

Volume II
No. 23



Wednesday
24th November, 1965

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

OFFICIAL REPORT

CONTENTS

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 3533]

BILL:

The Supply Bill, 1966 (Second Reading) [Col. 3544]

MALAYSIA

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

Official Report

Second Session of the Second Dewan Ra'ayat

Wednesday, 24th 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 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 BARIENG, P.M.N., P.D.K. (Sarawak).
- „ 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 Assistant Minister of Education, ENCHE' LEE SIOK YEW, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Sepang).

- The Honourable 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 SUM (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 HUSAIN (Lipis).
- .. ENCHE' ABDUL SAMAD BIN GUL AHMAD MIANJI (Pasir Mas Hulu).
- .. TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI MOHD. SALLEH, A.M.N., S.M.J., P.I.S. (Segamat Utara).
- .. ENCHE' ABU BAKAR BIN HAMZAH (Bachok).
- .. TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN ABDULLAH (Kelantan Hilir).
- .. ENCHE' AHMAD BIN ARSHAD, A.M.N. (Muar Utara).
- .. TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN SAAID, J.P. (Seberang Utara).
- .. CHE' AJIBAH BINTI ABOL (Sarawak).
- .. O.K.K. DATU ALIUDDIN BIN DATU HARUN, P.D.K. (Sabah).
- .. DR AWANG BIN HASSAN, S.M.J. (Muar Selatan).
- .. ENCHE' AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Muar Dalam).
- .. ENCHE' JONATHAN BANGAU ANAK RENANG, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- .. PENGARAH BANYANG ANAK JANTING, P.B.S. (Sarawak).
- .. ENCHE' CHAN 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 RANDEN *alias* DAGOK ANAK RANDAN (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).
- .. DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI ABDUL MAJID (Johor Bahru Timor).
- .. DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI HASHIM, P.M.N. (Jitra-Padang Terap).

- The Honourable 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. (Jerai).
- „ ENCHE' HARUN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Baling).
- „ WAN HASSAN BIN WAN DAUD (Tumpat).
- „ ENCHE' STANLEY HO NGUN KHIU, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN TO' MUDA HASSAN, A.M.N. (Raub).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN MOHD. NOORDIN, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Parit).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN SULAIMAN (Ulu Kelantan).
- „ TUAN HAJI HUSSAIN RAHIMI BIN HAJI SAMAN
(Kota Bharu Hulu).
- „ ENCHE' IKHWAN ZAINI (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' 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' KOW KEE SENG (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' LEE KUAN YEW (Singapore).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SECK FUN (Tanjong Malim).
- „ ENCHE' AMADEUS MATHEW LEONG, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' PETER LOH SU YIN (Sabah).
- „ DR MAHATHIR BIN MOHAMAD (Kota Star Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' T. MAHIMA SINGH, J.P. (Port Dickson).
- „ ENCHE' JOSEPH DAVID MANJAJI (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' MOHD. ARIF SALLEH, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ DATO' MOHAMED ASRI BIN HAJI MUDA, P.M.K. (Pasir Puteh).
- „ 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).
- „ 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).

- The Honourable 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).
- „ TUAN HAJI OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Hilir Perak).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Perlis Utara).
- „ TUAN HAJI RAHMAT BIN HAJI DAUD, A.M.N. (Johor Bahru Barat).
- „ ENCHE' RAMLI BIN OMAR (Krian Darat).
- „ TUAN HAJI REDZA BIN HAJI MOHD. SAID, P.J.K., J.P. (Rembau-Tampin).
- „ RAJA ROME BIN RAJA MA'AMOR, P.J.K., J.P. (Kuala Selangor).
- „ ENCHE' SANDOM ANAK NYUAK (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' SEAH TENG NGIAB, P.I.S. (Muar Pantai).
- „ ENCHE' D. R. SEENIVASAGAM (Ipoh).
- „ ENCHE' SIM BOON LIANG (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' SIOW LOONG HIN, P.J.K. (Seremban Barat).
- „ ENCHE' SENAWI BIN ISMAIL, P.J.K. (Seberang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' SNG CHIN JOO (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' SOH AH TECK (Batu Pahat).
- „ ENCHE' SULAIMAN BIN ALI (Dungun).
- „ PENGIRAN TAHIR PETRA (Sabah).
- „ ENCHE' TAJUDIN BIN ALI, P.J.K. (Larut Utara).
- „ ENCHE' TAI KUAN YANG (Kulim Bandar Bharu).
- „ ENCHE' TAMA WENG TINGGANG WAN (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' TAN CHENG BEE, J.P. (Bagan).
- „ ENCHE' TAN TOH HONG (Bukit Bintang).
- „ ENCHE' TAN TSAK YU (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' TIAN ENG BEE (Kluang Utara).
- „ ENCHE' TOH THEAM HOCK (Kampar).
- „ ENCHE' YEOH TAT BENG (Bruas).
- „ TUAN HAJI ZAKARIA BIN HAJI MOHD. TAIB, P.J.K. (Langat).

ABSENT:

- The Honourable the Prime Minister, Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Culture, Youth and Sports, Y.T.M. TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN PUTRA AL-HAJ, K.O.M. (Kuala Kedah).
- „ the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, DATO' V. T. SAMBANTHAN, P.M.N. (Sungei Siput).
- „ the Minister of Education, ENCHE' MOHAMED KHIR JOHARI (Kedah Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Labour, ENCHE' V. MANICKAVASAGAM, J.M.N., P.J.K. (Klang).
- „ the Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives, TUAN HAJI MOHD. GHAZALI BIN HAJI JAWI (Ulu Perak).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDUL KHALID BIN AWANG OSMAN, Assistant Minister (Kota Star Utara).

- The Honourable ENCHE' ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAJI TALIB, P.J.K. (Kuantan).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAUF BIN A. RAHMAN, K.M.N., P.J.K. (Krian Laut).
- „ DATO' ABDULLAH BIN ABDULRAHMAN, Dato' Bijaya di-Raja (Kuala Trengganu Selatan).
- „ Y.A.M. TUNKU ABDULLAH IBNI AL-MARHUM TUANKU ABDUL RAHMAN, P.P.T. (Rawang).
- „ 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).
- „ DR LIM CHONG EU (Tanjong).
- „ ENCHE' LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).
- „ ENCHE' LIM PEE HUNG, P.J.K. (Alor Star).
- „ DATO' DR HAJI MEGAT KHAS, D.P.M.P., J.P., P.J.K. (Kuala Kangsar).
- „ ENCHE' MOHD. ZAHIR BIN HAJI ISMAIL, J.M.N. (Sungai Patani).
- „ ENCHE' ONG KEE HUI (Sarawak).
- „ ENCHE' QUEK KAI DONG, J.P. (Seremban Timor).
- „ 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).
- „ ENCHE' STEPHEN YONG KUET TZE (Sarawak).

PRAYERS

(Mr Deputy Speaker *in the Chair*)

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

ESTABLISHMENT OF DOCK LABOUR BOARD, PENANG— PUBLICATION OF REPORT BY MR I. W. FREATHY

1. Enche' C. V. Devan Nair (Bungsar) asks the Minister of Labour if he would now publish the Report on the establishment of a Dock Labour Board at Penang submitted by Mr I. W. Freathy, ILO Expert early in 1964.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour (Enche' Lee San Choon): Mr Speaker, Sir, it is the normal practice for the ILO itself to publish the reports of its Experts. Mr Freathy's report has been sent by

him to the ILO but I am afraid that the ILO has not yet published the report.

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: If the Government, Sir, has received the report, would not the Government be able to undertake the publication of the report since it is a matter which touches a pressing problem.

Enche' Lee San Choon: Mr Speaker, Sir, as I said, it is the normal practice of the ILO to publish reports itself. So, we do according to the normal practice.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon (Batu): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, walau pun kebiasaannya ILO menerbitkan laporan itu, boleh-kah Kerajaan Pusat menerbitkan laporan itu, bagi kepada ahli² Dewan Ra'ayat ini.

Enche' Lee San Choon: Kita akan timbangkan perkara ini.

CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT— PORT OF PENANG

2. Enche' C. V. Devan Nair asks the Minister of Labour if he was aware of the hopelessly chaotic conditions of employment at Penang Port and would he accelerate consideration and implementation of the recommendations made by Mr I. W. Freathy.

Enche' Lee San Choon: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am afraid that the Honourable Member is behind time. Mr Freathy's recommendations have already been studied, and this House had during its June Session passed the Port Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act to give effect to these recommendations. The Port Labour Board, established under this Act, has already held its first meeting early this month.

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: Mr Speaker, Sir, in view of the fact that the report of the ILO Expert has not yet been published, and its actual proposals and recommendations are not in the hands of the Members of this House, it is difficult for us to say what has been implemented and what has not been implemented. Would the Government undertake to let us know what his recommendations are, so that Members of this House may decide whether, in fact, the recommendations made by Mr Freathy have been implemented.

Enche' Lee San Choon: As I said, Sir, the Act was passed basing on the recommendation of this ILO Expert and, as far as publishing of the recommendations itself, I have already answered to the question put up by the Honourable Member from Batu.

EMPLOYMENT EXCHANGE SERVICE—REORGANISATION

3. Enche' C. V. Devan Nair asks the Minister of Labour to give more details of the proposals for the reorganisations of the Employment Exchange Service which he announced at a meeting in Taiping on 28th August, 1965, and whether he had discussed his proposals with representative trade unions and employers organisations.

Enche' Lee San Choon: The proposals for reorganisation of the Employment Exchange Service, that the Minister spoke of at Taiping, related to his intention that the procedure for registration of job seekers at the Exchanges should be improved to provide for accurate details of the skills, training and educational levels of those job seekers. At present, however, we have to depend entirely on the information given by the registrants themselves. The provision of more accurate information in this respect would enable the Employment Exchange Service to be of better value to employers seeking workers and to job seekers themselves.

My Ministry is at the moment studying these procedures, and a final proposal would be discussed by the Employment Exchange Advisory Committee, on which are represented employers' and workers' organisations.

SHORT COLLECTION OF AD VALOREM REGISTRATION FEES ON MOTOR VEHICLES

4. Dr Tan Chee Khoon asks the Minister of Transport to state (a) if it is true that there was a shortage of collection of about \$9,000 in respect of *ad valorem* fees (Sales Tax) from 1964 to 1965 in respect of a firm of second-hand car dealers known as CAR MART in Jalan Pudu, Kuala Lumpur; (b) if so, how it is that such a mistake had been committed over such a long period of time; (c) whether it is true that the mistake was discovered in Alor Star in September, 1964; (d) why the same mistake was committed over and over again later; (e) the officer responsible for the collection of such fees in Kuala Lumpur and whether he has investigated this matter; if so, the results of his investigation; and (f) whether other companies are involved as well and the names of the companies that have been involved in this matter.

The Minister of Transport (Dato' Haji Sardon bin Haji Jubir): Mr Speaker, Sir, there was a short collection totalling \$17,258.00 in respect of *ad valorem* registration fees on some

second-hand vehicles registered by the Senior Registrar and Inspector of Motor Vehicles, Selangor, during 1964. The officer concerned had inadvertently misinterpreted the law governing the computation of such fees. The mistake was discovered when the file concerning one of the vehicles was transferred from the Kuala Lumpur office to the Alor Star office. When the short collection was discovered, immediate action was taken to recover the amounts short-collected, the details of which are as follows:

Name	Amount short-collected	Amount already received
Mr Lee Seng Teng	\$8,131.87	\$2,825.96
Mr Chin Yeo Loy	5,862.03	(Amount paid in full)
M/s Yong Soon & Co.	1,874.58	(Amount paid in full)
Mr P. H. Wong	746.04	(Amount paid in full)
Mr Tan Oon Chuan	655.39	(Amount paid in full)

Legal action is being taken against Lee Seng Teng to recover the full amount due from him.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, I have several supplementary questions to ask. Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Minister has not answered part (d) of my question, that is, whether it is true that the same mistake was committed over and over again after the mistake was discovered in Alor Star.

Dato' Haji Sardon: Sir, I have already replied. During the course of the year 1964, the Deputy Commissioner of Transport visited the Alor Star office, and when looking into some files, by chance, he spotted this particular file, which was transferred from Kuala Lumpur. As a result of that, investigations had been carried out; and that was how we were able to take immediate action. I think, as far as the officers are concerned, especially the Deputy Commissioner of Road Transport, he should be congratulated for his immediate action, after spotting the mistake by chance, on this question of inadvertent interpretation of the computation of fees. We have recovered all, except from this one particular person, who has still not paid the full amount

and we have to resort to whatever legal remedy for that.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Sir, the Minister has still not answered what I have sought to find out; that is, is it true that the mistake was discovered in Alor Star in September? If it is true, then is it also true that after September the same mistake was being committed here?

Dato' Haji Sardon: Sir, as far as I have been advised by the Department concerned, as soon as the mistake was discovered, an investigation was carried out to rectify everything. I have instructed the Department concerned. I did not investigate the case myself because, as a Minister, I do not do that.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Sir, in view of the fact that the Transport Department is a place where malpractices are galore and can occur, is the Minister absolutely sure?

Dato' Haji Sardon: Mr Speaker, Sir, may I make a clarification? Sir, instead of alleging malpractices and what-not, if the Honourable Member for Batu can say what things he wants me to take action or investigate, I will be very happy to do so. But to make a certain statement and later on, when it is challenged, he cannot substantiate it, that is where the difficulty lies. I am asking the co-operation of the Honourable Member for Batu: if you want me to investigate, I will do it; that is my duty as a Minister responsible to the people and to the Government.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, I did not make any allegation. I said "can occur"; I did not say "it did occur". Now, I hope the Minister does not put words into my mouth—I said "it can occur"; I did not say "it did occur". But, anyway, Mr Speaker, Sir, it is an assurance that I wish to ask from the Minister concerned. Can he assure this House that there was no, absolutely no, likelihood of collusion on the part of any of the persons concerned in this, and can he also look into this matter as to whether this "inadvertent mistake" that he talked of did not occur after September?

Dato' Haji Sardon: Mr Speaker, Sir, if only the Honourable Member for Batu did specify what month, then I will be able to trace all these investigations in detail. However, I will give an assurance to the Honourable Member for Batu that, if he is not satisfied about this and if he wants to know what are the months during which these were committed, I will certainly investigate it, and I will communicate personally to the Honourable Member, for his information. I think that is sufficient for the Honourable Member.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Terima Kaseh, Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam (Ipoh): Mr Speaker, Sir, I am glad for the assurance given by the Honourable Minister, but this matter has caused some concern. My supplementary question is this: Is the Honourable Minister aware of three motor-cars bearing these number plates—BM 4423 BM 1874 and BM 9889? Is the Honourable Minister aware that the duty paid on the first two mentioned vehicles was 80 per cent and that the duty paid and asked for in respect of the third vehicle was 60 per cent, although they were imported at one and the same time and by the same person and different duties were paid? I only wish to say at this stage that if I say something in this house, I am always ready to be challenged and to repeat it outside. If I am not, I do not say it. So, do not issue challenges, unless you are sure. In any event, I only ask this assurance from the Minister that these three cases, which I have brought up, will be investigated and put right. At this stage, that is all that I wish to ask.

Dato' Haji Sardon bin Haji Jubir: Since the numbers have been given now, Sir, I do ask for time, and if the Honourable Member for Ipoh will give his co-operation, certainly I will refer all these matters to my officer and will clarify and communicate to the Honourable Member for Ipoh.

Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam: I am obliged.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, for the Minister's information, I

too know all about these numbers. I, too, will be very grateful if, in communicating to the Honourable Member for Ipoh, the Minister will communicate to me as well (*Laughter*) because I know all about this.

KLANG COAST OMNIBUS COMPANY—PAYMENT OF ROAD TAX BY MONTHLY INSTALMENTS

5. Dr Tan Chee Khoon asks the Minister of Transport if he is aware that the K.C.O.C. i.e., Klang Coast Omnibus Company has been allowed to pay their road tax for their vehicles on a month to month basis when the minimum period for such payment is three months, and if so, to state what are the reasons for this malpractice and who is the officer responsible and whether any disciplinary action had been taken against such officer or officers.

Dato' Haji Sardon: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am aware that the Klang Coast Omnibus Company Ltd has been allowed to pay road tax for their vehicles on a month to month basis, because the company had been in financial difficulties. This is provided for in Rule 14 of the Motor Vehicles (Registration and Licensing) Rules, 1959. For the information of the Honourable Member, other bus companies which had been in financial difficulties were also granted similar concessions after they made out their case as one of the hardship cases.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, although now the Minister tells us that there is the power and although he says that this Company, K.C.O.C., has been in trouble, is it not the exception rather than the rule in his Ministry to grant exemptions of this nature because, if it is so, if such exemptions are granted widely, then it becomes an abuse of the reserve power by his Ministry?

Dato' Haji Sardon: Mr Speaker, Sir, I can assure the Honourable Member and this Honourable House that these applications on financial difficulties would be considered on their own merits and, as I said the Registrar is given this discretion, so that this discretion should be used sparingly, and

I can give an assurance to the Member that these matters have been granted after reference to the higher authorities, to the Commissioner, or even to me, to make sure that there is no hanky-panky business in this sort of matters.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, do I take it from the Minister that hanky-panky business does occur in the Department of Road Transport?

Dato' Haji Sardon: The Honourable Member for Batu always presumes and I am glad that I have got a chance here to rebut that presumption—unless it is proved to the contrary, Sir.

CHEQUES OF THE KLANG COAST OMNIBUS COMPANY DISHONoured

6. Dr Tan Chee Khoon asks the Minister of Transport if he is aware that the cheques from the K.C.O.C., i.e., Klang Coast Omnibus Company in payment for road tax for their vehicles have “bounced” time and again, and if so, to state who is the officer responsible for such practice and whether any action been taken against him and the company concerned.

Dato' Haji Sardon: Mr Speaker, Sir, on 9th June, 1965, two cheques from the Klang and Coast Omnibus Co., Ltd in payment of licence fees were dishonoured and subsequently returned by the Bank. Immediate action was taken to ask the company to make good the amount which they did on 21st June, 1965. Section 150 of the Road Traffic Ordinance provides for the Registrar or the Commissioner for Road Transport to accept cheques in payment of licence fees. The company has since been warned against tendering in cheques which it could not honour.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, if I heard the Minister correctly, he said that in June two cheques were issued by the K.C.O.C. and they were dishonoured by the Bank. The question that I wish to ask is this: Has, subsequent to that date, any cheque issued by the K.C.O.C. to the Road Transport Department been dishonoured by the Bank?

Dato' Haji Sardon: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am pleased to inform the Honourable Member for Batu that, as far as I am advised by my officer, Sir, the Company has since been warned against tendering in cheques which it could not honour and so far there is no further incident, and I think that warning has been quite effective.

NUMBER OF DETAINEES DETAINED FROM 1957 TO 1962

7. Dr Tan Chee Khoon (*under S. O. 24 (2)*) asks the Minister of Home Affairs how many detainees have been under detention from 1957 to 1962.

The Minister of Home Affairs (Dato' Dr Ismail): Mr Speaker, Sir, a total of 1,149 persons had been detained from 1957 to 1962. However, 1,143 had been released during the same period.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, is the Minister aware that amongst these people, who are still under detention, perhaps there are people who are no longer Malaysian citizens, i.e., they were taken in, I think, under Operation Cold Storage or under any other operation and they were citizens, Sir, of Singapore at that time. Is it the intention of the Government to have, as guests of his Majesty's Government, people who are not citizens of this country?

Dato' Dr Ismail: Mr Speaker, Sir, these people were arrested at that time or detained at that time for activities prejudicial to the security of the country. Now, the Honourable Member asked the number of detainees from 1957 to 1962. Now, Malaysia was formed in 1963. So, presumably, these people who were detained were not Singapore citizens then.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, although the period may be a little wrong, and I apologise to the Minister concerned, is he aware that there are detainees who are not citizens of this country and, if so, what is the intention of the Government regarding the enforced detention of these people. From the point of international law, has this Government any authority to detain anyone who is not a citizen of this

country? Should not the burden on the taxpayer be borne by the country of origin of these people?

Dato' Dr Ismail: Mr Speaker, Sir, as the Honourable Member knows, after Malaysia quite a number of detention places were designated and some of them were detained in Singapore during Malaysia time, when Singapore was part of Malaysia, and now there may be some of our citizens who are detained in Singapore and some of Singapore's citizens are detained in the Federation, by virtue of the fact, as I said just now, that during Malaysia, Singapore persons were detained at detention camps. So, my Ministry is looking into the matter now.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, will the Minister given an assurance in this House that—I won't say "harmonization"—normalization of these detainees, ours in Changi and theirs in Taiping or in Batu Gajah or Muar, will take place as soon as possible?

Dato' Dr Ismail: Sir, I cannot give that assurance because in the matter of security, we work very closely with the Singapore Government, and there is no difference on this matter of security, at least at present.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, is it a question of "birds of a feather, flock together"?

BAN ON PUBLICATIONS

8. Dr Tan Chee Khoon (*under S. O. 24 (2)*) asks the Minister of Home Affairs how many publications have been banned in Malaya, the main reasons for these publications being banned, and why is the book "The Walls has Two Sides" considered prejudicial.

Dato' Dr Ismail: Sir, 829 publications have been banned in the States of Malaya, of which 51 were banned since Merdeka. In addition, the importation of all publications issued by thirty publishing houses is prohibited. These publications have been banned on the grounds that they are prejudicial to the national interest, public order, security or morality of the Federation.

The book entitled "The Wall has Two Sides" has been deemed prejudicial on the ground that the author has given a lopsided account of the social, economic and human problems in China following a visit to that country. By doing so, he extolled communism as a solution for some of the difficulties in countries in South-East Asia, and secondly, promotes Chinese chauvinism.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, is the Minister aware that there is a large number of books arriving in this country and being displayed on the shelves of bookstalls, at least in Kuala Lumpur that I know of, that have to do with communism, with guerilla warfare, with Mao Tze Tung, I can count at least about five books on Mao Tze Tung, and I myself have bought two books on Mao Tze Tung. Now, what protection has the ordinary citizen against the likelihood of his being detained because these books are considered, or rather may be considered, prejudicial to the security of this country?

Dato' Dr Ismail: When a book is declared prejudicial, no action is taken against the person who is in possession of such a book. The only thing that happens is that the book is confiscated.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Then, Mr Speaker, Sir, is the Minister aware that one of the allegations of fact against Dr Rajakumar was that he was not in possession of such books, but that he was merely partly responsible for the introduction of books on Lenin and Marks, to the Henry Gurney Library in Malacca?

Dato' Dr Ismail: I presume those books are banned, rather than prejudicial books.

THE SUPPLY BILL, 1966

Second Reading

Order read for resumption of debate on the Question, "That the Bill be now read a second time." (23rd November, 1965).

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid (Seberang Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, menyambong ucapan saya sa-malam,

sa-bagaimana saya telah sebutkan, ia itu saya telah menarek perhatian Kerajaan supaya membuatkan dasar² atau ranchangan² untok menjadikan negara kita ini sa-bagai sa-buah negara di mana masharakat-nya ada-lah masharakat orang² pertengahan atau pun pada keselurohan-nya middle class citizen—dengan chara demokrasi memilik harta dan demokrasi memilik saham² dalam perusahaan² yang ada dalam negara kita ini.

Saya hendak berchakap di-atas Kementerian Pertanian dan saya harap Kementerian Pertanian akan bekerjasama dengan lebeh rapat lagi dengan Kementerian Perdagangan dan Perusahaan supaya dapat menjalankan tugas² bagi membela, khas-nya nasib² orang kebawahan ia-itu petani², nelayan² dan pekebun² kecil. Sa-kira-nya tidak di-buat undang² yang tegas untok memberi kawalan atau pun memberi lebeh kemudahan lagi kepada petani² menjual barang² mereka itu, memasarkan barang² mereka itu, menjual ikan dan juga buah²an sa-bagaimana kita dapati Menteri Pertanian menggalakan orang² menanam buah²an, tetapi manakala buah²an itu bertimbun² banyak-nya hendak di-jual pun tidak laku di-pasar. Kerana Kementerian Perdagangan dan Perusahaan membenarkan masok buah²an daripada luar negeri. Jadi saya harap-lah supaya ada satu saling pengertian di-antara kedua² buah Kementerian ini.

Saya tertarek hati di-atas ranchangan Kementerian ini hendak mengadakan satu undang² mengenai persatuan² peladang. Saya di-beritahu dua orang pakar daripada Taiwan sedang berada di-dalam negara ini untok membuat undang² dan ranchangan² yang menasabah dan pratik bagi memperbaiki kehidupan peladang² sakalian. Saya berharap manakala undang² ini siap, peladang² dapat menjalankan tugas-nya masing² bagi memperbaiki kehidupan mereka itu.

Mengenai nasib nelayan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pehak Kementerian Pertanian sudah pun membuat satu undang² menyekat pukut harimau yang kurang daripada 50 tan berat perahu atau kapal yang berusaha dengan pukut

harimau atau pukut tunda ini. Tetapi malang-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pengawal², khas-nya Polis Laut ia-itu Marine Police, konon-nya tidak chukup boat² marine. Jadi, saya sangat-lah dukachita di-atas perkara ini. Kerana, sa-bagaimana saya sebutkan pada mula ucapan saya sa-malam, di mana dudok-nya dedicated Government Officers? Ada orang² yang tidak menjalankan tanggung-jawab dengan sa-penoh-nya. Saya berani berkata demikian kerana pada satu masa sa-orang Wakil Majlis Undangan Negeri Perak masok bersama² di-dalam Marine Police Boat dan dalam tempoh tiga jam sahaja Wakil Undangan Negeri Perak itu dapat menangkap 5 buah kapal atau perahu pukut harimau dalam tempoh sa-singkat² masa. Jumlah yang ada pukut² harimau dalam Pulau Pinang dan Pulau Pangkor lebeh kurang 100 buah. Kalau Wakil Ra'ayat boleh menjalankan tugas menangkap tiap² kali sa-banyak 5 buah, saya nampak tidak ada soal jawab lagi bahawa pehak Marine Police, jika menjalankan tugas dengan sa-penoh-nya, dapat menangkap perahu² yang menjalankan perusahaan dengan chara haram dan membahayakan—mengancham kehidupan nelayan² yang di-tepi pantai—4 kali telah berlaku rusohan—pergadohan—di-dalam laut. Saya sangat dukachita atas perkara ini. Saya harap pehak Kementerian dan pehak Pengawal mengambil langkah yang chergas menangkap orang² ini supaya terselamat nasib nelayan² yang di-tepi pantai itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya boleh katakan tiap² tahun saya telah merayu kepada Menteri Buroh supaya Pejabat Pendaftaran Buroh yang ada di-seluruh Malaysia ini di-jadikan sa-buah pejabat yang memberi jaminan penoh kepada pendaftar² atau pun peminta² kerja. Tiap² kali saya bawa perkara ini, di-beri jawapan, dan sa-hingga hari ini saya menegaskan sa-kali lagi, tidak ada guna-nya Kerajaan mengadakan Pejabat Pendaftaran Buroh di-Pejabat² Buroh di-seluruh Malaysia ini jika tidak boleh memberi peluang dengan lebeh luas lagi kepada mereka itu mendapatkan kerja. Chuma Pejabat² Kerajaan sahaja yang mengutamakan

Pejabat Pendaftaran Buroh. Dalam Butterworth, di-tempat saya, 6,000 orang yang mendaftarkan nama pada hetong panjang dalam sa-tahun sabanyak 30 orang sahaja yang Pejabat² Kerajaan mengambil buroh. Jadi apakah nasib orang² yang 5,970 orang itu? Kerana satu undang² yang tegas tidak ada. Patut Kementerian ini membuat satu undang² memaksa semua majikan², bukan sahaja Kerajaan, mengambil buroh² melalui Pejabat Pendaftaran Buroh. Apabila undang² ini ada, dan di-jalankan kuat-kuasa-nya, baharu-lah kesulitan mengenai penganggoran ini dapat di-selesaikan sedikit demi sedikit. Kerana dengan chara ini dapat-lah sakalian warganegara kita yang ada berbilang bangsa di-ambil bekerja berkhidmat dalam sa-buah kilang perusahaan dengan sachara berchampur gaul—30% orang Melayu, 20% orang India dan 30% orang China dan lain², dalam satu perusahaan yang besar supaya dapat mereka ini bergaul di-antara satu dengan lain, dapat satu persefahaman supaya perpaduan di-antara ra'ayat akan dapat baik lagi. Jadi sa-lagi undang² ini tidak ada, saya akan berchakap lagi. Saya harap Menteri Yang Berhormat akan mengambil perhatian di-atas perkara ini. Jikalau tidak boleh di-jalankan kepada kesemua-nya, saya minta tiga pejabat dahulu di-jalankan yang mana tiga pejabat ini ada-lah di-bawah kuasa Kerajaan ia-itu Lembaga Letrik Kebangsaan dan yang kedua P.P.C., Pelabohan Pulau Pinang, dan yang ketiga pejabat Keretapi. Ini yang Kerajaan ada suara, Kerajaan boleh memaksa majikan² dan jabatan² mengambil buroh melalui Pejabat Pendaftaran Buroh. Saya dapat rungutan daripada pekerja² oleh sebab tidak ada-nya satu undang² menghadkan sa-kurang²-nya berapa banyak-kah gaji yang patut di-beri kepada sa-orang pekerja, maka di-dapati beberapa banyak majikan telah menggunakan peluang ini membayar gaji dengan chukup rendah, dengan tidak sa-patunya dalam tempat perusahaan yang akan di-adakan lagi, yang sudah di-adakan, dalam pengalaman saya sendiri, oleh kerana pemuda² di-kampung tidak ada kerja, maka di-

gunakan peluang ini untuk memberi pekerjaan, pekerja² kepada pemuda² yang menganggor dan memberikan satu hari bekerja 8 jam \$60, \$55 atau \$70 sa-bulan. Jadi dengan ini bagaimana-kah boleh dapat jaminan memberi sara hidup kepada sa-orang pemuda dengan keluarga-nya, dengan isteri dan anak-nya. Saya harap pehak Kementerian akan mengkajikan perkara ini, membuat satu undang² sa-kurang² gaji yang patut di-beri kepada sa-saorang buroh ia-lah sa-banyak \$30, mithal-nya, minta ma'af, sa-banyak \$3 sa-hari yang boleh menjamin kehidupan-nya; dan siapa juga majikan yang tiada mengikuti undang² ini, di-laksanakan satu tindakan kekerasan kapadanya.

Bersabit dengan perkara mogok, kita selalu-lah dapat perkara ini berlaku. Saya mendatangkan satu shor kepada Kerajaan untuk menjauhkan atau pun mengurangkan daripada perkara kejadian mogok ini. Sa-bagaimana yang saya ingat, Surohanjaya Pengkaji Bagi Gaji atau tangga gaji bagi kakitangan Kerajaan mula-nya pada tahun 1947 yang di-namakan Trusted Scheme, yang kedua barangkali dalam tahun 1952 Cowgill Scheme, dan sa-hingga hari ini belum ada lagi satu Surohanjaya Pengkaji tangga gaji kakitangan Kerajaan. Saya berharap Kerajaan akan membentok sa-buah Surohanjaya Pengkaji Tangga Gaji bagi jawatan² yang berkhidmat dalam jabatan² Kerajaan dengan berdasarkan kepada Unit System, kata-lah serendah² Unit, \$10. Sa-orang pekerja Budak Pejabat, mithal-nya, di-beri 9 unit tangga gaji yang mula ia-itu \$90 pada keselurohan-nya berdasarkan kepada unit di-timbangan di-atas kelulusan dan kelayakan mereka itu. Sa-kira-nya di-kehendaki pada satu masa menaikkan gaji mereka itu, di-naikkan sa-chara unit, sa-tengah unit \$5 keselurohan-nya, kata-lah daripada tingkatan bawah sa-hingga kaatas. Dengan chara ini, saya ingat, dapat mengurangkan bahaya pemogokan daripada kakitangan Kerajaan dan juga daripada pekerja² yang di-luar daripada jabatan² Kerajaan. Sa-kira-nya penyata Surohanjaya ini di-terima, boleh-lah di-mulakan tangga gaji itu kepada ahli² yang baharu berkhidmat

dengan Kerajaan. Orang yang lama itu biarkan-lah mereka terima tangga gaji yang sekarang. Insha Allah, dalam dua puluh tahun lagi manakala orang yang lama itu sudah bersara, baharu-lah kita dapat mententeramkan kedudukan kakitangan Kerajaan yang bekerja dengan Kerajaan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ingin berchakap di-atas Kementerian Perdagangan dan Perusahaan. Bagaimana saya sebutkan, Kementerian ini dapat menjalankan satu dasar dengan membuat undang² supaya membolehkan banyak daripada warganegara yang mampu boleh memilik saham dalam perusahaan² yang akan di-dirikan dalam Malaysia ini. Mengenai taraf perintis, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya harap Kementerian ini akan kaji sama, sama ada ranchangan ini atau dasar ini baik atau tidak. Pada pendapat saya taraf perintis yang dijalankan pada masa sekarang ini tidak begitu memuaskan. Kerana, mithal-nya, sa-buah kilang gula ia-itu memperbaiki mutu gula—refinery—di-Prai yang ada sekarang ini. Jadi kita bawa masuk gula No. 2 daripada luar negeri dan kita baiki mutu gula itu menjadi sa-bagai gula No. 1. Saya fikir lebeh baik kita usahakan menanam tebu dahulu, bahan-nya itu dahulu. Saya dengar penerangan Yang Berhormat sa-masa beliau berada dalam majlis membuka rasmi kilang gula di-Prai ia-itu Kerajaan mengadakan dan melancarkan dasar taraf perintis dengan mengadakan refinery dahulu di-samping itu menggalakkan orang² kampung menanam tebu, tetapi sa-hingga hari ini saya tidak ada dengar tanaman tebu yang luas yang di-kehendaki sa-kurang²-nya 20,000 ekar baharu dapat memberi gula No. 2 kepada refinery. Saya harap Kerajaan akan mengkaji sa-mula di-atas perkara ini, biar-lah kita tanam tebu atau bahan² itu dahulu sa-belum di-adakan “refinery”. Banyak sungutan daripada ra’ayat mengatakan gula daripada “refinery” tidak begitu manis, konon-nya, tetapi gula yang dimasukkan daripada luar negeri manis dan murah pula. Ini satu perkara yang saya harap mendapat perhatian.

Mengenai taraf perintis ini juga biar-lah Kementerian ini membuat satu

undang², siapa juga yang hendak menanamkan modal dalam negara kita ini, mesti-lah menubuhkan satu Public Company yang modal-nya mengikut berapa banyak orang ramai boleh membeli saham, jangan-lah di-hadkan serendah²-nya saham unit itu \$500 kerana orang² yang kebawahan ini tidak mampu, biar-lah di-rendahkan lagi sa-banyak \$100 satu saham supaya dapat banyak lagi orang memiliki saham² ini. Saya tarek perhatian supaya di-adakan satu undang² memberi peluang kepada pekerja² daripada kilang² perusahaan itu sendiri membeli saham, mesti-lah di-untokkan kepada mereka sa-kurang²-nya 25% daripada saham² itu di-khaskan kepada pekerja² yang bekerja di-kilang itu dengan chara bayaran beransor. Dalam sa-tahun, kalau mereka berkehendakkan \$100 mithal-nya, tiap² bulan \$10 di-potong daripada gaji-nya. Sa-puluh bulan ia dapat satu certificate, satu sijil, yang dia telah memiliki saham daripada kilang itu sa-banyak \$100 dan dia akan berasa bangga bahawa dia bekerja dalam kilang-nya sendiri dan dia berasa kalau dia berkhidmat pun dia boleh dapat untong daripada perusahaan itu dan dia akan dapat jaminan kerja-nya dan juga kerja yang memuaskan kerana dia bekerja di-dalam kilang-nya.

Bagini-lah chara-nya di-jalankan di-negeri Jepun dan telah mendapat sambutan yang baik dan mengeluarkan beberapa banyak barang² perusahaan sa-hingga penoh dalam pasar² di-dunia ini. Saya harap Yang Berhormat Menteri akan mengambil perhatian di-atas shor² saya itu mudahan² dapat banyak lagi ra’ayat jelata memiliki saham² dalam perusahaan² yang akan di-dirikan di-dalam negara kita ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada masa sekarang ini, kita lihat pasaran atau kemasokan barang² terlampau bebas, boleh di-masokkan barang² siap saperti radio, peti sejok, peti ice, television, motokar, motor cycle dan lain²-nya. Saya harap Kerajaan akan membuat satu sekatan barang siap radio, television, motokar, motor cycle, peti ice dan lain² tidak boleh di-masokkan. Kerajaan mesti membuat satu dasar barang siapa yang hendak berniaga mesti-lah membena “assembly plant”—kilang

pemasangan—dalam negara kita ini, di-bawa parts atau alat² untuk memasang menjadikan sa-buah radio, menjadikan sa-buah peti ice, menjadikan sa-buah television. Dengan chara ini dapat-lah banyak orang² yang tidak ada kerja masuk bekerja dalam kilang² “assembly plant”. Dengan chara yang sa-macam ini dapat Kerajaan menyekat kemasokan barang² yang siap dan dapat mengadakan beberapa banyak lagi “assembly plant” dan barang² yang boleh di-buat oleh kita di-sini tidak boleh di-masokkan. Biar kita buat barang di-sini, parts atau bahagian² yang boleh di-buat di-sini kita buat di-sini dan pasang, lengkapkan jadi sa-buah television, sa-buah radio, sa-buah motokar dan lain² dengan dapat kita memajukan ka-arrah ini pada masa yang sa-singkat²-nya, dapat-lah kita berdiri di-atas kaki kita sendiri untuk mengeluarkan apa juga barang² penggunaan untuk di-pasarkan ka-negeri² lain.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya dengar sharahan mengenai keselamatan jalan raya dalam television, surat² khabar dan radio mengenai beberapa banyak orang² yang dapat kemalangan jalan raya. 80% daripada orang yang mendapat kemalangan itu ia-lah di-Ibu Kota ini. Saya berharap pehak Kementerian ini akan menambahkan peruntokan mengenai penyelenggaraan Majlis Keselamatan Jalan Raya. Kerana ada sa-buah Jabatan pusat dan sa-buah Majlis—Road Safety Council—di-tiap² negeri. Peruntokan yang di-adakan chuma \$20,000 sahaja. Ada-kah memadai? Bagaimana-kah dapat Majlis² ini menjalankan tugas² jika peruntokan tidak ada! Dan saya harap dapat tambah lagi peruntokan kepada Majlis Keselamatan Jalan Raya ini dan dapat-lah Majlis² itu menambahkan daya upaya-nya untuk memperbaiki dan menolong Kerajaan mengurangkan kejadian kemalangan² di-jalan raya ini. Saya berharap-lah kepada Yang Berhormat Menteri Pengangkutan tolong ambil perhatian.

Mengenai pengangkutan di-luar bandar, saya tertarek hati manakala waktu saya berada di-Bangkok. Saya lihat roda tiga berjin yang di-guna-

kan untuk menarek atau pun di-sewa oleh penumpang². Saya berharap Yang Berhormat Menteri Pengangkutan akan mengeluarkan lesen bagi kereta roda tiga yang berjin ini, khas-nya kepada MARA, dan tidak siapa lain daripada MARA untuk mengadakan permit menjalankan teksi berjin roda tiga ini untuk perkhidmatan di-luar bandar dan barang siapa yang hendak meminta lesen, biar-lah mereka itu meminta kepada MARA untuk menjalankan teksi roda tiga di-luar bandar bagi penghidupan diri-nya sendiri. Mengenai pengangkutan dalam bandar, kita biarkan-lah bagitu, kerana kita ada banyak teksi² roda tiga yang tidak berjin, teksi² motokar yang ada dalam bandar. Dan saya harap dapat Menteri Yang Berhormat memikirkan sama ada baik atau tidak baik-nya melesenkan teksi roda tiga berjin sa-bagaimana yang di-jalankan di-Bangkok dan lain² negeri dengan maju-nya. Dan dengan chara ini MARA menjadi sa-bagai ejen mengimportkan teksi² ini dengan tidak di-benar lain daripada MARA menjadi ejen mengimportkan. Lesen ini dapat-lah di-kajikan oleh Jawatan-kuasa Pembangunan Luar Bandar—mihal-nya siapa yang patut menerima lesen² menchari kehidupan mereka itu sendiri.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, mengenai pengangkutan ini juga, kita tidak ada satu peratoran yang tegas, mengenai orang yang sudah ada permit, sudah ada lorry. Sa-buah Sharikat sudah ada 80 lorry Permit A, sa-buah Sharikat ada 20 lorry Permit A, sa-buah Sharikat ada 5 lorry Permit A dan manakala tidak chukup, di-benarkan mereka itu tambah lagi, empat tambah dua tambah tiga. Jadi bila-kah peluang orang yang tidak dapat lorry mendapatkan lorry Permit A? Saya harap Kementerian ini mengkaji sa-mula dengan sa-dalam², bukan hendak rampas balek—sekat orang yang ada itu chukup-lah, memadai-lah, jalankan-lah perusahaan mereka itu, bagi-lah peluang kepada orang yang belum ada.

Perkhidmatan bas bagitu juga. Satu jalan raya daripada, kata-lah, Kuala Lumpur pergi ka-Butterworth. Sapuluh tahun dahulu, chuma dua bas

boleh jalan chukup untuk memberi peluang kepada penumpang² daripada Butterworth ka-Kuala Lumpur dan Kuala Lumpur ka-Butterworth, manakala ramai penduduk-nya, banyak penumpang, tentu-lah di-kehendaki tambah pengangkutan perkhidmatan bas, tetapi kepada siapa yang di-beri? Kepada orang² yang asal di-beri. Kerana apa di-beri kepada orang yang asal? Ini satu tanda tanya.

Saya harap Kementerian ini tolong ambil perhatian—orang itu sudah ada chukup permit-nya jalan dua buah kalau di-kehendaki perkhidmatan lagi serahkan kepada MARA. Biar MARA menjalankan, dan MARA akan mengishtiharkan siapa juga bumiputra yang ingin mengambil bahagian dalam perkhidmatan bas beli saham, buat Sharikat. Semua jalan² baharu beri kepada MARA dahulu. Dan dengan chara ini dapat-lah orang yang tidak ada modal besar, mengumpulkan modal mereka itu masok dalam perkhidmatan² yang akan mendatangkan faedah dan untong kepada mereka itu.

Mr Speaker: Panjang lagi?

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid: Saya akan chuba pendekkan.

Mr Speaker: Saya harap Yang Berhormat beri-lah peluang kepada Ahli² yang lain berchakap. Ada ramai lagi Ahli² yang hendak berchakap.

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid: Sadikit lagi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dan saya lihat yang sa-tengah-nya itu sudah ada lori permit di-tambah trailer pula lagi, bukan main bahaya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Saya harap Yang Berhormat Menteri tolong permit trailer yang selalu mengganggu sa-hingga anak saya kena belah perut kerana melanggar trailer.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya pendekkan-lah. Saya menarek perhatian Yang Berhormat Menteri Kesihatan ia-itu kita selalu dengar laporan banyak orang terlantar jatuh kerana darah tinggi. Ini penyakit yang selalu menjadi². Jika satu penyiasat dapat di-buat mengenai penyakit T.B., di-adakan satu van khas pergi di-luar² bandar untuk menjalankan perkhidmatan ini, saya

harap Kementerian yang berkenaan akan mengambil satu langkah ia-itu dites (test) ada-kah darah mereka itu tinggi atau tidak; jika di-dapati tinggi dapat di-beri ubat dengan serta-merta dan dapat menyelamatkan orang itu. Banyak kita dapati orang² yang dapat sakit darah tinggi ini sa-hingga lumpoh, hilang fikiran, lumpoh sa-belah badan, boleh dapat kita kawal penyakit ini jika di-adakan satu kempen sachara besar²an. Bawa orang ini yang suka hendak test darah-nya tinggi atau rendah, boleh kita beri ubat yang boleh menyekat penyakit-nya.

Mengenai kekurangan doktor, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya sa-kali lagi merayu kepada Yang Berhormat Menteri—kaji-lah, sa-bagaimana satu ranchangan yang di-jalankan di-negeri Ceylon ia-itu satu perkhidmatan yang di-namakan “apothecaries”, sama-lah perkhidmatan-nya dengan Pembantu² Rumah Sakit (Hospital Assistants). Orang ini yang sudah berkhidmat salama 20 tahun, Kerajaan Ceylon member i keutamaan kepada mereka itu memberi licentiate medical officer untuk berkhidmat kepada Kerajaan. Saya harap Kementerian ini akan mengkaji bagaimana yang di-jalankan di-Ceylon di-beri licentiate medical officer kepada Pembantu² Rumah Sakit yang telah pun ada pengalaman yang chukup, dan chekap. Dengan chara ini dapat kita mengurangkan kerumitan mengenai kekurangan doktor. Sa-kiranya tidak dapat kita buat chara ini, sampai bila pun kekurangan doktor tidak akan dapat kita selesaikan. Saya harap Pembantu Rumah Sakit ini di-ambil banyak lagi daripada yang ada sekarang ini, kerana Pembantu Rumah Sakit ini sangat mustahak latehan di-beri sa-luas²-nya kepada mereka itu. Mereka ini memainkan satu peranan yang penting sekarang. Di-mana ada kekurangan doktor mereka-lah menggantikan tempat doktor itu melayan orang² sakit di-luar bandar.

Mengenai bantuan kepada kemalangan di-sebabkan oleh banjir, ribut dan kebakaran, saya harap Menteri Kebajikan ‘Am akan membuat satu peruntokan—reserve fund—bagi tiap² buah negeri untuk memberi bantuan

dengan serta-merta kepada orang² yang terlibat dalam kemalangan ini. Kerana baharu² ini, di-tempat saya sendiri, telah berlaku bah besar dan kita tidak dapat, dengan serta-merta, mengeluarkan wang untuk membantu orang² kemalangan ini. Sa-kira-nya ada wang peruntukan khas dalam tiap² negeri, dapat-lah daerah² mengambil wang itu dan menggunakan dengan serta-merta membeli beras, ikan, kopi dan lain² untuk bantuan sementara kepada mereka itu sebanyak 1,000 orang lebeh yang terlibat dalam banjir yang berlaku di-Utara Seberang Prai.

Satu masa dahulu, saya telah pun menhadang atau mengshorkan mengenai kerumitan penompang² di-tanah orang. Saya harap Menteri Kerajaan Tempatan dan Perumahan akan memikirkan supaya mengadakan sa-buah badan yang di-katakan squatters arbitration tribunal untuk menyelesaikan perselisihan di-antara penompang² di-tanah orang yang hendak membena atau memajukan tanah itu. Sa-kira-nya tidak ada squatters arbitration tribunal atau orang tengah untuk menyelesaikan perkara itu, selalu berbangkit masalah pergaduhan di-antara orang² ini.

Akhir-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berharap-lah kepada Kerajaan menimbangkan di-atas pendapat² saya yang mana saya fikirkan tidak ada jalan lain untuk memberi kepuasan hati kepada keseluruhan ra'ayat dalam negara ini melainkan mesti-lah kita membuat dasar atau ranchangan² yang menuju ka-arah matlamat membena sa-buah masyarakat orang² pertengahan atau pun masyarakat orang middle class. Jika kita tidak dapat menchiptakan tujuan ini, maka keselamatan negara, dan beberapa banyak lagi bahaya², akan berlaku. Kita tidak-lah suka melihat bagaimana negeri² yang lain menderita oleh kerana jurang di-antara orang yang ada dengan orang yang tidak ada itu terlampau jauh. Kita mesti-lah berikhtiar mendekatkan supaya keseluruhan ra'ayat menjadi orang² pertengahan atau masyarakat pertengahan dalam negara ini. Terima kasih.

Enche' Abdul Ghani bin Ishak (Melaka Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka mengambil peluang berchakap dalam hal Belanjawan pada tahun yang akan datang ini. Sa-telah mengikut daripada mula Anggaran Belanjawan ini di-bahathkan sa-hingga-lah pada pagi ini, pada saya dan pada penduduk² dalam kawasan Melaka Utara, anggaran yang paling menasabah, saya rasa, ada-lah telah dikemukakan oleh pehak Kementerian yang sama² kita dengar dan yang sama² kita perbahathkan sekarang ini. Walau bagaimana pun, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam hal² yang kita sedang lihat di-negeri ini, maseh lagi kita mendapati atau pun mendengar ada lagi suara² yang suka barangkali memesonkan atau mengalehkan pandangan² sa-benar oleh ra'ayat dalam Malaysia ini kepada perkara² yang tidak menasabah.

Saya suka berchakap dahulu perkara yang saya tidak setuju dengan pendapat² yang di-keluarkan, terutama sekali oleh sahabat² saya pehak Pembangkang. Saya bukan-lah orang yang tidak suka mendengar kechaman atau pun yang tidak suka mendengar fikiran² orang sa-belah sana, kerana dalam masalah ini hendak-lah kita teliti dengan sa-sungguh-nya dan tidak-lah sampai satu masa kita membuat tuduhan atau pun membuat kechaman² atau analisa perkara² yang barangkali di-ketawakan oleh ra'ayat sendiri yang sekarang sedang meneliti atau pun memerhati juga hal² perkembangan negara. Saya mengambil mithalan sa-bagai yang di-ucapkan oleh sahabat saya, mithal-nya dari Bachok, kadang² merayu sa-telah mengatakan ranchangan Kerajaan Perikatan, mengatakan Ranchangan F.L.D.A. mula² dia mengatakan gagal, tetapi istilah gagal apabila di-tanya oleh Menteri, dia mengubah pula perkara itu tidak chukup, tetapi dalam pandangan saya hal² yang di-suarakan oleh sahabat saya itu ada-lah jauh daripada sa-bagaimana yang betul yang ada terjadi atau pun yang sedang di-nikmat oleh ra'ayat di-luar bandar.

Mithal-nya, Ranchangan F.L.D.A. mula² dahulu, surat yang mula kita

dengar bahawa ranchangan ini ada-lah sa-olah² menghambakan ra'ayat, atau menghambakan orang kampung menjadi kuli Kerajaan, masok dalam ranchangan² yang ta' tentu arah hujung dan pangkal, tetapi hari ini, saya kalau Yang Berhormat dari Bachok itu suka mengikuti dalam masa saya melawat dalam kawasan saya, atau pun dalam tempat² Ranchangan F.L.D.A., mithal-nya, di-Melaka, mithal-nya kalau kita pergi ka-Kemendor, atau pun Telok Menggong yang sekarang telah mula di-toreh getah² daripada Ranchangan F.L.D.A. itu. Mula² dahulu datang-lah banyak daripada pehak² orang yang menyertai, atau pun yang masok, peserta itu pun mengadu hal itu dan ini, hal kepichekan mereka, hal kesusahan mereka untok membuka ranchangan yang sangat baik pada pandangan Kerajaan Perikatan kita. Jadi, pada masa sekarang ini lain keadaan-nya. Saya suka mengatakan pada musim buah²an yang telah lalu, saya sendiri rasa² malu hendak menengok dalam kawasan itu, bukan kerana takut datang, atau pun ta' mahu melawat, kerana atas shukor, atas nekmata yang telah di-dapati sa-telah mereka berkorban, atau pun sa-telah mereka meneroka enam atau tujuh tahun mereka mendapat hasil dan kadang² motokar kita penoh dengan rambutan yang longkah yang di-tanam, atau di-buat daripada tempat² yang saya katakan tadi. Ini sangat-lah berlawanan sa-kali dengan keadaan yang sa-benar yang ada di-Kelantan. Saya terpaksa berchakap, kerana saya meneliti daripada wakil PAS, baik daripada Kelantan Hilir, mahu pun daripada Bachok dan di-tambah pula tiga jam lebeh kurang oleh wakil dari Pasir Puteh, maka terpaksa-lah saya berchakap.

Ra'ayat sekarang ini bukan-lah berkejar² hendak mengalehkan pendapat mereka umpama macham gila burong tekukor. Jadi, ma'ana-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, burong tekukor yang sa-tengah orang ada gila hendak menangkap burong ini, sa-rupa-lah juga mendengar hendak bekerja pagi dan petang, kadang² pergi memikat burong ini hendak mendapat hanya suara yang manis, suara yang lemak, pada hal apa

yang hendak di-dapati daripada suara burong tekukor yang kita bela, atau pelihara, kadang² bukan memainkan lagi keadaan sa-saorang yang gilakan burong tekukor ini, hilang perasaan-nya hendak menangkap atas urusan rumah tangga, kerana apa yang di-paparkan oleh Yang Berhormat wakil dari Pasir Puteh mengatakan bahawa ranchangan kita, atau pun ranchangan Perikatan, atau pun keadaan ekonomi Perikatan, sangat-lah tidak sesuai dengan keadaan, dengan apa yang di-fikirkan, atau apa yang di-chakapkan-nya pada hari samalam. Saya pada hari ini, sa-telah pergi jalan ka-Kelantan, saya menengok, kalau ya benar-lah apabila wakil² daripada PAS ini berchakap hendak berkorban, hendak berjuang untok bumiputera, untok bangsa Melayu, tetapi sampai hari ini, saya tengok tidak ada langsung apa yang di-perbuat oleh Kerajaan Kelantan sendiri sa-telah mendapat mandat.

Pada tahun 1959 dahulu, 28 daripada 30 kerusi dia menang dan boleh menchorakkan apa sahaja warna, apa sahaja dasar yang boleh di-dayakan, atau terdaya oleh sa-buah negeri yang hendak memberi kemajuan kepada ra'ayat dalam negeri itu. Tetapi apa yang dia buat? Saya apabila balek membandingkan dengan hal keadaan negeri saya di-Melaka mithal-nya Melaka ada luas-nya 720 batu persegi. 720 batu persegi kalau kita jadikan ekar, lebeh kurang ekar-nya sa-banyak 460,800 ekar, tetapi dengan apa yang di-buat oleh Kerajaan PAS yang saya dengar, barangkali memang perkara ini betul, dan saya harus barangkali dapat juga mengatakan benda ini memang betul, sebab 510,000 ekar yang subur, yang banyak hasil, yang boleh di-katakan emas, atau pun intan di-Ulu Kelantan itu di-beri kepada orang yang bukan bumiputera. Jadi, macham mana-kah keadaan yang sa-benar-nya di-uchapkan oleh wakil² ini dan bagaimana pula mereka menudoh bahawa Kerajaan Perikatan sa-belah sini tidak pula membuat kerja untok kepentingan bagi pehak orang² Melayu, atau pun bumiputera yang di-maksudkan dalam ucapan itu.

Saya sungguh dukachita, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kerana dalam hal

rancangan Kemajuan Luar Bandar di-Kelantan, Kelantan sendiri patut mengaku bagi pehak kita Perikatan telah mendirikan itu dan ini berbagai² hal sa-hingga masjid pun, walau pun kami Perikatan yang dahulu di-tudoh bahawa orang yang tidak kuat berjuang dalam hal ugama, tetapi masjid di-Kota Bharu—Masjid Mahmudi yang di-Kota Bharu itu—kalau tidaklah di-bantu oleh Kerajaan Perikatan sa-banyak \$100,000 haruslah saudara² saya di-sana sembahyang di-kaki² lima, atau pun hampir barangkail dekat² tandas yang ada di-Kota Bharu itu

Enche' Abdul Samad bin Gul Ahmad Mianji (Pasir Mas Hulu): Untok penjelasan.

Enche' Abdul Ghani bin Ishak: Tuan boleh berchakap kemudian-lah! Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dengan keadaan ini, saya rasa, kalau di-ikuti apa yang di-fikirkan, atau yang di-katakan oleh pehak parti Pembangkang sana, saya tidak nampak apa benda yang patut di-ambil pertimbangan untok hendak di-selarikan dengan keadaan negara kita ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam masa-lah ini, chuba-lah kita fikir, umpamanya gadai tanah yang 510,000 ekar ini di-Ulu Kelantan ini sa-lama 33 tahun, kemudian ra'ayat Kelantan sendiri—saya tahu apabila saya lalu masa saya hendak pergi ka-Kota Bharu, saya lalu Temerloh, ada orang Kelantan yang dalam Rancangan Tanah Temerloh. Kemudian saya masuk lagi tempat lain, ka-Kuala Lipis, ada orang Kelantan lagi masuk bagi meminta tanah di-jajahan Lipis, tetapi di-negeri Kelantan sendiri—di-Kelantan sendiri—Kerajaan PAS yang mengatakan hendak berjuang sunggoh², hendak memberi keutamaan kepada bumiputera, kepada bumiputera, kepada orang Melayu, ini bolehlah kita tafsirkan sekarang apa yang di-sebutkan oleh wakil² daripada pehak PAS itu, umpama ra'ayat mengharap bunyi sahaja burong tekukor ia-lah lunak dan, barangkali nyaring, atau sa-bagai-nya, tetapi hasil-nya hampa sama sa-kali.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kemudian dalam masa-lah rancangan yang akan di-buat oleh pehak Perikatan kita sa-telah menubuhkan F.L.D.A., rancangan² tanah yang lain, kemudian akan di-laksanakan dalam Rancangan F.L.D.A., makin-lah mereka ini meletakkan ragu², atau pun menudoh kepada pehak kita ini tidak akan berjaya pada masa akan datang, tetapi kepada saya segala ucapan² segala fikiran yang di-keluarkan oleh sahabat saya daripada pehak Pembangkang ini terasa bahawa mereka-lah sendiri yang takut rancangan ini berjaya kerana dalam masa² yang akan datang, kita tidak lagi dapat hendak menahan, atau pun menyekat jalan fikiran ra'ayat kita sa-telah melihat keadaan yang sa-benar terjadi kiri dan kanan, sa-belah-menyebelah, atau pun di-tempat² di-negeri kita ini sa-bagaimana yang di-jalankan sekarang.

Berpaling saya kepada mengatakan wakil daripada Kelantan Hilir, atau pun wakil daripada Bachok mengatakan bahawa sudah-kah sekarang ini bagi pehak ra'ayat di-luar bandar, atau pun orang² ramai yang dudok di-luar bandar ini, dengan rancangan kemajuan luar bandar ini, sudah pun boleh dapat makan kiju, atau lain—ini saya rasa tentu-lah bagi pehak yang chara mereka berfikir macham mana, saya rasa tentu-lah bagi pehak chara mereka berfikir macham ini, saya rasa tentu-lah tidak dapat kita mengikut, atau pun hendak memberi ucapan tahniah kepada-nya, walau pun nampak dia hendak kemas dari ucapan-nya itu sa-olah² mereka ini berjuang betul² dengan orang² ramai, sedangkan apa yang di-lihat, atau di-rasa oleh ra'ayat di-luar bandar sekarang ini saya rasa terang pada pehak kita. Kalau pun, mithal-nya, rancangan Kerajaan hendak membantu atau hendak menaikkan taraf hidup orang di-luar bandar ini belum sampai kepada peringkat yang betul², yang kita kehendak, memang bagi pehak kita pun mengaku. Tetapi perubahan—process perubahan ini sedang berjalan dengan baik. Kalau mithal-nya—kata-lah saya bawa cherita—umpama sa-buah keluarga yang

pendapatan-nya kata-lah \$100 sa-bulan sa-belum merdeka, dan sekarang pun kata-lah dapat \$100 juga lebeh kurang. Tetapi, keadaan sa-belum merdeka dengan sa-sudah merdeka ini, saya rasa lain sadikit. Kalau dahulu pendapatan yang \$100 sa-bulan itu—ibu bapa terpaksa menampong sa-bahagian daripada-nya, hendak membiayai anak², melanjutkan pelajaran—nun jauh—memakai belanja, tambang dan lain² yang terpaksa bercheking untok hidup. Kemudian yang lain² juga, umpama hal² kesehatan—kalau dahulu, tiap² keluarga yang miskin itu terpaksa hendak mendapat rawatan itu jauh, terpaksa pergi—kadang² mereka tinggal, tidak-lah terubat di-tempat masing² kerana hendak mendapatkan hospital atau kelinik atau lain² yang jauh. Tetapi sekarang apabila kita adakan pusat² kesehatan, kelinik bidan, mereka tidak payah lagi menggunakan wang yang banyak. Dan kadang² memanggil bidan di-dalam kampung itu tidak payah lagi kena bayar, kerana ini telah di-sediakan oleh Kerajaan. Dan ini tidak-kah dapat di-taksirkan, ia-itu pehak pengkaji atau pun yang di-kaji oleh pehak pembangkang yang mengatakan ra'ayat ta' dapat apa daripada ranchangan, daripada apa yang di-buat oleh Kerajaan Perikatan kita. Jadi sa-rupa sahaja-lah keadaan² bagi pehak sahabat² saya di-sabelah pehak pembangkang sana—makin lama makin mahu lagi menutup jalan fikiran ra'ayat, terutama sa-kali di-Kelantan. Kerana apa yang saya tahu, mithal-nya, ranchangan Pelajaran Dewasa, sampai hari ini, pehak negeri Kelantan tidak menerima ranchangan kita hendak memasokkan pelajaran agama pada orang² dewasa. Sa-olah² bagi pehak sahabat saya—wakil pembangkang sana, mengingatkan bahawa semua orang² di-Kelantan di-luar² bandar itu sudah tahu, sudah faham, sudah 'alim agak-nya dalam hal agama. Yang sa-benar-nya mereka ini takut, barangkali. Bila di-masokkan guru² agama di-kelas² dewasa, pelajaran yang sa-betul-nya kita berikan

Enche' Wan Hassan bin Wan Daud:
(Rises).

Enche' Abdul Ghani: lepas sekarang boleh-lah—ada masa lagi. Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bila masok barangkali guru agama yang sa-benar-nya mengajar itu dan ini—yang baik—jangan lagi pak turut—sampaikan bila² tuan² guru agama chium tangan itu lebeh lagi berpahala daripada ini, akan bertukar di-Kelantan—itu-lah yang agak saya yang di-takuti. Agak saya, memang itu-lah. Pada hal kita tahu kebenaran, atau pun apa yang di-buat oleh Kerajaan sa-lama ini untok membasmi buta huruf, untok membasmi buta hati, dan untok membasmi keperchayaan² karut, patut benar, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, agak-nya kawan kita ini terima. Kerana, dia bagi pehak di-sana saya sudah katakan tadi, pada permulaan, sedangkan hendak membuat kemajuan ta' berdaya, hendak membuat surau ta' ada, madrasah ta' ada—sedangkan masjid Kota Bahru pun Kerajaan kita, Perikatan ini, memberikan bantuan \$100,000 baharu-lah boleh—baharu hendak di-adakan.

Jadi ini-lah yang saya nampak, perkara² yang di-katakan oleh pehak pembangkang ini sa-olah² mereka suka mendengar suara yang lemak merdu, yang manis sahaja yang akan di-terima oleh orang² ramai ta' ada langsung apa. Jadi, dengan keterangan saya, saya suka kalau mithal-nya, bagi pehak wakil² daripada Kelantan, saya suka hendak memberi tahu apa yang saya dapat tahu. Bila saya pergi kassana, saya dengar Kerajaan memberi hak istimewa kapada orang² bumiputra di-sana sangat-lah berbeza daripada apa yang di-ucapkan oleh mereka. Daripada keterangan² yang saya dengar, mithal-nya, di-seluruh negeri Kelantan, kalau di-banchi tiap² enam ekar tanah yang di-keluarkan, hanyalah satu ekar sahaja hitong panjang yang dapat pada bumiputra. Yang lima ekar daripada bahagian enam ekar tadi, di-beri kapada orang yang bukan bumiputra. Ini boleh saya terangkan, kalau mahu mithal-nya, dengan lebeh jelas lagi, kerana hal² ini terang, walau pun pehak wakil² PAS mengatakan itu dan ini, hendak mengalah pandangan kita ka-tempat lain, tetapi yang sa-benar kita tidak boleh padamkan benda

ini—kita ta' boleh hendak nafikan kerana terang daripada apa yang berlaku daripada dahulu sampai sekarang, jangan-lah bagi pehak wakil² daripada Kelantan itu berchakap bahawa apa yang di-chakapkan di-Kelantan itu, pehak kita Perikatan ta' tahu langsung. Pehak Perikatan pun ada berjalan kassana dan situ—ada berjalan dan bertanya, dan di-Kelantan pun bukan-lah orang² PAS semua-nya—bukan-lah orang² yang di-suroh "A"—"A"! sahaja; di-suroh "B"—"B"! sahaja. Mereka pun ada fikiran, mereka ada pendapat, mereka juga chintakan bangsa, chintakan bumiputra. Mereka juga berjuang kerana hendak menghidupkan keadaan ra'ayat yang sa-lama ini di-tinggalkan oleh penjajah dengan keadaan yang begitu. Jadi dalam masalah ini-lah yang saya rasa yang patut, terutama sa-kali bagi pehak ra'ayat Kelantan sekarang meneliti sunggoh² supaya tidak-lah sampai masa² yang akan datang. Kita harap kita akan dapat menaikkan atau pun hendak menyamakan—kata ucapan beliau juga—Yang Berhormat daripada wakil² PAS juga, menyamakan jurang atau pun hendak menebus jurang perbezaan di-antara yang berada dengan yang tidak, di-antara bukan bumiputra dengan ra'ayat bumiputra. Tetapi kalau langkah ini di-buat, kalau langkah ini di-'amalkan lagi terus, kalau tidak ada satu perubahan yang baharu yang patut di-buat pada masa yang pendek di-hadapan ini, bukan kata jurang, harus barangkali jurang itu di-lalui oleh ayer—jadi satu saloran yang tentu²-nya memisahkan di-antara kita. Wal hal Kerajaan yang dapat di-tubuhkan di-Kelantan sana, sa-bagaimana yang di-katakan sa-lama ini, ia-lah Kerajaan yang saban masa, saban hari, berchakap hendak berjuang untuk bumiputra, untuk orang Melayu. Jadi dengan keadaan yang sa-macham itu, saya rasa lebeh baik-lah di-antara kita meminta orang lain membaiki tingkah laku atau gerak-geri atau jalan fikiran sekarang—lebeh baik kita betul tingkah laku jalan sekarang atau perbuatan kita untuk berbakti kepada apa yang kita fikir, yang kita perchaya, yang kita perbuat itu untuk kepentingan bagi ra'ayat seluruh-nya.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berkenaan dengan hal lain, saya suka sadikit, hendak masok dalam hal pembangunan pada masa yang akan datang. Saya suka-lah hendak menyentoh sadikit. Bagi pehak saya di-Melaka, ada ranchangan perusahaan yang akan di-dirikan pada satu kawasan yang telah pun mula di-siasat oleh pehak Kerajaan Negeri Melaka, yang saya harap pehak Menteri yang bersangkutan akan dapat bersama² bekerjasama dengan pehak Kementerian, ia-itu satu kawasan perusahaan yang akan di-buka di-jajahan Alor Gajah. Saya harap juga perkara ini akan dapat kerjasama yang pesat dan oleh sebab, Tuan Yang di-Pertua pun ma'alum, di-Melaka tanahnya banyak atau negeri-nya yang mempunyai hutan atau lain banyak sa-bagai Kelantan sana, yang telah pun di-gadaikan pada orang yang bukan bumiputra. Jadi sa-lain daripada itu tentu-lah kita akan memberi keistimewaan pada kawasan² bagini, kerana salah satu daripada membantu ra'ayat yang makin hari makin banyak, tidak lain dan tidak bukan kita akan dapat mendirikan kilang² perusahaan untuk kemudahan kepada ra'ayat yang hidup di-sana.

Sa-lain daripada itu, ada satu perkara yang saya rasa panjang atau pun besar yang di-ranchangkan oleh pehak kami di-Melaka ia-itu

Enche' Abu Bakar Hamzah: Tolong bagi jalan-lah, kalau ta' bagi saya dudok. Saya hendak bertanya apa dia benda yang besar panjang itu?

Enche' Abdul Ghani bin Ishak: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Majlis ini kalau hendak tanya besar, hendak tanya panjang, hendak tanya apa pun—kalau wakil daripada Bachok itu mahu dudok dua jam pun boleh di-luar. Dalam Dewan ini ta' layak saya hendak berchakap dengan chara yang macham itu. Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ranchangan untuk menjadikan sa-buah pelabohan yang moden di-Melaka harus-lah di-usahakan pada masa² yang akan datang, kerana baharu² ini pehak Kerajaan negeri Melaka telah pun mengeshorkan bahawa sa-buah pelabohan yang baik yang harus barangkali boleh jadi pelabohan yang terbaik di-Tenggara

Asia ini, dapat di-adakan di-Pulau Besar. Jadi dalam pada itu, telah ada pun kompeni² daripada luar yang ingin menawarkan jasa baik-nya untuk menyasat kemungkinan dapat di-dirikan sa-buah pelabohan yang moden dan besar dan boleh di-jadikan sa-bagai sa-buah pelabohan yang terbesar barangkali di-Malaysia ini pada masa akan datang. Tetapi oleh sebab belanja-nya terlampau banyak, pengkajian-nya pun harus-lah di-buat dengan teliti dan harus-lah barangkali dapat kita siasat dengan lebeh baik pada masa akan datang. Jadi apa yang saya harapkan di-sini ia-lah bagi pehak Kerajaan Melaka atau negeri Melaka, harus-lah barangkali tidak akan terdaya atau ter-buat dengan sendiri, melainkan di-kehendaki kerjasama daripada pehak Kerajaan Pusat.

Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-kali lagi saya suka masok dalam perkara hal ranchangan² yang akan di-jalankan pada tahun 1966 ini, umpama ranchangan MARA. Saya suka hendak meng-ingatkan pada pehak yang berkenaan supaya ranchangan MARA ini bukan sahaja pegawai² yang hanya menjalankan tugas-nya untuk menyelesaikan kemahuan² orang ramai atau pun barangkali melayan surat² daripada orang ramai, tetapi saya rasa satu jabatan khas patut di-adakan pada MARA ini ia-itu pegawai² yang boleh membimbing, bukan dia pergi menyiasat sahaja atau pun barangkali menjalankan untuk pinjam meminjam atau membantu untuk meminta bantuan atau ranchangan² sahaja, tetapi hendak-lah ada jabatan yang membimbing, ma-ana-nya kalau sa-suatu tempat yang di-fikirkan patut hendak menjalankan suatu kerja yang baik atau pun satu perniagaan-kah atau apa yang patut di-buat oleh bumiputra, saya harap ada pegawai yang betul² bertugas untuk hal itu untuk memimpin, kalau tidak, saya rasa tentu-lah kemajuan yang akan di-dapati dalam hal ini lambat diperolehi terutama sa-kali oleh pehak bumiputra. Terima kaseh.

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: Meshuarat ini di-tangguhkan sa-lama 15 minit.

Sitting suspended at 11.35 a.m.

Sitting resumed at 11.55 a.m.

(Mr Speaker in the Chair)

Debate resumed.

Mr Speaker: I have a small announcement to make. I have to inform the Honourable Members of the House that there is only one day left, i.e. tomorrow, the 25th November, 1965, for the debate on the Second Reading of the Supply Bill, 1966. Therefore, I propose to allow private Members to speak only up till the adjournment of the House tonight. We can, if necessary, have a late sitting tonight. Tomorrow morning, it is my intention, when the House resumes, to call upon the Honourable Ministers to reply to observations made in the course of the debate.

Enche' Geh Chong Keat (Penang Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, to appreciate the impact of this 1966 Budget is to assess the difference between the pre-Budget day forecasts on the speculations and the actual Budget itself. The many favourable comments of confidence, expressed by the business and trading sectors, such as "a pleasant surprise", or "an Indian summer for the taxpayers" and "easily the best economic news of the year", speak for the proximity to the happy medium struck by the Honourable Minister of Finance.

We appreciate and realise that it is impossible for any Minister of Finance to present a perfect Budget, satisfying the taxpayers in every respect and keeping up with the national developments and advancement. I compliment our Honourable Minister of Finance for steering our nation through troubled waters with this Budget and sparing the public his Budget shocks, bearing in mind the magnitude of defence and security costs arising from Indonesian confrontation, the rapid expansion of education and the general extensive progress that is being made in economic and social developments.

I hope that I would not be touching on the nerve, or stepping on the toes of our Honourable Minister of Finance, by requesting him to consider the views

of those affected adversely by this Budget and the policy. In Parliament we debate on that Speech, and the public too has the right to express their views outside, and it has made requests or representations on their reactions to this Budget. It is the Minister's privilege to reconsider and give a final answer. Realising this, I request the Honourable Minister of Finance to maintain the good relationship between the Government and the public.

Sir, touching on the road tax, while agreeing with him that the owners of more luxurious cars with very large engine capacities should pay more on the licence fees, I would like him to consider the case of the wage-earners, office workers, teachers, salesmen and small traders and persons in other walks of life, depending on the motor cars or vehicles as a means or necessity for transportation rather than luxury.

These people have to travel to earn a living in or between rural areas and city and villages. The adjustment of reduction on the licence fee on a scale up to 1,100 or 1,500 cubic centimetres, will help this group of people considerably. Besides, the businessmen owning luxurious cars can have the licence fees passed on to their company operational charges, thereby deductible from their income tax returns, whereas the wage-earners, with fixed income, can't.

Sir, I wish to touch on the new telephone charges, Sir. Basing on the argument presented by the Honourable Minister of Finance that in normal circumstances the business subscribers use their telephones three times more than other subscribers, and the relation between the rental paid and the services provided, I think that all minimum rental charges should be the same, as both private and business telephones are receiving the same facilities and technical equipments provided by the Government and paying on the frequencies of utilisation of calls. The public request for a flat rate increase of about 30% of the existing rentals or, as a compromise, a \$100 per annum as minimum charge, with 5 cents per call but, knowing that the Honourable Minister has to be convinced, I present

the reason for alignment of the calculations on yield of revenue. Therefore, Sir, the highest charges, that I can think of, would be a flat rental charge of \$100 per annum for both private and commercial telephones with ten cents per call to a maximum of \$1,000 per annum, bearing in mind that a private telephone can also be turned into commercial use. Sir, I am just saying this as a suggestion but which need not be adopted by the Minister as the highest charge I am recommending, but however, he can, if he would like to, accept our offer of a flat increase of 30% on the existing rentals or \$100 per annum with 5 cents per call.

Sir, a private subscriber making about 5 calls daily will have to pay \$180 per annum (basing on 365 days per year), on metered calls, plus \$100 minimum rental, thereby paying a total rental of \$280, an increase of \$100 in revenue per year for the Government.

A business subscriber making about 30 calls daily on 300 working days in a year pays \$900 on metered calls, plus \$100 minimum rental, thereby will pay a total of \$1,000 maximum, an increase of \$730 in revenue yearly and with a concession of making extra calls to maintain his business.

Sir, in this way, the means of telephonic conversation will be utilised to the fullest and paying for the rental cost and services. We must not only think of revenues and yielding returns, but of the degree of achievement and progress in this communication field. As a matter of fact, these telephones have become a necessity in our daily life with communications in both social and economic development. In suggesting this minimum rental charge of \$100 per annum for both private and the business subscribers with a maximum charge or \$100 per annum with 5 cents per call, even though there is a strain on the subscribers, the social calls can be limited and the business can continue with the concession of maximum call charge without hindering the trading adversely. Above all, the Honourable the Minister of Finance will still get a substantial increase in revenue through this channel.

Mr Speaker, Sir, touching on the future status of Penang Island, I have to say that the people of Penang Island are lucky to have the consolation of assurances and re-assurances of the Honourable Prime Minister and the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister from time to time that it is up to the people of Penang Island to decide whether they should join the Common Market, or the Principal Customs Area, now or later. They also said that they did not wish to force the matter on the people of Penang Island, although the Government thought that it would benefit the people of Penang Island. The islanders have their confidence in the leadership and words of our two national guardians, but then the restrictions imposed and certain measures taken by both the Honourable Minister of Finance and the Honourable Minister of Commerce and Industry, such as the policy of protecting each and every local industry and the restrictive procedures pertaining to the re-export of goods imported under licence and those certified as goods manufactured in Penang under Certificate of Origin issued by the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, into the principal customs area or mainland.

The Honourable Minister of Finance has expressed his consciousness of the fact that Penang Island presents both a problem and a challenge as to what should be its eventual role in the projected Malaysian customs area.

Mr Speaker, Sir, Penang is still a free port in a restrictive sense by the doings of the Honourable the Minister of Finance and the Honourable Minister of Commerce and Industry—their doings and their plannings. The Honourable Minister of Finance has vet to answer how will the bonded warehouses scheme affect the local trade in Penang? Will it affect the repacking and the credit method of trading transaction operations at present? Penang port is a lighterage port and has any thought or planning been given to making it a modern deep water wharfage port? It has a legacy of skilled experience in lighter work and an enviable record for rapid handling of cargo. Has there been planning to build

some deep water berths in our port area? I am sure the Honourable Minister of Finance will accept that the Rueff Report was very general and even vague in its recommendations as far as Penang was concerned. In fact, the Rueff Report recommended the establishment of free-port zones as the only practical solution for the preservation and the healthy growth of these two free zone facilities outside the custom area, that is Penang and Labuan, and which after all have the advantages which they enjoy today and indirectly pass on to the neighbouring States in the customs area. Without detracting from the overall soundness of the Rueff Report, we would say that it assumes an identity of interest between Penang and Singapore, which does not exist. Penang is put together with Singapore and by reason of similar conditions under which the entrepot trade is conducted, but while it is intended that this entrepot trade is safeguarded, the extraction of the free-port area which is the whole island area into free zones does not affect both in the same manner. Singapore's loss in this respect is more than compensated for by a considerably extended tariff free market for her own products. Penang Island, or even the State of Penang, does not have a similar industrial base. In Penang Island, conditions are entirely different; the State of Penang is separated by a narrow channel, with Province Wellesley embodied with the mainland and the Penang Island separated from the mainland of Malaya.

The solving of the question of the free port status of Penang Island itself need not be a challenge, but the approaches must be sincere and genuine—to understand the peoples' problems towards positive economic planning and developments on the Island itself as a guarantee to the economic well being of the islanders and how fast can the planning be implemented and accomplished.

As a matter of fact, we have invited the Honourable the Minister of Finance to visit us often, to relax and lend us his patient ears; above all, drop his officialdom and he will learn more and share the confidence of the islanders,

but, be a State guest, there is the red tape and barrier to break. Please come to meet the common man; he will accord you the simple, sincere, welcome and you will learn him better and he, in turn, will learn and appreciate the goodness and richness in the heart of the Honourable Mr Tan Siew Sin, rather than knowing him as the Honourable Minister of Finance.

For Penang Island, whatever will be will be (*Laughter*). It depends on "whither go thou", as the island's free port status lies in the hands and design or pattern of the Honourable the Minister of Finance.

Let us not forget that Penang Island was thrown into the bargaining of the merger of Singapore into Malaysia, which could be described as a trend of political hopes towards Federation economic harmonisation. The objective was first and essentially political and seeking to build a political union, the customs union and the common economy were means to strengthen and unite all States of Malaysia. But today, with Singapore out of Malaysia, the *status quo* position of Penang Island was not strictly retained.

As the representative of Penang Utara, I request the Honourable Minister of Finance to give us his best consideration to evolve the best positive solution, with the best concession guaranteeing the economic well-being of the people of Penang Island:

- (1) The immediate need to work for and establishing of light industries, to be set up on the Island of Penang.
- (2) Positive economic planning and developments to meet the needs of the Island, and policies designed to raise the living standards of the residents to gain employment, economic, social and cultural progress.

Mr Speaker, Sir, speaking of the much publicised bridge, the construction of the bridge is an urgent need and would be an asset to Penang Island and the Mainland, which will make Penang a major port and attract more industries to the island itself, thus

helping to ease the unemployment problem and boost up the island's economy.

Lest I forget, the East-West Highway should be constructed linking Penang to Kelantan; and we welcome the announcement by the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister that he is giving this his immediate attention. This will open new markets to the East Coast of Malaya which so far have been the monopoly of Singapore.

As the development of the State lies with the Chief Minister of Penang, and we are not privileged to know what transpires between the State Government and the Honourable Minister of Finance with regard to the welfare and well-being of Penang Island, I can safely say that it is in good hands, and we can only hope for the best—so help us God.

I would like to request the Honourable Minister of Finance, like a sportsman, to accord us in Penang Island a sporting chance for survival, with a generous survival offer of an amendment to the Customs Ordinance, L.N. No. 372, Customs Duties (Exemption) (Goods of Malaysian Origin) Order, 1965, in regard to Section 3, sub-section 2, sub-heading "Exemptions", viz:

"For the purpose of this Order goods manufactured in Penang or Labuan"—we request for the insertion of—"unless supported by a Certificate of Origin issued by the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, are deemed to be goods manufactured outside Malaysia."

Therefore, I would read it as a whole—
Section 3, sub-section 2, sub-heading "Exemptions."

"For the purpose of this Order goods manufactured in Penang or Labuan, unless supported by a Certificate of Origin issued by the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, are deemed to be goods manufactured outside Malaysia."

This will be a good start of goodwill that will bridge the gap and make us part of Malaysia and not treated as a "foreign country". This will stop all economic confrontation against Penang Island to enable her light industries to resume and our unemployment problem relieved. Presently, many products certified as manufactures in Penang

Island are being heavily taxed not only on the raw materials but inclusive of the cost of labour.

(1) Collapsible steel doors and grills, metal windows, skylight frames and other parts of steel structure, these are manufactured from raw materials, such as mild steel bars and rods and angles, which are free of duty when imported into the mainland, but, as finished products, duty is being imposed on them on being brought into the mainland.

(2) *Durian cakes*. The duty is 25% on durian cakes. Before 1965, the duty imposed was only 5%. I appeal for the waiving of this duty, as these durian cakes are mostly produced by the rural dwellers in the country-side or kampongs, earning a sub-standard living but leading a happy life. The sale of this produce from Penang Island is about 30 tons per year. Normally there is no tax on the durian fruit, but the duty is imposed because a small percentage of sugar is used in its preparation, however, for one picul of durian, excluding the seeds, only 8 katties of sugar is used.

(3) *Nutmegs*: Desiccated sweetened nutmegs. This is also a local fruit, grown on the hills of certain parts of Penang Island only. Farmers and cultivators are being encouraged to grow it and it is subsidised by the State Government. About 30 piculs per month are being exported to the mainland. One picul of nutmeg costs less than \$20 and requires about 30 katties of sugar for preparing it into desiccated sweetened nutmeg. The duty on sugar is 7 cents per pound. Therefore, the cultivators would appreciate if the duty on the desiccated sweetened nutmegs could be waived as a token for encouragement of the growing of nutmegs, which in medicated oil be extracted from these fruits is also a potential dollar earner from the United States. I understand that quite a big supply of nutmeg oil is being exported to the United States from Penang, and it has earned quite a big amount in U.S. dollars for the country.

(4) *Joss papers*: The manufacturers appeal for review of the restrictions

imposed. They consider that the present 25% duty on the finished product of joss paper is very high and prohibitive and is thereby strangling and obstructing the expansion and progress of this type of product. There are 18 factories and, before the imposition of this 25% duty, they were allowed to import into the mainland tax free, as long as they possessed a Certificate of Origin issued by the Ministry of Commerce and Industry. Their business was so adversely affected that they had to close down, leaving about 100 workers unemployed. They feel that business in general in Penang also should not be retarded but should be encouraged. Therefore they are requesting that the policy of protecting the industries on the mainland should not put such an industry out of business in Penang. They agree that there should be some form of restriction but it should not tantamount to killing competitive trading and move towards a monopoly in trade. Sir, as has been appealed previously to the Minister of Finance, give us a survival chance. Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Minister of Finance spoke of his problem of the customs harmonisation as regards Penang Island's eventual role in the projected Malaysian Customs area. My Honourable friend from Sebrang Utara spoke on the illogical argument on equal fundamental rights within the same State but with very narrow views and without a second thought. I wish to quote here what I said during the previous Budget debate. The State Government of Penang, in the State's economic planning, has made plans to suit its geographical position. That is the mainland within the Principal Customs Area enjoys industrialisation planning and Penang Island to devote or concentrate her economic planning on tourism. These planning has virtually given birth to the Mak Mandin Industrialisation Scheme. The \$40 million project, involving the construction of a six-berth pontoon wharf at Butterworth and the developments to provide additional capacity for growth in traffic projected to arrive on completion of the highway connecting Butterworth with Kota Bharu on the East Coast.

Sir, I am presenting facts and putting up Penang Island's case before the House and the Honourable Minister of Finance, as I have always done in the previous Budget debates on common market and the Principal Customs Area. Penang free port was not created by accident 180 years ago, and it has developed into an enviable reputation as a free port. Facts also show that the free port has actually contributed to the growth of economic developments and prosperity of her neighbouring States. To say that, because the free port status hinders the progress of harmonisation of customs area, therefore she must come into it with this argument, I totally disagree. However, the people and the State Government weigh the positive offers of certain concessions to guarantee the Island and the people's economic well-being.

Mr Speaker, Sir, speaking on income tax and the Income Tax Ordinance (paras. 117 and 118 respectively), I owe the public a duty to draw the attention of this House and the Honourable Minister of Finance to the complaints from the public against high-handed persecutions of income tax payers by Income Tax executives and certain local officers trained under colonial methods.

Since our Parliament had passed laws, giving unprecedented wide powers to Income Tax Officers, with assurances from the Honourable Minister of Finance, the public are eager to know the necessary precautions taken to check, as well as curb the prevalent over-use and abuse of power on the part of senior officers and the methods applied, thereby causing sufferings and inconveniences to the general public.

Realising, the urgency of finding income for the country, our Parliament was very generous in giving omnipotent mandate to the Income Tax executives. The public, however, realise with reasonable fears, that with these wide powers, falling into the hands of inconsiderate executives can be very dangerous, especially, those aspiring for quick promotion or material gains, or those who want to show that they can be demi-gods.

The public expect that the Honourable Minister of Finance must not readily feel happy and satisfied with his Income Tax executives over a handsome sums of revenue collected, until he is sure and satisfied that the methods of collection do not border on oppression, persecution, or legal blackmail.

I understand that there were cases of income tax payers being victimised under threat of persecutions and having to submit to the arbitrary decisions of senior income tax officers even though they were unreasonable. They were subjected to long questioning and correspondence amounting to the testing of nerves and endurance and they finally agreed reluctantly to settle, in order to be free from further bothering by the officers, who were sometimes very surprisingly aggressive and high-handed. I have been told that there were instances of assessments being out of all reasonable proportion and after much prolonged bargaining were reduced very considerably. It would appear to me to be a system of building up the figures for slashing purposes but not assessing strictly to facts and figures of earnings.

In previous sessions of our Parliament, we debated on the dangers of equipping the Income Tax Officers with such powers. I have read in the press reports of many uncomplimentary statements in courts against Income Tax Officers:

Case No. 1 by a defence counsel and I quote from the *Straits Times* of 23rd May, 1965, page 4:

"The Income Tax Department should not persecute the defendant by involving him in more legal expenses trying to make him a bankrupt, I do not mind the Tax Department prosecuting my client, but I do mind their persecuting him."

Case No. 2, also by a defence counsel and I quote from the *Straits Times* of 22nd June, 1965, page 11.

"It is illegal and against the principles of our Constitution for the Income Tax Department to prosecute a taxpayer for an alleged offence identical with one for which he had previously been acquitted. The authorities cannot have luxury."

Luxury, here, means public funds for engaging a counsel for prosecution at a very big legal fee.

Case No. 3: A defence counsel stated, and I quote the *Straits Times* of 21st February, 1965, page 7:

"The Comptroller of Inland Revenue had committed an oppressive and unreasonable use of inquisitorial provisions of Law."

Case No. 4: A Magistrate, upon giving judgment, said and I quote the *Straits Times* of 27th February, 1965:

"The scope of section 61B is clearly restricted to returns of income tax. The intention of this section was not that the Comptroller should have monopoly to inflict visitations, or to lead the Comptroller out of his mortal frame and transform him into the status of a demi-god."

May I also quote Confucius, "By nature, men are nearly alike, by practice, they get to be wide apart".

Sir, I would like to mention, lastly, on these quotations from courts, a report from the *Straits Times* dated 19th November, 1965:

"Ruled in the High Court that any doubt in the interpretation of a provision in the Income Tax Ordinance should be construed in favour of the taxpayers."

Sir, I quote these uncomplimentary remarks made in Courts by those who really know the legal interpretations of the Income Tax Ordinance, as reported by the press, as examples of the raw deal that the taxpayers in this country are getting.

Mr Speaker, Sir, Section 83 of the Income Tax Ordinance provides the Comptroller to arrange with the Police to prevent a taxpayer who refused to furnish security to the satisfaction of the Comptroller from leaving the country without paying all tax assessed on him. A tax officer cannot wantonly invoke this passage about leaving the country unless the taxpayer had been previously served with demand notices, stating clearly all taxes due, which the taxpayer refused to pay or to furnish security, and unless he does not own any property in the country to cover his liabilities.

Quite contrary to this relevant section, it has come to my knowledge that a taxpayer was arrested and detained by the Police from the Secret Society Branch in Penang as a result of a directive from the Income Tax officer. I was further informed that

after the interrogation when it was found that the Police had no ground to detain this taxpayer, and after a telephone conversation between the tax officer concerned and the Police, the taxpayer was released, but his identity card was detained for two days. Incidentally, at the time of arrest, the taxpayer legally did not owe the Inland Revenue Department any unpaid tax, nor had he refused to pay any tax overdue and, above all, he did not possess any passport or visa. However, the next day after his release, many notices of demand were served upon him by the Income Tax Department, realising the mistake that they have made and trying to correct the position in their favour.

Sir, the public deplors such strong-arm measure applied upon a citizen of our democratic nation and fears of the repetition of such system of collecting taxes by the Inland Revenue Department.

Mr Speaker, Sir, these unpopular practices of the Income Tax Department are creating a feeling of resentment and abhorrence in the mind of the general public, which serves to show that some improvements must be made to protect the general public, otherwise the wrong impression may create or project an image for the Honourable Minister of Finance—here, I would like to borrow the phrase—"out of his mortal frame and transform him into the status of a demi-god", even though through no fault of the Honourable Minister of Finance.

Here we, in this House, know that, although the Honourable Minister of Finance is a very difficult man to deal with, he possesses a very high sense of duty, and we in this House must have the patience to convince him before any of us can get him to accede to popular public opinion—even at the expense of any election to characterise the sterling quality of our Honourable Minister of Finance.

I would also like to bring to the attention of the Honourable Minister of Finance and this House a conspicuous poster displayed in the room of the office of the Income Tax Senior Officer

in Penang, on which was written five Chinese characters—I quote: “*Chye Chee Jen Ping Ann*”, “Wealth gone, person safe” or “Money gone, person safe”. These five Chinese characters may be treated as a slogan and may have very, very deep meaning for those who know Chinese, and it is usually referred to a person who is very, very sick and whose life is an addict, and so it is preferable that he pays to be cured rather than to die. Reading between these few words may be an implied threat—as I said, between life and death—or, as I was informed, written by an accountant and taken by this Senior Income Tax Officer as a psychological approach of making the taxpayers parting with their wealth or money with a consolation.

However, Sir, Chinese businessmen, on reading this poster, especially with their attention drawn to it by the Senior Income Tax Officer during the interview as I am told, and knowing the real deep meaning of this phrase with its Chinese outlook, they were confused, with the intentions or actions and knowing the wide powers of that Officer, took the best way out, indicated by submitting to the Senior Income Tax Officer’s arbitrary settlement with silent protest.

I request, on behalf of the taxpayers, the Honourable Minister of Finance to take the necessary steps to investigate into this unorthodox practice of collecting income tax from the taxpayers. Our country is very progressive . . .

Mr Speaker: May I know how long more you will take?

Enche’ Geh Chong Keat: Just another ten minutes.

Mr Speaker: Ten minutes! But you promised me that half an hour ago, don’t you?

Enche’ Geh Chong Keat: Yes, Mr Speaker, Sir. Our country is very progressive and democratic. Therefore, in keeping with the progress of time we must keep up with improvements in our Income Tax Department too.

The recent comment of the Commissioner of Inland Revenue of New

Zealand must be taken as food for thought. I quote *Sunday Times*, 17th October, 1965:

“We realise that a taxpayer has obligations. But he has his rights too, the right to be treated with courtesy and respect. If we can give the taxpayer a rebate, we give it. Staff are encouraged to make liberal interpretations of the Tax Law: The old idea that the taxpayer is always wrong is out.”

“He contributed his success to the sweeping changes of his country’s income tax system. As a result, tax reforms have been greatly simplified, administrative costs slashed, and the taxpayers were left in a happier frame of mind.”

The humane approach of tax gathering was how Mr Rathgen described his country’s revamped income tax system—with emphasis on the most important factor in tax collections, of educating the people and helping them wherever possible. Therefore, I request the Honourable Minister of Finance to maintain effective public relations on tax matters and Government expenditures and keep the public informed from time to time.

To evolve a simpler tax form with instructions or explanations in the languages understood by the taxpayers, will be of great assistance, in particular, to the small-holders, estate conductors, clerks, workers, traders and hawkers, who are not educated in English or the National language, in submitting their income tax return forms.

It is not my intention to criticise the income tax officers, of the Department of Inland Revenue, but to take this opportunity of reminding the Honourable Minister of Finance of the problem of his income taxpayers. These problems have to be brought forth and their legal right to implore him to investigate or check the methods of assessing the public by the arbitrary settlement system from time to time.

Datin Fatimah binti Haji Hashim (Jitra-Padang Terap): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berchakap dalam perkara Anggaran Belanjawan Kerajaan bagi tahun 1966 ini, maka suka-lah juga saya mengambil sama bahagian untuk mengemukakan beberapa perkara yang saya fikir patut saya kemukakan di-Dewan ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, daripada apa yang saya telah dengar dari ucapan Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan, saya berasa puas hati atas kemajuan² pembangunan ekonomi yang pesat dan bertambah daripada sa-tahun ka-tahun. Sa-banyak sadikit, boleh di-katakan semua ra'ayat jelata telah merasa ni'mat kemerdekaan, ni'mat yang tidak pernah dan jarang di-rasa di-dalam masa penjajah dahulu terutama-nya di-dalam kawasan² luar bandar. Kerajaan telah membuat dan menyediakan berbagai² kemudahan dan membuka banyak peluang² bagi ra'ayat untuk mengambil bahagian meninggikan taraf hidup masing². Bermacam² bantuan telah di-sediakan bagi-nya. Tetapi ada sa-tengah² ra'ayat yang maseh lagi belum sedar, dan mengambil peluang ini. Mereka belum lagi mahu mengubah falsafah hidup-nya, dan maseh lagi lalai, sungguh pun Kerajaan telah membuat dan menjalankan banyak penerangan melalui kelas² dewasa, Jabatan Penerangan, perhimpunan tata ra'ayat dan lain²—banyak lagi bilangan² ra'ayat, terutama di-kampong² yang maseh lagi berpegang kepada kepercayaan dan adat lama. Saya harap Kerajaan memikirkan ini dan menchari jalan lain yang lebeh tegas dan berkesan, untuk menyedarkan mereka itu supaya pandangan dan falsafah chara hidup-nya berubah, supaya semangat dan perasaan mahu membuat, mahu menchari harta yang lebeh—mahu lebeh pandai, mahu lebeh kesenangan, di-semai, di-tanam di-tiap² sanubari mereka itu. Terutama-nya kepada kanak² dan pemuda pemudi. Kemajuan negeri kita, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bergantung kepada kesedaran mereka itu. Dan saya fikir ini-lah penyakit yang besar yang mesti segera kita ubah.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita semua sedar, hasil yang memberi kekayaan negeri ini ada-lah 'am-nya daripada tanaman, saperti getah, kelapa sawit dan padi; daripada usaha perlombongan saperti bijeh dan batu besi dan usaha perindustrian. Yang besar sa-kali ia-lah tanaman. Di-dalam lapangan ini-lah, sama ada di-ladang atau di-kebun kechil atau di-bendang²,

yang banyak sa-kali ra'ayat menchari sara hidup. Ekonomi negeri ini bergantung kepada perusahaan tanaman dan Kerajaan telah mengeluarkan dan membelanjakan sa-bahagian besar daripada wang pembangunan untuk lapangan ini. Rancangan Lima Tahun telah pun selesai. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sungguh pun demikian mustahak-nya tanaman dan pertanian kepada ekonomi dan pembangunan negeri ini, Kolej Pelajaran Pertanian hingga sekarang maseh lagi sa-buah sahaja, dan belum lagi di-besarkan. Saya sedar juga yang Kerajaan ada rancangan juga untuk hendak membesar dan mengadakan lagi beberapa buah kolej ini, supaya lebeh ramai pemuda pemudi dapat pelajaran. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, yang aneh-nya, mengapa-kah sa-lama ini tidak di-adakan sa-laras dengan rancangan pembangunan estate² getah atau pun ladang² getah dan kelapa sawit, Rancangan Kemajuan Tanah Persekutuan, Jabatan Penerangan ada memberi banyak peluang kepada ra'ayat yang ada kelulusan dan kebolehan untuk berkhidmat. Sudah sampai masa-nya jawatan di-ladang² yang maseh lagi di-pegang oleh orang yang bukan ra'ayat negeri ini di-ganti dengan ra'ayat negeri ini. Ini-lah satu jalan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untuk mengurangkan penganggoran. Scholarships hendak-lah di-beri sa-berapa banyak yang boleh di-keluarkan oleh Kerajaan dan bukan sahaja untuk menjawat jawatan yang kosong kelak di-dalam jabatan² Kerajaan, bahkan untuk mereka itu boleh bekerja di-dalam lapangan luar daripada Jabatan Kerajaan atau untuk membuka perusahaan tanaman sendiri sa-kali pun. Yang demikian, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam lapangan perlombongan kita tahu maseh beratus² lagi engineer² yang bekerja di-lombong² orang Eropah maseh lagi di-sandang oleh bangsa mereka itu. Mengapa-kah sa-lama ini Kerajaan maseh mahu hingga sekarang menghantar anak² negeri ini belajar engineer perlombongan chukup² dengan bilangan kosong yang ada di-dalam Jabatan Perlombongan ini.

Saya chadangkan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Kerajaan mesti-lah sanggup

menghantar, dengan memberi beberapa biasiswa yang lebeh banyak lagi kepada anak² negeri ini, terutama-nya bumiputra belajar menuntut 'ilmu engineering perlombongan; supaya mereka itu boleh bekerja dengan sharikat² perlombongan atau membuka lombong² di-dalam kawasan² yang di-khaskan untuk bumiputra. Saya sedar, ada sa-tengah² sharikat sekarang dengan sendiri-nya memberi biasiswa kepada anak negeri ini, tetapi bilangan tidak berapa orang sahaja, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Pendek-nya, untuk melepaskan batok di-tangga sahaja, Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

Negeri Malaysia sangat luas dan banyak kawasan lagi yang ada logam² yang berguna dan saya fikirkan ada bijak-nya kalau Kerajaan lebeh banyak lagi mengadakan faculty engineering, perlombongan, atau menghantar lebeh banyak lagi ra'ayat kita terutama bumiputra belajar ka-luar negeri. Kita mesti sedar, di-dalam perlombongan-lah, yang orang² dapat banyak kekayaan. Dan berapa peratus-kah bumiputra yang mengambil bahagian di-dalam perusahaan ini? Kerajaan mesti segera menchari jalan supaya kekayaan dan kesenangan yang dapat dari perlombongan mesti-lah sa-imbang di-antara kaum² di-negeri ini.

Berkenaan dengan batu besi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya dapati juga jualan di-negeri Jepun telah turun. Pentadbiran kereta api tidak mahu menurunkan tambang-nya, dan chukai maseh tetap saperti biasa. Sa-kira-nya Kerajaan tidak mengambil sa-suatu langkah untuk menolong perusahaan ini kelak ada yang tertutup, dan akibat-nya banyak bilangan penganggor, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Tambahan pula saya dengar, tidak lama lagi Australia akan mengeluarkan lebeh banyak lagi batu besi untuk di-jual ka-Jepun dengan harga yang lebeh murah daripada apa yang di-keluarkan oleh Malaysia. Sa-kira-nya tiada bantuan daripada Kerajaan, perusahaan ini akan datang, akan lebeh gelap, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Kita telah mendengar yang Kerajaan Singapura akan mengadakan sekatan bagi buroh² kasar dari

Malaya yang hendak masok menchari kerja di-Singapura. Bilangan yang kalau saya ta' salah kata-nya lebeh kurang 10 ribu orang sa-tahun. Kita tidak-lah menyalahkan atau berasa kesal atas chadangan tindakan Kerajaan Singapura itu. Sebab Kerajaan juga mahu menjaga kepentingan ra'ayat. Tetapi Kerajaan kita pula mesti berfikir dan menchari jalan untuk membantu dan menolong mereka itu kelak, yang mahu atau terpaksa pulang ka-Malaya. Saya bukan-lah berchadang yang Kerajaan kita mengambil tindakan balas—tidak sa-kali², Tuan Yang di-Pertua, yang kita hendak tahu, mengapa-kah ra'ayat kita itu terutama kebanyakan daripada Johor, kerana Johor dekat dengan Singapura, pergi menchari kerja di-Singapura—sebab-nya itu tentu-lah tidak ada kosong kerja kasar di-Johor, di-Melaka dan sa-bagai-nya.

Mengapa tidak? Kerana Singapura ada gudang kayu, gudang vaniac, plywood, gudang mengetin nanas dan lain² gudang, yang bahan²-nya datang daripada Malaya di-hantar jual ka-Singapura. Lihat-lah berapa banyak-kah lori nanas, kayu balak, yang masok ka-Singapura melalui Causeway. Saya chadangkan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untuk membantu kaum buroh kita supaya jangan berhijrah ka-Singapura, Kerajaan kita ini patut, ini bukan menyekat, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tetapi mengenakan chukai kapada kayu² balak dan buah² nanas apakala di-hantar keluar dari Malaya. Dengan demikian kaum² pemodal akan sedar berapa besar faedah-nya kalau mereka menanam modal dan membangun kilang² kayu, kilang nanas, kilang vania, kilang plywood dan kilang mengetin nanas di-Johor Baharu atau pun di-tempat² lain di-Malaya. Oh! ya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada yang menyangka, susah pula hendak di-bawa ka-kapal, tidak-kah Selat Teberau itu boleh masok kapal perang yang chukup besar dan kalau demikian mengapa pula kita tidak boleh adakan satu warf khas di-Johor Baharu untuk kapal perdagangan masok mengambil barang² untuk di-hantar keluar negeri dari Johor Baharu.

Saya perchaya Kerajaan sanggup, dan Kerajaan Singapura sangat suka dengan chadangan saya ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kerana ini mengurangkan buroh² kita daripada pergi bekerja di-Singapura. Saya harap Kerajaan kenakan chukai yang tinggi kapada kayu balak yang keluar daripada negeri ini. Ini bukan-lah kayu yang di-potong untuk di-hantar keluar negeri. Saya perchaya kaum² pemodal gudang kayu dan vania akan berhijrah ka-Johor atau pun ka-Tanah Melayu ini. Langkah ini bukan tindakan balas, bahkan menjaga kepentingan buroh kita, Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

Dan lagi saya dengar banyak lagi pengemis², saya bacha *Utusan Melayu*, daripada Malaya terutama daripada Kelantan dan Trengganu kata-nya datang merayau² minta sedekah di-Singapura, terutama dalam bulan puasa. Perkhabaran ini, kalau betul, ada-lah menyinggong perasaan dan keperibadian negeri kita, terutama orang² Melayu. Saya harap Pesuroh-jaya kita di-Singapura akan menyiasat perkara ini dan, kalau betul hendaklah di-ambil tindakan, di-hantar mereka itu balek ka-Malaya, dan kita tiada boleh harap Kerajaan Singapura akan memberi bantuan kapada mereka itu, kerana saya dapat tahu, di-Singapura, Jabatan Kebajikan tidak memberi apa² bantuan melainkan kapada ra'ayat Singapura sahaja. Dan lagi berkenaan dengan perubahan dan pelajaran orang² yang bukan ra'ayat Singapura ada-lah mendapat layanan yang berbeza dengan ra'ayat Singapura. Mithal-nya, sa-kira-nya sa-orang yang bukan ra'ayat Singapura masuk hospital kelas tiga, ada-lah di-kenakan bayaran yang jauh lebeh tinggi daripada ra'ayat-nya. Bahkan juga, di-sekolah rendah di-Singapura ra'ayat Malaysia kita di-kenakan bayaran sekolah dan tidak kita berikan belajar dengan perchuma bagaimana kita di-Malaya ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Ini pun saya harap wakil Kerajaan kita di-sana mengambil siasat dan perhati dan bantu kalau ada ra'ayat² kita yang menderita di-sana. Bagi ma'aluman Tuan² Yang Berhormat, Kerajaan kita ada-lah murah hati dan tiada membeza²kan ra'ayat dan bukan ra'ayat²,

dalam lapangan pelajaran atau bayaran hospital sa-kali pun.

Dalam masaalah penggangor, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka menarek perhatian Dewan yang mulia ini, ia-itu terdapat banyak lagi bilangan orang² yang bukan ra'ayat negeri ini bekerja di-gudang², di-kedai², di-ladang², pada hal kerja ini boleh di-pegang atau di-buat oleh ra'ayat negeri ini. Mereka² ini bukan ra'ayat, tetapi dengan sebab telah lama tinggal di-sini, ada-lah berhak tinggal dalam negeri ini. Mereka bekerja di-kedai², di-gudang² sa-tahun dua tahun sa-kali pulang sa-bentak ka-negeri-nya, Tuan yang di-Pertua, berjumpa keluarga-nya dan membawa-lah wang-nya.

Dari itu, satu chara hendak mengurangkan penganggoran ia-lah di-adakan satu undang² ia-itu ra'ayat negeri ini sahaja yang boleh bekerja di-negeri ini, melainkan kerja² yang tidak di-pegang oleh ra'ayat negeri ini kerana tiada kelulusan atau kemahiran yang tertentu, dan siapa yang melanggar undang² ini hendaklah di-hukum. Dengan jalan ini saya perchaya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, mereka² yang saya sebutkan itu akan membuat salah satu keputusan, sama ada hendak menjadi ra'ayat negeri ini atau pulang terus ka-negeri-nya kerana tidak dapat bekerja. Kita harap akan mendapat tahu bilangan² mereka itu apakala siap banchi-nya kelak. Saya berkata dengan tegas ia-itu ra'ayat negeri ini ada-lah bertanggung-jawab untuk keselamatan negeri ini, dan telah berkorban dalam serba serbi untuk mencapai kemerdekaan dan telah bertungkus lumus mengambil bahagian dalam politik untuk mendapat Kerajaan yang boleh membawa negeri ini kapada keamanan dan kema'moran.

Ini semua ada-lah titek peloh ra'ayat dan bilangan dari ra'ayat penganggor ada 100.000 jikalau saya tidak salah. Sudah sampai masa-nya pengorbanan ra'ayat mesti di-balas, di-beri lebeh peluang dapat bekerja menchari ni'mat sara hidup-nya yang sudah sewajar-nya. Mana yang boleh, semua kerja² negeri ini, baik dalam Kerajaan atau di-dalam lain² daripada Kerajaan, mesti di-beri

kapada ra'ayat dan kapada penganggor² yang saya sebutkan tadi.

Saya tidak tahan hati melihat berapa peratus anak² di-kampung kawasan saya yang apabila saya membuat lawatan, masing² ibu dan bapa berceritakan hal-nya, berapa susah hendak mendapat sa-barang kerja di-kampung, dan bila mereka pergi ka-bandar² pula, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bagitu juga nasib-nya. Mereka itu, daripada sa-hari ka-sa-hari, meningkat pelajaran mereka itu, kebanyakan ada pelajaran, tetapi tidak menchukupi dan tiada pula kemahiran di-dalam apa² lapangan, hendak kerja di-kampung² tiada tahu dan tiada ada kerja pula di-kampung, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Hendak makan gaji pula tiada kesampaian pelajaran-nya, tiada kebolehan, tambahan pula tiada kerja yang kosong walau pun kerja kasar sa-kali pun, Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

Di-Kelab Pemuda Pemudi-lah satu tempat pertolongan kapada mereka sakurang-nya ada-lah tempat kumpulan yang melapangkan kerunsingan dan masa yang berguna kapada mereka. Ini-lah satu masalah yang, saya percaya, kebanyakan wakil² Ra'ayat di-Dewan ini yang mana selalu melawat di-kawasan², berpendapat sama lebeh kurang saperti pengalaman saya. Saya harap dengan ada-nya Rancangan Lima Tahun ini kelak, Kerajaan akan memberi lebeh² lagi peluang kapada ra'ayat jelata yang berpendapat rendah dan menganggor, meninggikan taraf hidup-nya supaya dapat peluang bekerja, dapat mengambil bahagian dalam semua lapangan hidup dan ekonomi di-negeri ini. Kalau tidak, wang² yang berjuta² kelak akan memberi lebeh peluang sahaja kapada kaum² pemodal dan kontrektor² yang akan menjalankan kerja pembangunan yang berjuta² ringgit itu. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bagaimana pun saya ucapkan satinggi tahniah kapada Kerajaan, kerana jasa-nya kapada ra'ayat, terutama-nya kapada Menteri Kewangan kita yang telah memberi penjelasan yang panjang lebar, yang sangat memuaskan hati saya, khas-nya saya berasa bangga yang Kerajaan telah menurunkan chukai² kemasokan barang permata

dan emas (*Ketawa*) yang di-buat di-luar negeri, kerana orang perempuan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, memang-lah tidak boleh di-pisahkan daripada membeli perhiasan diri-nya. Saya berasa gembira juga atas langkah Kerajaan yang tidak banyak menaikkan chukai terutama-nya atas barang² yang diperlukan sangat oleh kaum ibu yang menjagakan rumah tangga. Had ini-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pandangan dan pendapatan saya. Demikian-lah saya ucapkan terima kaseh.

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: Mr Speaker, Sir, a year has gone by since the last Budget Meeting of this House and, however optimistic the Honourable Minister for Finance may sound, events took place in the last year which have increased the sense of insecurity and instability among large numbers of people. Political myopia and intolerance led to a situation in which nearly two million Malaysians in Singapore ceased practically overnight to be Malaysians—in the words of the Honourable the Prime Minister, on a subsequent occasion, Singapore was “kicked out”. Parents in the country do not have any longer the same confidence as they had in the past in the career prospects of their children and the unemployment curve, as has been admitted in the House, has arisen steeply while the process of selection for the jobs which are available leaves much to be desired. Intolerance of legitimate and constitutional political opposition is on the increase

Mr Speaker: The sitting is suspended until 4 p.m. today.

Sitting suspended at 1.00 p.m.

Sitting resumed at 4.00 p.m.

(Mr Speaker in the Chair)

THE SUPPLY BILL, 1966

Second Reading

Debate resumed

Enche' C. V. Devan Nair: As I was saying, Mr Speaker, Sir, the year just gone by has seen an increase in general unhappiness in the country, an increase

in the sense of insecurity and instability among large numbers of people and, within the last year since the last Budget, the *have-nots*, whether in rural areas or urban areas, and whether they be Malays, or Malaysians of Chinese or Indian origin, or Dyaks, Dusuns, Muruts, Melinaus, and so on, they continue to be *have-nots*—and indeed their numbers continue to increase. On the other hand, the *haves*—this Budget will make sure of it—will come into possession of more. No attempt has been made to redress social and economic injustice, social and economic imbalance, in favour of the *have-nots*. Altogether, Sir, a depressing situation exists in the country. Old certainties are gone, and a sense of insecurity with regard to the future pervades innumerable homes in Malaysia. Only big business has reason to be happy, because they have found that the Minister has not called upon them to make any sacrifices. His hands have not reached into their pockets but have gone into the wrong ones—but more of that later.

Sir, in his speech to the House on the separation of Singapore on August 9th, the Minister treated us to some poetry. Quoting Omar Khayyam, and trying to sound like a prophet, he told us—this is Omar Khayyam, Sir:

“The moving finger writes, and having writ moves on, Nor all thy piety nor wit shall lure it back to cancel half a line,

Nor all thy tears wash out a word of it”.

One had the impression, Sir, on listening to the Minister, that he secretly regarded himself as being the moving finger. What Enche' Tan Siew Sin decides, not all the piety of the people, nor all the wit of the Opposition, nor all the tears of the miserable can wash out.

Sir, it occurred to me, when listening to the Honourable Minister then, that there was another verse in Omar Khayyam, which perhaps more aptly fitted the situation in the country, and I will quote it—it goes as follows:

“What without asking, hither hurried whence (where have we come from),

And without asking, whither hurried hence, Another and another cup to drown the memory of this impertinence”.

And at least, Sir, as far as the people of Sabah and Sarawak are concerned, even that cup to drown the memory of impertinence is going to cost them more—they have to pay more for their beers and for their gins.

Sir, where do we go from here is the question which agitates the hearts and minds of the people of this nation. Last year at this time, in this House, the moving finger of the Honourable Minister of Finance wrote the turnover tax, the capital gains tax, the payroll tax and the crown corks tax. All the protests and warnings about the effects of these taxes had the same effect as water on a duck's back. But today, faced with the stark realities of economic life, he has effected a turnabout. So, what the moving finger wrote can be unwritten by protests. He has withdrawn, or considerably modified beyond recognition, or postponed indefinitely, most of the major tax proposals he rammed through this House last year. I cannot recall, Sir, another Finance Minister in any other country who has done anything similar, and also without turning a hair.

This year's Budget, Sir, has two major characteristics. First, it relies heavily on indirect taxation; second, it contains an almost complete withdrawal from the tax innovations made last year.

In most progressive countries, Sir, and even in some conservative ones, modern thinking is that revenue is best obtained from direct taxation on the ground that not only is such taxation most easily calculable in its effects on society and the economy, but that direct taxation is also the most equitable.

Sir, I have said that the much vaunted new taxes, which were introduced last year, have either been modified beyond all recognition, or completely withdrawn, with the exception of the payroll tax. The capital gains tax, which the Minister maintains to this day has little effect in its deterrence on the economy, is postponed indefinitely. In the case of payroll tax, it has been drastically modified in its application

in the sense that several groups of employers have been exempted from the payment of this tax.

In the case of the turnover tax, it is now not even qualified for that name. The Opposition in 1964 foresaw the deterrent effects such a tax would have on the economy, but the Minister remained unconvinced. Even to this day he maintains he has been right, and yet he has so modified it that it is no longer a turnover tax but a Customs levy of 2% at source. It will be recalled that the Opposition and practically everyone else told him last year that the multi-stage effects of taxation should not be imposed without the most careful consideration. Time has proved everybody else right. Again, in the case of the tax on crown corks, the Opposition and members of the public told him repeatedly that such a tax would have a crippling effect on the industry which consumes crown corks.

In last year's debate, it was clear that the Honourable Minister wore blinkers. Subsequently, he reduced the crown corks tax from 5 cents to 2 cents. I have a faint suspicion, Sir, that even at that time he had already realised that he was wrong, but to save face the industry using crown corks had to go on suffering until the Minister plucked up enough courage to do away with the tax.

This year's Budget is, therefore, a complete retreat on the part of the Honourable Minister. Unfortunately, in making such a retreat he has, like the pendulum, swung to the other extreme. This time he has concentrated almost entirely on raising additional revenue from indirect taxation. With the exception of making people in Sabah and Sarawak pay more in income tax, all his additional revenues are to be derived from a levy on consumption. In other words, the common people of this country have to bear almost the entire burden of producing new revenue, while big business—and much, I am sure, to the surprise of many circles in big business—has been spared. I can understand, Sir, fellow feeling for fellow millionaires, but it is quite difficult to sympathise with it.

When opening his speech, Sir, the Minister began by claiming that people in this country were enjoying a progressively higher standard of living. He says that the evidence of such a higher standard of living is everywhere—in the towns and the rural areas. But the people in the rural areas and the workers in the urban areas know that such a statement is manifestly untrue. Recent statements, Sir, made by the Finance Minister's Cabinet colleagues, as well as by officials connected with rural development, clearly admit that the plight of the Malay peasantry is not something to crow about. Everybody knows that such common amenities like water and light are not enjoyed by at least 75 per cent of the rural population.

As for the urban and plantation workers, 1965 was a year during which, because of new taxes, prices of most articles in use rose. This meant, in the absence of any rise in wages, a fall in the standards of living. Sir, those who have some acquaintance with the quarters of plantation workers, or mining workers in the slums, where industrial workers live, do not find there any evidence of the prosperity claimed by the Honourable Minister of Finance.

He justifies his assumptions, Sir, by quoting figures showing an increase in the gross national product. One does not have to be an economist to know that an increase in the gross national product will generally mean an increase in the *per capita* income, because *per capita* income is really the gross national product divided by the population. The question is, who enjoys the lion's share of the gross national product? What is of vital concern to the economy and to society is how the gross national product is distributed and consumed. There is absolutely no indication in the Minister's speech to show that the Government has even thought about achieving a fairer and a more just distribution of the wealth of this country of the gross national product.

Sir, any one who has even a superficial knowledge of the Malaysian

economy knows that the bulk of the gross national product is in the hands of planters and miners, and that the bulk of the products in the hands of planters and miners go to British investors—so much so that not only the Opposition, but practically all members of the public expected that in his search for additional sources of revenue, the Minister would have tapped the planters and the miners, instead of which he has tapped the consumers, the great majority of whom do not happen to be in big business. With his indirect taxation measures, it is they who will have to foot the bill. In spite of the better prices available for our principal exports, only capitalists are benefited—and also, Sir, the foreign capitalists at that. Labour, not only has failed to get a share of the better prices for our major exports, but has to suffer a lower standard of living because of the higher tariffs on commodities in the previous year.

Let us take, for example, rubber production. The Honourable Minister says that rubber production in Malaysia within the first nine months of this year amounted to 671,800 tons. This, Sir, would be equivalent to 1,128,624,000 pounds. He says that the average f.o.b. unit value of rubber exports for the first nine months of this year is one cent higher than that obtained in 1964. This means that the rubber industry obtained through more favourable export prices a sum of \$11,286,240. Sir, what has the Minister done to ensure that the workers get a share of this \$11 million, windfall through better prices which the rubber planters have got? All he has for the workers is a word of caution and a call for sacrifices.

Next, Sir, we will take the case of tin. He says that up to September this year, gross exports amounted to 57,400 tons valued at \$669.6 million. This works out to \$11,600 per ton. The export in 1964 was 54,900 tons in the corresponding period worth some \$516.5 million, and this works out to \$9,400 a ton. Therefore, Sir, there was a windfall through favourable prices of \$2,200 a ton. But now the Minister

says that this year production is expected to come to 62,000 tons. Now, Sir, it does not require a mathematician to work out that at \$2,200 a ton, 62,000 tons will yield \$136.4 million this year. Again, mining workers, who produce the tin, have no word of comfort from the Minister except a call for sacrifices—they have not got any part or share of this windfall.

At this stage it may be pertinent, Sir, to recall that during last year's Budget debate, we advised the Honourable Minister that the tin industry was in a position to shoulder a heavier burden of public expenditure, but he maintained that the tax on excess tin profits would be an adequate contribution by the tin industry. But in this year's speech, he has informed the House that excess tin profits tax is estimated to yield a mere \$5 million in respect of 1965 as against \$136.4 million the tin industry will reap through more favourable export prices of tin. In other words, Sir, the tin industry gets the bulk of the cake, the Government gets the crumbs, and the workers get nothing. And why, Sir, this tenderness, this special tenderness, for the tin miners?

A survey of the timber industry, Sir, gives the same story. Better prices were available this year for Malaysian timber exports but, again, the Minister has no word of comfort for workers in the timber industry and it should not be too difficult now, Sir, to understand why it was necessary for forestry workers to go on a fairly prolonged strike earlier this year.

Turning now, Sir, to rice imports. The Minister has, perhaps unwittingly, made a shocking disclosure which, if we consider the magnitude of the revelation, will continue to be remembered for long in the annals of this country. He says, Sir, and I quote: "The imports of rice into the States of Malaya fell by 41% to 183,300 tons".

Sir, working backwards, on an inverse ratio of 100/59, it can be seen that the imports for the corresponding period of nine months in 1964 amounted to 300,000 tons. Now, Sir, the shocking part of it is this, and I quote, again,

from the Honourable Minister's speech:

"I have an uneasy suspicion that a large part of the changes brought about since last year is accounted for by the disturbing increase in rice smuggling which is taking place over the Malaysian-Thai border but which is not so easy to prevent as the border is long, wild and unguarded."

Sir, the Minister does not say how large a part is being smuggled. But one can assume, if he means what he says, that something in the region of 100,000 tons of rice could have been smuggled in the nine months. The limit, of course, would be 127,000 tons, but making some allowance for possible increases in the domestic rice production—so the limit, Sir. Now for the Honourable Minister to say that 100,000 tons, not just two or three tons, but 100,000 tons or more of rice could have been smuggled across the border is something so shocking that there are no words adequate enough to describe it. Sir, we can thank the Almighty that it is not 100,000 tons of arms which have been smuggled across the border with the assistance of some of the underground friends of Soekarno across the Malaysian/Thai border. We can be thankful that it is not opium—100,000 tons of opium which have been smuggled into the country! Sir, what is the purpose of increasing our defence expenditure, if a simple thing like preventing—mind you, Sir—not just one pound or one ton but about 100,000 tons of smuggling cannot be achieved.

There is, of course, Sir, another question which is raised by this matter and that is the question of foreign exchange costs. Using the Minister's value of \$51.2 million for 183,300 tons of rice, one ton works out to \$280. 100,000 tons smuggled will mean unseen imports amounting to \$28 million. This figure obviously does not enter into the books, from which the Minister has compiled his balance of payment figures. Nevertheless, it is a real import, and it is a real cost in foreign exchange as his other figures.

While it is comforting to be informed by the Minister of Finance that industrial and commercial use of electricity, the most convenient index of industrial

development, has risen by 27.4% in the first seven months of 1965, compared with the corresponding period last year, it will be more comforting if the Minister had given figures to show that domestic consumption of electricity has also increased correspondingly, because consumption of electricity is not only an index of economic activity but also of progress in the standard of living of the people. Probably, Sir, at least 75% of our rural population have no light and water, and until the Minister can say that water and light have been brought to the peasantry, he has really very little to boast about. In all the grandiose plans that he has held out, Sir, the Minister holds out no hope of significant progress for the rural population. Like the urban workers, they have only been called upon to make more sacrifices. What they have a right to expect is that there should be at least a steady and a planned electrification of the villages. Even countries like Taiwan have vast rural electrification programmes. But in a country like Malaysia, where the Minister of Finance claims to have a higher *per capita* income in all Asia save Japan, there is not a word of bringing light to the masses.

Sir, the Minister's lack of concern is exemplified by the fact that, facing an admittedly grave unemployment situation, the Government, at this stage, appears to have only very vague intentions about solving it, such as enlisting the services of a well-known industrial consultant and the setting up of a National Institute of Scientific and Industrial Research. From the Minister's own figures, it is seen that in the field of services, there was a drop in 1965 of 1.3% of the total work force as compared with 1964. In the field of commerce, employment dropped in 1965 by 1.5% and in the field of manufacturing, employment dropped by 0.2%. These figures are not new, and in the words of the Minister, reflect no change in the basic trend of the employment situation in Malaysia. With all the Government's big talk of development, we seem to be marching backwards to greater unemployment. One would have expected that such an

adverse trend in unemployment would have stimulated the Government into activity quite some time ago. But even now, all that is offered to the public are pious hopes and good intentions. Even these pious hopes and good intentions are rather limited in the sense that whatever the consultant and the Institute may do in terms of industrial recommendations and research, far more depends on the make-up of the society in which industry is expected to develop. It is in regard to the make-up of society that the whole tenor of the Minister's Budget speech is objectionable.

As I said earlier, this Budget appears to be one to make the rich richer and the poor poorer. It is surely axiomatic that prosperity must be shared and must be spread in order to achieve maximum economic growth. In a closed economy, the concentration of purchasing power in limited hands only enhances consumption of luxuries and encourages wastage, but in an open economy like Malaysia's, such concentration of purchasing power can only mean a vast repatriation of profits and wide fluctuations in capital inflows and outflows.

The Honourable Minister offers a few so-called practical ideas to encourage the development of industry in Malaysia. The disturbing point, however, is that his suggestions do not admit of any fundamental change in the pattern of society, but are aimed only at providing incentives for capitalists to make more money. One of his suggested incentives, Sir, is to allow 100% drawback duties on imported raw materials utilised for manufactures intended for export. This incentive really means that, if a manufacturer exports something, he can claim full refund of the duties on the raw materials he uses in the manufactures, but he is not entitled to any refund on his local sales. The full effect, therefore, is to permit this manufacturer to be able to compete, perhaps, better on the international market, but the consumers, the workers and the peasants in this country, who buy his products, will have to pay the full share of any duties on the raw materials used in the manufactures. This is again an

illustration of the poor getting poorer and the rich getting richer.

Another of the Honourable Minister's so-called incentives for industrialisation is his development rebate, in which the quantum of incentive is to be directly related to the quantum of investment. It does not really take an economist to know that such a step is indeed a dangerous one. In a country like ours, in which the Minister himself admits that the trend of unemployment is growing worse, such a move can only be disastrous for labour. What the Minister really proposes is that the more a man invests, the more rebate he is entitled to. There is no argument that such an incentive is aimed at attracting capital from either domestic sources, or from foreign countries. The criticism, however, is that with such an incentive, the kind of industries that will be created would tend to be, by and large, capital intensive industries. In other words, use of capital will be maximum and use of labour will be minimum. Such capital intensive industries are not something Malaysia can afford, at the moment at least, until the unemployment situation has been considerably improved.

In this context, Sir, we might note that the Minister roughly estimates the amount required to create one job as \$18,000. Using these figures, he estimated the annual fixed investment required at \$1,260 million. He seems to indicate that he appreciates the magnitude of the investment required in both public and private sectors, if the employment situation is to be maintained, let alone improved upon. Unfortunately, he stops short there and gives this House no indication of what he proposes to do about it. He does not, in his proposals for incentives, even attempt to assess the capital that can be attracted into industry from either local or foreign sources. His development plans, of course, show nothing coming close to the capital requirements which he mentions.

Sir, the Minister in his speech next goes on to retail prices. He pats himself on the back and claims that the stability of retail prices is a manifestation of the soundness of our economy.

The unfortunate part of his speech, Sir, is that he equates the retail price index with the cost of living index. As everybody knows, Sir, retail prices as compiled by the Federation Government do not reflect in any way the cost of living. The cost of living index, Sir, takes account of the consumption pattern which the retail price index does not. The retail price index is merely an index which shows the movement of prices in a given number of commodities. None of these commodities have been weighed to give even a resemblance of the needs of a cost of living index.

Sir, the Minister cannot be unaware of the difference between a retail price index and a cost of living index. He was the person who introduced various new taxes in his last year's Budget. The fact that consumers' organisations were encouraged by the Government and formed was an admission of the fact that manufacturers and traders passed on the new taxes to the consumers. In certain cases, manufacturers and traders were rounding up the new taxes to the nearest higher figure.

Sir, in no part of his Budget speech does the Minister show any general drop in the prices of commodities. Therefore, if prices of commodities were not lowered, the addition of new taxes could only have made them dearer. It, therefore, takes a great deal of imagination and naivete to believe him when he says that retail prices in Malaya have not risen recently this year. Every housewife knows, Sir, that prices have risen and, if this is the case, then the Minister's retail price index must be wrong, and the compilers of this index must know of markets unknown to the housewives.

It is gratifying, Sir, to note from the Minister's speech that Malaysia has managed to escape inflation. The real question is whether such good fortune is purely accidental, incidental, or whether it can possibly be traced to the Minister's efforts. One can appreciate his difficulties when faced with heavy defence expenditure. He chose to withdraw purchasing power from the masses in the form of levies on various types of goods and duties and transfer

such purchasing power for use by the military forces. It is generally acknowledged, Sir, that defence expenditure can start off inflationary tendencies. The Minister himself has not claimed that the absence of inflation has been due to his efforts. One can, therefore, safely conclude that had it not been for the fortunate export prices of rubber, tin and timber, we would have found ourselves in serious difficulties. Sir, when one examines Malaysia's external trade and balance of payments problems, one cannot help being very sober and indeed melancholic after the survey. The total exports of Malaysia had very slow growth over the 1961-64 period, the increase totalling only some 5%. According to figures given by the Minister, rubber exports have fallen in value by nearly \$200 millions despite increase in quantity of rubber exported by about 10%, the general trend being that the price of rubber on the international market fell steadily from 81 cents to about 68 cents. During the same period from 1961 to 1964, Malaysia's imports have been increasing. The increase is some 14%. If all these increases have been reflected or are reflected in the imports of capital equipment and machinery for industrialisation, one could feel happy about the matter. But the Minister gives us no enlightenment on this. He has not given any figures to show that the rising imports have been attributable to the needs of industrialisation. Over the question of balance of payment the Minister appears to have painted a very rosy picture, completely out of keeping with reality. If one examines the trend over the past few years, it becomes immediately apparent, Sir, that the balance of current and long-term capital account has shown a steady decline in surpluses. This trend is apparent, although in 1964 there was a slight increase in the surplus. The official reserves of foreign and gold exchange have also been declining from 1962 onwards. In 1965, it has gone up by \$129 million, but the major part of this increase has been due to borrowings from abroad. Even so, the total of gold and foreign exchange reserves as at June, 1965, stands at around 3.4% above the 1961 level. This is all the

progress that the Minister can show for four years, and certainly it is not something to crow about. Furthermore, Sir, this is something which has been determined by world market prices of Malaysian major export commodities rather than by any action on the part of our Government.

The point here is that hardly anything seems to have been done by this Government to enhance the prosperity of the country and to enhance its export earning capacity. As I said earlier, Sir, it is only now that there is an intention to recruit an overseas industrial consultant and to set up an Institute of National Research. It is to be noted, Sir, that there is no central organisation such as an economic development board. In most countries, and in all emerging countries, there is a central directing body for economic development except ours.

The Minister's comments, Sir, on currency arrangements do not appear to afford other Governments much room for argument and, if this is the basis for amicable arrangements, then such arrangements will be very far away. The Minister speaks of this Government being in a position, whereby it will not accept any arrangement, which does not permit it to act effectively and promptly in vital areas of economic and monetary policy. This House must know, Sir, that the Brunei and Singapore Governments are equally entitled to adopt such an attitude and, if each of the three Governments starts with the proposition that it must be able to use currency management as an instrument of national economy and monetary policy, then the chances are that no mutually acceptable arrangements will be possible at all. And it is just, Sir, like three friends deciding to spend an evening out together and each friend insisting that they must all go to one particular restaurant—and this sort of attitude is typical of the Government's attitude before and after Singapore Day. Sir, the Minister should bear in mind that playing the part of an elder and dictatorial and arbitrary brother to Brunei and Singapore, is not something the other parties are likely to relish or to enjoy.

The Minister, Sir, went on in his Budget Speech to refer to economic relations with Singapore. His main prop is that there must be a political rapprochement as an essential prerequisite to economic union. Now, this is an indication of the fact that the Minister's political thinking with regard to Singapore is or tends to be somewhat vindictive and somewhat narrow. The basic fact is that the peoples of Singapore and of Malaysia must willy-nilly continue to live in the same milieu. What they have in common, Sir, is much greater than what divides them. Indeed, they have so much in common, that Malaysia and Singapore both agree that the joint security of the two countries should not be threatened by unilateral actions on the part of either. The leaders of Singapore as well as our own leaders in this country are committed to this approach. What then, Sir, does the Minister mean by "political rapprochement"? Does he mean that unless and until the people of Singapore decide on an M.C.A. Government as against the P.A.P. Government no economic union will be possible? If this is so, Sir, then I regret to say that the Minister must be living in a fool's paradise. But is the gulf, Sir, between Singapore and Malaysia all that unbridgeable? The two territories are both committed to the institutions of political democracy. They are committed to each other's defence and security. They have far more in common with each other than the United States and the Soviet Union have in common with each other, but in spite of political and ideological differences, Russia and the United States have agreed to economic co-existence.

Sir, the Minister has surely got his facts wrong when he says that Britain's failure so far to gain entry into the European Common Market is a vivid illustration of his thesis that political rapprochement is an essential prerequisite for economic union. Sir, it is nothing of that kind. Britain failed to gain entry into the Common Market, not because of any fundamental difficulties of political rapprochement as

between Britain and the western European countries, but because Britain could not bring the Commonwealth with her into the European Common Market. Britain had the dilemma of having either the Common Market or the Commonwealth. She tried to find a road that would give her access to the Commonwealth and the European Common Market and she failed—and that is all there is to it, Sir.

The Minister proposes to substitute for “Common Market” the words “Customs Area”, and the reason he gives appears to be rather flimsy. Probably, he objects to the term “Common Market” by reason of the circumstance that it originates probably from Singapore. Sir, if Singapore and Malaysia are to grow further apart—in spite of the fundamental things that the two peoples have in common, then history will undoubtedly hold the Minister of Finance here and people like him responsible for dividing what never ought to be divided on the basis of narrow political prejudice and petty animosities and on the basis of the fear of political competition. Sir, let not the future say of the Hon’ble Minister of Finance that fear of political competition was his spur.

Sir, the Minister went on to elaborate on the advantages Singapore had in terms of economic

Mr Speaker: May I ask the Honourable Member how long more he will take?

Enche’ C. V. Devan Nair: I expect to take another twenty minutes, Sir.

Mr Speaker: We have sufficient time for only four speakers before the close of the day.

Enche’ C. V. Devan Nair: I do realise that, Sir. However, I shall try to shorten my speech.

Mr Speaker: Will you cut down your speech to, say, ten minutes? Will you do that?

Enche’ C. V. Devan Nair: I will do that, but I do hope that in future years more selfish persons than I will also be hauled up.

Sir, he went on to elaborate on the advantages Singapore had in terms of economic and commercial development over the States of Malaya that had to be offset by the Annex “J” arrangements. But in another breath he uses the word “harmonisation” to introduce the very circumstances relating between Singapore and the States of Malaya to relationships between the States of Malaya on the one hand and the States of Sabah and Sarawak on the other. In terms of economic, financial and commercial development, Sabah and Sarawak, Sir, stand in relation to the States of Malaya in the same way as the States of Malaya stand in relation to Singapore. Therefore, if the Minister is right that, if Singapore were to be integrated into the Malaysian Common Market, Singapore had a price to pay, he should not conveniently forget that if the States of Malaya want to integrate with Sabah and Sarawak markets, the States of Malaya also have a price to pay but instead he harmonises by making Sabah and Sarawak pay more for everything, and, in all his additional taxes on commodities, Sabah and Sarawak are made to bear more than their proportionate burdens. The Chief Minister of Sabah, Sir, has already commented upon this, and I hope that his comments will not mean that Sabah will soon have another ex Chief Minister.

Sir, the Minister goes on to say that capital formation has been steadily rising. Unfortunately, he has not told the House where and how his figures were compiled. He claims that between 1963 and 1964 there was a gross capital formation of \$1,594,000,000 or an increase of some ten per cent. He further expects that in 1965 there will be an increase of eleven per cent over the 1964 level.

As for his references to the increases in the case of Sabah and Sarawak, Sir, the House will note that the figures of increases here are even less reliable and, in terms of percentages, probably misleading.

Sir, be that as it may, there is an error in what he says. He says that in Asia Malaysia’s *per capita* income is

exceeded only by that of Japan. This error on his part perhaps indicates his general myopia towards the country's nearest neighbour. Two hundred and fifty miles away, Sir, is a country with a *per capita* income of \$1,500 per year.

On Federal Government accounts, it is quite clear from the Minister's speech that he proposes only to live on yesterday's savings and tomorrow's borrowings and instead of attempting to meet current requirements from current taxation, he has chosen the path of drawing upon reserves and to increase borrowings. In 1964, Sir, the running down of Federal liquid assets amounted to \$196 million. For 1966 he proposes to run down Federal liquid assets by \$261 million. In 1964 he borrowed, both locally and abroad, \$218,000,000. In 1966, he proposes to borrow \$320,000,000. The Honourable Minister need not have resorted to such measures. His admission that the estimates of the Comptroller-General of Income Tax that around \$100,000,000 a year is evaded in income tax shows what he could have done in preference to increasing the public debt. Again, he has admitted that more than 100,000 tons of rice have perhaps been smuggled into this country—what of other items, and what of the loss of revenue from more costly items, which may have been smuggled through? Surely, Sir, it is not all that insuperable to clean up the machinery of tax collection in this country. Instead of resorting to measures which run down the country's stability and mortgaging our future generation, the Minister should have decided that the present generation ought to bear a heavier burden. Since the present generation that should bear this heavier burden consists largely of external capitalists, there is even less reason why improvements in taxation measures should not take the place of consumption of past savings and future earnings.

The House will note, Sir, that the charges on the public debt stand at nearly \$166 million a year and represent more than ten per cent of the gross current expenditure. The total public debt stands now at nearly \$2,600,000,000 representing nearly two

years' revenue of the country—two years' revenue of the country! If the Minister goes on at this rate of borrowing, he will find that he will land us all into a situation where we must borrow in order to live, and I am sure that the Minister will not recommend to any of the Treasury employees to be in debt to the tune of nearly two years' emoluments—two years' earnings.

However, in the matter of national financial policy, he commits us all to being in debt to the tune of two years' revenue collection. Living in debt, Sir, is bad enough, but living as we do, dependent on export earnings from rubber and tin, over the prices of which we have no control, we are in a more precarious position, and the Minister should take full note of the disastrous consequences that will befall this country if we, as a heavily indebted nation, were ever faced with the prospect of low world prices for rubber and tin.

Turning now, Sir, to his proposals for expenditure for 1966, the immediate impression is that the vast expenditure of \$1,600,000,000 does not go very far towards benefiting the "have-nots" of this country—the peasantry and the working class. Only \$138.8 million is budgeted for economic services and even this, on further analysis, is not found to be strictly all for economic services resulting in direct benefits. The expenditure in general administration comes to \$208.7 million while the debt servicing amounts to \$166.6 million. Defence, of course, takes the cake at \$382.2 million. Of the sum allocated for economic services, the total expenditure on agriculture and co-operatives comes to only \$18.4 million and rural development gets a mere \$10.9 million. The House will note, Sir, that Malaysia has a rural population of nearly four million and against this, Sir, the sums allocated are really pitiful and work out to less than \$8 per head per year—even so, not all this \$8 goes as direct benefit to the rural population. The expenditure in industries comes to \$4.6 million and is largely budgeted for trade missions abroad.

The expenditure on Social Services includes Education of \$352.2 million and Public Health of \$119.2, but it is an open question as to how much of this allocation for Education actually goes towards building of schools in the rural areas, recruitment of teachers, and so forth.

Sir, Labour and Welfare Services have been allocated a paltry sum of \$10.8 million which, in comparison with the total working population, is of very little real significance.

Over all this, the House will note that in debt servicing the cost of the country will amount to \$166.6 million in 1966. The House will also note that this figure is higher than the combined provisions for economic services.

Sir, while conceding that nowhere in his speech has the Minister made a comparison of wages of Government servants with that of workers in commerce and industry, if wages of Government servants are comparable to those of workers in commerce and industry, and if wages to workers in commerce and industry are low in relation to their productivity, then it stands to reason, Sir, that Government servants have also been underpaid. Sir, if his observations to the workers that they should get a fair wage does give the impression that, perhaps Malaysians workers have been living on charitable wages in the past. The truth is that the productivity of Malaysian labour has been such that fantastically high profits have accrued to entrepreneurs in the rubber, tin and timber industries.

The House will have noted the rather lame excuse given by the Minister for raising revenue by indirect taxation that it takes at least three years to train an inland revenue officer and so forth. Sir, in advancing this excuse, he has made some shocking disclosures. He has disclosed that the evasion of income tax, when he took office six years' ago, was only in the region of \$5 million a year but is now in the region of \$100 million a year. What he is really confessing, Sir, is that under his management, the Income Tax

Department has deteriorated to the extent where evasion has increased twenty-fold practically. No new changes have been made, Sir, in the basic structure or in the rates of income tax.

On relations between the States of Malaya and of Singapore in the field of income tax the Minister has not revealed whether steps have been taken to negotiate with the Government of Singapore a double taxation agreement. One would have expected that after Singapore Day, with two sovereign States, it would be obviously impossible for the existing combined provisions to apply to the two territories. It is now more than three months, and yet the Finance Minister is unable to say that the double taxation agreement is in the offing.

The turnover tax of the 1964 Budget is now completely converted, as I have said, into a customs levy. Such being the case, Sir, the very term itself is a misnomer and one would expect the Minister to have the courage to say so and to change the name itself. The tax as it stands—a flat 2% levy—has absolutely nothing to do with turnover and the continued use of this term will not only confuse people in this country but also—and this is very significant—prospective investors from abroad.

Sir, a minor innovation made by the Minister in the present Budget is his proposal to place a charge on telephone calls above 100 calls a month. One can only hope, Sir, that the Minister has done his homework and that the cost of capital equipment and the technical arrangements and administrative charges and so forth that will be entailed in the collection of this tax, will not exceed what he can raise by means of the extra 10 cents a call.

Sir, the Minister hopes to raise from domestic borrowings about \$1,225 million. Only the future will tell whether he will be able to do this. If he succeeds, the House should bear in mind that the servicing of this loan alone will take at least \$80 million to \$100 million a year.

He also expects to run down Malaysia's reserves by \$800 million. This would work out roughly to \$160 million a year and at the end of this period will bring Malaysian reserves to a bare minimum level. The advisability of such a step is open not only to domestic question, Sir, but possibly also will be opened to international doubt.

He hopes to raise \$1,900 million from foreign sources. He hopes that \$1,000 million will be forthcoming as foreign loans and \$900 million as foreign grants. As I am not in the confidence of the Minister, Sir, I am unable to say what grounds the Minister has for this optimism.

Thus, Sir, after six years at the helm of the Treasury, all the Minister can do is to produce a Budget as unrealistic as it is unwise. It is a Budget that robs the poor and enriches the wealthy. It is a Budget that makes consumer goods costlier, especially to people in Sabah and Sarawak. It is a Budget that depletes past savings and mortgages the future. It is a Budget that may well place, Sir, the nation before the bankruptcy court of world finance. In short, it is a Budget that possibly only the Minister himself can be proud of.

He calls it, Sir, strangely an austerity budget with one breath and with another pleads for foreign loans and grants. Never has a Finance Minister of our country brought our nation into such international disrepute. America probably slammed the door in his face when he called at Washington with cap in hand. Britain pleads a weak pound and heavy defence commitments.

Even at the height of the Emergency, Sir, our country held up its head in pride. But, after so many years of peace, all the Minister has done is to bankrupt us and to make us a nation of rejected beggars. What is worse, we need not be a nation of beggars, if only the Minister has the courage to tap the sources within our country. Malaya does not have to go with begging bowls, Sir, to Washington or London. It has the money, if only the Minister dares to take what is after all a legitimate and moral due to the nation. Big business, Sir, must be

obliged to pay big money for big development and the big money is there with big business, and I would strongly commend to this Government not to place heavy pressures on consumers, but go to direct taxation and get the money from where it can come. Thank you, Sir.

Dr Mahathir bin Mohamad (Kota Star Selatan): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun untuk mengucapkan tahniah kepada Menteri Kewangan yang telah membentangkan satu Anggaran Belanjawan yang sangat sesuai bagi keadaan masa dan juga bagi kehendak² ra'ayat. Kita maseh ingat kegelisahan yang tertimbul di-dalam dan di-luar Rumah yang bahagia ini, di-antara puak Pembangkang dan juga penyokong² Kerajaan sa-lepas sahaja Yang Berhormat Menteri menerangkan Anggaran Belanjawan tahun yang lepas. Di-masa itu, Yang Berhormat Menteri telah pun menegaskan kegentingan negara oleh sebab konfrantasi, mustahak-nya menchari perolehan yang lebeh untuk Kerajaan, dan juga menchuba chukai² chara baharu. Di-dalam bahathan yang berlaku, Yang Berhormat Menteri telah meminta supaya chukai² baharu ini di-beri peluang berjalan untuk menyatakan sesuai atau tidak untuk negara kita.

Sunggoh pun sa-panjang tahun, kita telah mendengar bantahan yang hebat terhadap chukai² baharu dan kesan² yang tidak baik terhadap ekonomi Malaysia, tetapi tentu-lah nyata kapada semua sa-lepas Budget Speech baharu² ini, yang cherita² kesusahan yang chukai² baharu membawa bukan-lah bagitu burok sa-hingga ekonomi kita merosot. Sa-balek-nya, mengikut angka² yang telah di-peredarkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri, kita maseh lagi memegang tempat yang kedua di-dalam Asia Timor tentang *per capita* income. Walau pun kesan chukai² atas ahli berniaga tidak bagitu burok, Yang Berhormat Menteri telah menimbangkan bantahan terhadap chukai² tahun 1965 dan telah menarek balek separoh dan menukarkan separoh lagi. Sikap ini sangat-lah sesuai bagi satu Kerajaan yang berasaskan demokrasi. Dan saya menguchapkan ribuan terima

kaseh kapada Yang Berhormat Menteri. Saya telah berharap ra'ayat Malaysia daripada semua golongan patutlah menaruh kepercayaan yang penuh apabila Kerajaan Perikatan menegaskan yang Kerajaan akan menerima dan menimbangkan tegoran yang membena daripada ra'ayat.

Tetapi Tuan Yang di-Pertua, nampaknya harapan saya ini tidak berasas. Saya sudah mula dengar orang ramai berkata bahawa chukai talipon dan rokok tidak patut. Saya perchaya Wakil² Ra'ayat dalam Rumah bahagia ini, juga akan menyebut tentang chukai² baharu ini dan berkata ini akan membunuh perniagaan dan merosakkan ekonomi negara kita. Sa-masa itu juga kita akan dengar permohonan tambahan belanja untuk serbi supaya kawasan masing² dapat di-perelokkan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-America Sharikat, negara yang kaya raya, sungoh pun banyak pengemis di-New York, President Johnson terpaksa berperang dengan Ahli² Kongres daripada pehak pembangkang dan penyokong Kerajaan baharu² ini bukan untuk menaikkan chukai, tetapi supaya chukai² pendapatan di-kurangkan. Ini menunjokkan tanggung-jawab ahli² Kongres Amerika Sharikat. Saya tidak perchaya peristiwa yang sa-macam ini boleh berlaku di-Malaysia. Tidak ada siapa yang suka membayar chukai, saperti mana kata Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan, tetapi sa-kurang²-nya patutlah kita ingat ia-itu kalau kita ingin supaya negara kita menjadi satu negara yang develop, orang yang berada patutlah membayar chukai yang lebeh supaya Kerajaan dapat meluaskan lagi usaha² untuk membasmikan keburokan di-sisi orang² tidak berada, oleh kerana tiap² chukai ada kebaikan dan keburokan-nya dan ada yang menyokong dan yang membangkang, sa-chara orang yang kurang pengalaman atas perkara ini, saya ingin tanya ada-kah salah jika di-pinta orang² ramai dan juga Wakil² Ra'ayat dari semua pehak menchadangkan chara² baharu untuk membuat chukai atau menaikkan chukai yang lama yang sesuai bagi mereka. Kalau mereka tiada ada chadangan, maka Yang Berhormat Menteri bolehlah bebas membuat apa² chukai.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-bagai sa-orang yang bukan pakar ekonomi, saya kurang berani membuat tegoran apa² berkenaan dengan prinsip² ekonomi dan chara² menggunakan angka² untuk membayangkan kedudukan ekonomi sa-suatu negara. Dari itu, apa yang saya katakan di-sini yang boleh di-anggap bodoh oleh pakar², saya harap dapat di-betulkan. Satu chara menggunakan angka oleh pakar² ekonomi untuk proof itu dan ini ia-lah angka² average. Kita dengar di-sini ia-itu kita punya gross national product sekian, dan *per capita* income sekian. Ini ia-lah average figure dan average figure ini di-banding dengan average figure tahun² yang lepas dengan negara² yang mundor, dengan chara ini dapatlah kita tinggal di-dalam keadaan Euphoria atau pun angan² sedap, walau pun pada fikiran saya yang bodoh ini, average figure ini boleh menyembunyikan keadaan yang burok. Buat menggambarakan ma'ana saya dengan jelas lagi saya ingin cheritakan berkenaan dengan sa-orang hamba Allah yang telah mati lemas di-dalam suatu sungai yang average depth-nya chuma dua kaki.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sebab yang saya ingin membayangkan apa yang boleh tersembunyi di-belakang average figure ini ia-lah oleh kerana *per capita* income dan gross national product yang telah di-terangkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan tidak ada kena mengenai dengan keadaan penduduk di-kawasan saya. Angka² ini jauh sa-kali daripada *per capita* income atau pun gross kawasan product di-Kota Star Selatan. Saya kata ini sa-chara umum oleh kerana saya bukan pakar ekonomi, tetapi saya tahu pakar² ekonomi juga tidak dapat menaipkan apa yang saya kata, oleh kerana mereka belum pernah membuat comprehensive economic survey di-dalam kawasan saya.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sebab yang saya kemukakan fikiran saya atas perkara average figure ini ia-lah supaya dapat saya menarek perhatian yang lebeh berat daripada Kerajaan dengan keadaan di-kawasan luar bandar, terutama di-kawasan saya di-Kota Star Selatan. Saya sedar bahawa, Kerajaan telah adakan banyak ranchangan² untuk

meninggikan perolehan orang² kampung tetapi sungguh pun usaha ini di-jalankan dengan giat-nya, saya tahu bahawa unemployment dan under employment di-kampung² tersangat-lah tinggi dan ranchangan² yang ada sekarang tidak boleh mengurangkan angka² employment di-kampung². Tuan Yang di-Pertua, oleh kerana Tanah Melayu, khas-nya, kekurangan tanah untuk bertanam chuchok, maka dengan bertambah-nya penduduk² di-kampung² bersebab dengan kempen kesihatan, sudah tentu bilangan orang² yang tiada kerja di-kampung akan lebeh banyak daripada sa-tahun ka-satahun. Keadaan ini akan lebeh merosot jika soal unemployment dan under employment di-kampung² tiada di-ambil berat oleh Kerajaan. Kebanyakan daripada orang² di-kampung ia-lah orang Melayu. Di-dalam ranchangan untuk mendiversifykan Malaysian economy, orang² Melayu yang tinggal di-kampung² tidak di-beri apa² peranan. Kalau di-pekan orang² sudah mendapat skill² yang baharu seperti membena rumah² berbilang tingkat, menjadi mechanic radio, electronic, menjadi boroh chekap dalam civil engineering work dan sa-bagainya, orang² di-kampung maseh tertinggal dengan kecekapan zaman purbakala dan tidak sesuai dengan perubahan masa. Perbezaan antara kebolehan mereka dengan kecekapan orang² di-pekan sa-makin lama sa-makin bertambah.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya takut jikalau Kerajaan ini tidak mengambil berat atas keadaan ini—tiada di-ambil berat oleh Kerajaan—kita di-dalam Rumah bahagia ini maseh bergantung kepada penyedap, gross national product dan national *per capita* income, maka kita akan di-konfrontasikan dengan keadaan yang lebeh burok tidak lama lagi.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya fikir masa telah tiba untuk kita mengambil berat berkenaan dengan beberapa chadangan yang boleh mengatasi soal perbezaan antara kecekapan orang² di-kampung² dan orang² di-bandar. Satu di-antara-nya yang maseh tergantung² sa-lama lebeh kurang tiga tahun oleh kerana tidak ada peruntukan ia-lah Works Brigade. Works Bri-

gade ini jika di-amalkan dengan baik, akan mengurangkan soal unemployment dan under employment di-dalam dan di-luar bandar². Belanja untuk mengadakan Works Brigade itu bukanlah banyak dan kerja² untuk mentadbir-nya juga bukan susah, yang kekurangan chuma kemahuan. Kita telah mendengar bilangan murid² yang akan keluar daripada sekolah dan menchari kerja pada tahun ini. Jikalau kita tidak adakan Works Brigade, boleh jadi Kerajaan ini akan di-serang oleh satu unemployed army. Kita boleh memilih sekarang yang mana yang kita mahu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, satu lagi chara yang saya ingin kemukakan supaya kecekapan moden dapat di-peredarkan kepada orang² kampung yang tidak atau kurang pekerjaan ia-lah dengan memperbesarkan lagi Jabatan Kerja Raya. Pada masa yang akan datang, kerja membena negara akan bertambah² dengan tidak mendatangkan kerugian kepada kontrektor² yang ada sekarang. Jabatan Kerja Raya boleh sanggup lebeh banyak lagi civil engineering project. Sebab yang saya kata bagini ia-lah oleh kerana di-Kedah, jambatan yang besar di-bena oleh Jabatan Kerja Raya sungguh pun di-lain² tempat kerja yang seperti ini selalu-nya di-berikan kepada kontrektor. Keuntungan kepada Kerajaan banyak dan pada sa-buah jambatan yang baharu di-bena di-Alor Star, Kerajaan telah untong sa-banyak \$300,000. Tetapi apa yang menarek perhatian saya ia-lah Jabatan Kerja Raya dapat menggunakan buroh kasar dan chekap, yang terdiri daripada orang² Melayu kampung, yang biasanya tidak boleh di-terima oleh kontrektor². Mereka ini memboktikan ia itu orang² kampung dapat belajar "skill" yang baharu kalau di-beri peluang dan arahan yang bersimpati. Mereka ini menunjukkan yang mereka juga boleh mengambil peranan yang sa-patut-nya di-dalam membenakan negara. Mereka ini menafikan fahaman lama yang orang² kampung chuma sesuai sa-bagai petani dan tidak boleh belajar chara hidup yang baharu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, daripada perhatian saya ini, saya ingin mengshorkan

ia-itu Jabatan Kerja Raya di-perbesar-kan lagi dan orang² kampung yang tiada bekerja di-jadikan buruh kasar dan di-beri peluang bekerja di-dalam beberapa "civil engineering" projek yang patut di-kerjakan oleh Jabatan Kerja Raya. Saya tahu jawapan kurang pegawai dan "engineer²" semua akan timbul tetapi halangan boleh di-atasi jika kita benar² ingin melaksanakan-nya.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya biasa dengar ia-itu orang kampung baik-lah tinggal di-kampung, anak peladang mesti-lah mati sa-bagai peladang. Bandar untuk orang² bandar sahaja. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada pandangan saya, fikiran yang sa-macam ini sangat-lah kulot dan tidak sesuai dengan peredaran masa. Kita tidak payah tanya kapada pakar² ekonomi untuk memahami apa akan jadi jika orang² bertambah, tetapi tanah untuk bertanam chuchok tidak boleh di-perluaskan lagi. Orang² kampung tidak boleh lagi berdiam diri di-kampung². Mereka mesti-lah di-beri peluang untuk pekerjaan yang lain daripada bertanam chuchok sahaja. Mereka mesti di-ajar "skill" yang baharu. Mereka mesti mengambil tempat mereka yang sa-patut-nya dalam usaha memperluaskan asas ekonomi Malaysia. Kalau dalam usaha mengajar "skill" yang baharu dan memberi peluang employment yang baharu, kita terpaksa membawa orang² kampung ka-pekan². Kita mesti terima "challenge" ini dan "tackle" the problem of urbanisation dengan fikiran yang tidak terikat dengan konsep² lama. Kita ta' boleh mengegetar kerana takut menambah bilangan orang² yang tiada bekerja di-bandar² dengan orang² dari kampung². Sa-suatu problem tidak boleh di-nafikan dengan tidak menghadapikan-nya. Perkara "un-employment" dan "under employment" di-kampung² tidak boleh di-tolakkan dengan chara menjauuhkan daripada mata. Sa-lagi perkara ini tidak di-ambil berat oleh Kerajaan maka angka² "gross national product" dan "*per capita* income" ta' ada bermaana kapada orang² di-Kota Star Selatan, khas-nya dan penduduk² luar bandar 'am-nya.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berharap Ahli² Yang Berhormat tiada meng-

anggap chadangan saya sa-bagai satu bokti perasaan perkauman. Saya per-chaya Kerajaan Malaysia tidak akan sehat melainkan semua kaum dapat merasa kesenangan yang angka² ekonomi menunjokkan. Saya perchaya Malaysia chuma akan maju apabila semua gulongan daripada semua kaum daripada kampung dan bandar dapat maju bersama.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-belum saya berhenti, sa-kali lagi saya ingin meng-ucapkan tahniah kapada Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan yang telah berjaya memimpin ekonomi Malaysia di-dalam zaman gelap dengan kon-frantasi walau pun di-serang oleh pehak pembangkang dan penyokong² Kera-jaan. Kerajaan yang selalu "sensitive" kapada kehendak² ra'ayat, selalu akan berjaya. Anggaran Belanjawan yang telah di-kemukakan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan mem-bayangkan kehendak ra'ayat. Dari itu Kerajaan Perikatan tentu akan berjaya.

Sa-kali lagi saya ucapkan terima kaseh kapada Yang Berhormat Menteri yang selalu mengambil berat atas kehendak² ra'ayat. Terima kaseh, Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

Enche' Tan Toh Hong (Bukit Bintang): Mr Speaker, Sir, we have been listening to the Opposition Members for the last few days criticising this Budget left and right. I submit that their criticisms are lacking both in depth and in perspective. None of them has really touched on the central economic problems that are facing our nation.

The crux of the problem, Sir, facing us today and the future is the problem of creation of wealth—how to keep on accelerating our economic growth, so that *per capita* income will increase; how to create more employment oppor-tunities to meet the explosive pressure of rising population; how to keep on raising our standard of living. Sir, all those are clearly and implicitly stated by the Honourable Minister of Finance in his Budget speech. Given such needs and objectives, then I say that these budgetary proposals are certainly the right steps in the right direction. On the one hand, the Honourable Minister

has applied a drastic brake on expenditure by the Government and on the other, he has produced a liberal taxation policy.

On the taxation side, Sir, he has postponed the capital gains tax and abolished the crown cork tax. As for turnover tax, he has drastically changed it to a single-stage tax on the sale of imported foreign goods which, I think, should really be called "sales tax on imported goods" not "customs levy", as stated by the Honourable Member for Bungsar, because the tax is only levied after the sale of the goods has been done, not before. As for income tax, both personal and company, he has hardly touched it at all.

All these are incentives for increased commercial and industrial activities. Such action would be a timely boost to our economy, which is already faced with serious external pressures. The stock market has now shown signs of recovery after a dull and inactive period, and I am sure more and more new factories, new construction of housing and new economic activities will be induced by such a liberal taxation policy.

Sir, the whole speech by the Honourable Minister of Finance is a disappointment to the pessimists, including the Opposition Members, who, expecting tax increases, could not find grounds for complaints. Consequently, they could only talk out of turn concentrating on irrelevant, petty criticisms. The warm welcome given by businessmen, industrialists and developers is an expression of confidence in the Honourable Minister of Finance for his handling of the Budget.

A notable good social feature of the Budget, I feel, is that fixed income groups, people like typists, stenographers, teachers, pensioners, Government servants and all salary earners, are hardly touched by direct income tax proposals. The wages they carry home are not subject to any further increase in tax at all. Who can honestly charge the Honourable Minister of Finance as a capitalist, as the Member for Bungsar has done, when he has

shown so much sympathy to the wage earners who earn their income by their own sweat and labour?

On the expenditure side, the Minister has deliberately applied, if I may use his own words, "the most vigorous economy in less essential fields of public expenditure". On this austerity drive, on less prestige projects, on cutting out frills in public buildings which have no functional value, the Honourable Minister deserves the commendation of this House.

From the standpoint of high economic policy, Sir, this Budget, the 1966 Budget, excepting the new tax structure on telephone and road transport charges, is one of the most sound, liberal and expansionary budgets. It is an expression of a bold act of faith in our economy which is ever expanding. *Hear! Hear!*

Per capita income in 1965 has risen. Our national wealth has increased and the Gross National Product is growing at a rate of 8.5%, which is higher than previous levels. This covers more than our normal population growth of about 3.2% p.a. By such incentives, e.g., postponement of capital gains tax, drastically changing the turnover tax to sales tax on imported goods, abolition of crown-cork taxes, non-increase in direct taxation on companies and individuals, the economy is given a good expansionary boost. We shall expect a new height of dynamic economic growth. At the very least we can say, by and large, this year's Budget, excepting those taxes on telephone and road-transport licensing, has been greeted without the usual flare-up of criticism that budgets invariably provoke.

While we are happy with the rate of economic development so far attained and with the expected higher level of industrial and economic activities that would be induced by this expansionary Budget, we should not lose sight of the fact that our economic future still depends very much on rubber and tin.

A drastic drop in the prices of rubber and tin will put us in an untenable position. As such, I would like to urge the Government to spare no efforts in

accelerating our economic and agricultural diversification, in encouraging the setting up of new industries for new products for export, in re-orientating our agricultural activities to the export of new products. The objectives are quite clear, for we have to earn more and more for our national coffers.

What steps have the Government taken to encourage the growing either on plantation basis or small-holder basis for export of sugar, coffee, tea, groundnuts, maizes, soya beans, tapioca, etc.?

Our coconut products, whose production is steadily deteriorating, need a vigorous rehabilitation. The growing of banana for export which has a good market in Japan is a project worthwhile looking into. We can easily alienate 20,000 or 30,000 acres of good and suitable land near ocean-transport facilities for the growing of bananas either on F.L.D.A. basis or by private estate-developers.

All these need Government support. I am sure this House will not hesitate to allocate funds and subsidies to encourage diversification of new agricultural products for exports.

Such agricultural diversification for export depends on a liberal land policy. Our new villagers, our kampong people, our farmers, are all crying out for more land. They are all land-starved. If our Government could liberalise land alienation, expansionist forces in the private agricultural sector will play its own natural part to bring about new products for export and to bring about greater total production.

Sir, had we had such a liberal land policy, revenue that could have been derived by the government through increased crop production and through new exports would have made it unnecessary to levy 10 cents charge per telephone call for those exceeding 100 calls per telephone per month as well as those tax changes on road transport licensing.

A dynamic land policy through its productivity could easily generate a revenue of \$15.3 million, that is now expected to accrue from this telephone charge and road transport licences. At

the same time, more important still, it will relieve the surplus employment capacity in the rural areas—in the kampongs, in the new villages—and help to increase rural income for our kampong folks and our new villagers.

Going hand in hand with agricultural diversification and export orientation, we should also find ways the means to promote those activities which are import—substitution. To be more self-sufficient in domestic supplies, e.g., in rice, sugar, vegetables, fruits, meat, poultry and eggs, the problem is not just to create proper conditions by way of subsidies, free fertilizers, disease control, etc. We should also help the farmers and the producers to enhance their skills and techniques both in production and in marketing.

Similarly, in the fields of industrial activities, greater incentives and encouragement should be given to diversification—types of industries which are import—substitution and export—substitution. In this respect, the quicker the Federal Industrial Development Authority begins its work the better it is for us.

While we can say this budgetary policy is expansionary and a booster to the economy, we must not forget that monetary policy could and should be used as a weapon to buttress an expansionary fiscal policy.

For instance, regarding the interest rate on borrowings and availability of credits, the emphasis under the present objectives of economic growth and creation of wealth should be cheaper finance and easy accessibility to credits.

If our objectives are to expand and to generate growth, then not only we should have a lower rate of interest on borrowings but also we should induce commercial bankers to facilitate a greater volume of advances on easier terms.

It appears to me upon analysing the Bank Negara report and bulletins, the economy now is subject to a tight money situation. The following figures bear my contention.

During 1964, when commercial banks advances are more liberal, on a

monthly average basis, advances rose by 12.6% at the end of 1964, as compared to 6.7% rise of deposits for the same period at end of 1963.

However, the situation is different in 1965: (+ shows increases, — shows decreases).

Period 1965	Deposits	Advances
end of April ...	— 0.9%	— 0.7%
end of May ...	+ 0.4%	+ 0.1%
end of June ...	+ 2.4%	— 0.7%
end of August ...	+ 1.3%	+ 0.6%

Sir, this 1965 tightmoney situation will only dampen our economy. At this stage of our economic development, expansionary measures are appropriate as is evidenced by the booster Budget. It is imperative that cheap finance and liberal credit facilities should be offered by our commercial banks through the working of the Central Bank to the manufacturing, construction, agricultural and other economic sectors. Such a liberal monetary policy, Sir, will only help to generate increased economic, industrial and agricultural activities, thereby bringing about not only higher income *per capita*, greater Gross National Product, but also more revenue to the Government.

Sir, I would strongly urge the Honourable Minister of Finance to induce commercial bankers not only to give more liberal advances but also to charge a lower rate interest. It is especially important that not only local banks should be so induced, but also foreign-commercial banks and insurance companies, which should participate more actively in long-term financing in our local economic activities such as industrial, agricultural, commercial and constructional projects.

Before I conclude, Sir, on this question of bank rate, it is observed that our interest-rate movement is very much related to the movement of bank rate in London, in the United Kingdom. Whenever there is an increase in bank rate in London, because of the free flow of our capital to the United Kingdom, we have also to impose a similar increase in bank rate here. This is unhealthy, Sir, from

the long-term point of view, for the simple reason that such increase may not necessarily be warranted by internal needs and local situations and conditions. There is, therefore, a need to look into our foreign exchange policy, so that they too could be used as an efficient instrument for our domestic needs and objectives.

I therefore, strongly urge our Honourable Minister of Finance to bring about a needed change in our monetary policy, viz; cheaper finance and more liberal advances by commercial banks, so as to go hand in hand with his laudable budgetary policy which is liberal and expansionary in nature.

Sir, I would have liked to talk some more but in view of your earlier request I think I will stop here now. Thank you Sir.

Tuan Haji Othman bin Abdullah (Hilir Perak): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka menchampori perbahathan ini, tetapi saya suka-lah menyatakan kepada Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bahawa saya tidak akan banyak menyentoh perkara² yang sudah di-sentoh oleh teman² saya sa-belum daripada saya ini dan sa-dapat mungkin saya akan memendekkan penerangan dan pendapat saya ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau kita ikuti ucapan Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan, sa-waktu mengemukakan Rang Belanjawan kita bagi tahun 1966 ini, kita mendapat suatu harapan jaminan daripada Yang Berhormat Menteri yang menyatakan bahawa Malaysia, walau pun di-dalam bentuk menghadapi konfrantasi dan sa-bagainya, maseh dapat memberikan kedudukan ekonomi kita yang baik dan dapat pula memberikan harapan² yang berguna pada masa yang akan datang bagi negara kita.

Di-atas ucapan Yang Berhormat Menteri ini-lah timbul-nya beberapa kechaman² yang di-kemukakan oleh beberapa orang Ahli, Yang Berhormat, baik daripada pehak P.M.I.P. (PAS) atau daripada pehak Pembangkang yang lain dan daripada kita sendiri—daripada pehak Kerajaan ini. Tuan

Yang di-Pertua, pandangan² yang dikemukakan oleh Ahli² Yang Berhormat di-dalam Dewan ini, membayangkan kepada kita bahawa harapan² bagi negara kita hidup pada masa yang akan datang, di-dalam bentuk ekonomi yang lebeh sempurna dan lebeh maju, menjamin kedudukan ra'ayat negeri ini, di-pandang oleh berbagai² parti politik yang ada di-dalam Dewan ini dari sudut yang bermacam². Ada orang yang membahathkan soal pendapatan tiap² sa-orang mengikut hitong panjang, yang pendapat mereka itu tidak dapat di-terima oleh 'akal. Pada faham saya sendiri, apa yang diterangkan oleh Menteri Kewangan di-dalam Dewan ini, ia-lah sa-chara hitong panjang bukan-lah sa-bagai suatu perinchian bahawa tiap² sa-orang warga negara itu mendapat hidup atau pun pendapatan yang lumayan saperti mana yang di-sebutkan \$900.00 sa-tahun itu. Walau dalam negeri yang kaya sa-kali pun, saperti mana sa-orang daripada sahabat saya menyatakan, di-Amerika mithal-nya, sa-buah negara yang paling kaya sa-kali dalam dunia. Kalau kita tengok di-negeri itu, kita akan melihat berapa manusia² yang tidak berumah, tidor di-tengah² jalan dan di-New York itu sendiri kita nampak beratus², beribu² orang yang duduk termenong di-tepi jalan tidak mempunyai penghasilan dan tidak mempunyai pendapatan dan pekerjaan, sedangkan negara Amerika itu ada-lah negara yang paling kaya. Ini perinchian. Tetapi mengikut hitong panjang, negara Amerika ada-lah negara yang terkaya di-dunia. Tetapi bagi kita demikian juga hal-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, walau pun kita perinchikan tiap² warga negara kita itu, ada yang mendapat lebeh dan ada yang mendapat kurang dan bagi kita dengan kelebih² itu—kata sa-tengah kawan² di-dalam Dewan ini—termasok ka-dalam "pocket" ahli² capitalist. Tetapi Kerajaan kita mempunyai ranchangan² dan kerja² yang hendak kita buat pada masa² yang akan datang, supaya pembahagian rezeki yang sama itu dapat di-berikan di-antara penduduk² yang lumayan hidup-nya dengan penduduk² di-luar bandar khusus-nya.

Pada umum-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam belanjawan kita ini, saya tertarek hati benar kapada apa yang telah di-nyatakan, peruntokan kewangan kita yang paling besar sa-kali ia-lah: yang pertama sa-kali kapada pelajaran dan yang kedua-nya kapada pertahanan. Pelajaran kita terpaksa menambah pada tahun hadapan ini, sa-banyak \$32 juta berbanding dengan peruntokan tahun yang sudah sa-banyak \$320 juta itu dan sekarang kita terpaksa tambah lagi \$32 juta menjadikan \$352 juta. Kalau kita tengok nampak dengan jelas-nya, bagaimana pesat dan bagaimana Kerajaan mengambil berat terhadap pelajaran dan pendidekan anak² kita. Sekolah di-merata² tempat telah kita dirikan, guru beratus², beribu², kita didek, kita beri asohan, didekan, latehan supaya anak² kita ini tidak akan menerima nasib saperti nasib orang tua² kita dahulu saperti mana yang kita sendiri tahu, nasib mereka itu memotong getah dan akhir-nya memotong getah. Tetapi kita telah menguntokkan peruntokan kapada Kementerian Pelajaran ini bertambah daripada sa-tahun ka-satahun dengan harapan supaya anak² kita akan menjadi manusia yang dapat mengubah kehidupan-nya daripada masa yang telah sudah menjadi lebeh sempurna dan lebeh menafa'at. Dalam hubungan ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya rasa, Menteri Pelajaran kita ini sebok kahulu ka-hilir dalam sa-minggu membuka sekolah sampai tujuh lapan buah. Membuka sekolah sampai tujuh lapan buah ini menimbulkan rasa yang tidak senang oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Pasir Puteh, yang mengatakan tidak ada kerja lain Menteri ini melainkan membuka sekolah dalam sa-minggu tujuh lapan buah.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-negeri Kelantan kalau saya tidak salah, Ranchangan Lima Tahun Yang Kedua telah menguntokkan perbelanjaan sekolah dan pelajaran kita ini kira² \$8 juta dan masa yang akhir ini, Menteri Pelajaran kita sebok pergi ka-Kelantan beberapa kali dan di-Kelantan membuka sekolah di-sana sini. Saya rasa tidak-lah patut Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Pasir Puteh, menyatakan

kekesalan-nya di-atas perbuatan Menteri yang membuka sekolah² itu. Saya nampak, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-sini ada nampak iri hati, nampak-nya, sebab di-negeri Kelantan sekarang, pembangunan persekolahan ini bertambah maju dan sekolah² bertambah dari satu masa ka-satu masa. Yang aneh-nya, apabila hendak merasmikan pembukaan sekolah itu, mereka panggil Menteri Pelajaran sendiri dengan kehendak Lembaga Sekolah itu, dengan permohonan² mereka itu sendiri supaya Menteri datang, tetapi tidak memanggil Yang Amat Berhormat Menteri Besar dalam negeri Kelantan. Waktu dahulu—waktu saya dudok di-Kelantan—Tuan Yang di-Pertua, PAS telah menhuba, supaya tiap² projek yang di-buat oleh Kerajaan Pusat ini jangan di-benarkan sa-orang Menteri Kerajaan Pusat untuk membuka-nya, kerana pembangunan itu datang daripada Kerajaan Pusat. Jadi rasa saya, rasa yang tidak sedap sa-macam ini, tidak-lah patut dikemukakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Pasir Putih sa-malam, tentang kelam-kabut-nya Menteri kita membuka sekolah di-sana sini, tetapi saya memberikan kepujian kepada ra'ayat negeri Kelantan, yang pada faham saya, telah sedar dan telah mengerti dan baharu² ini Menteri itu sendiri di-dalam membuka beberapa buah sekolah telah di-iringi oleh satu kampung—lima puluh dua ekor kuda—yang belum pernah di-buat-nya terhadap sa-orang Menteri yang di-lantek di-dalam negeri Kelantan dan empat ekor gajah. Rasa saya belum pernah di-rasa oleh Menteri PAS dalam negeri Kelantan dan ini rasa saya menunjukkan rasa tidak sedap bagi PAS dalam negeri Kelantan dan kerana itu-lah dia menchabar agak-nya, kalau tidak sedap hati pergerakan pelajaran dalam negeri itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bagini-lah kedudukan persekolahan, bukan sahaja di-dalam negeri Kelantan, tetapi di-mana² pun juga sekolah. Kita ini telah mendapat keutamaan yang tinggi, keutamaan yang lebeh, lebeh daripada Pertahanan sendiri, sa-kali pun negeri kita ini sedang menghadapi anchaman daripada konfrantasi Indonesia tetapi tidak membiarkan soal pembangunan

dan roh anak² kita. Sa-bagaimana yang saya katakan tadi, Menteri Pelajaran, sa-kali pun di-dalam motorkar-nya tidak ada sejadah, tidak ada tasbeh—sa-bagai-mana orang² PAS ada tasbeh, sejadah—tetapi kadang² sejadah itu di-buat azimat kemudian berchampur dengan kayu golf.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyebut perkara ini bahawa soal pelajaran dan pendidekan anak² kita ini ada-lah soal kita. Sa-lama hari ini kita menengok dan memekek di-dalam Dewan ini, ra'ayat kita kurang penghidupan-nya tidak lumayan, kenapa timbul soal² saperti ini, tidak lain dan tidak bukan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sebab²-nya timbul ia-lah oleh kerana kekurangan ilmu pengetahuan kita daripada semua sudut. Ilmu pelajaran dari semua sudut, kita tidak dapat memaksakan anak yang tidak berpelajaran itu mengerjakan sa-suatu pekerjaan yang dia tidak tahu. Walau pun kita suka orang² kita, anak itu, berniaga, buka satu sharikat besar², tetapi kalau tidak ada pelajaran, tidak ada pengalaman, tidak ada pendidekan yang sempurna, sharikat² yang begitu besar akan tenggelam sa-rupa saperti mana yang berlaku pada beberapa tahun yang telah lalu. Oleh kerana tidak ada pengalaman dan pelajaran, sa-buah Sharikat Kapal Haji telah tenggelam belum sampai di-pelabuhan di-Judah, kerana wang² telah tidak tentu arah. Niat hati ada hendak menjadi Pengarah Sharikat Perkapalan Melayu German—ada hati!—tetapi pelajaran tidak ada, pengalaman tidak ada, dan akhir-nya tenggelam dan di-bawa ka-hadapan Mahkamah.

Ini-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, satu chontoh yang mustahak bagi kita mendidek anak² kita dalam semua bidang pelajaran. Kita tidak guna menchabar atau pun menyatakan bahawa dasar pelajaran ini tidak betul, ini tidak betul. Paling senang kerja dalam dunia ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, menyatakan kerja orang tidak betul, itu-lah yang paling senang sa-kali, tidak ada kerja memechat nombor satu punya senang, tetapi bila hendak membuat, ini-lah timbul masalah, boleh-kah kita bekerja, boleh-kah kita membuat atau

tidak. Ini masalah yang berat. Bukan perkara² cerita berserah, kalau kita berserah di-tengah padang chukup senang, tetapi bila kita hendak mengerjakan perbuatan, hendak menghasilkan tujuan, chukup susah. Bagi saya sendiri—kawasan saya ini, Hilir Perak, yang boleh di-katakan satu bandar pun tidak ada—nama-nya bandar ada, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, “Kampung Bandar” nama-nya tetapi bukan bandar—kampung! Tidak ada satu benda, satu kampung, satu bandar atau satu pekan pun dalam kawasan saya sejak daripada Hulu Kampong Gajah sampai ka-Hilir Kota Setia. Nama-nya sedap, Tuan Yang di-Pertua—“Setia”—dan sampai mengelok masuk ka-bendang², tidak ada satu bandar, tidak ada elektrik, tidak ada apa pun, tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya memandang kehidupan ra’ayat di-kampung² itu, ada yang susah, ada yang senang, sa-rupa-lah dengan sunnatullah—kejadian Tuhan—ada tinggi ada rendah, siapa yang mengerjakan kudrat (kuasa-nya) lebeh, dia dapat lebeh, siapa yang dudok termenong di-tepi tangga menengok bayang dalam sungai, maka melarat-lah hidup-nya. Kita hendak paksa orang suka memenongi ini bekerja, pada arah hati-nya tidak di-situ, tentu-lah tidak mendapat kejayaan.

Ranchangan untuk menebang getah yang tua² untuk di-tanam sa-mula, bagi orang yang mengikut ranchangan itu sekarang sudah hampir² mendapat hasil, tetapi bagi orang² yang berangan² hidup-nya tentu-lah akan hanyut di-tengah jalan sahaja. Tetapi hendak kita paksa seperti mana yang sa-orang Ahli Yang Berhormat, pada awal perbahathan ini menyatakan—Kelantan Hilir kalau tidak salah—bahawa Undang² menchantumkan—menyatukan tanah² yang tidak ekonomi—menjadi satu tanah yang berekonomi. Kalau Undang² itu kata-nya, tidak ada kuku sedikit pun, tidak boleh dilaksanakan, mesti di-paksa baharu jadi. Kalau tidak ada paksa tidak boleh jadi, kalau A dia hendak, B tidak mahu, hendak buat macham mana? Jadi dia suka supaya di-lakukan satu paksaan kepada orang yang ada tanah yang bukan “Economic Holding” tanah-nya supaya di-ambil.

Jadi, kalau ini masalah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau kita bahatkan soal ini—ini berlawanan daripada pelajaran Islam, yang ia sendiri menyatakan ajaran Islam itu tidak boleh paksa, sehingga orang hendak masuk Islam pun kita tidak boleh paksa bagaimana kita hendak ambil hak-nya, harta-nya, tidak boleh di-paksa sama sa-kali. Jadi kalau macham, dasar Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Kelantan Hilir hendak memperjuangkan Islam kemudian memaksa orang itu dengan paksaan Undang²—ini berlawanan dengan Undang² Islam. Apa yang kita buat di-dalam Undang² Pemulehan Tanah² Yang Tidak Berekonomi, supaya mereka itu menyedari bahawa tanah yang dua ekar pada mereka itu tidak chukup. Mereka mesti-lah bersama², bagaimana hendak membetulkan tanah itu. Chara bertolak ansor, chara berlapang dada, chara pengetahuan, pelajaran, chara menginsafi kedudukan. Ini-lah sahaja, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jalan untuk meninggikan taraf hidup ra’ayat di-kampung². Oleh kerana saya katakan tadi, kawasan saya itu ada-lah kawasan kampung sekarang ini, dan kawasan kampung yang seperti kawasan saya ini, walau pun dia tanam padi dan hasil-nya dapat sa-tahun sa-kali, tetapi kalau Tuan Yang di-Pertua sudi datang di-kawasan saya tiap² rumah ada Honda dan Scooter. Ada Honda dan Scooter bukan menunjukkan kemerosotan hidup, tetapi menunjukkan taraf hidup yang agak lumayan—tinggi sedikit. Sebab kalau dia tidak tinggi, dia tidak boleh membeli. Kalau beras dia tidak boleh beli, kalau barang lain dia tidak boleh dapat kenapa dia mesti boleh beli Honda? Bagi saya inilah satu bukti yang menyatakan bahawa kehidupan orang² di-kampung² itu sudah mula naik, bukan sudah chukup, tidak chukup, tetapi sudah mula naik. Sebab² telah mula naik, ialah oleh kerana chara² hendak membawa ra’ayat yang di-kampung² itu dengan pelajaran dan penarekan, supaya mereka dapat memberi bantuan di-dalam penghidupan mereka sendiri dalam negara ini dan kemudian dapat menyokong negara ini menjadi satu negara yang ma’amor dan bahagia.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam ucapan Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan, ada tiga puncha kekayaan hasil negeri kita ini. Yang pertama daripada getah, bijeh, kayu-kayan. Ketiga² ini, sama ada getah, bijeh, kayu-kayan, dia merupakan sumber yang besar bagi penghasilan negara. Bila kita menyatakan getah di-sini, ia-lah getah di-estate² yang besar². Kalau kita katakan bijeh di-sini ia-lah lombong² bijeh yang besar², kalau kita katakan kayu-kayan di-sini ia-lah kayu-kayan daripada penghasil² kayu yang besar. Di-dalam ketiga² hasil atau pun puncha penghasilan negara, bagi ra'ayat bumiputera atau pun bagi orang Melayu, tidak dapat mencham-pori diri-nya dengan sa-penoh di-dalam ketiga² puncha ini, melainkan sadikit² sahaja. Kalau berkenaan dengan getah, dia hanya mempunyai kebun² getah yang sudah tua², kalau soal² bijeh hanya baharu hendak bacha bismillah, kalau soal kayu-kayan baharu hendak chuba. Jadi, ketiga² sumber ini di-mana saya katakan dan Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan menyatakan, ada-lah sumber kekayaan negara kita, sumber kekuatan kewangan kita. Maka untuk mengekalkan kekokohan ekonomi di-masa hadapan, maka ladang² getah yang tidak bereconomic holding—saperti undang² yang telah kita luluskan—kalau dapat di-beri galakan yang lebeh sempurna, maka saya rasa ra'ayat bumiputera dan orang² Melayu di-luar² bandar akan dapat menyumbang tenaga-nya yang lebeh besar kepada penghasilan getah di-mana dia akan dapat menyumbangkan tenaga dalam penghasilan negara.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ranchangan F.L.D.A. di-mana telah berjalan beberapa tahun, pada masa ini Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bachok beberapa hari yang telah sudah menyatakan bahawa F.L.D.A. itu telah gagal. Pada fahaman saya F.L.D.A. itu tidak gagal, oleh kerana sa-panjang yang kita tahu F.L.D.A. (Lembaga Kemajuan Tanah Persekutuan) baharu di-dalam perchub-an, di-dalam ikhtiar dan hasil-nya belum dapat sa-hingga sampai kepada perangkat matlamat yang di-tujukan oleh F.L.D.A. itu sendiri. Boleh jadi di-Ayer Lanas, tidak berapa lama lagi

mereka akan dapat menoreh getah mereka sendiri, hasil daripada Ranchangan F.L.D.A. ini, boleh jadi di-Chalok tidak berapa lama lagi akan dapat hasil² daripada kerja mereka.

Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, satu perkara yang patut kita fahami baik², bahawa Kerajaan Perikatan ini baharu berkuasa sa-sudah kemerdekaan kita ini lapan tahun dan di-dalam masa lapan tahun ini banyak pembangunan yang sedang di-buat—baharu kita hendak mengeluarkan modal dan hasil-nya belum dapat kita lihat pada hari ini. Kalau sa-kira-nya Kerajaan Perikatan ini dapat di-pinjamkan oleh Ahli² Yang Berhormat dari PAS—tongkat Nabi Allah Musa—alangkah baik-nya supaya dapat kita gunakan tongkat itu—sebab dalam Koran cherita tongkat Nabi Allah Musa ini chukup mujrab, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Dipukul sahaja ka-batu terbit anak sungai—12 anak sungai terbit, sa-kali pukul 12 anak sungai terbit, tiap² orang tahu tempat minum dia. Jadi, alangkah baik-nya kalau Ahli Yang Berhormat dari PAS boleh bawa tongkat Nabi Musa, pinjam daripada Nabi Allah Musa bawa ka-kawasan saya. Tiga kali pukul chukup-lah, semua bendang² akan berayer dan bersungai. Tetapi kita bukan ada tongkat yang saperti itu dan juga PAS tentu-lah tidak ada tongkat yang saperti itu . . .

Wan Hassan bin Wan Daud (Tumpat): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untk penjelasan. Berapa banyak tongkat Nabi Musa yang di-kehendaki saya sanggup memberi-nya . . .

Mr Speaker: Penjelasan apa?

Wan Hassan bin Wan Daud: Dia berkehendakkan tongkat Nabi Musa nampak-nya tadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Saya mahu tanya apa maksud tongkat Nabi Musa yang di-kehendaki itu?

Tuan Haji Othman bin Abdullah: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau dia tidak tahu, dia balek ka-pondok mengaji apa ma'ana tongkat Nabi Musa itu. Tanya tuan guru di-pondok tongkat Nabi Musa itu apa!

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, itu-lah yang saya katakan tadi kita, baik daripada

pehak Kerajaan, baik daripada mana juga, tidak ada kuasa yang seperti itu, tidak ada tongkat Nabi Musa, tidak ada lampu ajaib, tidak ada apa². Kita terpaksa menunggu masa, kita terpaksa berdikit² dalam perjalanan kita. Sekarang pun, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, macam Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Tumpat, dia tahu-lah kawasan dia sendiri ada sa-buah jambatan melintang di-situ, belanja-nya \$5 juta, dapatkah sekarang penghasilan itu \$5 juta balek? Tidak dapat. Dia terpaksa mengambil masa, mengambil chukai tiap² satu motokar \$1.00, 50 sen, 20 sen, mithal-nya, dia terpaksa mengambil masa baharu, dia pulang modal dia itu balek, entah sa-tahun, entah dua tahun, entah tiga tahun baharu \$5 juta itu pulang balek. Itu jam tegakkan, itu jam hendak dapat hasil, itu jam hendak senang. Hanya kata saya tongkat Nabi Musa sahaja yang boleh buat begitu. Jadi, itu-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam soal pembentokan masyarakat kita di-luar bandar, suatu masyarakat yang patut kita ambil tahu dan beri pengertian, bahawa dasar Kerajaan dalam pembangunan ekonomi yang menjadi sumbangan kepada pembangunan negara kita ini patut mereka menyedari, terutama saya katakan dalam soal getah yang saya katakan tadi.

F.L.D.A. pada mula-nya tentu-lah tidak dapat hendak menengok hasilnya, tetapi manakala sudah lapan tahun enam tahun daripada di-mulakan, maka waktu itu kita baharu dapat tahu tiap² orang yang mendapat tanah itu yang 6 ekar tanah dia pasti dapat \$300.00 sa-bulan kalau dia tidak hendak jadi senang, jadi tauke, dengan syarat harga getah tidak seperti yang ada sekarang. 6 ekar tanah kalau dia sendiri buat kerja—3 kati satu hari—dia boleh dapat sa-kurang² 20 kati satu hari dengan harga sekarang 60 sen. Ma'ana-nya dia dapat \$12.00 satu hari, kalau tiga puluh atau kali dua puluh, chukup, atau kalau dua puluh lima, chukup, sudah menunjukkan bahawa kerja F.L.D.A. ini akan menimbulkan suatu kehidupan yang lumayan, tetapi bukan sekarang, sa-sudah ia berhasil. Untuk menimbulkan, untuk sampai kepada hasil, terpaksa bekerja, terpaksa

berusaha, terpaksa-lah bersusah sadi- kit. Tetapi belum lagi kerja di-mulai datang-lah ahli² PAS pergi kempen di-sana. Dia kata, "Ini haram, ini gagal, tidak boleh, ini bukan mu punya tanah, ini tanah Kerajaan".

Ini-lah yang menyebabkan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, yang ra'ayat di-F.L.D.A. itu chabut lari meninggalkan tempat itu. Dan kalau sa-kira-nya orang lain boleh maju chara begitu tidak apa, dia chuma sa-mata² hendak menggagalkan ranchangan. Ini tidak 'adil macham itu. Kita galakkan, tengok di-Ayer Lanas, kita galakkan betul² sudah lapan tahun—dapat hasil atau tidak? Ini dia, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau kita sa-bagai manusia yang bertanggung-jawab kepada ra'ayat kita sendiri, tetapi kalau sentimen parti, jangan! Ini, kata-nya, anak jadi emak, emak jadi bapa, dia punya bunga, ada bunga sekian peratus. Ini haram semua sakali lari-lah orang. Bila lari makan pun susah, pergi-lah dia membuat tanah² haram, datang, Kerajaan halau. Ini-lah nasib ra'ayat di-kampong². Sudah-lah begitu, hendak minta tanah pun tidak dapat, bukan kepada mereka di-beri tanah, tanah di-beri pada orang lain. Ini nasib orang² di-kampong² yang patut sa-tiap parti politik—baik parti Pembangkang atau parti kita ini memberi kesedaran tentang tugas mereka di-masa hadapan. Dan bagaimana mustahak-nya kita mengambil peranan di-dalam bidang menghasilkan getah yang mempunyai nilai—standard—yang baik sa-bagaimana jaminan Menteri Kewangan, bahawa getah kita-lah sa-bagai suatu punya yang besar dalam negeri ini. Ada baik-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada ladang² getah yang banyak sekarang ini yang di-punya oleh orang bukan ra'ayat negeri ini—daripada orang luar—daripada kapitalis luar negeri. Saya rasa tanah² itu ada yang sudah mula di-jual. Saya mengshorkan kepada Kerajaan, supaya MARA mengambil bahagian dalam soal ini. MARA ambil tanah itu, beli tanah itu—tanah estate yang besar² itu di-beli oleh MARA. Kalau tidak ada wang, pinjam daripada Kerajaan. Bank Bumiputera beli benda itu. Apabila sudah di-beli kemudian baharu kita bahagi², mengikut economic holding,

kapada ra'ayat yang tidak mempunyai tanah.

Jadi, dua sumber—satu F.L.D.A. dan satu membeli estate² yang hendak dijual, kemudian kita berikan kepada orang² yang tidak ada tanah atau mempunyai tanah yang tidak economic holding supaya mereka itu dapat menyumbang penghasilan negara daripada getah.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pendek² sahaja saya berchakap, berkenaan dengan bijeh, maka penghasilan juga menjadi sumber kekuatan negara dan kewangan negara. Apa yang di-sebutkan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan—lombong pam yang di-daftarkan 907 berbanding dengan 687, erti-nya sudah naik sedikit, sedangkan lombong sa-chara dredging tidak bertambah. Jadi, oleh kerana bumiputera tidak mempunyai wang yang banyak, dan jikalau dia bersharikat pun wang itu tidak begitu banyak, maka patut di-beri galakan kepada bumiputera yang mempunyai kechenderongan di-dalam melombong ini, kalau tidak dapat besar² pun, sedikit² dapat di-beri kepada mereka itu peluang² oleh Kerajaan dan dengan demikian dapat menambahkan penghasilan yang sekarang ini hanya di-keluarkan oleh pemodal² besar, dapat menambahkan penghasilan bijeh kita itu dengan ada-nya lombong² kecil yang di-punya² oleh orang² Melayu atau orang² di-luar bandar.

Bagitu juga hal-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dengan kayu-kayan yang saya harap supaya kayu-kayan ini juga dapat di-beri peluang, bukan hanya kaum yang mempunyai modal, tetapi di-beri peluang kepada ra'ayat bumiputera supaya dapat bersama² dengan orang yang mempunyai modal sekarang ini menambahkan hasil-nya, bukan hendak merebut apa yang ada pada orang yang ada sekarang, tetapi menambahkan hasil. Kalau orang yang ada sekarang ini dapat mengeluarkan 10 tambah dengan kita 2—menjadi 12. Walau pun kita kecil tetapi kita dapat memberikan sumbangan di-dalam menambahkan penghasilan negara di-mana bererti, dengan penambahan itu, akan menambahkan pula hasil negara.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, semua belanja² yang di-terangkan oleh Menteri Kewangan, Anggaran yang sa-banyak \$1,644 juta itu, termasuk belanja² yang ada di-Kementerian² sedangkan kita membelanjakan wang yang lebeh daripada penghasilan yang kita dapat dan kita menghadapi kekurangan wang bagi menutupi perbelanjaan itu, maka oleh Menteri yang berkenaan—Menteri Kewangan kita—telah-lah mengemukakan chukai² bagaimana hendak menambahkan penghasilan kita itu. Bila menyebabkan chukai, ini-lah timbul-nya debate dalam Dewan ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Kelmarin saya mendengar Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Pasir Puteh

Mr Speaker: Saya suka hendak mengingatkan, sudah sa-tengah jam lebeh, sudah!

Tuan Haji Othman bin Abdullah: Penghabisan. Ini sedikit sahaja. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kelmarin Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Pasir Puteh, telah menyatakan tidak sesuai-nya dengan penurunan chukai daun terup, bukan oleh kerana turun-nya harga chukai daun terup itu dia tidak suka, tetapi berma'ana kata dia, “dengan penurunan chukai, menggalakkan perjudian”. Itu dia kata. Sudah-lah perjudian, tetapi dalam daun terup itu ada gambaran yang menimbulkan geram dia. Kalau tidak salah, itu-lah dia sa-malam Ahli Yang Berhormat itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau ini kita bahathkan, perjudian, bukan hanya timbul daripada daun terup dan geram bukan hanya timbul daripada gambaran yang ada di-dalam daun terup, tetapi tidak ada gambaran pun orang naik geram juga. Ada juga, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bukan ta' ada—ada, dan ta' ada daun terup, orang berjudi juga. Apa, satu chontoh, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-Kelantan bila ada pilehan raya, ra'ayat Kelantan berjudi. Berjudi—siapa-kah di-antara chalun ini menang—chalun Perikatan-kah atau PAS-kah? Orang PAS memasang kaki supaya berjudi supaya di-beri wang, di-adakan perjudian supaya chalun dia menang dan bagitu juga orang² Perikatan, di-chari orang dia supaya dalam perjudian ini ada menang. Jadi

di-dalam soal perjudian ini, rasa saya, bukan sahaja pada daun terup sahingga di-dalam pilihan raya ada perjudian dan saya yakin, Ahli² Yang Berhormat daripada PAS yang menang di-Dewan ini, hasil daripada perjudian pilihan raya dalam negeri Kelantan sendiri. Jadi, bagaimana-kah kita hendak menyekat perjudian? Di-mana perjudian itu ada, di-mana² sahaja. Chuma, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dia tengok yang gambar yang tidak sedap begitu dan bagini menimbulkan bahawa kita ini tidak bermoral, tidak berakhlak.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau itu-lah yang di-tuduh oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada PAS, saya suka menchabar mereka itu supaya mereka menunjukkan berapa orang pelachor dalam negeri Kelantan telah mereka hapuskan sejak mereka berkuasa. Ini pun satu pelachoran. Ini-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, alang-kah senang-nya berchakap, membuka mulut daripada menimbulkan satu hadith. Jadi, pada akhir-nya

Dato' Mohamed Asri bin Haji Muda:

Untuk penjelasan. Saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangkitkan soal daun terup itu ia-lah berdasarkan kepada ucapan Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan. Kata dia, "kerana payah sangat hendak menjaga, orang banyak melarikan chukai, maka yang \$4 lebeh itu di-turunkan kepada \$2 lebeh". Ada pun perkara yang saya sebutkan kemudian itu ia-lah perkara yang berkaitan dengan soal daun terup. Jadi, Yang Berhormat itu mengaitkan pula dengan soal judi, pilihan raya. Saya ingin bertanya Yang Berhormat itu, masa dia menang pilihan raya di-kawasan Tanah Merah di-Kelantan dahulu ada-kah menang sa-chara judi macham itu?

Tuan Haji Othman bin Abdullah:

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kelmarin Ahli Yang Berhormat itu waktu di-tanya, ada-kah dia sendiri menengok gambar itu, dia kata kalau ta' tengok, macham mana hendak berchakap. Dia tengok gambar yang luhah itu. Jadi, macham itu-lah jawab saya. Kalau saya sendiri tidak tahu macham mana saya hendak berchakap, sebab saya memang dudok di-Kelantan itu dahulu—saya tahu.

Jadi, kalau saya ta' tahu dudok, bagaimana saya hendak berchakap. Ini-lah. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya kata perkara ini tidak berbangkit, tetapi dikait²kan kepada benda yang seperti itu, chuma masalaah-nya chukai daun terup ini di-kurangkan atau tidak, tetapi dia sudah twistkan lain macham, jadi, saya pun twist lain macham juga.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, rasa saya kalau saya hendak berchakap pun panjang sangat, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, chukup sekian, tetapi saya mengharap-kan, pada akhir-nya kepada Menteri Kewangan, supaya menjaga sedikit wang negara kita ini, tetapi dalam masa hendak menjaga duit negara kita ini, jangan-lah sampai Pejabat Parlimen ini pun bertimbun² tuntutan tidak berbayar. Saya mendapat tahu, talipon Ahli² Dewan Ra'ayat banyak yang belum berbayar, kerana hendak menjimatkan wang—wang ta' ada, sahingga bertimbun² wang tuntutan Parlimen berkenaan dengan pembayaran talipon, keretapi, tidak berbayar dan minta supaya di-kurangkan. Bagaimana, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, hendak di-kurangkan orang ini mempunyai hak menggunakan-nya. Jadi, kalau hendak di-kurangkan, benda lain-lah; yang dalam Dewan Ra'ayat ini—yang berkaitan dengan Ahli Dewan Ra'ayat ini—sa-dapat²-nya ta' usah-lah di-kurangkan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berkaitan dengan kurang wang ini—sadikit lagi—saya rasa ada satu perkara, kalau saya tidak chakap terkilan sadikit. Saya minta Menteri Kewangan kita menengokkan sadikit tentang pegawai² kita—pegawai² Kerajaan—yang tidak ada rumah. Bila pegawai Kerajaan tidak ada rumah, dia terpaksa menyewa rumah, sewa rumah keluar itu \$600 hingga \$700—Kerajaan bayar. Beberapa ribu million ringgit telah di-belanjakan, pada hal jikalau dia dudok dalam rumah Kerajaan chuma \$60 sahaja, malang-nya ada pegawai Kerajaan kita, dia dudok di-rumah Kerajaan, dia buat rumah di-luar. Dia bayar \$60 dia dapat \$700. Jadi, macham berniaga pula. Tetapi chuba Menteri Kewangan selideki, berapa orang pegawai² kita yang ada rumah yang

berlebehan, suroh dia dudok di-rumah dia dan rumah yang dia dudok itu beri kapada orang lain yang menyewa diantara \$600 hingga \$700 yang kita bayar itu, dudok di-rumah Kerajaan. Maintenance atau pun perbelanjaan memperbaiki rumah itu bermillion², Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berjuta² ringgit. Ini barangkali ta' berapa kita sedari, tetapi pegawai kita ada. Jadi, chuba tengok sedikit lebeh kurang supaya dapat kita kurangkan perbelanjaan kewangan kita, jangan kami Ahli Parlimen sahaja kena sampai, bill talipon kami ta' berbayar. Sekian, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, terima kaseh.

Enche' Sim Boon Liang (Sarawak):
Mr Speaker, Sir, before the introduction of the draft Budget to the House, there were much speculations among the people of Sarawak as to whether there was going to be additional or increased taxation to pay next year. After listening to the Budget speech given by the Honourable the Minister of Finance last week, it is found that there are going to be dearer arak, dearer sugar, 2% of new single stage tax, 2% for payroll tax and many other taxes will be introduced and extended to Sarawak as those obtaining in the States of Malaya. Sir, as I am from Sarawak and also from a rural constituency, I will fail in my duty, if I do not stand up to say something on the people's behalf. Sir, Sarawak is an agricultural State, and the great majority of the people are farmers and labourers. They have very low incomes, and their livelihood is mostly depending on the local produce from their gardens and labours. At present, Sir, the prices of local produce are so low, that they hardly earn their living. The increase of import duty on sugar will hit them, and they will be very much aggrieved. The price of sugar will be increased by \$3.50 per bag. Of course, Sir, those poor people will suffer, for they have to buy dearer sugar. Therefore, Sir, I urge that the Government will take this matter into consideration. I agree to the increase of import duty on arak, cigarettes and some luxury goods, because to drink arak and smoke cigarettes are just a luxury. To increase the tax on these particular goods, I think, is quite

reasonable. In fact, Sir, the import duty on motor vehicles, face powders, perfumes, lipsticks and some other luxury goods should be increased too, because only rich people can afford to buy and use them.

With reference to the new single stage tax and payroll tax, Sir, the Honourable Minister of Finance has said that the Government has now decided to convert the existing multi-stage tax into a new single-stage tax from January 1st, 1966, but that the rate of charge will be increased from $\frac{1}{2}$ % to 2% for the single-stage tax, and 2% for the payroll tax, which will be introduced and extended to Sarawak in line with the other States of Malaya. On this, Sir, I feel that the taxes are too high for Sarawak and for the people to bear. It is a sudden shock to the people of Sarawak. Sir, as we know, the States of Malaya are more advanced and are more progressive than Sarawak for years, and Sarawak, as everyone knows, is really still a baby, a very backward state. Therefore, Sir, the rates of taxes for Sarawak should not be brought up into line with that of the Federation of Malaya at present, but should be brought up to Federation of Malaya levels in gradual stages in a period of at least seven years or more, and the step should not be grossly disproportionate. Sir, I think everyone in this House knows that this was mentioned in the Inter-Governmental Committee Report, paragraph 24, providing with safeguard. Sir, as I have said just now, these taxes will affect the consumers especially the poor people, who will suffer for they have to pay more for the prices of their daily goods with their limited income. Therefore, Sir, I urge the Honourable Minister to reconsider favourably the rate of taxes for Sarawak. I also hope, Sir, that the Minister of Finance should consult with the Sarawak State Government before introducing any further changes of taxes for Sarawak because of unequal circumstances and conditions between Federation of Malaya and Sarawak.

Lastly, Sir, it is gratifying to note that at this time the Government realises the importance of the tourist

industry in Sarawak and Malaysia as a whole. This could be a worthwhile development and should be explored in order to help increase our revenue. Thank you, Sir.

Wan Haji Abdul Kadir bin Ismail (Trengganu): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam masa empat hari perbincangan tentang perbelanjaan ini, kechaman² Pembangkang yang di-lancharkan kepada belanjawan ini, ada-lah mengatakan konon-nya, bahawa belanjawan yang di-kemukakan ini menguntongkan capitalist—menguntongkan pemodal. Lepas sa-orang, sa-orang dan lepas satu Parti, satu Parti yang berchakap dalam perkara ini, sa-hingga saya bertanya diri saya sendiri, tidakkah ada kechaman jenis lain yang hendak di-kemukakan? Kerana saya berani chabar pehak Pembangkang—tidak ada satu Belanjawan di-negeri² yang bukan kominis yang tidak membuka jalan keuntongan kepada pemodal atau memberi galakan kepada pemodal. Hanya Belanjawan negeri kominis sahaja, yang barangkali menutup jalan memberi galakan kepada modal dan pemodal. Saya harap kepada Pembangkang boleh bawa chontoh, mana chontoh Kerajaan Socialist, Kerajaan Buroh British, Kerajaan Socialist India atau lebeh dekat pada idea Ahli dari Bungsar barangkali hendak bawa—Kerajaan Socialist Singapura—yang Belanjawan-nya tidak memberi keuntongan atau memberi galakan kepada pemodal.

Semua akhbar² yang ada di-negeri ini—dari semua bahasa—ada-lah memuji belanjawan yang ada ini sa-bagai Belanjawan yang baik dan sederhana. Jadi apa-kah lagi yang hendak di-salahkan oleh pehak Pembangkang? Sa-bagai chiptaan manusia, Belanjawan ini memang ada kekurangan-nya, tetapi jangan-lah membuat ucapan yang hanya melonggokkan keburokan sa-mata²—saperti yang dibuat oleh Ahli² pembangkang—Ahli dari Batu-kah, Dato Keramat-kah, Kelantan Hilir-kah, Bungsar-kah, Pasir Puteh-kah, sa-olah² Belanjawan yang ada ini tidak ada langsung baik-nya, sa-bagai sa-orang manusia yang penoh dengan puru sahaja umpama-nya.

Kapada Front Socialist saya hendak bertanya—kalau dia berchakap tentang Socialist—mana dia programme socialist daripada Front Socialist—chubalah tunjukkan. Saya tahu dan ramai orang tahu Pemangku Ketua Parti Ra'ayat Malaysia, telah keluar daripada Front Socialist kerana membantah yang Parti Buroh sudah hendak meninggalkan dasar hendak menghak-negarakan sharikat² asing. Ini sa-lain daripada bosan dengan dasar Chauvau-nist yang melampau yang ada dalam Socialist Front. Kemudian kita dengar pula, pada hari sa-malam, Ahli daripada Pasir Puteh mengatakan belanjawan ini belanja yang bertelut menyembah kepada kaum kapitalis, saya mendengar kechaman dari Ahli Pasir Puteh ini, saya sendiri naik hairan, siapa yang sa-benar-nya bertelut dan menyembah kepada kapitalis—tidakkah Ahli daripada Pasir Puteh itu sendiri, sa-bagai Ketua Kerajaan Kelantan yang bertelut dan menyembah kepada kapitalis dengan mengga-daikan tanah² di-Hulu Kelantan? Tidak-kah ini satu jenis penyembahan, satu jenis telutan yang tidak pernah di-lihat dan di-saksikan oleh sejarah tanah ayer kita. Saya berharap kepada Ahli Pasir Puteh dan rakan²-nya, betulkan-lah rumah sendiri dahulu; kalau rumah sendiri daripada kacha tidak usah-lah lontar rumah orang lain. Hinggakan orang kuat PAS, Yang Berhormat Enche' Shofie pun, keluar daripada PAS sekarang ini, dan bertanya dalam Dewan Negeri Kelantan, apa PAS buat pada orang Melayu dengan dasar menyembah dan bertelut kepada kapitalis asing tadi?

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-lain dari itu, saya suka hendak menyentoh sadikit tentang bumiputera—terlalu banyak di-perkatakan perkara bumiputera ini pada masa yang akhir² ini. Bahkan sa-tengah² orang, Ahli² Dewan ini, mengambil kesempatan dari ketiadaan ta'arif Undang² kepada perkataan bumiputera itu, terutama Ahli dari Batu dan dari Tanjong. Oleh sebab tidak ada ta'arif Undang² atau ta'arif bumiputera itu, mereka menghendaki supaya lebeh sadikit digunakan perkataan itu, lebeh baik. Saya sendiri hairan kenapa-kah mereka

itu memusohi perkataan bumiputera. Saya merasa memang ada tujuan politik yang jahat di-belakang.

Perkataan bumiputera ini di-gunakan untok membezakan kedudukan ekonomi antara orang² yang bukan bumiputera—yang mewah ekonominya—dan kedudukan ekonomi bumiputera yang sangat mundor, kerana bumiputera itu ia-lah anak negeri yang asal di-sini dan bukan daripada anak negeri yang mendatang. Kedudukan ekonomi tidak sa-imbang ini atau "economic imbalance" ini, ini-lah yang sa-benar-nya merupakan "silent revolution" yang kalau tidak di-betulkan, yang kalau tidak di-ubati bersunggo², akan meletus dan membakar hangus tanah ayer kita ini. Ada-kah tujuan Ahli² Pembangkang, terutama sa-kali dari Batu dan Tanjong

Mr Speaker: Persidangan ini di-tempohkan sa-lama 15 minit.

Persidangan ini di-tempohkan pada pukul 6.36 petang.

Sitting resumed at 6.55 p.m.

(Mr Speaker in the Chair)

Debate resumed.

Mr Speaker: Ahli Yang Berhormat itu sudah berchakap tadi sa-lama 10 minit, tolong pendekkan sadikit.

Wan Haji Abdul Kadir bin Ismail: Terima kaseh. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tadi saya katakan bahawa kempen menentang bumiputera yang dilancarkan oleh Parti Pembangkang ini mempunyai tujuan politik yang jahat di-belakang-nya. Saya bertanya, adakah tujuan pehak Pembangkang dari S.F. dan U.D.P., untok menghapuskan penggunaan perkataan bumiputera ini ia-lah bertujuan untok menghapuskan hak² istimewa di-Malaya, Sabah dan Sarawak. Jika ini-lah tujuan mereka itu, maka saya berkata, tidak ada bumiputera di-Malaya atau di-Sabah dan di-Sarawak yang akan mengizinkan ini dan dengan sikap ini Ahli² Pembangkang, S.F. dan U.D.P. itu, akan membawa kehanchoran dengan tidak di-sedari-nya kapada Malaysia ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka-lah hendak menyentoh sadikit tentang dasar luar dan dasar luar kita yang berpedomankan berbaik² dengan semua negara yang ingin bersahabat dengan kita—ia-lah dasar persahabatan yang baik. Tetapi pada hari sa-malam, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Pasir Puteh, ada mengatakan bahawa dasar luar kita ini telah merosot. Saya hairan sa-kali kerana kalau dasar luar kita sudah merosot—sambutan-nya sudah kurang—bagaimana-kah baharu tidak sampai 3 minggu, Republic Arab Bersatu telah bersetuju menanda tangani Perjanjian Kebudayaan dengan Malaysia? Kedudukan kita—Malaysia—di-Afro Asia pada masa ini bertambah² baik. terutama sa-kali sa-lepas peristiwa 30 September di-Indonesia ini, kerana peristiwa itu telah membongkar bahawa sa-benar-nya kominis-lah yang berdiri di-belakang konfrantasi Indonesia itu. Maka kalau Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Pasir Puteh mengatakan dasar luar kita telah merosot maka tanda-nya beliau sa-bagai orang buta berjalan dengan tidak bertongkat.

Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Pasir Puteh juga, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada menyebut tentang Menteri Pelajaran yang tadi di-sebutkan oleh saudara saya, Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Hilir Perak, tentang kata-nya Menteri Pelajaran ini hanya banyak melawat² sahaja. Saya hendak tambah sadikit, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya fikir Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Pasir Puteh—Ketua Kerajaan Kelantan—takut kapada lawatan Menteri² Pusat ini, takut pengaruh dia itu hilang, pengaruh PAS hilang—habis kuasa. Kerana orang² PAS ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, antara ayat Qur'an yang banyak dia baca 6,666 ayat itu, satu ayat yang di-bacha hari² di-jadikan wirid—*Ayatulkursi*", ayat hendak kekalkan kerusi—itu sahaja—takut hilang kerusi sahaja. Jadi mereka ini takutkan kapada bayang², Tuan Yang di-Pertua, macham kata orang² tua kita, sebab takutkan hantu tunggol pun di-sangka-kan hantu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam hubungan dasar luar negeri ini, yang kita dan Kerajaan kita barangkali

hendak sangat berhubung baik dengan jiran yang paling dekat dengan kita ia-itu Singapura, tetapi dalam praktiknya—dalam hubungan kita sa-telah perpisahlah Singapura daripada Malaysia ini—kalau ada pun sedikit sa-banyak kekerohan perhubungan, biasa-nya Singapura-lah yang memulakan. Tadi, Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Bungsar ada menudoh, Malaysia ini sa-bagai arbitrary elder brother dan meminta supaya Malaysia tidak champor tangan dalam hal Singapura—hands off Singapore!

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ini ada *Utusan Melayu*, 13hb November, menyiarkan ucapan Menteri Buroh Singapura yang menghasut, supaya ra'ayat Malaysia ini memilih Kerajaan baharu. Jadi bagini-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita berkata-lah kepada Singapura menerusi Wakil Bungsar,—tidak ada di-sini sekarang—Wakil Bungsar yang mempunyai dua hati—satu hati di-Kuala Lumpur dan satu lagi di-Singapura—“hands off” Malaysia. Jaga-lah Singapura rumah tangga sendiri sahaja dan biar-lah dunia tahu pada masa ini bahawa Singapura-lah yang memulakan kekerohan suasana di-antara kedua negara ini.

Saya ingin juga bertanya kepada Ahli dari Bungsar ini, yang saya sifatkan sa-bagai penyuluh atau sa-bagai matahari—bukan matahari bagi Shari'kat Transport, matahari penyuluh—kapada P.A.P. di-Kuala Lumpur, di-mana-kah letak ta'at setia beliau ini di-Singapura atau di-Kuala Lumpur? Baharu ketika sidang Belanjawan ini hendak di-mulakan, beliau telah mengumumkan, bahawa ia memutuskan hubungan-nya dengan M.T.U.C. Singapura. Barangkali takut soal beliau itu di-bangkitkan dalam sidang ini. Tetapi baharu pada bulan lepas, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-bagai M.P. di-Malaysia, beliau menjadi tuan rumah kepada pemimpin² buroh Afro-Asia bagi pehak Singapura di-Singapura dan entah berapa guni maki hamun yang di-churahkan-nya kepada Malaysia di-hadapan pemimpin² buroh Afro-Asia itu. Mujor-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pemimpin buroh Afro-Asia itu chelek mata-nya. Oleh itu saya nasihatkan, lebeh baik-lah ahli Bung-

sar itu gulong tikar dan balek-lah ka-Singapura kerana ta'at setia-nya bukan kapada Malaysia.

Kita baharu sa-hari dua ini ada baca, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berita bahawa Persatuan Mahasiswa²/University of Malaya yang mengaku tidak berpolitik ada mengambil tindakan mengenai perkara bayaran peguam Enche' Abdul Rahman Talib. Saya bertanya, kenapa kalau mereka sa-bagai pejuang dan pembela negara, tidak mereka mengambil tindakan terhadap champor tangan Menteri Buroh Singapura ini—champor tangan negeri luar kapada Malaysia—saperti mereka lakukan kapada perkara bayaran peguam Enche' Abdul Rahman Talib ini? Saya churiga, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bahawa Persatuan Mahasiswa University of Malaya ini bertindak dengan ilham dari gulongan² politik yang tertentu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli dari Pasir Puteh ada menudoh saya pada hari sa-malam, bahawa konon-nya saya ini tidak menitek beratkan soal bahasa, tetapi sayang-nya beliau tidak ada sekarang, tetapi saya memang mengambil berat dalam soal bahasa dan sekarang pun saya hendak sentoh soal bahasa. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, barangkali seluroh tanah ayer puas hati dengan jaminan daripada Kerajaan dan dengan chatitan dalam Perlembagaan, yang menetapkan matlamat tahun 1967 sa-bagai masa untuk merasmikan bahasa kebangsaan sa-bagai bahasa rasmi yang tunggal bagi Malaya—Tanah Melayu. Dalam hubungan ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka hendak menyentuh dan memberi kepujian kapada pegawai² Kerajaan, kerana kita ini dalam pentadbiran, yang mustahak pegawai Kerajaan, kerana kita baca berita bahawa lapan ribu orang pegawai Kerajaan, pada tahun ini, mengambil pepereksaan bahasa kebangsaan, satu langkah menunjukkan bagaimana semangat mereka untuk mempelajari bahasa kebangsaan. Saya chadangkan kapada mereka² yang lulus daripada lapan ribu orang ini, pehak Kerajaan, untuk menggalakkan penggunaan bahasa kebangsaan patut-lah memberi “incentive” atau galakan yang patut

kapada pegawai² yang lulus peperiksaan bahasa kebangsaan itu dan saya menhadangkan kelayakan ini di-kira dari segi kenaikan pangkat, supaya pertimbangan di-utamakan kepada pegawai yang lulus peperiksaan bahasa kebangsaan, kenaikan pangkat bagi pegawai² yang lulus peperiksaan bahasa kebangsaan.

Di-sini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka-lah dapat tahu sedikit, kerana kita dahulu tidak di-beri tahu, bahawa dalam soal bahasa ini ada berkait dengan "scheme of service" dan pehak Kerajaan ada menubuhkan jawatan-kuasa bagi meninjau dan menyemak "Scheme of Service" untuk mengubahnya, untuk di-sesuaikan dengan perkembangan bahasa kebangsaan ini. Kita ingin tahu-lah sa-takat mana-kah sudah di-jalankan oleh jawatan-kuasa ini untuk menyemak dan meminda "Scheme of Service" bagi, memberi kedudukan yang sewajar kepada bahasa kebangsaan dalam "Scheme of Service" Kerajaan supaya hilang dan lenyap-lah segala keraguan, segala kebimbangan yang di-rasakan sa-lama ini.

Mr Speaker: Saya suka hendak mengingatkan kepada Ahli Yang Berhormat, masa ini Ahli banyak lagi hendak berchakap dan ada satu jam lagi. Kalau 15 minit sa-orang pun—4 orang sahaja lagi. Tolong-lah pendekkan sedikit, butir²-nya pendekkan.

Wan Haji Abdul Kadir bin Ismail: Ya-lah, terima kaseh. Kemudian saya sentoh sedikit sahaja berkenaan bahasa kebangsaan, berkenaan dengan *Radio Malaysia* kita ia-itu tentang bahagian warta berita-nya. Ini perkara sudah lama dan di-ulang bertahun², bila-kah kita dapat *master bulletin* dalam bahasa kebangsaan dari sa-tahun ka-satahun kita sudah dekat tahun 1967, kalau tahun 1967 bahasa rasmi *master bulletin* maseh lagi bukan bahasa kebangsaan—malu kita. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya chadangkan kalau pegawai-nya payah dan latehan tidak ada, patut-lah di-adakan *intensive training* kepada pegawai² yang ada ini, adakan target sekian—sa-tahun-kah, dua tahun-kah, supaya dapat-lah perkara ini di-jalankan pada masa yang patut.

Kemudian akhir sa-kali, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya akan ringkas sahaja, mengenai soal pelajaran. Saya rasa dasar pelajaran kebangsaan yang ada sekarang ini, satu dasar yang boleh di-terima oleh semua pehak, dasar yang paling sesuai dan dalil-nya hingga Ketua² Pembangkang sendiri saperti, Ahli dari Tanjong, ada-lah satu orang yang bertanggung-jawab membentok dasar pelajaran kebangsaan yang ada pada hari ini—pada masa ia menjadi ketua M.C.A. Dalam sistem pelajaran kita ini, ada beberapa "stream", "stream" untuk bahasa kebangsaan, bahasa Inggeris, bahasa China dan bahasa Tamil. Bahasa kebangsaan, kita pun ma'alum sahaja, bahasa Tamil kerana memang ada ra'ayat kita yang bangsa Tamil dan di-berikan mereka itu pelajaran—di-bantu oleh Kerajaan hingga sa-takat sekolah rendah, bagitu juga bahasa China. Sa-perkara yang menimbulkan tanda tanya, apa akan jadi dengan *stream* bahasa Inggeris, kerana tidak ada kaum yang bahasa ibunda-nya bahasa Inggeris, yang tinggal dalam tanah ayer kita ini, apa akan terjadi pada sekolah *stream* bahasa Inggeris ini? Yang saya chakap ia-lah sekolah² Inggeris yang di-bantu oleh Kerajaan sekolah² *private*, sekolah² yang tidak di-bantu itu, dasar masing² ikut suka masing².

Jadi saya rasa kita memang meng-anggap bahasa Inggeris suatu bahasa yang penting dan kita jadikan dia satu mata pelajaran yang wajib, tetapi untuk menjadikan dia satu *permanent feature* dalam *system* pelajaran kita yang tidak ada latar belakang, orang yang menggunakan bahasa ibunda—bahasa Inggeris—barangkali tidak lojik. Sa-suatu langkah harus di-ambil bagi menukarkan perkara ini sesuai dengan dasar pelajaran kebangsaan kita. Saya merasa bahawa perlahan², langkah² kena-lah di-ambil bagi menukarkan *stream* ini kepada *stream* yang 3 yang lain itu—sama ada di-tukar kepada bahasa kebangsaan atau bahasa China atau bahasa Tamil, tetapi makin lebeh dekat dengan bahasa kebangsaan terus dan barangkali soal-nya guru. Jadi dalam kita mengadakan satu latehan untuk guru sekarang ini,

kita mengadakan 2/3 daripada guru di-lateh untuk mengajar di-sekolah kebangsaan, maka boleh di-tambah bagi melateh guru yang ada di-sekolah Inggeris sekarang ini, supaya dapat mereka itu melayakkan diri mengajar dengan bahasa penghantar yang bukan bahasa Inggeris itu, maka baharu-lah kelak dalam masa kita menyambut tahun 1967 ada permulaan kita lakukan bagi menyesuaikan dengan *context* daripada dasar pelajaran kebangsaan kita ini. Saya tengok, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bukan sahaja di-Masir tempat saya lama dudok, tetapi di-Iraq yang saya pergi baharu² ini, di-sana bahasa Inggeris juga menjadi satu mata pelajaran yang wajib di-dalam sekolah², sunggoh dia bahasa kebangsaan-nya bahasa Arab. Kemudian banyak fakulti di-sana yang maseh di-ajar dengan bahasa pengantar, bahasa Inggeris saperti faculty of medicine, faculty of science, faculty of agriculture, maseh di-ajar di-Iraq dengan bahasa Inggeris dan banyak guru² daripada London, Australia yang mengajar di-sana. Barangkali negeri kita pun boleh membuat bagitu dengan tidak merosakkan apa² yang kita mengambil langkah tentang sekolah² yang berbahasa Inggeris ini pada masa yang tidak berapa lama lagi. Ini baharu-lah jadi, kerana kalau ada dua stream—satu bahasa kebangsaan dan satu bahasa Inggeris—galakan kehendrongan untuk pergi kepada satu saluran sahaja itu kurang, barangkali bahasa Inggeris-lah jadi kita hendak menggalakkan penggunaan bahasa kebangsaan, maka akan kurang-lah kejayaan kita bagi menggalakkan penggunaan bahasa kebangsaan dengan ada-nya stream Inggeris di-kekalkan itu. Jadi saya rasa, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, itu sahaja-lah ucapan saya ringkas sahaja dan saya berharap bahawa Dewan yang mulia ini akan dapat memberi pandangan² yang “constructive” kepada Budget yang di-kemukakan ini dan saya perchaya bahawa Budget yang di-kemukakan ini akan dapat di-terima oleh semua pihak. Terima kaseh.

Enche' Khoo Peng Loong (Sarawak):
Mr Speaker, Sir, the tax changes for 1966, which would bring in \$4,700,000

more in taxes from Sarawak, have caused great anxiety and will create heavier burdens to the people of Sarawak. The turnover tax of 2% at source on imported goods will make it worse and endanger the business in Sarawak. When the businessmen of Sarawak have to pay a turnover tax of $\frac{1}{2}$ % this year, they already find that it is crippling their business. What more if they have to pay 2% in 1966? Here is an example, Sir.

Supposing a shop were to have a turnover of \$5 million in 1964, it has to pay \$25,000 on the turnover tax of $\frac{1}{2}$ % in 1965; if this shop has the same turnover of \$5 million on imported goods for 1965, it has to pay \$100,000 on the turnover tax of 2% in 1966. Will this not make the shop go out of business, because no provision has been made to provide for this tax during the 1965 trading? As the Honourable Minister of Finance is aware, Sarawak merchants have to import all their goods from Singapore, Thailand and other countries, and mostly on credit, as there is hardly anything manufactured in Sarawak. Therefore, I would urge the Honourable Minister of Finance to study very carefully how this turnover tax of 2% is to be imposed on the merchants in Sarawak, because if it is based on the 1965 turnover, many shops may have to cease business, and it will cause business panic in Sarawak.

In his reply to my question the other day, the Honourable Minister of Finance assured me that the tax increase in Sarawak will be by graduation but I find that it is more by acceleration.

Mr Speaker, Sir, since Singapore left Malaysia, there is already a growing fear—and I would say that it is a genuine fear—amongst the people of Sarawak that the cost of living is bound to increase, that the prices of goods will be higher than when Singapore was part of Malaysia, and that the business communities will suffer through restrictions, quotas, and other systems which will be introduced by the Customs Department. It is a well-known fact that the businessmen of Sarawak get their goods mainly from

the wholesalers in Singapore and, in turn, the products of Sarawak are sold in Singapore. The fear that the Government would impose restrictions and higher duties on Singapore goods is now confirmed, and there is a further fear that the businessmen of Sarawak may be forced to cease trading with Singapore. If this is to happen, Sir, the people of Sarawak will suffer great hardships through no fault of their own. In this respect, I appeal to the Honourable Minister of Commerce and Industry and other Honourable Ministers closely connected with trade to give due consideration to the welfare of the people and the business communities of Sarawak, so that they will not be made to suffer for this state of affairs, for which the peoples are in no way responsible.

Not only the peoples of Sarawak must not be made to suffer, but the interest of the people of Sarawak must be protected and safeguarded against unfair competitions from outsiders. In Malaya, we often hear businessmen asking the Central Government to impose a tariff to protect their infant industries. Protection must not be limited to factories and industries in the mainland but must also be extended to Sarawak. Local industries in Sarawak must not be allowed to face unfair competition. I am referring to outsiders coming to establish factories in Sarawak, where there are already sufficient factories producing the same type of goods and products. With enormous financial resources at their disposal, which unfortunately are not available to the local people and capitalists, the local capitalists have to face unfair competition and unless their interests are safeguarded, they are bound to suffer in the end.

After Singapore's separation, Sir, Singapore is treated as a foreign country and with the new tariff imposed on Singapore manufactured goods, the Government is in effect creating a completely new situation as far as the business of Sarawak is concerned, because, as I have said earlier, we traditionally traded with Singapore and sold our produce primarily to Singapore.

I read in the newspapers that there are many things manufactured in Malaya which are exempted from duty when imported into Sarawak. This is very good news, Sir, but the Honourable Minister must realise that when Sarawak merchants import these goods from Malaya, they will have to pay higher freight charges, etc. The fact remains that the price of these goods is now higher than when Singapore was part of Malaysia. Exemption from duty, therefore, does not benefit the people of Sarawak, but the manufacturers in mainland Malaya. Consequently, the peoples of Sarawak do not share in the prosperity of the manufacturers. So, from whichever place they buy, they have to pay more now for their goods. Mr Speaker, Sir, of course, the State Government of Sarawak is partly responsible for this state of affairs, because, as the State Government and representatives of the people, it is their duty to ensure that the peoples of Sarawak are not made to suffer. There seems to be a lack of co-ordination between the State Government and the Central Government. As a representative of the peoples, it is my duty to air their grievances in this House. I consider it right for me to speak and warn the Central Government of the dangers which will befall the peoples of Sarawak unless action is taken to protect and safeguard their interests. I would welcome any public assurance from the Honourable Minister of Commerce and Industry that he will study reports and will see to it that the peoples of Sarawak will not be made to suffer.

Enche' Tiah Eng Bee (Kluang): Mr Speaker, Sir, about this time of every year, people who have interest in our country, whether rich or poor, are anxiously awaiting what our Honourable Minister of Finance would bring for the prosperity and well being of our country. Mr Speaker, Sir, our Government has again shown to the whole world that we are a truly democratic country and that our Honourable Minister of Finance is always prepared to listen to constructive criticisms on national policies.

When our Honourable Finance Minister announced the turnover tax at the Budget meeting last year, most of the business people through their respective Chambers of Commerce had stated that this was a most unfair system of taxation as the businesses which were run at a loss were also liable to taxation on their turnover for the whole year. They had sent numerous appeals after passing many resolutions at their meetings; they also sent delegations to meet our Finance Minister to lay their grievances; and they also made certain suggestions for other forms of taxation. Now, our Finance Minister has announced the abolishment of this controversial turnover tax. I am sure that every one will now be very happy at this unexpected turn of events. As for myself, I would like to say that I am very happy to hear this announcement from our Honourable Finance Minister as I would receive a good welcome from my constituents on my visit to them. I also like to appeal to our Honourable Minister of Finance to give due consideration to those small businessmen, who are liable to pay turnover tax in 1965.

However, I would like to make it clear that every loyal citizens of Malaysia must sacrifice for the security and well-being of our country and to meet confrontation from our enemies. All of us must now show our loyalty by purchasing National Defence Bonds, and contributing generously to the Patriotic Fund. Only in this way, could the security of our country be assured and the business people could continue to carry on their businesses. All citizens must realise that it is not the intention of the Government to burden them with heavy taxation unless very necessary.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I would also like to mention about the Quota System. All of us agree that manufacturers should be accorded protection for their manufactured goods. However, I hope the Government will not impose quotas unless very necessary, as our local manufacturers have not yet been able to produce as much as required by the people and also some manu-

factured goods are not up to the standard of imported goods. Therefore, I appeal to our Minister of Commerce to relax or abolish the quota whenever that is possible.

I am sure that car owners will not grumble over the slight increase in car licensing fees. In fact, the new system is much more fairer to all classes of car owners, that is, those who can afford to buy big cars would have to pay more for their car licences. The small additional fees for motor buses and motor lorries would not affect the public as these could easily be absorbed by the operators themselves.

The abolishment of the duty on crown corks is of more particular interest to the poor, as it has been stated that aerated waters are consumed more by workers than the wealthy. Our Hon'ble Minister of Finance had now abolished this tax, so that the workers could now enjoy their bottles of aerated water at the old price. This would also put a stop to the smuggling of crown corks which we read in the newspaper lately.

I hope that there would not be any misunderstanding at the reduction in the duty for playing cards. This, as our Hon'ble Finance Minister had said, was to stop smuggling and not to encourage people to gamble.

Sir, except for the charge of this 10 cents per call on the telephone after the first 100 calls, I am sure that all Members of this House will concur with me that the Budget proposals for the next year are of great incentives for the local manufacturers and industrialists to play their part for the progress of our country. Thank you.

Enche' Yeoh Tat Beng (Bruas): Mr Speaker, Sir, I should like to make some comments on the speech made by one of the Hon'ble Members from the P.M.I.P. bench yesterday. I wish to emphasise that I am making this observation as a true and loyal citizen of this country with honesty, sincerity and pride, and having in mind nothing but the interest of this beloved country of ours.

With regard to the comment made yesterday that our Hon'ble Prime Minister is now old and generous towards the Chinese, I feel, it is narrow minded and racial in outlook. The Hon'ble Prime Minister is not only known to be just and fair to all, but also he has absolute concern over the Malays and natives at heart. Because of his wise and able leadership, the foundation of this country has been well and truly laid and racial harmony and prosperity has been assured. We in the M.C.A. have absolute faith and confidence in his leadership.

We have also been orientated not just only to look after the interests of the Chinese, but also we shall continue to give our best assistance to the Malays and the natives and we look upon them as brothers.

The language issue has been confused, misunderstood and controversial. There are Malays who are in the wrong belief that after 1967 the Malay language will be the only language existing in this country. There are also Chinese who also have been led to the same belief and naturally, possess unjustifiable fear. It has been duly stated in Article 152 of our Constitution in no uncertain terms that Malay will be the sole official and national language and that the other languages as well at the same time will be encouraged and used. I strongly believe, and I am sure the Chinese will support it as the national language, because a common language is essential to convey thoughts and understanding among the different races in this country. While we are promoting the national language, we must not also ignore the importance and practical usefulness of other languages, in particular, English and Chinese. As English is one of the popular international languages and as there are also some over 700 million Asians using the Chinese language, therefore, the position is clear that the Malay language shall be the national language and the only official language in this country and that English, Chinese and other languages have to be encouraged as well. It will be absolutely impracticable and impudent to suggest that only the Malay lan-

guage, and no others, shall be taught and used in this country. A small country like ours cannot isolate ourselves from others. We must have diplomatic and commercial relationships with others. Imagine that all of us know only one language, namely, the Malay language our national language, how can we communicate and correspond with others. Are we going to engage foreigners to be our interpreters and, even so, some of us will have to understand the respective languages which we have to use everyday.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I think we all agree that the Budget is indeed satisfactory and has been well received. If the Honourable Minister of Finance cuts a bigger coat from the cloth, the conservative estimates of revenue will, in all probability, at the end of 1966 exceed his expectations to turn his deficits to quits, or a small surplus. Praise is due to him for his masterly feat. However it is a grave concern that the asset liquidity has steadily dwindled and that has to be watched, or else posterity will have to bear higher taxation or be burdened with increasing national debt. I hope this will not be so, as the fruits of the development projects will in the course of time become the backbone of our prosperity. The so-called austerity Budget, I hope is not at the expense of curtailing the efficiency of the Government administrative machinery. To prune expenditure without due regard to the urgent and vital demand of the services is foolish economy. To my personal knowledge, in certain Ministries there have been inordinate delays due to unavoidable pressure of work consequent upon expanding activities.

I believe the Ministry of Finance has a special division called the Organisation and Methods Division, but apart from its present duties it could not extend its special services to other Government Boards, such as the Fund "B" Rubber Industry Replanting Board, which is now faced with increasing yearly expenditure where, in my humble opinion, there are substantial avenues of savings only if an intensive methods reorganisation is carried out. If I am permitted to suggest the

O.&M. Section should be expanded as its work would be a very valuable contribution to the exercise of economy.

Sir, another subject that I wish to bring up is on the Federal accounting scholarships.

Mr Speaker: How long are you going to take?

Enche' Yeoh Tat Beng: Five minutes more, Sir, I will be very short. I believe there were two scholarships advertised in 1963 tenable in Malaya. Though the Public Services Commission interviewed the candidates and made their selection on the basis laid down, somehow or other they changed their award and the two successful candidates were given scholarships overseas. Mr Speaker, Sir, scholarships overseas are very expensive. Instead of the two overseas scholarships, with the same amount of money three or four persons could be trained in Malaya. We have capable practising principals of Chartered or Certified Accountants, who are capable of training our students to sit for the exacting examinations of the Malayan Association of Certified and Public Accountants which are equivalent in standard and comparable to those of similar bodies overseas. This will avoid waste of public funds, save foreign exchange, and increases the tempo of supply of accountants in this country, who have very much need to man the Public Services. So, Mr Speaker, Sir, if this has not been done, I should like this subject to be seriously reviewed by the Government. Thank you very much, Sir.

Enche' Hussein bin To' Muda Hassan (Raub): Dato' Yang di-Pertua, saya hendak berchakap enam minit sahaja. Sudah tujuh kali Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan membuat ucapan Budget di-dalam Dewan Parlimen negara kita ini, maka selama itu juga-lah ia mendapat tegoran yang membena, tegoran yang melulu dan juga tegoran yang mendapat kepujian juga, tetapi di terima oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan ini dengan penoh rasa bertanggong-jawab. Teringat juga pada satu jawapan dia dalam Dewan ini, ia-itu "tiada ra'ayat

dalam sa-sabuaah negara yang menyambut baik di-atas tiap² kenaikan chukai oleh pemerintah" maka oleh sebab negara kita ini di-dalam pembangunan, dalam serba-serbi dan sedang dalam menghadap anchaman dari luar negeri, maka pada pendapat saya, patut-lah ra'ayat negeri ini berkorban sedikit sa-banyak.

Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan ini yang ada pada masa sekarang, kalau saya tidak silap, 17 tahun sudah dudok dalam Dewan Legislative Council dahulu dan juga dalam Dewan Parlimen ini. Maka dia ini, rasa saya, saya beri penoh kepujian kerana fahaman-nya bagaimana hal keadaan negara kita dalam segi kewangan, kerana dia sendiri pun sa-orang yang tahu menurut hal perniagaan. Jadi, Budget yang di hadapan kita, yang kita sudah beruchap di-antara satu dengan lain dalam dua tiga hari ini, satu Budget yang penoh dengan timbang rasa. Jadi, oleh sebab itu, saya sa-bagai penyokong Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan ini, saya harap dia sambut-lah segala tegoran ini dengan penoh minat, jikalau sa-kiranya tegoran itu ta' ada faedah kapada negara, champakkan dia ka-tepi sudah.

Saya suka-lah hendak menyentoh pula dalam soal hendak membanyakkan hasil negeri kita ini, sunggoh pun dalam Dewan yang berbahagia ini juga, kita bersama² telah meluluskan satu Undang², saya hendak sebutkan "The Three Digit Lottery," sa-bagaimana terkenal di-tempat saya sa-bagai Loteri Tikam Ekor. Di-tempat saya, orang-nya miskin², bandar-nya kechil, tetapi dengan adanya loteri-nya tikam ekor ini di-situ nampak-nya telah menyebabkan ra'ayat di-situ dudok merana sedikit-lah. Jadi, perniagaan di-situ boleh di-katakan merosot sedikit, kerana saya dapati lebeh \$50,000 sa-bulan duit daripada ra'ayat di-situ untuk membeli tikam ekor, duit itu di-hantar ka-Kuala Lumpur ini. Jadi, kalau \$50,000 sa-bulan duit orang Raub itu di-gunakan dalam bandar Raub itu, alang-kah besar faedah-nya kapada orang² perniagaan dan begitu juga kapada orang² lain. Jadi, saya harap kapada Yang Berhormat Menteri ini, dengan terus terang

saya berchakap, terek-lah lesen Three Digit lottery yang ada di-bandar Raub itu pada masa sekarang—ta' ada memberi faedah kepada ra'ayat.

Jadi, saya hendak menarek perhatian pula berkenaan dengan belanja dalam Kementerian Pelajaran, bagaimana kita ketahuī, perbelanjaan dalam Kementerian Pelajaran ini ia-lah yang paling tinggi sa-kali daripada tiap² Kementerian yang ada dalam negeri ini. Jadi, saya menguchapkan tahniah kepada Menteri Pelajaran, kerana telah menjalankan tugas²-nya dengan penoh tanggung-jawab dan mengikut bagaimana banyak belanja-nya yang di-untokkan kepada Kementerian dia—saya dapati tanggung-jawab dia itu lebeh daripada Perdana Menteri nampak-nya. Jadi, saya harap dan berdo'a-lah mudah²an dasar pelajaran kita ini akan berjalan dengan baik dan memberi faedah kepada anak² kita.

Saya suka hendak sebutkan dalam hal pelajaran ini, saya ingat saya ada dengar forum dan juga berita² dalam hal² yang lain, terutama sa-kali kekurangan penuntut Melayu di-dalam jurusan science dan perubatan. Jadi, saya pun siasat-lah di-tempat saya di-tiap² sekolah. Saya menudoh ada discrimnasi terhadap penuntut² Melayu—itu saya berani bertanggung-jawab kepada Menteri Pelajaran. Sebab-nya, saya dapati, penuntut² Melayu apabila sampai sahaja agak-nya kepada L.C.E. telah di-galakkan pergi meninggalkan kelas science, dan di-galakkan dia masok dalam bahagian Arts. Tujuan-nya ia-lah untuk hendak jadi pegawai² yang menggunakan Arts sahaja. Jadi, bagi penuntut perempuan—daripada perempuan-nya pula di-galakkan mengambil Domestic Science—tidak di-galakkan kepada General Science. Jadi, saya hendak menudoh pula pada mana² pehak yang patut saya buat ini, tetapi perkara² ini ada berlaku—saya penoh bertanggung-jawab. Jadi oleh sebab kita ketahuī, ia-itu orang² Melayu ada kekurangan dalam segi kedokteran dan juga dalam engineering, maka saya harap-lah pada Menteri Pelajaran, sila lihat ini supaya dapat perkara² yang di-sekat ini atau pun di-tunjuk arah

oleh orang yang bertanggung-jawab terhadap murid² Melayu jangan terjadi lagi.

Lagi pula, saya dapat dalam masa dua, tiga tahun yang sudah, banyak-lah sekolah² di-bangunkan, sana sini—banyak sekolah chantek², tetapi saya hairan di-tempat saya—di-adakan sekolah, di-chantekkan sekolah, tetapi padang permainan tidak ada di-sediakan. Jadi kita hendakkan budak² kita pergi masok Olympic—hendak menang medal emas-kah, medal perak-kah. Jadi macham mana kalau budak² sekolah kita tidak di-lateh dalam padang permainan yang agak baik sadikit—bagaimana hendak dapat medal² emas ini, atau medal² perak besok. Dan yang akhir saya suka-lah sebutkan—ini hal Cameron Highland, berkenaan dengan perkembangan . . .

Mr Speaker: Ada kita janji tadi . . .

Enche' Hussein bin To' Muda Hassan: Satu sahaja lagi Dato'. Saya, dahulu, mula² ranchangan electricity di-Cameron Highland itu saya sambut baik-lah, bagus-lah kawasan saya, tempat pelawat² boleh pergi melihat. Tetapi kesudahan-nya, tidak ada memberi faedah kepada negeri Pahang—Raub di-sabalek gunung pun tidak dapat faedah apa², habiskan sungei pun tidak lagi mengalir ka-situ tetapi—mengalir masok ka-negeri Perak. Jadi saya harap-lah kepada Menteri Perdagangan, tolong-lah beri kemudahan sadikit, sudah-lah sungai itu tidak masok balek ka-negeri Pahang, negeri Pahang pula sudah memberikan tanah untuk faedah orang lain, jadi harap-lah dapat sampai ka-Raub kemudahan itu, tidak usah-lah ka-tempat lain dahulu. Jadi berkenaan dengan hal lain tidak dapat-lah saya panjangkan, saya hormati permintaan daripada Dato' Yang di-Pertua, untuk memendekkan ucapan, sekian-lah ucapan saya—terima kaseh.

Enche' Abdul Karim Abu: (Melaka Selatan): Dato' Yang di-Pertua, dalam menyokong ucapan dasar Menteri Kewangan, saya juga merasa puas hati—bukan-lah saya puas hati kerana Menteri Kewangan itu orang Melaka, yang saya ini orang Melaka—tetapi

di-atas Budget yang di-bentangkan ini, dapat-lah kita ukor kedudukan Parti² Pembangkang. Dalam tahun yang sudah, Parti² Pembangkang membawa kita dalam ucapan-nya ka-Indonesia, tiap² orang Parti Pembangkang berchakap, membahathkan ucapan dasar Menteri Kewangan, dia mengalah pandangan kita ka-Indonesia. Tetapi empat hari yang telah lalu ini, tidak ada sa-orang pun daripada Parti Pembangkang, berchakap membawa kita bandingan dengan Indonesia, tetapi dia membawa pula pandangan kita ka-Singapura. Sebab-nya saya berpendapat, kerana Indonesia pada masa ini, kominis sudah hendak tamat. Jadi Parti Pembangkang, sudah tidak sokong lagi Indonesia, saya tidak tahu-lah Singapura. Tetapi kalau di-tengok chakapan² Parti Pembangkang ini, Singapura ini kena-lah Kerajaan kita berhati² dalam, hendak kata abang adek—adek muda, adek tua. Saya berharaplah bagi pehak Kementerian, Perdana Menteri dan lain², berhati² hal Singapura ini.

Dato' Yang di-Pertua, saya berasa terkilang kalau tidak berchakap, berhubung dengan ucapan daripada Wakil Ipoh pada hari sa-malam, juga Wakil Socialist, yang menghilangkan masa terlampau banyak, berchakap berhubung dengan Sharikat Matahari. Ini juga dapat kita ukor, siapa-kah orang-nya yang berchakap itu dan nampak-lah tebal-nya semangat perkauman, kerana Sharikat Matahari ini, baharu ini-lah munchul-nya satu sharikat orang Melayu—sudah bermacham² tuduhan, sa-hingga menghilangkan masa berjam² bagi pehak Parti Pembangkang berchakap berhubung dengan Sharikat Matahari ini. Pernah Wakil daripada Batu menudoh Sharikat Matahari ini—sharikat orang kaya Melayu. Yang orang kaya lain itu mengapa tidak di-sebut dalam Dewan ini? Pada hal baharu-lah satu sharikat orang Melayu yang hendak bangkit—sudah di-bawa berjela² di-dalam Dewan ini.

Dato' Yang di-Pertua, bermacham² lagi tuduhan yang telah di-lemparkan kapada Kementerian Kewangan. Saya suka-lah berchakap sedikit berhubung

dengan ucapan wakil PAS daripada Pasir Puteh, agak-nya dia tidak ada modal lagi hendak berchakap, dia membangkitkan berhubung dengan wang loteri. Wang loteri ini rasa saya tidak payah di-sebut² lagi kerana, pehak Raja² Melayu, telah bersetuju wang itu di-masokkan dalam Perbendaharaan Negara. Jadi orang² PAS ini sudah hilang modal hendak chari pengarah pada ra'ayat Kelantan maka di-sebut² berkali². Dato' Yang di-Pertua, saya, oleh sebab Wakil PAS ini berchakap menudoh Kerajaan Pusat berterang², saya suka-lah mengingatkan kapada Kerajaan PAS di-Kelantan—kalau ta' salah dalam tahun 1963—Kerajaan Kelantan hendak membayar gaji pegawai² Kerajaan yang bekerja yang di-bawah pemerintahan Kerajaan PAS di-Kelantan, tidak dapat hendak membayar gaji—terpaksa meminjam wang bank—minta jaminan daripada Tun, dari Kuala Lumpur. Ini menunjukkan Kerajaan PAS, bukan Kerajaan Pusat yang bengkerap, tetapi Kerajaan PAS-lah yang bengkerap. Dato' Yang di-Pertua, jadi Parti² Pembangkang ini berchakap dan berkata, dengan tidak mengukor baju di-badan-nya sendiri.

Berhubung dengan bahasa, telah berjela² di-bawa, terutama sa-kali oleh wakil daripada Ipoh—kalau di-tengok kulit-nya pun sa-rupa dengan kulit saya—hitam! Yang di-bela-nya itu, orang kulit puteh—bahasa China. Adakah munasabah sa-orang kulit hitam—rumah-nya lain, betul hati-nya jujur hendak membela bahasa China ini. Jadi, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, saya suka-lah mengulang ia-itu Yang Teramat Mulia Tunku dan Menteri Pelajaran juga, telah beruchap seperti yang diterangkan oleh wakil daripada Ipoh. Apa yang di-katakan oleh Yang Teramat Mulia Tunku, tidak lari daripada Perlembagaan kita, ia-itu kalau kita hendak ubah, hendak tolak ansor pun, hanya-lah perkara yang dituliskan di-dalam Perlembagaan sahaja. Jadi jangan-lah Wakil Ipoh hendak mengelirukan ra'ayat kerana dia telah berkata dalam ucapan-nya—dia sentiasa akan menerima ilham daripada Kerajaan Singapura. Jadi, saya fikir kalau dia sentiasa menerima

ilham daripada Kerajaan Singapura, lebih baik dia pindah ka-Singapura sahaja, tidak usah-lah dia menjadi juara, antara orang Melayu dengan orang China, hendak di-laga²kan didalam tanah ayer kita ini. Dato' Yang di-Pertua, satu sahaja chadangan saya yang patut barangkali Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan mahu menerima bagi menambah pendapatan negeri kita, ia-itu patut-lah Menteri Kewangan mengenakan lesen kepada pelachor² dalam negeri ini (*Ketawa*). Sebab saya kata begitu, ini banyak juga hasil-nya yang akan dapat. Pelachor ini memalukan negeri dan kalau kita tidak kenakan lesen, dia bebas sangat sa-hingga askar orang puteh itu di-kejar²-nya di-tengah jalan, tetapi kalau di-beri nombor di-tengah belakang ada tanda—dia ada lesen—barangkali perempuan² pun tidak berani hendak menjadi pelachor dan kalau ada lesen kita boleh paksa dia periksa doktor, jadi orang laki² tidak kena sakit. Dato' Yang di-Pertua, perkara ini barangkali menjadi satu gelak dan ketawa, tetapi ada negeri² yang mengenakan lesen kepada pelachor².

Sa-lain daripada itu, saya suka-lah berchakap dalam ucapan dasar ini ia-itu berhubung dengan kebimbangan Singapura. Saya berharap kepada Menteri yang bertanggung-jawab berhubung dengan kebebasan bersurat khabar, sa-tahu saya *Berita Harian* dan *Straits Times*, di-buat, di-chap di-dua tempat—satu di-Kuala Lumpur dan satu di-Singapura. Jadi surat khabar ini di-chetak kerana dua tempat ini sangat-lah merbahaya, kerana yang di-chetak di-Singapura itu sa-mata² hendak memberikan propoganda, memajukan, memberikan perangsang kepada orang² Sabah dan Sarawak ia-itu penganjor Singapura-lah yang paling maju, yang paling baik. Jarang sangat dalam surat khabar ini yang di-hantarkan ka-Sabah dan Sarawak berhubung dengan hal kita Malaysia. Itu sebab kita dengar kebanyakan ucapan² daripada wakil² Sabah dan Sarawak, macham² rayuan daripada-nya, kadang² kita dengar dia tidak hendak menerima chukai yang di-kenakan, tetapi pembangunan negara mesti

mahu. Jadi kedudukan hal ini nampak-nya ganjil tetapi sangat merbahaya dan boleh jadi sampai satu masa akan datang, chita² penganjor² yang ada di-Singapura itu hendak menjadikan tiga kali S, hendak mengatorkan tiga S. S—Sabah, S—Sarawak, S—Singapura menjadi satu. Jadi saya berharap-lah perkara ini patut pehak Kementerian yang bertanggung-jawab, mengambil perhatian yang berat kerana berhubung dengan surat khabar ini, memang berat yang di-sampaikan deras dan patut-lah kita beri pujian kepada ahli² surat khabar, umpamanya, dalam dasar kita berhubung dengan perbelanjaan kita tahun 1966, semua surat khabar tempatan memberi sokongan. Jadi apa yang di-katakan oleh Parti² Pembangkang itu chuma hendak ambil sedap dia sahaja, hendak melepas geram dia sahaja, munasabah-kah ucapan daripada PAP yang tinggal di-sini—wakil Bungsar kalau tidak salah—dia kata buroh di-estate itu susah, pada hal dia tidak pernah pun barangkali pergi ka-estate², macham mana kesenangan dia orang, senang-nya bukan-lah senang sa-rupa pegawai Kerajaan, tetapi senang dia itu senang saperti bandingan masa penjajah dahulu. Masa penjajah dahulu bagaimana buroh dalam estate tetapi sa-sudah merdeka bagaimana buroh dalam estate ini, tetapi lantang sangat wakil yang berchakap tadi menudoh Kerajaan tidak mem-bela buroh kerana dia hendakkan undi daripada buroh, tetapi apa yang dia buat dia juga yang untong—pergi ka-negeri luar, pergi ka-mana² dengan nama buroh, ini-lah mahu dia. Jadi saya berharap-lah pehak buroh kita tidak terpengaruh di-atas apa yang di-katakan oleh wakil daripada Bungsar itu tadi.

Akhir nya, saya berulang balek sa-mula, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, dalam banyak² Kementerian ini, saya berchakap hanya dua: Kementerian Kesihatan, saya hendak sa-orang doktor datang di-hantarkan ka-Jasin kerana sudah dapat 44 dan ada Menteri Kesihatan ini sa-olah² tidak begitu melayan, orang yang menderma darah sampai 76 kali derma, tetapi dia menyampaikan bintang itu sama ada

pingat-kah atau lain-nya, tidak di-
layan sangat, tidak seperti di-Pulau
Pinang. Di-Pulau Pinang Kerajaan
melayan dengan baik orang² yang
menderma darah ini, tetapi di-
Kuala Lumpur ini tidak di-layan
sangat. Pada hal ini, derma darah ini,
patut di-sanjong tinggi pada orang
yang menderma darah.

Yang kedua, Kementerian Pene-
rangan dan Penyiaran. Saya ulang balek
Kementerian Penerangan dan Pe-
nyiaran—ini mustahak sa-rupa dengan
Kementerian Pertahanan, tetapi apa-

bila kita tengok Budget yang di-
untokkan oleh Menteri Kewangan,
sangat-lah sedikit—banyak di-potong²
lagi—jadi kalau-lah ada membuat
Budget Tambahan pada masa depan
Kementerian Penerangan dan Penyia-
ran ini patut-lah di-berikan keutamaan.
Saya tidak hendak menerangkan apa
mustahak-nya dan saya akan terangkan
dalam masa hadapan. Terima kaseh.

Mr Speaker: Majlis Meshuarat ini di-
tanggohkan hingga pukul 10 besok.

House adjourned 8.00 p.m.