

**Volume III
No. 3**



**Thursday
16th June, 1966**

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

DEWAN NEGARA (SENATE)

OFFICIAL REPORT

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

CONTENTS

ADJOURNMENT TO A LATER DAY (Motion) [Col. 437]

MOTION—

**The Yang di-Pertuan Agong's Speech (Address of Thanks)
[Col. 437]**

DI-CHEK DI-IABATAN CHETAK KERAJAAN
OLEH OOI THEAM HOCK, PENGUASA, IPOH
1968

Harga: 50 cts

MALAYSIA
DEWAN NEGARA (SENATE)
Official Report

Vol. III

Third Session of the Second Dewan Negara

No. 3

Thursday, 16th June, 1966

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

PRESENT:

- The Honourable Mr President, DATO' HAJI ABDUL RAHMAN BIN MOHAMED YASIN, S.P.M.J., P.I.S., J.P. (Johor).
- .. TUAN A. ARUNASALAM, A.M.N. (Appointed).
- .. TUAN ABDUL RAHMAN BIN AHMAD (Perlis).
- .. TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN HAJI ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Penang).
- .. PUAN BIBI AISHA BINTI HAMID DON, A.M.N. (Appointed).
- .. TUAN AMALUDDIN BIN DARUS (Kelantan).
- .. DATO' JOSEPH AUGUSTIN ANGIAN ANDULAG, P.D.K. (Sabah).
- .. TUAN AWANG DAUD MATUSIN (Appointed).
- .. DATU TUANKU BUJANG BIN TUANKU HAJI OTHMAN (Sarawak).
- .. TUAN CHAN KWONG-HON, J.M.N., S.M.S., J.P. (Selangor).
- .. TUAN CHEAH SENG KHIM, J.P. (Penang).
- .. DATO' DR CHEAH TOON LOK, D.P.M.K., D.M.K., J.M.N., J.P. (Appointed).
- .. DATO' J. E. S. CRAWFORD, D.P.M.P., J.M.N., J.P. Dato' Kurnia Indera (Appointed).
- .. TUAN D. S. DORAI RAJ, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Appointed).
- .. DATO' FOO SEE MOI, D.P.M.K., J.P. (Appointed).
- .. TUAN GOH CHEK KIN, P.J.K. (Trengganu).
- .. TUAN HOH CHEE CHEONG, A.M.N., J.P. (Pahang).
- .. TUAN C. D. ISMAIL, J.M.N., J.P. (Appointed).
- .. TUAN ANDREW JIKA LANDAU (Appointed).
- .. DATO' Y. T. LEE, D.P.M.S., J.M.N., P.J.K., J.P. (Appointed).
- .. TUAN LIM HEE HONG, J.M.N., J.P. (Appointed).
- .. TUAN LIM JOO KONG, J.P. (Kedah).
- .. TUAN MOHAMAD ADIB BIN OMAR, P.J.K. (Trengganu).
- .. DATU PENGIRAN MOHAMED DIGADONG GALPAM, P.D.K. (Sabah).
- .. TAN SRI HAJI MOHAMED NOAH BIN OMAR, P.M.N., S.P.M.J., D.P.M.B., P.I.S., J.P. (Appointed).

- The Honourable TUAN HAJI MOHAMED SAAID BIN HAJI ABU BAKAR (Appointed).
 .. DATO' ATHI NAHAPPAN, D.P.M.S. (Appointed).
 .. NIK HASSAN BIN HAJI NIK YAHYA, J.M.N. (Appointed).
 .. TUAN SAIDON BIN KECHUT, A.M.N. (Appointed).
 .. DATO' SHEIKH ABU BAKAR BIN YAHYA, AL-HAJ, D.P.M.J., P.I.S., J.P. (Johor).
 .. TAN SRI G. SHELLEY, P.M.N., J.P. (Appointed).
 .. TUAN SYED AHMAD BIN SYED MAHMUD SHAHABUDIN, J.M.N., S.M.K., J.P. (Kedah).
 .. TUAN SYED DARUS BIN SYED HASHIM (Perlis).
 .. TUAN WILLIAM TAN (Appointed).
 .. TAN SRI T. H. TAN, P.M.N. (Appointed).
 .. TUAN S. O. K. UBAIDULLA, J.M.N. (Appointed).
 .. DATO' WAN IBRAHIM BIN WAN TANJONG, J.M.N., P.J.K., Orang Kaya Indera Maharaja Purba Jelai (Pahang).
 .. WAN SULAIMAN BIN WAN TAM, P.J.K. (Appointed).
 .. TUAN YAHYA BIN AHMAD, P.J.K. (Negri Sembilan).
 .. TUAN YAHYA BIN HAJI AHMAD (Perak).

ABSENT :

- The Honourable the Minister without Portfolio, TAN SRI ONG YOKE LIN, P.M.N. (Appointed).
 .. TUAN ABDUL SAMAD BIN OSMAN, P.J.K. (Appointed).
 .. TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN HAJI ABDUL MANAP, P.P.N. (Melaka).
 .. PUAN AISHAH BINTI HAJI ABDUL GHANI (Appointed).
 .. TUAN CHAN KEONG HON (Appointed).
 .. TUAN GAN TECK YEOW, J.M.N. (Appointed).
 .. TUAN HONG KIM SUI (Appointed).
 .. TUAN KOH KIM LENG (Melaka).
 .. DATO' LEE FOONG YEE, J.M.N., P.P.T., J.P. (Negri Sembilan).
 .. TUAN S. P. S. NATHAN (Appointed).
 .. TEMENGGONG OYONG LAWAI JAU (Sarawak).
 .. TOK PANGKU PANDAK HAMID BIN PUTEH JALI, P.J.K. (Appointed).
 .. RAJA RASTAM SHAHROME BIN RAJA SAID TAUFHY (Selangor).
 .. DATO' E. E. C. THURASINGHAM, D.P.M.J., J.P. (Appointed).
 .. WAN MUSTAPHA BIN HAJI WAN ALI, S.M.K. (Kelantan).
 .. TUAN YEOH KIAN TEIK (Perak).

IN ATTENDANCE :

- The Honourable the Minister of Health, TUAN BAHAMAN BIN SAMSUDIN (Kuala Pilah).
 .. the Minister for Welfare Services, TUAN HAJI ABDUL HAMID KHAN BIN HAJI SAKHAWAT ALI KHAN, J.M.N., J.P. (Batang Padang).

PRAYERS

(Mr President *in the Chair*)

ADJOURNMENT TO A LATER DAY

(MOTION)

Dato' Y. T. Lee: Mr President, Sir, I beg to move the motion standing in my name,

That at its rising today the Senate shall stand adjourned until 10 a.m. on Monday, 27th June, 1966.

Puan Bibi Aisha binti Hamid Don: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That at its rising today the Senate shall stand adjourned until 10 a.m. on Monday, 27th June, 1966.

MOTION

THE YANG DI-PERTUAN AGONG'S SPEECH

Address of Thanks

Order read for resumption of debate on Question:

Bahawa suatu ucapan yang tidak seperti-nya di-persembahkan kepada Ka-bawah Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong demikian bunyi-nya—

“Ampun Tuanku,

Patek, Yang di-Pertua dan Ahli² Dewan Negara Malaysia di-dalam Persidangan Parlimen, memohon ampun mempersembahkan suatu ucapan yang zalil daripada Majlis Dewan Negara menguchapkan berbilang-banyak shukor dan terima kasih kepada Ka-bawah Duli kerana Titah Uchapan Ka-bawah Duli pada masa membuka Penggal Yang Ketiga Parlimen Yang Kedua.”
(15hb Jun, 1966).

Dato' Athi Nahappan: Dato' President, Sir, the Gracious Royal Address this year is noted for its brevity. This is unusual compared with the previous years. Though brevity has been sought, it is heartening to note that all the essentials have been very adequately covered in the Royal Address itself. It is again significant to observe that nearly one-fourth of His Majesty's observations has been directed to foreign affairs. This is aptly so. We are right now in the midst of an international whirlpool. For the last three

years we have gone through a period of trials and tribulations and, on the whole, we have acquitted ourselves very ably and admirably. As it has been said by other Honourable Members, this is almost entirely, if not exclusively, due to the very wise leadership that this country has enjoyed in the personalities of the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister and also on the whole by reason of the response and inspiration of the people. I think objectively speaking, philosophically speaking, such trials and tribulations as we have had for the last three years are necessary for a people to grow up. During difficult periods one grows up, one matures, one experiences challenges and by facing these challenges with an unanimity of mind as far as possible and trying to find solutions for them, one grows up. And we, though a small nation, though a young nation, had to face these challenges suddenly. I do not think the Tunku would have envisaged this when in the month of May, 1961 he mooted the idea of Malaysia and then everything seemed to go smoothly; but then, towards the end of 1962, we found ourselves in the midst of challenging international problems; and from the beginning of the year 1963 almost we have found ourselves in the midst of these challenges and from then on we have met them, and we have reasonably solved them if I might say so. That is why His Majesty graciously referred to two memorable events this year and he termed them, firstly, as the successful recent Bangkok Conference, and the other is the restoration of diplomatic relations with Manila. These two, His Majesty referred to as “memorable events”, and I would hope that these would be followed by the third memorable event, that is, the normalisation of diplomatic relations with Pakistan. This was, again, a by-product of the overall problem that we met during this period.

Sir, it has been said that the policy of Malaysia in regard to Indonesian confrontation was approached on two grounds in seeking a peaceful solution. One is that any solution must be acceptable to both sides and the other is that it must be consistent with Malaysia's sovereignty. Now, with these

twin pillars the recent Bangkok Conference was approached, and we are now informed by our leaders, particularly by Tun Razak, that on these two points we have scored the desirable objectives. The more important one is that it must be consistent with Malaysia's sovereignty; and Indonesia, it would appear, has agreed to recognise and respect this part of the negotiation, because the other part is that whatever terms agreed upon must be acceptable to both sides. Of course, after these various Notes that had been exchanged in Bangkok—they were not agreements, they were merely exchange notes—they had to be ratified by the respective Governments. In so far as ourselves are concerned, the matter was considered by the Cabinet, and the Cabinet has blessed the moves taken by the Deputy Prime Minister. In so far as Indonesia is concerned, though they have not officially, formally ratified the moves taken by their Foreign Minister, Adam Malik, they have recently sought certain clarifications. It was not mentioned what clarifications they were after, but the Foreign Minister of Indonesia did point out hints that they hinged upon certain military matters, and we had sent our Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, who had been there for the last few days, and he has come back and told us that the necessary clarifications had been made to the Indonesians and we hope that Indonesia would ratify the initial moves taken. It was not envisaged that everything ended in the Bangkok Conference; there had to be subsequent moves, interchanges and finally definite, positive and conclusive evidence would have to be arrived at. In the meanwhile, we have been assured by the well-known President of Indonesia that he would keep silent in thousand tongues and he would let his Ministries to continue with the search for a complete peaceful formula in regard to confrontation. What is, so far as we are concerned, heartening in this year at the Opening of the Parliament is that when Tun Razak came back he did clearly tell the Nation that confrontation is over. He did say this on arrival at the Airport. And he said, at any rate un-

officially, this was the hard fact of the reality of the Bangkok Conference. He said and I quote, "You can say confrontation is over. It is over for good." He also said, and I quote, "Indonesia now recognises Malaysia's independence and sovereignty". Now, from this it is clear that while Malaysia's independence is recognised, Malaysia's sovereignty is recognised, that other matters such as the military movements on the borders, opening of the trades, normalisation of diplomatic relations, and so on and so forth, which were the immediate products of the confrontation, would have to be resolved, and these are matters for successive talks between the two countries. For this we are very grateful to our leaders. We hope, and sincerely indeed, that there would be no going back on this very important essential of the recognition of Malaysia's sovereignty and independence. There should be no question of any more ascertainment as to the validity of the creation of Malaysia. In fact, according to the Manila Accord and the Joint Statement, we had fulfilled our parts of the obligations a long time ago, as early as August 1963 when the United Nations had its survey and U Thant gave his verdict. But they were not satisfied, and I hope they would not further seek some kind of formula to challenge or question the validity of the sovereignty of Malaysia and our leaders have given us hope that it would not be done; because if it is done, then I think from the international angle, from the constitutional angle, we would be putting ourselves into an unnecessary position of doubt. So far as this House is concerned, I am sure every one will share with me that we have complete confidence in our leaders that such an inroad would not be allowed to be made in so far as the sovereignty issue is concerned, which is fundamental, which is absolute, and which cannot be made vulnerable.

Sir, with regard to the restoration of diplomatic relations with the Philippines, which His Majesty graciously referred to, this again had come in at the right time, with an appropriate setting and in harmony with the developments that had been taking place during the last few weeks though we were kept

informed almost day by day, hour by hour, that restoration was coming and finally it did come on the 3rd of June this year.

The Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the Philippines had used very handsome and generous words. He had said that this restoration ushered in a new era of peace and he hoped it would be an enduring one and he also hoped that Maphilindo could be resuscitated and he referred to the concept of ASA and he said that this regional ingenuity may be fused with the concept of Maphilindo into a harmonious whole, perhaps under another name, and expanded to include other friendly Asian countries, and I quote his words, "which would be more conducive to solving common regional problems and more responsive to the aspirations of our peoples for an abundant life". He went on to say that ASA and Maphilindo were the products of Asian inventiveness. Of course, we do remember that not so long ago our Prime Minister did say in one of his press statements that so far as Maphilindo is concerned, you can forget about it. He said it was never there and it never got its birth and we might as well forget it. That is the attitude so far as we are concerned, and I think the Prime Minister is quite correct. This does not mean to say that the structure of ASA could not be enlarged so as to include like-minded nations into its framework. That has already been considered and it has already been announced that very soon the three parental countries would consider the scope of admitting or inviting other countries in the region. That is a desirable objective and it should be pursued, but to fall back on Maphilindo would be completely unrealistic, the reason being Maphilindo was a still-born child; it never had its life, and secondly, when it was born, it was born with a concept which ushered in immediate misgivings and fear. This was originally conceived and submitted for consideration at the tripartite Summit Meeting held in Manila from the 7th to 11th June, 1963, almost exactly three years ago. This was stated as the Macapagal Plan, and in the Manila Accord, paragraph 6 says, and I quote, "In this context, the three Ministers supported

President Macapagal's Plan envisaging the grouping of the three nations of Malay origin working together in closest harmony but without surrendering any portion of their sovereignty. This calls for the establishment of the necessary common organs." The significant words at that time were "the grouping of the three nations of Malay origin." This was considered by impartial observers as being unnecessarily restrictive, limited to our racial identity. As a result a number of people felt that the emphasis, the overtone was not an objective as it should be and ever since this did not get going and as the Tunku has said we should forget about it. If ASA is to be developed, the emphasis should be more on a regional identity and not on racial identity. For regional benefit, for regional development, and for regional harmony—that should be the emphasis, that should be the desirable objective and not any, connotation on the basis of a race. I think gone are the periods in these modern days of internationalism, when the idea of a "one world" is growing more and more through the ages and instrument of the United Nations, to think in terms of a race and that is not desirable. Of course, at that moment situations compelled us to fall in line with that suggestion, but subsequently there were varied reasons to have this dropped. We are now on a strong footing or a sound footing in so far as ASA is concerned and ASA, of course, should be developed for a number of reasons. It is not necessary for me to go into the various practical benefits of this. As it is, one of the Steering Committees is meeting in Bangkok right now and they have got on their slate 29 positive projects—projects such as ASA Airways, ASA Shipping Lines, free trade, removal of tariffs and free flow of people between these regions. All these are very sound, very progressive, very dynamic ideas and we should go towards this direction, because, though it is good to have other members coming in, I think we should not wait till it has expanded in its structure and then only begin to think in terms of positive acts. I think it would be a better tactical move for these three countries to get down to brass tacks, to get down to

something more positive and dynamic so that it would be an inspiration to other countries in the region and then they would themselves come in rather than they coming in by our invitation. Coming in by invitation now at this stage before we have really got going with any kind of positive results, is merely in the hope of doing something, merely in expectancy, but if ASA is now made a feasible organ to get something done practically, then that would be a definite positive selling feature in so far as ASA concept and machinery are concerned. As the Prime Minister said at one time, if I remember correctly, what is important is the quality of the Association, not necessarily the quantity of it, and if three nations could get together and get down to the process of quality rather than numeral quantity of mere membership, I think that would be a more positive direction.

In so far as the resumption of diplomatic relationship with Philippines, the other remaining factor is the question of Philippines' claim on Sabah. The Joint Communique that was issued on 3rd June, 1966, had this paragraph, and I quote, "They—meaning Malaysia and the Philippines—also recognise the need of sitting down together as soon as possible for the purpose of clarifying the claim and discussing means of settling it to the satisfaction of both parties in consonance with the Manila Accord and Joint Statement." This is the relevant paragraph in so far as the claim by the Philippines over Sabah is concerned. From this it is interesting to note that the claims themselves are in doubt. Now, the Philippines is supposed to have made a claim in so far as Sabah is concerned and they say they have already made the claim and it is on the books, but in so far as we are concerned we still are at a loss as to the real character of the claim. There are still doubts about it. That is the situation and the first thing that has been envisaged is that both parties should sit down to clarify the claim of the Philippines. The claim is still not unequivocal; it is still equivocal and the onus is being thrown, in fact, the onus should be thrown on the Philippines, rather than we sitting with

the Philippines and trying to seek clarifications about their claims.

If they are claiming something, if they say that it is their right, it is their onus, it is their responsibility to set it down in clear uncertain terms what is their claim. That they have not done hitherto and I hope we will not be called upon to sit with them to clarify their claim. The subsequent step is to discuss the means of settling these claims. First, is to have the claims clarified, then the means of settlement to be discussed over these claims. But the important other phraseology of the Joint Communique is that any settlement must be to the satisfaction of both sides in consonance with the Manila Accord and the Joint Statement. I am not very sure as to the meaning of these words and I think the Honourable Members would agree with me that it will be made known to the nation that any settlement, if it is to be a settlement, must be satisfactory to both sides—that is what the Communique says. This implies that the settlement process should be more by way of conciliation and negotiation, more bilateral in character, rather than reference to a third party, arbitration or judicial process, because it says any settlement must be "satisfactory to both sides". As we have now satisfied by direct bilateral negotiation with Indonesia in so far as confrontation is concerned, I hope that this says what it means, that it would be settled by direct bilateral negotiations rather than referring to any international tribunal such as the International Court of Justice or any other forum of arbitration.

If you will recall, Sir, that in so far as the procedure was concerned in the Manila Accord and in the Joint Statement, there are various processes mentioned for settlement, such as, negotiation, conciliation—in paragraph 12 of the Manila Accord—arbitration or judicial settlement as well as other peaceful means of the parties' own choice in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations and the Bandoeng Declaration. This was what is mentioned in the Manila Accord and subsequently also referred to in the Joint Statement.

The original claim, as we know, was against the United Kingdom, but Malaysia being the successor State insofar as Sabah and Sarawak are concerned we have more or less impliedly assumed responsibility in the Manila Accord that their acceptance of Malaysia is not without prejudice to their claim and right over Sabah. The wordings "claim and right" are used almost in a complete manner without any qualification. That is an unfortunate wording, but subsequently it has been agreed that it should be by any one of these various processes. But now in the Joint Communique it would appear that the settlement should be more by way of bilateral dealing to the satisfaction of both parties and I hope that this would be done as soon as possible by the two countries sitting down without inviting anybody into the picture and I sincerely hope, and I am sure the Hon'ble Members here would also hope, that in the larger interest such as the concept and practice of ASA, that the claim over Sabah is really completely antiquated, unrealistic and it is not practical or feasible and within the context of the United Nations' survey that was carried out by the Secretary-General under the General Assembly's Resolution 15/1941 and according to principle 9 of the Annex to the Resolution. The United Nations team had already satisfied themselves that Malaysia was the major issue in the election that took place in 1963, that the electoral registers were properly compiled, elections were free, and votes were properly polled and properly counted, and so on. I myself had the privilege and honour of being Malaya's observer at that time in Sabah and the verdict of the United Nations could not be doubted in any manner. In fact, Manila did send in their observers towards the end and I am sure Manila never questioned the validity of the verdict of U Thant. And now the claim still persists because despite the survey, the Manila Accord had given a provision in favour of Manila that all these things were subject to their claim and interest. They are pursuing with this. My hope is that they would drop this in the interest of peace, in the interest of the larger benefit of

the region and in any event their moral claim is not sound as their legal claim, because there are the other territories in the parts of Borneo held by Indonesia which belong to the original Kingdom and Philippines had been very silent about the other parts of the Borneo state. They have been only raising their claim so far as Sabah is concerned. If at all they had any propitious moment to claim, that was soon after the War when the British North Borneo Company was dissolved and when the United Kingdom colonial aegis was introduced by the United Kingdom Government sometime soon after the War in 1946. During all this period, from 1946 till 1953, when Britain was using it as a raw, direct colony, Philippines just kept quiet. There was no claim at all of any kind, but only when Malaysia came into the picture and there too through normal processes and conformity with the United Nations Resolution and so on, this claim has been made and this claim in any event, is not now sustainable and I hope that Philippines would reconsider it in the interest of peace and prosperity.

That, Sir, is my observation in so far as foreign affairs are concerned and I should like at this stage to give our warm tribute and respect to our two Ministers, the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister, for their successful handling of these two problems which had vexed us for some years now. We should also take this opportunity to pay our tribute to that band of very able and hard-working members of the Foreign Ministry, from Tan Sri Ghazali Shafie downwards. Our Ministry had been created, in fact after the events, as in many other fields. Ever since Independence events have been going ahead of us and we have been catching up with the events by our thinking and organisation. This was one of the Ministries that was born directly as a result of Independence and it has been trying to catch up with the demands of the various problems of the day and even now they are so terribly understaffed and they have not got all the specialised classifications and divisions desirable in a Department of Foreign Affairs.

The difficulty in getting suitable people is always there, and with all these handicaps this problem came on us very suddenly and we had to cope with it, and I think in so far as the Department is concerned, it had discharged itself very ably and more particularly Tan Sri Ghazali himself has shown the clarity of mind and the brilliance of a diplomat, necessary for a challenging problem such as this. They all, one and all in the Ministry, deserve our tribute for their very able work, and we hope that the Ministry would be enlarged and more rationalised in its division of labour, so that the Ministry would give even more better service than they had hitherto done.

Sir, now I should like to touch on another matter and that is the question of education. Sir, it is time that the country should have expansion of the existing University either by creation of another University or by creation of University Colleges elsewhere. The target in so far as our University is concerned is 7,000 students by 1970 and everything is being done to achieve this target, but we have been for a long time, and we are now and I think we will be for a number of years in the future, depending on a number of foreign countries for our boys to go for further education. Mainly we have been confining ourselves to the Commonwealth countries, chiefly three of them—the U. K., Australia and New Zealand—these are the main countries that we have been depending upon; and we have more or less got ourselves tied to the British traditions, British standards, in our educational concepts. But I think the time has come now for us to take a good look at these traditional ties with Commonwealth countries. Although it is desirable because of our past connection and the usefulness of the English language and so on, I think we should now widen our horizon in our educational concepts and educational mileages. These countries themselves are already beginning to have problems, because of the population growth in these countries and the changes in their structural economy demanding further technological and scientific developments and the con-

sequent changes in patterns of education with a greater accent and emphasis on science and technology. Now, as a result, these countries themselves are finding lack of spaces in their universities and some time ago you might recall there were various views expressed, particularly in Australia. Warnings were given that the admission of foreign students may have to be restricted in Australia. At the moment, we have a greater number of students in foreign countries than we have in our University; and I think this situation will have to go on for a number of years. Even if we keep expanding, our rate of growth is now going pretty high—about 3.2%—and the educational expansion has been so dynamic here that the tendency to catch on with education is there now in all stratum of the society, rich or poor, and everybody is conscious of giving his child a better deal in education, and there would be a very great demand for educational places, especially in the university here. Even if we keep expanding, I do not think the gap can be closed, and we have to rely on foreign countries for a number of years. That is a fact. Here is a warning that comes from Australia, and recently the Australian Minister of Education, Senator Gorton, has indicated that admission of foreign students into Australian universities will have to be restricted. This situation demands for action on our part. We have to now begin to think straightaway what we are going to do. It would appear that the reason for the views of Australia or New Zealand or the United Kingdom for hinting this to us is not merely the cost of students alone. Yesterday, the Honourable Senator, Dato' Dr Cheah Toon Lok, referred to this point himself, and he did mention the figure that in U.K. roughly about £1,000 is being spent by way of subsidy on each foreign student. I did check up the figures. It would appear that the figure is around something like M\$3,000 and that appears to be the average figure spent on any foreign student by these countries—that means that the taxpayer in the U.K. or Australia or New Zealand has to put out by way of subsidy around M\$3,000

to every student of ours who goes to these countries for further education. The reasoning behind the idea of restricting foreign students coming into these countries, it would appear, is not necessarily the prohibitive cost, but, as I indicated, it is the desire to find places for their own students in their own countries because of the population growth. What are we going to do? One way of solving this problem, as I indicated earlier, is to widen our horizon in so far as educational concepts are concerned; and we have been tied so long to the British traditions. It is time now that we looked into other countries, particularly the United States, which do not mind the cost problem; I think they would be able to take in as many students as we can provide. The idea of going to the United States to find out the quality of various universities was mooted some time ago, and one of the former Ministers of Education indicated that he would be going to the United States to see for himself, but this has not been done as yet; and I think it would be absurd for us to close our eyes to the quality of the United States' degrees in all fields. There are so many anomalies. We do not recognise U.S. medical practitioners' qualification here, but we do allow the Korean doctors who are tied to the U.S. standards to practice and serve in our country. These anomalies have got to be removed, and it is time that the U.S. standards cannot be overlooked or we cannot take an ostrich-minded attitude, because we have found it convenient to tie ourselves with the British standards. Not merely the United States, I would even go in so far as to say that there are a number of other countries in Europe, Germany, the Scandinavian countries and some other countries, who have developed very much, equally well with the U.K. or even better in certain fields, particularly in the fields of science and technology and we should send our boys there.

We should not even overlook Japan which has gained international recognition in a number of technical and scientific fields. Today she is, by far, the leading country in the world in the field of shipbuilding, and in electronics

she has excelled herself even more than many developed countries, the veteran countries in Europe or America. It is time that we should get away from the prejudice that no Asian country is really suitable enough for us and that we should go back always to the European countries or the derivative European countries, such as Australia and New Zealand. I am not in any way decrying their qualities, but I am only saying in another way that it is time that we should widen our horizon. Of course, there is this difficulty of languages, but it has been said that in so far as technical studies are concerned, scientific studies are concerned, that the language problem is not really a major problem and that it can be overcome within a very short time by various rationalised methods.

The other thing that we should do is to introduce various languages in our primary and secondary schools. While, of course, we all have to learn the national language—there is no doubt about that, there is no qualification as to that—but I would hope for a day every Malaysian would be tri-lingual. It has been defined that an intellectual is no longer a uni-linguist or uni-lingual. The modern-day intellectual is considered to be at least tri-lingual. In Europe, or the average cultured Britisher, or for that matter even in America, the modern tendency is to learn at least two or three languages, and this country is wonderfully set for us to learn at least three languages. While, of course, all of us must learn the national language and use it, in accordance with the principles of the Constitution at all levels as quickly as possible, we need an international language, which is none other than English, and all of us must learn it if we are to get along in the field of science and technology; and I think in addition to that it would be better if every Malaysian knows another Asian language—either Japanese or Chinese or Hindustani—because Asia is now forging ahead and for a better understanding. For us Malaysians with a multi-racial character, here is the beautiful setting to have at least tri-lingual ability, so that we would have

a kind of product sufficiently wide enough in its attitude, broadminded, accommodating and understanding.

Now, that is necessary, and that is only feasible if we become tri-lingual or at least qualified in two languages as the minimum. This should be the desirable objective of the Education Ministry and I think we should start off by introducing provisions to teach various languages. Apart from the national language and English we should even teach other European languages and other Asian languages for optional students who would like to learn for various purposes, and I think it is not difficult to make arrangements with these countries to provide teachers to give education in these languages.

Now, having said this, I would say that the time has also come for us to expand our Universities. It has been said that there is a provision or, rather, it has been hoped that there should be a University College in Penang and there should be a Borneo University. It has been talked about, but we have not travelled very much in this educational mileage. In so far as Penang is concerned, Penang seems to be very exuberant with this idea and they have set a target for themselves to collect \$10 million to have University Colleges there. They have gone ahead and acquired 600 acres of land in the Glugor/Bayan Lepas area and they have paid \$2 million for it. I understand even the Penang Municipality has agreed to give, or has indeed given, about \$2½ million for this project; and the Penang people seems to be enthusiastic. But this is not a burden for Penang alone. If it is going to be a University College or a University eventually, it is national in character, though it is set in a particular region. The responsibility is, of course, nationwide. I think the case for a second University, to be started off as merely educational colleges, is very sound and very pressing indeed in the States of Malaya and also in Borneo. And the Prime Minister has himself agreed to give the necessary impetus as the Chancellor of the University of Malaya. It has been hinted that it might just as well to have the Law Faculty in

Penang. At present the University of Malaya has no Law Faculty; perhaps the proposed Penang College can fill this gap and try to develop a personality of its own in a specialised manner, rather than being a general university. Then it would be complementary to the University in Pantai Valley. Penang should concentrate on such fields as have not been covered by the University here and try to develop quality so that the reputation would not be merely recognised within the four corners of our country but also it would be recognised in this region to start off, and eventually to get international reputation specialisation is desirable. In fact, even in the United Kingdom, if we want to be an architect nobody would go to Oxford or Cambridge, they would rather go to Birmingham; and if we want to know something about political science, particularly with reference to South-east Asia, you would go to Connelly University. Now, such reputation has been developed in the United States, and I hope this proposed Penang University would be considered and conceived in the pattern and earn a reputation for specialisation.

Now, Sir, that is so far as the matter of Higher Education is concerned, but I would like at this stage to say that our Universities have an important role during this most exciting period of our self-growth. There should be dynamism in not merely action but also in the thoughts of the country. A thinking nation is what we want, and in order to stimulate the nation to think and to think in certain themes is absolutely necessary if we are going to stabilise our democracy. The people should not be just complacent, or should not be merely receptive, but they should also be articulate. And in one or two fields I find though the Government has been very active and very enlightened in its measures and in its thoughts but the same thing has not been conveyed to the people and from the people's side the response is not very impressive enough. Now, in order to fill up this gap, I would suggest that there should be a number of extra-mural courses started in the University here. I am very glad to note that a separate Department of Economics and Public

Administration is to be created next year and this necessary work is already going on. A department of this type should have a number of extra-mural courses wherein members of the public, professional men and others could attend evening classes and they could have week-end classes or vacation classes with residential benefits where this idea of discussion on be promoted and developed in the fields of economic development. Now, economic development should not be the field of experts alone. It should be talked about by the people. The ordinary man in the street would be able to have some broad ideas of the broad concepts of our plans, what we hope to do and what we are doing. And in order to give this knowledge there should be such courses. There should be courses on our Constitution—the fundamental liberties of the Constitution. What are these liberties? How can you maintain your democracy within the concept of various restrictions? These are things that we can impart to the public through extra-mural courses. They are provided in other countries. I have attended myself in Europe a number of matters as a lay student and we should begin to do in that direction something of that kind so that the people would begin to talk, particularly about the economic development that is taking place throughout the country. Very few people these days talk about these matters, and very few people know what is going on. Now, this is a sad gap and we should do something about it.

The third point, Sir, that I am coming to is the question which is rather dear to me because of my association with the Federal Capital and with the Traffic Advisory Committee in the Federal Capital. Now, that is this frightening and horrifying problem of road accidents in the country. Recently a Road Traffic Week has been held in the Federal Capital and it is being repeated year after year so as to promote road sophistication of the people. Despite that, the figures are there to remind us to this growing problem, which is still out of hand. Now, last year alone there were about 729 people killed on the roads of Malaysia, of whom about 104 were killed in Kuala

Lumpur. 8,000 persons, if figures would just give a picture, were injured in Malaysian roads in 1965. And during the last ten years 4,750 people were killed throughout Malaysia and 85,000 people were injured during this period. These are the figures.

Our rate of vehicles growth is phenomenal. Every year we are adding something like 30,000 units of motor vehicles on our roads and at the moment we have 395,118 motor vehicles on our roads, as at the end of 1965. Now this is a very large number considering other Asian countries; on a per capita basis, we are having the highest vehicle ownership in the region. The country is collecting something like—from the APPENDIX one would get all this information or at least some of them—we collected in 1965 \$108 million by way of revenue from road transport. But still the accidents are there. The accidents are there because vehicles are growing, the population is growing the road sophistication is not sufficiently growing matching up with these, and the town planning is again not matching up with the demands and the dictates of modern road transportation.

Recently the Commissioner for Town and Country Planning warned that if we do not do anything now itself in so far as the Federal capital is concerned, we would end up in the kind of mess that New York did some years ago. That is a warning indeed to be heeded to. Many of these accidents, it has been said 80% of the accidents, are caused by the drivers themselves, by negligent driving, cutting in and out, overtaking recklessly, disregard for pedestrians, not falling in line with the various filters and so on. These have been the reasons and they have been repeated often enough for us to know them well, and though the road sophistication or the behaviour of the people is slowly growing, I don't think it is fair to expect very much immediate results. What is lacking in commensurate proportion is the degree of enforcement. I think everybody has a healthy respect for a summons when received and a couple of summons received too often, if it ends up in an endorsement on the licence or subsequent cancellation of the

licence, might do the trick. In Kuala Lumpur alone last year there were about 12,000 incidents. There were many others, but not every one of them was booked or brought into court. The Traffic Police, as it is now, is doing its work very ably, but they can only go up to a point and no further. The manpower of the Traffic Police at the moment is most utterly inadequate. It is not commensurate with the growth of the vehicles, nor commensurate with the growth and the expansion of the towns and the population. There is an immediate case to go into all this traffic police mechanism, to modernise this mechanism and the highway patrols and other patrols should be brought up-to-date; and secondly, the manpower of it should be brought up-to-date. This is a field that must be attended to as quickly as possible if we are going to minimise this problem. I dare say that we can never hope to completely eliminate this cause; no country has eliminated road accidents but what we should do and what we can do is to keep it as low as possible. Here is a very real need for the Ministry to do what is necessary in harmony with experience gained elsewhere.

There is a suggestion made that safety belts would be introduced early next year and that legislation would be brought about—safety belts for the front seaters and also helmets for the motor-cyclists and pillion riders. But, of course, this would not prevent accidents but would probably prevent injuries from arising. But it is a right step and many other practices should be looked into, as practised in other countries and we should try to improve the situation. The speed-hogs must be brought to book and must be severely dealt with and that is the only way of drilling the importance of a sense of responsibility into the minds of those suffered by recklessness or utter disregard for the welfare of others. While this goes on, of course, the education of the public should go on by various projects and programmes, such as the Road Safety Week.

While touching on this point, I should also like to refer to the Motor Insurers' Bureau, which has been

suggested. Unfortunately, this was not mentioned in the Royal Address when dealing with road safety. The Honourable Minister himself recently mentioned that legislation would be drawn up and that meetings had already been held with the Treasury representatives and the Treasury has more or less agreed. The idea of a Motor Insurers' Bureau came as a result of a judgment given by the former Lord President, Tun Thomson. He mentioned this because he had to off-set a judgment given in favour of a widow who lost her husband in very poor circumstances with three children. She got \$10,000 in the hearing at the High Court. Then there was an appeal to the Court of Appeal and in the Court of Appeal, for technical reasons, she lost the case, and Tun Thomson very sadly allowed the appeal against this damage given. He said this, and I quote, "Things like this should not happen in a civilised society. It may be legal justice; it is not social justice." For legal justice, he had to disallow the damages given but he said that for social justice she should have had something. And social justice is a thing that the Court has no jurisdiction over. Social justice is a matter for the Government itself and for the society at large. And where in a case like this, where for technical reasons if the owner of a motor car is not found liable to give damages through the insurance company, and if a person is killed leaving dependants in utter helpless conditions, then the society should come to the rescue and aid of this family and this can be done by this proposed Motor Insurers' Bureau, whereby all these insurance companies, it has been suggested, should voluntarily get together and keep a reserve fund by way of contribution amongst themselves so that in cases such as this, there would be an *ex gratia* payment to the victims of the accident. Though they may not win in a court of law, because of the social justice concept they should be given some kind of monetary help, and this is a thing that should be attended to as early as possible.

Now, Sir, I come to my final point and that is one or two views on the economic development of this country,

and then I will conclude my speech. *(Laughter)*.

Sir, the Honourable Minister of Finance recently went round and he came back and we heard views that the country that is very closely tied with us, the United Kingdom, has not given us the help that we expected from them. Then, there were various views about it, and it was a sad disappointment no doubt. The Minister has indicated that the gap is \$630 million for us to proceed with the First Malaysia Plan and 12 other countries, the Aid-Malaysia-Club, have already given their support and they indicated that they would come out with various forms of help, but the United Kingdom has flatly said "No" because of their balance of payments difficulties. The British High Commissioner here has said that there is still room for further talks; he did mention that Britain has been giving us help since 1963—\$175 million for Defence and \$35 million for economic aid and so on and so forth. There have been some angry views expressed that we should get out of the Commonwealth. We do not know who mentioned that, but this kind of views were expressed. Our Plan, of course, does not necessarily depend on the aid of one country or another. Our Plan has been well praised. Recently the Executive Director of the World Bank, who was here, Mr Abdul Rahman Tazi said it is a very well conceived and realistic strategy of economic growth. That was his view as regards our First Malaysia Plan. And there had been many others who had praised this Plan as being a very realistic one. However, there was another economist who said, an Australian economist, Mr Wilson, that our economic growth has been haphazard. But it is interesting to note that Dr Lim Swee Aun recently said that, hitherto we have allowed a decentralised free enterprise, that we did not restrict, sufficient incentives were given for enterprises to invest and produce whatever they liked, and that was the kind of enterprise that we promoted here, and as a result a number of industries grew. These were light industries, in order to meet our immediate consumption needs, and these were

termed as import substitution industries: to reduce our imports and to that extent we saved our foreign exchange. Dr Lim said that this phase has now gone; we are now emerging into the second phase. This second phase is the one in which he said that we are now beginning to think in terms of heavy industries, and heavy industries of certain types are to be started off with a larger capital; and with this in mind F.I.D.A. had been set up by way of legislation, i.e. the Federal Industrial Development Authority. This Authority has been on the Statute Book for some time; there has been a search for about two years to get a Director and finally a Director has been recruited from Norway, and we hope that F.I.D.A. will begin to operate as quickly as possible. The main work of F.I.D.A. is to control the growth of industries, particularly heavy industries, to co-ordinate and to identify to some extent or even participate. Now, here is where I should like to give my views briefly and conclude my speech. *(Laughter)*.

Up till now there have always been two views. One view is that developing countries such as ours, small though it is, should only confine ourselves to small industries. There are no markets, there is no population sufficiently big enough to absorb what we produce, and therefore we should limit ourselves to small scale industries. This has been the view expressed by various economists and which has been practised in not less than something like 50 developing countries and as a result there has been some degree of economic growth in a number of these developing countries. So far as we in Malaysia are concerned, including Singapore, for instance, we have over the years something like 12,000 units and during the last few years in Malaysia alone, something like 300 new units have been created by way of pioneering industries and so on. And on the whole it has worked well. There has been some degree of savings, there has been some degree of earnings by way of exports as a result of these small scale industries. And now it has been said that the time has come to have more basic industries.

Now, when we think in terms of basic industries, it is necessary that the Government now should also depart to some extent from the original concept of having this decentralised economic freedom given to the various enterprises, that they start whatever industries they like and make whatever profit they can, which was based on what is known as the "Macrow economic planning" as it has been practised in other countries. But when we think in terms of heavy industries, it has so many other correlated problems, including very sizeable capital participation; and here is where Government should step in and should not be shy of taking direct involvement or participation in the creation of these heavy industries and also to accelerate thereby the promotion of growth of industries. Now, this is necessary. It is not very clear from the F.I.D.A. legislation or even as a policy whether our Government is going to do that. In fact, the other theory that has been adopted by a number of other developing countries is that in a developing country, the Government should take the lead—the Government not merely take the lead but also take participation in the growth of industries. I was happy to read recently that Tun Razak said that through M.A.R.A. a number of corporations would be established and Government would create a number of industries and then eventually decentralise there by handing them over. Now, that is a right step and I hope this will be enlarged so that the economic growth of the country can be accelerated.

So far as capital formation is concerned, we here have had a very fortunate setting; in fact our capital formation has been very encouraging. In 1964 it has been 19 per cent of the Gross National Product. This is very good. But unless a country begins to save, it can never prosper. It has been said that Japan, when it started off its industrial phase, it started off in a big way of saving. They followed the West in every manner. They copied the West in all patterns except the consumption pattern, that is to say, they denied themselves of consuming their growth. They sold what they developed and produced

and they tightened their belts and saved. And today it is said that Japan is the most leading country in the quantum of savings. Sometimes they saved 20% to 30% of the G.N.P., or a number of sectors of the G.N.P. Now, this is a thing that we can learn profitably from Japan. Of course, we can also borrow. Within our First Malaysian Plan, the public sector envisages about \$4,550 million, out of which about \$1,900 million is expected from grants and foreign aid, and the Minister of Finance has said the gap is \$630 million. There is nothing wrong in borrowing. There are people who say that we should not borrow, we should stand on our own feet, but if you look into the history of other countries, you take England for instance, England did borrow in the 17th century from Holland; then in the 18th century and the 19th century England was the world's largest creditor. The United States borrowed in 19th century. Today she is the largest creditor for various other countries. So there is nothing wrong in borrowing, but I should like to see that we also have a very good proportion of reserves, and I think this is one of the things that is in the minds of other countries whenever they say that "Malaysia is well off, Malaysia need not borrow, Malaysia can stand on its feet because it has got a large reserve fund (something like \$3,000 million). Why can't it be used for development?" This is considered to be one of the highest and in a number of other developing countries, such reserve fund is not kept aside. But we have been keeping this as a security cushion and for the stability of our currency. But, perhaps, we can rely on it to some extent so that it can be brought into use so that the social return could be greater and there should be various steps taken to promote savings through the commercial banks in the country. Recently, I think in August 1965, the Post Office Savings Bank interest rate was increased from 2½ to 3 per cent. It might be worthwhile to increase the rate of interest of the banks for depositors. That might perhaps give incentives for people to save through the banks and there should be various other methods introduced at

decentralised levels at various institutions, factories, offices and in other fields whereby various new techniques of saving processes should be introduced so that members of the public with ideas of developing the country can put something into our savings kitty.

With these views, Sir, I would like to associate myself with the other Honourable Senators in expressing my humble thanks to His Majesty for the Gracious Address this year, and this year is certainly a year of jubilation for us, and on assumption to the Throne by His Majesty the first Royal Address started off with a keynote of the message of peace, and we hope that during the era of His Majesty, we would not merely have peace in our country but also growing prosperity. Thank you very much. (*Applause*).

Dato' J. E. S. Crawford: Dato' President, Sir, I wish to fully support the motion now being debated by this Honourable House—That an humble address be presented to His Majesty offering our humble thanks for the Gracious Speech from the Throne on the opening of the Third Session of the Second Parliament.

Dato' President, Sir, it is not my intention today to take up the time of the House with my usual lengthy speech. However, Dato' President, I do wish to stress that I entirely agree and support what Yang Berhormat Tun Dr Ismail said elsewhere, as reported in the *Straits Times* this morning. With your permission, Dato' President, I now quote those most significant and factual words, "The Alliance Government believes that any emotional outburst over the issue will serve no useful purpose and will benefit no one. Since the British Government has emphatically maintained a negative attitude to Malaysia's request for financial aid, we must readjust our thinking towards the British Government." Dato' President, Sir, what I have just quoted from what Yang Berhormat Tun Dr Ismail said in another place proves, I feel sure that Hon'ble Members will agree, that any disagreement we Malaysians may have with the United Kingdom is not with the British people, who we all know are our friends and have always been

so, but entirely with the present British Cabinet. That is all I wish to say, Dato' President, Sir. Thank you. (*Applause*).

Tan Sri G. Shelley: Mr President, Sir, I would like to add my humble respects and thanks to the expressions of gratitude for the Gracious Speech of His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong. The welcome news of today is the end in sight of confrontation. For this, we have to thank the wise counsel that has prevailed on both sides between the two nations and especially to our Acting Prime Minister, Tun Abdul Razak and his team who assisted him at the talks. In our joy today, let not our memories be so short that we forget the men who have made it possible for our nation to sit at the negotiation table with pride and dignity and not as a vanquished nation. We are grateful to those men who have sacrificed much and who were prepared to die for the nation in defending its integrity. Especially are we grateful to those friends of ours who have sent us material aid and their men to fight side by side with us. Without them we would not have achieved the position of strength that we are in today. They have sacrificed a great deal. In many homes today, in New Zealand, in Australia, and particularly in Britain there is many a vacant seat at the "makan table." This seat was once occupied by a beloved husband, a brother, a sweetheart, or a good friend. They volunteered to come to our assistance to face death, if death was necessary, in order to help us in the plight that we were confronted with. Let not, therefore, our memories be so short and let not the sin of ingratitude be ours.

In our foreign policy, it has been suggested that we should be non-aligned, I suggest, Sir, that there is no such thing as non-alignment. We are aligned by aligning ourselves with non-aligned nations. We have still the menace of militant Communism facing us. Let us not bury our heads in the sands of delusion and think all is well above the surface. Instead, let us join our neighbours who are equally ready to abolish militant Communism in this part of the world.

We have had this menace with us for many a long year. No sooner had we finished with our own problems in Malaya than we were confronted with militant Communism from the Indonesian side. We have seen the aggression of militant Communism with its offensive movements from the north and from the south. Fortunately, Indonesia has discovered the ill-effects and the destructiveness of militant Communism and they have checked and paralysed the pincer movement on the south. But we still have a very active force in the north and it is to the credit of the Americans that they are helping to prevent this pincer movement from approaching in our direction. Were it not for them we would soon find militant Communism on the frontiers of Thailand and moving downwards. We will then find them eventually at our door step. So our foreign policy cannot necessarily be one of non-alignment. It must be an anti-militant Communist alignment.

Sir, we have had difficulty with our neighbour across the Causeway recently and the incident could have led to a greater crisis had it not been for the tact and diplomacy of our Prime Minister, the Tunku. When he came into the picture, things seemed to have settled nicely, because, he made contact directly with the Prime Minister of Singapore. Misunderstandings and such like were immediately removed and normal relationship once again prevailed. I would, therefore, suggest in all seriousness that a "hot line" be established between the desk of the Tunku and the desk of the Prime Minister of Singapore. Should there be any incident this "hot line" could be brought into use and any misunderstanding settled immediately between the two Prime Ministers before the *Press* and individuals distort the issue.

On the matter of education, I feel and I am sure the parents and guardians of school-going children will also be most grateful to our Minister of Education for his firmness and his straightforwardness in dealing with the issue of education and the conduct of teachers. Discipline has been lacking in our schools increasingly in recent years

and it was high time that someone spoke firmly to these teachers and brought them to realise the important role they were playing in the education of our children. It is unfortunate that indiscipline prevails more in the Government-run schools than in the Mission schools.

It is good to note that something is being done for the health services to benefit our people. I refer to the proposed health insurance scheme. There is at present a nasty defect in the system of admitting patients into the hospitals, especially when often they are not able to meet the heavy charges of the hospital. There is a means test and it depends on how much you tell and how much you are able to pay, to get into the proper ward. Naturally, there is discrimination between a fellow with a nice white shirt and the chap who comes in without shoes. That should not be so. This proposed health insurance would, I think, solve that problem. I suggest that the system adopted by Australia should be looked into. This system brings in insurance companies to share in the responsibilities of financial arrangements for the health insurance scheme. If my information is correct, it is compulsory for Australians to take out a health policy whereby when they are ill they could go to the particular ward of their choice—1st, 2nd, 3rd, or whatever it is. The charges for the hospital will be normal, but in accordance with their insurance policy they will pay a proportionate sum that they are entitled to according to the premium they pay. This avoids the defects which are quite obvious in the system of the United Kingdom.

On the Common Market, Sir, it must be remembered that the Common Market is not all one-sided. We want to sell our goods in other people's countries and these other nations want to sell their goods in our country. Therefore, our industries should be equally, if not more, efficient as those prevailing in other countries. We should have a flying start when the Common Market idea is ready for operation. It is interesting to know how much foreign exchange our industries are earning for the country today.

With regard to labour—I have mentioned it before and I will mention it again—when there is a big project in any State or in any place, the labourers and the workmen of that area should get priority in the jobs that are available. It has been suggested that in Butterworth, with regard to the deep water wharves unskilled labour has been brought in, and I suggest that this matter be looked into and the unemployed in Butterworth be given a chance to obtain these jobs. There is a great number of unemployed in Butterworth, which runs to about 3,000 to 5,000; and all these young men are crying out for work.

Now, Sir, the Public Service is the target today among the ratepayers. There is evidently some slackness, if not inefficiency, within the Public Service in Malaysia. The slowness in which matters are dealt with is the talk of ratepayers. There is at the moment a Commission looking into the salaries of the members of the Public Service, but they will not get any sympathy unless they do something more for the money that we ratepayers have to pay. There was a glaring case mentioned in the papers a few days ago. One man got the "sack" in 1960 in Ipoh and he was told to leave his house, but he did not leave the house until the 1st January, 1966. It took six years before this man was evicted and in the meantime someone else was waiting for the house. In the course of this time, he defied the Government, and he defied the law court. There are obviously some defects in our Public Service, and I do hope that it will receive the attention of the Government to bring the Public Service to serve the public in a better way.

Tuan Haji Mohd. Saaid: Dato' Yang di-Pertua, saya berdiri menyokong Titah Uchapan Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong. Di-sini saya suka sedikit menyentuh berkenaan dengan Kementerian Hal Ehwal Dalam Negeri. Dato' Yang di-Pertua, maseh tahu yang Pasokan Polis di-Raja telah pun menjalankan kewajipan-nya dan juga patut-lah kita mengucapkan ribuan

terima kaseh untuk keamanan negeri ini. Tetapi apa yang menyedehkan saya, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, perkara yang berlaku tidak berapa lama dahulu di-Taiping, ia-itu sa-orang Polis bekerja malam, dan di-nampak-nya satu orang, di-tahan-nya, kemudian dia bertanya berkenaan dengan Kad Penge-nalan; tetapi apa telah terjadi orang itu lari, dan di-kejar-nya, dan malang-nya, mata² ini kena tikam, di-sebabkan tidak ada di-beri oleh Kerajaan lampu suloh kepada orang² Polis yang bekerja malam, atau menjaga beat. Jadi ini patut-lah Kerajaan mengambil perhatian berat memberi lampu suloh kepada orang² Polis yang berjaga malam.

Lagi, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, ia-itu tidak ada satu Polis Station sa-bagai-mana yang di-adakan di-Kuala Kangsar, ia-itu satu Polis Station mengadakan 3 kawasan berasingan, tetapi satu Polis Station, rumah-nya burok dan lagi jikalau, Dato' Yang di-Pertua perhatikan, amat-lah sedeh-nya kedudukan Polis² yang bujang itu memasak di-bawah tangga. Jadi patut-lah Kerajaan membena Polis Station yang baharu untuk kawasan Kuala Kangsar itu. Lagi, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, jika di-perhatikan di-seluruh Malaysia ini kebanyakan pegawai² Polis, rumah-nya jauh dengan Polis Station, sa-tengah-nya mendapat rumah Kerajaan, dan sa-tengah-nya menyewa. Patut-lah di-utamakan pada Pegawai² Polis yang rumah² berhampiran dengan Polis Station itu di-utokkan kepada Pega-wai² Polis.

Dato' Yang di-Pertua, lagi saya suka menerangkan ia-itu berkenaan Kementerian Pelajaran. Kita maseh tahu ia-itu tahun 1967 ini, yang bahasa rasmi akan di-gunakan di-seluruh Malaysia ini, bahasa Melayu, dan sudah sa-patut-nya pada mula² tahun hadapan Sekolah Jenis Kebangsaan Inggeris, Murid² yang memasoki Sekolah Jenis Kebangsaan Inggeris hendak-lah di-ajar Bahasa Kebangsaan dan satu mata pelajaran sahaja, dengan bahasa Inggeris. Sebab-nya di-Sekolah Jenis Kebangsaan Inggeris itu ada banyak bangsa mengaji di-situ dan kita mesti utamakan-lah Kebangsaan lebih daripada yang lain.

Dato' Yang di-Pertua, Kementerian Pembangunan Negara dan Luar Bandar; di-sini berapa banyak bilek bacaan, balai raya telah di-adakan di-seluruh Malaysia ini. Tetapi dengan sedeh-nya, bandar di-Raja Kuala Kangsar sa-hingga hari ini tidak ada, baik pun balai raya atau pun bilek bacaan. Sa-patut-nya satu bandar yang besar sa-macam itu Kerajaan mengambil perhatian berat untok di-adakan Town Hall atau pun balai raya. Terima kasih.

Tuan Yahya bin Ahmad: Dato' Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong usul yang ada di-hadapan, mengucapkan terima kasih Titah Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong. Di-samping itu saya memberi-lah pendapat serba sedikit berkenaan Titah di-Raja. Yang pertama, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, berkenaan Jabatan Perdana Menteri. Mengikut Titah di-Raja ada dua orang pakar daripada Amerika Sharikat hendak di-tugaskan di-Jabatan Perdana Menteri untok melichinkan lagi pertadbiran negara Malaysia ini. Saya berpendapat pakar² yang di-datangkan atau di-datangi daripada luar negeri untok melichinkan pertadbiran negara Malaysia pada hari ini, saya rasa tak berapa mustahak; sebab pakar² pertadbiran yang ada dalam negara Malaysia ini chukup dan lichin menjalankan tugas², bukti-nya semenjak kita merdeka sa-lama 9 tahun beberapa pembangunan, pertadbiran dan keamanan dalam negara Malaysia, bahkan saya perchaya dalam Dewan ini juga ada juga bekas pakar² pemerintah sebab kalau di-datangi atau di-datangkan pakar² pemerintah daripada Amerika Sharikat atau pun daripada Great Britain yang mana kadar keadaan penduduk² di-sana boleh-lah di-katakan 90 peratus satu bangsa; tetapi di-Malaysia ini ada-lah berbilang² bangsa dan lain keturunan dan ugama dan kebudayaan. Saya perchaya barangkali juga negeri² lain datang ka-mari belajar soal pemerintahan.

Yang kedua-nya, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, saya ta' tahu sama ada lichin-kah atau belum-kah pemerintahan pada hari ini, terkadang² apabila hendak berjumpa satu² Ketua Jabatan terpaksa melalui 4-5 orang, jumpa

dengan budak pejabat, kemudian Kerani Kechil, Kerani Tengah, Kerani Besar baharu dapat jumpa Ketua Pejabat, memakan masa daripada pukul 9.00 hingga 2.30 baharu dapat. Saya ta' tahu ini ada-kah satu lichin-chinan dalam pertadbiran atau pun sa-balek-nya. Kalau di-bandingkan dalam pemerintahan British dahulu barangkali lebeh senang hendak jumpa British Advisor atau pun Resident satu² negeri.

Yang kedua-nya Dato' Yang di-Pertua, saya menyentoh sedikit berkenaan dengan Kementerian Pelajaran. Yang pertama, di-galakkan Kementerian Pelajaran penuntut² atau pun murid² belajar lebeh dalam ilmu sains, tetapi ada sa-tengah² sekolah menengah pada hari ini ada guru sains tetapi tidak ada kelengkapan ada kelengkapan-nya tidak ada guru-nya sa-hingga satu² sekolah itu menghantar surat kapada Kementerian minta kelengkapan sains enam bulan, tidak timbul dan tidak bunyi. Jadi sa-kira-nya penuntut² di-kehendaki berlately dalam perkara ini patut-lah Kerajaan atau pun pehak yang bertanggung-jawab melengkapi dengan sa-chukup²-nya supaya penuntut itu tidak sia².

Yang kedua, dalam soal pelajaran juga, Kementerian Pelajaran baru² ini telah jadi satu permogokan di-Sekolah Menengah Pertukangan Bukit Senyum, Johor Bahru yang mana pada hari ini penuntut² di-sana lebeh kurang 200 orang telah keluar, barangkali juga ada-lah tidak puas hati kapada penuntut² itu sama ada chara layanan atau pun alat² kelengkapan yang hendak dituntut oleh penuntut² itu. Saya sempat melawat tempat itu pada bulan satu tahun 1966. Saya dapati di-muka depan chantek apabila sampai ka-belakang, pergi tempat tukang kayu tidak lebeh 10 atau 12 keping papan, dan bagi tukang besi saya dapati berlonggok motokar² burok dan di-sini berlonggok lori² Jabatan Kerja Raya. Saya fikir penuntut tukang besi itu, besi² burok itu-lah barangkali di-ambil-nya di-pelajari-nya. Barangkali ini juga satu tidak puas hati bagi pehak murid² itu saya harap Kementerian yang bertanggung-jawab akan dapat mengatasi

kesulitan ini lebeh² lagi siaran telah dikeluarkan oleh Guru Besar atau penguasa sekolah itu yang mana mengatakan sa-sudah 26 haribulan sa-kira-nya penuntut² itu tidak menghadhiri diri akan di-anggap berhenti dengan sendiri-nya. Kalau tidak adalah satu penyelesaian mungkin juga kalau murid ini tidak hadir dalam sekolah ini kesemua-nya sekali tentulah sekolah itu kosong. Kemudian apabila di-tanya oleh orang apa sekolah-nya itu dan apa Che' gu-nya itu? Saya fikir jawab-nya guru-nya ia-lah guru besi dan guru kayu sebab murid tidak ada kalau sa-kira-nya ada ketetapan ini, kalau murid tidak di-kehendaki belajar lagi, guru pun berhenti itu lagi baik.

Soal yang ketiga, dalam Kementerian Pelajaran juga, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soal bahasa dalam melaksanakan Bahasa Kebangsaan yang akan jadi bahasa yang tunggal dalam Persekutuan Tanah Melayu pada tahun 1967 mungkin 6 bulan lagi terbit matahari 1967 dan juga Kerajaan menggalakkan pula pada orang dewasa dan di-buka-lah beberapa banyak sekolah dewasa untuk menuntut Bahasa Kebangsaan. Tetapi malang-nya dalam dewan yang mulia ini juga patut di-galakkan untuk bertutur atau berchakap Bahasa Kebangsaan supaya menjadi tauladan kepada apa Kerajaan dan apa yang kita suruh. Saya rasa ini ada-lah Kerajaan. Jadi janganlah sampai di-tudoh oleh ra'ayat "ketam menyuroh anak berjalan betul", tetapi ibu-nya jalan mengereng.

Dalam perkara Kementerian Dalam Negeri baharu² ini, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, telah di-tubuhkan satu jawatan-kuasa penchegeh rasuah yang di-ketuai oleh Yang Amat Berhormat Tun Dr Ismail peringkat Menteri. Saya perchaya Jabatan Penchegeh Rasuah ini memang-lah rumit dan sulit untuk menjalankan tugas yang mana jangan dapat ra'ayat negeri ini menudoh Kerajaan berleluasa menjalankan rasuah. Jadi di-sini, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, dalam soal ini patut-lah satu istilah rasuah di-fikirkan betul² dalam satu peratoran atau di-buat satu undang² supaya Jabatan Penchegeh Rasuah dapat men-

jalankan tugas yang sa-wajar-nya. Umpama-nya, satu mithalan, satu² pekerja tertentu umpama-nya hendak membuka satu² factory, atau satu² bangunan yang besar, kemudian dibuka oleh sa-saorang yang tertentu, sa-sudah itu di-hadiahkan dengan gunting emas atau dulang emas. Ini ada-kah masok atau tidak dalam soal rasuah?

Dato' Yang di-Pertua, berkenaan dalam Kementerian Penerangan, saya berpendapat ada sa-tengah² tempat Jabatan Penerangan ini kadang² poster-nya pun tidak ada. Apabila di-katakan di-mana poster itu? Jawab-nya wang tidak chukup. Kadang² anggaran perbelanjaan satu² pejabat itu hingga bulan enam sudah habis. Pada bulan enam akan datang sa-hingga akhir tahun tidak ada langsung apa yang hendak di-belanjakan. Kadang² oleh sebab ada-nya simpati pegawai² itu, duit poket-nya sendiri di-keluarkan untuk kepentingan negara. Dan saya perchaya penerangan ini ada-lah satu yang mustahak sekali dalam negara ini bahkan juga dalam dunia. Tidak mustahil kira-nya bom atom tidak boleh menyelesaikan satu perkara. Tetapi penerangan² yang luas, penerangan² lanjut barangkali boleh menyelesaikan satu masaalah dan satu perkara. Sekian-lah, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, saya mengucapkan terima kaseh.

Tuan Haji Abdul Hamid Khan bin Haji Sakhawat Ali Khan: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bagi pehak Kerajaan saya ucapkan sa-tinggi² terima kaseh kepada Ahli² Yang Berhormat yang telah beruchap dalam masa membahathkan Titah Uchapan Ka-bawah Duli Yang Maha Mulia Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong pada masa membuka Penggal Yang Ketiga Parlimen Yang Kedua baharu² ini. Saya yakin dan perchaya perkara² yang telah di-bangkitkan oleh Ahli² Yang Berhormat dari semenjak hari kelmarin sa-hingga hari ini telah pun di-ambil ingatan oleh pegawai² dari pada Kementerian² yang ada berkaitan dan akan di-sampaikan kepada Menteri² yang ada kaitan perkara² yang di-bangkitkan itu untuk ma'alum Menteri² itu, dan saya yakin dan perchaya juga apa² tindakan yang perlu akan

di-ambil berikutan dengan ucapan² yang telah di-buat dan akan di-jalankan. Umpama-nya apa yang dapat di-jalankan sekarang ini juga telah pun di-jalankan umpama-nya satu perhatian yang di-bawa oleh Senator Saidon Kechut pada hari kelmarin berkenaan dengan bintang² Malaysia, saya nampak pada hari ini pada masa saya ada di-sini, bintang² itu pun telah di-edarkan kepada Ahli² Yang Berhormat dan bila ada peluang saya harap pada satu² hari istimewa untuk Ahli² Yang Berhormat itu memakai bintang² itu. Sakian sahaja yang dapat saya ucapkan pada Majlis ini berkenaan dengan Titah di-Raja itu (*Tepok*).

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

Bahawa suatu ucapan yang tidak saperti-nya di-persembahkan kepada Ka-bawah Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri

Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong demikian bunyi-nya:

“Ampun Tuanku,

Patek, Yang di-Pertua dan Ahli² Dewan Negara Malaysia di-dalam Persidangan Parlimen, memohon ampun mempersembahkan suatu ucapan yang zalil daripada Mailis Dewan Negara menguchapkan berbilang-banyak shukor dan terima kasih kepada Ka-bawah Duli kerana Titah Uchapan Ka-bawah Duli pada masa membuka Penggal Yang Ketiga Parlimen Yang Kedua.”

Dato' Y. T. Lee: Mr President, Sir, I beg to move that the House be now adjourned.

Puan Bibi Aishah binti Hamid Don: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya sokong.

Question put, and agreed to.

Mr President: Persidangan meshuarat ini di-tanggohkan sa-hingga pukul 10 pagi, hari Ithnin, 27 haribulan Jun, 1966.

Adjourned at 12.10 p.m.