry, but would not it be a fact to say that right at this point of time safety precautions in industry are rather conspicuous by their absence?

Enche' V. Manickavasagam: I cannot agree with that, Sir, because the workers and the employers are already aware of their duties and responsibilities and it is all being observed.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ORDINANCE, 1952

(No. of Fatal/Cases and Amount of
Compensation)

2. Enche' C. V. Devan Nair asks the Minister of Labour to give details of fatal cases reviewed under the Workmen's Compensation Ordinance, 1952, showing cause and amount of compensation paid in each case, during the first nine months of 1965.

Enche' Manickavasagam: Mr Speaker, Sir, the details sought by the Honourable Member are as follows:

<i>Accident while working on machinery—</i>			
Number of cases	6		
Amount of compensation paid	\$23,781		
<i>Railways—</i>			
Number of cases	1		
Amount	\$6,000		
<i>Accident on Ships—</i>			
Number of cases	6		
Amount	\$27,927		
<i>Accident arising from vehicles—</i>			
Number of cases	69		
Amount	\$367,289		
<i>Explosion, fire, or poisons out of corrosive substance—</i>			
Number of cases	2		
Amount	\$13,338		
<i>Electricity—</i>			
Number of cases	3		
Amount	\$15,184		
<i>Fall of persons or objects or striking against objects—</i>			
Number of cases	111		
Amount	\$587,869		
<i>Miscellaneous—</i>			
Number of cases	9		
Amount	\$30,920		
<i>Total cases</i>	207		
<i>Amount</i>	\$1,071,380		

RE-ELECTION OF OFFICE BEARERS OF TRADE UNIONS—(1st JANUARY TO 30th SEPTEMBER, 1965)

3. Enche' C. V. Devan Nair asks the Minister of Labour to give details of unions ordered by the Registrar of Trade Unions to hold re-elections of office bearers and the reasons in each case, during the first nine months of 1965.

Enche' V. Manickavasagam: Mr Speaker, Sir, four unions have been ordered by the Registrar of Trade Unions to hold re-elections during the first nine months of 1965. They are:

(1) *The Kesatuan Pekerja Securicor Malaya Ltd* on the ground that the nomination and election of officers of the union were not conducted in the prescribed manner.

(2) *The Government Medical and Health Employees Trade Union:* The Johore branch of this union was ordered to conduct fresh election of officers as proper notice of the meeting was not given. Written nominations were not invited and nominations for the principal posts were contrary to the rules confined to members residing in Johore Bahru. The Pahang branch of this union was also ordered to conduct a fresh election as the officers of this branch had been elected by district delegates and not by members as required by the rules of the Union.

(3) *The Transport Workers Union: Federation of Malaya:* The Kelantan branch of this union was ordered to conduct a fresh election because members who are not in benefit had been permitted to participate in the voting.

(4) *The United Malayan Estate Workers Union* was ordered to conduct a fresh election of its Malacca branch as the previous election had not been conducted by secret ballot.

COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO AFFAIRS OF THE PENANG CITY COUNCIL

4. Dr Lim Chong Eu asks the Minister for Local Government and Housing to state:

(a) When the Government intends to set up a Commission of Inquiry

into the affairs of the Penang City Council;

- (b) in view of the fact that this Inquiry was first promised by the Alliance State Government in 1963, the reasons why there has been such a considerable delay in the setting up of the Commission of Inquiry.

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

Mr Speaker, Sir, as the Honourable Member is aware, local government is a State subject in the 9th Schedule of the Malaysian Constitution and, therefore, the authority to set up a Commission of Inquiry to investigate into the alleged mal-administration or mal-practice of any local authority lies with the State Government. However, it is understood that the delay in setting up the Commission of Inquiry to look into the affairs of the Penang City Council is due to the difficulty experienced by the State Government in obtaining the services of a High Court Judge to head the commission owing to the shortage of Judges. This matter is still being vigorously pursued, and it is hoped that the services of a High Court Judge will be made available soon.

Enche' Lim Chong Eu: Sir, we were quite well aware that the matter is within the purview of the State Government, but we hope that the Minister for Local Government is also, naturally, interested in the well-being and the healthiness of any local-authority; and in view of the fact that the vigour which the Penang State Government has exercised to find a High Court Judge, so much vigour that it has taken it two years to produce nothing, would not the Honourable the Minister for Local Government please kindly assist the Penang State Government in its vigorous campaign to obtain the assistance of a High Court Judge, so that we can clear up this matter once and for all; otherwise the stigma which was alleged by a former member of the Labour Party, who has now defected into the Alliance State Government front benches will remain and, Sir, I maintain that George Town, being an important City Council,

should not have this stigma riding over its head for too long. Will the Honourable Minister assure us that he would assist the vigorous campaign of the local State Government?

Enche' Khaw Kai-Boh: The Honourable Member will recall that this question was raised last year and I read to this House a minute from the High Court Registrar-General as to the difficulty experienced in obtaining the services of a High Court Judge; and in fact, as Minister for Local Government and Housing, I have repeatedly intervened in this matter in trying to procure the services of a High Court Judge, and the latest step I have taken was that, if a High Court Judge's services are not available, we may ask a President of the Sessions Court to take over the Commission of Inquiry but the matter is still being pursued and I am still hoping that the services of a High Court Judge will be made available for the purpose of this Commission.

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Sir, what are the reasons why the President of the Sessions Court is not considered suitable for this kind of Inquiry?

Enche' Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I have not said that the President of the Sessions Court is not suitable. I have even gone to the extent of suggesting that, if a High Court Judge is not available, we may consider obtaining the services of the President of the Sessions Court. But it has turned out that even the services of the President of a Sessions Court are not easily available, because of the shortage of qualified personnel as President of the Sessions Court. I did not say that the President of the Sessions Court is not suitable. He is eminently suitable.

PENANG CITY COUNCIL—ELECTION IN APRIL, 1966

5. Dr Lim Chong Eu asks the Minister for Local Government and Housing to state whether or not the Government intends to allow the Penang City Council to hold its election, as scheduled, by April, 1966; is the Honourable Minister aware that the City Council is no longer truly representative of the

wishes of the people living in the City; since George Town in the only council with a City status in Malaysia, whether he would give an assurance that the City Elections will not be unduly and indefinitely postponed or suspended.

Enche' Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, in view of the present state of emergency in our country, and the fact that the Emergency (Essential Powers) (Suspension of Local Government Elections) Regulations still apply, I cannot give a categorical assurance that Penang City Council will be allowed to hold elections as scheduled for April, 1966. I can assure the Honourable Member, however, that the question of permitting elections not only for the City Council of Penang but also for all local authorities throughout the States of Malaya is a subject which is constantly under review by the Government. As the emergency situation improves, active consideration will be given to the holding of local government elections throughout the States of Malaya. Whether the City Council is no longer truly representative of the wishes of the people living in the City is a matter I cannot comment on, as all the present councillors were, in fact, elected by the people in that City. Only the next elections will tell whether they have since lost the trust and confidence of the people or not.

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Sir, the Honourable Minister, in his reply, has mentioned the fact that the whole subject is under constant review. Sir, we have had a situation now where there was a by-election in Ayer Itam and there is another by-election going on in Rahang—and there a peculiar situation prevails in that a State by-election was carried out, but a local authority, a rural district council election, which would have fallen within the same area, was not carried out. Now, the larger constituency of the State election produced a situation, and the results of the by-election, I think, would give both the Honourable Minister, as well as the Government, full confidence in its own Police and law enforcement authorities, in the sense that these elections went by with no incident and

certainly without all these fears and doubts, which the Government persistently hurls at us as an excuse to delay and suspend local authority elections. Will not the Honourable Minister, therefore, consider that it is time to review the situation, particularly in the State of Penang?

Enche' Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, on a matter of this nature, we depend on the assessment of the expert in connection with security; and it is not a matter I am competent to comment on. If the experts' opinion is such that it is not advisable at this stage to hold country-wide elections of local authorities, as opposed to a single instance of a by-election, we have to abide by the experts' opinion.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: If I understand his answer correctly, part of the reason as to whether or not the elections will be held depend upon the Royal Commission of Inquiry looking into the necessity, or otherwise, of having local government. If I am correct, is it not a fact that one of the Commissioners of the Commission of Inquiry, Mr Lim Cheng Poh, is no longer living in Penang and is, in fact, practising vigorously in Hong Kong, having decided that Malaya had no future for him? With regard to the other member of the Royal Commission of Inquiry, he happens to be no other person than Mr D. S. Ramanathan himself, who has made allegations against the City Council as yet unsubstantiated?

Enche' Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, as the Hon'ble Member for Dato Kramat is well known for his not paying attention to what is said in this House, I would repeat, again, for his consumption, that it was because of the prevalence of the Emergency (Essential Powers) (Suspension of Local Government Elections) Regulations that local authority elections are not being held at present. It has nothing to do with the Royal Commission of Inquiry whatsoever. If he had paid attention to my reply given earlier to the Member for Tanjong, he would not have wasted the time of this honourable House. Furthermore, I cannot see any relevance whatsoever in the Hon'ble

Member mentioning the name of Mr Lim Cheng Poh, because I cannot see what relevance it has in connection with this question and has nothing to do with the supplementary question; and, furthermore, I think it is not fair for any Hon'ble Member of this House to make reference to any other person outside this House who is not in a position to defend himself in this House. (SEVERAL HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!).

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Mr Speaker, Sir, do I then take it from the reply of the Hon'ble Minister for Local Government and Housing that whether or not elections will be suspended in the local councils has nothing to do whatsoever with the Royal Commission of Inquiry?

Enche' Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, it is quite right. It has taken such a long time for the Hon'ble Member to understand what I said. (HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!).

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Then why have the Royal Commission of Inquiry at all?

Enche' Khaw Kai-Boh: There, again, Mr Speaker, Sir, repeated publicity has been given to the object of this Royal Commission of Inquiry. The Hon'ble Member for Dato Kramat obviously has not been following what is going on in the press. (HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!). The object of the Royal Commission of Inquiry is to review the system of Local Government which is not an uncommon practice even in the United Kingdom where local government has been in practice for a great number of years, it was only as recently as two years ago that a Royal Commission of Inquiry was appointed to review the working and system of local government.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Mr Speaker, Sir, surely, as far as I understand it, the impression given to the people outside this House is that the purpose of the Royal Commission of Inquiry is to find out whether or not local councils should be represented by elected representatives or not, which means elections or not?

Enche' Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, that is the personal opinion of the Member for Dato Kramat himself (*Laughter*) and certainly not the general impression of members of the public.

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: I am intrigued, Mr Speaker, Sir, by the argument that State by-elections can be held because they are not country-wide—they only occur occasionally—but elections to the local authorities cannot be held on the ground that there is an emergency and that these elections will be country-wide. Sir, by the same token, would the Minister agree that the Government would advance the very same argument if it decided, say, to suspend indefinitely general elections to this Parliament in 1969?

Enche' Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am no crystal gazer—I cannot project myself to 1969. I have said earlier that in a matter of this nature this Government is guided by the expert opinion of the Security Authorities; and as such, we have now in existence the Emergency (Essential Powers) (Suspension of Local Government Elections) Regulations, and as long as these regulations are still being in force there will be no local authority elections. I think the problem is as simple as that. Incidentally, it may be mentioned in this House that there is no such thing as local authority election in Singapore (*Laughter*).

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: On a point of information—may I inform the Honourable Minister that I am not here as an apologist for Singapore. He might take that up with the Prime Minister of Singapore—it has nothing to do with me. (*Laughter*).

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Sir, it is quite clear in the answers from the Honourable Minister that the declaration or the decree of emergency has affected the fundamental grass-roots of constitutional democracy in our country and the Honourable Minister is not in a position to answer the question on the emergency itself. Because of the peculiar and particular position of the City of George Town—it is the only city in our nation at the present time, since

the eviction of Singapore and repeated visits by major leaders of the Alliance Government has given George Town extreme prominence, will not the Honourable Minister consider looking into the position whereby local authority elections could be held not on a simultaneous nation-wide basis, but from one place to another, or town by town—and in this particular case of the City of George Town at one particular time confined only to the city?

Enche' Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, as I said earlier, this involves security considerations and it is not a matter that I, as the Minister of Local Government and Housing, am capable of answering the question. Perhaps, if the Honourable Member will direct a proper question at the proper time, it will be answered by my colleague, the Minister of Home Affairs.

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Sir, I am glad now that we have focussed attention not from a nation-wide point of view but just to the City of Penang; and even if the question of security of the City of Penang under emergency circumstances are open to doubt, would not the Honourable Minister, in the interest of local government, in the interest of democracy, consult his colleagues in the Cabinet as to whether judging from the records of the last performances of the public and within the last one year, city council elections could not be held in Penang under those limited conditions?

Enche' Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I mean as far as the Alliance Party is concerned, we do want to have elections as soon as possible, but we have to consider the general public interest, firstly; and I can assure the Honourable Members of this House, as I have said earlier in my original reply to him, that this matter is receiving the constant review of my Ministry and if I deem it necessary, representations will be made to my Honourable colleague the Minister for Home Affairs.

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Sir, at last we have a situation, where the interest of democracy are represented by the

Minister for Local Government. Sir, we are not satisfied with this question of constant review. We are asking the Honourable Minister whether, in the particular case of the City of Penang, he would not take the matter up vigorously (since this is a term which is now apparently consonant with the Alliance Government) with the Honourable Minister for Home Affairs and ensure that the City Council elections can be held as soon as possible.

Enche' Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member can be assured that the Alliance Party is more concerned with holding elections in Penang so that we can regain all the seats that we have lost. (*Laughter*).

Enche' Abu Bakar bin Hamzah (Bachok): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, adakah benar atau tidak bahawa akibat daripada tekanan² pihak Majlis George Town supaya di-adakan pilihan raya, sedangkan bagi pihak Kerajaan hendak menanggohkan oleh kerana tekanan itu maka Menteri kita ia-itu Menteri Kerajaan Tempatan dan Perumahan, rasa tidak senang dan dia mengambil keputusan akan berhenti daripada menjadi Menteri dan menjadi Manager bagi sa-buah kilang yang hendak buat rumah² baharu, adakah benar cerita itu atau tidak?

Mr Speaker: Itu soal lain (*Ketawa*).

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Mr Speaker, Sir, this is a supplementary question, arising out of the reply given to the last part of my question by the Honourable Minister. Apparently now, Sir, it is not just the emergency which determines factors, it is a question of whether the Alliance can win before the Government will review and allow local elections to take place. Sir, I hope that the Minister for Local Government can take this opportunity right now to reassure us that this answer which was given just now was probably not a matter of policy and probably a matter of emotion.

Enche' Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I think it is very presumptive on the part of the Honourable Member from Tanjong to think that U.D.P. is the only Party that can win elections in Penang. (*Laughter*).

Dr Lim Chong Eu: I do suggest, Sir, that this is not the answer to the question which I have asked, because if the principle is that we are not holding local authority elections, because there is an emergency on, our debate on this matter is very difficult. If, on the other hand, the last reply by the Honourable Minister implies that the review is subject to the fact that the Alliance Government will hold elections if it can win, then, Sir, I think the second issue is political and controversial and undesirable.

Enche' Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I have repeatedly said, during the course of the answer to this question, that the most important consideration in connection with this matter of elections is the security aspect and the security of the members of the public—that is the paramount considerations, and all the other considerations are quite subsidiary to this paramount consideration.

Dr Lim Chong Eu: We are glad to hear that it is subsidiary—the Alliance winning is only a subsidiary matter. However, Sir, the fact that the Honourable Minister chose to reply to my question in that manner must raise considerable fears and doubts throughout the country.

PERANAN PEJABAT² PENERANGAN

Datin Fatimah binti Haji Abdul Majid bertanya kepada Menteri Penerangan dan Penyiaran, oleh kerana Jabatan Penerangan itu memegang peranan penting dalam masaalah semangat Negara di-dalam dan di-luar negeri khas-nya masaalah menentang konfrontasi Indonesia dan sangat mustahak pula kepada negara, ada-kah Kerajaan berchadang mendirikan Jabatan Penerangan yang bersendiri di-tiap² negeri dalam Malaysia dan memberikan pertimbangan yang wajar terhadap kaki-tangan dan bangunan Pejabat² ini dan jika ya, bila-kah perkara² ini akan di-laksanakan.

Menteri Penerangan dan Penyiaran (Enche' Senu bin Abdul Rahman): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mengu-

chapkan terima kaseh kepada Ahli Yang Berhormat kerana memberi perhatian kepada kepentingan Jabatan Penerangan dan pegawai²-nya. Saya mengaku bahawa sa-lama ini memanglah benar bahawa di-satengah² tempat, Pejabat² Penerangan ini di-tempatkan di-bangunan² yang tidak sesuai sebagai kedudukan kepentingan perkhidmatan penerangan ini. Pada masa ini Kementerian saya sedang berusaha untuk membaiki kedudukan yang tidak sesuai ini. Dalam pada itu tidak dapat-lah saya memberi pengakuan bahawa tiap² Pejabat Penerangan akan mempunyai bangunan-nya sendiri dan kerana ini ada-lah bergantung kepada keadaan kewangan dan keadaan di-tempat² itu sendiri. Di-satengah² tempat, ada lebih faedah²-nya jika Pejabat Penerangan ini di-tempatkan bersama² dengan jabatan² Kerajaan yang lain, tetapi ada tempat²-nya yang berkehendakkan bangunan-nya sendiri. Perkara ini ada-lah di-dalam perhatian pertimbangan Kementerian saya dan begitu juga berkenaan dengan kaki-tangan pejabat² tersebut.

Enche' Hussein bin To' Muda Hassan (Raub): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soalan tambahan. Mengikut penerangan daripada Yang Berhormat Menteri itu tadi, berkenaan dengan Pejabat Penerangan, saya hendak bertanya sedikit sahaja. Ada-kah Pejabat Penerangan Negeri (PAS Negeri) pada masa sekarang, menerima arahan daripada Kementerian ini atau daripada Kerajaan Negeri?

Enche' Senu bin Abdul Rahman: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Pejabat Penerangan di-tiap² negeri ada-lah menerima arahan daripada Kementerian Penerangan.

Enche' Hussein bin To' Muda Hassan: Soalan tambahan satu lagi. Jika sa-kira-nya Pejabat Penerangan Negeri menerima wang daripada Kerajaan Negeri, Pejabat Penerangan itu mesti melaporkan dan meminta kebenaran daripada Kementerian dahulu baharu boleh membelanjakan duit dalam negeri itu.

Enche' Senu bin Abdul Rahman: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak dapat memahami soalan itu.

Enche' Hussein bin To' Muda Hassan: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Pejabat Penerangan Negeri menerima peruntukan daripada Kerajaan Negeri, ada-kah dia boleh membelanjakan duit peruntukan itu dengan sa-suka hati Pejabat Penerangan Negeri itu atau tidak.

Enche' Senu bin Abdul Rahman: Jawapan saya tadi, Pejabat Penerangan Negeri ada-lah menerima arahan daripada Kementerian Penerangan bukan daripada Negeri.

Enche' Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Tuan Yang di-Pertua soalan tambahan. Oleh kerana kesemua chawangan Jabatan² Penerangan ini dudok langsung di-bawah Kementerian Penerangan di-Kerajaan Pusat ini, ada-kah Kerajaan Pusat ini telah memberi apa² perintah sa-hingga sa-barang *Gazette* tidak pernah di-hantar kepada saya, daripada tahun dahulu lagi saya minta, apa pun tidak pernah di-hantar salain daripada Bill Parlimen ini. Adakah Menteri ini memberi apa² arahan bagitu?

Enche' Senu bin Abdul Rahman: Jawapan daripada saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, itu ia-lah daripada Pejabat Penchetakan Kerajaan.

GAJI BAGI PEGAWAI² PENERANGAN

Datin Fatimah binti Haji Abdul Majid bertanya kepada Menteri Penerangan dan Penyiaran ada-kah Kementerian-nya sedar bahawa tangga gaji kaki-tangan² Pejabat Penerangan sekarang ini tidak sa-imbang dengan tugas² mereka ya'ani semua jawatan² penting yang biasa-nya di-sandang oleh Pegawai² Dagang Bahagian I dalam zaman penjajahan dahulu, sekarang ini di-pegang oleh pegawai² anak negeri dalam Bahagian III dan yang tidak menerima elaun tambahan dan tidak dapat kemudahan² sa-timpal dengan jawatan² mereka; bahawa semenjak di-lancarkan "Gerakan Siap Sedia" untuk menentang konfrontasi Indonesia, kaki-tangan Jabatan Penerangan telah di-arahkan bekerja walau pun pada hari minggu atau hari kelepasan 'am dan bahawa mereka di-kehendaki senentiasa siap sedia sa-lama 24 jam

dengan tidak di-benarkan berchuti melainkan dengan sebab² yang tidak dapat di-elakkan dan jika sedar, apakah tindakan yang beliau berchadang hendak ambil untuk mengatasi perkara ini.

Enche' Senu bin Abdul Rahman: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-kali lagi saya menjunjong tinggi di-atas perhatian dan penghargaan Ahli Yang Berhormat terhadap masaalah² mengenai pegawai² Jabatan Penerangan. Saya sendiri dan Kementerian saya juga chukup sedar tentang kedudukan pegawai² Jabatan Penerangan di-tiap² tingkat dan sentiasa menchuba membaiki-nya sa-berapa yang boleh. Dalam pada itu, saya suka mema'alumkan bahawa Kerajaan telah pun melantek sa-buah Surohanjaya Gaji dan soal tanga² gaji mereka telah pun di-panjangkan kepada Surohanjaya tersebut dengan sokongan² yang kuat dari Ketua² Pejabat Kementerian Penerangan saya.

PELUANG BAGI GURU² SEMEN- TARA MENJADI GURU² TETAP

Datin Fatimah binti Haji Abdul Majid bertanya kepada Menteri Pelajaran ada-kah Kerajaan berchadang memberikan guru² sementara peluang menjadi guru² tetap yang terlatah.

Menteri Muda Pelajaran (Enche' Lee Siok Yew): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Kementerian Pelajaran telah mengadakan peluang² itu semenjak tahun 1964. Umor yang sa-tinggi²-nya telah di-longgarkan dari 23 tahun kepada 30 tahun untuk membolehkan guru² sementara meluluskan asas yang sa-kurang²-nya, dan pengalaman mengajar tidak kurang daripada 3 tahun untuk memohon masok latehan guru.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

(STANDING ORDER 18) (MOTION)

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Mr Speaker, Sir, I have submitted notice to you under Standing Order 18 to ask leave to move adjournment of this House under that Standing Order for the purpose of discussing the following matter, which

is of a definite and urgent matter of public importance: namely, whether it is right and proper for the Government to expend public monies on matters of litigation of a private nature involving Members of the Government, or indeed any Member of this House.

Sir, the reason why I have asked permission to move this Motion is that Treasury Memorandum on the Second Supplementary Estimates Expenditure for 1965 of the Government of Malaysia, Command Paper 37 of 1965, does not specifically state under Head S. 47 that the sum of \$88,323 be spent from Contingencies Fund is for the purpose of payment towards the legal fees and cost expended by the former Minister of Education, Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Talib, in his libel action against Mr D. R. Seenivasagam which is action of a private nature. This fact was only brought out by the Honourable Assistant Minister of Finance in his speech introducing the Bill, which therefore makes it impossible for any Member of this House to move an amendment to the Schedule to reduce the Supplementary Estimates of Expenditure of 1965, Command Paper No. 36 of 1965, by the said sum of \$88,323 under Standing Order 66 (7).

Sir, I have framed my matter of importance in the words I have, in order to permit the Government to reply to certain statements that were made in this House, because an Alliance backbencher has said that the question of collective responsibilities is involved because if in fact the Government accepts this idea of collective responsibility, as has already been suggested by the Member of Dato Kramat, in the case of a suit which fails then the Government should fall and resign, Sir.

Dato' Abdullah bin Abdulrahman (Kuala Trengganu): Mr Speaker, Sir, what I said was that the payment was made, based on the principle of collective responsibility, as well as based on the fact that Yang Berhormat Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Talib was also a Government servant, who had been a Minister and a Cabinet Member. I hope the Honourable Member for Tanjong would understand properly what I really said.

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Sir, I was going to suggest that neither the statement made by the Honourable Member, nor that of the Member for Dato Kramat, would satisfy us. We would like to have the point of view of the Government benches itself, because if the Government held to this idea of collective responsibility, then it is obviously obnoxious, immoral, and illegal for us to pursue with the debate on this particular item, which has not yet been paid out, and Government would have a graceful way of withdrawing this particular item from the supplementary budget. That is why I have put it down. Otherwise, we would have taken a much more strong view and say that it is not proper for Government to have included this item. So, under those circumstances, I feel some clarification from the Government benches at this stage would make the discussion of the Supplementary Bill much more amenable and amicable.

Mr Speaker: The Honourable Member for Tanjong has asked leave to move the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 18 for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, and the matter has been read out by him—whether it is right and proper for Government to expend public money on matters of litigation of a private nature involving Members of the Government or indeed any Member of this House. I have given the Honourable Member's application careful consideration and have come to the conclusion that it is not a matter of such prima facie urgency as to justify my giving the Honourable Member leave to move such a Motion. Moreover, it is possible for the Honourable Member to touch on this matter during the discussion on the Supplementary Estimates which is before the House this very morning, and Honourable Members will have every opportunity to speak on it—every Member.

The Minister of Home Affairs and Minister of Justice (Dato' Dr Ismail): Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise to accept the Honourable Member's invitation to give clarification on the relevant item under

discussion. Sir, the Honourable Member for Ipoh and other Members of the Opposition have criticised the Government for asking the sum of \$88,323 under Head S. 47, Sub-head 97, Attorney-General, on the ground that the Government has no moral and legal basis to spend this sum on legal expenses of Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Talib, the former Minister of Health. The Honourable Member for Ipoh went a step further, and accused the Government of trying to conceal the fact that the amount asked for was for the legal expenses of Enche' Rahman bin Talib. He based his accusation on the basis that Command Paper No. 37 did not state reasons for asking the said amount. Now, I would like, first of all, to state that Government never had any intention of concealment in this case. The relevant Command Paper states that the additional sum of \$88,323 is required for legal expenses, fees and retainers as the existing provision has been found to be inadequate. Now, this is a fact. If the amount available is adequate, then there is no reason to ask for the supplementary amount. The Honourable Member said that the White Paper should state that this additional asked for was to cover legal expenses for Enche' Rahman bin Talib, if the Government had no intention of concealment.

Sir, it is not customary to give details of specific cases which come under this Head and Sub-head in the White Paper. Details are given either by Minister when introducing subjects, which come under their respective Ministries in the Committee stage, or if this is not done, then Honourable Members in the course of the debate can ask for these details. Now in this case the Government went further than what is customary practice. The Assistant Minister of Finance in the course of introducing the Bill, during the second reading, highlighted the fact that the amount asked for was legal aid for Enche' Rahman bin Talib. By this gesture, if the Government is to be accused of any guilt, it will be accused of being guilty of giving prominence rather than concealment of this particular case.

I come now, Sir, to the point whether Government is morally and legally justified in spending this money, if approved by the House, on the legal expenses of Enche' Rahman Talib. Sir, Enche' Rahman Talib was a Minister of Health, when he was accused of corruption in this House by the Honourable Member for Ipoh. Enche' Abdul Rahman Talib then challenged the Honourable Member for Ipoh to repeat his accusation outside the House, so that he could take legal action in court. The Honourable Member for Ipoh obliged. As a Minister, Enche' Abdul Rahman was obliged to vindicate his name in court. Before doing so, he consulted his colleagues in the Cabinet. We, in the Cabinet, endorsed Enche' Abdul Rahman's decision and assured him that Government would pay for his legal expenses, because the Cabinet believed that this case had bearing on the person of Enche' Abdul Rahman, not as a private individual but in his capacity as a Minister. The court had to decide whether he was guilty or not. If he were guilty, he had to resign. If he were not, then he vindicated not only himself but also the good name of the Government. Sir, I am not going further on this point, because the case is on appeal and therefore *sub judice*. In the meantime, Enche' Rahman Talib had conformed to normal democratic practice and had resigned as Minister.

Sir, the Government, therefore, has done right in this case and makes no apology for taking this decision to ask for this supplementary estimate in order to pay the legal expenses of the former Minister of Health. We contend that if Enche' Rahman Talib were not a Minister of Health, then the Member for Ipoh would not have taken the course he had taken in trying to accuse Enche' Abdul Rahman Talib as being corrupt. The fact that he chose in this House and outside to call Enche' Abdul Rahman as Minister of Health and, thereby, implying that the Government was sheltering a corrupt Minister, it is right, therefore, for the Government to give Enche' Abdul Rahman Talib, who was the Minister of Health, either to vindicate himself, or if he could not and if the court

decided against him, then he had to resign from the Government—and I think that is a proper democratic practice for the Government, and the Government has every right to do this. (*Applause*).

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of order

Mr Speaker: No more. There is no debate.

Dr Ng Kam Poh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to point out

Mr Speaker: No more. There is no debate. I have already ruled.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, Sir.

Mr Speaker: There is no Order involved here. I have already ruled. I have made an exception for the Minister to address the House. That is the only exception I can allow.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: I was going to say that, perhaps, he was speaking under S.O. 14, Statements by Ministers, which is outside of this debate. That is what I wanted to know. That is all.

Dato' Dr Ismail: I was making a point of clarification, as asked by the Member for Tanjong.

BILLS PRESENTED

THE INCOME TAX LAWS (MALAYSIA) (AMENDMENT) (No. 2) BILL

Bill to amend further the laws relating to income tax of Sabah, Sarawak and the States of Malaya; presented by the Assistant Minister of Finance; read the first time; to be read a second time at a subsequent sitting of the House.

THE TURNOVER TAX (AMEND- MENT) BILL

Bill to amend the Turnover Tax Act, 1965; presented by the Assistant Minister of Finance; read the first time; to be read a second time at a subsequent sitting of the House.

THE EXCISE (AMENDMENT) BILL

Bill to amend the Excise Act, 1961; presented by the Assistant Minister of Finance; read the first time; to be read a second time at a subsequent sitting of the House.

BILL

THE SUPPLEMENTARY SUPPLY (No. 2) BILL

Second Reading

Order read for resumption of debate on motion, "That the Bill be now read a second time" (17th November, 1965).

Debate resumed.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise to move an amendment under Standing Order 53 (4) of the Standing Orders which says that "On the second reading of a Bill, an amendment may be proposed to the question, '*That the Bill be now read a second time*', to leave out the word 'now' and add, at the end of the question, '*on this day six months* . . .'"

Mr Speaker, Sir, I now move that the word "now" be deleted on the second reading of this Bill and to add in the words "on this day six months". The reason for this is that we cannot amend any clause in this Bill without a two-day notice and, as the Honourable Member for Tanjong has stated, the Treasury Memorandum did not come in time for us to move that this item of payment for the former Minister of Health, Enche' Abdul Rahman Talib, be deleted from the Supply Estimates. And since you have ruled that this matter is not of public importance as to allow a debate on this point, I have therefore thought fit that we should now move that this Bill be read six months hence, in order to give time to the Government to reconsider its stand that the Cabinet believes, as the Minister of Home Affairs has said, that this was a ministerial job upon which the former Minister of Health was taken to court.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I ask the Cabinet to think again whether or not in the light of subsequent findings of the

court its first decision to defend the Minister of Health was correct. If it had been held that there was nothing wrong with the action of the Honourable Minister of Health, perhaps, there could have been an excuse . . .

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The former Minister.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: I am sorry, the former Minister of Health—*(Laughter)* perhaps the Cabinet might have an excuse to say that he had been maligned in the course of his duties. The Honourable the Minister for Home Affairs has said that if the Government was wrong, it was not wrong in trying to shield the fact that this money had been expended out of Treasury funds, but that it had given prominence to this expenditure. Well, Mr Speaker, Sir, whether or not that kind of behaviour is thick skinned, or otherwise, of course, will again be a matter of opinion. The fact that we are blatant does not, therefore, mean that we are innocent. We may be blatant and equally guilty.

The second point given by the Honourable Minister for Home Affairs was that approval for this expenditure was given by the Cabinet, before the action was started.

Dr Lim Swee Aun: On a point of Order, Mr Speaker, Sir: The Honourable Member spoke on this in the debate on the second reading of the Bill yesterday. Is he allowed to speak again to move this amendment?

Mr Speaker: Yes, if he is moving a motion for the postponement of the second reading of the Bill. He is very long winded about it. *(Laughter)*.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Mr Speaker, Sir, I only have got four points. The third point is the question of collective responsibility. According to the Honourable Member for Kuala Trengganu Selatan, he said the payment is justifiable, based upon the principle of collective responsibility; and, if it is based upon the principle of collective responsibility, then collectively the Cabinet ought to resign if one Minister is found guilty—that is also on the same principle.

Dato' Abdullah bin Abdulrahman:

On a point of clarification, Mr Speaker, Sir. I spoke in the national language yesterday and I think, for that reason, the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat misunderstood me. What I said was that at the time when the statement was made, Y.B. Enche' Abdul Rahman was then a Minister and a Member of the Cabinet, and thus a Government servant. In addition to that, based on the principle of collective responsibility, my view is that the Government is justified legally in spending for Enche' Abdul Rahman in his litigation. I also said that, based on the principle of collective responsibility, it should be the duty of the Government to see to the welfare, to the interests, and to the integrity of Members of its Cabinet. That was what I said. On two points I said, and not only on one point of collective responsibility.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Mr Speaker, Sir, first of all, he alleges that I do not understand Malay. Now he thinks that I do not understand English. I suppose he had better speak in Mandarin *(Laughter)* and make it another official language in this House.

What he said this morning is very clear. He said in answer to the Honourable Member for Tanjong, "My statement was"—in his words—"based on the principle of collective responsibility".

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Mr Speaker, Sir, ...

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Wait a minute. Then he jumps the gun by talking of Government servants—that is also based upon the principle that the former Minister for Health was a Government servant, and I was going to deal with this second point. I am sure he is aware that Gurbachan Singh, an Inspector of Police, is on trial for corruption in Kedah and, I understand, that Police Regulations are that until a person is convicted, he is not dismissed from the post, and he holds his post substantially until he is convicted. From his argument, therefore, he ought to run quickly to gather Government funds to defend that

inspector on charges of corruption. His is rather a fantastic statement.

With regard to the fourth point, which was brought up by the Hon'ble Minister for Home Affairs, his argument was that, since this matter was brought up in the Parliament by the Hon'ble Member for Ipoh, and the former Minister for Health challenged him to repeat it outside the Parliament, therefore since it occurred or started in Parliament, it was a matter of ministerial responsibility and ministerial duty. Well, I am sure we all have heard of the Profumo case. Who has not heard of the Profumo case? He had to resign later on. Who has not heard of Christine Keeler? The whole thing arose in the British Parliament. Accusation was made in the British Parliament. Profumo swore the truth of certain statements which he later withdrew and said they were not true—they were, in fact, falsehood. Upon that, a case started and Profumo resigned. Did the British Parliament pay for the expenses, or compensate Mr Profumo?

Dato' Abdullah bin Abdulrahman: Mr Speaker, Sir, in the case of Profumo, was any libel action taken?

Mr Speaker: Are you going to elaborate very long on this Profumo business?

Dato' Abdullah bin Abdulrahman: That is why I am asking the Hon'ble Member—no elaboration was taken in favour of the Profumo case.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: I am glad, Mr Speaker, Sir, of the fact that every-time the Hon'ble Member for Kuala Trengganu Selatan, opens his mouth, he puts his foot in it. (*Laughter*). Of Course, in the case of Profumo, it was a sex scandal and in the case of Hon'ble Rahman Talib, it was a corruption scandal. That is the only difference. But nevertheless, they are both scandals. (*Laughter*).

Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that this amendment be taken.

Enche' Stephen Yong Kuet Tze: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Mr Speaker: I have to put to the House the question that the Bill . . .

Dr Ng Kam Poh: Mr Speaker, Sir, before you put the question to the House, I would like to explain the procedure here in Parliament in respect of his interpretation of the Standing Orders. It is true that he can move a motion within Standing Orders to have this debate postponed for six months. However, Sir, I do not think the amendment is in order in the sense that he can debate this in Committee; he can stress on it, talk on it—everything within the Ministry of Justice. There is no need, Mr Speaker, Sir, to postpone this indefinitely for six months. What is the object of this postponement? That is, Sir, what I am trying to put to the House.

Enche' Lim Kean Siew: Mr Speaker, Sir, I don't know if the Hon'ble Assistant Minister of Finance is aware of the Standing Orders. You cannot amend the item, nor delete it. That is why I moved this motion.

Mr Speaker: The amendment "That the Bill be read a second time on this day six months" is open for debate.

Enche' Stephen Yong Kuet Tze: (*rises*).

Mr Speaker: Before you begin to address the House, I think we should suspend the sitting for a few minutes.

Sitting suspended at 11.10 a.m.

Sitting resumed at 11.40 a.m.

(*Mr. Speaker in the Chair*)

Debate resumed.

Enche' Stephen Yong Kuet Tze: Mr Speaker, Sir, in seconding this motion, I think it might be well recalled that the action arose out of a certain allegation made by the Honourable Member for Ipoh against the former Minister of Education—as a Member of Parliament, of course, it will be his duty, if he knew that there was some malpractices or any lack of propriety on the part of the Government Ministers and the Ministers. To maintain his innocence, there were courses open to him, to the Government anyway, of either appointing a Commission of Enquiry, or some other

steps that are open under the Standing Orders. But the former Minister concerned chose to have his name vindicated in Court. Sir, although we know that this case is now up for appeal, sub-judice but we can say, as a matter of fact, that once a High Court Judge did make his decision known, and a verdict was passed, which we all know. Now we know that before the action was taken, the Cabinet had already decided to back this man up and, therefore, the remark which was made by the Prime Minister, at the time when action was to be heard, that this man was innocent, would have some substance, because as we all now know the Cabinet had already made up its mind that this man was innocent. Sir, our Court derives its foundation of justice from common law and there is a very serious crime, in common law, of champerty which is that of financing people to take part in litigation. It is very akin to conspiracy and I do not know whether the Government is aware of this, but it looks to me that what Government had done was very near to participation of this crime of giving money, encouraging one Member of Government to go and take action. I would perhaps concede if an action is taken against the Government Minister—that is, of course, something beyond his control, something might be said of supporting him because he will be brought to Court against his will; but here is a completely different situation. There were courses open which could be thrashed out about his complaint but no, the Government chose to back him up and asked him to go to Court.

Sir, I think we must bear in mind the procedure of the appointment of judges, either the security or tenure for judges—the appointment of judges is on the advice of the Prime Minister. So you see, Sir, the danger of the interpretation that the body—the Cabinet and the Prime Minister, who as a body, is responsible for appointing judges—has taken side will make a judge, no matter how strong a character he may be, to be in a very embarrassing position, even though, and I do believe, judges appointed are men of integrity

and impartiality. But the public would have some impression that there was pressure being put on the judiciary by the Government to take one side. Now, that of course is a very bad thing to happen.

Sir, I am reliably informed that the judge, who heard this case, earlier on had applied for citizenship, which would have been given as a matter of course to most people in that position, suddenly found that his application was shelved. Up to now I understand that his application has not been considered or approved. Now, Sir, again that is one instance where

Dato' Dr Ismail: The Honourable Member's statement says that this particular judge's application for citizenship was delayed. I challenge that statement, Sir.

Enche' Stephen Yong Kuet Tze: But I have reliably been informed that that is so. If the Minister says that it has not been delayed, well, I have to take his word for it.

Dato' Dr Ismail: I challenge the Honourable Member because he has no right to make a statement which is very specific, which is untrue. So he must withdraw that. If he is uncertain that he must not say it.

Mr Speaker: I think the Honourable Member had better decide whether to withdraw the statement or go on with it. If you go on with it you have to prove it.

Enche' Stephen Yong Kuet Tze: Sir, I am told by this man himself. I cannot say whether what he told me is true; but this is what I can say—if the Minister says it was not delayed I am prepared to take his word for it.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Ya'kub: Under Standing Order "a Member who asserts a fact must be responsible for the accuracy of that fact".

Enche' Stephen Yong Kuet Tze: Sir, I cannot do no more than to repeat what has been told to me.

Mr Speaker: I must rule that in repeating you are asserting the fact, you know. Are you not?

Enche' Stephen Yong Kuet Tze: Sir, if someone tells me, "My application has been delayed", how can I, as a Member of Parliament, say that I cannot accept his word, whether it is true or not.

Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Ya'kub: Does he accept it, believes that it was true—what the man told him was true? That is the very point. If he accepts that, he accepts the responsibility for the accuracy of statement of fact.

Mr Speaker: That is the question if I may point out. The question is when you repeat a statement of fact that means either you believe it or else

Enche' Stephen Yong Kuet Tze: I do believe it, Sir, but I do not know whether I can say that it is actually true. (*Laughter*). Someone told me, "I have made an application, my application is delayed", now I am in a very difficult position not to say that

Dato' Dr Ismail: The Honourable Minister had made a specific allegation which is a very serious one. If the Honourable Member makes that allegation he must be quite sure of his facts otherwise he should withdraw what he has said.

Enche' Stephen Yong Kuet Tze: If the Minister is really assuring us that in fact that it is not correct, then I am prepared to accept his word and withdraw it. But I like it to be known that I have made this statement not without any basis. Sir, I am not saying that there was this move from the Government to do what in the minds of the people the Government is doing, but it is the impression that is important, the impression that we can go to court without any interference from any quarters, particularly from Government.

Dr Lim Swee Aun: On a point of clarification, is the Honourable Member claiming that the Government did use influence on this particular judge to influence his judgement?

Enche' Stephen Yong Kuet Tze: Sir, I hope the Minister has heard me rightly. I have made it quite clear that

I did not suggest that the Government used influence. What I said was, the impression that was created.

Sir, I have said that the Government has certain duties to perform—to run the Government efficiently and properly. Similarly, the Members of Parliament have their own duties and functions too. And if any aid is to be given in this case, I suggest that the aid should be given to the Member for Ipoh for performing a public duty and not to the former Minister.

Sir, we have here a situation of a Government Minister accused of certain misdeeds, or other acts, which are not proper, being given financial aid from the public funds. Would that not be an encouragement to other Ministers that they could rely on financial aid and if anybody were to challenge them on their misdeeds, they will gladly go to court and then take action on the poor? We have a few Members in this House, having the financial background as the Member from Ipoh, and they would find themselves bankrupt, if he were taken to court. Here, Sir, is something which, I think, must be removed from our system—and this system what appears to be sticking together of the bays, right or wrong. We have heard of collective responsibility and I do not know whether in this case this would be denied by the Government with regard to backing up Ministers in all cases. I am not saying that we cannot back up Ministers at all, but there are cases as I have already mentioned, if a Minister can be called to the court against his will, it is right and proper that public funds be utilised to defend him, but not to use public funds to make him to initiate proceedings. We see here, Sir, the very unhealthy set-up of a Minister having to fall back on public funds to vindicate his personal name and it was a charge against him personally, and it was not any accusation against the Government as a whole. So, where is the justification for public funds to be spent on that account? We know that he had to resign, but it took him a long time to make up his mind to resign. If I know of practices elsewhere, in democratic countries, any Minister,

even though there is a wind of suspicion, it will be his duty to resign and vindicate himself and not to wait until the court has made its decision. And it does give a bad name to the Government and also to the country as a whole, because we believe in democracy and the practice of democracy was not done in this case.

Therefore, Sir, I would urge that the Government would at this hour postpone consideration of this Bill, particularly because we are unable to withdraw that particular sub-head under the Standing Orders, for the sake of democratic principle which has to be maintained.

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the motion for amendment, and I would like to observe that this is a day of shame for this House. The fact that Government backbenchers and the Minister of Justice himself should stand up before this House and justify a matter, which would be regarded as indefensible in any other parliamentary democracy—that is what has happened; and I think all Members of this House, who cherish the prestige of this House, must protest against what has happened. I would ask the Honourable Minister to quote one international precedent, in one parliamentary democracy anywhere, where the Cabinet and the Government holds that they are collectively responsible for the alleged misdemeanours, or the actual misdemeanours, of a Cabinet colleague. I think the records will show that in parliamentary democracies elsewhere, for far less reasons Ministers have resigned and have been held responsible for vindicating themselves against the charges levelled against them, without any call on the public purse. That is an established fact and an unarguable fact.

Sir, the Government had an opportunity today to retreat gracefully from an untenable position, a morally untenable position, but it would appear, Sir, that a durian-type skin is not the peculiar attribute of the Honourable Minister of Finance but is an attribute which is shared equally by all his

colleagues in the Cabinet, and we have had a durian-type situation created, which is bound to have a durian-type impact on public opinion.

Sir, the right thing for the Government to do would have been not to attempt to defend the indefensible, to outrage all precedents, and to make Malaysia and this august House the target of international scorn and contempt, but to have quietly and gracefully retreated from, let us face it, a totally, thoroughly, untenable position. However, as I said, we have witnessed the sorry spectacle of people, who should make it their business to cherish the prestige and dignity of this House, standing up and defending something which is quite indefensible by any standards, and especially by the standards of parliamentary democracy and parliamentary democratic institutions throughout the world.

Sir, I think it is clear that we are not concerned here, in this particular case, with the merits, or the demerits of the allegations against the former Minister that is now the subject of appeal. But, Sir, in the first place, it is the normal practice in a parliamentary democracy for a Minister to resign, if serious charges of impropriety are levelled at him and then to seek to clear his name. MacMillan and his cabinet did not consider themselves collectively obliged to defend their colleague, Mr John Profumo. There, it was a case in which the allegations had been admitted by the Minister himself. But, in both cases, as the Member for Dato Kramat had pointed out, a scandal, and more than a breath of scandal, surrounded the two cases. Sir, Government tells us that it is committed, and it has committed itself to meeting the legal fees of the former Minister for Education. Are we to understand that it is also committed to support him and pay his cost right up to Privy Council, if that should become necessary? That the public of this country, the taxpayers, are to pay for defending a man alleged to have committed serious misdemeanours right up to the Privy Council, pay Queen's Counsel fees as well? What is the precedent? Where is the precedent? The

shocking thing is that this House should ever have been called upon to debate such a thing—such a debate should have been completely unnecessary.

Sir, in the case of the former Minister for Education, as we all know, he decided to remain in the saddle for quite some time even while the case was proceeding. That was the first breach of precedent, which had taken place. We have heard about this collective responsibility business, but if it turns out that Enche' Abdul Rahman Talib loses his case in the Court of Appeal, does it also mean—and this point has been made again and again—does it also mean that the Ministers of the Alliance Government elect accept responsibility individually and collectively for his misdemeanours? Sir, the Honourable Minister of Justice, he stated that, well, charges were levelled against him because he was the Member of the Cabinet. Sir, the point has already been made that the charges levelled against the former Minister for Education were not charges connected with his ministerial duties; in fact, they covered certain alleged acts committed outside the scope of his duties and functions as a Minister. Are we to understand that, if one of the Ministers of the Government commits a crime, let us say—I am not suggesting that they are capable of doing so (*Laughter*)—but hypothetically, commits a crime, does it mean that the defence costs of that colleague would be met from public funds? Is that a contention which can be seriously upheld at the bar of international opinion anywhere? Sir, if this precedent is to be set, then not merely every Minister, but every Member of Parliament, every Government servant in this country, every public servant in this country, can quite rightly claim, "I am free to do what I like, to commit all the indiscretions that I want to, because I can make a call on the public purse"—the same analogy would apply, and I say, Sir, that it is a very, very sad thing that this House should have been permitted to have put itself in a position of inviting public scorn,

ridicule and contempt not only locally but also internationally. Thank you.

Enche' Abu Bakar bin Hamzah (Bachok): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun hendak berchakap sedikit menyokong pindaan supaya perkara ini di-tanggohkan kepada kali yang lain. Saya menyokong berlainan sudut ia-itu saya hendakkan perkara ini di-tanggohkan, bukan kerana supaya Kerajaan menarek balek apa yang Kerajaan telah meminta, tetapi ia-lah supaya Kerajaan dapat menerangkan bahawa tindakan itu betul boleh di-buat bagitu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada mulanya, kalau kita melihat kepada penerangan yang meminta \$88,323 di-dalam ini, saya rasa, tidak ada apa sa-suatu di-dalam itu, sebab perbelanjaan yang \$88,323 di-minta untuk hendak membayar perkara² yang bersangkutan-paut dengan legal expenses dan saya rasa tidak ada satu Ahli pun di-dalam Dewan ini yang pernah bagitu tegas meminta supaya Kerajaan memotong permintaan itu. Sa-tinggi²-nya ia-lah Member² atau Ahli² itu bangun berchakap dan menunjokkan beberapa perkara yang dia tidak puas hati, tetapi di-dalam perkara ini berpanjangan ia-lah kerana ada satu kesilapan ia-itu di-dalam penerangan, mengapa wang ini di-minta, saya tidak ada pada waktu itu, tetapi mengikut keterangan daripada Menteri kita baharu² ini mengatakan, Menteri Muda kita ini telah pergi jauh sangat lebih daripada demokratik dan dia-lah yang menceritakan bahawa \$88,323 di-kehendaki ia-lah untuk membantu Yang Berhormat Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Talib. Tetapi kalau-lah perkataan-nya, bunyi-nya bagini sahaja, sa-bagaimana bijak-nya Menteri Hal Ehwal Dalam Negeri kita itu, perkara itu tidak berbangkit dan ini membayangkan bahawa yang satu itu bijak dan yang satu lagi tidak bijak. Mistakes yang berlaku di-sini ia-lah daripada Menteri yang mengemukakan perkara ini dan saya rasa kalau kita hendak departmental action pun Cabinet boleh suspend biar dia berhenti daripada menjadi Menteri Muda dalam perkara itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, lagi satu perkara ini menjadi bertambah rumit, apabila keterangan daripada Ahli Yang

Berhormat daripada Kuala Trengganu Selatan ia-itu dalam penerangan-nya itu dia telah pergi lebih jauh lagi daripada Menteri Muda dan meninggalkan berbatu² berani-nya daripada Menteri yang sa-benar ia-itu di-bayar wang ini ia-lah kerana memandang orang yang kena-mengena dalam ini—saya tidak mahu kata Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Talib, sebab dia tidak ada di-sini. Kalau dia ada di-sini dia boleh defend, kita sebut Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Talib yang tidak ada, macham lawan bola dengan team yang tidak ada, tentu kita menang.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, apabila Ahli Yang Berhormat menyebut perkara yang di-bayar, yang pertama ia-itu dia itu Government Servant, dan yang kedua di-beri bantuan di-atas basis collective responsibilities. Jadi membuka dua gelanggang lagi kepada orang ini, jadi bertambah rumit-lah. Maka kalau-lah dia itu pegawai Kerajaan, tiap² pegawai² Kerajaan yang di-dapati salah dalam Mahkamah, Kerajaan kena bayar wang, itu tidak berlaku dan kalau sa-kira-nya ada peguam² (lawyer) yang boleh menentukan bahawa pegawai Kerajaan, bila dia bersalah, Kerajaan kena bayar wang. Lebih baik saya tidak resign daripada pegawai Kerajaan daripada menjadi Member of Parlimen, tiap² kali buat salah dapat wang Kerajaan.

Dato' Abdullah bin Abdul Rahman: On a point of clarification, Ahli Yang Berhormat ini tidak faham apa sa-benar-nya yang saya katakan, dia katakan berasas kepada collective responsibilities. Apa yang saya katakan petang sa-malam—ia-lah berasas kepada tanggung-jawab bersama—principle of collective responsibilities, maka ada-lah tanggung-jawab Kerajaan yang berkuasa membela kepentingan-nya, kalau di-tengok text speeches saya itu—membela" kepentingan dan kebajikan Ahli Cabinet-nya. Itu yang saya katakan dan sa-lain daripada itu pembelaan dia sa-bagai Government servant.

Enche' Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya telah berchakap berkenaan dengan Government Servant, berkenaan dengan collective responsibilities—saya tidak terang lagi

dan dia sudah menangkis apa yang saya belum kata lagi. Ini satu perkara 'ajaib sebab dia hendak lari-lah dari perkara itu. I stand—walau pun dia loyar, saya hendak lawan hari ini (*Ketawa*).

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jadi bahagian yang kedua ia-lah kita memasokkan perkara ini di-atas dasar collective responsibilities. Ini-lah yang menjadi satu puncha yang memberi peluang lagi kepada orang² yang tidak puas hati dalam perkara ini. Kalau benda ini di-biar begitu sahaja dan kalau sa-kira-nya ada Ahli² yang memikirkan tidak terang apa dia legal expenses, bila berlaku, di-mana berlaku di-masa itu di-masa itu di-terangkan, saya ingat tidak ada orang yang bertanya lalu begitu sahaja, tetapi pergi chari penyakit sendiri (*Ketawa*). Kita ini kadang² kalau kita berchakap banyak sangat dan kalau kita dudok diam orang sangka kita bodoh, bila kita berchakap orang confirm kita bodoh, Tuan Yang di-Pertua (*Ketawa*).

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak hendak bertengkar dari segi orang yang kena tuduh ini sa-bagai Government Servant atau pun sa-bagai collective responsibilities di-atas itu, tetapi saya suka-lah hendak menunjukkan ia-itu pandangan saya berlainan daripada Ahli daripada Bungsar tadi ia-itu dia mengatakan bahawa sa-olah² dia chabar (challenge) kepada Kerajaan. Di-mana ada satu precedent yang berlaku di-dalam Majlis Meshuarat di-mana² dunia yang satu Cabinet pernah menolong kawan yang telah melakukan salah? Saya fikirkan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli Yang Berhormat ini kurang membacha buku (*Ketawa*). Kalau sa-kira-nya dia membacha buku, tentu-lah dia dapat dalam buku cherita lama² ia-itu di-zaman sa-belum sejarah, masa manusia maseh di-dalam 'alam babarianism lagi, ada perkara² yang kawan²-nya menolong kawan²-nya melakukan perbuatan salah, jadi ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dia kurang membacha dalam perkara itu—ada perkara itu (*Gangguan*). Jadi saya berlainan-lah dengan pendapat-nya dalam perkara itu; ada berlaku di-zaman² yang belum tamaddun lagi (*Ketawa*).

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, yang kedua memang-lah tidak patut kita mengadakan satu peristiwa atau pun satu *precedent* di-dalam Parlimen kita ini yang satu² orang itu, apabila dia melakukan kesalahan, kita menolong dengan bantuan wang. Saya bukan-lah hendak mengatakan kepada pihak Kerajaan Perikatan sahaja, tetapi kalau ini-lah menjadi satu contoh di-dalam Parlimen kita, saya bimbang apabila Kerajaan lain naik dan boleh jadi Kerajaan lain naik pula, banyak lagi membuat kesalahan, maka dia akan sedap atau pun dia akan menggunakan apa yang telah di-lakukan oleh Kerajaan Perikatan itu. Maka berpanjangan²-lah tiap² Kerajaan yang naik, dia menggunakan hak ini dan sampai bila² pun *member² Cabinet* ini terjamin daripada kesusahan kewangan apabila dia telah melakukan satu² kesalahan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, lagi satu perkara, kita kata-lah Kerajaan ini memang menghargai sa-saorang Ahli Parlimen dan boleh jadi dalam niat Kerajaan yang tidak di-sedar oleh Ahli Bungsar ini ia-itu yang sa-benar-nya Kerajaan Perikatan bukan sahaja hendak memberi kepada Menteri² hak yang sa-macam ini, tetapi dia hendak memberi juga barangkali kepada member² yang lain termasuk juga kepada Ahli dari Bungsar ini. Kalau ini-lah yang sa-benar-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, mengapa-kah \$88,323 ini diberi kepada member alliance sahaja (*Ketawa*) tidak di-beri kepada Ahli Ipoh sana, baharu-lah adil dalam perkara ini, baharu-lah menjunakkan Parlimen kita ini menjaga Ahli² Parlimen-nya tetapi nampak-nya sekarang ini dia memandang sa-belah pihak sahaja.

Satu perkara lagi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perbahathan pada hari ini yang sunggoh-nya bagi pihak Ahli Bungsar mengatakan satu hari yang malu besar, tetapi saya memandang hari ini ada-lah satu hari yang lucu di-dalam sejarah Parlimen di-dunia, ia-itu tidak pernah berlaku di-dalam mana² Parlimen, sa-takat yang saya baca, *back benchers* dan Menteri² Muda itu lebeh maju lagi dalam memberi keterangan di-ketika meminta peruntukan daripada Menteri-

nya sendiri. Jadi ini-lah satu perkara lucu dalam satu² Cabinet yang menjadi hak istimewa kepada Kerajaan Perikatan yang tidak boleh di-champor dan di-share oleh Kerajaan² yang lain.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak-lah hendak melibatkan diri, sama ada Ahli Yang Berhormat Enche' Abdul Rahman Talib, itu bersalah atau pun tidak, dan saya tidak-lah pula hendak memasok, memihakkan kepada ahli di-Ipoh, yang dia itu berhak membuat begitu, tetapi apa yang kita kenamengena di-dalam Dewan ini ia-lah kalau-lah sunggoh, saya kata kalau-lah sunggoh ini, kerana Menteri Dalam Negeri tadi tidak menyebut pun berkenaan dengan wang ini kalau sunggoh hendak di-gunakan untuk membela Enche' Rahman Talib, tetapi dia telah menyebut bahawa Menteri Muda itu telah jauh pergi dan dia tidak menyebut tentang ahli daripada Trengganu dan kalau-lah ini betul, saya katakan kalau ini betul, saya barangkali menunggu² Menteri kita ini akan bangun bahawa apa yang di-sebutkan oleh Menteri Muda dan Ahli daripada Trengganu itu tidak betul, tetapi merepek sahaja, kalau itu-lah Menteri boleh membuat statement, saya rasa benda ini boleh di-selesai sekarang (*Ketawa*).

Dato' Abdullah bin Abdul Rahman Kuala Trengganu Selatan): Mr Speaker, Sir, sekarang Ahli Yang Berhormat ini ada buat kaitan dengan apa yang saya chakap. Saperti Tuan Yang di-Pertua tahu sa-benar-nya ini pada pendapat saya sa-bagai *back-bencher*, tiap² sa-orang boleh memberi pendapat-nya kepada satu² motion, sama ada hendak kita luluskan atau pun tidak perbelanjaan itu, terpulang kepada semua ahli² di-dalam Rumah yang berbahgia ini. Jadi dengan sebab itu saya object perkataan "lucu" yang di-gunakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat, oleh kerana ada pandangan saya beri itu, dia kata telah jadi lucu, itu saya bantah keras. Dan saya menuntut kepada Ahli Yang Berhormat supaya menarek balek perkataan itu—perkatahan itu tidak boleh di-gunakan di-dalam sa-buah Dewan saperti Dewan yang berbahgia ini.

Enche' Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau-lah perkataan "luchu" itu sudah tidak boleh di-gunakan di-dalam Dewan ini, kalau sa-benar, saya bersedia menarek balek perkataan "luchu" itu tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kerana kita hendak argue dari segi itu, saya tidak mengatakan oleh kerana ada perka-taan yang di-tegaskan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat yang tertentu itu, maka Cabinet kita atau pun Dewan kita ini menjadi luchu, saya mengatakan per-bahathan pada hari ini di-atas—in general-nya—merupakan satu luchu dan saya rasa, saya pun satu bahasa loghat boleh-kah Ahli Yang Berhormat itu kalau-lah saya minta dia menen-tukan luchu dari segi legal-nya boleh tunjukkan dalam *law* bahawa perka-taan "luchu" itu tidak boleh di-pakai di-dalam Parlimen ini atau pun dia sa-bagai bahasa dia sahaja, *technical term*, *legal term* itu boleh-kah perka-taan luchu itu mesti *dismisskan* daripada Dewan ini, boleh tunjok di-mana satu *Standing Order*, saya boleh ikut sekarang, saya boleh tarek balek (*Gangguan*) *shame*. Pertanyaan yang tidak akan dapat berjawab sama sa-kali (*Gangguan*).

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, apa yang saya sebut tadi ia-lah kita tidak-lah hendak menentukan masaaalah saudara kita, Ahli Yang Berhormat Enche' Rahman Talib itu, kerana walau pun perkara itu betul berlaku, tetapi sa-suatu per-kara yang kena-mengena peribadi sa-saorang, kalau dia betul² dari segi *criminal* kalau dia salah sa-kali pun, sa-kali dia salah itu, kita tidak boleh ungkit lagi sa-kali, kalau dia telah kena hukum kita katakan dia ber-salah, besok kita hendak kata lagi dia penchuri, tidak boleh, sebab dia penchuri sa-mata² dengan kesalahan yang pertama dan pada kali yang lain kalau dia tidak menchuri dia tidak boleh di-sebut sa-bagai penchuri—itu dari segi *legal*, saya rasa, saudara saya dari Kuala Trengganu Selatan ber-setuju dengan saya dalam perkara itu.

Yang kedua, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, yang saya sebut ini ia-lah ada-kah satu² perkara yang di-lakukan oleh sa-orang Ahli di-dalam *Cabinet*, sama ada perkara itu betul² merupakan

crime atau pun perkara² itu mempu-nyai beberapa rukun yang boleh meli-batkan ahli itu nyaris² boleh di-tudoh melakukan satu *crime*, ada-kah *cabinet* kita ini patut memberi bantuan kepada orang yang bersalah yang sa-macham itu. Saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada pendapat saya, kalau-lah sa-saorang Menteri atau pun sa-saorang Ahli Parlimen ini sedang di-dalam menja-lankan tugas-nya sa-bagai sa-orang pegawai dan perkara² itu di-dapati bersalah, boleh-lah kita bawa di-dalam *cabinet* dan *cabinet* menentukan kesi-lapan-nya dan kesalahan-nya itu ia-lah sa-mata² *departmental*. Tetapi sekarang, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perkara ini telah kita bawakan ka-dalam mah-kamah dan biar-lah mahkamah menentukan.

Yang ketiga, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya juga hairan kalau-lah perkara ini betul, apa-kah mustahak-nya yang Kerajaan kita ini hendak mengadakan wang \$88,323 itu khusus kepada ahli yang berkenaan dengan itu, tetapi kalau Kerajaan berkehendakkan wang itu untuk menjalankan satu² kerja yang kena-mengena dengan undang², tetapi di-dalam itu terlibat-lah sahabat kita yang berkenaan ini, maka saya rasa perkara itu tidak menjadi hudoh sa-bagaimana yang kita tengok seka-rang ini.

Tetapi "\$88,323 is meant for that man"—itu menjadi kachau kita di-dalam Dewan ini. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, walau bagaimana pun kita nampak-lah pada hari ini kalau saya katakan malu tentu-lah orang² Perikatan suroh tarek balek perkataan malu. Jadi, saya tidak tahu hendak sebutkan apa-lah hari ini perasaan orang² Perikatan, terutama orang² yang telah tersalah membuat kenyataan² yang melibatkan Kabinet mereka itu susah hendak menghadap pehak Pem-bangkang dalam perkara ini. Apa-kah perasaan mereka itu ia-itu mereka itu chuba hendak mempertahankan orang yang tidak patut di-pertahankan. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, terjauh daripada per-kataan² *crime* atau pun salah, tidak salah, tetapi ini ada-lah satu kemeru-sutan dari segi akhlak—moral sa-bagai sa-orang Menteri.

Saya teringat, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam satu perpatah Arab—saya bukan Arab tetapi saya teringat perkataan itu—berbunyi: (*dalam bahasa Arab*) Umat² manusia di-dalam dunia ini . . .

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health (Enche' Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Dewan ini menggunakan dua bahasa sahaja—bahasa Melayu dan bahasa Inggeris. Yang Berhormat itu berchakap dalam bahasa Arab (*Ketawa*).

Enche' Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Saya tidak berchakap Arab—saya membawa potongan kalimat Arab yang kemudian-nya saya terjemahkan dan Ahli Yang Berhormat tidak dapat membezakan antara “berchakap” dengan “memetek” (*Ketawa*). Tuan Yang di-Pertua, erti-nya umat² manusia di-dalam dunia ini tersukat dengan akhlak mereka itu. Jikalau akhlak mereka itu hilang, hilang-lah hakikat umat.

Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dari segi badan dan material sahaja, maka Kerajaan Perikatan yang ada orang² yang boleh di-bilang, tetapi dari segi moral mengikut kaedah sha'ir saya bacha ini, mereka itu tidak mempunyai nilai dari segi moral. Jadi, ini-lah Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka perkara ini di-tanggohkan kepada 6 bulan lagi. Bukan kerana hendak menarek wang ini, tetapi kerana hendak proof kepada Dewan ini bahawa Kerajaan Perikatan itu tidak begitu kotor peribadi dan moral orang²-nya. Jadi, untuk memberi peluang kepada mereka itu membersehan segala kotor akhlak, jika ada. Sekian, Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

Dato' Dr Ismail: Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose the motion because of the simple fact that the Mover of the motion and the supporters of the motion have not given the valid reasons for asking for the Bill to be delayed. Let us take, for example, the argument used by Enche' Stephen Yong from Sarawak. He said that there were other ways open to Enche' Rahman Talib other than going to court to seek redress in this particular case. Sir, this is a very extraordinary statement to be made by the Honour-

able Member in view of the fact of what he has said concerning the appointment of judges in this country. Now, Sir, he has said that because the Cabinet has a hand in appointing judges in this country an impression has been created that the judges are not truly impartial. Now, Sir, if, for example, a commission were to be appointed to go into this case, what then the Honourable Member would say? He would say that this commission would be biased. If he could accuse the judges of this country who are independent, yet by the fact that the Cabinet has a hand in appointing judges would create the impression that they are not impartial, what would he say then in the case of a commission appointed by the Cabinet? This was the very reason that the Government chose to encourage Enche' Abdul Rahman Talib to go to court. Further, in this House Opposition Members have always urged the Government to bring cases to court—you can read the proceedings of this House where Hon'ble Members have always asked that Government should go to court in many cases. Now, Sir, I think, it is unfortunate that the Hon'ble Member from Sarawak, Enche' Stephen Yong, should have chosen on this occasion to make the statement that the present manner of appointing judges will create an impression of impartiality, because this very case proves that the judges in this country are impartial and cannot be influenced by the Cabinet. Otherwise if the Cabinet had any influence on the judges their verdict would have been different. (*Applause*).

And then he put forward the extraordinary argument that Ministers can only be paid out of public funds in cases where the Ministers are dragged to court. In other words, the Ministers must always be on the defensive all the time. In other words, if a Member of the Opposition chose to bring the Ministers to court then that is a justifiable case for the Government to ask money to be spent on that particular Minister out of public funds.

Now, Sir, surely if the Minister can be paid according to the Honourable Member's argument out of public fund,

when he is dragged to court, then what is there to prevent a Minister, who believes himself to be innocent, and his colleagues believe him to be innocent, to go to court to clear his name, and as a Minister of the Government to ask public funds to be spent on him. Now, Sir, the Honourable Member from Sarawak, Enche' Stephen Yong again said that the very fact that the Cabinet supported Enche' Abdul Rahman Talib to go to court proved that the Cabinet was confirmed that Enche' Rahman Talib was innocent. Now, Sir, this is a very extraordinary statement. What the Cabinet did was that the Cabinet believed that Enche' Rahman Talib was innocent, and that was why we agreed that he should go to court. We did not say that we were confirmed that we were certain that Enche' Rahman Talib was innocent. We only believed that he was innocent, and therefore, he should go to court to clear his name. And then he said that this case was to vindicate Enche' Rahman Talib in his personal capacity, or to use his own expression, to vindicate his personal name. Now, I have pointed out that Enche' Abdul Rahman Talib went there as the Minister for Education—here I take the opportunity to correct myself because he had held so many portfolios and when this case was brought up he was the Minister of Education. Now, he went there to vindicate himself as the Minister of Education. Then he made another extraordinary observation, that a Minister should resign if there is suspicion against him. Sir, in that case the whole of us will have to resign, because you are all suspicious of us. I mean this is a very extraordinary statement in that if one Honourable Member in this House rises up and accuses me of misdemeanour then I should tender my resignation and fight him afterwards. Why should I? I also must clear myself while still a Minister. Why should I resign first? That is a very extraordinary argument to put forward.

Then we come to the Honourable Member for Bungsar. He says that it is indefensible in all countries practising parliamentary practice to spend public funds in support of a Minister who is

alleged of misdemeanour. He says that there is no case where the Cabinet is collectively responsible for misdemeanour of a colleague. Sir, I agree with him. The Cabinet is not collectively responsible for this misdemeanour of a colleague, but the Cabinet is responsible in that Ministers in the Cabinet are above reproach, and this is the attitude we adopt, because we do not want any reflection on the Cabinet, or on any Member of the Cabinet, because if we harbour any Minister who is under a cloud, or who had done any misdemeanour, then that Cabinet will not have the respect of the people of this country and the outside world. He repeated the argument put forward by Mr Stephen Yong that a Minister should first resign, if he is alleged to be wrong, and then fight the case in court. He quoted the case of Mr John Profumo. Sir, in the case of Mr John Profumo, if you remember correctly, first of all, the Prime Minister, Mr MacMillan, defended Mr John Profumo on the words of Mr Profumo that he had nothing to do with the Christine Keeler's case. But when, later on, the Prime Minister found out that he was involved in the Christine Keeler's case, then he had to resign. It was only when it was confirmed that Mr John Profumo was guilty of misdemeanour that he had to resign, not when he was alleged to have been guilty of misdemeanour that he should resign. This Cabinet cannot accept that a Minister should resign just because he is being alleged of doing something. If, for example, that allegation is proved then there is no other course but for the Prime Minister to demand the resignation of that Minister.

Then the Honourable Member for Bungsar made this observation, that the charges against Enche' Rahman Talib was not against his ministerial duties. Of course, it is not against his ministerial duties, but they are charges against his personal integrity as a Minister of the Government. We cannot have a Minister in the Cabinet, who is lacking in integrity and that is what we wanted to prove; we wanted the final proof as to whether Enche' Rahman Talib was guilty or not; and if he was

guilty then he had no other course but to resign. So, this is a matter of Cabinet responsibility which has cropped up in this debate. We do not say that the Cabinet is collectively responsible for this misdemeanour of any of its Member, but we do say that if any Member of the Cabinet is guilty of misdemeanour then it is the duty of the Cabinet to demand his resignation, and that is what we have done.

Pada penghabisan-nya, ini-lah hujah² yang datang-nya daripada Ahli daripada Bachok. Saya tidak-lah hendak menjawab semua hujah² dia, chuma satu sahaja yang saya hendak jawab, oleh sebab saya fikir dia kurang mengerti sedikit jawapan saya dalam bahasa Inggeris tadi. Dia mengatakan ia-itu kenyataan², sebab², kita hendakkan duit ini tidak di-masokkan dalam Command Paper. Bagaimana yang saya katakan dalam White Paper ini, perkara² umpama-nya khas yang berkenaan dengan perkara Legal Aid ini, memang-lah lazim-nya kita tidak taroh tiap² case itu dalam White Paper ini.

Enche' Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Kenyataan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak menuntut pehak Menteri ini menyebut perkataan di-dalam ini. Saya kata, kalau-lah benda ini di-biarkan begitu sahaja dengan explanation yang ada ini, perkara ini tidak berbangkit. Tetapi oleh kerana kesilapan daripada sa-orang Ahli daripada Menteri Muda pergi mencheritakan—in detail—menyebut tentang belanja pada Enche' Rahman Talib itu, itu-lah yang menimbulkan perbahathan ini. Saya kata begitu.

Dato' Dr Ismail: Jadi kalau kita tidak buat keterangan pula nanti, dia kata kita hendak menyembunyi pula (*Ketawa*). Jadi ini-lah yang serba-salah. Jadi itu-lah sebab-nya saya kata tadi, kalau Kerajaan hendak di-tudoh, bukan-lah kita ini salah kerana hendak menyembunyi bahkan kita salah-lah kerana hendak menyiarkan, menghebahkan perkara ini (*Tepok*).

Amended question, "That the Bill be read a second time on this day six months", put, and negatived (*Applause*).

BILL

THE SUPPLEMENTARY SUPPLY (No. 2) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed on question, "That the Bill be now read a second time".

Enche' Abdul Samad bin Gul Ahmad Mianji (Kota Bharu Hulu): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya dapat menyambong balek apa yang berlaku sa-malam, kebetulan sama² jam 12.45.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam masa-lah S. 65, ada beberapa perkara yang saya hendak sebutkan ia-itu seperti yang telah saya chakap kelmarin, perkara pengambilan pegawai² yang telah di-lakukan untuk Kementerian ini. Baharu² ini, dan mengikut fahaman dan keterangan daripada Yang Berhormat Menteri itu, ta' kena-lah di-masokkan dalam Kementerian ini, tetapi walau macham mana pun benda itu sudah saya chakap, jadi ta' payah-lah saya ulang lagi.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, chuma ada dua tiga perkara dalam masa-lah Kementerian ini ia-itu kita semua sudah tahu, seperti yang telah di-ucapkan oleh Menteri itu sendiri ia-itu modal anak² Melayu atau pun bumiputera dalam masa-lah Kementerian Pengangkutan ini daripada 1.9 juta di-bandingkan dengan orang Melayu hanya .3 juta sahaja dan apa yang berlaku dalam Kongres Bumiputera ia-itu keadaan pengangkutan yang berlaku di-Sarawak, mithal-nya, seperti yang telah di-ucapkan oleh sa-orang Ahli Kongres yang datang daripada Sarawak yang bernama Dato' Abang Haji Marzuki ia-itu dari, 1,000 buah teksi yang ada di-Sarawak, tidak sa-buah pun kepunyaan anak bumiputera. Ini dua masa-lah. Saya nampak Menteri itu ta' tahu hendak jawab-kah, apa-kah, ini ada dua masa-lah yang

The Minister of Transport (Dato' Haji Sardon): On a point of clarification, Sir, sa-belum panjang perkara ini, baik-lah chermat sa-belum hendak berchakap kesah Sabah dan Sarawak. Saya fikir beberapa kali saya chakap dalam Rumah Yang Berhormat ini, Sabah dan Sarawak dalam segi Pejabat Kenderaan Raya, di-dalam tempoh 10

tahun, mengikut perjanjian sa-belum Sabah dan Sarawak masuk bersama² di-dalam Malaysia ini, di-dalam tanggungan Kerajaan Negeri sendiri. Dan saya telah memberi jawapan dua tiga kali kepada Ahli² Yang Berhormat daripada Sarawak, saya fikir Ahli² daripada Sarawak pun maseh ingat lagi berkenaan dengan itu.

Kedua-nya, soal polisi kenderaan tidak timbul. Saya, harap Yang Berhormat ada Standing Order yang semua setuju—chuba buka Standing Order 67 (5). Di-situ mengatakan, perbahthan atas Rang Undang² Perbekalan tambahan bukan tambahan dalam Jawatan-kuasa perbahathan, hendak-lah terhad kepada butir² terkandung dalam anggaran² belanja yang di-minta. Maka saya ta' minta peruntukan wang tambahan bagi negeri Sabah dan Sarawak. Yang sa-benar-nya policy kenderaan itu bebas dalam negeri² Borneo. Maka saya harap-lah waktu-nya ada, saya katakan waktu kita membahath Belanjawan tahun 1966 nanti. Saya sudah kata, satu hari satu malam!—pun kur-semanget, saya tunggu!

Enche' Abdul Samad bin Gul Ahmad Mianji: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Menteri Yang Berhormat ini tidak faham Standing Order (*Ketawa*). Yang Berhormat mengatakan dalam jawatan-kuasa. Ini bukan jawatan-kuasa! Kita membahathkan, kita membahathkan supplementary, dalam supplementary, Standing Order (*ganguan*).

Enche' Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Tongkat itu pun dudok atas itu lagi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua (*Ketawa*). Kalau Jawatan-kuasa ta' ada lagi (*Ketawa*).

Enche' Abdul Samad bin Gul Ahmad Mianji: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Fasal 66 bagini kata ayat-nya. Tuan Yang di-Pertua—"sa-telah di-chadangkan usul hendak di-bachakan Rang Undang² ini kali yang kedua dan di-sokong, maka boleh-lah di-jalankan berbahathan dengan serta-merta, tetapi hendak-lah di-hadkan kepada asas² 'am dasar dan tadbiran Kerajaan, seperti yang dinyatakan dalam peruntukan² tambahan yang di-masokkan dalam Undang² dan dalam Anggaran Belanja Tambahan itu". Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tolong memahamkan kepada Yang Berhormat

Menteri itu—Standing Order itu (*Ketawa*). Saya bukan hendak bahath masaalah ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

Mr Speaker: Ada pun perbezaan perbahathan di-dalam Committee sekarang itu sangat sedikit perbezaan-nya. Ada dalam buku Standing Order ini mengatakan perbahathan itu hendak-lah di-hadkan kepada dasar perkhidmatan, tidak mengenai butir² perbelanjaan itu di-dalam masa Committee stage. Sekarang ini boleh di-jalankan butir² itu sedikit sa-banyak, tetapi bukan policy.

Enche' Abdul Samad bin Gul Ahmad Mianji: Saya benar, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Benda ini bukan susah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tetapi sahaja, ma'alum-lah—benda ini benda kecil. Chuma saya hendak tahu daripada pehak Menteri ini, apa-kah ada di-buat satu benda yang hendak membetulkan kejadian² itu tadi? Saya pun tahu, Menteri tadi banyak kali berchakap, saya dengar, ia-itu kejadian² di-Sarawak dalam masaalah bumiputera ini, dalam, sa-puloh tahun lagi baharu-lah Kerajaan Malaysia ini berhak champor tangan, tetapi masaalah sekarang saya hendak tahu apa-kah Kementerian ini sudah buat satu² chara supaya jangan berlaku daripada sa-ribu teks yang di-Sarawak itu, hanya sa-orang sahaja yang ada pada bumiputera, supaya jangan berlaku benda sa-macham itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada lagi satu kejadian ia-itu "plate lorry" Plate A, ia-itu khas untuk sewa dan upah. Saya banyak kali sudah mendengar pehak Kementerian atau pun pehak Yang Berhormat Menteri ini sendiri berchakap ia-itu hendak memberi keutamaan kepada bumiputera dalam masaalah ini. Tetapi ada satu benda ia-itu syarat² orang yang hendak meminta permit teks ini hendak-lah lebeh dahulu ditemuduga oleh orang² yang sudah ada lorry dan kalau sa-kira-nya orang² yang ada lorry itu membangkang, maka tidak-lah dapat orang² yang meminta permit itu. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam masaalah ini kalau-lah sa-lagi syarat ini ada, maka sa-lama itu-lah kita tidak dapat menolong orang Melayu atau pun bumiputera ini, dalam perniagaan lorry² dan sa-bagai-nya. Saya meminta jasa baik Yang

Berhormat Menteri ini supaya memikirkan dalam masaalah ini dengan sādalam²-nya dan kalau boleh, ubah chara² mengeluarkan permit lorry ini.

Perkara yang ketiga, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-itu kita sudah tahu banyak berlaku dan heboh merata² tempat ia-itu kereta² yang membawa anak² ka-sekolah. Benda ini, kejadian ini, berlaku sudah berpuluh² tahun. Ada kadang kala kereta yang membawa budak² ka-sekolah ini di-tangkap dan di-denda, kemudian lepas sa-minggu daripada itu, di-buat juga kerja ini. Tetapi pihak Kementerian ini tidak pernah memikirkan bagaimana hendak menchari satu jalan supaya boleh mengeluarkan permit khas kepada kereta² untuk membawa anak² kita ka-sekolah. Kita tahu, kita pun ada kereta dan semua pegawai² Kerajaan ada kereta, tetapi tidak-lah chukup untuk kita membawa anak² ka-sekolah, kita kena pergi ka-office, kena buat kerja, kena pergi market, dan anak² sekolah ini kita terpaksa menyerahkan kepada kereta² lain di-beri upah, tetapi kereta² itu kadang² di-tangkap dengan chara tidak ada satu dasar khas. Saya minta pihak Kementerian ini tolong, sudah lama benda ini berlaku. Jadi tolong membuat satu² benda. Saya suka menengok Menteri tersenyum. Tolong buat satu benda supaya benda bermacam ini tidak berlaku lagi.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya pergi kepada S. (14) ia-itu Perdagangan dan Perusahaan. Benda ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-lah satu benda yang di-adakan khas sa-buah Kongres Bumiputera, kerana hendak meninggikan taraf bumiputera di-dalam perdagangan dan perusahaan. Masaalah satu, masaalah yang penting ia-itu masaalah perusahaan batek di-Kelantan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Sudah banyak kali dan sudah bertahun² masaalah batek Kelantan pernah di-ucapkan, baik pun di-Dewan yang mulia ini atau pun Dewan yang lama, oleh wakil² daripada pihak Persatuan Islam Sa-Tanah Melayu ini. Dan ada-lah banyak jaminan² yang di-beri oleh pihak Kementerian ini daripada satu Menteri yang lama dan kepada Menteri yang lain.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, batek di-Kelantan ini ia-lah satu perusahaan yang turun temurun yang di-buat oleh orang² Melayu di-Pantai Timor, ada di-Trengganu dan ada di-Kelantan. Perusahaan batek ini mendapat tempat yang baik yang di-hantar ka-seluruh Tanah Melayu tetapi malang-nya, Kerajaan telah membenarkan batek² yang di-buat daripada negeri Jepun dan daripada negeri Thailand masuk ka-Tanah Melayu dengan harga hanya \$36 satu kudi, dan batek daripada Jepun murah lagi daripada batek yang di-buat di-Kelantan. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita mesti sedar bahawa orang di-negeri Kelantan telah membuat batek tidak dengan mesen, tidak dengan jentera, tetapi membuat-nya dengan tangan, menchelup-nya, memukul-nya dan melilin-nya hanya dengan tangan. Maka tidak-lah dapat orang² itu menjual kurang daripada harga dua ringgit, mesti lebeh, dan apabila di-buat, benda macham ini mesti jua lebeh daripada \$2 dan kita pula membenarkan batek daripada Jepun dan daripada Siam masuk dengan harga hanya \$30 atau pun \$35 satu kudi. Maka perusahaan anak Melayu atau pun perusahaan bumiputera dalam negeri ini akan hanchor dan sebab itu-lah di-Kelantan hari ini lepas satu, satu, kilang batek ini tutup perniagaan mereka.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, baharu² ini pihak Kementerian Perdagangan dan Perusahaan telah mengenakan chukai² khas kepada tujuh barang² yang di-bawa masuk daripada negeri luar, ia-itu dawai pagar, pagar rumah, besi² waja, dawai berduri, kertas² yang di-bakar waktu orang² China mati, barang² pelastik dan kichap. Kata Yang Berhormat Menteri Perusahaan dan Perdagangan, Kerajaan mengambil tindakan itu, menurut-nya, ia-lah untuk menjamin sharikat² yang mengeluarkan barang² sa-rupa ini di-negeri ini. Kerajaan terpaksa mengadakan satu chukai khas kepada barang² yang di-import daripada luar—tujuh barang² itu, kerana benda tujuh, barang² itu berbetulan sudah ada kilang-nya di-tanah ayer kita ini. Mengapa-kah masaalah batek ini yang sudah di-laung²kan bertahun² lama-nya

tidak di-kenakan satu² syarat supaya barang yang di-bawa masuk daripada negeri luar, ia-itu batek itu, di-kenakan satu cukai yang agak mahal supaya orang, bila mahu beli, dia akan beli batek daripada tanah ayer-nya sendiri, batek yang di-usahakan oleh anak negeri ini. Ada-kah kerana berbetulan kerana yang membuat batek itu orang Melayu maka tidak di-hiraukan oleh pihak Kementerian? Ini-lah masalah Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

Masalah yang kedua, masalah ekonomi ini sudah banyak di-chakap oleh seluruh pihak baik daripada pihak Kerajaan sendiri atau pun pihak pembangkang yang baharu² ini keluar dalam surat Khabar *Utusan Melayu* dengan huruf besar mengatakan Yang Berhormat Menteri Perdagangan telah menikam bumiputera daripada belakang dalam masalah kilang kertas. Tetapi, saya tidak tahu sama ada dalam Dewan ini dia mahu berchakap macham itu atau pun tidak.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-belum merdeka ekonomi bumiputera ada-lah mundur. Mundor sa-kali kerana sangat² terbiar, tanpa sedikit pun mendapat perhatian penjajah yang memang berniat hendak menikam perkembangan bangsa Melayu dalam iktisad. Sa-telah beberapa tahun merdeka, terdengar-lah oleh kita akan usaha² yang konon-nya mahu memperbaiki kedudukan bangsa Melayu. Ada-kah ini berhasil? Ini soal-nya, ada-kah ini berhasil? Dapatkah ranchangan ekonomi pemerentahan yang berjalan di-atas landasan ekonomi liberal, yang di-warisi dari zaman penjajahan itu menolong, dapat menolong orang² Melayu? Pemodal besar², sama ada dalam negeri atau luar negeri, berlumba² menjalankan perusahaan dan perniagaan dengan bebas dan memegang penuh ekonomi negara, sedangkan bangsa Melayu hanya menumpang kepada perekonomian mereka. Dasar inilah yang menyebabkan orang Melayu mundur dan terpaksa hidup menumpang di-negeri-nya sendiri.

Enche' Wan Abdul Kadir bin Ismail (Kuala Trengganu Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya nampak Ahli Yang

Berhormat itu membaca, bukan berchakap, barangkali ada juru tulis-nya di-belakang.

Enche' Abdul Samad bin Gul Ahmad Mianji: Nombor berapa Standing Order? Kalau ta' ada, duduk diam². Dasar ekonomi liberal ini mesti diubah kepada satu dasar yang lebih memberi kesempatan dan jaminan untuk bumiputera Melayu mengejar ketinggalan ekonomi mereka. Ekonomi liberal berdasar pertandingan modal dan kebolehan, sebab itu-lah dasar ini boleh menjamin pihak yang mempunyai modal yang lebih besar dan pengalaman yang banyak.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita pun sudah dengar Yang Berhormat Menteri Perdagangan dan Perusahaan berchakap dalam Dewan ini, kata-nya orang Melayu hendak-lah berlumba² merebut perdagangan dalam negeri ini. Orang Melayu hendak-lah berlumba². Macham mana orang Melayu hendak berlumba², orang lain sudah sa-puluh batu, kita baharu satu batu. Modal tidak ada, dan sa-bagai-nya—yang pertama. Yang kedua, daripada “A” sampai “Z”, semua ekonomi itu sudah ada dalam tangan orang, daripada jarum sampai kapal terbang, semuanya sudah ada dalam tangan orang. Chelah mana orang Melayu hendak masuk? Macham mana hendak menyuruh orang Melayu ini berlumba²? Sebab itu-lah dasar ini boleh menjamin pihak yang mempunyai modal yang lebih besar.

Enche' Wan Abdul Kadir bin Ismail: Sa-orang Ahli tidak boleh membaca ucapan-nya. Yang Berhormat ini membaca lagi.

Mr Speaker: Tidak boleh di-baca.

Sitting suspended at 1.00 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 4.00 p.m.

(Mr Speaker in the Chair)

THE SUPPLEMENTARY SUPPLY (1965) (No. 2) BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Enche' Abdul Samad bin Gul Ahmad Mianji: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya

menyambong ucapan saya pagi tadi berkenaan dengan ekonomi orang² Melayu ia-itu ekonomi liberal yang dijalankan oleh Kerajaan kita hari ini. Dasar itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ialah satu dasar monopoli dan sebab itu-lah usaha orang² Melayu yang bermodal kecil dan di-usahakan-lah orang² Melayu selalu di-tekan dan di-hanchorkan. Saya memberi satu tau-ladan dengan apa yang berlaku, yang pernah di-ucapkan oleh Yang di-Pertua Gabungan Dewan² Perniagaan Melayu Malaysia, Tuan Haji S. M. Aidit. Tekanan yang tidak sa-chara langsung ka-atas ahli² perniagaan Melayu yang hendak memajukan perniagaan mereka dengan mengharap-kan bank² asing telah di-cheritakan di-Meshuarat Agong Dewan² Perniagaan Melayu Pulau Pinang. Sa-terus-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kebanyakan bank² di-negeri kita ini sa-chara tidak langsung menolong atau membantu peniaga² Melayu yang menghendaki bantuan sa-bagaimana yang di-dapati oleh peniaga bangsa² lain. Ini-lah satu ucapan yang di-keluarkan oleh Yang di-Pertua Gabungan Dewan² Perniagaan Melayu, Malaysia—kalau dia tidak betul, maka tidak betul-lah ucapan itu.

Orang Melayu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sudah berkali² chuba bangun dan chuba sa-boleh²-nya untuk bangun, tetapi kerana sistem yang tidak menjamin kenaikan mereka itu, dan dengan tentangan langkah² yang jahat, perhubungan untuk membangun itu hampa dan terus hanchor begitu sahaja. Untuk membangunkan ekonomi orang Melayu bukan sahaja berkehendakkan pimpinan dan modal; tetapi juga perlindungan yang benar² terjamin dari sa-barang niat jahat kapitalis² asing tanpa perkara itu jangan mimpi orang Melayu boleh maju. Apa erti-nya modal, jika peluang untuk berniaga tidak ada. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita maseh ingat cerita Menteri Muda Perusahaan

Mr Speaker: Atas item mana yang tuan chakapkan itu?

Enche' Abdul Samad bin Gul Ahmad Mianji: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, S. 14.

Mr Speaker: Saya suka ingatkan tolong-lah tepatkan kepada S. 14 itu.

Enche' Abdul Samad bin Gul Ahmad Mianji: kesah bagaimana Menteri Muda Perdagangan dan Perusahaan Malaysia ini chuba meminta tolong pada taukeh dan kapitalis² dalam negeri ini supaya mengambil orang² Melayu

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid (Seberang Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Peratoran Meshuarat 67 (3) ucapan Yang Berhormat itu tidak kena-mengena dengan perbelanjaan yang di-untokan untuk Kementerian Perdagangan dan Perusahaan di-atas Kepala 14. Peruntokan ini di-buat khas-nya Pechahan-kepala (Baharu) 42a—Pemberian Sementara untuk Menutup Kerugian atas Bekalan Api Letrik kepada Kampong² Baharu: Jadi saya tarek perhatian Yang Berhormat itu kepada Peratoran Meshuarat 67 (3)—

Sa-telah di-chadangkan usul hendak di-bachakan Rang Undang² ini kali yang kedua dan di-sokong, maka boleh-lah di-jalankan perbahathan dengan serta-merta tetapi hendak-lah di-hadkan kepada asas² 'am dasar dan tadbiran Kerajaan saperti yang di-nyatakan dalam peruntokan² tambahan yang di-masokkan dalam Rang Undang² dan dalam anggaran belanja tambahan itu.

Ini terkeluar langsung pada apa yang di-untokkan itu. Saya harap, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ambil perhatian dan menahan Ahli Yang Berhormat itu berchakap.

Mr Speaker: Saya perhatikan. Tolong-lah ikut Peratoran.

Enche' Abdul Samad bin Gul Ahmad Mianji: Saya sudah ikut dan pagi tadi sudah panjang, masalah ini sudah betul. ta' payah lagi di-bangkitkan benda itu.

Mr Speaker: Perkara yang di-bangkitkan itu tidak tepat kepada Kepala itu. Kalau hendak berchakap butir² waktu dalam committee, boleh-lah.

Enche' Abdul Samad bin Gul Ahmad Mianji: Tidak butir², saya tidak sebut butir², Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

Mr Speaker: Ia-lah.

Enche' Abdul Samad bin Gul Ahmad Mianji: Menteri Muda Perdagangan dan Perusahaan telah meminta orang², tauke² dan capitalist² dalam negeri ini supaya mengambil orang² Melayu menjadi buroh di-kedai² mereka, dan kita ingin tahu daripada pihak Kerajaan, sudah-kah permintaan Menteri Muda ini di-terima oleh pihak² *capitalist* dalam negeri ini?

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, apa yang berlaku sekarang ini, ia-itu Menteri Muda yang berkenaan itu di-beri chuti selama dua tahun dan mengikut puncha² yang saya tahu, Yang Berhormat Menteri Muda itu akan di-tukarkan menjadi Duta, ka-mana² entah-lah. Boleh jadi, kita tahu sebab²-nya maka Menteri Muda di-tukarkan, dan boleh jadi saudara² saya daripada orang² UMNO ini pun tahu mengapa Yang Berhormat Menteri Muda ini di-tukarkan, atau pun di-beri chuti begitu panjang.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-patut-nya Kerajaan, kalau betul² mahu menolong orang² dalam masalah ini, menggalakkan dan menwajibkan sharikat² asing memberi peluang kepada orang² Melayu mengendalikan bersama sharikat² itu, atau dari sekarang Kerajaan sa-patut-nya hapuskan semua Dewan² Perniagaan yang berasingan, seperti Dewan Perniagaan Melayu, Dewan Perniagaan China dan Dewan Perniagaan India. Sudah sa-patut-nya Kerajaan dari sekarang membangunkan satu sahaja Dewan Perniagaan yang menyatukan ketiga² gulongan dalam satu Dewan Perniagaan itu. Ini-lah hanya satu chara yang dapat membangunkan dan saya perchaya, jikalau-lah Kerajaan menjalankan seperti ini, dalam sedikit masa lagi bumiputera negeri ini akan dapat membangunkan ekonomi-nya.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita tahu dan saya pun tahu bila kita mencheritakan hal bumiputera, atau pun bangsa Melayu ini, boleh jadi saudara² daripada orang² UMNO akan bertentang dan saya tahu juga bahawa walau pun di-hadapan kita ini bagini kita tentang, tetapi di-lubok hati dan sanubari saudara² kita itu akan mengiakan apa kata-nya. Tuan Yang di-Pertua,

bagitu-lah juga Yang Berhormat Menteri² yang berkenaan akan mengakui kelemahan kedudukan ekonomi orang² Melayu ini, tetapi ta' dapat-lah mereka mengiakan apa yang di-uchapkan oleh pihak Pembangkang. Saya maseh ingat, pada satu masa, Yang Berhormat Timbalan Perdana Menteri sendiri telah beruchap, beruchap di-satu tempat dan saya mesti ingatkan kata² Yang Berhormat Timbalan Perdana Menteri itu bahawa ranchangan² yang di-jalankan sekarang ini tidak boleh membuahkan sa-suatu yang menguntongkan, tetapi dia terpaksa menjalankan-nya.

Ini-lah ucapan dan saya bertanggung-jawab dengan ucapan yang di-buat, kalau-lah pihak Timbalan Perdana Menteri mahu menafikan, saya ada bukti² yang boleh menunjokkan. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dan sudah menjadi kebiasaan bila satu² projek yang di-jalankan itu tidak berjaya, maka ra'ayat-lah yang akan di-salahkan, kerana tidak berusaha dan kerana tidak bersunggo². Ini-lah nasib yang di-terima oleh bangsa Melayu dan pada tiga hari yang lalu, harapan² seluruh bumiputera dalam Malaysia ini telah hanchor dan musnah segala chita² dan impian dengan pengakuan yang di-buat oleh Yang Amat Berhormat Perdana Menteri yang mengatakan seluruh ra'ayat Malaysia ini boleh di-terima sa-bagai bumiputera.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya fikir itu-lah sahaja yang dapat saya sampaikan ka-dalam Dewan ini. Saya ucapkan terima kaseh.

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: Mr Speaker, Sir, I shall, first of all, take Head S. 21, Ministry of External Affairs. This covers appropriations, and I note with pleasure that funds have been asked for the setting up of new missions and for financing goodwill missions to West Africa and the Middle East, and so on. Nobody, Sir, will quarrel with such requirements. But what disturbs me is that the benefits which are bound to accrue, or should accrue, from the sending of such Malaysian goodwill missions to Afro-Asian countries tend to be cancelled out by some of the pronouncements

and statements of the Government on foreign policy issues. Sir, it is surely impossible to believe that anyone can defend in the capitals of Africa, in places like Cairo and Algiers, the lavish welcome which was given in Kuala Lumpur for the Prime Minister of South Vietnam who, in the eyes of the Afro-Asian world, with very few exceptions, generally represents only his American sponsors. What good will it do us in Afro-Asia to come out with periodic statements applauding the American bombing of North Vietnam? What possible good can that do to us, Sir, for the very good reason that the whole of Afro-Asia practically, apart from a few exceptions—South Korea, perhaps, and places like that—have taken a stand either deploring or condemning outright these American bombardments of North Vietnam? Take again, Sir, the well-known hobnobbing with Formosa of people in very high positions in the Alliance and also, of course, of the amorous explorations in the exotic city of Taipeh, by these gentlemen. All this goes to show, Mr Speaker, Sir, that our foreign policy suffers from a lack of coherence. The left hand very often does not know what the right hand does, and very often does not care even if it knew.

Sir, Dr Mahathir comes out with fierce anti-colonial, anti-imperialist statements with the legitimate hope that his Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organisation will secure admission to the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Movement. But pronouncements are made on foreign policy issues by our Government, which will make it quite certain that Dr Mahathir and his colleagues will never secure admission into the Afro-Asian fraternity however big the pile of anti-colonial and anti-imperialist statements they might accumulate.

Dr Mahathir bin Mohamed: Sir, I would like to state that the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organisation is not a Government organisation and that if the Government says something it does not implicate the Organisation; and, therefore, what the Government says need not necessarily influence

other people into accepting or not accepting the Organisation.

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: I will let that alone, Mr Speaker, Sir. I do not intend to get into a debate with the Honourable gentleman on that particular issue. But let us not be fobbed off by the explanation that Malaysia is an anti-communist nation and must, therefore, take an anti-communist stand. Our Prime Minister, I think he is generally considered as a man of very generous instincts, but his judgement does fail him when it comes to attitudes on specific foreign policy issues, like the American bombardment of North Vietnam.

Sir, the Honourable Prime Minister tends to assume that Afro-Asian opinion generally will see the same justification for the American bombardment of North Vietnam, which he does, but his assumption that only pro-communist forces condemn American stupidities in Vietnam is surely wrong. We only have to look, Sir, to India. Would anyone call Mr Shastri of India a lover of the communists or of Peking? The Indian Government, definitely not either pro-communist, or pro-Peking for that matter, has taken a clear-cut stand, deploring what has got to be deplored and what is deplored in Afro-Asia generally.

Sir, I do not say that we ought to jump from a pro-western band wagon to a pro-eastern band wagon, although I know that there are a number of people in this country, who would like this Government and this country to do precisely that. What I ask for is that we should be able to project an image of ourselves which will prove to the world—and, particularly, to Afro-Asian opinion—that we are genuinely independent in foreign policy and that we do not ride on any one's band wagon whether it be a western band wagon, or an eastern band wagon, but that the only band wagon that we will choose to ride on is the Malaysian band wagon. Our foreign policy, Sir, should be to show the world that we are neither pro-west nor pro-east but just pro-ourselves—pro-Malaysia—and that basically our

foreign policy is governed by that consideration alone.

Next, Sir, I come to Head S. 49 which covers the appropriations for the Ministry of Labour. Mention is made under this Head about the needs of the Industrial Arbitration Tribunal set up in accordance with the Essential Arbitration in the Essential Services Regulations, 1965, but I would like to know, Sir, whether our Industrial Arbitration Tribunal has the power to decide on a dispute between the War Department employees in this country and the British military authorities. Does our Industrial Arbitration Tribunal possess the right to adjudicate on such a dispute, or does the British military authorities, perhaps, claim any extra-territorial rights with respect to their dealings with their employees? Now, if this is not so, then I would like to know whether the Honourable Minister has taken cognisance of the industrial unrest among the War Department employees in this country, and will consider sending this dispute to the Industrial Arbitration Tribunal for settlement, and if the British military authorities choose to be difficult about it, whether this Government would explain to them politely and firmly that we do not want to smack of neo-colonialism here, or neo-colonialist attitudes, on the part of the British Military Authorities and that their employees should come within the jurisdiction of our labour laws and of our Industrial Arbitration Tribunal.

Sir, if I may hark back to a complaint and the suggestion, which I made to the Honourable Minister, with regard to the Industrial Arbitration Tribunal to the effect that trade unions should be enabled to meet employers on equal terms before this Arbitration Tribunal, and that just would not be made possible if lawyers are to get into the picture. For one thing, Sir, many of our trade unions are not affluent organisations. Their bank balance is very small compared to the bank balance of their employers who have got considerably more resources at their disposal; and if lawyers continue to be allowed to represent either employers or employees

and trade union organisations before the court, then the chances are that the Industrial Arbitration Court will be cluttered up with all kinds of petty legal quibbling. An industrial arbitration court, Sir, is essentially different from a law court. Here, the terms of reference of this tribunal, of this court, would be not to decide on legal issues, but to resolve industrial disputes, and in the resolution of industrial disputes, so many factors will have to be taken into account. Do not let us do anything, which will mean that this experiment in arbitration is spoiled, and the purpose for which it has been set up is deviated from, and I hope that the Minister will sympathetically consider this suggestion which I believe will have the general support and sympathy of the trade union movement in this country.

Head S. 32, Ministry of Health: Sir, I wonder how it is possible for the Ministry of Health to assess its requirements and how it is possible for Members of Parliament to assess such requirements, when it is borne in mind that since 1959 there has not been a single annual report for the Medical Department? I would like the Minister for Health to inform this House about the reasons why no such annual reports have been issued in respect of this Department for the last seven years. Is it, perhaps, that it has been discovered that what he has to report would reveal more scandals which would probably burden the Government, already over-burdened with scandals, with more scandals.

Finally, Sir, I take the Head of the Local Government and Housing—Head S. 60. To start off, I would like to say that I am going to oppose everything which is asked for here, in the light of some of the debates and some of the revelations which have been made in this House in respect of this pre-fabricated housing scandal. Sir, this debate has revealed what appears to be the dubious dealings of the Ministry of Local Government and Housing with the firm of K. C. Boon and Cheah. The basic facts that have emerged are simple and unarguable and quite

definitely has upset public opinion and they are as follows:

A representative of the firm of K. C. Boon and Cheah—this has not been denied, it has on the contrary, Sir, been confirmed

The Minister for Local Government and Housing (Enche' Khaw Khai Boh):

Sir, it is too premature for the Honourable Member to say that this has not been denied, because I have not replied yet.

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: Well, Sir, in the debate this allegation was made, and we will wait for what the Minister has got to say. But it has emerged that the representative of this firm happened to be in France—and it has been alleged, not entirely by coincidence either—at the same time as officials from the Ministry of Local Government and Housing, who were present there. Now, this decidedly has given the firm a definite advantage over all other firms, who might have wished to tender for the prefabricated low-cost housing project. It also seems to have made it quite certain, right at the very outset, that the contract would inevitably go to the firm whose representative appeared to have such close contact with the Ministry of Local Government and Housing.

Now, on the basis of these facts, Sir, if the allegations made in this House are, in fact, true, any Minister in any self-respecting parliamentary democracy would have felt obliged to resign, pending the clearing up of all public doubts as to his integrity and the integrity of his Ministry officials. Incidentally, Sir, it comes to my mind, as I look at the appropriations, that there does not seem to be any find here set aside to finance the legal costs of a libel suit which the Minister has taken up against the *Straits Echo*, and I make these observations in the light of the declarations that have been made in this House this morning—that in such matters it is a collective responsibility and the Government is obliged to meet such legal costs; but, perhaps, there is an omission, Sir.

Enche' Khaw Kai-Boh: Sir, I wonder what relevance has the libel

suit to do with the Supplementary Estimates that the Honourable Member is referring to at the moment. This is a typical trait of character assassination without any foundation whatsoever and hiding under the umbrella of the privilege of this House which is a despicable abuse of the parliamentary privilege of this House.

Mr Speaker: I wonder myself what it has got to do: you are touching upon the subject

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: Well, Sir, I just took it this way. This morning we were told that legal costs.

Mr Speaker: You may not touch on Government policy and administration at large.

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: As you please, Mr Speaker, Sir. I will abide by your ruling, but without conceding to his objection. Sir, coming back to this, that if such unsavoury allegations had been made by the Opposition in other parliamentary democracies, and I am talking now about this K. C. Boon and Cheah firm, I would suggest that the proper thing for the Minister to do would be to do what other Ministers in other parliamentary democracies would have done—and I can remember occasions, Sir, when for even lesser reasons, Ministers of the Government of India have honourably tendered their resignations. I think in view of the very serious allegations which have been made—and quite definitely, Sir, let us all examine in our own hearts and admit that it has left a very bad taste in the mouth, the questions asked and the answers given—and in view of this public uncertainty, I would—and in view of the fact that as a Member of this House, I would want to cherish the prestige and the dignity of this House—I would call upon the Minister to resign pending investigations into the whole matter.

Enche' Khaw Kai-Boh: On a point of clarification: will the Member specify the points that he has generalised on allegations. I would like the Member to specifically enumerate the points of allegations, instead of going around the bush, saying allegations—allegations of what nature?

What precisely is he trying to get at now?

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: Mr Speaker, Sir, surely you don't want me to bore you with a repetition of the speeches made by the other Hon'ble Members of the Opposition—by the Hon'ble Member from Ipoh, the Hon'ble Member for Dato Kramat, and so on?

Mr Speaker: I do not mind being bored as long as you satisfy the Honourable Minister (*Laughter*).

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: May I refer the Hon'ble Minister, Sir, to reports of the speeches which have been made? The fact, just to give one of the facts, Sir.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: All!

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: All—I shall include as a statement and release to the Press all the speeches that have been made by Members of the Opposition here. I say, Sir, that publicly, if I had been in his shoes (*An Honourable Member:* You are not.) Thank God I am not. Heaven forbid that I should ever be in his shoes. Sir, if I had been in his shoes, although Heaven forbid, an honourable man in that position, will say "Look, there is all this public outcry, allegations of various kinds have been made, let me resign. I am going to vindicate myself in public, and I will resign". I will resign. And I say my esteem for him would shoot up if he did that.

Enche' Khaw Kai-Boh: Sir, he has not yet mentioned anything about his allegations. I would like him to say once for all here, in this House, openly what are precisely the allegations against me; and before he starts talking about resigning, I would like to hear what are the specific allegations—he is just simply launching on a general course of character assassination, and as I said earlier, Mr Speaker, Sir, it is a despicable abuse of the parliamentary privilege of this House.

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: Sir, I am not somebody who can easily be flattered and bullied. I am saying that a public situation has arisen in view of

the controversy, which has arisen over the giving of this contract, pre-fabricated contract, to this firm in the general context of what has happened. I am not saying that he has already been proved guilty. He may very well be able to defend himself, and possibly successfully. I do not know, but I say even in the context of such a public situation.

Enche' Khaw Kai-Boh: I do not know what the Honourable Member is driving at. Guilty of what? I mean, if he thinks that I am so seriously bad as to warrant my resignation, he should bring a proper motion in this House to impugn on my character, instead of beating about the bush, talking generally about allegations which he cannot substantiate.

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: If the Honourable Minister chooses himself to beat about the bush and refuses to understand the gist of what I am saying, then I say I am very sorry for him. He does not understand. (*Interruption*). I say, Sir, that in my view, if I were in his position I would tender my resignation and invite a public commission of enquiry (*Interruption*). Sir, it must be quite apparent that what I said this morning is quite true—this is a durian-type skin—double fold (*Laughter*). I shall await his reply, Sir, and hear what he has got to say, and I finish. (*Interruption*).

Mr Speaker: I shall ask the Members to keep very much to themselves and not to make interruptions.

Dr Mahathir bin Mohamad (Kota Star Selatan): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ingin membuat tegoran sedikit berkenaan dengan Perbelanjaan Anggaran yang ada di-hadapan kita pada hari ini. Yang pertama-nya, di-bawah Head S. 21—Ministry of External Affairs telah pun di-buat peruntukan sa-banyak \$13,500 untuk membeli sa-buah motokar baharu untuk Duta Besar kita di-United Nations New York. Saya ingin membuat tegoran ini ia-lah oleh kerana chara memikirkan untuk membuat peruntukan ini, pada pandangan saya tiada-lah sesuai.

Saya di-beritahu ia-itu bagi tiap² Duta Besar kita, kita boleh membuat

peruntokan chuma sa-banyak \$13,500 untuk membeli motokar, tetapi keadaan di-dalam negeri² di-mana kita ada Duta Besar, berlainan, umpama-nya, kata-lah kalau kita ada Duta Besar di-Outer Mongolia—\$13,500 boleh-lah membeli sa-buah motokar Cheverolet yang boleh menjadi satu *status symbol* di-dalam negeri Outer Mongolia, tetapi di-dalam New York kalau-lah sa-orang itu chuma menggunakan motokar Cheverolet atau pun Ford, maka mereka itu di-anggap saperti peladang kechil atau pun orang² yang membuka kedai menjual buah²an di-New York, ya'ani membuat peruntokan yang sa-banyak ini untuk membeli sa-buah motokar yang tidak ada status-nya di-dalam New York ia-lah satu perkara yang ganjil dan chara² pemikiran yang sa-macham ini patut-lah di-ubah. Kalau kita ingin supaya Duta Besar kita di-New York ada status-nya, maka patut-lah kita membuatkan satu peruntokan yang sesuai untuk sa-orang Duta ia-itu sa-kurang²-nya di-dalam New York mahu-lah Duta Besar kita menggunakan motokar Cadilac. Jangan-lah pakai motokar Ford. Di-Malaysia ini, kalau kita pakai Ford, itu sudah besar, sudah chukup untuk sa-orang Duta tetapi di-New York kalau pakai motokar Ford nampak macham orang jual buah²an di-dalam kedai kechil sahaja.

Sa-balek-nya pula Duta Besar kita di-New York tinggal di-satu tempat yang bernama Waldorf Towers. Ini ia-lah satu hotel yang terbesar sakali di-dalam New York dan saya perchaya belanja untuk menempatkan Duta Besar kita di-dalam Waldorf Towers ini kalau di-jumlahkan pada satu tahun, boleh beli barangkali dua buah Cardilac. Jadi ini-lah satu chara fikiran yang ganjil ia-itu kita khaskan \$13,500 untuk membeli motokar kechil untuk Duta Besar kita, tetapi untuk tempat kediaman-nya, yang mana barangkali orang² di-New York tidak dapat tahu sama sakali, kita berani belanja sa-hingga \$24,000 sa-tahun.

Saya harap-lah chara² pemikiran yang sa-macham ini patut-lah di-tukarkan supaya sesuai dengan kehendak² polisi Jabatan External Affairs kita. Juga baharu² ini di-masa saya

berada di-New York, telah ada ura² untuk mengambil tempat di-dalam satu office block bagi Pegawai Perdagangan atau pun Secretary for Commerce di-dalam Kedutaan dan untuk Information Department. Tetapi setelah di-buat *reservation* di-sana, maka saya di-beritahu ia-itu Kementerian Kewangan di-sini telah menahan dan ini memaksakan Kedutaan kita di-sana menolak balek *reservation* yang telah di-buat. Pada tahun lepas di-buat saperti ini, maka dengan chara ini orang pun kurang perchaya kapada janji² yang di-buat oleh Duta Besar kita di-New York. Saya berharap-lah dengan kerana mustahak-nya mengadakan satu information office dan juga commercial attache di-New York maka kita akan membuat keputusan ia-itu patut-lah kita membuat peruntokan untuk mengadakan office yang sesuai di-New York untuk commercial attache dengan Pejabat Penerangan di-sana.

Berkenaan dengan Head S. 32—Kementerian Kesihatan, saya juga ingin menguchapkan terima kaseh kapada Kementerian yang telah membuat peruntokan sa-banyak \$200,000 untuk Lady Templer Hospital. Saya perchaya wang yang sa-banyak ini sangat-lah berguna kapada Lady Templer Hospital sunggoh pun tidak menchukupi untuk semua orang² yang di-rawat di-situ. Di-dalam ucapan yang telah di-buat oleh, Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Batu, dia menyebutkan Malayan Association for the Prevention of Tuberculosis atau pun M.A.P.T.B., yang mana kata-nya Association ini telah memberi pertolongan yang kechil sahaja kapada orang² yang mengidap penyakit T.B. Saya perchaya, perkara ini benar, tetapi sunggoh pun peruntokan yang di-beri oleh M.A.P.T.B. ini kechil, tetapi sangat-lah di-hargai oleh orang² yang mengidap penyakit T.B. di-Malaysia ini dan ini ia-lah satu usaha Kerajaan yang mendorongkan wang Lotteries Board kapada Association ini ada-lah satu benda yang patut ra'ayat, terutama sa-kali Wakil² Ra'ayat menguchapkan terima kaseh kapada Kerajaan. Sunggoh pun wang yang di-beri ini sadikit, tetapi faedah yang dapat daripada peruntokan yang sadikit ini sangat-lah besar.

Walau bagaimana pun saya berharap supaya Kerajaan memberi lebih lagi peruntukan kepada M.A.P.T.B. ini, dan juga kepada Hospital Lady Templer ini, supaya penyakit T.B. dapat di-hapuskan pada masa yang tidak lama lagi.

Satu lagi sahaja perkara yang saya ingin membuat tegoran ia-itu berkenaan dengan Head S. 35—*Immigration*. Di-sini telah ada peruntukan sa-banyak \$34,790 untuk Pejabat Immigration.

Baru² ini saya pulang daripada United Nations dan antara Bangkok dengan Subang Airport, saya telah diberi satu kad untuk di-isikan bagi kegunaan Pejabat Immigration. Ini ia-lah satu perkara yang biasa pada tiap² orang yang masuk ka-dalam negeri ini ia-itu mesti-lah di-isikan di-dalam kad itu benda² seperti nama, pekerjaan, tempat beranak, bila beranak, dan lain² lagi. Tetapi yang ganjil sa-kali berkenaan dengan kad ini ia-lah disebutkan di-atas itu “Pejabat Immigration Singapura”. Saya percaya Kerajaan tidak-lah begitu miskin, tidak boleh membuat peruntukan daripada bulan September yang kita berpechah daripada Singapura, supaya dapat di-chap kad yang menetapkan ia-itu ini ada-lah kad Immigration Malaysia bukan kad Immigration Singapura sungguh pun Pejabat Immigration di-sini nampak-nya tidak berbeza antara Singapura dengan Malaysia. Saya harap Kerajaan dapat membuat Tambahan Peruntukan untuk menchetak chap kad baharu supaya perkataan “Malaysia” di-gantikan jangan-lah digunakan perkataan Singapura. Terima kasih.

Tuan Haji Othman bin Abdullah (Hilir Perak): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka juga menyertai perbahathan di-dalam Perbelanjaan Tambahan ini. Yang Pertama sa-kali, saya suka menyentuh Kepala 7—Masjid Negara. Kita berasa shukor kepada Tuhan oleh kerana Masjid Negara telah dapat sempurna terdiri dengan megah-nya di-Ibu Kota Malaysia ini dan perbelanjaan pembukaan yang telah di-minta di-dalam Dewan ini sa-banyak \$100,000 ada-lah satu peruntukan yang munasabah dan patut di-berikan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Masjid Negara itu ia-lah sa-buah tempat ibadat orang² Islam dan menjadi lambang kepada kebesaran negara kita yang menjadikan Islam sa-bagai ugama rasmi. Saya rasa bukan sahaja pehak kita—pehak Ahli² Perikatan—berasa shukor kepada Tuhan di-atas tertegak-nya sa-buah Masjid Negara, itu, tetapi juga pehak Pembangkang yang beragama Islam, tentu-lah akan berchukor menguchapkan shukor kepada Tuhan di-atas tertegak-nya sa-buah Masjid yang kita harap akan dapat menyinarkan chahaya Islam ka-seluruh negara kita ini. Malang-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ini tidak nampak oleh mereka itu.

Walau bagaimana pun, sudah-lah menjadi kebesaran bagi negara kita ini di-mana Masjid Negara itu telah dirasmikan pembukaan-nya dan bukan sahaja Masjid Negara itu megah dengan bangunan-nya, tetapi patut kita menchatitkan di-sini bahawa Architect yang membuat Masjid Negara itu ia-lah sa-orang Islam—sa-orang bumiputera, ia-itu Enche’ Baharudin bin Kasim, sa-orang dari satu²-nya anak bumiputera ini yang telah menunjukkan kebolehan-nya. Dan kalau sa-kira-nya anak bumiputera ini di-berikan peluang² yang sama seperti Enche’ Baharudin untuk membangunkan bangunan² di-masa yang akan datang, saya rasa Architect² kita daripada bumiputera ini tidak kurang kepandaian-nya dan kecekapan-nya daripada ra’ayat Malaysia yang bukan bumiputera. Saya memberikan ucapan terima kasih yang tinggi kepada Kementerian yang berkenaan yang telah memberikan peluang yang bagini keamanan kepada Enche’ Baharuddin bin Kasim.

Apa yang saya hendak sentoh lagi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam perkara Masjid Negara ini, ia-lah supaya kita dapat melengkapi Masjid Negara itu dengan apa yang kita mahu ia-itu melengkapi dengan Kutub Khanah yang sempurna, yang lengkap dan yang boleh menjadikan tempat muraja’ah—tempat mengambil dan menyedut ilmu pengetahuan, seperti mana yang telah di-janjikan oleh Kerajaan kita pada kita sendiri.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-telah saya menyentuh soal Masjid Negara ini,

saya suka menyentoh perkara Kementerian Perdagangan dan Perusahaan. Di-dalam perbahathan pada pagi ini dan sampai pada petang ini, kita telah mendengar beberapa tegoran daripada pehak Pembangkang, bahawa dasar perekonomian kita ini ia-lah dasar yang tidak betul, yang telah di-lalui oleh negara kita ia-itu satu dasar perekonomian liberal, di-mana kita memberikan kesempatan kepada orang² yang senang bertambah senang.

Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Pasir Mas Ulu telah mengecham dasar ekonomi liberal ini. Tetapi malangnya—yang saya katakan malangnya—oleh kerana Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Pasir Mas Ulu, tidak menyatakan kepada kita bentuk ekonomi yang mana-kah yang hendak kita ikut setelah dia mengkondemkan sistem ekonomi kita yang ada sekarang. Ini-lah chara-nya, kalau kita hendak membahatkan, kalau dasar ekonomi kita sekarang ini tidak baik, tidak sempurna dan tidak mendatangkan keuntungan kepada ra'ayat yang miskin, kepada bumiputera, apa-kah satu sistem ekonomi yang hendak di-kemukakan dalam Dewan ini yang boleh kita pertimbangkan dan, kalau mustahak dan perlu, kita ubah dasar liberal dan economy liberal kita itu. Tetapi kalau datang dan menyatakan tidak baik sahaja, ini tidak elok dan kemudian tidak pandai mengemukakan barang yang lebih elok, ini erti-nya berchakap sahaja tidak menunjokkan jalan yang benar.

Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka menarek perhatian kepada Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Pasir Mas Ulu, sejak saya dengar daripada pagi tadi sampai pada petang ini, sa-lamanya menyatakan bahawa dasar perekonomian kita ini tidak mendatangkan sa-barang keuntungan. Patut Ahli Yang Berhormat itu menyatakan, kata saya tadi, apa-kah theory economy, kalau dia boleh mengemukakan satu theory economy bagi negara kita ini, bagi menggantikan yang di-sebutkan "economy liberal" pada kita, dia boleh belajar-lah dengan Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Kelantan Hilir supaya dia dapat tahu sedikit apa ma'ana-nya "economy liberal" itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berasa dukachita menyatakan di-sini, shor yang di-kemukakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Pasir Mas Ulu tadi. Kata dia, "Dewan Perniagaan China, India dan Melayu di-bubarkan, di-jadikan satu sahaja dewan perniagaan,". Nama-nya dia tidak sebut, Dewan Perniagaan apa-kah nama-nya, dia tidak sebut. Bagaimana-kah bentuk-nya, dia pun tidak sebut, bagaimana-kah tujuan-nya dan apa-kah tugas-nya, pun dia tidak sebut. Jadi apa dia mahu, bubarkan Dewan Perniagaan Melayu supaya jangan ada, Dewan Perniagaan India pun jangan ada, Dewan Perniagaan China jangan ada. Jadi Kerajaan mesti menubuhkan satu Dewan Perniagaan—hanya satu sahaja. Jadi saya rasa ragu di-sini apakah Dewan Perniagaan ini, Dewan Perniagaan China, Dewan Perniagaan India, Dewan Perniagaan Melayu ditubuhkan oleh Kerajaan kalau sa-kiranya Dewan² Perniagaan ini bukan ditubuhkan oleh Kerajaan, kena apa mesti kita tidak menggesa Kerajaan kita menubuhkan satu Dewan Perniagaan yang tidak Melayu, China dan India—satu. Bukan-kah Dewan Perniagaan ini mengikut initiative, mengikut kehendak dan pendapat² ahli² perniagaan itu sendiri melahirkan dewan perniagaan.

Dan rasa saya, kalau satu sistem yang di-kemukakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Pasir Mas Ulu, supaya menghapuskan semua Dewan² Perniagaan dan kemudian melahirkan satu sahaja Dewan Perniagaan bagi Tanah Melayu—bagi Malaysia ini—yang di-anjorkan oleh Kerajaan, maka berma'ana-lah sistem ekonomi kita ini sudah memaksakan kepada sa-tiap warga-negara ini mesti tundok kepada suatu chara yang di-buat oleh Kerajaan ia-itu Dewan Perniagaan yang di-bawah pertadbiran Kerajaan.

Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-bagaimana kita sudah mendengar beberapa hari yang lalu, di-dalam perbahathan² yang panas berkenaan dengan—tanah Rang Undang² Tanah baharu² ini—Timbalan Perdana Menteri, Tun Abdul Razak, telah menyatakan bahawa chara dan sikap pemerintahan kita ini ia-lah bukan

bersikap kuku besi, bukan bersikap dictator, tetapi bersikap meminta kepada ra'ayat dan menganjorkan kepada ra'ayat dengan sukarela untuk membentok pembangunan kehidupan-nya dan perekonomian-nya sendiri. Jadi menjadi suatu ke-ganjilan kepada saya, bagaimana-kah chara-nya kita hendak melahirkan suatu Dewan Perniagaan sa-bagaimana yang telah di-kemukakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Pasir Mas Hulu dan kalau saya, tidak salah, berchakap ini lebih senang daripada berbuat.

Kemudian yang menarek perhatian saya ia-lah shor yang di-kemukakan-nya itu, kata-nya, fikiran yang lebih di-kemukakan itu, banyak kita menaruh simpati dengan dia, chuma kata dia, "kita punya mulut tidak boleh chakap". Jadi dia tahu hati kami. Kalau dia tahu hati kami erti-nya di-sini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya rasa dia ini kurang² lebih sedikit-lah daripada Malaikat. Tetapi kita di-sini, terutama sa-kali dalam Kementerian masalah perekonomian ra'ayat, perekonomian negara. Kita tidak terkunchi mulut kita, kita tidak di-kongkong di-dalam memberikan fahaman kita di-dalam membentok pembentokan kehidupan kita. Sebab itu-lah sudah banyak kita katakan, kita tidak mahu merampas hak orang lain di-berikan kepada satu puak, saperti sistem kominis atau sistem Socialis, dia ambil orang punya dan di-beri kepada orang lain. Bukan itu chara kita, chara kita ia-lah memberikan kepada orang yang tidak ada kesempatan supaya sama dengan orang yang memang ada sekarang. Memang berlainan-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sistem kita yang liberal ini dengan sistem kominis. Kalau sistem kominis, semua orang tahu, rampas hak orang itu berikan kepada orang lain, dan sistem kita biar-lah orang di-atas itu tetap dengan ekonomi-nya yang kuat tetapi kita memberikan kemudahan², peluang², kepada orang yang belum kuat perekonomian-nya itu supaya sa-taraf dengan orang yang telah kuat di-dalam perekonomian-nya. Untuk ini Kerajaan bertindak, bukan sahaja bertindak, tetapi berikhtiar, berjalan, berusaha bagi membantu perekonomian itu dengan mengadakan MARA, Bank

Bumiputra—ini semua-nya ada-lah tanda bagaimana kita hendak meninggikan kedudukan ra'ayat bumiputra dalam negeri ini dari sudut perekonomian-nya.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berasa amat dukachita sa-kali, sahabat saya daripada Pasir Mas Hulu mengatakan, harapan orang² bumiputra dalam membentok kehidupan-nya di-masa hadapan telah di-hanchorkan oleh ucapan Yang Teramat Mulia Perdana Menteri pada dua hari yang sudah yang kata-nya, mengikut istilah bumiputra, sa-siapa sahaja yang ada dalam negeri ini—bumiputra-lah!

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Pasir Mas Hulu faham bahasa Melayu dan belajar bahasa Melayu, dengan sa-benar-nya, dia tahu-lah ma'ana bumiputra ini, hanya orang yang suka mengelirukan sahaja, hanya orang yang suka bermain dengan perchakapan—yang akan memesongkan ma'ana bumiputra itu. Tetapi, Tunku Perdana Menteri, telah menyatakan, walau pun orang² yang bukan berasal daripada bumiputra, kalau dia hendak menjadi bumiputra, dia boleh menganggap diri-nya bumiputra. Tetapi ada-kah kita ini berchakap, Yang Teramat Mulia Perdana Menteri katakan-lah sa-bagai suatu kenyataan, ada-kah di-antara orang² yang bukan bumiputra, sanggup diri-nya jadi bumiputra pada hal dia bukan bumiputra? Dan kalau sa-kira-nya Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Pasir Mas Hulu menyatakan, ini suatu ke-hanchoran, harapan bagi bumiputra, saya rasa ini hanya kempen murah yang akan di-bawa daripada Dewan ini pulang ka-kampung.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka menyentuh masalah dasar luar negeri kita ini, yang sa-banyak sedikit-nya telah di-senggong di-dalam perbahathan tadi. Ada Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada kita di-sini, dalam Dewan ini, menyatakan, bahawa kita ini terlalu pro-barat, terlalu mengikut kehendak British, kehendak Amerika, Amerika bom Vietnam, kita menyokong! Saya tidak nampak, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita menyokong Amerika Sharikat sebab dia mengebom Vietnam dan saya tidak nampak

Mr Speaker: Head nombor berapa ini?

Tuan Haji Othman bin Abdullah: Head 21, muka 36—Kementerian Luar Negeri, saya hendak masuk kepada Persidangan Afro-Asia. Ini permulaanlah dahulu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada orang menyebut, Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Bungsar tadi menyebut, bahawa kita ini terlalu mengikut arahan daripada kaum Colonial (British), terlalu mengikut faham Amerika sa-hingga Amerika mengebom Vietnam, kita bersetuju. Kita tidak bersetuju, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dengan sebab perbuatan Amerika di-Vietnam itu, samata² kerana dia anti-Vietnam atau anti-kominis. Kita sa-bagai orang yang anti-kominis—sa-bagai negara yang menyatakan tidak bersesuaian dengan kominis—bukan kerana Amerika mengebom Vietnam, bukan oleh kerana negara lain menentang kominis, tetapi kita menentang kominis kerana pengalaman kita sendiri, pengalaman yang kita belajar sa-lama, 12 tahun lama-nya, kominis dalam negeri ini telah menyeksa ra'ayat negeri ini, telah menyusahkan kita 12 tahun lama-nya, telah mengambil nyawa ra'ayat negeri ini, telah merosakkan perekonomian ra'ayat negeri ini dan, oleh kerana kita menderita dengan sebab perbuatan kominis yang mengganas itu, kita mengambil satu sikap menentang kominis, kita mengambil satu dasar luar negeri kita menentang kominis. Kita menentang kominis bukan bermatanya kita mengikut British dan Amerika. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau sa-kira-nya, mithal-nya, sa-buah Kerajaan dia mengikut faham Russia, ada-kah kita mengatakan dia-nya itu menjadi satellite Russia? Macham sekarang ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-buah negeri pergi ka-Russia, pergi ka-China—tengok China Kominis—kita tidak boleh mengatakan dia-nya itu pro atau pun dia itu menyokong kominis dan hanya sa-kadar barangkali fikiran dan pendapat-nya sesuai dengan pendapat orang Russia dan sesuai dengan pendapat orang kominis. Di-dalam hubungan ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, telah di-nyatakan, bahawa dasar luar negeri kita, kita sanggup

membuka Kedutaan kita dan berhubung dengan negara—hatta negara kominis sa-kali pun—Russia sa-kali pun asal mereka itu tahu kepada dasar kita ini dan memahami kedudukan kita. Kerana itu-lah di-dalam Pechahan-kepala 63 ini kita telah menghantar satu rombongan untuk bersedia menghadhiri Sidang Afro-Asia di-Algeria yang telah di-tanggohkan itu. Kita telah membelanjakan wang yang banyak—\$150,000—untuk hendak menghantarkan satu rombongan kita menghadhiri Persidangan itu, menghadhiri Persidangan Afro-Asia dengan menyatakan dasar kita yang sa-benarnya dan keperchayaan politik kita sendiri, yang orang lain tidak boleh memaksakan keyakinan mereka itu terhadap kita. Tetapi malang-nya Sidang Afro-Asia Yang Kedua itu telah di-tanggohkan pada awal-nya dan kemudian di-tanggohkan lagi pada waktu yang tidak di-tetapkan.

Dengan hadir kita di-dalam Sidang Afro-Asia itu membayangkan dasar luar negeri kita, bahawa kita sa-bagai sa-buah negara yang di-dalam lingkungan Asia dan Afrika, kita mahu hidup dengan lingkungan itu dan kita mahu bersama² dengan mereka, bukan oleh kerana kita di-tekan oleh keadaan² saperti mana yang di-sebut oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Bungsar tadi, macham kita ini menonjol² diri hendak di-terima menjadi keluarga Afro-Asia sedangkan kita menyokong Amerika dan, neo-colonial, kata-nya.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ini-lah salah faham dan kempen jahat saperti inilah bagi orang yang bermuka dua dan gergaji bermata dua—ini-lah yang selalu-nya akan merosakkan dasar negeri kita sendiri, satu tapak kaki-nya di-luar negeri ini, di-luar Selat Tebrau, dan satu tapak lagi di-Bungsar, kemudian bermuka² dengan dasar luar negeri. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau dia benar² tahu dan sedar di-atas dasar luar negeri kita yang kita chuba untuk tidak memecah kepada salah satu block yang sedang bertengkar dan hendak berperang sekarang ini, apa salah-nya mengemukakan yang jahat keluar negeri atau menyatakan kepada keluar negeri yang menyatakan kita ini neo-colonial Indonesia, sudah-lah

mengatakan kita ini neo-colonial. Tahu², ada sa-orang dua pula daripada ra'ayat Malaysia, yang menyokong pendapat yang saperti itu. Ada-kah orang ini menjadi tali barut kapada orang yang menudoh kita sa-bagai neo-colonial. Jadi ini-lah yang kita tidak faham akan manusia yang berdiri kaki-nya, sa-belah di-luar Tanah Melayu dan sa-belah lagi di-dalam Malaysia ini. Orang ini-lah yang patut di-ambil perhatian berat oleh Menteri Keselamatan Dalam Negeri, supaya mereka tidak akan merosakkan dasar kita.

Jadi pada akhir-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mengharap supaya sidang Afro-Asia yang kedua ini akan berlangsung dan kita akan dapat menyertai sidang Afro-Asia itu dan kita akan bukan sahaja menyatakan pendirian kita yang tegas dalam masaalah pergolakan dunia sekarang, tetapi saya yakin, negara kita ini akan mengutok dengan sa-hebat²-nya Kerajaan Ian Smith di-Rhodesia Selatan, yang sekarang ini telah menyatakan sa-buah negara yang merdeka tetapi menindas ra'ayat Afrika yang empat million dan kita berharap wakil² kita yang akan pergi ka-Afro-Asia dan Kerajaan kita akan sedar untuk menghanchorkan atau pun menolong pergerakan Afro-Asia meleborkan orang² saperti Ian Smith di-Rhodesia Selatan itu, yang telah merampas dan merompak hak dan kedudukan ra'ayat Afrika sendiri.

Jadi kita berdo'a samoga dasar luar negeri kita ini dapat di-faham, bukan sahaja oleh ra'ayat di-luar negeri kita, tetapi dapat di-faham oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Bungsar yang kaki-nya letak di-sabelah negeri dan keperchayaan dan ta'at setia-nya terletak di-tempat yang lain. Terima kaseh.

Enche' Stephen Yong Kuet Tze (Sarawak): Mr Speaker, Sir, I refer to the provision of \$49,050 under Head S. 47 for the reprinting of Federal Laws in Kuala Lumpur. It does look to me that there is duplication here. The reprinting of the Federal Laws is done in Kuala Lumpur, costing \$25,000.00 and it is also done in Sabah and Sarawak costing about the same. Sir, we know that if printing is done at one

place and time the cost of reprinting is much less, unless of course the Federal Laws referred to under sub-time (ii) are different laws, but it is not so stated in the Explanatory Note. I do not know whether the reprinting of the Federal Laws means, in fact, a consolidation of the laws and bringing the laws up-to-date because much of the laws have been amended in the course of a few years—and it is a fact that people do find it difficult to follow the laws with all these amendments that have been going on—and opportunity should be taken—it is my submission that if this reprintings are only reprinting of the laws that have been passed, that would not solve matters at all—to make a revision of the whole set of laws by bringing the laws up to date and then to have it printed in one State, because as suggested here, reprinting the laws in two places does incur more cost.

Under another sub-head of the same head, Sir, we have now known that the Government more or less expect legal action expenses in connection with an appeal, which appeal would be either dismissed or allowed. Of course, in some cases there would be order of a retrial, but if the appeal is allowed, then of course costs would be awarded and damages would also be awarded. Therefore, we would like to know, since the Government is having an interest in it if the event of the costs being awarded and damages awarded, whether these would be accrued to revenue.

Enche' Amadeus M. Leong (Sabah):

Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Supplementary Supply Bill, 1965. Since the object of this Supplementary Supply Bill is to give statutory authority for certain additional payments to be made for public services, I beg leave, Sir, to speak a few words, in order to give some information of the state and condition of the telecommunication system in certain parts of Sabah, as this matter is a Federal concern and, moreover, I am confident that the Honourable Minister of Finance, or the Honourable Minister concerned, will certainly be most considerate to create some funds to consider the request of the people of Sabah.

Touching on Head S. 73 Mr Speaker, Sir, I am urged to draw the attention of the Honourable Minister concerned that telecommunication system in certain parts of Sabah is still in a bad state of *inadequacy* especially the section between Jesselton and Papar which are only 24 miles apart. There have been many complaints from business firms, and even from Government Departments, of the delay rendered by the Central Exchange in Jesselton for getting a call through to a subscriber required—sometimes it took even almost half an hour or more to get to the Exchange operator to listen to what the subscriber, or a Government servant, requires and occasionally they give you a headache of being entirely ignored. Whenever a complaint is made, the same usual excuse is to be expected, and that is that the lines at that time were engaged. How far it was true still have to be found out. Could the Minister consider then to take steps to improve the sector in question specially. Moreover just imagine what would happen if an emergency case were to arise in that particular area? Another matter to which I would wish to draw the attention of the Minister concerned, Mr Speaker, Sir, is concerning the problems of Posts and Telegraphs employees in Sabah. As this is the concern of his Ministry as well, I find it . . .

Mr Speaker: Under what Head are you speaking.

Enche' Amadeus M. Leong: This is in connection with S. 73.

Mr Speaker: Please continue.

Enche' Amadeus M. Leong: As it is the concern of this Ministry as well, I find it my duty to inform him that there has been much grouse especially among the rank and file of the Post and Telegraphs staff. We couldn't blame them for having done so, due to the fact that the cost of living in Sabah is now so high. The effect of it has not only been endured by the P. & T. staff and the staff of other Government Departments but also by the seconded officers from Malaya as well.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I wish to enlighten this House that the cost of living in

Sabah is at least 30% higher than that in Malaya. So with the high cost of living allowance, their colleagues are enjoying over here, which they are not entitled to receive, the poor fellows over in Sabah are receiving evidently 33½ per cent less, reckoning that they are equally paid. For the sake of their distress, Mr Speaker, Sir, I suggest that the Government should consider taking steps of improving the situation of their employees in Sabah by providing them with the same privileges as their colleagues in Malaya have been given and at the same time taking into consideration the high cost of living prevailing in the State of Sabah, Sir. Thank you.

Enche' Abdul Razak bin Haji Hussin (Lipis): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berchakap pada petang ini chuma hendak menyentoh sedikit sahaja dalam Head 33 berkenaan dengan Tawarikh Dharurat. Sa-panjang yang kita faham, Tawarikh Dharurat ini telah pun diluluskan pada tahun 1961 dahulu dan akan di-siapkan pada akhir tahun 1966. Saya tidak hendak soal banyak apa² atas peruntukan wang yang di-kehendaki itu sa-banyak \$7,150. Soal yang saya hendak bangkitkan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soal Tawarikh Dharurat ini, kerana tawarikh ini belum siap, mengikut keterangan ini akan di-siapkan pada akhir tahun 1966. Jadi, saya maseh ragu² isi Tawarikh Dharurat itu, sebab ini akan mengenai seluruh ra'ayat. Saya hendak tahu dan minta Menteri Yang Berhormat tolong terangkan. Siapa yang mentasrihkan Tawarikh Dharurat ini sa-belum dia di-chap, atau kita beri kapada—satu badan—bagi mentasrihkan sa-belum tawarikh ini di-chap. Ini saya minta di-beri jawapan, kalau saya silap tolong betulkan. Kerana saya tahu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perkara ini akan siap pada akhir tahun 1966, jadi, mengambil masa lebih kurang satu tahun lagi. Tetapi sa-bagaimana yang saya katakan tadi saya tidak bangkang masaalah kewangan, saya bersetuju kewangan ini di-luluskan. Kalau sa-kira-nya di-kehendaki lagi saya memang menyokong, sebab ini akan jadi kenangan² pusaka, keturunan yang akan datang, tetapi masaalah yang saya bangkitkan

sekarang ini ia-lah isi Buku Tawarikh Dharurat ini. The History of the Emergency—12 tahun lama-nya. Kerana kadang² dalam masa kita mengisi perkara² ini akan menyinggong hak sa-suatu kaum dalam negeri ini. Saya suka hendak mencontohkan yang lain, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sekarang Tugu Kebangsaan kita sudah siap telah pun di-dirikan di-atas sa-buah bukit yang tidak jauh dari Bangunan Parlimen ini, ia-itu memperingati tentera kita, pasokan keselamatan kita, berjuang untuk tanah ayer-nya dalam masa dharurat. Kita berasa tidak begitu gembira, sebab kita lihat patong itu semua pakai topi dalam lembaga itu. Orang luar datang ka-Tanah Melayu, dia tidak dapat membayangkan perkara yang sa-benarnya, siapa dia yang memperjuangkannya ada-kah orang yang di-gambarkan dalam patong di-terakan di-atas bukit sana. Kesilapan ini, saya fikir, tidak banyak silap, chuma kalau kita boleh ubah satu dua lembaga dalam patong itu, kalau kita boleh gambarkan dengan ada songkok, ini sudah cukup untuk ingatan kita kepada Pasokan Askar Melayu di-Raja dan Polis kita sendiri—tetapi bila dia pakai topi hijau itu, kita samar² siapa punya patong itu, jadi dharurat ini hapus, mungkin kerana tentera yang membantu kita dari luar. Ini pernah kita dengar. Sejarah jangan berulang, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Jadi kesilapan ini, kesilapan pada patong ini, kita tidak hendak berlaku lagi pada buku Tawarikh Dharurat kita.

Pada suatu ketika, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, orang² kita masok dalam hutan, saya maseh ingat pengakuan daripada Sir Gerald Templer sendiri, ada-lah parajurit tanah ayer yang mahu menuntut kemerdekaan negara kita ini, tetapi pada masa yang akhir telah di-pelinchongkan oleh anasir² kominis, maka orang itu jadi kominis. Jadi, daripada ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya takut kita ini selalu menerima yang masak, bila sudah masak mengapa telor ini beku—ini yang saya takut. Sa-belum telor itu di-rebus, kita patut ingatkan sa-takat mana telor ini kita masakkan. Ini-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ingatan saya yang ikhlas atas buku Tawarikh Dharurat kepada pehak yang berkenaan, dan saya ingatkan sa-mula, siapa

yang mentarihkan buku ini sa-belum buku ini di-chap. Siapa yang bertanggung-jawab? Mengikut di-sini ia-lah Kementerian Hal Ehwal Dalam Negeri yang akan bertanggung-jawab dalam masaalah Tawarikh Dharurat ini, tetapi kita minta, ada-kah Kementerian ini sudah membentok satu badan yang akan mentasrihkan isi² Tawarikh Dharurat kita itu, kerana kita takut, kalau sudah jadi satu² kesilapan, akan melibatkan perasaan sa-suatu kaum yang benar² terlibat dalam negeri ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, memang kejadian alam, manusia itu manusia, alam itu alam. Masa kita bekerja, tidak banyak orang mahu menolong kita, tetapi bila musim buah, masing² keluar dengan membawa bujam. Jadi ini memang kelaziman yang manusia tetap manusia. Dalam masaalah ini saya ingatkan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada Menteri Yang Berhormat supaya “pisang jangan berbuah dua kali”. Kalau ini belum berbuah, kita harap buah-nya keluar lazat, buah yang baik yang boleh di-minati oleh tiap² anak dan keturunan kita yang akan datang. Kalau sa-kira-nya Buku Dharurat ini salah kita buat, buku itu akan kekal, bukan pada zaman kita tetapi zaman anak chuchu kita yang akan datang. Jadi sa-belum perkara ini silap, atau kalau tidak silap dan kalau belum tersilap, saya ucapkan tahniah kepada pehak yang berkenaan kerana perkara ini tidak tersilap, tetapi kerana saya fikir perkara ini—completed before the end of 1966—yang mengambil masa sa-tahun lagi jadi banyak cherita-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-tahun lagi kita karang. Jadi dalam masa kita mengarang itu-lah yang kita takut—kalau² tersalah. Ini-lah ingatan saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, yang saya harap dapat pertimbangan daripada pehak yang berkenaan.

Sa-perkara lagi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-lah Kepala 41—Pusat Latehan Tata Negara, peruntokan yang di-kemukakan sa-banyak \$10.00. Jadi saya tidak-lah hendak membangkang peruntokan itu, saya chuma minta dalam masa tata negara itu di-jalankan, ilmu atau pengetahuan yang di-ajar dalam tata negara itu, hendak-lah satu daripada-nya kebudayaan ra'ayat negeri ini. Kita

tahu sekarang ini satu daripada ikhtiar menjauhkan pergaduhan di-antara kaum ia-lah persefahaman di-antara kaum² itu. Jadi, satu daripada pelajaran yang patut sa-kali di-adakan dalam Pusat Latehan Tata Negara ini, ia-lah pengetahuan bermasyarakat di-antara kaum dengan kaum.

Dato' Yang di-Pertua, orang² Melayu akan lebih menghormati orang² bukan Melayu, kalau orang² bukan Melayu berchakap, bertutor, mengerti 'adat resam orang Melayu. Ini tabi' orang Melayu. Umpama-nya dalam satu isti-'adat ma'af, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kepantasan orang Melayu berkahak, berludah, tetapi menjadi kesukaan dan kelaziman kepada satu kaum yang lain. Ini satu perkara kecil yang saya chon-tohkan. Jadi, ini-lah saya harap, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bila Pusat Latehan Tata Negara ini di-tubuhkan nanti, satu daripada pelajaran atau chara mata pelajaran yang di-beri ia-lah kebudayaan, kemasyarakatan antara kaum dengan kaum. Bila perkara ini sudah ada, sudah tersimpul dalam hati senubari tiap² kaum itu, saya fikir menyatu-padukan kaum ini, bukan sahaja di-salurkan melalui persekolahan², tetapi juga melalui persefahaman di-antara satu badan, satu jiwa dengan satu jiwa. Ini-lah sahaja, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, perchakapan saya pada petang ini dan sa-belum saya berhenti, saya minta ma'af. Terima kaseh.

Enche' Ahmad bin Arshad (Muar Utara): Dato' Yang di-Pertua, saya hanya hendak berchakap dengan sa-beberapa ringkas. Satu perkara yang saya hendak bangkitkan ia-itu dalam Head S. 7—Perdana Menteri, Pechahan Kepala-nya ia-itu saya rafa'kan ucapan terima kaseh kepada Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong yang telah bermurah hati menganugerahkan, bagi pehak kami Wakil² Ra'ayat, ia-itu Pingat Peringatan Malaysia. Sebab saya bangkitkan ia-itu datang daripada satu jabatan yang tertinggi sa-kali dalam Malaysia ini, dapat memandang bahawa kami Wakil² Ra'ayat Malaysia ini ada membuat kerja, tidak-lah sa-bagaimana yang di-katakan, oleh sahabat saya Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu, dia kata dia tidak meminta pangkat ini,

tetapi dia tidak chakap dia tidak hendak, jadi

Dr Tan Chee Khoo: Untuk penjelasan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya hendak bertanya, apa-kah ada di-buat, atau tidak di-buat oleh Ahli² Dewan Ra'ayat ini untuk di-beri pingat itu?

Enche' Ahmad bin Arshad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-panjang saya tahu bahawa hendak mengukur atau menilai khidmat Ahli² Yang Berhormat, bukanlah Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Batu. Jadi, penghargaan ini patut-lah kita junjong tinggi. Tidak tahu-lah saya sudah menjadi kebiasaan Socialist Front bahawa anugerah bintang daripada Duli Yang Maha Mulia Raja² itu tidak perlu, selalu dia kata duit yang macham ini membazir

Dr Tan Chee Khoo: Untuk penjelasan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada-kah Ahli Yang Berhormat itu sedar beberapa Ahli Yang Berhormat di-Rumah ini tidak hadir dan banyak saya tengok, pada pendapat saya, walau pun mereka hadir, mereka duduk tidor di-sini apa yang di-buat di-sini supaya di-beri pingat itu?

Enche' Ahmad bin Arshad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-bagaimana penjelasan saya bahawa nilai anugerahan bintang² yang sa-umpama ini, bukanlah hadir-nya Ahli² Meshuarat dalam Dewan ini, bukan-lah dengan sebab Ahli² Dewan ini berchakap, tetapi kerja di-luar daripada Dewan ada lebih baik daripada Ahli² Yang Berhormat daripada Socialist Front, dengan sebab itu wujud-nya Malaysia ini. Tetapi, satu perkara, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, berhubong dengan pingat ini, yang saya berasa termengkelan, bukan dukachita, bahawa anugerah yang begitu tinggi di-beri kepada kami, Ahli² Meshuarat ini, ia-lah di-lampirkan kepada meja² kami sahaja. Saya fikir dahulu kotak yang di-sampaikan ini kotak daripada Pejabat Sharikat Rothmans—Sharikat Rokok. Jadi, saya fikir satu barang yang tinggi ini yang sudah di-gazettekan, barang yang sa-umpama ini, kalau boleh masa yang akan datang di-sampaikan-lah dalam satu² Majlis—bagi pehak saya-lah saya kata, menghendakkan supaya di-adakan perjumpaan, kalau tidak Majlis Duli Yang

Maha Mulia Yang di-Pertuan Agong menyampaikan pangkat² bintang² ini, Majlis yang di-adakan oleh Yang Amat Berhormat Perdana Menteri atau Timbalan-nya dalam jamuan makan, supaya pehak kami, Ahli² Dewan Ra'ayat ini, menerima dengan penuh kehormatan dan kebesaran. Ini pandangan saya.

Dato' Yang di-Pertua, saya hendak berchakap atas S. 64—Pechahan-kepala dalam Kementerian Pembangunan Negara dan Luar Bandar, Pechahan-kepala yang kechil yang meminta peruntukan wang kerana gaji. Apa yang saya hendak bangkitkan dalam masalah ini, daripada gaji ini-lah maka pegawai² pentadbiran dalam Kementerian ini dapat menjalankan kerja²-nya dengan penuh sempurna, tetapi satu perkara yang saya harapkan, Kementerian ini mengambil ingatan, dalam Rancangan Pembangunan Luar Bandar, juga Lembaga Kemajuan Tanah yang telah di-buka oleh Kerajaan lebih daripada 66 rancangan. Saya minta supaya di-selideki, satu perkara, yang selalu-nya terjadi kehilangan baja, rachun dan minyak lalang yang berpuluh² ton. Kejadian ini berlaku, bukan di-seluruh Rancangan Kemajuan Tanah. Saya menerima aduan ini daripada peserta² Lembaga Kemajuan Tanah itu dan saya fikir inilah, dengan sebab kechuaian pengurus² di-lembaga tersebut. Saya pernah berjumpa dua tong besar minyak pembunoh lalang di-salah sa-buah kawasan Lembaga Kemajuan Tanah yang saya taksirkan berharga tidak kurang daripada \$200 telah di-letakkan di-tempat yang tidak selamat—di-tepi hutan tepi jalan raya. Saya memahami barang ini memang tidak selamat dan jauh pula daripada kawasan Lembaga Kemajuan Tanah. Dengan kehilangan baja dan rachun, maka usaha Kerajaan hendak meneruskan kebaikan Rancangan Lembaga Kemajuan Tanah ini, merosot dengan sebab pokok² getah atau pokok² kelapa sawit itu tidak ditaborkan baja lalang tiada bagaimana yang di-mestikan. Jadi, saya harap

dalam pembayaran tanah² yang di-buka ini, waktu tanah ini telah berhasil.

Satu perkara lagi, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, ia-itu berhubung dengan Kepala-kechil 74—Upachara Pembukaan Rasmi Masjid Negara. Walau pun telah di-sebut oleh sahabat saya Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Hilir Perak tadi, tetapi saya mempunyai pandangan yang lain sedikit, ia-itu Masjid Negara ini telah di-buka dengan penuh kehormatan dan keagongan serta di-hadzihi oleh seluruh umat Islam dalam dunia ini. Satu perkara yang saya hendak bangkitkan, bahawa susunan majlis itu tidak begitu kemas. Sebab umat² Islam yang di-minta datang kerana menghadiri upachara perasmian Masjid ini—telah di-seru melalui siaran radio—mereka datang beramai² di-tempat itu, tetapi mereka tidak di-benarkan masuk dalam kawasan Masjid itu. Mujor-lah, Yang Teramat Mulia Perdana Menteri sampai, dengan murah hati membenarkan semua sa-kali orang² masuk kawasan Masjid itu. Maka banyak-lah orang yang mengalir ayer mata dengan sebab keizinan yang telah di-berikan oleh Yang Teramat Mulia Tengku Perdana Menteri. Jadi suasana yang sa-umpama itu, hingga menyebabkan orang ramai sudah naik satu perasaan lain, menyebabkan di-panggil Pasokan Polis Penchegeh Rusohan ka-Masjid yang mulia ini dan menyebabkan pintu Masjid pada hari itu roboh. Jadi, saya berharap pada masa yang lagi akan datang, kalau ada satu perasmian berhubung dengan bangunan² yang berunsor kebangsaan, tidak-lah molek kita siarkan melalui radio, supaya orang ramai berebut² datang. Maka natijah-nya bagaimana yang kita dapat pada hari perasmian Masjid itu. Satu perkara sahaja lagi, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, ia-itu S. 14,—Kementerian Perdagangan dan Perusahaan—dalam Bahagian Perdagangan yang saya hendak nyatakan.

Mr Speaker: Head berapa?

Enche' Ahmad bin Arshad: Head 14—ia-itu berhubung dengan barang²

Kepala 64, tadi saya hanya menyebut sedikit sahaja. Sangat-lah menyedehkan kerana berhubung dengan pelajaran dewasa dalam pembangunan negara sangat-lah mustahak ra'ayat di-negeri ini di-beri pelajaran melalui pelajaran dewasa. Tiap² negeri, pelajaran dewasa ini berjalan dengan lancar dan baik dan ada Pengelola Pelajaran Dewasa tiap² negeri. Yang menyedehkan saya. Pengelola Pelajaran Dewasa Melaka, Pulau Pinang dan Trengganu, kalau ta' salah, gaji-nya chuma \$400 sa-bulan, naik-lah sedikit² \$15 sa-tahun sampai \$580 dan sewa rumah lebih kurang \$26 ia-itu dalam jawatan yang rendah. Pada hal negeri² lain daripada negeri yang saya sebut tadi, Pengelola² Negeri-nya mula gaji \$592 dan naik berperingkat² lagi. Ini mengapa di-bezakan? Pada hal negeri Melaka sungguh pun kecil mari-lah siasat berapa banyak kelas² dewasa! Ini-lah rayuan saya, beri-lah dengan chara sa-imbang, jangan-lah pandang, negeri itu kecil, Pengelola-nya pun di-beri gaji yang kecil dan kemajuan kelas² dewasa ini, saya yakin dan percaya, ia-lah terpujang kepada usaha Pengelola Pelajaran Dewasa tiap² negeri itu. Kalau belanja atau gaji-nya kecil konon dia itu Pengelola seluruh negeri hendak sa-taraf dengan Pengelola negeri Selangor ini umpama sudah tidak cukup belanja. Jadi, kena-lah di-timbangkan oleh Kementerian yang berkenaan berhubung dengan hal Pengelola ini. Terima kasih.

Mr Speaker: Persidangan ini ditempohkan sa-lama 15 minit.

Sitting suspended at 6.00 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 6.24 p.m.

(Mr Speaker in the Chair)

Debate resumed.

Enche' Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise to speak on the points raised by the Honourable Member for Ipoh, the Honourable Member for Batu, the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat and the Honourable Member for Bungsar touching on my Ministry.

I will first dispose of the point touching on the maintenance of Ministers' residence. I need not elaborate on

the details, as the whole principle of this vote has been dealt with by my Honourable colleague, the Minister of Home Affairs—very briefly, as Ministers, we have to live in residence maintained at the standard commensurate with the dignity of our office. I shall leave it at that.

I will now come to the question of industrialised housing. My visit to France to see industrialised housing was made at the invitation of the French Government, and the programme which was drawn up by the French Government included visits not to one system but to several systems and several factories using different systems of prefabrication, completed housing estates under occupation and sites where flats were under construction.

Publicity was given to my visit in the national press prior to my departure. This publicity, as well as repeated announcements made by the Ministry since my return from Germany and Denmark in September, 1964, that this Ministry would encourage consortium agreement involving joint venture, if industrialised housing was to be introduced, resulted in repeated enquiries from numerous constructional firms. Many wish to visit factories in France during my tour. It is relevant to state that some of them have already been to Europe earlier to visit factories in Germany and Denmark with the support and recommendation of this Ministry. Those who wished to proceed to France during my tour were directed to the French Embassy, so that facilities might be afforded them, since the French Government was responsible for my programme. Representatives of several firms, including K. C. Boon and Cheah, went to France and were included in the itinerary to visit the various factories and sites. There is nothing sinister about this because the Government had made it very clear that any introduction of any prefabricated system could only be done on a joint venture basis with the ultimate aim that the local people can eventually take over—a well-established policy of the Alliance Government.

I wish to repeat that the representative of Messrs K. C. Boon and Cheah was not the only contractor who was in France during my tour. There were others who took the opportunity on their own initiative to visit France at the same time, so that they too could be afforded the same facilities to visit factories, prefabricated housing estates and sites. They came of their own accord and paid their own expenses. I was not in France to select or choose any particular system or systems. In fact, I am convinced that several systems now in use in France, Germany and Denmark are applicable to this country subject to modifications. My purpose in visiting France was to see for myself how the various systems of prefabrication have been developed and are now being used. It was also my intention to interest French firms in industrialised housing to come into Malaysia, so that they could enter into joint venture with Malaysian concerns. In this connection, Sir, I would like to point out that, by and large, nearly all the big concerns in France are reluctant to come out to Malaysia owing to their heavy commitments all over Europe; and I had to ask the Minister for Housing in France, Monsieur Myniol, for his assistance and intervention to encourage the French firms to come over to Malaysia. I would also like to state that I had visited Germany, Denmark and the United Kingdom to study industrialised housing. I repeat again my visit was not made to select any particular system or systems, but rather to familiarise myself with the several techniques, which have been successfully adopted in Europe and reported on favourably by my technical officers. It is up to the contractors and the developers interested in industrialised housing to select for themselves the particular system which in their own view is the most efficient and economic. Having seen the various systems myself, my officials and I would be in a position to decide whether any particular system offered by any contractor can be successfully adopted and used in Malaysia.

The Honourable Member for Ipoh obviously did not pay careful attention to the lengthy answer, which I have given to the question by the Honourable Member for Batu on Monday. If I am not mistaken he was only present towards the end of my reply. However, for his benefit I would like to state that Citra had already obtained a licence to use the TRACOPA system and the partnership with Messrs K. C. Boon and Cheah was entered into long before the representative of Messrs K. C. Boon and Cheah visited France at the same time as my visit. There was, therefore, no question of K. C. Boon and Cheah going to France to select a system which was going to be accepted by my Ministry. As explained in my reply to the question on Monday, I had said that this joint venture had already been doing a lot of spade work in industrialised housing and this, therefore, gives them the lead over others. In fact, this Company had on their own initiative already been making studies in industrialised housing before my Ministry came into being. I had also mentioned that there was another Company namely Sharikat Seri Kemajuan which was interested in industrialised housing and had made offers to negotiate with the Federal Commissioner long before my visit to France and other European countries.

In this connection, I would also like to state that there has been wide publicity given to the proposed introduction of industrialised housing as far back as April, 1963, and I have with me newspaper cuttings to prove my point. I have before me, Sir, firstly a cutting from the *Malay Mail* dated 19th of April, 1963, with headlines "Prefab Low-Cost Homes may be the answer in Kuala Lumpur". I would like, with your permission, Sir, to just quote a few lines from this report:

"We are always on the look-out for ways of reducing cost and time in our housing programme. We feel that prefabrication is one of the avenues by which we can achieve this. I should imagine that the work could be standardised and the finished product should be much better because the component parts are produced under ideal condition. We are going into this field in a big way. We believe that as a public authority

we should take the lead while, of course, working in partnership with private enterprise”.

Now all these referred to what the Federal Commissioner said in an interview with the press.

I have also, Sir, another cutting going back to 22nd of July, 1963—again, long before my Ministry came into being: I quote:

“New Low Cost Housing.—Municipal Architects now in France to study the French methods for Federal Capital. Kuala Lumpur may follow the French methods of building a house in a factory including flats, many stories high, to ease the housing shortage. The Commissioner of Federal Capital, Haji Ismail bin Panjang Aris indicated to-day”.

Again, Sir, in the *Straits Times* of 23rd July, 1963, the editorial had this to say:

“From France he has returned—(referring to Tuan Haji Ismail)—From France he has returned with a new approach to the housing shortage. The French, it seems, have developed a technique for pre-fabricating multi-storeyed flats that is both cheap and fast. Haji Ismail believes this method can be introduced in Malaya and would open up new prospects for clearing the slums”.

Again, Sir, in another cutting in the *Straits Times*—now in 1964, a year later—3rd of March, with the headline:

“Building Flats. French way.” “Municipal Architects report tells how housing problem can be tackled here. Mr Chow thinks that the French method of factory-built house can be successfully applied here. The Commissioner, Haji Ismail bin Panjang Aris is reported to be enthusiastic about the report”.

Again, Sir, in the *Malay Mail* of 6th May, 1964, was a report with a headline:

“Call for prefabs sparks off keen tussle among builders. The call for prefabrication of Kuala Lumpur multi-storeyed flats development has sparked off a keen rivalry between some of the leading contractors here.”

I quote this cutting, Sir, to show that it was entirely up to any firm, company, or individual, who have the initiative, to take steps to join up with foreign firms using industrialised housing techniques, and to avail themselves of the opportunity to make an offer to introduce industrialised housing to the Commissioner of the Federal Capital. There is no question of any-

one being given undue advantage. The whole thing was brought out as far back as 1963 and it was up to those with initiative to grasp for themselves the opportunity offered.

I would also wish to mention that several contractors, developers, and building firms went to Europe to make a study of industrialised housing with the support and encouragement of this Ministry. It is in the interest of the building industry that my Ministry should encourage contractors, etc., to study new techniques, so as to achieve greater efficiency and also cut down costs by entering into joint ventures with European firms using known and proven industrialised housing techniques.

Now, I would also like to turn my attention to the Honourable Member for Batu. He said that there was a race between the *Straits Times* photographer, who wanted to photograph the signboard and the firm of K. C. Boon and Cheah-Citra, who wanted to take it down. If the Honourable Member of Batu would only care to visit the site, he will see the signboard is still standing there. In so far as this Ministry, of the Commissioner of the Federal Capital, is concerned, this signboard was erected by Messrs. K. C. Boon and Cheah-Citra on their own initiative and at their own risk. They were given permission to carry out boring tests and site survey on the understanding that the Commissioner would not in any way be committed regarding the award of contract. There was no question of this signboard influencing the Negotiating Committee in its deliberations, and I have stated the Negotiating Committee consists of officials who are financial, technical and legal experts.

Now, I come to the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat. The Honourable Member asked, why it was necessary for so many people to go to Europe to study such, what he termed as “a small matter” as industrialised housing. As a Minister responsible for Housing, I do not regard the introduction of industrialised housing as “a small matter”.

Anyone with some knowledge of industrialised housing would readily realise that its introduction would revolutionise the building industry in this country. In order to introduce industrialised housing successfully with a view of tackling our housing shortage, it is imperative that administrative and technical officials should closely study the subject in Europe. It was because of lack of this that its introduction in Singapore failed. Even in Europe, the introduction of industrialised housing in its early years had encountered difficulties, and it is only now that several systems have been perfected. Industrialised housing has achieved such prominence in Europe that other countries, including Asia, are turning to industrialised housing to solve their housing shortage. Both Japan and India have introduced this. Even Singapore had to award a negotiated contract without tender to bring in industrialised housing.

If the Honourable Member had paid attention to my answer on Monday, he would have realised that industrialised housing was discussed at the meeting of the Working Party on Housing and Building Materials held in Bangkok in June this year. Surely, this shows that the subject is of such significant importance to Asian countries as to merit discussion at this level. To dismiss the subject of industrialised housing as "a small matter" is to display the height of ignorance. I can assure the Honourable Member that it is no small matter and, as far as I am concerned, I do not wish the introduction of any industrialised housing system in failure.

Now, I come to his reference to Enche' Hisham Albakri and his father, Dato' Mustapha Albakri. This, Mr Speaker, Sir, I consider a despicable abuse of Parliamentary privilege. Neither of them is in a position to defend themselves in this House, and I dare say that if what had been said is repeated outside this House would be tantamount to a libel. I wonder whether this Honourable Member would have the audacity to make such an insinuation outside this House regarding them without hiding under

the umbrella of Parliamentary privilege. I see that undue publicity has been given to this unwarranted smear, and I hope the Press will give equal publicity to what I have said and what I am going to say.

Enche' Hisham had no part to play in the choice of any system by the Ministry, or by the Commission of the Federal Capital. If the Honourable Member had listened very carefully to my reply on Monday, he would have fully understood the position. All that Enche' Hisham Albakri did do was to visit Russia and France under the auspices of the United Nations, and the French Government, to study industrialised housing and on his return he reported favourably on industrialised housing as a system and that it could, with modifications, be introduced in Malaysia. He did not recommend the adoption of the TRACOPA system used by Citra, nor did he recommend any other system. All along the Honourable Member for Dato Kramat has been displaying complete ignorance of what has been going on. I do not know what relevance Enche' Hisham Albakri's resignation from Government service had to do with this negotiation. As far as I am aware, he resigned to go into private practice. The question of Dato' Mustapha Albakri being a shareholder, or a Director, of K. C. Boon & Cheah had absolutely no relevance. This is an absolutely dirty "below the belt" smear.

I would like to remind the Honourable Member that "a little knowledge is a dangerous thing", and it is most unbecoming of a Parliamentarian to dump such trash in this Honourable House. Then, there was this reference to some Municipal officials, who could not understand the lectures in French although there was a translator. I really do not know what the Honourable Member was talking about. However, it might interest him to know that the Municipal Architect, who was in France on a French Government Technical scholarship, was sufficiently conversant in French, having studied French at the University of Bescanson. There was no other person attending

the same lectures with him and no translator was assigned to him. The other Municipal official who went to France was the Commissioner himself, the Commissioner of the Federal Capital, but as far as I am aware, he did not encounter any language difficulties.

There is also the complaint that Honourable Members were not given sufficient time to raise supplementary questions. The time limitation was not of my making; this is governed by Standing Orders of this House. However, this general debate has given all the opportunities for Honourable Members to raise any other points, which they might have on the subject, and despite their irrelevance, in respect of which I am fully entitled to refuse to answer, nevertheless, I am replying fully to every point raised.

The Honourable Member then referred to the cost in Singapore being \$3.62 per sq. ft. Obviously, there appears to be lack of liaison between him, that is Honourable Member from Dato Kramat, and his colleague, the Member for Batu, who referred to the Singapore price being \$8.00 per sq. ft. Once again the Member for Dato Kramat has displayed his ignorance, because he does not know what \$3.60 actually represents. For his education, I have with me a costing schedule supplied by the Singapore Housing and Development Board where although the shell of the building, only the shell of the building is quoted at \$3.92, the ultimate inclusive cost per sq. ft. is given as \$8.41, which includes sanitary fittings, gas and water connections, elevator and so on. If the Honourable Member is willing to undertake a project at an all-in cost of \$3.62 per sq. ft. I will be more than happy to recommend the approval of an award of a pilot project contract to him. At any rate, Sir, as I have said on Monday, there can be no comparison of building costs in Singapore and the States of Malaysia. The best yardstick in the States of Malaysia is the average cost of a number of projects in respect of which tenders have been awarded in this country.

The Honourable Member then alleged that the advertisements in the press had been tailor-made to suit Messrs. Citra, K. C. Boon & Cheah. I have read out the details required for registration in my reply on Monday, and if he had paid attention he would have realised that these details are absolutely necessary if we are to ensure that industrialised housing will be a success in this country in the light of failure in Singapore.

Normal registration of contractors under categories A, B, C, etc., is quite a different matter and not related to industrialised housing. As I have explained, industrialised housing is a major step in the building industry in this country, and I am responsible to this House to see that all firms wishing to employ industrialised housing system must have the requisite qualifications. The door is still open to any contractors to register to undertake pilot projects using industrialised housing techniques.

It is observed in the *Straits Times* of the 17th November that "Prefab" or industrialised housing, as it is technically called, incurs higher building costs than conventional methods. This appears prominently in the *Straits Times* of November 17th, 1965.

I have repeatedly stated in this House that my Ministry insist on industrialised housing costs not to exceed conventional costs. There is no country within the knowledge of this Ministry which has introduced industrialised housing other than by negotiated contract. This includes Singapore, as confirmed by the *Straits Times* of 17th and 18th November, 1965, which I have here in this House, and both reports confirmed that no tender had been issued when Singapore first introduced industrialised housing. The only point for such a contract to have an element of cost which is not higher than the conventional cost is again the same criterion adopted by this Government.

Now, again, in the report in today's *Straits Times*, several reasons were given why the system failed in Singapore. If I may be allowed to add one

more reason, Sir,—the lack of any sense of involvement by the owner of the foreign system using the technique is the cause for the failure, because the foreign firm owning the technique has no sense of involvement and is not committed, and for that reason my Ministry has insisted on the registration particulars for the contractors to specify in what way is the foreign firm owning the system involved in the whole project such as equity participation here and it illustrates the point why it is so necessary that those who are interested in registering for participation on projects must comply with the requirements as advertised, and not because they were tailor-made for any particular firm.

I wonder if Members of the Opposition are aware of the very serious housing situation when they oppose the introduction of industrialised housing system through negotiated contract. While this Ministry is trying its very best to solve the shortage. In this connection, I would like to draw the Honourable Members' attention to my answer to question No. 140 laid on the table of this House, which I will read, Sir—I shall only quote one paragraph in my reply to a question raised by none other than the Honourable Member for Batu, Dr Tan Chee Khoon: "Summing up the housing situation in this country", I said, "acknowledging a 20-year period to work out the present backlog in housing it will be necessary to build 16,000 units per annum which, in addition to the 18,720 units required for population increase given a total of 34,720 units of low-cost housing to be built per annum". I can say with confidence that with only conventional housing method this housing shortage will never be solved, because our conventional method workers would be tremendously overloaded.

I have replied to all the points raised by the Opposition members, including the Member for Bungsar, who launched on a spree of character assassination abusing parliamentary privilege of this Honourable House and who, on being challenged was unable to make one single specific allegation

on what he continuously referred to as allegations against this Ministry and its Minister. Those who live in glass houses must not throw stones. It is for the same reason that Singapore Government has accepted the principle of awarding contract, without tender, to bring in industrialised housing that the Federal Commissioner does so here.

Before I sum up, Sir, it is important to emphasise that the Federal Commissioner has every right and is legally empowered to proceed and award such a contract without tender and without reference to me; and it was because that this being a pilot project bringing in a new technique that I directed reference to the Cabinet, which in turn directed same to a Cabinet-appointed Committee. I do not come into the picture at all in the actual negotiations, which are undertaken by a committee of financial, administrative, technical and legal experts of officials. My Ministry is convinced that if the housing shortage is to be tackled effectively to catch up with the backlog as well as to cope with population increase we have to do the following things.

Firstly, to resort to industrialised housing technique to supplement conventional methods. This has been proved in France, Germany and Denmark. Even Britain, known for its conservatism, has accepted this although almost 10 years too late.

If we are to introduce this, we must negotiate for pilot projects to enable factories to be established, and in no country is it known that pilot projects can be launched on tender basis, including Singapore. This is confirmed in France, Denmark, Germany and United Kingdom. Even in conservative England, I have just confirmed during my recent visit to the United Kingdom that the Liverpool Corporation, with the approval of the Ministry of Housing, awarded a contract of £9.5 million in order to bring in the French Camus system.

Thirdly, so long as this Ministry is convinced that the system is sound, and well tried out in Europe, that joint venture with involvement by the firm

owning the system, such as equity participation, that costs not to exceed conventional costs; that it is faster than the conventional method, and finally that the final terms and conditions are acceptable to the Cabinet-appointed Committee.

This Ministry will as long as these conditions are fulfilled forge ahead irrespective of what the Opposition may say as the Chinese saying goes. "We cannot prevent evil people with evil mind thinking evil of good intentions".

Thank you. (*Applause*).

Dr Lim Swee Aun: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member from Pasir Mas Hulu wanted to know why the *batek* industry has not received any protection whereas fencing wire, sawyer's saws, iron nails, and all general things, have already received protection. Sir, I would like to explain to this House the procedure which has to be followed before protection is given. Usually, it is for the manufacturer to ask the Government for protection and the manufacturer has to satisfy the Government that there are adequate reasons why there should be protection, and all the spade work for supplying such information is given by the manufacturer. Then, this is referred to the Tariff Advisory Board which listens, hears and investigates and recommends to Government the degree of protection that is necessary. In the case of *batek* this was brought up quite two years ago by the Honourable Member from Kelantan Hilir, and at that time no work has been done as to the question of supplying statistics and to find out whether or not the *batek* industry required protection other than it should deserve protection in the opinion of the Members of Parliament. Since then, a committee of officials has been set up and the first problem that they came across was the definition of *batek*—a legal customs definition which could not be challenged in court, which could be upheld in court, and yet a definition that would not be so wide as to cover all other printed cloths, as otherwise we will be using a hammer to crack a nut. So this committee has at last come to a definition and they

defined *batek* as "*Batek* means any cloth commonly accepted in the trade as '*kain batek*', and any cloth processed, printed with patterns ordinarily found in *kain batek* as accepted". As you will see this definition is very involved and has still not yet been tested in court. However, the Statistics Department has since been collecting data as to the amount of cloth which would come under this definition of *batek* that has been imported, and this information will all be handed over to the Tariff Advisory Board for them to make a recommendation to the Government as to whether or not there should be protection. As I understand it, since confrontation the marketing of *batek* has improved and that it is, in fact, the problem that we are not producing enough *batek* cloth rather than that we are not able to sell *batek* cloth.

The second point raised by the Honourable Member for Pasir Mas Hulu is that he suggested that the Government should have a more dynamic policy to help the *bumiputera* in their economic expansion. Sir, I am sure the Honourable Members of this House are aware that there was a Congress Bumiputera on economic problems, and they have passed several resolutions which have been accepted by the Government and many of them have been already put into practice, and I am sure those steps taken are dynamic enough to improve the economy of the *bumiputeras*, and in the last few days we had the MARA Bill passed and also the establishment of the Bank Bumiputera.

Sir, the other point I want to touch on in reply to the Honourable Member for Muar Utara, who said that the pencils produced in this country are not up to standard, and his reason was that the lead was very hard and when you write it would tear the paper. Sir, I am sure all Honourable Members do know that that should not be a valid reason that the pencil is no good, or of poor quality, because there are different types of lead used in pencils just like the hard lead and the soft lead, and anybody buying a pencil would naturally look and see whether it is HB which means hard lead, BB,

or 3B if you want soft lead. In any case, if it tears the paper, then he should buy another degree of softer lead in the pencil, and not condemn the pencil because it has a hard lead in it. Sir, the company which has just started making pencils here has to import graphite to form the lead part of the pencil and, as it is imported, I am sure they would produce all the different degrees of softness, or hardness, of the lead to suit the different demands for the pencil in this country; and I am sure it is to the interest of that manufacturer to improve his quality and if he can find a bigger market and can produce in volume, it would be cheaper in its retail price. Therefore, I do hope that our Honourable Members of this House would help popularise our "Made in Malaysia" goods and not join in the campaign to say the local-made goods are of poor quality.

Sir, the Honourable Member from Melaka Selatan suggested that I should visit the co-operative rice-mills in Tanjong Karang, Malacca, and Trengganu to see for myself whether or not these co-operative rice-mills are losing money, because Government has not or will not increase the price at which we buy the rice from them. Sir, I remember, in one of the past sessions, a similar question was put to me and I had to explain in this House the method in which Government pays rice-millers for the rice they mill.

The Government guarantees the padi producer that the minimum price at which he can sell his padi at the mill door is \$16 per picul, and on that price the calculations of converting that padi into rice, including bank charges, transport charges, and all the other factors come to \$430 per ton. Now, when my Ministry buys that rice, it pays the rice-miller \$430 per ton at the present guaranteed minimum price of \$16 per picul ex-mill. Sometimes the mill is some distance from the Government rice godown; sometimes it is just next door to the Government rice godown. If the mill is some distance away from the Government rice godown, then the Government pays for the transport charges for carrying that rice from

the mill to the Government rice godown and that factor, depending upon the mileage, will be added on to the \$430 basic price. Sir, in 1959, when the Tanjong Karang and the Malacca co-operative rice-mills started to produce, the guaranteed minimum price then was not \$16 per picul but lower. At that time there were also rice-millers in Petaling Jaya. Now, these rice-millers in Petaling Jaya were not allowed by the State Government to purchase their padi in the Tanjong Karang area, because the padi in that area was reserved for the Tanjong Karang co-operative rice-mill. So, these rice-millers had to go further afield, from distances varying from 50 to 100 miles, to get their padi, bring it all the way to Petaling Jaya, mill it, and then send that milled rice to my rice godown. So, at that time we had, according to our formula, to pay these Petaling Jaya rice-mills the basic factor plus the transport charges. The Tanjong Karang rice-mill and the Malacca co-operative rice-mill happened to be very close to the Government rice godown. Therefore, the price differential between the price paid to the Petaling Jaya rice-mills and the Tanjong Karang rice-mill would be the difference in the transport charges. However, on the plea of the then Minister of Agriculture, my Ministry agreed to pay the Tanjong Karang rice-mill the same price as what my Ministry paid to the Petaling Jaya rice-mill delivered up to my godown, that is to say, my Ministry subsidised the co-operative rice-mill at Tanjong Karang to the extent of the transport charges which was added on to the Petaling Jaya mill from their mill to my godown, and the rate was 25 cents per ton per mile. These two rice-mills—the co-operative rice-mill at Tanjong Karang and the co-operative rice-mill at Malacca—were exceptional cases where Government subsidised them although they did not have to carry their rice any distance, because they were almost next door to my rice godown. They were paid that element of transport charges which the Petaling Jaya rice-mill had to be paid by us, because of their distance from the Government rice godown. Since then every year from

1959 to 1963, the Ministry of Agriculture asked us to give them this special price. My Ministry continued to subsidise these two co-operatives up till 1963, which is about five years, but when we found that the rice trading account could not stand this subsidy any further, because it was a loss to us, we decide that from 1964 they would be paid the proper price due to them as every other rice-mill in this country. Sir, my point is that if after five years of subsidy by the Government the co-operative rice-mills cannot make money, then I am sure they cannot blame the Government for it. So, whether or not I visit these rice-mills, I cannot help them unless they put their house in order and increase productivity. And I hope they will, because after five years of training and practice, they should be able to be sufficiently competitive with the other rice-mills. Thank you, Sir.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Labour (Enche' Lee San Choon): Mr Speaker, Sir, I wish to refer to the Honourable Member for Bungsar, who has referred to the strike by the War Department employees. Mr Speaker, Sir, we are aware of the strike by the employees of the War Department. As a matter of fact, my Minister and officers of my Ministry have been and are still trying their best to bring about an early settlement. This strike is unfortunate. Given goodwill on both sides, I am sure this dispute can be settled through the conciliatory effort of my Ministry.

The Honourable Member for Bungsar also referred to the Industrial Tribunal. Sir, as the Honourable Member for Bungsar himself is aware, the new regulations also provide for trade unionists to appear on behalf of trade unions which are not in a position to engage lawyers. I may add that the procedure adopted by the Industrial Tribunal are different from a law court and that the scope of legal representative in an Industrial Tribunal is limited. However, this matter is under constant review and should this system be found not satisfactory, I am sure the National Joint Labour Advisory Council will advise my Minister accordingly.

The Minister of Lands and Mines (Enche' Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub):

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member from Sarawak, Mr Ong Kee Hui, yesterday made two observations in connection with Head S. 33 Home Affairs. In his first observation, he referred to the question of regrouping in Sarawak for which he noted there is a sum of \$2.5 million, shown under the Ministry's Estimates Sub-head 52. He stated that provision for such purpose is also shown under the Ministry of National and Rural Development.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the explanation is that the sum of \$2,500,000 is the estimated sum required for Phase I of what is called "Operation Hammer", Resettlement/Regrouping Scheme, along the Serian Road in Sarawak, which was carried out as a result of terrorist attacks on police stations and scattered bazaars, etc. As the financial provision was required urgently, this sum was advanced from the Contingencies Fund to supplement the Ministry's vote on Resettlement/Regrouping for which a sum of \$750,000 only was shown in the 1965 Estimates. A sum of approximately \$1 million only was spent on Phase I of the operation and the balance of about \$1.5 million was frozen by the Treasury and subsequently transferred to the Ministry of National and Rural Development for Phase II of the Operation.

The second point he raised, Mr Speaker, Sir, is that under the First Malaysia Plan, Sarawak will get about \$300 million for development projects, and for resettlement projects alone will cost about \$3 million. He expressed doubt as to whether resettlement of people could achieve the object intended as he felt that confining people in one area will not help solve the problem. The answer to that, Mr Speaker, Sir, is that by isolating these subversive people Government will prevent them from subverting other innocent people. In other words, they cannot carry out their subversive activities as they used to do amongst members of the public. Secondly, by rehousing the people in settlement areas long term development plan can be

worked out for these people, and this is being done now by the Ministry of National and Rural Development in Phase II of what is called "Operation Hammer" in Sarawak.

There is another small point, Sir, in respect of Head S. 47 in page 37. The Honourable Member, Mr Stephen Yong, also from Sarawak, asked this afternoon, why it is necessary for the Government to print Federal laws in Sarawak as well as in Kuala Lumpur. He considers that it would be cheaper to reprint all the laws in Kuala Lumpur. The short answer to that, Mr Speaker, Sir, is that it is very cumbersome and very difficult to send volumes and volumes of laws by mail to Sarawak. It is very much more convenient, if we send a piece of paper from here to Sarawak and let the printing be carried out in Sarawak, and as soon as printing is done, then the laws can be distributed in Sarawak. We have to do that, Sir, because we cannot extend Federal laws to Sarawak, enforce the laws in Sarawak, unless the people of Sarawak have got the chance to have access to those laws and see what the laws are. If we keep the laws in Kuala Lumpur only and expect the people of Sarawak to know what the Federal laws are and, if they do not understand, we punish them—that is morally incorrect. Therefore, we have to have this estimate and we thought that the best way of tackling this problem is to get the Federal laws reprinted in Sarawak for distribution. Thank you, Sir.

Enche' Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka mengucapkan terima kasih kembali kepada Yang Berhormat dari Kota Star Selatan, kerana pemberian tambahan sa-banyak \$200,000 kepada Lady Templer Hospital. I would like now to reply to the Honourable Member from Batu. It appears that the Honourable Member for Batu is trying to mislead this House into thinking that the Ministry of Health has not been doing anything at all to assist the T.B. sufferers and their families, but the Ministry's provision for T.B. Campaign alone is about \$2,668,582 for the year 1965 and this year the amount will be \$2,703,104.

In addition, every Government Hospital, in Malaysia has T.B. wards, or T.B. beds, totalling about 3,638 beds, the expenditure on which is not included in the figure I have just quoted. The average cost of maintenance per bed is about \$5,000. So, if the Honourable Member for Batu would multiply \$5,000 by 3,638 beds, then he would know the amount of money being spent for tuberculosis.

The other point mentioned by the Honourable Member was about the charge made in the Lady Templer Hospital of \$1, I would like to tell the Honourable Member that the Treasury has already agreed in principle that all the T.B. patients recommended by the Chief Medical and Health Officers for special treatment in the Lady Templer Hospital will be charged a minimum of \$1 per patient per day, but this sum of fee will not be collected from the patients by the Lady Templer Hospital but from the Ministry of Health, which will be given an allocation by the Treasury.

The Minister for Transport (Dato' Haji Sardon bin Haji Jubir): Dato' Yang di-Pertua, saya hendak ringkas-kan sahaja keterangan saya kepada Yang Berhormat wakil Pasir Mas Hulu, terutama sa-kali tidak banyak bangsa Melayu dalam Kementerian saya, nanti-lah apabila sampai bab itu saya akan terangkan, tetapi saya mohon-lah kepada Ahli² Yang Berhormat dan orang ramai supaya, apabila ada 'iklan² jawatan² kosong di-dalam Kementerian Pengangkutan ini, supaya anak² Melayu kita dan siapa juga dari warga Negara Malaysia ini, memohon supaya Public Services Commission boleh menyemak dan memberi peluang bertemu duga dengan orang² yang ber-kelayakan.

Yang kedua-nya berkenaan dengan plate lori "A", konon-nya kalau orang Melayu meminta plate lesen "A" ini di-bangkang, apabila di-bangkang tidak dapat-lah. Ini tidak betul, kalau-lah semua orang yang memohon plate "A", bukan Melayu sahaja, tetapi semua bangsa, ada juga akan di-bangkang, tetapi bangkangan itu kalau tidak menepati dan yang memohon itu ada keterangan yang chukup, Majlis pelesen

akan menimbang terutama sa-kali permohonan daripada bumiputera, kalau tidak ada timbangan seperti itu tentu-lah tidak ada bumiputera hari ini yang ada dalam perniagaan pengangkutan. Maka ini dengan sendiri-nya menapi-kan tuduhan yang kata-nya apabila di-bangkang tidak dapat-lah. Bukan itu sebab-nya yang sa-benar-nya tidak chukup keterangan-nya, Majlis Pelesen chukup 'adil, boleh ulang bichara juga kalau tidak puas hati.

Yang akhir-nya berkenaan dengan motokar² membawa budak sekolah banyak kena tangkap. Saya tahu, saya bacha surat khabar, ada report-nya banyak sudah kena tangkap di-Kelantan, kerana hendak menjaga keamanan budak² sekolah itu dan kita sudah chadangkan apa² kenderaan yang boleh membawa enam orang di-ma'anakan bas sudah saya nasihatkan pertubohan² Ibu Bapa, di-mana² sekolah supaya berunding mengadakan bas² sekolah. Saya harap Yang Berhormat juga akan dapat, barangkali mengeshorkan, supaya dapat-lah mengumpul modal sadikit dan belilah bas² second hand kerana membawa budak² sekolah itu, chukai-nya hanya \$70 sahaja bagi sa-tahun, tetapi ini bukan kerana untong, kerana perkhidmatan kapada kanak² sekolah.

Tentang motokar² yang hendak membayar chukai kerana membawa kanak² sekolah ini, sedang di-rundingkan dan rakan saya Menteri Kewangan sedang menimbangkan berapa yang patut chukai² itu. Kalau di-kenakan chukai membawa budak² sekolah bagaimana chukai² taxi yang biasa, tentu-lah tidak ada orang yang hendak memohon membayar chukai² begitu mahal kerana hanya di-benarkan bawa budak sekolah. Sabar-lah, ta' lama lagi kita akan putus soal itu. Terima kaseh.

Menteri Muda Kebudayaan, Belia dan Sokan (Engku Muhsein): Dato' Yang di-Pertua, Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Sarawak, Yang Berhormat Enche' Ong Kee Hui, sa-malam ada membangkitkan berkenaan dengan pendirian tidak 'adil Surohanjaya Perkhidmatan Awam chawangan Sarawak dalam perlantekan chalun².

Tegoran Ahli Yang Berhormat itu, saya rasa, menyentoh pendirian Surohanjaya Perkhidmatan Awam sa-bagai satu badan yang bersendirian dan di-dalam perkara ini patut-lah di-ingat, Undang² Perintah Tetap Dewan Ra'ayat ini, Fasal 36 (8)—menentukan perkara² itu tidak patut di-sentoh dan jikalau-lah Ahli Yang Berhormat itu bersungguh mempunyai kenyataan yang boleh menyokong tuduhan-nya itu, maka saya chabar supaya boleh-lah beliau membawa satu motion di-bawah Peratoran Meshuarat yang saya sebutkan tadi.

Berkenaan dengan pandangan beliau juga dalam perkara, bila-kah sempadan pilihan² raya dalam negeri Sarawak akan di-adakan ia-itu dalam Butiran Head S. 4, maka saya rasa perkara ini sa-benar-nya telah-lah di-buat soalan mulut oleh Yang Berhormat daripada Tanjong, dua tiga hari yang lalu dan telah di-jawab dengan panjang lebar oleh Yang Amat Berhormat Perdana Menteri sendiri. Jadi saya tidak nampak apa-kah sebab-nya perkara ini di-bangkitkan sa-mula sa-lain daripada barangkali chuba² hendak membangkit²kan perkara yang betul.

Berkenaan dengan Head S. 7—Yang Berhormat daripada Batu telah membuat pertanyaan dalam perkara Supplement, yang di-minta kerana hadiah rasmi mengikut kata-nya, telah digunakan barangkali untuk membuat medal Malaysia, yang baharu² ini telah di-edarkan kapada Ahli² Yang Berhormat mengikut kata-nya pula buat malu sahaja. Pertama sa-kali saya hendak menerangkan, Supplement yang di-minta ini bukan-lah untuk membuat medal itu tetapi yang sa-benar-nya belanja membuat medal itu telah di-luluskan di-dalam meshuarat yang telah lalu. Supplement yang di-minta ini ialah berkenaan dengan mengadakan hadiah² rasmi sa-masa lawatan Duli² Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong ka-Timor Tengah dan juga lawatan² Yang Teramat Mulia Tunku Perdana Menteri dan Yang Amat Berhormat Timbalan Perdana Menteri ka-negara² Africa dan lain². Saya perchaya Ahli Yang Berhormat itu sendiri dalam beberapa kali

memberikan pandangan, patut-lah sangat di-adakan perhubungan² yang rapat dengan negara² Afro-Asia dan sa-bagai Kerajaan yang tahu akan harga dirinya, saya rasa, tentu-lah kita, dalam mengadakan persahabatan² dengan negara² itu, mesti-lah ada perhubungan² dan juga chara bertukar² hadiah² ini ada-lah menjadi adat kebiasaan bagi mana² negara juga yang merdeka dan berdaulat. Jadi dalam perkara yang di-sentoh oleh beliau, perkara membuat medal ini, tidak kena mengena langsung. Beliau juga menyatakan yang beliau merasa malu menerima medal itu; beliau sendiri merasa tidak patut menerima medal itu. Jadi, jikalau beliau, Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Batu ini, merasa tidak senang menerima medal itu boleh-lah di-pulangkan balek, perkara ini juga di-bangkitkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Muar Utara, kenapakah medal² ini di-hantar melalui post atau register biasa, tidak di-adakan satu upacara yang khas. Jadi, saya rasa, Ahli Yang Berhormat Muar Utara bersetuju-lah, kita hendak minta Kerajaan berjimat chermat begitu dan bagini, jadi hendak mengadakan satu upacara khas kerana medal Malaysia yang di-keluarkan lebeh 2,000 orang, saya rasa ini banyak sangat-lah belanjanya dan banyak masa yang terbuang. Dalam masa pembenaan negara ini, saya percaya Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Muar Utara bersetuju dengan saya, kita hendak-lah sa-berapa yang dapat menjimatkan wang dan menjimatkan masa kita untuk perkara² yang mustahak.

Yang Berhormat daripada Batu juga akan membangkitkan berkenaan dengan tambahan belanja Upacara Menyambut Hari Keputeraan Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong. Suka-lah saya menyatakan ia-itu sa-benar-nya kita telah dapat mengecilkan perbelanjaan daripada tahun yang lampau. Perbelanjaan bagi tahun ini ia-lah sa-banyak \$43,047 sahaja, berbanding dengan perbelanjaan dalam tahun 1964 sa-banyak \$53,700, yang bererti kekurangan sa-banyak \$10,000. Ini-lah satu perkara yang patut di-ambil perhatian oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat itu.

Yang Berhormat daripada Batu juga ada membangkitkan perkara perbelanjaan \$100,000 kerana Masjid Negara, yang pokok kata-nya itu terlampau banyak begitu dan bagini. Jadi, saya rasa, ini pembukaan Masjid Negara ia-lah sa-kali sahaja di-buat dalam sejarah tanah ayer kita ini dan wang yang di-keluarkan itu bukan sa-mata² kerana belanja pembukaan itu, tetapi juga kerana belanja kerajaan² dan lain² kepada tetamu² yang datang daripada luar negeri, daripada sa-genap pelusok alam ini. Jadi sa-lain daripada upacara ugama, keraian² yang kita buat kepada tetamu² kita, daripada luar negeri itu sangat besar erti-nya pada perhubungan persahabatan kita dengan negara itu dan juga untuk faedah negara kita dalam keadaan² dunia sekarang ini. Jadi saya rasa belanja \$100,000 itu sangat-lah menasabah dan dalam perkara ini juga, Yang Berhormat daripada Muar Utara ada membangkitkan, mengikut kata-nya, pada hari itu upacara-nya ada berlaku sedikit tidak begitu tertib, oleh kerana banyak sangat dikerumun oleh orang² yang datang ka-Masjid itu. Jadi perkara ini, suka-lah saya tegaskan, pehak Committee Masjid Negara ini telah menjalankan segala daya upaya membuat satu susunan yang teratur, tetapi bagaimana di-ketahui Masjid ini hak semua orang Islam. Jadi barangkali-lah, oleh kerana semangat keugamaan begitu kuat, meninggi² pada hari itu dan sa-bagai satu chara menyatakan kegembiraan mereka pada hari itu, jadi berlaku-lah sedikit, barangkali perkara² yang tidak begitu teratur, yang walau macham mana pun, saya rasa, pada keseluruhannya upacara itu telah dapat di-jalankan dengan chukup memberi puas hati dan chukup memberi kesempatan dan segala chara² yang menasabah dan sesuai untuk semua pehak yang berkenaan.

Yang Berhormat daripada Hilir Perak juga ada membangkitkan perkara Masjid Negara ini, ia-itu pandangan beliau supaya di-adakan Kutub Khanah. Sa-memang-nya, saya di-beri tahu Masjid Negara ini, dalam ranchangan-nya, akan mengadakan Kutub Khanah yang di-harap menjadi

sa-buah Kutub Khanah, walau pun tidak sangat terbesar dalam dunia ini, tetapi satu Kutub Khanah yang boleh di-katakan mempunyai segala buku² dan kitab² dan lain² lagi dalam perkara ugama Islam yang boleh di-katakan satu daripada yang besar dalam dunia ini. Ranchangan² ini sedang di-ator dan saya perchaya-lah, dari sa-tahun ka-satahun, chara²-nya yang menasabah akan di-jalankan untuk melaksanakan chita² itu.

Menteri Muda Pembangunan Negara dan Luar Bandar (Enche' Sulaiman bin Bulon): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bagi menjawab soalan yang di-kemukakan oleh Wakil dari Melaka Selatan, maka sa-benar-nya ada-lah gaji Pengelola Pelajaran Dewasa di-Melaka itu rendah. Ini ia-lah di-sebabkan kita letakkan jawatan itu di-bawah Bahagian II dan tidak seperti mana yang kita buat di-Johor, Perak dan lain² negeri, di-pakai Bahagian I. Walau pun demikian, kita—Kementerian ini—maseh lagi menimbangkan dari beberapa segi dan kita harap akan dapat keputusan yang lain ia-itu kerana memikirkan, seperti juga, bukan di-Melaka, Pulau Pinang, Trengganu, maseh juga di-sana kita letakkan Pengelola-nya di-bawah Bahagian II. Jadi perkara ini maseh lagi dalam timbangan.

Yang kedua, Wakil daripada Muar Utara, telah mengemukakan ia-itu banyak baja dan barang² yang lain dalam baja dan barang² yang lain dalam ranchangan FLDA, yang tidak sampai kapada peserta² ranchangan itu. Maka sa-takat ini belum-lah ada Kementerian ini mendapat apa² aduan tentang perkara ini dan wakil kita daripada Muar Utara pun tidak menyentoh di-mana tempat-nya kejadian itu berlaku dan dari mana ranchangan itu terbit-nya dan bagaimana kehilangan itu berlaku. Jikalau-lah benar perkara ini berlaku, maka kita—pehak Kementerian ini—sedia menyiasat dan bertindak di-atas soal² yang seperti itu. Sekian-lah, terima kaseh.

Enche' Chen Wing Sum: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for Batu wanted to know about the sum of \$290,000 appearing under Head

S. 17 in respect of Secret Service under the Ministry of Defence—whether it is payment for the C.I.A., or some other secret purposes. Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for Batu cannot be so ignorant, and the reason why the Honourable is so allergic to such service is obvious. Moreover, the said Honourable Member who had given no legitimate ground whatsoever as to why the said sum should not be spent had led this House to believe that such allocation was made for one sole purpose—to help our enemies. However, Honourable Members must realise that not only we owe an obligation to our people to save their lives, and to protect their properties, but also we have an absolute duty to defend the sovereignty and the integrity of our country. To the mind of any loyal and right thinking citizen of this country, the sum of \$290,000 spent on Secret Service is not only justifiable but also essential in the circumstances. Mr Speaker, Sir, from the very nature of the term "Secret Service", Honourable Members would appreciate that I cannot reveal and elaborate how the said sum has been spent.

Dr Ng Kam Poh: Mr Speaker, Sir, in summing up this debate in which various Ministers have replied to various points raised by the Opposition Members, one must reflect back to the last three days of this exhaustive debate when the Opposition has more or less pinned the Government Benches down to the two controversial issues. One, Mr Speaker, Sir, is that they tried to impute shady motives or allegations against the Minister of Housing; the other is that they tried to say that we had concealed subjects under the Government expenditure because of the then Honourable Minister of Health, Enche' Abdul Rahman Talib.

On this point, Sir, the Honourable Minister of Home Affairs has very ably replied to the various Speakers and I need not elaborate, but what I want to point out is that the Honourable Member for Bachok differs from the other Honourable Members in saying that if I had not pointed this out there would not be any trouble here today and that I am cleverer than the

Minister of Finance. Should I fail to point this out, would it not mean that I am trying to hide this matter from the House as pointed out by the Minister of Home Affairs?

Mr Speaker: I ask the Member "To point out what?"

Dr Ng Kam Poh: To point out the question of the \$88,323 in Supply Head 47.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Bachok telah berchakap berkenaan dengan perkara Kepala S. 47. Dia mengatakan saya lebeh pandai daripada Menteri saya, fasal saya keluaran Kepala S. 47 berjumlah \$88,323. Tetapi jika saya tidak mengeluarkan perkara ini, tidak boleh-kah pehak Pembangkang di-sana boleh beri tahu kepada ra'ayat di-Malaysia Menteri Muda ini tidak berapa betul kerana sudah makan suap. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, itu ia-lah haram (*Ketawa*), dan Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bachok boleh mengatakan dalam bahasa kebangsaan "otak udang" (*Ketawa*)—minta ma'af, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak berapa pandai berbahasa kebangsaan. Beri-lah 3 tahun—3 tahun sahaja—boleh-lah kita berbahath di-dalam bahasa kebangsaan (*Tepok*).

Other than that, Sir, there is nothing much more for me to comment except to say that the tactics displayed by the Opposition in delaying this Budget debate, because of the time factor, I think is not completely proper. However, Sir, that is within your purview and not mine.

Finally, Sir, I would add that the Treasury has never had any shady dealings in anything with anybody. Everything is within the Second Supplementary Supply Estimates, given here as Command Paper No. 36 and Command Paper No. 37, and I have highlighted the items in the Supplementary Supply Bill in my speech on Supply Head S. 37 in this matter. Let us, therefore, never for one moment ever think, that the Treasury is up here to cheat or to conceal anything from this august House. Thank you.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time.

The House immediately resolved itself into a Committee of Supply.

(Mr Speaker in the Chair)

SCHEDULE—

Heads S. 1, S. 4, S. 5, S. 6, S. 7, S. 8, S. 11 and S. 12—

The Assistant Minister of Culture, Youth and Sports (Engku Muhsein bin Abdul Kadir): Dato' Pengerusi, dengan izin tuan, saya memohon supaya Kepala S. 1, S. 4, S. 5, S. 6, S. 7, S. 8, S. 11, dan S. 12 di-bawa sa-kali gus. Saya memohon supaya S. 1—Parlimen, berjumlah sa-banyak \$30,478: S. 4—Election Commission sa-banyak \$23,320: S. 5—Public Services Commission sa-banyak \$39,930: S. 6—Railway Services Commission sa-banyak \$4,402: S. 7—Prime Minister sa-banyak \$466,313: S. 8—Office of the Federal Secretary sa-banyak \$100,000: S. 11—Statistics sa-banyak \$34,000: dan S. 12—Overseas Service Aid Scheme sa-banyak \$460,490 menjadi sa-bahagian daripada Rang Undang² ini.

Keterangan² lanjut telah ada dalam Command Paper No. 37 tahun 1965 yang saya rasa ta' patut-lah saya melanjutkan lagi.

Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$30,478 for Head S. 1; the sum of \$23,320 for Head S. 4; the sum of \$39,930 for Head S. 5; the sum of \$4,402 for Head S. 6; the sum of \$466,313 for head S. 7; the sum of \$100,000 for Head S. 8; the sum of \$34,000 for Head S. 11 dan the sum of \$460,490 for Head S. 12 ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Head S. 14—

Dr Lim Swee Aun: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that S. 14—Ministry of Commerce and Industry, \$407,543 stand part of the Schedule. The reason why this amount of money is required are contained in Command Paper No. 37. I hope the House will approve it.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Abdullah (Kelantan Hilir): Tuan Pengerusi, saya

ingin hendak bertanya sedikit kepada Yang Berhormat Menteri yang berkenaan, mengikut Command Paper 37 dan di-terangkan di-sini bahawa-bahawa di-harapkan bahawa supply electricity ini kepada kampong² baharu akan diselenggarakan oleh pihak National Electricity Board, State Government and Local Council. Tetapi nampak-nya mereka tidak menyelenggarakan dan perkara ini bukan sahaja pada tahun ini, sa-bagaimana yang saya tahu, perkara ini telah berlaku di-tahun² yang lalu juga. Kalau begitu, saya suka-lah hendak mengetahui mengapa Kerajaan Pusat tidak mengambil tindakan supaya Perbadanan² yang tersebut di-bawah ini menunaikan kewajipan mereka.

Dr Lim Swee Aun: The Central Government is still negotiating with the State Governments concerned to take over the responsibility of the supply of electricity to these new villages; but up to date these State Governments still refuse to take over the responsibility.

Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$407,543 for Head S. 14—Ministry of Commerce and Industry, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Head S. 15—

Engku Muhsein bin Abdul Kadir: Dato' Pengerusi, saya memohon supaya S. 15—Ministry of Culture, Youth and Sports sa-banyak \$250,000 menjadi sa-bahagian daripada Jadual. Keterangan yang telah ada dalam Paper No. 37.

Enche' Ahmad bin Arshad: Dato' Yang di-Pertua, saya chuma hendak meminta penjelasan daripada Yang Berhormat berhubung dengan Kementerian-nya ini—berapa buah negeri yang mengambil bahagian dalam sukan itu—sukan sepak raga jaring.

Engku Muhsein bin Abdul Kadir: Command Paper ini menerangkan belanjanya \$250,000 itu ada-lah kerana SEAP game atau pun Sukan Tenggara Asia dan bukan-lah sepak raga jaring. Negeri² yang mengambil bahagian ia-lah Malaysia, Thailand, Kemboja, Vietnam—ia-itu negara² yang dalam lengkungan Tenggara Asia ini.

Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$250,000 for Head S. 15 for Ministry of Youth, Sports and Culture, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Head S. 17—

Enche' Chen Wing Sum: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a sum of \$320,030 appearing under Head S. 17 for the Ministry of Defence in the Supplementary Supply Bill, 1965, form part of the Schedule. Particulars are adequately set out in the Command Paper.

Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$320,030 for Head S. 17 for the Ministry of Defence, ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Head S. 19—

Menteri Muda Pelajaran (Enche' Lee Siok Yew): Dato' Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun bagi menchadang supaya wang sa-banyak \$12 juta untuk Kepala Peruntukan 19, Pechahan-kepala 32 di-jadikan sa-bahagian daripada jadual.

Wang yang di-perlukan itu, ia-lah untuk sumbangan yang patut di-jelaskan kepada Kerajaan Singapura, bagi kemudahan² yang di-beri kepada penuntut Malaya yang belajar di-University Singapura pada tahun 1962 hingga 1964. Betul² berkenaan bilangan penuntut² Malaysia yang belajar di-University Singapura sa-lama masa yang tersebut itu ada-lah seperti berikut: Tahun 1962 hingga 1963—695 orang penuntut. Tahun 1963 dan 1964—724 penuntut. Tahun 1964, 1965—705 penuntut. Kebanyakan penuntut² Malaysia yang belajar di-University Singapura itu ada-lah didalam Faculty Undang² dan Perubatan.

Sa-bagaimana Ahli² Yang Berhormat dalam Dewan ini sudah ma'alum, pada masa ini, tidak-lah ada Faculty Undang² di-University Malaya dan Faculty Perubatan pula baharu sahaja di-tubuhkan. Sa-lain daripada itu, beberapa faculty di-University Singapura belum ada lagi di-University Malaya dan sa-balek-nya. Oleh hal yang demikian, ada-lah mustahak sa-lama beberapa tahun lagi, bagi penuntut² Malaysia masuk ka-University Singapura, dan bagi

penuntut² Singapura pula masok ka-University Malaya. Tetapi walau bagaimanapun, dengan penubohan Faculty Sastera dan Faculty Perubatan di-University Malaya baharu² ini ada-lah perkembangan di-lain² jabatan yang baharu² di-jalankan, yang di-ranchangkan bagi University itu, maka ada-lah di-harapkan lebih banyak lagi tempat² dapat di-adakan di-University Malaya Kuala Lumpur, bagi penuntut² Malaysia. Dan dengan hal yang demikian, bilangan penuntut² Malaysia yang masok ka-University Singapura akan kekurangan.

Sumbangan semua-nya 12 juta ringgit yang di-bayar untuk bayaran kepada Kerajaan Singapura, itu ada-lah mengesahkan kepada Anggaran Perbelanjaan yang di-jalankan tiap² faculty itu. Mengikut perbelanjaan bagi tiap² sa-orang penuntut seperti berikut: Sastera dan Undang²—tiga ribu ringgit sa-orang sa-tahun. Sains, kejuruteraan dan pertanian—enam ribu ringgit sa-orang sa-tahun. Perubatan, termasuk pergigian dan ubatan²—lapan ribu ringgit sa-orang sa-tahun. Saya suka menerangkan di-sini, Tuan, bahawa sumbangan yang berdasarkan kepada

bayaran sa-rupa itu telah juga di-terima dari Kerajaan Singapura bagi kemudahan² yang di-berikan kepada penuntut² Singapura yang belajar di-University Malaya. Dalam tahun 1962-1963—82 orang penuntut² Singapura telah belajar di-University Malaya, 84 orang dalam tahun 1963—64 dan 76 orang dalam tahun 1964 hingga tahun 1965. Ada-lah di-chadangkan, di-gunakan untuk mendapatkan angka 12 juta ringgit itu hendak-lah di-gunakan bagi mengira sumbangan yang patut di-bayar untuk tahun 62 hingga tahun 64. Sumbangan itu sa-makin terpaksa-lah di-semak semula menurut perkembangan yang telah berlaku di-kedua buah University itu. Oleh hal yang demikian, ranchangan sedang di-susun untuk menu-bohkan sa-buah jawatan-kuasa, untuk mengkaji bayaran² itu. Dan jika perlu, membuat peratoran² bagi tahun 1965 dan tahun² yang akan datang. Tuan Speaker, saya mohon menchadangkan.

Question put and agreed to.

The sum of \$12,000,000 for Head S. 19 ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

Adjourned at 8 p.m.