

13

13

Jilid III
Bil. 1



Hari Isnin
21hb Mei, 1973



LAPURAN PERSIDANGAN
OFFICIAL REPORT

DEWAN UNDANGAN NEGERI PULAU PINANG
YANG KETIGA
THIRD LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY PENANG

PENGGAL YANG KETIGA
Third Session

MESYUARAT YANG PERTAMA
First Meeting



LAPURAN PERSIDANGAN
OFFICIAL REPORT

DEWAN UNDANGAN NEGERI PULAU PINANG
YANG KETIGA
THIRD LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY PENANG

PENGGAL YANG KETIGA
Third Session

MESYUARAT YANG PERTAMA
First Meeting

KANDUNGANNYA

- UCAPAN TUAN YANG TERUTAMA GABNOR [2]**
- MEMBENTANGKAN RISALAH-RISALAH [10]**
- USUL DI BAWAH PERATURAN MESYUARAT 15 (3) [10]**
- PEMILIHAN AHLI YANG MEMPENGERUSIKAN DI BAWAH PERATURAN
MESYUARAT 3 (1) (b) [11]**
- USUL 6 (1) [12]**
- USUL DI BAWAH PERATURAN MESYUARAT 34 [28]**
- USUL DI BAWAH PERATURAN MESYUARAT 9 [77]**

PULAU PINANG

DEWAN UNDANGAN NEGERI YANG KETIGA

Laporan Persidangan

PENGGAL YANG KETIGA

MESYUARAT YANG PERTAMA

Hari Isnin, 21hb Mei, 1973

HADIR :

- Yang Berhormat Tuan Speaker (Datuk Harun bin Sirat, D.M.P.N.)
Yang Amat Berhormat Ketua Menteri (Dr Lim Chong Eu)
Yang Berhormat Penasihat Undang-Undang Negeri (Encik Abu Talib bin Othman)
Yang Berhormat Timbalan Ketua Menteri (Encik Ooh Chooi Cheng, J.P.)
Yang Berhormat Ahli Kawasan Tanjung Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim)
„ „ Kawasan Tanjung Tengah (Encik Tan Gim Hwa, J.M.N.)
„ „ Kawasan Tanjung Selatan (Encik Wong Choong Woh)
„ „ Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S. P. Chelliah, J.P.)
„ „ Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Encik Ismail bin Hashim, J.P.)
„ „ Kawasan Kepala Batas (Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Haji Abdullah, A.M.N., J.P.)
„ „ Kawasan Butterworth (Encik Ooi Ah Bee)
„ „ Kawasan Glugor (Encik D. C. Stewart)
„ „ Kawasan Permatang Pauh (Tuan Haji Mohamad Nor bin Haji Bakar, J.P.)
„ „ Kawasan Dhoby Ghaut (Encik Khoo Teng Chye)
„ „ Kawasan Nibong Tebal (Encik Teoh Chung Hor *alias* Teoh Kooi Sneah)
„ „ Kawasan Muda (Tuan Haji Abdul Kadir bin Haji Hassan, P.J.K., J.P.)
„ „ Kawasan Tanjung Utara (Encik Khoo Kay Por)
„ „ Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan)
„ „ Kawasan Tanjung Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap)
„ „ Kawasan Jelutong (Encik Koay Boon Seng)
„ „ Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin)
„ „ Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik Veerappen a/k Veerathan)
„ „ Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How)
„ „ Kawasan Balik Pulau (Encik Abdul Rahman bin Haji Yunus)
„ „ Kawasan Tasek Glugor (Encik Mustapha bin Hussain)

1. DOA

2. UCAPAN TUAN YANG TERUTAMA GABNOR

Tuan Speaker: Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat dan para jemputan sekalian, Tuan Yang Terutama Gabnor akan tiba masuk sebentar lagi.

(Tuan Speaker, didahului oleh Setiausaha Dewan Undangan menuju ke pintu bilik Dewan untuk menyambut Tuan Yang Terutama Gabnor dan Yang Mulia Toh Puan Datin Hajjah Sharifah Fatimah).

(Tuan Yang Terutama dan Yang Mulia Toh Puan Datin Hajjah Sharifah Fatimah diiringi oleh Juruiring-juruiring memasuki bilik Dewan, didahului oleh Tuan Speaker dan Setiausaha Dewan Undangan. Para hadirin berdiri dan tunduk sambil Tuan Yang Terutama dan Yang Mulia Toh Puan Datin Hajjah Sharifah Fatimah berjalan menuju tempat duduk).

Setiausaha Dewan: Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat, ucapan Tuan Yang Terutama Gabnor. (Ketua Menteri menyerahkan ucapan kepada Tuan Yang Terutama).

Tuan Yang Terutama Gabnor: Hari ini menandakan permulaan Penggal Yang Ketiga Dewan Undangan ini dan kita mengucap syukur kepada Tuhan di atas rahmatnya, bagi keamanan, kemajuan dan kemakmuran yang telah dicapai di dalam Negeri ini. Kadar pertukaran dan pembangunan yang telah berlangsung di dalam Negeri kita sungguhlah pesat, dan adalah sesuai bagi kita memandang ke belakang untuk meninjau betapa jauhnya kita telah maju sebelum kita memandang ke hadapan dan cuba meramalkan apa yang terdapat di masa hadapan.

Pilihanraya ke Dewan yang begini sempurna telah diadakan dengan jayanya pada bulan Mei, 1969. Oleh kerana keadaan Darurat, Yang Berhormat Ahli-ahli yang dipilih telah tidak dapat bersidang sehingga selepas Februari, 1971 apabila Demokrasi Berparlimen dikembalikan dan Ahli-ahli Dewan Undangan yang dipilih telah dapat mengambil bahagian di

dalam Perundangan Negeri ini di mesyuaratnya pada 12hb April, 1971. Semasa tempoh Pemerintahan Darurat, Majlis Gerakan Negeri yang dipengerusikan oleh Yang Amat Berhormat Ketua Menteri, telah dibentuk untuk mentadbirkan Negeri ini dan dengan adanya kerjasama yang baik daripada rakyat, perkhidmatan-perkhidmatan, pentadbiran, Pasukan-pasukan Polis dan Keselamatan, Wakil-wakil Rakyat yang telah dipilih dan Ahli-ahli Majlis-majlis Muhibbah, dan dengan limpah kurnia dari Tuhan, kita telah dapat menjaga keamanan dalam Negeri ini dan menubuhkan satu gambaran harmoni di antara kaum dan di antara ugama, keamanan dan kesetabilan bagi Negeri ini.

Keadaan dalam tahun 1969 merupakan cabaran yang terbesar. Manakala usaha-usaha utama kita pada masa itu adalah untuk menjaga keamanan dan keselamatan di dalam Negeri, ke semua sumber-sumber kita yang ada telah digembelngkan untuk merancang bagi pembangunan dan kemajuan Negeri Pulau Pinang. Daripada usaha permulaan kita di dalam bidang perindustrian, kita juga menempuh kemajuan di dalam bidang agro-horticulture. Kedua-dua aspek stratiji pembangunan kita ini bersama-sama telah dapat menyediakan pekerjaan-pekerjaan yang diperlukan oleh mereka yang menganggur di dalam Negeri ini di samping membawakan semangat pertukaran yang sungguh perlu supaya dapat melepaskan ekonomi Negeri ini daripada kebuntuan yang dihadapinya di penghujung tahun 1960han. Kedudukan ekonomi Negeri yang begitu mencemaskan adalah dicerminkan di dalam kadar pengangguran yang tinggi yang dianggarkan sebanyak 39,000 orang, satu angka yang merupakan 14%—16% daripada jumlah tenaga buruh di dalam Negeri ini pada tahun 1969. Sebagai tambahan 7,000 murid-murid yang keluar daripada sekolah memasuki kumpulan mereka yang mencari pekerjaan tiap-tiap tahun. Peluang-peluang pekerjaan di dalam sektor swasta sangatlah terhad dan terdapat keadaan di mana rakyat-rakyat kita yang berkebolehan telah

meninggalkan Negeri ini ke lain-lain Negeri dan juga ke seberang laut. Oleh itu, terdapat satu keperluan yang mendesak bagi membentuk semula sifat-sifat ekonomi Negeri ini dan untuk melancarkannya daripada ekonomi perdagangan kepada ekonomi perindustrian di luar bandar dan perbandaran kawasan luar bandar di dalam keadaan yang mana pelancungan, pembangunan agro-horticulture, pembaharuan dan pembangunan semula kawasan-kawasan bandar akan memainkan peranan yang terpenting.

Sambil kita sekarang menikmati kejayaan rancangan-rancangan pembangunan perindustrian, kita sentiasa perlu menentukan bahawa di dalam Negeri ini terdapat bekalan-bekalan tenaga buruh, kewangan dan sumber-sumber pentadbiran yang mencukupi, kesanggupan material dan pertumbuhan untuk membolehkan Negeri ini meneruskan rancangan-rancangan pembangunan ini ke tahun 1980an dan selanjutnya. Kerajaan Negeri adalah benar-benar sedar akan perlunya menubuhkan satu Yunit Perancang Negeri yang akan menyelaraskan rancangan-rancangan pembangunan Negara, Negeri dan Kerajaan Tempatan pada ke seluruhnya. Yunit Perancang Negeri ini akan ditubuhkan tidak lama lagi untuk sentiasa mengadakan hubungan dengan ejensi-ejensi dan badan-badan pembangunan di dalam Negeri Pulau Pinang dan dengan lain-lain Negeri-negeri dan ianya akan mengkaji pertukaran di dalam perjalanan ekonomi Negeri ini.

Semua rancangan-rancangan yang telah dijalankan oleh Kerajaan adalah bertujuan bagi menyediakan galakan untuk pembangunan supaya dapat meneruskan kadar pembangunan ekonomi. Objektifnya bukan hanya tertumpu terhadap menyatukan masyarakat kita tetapi juga untuk menjaga perbelanjaan hidup di Pulau Pinang rendah secara bandingan dengan lain-lain Negeri-negeri di dalam Negara ini di samping menjaga sifat-sifat dan kualiti hidup yang merupakan cara Pulau Pinang.

Hari ini saya sukacita memaklumkan kepada Dewan bahawa usaha-usaha pembangunan Kerajaan Negeri telah mengurangkan kadar pengangguran daripada kadar yang dianggar di antara 14% hingga 16% pada tahun 1969 kepada kadar yang dianggarkan sebanyak 10% buat masa ini. Projek-projek pembangunan ini telah juga membolehkan Kerajaan Negeri memulakan bidang-bidang aktiviti yang baru yang akan terus mengukuhkan kemampuan kita bagi kemajuan di masa hadapan. Manakala pada tahun 1969 kita hadapi masalah yang rumit pengaliran keluaran cerdek-pandai dari Negeri ini, masalah kita dalam tahun 1973 adalah bagaimana untuk membekalkan tenaga buruh yang mahir dan separuh mahir secara mencukupi bagi industri-industri baru yang sedang didirikan dan yang akan didirikan di Kawasan-kawasan Perusahaan dan juga Kawasan-kawasan Perdagangan Bebas. Terhadap ini, Kerajaan Negeri akan memberi segala bantuan dan kemudahan latihan yang boleh untuk menggalakkan kemajuan kemahiran-kemahiran teknologi rakyat kita dengan menubuhkan lebih banyak lagi instituit-instituit latihan.

Keadaan dalam tahun 1969 memerlukan Rancangan Pelbagai Guna yang terbesar di dalam Negeri ini pada ke seluruhnya dan pelaksanaan secara pesat objektif-objektif yang telah dikenali untuk menghidupkan semula ekonomi Negeri dan Kerajaan Negeri tidak menghiraukan penat-lelah ataupun masa untuk menjalarkan rancangan dan pelaksanaan program-program pembangunan yang perlu untuk mencapai objektif ini. Pegawai-pegawai daripada Perkhidmatan Pentadbiran Negeri dan Persekutuan bersama-sama dengan penasihat-penasihat daripada luar negeri bertugas kuat bersama-sama dengan Kerajaan. Objektif utama ialah untuk melaksanakan rancangan-rancangan pembangunan yang akan mengujudkan lebih banyak lagi peluang-peluang pekerjaan bagi semua rakyat kita di dalam Negeri ini dan dengan itu menolong melahirkan satu masyarakat

yang baru dan adil yang akan membawa kemakmuran yang lebih bagi bilangan yang terbesar di semua bahagian Negeri ini dan dengan itu membetulkan keadaan ekonomi yang tidak seimbang di dalam Negeri.

Adalah ditetapkan bahawa rancangan utama bagi menghidupkan semula dan untuk memberi tenaga baru ke dalam ekonomi ialah melalui perindustrian yang ditujukan terhadap memajukan dan menubuhkan industri-industri yang menggunakan tenaga buruh yang banyak dan bercorak eksport. Untuk melaksanakannya, satu konsep terbaharu mengenai Kawasan Perdagangan Bebas telah diperkenalkan dalam rancangan pembangunan. Walaupun pengeritik-pengeritik dan mereka-mereka yang curiga membuat teguran dan kecaman-kecaman yang kuat, pada hari ini, empat tahun kemudian, kita boleh memandangkan ke belakang dengan rasa kepuasan akan kejayaan yang telah dicapai dan dengan itu kita dapatlah memandangkan ke masa hadapan dengan penuh keyakinan dan kepercayaan bagi kemajuan yang terus-menerus di masa hadapan.

Pada bulan Mei, 1969 terdapat hanya sebuah kawasan perusahaan yang diuruskan di Mak Mandin dalam kawasan yang seluas 320 ekar. Pada masa itu terdapat hanya 15 kilang-kilang yang dijalankan yang memberi peluang-peluang pekerjaan kepada kira-kira 2,400 orang dan yang mempunyai jumlah permodalan pelaburan sebanyak \$22.54 juta. Di dalam bidang pelancungan, jumlah pelancung-pelancung asing yang melawat Negeri ini adalah kira-kira 32,000 orang. Jumlah bilik-bilik hotel yang ada pada masa itu hanya kira-kira 1,850. Di hari ini dalam tahun 1973, terdapat 7 Kawasan-kawasan Perusahaan dan Kawasan-kawasan Perdagangan Bebas yang diuruskan di Mak Mandin, Perai, Bagan Serai, Bayan Lepas dan Pulau Jerejak. Jumlah luasnya kesemua Kawasan-kawasan perusahaan dan Kawasan-kawasan Perdagangan Bebas adalah lebih daripada 5,000 ekar. Pada hari ini, 52 buah kilang-kilang telahpun ditubuhkan dan 70 buah kilang-kilang diluluskan untuk dibina. Kilang-kilang

ini akan memberikan peluang-peluang pekerjaan terus kepada lebih daripada 29,000 pekerja-pekerja, dan tambahan sebanyak 49,000 peluang-peluang pekerjaan bantuan dan yang tidak langsung bagi rakyat kita. Adalah dianggarkan bahawa menjelang tahun 1980 jumlah kerja-kerja yang akan diwujudkan akan digandakan dengan adanya rancangan Pembangunan Bandaran Yang Disatukan.

Pada penghujung bulan Mac 1973 kesemua 52 buah kilang-kilang yang telahpun didirikan menduduki kawasan seluas 218 ekar dengan jumlah permodalan yang dianggarkan sebanyak \$101 juta. Kilang-kilang ini bersama-sama menyumbangkan kira-kira \$40,000 setahun kepada ekonomi Negeri ini. Seterusnya 10 buah kilang telah diluluskan untuk dibina di dalam masa 12 bulan yang akan datang. Kilang-kilang ini menduduki kawasan seluas 417 ekar dan permodalan kilang-kilang ini yang disatukan adalah dianggarkan sebanyak \$220 juta. Sebagai tambahan, terdapat lebih 400 buah kilang-kilang yang didirikan di dalam kawasan-kawasan yang terletak di luar kawasan-kawasan perusahaan yang telah ditubuhkan dan kilang-kilang ini memberi peluang-peluang pekerjaan bagi kira-kira 25,000 pekerja.

Di dalam bidang pelancungan, jumlah pelancung-pelancung yang melawat Pulau Pinang telah berlipat ganda. Pada tahun 1969, 32,000 orang pelancung-pelancung asing melawat Negeri kita ini. Pada tahun 1972 angka ini telah meningkat hingga 64,000 orang dan adalah dijangkakan bahawa menjelang tahun 1975 angka ini akan melebihi 140,000 orang dan melebihi 500,000 orang menjelang tahun 1980. Perkembangan di dalam pelancungan akan melibatkan tekanan yang sangat kuat di atas kemudahan-kemudahan penginapan hotel di dalam Negeri. Mujurlah sektor swasta telah menyambut seruan ini dan bilangan bilik-bilik hotel telahpun dibina sehingga 3,000 bilik dan tambahan sebanyak 400 bilik lagi akan diadakan menjelang penghujung tahun ini. Penggunaan Pengkalan Udara Militeri di Butterworth, bagi

kegunaan yang mana Kerajaan Negeri berterima kasih kepada Kerajaan Pusat dan Sistem Penerbangan Malaysia, telah sedikit sebanyak membantu di dalam kemasukan pelancung-pelancung. Ini adalah satu tindakan sementara dan pembinaan sebuah lapangan terbang antarabangsa dengan landasan yang lebih panjang di Bayan Lepas untuk memenuhi keperluan-keperluan industri pelancungan yang semakin berkembang telahpun diluluskan pada dasarnya oleh Kerajaan Pusat.

Manakala perindustrian dan pelancungan telah diberi keutamaan di dalam Rancangan Pembangunan Negeri, sektor agro-horticulture di dalam ekonomi kita juga dimajukan seterusnya. Kerajaan Negeri telah memulakan rancangan-rancangan untuk memperbaiki teknik-teknik yang ada bagi pengeluaran tanaman-tanaman teradisi dan untuk memajukan bidang-bidang agro-based yang baru. Satu daripada hasil terbesar ialah dengan memperkenalkan tanaman cendawan secara besar-besaran di Bagan Serai pada penghujung tahun ini.

Dalam tahun 1972 kira-kira 41,000 ekar tanah telah ditanam dengan padi. Dengan adanya tanaman padi dua musim dan dengan teknik-teknik yang diperbaiki, pengeluaran padi di dalam Negeri ini hampir-hampir digandakan daripada 23 juta gantang dalam tahun 1960 kepada 37.5 juta gantang padi bernilai kira-kira \$24.3 juta dalam tahun 1972. Hari ini, di dalam Negeri Pulau Pinang, terhadap kira-kira 1,400 ekar yang ditanam dengan buah pala dan 650 ekar yang ditanam dengan cengkeh, kebanyakan daripadanya ditanam di Pulau Pinang. Pada tahun dahulu, 1,200 pikul cengkeh yang bernilai \$780,000 dan 40,000 pikul buah pala bernilai lebih dari \$1 juta telah dihasilkan. Walaupun koko dianggap sebagai tanaman yang baru, tanaman ini telah maju dengan cepatnya dan sekarang terdapat kira-kira 500 ekar ditanam dengan pokok ini. Sebagai tambahan, tanaman orkid mengikut dasar perdagangan telahpun dimajukan. Buat masa sekarang terdapat lebih dari 20 ekar yang ditanam dengan orkid di dalam Negeri ini.

Orkid-orkid yang dihasilkan di dalam Negeri ini dianggarkan sebanyak 3 juta kuntum setahun bernilai \$900,000. Di dalam usaha-usaha Kerajaan untuk memajukan tanaman-tanaman baru dan memajukan aktiviti-aktiviti agro-horticulture, satu Pusat Pertanian yang baru akan ditubuhkan di satu tapak seluas 62 ekar di Relau untuk mengadakan penyelidikan dan percubaan yang tertentu di dalam aspek-aspek terbaharu industri-industri agro-based.

Saya juga sukacita memaklumkan bahawa banyak kejayaan telah dicapai di dalam bidang perikanan dan ternakan binatang yang juga termasuk di dalam sektor agro-horticulture ekonomi Negeri ini. Sebagai sebahagian daripada usaha-usaha Kerajaan dalam menggalakkan pembangunan industri perikanan, Institut Latihan Perikanan telahpun ditubuhkan dan sekarang diuruskan di Batu Maung. Institut ini memberikan latihan di dalam bermacam-macam kemahiran untuk nelayan-nelayan dan dengan kemahiran-kemahiran tersebut nelayan-nelayan akan dapat belayar lebih jauh lagi ke lautan dalam dan mendapat hasil yang lebih lagi dari usaha-usaha mereka. Adalah tujuan Kerajaan Negeri untuk memajukan sebuah industri perikanan yang sihat dan dengan objektif ini nelayan-nelayan akan dapat memperoleh hasil daripada usaha-usaha mereka yang selaras dengan harapan-harapan di dalam sebuah masyarakat perindustrian yang baru. Dalam tahun 1972 sejumlah 524,000 tan ikan yang bernilai \$24.6 juta telah dihasilkan di dalam Negeri Pulau Pinang. Ekspot ikan tuna dalam tahun 1972, kebanyakannya ke Amerika Syarikat, Itali dan Negeri Jepun adalah di dalam lingkungan 211,000 pikul yang bernilai kira-kira \$17.6 juta. Dalam tahun yang sama lebih daripada 228,000 pikul udang yang bernilai \$72.4 juta telah diekspot ke Negeri Jepun, Amerika Syarikat dan Eropah.

Kerajaan Negeri adalah bersungguh-sungguh berusaha memajukan penubuhan sebuah industri ternakan haiwan yang kukuh dan di dalam perkara ini sebuah Kompleks Ternakan Haiwan telahpun ditubuhkan di suatu tapak

seluas 60 ekar di Bukit Minyak di Juru. Kompleks ini yang akan termasuk sebuah Pejabat Haiwan akan dilancarkan dengan sepenuhnya menjelang hujung tahun 1974 dan ia mengandungi sebuah yunit untuk kemudahan membiak ternakan ayam dan sebuah makmal bagi menyelidik penyakit-penyakit. Ianya juga mengandungi sebuah yunit bagi membiak ternakan babi dan sebuah yunit permainan beradas. Mengenai ternakan babi, Kerajaan telah membuat peruntukan yang tertentu bagi penempatan semula penternak-penternak binatang ini di dalam sekim-sekim ternakan yang dipusatkan yang akan dapat dijalankan secara kukuh dan yang akan dapat mengurangkan perkara-perkara sensitif di dalam kalangan rakyat kita.

Dengan adanya kadar pembangunan yang pesat di dalam semua sektor di dalam Negeri ini, kita perlulah mengadakan rancangan dan kawalan yang kuat di dalam rangkaian pentadbiran untuk menentukan kemajuan masa hadapan ekonomi kita. Pertanda-pertanda adalah bahawa kadar pembangunan yang dicapai setakat ini telah melebihi kadar yang telah dirancangan pada awalnya. Ini boleh dilihat daripada kemajuan yang telah diperolehi di dalam bidang-bidang perindustrian, pembangunan agro-horticulture dan juga dalam bidang galakan pelancungan. Secara tertentu bilangan pekerjaan yang semakin cepat diadakan boleh dilihat dengan jelas melalui kemajuan yang dicapai oleh sektor elektronik di dalam bidang perindustrian—dalam bulan Disember 1970 terdapat hanya 60 pekerja-pekerja di dalam bidang baru perindustrian ini, 700 menjelang penghujung tahun 1971, 3,300 menjelang tahun 1972 dan menjelang penghujung tahun ini adalah dianggarkan bahawa sekurang-kurangnya 7,000 pekerja-pekerja akan mendapat pekerjaan di dalam industri elektronik sahaja.

Rancangan-rancangan bagi pembangunan Negeri telah dilancarkan dengan tegasnya dan kadar yang dicapai pada hari ini akan bertambah lebih pesat lagi. Oleh itu, adalah perlu

bagi Negeri menjamin dan meneruskan kadar pembangunan ini dan dengan itu Kerajaan Negeri telah memberi perhatian yang teliti bagi mengadakan latihan-latihan untuk bakal-bakal pekerja-pekerja kita di masa hadapan. Kerajaan Negeri adalah buat masa ini merancang untuk mengambilalih dan memperbesar lagi Pusat Latihan Sambil Belajar Bandaraya yang ada sekarang. Kerajaan Pusat telah menubuhkan sebuah pusat Instituit Latihan Perindustrian di Perai dan Instituit ini telahpun dijalankan dan memberi kemudahan-kemudahan latihan yang berguna bagi pekerja-pekerja industri kita. Di masa yang sama Pusat Daya Pengeluaran Negara dengan kerjasama Persatuan Pekilang-Pekilang dan Persatuan Daya Pengeluaran Malaysia dan juga Instituit Pengurusan Malaysia telah mengadakan beberapa seminar-seminar dan kursus-kursus mengenai pengurusan di dalam Negeri ini dan juga di Petaling Jaya.

Kejayaan yang telah dicapai setakat ini telah hanya dapat diperolehi melalui usaha-usaha tekun pegawai-pegawai Kerajaan, perkhidmatan-perkhidmatan yang berdedikasi daripada Angkatan Polis dan Angkatan Bersenjata, usaha-usaha bersungguh-sungguh daripada kakitangan Perbadanan Pembangunan Pulau Pinang dan Pihak-pihak Berkuasa Tempatan Negeri, perantaraan yang berkesan di antara Gerakan dan Perikatan di dalam Kerajaan Campuran, persefahaman dan kerjasama yang mendalam di antara Kerajaan-kerajaan Negeri dan Pusat dan penghargaan serta kerjasama daripada rakyat kita yang telah menyambut secara terpuji pertukaran-pertukaran yang telah berlaku. Kepada semua orang-orang yang berkenaan, saya sampaikan setinggi-tinggi ucapan terima kasih dan penghargaan.

Sambil kita ketahui bahawa kita telah mencapai kejayaan dan bahawa Pengeluaran Kasar Kawasan telah bertambah, Kerajaan Negeri adalah sedar bahawa suri-suri rumah-tangga di dalam Negeri ini tidak ada tertarik dengan perangkaan-perangkaan ke-

majuan jika mereka mendapati bahawa sekarang mereka perlu membelanjakan wang yang lebih banyak lagi untuk membeli jumlah barang-barang makanan dan barang-barang keperluan yang sama dari pasar dan juga dari kedai-kedai. Kerajaan Negeri adalah juga sedar bahawa pekerja-pekerja kita sekarang perlu menyimpan bahagian terbesar daripada pendapatan mereka untuk membeli rumah-rumah. Kerajaan Negeri menghargai dan sedar bahawa kenaikan-kenaikan harga yang tidak dikawal boleh membuntukan tambahan di dalam kuasa pendapatan rakyat kita dan seterusnya boleh menghampakan hasil-hasil pembangunan. Adalah bagi sebab ini sekarang yang Kerajaan Negeri telah merayu supaya diadakan kawalan yang lebih ketat terhadap harga-harga, untuk mengadakan tanda-tanda harga yang lebih berkesan terutama sekali mengenai barang-barang makanan dan barang-barang keperluan dan juga mengenai rumah-rumah murah. Kerja-kerja yang bersemangat oleh Persatuan Pengguna Pulau Pinang sangatlah dipuji di dalam aspek pembangunan Negeri kita ini.

Akan tetapi mestilah dihargai bahawa ada hadnya terhadap apa-apa yang Kerajaan Negeri, di dalam konteks terbesar Negara ini, boleh buat untuk menahan kenaikan di dalam harga-harga barang-barang oleh kerana kenaikan-kenaikan ini adalah dipengaruhi terus oleh harga-harga yang terdapat di lain-lain tempat di dalam Negeri ini, dan juga oleh keadaan-keadaan di dalam dunia. Adalah bagi sebab ini sekarang yang Kerajaan Negeri telah meminta kerjasama daripada Kerajaan Pusat untuk mengadakan jagaan yang rapi terhadap curak kenaikan harga di seluruh Malaysia dan di dalam Negeri ini pada khususnya.

Kebajikan rakyat kita mestilah dijaga dan dari mula lagi adalah penting untuk menumpukan aktiviti-aktiviti kita untuk menyelesaikan masalah-masalah kemiskinan. Kerajaan Negeri telah menentukan bahawa sektor kemiskinan ada perhubungan secara khas dengan mereka-mereka yang tidak mempunyai tanah dan mereka yang menganggur dan juga mereka-mereka

yang tidak mempunyai tanah-tanah yang mencukupi untuk mencari penghidupan ataupun mereka-mereka yang mempunyai pekerjaan yang menghasilkan pendapatan yang terlalu rendah untuk keperluan sara hidup. Kita, pada hari ini, telah mencapai satu peringkat apabila kita mesti memenuhi keperluan-keperluan sektor-sektor yang kurang bernasib baik di dalam masyarakat kita. Untuk berbuat demikian, kita mestilah menentukan supaya keamanan dan kestabilan ujud dan disamping itu kadar pembangunan diteruskan.

Kerajaan Negeri akan terus memajukan dasar memperbetulkan keadaan ekonomi yang tidak seimbang melalui perindustrian di luar bandar dan memperbandarkan kawasan-kawasan luar bandar, dan di dalam keadaan ini Kerajaan adalah betul-betul sedar akan perlunya memperbaiki keadaan hidup pekerja-pekerja di dalam kilang-kilang baru dengan membuat rancangan untuk memajukan kemudahan-kemudahan perumahan di dalam lingkungan pendapatan mereka dan juga bagi menyediakan kemudahan-kemudahan rihat dan hiburan berhampiran dengan kawasan-kawasan di mana mereka tinggal dan bekerja. Ini memerlukan taksiran yang sungguh mendalam mengenai keperluan-keperluan infrastruktur sosial kita dan perbelanjaan pembangunan seperti ini. Juga, lebih penting lagi, ini memerlukan penerimaan prinsip-prinsip kawalan dan di dalam hal ini penubuhan sebuah Jabatan Perancang dan Kawalan Pembangunan Negeri adalah merupakan satu keputusan dasar yang terbesar.

Jabatan Perancang dan Kawalan Pembangunan Negeri adalah berasaskan pembesaran tugas-tugas Pejabat Perancang Negeri dan penyatuan dan pembentukan semula Majlis-majlis Tempatan yang ada. Tanggungjawab yang lebih lagi akan diberikan kepada Pejabat Perancang Negeri untuk menentukan bahawa perancangan adalah sesuai dengan keperluan-keperluan rancangan pembangunan di dalam Negeri. Oleh yang demikian, dengan adanya pengetahuan, tenaga rakyat

dan sumber-sumber daripada Majlis-majlis yang disatukan, Jabatan Perancang dan Kawalan Pembangunan Negeri akan ditubuhkan dengan lebih berkesan lagi untuk melaksanakan tugas-tugas yang perlu dalam memberi nasihat dan menyalurkan usaha-usaha kita terhadap kemajuan sosial.

Pada kiraan terakhir, objektif yang asas di dalam Rancangan Pembangunan Negeri adalah untuk menentukan supaya kerja-kerja pembangunan di dalam Negeri ini memberi faedah yang lebih lagi kepada rakyat kita di semua bahagian di dalam Negeri ini. Kerajaan akan terus-menerus berusaha terhadap mencapai objektif ini. Sebagai contoh objektif kita di dalam pembangunan kawasan-kawasan pantai akan memberi khidmat kepada rakyat kita bukan sahaja dengan menyediakan untuk mereka lebih banyak lagi peluang-peluang pekerjaan tetapi juga bagi keperluan rihat dan hiburan mereka. Setinggalan-seinggalan yang sedang dipindahkan semula akan diberi peluang-peluang yang lebih baik bagi mencari penghidupan dan ditempatkan mengikut satu cara yang mana mereka akan menjadi sebahagian daripada masyarakat baru yang akan ujud.

Penubuhan Pihak Berkuasa Air Negeri adalah satu contoh bagaimana Kerajaan telah berusaha untuk memperbaiki keadaan ekonomi semua rakyat kita di dalam setiap bahagian Negeri ini. Pada hari ini terdapat satu kadar bayaran air yang sama yang dikenakan bagi semua kawasan-kawasan di dalam Negeri ini. Kadar-kadar ini mencerminkan pembahagian yang saksama oleh semua orang di dalam Negeri ini terhadap tanggungan-tanggungan pinjaman dan bayaran-balik pinjaman kepada Bank Pembangunan Asia supaya dapat memperbaiki bekalan air di dalam Negeri. Dengan pelaksanaan bayaran-bayaran air yang ada sekarang, Kerajaan Negeri telahpun dapat menghapuskan kadar-kadar air yang selama ini telah ditanggung oleh pembayar-pembayar cukai Majlis-majlis Daerah. Rakyat kita mesti menghargai bahawa kadar-kadar bayaran yang baru ini adalah rendah secara bandingan dengan kadar

bayaran-bayaran air di lain-lain Negeri di dalam Negara ini. Mereka mesti memahami bahawa hasil-hasil yang dijangkakan daripada bayaran-bayaran air yang baru bererti yang Kerajaan Negeri terpaksa menanggung sebahagian daripada anggaran perbelanjaan Pihak Berkuasa Air Negeri dengan memberikan satu bantuan kewangan berjumlah \$1.7 juta tanpa faedah bagi tahun 1973. Akan tetapi adalah dijangkakan bahawa dengan perindustrian yang lebih pesat lagi Pihak Berkuasa Air Negeri akan dapat mengseimbangkan anggaran perbelanjaan dalam tempoh beberapa tahun yang akan datang.

Saya adalah juga sukacita memaklumkan kepada Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat bahawa Perbadanan Pembangunan Pulau Pinang telah mencapai berbagai-bagai kejayaan yang cemerlang di dalam ekonomi Negeri dan telah juga meletakkan asas bagi pembangunan ekonomi selanjutnya. Perbadanan adalah sentiasa menarik lebih banyak lagi pelabur-pelabur ke Negeri Pulau Pinang dan di masa yang sama telah membantu pengusaha-pengusaha tempatan untuk memasuki lapangan perindustrian. Baru-baru ini, Perbadanan telah dapat memajukan penubuhan Nusantara dan Penang Investment Sdn. Bhd. 1 dua syarikat-syarikat tempatan dari pelabur-pelabur di dalam Pulau Pinang sahaja yang akan dapat menolong secara rapat bukan sahaja dalam usaha menggalakkan pembangunan industri tetapi juga mengukuhkan usaha-usaha memajukan penyertaan Bumiputra dalam lapangan-lapangan pembangunan. Kejayaan Perbadanan Pembangunan Pulau Pinang bolehlah dinilai, secara tertentu daripada hakikat bahawa ianya telah dapat menyumbangkan kira-kira \$ $\frac{1}{2}$ juta di dalam bentuk suatu bantuan kewangan kepada Kerajaan Negeri.

Mengenai usaha perumahan, dasar Kerajaan adalah untuk membina lebih banyak lagi yunit-yunit perumahan untuk membolehkan rakyat kita, terutama sekali mereka yang berpendapatan rendah, mendapatkan rumah pada kadar yang lebih murah dan dengan

itu mengurangkan kenaikan-kenaikan yang tidak sewajarnya di dalam harga rumah-rumah yang diperlukan. Kerajaan Negeri adalah seterusnya melaksanakan pembangunan perumahan di dalam bandar-bandar baru di kawasan-kawasan Bayan Lepas dan Bagan Serai dan di lain-lain kawasan di luar bandar di dalam Negeri ini, supaya nilai-nilai harta di dalam Kawasan Bandaraya dan kawasan-kawasan bandaran yang tertubuh tidak akan naik mengikut kadar yang tidak berpatutan dan berlebihan. Sekim-sekim pembaharuan bandar akan juga dijalankan di dalam kawasan Bandaraya George Town dan kawasan-kawasan bandaran Butterworth, Bukit Mertajam dan Nibong Tebal.

Di dalam usaha memajukan pembangunan perindustrian, pembangunan bandaran dan pembaharuan bandaran dan memajukan pelancungan, Kerajaan Negeri tidak terlupe akan bahaya-bahaya pencemaran dan keperluan bagi mengadakan kawalan alam yang sesuai. Kita adalah sungguh sedar akan akibat-akibat pencemaran di dalam negeri-negeri yang sangat maju di dalam lapangan perindustrian di dalam dunia ini. Oleh yang demikian, di dalam rancangan kita, jagaan yang mendalam adalah diberi untuk menentukan supaya udara kita sentiasa bersih, sungai-sungai dan laut-laut kita jernih dan pantai-pantai kita indah.

Kerajaan Negeri akan membentuk semula Pihak-pihak Berkuasa Tempatan dengan objektif keseluruhannya bagi mengujudkan satu pertubuhan yang lebih kukuh dan lebih berkesan terdiri dari Pihak-pihak Berkuasa Tempatan yang akan lebih lagi dapat berkhidmat bagi keperluan-keperluan rakyat di peringkat pentadbiran ini. Adalah difikirkan bahawa Majlis-majlis Tempatan, dengan adanya sumber-sumber yang disatukan dan kakitangan yang dapat berkhidmat daripada sebuah Majlis kepada yang lain, akan boleh bertugas dengan lebih baik lagi di dalam satu cara yang selaras dengan stratiji pembangunan sosial-ekonomi Negeri ini pada amnya. Melalui kerjasama demikian, Majlis-majlis Tempatan di Seberang Perai akan disatukan

untuk menjadi sebuah Pihak Berkuasa Tempatan dan Majlis Bandaraya serta Majlis Daerah Luar Bandar di Pulau Pinang akan disatukan untuk menjadi satu lagi Pihak Berkuasa Tempatan. Usaha-usaha membentuk semula Pihak-pihak Berkuasa Tempatan telahpun dimulakan dengan mengadakan perundingan yang rapat dengan lain-lain Negeri melalui Majlis Kebangsaan bagi Kerajaan-kerajaan Tempatan dan dengan persetujuan daripada Menteri yang berkenaan.

Manakala pembangunan ekonomi adalah perlu bagi kebaikan Negeri ini, Kerajaan adalah sedar akan hakikat bahawa projek-projek pembangunan akan mengakibatkan sedikit sebanyak perubahan di dalam curak-curak hidup yang tradisi di kawasan-kawasan di mana projek-projek pembangunan sedang dijalankan. Sebagai contoh, petani-petani padi di Bayan Lepas dan penternak-penternak babi di Sungai Keluang perlu dipindahkan serta ditempatkan semula di dalam kawasan-kawasan baru yang dirancang dengan betul supaya membolehkan penubuhan kilang-kilang baru di dalam Kawasan-kawasan Perdagangan Bebas dan bagi penubuhan projek-projek perumahan di dalam bandar-bandar baru yang dirancang bagi kawasan tersebut. Penempatan semula dan pemindahan adalah merupakan tanggungan yang perlu dihadapi oleh rakyat apabila pelan-pelan dilaksanakan untuk menukar bentuk ekonomi Negeri ini daripada curak pertanian yang tradisi dan ekonomi perdagangan untuk menjadi sebuah masyarakat perindustrian yang termoden dan yang mana faedah-faedah darinya akan dirasai oleh bahagian yang terbesar daripada rakyat kita.

Pertukaran-pertukaran ini telahpun diterima oleh rakyat kita dalam semangat muhibbah, kerjasama dan penyesuaian. Saya sangatlah bangga akan rakyat di atas persefahaman dan kesabaran yang mereka telah tunjukkan. Rakyat kita telah sedar dan menghargai usaha-usaha ikhlas dari Kerajaan Negeri untuk memajukan pembangunan di Pulau Pinang yang akan menghasilkan satu taraf hidup yang lebih tinggi

lagi dan peluang-peluang yang lebih banyak bagi rakyat kita memajukan kebaikan sosial mereka. Lebih penting lagi, rakyat kita telah menyambut baik terhadap cabaran bagi menubuhkan satu masyarakat Malaysia yang benar-benar bersatupadu dan adil yang berasaskan kepada perinsip-perinsip Rukunegara. Sejarah pembentukan Negeri Pulau Pinang di masa yang akan datang akan sesungguhnya merupakan rekod mengenai ketabahan dan dedikasi rakyat dan Kerajaan bersama-sama bekerja bagi kepentingan Negeri Pulau Pinang dan juga Malaysia pada keseluruhannya.

Tuan Speaker: Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat dan para hadirin sekalian, Tuan Yang Terutama Gabnor dan Yang Mulia Toh Puan akan berangkat keluar sebentar lagi.

Dewan ini adalah ditangguhkan sehingga 2.30 petang ini.

Sekarang saya dengan sukacitanya menjemput Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat dan para hadirin sekalian ke bilik Dewan bangunan ini untuk jamuan ringan.

(Tuan Speaker mengumumkan keberangkatan Tuan Yang Terutama Gabnor dan Yang Mulia Toh Puan Datin Hajjah Sharifah Fatimah. Tuan Yang Terutama dan Yang Mulia Toh Puan Datin Hajjah Sharifah Fatimah diiringi oleh Juruiring-juruiring keluar dari bilik Dewan, didahului oleh Tuan Speaker dan Setiausaha Dewan Undangan).

Dewan ditangguhkan pada jam 10.55 pagi.

Dewan bersidang semula pada jam 2.34 petang.

3. MEMBENTANGKAN RISALAH-RISALAH.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Speaker, saya mohon membentangkan di atas meja Dewan Kertas-kertas Bilangan 1 hingga 6 tahun 1973, seperti yang tersenarai dalam Susunan Urusan Mesyuarat, dan Tuan Speaker, mengikut Peraturan Mesyuarat 22 (1) saya mengarahkan Yang Berhormat Ahli dari Kawasan Tasek Glugor iaitu Yang Berhormat

Encik Mustapha bin Hussain, selaku Pengerusi, Jawatankuasa Kira-kira Awam, untuk membentangkan di atas meja Dewan Kertas Bilangan 7 tahun 1973.

Ahli Kawasan Tasek Glugor (Encik Mustapha bin Hussain): Tuan Speaker, saya mohon membentangkan di atas meja Dewan Kertas Bilangan 7 tahun 1973, iaitu Lapuran Jawatankuasa Kira-kira Awam atas kira-kira Negeri bagi tahun-tahun berakhir pada 1969 dan 1970 dan Penyata Juru Odit atasnya.

USUL DI BAWAH PERATURAN MESYUARAT 15(3).

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Speaker, dengan kebenaran saya mohon izin untuk mencadangkan Usul-usul di bawah Peraturan Mesyuarat 15 (3) supaya pertama: Usul di atas nama Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Kawasan Kelawei di Perkara 6 (I) dalam Susunan Urusan Mesyuarat "Bahawa Dewan ini tidak ada keyakinan terhadap Tuan Speaker" dibawa dengan sertamerta dengan tidak menghiraukan syarat-syarat yang lain juapun di dalam Peraturan ini dijalankan tanpa mengikut aturan yang telah ditetapkan. Tuan Speaker, Usul ini adalah satu usul yang mustahak demi kepentingan awam dan mempunyai kesan-kesan terhadap kebijakan Dewan Undangan Negeri serta kepentingan semua rakyat Pulau Pinang. Oleh itu, sangatlah mustahak bagi perkara ini diuruskan dengan sertamerta agak kedudukan Tuan Speaker boleh dijelaskan sama sekali.

Dan, kedua bahawa Perkara 6 (A) di dalam Susunan Urusan Mesyuarat dibawa selepas sahaja soalan-soalan untuk jawapan mulut dan bertulis diselesaikan. Mengenai Usul pertama adalah penting dan mustahak bagi perkara ini diperbincangkan dengan sertamerta. Mengenai Usul kedua iaitu 6 (A) Datuk Speaker, akan sedar bahawa ianya bukan sahaja wajar dan tepat iaitu ucapan terima kasih patut disampaikan oleh Dewan ini kepada Tuan Yang Terutama kerana sudi melafazkan ucapan dengan seberapa awal yang boleh. Tetapi juga ini adalah selaras dengan kelaziman yang telah diamalkan oleh Dewan ini dahulu.

Tuan Speaker: Usul dibenarkan.

Timbalan Ketua Menteri (Encik Ooh Chooi Cheng): Saya mohon menyokong.

Ketua Menteri: Datuk Speaker, saya ucap terima kasih kerana dapat kebenaran daripada Datuk Speaker dan sekarang saya mencadangkan di bawah Peraturan Mesyuarat 15 (3) satu Usul supaya: pertama, Dewan ini sekarang terus membahaskan Perkara 6 (I) dalam Susunan Urusan Mesyuarat di bawah nama Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Kawasan Kelawei dan kedua Dewan ini membahaskan Usul 6 (A) di dalam Susunan Urusan Mesyuarat di bawah nama Yang Berhormat Tuan Haji Mohamad Nor bin Haji Bakar, Ahli dari Kawasan Permatang Pauh tanpa menanti gilirannya yang tertentu.

Timbalan Ketua Menteri (Encik Ooh Chooi Cheng): Saya mohon menyokong.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Tuan Speaker, bolehkah saya bertanya Usul yang dibawa oleh Ketua Menteri ialah 2 usul. Saya ingat lagi sesuai jika Usul ini ambil satu sekali, fasal tidak tentu ada setengah orang bersetuju satu, tidak bersetuju yang kedua. Sebab itu, saya minta Tuan Speaker buat satu ruling Usul ini mesti diambil satu persatu.

Tuan Speaker: Menurut pendapat saya baiklah Usul ini dibawa keduanya sekali dan dibawa undi satu persatu.

Soalan dikemukakan dan dipersetujui.

Tuan Speaker: Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat sepertimana Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat sedia maklum dengan kelulusan Usul yang dikemukakan oleh Yang Amat Berhormat Ketua Menteri sebentar tadi bermaknalah bahawa Usul tidak keyakinan terhadap Tuan Speaker yang dikemukakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Kelawei akan dibahaskan terlebih dahulu daripada perkara-perkara yang lain. Setahu saya di dalam sejarah Negeri ini Usul tidak keyakinan terhadap Speaker belum pernah dikemukakan dalam Dewan ini. Juga, saya

dapati tidak ada apa-apa peruntukan di dalam Standing Order Negeri Pulau Pinang yang mewajibkan Speaker meninggalkan Dewan tatkala satu Usul tidak keyakinan terhadapnya dibahas di dalam Dewan. Nyatalah bahawa tidak ada satu precedent pun yang boleh saya ikuti di dalam keadaan sekarang. Selepas menimbangankan masaalah ini dengan sedalam-dalamnya demi untuk menjaga kehormatan Dewan ini saya mengambil keputusan tidak akan mempengerusikan Dewan ini semasa Dewan membahaskan Usul yang dikemukakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Kelawei. Saya mengambil langkah ini semata-mata dengan tujuan membolehkan Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat sekalian membahaskan Usul ini dengan berhati-hati dan dengan secara berterusterang tanpa sebarang perasaan segan atau teguran atau campurtangan daripada saya. Saya berharap dengan tidak hadirnya saya di dalam Dewan ini Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat akan dapat membahaskan Usul ini dengan pandangan yang terbuka. Dengan ini saya meninggalkan Dewan.

(Tuan Speaker meninggalkan Dewan).

PEMILIHAN AHLI YANG MEM-PENGERUSIKAN DI BAWAH PER-ATURAN MESYUARAT 3(1)(b).

Setiausaha Dewan: Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat, oleh kerana Yang Berhormat Tuan Speaker tidak hadir dalam Dewan, Dewan ini hendaklah memilih seorang Ahli, selain daripada Yang Amat Berhormat Ketua Menteri, menjadi Tuan Pengerusi mesyuarat ini. Mengikut Peraturan Mesyuarat 3 bolehlah saya menjemput seorang Ahli membuat cadangan.

Ahli Kawasan Butterworth (Encik Ooi Ah Bee): Tuan Setiausaha, di bawah Peraturan Majlis Mesyuarat ini di bawah 3 (b) yang menyatakan apabila Setiausaha mengumumkan dari mejanya bahawa Speaker tidak hadir maka Dewan bolehlah memilih seorang Ahli selain daripada Ketua Menteri untuk mempengerusikan Persidangan itu daripada seorang Ahli yang dipilih itu hendaklah diserahkan segala-gala kuasa jika tatkala beliau mempengerusikan Persidangan Dewan. Dan suka juga,

Tuan Setiausaha, saya mencadangkan Yang Berhormat Encik Ismail bin Hashim, Ahli daripada Bayan Lepas menjadi Pengerusi.

Ahli Kawasan Muda (Tuan Haji Abdul Kadir bin Haji Hassan): Tuan Setiausaha, saya wakil Muda, memohon menyokong.

Setiausaha Dewan: Bolehkah saya bertanya samada Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas, Yang Berhormat Encik Ismail bin Hashim, sanggup menerima jawatan jika dipilih?

Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Encik Ismail bin Hashim): Ya.

Setiausaha Dewan: Terima kasih. Bolehkah saya tanya adakah cadangan yang lain.

Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat oleh kerana hanya seorang Ahli yang telah dicadangkan dan disokong, dengan ini, saya mengisytiharkan Yang Berhormat Encik Ismail bin Hashim, Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas dipilih menjadi Tuan Pengerusi Mesyuarat ini. Dipersilakan Yang Berhormat Encik Ismail bin Hashim.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat sekalian saya mengucapkan terima kasih kepada Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat yang telah pun memberi kepercayaan dan memilih saya untuk menjadi Pengerusi Mesyuarat kita pada petang ini iaitu semasa peninggalan Tuan Speaker kita. Masalah yang ada di hadapan kita sekarang ialah satu Usul daripada Yang Berhormat Ahli daripada Kawasan Kelawei yang berbunyi: "Bahawa Dewan Undangan tidak ada keyakinan terhadap Tuan Speaker". Jadi saya sukalah mengingatkan Ahli-ahli Dewan sekalian dalam masa Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat membahaskan Usul ini saya minta supaya tuan-tuan sekalian memberi pandangan-pandangan dan pendapat-pendapat terhadap Usul ini sahaja. Saya tidaklah hendak membenarkan tuan-tuan bercakap di luar daripada hal Usul ini. Kalau sekiranya ada didapati tuan-tuan yang bercakap di luar daripada

perkara ini, saya, dengan memandukan Peraturan-peraturan Mesyuarat, akan menyekat tuan-tuan sekalian bercakap dan berucap.

Jadi, sekarang saya mempersilakan Ahli daripada Kawasan Kelawei untuk membawa Usul.

USUL 6(1). USUL OLEH YANG BERTHORMAT ENCIK YEAP GHIM GUAN.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Dengan kebenaran, bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we on this side of the House have got used to some of the methods. And today's proceedings in bringing forward this particular Motion comes as no surprise to us. I say, categorically, *no surprise*. In fact, it would have been a surprise if this had not taken place. This is reminiscent of the type of no confidence in the Chief Minister.

I am sure, Mr Speaker, Sir, that in spite of the fact that you are new at the Chair you have vast experience in the Assembly, and you are well aware of the depth and the extent to which we can debate what is basically, what is fundamentally, the functions of this House—the role of the Members of this Assembly *vis-a-vis* Mr Speaker. Therefore, that relationship is one of the most important relationships one can think of in the set-up of Parliamentary democracy.

I for one, in moving the Motion, do not relish the responsibility that I have undertaken. But we do not shirk it all the same, even at the cost of antagonising people in positions of power and status in this State, because we feel that paramount to any other consideration is the consideration that we on this side of the House, as well as Members of the back-benches, if circumstances do arise as they have in this House, have seen a lot of things that we and the back-benchers of Government, and those whose conscience so decide, are able to speak in this House without fear or favour, and without unnecessary interruption—in some cases planned interruption; planned obstruction to prevent

the Members of this House from carrying out their duties. Whether Members of the Government look upon their duties that seriously is a matter for them to decide. But we on this side of this House certainly will not allow ourselves to be manipulated, allow ourselves to be obstructed, in what we see as our manifest duties to the electorate who very clearly gave us a mandate in 1969.

In commencing my arguments on this Motion, I would like to draw the attention of the House to what is everyday the most important reference to our proceedings in this House. And that is the prayer—the “Doa”—that we recite, irrespective of our religion. That is the guiding principle of how we conduct ourselves in this House. And this is read by the Speaker. It says here:

“Almighty God, we beseech Thee to behold with Thy abundant favour us Thy servants whom Thou hast been pleased to call to the performance of important trusts in these lands.”—

important trusts in these lands—

“Let Thy blessing descend upon us here assembled, and grant that we treat and consider all matters that shall come under our deliberation”—dengan segala keadilan dan keikhlasan—“in so just and faithful a manner as to advance Thy Honour and Glory”

The Chief Minister used to use the word “force”—either “target” or “force”. What force I cannot remember at the moment. He did describe, in his colourful phrases that we get now and then in this House, that “the Chief Minister is the target”. We would not want to make the Speaker of this House the “target”. But we would want to see that the functions of the Speaker, and the manner of his rulings are conducted with—what we prayed before we commenced proceedings—“keadilan”; with justice and fair play to all. Can we really say that of the former Speaker in this House? Can we really say that? That is what we in this House must decide. I feel

that if we appeal to Allah, and then we do not proceed to carry out what we appeal to him, then I ask all Members in this House, irrespective of whether they prescribe to the Islamic faith or not, to search our conscience—whether in participating in this debate we have (*gangguan*).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Yang Berhormat, tangan di sebelah itu bawa ke luar.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Terima kasih, Tuan Speaker boleh ajar.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Itu saya ajar perlahan-lahan.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Terima kasih. We on this side would urge Members of the Government to search their conscience because apart from your responsibility to this House, and apart from your responsibility to the Government, you have a responsibility to the people. Apart from your responsibility to the people, if you wish to relegate that responsibility, you have a responsibility. And you will one day have to answer for what you failed to feel everyday you recite this prayer.

I deem it an honour that the Chief Minister has once again advanced a Motion of mine to the forefront, breaking all precedents; that he should think that this Motion is significant enough to take precedence even over the Motion of Thanks to the Address of the Governor. I thank the Chief Minister for that privilege.

We know that the Honourable the Chief Minister—and the worthy part of this debate—is a man of fantastic capacity, tremendous beans; a man whom we can well say (*gangguan*).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Kawasan Kelawei, bila saya bercakap tuan sila duduk.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Terima kasih.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Usul yang ada di hadapan kita ialah Usul "Dewan Undangan tidak ada keyakinan terhadap Tuan Speaker". Tetapi, saya telah mengikuti ucapan tuan selama 10 minit tuan tidak ada menyebutkan berkenaan dengan Speaker, tetapi apa yang tuan sebut ialah berkenaan dengan Ketua Menteri. Saya boleh benarkan, sebab barangkali ada syak-wasangka tuan atas perjalanan Speaker ini kerana dipengaruhi oleh Ketua Menteri. Tetapi saya tidak hendak tuan bercakap begitu panjang berkenaan Ketua Menteri kalau sekiranya tuan hendak bercakap masaalah itu, tuan boleh bawa satu usul tidak percaya kepada Ketua Menteri bukan kepada Speaker. Sila.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Terima kasih. Tuan Speaker. I presume I can proceed now. I do not wish to be suspended again by another Speaker.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I can well remember what I say. I do not have a tape-recording here. Of course, I would bow to your greater enlightenment and intelligence. But I think we have got the privileges of modern technology. And I think I have only uttered two sentences in connection with the Chief Minister of Penang so far. The rest I have spent talking about the prayer, and some reflections on the duty of the Speaker. Perhaps we do not have the advantage of instantaneous recording to be presented to each Member here. But that again is a matter which posterity may well decide. And it does not matter. We are well used to a lot of things.

As I was saying before I was interrupted, there are people in this House who may wish to wear more than one hat. I sit over here wearing the hat of a Member of the Opposition. There are those who not only wish to become Speakers (*gangguan*).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Wearing hats or wearing the pants?

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Pants, Tuan Speaker, also can be worn. It is a matter of allegiance. Allegiance; not blind

allegiance. Not the allegiance of a blind bullock, blind cow, blind horse, but an allegiance of equals. That is what we must have. We are well aware. We are not children in this House. We are not that new in politics. We are well aware that a Speaker has a responsibility to the Government. But he has a responsibility to the Opposition too. I might say that the relationship between the Speaker and the House *vis-a-vis* the Government, the Chief Minister and the Opposition is distinctly as follows. That is, to the Government it should be a relationship of co-operation—bekerjasama; that is the word—work together. It is a very important Malay word: bekerjasama—to work together; better than the English word itself: co-operation—to work together. But not, Mr Speaker, Sir, collaboration. That is not the relationship—a relationship of a collaborator. That is not a relationship between the Speaker and the Chief Minister. I ask this House to consider whether the relationship between the Speaker of this House and the Government is that. And I will give illustrations, Sir. I will in the course of what I say give poignant illustrations. I may even quote, with your permission, distinct statements made either today or better left forgotten. Unfortunately to us we hold these words so dear and close to our hearts that we must quote these very words in this House. But tantamount to that, as I said, we believe that there should be co-operation between the Speaker and the Government because the Government must get its business through. That is all. But on the other hand the Speaker has a duty to the Opposition; and for those who may oppose and yet sit at the back. They must be given the right to ventilate, in all fairness, to all degrees equally as much as extended to the Honourable Chief Minister and to other Members of the Government. By virtue of being Chief Minister it does not mean he has any special rights. Whatever special rights he has are, I must qualify, the rights vested in the Government. And so long as he is in this House he is just like any other members in this House, subject to the same rulings, and the directive of the

people. He is no bigger than the Speaker. He should not try to be bigger than the Speaker. But we will, in the course of this debate, go on to illustrate how uneven the Chair of the Speaker is in comparison to the Chair of the Chief Minister. How uneven! Or shall I be more direct? How much lower the Chair of the Speaker is than that of the Chief Minister.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like, before I go further, to quote a few illustrious words, with your kind permission. I believe that the records of past proceedings in this House, especially of our present Legislative Assembly, are relevant to this House. May I with your permission quote? Thank you. Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to quote the words of the then Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas, Encik Ismail bin Hashim, with your permission.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Di-benarkan.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Ya, benar. Tuan Speaker, it was on the occasion of the Mesyuarat Yang Pertama bagi Penggal Yang Pertama, Hari Isnin, 12hb April, 1971. It says, "Tuan Speaker, sebelum saya bercakap kepada Usul pindaan saya, saya sukalah bagi pihak Ahli-ahli Perikatan (he was here formerly) dalam Dewan ini hendak menerangkan kedudukan kejadian yang berlaku pada hari kelmarin, kami pihak Perikatan rasa sungguh dukacita atas masaalah itu, berhubung dengan perkara ini, Tuan Speaker, kami rasa ada dua sebab, maka perkara itu berlaku. Perkara yang pertama itu, boleh jadi Tuan Speaker baru dilantik dan barangkali pengalaman Tuan Speaker kurang dan dengan sebab itu Tuan Speaker tidakpun langsung memberi kebenaran atau memberi peluang kepada kami bercakap di persidangan kita kelmarin, atau adakah Tuan Speaker telahpun dinasihatkan oleh Ahli-ahli yang di sebelah sana menyatakan jangan bagi peluang langsung kepada Ahli-ahli Pembangkang bercakap. Kami Perikatan Tuan Speaker, menyokong Tuan jadi Speaker, dan menghormati tuan dan kami berharap sokong kami ini akan dapat tuan kekal menduduki sebagai Speaker dan kami

tidak mahu melihat tuan diubah dari satu jawatan ke yang lain, hari itu Tuan jadi Timbalan Ketua Menteri sekarang tuan dipilih jadi Speaker pula, walau bagaimana saya rasa dan kami rasa dalam Dewan ini sekarang tuanlah yang paling berkuasa sekali dari Ahli-ahli Dewan yang lain".

And I do not wish to read further. Not, Mr Speaker, Sir, that I feel that what you said was irrelevant. But I am afraid if I read further Members of the Government may object and say that you are giving me too much latitude. But, as I say, that was what you said that day. And I think I do not wish to cause exhaustion. But I think that was said in all sincerity; in all frankness as an adviser, from yourself then as Leader of the Opposition. What more, Sir? You, as the Member for Bayan Lepas, had already, as early as 1971, said that there may be people "sebelah sana" who are directing, advising the Speaker to do all sorts of things.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: At that time; I agree.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Yes, I agree, Tuan Speaker, thank you. So, Sir, what am I as a simple Member of the Opposition, representing only basically three, and on behalf of the Opposition eight of us? What are we to do when we do not have the prospect and the far-sightedness to be promoted even to the Government benches? But you have seen the light. And I am only attempting to have a glimpse of what you have already seen well in advance. I take that as, shall we say, the opening note of our debate today. I think that these words were spoken in sincerity.

Tuan Speaker, Sir, the history of our present Speaker (gangguan).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Ex-Speaker.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Ex-Speaker, I beg your pardon. And this is also unprecedented: a Speaker who basically has—What is the Japanese term? I do not wish to introduce another language in this House—committed political suicide by

resigning from his Speakership. I do not want to be (*gangguan*).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Saya ingat dia bukan resign.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Well, then he must resign before you can be Speaker.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: No. Saya rasa tuan duduk biar saya terangkan kedudukan. Tuan Speaker meninggalkan Dewan ini kerana hendak memberi peluang Ahli-ahli membincangkan masaalah yang mengenai diri beliau. Itu masaalahnya.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Terima kasih. Well, then let me put it this way: that he has decided that he would not in fairness be present in this debate. But to all intents and purposes he is not absent on sick leave. He is not detained in a foreign country. He has, however, technically to all intents and purposes vacated the seat of Speaker. That is sufficient.

Sir, as I said, in order to understand why we in this part of the Opposition, and you yourself before you crossed over to the Government side felt so badly about the Speaker and had so little confidence, we cannot bring to this House a Motion as serious as what the Chief Minister has said, and then try to cross over the issue, and to get away with put it this way—murder of a Speaker. We should not do that. We should substantiate. I am sure the Speaker would want us to substantiate. You would want us to substantiate every allegation; and we hope to do so. As I said, we on this side of the House lost confidence, Sir, in the Speaker long, long ago. And if you remember why we lost confidence in the Speaker, for those who have shorter memories—which do not include yourself, I hope—I would like to read, again with your permission, the same Report. And we have, Sir, a lot of Reports which have not been printed by the Government where we can quote a lot of things. It is that unfortunate. But we have here a Report which I think is again very poignant to our point. This was also in connection with the first Meeting

when I from this side of the House, sitting the other side further down, after a voice vote had been taken, asked the Honourable the Speaker for a division. What was the outcome of the request for a division. What was the outcome?

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Thrown out.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): It was thrown out. Thank you very much. That is a warning, I say. Thank you very much.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Thank you for reminding me.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Yes, It was thrown out. We had no chance to voice; and I think you also did not have a chance to voice your grievance over this issue; and it was thrown out. But the important point is not that it was thrown out. The important point is not why I was suspended from this Assembly. The important point is how I was suspended. The important point is why this call for division was thrown out; how it was thrown out. It can be thrown out. But how and why? What do our Standing Orders say in connection with division? Mr Speaker, Sir, they say—and with your permission again I would like to refer to the relevant Standing Order: “114. On a question being put by the Speaker, the votes may be by voices, “Ayes” and “Noes” with a show of hands, and the result will be declared by the Speaker, but any Member who desires a division”—it says “any Member who desires a division”—“may call “Divide” whereupon, after such warning as the Speaker may consider sufficient”—which is presently, after having learnt that futile lesson, the division bell which has been installed lately—“the votes shall be taken by the Clerk, by himself or by tellers appointed by him, asking each Member separately how he desires to vote. The vote of the Speaker shall be taken last. Every Member shall upon his name being called give his vote by saying “Aye” or “No”, or he may say “Not voting”. When the votes have been taken by the Clerk, the Speaker shall declare the

result and the Clerk shall enter the vote of each Member in the minutes of the proceedings."

Sir, I think these Standing Orders are very clear and simple Standing Orders. It does not take any legal learning to understand. Mr Speaker, Sir, when you were here you quite understood it. And in fact you were yourself very adamant and angry. Your words are here. I do not like to quote you again. Then there may be trouble. But there you are. The Penasihat Undang-undang Negeri is here, if my interpretations of these Standing Orders are wrong he will be the first to jump up. It says very clearly, Sir, that when a voice vote has been taken any Member can stand up straightaway and says "Divide". That is all. Am I correct so far? But, Sir, what happened on that wonderful first day, you know, of the Speaker of this House? As you said, it may be due to inexperience. At that time we were prepared to say it was due to inexperience. But today, after four years of Government, three Sessions, do we still say and claim that we are inexperienced? And if we are inexperienced then, Sir, there should be no confidence in the Speaker. After three years I tend to feel that it is not inexperience. I would like to read now that happened on that day.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Tuan minta kebenaran?

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Saya minta kebenaran. Terima kasih. I only read the relevant part. I do not want to go too far. I read the part where Ahli Kawasan Bukit Mertajam comes into the picture. He plays a very small role around here. But if he plays he plays a very significant one. "Encik Ooh Chooi Cheng: Tuan Speaker, Saya menyokong Usul itu"—to bring forward the Government Motion. And that was the Usul under Standing Order 118; suspending as usual. They like to suspend Standing Orders around here. "Soalan dikemukakan dan dipersetujui." That is the introduction to be made. Now, here is the interesting part: "Ahli Kawasan Kelawei: Tuan Speaker, saya minta division." I suppose that is not perfect Malay.

Perhaps it could be, "Saya minta division." But I am not very sure. I think it is understood. And also, "Mengiklut Standing Order saya minta division." And what does our Member for Bukit Mertajam say? Sir, it is interesting to know that the Member for Bukit Mertajam said, although he chose to be absent from this Proceeding. He is a very experienced Member in Dewans. I wouldn't say which Dewan; not necessary. But he is a Member of the Bukit Mertajam District Council. And he is a firebrand there, I understand, reading from the Minutes which I have had a glance at a few weeks ago. He is a firebrand also. I read the Minutes. It means that he is a man of considerable experience of Standing Orders. And what does he say, Sir? "Ahli Kawasan Bukit Mertajam: Tuan Speaker, keputusan baru sahaja diambil oleh itu permintaan division itu sudah terlambat". That is advice from the Government benches, mind you. But there is advice from the other side, Sir. Whether you call it devil's advocate or otherwise, there is the advice. "Ahli Kawasan Kelawei: Saya ingat tidak terlambat". As you can see, Sir, in spite of the remarks of our absent Speaker—Now I use the words 'absent Speaker,' 'absentee' (gangguan).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: That is right.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Our absentee Speaker used to remark and say I do not try to speak Bahasa. Even in the first day I tried very hard, Sir. And I said, 'Saya ingat tak terlambat, Tuan Speaker'. And who else jumped in where angels fear to tread? Who else? I do not like to use the word 'fools'. It is unparliamentary. I do not use it. Who else? 'Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Selatan (Wong Choong Woh): Tuan Speaker, ada banyak mengundi "Ya". Saya ingat tidak boleh dibahaskan lagi'. There you are. One is an accident; two, as they say ; three, enemy action from the Government benches. From the Timbalan Ketua Menteri; not Ahli Bukit Mertajam. Timbalan Ketua Menteri; no other. And he was thereafter

promoted—the Member for Tanjong Selatan (Wong Choong Woh). Is not this misleading the Speaker? And what do you have as a result of that? ‘Tuan Speaker:’—this is the part—‘Bahas tidak dibenarkan’. Sir, I never asked for *bahas*, if I am not mistaken. My Malay is not that good. ‘Bahas’ means ‘to debate’. Right? I did not ask for a debate. I asked for a division. There is one who says, ‘No more debate’. The other one says ‘terlambat’. Which is right? On the very first day itself, Sir, we already take the role: How are we going to conduct ourselves in an atmosphere of goodwill, Rukunegara, Muhibbah in this House when this kind of things are perpetrated?

And again here I would like to reiterate—I do not want to read the earlier part—what the Member for Bayan Lepas said in support of his case:

‘Tuan Speaker, saya rasa ini satu masaalah yang penting dan saya fikir Tuan Speaker kenalah benar juga Ahli-ahli Pembangkang memberi pandangan sebelum Tuan Speaker mengambil satu-satu keputusan. Saya rasa kalau Tuan Speaker tak benar langsung pihak Pembangkang memberi pandangan-pandangan terhadap Usul yang dibawa oleh Yang Amat Berhormat Ketua Menteri atas Peraturan 118 tadi kami pihak Pembangkang rasa sungguh dukacita atas masaalah dan tindakan tuan dalam Majlis Mesyuarat pada hari ini—‘dukacita atas masaalah dan tindakan tuan dalam Majlis Mesyuarat’.

We regret on this issue, and on the action of the Speaker. These are not my words. So I would like here in the course of this debate, if we hear anything at all—just a token, which is important; justification; again, one of the stratagems of the great leader—someone bright and sparkling standing up and saying, ‘There in no *asas*’. I base my contention, to begin with, on this foundation that no other than even the present Speaker has so described our absentee Speaker. So, what do we find? Can we really say that the conduct of that day’s session was implacable? So fair? Can we be generous to the

Member for Bukit Mertajam and say that he made a mistake? Has he ever apologized to this House that he made a mistake? Has the Timbalan Ketua Menteri ever stood up in this House subsequently and said, ‘From reflection, after reading the Report I would like to tender my apologies to the Speaker and the Members of this House that on that day I made a mistake’? Has he ever done so? No. It is still practice to be followed, I presume. And it was followed. That’s about all. We would trace the history of these proceedings from that day to the last Sitting, Sir.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we know that the Government that came to its first Session was a Government that was plagued with a lot of sorrows and ills; and it had to be injected with four new Members to revive its already-dying legacy. But whether it is because the Government faces a crisis, or whether it has found new blood, new energy, it has nothing to do with the Speaker. But, sad to say, the Speaker has been used as a ‘hemp’ behind all proceedings in this House.

I would now refer, Mr Speaker, Sir, to the deliberate misinterpretation of the Standing Orders. I am not very sure whether the Honourable Member for Bayan Lepas, as he then was, or a few minutes ago anyway, did submit questions at the first Sitting. But we from the D.A.P. certainly submitted questions in the first session. We submitted questions, and we submitted Adjournment speeches. And what happened to those questions and those Adjournment speeches? They were summarily rejected. Why? On the flimsy pretext, Sir, that the Standing Orders do not allow for questions and Adjournment speeches without a Speaker. I say it is flimsy. Why? And I go back to this particular record. Because I submit—and here again, of course, the Chief Minister can always call on the Penasihat—that the Standing Orders were silent; and that the powers of the Speaker are wide enough for him to approve questions if need be. At least Adjournment speeches can. Again, they were rejected. But if we reject the business of the Opposition we have

similarly to reject the business of the Government because under the Standing Orders there is no distinction between the business of the Government and the business of the Opposition. They only refer to Adjournment speeches, approval of questions, and so forth; inclusion of matters. And if there is no Speaker to include the business of the Opposition similarly there is no Speaker to include the business of the Government. There is no Speaker to set out the Order Paper. And yet the Government had the cheek to come to this House and include its business in the Order Paper; to send out its own Order Paper without a Speaker. It issues its Order Paper for itself. One Rule for the Government; or at that time one Rule for the Gerakan, and one Rule for the Opposition. Is that fair? And on that day, more beautiful still, the great strategist comes to this House and then suspends the Standing Orders under "118" and says, "In view of the fact that we have not elected a Speaker, under Standing Order 118 I move that the Standing Orders be suspended, and the business of the Government be included". And that was when the trouble started, because at that time the Member for Bayan Lepas also asked that the business of the Opposition be included. And that was when the great naked power came out which swept everything aside. Reasoning being set aside in the House. That itself is bad enough. We have the privilege and the advantage of having a Penasihat Undang-undang Negeri to advise an incoming Speaker. And yet what happens? In the Rukunegara—fair play, justice to all—that you drum in the schools, shout from the roof top. Practise the Rukunegara then.

Ahli Yang Mengerusikan: Jangan tumbuk meja itu nanti pecah. (*ketawa*).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): You do not practise. You practise one-sided Rules. Gentlemen of the Government, how long can your conscience sustain yourselves in ignoring truth? Not all are without conscience, I take it. And this was perpetrated by the Speaker at the first

Sitting itself. And is that all the Opposition can make out a case and say? I would like to always stress that we have no advantage in this House. In fact whatever we have is disadvantages. One of the strategies of having this Motion now is that, well, since it is afternoon perhaps it may not catch the Press tomorrow.

Sir, should the Speaker lend himself to this kind of things? Even today's proceeding itself is a proof. But I will go in chronological order. I do not like to jump here and there. And then, Sir, taken out of the Assembly also, what is the relationship between the Speaker and the Members of the Opposition? I say that, Standing Orders aside, a Speaker must conduct himself so that not only is he fair to all, but be seen to be fair to all. But is that what we can say about our Speaker again? I would like to refer to something that is in a sense strictly outside the part of attacking the Speaker in his official capacity. And this is a small point along which I like to raise. A lot of people may not agree with me. I do not think it 100% demonstrates that the Speaker is not entitled to his opinion. But what I say is that even in little things like this the Speaker has proven himself to be indifferent, unreasonable, and completely insensitive—that is the word—to the opinion of the Members of the Opposition. And that occasion I refer to is the visit of our Federal colleagues from the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. In that visit and at that time we had not yet formed a Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. We had never met. The idea had not even been raised with the Opposition. And I don't wish to search through all these volumes and quote exactly. But I think the Member for Tanjong Barat did once say in this Assembly when he was in the Opposition—but he is not here now—"Parliamentary democracy must mean Government and Opposition. They must be both represented". Well, if they are represented they should be consulted on a thing of such small significance—as to whether the Speaker could represent the Penang members of

the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Kuala Lumpur at the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Meeting. No attempt was ever made to discuss, to consult. And this is one of those things that the Government talks about in its Manifesto when it got elected—"We shall consult the people". Let us consult the people's representatives first. Then you consult the people. And did the Speaker ever consult the Opposition as to whether he could use the name of the Members here and call himself the Chairman of the Penang Branch, although it had not been established? Did he ever ask? Was it difficult or impossible to take the telephone and ring the leaders of the various Opposition groups and say, "Would you object if I represented you all because I am the Speaker of the House? Although the Branch has not been formed officially, do you mind if I represent the Members?" Would we object? Do you seriously believe we don't take objection to a thing like that? Do we show that we are such people? We would not object to it. And even if we do object, at least give us the courtesy of consultation. But what was done? All of us, like the general public, have to read one morning in the newspapers that the Speaker has been elected as the Chairman, and he is now representing the State Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. Is that being sensitive to the feelings of the Members of the Opposition? Is that being fair? Or is that the attitude of the dictator; the attitude of a person who wishes to have naked power in this House? I say that is the meaning of that attitude because it does not concern the functions of this House. It concerns relationship—and I say it with the adjective "good"; good relationship—between Members of the Opposition and the Speaker. The courtesy of a phone call: was our absentee Speaker capable of that? Here again I may well use the words that the Member for Bayan Lepas used: Was this inexperience? Was this because we have a new Speaker? Or was it because of advice from people that side? As I said, one incident may be accidental. Two we may still forgive. But not to go on and

on, and press and oppress. We will make a stand. Even a rabbit would fight back. And we, I guarantee the Members of Government here, are no rabbits. If at all, we do the hunting here.

Mr Speaker, Sir, that is, as I say, taking us outside this Assembly. I like to take us back into this Assembly again. As Members of this House we have privileges. We have the privilege as Members, and we have privileges as citizens of this country. Just because we are Members of this House does not mean we forfeit our rights of citizenship. Just because we happen to be Members of this Assembly does not mean that the Speaker can tell us to sit and stand where and when he likes. Let us be fair. If we obey the ruling of the Chair it is because we respect the Chair. And let us have the respect that comes from the heart; not hypocrisy.

And in this, Sir, I go further on that. I like to challenge the Government Members. And I am not trying to take sides on this. I am not pro-Alliance. And that accusation is hurled by me to a Member of the Government. There may be those who may tread where angels fear. I have criticised the Alliance Government in posterity. But I must take off my hat, Sir, to your colleague, the then Speaker of the former Legislative Assembly—the one prior to this one—because at least he was fair. He was so fair that one day he allowed the present Chief Minister of Penang to speak—I do not know if my calculation is correct—nearly 4 or 5 hours. And where they allow us a little latitude to express ourselves here they say, "Oh, we give you the world already". But that is beside the point. We will draw comparisons very soon with the performance of the then Speaker, sad as it is, although he was an Alliance Speaker. That is something we should not be prejudiced against, because once a man has sat in that seat he should know best. As usual, as I said, you have been elected, and you are vested with all the powers. A man must know

how to feel the shoes of that power; must learn, and respect that power, and uphold that power. That the absentee Speaker never could do.

I refer back to what I said earlier. As Members of this House we do not forfeit our rights just because we are Members. And I say the Member for Sungei Bakap, our friend Encik Veerappen, was angered also on this occasion with what we jointly called the interference of the Speaker—and interference, again I say, Sir—at the instance of those on the other side. On that occasion I referred to the statement by the Speaker castigating the Members of the Opposition for having released their questions to the Press. You come to a situation where a Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of Penang tells the Members what to print and what not to print; and tells the Members of this House what they can release to the Press, and what they cannot release to the Press. And for that initiative of his he got his picture in the “Star”. I congratulate him. But, Sir, jokes aside, where is it in the Standing Orders? I do not like to quote Tunku Abdul Rahman. I do not read from A to Z, and Z to A before I come to a decision. But I have read these Standing Orders. Where does it say that the Speaker of this House has the right to tell me or any Members of the Opposition what to release and what not to release to the Press? Was that not an infantile outburst of the Chief Minister? *Of the Speaker*—I beg your pardon if I keep on saying “Chief Minister”. It is because the *ultra-ego* is too strong. But I ask: Is there anything in the Standing Orders to say that we cannot release our questions to the Press? Is this not free democracy? Is there no freedom of the Press? We know that “Bernama” wants to control the Press, although Encik Soviee says otherwise. But the Speaker of this House wants to control the Press; and yet he himself issued a Press statement—a very well-worded Press statement. I take off my hat to him, Sir, but I say it is completely off the target. The Speaker of this House must conduct himself in a way that people will respect him. And what he says must be said with that conviction

and without tagging—of a knowledge of the law, and Standing Orders, and propriety. I cannot say that of our present Speaker. He issued a rash statement condemning Members of the Opposition for having released statements to the Press.

I would like to draw two illustrations. One, Parliament: The Speaker of the Dewan Rakyat has never in his moments of whatever sense of power issued statements to the Press saying, “You or Members of the Government, do not issue your Press statements or questions before I approve them”. He has never done that. Here again people do rush in where angels fear to tread. And what was the result of all that? What did he reap for the bother he took—condemnation of the Members of the Opposition? On top of that, a very, very unceremonious and undistinguished retreat in silence. One would expect that after having been replied to in such a manner by the Members of the Opposition the Speaker would come forward with a statement explaining things. No. Absolute silence. The learned, distinguished, experienced Members of the Government benches—with some Local Council experience; some second term—have never bothered to help the Speaker with a statement to understand why he made such a—I do not want to use an unparliamentary word—“stupid”—it is a very bad word; I will try to find another word—“statement”. He should not do that. And this was done.

Sir, for all the knowledge, and for all the reference for future Speakers, what the Members have done was not to challenge the authority of the Speaker. Let me explain. I do not wish to have any misunderstanding. What Members of the Opposition did was merely to let our free Press—or the Press that we trying to keep free—know that “these are the questions that we have submitted”. We have never said that “these are the questions that will be allowed”. And even if we said so there is nothing the Speaker can do about it. But we are not disconcerted. That is all we are saying. And is anything wrong? Is there anything under

the Federal Constitution which says that we can't do it? Is there anything under our State Constitution? The *Penasihat Undang-undang Negeri* is there. If there is he will be the first to pop up. There is nothing. We have every right. It is guaranteed by the Constitution—freedom of expression, except for certain things. And that will be amended in the next Sitting of Parliament—freedom of expression; freedom of speech and assembly and association—Article 10 of the Constitution. Here we have a Speaker trying to subvert Article 10 of the Constitution. We mean the absentee Speaker, Sir, (*ketawa*). I do not like to say it. Is that not bad enough? We would like to respect our Speaker. I have nothing against the Speaker of this Dewan. If people would care to read back the records, time and again I have pressed that the Speaker of this House be given facilities—a motorcar; a house, which the former Speaker enjoyed. That is a question which we on this side keep on wondering about—why our Speaker has no official car; our Speaker has no official house. He is so inaccessible. When we want him we have to look into the jungles of Alma. I tried to speak to the Speaker several times in the last few weeks. I couldn't find him. He has no official residence.

I will be the first to say that we should economise. There is no question of economy here. The Speaker apparently is not aware of the dignity of his office; that we can have no confidence in him now. If the Speaker has no confidence in his own office, can we have confidence in him? Can we? And together with the instruments of the office is the status—a right to a car paid for by the Government; the right to an official residence.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Dengan sebab itulah yang tuan bawa Usul tidak percaya kepada Speaker?

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Itu pun ada kesangkutan.

Tuan Speaker, I will explain further. The Speaker must first of all respect his own office before he can expect

others to respect his office. And the economic reason is the last reason, because we know that in this State we spent about \$900,000 renovating the Chief Minister's office alone. We are not going into the figures a second time. But that is what we do. The Speaker is next to the Governor in terms of protocol; not the Deputy Chief Minister. He may want to be; but he is not even in the Constitution. (*ketawa*). That is a fact. Correct me if I am wrong. The Speaker is next to the Governor, and yet he has no official mansion, no official car. Even the status is lacking. This I say is testimony of the respect the Government has for the office, on two counts. If it is argued that the Speaker himself doesn't want a mansion and a car, I ask, "Why?" And why should it be allowed? We are not going to bar any holds here. We are going to speak the truth. I say that he is not what we expect of a Speaker. If the former Speaker could conduct himself as a Speaker, and use the instruments of the Speaker, why can't our present Speaker? Because the office of the Speaker is not an office that is respected even by the Government. That is why they changed the Speaker even before the Assembly sat, as you yourself have noted. You do not change horses in mid-stream. They say donkeys are changed. But, Sir, is that what you do? Is it implied that the Speaker does not want a house; and in lieu thereof he is given something else? I say that is wrong. And let us know in this House why the Speaker does not want an official mansion, and why he does not have an official car; why he borrows a car on a day like this? The former Speaker had a car for himself.

Sir, I say this is in fact testimony of the degree of respect the Government is giving to the Chair. They are not bothered with it. And, further, why are they not bothered? The Chief Minister, when he was on this side of the House, used to wax rich. I always quote him. And he said I have been studying him so much. You can read every word that he says.

Ketua Menteri: Study more.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): I will, if you make all your Proceedings available. But it is not so in this House. We will come to that next.

He used to wax rich. He said we must have a separate Department for the Speaker. We must not tukar sini, tukar sana, pinjam sini, pinjam sana. We must not borrow staff from the Bangunan, he said. I think you were there. You probably remember that. He said that the people of Penang have given you a mandate. And if the Chief Minister wishes to carry out this we support him one hundred per cent. And don't say the Opposition always opposes. Why can't a separate Department be set up for the Speaker? And I say this is relevant to my point. How can he be an independent Speaker when every time he needs to do anything he has got to run and borrow a clerk, borrow a typist; and even borrow the Clerk of Councils? If the Chief Minister needs time to look up what he said the last time I will be prepared to step down. But he did say that. Why is it not done? Here again it revolves around this issue that the office is not an office which the Government takes very seriously. Not only that he failed to create a separate Department and, in the words of the Chief Minister, introduce a separate head of budgeting—those were his words: “a separate head of budgeting for the Speaker”—he also failed to give the Speaker the instruments of office which the office rightly deserves. And I say that is due solely to the fact that that office is not taken seriously.

And I would further say that, as far as the Government is concerned, one Sitting in six months is already too often. This complies with the letter—not the spirit, but the letter—of the Constitution. And why do I say “letter of the Constitution”? This is something that the Speaker should be concerned with. And the Speaker should not wait for the Government to say, “We are going to have some business”. Say, “I am going to hold a sitting on such and such a date”, and invite the Government to bring their matters forward.

We had the great privilege last year of having to approve a Supplementary Budget on the eve of 1973. This is what the Government does. And that, Sir, is only one illustration of how our Speaker conducts himself in this House. I would like as a further illustration to point out that our Standing Orders quite clearly state that a proposition which has been disposed of should not be raised again in the same Session—at least for six months. It is provided. I do not have the note here particularly at the moment. But I think everybody will agree, as far as that is concerned that a proposition once disposed of—anyway I think that is agreed—cannot be raised again in the same Sitting. And let us see here what our wonderful Speaker does. And I would refer now to the Minutes—only the Minutes; not the records—of the Assembly. And that is the kind of thing, Sir. We play cat and mouse here. The Government does not come here to do business. Even on the question of Sitting of this Assembly the Speaker takes no initiative to consult the Opposition; and presumably for the sake of formality consults the Government. And it is made to appear that the Speaker arbitrarily carries on—morning, afternoon, evening, and even midnight if he likes. Just like that, without any concern for the needs and the sensitivities of the Opposition. That itself is bad enough. Here we have a Speaker who allows the Chief Minister to do as he likes. And I think in this case again, Mr Speaker, Sir, you have personal knowledge of this.

And I refer to the Minutes of the Sitting on the 16th June, 1972; and I read at page 44, with your permission again. And this is the kind of nonsense that goes on—“Motion under Standing Order 9. The Chief Minister addresses the Assembly and, seconded by the Member for Kelawei”—I seconded it—“moves—That the House is not adjourned until all business is completed”. It was moved; seconded by me. The Motion is agreed to that the House does not adjourn until all business is completed. That means we go right up to midnight. But what happens, Sir? The Chief Minister has a change of mind. The Chief Minister changes his

mind like some people change their shoes. "Shoes" is the word. He goes back and decides that he wants to take a long walk. And he comes back, Sir, on the same Motion, you know, reversing. And this is—let us not take it as a joke—serious. A decision of the House had been made. And you were acquainted with this decision, I think, because we had a discussion in chambers. The Chief Minister comes back. The Assembly resumes at 7.03. Adjournment of a few minutes. 7.03, resumes. The Chief Minister addresses the Assembly and, seconded by the Member for Nibong Tebal—another one treading in; Teoh Kooi Sneah—moves that the Assembly adjourns at 7.30 till Monday morning at 9.30. Now, is this not giving the Chief Minister fantastic latitude in this House? One moment he moves under the same Standing Order that the House continues until all business is closed. In other words he wants to finish this House one way or the other. And the next moment he comes back. And mind you, we are worried about what is happening in this State. You know, people made election promises; and then they did not keep them after a few days. Here it is only a matter of hours. From 4.45 to 7.03 the Chief Minister has changed his mind. Two and a half hours only, and he has changed his mind. He comes back and tells the Assembly he wants the House to adjourn at 7.30. And is this not against the Standing Orders? We had decided. We had moved a proposition in this House that this House do not adjourn, Sir, until all business is completed. And the Chief Minister comes back to this House, and moves another Motion contravening his own original Motion that was carried by this House. Now, is that the way we conduct ourselves in this House? Is that the way of doing things? Is that not giving the Chief Minister absolute latitude? Isn't it? And I feel, Sir, that even Minutes prove by themselves that we have a Speaker who is biased, and who leans towards the Government too much. And for the information of the Chief Minister, in case he gives a reply, I would like to state very clearly that I seconded the Motion because I agreed

with him—that if he wanted to continue the Meeting till the night because he thought that he had more important things to do on Monday I supported him, and I agreed. But I for one do not change my mind in three hours. And when he decided to do this I refused to second his Motion. And I had a feeling, Sir, that you also refused. Therefore, a back-bencher, where angels fear to tread, came in and seconded the Motion. Sir, it is not my words alone. These are the records of this House that indicate very clearly how our Speaker can hear from one angle, and not another. Is this a manner in which we expect our Speaker to instil confidence in us? Do we have confidence in a Speaker who allows this sort of thing to go on under his nose? And that is not all, Sir. We have got other illustrations. We will give, point by point, other illustrations, more colourful. One illustration I would like to give now is the continued use of the word "bodoh" by the Chief Minister in this House. I know the Chief Minister is a hell of a tricky chap. Pardon me if I use the words "hell of a tricky chap". But I think—he is the Chief Minister of Penang—when I refer to him as the Member for Kota he doesn't like it. He is the Chief Minister. He is the Yang Amat Berhormat. He should be duly "berhormated".

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Apa itu terhormat?

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Terhormat. And I know that by some sheer oversight—shall we say, using a very loose term—our forefathers used the word "bodoh" in translation for the word "frivolous". We know that. But, as my friends on the left on this side had said, surely the Chief Minister knows, with his learning in the Bahasa, his vast experience in the Assembly and Parliament, and God knows what else, that the word "bodoh" is certainly not equivalent to the word "frivolous", unless he says that his Bahasa is so terrible. Mine is bad, but his is terrible. Surely even a schoolboy who cannot pass the M.C.E. Bahasa paper can say

that the word "bodoh" is not "frivolous". Maybe tidak ada asas. But I do not know. My Malay is very poor. But certainly not "bodoh". But the Chief Minister insists on using the word "bodoh" in this House. And he even quoted the Standing Order. And the beautiful part: the Speaker allows it. On top of that he says all of us are bodoh in the beginning. In the record the Speaker says everybody here is bodoh. But, Sir, I remember that when pressed by the Opposition here the Speaker did say to the Chief Minister, "I think we should not use the word "bodoh" any more. Although it is used I think it is a mistake. We should not use the word "bodoh" anymore". And the Chief Minister went on to use it.

It was the Chief Minister who tried to quote Order 51. He said "15" that day, and got me suspended. But I should quote Order 51 because when he was told by the Speaker that the word "bodoh" should not be used he still used the word "bodoh". And then again he is the Chief Minister. He can do what he likes. We do not have confidence in the Chief Minister. I can tell you the whole of Penang has no confidence in the Chief Minister. He may win his vote; but that does not matter. But, Sir, here in this House it is not a matter of confidence you command here. It is not a matter of votes you command here. You may have a majority.

The Speaker of this House must command the confidence of the Opposition as well—not the majority; the Opposition—before he can sit in that Chair and call himself a Speaker, a Referee, a Magistrate. This is what a Speaker is—a Referee; an Arbitrator; an unbiased person. So I would like to acquaint the Members of the Government with the fact that it is not a matter of you having your number of votes. You look over this side and say "They have eight here. They can't beat us in this Motion". You are very mistaken. It is not a question of confidence on this side of the House. A Speaker must enjoy the confidence of people on this side as well as people on that side. It is not good enough for

him to enjoy the confidence of people of one side. He must not only be above influence but be seen to be above influence. So I would like to disenchant the Members of the Government right now at the very beginning. We are not here to weigh the number of votes we have on the decision, and the number of votes we have on the Government; and to say, "We win; "one-two-som". No. I am sorry to say this is not an issue here.

This is not a Motion of no confidence in the Speaker. It is a Motion of no confidence in the Chief Minister. But here if you lose by one vote you have lost the confidence. If you win at the expense of one negative vote against you, you still have lost the confidence of the Opposition. The point is whether the Opposition have made out a proper case. That is the point. And I say that as the case goes on it becomes tighter and tighter. So much so that the Speaker who walked in through that door may not walk out again if he has a conscience. We are not here dealing with votes. We are here dealing with the way the Speaker has forfeited his high office by virtue of tainting it. And I might add, Sir, that if we live in a free democracy, if we live in a system of check and balances, if we live in a system where there is no political corruption, and if we live in a system where truth can prevail, this debate can and should be called and be known as "The Chief Minister's Watergate of Penang". Yes, the Watergate of Penang because it is subversion of the Constitution at a very high level. It is not something to scoff at. We get provision under the Federal Constitution itself. The Member for Butterworth may be skeptical, and takes on a skeptical pose. You will be surprised! And the days of the election are drawing very near. The Constitution does provide that the Federal Government can see to it that a State Government complies with the Constitution. And I say that subversion of an office of Speaker is subversion of the Constitution because the Dewan has its origin in the State Constitution which has its origin in the Federal Constitution. So it is technically not altogether

that easy for you to get away with it. If we live in a free democracy of checks and balances, where people have political principles, where any office no matter how high can be subject to scrutiny, I say here with full knowledge that none other than the highest officer of the State has subverted the office of the Speaker. And that amounts to subverting the Constitution of this State, because where you have the influence of a Speaker we cannot conduct our affairs here. And I will show this House why we cannot conduct our affairs here in freedom; and why obstacles are being put in the way of peoples' representatives, one obstacle after another. We shall show that even in this present Session itself obstacles have been placed in our way. We will show how abundantly clear beyond a reasonable doubt it is that the Speaker does not make decisions based on justice, based on precedence; but makes decisions based on whims and fancies of the Government. And this will be known one day as the Chief Minister's Water-gate.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we in this House have noted with apprehension the manner in which what the Chief Minister does, and even the Members of the Government, in contravention of the Standing Orders is overlooked. What the Members of the Opposition do even in compliance with the Standing Orders is disallowed. I will give another example. In the Meeting in June, 1972, the Speaker of this House ordered the Member for Bagan Ajam, after he had crossed the floor and made allegations against the Chief Minister, to sit at the back of my chair when the back-benches were there. It is not a smiling matter. The Chief Minister may find it comical. It is not comical.

Ketua Menteri: Excuse me, Sir.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): It reveals what goes on in this House, and what goes on in this Government. And it reveals the total lack of sincerity of the Chief Minister. The Member, when he crossed over, asked for permission to sit where the Member for Tasek Glugor is now

sitting. He asked for permission to sit there. But because he himself made up his mind to sit there the Speaker told him, "No. Sit at the back".—"belakang". Does it make any difference whether he sits at the back or he sits there, taking into consideration the number of seats here? As we can see, there is enough space for him to sit there. We are now sitting eight. The last time it was eight. Why was it the Speaker told him to sit at the back? I say that the Speaker was motivated by vendetta; motivated by a desire to protect the Chief Minister; to make life difficult for the Member for Bagan Ajam. That is right. If the Member for Bagan Ajam, I venture to say, had come to sit at the back on his own he would have been told to sit there. That is the unfairness of this House. And the people cry out for justice. We are not elected here on our own steam. We represent the people. And when you stop us from representing the people you are subverting the writ of the people. Get it clear. But, Sir, that is not all. In this House we proceed by episode. One chapter after another, the plot thickens.

After that we come to the—shall I use the word "famous"; or is it "infamous"?—December meeting where we could pass the Budget in two days—wonderful; where no Member of the back-benches would even speak on the Budget. In two days steamrolled through in this House. A Budget of a State—\$24 million or more—passed without a debate. That is the distinction of this House. It is a shame of the Members of Government. And in that particular session what, Sir, happened in this House, because the Member for Bagan Ajam had sat behind me, and because from what I understand of certain things maybe, according to him, he could see the Chief Minister's signals from this side? Well, I do not know. Because of that maybe, or other reasons. I do not want to venture to say that there are other reasons that could plague the minds of the Speaker and the Chief Minister. Because of that, or because of something else? This is playing it for the school, you know—I don't even categorize it as a school. A

kindergarten. Or maybe kindergarten is too high a standard again—for the behaviour of Government Members. They have something now lower than kindergarten. He was told on that day when he came, on the very morning, Sir. And mind you, Sir, as I said, we anticipated what the Chief Minister would have done on that morning because, to reveal a little bit of a secret in this House, I told the Member for Bagan Ajam “First thing you go in the morning don’t be surprised if your seat is somewhere else already”. And true to life he rang me up and said, “Yes, my seat has now been shifted to where the Member for Tasek Glugor is now sitting”.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Kali ini dia ada di tengah-tengah.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Ya, sebab dia sudah masuk jadi seorang ahli Parti. Dia sudah di-promote-kan.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Dia tidak masuk D.A.P.?

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Itu tak usah. Itu sekampung. Bukan satu masaalah yang ditimbangkan di sini. Tapi kalau pihak Kerajaan mahu kita boleh bahas. This is what happened. And, Sir, I say that is not a joking matter because it reveals what sort of mentality we have *di sebelah sana*. It reveals the mentality, the vindictiveness. He was an independent Member. Now he sits there because he is a member of the PEKEMAS. Because he has been so ill-treated he must find some support. (*ketawa*) And I say it is true. And that is what you call ill-treatment of a Member. And I use the word “ill-treatment”. Give respect to a Member. He is not a mere schoolboy who comes to school; and the teacher says, “Today you are naughty. Detention class”. (*ketawa*) He is an elected representative of the people of Bagan Ajam. And you show contempt for the people of Bagan Ajam when you tell him, “You go over there”. And that is not all. And then the Member asked. And it is here, Sir. I do not wish the Honourable

the Chief Minister or any Member of the Government to misuse what I say. I have copies of all the proceedings here, word for word. You can refer to them. And what did the Speaker say to him? He asked, “Saya minta izin; saya mahu explain; saya mahu cakap sedikit”. “Tak boleh”. “Baik”. “Tak boleh”.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): ‘Tidak’.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tidak. All right.

You already tell a man you treat him like a dog. You say. “You go over there”. (*ketawa*) At least he is entitled to one bark. But you won’t listen to him. You tell him, “Tidak”. (*ketawa*) It is no joking matter. You are undermining the Constitution of this country. Who are the running dogs? You, perhaps. (*ketawa*) And you will be running very soon when the election comes. Running from the people. Sir, is this justice perpetrated? And mind you, as we said, we read it. We read it in this House. We anticipated that sort of thing to happen; and it happened. You are not lower than a skunk. You do things like that. You one day tell a Member to sit “there”; another day you tell him to sit “there”. You are not God. And that is why you have a Motion today of no confidence, unprecedented as it is in this country and in the history of democracy. But you cannot perpetrate things like this and get away with it. If there is a God he will punish you. And you recite this every day—“Ya Allah. . . .” Is this what Honourable Members of the Government think they are doing? This is a system, even in science, of action and reaction. For every action there will be a reaction, delayed as it may be; slow as it may be. Slow-motion delayed action. But it will come for every injustice that is perpetrated—using the words—Honourable Members of the Government. You will be made to suffer for it. Search your conscience. Search your hearts, whether what you do is right; what you do is in defence of your Party, or whether what you do is really going too far; and that it is high time that you call a stop to it; and

that it is high time there should be some common understanding in this House that Members here should not in the course of their carrying out their duties be treated like children, and pushed around the place just because you say, "Saya punya keputusan is unquestionable". Is that what you do? I ask the Honourable Members of the Government who have sat over here before: Have you received the same treatment from the former Speaker? Have you?

We on this side of the House cannot participate when we get suspended. But you freely chose not to participate, and walked out in the days of Wong Pow Nee when you didn't prepare your Budget speeches. There lies the difference. Those of you who are older should be meeting your Maker very soon. (*ketawa*) Meet him face to face; not back to back.

Sir, I refer to that incident. Is that fair? And has the Speaker ever explained why he did that? I would have had the common courtesy to ring the Member for Bagan Ajam and say, "Look, in the coming session I think that you should not sit there because"—you could give any reason you want—"I don't like you to be alone by yourself, lonely. You come and sit here". That is the action and reaction of an honest, sincere, generous man. But the action and reaction of a guilty man is to say, "Get out of there, and don't argue with me. If you don't like it get out of this House". Those were his words—"Kalau awak tidak terima boleh keluar dari sini." Boleh keluar dari sini! Yes. "boleh keluar". But we were elected by the people to this House. How can he *boleh keluar dari sini*? That I want the Honourable Members of the Government to explain if they can. And we are prepared to sit here and listen to the explanation why that was done that day—a personal insult to the Member for Bagan Ajam.

So you think that we have no cause for this debate? We have a hundred and one causes.

Dewan ditangguhkan pada jam 4.30 petang.

Dewan bersidang semula pada jam 4.45 petang.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Yang Berhormat, saya mencadangkan supaya Dewan ini akan kita jalankan sehingga selepas soalan-soalan pada hari ini. Dan, besok dan berikutnya Dewan akan ditangguhkan pada pukul 1.00 tengahari dan disambungkan balik 2.30 petang sehingga pukul 7.30 malam. Ini ialah hasil daripada, apa yang saya dapat tahu, perbincangan di antara Speaker yang lepas dengan Ketua Pembangkang.

Sekarang Dewan disambungkan (*gangguan*).

USUL DI BAWAH PERATURAN MESYUARAT 34

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Pheok Kin): Tuan Speaker, saya tidak bersetuju dengan ini. Tuan Speaker, sebab itu saya mencadangkan mengikot Standing Order 34, Dewan ini ditangguhkan pada pukul 5.30 petang tiap-tiap hari dalam mesyuarat Dewan pada kali ini.

Dengan izin bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

My reason for putting forward this Motion is that in my view there is absolutely no necessity whatsoever to have a night session tonight. It is understandable, and it is accepted Parliamentary practice, that night sessions will only be introduced at the end of a particular session, during the last two or three days, when it is discovered that the business of that particular session cannot be completed in time. And never in the history of any Parliament or any Dewan did we have night sessions being introduced on the first day. And to do so will be purely to accommodate the Government, and not in the interests of all concerned in this House.

And also with regard to hours of meeting. I would submit that as far as this Dewan is concerned we should follow the practice in all offices—an 8-hour day. If we are preaching an 8-hour day outside, and say workers should work only an 8-hour day, why should Members of the Dewan be exhausted working such long hours? Particularly with the

kind of work in the Dewan, it is essential that most of us be fresh to think and argue intelligently. It is no use compelling people to sit here for hours. In the process, because of mental fatigue, tempers will rise. And as a result you will have the spectacle of arguments on irrelevancies; and also sometimes we have the occasion to witness frayed tempers, and all that. So, in view of my argument I like to propose that this Assembly adjourns at 5.30 p.m. daily during this current Meeting of the Assembly.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat, Usul yang dibawa oleh Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam ialah meminta supaya Dewan ini ditangguhkan tiap-tiap hari hingga 5.30 petang. Siapa menyokong Usul ini?

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Saya sokong. Tuan Speaker, dengan izin bercakap dalam bahasa Inggeris. I support this Motion; and also like to explain what I said in chambers. What I indicated was that if the Chief Minister insisted on going on right up to midnight we know that on a challenge here openly it is a matter of conscience alone. With the number of votes that the Government commands the Motion will be defeated. But I indicated that, as far as I myself am concerned, and Members of the Opposition, I think that generally we, in fact, have become quite used to that sort of thing, and are prepared, even at great sacrifice to all, if the Chief Minister insists on sitting right up to midnight (*gangguan*).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Saya tidak suka tuan bercakap berkenaan dengan Chief Minister.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Ya.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Sebarang Usul ini ada dalam Majlis kita dan kita runding. Ini bukan soal Chief Minister—Usul Dewan. Kalau Dewan bersetuju kita jalan dan kalau Dewan tidak bersetuju kita tidak payah jalan.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Then I correct myself, and say that the Government may not

wish to prolong this debate for another day; and they wish to sit on the questions right up to the night so that the supplementary questions which will require explosives to be blown up may not get the ventilation that they normally would get. But that was the only reason why I said that we are game for anything. Go ahead. We are game for anything in this House. But if reason were to prevail I definitely support the Motion that we must not—and I said it before—have these sessions right up to midnight. If we insist on having the questions also dealt with today, at the rate we are going it will be a midnight session. So, I think that the proposal made by my colleague on the left should be supported. And I certainly support it without hesitation.

And I would ask the Members of Government to reconsider their stand in the light of proceedings in this House; and let us not force sessions right up to midnight. Let us hold sessions everyday from a definite time to a definite time. Let us not say we are going to sit until questions are finished. What is the meaning of "until questions are finished", Sir? It is now 5 o'clock, if that clock can be trusted. The questions under the Standing Orders will take three hours to 8 o'clock. If we just go from here to the questions we will only stop at 8 o'clock, if we do not have any break. If we add two more hours, being very moderate about it, plus a break, we will definitely go up to 11 o'clock. Is this what the Government wants—again to hold these sessions right up to midnight? Sir, I feel that this talk of finishing questions is just trying to draw a red herring. It is not a question of finishing questions today. It is a question of dragging this debate, and threatening to have it right up to 1 o'clock tonight; and tomorrow morning if need be. So, I feel that if the Government Members can sober up then they would look at this Motion in that light and support it. And let us have consistent sittings every day at a definite time. Let us not revert to the old practice of satisfying whims, fancies and self-interest.

We have a duty also to the civil servants of the Dewan who have their own commitments; and they do not know when they are going to go home to their families. That is not fair also. That is one of the things that will need to be raised. Let us have today's session terminate at the time proposed by my colleague on the left. And let us deal with this matter entirely as a non-partisan matter. It is not Party ideology or anything of that sort. This is a meeting of minds of reasonable people; and we hope that there are reasonable people across the floor.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, inilah kita dapat tunjukkan dengan terang sekali macam mana Ahli-ahli dari Parti Pembangkang bukan sahaja hendak buang masa di dalam mesyuarat Dewan ini tetapi macam mana mereka pandai sekali cari lubang-lubang atau (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Mesti ada lubang baru boleh cari (*ketawa*).

Ketua Menteri: Itupun tunjuk terang macam mana tingkatan fikiran mereka. Tetapi cari lubang-lubang di dalam peraturan yang ada. Macam mana mereka boleh bercakap panjang-panjang sekali, ulang-ulang balik banyak sekali yang sungguh tidak ada apa-apa perkara yang berlaku dibahas di dalam Dewan ini. Dengan izin, Tuan Speaker, bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

Sir, I think this is a unique occasion when you are presiding at an unusual Meeting on a Motion of no confidence. This is serious enough. When the time comes we will have to debate this. Now, very much more serious, of course, is the fact that just before the Meeting began the Honourable Member from Kelawei was present in the Speaker's room; and the Speaker sent for me to ask what decision we should take with regard to the fixing of the hours. Secondly, at that time I had already told him we will consider this issue, and I will let him know tomorrow morning. Just now at the adjournment I tried to find a consensus of opinion as to how we could proceed in this

House reasonably and without taking too much time, all depending upon how much more the Honourable Member from Kelawei has to give off the spite that he obviously has nourished when the Honourable Speaker had previously suspended him. We appreciate that he has to work out his spite and his spleen; and it may take him a longer time than most other people to get rid of his feelings of frustration. We were quite willing to bear with him as long as possible. But, Sir, there are two points that arise. No. 1: when the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam referred to Standing Order No. 9 he asked you for a decision, which you gave. And your decision, which I myself felt might possibly take the Meeting to very late at night, was perhaps different at the time when you were replying to the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam. But you did give a decision. Having given a decision from the Chair, the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam then said that he was not satisfied with your decision; and hence the Motion. Now, in the course of the Motion he mentioned that it is never done in any Parliament—to go on for night session.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): On the first day.

Ketua Menteri: On the first day or on the 3rd day, or whatever it is. Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not know what the authority of the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam may be. But certainly I do not think the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam can ever cite an instance anywhere in the world, where Parliamentary democracy based on Erskine May is practised, where we have such an extraordinary situation where a Member has been elected on Standing Rules and Orders to preside over a debate of no confidence on the Speaker. Sir, this is a most extraordinary situation. Now, if needs be—if he wanted to debate this particular Motion without taking to the questions that follow on the Order Paper—if we have to debate this question through the night we will complete this question through the night in order once and for all to clear this question of no confidence on the Speaker. That, Sir, I think is reasonable.

The other matter is this: the Honourable Member this morning suggested—not only pertaining to the first night; not pertaining to the first day—that every day this House should adjourn at 5.30 p.m. So obviously, Sir, he was not thinking of only one day, nor the first day of this Sitting. He was thinking of many other things. Sir, I feel, first, that having cited the Standing Orders, and having asked an opinion of the Chair, and the Chair having ruled accordingly, much as I agree with the Honourable Member from Kelawei, because he best knows how much he still has, he might possibly have to debate till very late at night. At least, Sir, since you have already made such a ruling in this House, I think this House should accord your ruling a certain degree of privilege.

Certainly, Sir, it is never the intention of the Government at any time to be afraid of the Press reporting in full everything that Honourable Members have to say. It would be a wonderful thing indeed one of these days, when the Press in fact report also a lot of the nonsense that is talked by Honourable Members. Mr Speaker, Sir, unfortunately the Press count and value their space. And certainly it is not the intention of Government to try and steal the thunder from the odd Members of the Opposition when they want to have the limelight. After all they have to divide amongst themselves the different fragments of their ventures as to what it is that they want; as to who should get bigger limelight; who should appear in the Star or the Straits Echo, and so on. That is entirely up to them. Certainly it is not Government's intention whatsoever to creep into what is called the reporting time.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I suggest that the Motion as it stands, namely that the House adjourn every day at 5.30, does not merit the support of the House; and we on this side I am sure will oppose this particular Motion. However, I do suggest, Mr Speaker, Sir, that perhaps you yourself, in making the decision that this particular Meeting today goes on until questions are dealt with, perhaps may like to review your own

decision, and apply Standing Orders as they are when the time arises. And we on this side of the House would abide by whatever decision you think fit.

I would like to suggest, Sir, that the important thing today is to get over this question of no confidence on the Speaker. And however long it may take us we will go on. However, Sir, as I said, the difficulty in sitting on the Chair is when to distinguish Standing Order 51 (4) on Members who persist in irrelevance and tedious repetition of arguments. That, Sir, I think is an experience you will relish and remember for your lifetime. For the last 2½ hours you must have been trying very hard to find out exactly what is the definition of those words.

Soalan dikemukakan dan Usul tidak dipersetujui.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Sebarang kita balik kepada Usul daripada Ahli Kawasan Kelawei.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tuan Speaker, terima kasih. Dengan kebenaran bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris: Mr Speaker, Sir, as I concluded before we adjourned, we on this side of the House have got 101 causes as to why this debate is necessary today. And, much as I would like, Sir, to make myself as short as possible, unfortunately, Sir, the transgressions of our absentee Speaker are such that they are many and varied. And unless we attempt to recall each and every significant violation of the Standing Orders itself we will face then a charge from the Honourable Chief Minister that we have brought this Motion just to embarrass the Speaker, without attempting to go really into it, and we are wasting our time. Otherwise, we will be accused of something. We prefer then to be accused of being long-winded, because that is the opinion of the Chief Minister. And that opinion unfortunately, as the years go by—four years; and the fifth year coming—the people will have less and less regard for. And it is not, as I said, a matter of clearing this question. There is no question of clearing this question before

us. What we are dealing with is whether the grounds have been established. And we will not win this Motion by mere and sheer majority.

Sir, I would like to give another illustration as to what I mean when I say the Speaker does not enjoy the confidence of this House. Sir, as I had said earlier, I hope the Chief Minister will also be fair enough to agree that I cannot just make bald statements here without substantiating my allegations. I must substantiate. Sir, on this question of how fair his rulings are in this Assembly that is an issue again. I give an illustration.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Speaker, saya minta keterangan. Dengan izin (gangguan).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Tidak minta kebenaran.

Ketua Menteri: Saya minta kebenaran bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris. Sir, I do not think the Honourable Speaker is on trial. We are here debating. Nor is this a Court of Parole. This is a State Assembly debating a Motion standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Kelawei.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tuan Speaker, dengan izin. When I used the word "trial", of course, I did not mean the Court of Law. I mean the confidence—whether he enjoys the confidence of the House—is on trial. That issue is on trial. That is what I mean. So the Chief Minister need not unduly worry that we may impeach the Speaker.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Saya rasa tuan jalanlah apa lagi tuan hendak bercakap berkenaan kelemahan Speaker.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Yes, Sir. But since the Chief Minister clarifies I have to clarify what he clarifies. (Ketawa). Sir, as I was saying before the Chief Minister clarified himself, one of these little doubts that we have about the stability of the Speaker is illustrated by his decision one day in this House. And that was in the, as I had referred to

earlier, infamous Sitting of December, 1972. And in that Sitting I remember that, apart from shouting at the Member for Bagan Ajam, there was the occasion when the Honourable Member for Tanjong Bungah, during question time, raised an issue in connection with the theft or misappropriation of vaccine in connection with the outbreak of swine fever; and the Member was asking the Chief Minister to confirm a certain incident where an employee of the Veterinary Department, I think, was charged or apprehended by the Customs for having in his possession this vaccine. And when the question was pressed the Chief Minister (gangguan).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Pensil itu letak di bawah, jangan tunjuk dengan pensil.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Saya, tetapi tidak apa ini, ada sedikit habitlah.

Tuan Speaker, the Chief Minister pressed for the Member to substantiate. He said, "I want you to substantiate. Name the person. Give the Case number". Well, he is a more experienced man. Obviously he knows the tricks of the trade, and the "lubangs". Sir, I think that on questions like this, if a Member knows about something concerning the State, even though he cannot substantiate, he can ask a question with such and such a rider, or such a proposition. Well, he does not have to substantiate. But where the Chief Minister finds it difficult for him to answer he says "You substantiate. And if you do not substantiate you withdraw". I think all Members will remember that it was at that question time. Well, we may have different opinions as to whether the Chief Minister was right in challenging the Member to substantiate, or whether the Speaker was right in upholding that challenge. And we may have our differences, right or wrong, as to whether it will ever be substantiated at all. But where we cannot have a difference of opinion, Sir, is when the ruling is not equally applied to all Members. And in that particular Meeting itself the Chief Minister,

whether by way of a slip of the tongue or a fault of his mind, alleged that the Member for Ayer Itam was a Member who had been suspended by Parliament. Am I correct? He made that allegation—a very serious allegation—in the course of a debate requesting the House to adjourn to allow Members like the Member for Sungei Bakap and the Member for Tasek Glugor to go to Parliament because of coincidence of the Sitting of Parliament. And it was completely irrelevant by the Chief Minister. The Chief Minister made a completely groundless allegation that the Member for Ayer Itam had been suspended by Parliament. I do not take heed. Sir, we pressed for the Chief Minister to substantiate that allegation. What happened?

The Chief Minister sat, as he is sitting right now, in complete indifference. The Speaker never asked the Chief Minister to substantiate on such a serious personal allegation against an Honourable Member of the House. But here was an allegation without a name, about some civil servant who had taken vaccine from the Government. And he was asked to substantiate or withdraw. And here is a case of an Honourable Member who has been slandered, shall I say. And yet the Speaker did nothing to ask the Chief Minister to substantiate.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Because he is the Chief Minister.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Oh, I see. I forgot. Is that so? Is there anything in the Standing Orders to say that the Chief Minister need not substantiate anything he says? Is there anything there? Sir, what more proof do we need that there is one rule for the Opposition, and there is one rule for the Chief Minister himself.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Itu tidak ada kena-mengena dengan Tuan Speaker. Apa yang ada kena-mengena dengan Speaker itulah cakap. Kalau apa yang dicakap berkenaan masalah Chief Minister, saya rasa itu salah, berlainan dengan apa yang dimaksud ataupun Usul yang tuan bawa.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Itu, Tuan Speaker, ada hubungan. Sebab keputusan Tuan Speaker mesti adil, mesti di-aplikasikan kepada seluruh wakil di dalam sini. Tidak boleh satu wakil satu peraturan, lain wakil lain peraturan. Itu saya ingat tidak ada langsung di dalam Peraturan Mesyuarat kita. Dengan izin: Sir, therefore, that calls for an explanation. Can we keep on allowing this to happen in this House? First, as I said, Members being told to move around like musical chairs in this House. Members being called 'Stupid', 'Bodoh'. Members been slandered. And they have been suspended when there are no grounds for it. Is this something that we can allow to go on? No. It is very serious. As I said, the Speaker owes a certain responsibility to the Government; but not to the extent of lending a helping hand to the Government when they are in difficulties. And I say 'lending a helping hand to the Government when they are in difficulties'. Why do I say that? Sir, it is. I say—and if I am not wrong, if I were to go back to the decisions made by the former Speaker, the Alliance Speaker—that all rulings must apply equally.

Now, the Speaker of the House has got powers under the Standing Orders. And those powers in connection with questions, for example, are that it is the Speaker, and the Speaker alone, who decides whether a question is relevant or not. I think you agree. It is the Speaker, and the Speaker alone, who decides that he will rule whether a question is relevant or not. And if we read what has taken place under Tuan Haji Sulaiman I think we can see that he has always done that. He decides. I am not carrying a torch for the ex-Chief Minister of Penang, Wong Pow Nee; but I know that. And I challenge the Chief Minister to cite an instance where Tan Sri Wong Pow Nee, as the Chief Minister of Penang, through his lack of learning; being only a mere teacher—never became a Queen's Scholar; never became a doctor (ganggung).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Itu tidak ada kena-mengena dengan Usul ini. Saya rasa kalau tuan bercakap-cakap lain daripada yang tuan bawa Usul yang tidak kena-mengena dengan Usul saya akan cuba stop—saya akan cuba berhentikan tuan. Kita tidaklah mahu membuang masa Dewan ini kalau tuan bercakap yang tidak ada kena-mengena. Banyak kali saya beri amaran.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Yes, thank you. Tuan Speaker, I would like to explain that this has relevance because I am sure you want us to give an explanation. This is relevant because I am coming to the point that under Standing Orders whether a question is relevant or otherwise is the prerogative of the Speaker, I agree. But is that so in performance in this House? And I would refer to Order 25(3).

“Notwithstanding anything hereafter contained any Member to whom a question is addressed may, with the approval of the Speaker, refuse to answer such questions on the ground of public interest and such refusal cannot be debated or questioned.

Yes, under that Standing Order the Speaker has got powers to allow or disallow a question. Now, what do we find in this Assembly? In all the Sessions where we have had the privilege of questioning the Honourable the Chief Minister, whenever a question is asked that he cannot answer, or that he does not wish to answer, the Chief Minister himself says, “Tak sangkut”. And that is why I say some people want to wear two hats. They want to be Chief Minister; they want to be Speaker. That decision whether it has relevance or has no relevance is up to the Speaker to make. It is not for a member to just say, “Tak sangkut” and then sit down. He refuses to answer. We have had more than ample illustrations of the Chief Minister refusing to answer on the mere pretext “Tak sangkut”. Sometimes even in fact not because it “Tak sangkut”, but because sometimes when the Opposition Members ask in Malay he does not understand the question in Malay itself. He says “Tak sangkut”. That is a fact. And the Speaker allowed

it. That is the most beautiful part. And if the Chief Minister says “Tak sangkut” he will say “Tak sangkut”. What is the point of having a Speaker at all?

And coming back on the question of consistency of Sittings, I am sad to say that perhaps for once this session we may have to change after today only; after they have cleared this Motion. For once we may come to an agreement as to the hours of sittings. But I am not afraid of contradiction when I say that the records will stand out that we have been holding Sittings in this House irregularly. Sometimes we sit up to three o'clock, sometimes we sit up to seven o'clock, sometimes we sit up to twelve o'clock, sometimes we sit up to ten o'clock. It is like a yo-yo. It is like a clock that is running with rain water inside. Why is it that the Speaker has never been able to hold in rein the time of these Sittings? It is a shame! And I say it is calculated to assist the Government. I give an illustration: In the last debate over the Water Enactment, when it was discovered that there were mistakes in the Enactment, all of a sudden the Speaker was nice to the House. He said “I think all the Members are very tired tonight; and I think we will close the session now”. That is what he did. It is in the records. Why? To give the Government time to go home and look up the Enactment, and clear all the mistakes, and bring out the mistakes. That was what it was done for. Everybody of sound mind could have seen that. Is it necessary? And that was even done without consultation.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Adakah tuan sedar bahawa Tuan Speaker datang dari Ahli parti yang sama?

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tuan Speaker, we on this side of the House cannot fathom a lot of things that happen here; but we can only see what is patently before us. And that is the manner in which the Speaker does things, which to us is highly erratic. And it looks like a robot which has gone out of control sometimes. The messages have gone in very peculiarly, and instructions are not carried out thoroughly. And we have

got other illustrations to prove this. It is all in the records. The Water Enactment is only one example.

Another example, Sir, was the famous—I call it famous this time because it can be given some fame—debate over the Governor's speech we have one year ago. Or shall we say the lack of debate in this part actually", where there was a sensational disclosure by the Member for Bagan Ajam who walked over; and all sorts of allegations made against the Chief Minister. And here we on the Opposition waiting for the chance to speak. And all of a sudden, before we could speak, the Chief Minister's Political Secretary jumps up. And although I think Encik Veerappen jumped up, I jumped up, and a few other Members also jumped up and caught the Speaker's eye. Although he was facing this way he could see that side. And he said, "Member for Butterworth". What is going on? In a debate on the Governor's speech every opportunity should be given to Members to say something. Because of the allegations made they were afraid it could be brought up. The Opposition was pushed aside. Debate over the Governor's speech: substantial replies were never given. Debate over the Budget: no debate at all. That is the distinction of the Government. And that is what the Speaker has allowed in this House is that something that we can tolerate? We certainly cannot tolerate this kind of things.

I raise another example of how the Speaker assists the Government unfairly because he always says "My decision is almighty". Where almighty? They don't even suspend you, apparently. And they don't even do a good suspension at that. I would say that if the Speaker were rough with us on this side because of the number of questions we ask we can understand. But where Members very frequently ask questions and press questions they should be given due consideration. But one day when the Member for Tasek Glugor was asking one question and supplementary question he was stopped.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Apa? Member Tasek Glugor tidak buat kerja.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): No. He was stopped.

Ahli Kawasan Tasek Glugor (Encik Mustapha bin Hussain): Saya ada bertanya soalan tambahan, tetapi Tuan Speaker tahan saya. Tetapi soalan itu dijawab oleh Yang Amat Berhormat.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): And what was the *tahanan*? That is the point. Sensitive. Right? Sensitive issue. What on earth is this? You have got the Sedition Act. If it is sensitive you can always call him in and have another Privy Council case. But there you are. He is asking a legitimate question on behalf of his constituents; and the Speaker rules "sensitive". Where? And without this debate we can never say anything about it. That is the beauty of it. But that is the sorrow of it. At least we kept that. Every Member, Sir, on this side of the House has suffered an injustice.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Jangan tunjuk macam itu.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Terima kasih. Every Member, Sir, in that event has suffered an injustice. Is it fair? I said "every Member"! Is this the way? We don't expect the Speaker to be a model of good behaviour himself. But let us be a bit fair at least. Nobody would just want to bring a debate like this. The Chief Minister was trying to imply in his reply to the earlier motion: Oh, I must ventilate my spite because I was suspended. I will go on to my suspension very, very soon. And we will discover how great this suspension was—how beautifully it was planned, and how badly it was carried out.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Saya ingat kalau tuan hendak bercakap yang itu satu perkara yang bagus bercakap, bercakap yang itu (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tuan Speaker ada banyak-banyak hal berkenaan dengan ini. Saya pun perlu—sahaja bercakap berkenaan dengan saya. Ini bukan antara saya dengan Speaker. Ini antara

pihak Pembangkang dengan Speaker. Kita, bukan saya, dalam Usul ini, tidak percaya kepada Speaker. Ini bukan itu. Kita tidak percaya.

Sir, let us go to another point—the question of a House Committee. Now, on the occasion, I think about 1½ years ago, because of one very late sitting we had where there were, as the Members on my left had said, many explosions, and show of bad temper because of very, very abrupt rulings by the Speaker we on this (*gangguan*).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Jangan tunjuk pensil itu kepada saya.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): side of the House refused to proceed with our Adjournment speeches because of the unfair rulings that night. And the Chief Minister—I do not know whether out of sincere goodwill, or just one of his acts; his favourite stratagems; or whether it was a moment of sincerity; God and the Chief Minister knows—said (*gangguan*).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Itu tidak ada kena-mengena.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Ada berkenaan. Saya akan datang. He asked me and said, “I think we should form a House Committee berkenaan Speaker”. So I said, “Excellent idea. Let us form a House Committee”. But, sorry to say, after that had been mentioned the Chief Minister forgot about it until I had to write him a personal letter. And when he spoke that night with me—and in front of reporters too—he said, “I think we have to form a House Committee”.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Itu tidak ada kena-mengena dengan soalan.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Ini ada kena. Tuan Speaker, sila bagi (*gangguan*).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Saya faham apa maksud. Sila duduk. Saya faham apa maksud Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Kawasan Kelawei iaitu Speaker ini telahpun di-influence oleh

pihak Kerajaan. Tetapi cuba memendekkan keterangan-keterangan yang menunjukkan Kerajaan telah mempengaruhi Speaker. Cakap masalah Speaker dahulu.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Ya, baik. Well, as a result the House Committee was formed. And I dare venture to say that from what the Chief Minister himself had indicated the House Committee was formed for the specific purpose of arranging Sittings and times of debate. And yet, when all the various sections, were represented what happened when the House Committee were subsequently formed? And in fact we are going to nominate new Members today. What happened? Oh! when the Meeting was held the Speaker said “Oh! this has nothing to do with Sittings and times. This is to make sure that the lavatory is working; that we have a sitting room: you get a telephone; and that’s about it. Nothing to do with the arrangements of Sittings and hours”. Now, what happened between the time the Chief Minister promised something and the time it was finally carried out? Something obviously happened. Where again can we trust the Speaker? One may say, Oh! that is a small matter? I do not know whether that is a small matter. But I think that is serious enough for this House to consider.

And now we come to that interesting issue of my suspension from participating in this House. Now, I am sorry to say that I do not agree with Members of the Government that I was suspended by the Speaker. No, no, Sir. I was not suspended by the Speaker. If you care to read your Standing Orders, I was suspended by the Honourable Members of the Government—by their sheer majority here, in spite of the Chief Minister’s generosity in abstaining from voting. He wants to be clean. He wants to be Nixon—I see no evil, I speak no evil, I hear no evil. He wants to be President Nixon of “Watergate”.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Itu tidak ada kena-mengena dengan Speaker itu—“Watergate”.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Kita pun ada 'Water-gate'".

Sir, I was not suspended by the Speaker because acting under Order 51 the suspension was not by the Speaker. It was by the Dewan. Let us be frank about it because the notes of the proceedings are there—by the Members of the Government. By sheer majority they hope to silence us. (*Ketawa*) Yes. Don't "huhhuh." You'll have your chance to reply, if you dare to reply. That is what was done—using your sheer parliamentary majority, you suspend a Member. That is your credit. That is your distinction in this House, for those who don't speak at all.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Saya ingat itu tidak kena-mengena langsung. Tuan boleh bercakap dalam masa ucapan terima kasih kepada Tuan Yang Terutama Gabnor. Tuan boleh bercakap berkenaan dengan itu. Tetapi ini tidak ada kena-mengena. Saya beri amaran yang kedua. Lagi sekali saya akan berhentikan tuan bercakap mengikut Standing Order 51 (4).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tuan Speaker, Dewan tidak berhak di atas Tuan Gabnor.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Boleh tuan sambungkan ucapan tuan itu dalam (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tuan Speaker, dalam ucapan Gabnor.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Ya. Dalam ucapan Gabnor masa kita bahas ucapan Tuan Gabnor. Tuan boleh bercakap itu.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Saya tidak cakap masa (*gangguan*).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: The way macam mana Government ini berjalan.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tuan Speaker, the Standing Order 51 invoked by the Speaker is not the Standing Order under which the Speaker acts. It is the Standing Order

on which the Government acts. If at all the Speaker acts he acts under Standing Order 51 (5) not 51 (1). 51 (1) is where he invites the House. And that is why I say it is not an accident. It was all planned. Why do I say it was planned? We shall get into that. And that is concerning the confidence of the Speaker. It had to do with what I was attempting to do on the day I was suspended. That is the issue. The Chief Minister said I was ventilating my spite. Sir, on that occasion I was trying to draw to the attention of the House that the time for the closure on questions had not come. That was what I was trying to do. I was not trying to cause any damage to the Chief Minister. And I say this is an injustice perpetrated by the Government; and by none other than the head of the Government. I hope he will be able to live through this. I hope he does not have a conscience, and is able to sleep soundly through this. Order 26, Rule (7), was what I was trying to direct to the attention of the House. When question time had gone through three hours the Speaker attempted to stop further questions. Now, if it is a question of the Speaker not being acquainted with Order 26, Rule (7), I say he has no business being a Speaker. After two Sessions if he does not know his Standing Orders then I say the House has no confidence in him, issues aside. A Speaker jolly well gets to know his Standing Orders. And all I was trying to do was to direct the House to Order 26, Rule (7) which says, "Oral questions shall be limited to a minimum of three hours for each sitting and no oral questions, other than any supplementary questions arising out of a question already asked which the Speaker may permit, shall be taken beyond this maximum time". So it is very clear from this Standing Order—three hours. And I hope we can remember this when we answer our questions at 12.00 o'clock tonight—that the Standing Orders provide that three hours is not the limit for questions. Let us get it very clear. It is the limit for original questions. Supplementary questions can go on for another five hours. And I was told by the Member for Bagan Ajam

that one day—what were the colourful phrases you used?—the Chief Minister screwed Wong Pow Nee for how many hours on some supplementary questions?

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Free-port status.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Oh, free-port status. So you can carry on with supplementary questions for hours after the initial three hours. That was all, Sir. And the records are here. I challenge the Members of the Government to produce the records. They are here. That was all I was citing. I was drawing attention, as any ordinary Member and any responsible Member of the House would have done, to the Chair; not to mislead the Chair. Not like the Honourable Member for Tanjong Selatan who has had vast experience in this House, and the Member from Bukit Mertajam who has been in the Local Council before. What I was doing was merely to tell the Speaker that the ruling was wrong. After three hours on that day there were further supplementary questions going on. He should allow supplementary questions to go on. It is not for the Speaker to sit there and look at the clock like a cat looking at a mouse, and pounce on him and say, "Three hours, finished". Sir, it is very clear. I will read it again: "Oral questions shall be limited to a maximum of three hours for each sitting and no other questions, other than any supplementary questions arising out of a question already asked which the Speaker may permit, shall be taken beyond this maximum time". It is crystal clear. Sir, on that basis of the incident the Speaker, so called, and the Honourable Members of the Government, using their majority—you can try it again today—suspended me. Is that justice? Search your hearts; search your conscience. I say that was deliberate. I say that was planned, because the Member for Bagan Ajam has time and again told me, "One of these days they are going to suspend you. They are waiting for it", while he was still a Government Member. That

was a friendly advice. Yes, this is not a laughing matter because we have the evidence from the Member for Bagan Ajam also that the Speaker has been attending Party Caucuses—Pre-Council Meetings of the Government. The Speaker of the House should not attend Pre-Council Meetings of the Government any more once he is elected. Why should he attend Pre-Council Meetings of the Government? To plan the strategy against the Opposition? I think it is a shame to this House; and I say it was planned. Why do I say it was planned?

The Chief Minister, Sir, is a man—I give him that credit, although he takes it and does not get rolled over by it—who knows the Standing Orders pretty well. He is very experienced, and has been here long enough. We have made a study of what he has done here; and we have avoided his mistakes. He knows his Standing Orders, Sir. But on that day the Chief Minister, who is normally very sharp stood up in objection to what I was saying on the point of Order 15 (1). 15 (1) is Order of Business of the day. Of course he had no right to object to me. And that was why I objected to his interruption. Sir, was it a slip of the tongue that the Chief Minister quoted the wrong Standing Order? Or was it a signal? As some would say, the reverse of 51 is 15? Let us look at it.

Ketua Menteri: 'Ang-kong-jee' (*Ketawa*).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): That will be your 'ang-kong-jee'. Don't you worry. What is the reverse of 15? 51. A Member shows disregard for the authority of the Chair. Suspension Sir. Was it a signal to some loyal, faithful—and the words used—running dog? I don't like the word, but it is used. Don't look at me. The Member for Nibong Tebal used it. It is a bad word. I don't like to use it. But it was used anyway—a signal to the Member to stand up and be a hero and say, "I move under Order 51." The Member continually disregards the authority of the Chair. Have him suspended".

Sir, to betray comrades once is one thing; but to betray twice in the Assembly is another. History will condemn you. Sir, that is done. The Chief Minister who is so experienced can quote the wrong Standing Order; and thereafter Sir, succeeded in moving a Motion to have me suspended. I say that under that Order it is a suspension by the Members of the Government. I am not particularly concerned because we know the majority in this House has naked powers, as the Chief Minister once said. But not-so-naked powers now. The only Order the Speaker can act under is 51 (5): "The Speaker may order Members whose conduct is grossly disorderly to withdraw immediately from the Assembly Chamber during the remainder of the day's sitting". That is all the power the Speaker has—during the remainder of the day's sitting. Tomorrow you are back again. But why did they use that drastic step? We have the Privileges Committee. If a Member is unruly in any breach of the privileges you can refer him to the Privileges Committee. Why was that step not taken? They wanted to push through that Budget without debate. And I say that the Speaker collaborated with the Government, and carried out this injustice; this blot among other blots to come on the reputation of the leaders of the Government. Sir, whatever differences we have politically, let us conduct ourselves in fairness, and in accordance with the Standing Orders here. And let us be proud of what we do here in keeping to the Standing Orders, merely advocating one thing or another. That is our difference. But let us be fair to ourselves and to each other. I do not think a man with a conscience can look back on December, 1972, with pride. I was not suspended by the Speaker, Sir. The Speaker was merely an instrument carrying out the wishes and the plans of the Government which had already made up its mind to suspend me. And that was why before the session started somebody remarked that it would be a quick session this time.

Sir, I would further go on to prove why I say the Speaker does not warrant our confidence, because in the very

Motion of no confidence itself a mistake was made. It is so ridiculous. But we do not suffer fools easily. I do not say "fools here". But we do not suffer easily. And we are not prepared to remain here (*gangguan*).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Jangan tumbuk meja.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Sorry at tolerance because we remain here, because of a mandate to represent the people. We do not come here on your auspices.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S.P. Chelliah): So are we.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Not for long.

Sir, the Speaker, and the Honourable Member for Sungei Pinang who likes to talk a lot, does not even know how to suspend a Member under Order 51.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S.P. Chelliah): But you were suspended.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): He does not know how to suspend a Member under Order 51. Sir. And for the first time we have only ten pages of Minutes. And I think the Minutes are more voluminous than the Proceedings, Sir. And you allowed the wonderful suspension. It is a wonderful suspension. If you want to suspend a Member who is unruly, disrupting the House, and disobeying the ruling of the Chair, you suspend him with due effect. Do you catch my meaning? But what do they do? These wonderful people of the Government—16 Members; What do they know? They do not even read the Water Enactment; but they claim to have suspended me. May I read from the Minutes, page 5: "The Member for Kelawei"—and this is a proposal by the Member for Sungei Pinang, the "Viet Nuar" (?) of the Speaker, if you understand what the meaning of the word is.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S. P. Chelliah): I am not a lawyer "buruk".

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): You don't have to be lawyer to know the words "Veit Nuar".

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Saya ingat perkataan itu tak usah disebut. Saya ingat perkataan itu tak usah pakai. Tarik balik perkataan itu.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): O.K., I will take back the words "Viet Nuar" if it is not suitable.

Sir, what does it say here? The Motion is a beautiful one. The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr S. P. Chelliah) moved the Motion—of course, he feels very proud about it—seconded by the Member for Tanjong Selatan who is well known for misleading the Chair, "That the Honourable Member for Kawasan Kelawei be suspended from the service of the Assembly for two days because he has shown total disregard to the Chair" And a vote is taken. And what is the decision made? It is very beautiful: "The Member for Kelawei is suspended from the service of the Assembly on 5th and 6th December, 1972". Sir, the suspension was made on the 4th December, 1972. If a Member is really disrupting the order of the House you suspend him with immediate effect—the 4th also. But you suspended him on the 5th and 6th. So he can go on disrupting the House on the 4th till mid-night! Is that what you do? (*Ketawa*).

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S. P. Chelliah): But you didn't do that. You went out.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Wait-lah. If I may quote, your matter is a in the face of such a show of naked power. We must teach them the consequences. Sir, do you know how to suspend a Member? Suspend with immediate effect. But they suspend on the 5th and 6th, so you can conduct yourself in your own manner on the 4th, intended for the 5th and the 6th. Or was it actually intended, because you wanted to get rid of a Member so that the debate over the Budget would not take place. And thus you had a smooth passing of your Budget.

You want a full passing of the Budget. Have it with our compliments. And you have the distinction of a Budget passed without debate, because we are not going to remain here at sufferance. And as a protest we walked out on the 4th. You did not kick me out on the 4th; only on the 5th and 6th. So get your facts clear. If you want to suspend the next time do it properly. And I say, Sir, the Speaker lent his office to this.

Why do we move an unprecedented Motion against the Speaker? Because of the type of things that go on here. We cannot tolerate that. What is a democracy by having a divided democracy? We cannot tolerate that. We are prepared to go behind bars; but we are not prepared to subject ourselves to the whims and fancies of a manipulated figure. So that in itself is an infamous chapter that is closed, Sir. But let us reflect, because the D.A.P. and I myself personally threatened, and I said I was to move a Motion of no confidence in the Speaker; and we have moved it. You cannot all revalue anything here more really than life. We value our word. We promised to move, and we moved. You can take that as a kind of principle. And, Sir, that is not all. We moved, Sir, because we were forced to move; because the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap was also forced in the June Session of 1972 to threaten in this very House, Sir, in view of the conduct of the Speaker in terminating the debate on the Budget, if I am not mistaken, that he himself would move a Motion of no confidence. So therefore, Sir, it is not myself. It is not a vendetta which the Chief Minister is trying to say I am carrying out. I have no vendetta. I have no axe to grind. But I have my day in Court, let us say, with the Members of the Government who manipulate the Speaker.

When the Member for Sungei Bakap moved a Motion of no confidence, what was the reaction of the Speaker to that? He came back and threatened the Members, "I will not tolerate threats of any nature. Maybe I will take strong action". That is what he said. It is in the records again. Now, Sir, the Member for Sungei Bakap going back

thought: Well, the Speaker is a Speaker. We will be generous. We on this side of the House did not press the issue because, well, to err is human. We are prepared to overlook even that. But we cannot allow it to go on unchecked. One Member had threatened a Motion of no confidence against the Speaker. We are not going to make empty threats in this House. We are going to make threats, and we are going to carry them out. And that is why we are here to debate. But, Sir, a threat that had been made by an Honourable Member should not be taken lightly. And even if the Speaker, for his name, for his face, must react violently let him react violently; and subsequently sober down, with or without the "tua".

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: What did you say?

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tua. Old age maybe. He may be old.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Saya ingat tuak. Todikah? Apakah? (*Keta-wa*).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Maybe old age. But, Sir, can we attribute it to that? Can we? Once a threat has been made, after an initial fire, if I am angry at the moment, I will cool down. The Chief Minister was angry. He cooled down. He has experience. But I mean that when people are manipulated they go out of focus. We have not gone to that technological age where go-karts react like human beings. But, Sir, we have a situation here where the Speaker was completely indifferent to the threat. And what was the outcome of that? Suspension. After the Member had threatened I was suspended. So the Speaker was going further, after we had given due notice, in a sense orally, let us say, that we would move a Motion of no confidence. I am not saying that he should bow to threats. But he must show himself up more reasonably; more sensitive to the interests of the Opposition. No, no, no. Some people are beyond reformation. What happens, Sir, when you do that?

Sir, we in this House have submitted questions for this Assembly. And on this side of the House we have submitted questions for approval by the Honourable the absentee Speaker. And what does he do with these questions, Sir? Now, if we accept for a moment that the Government does not manipulate the Speaker then I say that something is inherently wrong with the Speaker, or he must be changed. Why? We submitted questions to the Honourable Chief Minister. And I have to take my example, Sir. I submitted 34 oral questions, and 16 questions for written answers—a total of 50 questions. Do you know what the Honourable the absentee Speaker has done to those questions? I haven't got the latest list. He purports to amend the Standing Orders by himself. That is the beautiful part again. What does he do, Sir? Out of my 34 questions—if you will bear with me while I find it—he cut out 21 questions out of my 34. Now, I will be the first to admit that I am not perfect. I may infringe Standing Orders here and there. And when one or two questions he cuts out I give the benefit of the doubt to the Speaker. But, Sir if 21 questions are cut out, what benefit of the doubt could I get, Tuan Speaker? The Member for Balik Pulau submitted 10 questions. Six questions were cut out, if I am not wrong—kalau saya tidak silap. Ten questions—sepuluh soalan.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Tidak payah tanya.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Apa yang saya cakap mesti didengar.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Do you know what you mean by, "Apa yang dicakap mesti didengar?" Mana boleh, apa yang dicakap mesti didengar? Tidak boleh.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Saya mesti, or shall we say dapat syak dari orang?

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Lagi salah.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Salah tidak apa. Balik M.C.E.—lah. Itu sahajalah. Ribu-ribu orang pun sudah salah.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Lagi salah.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tuan Speaker, thank you for your asides. At least they make things interesting in this House, while the former Speaker can only say “ulang-ulang”.

But if 13 questions were left out of 34, Sir, can we give the benefit of the doubt to the Speaker? That is not good enough. I protested, Sir; and I wrote him a letter on behalf of the Members of the Opposition. And I would like to read this letter dated the 12th of May:

“Tuan Yang Dipertua, Dewan Undangan, Pulau Pinang. Sir, several Members of the Opposition have been greatly disturbed by your arbitrary rejection of a large number of questions submitted for the coming session of the Legislative Assembly. This rejection has not been explained, and are not in line with precedents and the Standing Orders of the House. I am therefore obliged to lodge a very strong protest against this action which is calculated to have an effect on the dignity and impartiality of the office of the Speaker. I shall be obliged if I could have a meeting to discuss the matter early, to avoid a serious situation arising.”

And, Sir, what was the response to this letter? The response is the usual response you get from the Government. It went into the waste-paper basket; and no useful reference made. No sensible reply ever came out of it. And what was the response to it? That is the important thing. The response, not by way of a reply, Sir, was another letter to me and to the Members of the Dewan, sent by special despatch on a Sunday. I think that is where the Government is efficient. When they want to cut questions out they even work on Sundays. But that was a personal letter to me. I have it here now. That was a general letter to Members of the Assembly saying that—I would like to read this beautiful letter which was written by the Clerk of Council, no

doubt dictated by the Honourable Speaker, and no doubt dictated by somebody else:

“Saya diarah merujuk kepada Susunan Mesyuarat bagi mesyuarat pada 21hb Mei, 1973, dan memaklumkan bahawa Soalan-soalan Mulut Bil. 1, 2, dan 3, di bawah nama Y.B. Encik Yeap Ghim Guan (muka 5 dalam naskah Bahasa Malaysia dan juga Bahasa Inggeris) telah ditolak oleh Y.B. Tuan Speaker pada mulanya.”—

“pada mulanya”. And it was already yielded for the paper, he said; “pada mulanya”. What nonsense. Then he said,

“Tetapi disebabkan kesilapan, soalan-soalan tersebut dimasukkan ke dalam Susunan Urusan Mesyuarat. Oleh itu, soalan-soalan ini hendaklah dipotong dari Susunan Urusan Mesyuarat dan Soalan-soalan Mulut Bil, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 dan 13 dinomborkan semula menjadi soalan-soalan Bil. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.”

Sir, after a protest you hit back. You cut more questions. Is that it? And I want to know: How does a Speaker, after having served notices of the Orders of the Day, by himself amend the Order Paper? How does he amend the Order Paper which has been set and served. And you send letters to Honourable Members saying “Sila ganti muka lima dalam naskah bahasa Inggeris dengan muka lima yang baru ini” He must be kidding. You are playing masak-masak with the Assembly? You cannot just put in a piece of paper and take it out. If you can, Sir, and you make mistakes in your Bill, you substitute on another printed form. You cannot do that. You have to move a Motion to amend the Order Paper; even to cancel the Order Paper. But that is not done, Sir. This is why I say we have no confidence in the Speaker. These are the actual overt acts which we can see with our eyes. And what are the questions? You would find it interesting to know that out of so many written questions that were submitted by me, 16 written questions—I took the trouble to write them—six were thrown out, and ten were approved. Have I got a complaint that my questions alone had been thrown out? The Member for Bagan Ajam also, I think, had half his questions thrown out. If I am not

mistaken, half his questions were thrown out. The Member for Jelutong also had nearly half his questions thrown out. What, Sir, is this all about? Is this an accident, or was it a deliberately planned rejection of questions so that you do not have to answer questions? Why is it that even today, Sir, the Government is allowed by the absentee Speaker to deal with questions before the speech of the Governor? Now, taking this Motion aside, I say the speech and the Motion of thanks to the Governor should take precedence over all other work, except if the Honourable Chief Minister so feels. Sir, why? Because we have precedence here, Sir. In the previous Sittings the Chief Minister had given answers to the written and oral questions before the debate on the Governor's speech. And yet now he wants to advance the Motion so that questions are not asked, and glaring queries and remarks are not made in a Motion of this type. Is that it? What is the reason? But, Sir, rejection of a number of questions is itself quite insignificant if we do not see what the questions are all about. And I say that the Chief Minister and the Government have more than once utilised the office of the Speaker to obstruct the Opposition from asking several questions. And even questions by you in the last Sitting, before you joined the Government benches, about the Government activities. And I give an example, Sir.

The absentee Speaker has time and again, from the time he started, but rather unsurely, refused to allow questions which are put about Penang Electronics. And what is his ruling on that, Sir? He says Penang Electronics is a *Sendirian Berhad*. This is very relevant to his status, and the confidence we have in him. How can he make such a ruling? I say "*Sendirian Berhad*" only means that a Company is established under the Companies Act, with certain privileges that a public Company does not enjoy—certain privileges about its Accounts, and certain conditions it does not have to meet. But other than that there is no reason why questions cannot be asked about Penang Electronics. And that is the main

contention about the failure of the Government in fact. Thousands of dollars have been lost in Penang Electronics; and this is a cover-up. And that is why it says "Watergate". This is a cover-up, Sir. And I challenge the Chief Minister, and I challenge any Member from the Government responsible for the P.D.C. to deny that Penang Electronics (*gangguan*).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Itu P.D.C. tidak masuk dalam Usul itu. Tuan boleh cakap dalam (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Well, Tuan Speaker, I am trying to explain why I say the Speaker is wrong in approving all these questions. If you will bear with me, now I say, Sir, that out of the total number of shares only one share is not held by P.D.C. in the Penang Electronics. And that one share is held by Intan Utara, a Company incorporated by the Gerakan Members. Fortunately, two Gerakan members from the State of Kedah; one, Ong Boon Seong. One share. That was the only share that was held by the Company which is not under Government control.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Itu tidak kena-mengena.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tuan Speaker, itu saya mesti terangkan. Dengan asas itu, Tuan Speaker tidak benarkan soalan itu. Dengan izin: He said he would not allow questions to be asked because it is a private Company. Is it a private Company? Even on the basis of a private Company, can't we ask? The money of P.D.C. which is the money of this State—P.D.C. is under this State—is invested in Penang Electronics; and yet we are not allowed to ask questions about its Accounts. Sir, in Parliament the Alliance Government, for all that is said about it, answers about Malaya-wata, PERNAS, Bernama, and so on. Malayawata is at least 40% owned by the private sector. And yet he refused to answer about Penang Electronics. It does not deter us. And this is an important thing, Sir. And I think that it

was a challenge from the Government. Sir, we in this House should be privileged people. And yet the money of this House has been allocated by Members here, and spent on Penang Electronics, but we are not allowed to ask a single questions about Penang Electronics. Now every single question has been eliminated. And previously any question that was of any value, that would expose the Government was deleted; and only irrelevant questions were allowed about Penang Electronics. And I will show you, Sir, the claim is so ridiculous. On a payment of a fee, Sir, we can get certified copies of the Accounts of Penang Electronics. And we in this State allocate millions of dollars for Penang Electronics. And we can't get a statement from the Chief Minister. But we pay, Sir. We can find, issued by the Companies Registrar—and it is stated here—that only one share is not held by P.D.C. Have a look. We pay for it. But you will not tender these Accounts in this House. You will not answer about this in this House. How? The former Speaker would have asked the Government to answer. But here the Speaker acts as a barrier.

It is not a vendetta that we have against the Speaker. It all goes against the whole system of democracy in this State. This is an abuse that the heavens cry out for justice. We are not elected here just to be a rubber stamp. We are entitled to ask about Penang Electronics. The man in the street can send a letter to the Registrar of Companies and get at least these facts about Penang Electronics—how many shares; what is the Balance Sheet; who are the Directors—like the Honourable Member for Tanjong Tengah, the Secretary, while an Ex. Co. member—of Penang Electronics. So, are we not justified in saying that we have no confidence in a Speaker who perpetually obstructs us in our examination of Government affairs and finances? We are highly justified, all because of one share, and one pretext that it is a private Company. And everybody ought to know that the fact that it is a private Company means nothing. The Penasihat is there to tell

you. You can still give the information. The Federal Government gives information about Malayawata because the Federal Government has got an investment in Malayawata. But you refuse. Why? Because it is a failure. And that is why these questions have been eliminated. One of the oral questions eliminated: "Will the Chief Minister confirm that Penang Electronics has ceased functioning at its factory at Bayan Lepas?" Will you confirm? Are you afraid to confirm? Why do you hide behind the sarong of the Speaker? "Will the Chief Minister confirm the losses sustained by Penang Electronics, 1970, 1971, 1972, with breakdown figures?" These have been rejected. But I have already said that questions have been allowed about Penang Electronics, strangely enough. On previous Sittings questions on Penang Electronics have been allowed. But I say insignificant questions which the Chief Minister feels that he is prepared to answer for face value.

I am afraid that I may take some time to draw out each particular question. But I assure the House—and the Members have got the records—that questions have been allowed by the Speaker. And I ask the Chief Minister to search his conscience, and let us know whether questions have been allowed, and whether he has actually answered some questions. He will not answer financial questions—questions that will reveal that Penang Electronics is losing money; questions that will reveal that funds of Penang Electronics have been misused, and channelled in wrong matters; and Accounts are not in order actually. There is a statement here to say that full Accounts have not been rendered for the first year's trading. Is that not bad enough—refusing to answer questions? And the House should have notice of proceedings that have gone on in other legislatures prior to hours where the Speaker of the house even allowed questions to be asked about Federal matters. Yes, federal matters. And our Standing Orders, Sir, allow questions about Federal matters, let me say. They

allow questions about Federal matters. The Chief Minister nor the Speaker cannot hide behind each other's sarongs. It says—Order 25 (5)—

“Where the question asked refers to a matter which, by virtue of the Constitution of the Federation of Malaya, is under the control of the Federal Government or any department thereof, the Speaker may, in his discretion,” I agree—‘discretion’.

And a man must learn how to exercise discretion if he is going to be a Speaker, and have the confidence of the House—“the House” meaning the Opposition also.

“ . . . in his discretion, either (a) refuse to allow such a question, or (b) if in his opinion the question concerns a matter of predominant local interest”

Local interest! If we ask about Selangor we are looking for trouble. That is fair.

“ local interest direct that the question be referred to the Federal Government and the answer thereto tabled at a subsequent meeting;”

It is there—Order 25. But, Sir, that has been done. I am not asking for precedence to be set, and unusual things to be done. Oh, no. We are quite happy if small blessings are bestowed upon us.

And let us learn something from people who have gone before us, whether they are Queen's Scholars or otherwise. Some Queen's Scholars don't make it, you know, one way or the other.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: “Queen's Scholar” tidak ada kena-mengena dengan Usul. (*ketawa*).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Alright. I withdraw that if you find it distasteful. It doesn't matter. But I am just giving an illustration, Sir.

Now, the question that was asked by the former Member for Kota was beautiful—part of it. He asked the question. Sir, I am quoting, with your permission, the Legislative Assembly Report—Third Sitting of the Fifth Session, Wednesday, 27th November,

1968. And what did he say, Sir? Written question at page 197:

“Chief Minister:

Tuan Speaker, jawapan-jawapan kepada soalan-soalan yang telah dikemukakan adalah dibentangkan di atas meja Dewan.”

Usual thing. Nothing wrong with that. Now, here comes the brilliant chap:

“Member for Kota (Dr Lim Chong Eu) asks the Chief Minister:

Will the Honourable the Chief Minister kindly inform this House what is the length of the present runway at Bayan Lepas Airport?”

Statistical question, he asked. I think if we really look at the Standing Orders some of these questions also cannot be asked. But never mind. He is an experienced man.

“What is the length of the runway which will be capable of serving one of the jumbo jets?”

You know, the Chief Minister of Penang is supposed to be a scientist. He should know these answers. But never mind, Sir. If we are in the cut and thrust, as the Chief Minister says, we must give and take. So, he got everything he wanted, you know, when he was there at that time. He took it. And what was the reply—the beautiful part? You know, as I said, the Honourable Tan Sri Wong Pow Nee: I carry no torch for him, you know. But I am willing to respect him for what he did. The record stands. What did Tan Sri Wong Pow Nee, your colleague, Sir (*gangguan*).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Itu tidak ada kena-mengena.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Ada kena (*Ketawa*). Ini kena sebab Speaker tidak benarkan soalan, tetapi lain Speaker benarkan. Ini precedent. Ini Standing Order 25 (5).

On the same page:

“Chief Minister:

These questions have been referred to the Federal Government. When answers are received they will be tabled in accordance with Standing Order 25 (5) (b).”

Here you have a Chief Minister who gave the answer. He did not dodge.

He is not an artful dodger. He gave the answer. But do we ever have this in this House? And, Sir, what does the Standing Order say? “. a matter of predominant local interest” The Airport, I agree with the Chief Minister when he was over here, is of interest to the people of Penang. And what has happened to our questions when we ask about this kind of thing? They have been cut out. And I will come to something else later.

I will show you this: “Will the Penang Island/Province Wellesley linkage project be implemented by 1974?” That was promised under their Manifesto. But what is the reply from the Honourable the Speaker to that question that has been rejected? What was his reply, if you would bear with me? Ah, a beautiful reply. Beautiful on all fours with my argument. My question is No. 7, Sir. And No. 7 is one of the questions that were rejected for this reason. And I read the letter from the Honourable the absentee Speaker dated 12th of May, 1973. He said—and I will read the top part first. And of course I must add here that it is written by the Clerk of Council; obviously the Clerk of Council writing on behalf of the Speaker. We understand that. We do not blame the Clerk of Council—

“Tuan saya diarah merujuk kepada surat tuan bertarikh 5.5.73 dan memaklumkan kepada tuan bahawa Yang Berhormat Tuan Speaker telah meluluskan semua soalan-soalan mulut dan bertulis dalam surat tuan kecuali”—except “yang berikut:”

The Speaker has approved all your questions except the following. What is the following? I will just quote the one I am asking about at the moment. Those that are not approved, and the reasons: 7, 23, 27. Let us look at 7—I have already mentioned: “Will the Penang Island/Province Wellesley linkage project be implemented by 1974?”

“23. What is holding up implementation of the free port zone—typing error—free trade zone”. He understood the question; never mind.

And another one: “27. Has the Federal Government indicated one way

or other with regard to Penang free port status? Has a time schedule been set for total abolition?”

Ini 3 soalan. Saya mengaku ada sangkut sedikit dengan Kerajaan Pusat, tetapi banyak bersangkutan dengan Kerajaan Negeri. Sebab apa? Sebab dalam Manifesto Kerajaan Gerakan ada ditimbulkan free port, free trade zone, bridge (titi). Ada. Kalau tidak ada mengapa Ketua Menteri sebagai Ketua Gerakan pada masa itu masuk ini dalam Manifesto dan cakap kepada rakyat Pulau Pinang: “Saya mahu buat ini-itu.” Bohongkah? Saya ingat Ketua Menteri bukan orang yang bohong. Dia tidak bohong. (*Ketawa*). Ya, benar. Apa dia cakap dia tahu. Dia ada tanggungjawab. Apa itu?

Bila kita mahu soal dalam Dewan ini berkenaan dengan hal ini, apa sebab dibuat oleh Tuan Speaker. Saya mahu baca: “Soalan mulut”—berkata “7, 23, 28 telah ditolak.” “Telah ditolak”—has been rejected “oleh sebab soalan-soalan ini”—because these questions—“adalah berkaitan dengan sesuatu perkara yang perkara itu di bawah kawalan Kerajaan Pusat.” Peraturan Mesyuarat 25 (5) (a). Saya tengok ini baik. Can refuse to allow such questions. Tetapi ada (b). Dia tidak boleh baca lagikah? Kalau dia ada asas mahu jalan dalam (b) atau (a)—If in his opinion the question concerns the matter of predominant local interest.

Titi? Tidak ada berkenaan dengan Pulau Pinang? Tidak? Free port—taraf pelabuhan bebas tidak ada berkenaan dengan Pulau Pinang. Dalam career, saya minta maaf, dalam career Ketua Menteri, di sini sebagai pihak Pembangkang, modal dia sahaja free port—hari-hari kita boleh baca Berita Harian. Tetapi sekarang dia kata “tidak boleh”. Apa ini? Ada ini keadilan? Tidak sangkut dengan free trade zone-kah? Tadi, dalam titah ucapan Gabnor apa itu?—Governor address. Baru dia timbul free port status. Tidak timbul tidak apa. Free trade zone ada di sini. Tidak sangkut? Tetapi sekarang Kerajaan Ketua Menteri langsung tidak mahu jawab soalan ini. Apa sebab? Apa sebab dahulu dalam Dewan inipun ada jawab. Tetapi sekarang tidak mahu jawab, Apa

sebab? Kita rakyat Pulau Pinang mahu tahu. Kita mesti dapat satu keterangan. Apa ini? Kita, di sini, mainkah? Main bolasepak. Saya kata main bolasepak apa sebab. Sebab apa?

Ada satu hari di sinipun, ini satu aside, bercakap. Satu misal, satu contoh sahaja, contoh kecil di dalam Dewan ini, mesyuarat tadi. Dia kata, "Saya mahu cadang satu pindaan ke atas satu rang undang-undang untuk dibahaskan di sini". Di masa itu saya sungguh silap. Saya ingat saya tulis "9", bila saya ingat mahu tulis "3" atau *vice-versa*. Masa itu, Tuan Speaker kata, "Oh! Saya tolak pindaan ini, saya tolak. Saya tidak terima fasal awak sudah silap." Dalam Bahasa Inggeris barangkali saya sudah tulis "9" dan dalam Bahasa Kebangsaan saya tulis "3". Saya sudah silap, saya mengaku. Dia kata dia tolak. Baik. Kalau keputusan itu saya tidak boleh lawan, saya terima. Tetapi dalam rekod, dalam lapuran Dewan kita boleh baca. Saya minta lagi, Tuan Speaker. Sebab itu bolehkah bagi balik pindaan saya? Itu kertas saya, hak saya. Sebab saya bagi kertas, bagi balik kalau tolak pindaan itu. Tidak apa bagi balik kertas. Apa dia kata, "Oh! Tidak boleh. Saya tidak boleh bagi balik". Kertas saya, kalau tidak terima pindaan bagi saya. Itupun dia tidak mahu bagi balik. Hari itu saya sudah kata ini main-main. Sebab apa dia mahu itu sebab dia takut saya terima balik saya ubah, taruh balik. Ini tidak sesuai buat. Kita mahu jaga taraf Speaker. Itu tak usah buat. Saya ada mata boleh tengok. Itu saya cakap sebagai satu contoh. Dia kata, "Sebagai lawyer, awak mesti tahu 3 dengan 9. Tetapi bila Kerajaan buat kesilapan dalam 140 kesilapan dalam Enakmen Bekalan Air. Oh! Itu tidak besar. Inikah keadilan? Sebab itu, saya fikir, kita dalam Dewan ini buat macam ini. Kita mesti jaga nama Speaker. Kita mesti jaga nama Speaker. Tetapi, Speaker, dahulu masing-masing menjaga nama sendiri.

Dengan kebenaran, Sir, that kind of activity—rejection of our questions—if it is based on sound reasoning we are quite prepared to accept. We are gentlemen. We can take a lot of things.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Do you have any answer?

Ahli Kawasan Kelawej (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Yes, I have.

If we can take suspension we can take a lot of things. Sir. But we cannot take one thing, Sir. Injustice, we cannot take. And we read, Sir, what are the reasons he gives for rejecting my question, again, Tuan Speaker (*gangguan*).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: I, think, yang itu berkenaan dengan soalan-soalan itu sudah terang. Kalau ada lain-lain masalah boleh kemukakan.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawej (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tuan Speaker, saya mesti bagi keadilan ke atas Tuan Speaker yang tidak hazir di sini. Saya tidak boleh sahaja buat tentang itu, saya harapkan kalau saya kata dia sudah tolak soalan saya dengan tidak ada asas, saya mesti bagi contoh-contoh satu persatu—sebab contoh satu persatu, diapun ada bagi sebab satu persatu. Saya mesti beri dia tahu. Sebab dia ada banyak sebab di atas tolak soalan saya.

Dengan izin, Sir: I have said earlier that he rejected the questions on the basis that these are personal matters, he says. And I say that the Constitution of this land is supreme. We are not going to allow people to do as they like. On the rejection of my question on Penang Electronics—do not take my word for it—the reasons he gave are wrong. He has in his own letter said: "Number 1 question—ditolak telah ditolak oleh sebab soalan ini ada berkaitan dengan hal ehwal satu Syarikat bersendirian."—a private Company of which the Government has got 99.9% shares inside—"Dan dengan demikianlah tidak termasuk dalam bidang kuasa." Sir, if he would care, and if he respects himself and the Chair, he would not do such a thing. This is too open.

Another question that he rejected, Sir—a very interesting question: I asked the Question Number 5: As Officer Administering the Local Authorities, how many times did the Honourable

Chief Minister visit each Local Authority in 1973, giving a breakdown. Sir, a question substantially similar in essence to my question was asked by none other than the Ketua Menteri when he was here. He asked it when Wong Pow Nee took over the City Council. He asked how many times Wong Pow Nee visited each Authority. If you do not visit them you are not efficient: that sort of thing. We are asking him how many times he went. And what is the outcome of that? What does the Speaker say about that question? We want justice here. We do not want privileges.

Soalan 5 dan yang lain telah ditolak oleh sebab soalan-soalan ini adalah berkaitan dengan perkara-perkara yang berada di bawah kawalan Majlis-majlis Tempatan dan dengan demikianlah tidak termasuk dalam bidang kuasa 24 (a). Sekarang go back to 24 (a)—“Questions may be put to the Chief Minister relating to—(a) all affairs of State with which the Chief Minister is officially connected;”

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Not the same one.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): That is the Standing Order. Is the Chief Minister not the Officer Administering the Council now?

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Not the same Chief Minister.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Not officially. (*Ketawa*).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Oh, I beg to defer. You are being too kind. Precisely—officially.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Jangan ketuk macam itu.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Ada serangga.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): It's a private property.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Saya minta tolong kawal Majlis ini. Jangan jadi market.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tuan Speaker, tadipun kawan kita di sebelah sini bercakap kalau orangpun marah mesti harap bagi itu, tetapi kita mesti bacalah dalam *Gazette* Notification, Sir, issued by the Chief Minister himself.

Pada 28hb Disember, 1972, baru-baru sahaja di masa dia ambil balik kuasa Majlis Tempatan daripada kawannya, Timbalan Ketua Menteri. Apa asas kita pun tidak tahu, barangkali ada kerja dan asas, tetapi kita baca Municipal Ordinance. Ini, dia jalan, di atas Municipal Ordinance kita—itu siapa buat dahulu?—Wong Pow Nee buat. Sekarang dia dapat kerja dari Wong Pow Neekah?

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Itu tidak kena-mengena dengan Wong Pow Nee dengan Usul ini. Saya minta tarik balik dan jangan sebut lain kali dengan perkataan Wong Pow Nee.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tuan Speaker, saya terima kasih, tetapi saya bukan marah Wong Pow Nee. Saya kata Wong Pow Nee baik.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Lain kali saya minta jangan sebut Wong Pow Nee.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Baik, tetapi dalam context boleh saya ingat.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Boleh sebut Ketua Menteri dahulu.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Ya, baik. Tetapi saya takut orang sudah lupa namanya. Dia sudah hilang banyak tahun.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Saya tidak mahu argument lagi dalam masalah ruling saya.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Terima kasih, tuan.

Mr Speaker, Sir, let us abide by the rules. Fair enough. Let us abide by the laws. The former Government, in an attempt to take over the City Council which was then controlled by the

Socialist Front, used underhand strategy. I must say in passing. But that was an era before us. Under an amendment, 398B, it gives certain powers to the State Government to take over the City Council, and thereby giving wide powers to take over other Local Councils. So, dalam Municipal Ordinance di bawah Seksyen 398B (1), kita mahu tahu, tuan, apa Ketua Menteri, Doktor Lim Chong Eu sudah buat. Apa ia boleh bagi? Maka oleh yang demikian, saya baca sahaja paragraph yang bersangkutan, pihak yang berkuasa Negeri pada menjalankan kuasa-kuasa yang diberi oleh Seksyen-kecil 1 Seksyen 398B Ordinan Perbandaran—dengan ini membuat satu perintah dan saya sekarang kalau silap dengan bacaan saya atau pendapat saya atas undang-undang, saya beri peluang kepada Penasihat Undang-Undang Negeri beritahu saya, bila, di mana silapnya.

Seksyen 1 menjawab berikut: “1. Perintah ini bolehlah dinamakan Perintah (Pemindahan Tugas-Tugas) Majlis Daerah Tengah, Seberang Perai” dan mengikut bentuk lain-lain Majlis—Majlis Daerah Luar Bandar, Pulau Pinang, Majlis Daerah Utara, Seberang Perai—Oh! Dia ada banyak Majlis Negeri. Kesemua dia sapu—Majlis Daerah Selatan, Seberang Perai. Semua 5 Majlis di Pulau Pinang dia ambil sekali. Ini powernya. Apa dia kata: “hendaklah berjalan kuatkuasanya pada 1hb Januari, 1973.” “Kedua, semua tugas-tugas Majlis Daerah Luar Bandar, Pulau Pinang adalah dengan ini dipindahkan kepada Ketua Menteri, Pulau Pinang sehingga Majlis tersebut bermesyuarat pada hari yang ditentukan selepas suatu pilihan raya am pada Majlis tersebut diadakan.”

In English, very simply: All the functions of the City Council and R.D.C., Seberang Perai, Seberang Tengah, Nibong Tebal—“all the functions of the City Council, George Town, are hereby transferred to the Chief Minister, Penang.” “Chief Minister, Penang.” It did not say, Mr Lim Chong Eu, personal. “Chief Minister, Penang”—di atas office-nya, rasminya; “Chief Minister, Penang” until the said Council

shall meet on the appointed day after the general election of the said Council itself.

Tuan Speaker, tak apa, kepandaian kita, Speaker kata: “ditolak sebab soalan-soalan ini adalah berkaitan dengan perkara yang berada di bawah kawalan Majlis-Majlis Tempatan dan dengan demikianlah tidak termasuk dalam bidang kuasa 24 (a).” Apa 24 (a)? “Questions may be put to the Chief Minister relating to—(a) all affairs of State with which the Chief Minister is officially connected;” Ini bukan officially connected-kah? *Gazette* Notification giving the Chief Minister the control of the Council. Not officially? Kalau bukan rasmi bila Chief Minister sudah letak jawatannya, dia boleh lagi menjadi Ketua Majliskah. Inikah benar? Saya minta kalau Penasihat Undang-Undang boleh beritahu bila dia berhenti jadi Ketua Menteri dia boleh jadi Ketua Majlis. Boleh? Ikut gezet ini bolehkah? Boleh beri keterangan? Saya (gangguan).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Boleh jalan.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tak mahu kita boleh faham. So, ada asakah? Dengan izin: Is there a basis for the rejection of these questions, Sir? No. certainly not, Sir. Not even on the reading of the Standing Orders. But I would read the Standing Orders alone. Let the people know. That is the Constitution of this land. Sir, when our Chief Minister was on this side of the House, one day at the City Council Padang he was so taken by the amendment of the Constitution that he tore the Constitution. I witnessed it myself. And then he says: They were still in school. When do they know about politics? I have been in politics so long. But we, of course have to learn from the masters. But we learn not to make his mistakes.

Sir, what does the Ninth Schedule of the Federal Constitution say? Apa yang dikatakan oleh Perlembagaan kita? Perlembagaan yang kita mesti jaga, mesti hormatnya—apa yang dicakap dalam

ini, apa yang teratur dalam sini—tengoklah Jadual Sembilan. Saya ingat Kerajaan Ketua Menteri pun faham apa Jadual Sembilan.

The Ninth Schedule, Sir, refers to what is known as Legislative List. And the Chief Minister claims to be one of those who had a hand—I do not know which hand, left or right—in the drafting of the Constitution. But what does it say about Legislative List—Article 74? And I would like to refer briefly. Article 74 says—Subject matter of Federal and State laws—“(1) Without prejudice to any power to make laws conferred on it by any other Article, Parliament may make laws with respect to any of the matters enumerated in the Federal List or the Concurrent List (that is to say, the First or Third List set out in the Ninth Schedule)” I need to read only that part. What does the Ninth Schedule say? “Federal List. No. 1 under the Legislative Lists: External affairs; No. 2 Defence of the Federation”

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Apa? Adakah sangkut-paut dengan perkara ini?

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Ada sangkut, fasal dia tolak soalan ini—kata ini tak masuk dalam Dewan, tetapi saya ada bukti. Ini ada masuk dalam Dewan ini, masuk dalam Perlembagaan kita. Itulah seriousness dan kita sekarang tengok “State List”, apa dia kata dalam “State List”—Muslim Law semua sudah faham. Land semua sudah fahamlah. Ini semua tidak gaduh. Tetapi tengok 4—“Local government outside the federal capital, including—(a) Local administration; municipal corporations; local town and rural board and other local authorities; local government services; local rates; local government elections”. Ini dalam kawasan Negeri tetapi apa Speaker kita kata—kita baca Doa ini—kata itu sama dengan 24—ini tak sangkut dengan Ketua Menteri. Ini adilkah, Tuan Speaker? Saya minta keadilan. Benar-kah boleh tolak di atas asas ini? Tak boleh. Cannot be rejected, Sir, on this reasoning because local councils under

the Constitution are within the jurisdiction of this State. It is the State List. We are in control of this matter, and we can ask these questions. And, Sir, the Constitution itself. But the *Gazette* Notification itself provides that the Chief Minister is responsible for the Majlis; and he is answerable to this House. And, on top of all that, have we asked questions about City Council in this House? Have we asked? Yes, we have asked. Before this session we have asked. Even back-benchers have asked. Other Members have asked; and they have been answered. There were a lot of questions about bus service and a lot of other things. And now you reject these questions on this basis? And the beauty of it Sir is that at the time that these answers were given the Chief Minister had set up this so-called Committee of three wise men of Ex. Co. members to run the local council. And at that time he condescended to answer these questions. That is the beauty. But certain questions pushed. He said, “I am no more in administration. Therefore I cannot give these assurances. I cannot direct this”. True or false, we accept it. But now, Sir, when he himself has taken over under this from 1st January, 1973, he refuses to answer these. I say *he* refused because I cannot think of a Speaker acting on his own on this. There is only one word to describe this, and it is “unparliamentary”; crazy. Only one word to describe it. I cannot find any other word.

Dewan ditangguhkan pada jam 6.57 petang.

Dewan bersidang semula pada jam 8.30 malam.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat, Dewan disambung semula dengan Usul daripada Ahli Kawasan Kelawei.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tuan Speaker, dengan kebenaran bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

Tuan Speaker, before we adjourned I drew the illustration that Local Authority questions are permissible in this House. And I say so not only on

the basis of the examples I had given but also because previously the same Speaker, Sir, had himself approved questions in connection with Local Councils which I myself had asked and which other Members of this House had asked. Now, the question must arise: How does the Speaker make one decision at one Sitting, and then turn around and contradict his decision in the present Sitting? How does he account for that? Does he owe no duty to this House to explain why such a thing is being done?

I refer to an example, with your permission again: The Orders of the Day of the First meeting of the Second Session of the Third Legislative Assembly held on Tuesday, 6th June, 1972; and I refer to page three—my question number seven at that particular Sitting: “How many members of City Council and Local Council *Ad Hoc* Committees are members of the Gerakan?” That question was allowed and included in the Order Paper. That is about the City Council. Another question—number twelve: “Is the City Council going ahead with plans for an upward revaluation of properties in the city area? When will this be implemented?” Again another question about the City Council.

Another question about the State Water Authority which he also allowed in that Sitting—Sixteen: “Has the proposed Water Authority been set up? If not, why not?” And now the question which he also cut out, as I had explained earlier—my number seven question: “Will (*gangguan*).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Number seven question?

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): He also approved the question in the previous Sitting: “Will the Penang Island/Province Wellesley linkage project be implemented by 1974?” Now the question in the previous Sitting: “What progress was made towards the construction of the linkage between Penang Island and Province Wellesley?” All these were approved by the absentee Speaker. Now, why did he reject this question.

On the basis that they are not connected with the Chief Minister? On the basis that they are Federal matters? Mr Speaker, Sir, I think fair-minded people would want an answer. It is sad that the Speaker not only does not want to preside over this Sitting but has also chosen not to be here, even to hear about matters concerning his responsibility.

And I would like to further quote something that is not new. It is not something that the D.A.P. Opposition is trying to press on the Speaker and the Government to answer. I quote here a question and this is from Proceedings in this House. With your permission I quote here a question in the Second Legislative Assembly, Second Sitting of the Fourth Session, 15th November, 1967—the question that was asked on page 157: “Is there any plan to make up and to metal Zoo Road?” Sir, to metal Zoo Road is the Local Council’s jurisdiction. Now, who asked the question? None other than the Member for Tanjong Barat, Mr Teh Ewe Lim, asked the Chief Minister. Is this something the Government is unaware of—something strange that they stumbled over? And the Auditors are beginning to ask questions on Local Councils.

Now, here is another question, Sir, again proving very well that we have every right to ask this question. Number five, page 158. “As the sole administrator of the City Council of George Town, could the Honourable the Chief Minister inform:— (a) how many parking meters have been damaged and pilfered by thieves”. Again, the author for that is Encik Teh Ewe Lim, Member for Tanjong Barat. He asked that question. He was allowed. The then Chief Minister gave all those answers.

And better still, we have another question here by none other than another member of the Ex. Co.—or ex-member of the Ex. Co. Mr Khoo Kay Por, who—at page 165—asked: “Is it true that as the sole administrator of the City Council the Honourable the Chief Minister contemplates to increase the water rates?” There is another question. These were all, Sir,

allowed by the then Speaker, and answered by the Chief Minister at that time. Why have these now been rejected?

The question that baffles the mind is: Why does the Speaker of the Assembly do such a crafty thing—going against, as he must know, precedence, constitutional convention, and even his own decision in this House? Why? Is he committing political suicide? Is he being used as a scapegoat to give the Government another six months life to refuse to answer questions that are being asked concerning maladministration, perhaps of this State and the Local Authorities?

Sir, the then Chief Minister of Penang said that he as Chief Minister is responsible to this House as Officer Administering the Local Councils—at that time the City Council—and he expressed the opinion that there is nothing stopping Members of the Opposition from raising anything about the budget, or anything in connection with the City Council. At that time, when the Chief Minister was over this side, he was complaining that the then Chief Minister was sort of a dictator over the City Council. And that was a clear answer given; and in fact the present Chief Minister and the Speaker before this Sitting had allowed it. And that was the beautiful part: the Chief Minister has passed the powers over to the Committee of three Ex. Co. members. And yet now this obstruction. Is this justice? Do they really believe that what they do is right, Sir? What is inherently wrong is going to be wrong no matter what powers you threaten to use. You have to discuss politics one day; maybe not today. Maybe tonight you may win this Motion by virtue of a majority. Sir, as I had stressed, it is not a question of winning the Motion. It is a question fundamentally whether you convince this House that we should have confidence in the Speaker. I say continuously, Sir—as I have had so far the opportunity to illustrate—that we have no confidence in the Speaker.

Another example which I would like to raise is a very serious one. Sir, in comparison with what you are doing in

this Assembly; in comparison with your conduct of this Assembly; is a great distinction and a shameful distinction. The last time, if you would recall, when I was in this Assembly, at one time quoting from the very Minutes of the Proceedings of the Assembly with the permission of the absent Speaker, he disallowed my quoting. I remember that on that occasion I was trying to quote the words of the Chief Minister when he said that we should be allowed to debate the Budget of the City Council, and that is was a shame that the Budget of the City Council, despite the number of State Budgets, was not debated by the then Alliance Government. And you, Mr Speaker Sir, were a Member at that time of the Government. Remember? I was trying to quote from there. And it is in the record of this House, Sir, that the Speaker told me I could not quote from a record of these Proceedings. You have quite correctly allowed me to quote from the records because the records of the House are relevant to the debates of this House, especially when that Member who uttered those words is still here today, and sitting so far away. Can we have confidence in the Speaker who makes decisions like that? Can the Chief Minister summon sufficient sincerity to say that we have no case?

Another example, Sir. This may be small from the Government's point of view; but we know it. It was a complaint from the members of the Press. Initially when the Proceedings started in this House members of the Press were allowed to take photographs here. But I presume there must have been a report lodged by Government Members that they were not getting sufficient publicity out of that, for the Speaker at a subsequent Sitting completely disallowed photographs from being taken here. I am not saying that photographs should be taken. I am saying that if you had disallowed, let us have a real reason why you disallowed completely. You completely banned members of the Press. Here is another indication that there is no justice; there is no fair play; there is no reasoning. What is being done here is merely the usurpance and distortion of powers in this House.

I am trying to be very quick because I do not wish to waste the time of this House.

Another example which I would like to raise, which took place in this House also, is a matter of record. I say we should be fair to both sides. This was when I, at one time, was attempting to move an amendment to a Government Bill; when I gave the amendment, mind you, Sir, in Bahasa, written in compliance with the Standing Orders. I submitted my amendment. And what happened? The Speaker rejected it. He said, "You have to submit an English version. Without the English version I will not accept it". Sir, we are told to use the National Language. We are trying to use the National Language. When we use the National Language, what does the Speaker do? Reject our amendment because we only use the National Language? That, Sir, is a contravention of the National Language Act, if at all, by a Speaker of this House. Can we take seriously the statement made by our absentee Speaker when he said several times in the earlier Proceedings, "I hope Members will try to speak in the Bahasa". We must try. We support it. But when we do use it—and just because on that particular occasion the Speaker thought that I did not have the English version—he rejected the "pindaan". Sir, is that fair? I ask you. Let us search our conscience. Is that right? That was used as an obstacle to prevent the Opposition from moving an amendment. But that is hardly going to be set up under "stiffening". Today we have scrutinised the record of our absentee Speaker. Can he justify this kind of action? Can you? How long can you keep the lid down—keep the pressure from exploding when you abuse your authority to the extent that we cannot respect the Speaker; we have no confidence in him?

So, why do I say we cannot respect the Speaker if the Government does not give him the same respect? Because I have seen with my own eyes the kind of respect that the Government gives our Speaker. I was the unfortunate witness to an incident in this very

House, Sir, in the chambers of the Speaker. One night, after a very long session in connection with certain amendments which I had desired to move in this House, I was talking to the Speaker in front of another Member of Assembly, and the Clerk of the Assembly discussing, and giving notice to the Speaker that I intended to move certain amendments the next day. For what reason I do not know, the Political Secretary of the Chief Minister came in no less than three times, Sir. He was in a hurry. He wanted the Speaker to go somewhere with him. And that was official business transacted in the Speaker's chambers. This Member came in and shouted at the Speaker several times—shouted at the Speaker: "Hurry up. We are not waiting for you". Is this respect? Is this the respect you extend to your Speaker, especially in front of Opposition Members? You don't do that to the extent, Sir, that somebody has to turn to the Political Secretary and tell him very bluntly that the Speaker was transacting official business. Is it right if you don't respect the Speaker you elect? Can we blame this House? We have no confidence in him. This is what is going on in this House. This is not the way to treat the Speaker. We have never done that. But where it comes to standing up for our rights we will stand up for our rights here. That is all we want. We want, Sir, fair play above all. We don't want this sinister strategy that we see in this House. It is very bad.

We could go on, Sir, the whole night bringing out every single example, every citation. But, whatever it is, in the end it lies in the conscience of the Government—whether they believe, Sir, in this democracy that is fundamental in a strong Government. A good Government does not need to hide behind the "sarung" of the Speaker. All a strong Government does need is a fair Speaker, and letting the Opposition say what they can. There are rules and regulations. The Opposition cannot distort the truth. If whatever is being said is not the truth, it is for the Government—utilising the time and the co-operation that they have from the Speaker—to expose what is wrong by

coming to this House. Playing with the Standing Orders, rejecting questions, only invites the implication. Sir, that this Government has a lot to hide.

The people and we on this side of the House would like to ask what is wrong with answering questions about Penang Electronics. Is there something seriously wrong in Penang Electronics? What is wrong with answering questions about how many times the Chief Minister visited the Local Council, unless the Chief Minister does not visit the Local Council? What is wrong, Sir? I asked a question about a kampung in Bagan Jermal (*gangguan*).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Tuan sudah bawa tadi. Jangan ulang.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tuan Speaker, Sir, I am rounding up my speech. What is wrong, Sir, in asking a question about Sungai Babi? Itu dalam kawasan saya. Penduduk-penduduk di Sungai Babi beritahu saya bahawa sungai itu selalu kotor, semua binatang yang mati dibuang di sana. Air sungai tidak boleh jalan, selalu di masa air laut naik dan air dari sungai datang, kampung itu banjir—flooding.

Apa salah saya minta Kerajaan Ketua Menteri atas apa cadangan City Council untuk mengatasi soalan ini. Apa salah saya, kita mesti tahu, semua orang mesti tahu, kalau orang salah pun mesti tahu. Apa salah saya, tidak boleh cakap salah sahaja, dan sebab-sebab yang diberi tidak ada asas langsung.

What is wrong, Sir, in our doing our duties when, as I have said, all these are taken as fears. Members have asked questions, but all these are rejected; which only means that the Government has something to hide by utilising the Speaker. Or the Government does not wish Members to conduct their duties and perform their responsibilities to the electorate. That is the question fundamental to them. If the structure of the Dewan collapse—and it must collapse at the rate we are going; at the rate we suppress the truth; at the rate we subvert the office of the Speaker—then what suffers? Democracy, Sir, in this State

suffers. Whatever the Government of this State succeeds in or fails to achieve, at least it must hand to the next Government a heritage of democracy, so that the democratic system as handed to the present Government has not lost one iota in its value when it is handed to the next Government, be it the same or otherwise. This is a responsibility over and above Party loyalty, Party consideration and ideology. All of us have a say in this House to preserve democracy because in this country we are faced with a struggle between the democratic system of government and the extra-parliamentary system. If we subvert—as we do subvert now—the Chair we are doing away with every manner of parliamentary democracy in this House. And I for one say—if the Chief Minister cannot hear, the Members of the Government cannot hear—that whatever the Party Constitution do not downgrade our system of democracy, or what very little there is left. Our system of democracy depends on checks and balances. The Opposition has a right to express their views. They do not command the majority. But it is only when governmental crises arise, as we have seen in this House itself, that there is a threat to the Government. Other than that the Government is quite safe in its comfort. Therefore, the just government, the good government can rule and have its way. It will always allow the Opposition a fair voice. The number of hours Members of the Opposition are allowed to speak is not necessarily the criterion. It is how they are allowed to speak, what they are allowed to speak. That is the criterion.

Sir, when I began my delivery on this debate I commenced by quoting what you yourself have said in this Assembly. I would like to add by quoting what the Chief Minister himself said in this Assembly. But when he said it at that time he was wearing another hat and another pair of shoes, and he was over here. These are the views of the Chief Minister. And if he has any sincerity he would carry them out. These are his words: "When we talk about representative government we include the Opposition. We

mean that parliamentary democracy must have a Government and have an Opposition." These words are said at the Second Legislative Assembly. Sir, the Chief Minister not only has the power now; he has the opportunity to carry out these words of his which are in the records of this Assembly. They should be sacred to him. He did not utter these words in a moment of insanity. He must have thought with due deliberation. I assure the Chief Minister that what we are proposing in this House is not a condemnation upon the man. We have nothing to gain from the Speaker of this House. But we would like him to conduct himself properly; and be seen to conduct himself properly in the spirit of what the Chief Minister himself had said—that there is a Government and an Opposition. But when you suppress the Opposition by obstructing them from carrying out their duties, from asking questions, and obstructing them in the actual delivering of their speeches, then I say you are making a nonsense of this; that the Opposition is a mere rubber-stamp. So, let us hope that the Government will carry out the sincere expressions of a man who said those words when he was here. And let us hope that this debate is not taken as a challenge to the Speaker. We have nothing against the Speaker; but we have everything to gain from the Speaker respecting our rights and our privileges in this House. Thank you.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Ada Ahli yang menyokong?

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Datuk Yang Dipertua, saya (*gangguan*).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Bukan "Datuk", saya (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S.P. Chelliah): Fasal mahu beri hormat sahaja, Tuan Speaker. Sungguhpun awak belum dapat Datuk (*gangguan*).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Bukan "awak". Bukanlah kata "awak"—cakap kasar bahasa.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Baiklah tuan, tuan tidak suka sebutkan "Datuk", saya sukalah cakap tuan. Kalau begitu, saya minta izin sekarang bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris. Boleh?

Mr Speaker, Sir, I wish to second this Motion. Mr Speaker, Sir, I must say it pains me much to second this Motion because I have been associated with him for some time. He is a good man, and basically a simple man; but his goodness and his simplicity have been exploited completely by the powers that be. And my support therefore the aircondition has gone off.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Cakap apa tuan hendak cakap.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S.P. Chelliah): Itu aircondition sudah mati".

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): I also support this Motion in the hope that in future the Proceedings of this House will be conducted with complete impartiality, and with due regard to the minority in this House.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we have had the opportunity of having you there in the seat for the last, shall we say, six hours or five-and-a-half hours; and we have noticed how—the irony of it—you have conducted this Assembly. And may I take this opportunity of congratulating you on your being elected. Though that may be beside the point, I do really appreciate this because of the comparison, in the chance you have had, between you and the person who has had the pleasure and the honour of being our Speaker. Mr Speaker, Sir, I have personally on one occasion—that is mentioned by the proposer in the last debate on the Governor's Address—given public notice of my intention to move such a resolution. But I thought in all sincerity that the Speaker would mend his ways. It is now exactly a year, or almost a year since then; and there has been no such sign of improvement. Mr Speaker, Sir, as far as the Speaker is

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Which Speaker?

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): The official Speaker who is paid officially. I will call him "official" if you don't mind.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S.P. Chelliah): Dengan izin bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

Does he mean that the seat is important, or the Speaker is unofficial?

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Under what Order?

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S.P. Chelliah): Clarification-lah. You sit down-lah.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Well, we have a Speaker now who takes the place of the official Speaker. If I am wrong (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S.P. Chelliah): Unofficial-lah.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Can I continue? Thank you very much.

When I refer to the Speaker, since the Motion is in his capacity as Speaker, and not in his personal capacity, I hope the Honourable Member for Sungei Pinang understands that.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S.P. Chelliah): Tahu, tahu.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): The Speaker has failed in his duty as Chairman. He has allowed the majority to suppress the views of the minority. Of course, the Chief Minister will tell us, "We have not suppressed them." Look at the Honourable the Member for Kelawei. He talked for almost six hours; and he had not stopped him. Yes, he is a clever man. If he is not, his cleverness is yet to be seen; not in Penang politics, but in Malaysian politics. He will even play out UMNO. We will wait and see.

Mr Speaker, Sir, a number of the Members of the Opposition were allowed to speak on the debate on the

Governor's speech last year: And you must remember very distinctly that at least two Members, myself and the Member for Kelawei (*gangguan*)

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Per-kara ini tadi sudah dibangkitkan.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Sungguhpun sudah bangkit, ini different angle.

I hope you will permit me. This is an instance. That was not just the Member for Kelawei. Mr Speaker, Sir, he was then recognised by the Government as the Leader of the Opposition in this House. And he was presented as such to none other than Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth when she came to the shores of this island; and he was recognised as the Leader of the Opposition. And although the Leader wanted to speak he was not allowed. And you would remember very, very distinctly that the Speaker was cock-eyed in that he could not see this side until I had to shout, "pandanglah sebelah sini". And it is in the record. It was in the papers that he refused to look at this side of the House. Now, that, Mr Speaker, Sir, you will not tolerate from any Speaker at all. He must not look at one side alone. He must look at both sides.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Sebab muka tuan itu terlampau bengis.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Tetapi lampu ini terang.

When asked to look at this side of the House he kept looking at the Government side. This was not once. Bukan sekali, tahu? First, when the Chief Minister stood up to speak; and next when he called upon the Member for Butterworth to wind up. This is an inexcusable breach of duty, and a display of despicable bias on the part of the Speaker. Mr Speaker, Sir, the Speaker of the Assembly is not only expected to be fair and just like a Judge; but he must ensure that the rights of the minority are not infringed. And the minority has a right. That is why we have a Speaker. In fact the

Speaker should be the protector of the minority against the tyranny of the majority.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Jangan tunjuk tangan.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): I was just 'tunjuk' the opposite, not the particular person.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Kalau hendak tunjuk, tunjuklah saya.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): You are an impartial man. Mana boleh tunjuk. (*Ketawa*).

I said "the tyranny of the majority". You know, to the Chief Minister, in all his gentleness and cleverness, this is a very important Motion that must be disposed of. How? In the darkness, in the silence, when the rest of the country is sleeping; when the rest of the citizens are asleep. But they come here because it is important; and they are interested. And so they are a microcosm of the vast majority of the citizens in this State. Mr Speaker, you said this is the first time such a unique Motion has been brought up in this House. Not only unique in this State. Never in the history of the Malaysian Parliament or of any Legislative Assembly in the states have we ever had before a Motion of no confidence in the Speaker. And, therefore, our Chief Minister and his Government have given it so much importance that it must be debated when the Press has gone to bed, so that there will be nothing in the Press. He wants everything to be out. He wants to be judged by themselves. But the world will judge his greatness. Mr Speaker, Sir, on that occasion there was no Motion for closure of debate. And it is not the prerogative of the Speaker to end debates. It is not, Mr Speaker, Sir, for the Speaker to end debates, I repeat. And nobody can stop him. But the House can order a Motion for closure of debate. And I do not think even he can—Mr sungei Pinang.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S.P. Chelliah): Yes, Mr Sungei Bakap.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Saya minta maaf, saya tidak mahu tuan-tuan bercakap "Mr Sungei Pinang", "Mr Sungei Bakap".

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Minta maaf.

As I have said, a Motion must be brought up. Mr Speaker, Sir, it is provided in the Standing Orders, for it is called the guillotine, if I am right. You can stop a debate if it has gone too long, by the majority bringing a Motion for the closure of debate. And the question can be put. But the question shall only be put with the leave of the Speaker. And the leave of the Speaker cannot and should not be given unless the views of the minority have been expressed. Mr Speaker, Sir, on that occasion I submit that the views of the minority were not fully expressed. And another thing: it was an important debate, it was a debate on the Governor's gracious Address. And to cut off the Members is most deplorable and despicable. I can understand that the Speaker wanted to reserve the nice morning, the first thing in the morning to get the glory of the Press. But the Chief Minister is not the "end all" and the "be all" of the House, you know. He may be the Chief Minister of the State; but he is nothing in this House! Minta maaf. (*Ketawa*).

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S.P. Chelliah): You can tell them its (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Please-lah, this is for emphasis only. You can do anything you want.

You can throw your shoes.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S.P. Chelliah): Tidak ada emphasis, tidak usah minta maaf.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): As I was saying, the Chief Minister is just one of us. In this House we stand for the Speaker; and the Speaker must exercise that responsibility. Today I am sad to say that

the Speaker has given up that responsibility. He represents the dignity of this House. He has given up the dignity of this House—shameful to you, to me and to everyone else who calls himself a Member of this Assembly. I give you an example—this morning, what protocol he had. Who is inviting, Datuk Speaker? I mean, Tuan Speaker. You do not like to be called “Datuk”. Maybe next year bolehlah. Tuan Speaker, an invitation that is issued in the name of the Speaker and Members involves the Judge, the Chief Polis Officer, and so forth, as our guests to the Opening of this House, the Third Session of the Third Assembly. But the person who invited was not there to receive the guests. Malu, bukannya? Kalau awak punya kenduri awak tidak buat (*gangguan*).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Tidak boleh kata “awak”. (*Ketawa*).

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Tuan.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Ya, “Tuan”.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Minta maaflah saya bukan pergi sekolah.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Belajarlah.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Ini baru sahaja Tuan bagi tahu. If we have a ceremony in our house we must wait for the guests. And here the Judge who holds our life and death—you know, referring to the Chief Minister, and including what you call the official Speaker, you know—had to wait for the Speaker. Itu patutkah? Is it fair? Is it proper? I ask you, Sir. The guests were invited. The guests had to wait for the Speaker. He is our representative, you know. The Speaker is the Head of this Assembly. He should be waiting to receive the guests. And then when the Governor came, who received the guests? Not the Speaker, but the Chief Minister. Who is he? He may be the royal escort; but he does not represent the House. You are not here representing the House, Mr Chief Minister. And you cannot usurp the

powers of the Speaker. And the Speaker should not allow him to usurp his powers.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Masa tengah malam ini, jangan tumbuk meja nanti pecah.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Saya tumbuk meja tetapi bukan tumbuk orang. You don't allow?

If the Speaker wants to disgrace himself I won't mind. But let him not disgrace this House, and disgrace parliamentary democracy. As such, I do not want him to be a tool of manipulators so that it sets a precedent for the rest of the States in this country. Do you know what is going to happen, Mr Speaker, Sir? This House will be setting precedents, and teaching the rest of this country, and even Parliament, what to do.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I said that the Speaker should be one who is there to ensure that the rights of the minority are not infringed. Although there is no such provision in the Standing Orders of the Assembly, there is such provision in the Standing Orders of Parliament. With the Order 40 of Parliament—I hope you won't rule me out of order, saying this does not concern us—after a question has been proposed a Member rising in his place may claim to move that the questions be now put—that means closure of debate—and unless it appears to the Chair that such Motion is an abuse of the rules of the House or an infringement of the rights of the minority then the question shall be put forthwith and decided without amendment or debate, notwithstanding that the mover of the original Motion or amendment has had no opportunity to make his reply.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I hope that the House is aware, and that the Speaker is aware that this Motion we are now debating is a Motion that may be defeated, maybe with the support of the Members of the Alliance. But this is not a Motion that supports or upholds or that wants to prop up a Government. No. This is a Motion that is going to decide whether we are conducting our

affairs properly or not. And therefore I hope that the Members of the Alliance who are now in coalition with the Gerakan Government will think what is proper for this House and for this country, and would want to vote accordingly; and not just because you are in the Coalition you support anything that is done by the Government. This is not a Motion that is against the Government. This is a Motion (*gangguan*).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Ini tidak payahlah tuan ajar.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Bukan mahu ajar. Mahu bagi pandangan sahaja. Therefore, since there is residual provision under Order 117 of our own Standing Orders which states—

“(1) In case of doubt the Standing Orders of the Assembly shall be interpreted in the light of parliamentary practice relevant thereto.

(2) In any matter for which these Standing Orders do not provide, such practice shall be followed, as does not conflict with the provisions of the State Constitution or with any other provision binding upon the Assembly.”

the Speaker cannot claim to be ignorant. If he is still ignorant after three years in the seat it is inexcusable. I would personally say excusable-lah. But the Speaker must know that in this House he takes precedence over everybody; and he acts according to the rules of the House. And where there are no such rules that calls on parliamentary practice as provided for under Order 117. As such, Mr Speaker, Sir, on that day, to call the mover of the Motion of thanks to his Excellency the Governor to close the debate is an abuse of the rules of the House, and an arbitrary exercise of usurped powers. Why do I say usurped powers? He has no powers; therefore any person who has usurped his powers must be condemned.

My second point is this: The Speaker has also abused his powers of adjournment as contained in Order 9. It has been pointed out earlier in our special Motion. He does not fix times for Sittings and for adjournments, but acts

according to the dictates of the Government. We saw it today. This is merely to let the Government play “cats and mice” with the Opposition. As such, he is not fit to be a Speaker. With due regret, I say he is not fit to be a Speaker. Mr Speaker, Sir, you might remember at one time he made a ruling. He fixed times for the Sittings. He did that you know. Very nice of him. He fixed the times. But even this he did not follow. He ignored his own rulings. What sort of a man is he? As a Speaker, what is that strange power that is behind him or inside his sarung thickling him all the time. (*Ketawa*) He violated his own ruling. This, you may agree, is inexcusable.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: How do you know I will agree?

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): *You may*, I said. I did not say *you will*. Pardon me. This is inexcusable as it was deliberate and mischievous to favour the Government at the expense of the Opposition, whereas, as I said earlier, his duty is the exact opposite—to protect the rights of the minority.

Mr Speaker, Sir, our Standing Order says—our Standing Order is beautiful; in a way confused. And no wonder the Speaker is now to be the scapegoat for all this—“Sittings of every session shall begin on such days and at such hours as the Governor may appoint”. When we say “Governor” it is well understood as the Government. That is prerogative. But the Governor has stated that we will meet at 10 on such and such a day; don’t know when we will end. Therefore, does his Excellency the Governor, or our Ketua Menteri and his Government mean that we go on sitting from 10 until we finish all business? Does he mean it? Mr Speaker, Sir, then if we sit on continuously, you know the Governor has not fixed the time, therefore the Government and the Ketua Menteri have failed to advise the Governor to fix the time of Sittings. And that is why you have a Speaker who is between the devil and the deep blue sea. But the Speaker has his powers under Order 9. He can adjourn the

Meeting at any time. And like all reasonable men he must act reasonably. And if he does not act reasonably then he is not a reasonable man and not fit to be a Speaker. "All Assemblymen should come and assemble here at 9.30"—that is what he said. And if we go on at the will or the pleasure of the Chief Minister or his Government it is inhuman. Of course, we are prepared to sit as long as he wants. If you can sit, we also can sit. God has given you that strength; we also have the strength. But one thing we can tell you: each one of us can sit longer than you because it is a combine. You must sit. The others cannot sit without you. But we can sit. One by one we can take you on any time. Bolehlah. But you are a clever man. Any time. (*Ketawa*). It is a good thing to laugh because the Members are happy, and the people are also happy.

My third point is this: The Speaker is completely ignorant of the Standing Orders—and obstinately thinks he is right even when his attention is drawn by you. I give you an example: I remember introducing an amendment to a Bill in the Committee stage. He rejected my amendment—to my surprise no doubt—stating that I should not amend in the Committee stage; that if I wanted to amend I should do so in the Second Reading. Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not know how to describe that statement of the Speaker. I do not know whether to call it stupid, ignorant or dishonest. Mr Speaker, Sir, it states here what the Second Reading is. We should follow what it says here, for it is our bible. Under "Second Reading" it merely says that the discussion shall be confined to the principles and merits of the Bill. And it is only in the Committee stage that we can have amendments. But the clever twister in the name of the Chief Minister misled the Speaker; and the Speaker ruled me out. Tidak benar. Saya hormatlah rulingnya. So, when we as Members of this House have to respect the ruling of the Chair this is the occasion when we can challenge the ruling. And I can bet you, Mr Speaker, that every ruling of the Speaker can be challenged. But on

substantive Motion; and therefore it is not a threat. Don't try to say that we are threatening. We will do it. Every ruling of the Chair will be challenged to decide. We will be trampled by the majority; it doesn't matter. The important thing is that we are alive and kicking. And we will kick if we can kick; and as hard as we can.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the rules as to amendments is in Order 60 (2); but the Speaker refused to allow me to move the Motion. This, Mr Speaker, Sir, is a denial of my right as a Member of the Assembly. And the Speaker must accept full responsibility for his, as I said, stupid action; of course, no doubt misled by the Chief Minister.

Fourthly, his extra precautions when he asked the House to suspend his own self-chosen Opposition Leader at the last Sitting. He gave no warning of that. Order 51, as the Member for Kelawei pointed out, is the opposite of Order 15. That was the signal of the devil.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan:
Jangan cakap. Itu serupa.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Thank you. If you accept it, baguslah.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Apa yang telah diucapkan serupa. Jadi tuan ulang lagi.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Angle tidak serupa. Tetapi ini benar. He gave no warning. There is ample opportunity in the Standing Orders to ask the Member, as pointed out, to discontinue speaking, or to withdraw completely from the House. But he took the one step which had been given to him; and that is suspension. So he asked for suspension. And there was that great, brave soul from Sungei Pinang who was prepared to move it. And he did it. But what I regretted was the fact that although the Speaker perhaps lost his control and his composure while asking for the suspension, yet the next day he refused to allow the termination of the suspension, because,

as pointed out by the Member for Ayer Itam, the next day, after a good night's sleep, you know, he refused to terminate the suspension.

Mr Speaker, I must say, as I said earlier, that I appreciate the difficult position the Speaker is in, being a Party man, a Member of the Gerakan and a loyal man, a very good loyal Gerakan man, no doubt.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S.P. Chelliah): Not like you.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Am I still a member of the Gerakan? You are not loyal. I am not a member because I was not loyal at that time? Can anybody, including the Chief Minister of Penang, say I was disloyal when I was a member? Ask him if he can prove. I take him on any time, anywhere, any place. It is a fact that I did my best to try to stay. Tak apa, itu lain perkaralah. Never mind, what you have brought in is good because it gives me time to think.

As I said, it is a difficult position for a man who is a Speaker to disrobe himself, so to say, from the cloth of Party and partisanship, and become an impartial man. I appreciate it, Sir. But if you can't be an impartial man then you must resign. I have said all this, you know, with full appreciation because I was one of those—and you are one of those, I think—who supported the fact that he should be the Speaker, Sir. But when you find that the post that you hold is intolerable, the people make it intolerable for you, then like a gentleman the Speaker must resign his office as Speaker, and not sit there and hold on to his hand and sarung. If he wants the appointment he cannot protect his Party. No, he is not there to protect his Party, but to protect the minority. In other words, he cannot have his cake and eat it.

Finally, I come to the point of the arbitrary rejection of questions without regard to parliamentary practice. In some cases the reasons are simply

shocking. I know you will say that if the Member for Kelawei has dealt with it extensively (*gangguan*):

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: About what?

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): About the questions—nearly thirty minutes. Yes, you did it beautifully.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: I don't want you to do it again.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): But, Mr Speaker, I do not know whether you know that the questions that were submitted were not the same as submitted by me. Subjectnya serupa.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Contohnya tidak serupa.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): While I say you will stop me (*gangguan*).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Saya tak stop.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): You say that I have touched on the same questions as he has done. O.K. In my case one-third of my questions were rejected. I would tell you, Mr Speaker, this is the first time he was very angry, you know, that the Motion was a debate. He wanted to show his powers; but he has spoilt stupidly; spoilt his own position by rejecting so many questions. If you add up the number of questions that have been rejected you will never say the same thing. I don't think that all the questions that have been rejected in Parliament, plus all the fourteen or thirteen State Assemblies, can equal the number of questions that have been rejected. That shows the pity and stupidity of the Speaker. You know, if the Speaker is not stupid then we on this side must be stupid. We on this side know we do not claim to have plenty of experience questioning the Government. And yet I can say for one thing that the total number of questions that I have submitted in

Parliament, and which have been returned, does not exceed the total that was rejected right in this House in this Sitting. That means that either I must be stupid or the Speaker must be stupid. I leave it to the world to judge this. I put this one to you. How would you allow this? I am saying this because it was stated by His Excellency the Governor when he addressed us. I asked a question on the number of jobs that have been created by the factories in the free trade zone at Bayan Lepas.

Ahli Yang Mengerusikan: Apa kena-mengena dengan Usul?

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): I say I asked the question which was rejected by the Speaker. And I say he was wrong.

Ahli Yang Mengerusikan: Saya tidak benarkan.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): You see, the Speaker rejected it. But, Sir, have you opened the papers in any week—I won't say "any day"—and failed to read that the Chief Minister talks about the number of jobs he has created? Only recently he had a dialogue. Can he say that he has created 50,000 jobs? But my questions on the number of jobs created was: "How many people were employed? How many are males? How many are females? And what wages are they paid?" The answer was, "Ini perkara ditolak kerana soalan berkenaan syarikat persendirian." You know, private enterprise. Tetapi, is he the spokesman? Does the Speaker know? I want to ask the Speaker whether he knows that the Chief Minister every day speaks on behalf of private enterprise. He does everything for private enterprise in this State. Does he know that, or is he blind, deaf or dumb? If he was deaf he would not have heard what the Governor said this morning, because the Governor also made reference to all the jobs that have been created. If the Governor can say it, and the Chief Minister also, why does the Speaker stop me? Stop this House.

By stopping me he is not stopping me alone. He can stop me at any time; it doesn't matter. But he is stopping this House. And by stopping this House from knowing the truth he is stopping the whole State from knowing. He is preventing ratepayers from knowing how our money is being spent, because too much money is being spent. It doesn't matter. He is not prepared to stay very long, definitely. That is because the people must know. Now, if it is the truth that 50,000 jobs have been created then this House is entitled to know how it has been created. Is it the truth, or is it a lie? Nobody knows. Now you can't know. The Speaker stops us. Surely, if he doesn't want me to ask the question at least he should give the Chief Minister the privilege to substantiate his own statement in this honoured House to which he is accountable. He must account here. It is stated that every six months he must come here, whether he likes it or not. He must come here and account for it. It is a pity and a tragedy that the Chief Minister faces every six months—he must come here and account for it. And the Speaker cannot allow his sarung as a hiding place for the Chief Minister.

Ahli Yang Mengerusikan: Saya tidak pedulikan sarung. Kalau hendak cakap teruskan.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): I also pakai sarung, very comfortable. Tapi Mr Speaker, sarungnya transparent. We can see through.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S.P. Chelliah): Mata terang.

Ahli Yang Mengerusikan: Apa yang saya kata tuan telah bercakap berkenaan dengan sarung. Perkataan sarung ada sepuluh kali dalam Dewan ini.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Tak apalah. Tapi the Speaker is definitely wrong in rejecting a question that wants to get at the truth. The Speaker cannot think that the Chief Minister should be at liberty to hoodwink the people, and

bluff this House, or withhold information from this House. As was stated, you know, M.A.S., our golden airline, is a Company; yet questions on M.A.S. are answered by none other than the Minister of Communications. PERNAS and—what have you—Malayawata were cited. Here I am talking of M.A.S.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Only M.A.S. and Malayawata.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): You see what I am trying to say? Here they refused to answer questions. I am sure the Chief Minister loves to answer questions. He is a great man who loves the Assembly; loves the thrust of debate.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): The cut and thrust.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): The cut and thrust of debate. He loves it. We have a very active Chief Minister. He likes to sit alone at night without anybody. Everybody goes to sleep. His cut and thrust of debate are confined to the four walls.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Ketua Menteri suka duduk di Dewan ini tidak ada kena-mengena dengan Speaker.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): But you see, what I am trying to say is that, whether the Chief Minister is a great democrat or not, he loves all this. But the Speaker does not allow it. Itulah susah. The Speaker is not allowing him to display his talents, and play exclusively to this House.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Sayang.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Kasihan.

The mover of the Motion has already clearly stated that it is very strange that under Standing Order 24 (a), although the Chief Minister is only liable to answer questions with which he is officially connected, and

although he is officially the Officer administering the Government, the Speaker, and not the Chief Minister, thinks and is of the opinion..... Perhaps his advisers also think. Who are the ghosts who call themselves advisers, if he has any advisers at all who think that the Chief Minister is not responsible to this House for the actions of the District Councils and the City Council? It is strange, you know. While he allows the Motion on the Water Authority to be discussed, while he allows the Motion on the City Council to be discussed, yet the Speaker does not allow questions on the Rural District Council or the Government, or the City Council, or the Water Authority to be discussed. What sort of double thinking? Is it Dr Jekyle and Mr Hyde, or what? I pun tak tahu. Pity him, no doubt. I really don't know what is the thinking of the man. How can he allow a Motion on the City Council to be debated when he does not allow questions. That is inconsistency in his own ruling. It is not that the Speaker is stupid. The manipulators are greater stupid idiots.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Tarik balik perkataan "idiot".

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): O.K. minta maaf. Saya tarik balik.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I would not want to belabour this House any further. We have had a long discussion. But I would like to say that by rejecting this question the Speaker is preventing this House and the ratepayers from knowing how the State's finances are being used. This is a serious matter. As you know, there can be no taxation without representation. And if the representatives cannot know how the money is spent then the attitude of the Speaker undermines parliamentary control. And if the action of the Speaker is unchecked it will result in a loss of confidence of the people in the parliamentary process. This is too serious. Therefore, from what I have said, it is and it ought to be absolutely clear that the Speaker has failed in

his duty. He deliberately neglected to protect the minority; mischievously sided with the Government; and is completely wrong in arbitrarily rejecting legitimate and proper questions, and is thus helping the Government. As such he has lost the confidence of the House, and must resign. I therefore hope that this Motion will have the full support of this House. Thank you very much.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Tuan Speaker, saya minta izin bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

Tuan Speaker, I rise to support this Motion with a mixed feeling; a feeling of hesitation; a feeling of reluctance; and a feeling of discomfort. As the Speaker is elected by the Members of this House he should be given all the due respect of the House. He should be given all the respect from the Members, either from the Government side or from this side of the House. Therefore, I feel that it is very uncomfortable; and I really hesitate to support the Motion. But on the other hand, Tuan Speaker, as the Speaker he must possess the quality of impartiality, the quality of fairness, the quality of justice, and the quality of mutual respect between himself and the Members of the House. From the last few Sittings of this House, I really discovered with great dismay that he has nothing of that sort of quality I mentioned just now. Therefore, I have to rise and support this Motion.

Mr Speaker, Sir, with your permission, may I read a passage from the gracious speech by His Excellency the Governor of Penang dated 6th June 1972, in which His Excellency said: "To play their role"—that refers to the Members of the House—"as the elected representatives of the people in the same spirit of dedication." Also another passage which I would like to quote, with your permission, Sir. On the 12th April, 1971—that was the first Sitting of the first Session—His Excellency stressed the

fact that the duties and the responsibilities that the elected representatives should shoulder will be even greater—that means after May 13th.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we all come to this House not as a man, so-and-so. We come to this House as elected Members of the people in our constituencies. And, as my colleagues have said just now, we come here equal. Therefore I strongly stress that we must have respect for each other—a mutual respect. Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable the Chief Minister, the Honourable Members of the Government, and the Members on this side all sit here because we all have our duties and responsibilities to shoulder for the people in our constituencies. And therefore we meet here.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Saya tarik perhatian tuan. Dua orang Ahli telahpun bercakap, berkenaan dengan tanggungjawab Ahli dalam Dewan ini. Saya rasa perkara itu tidak payah diulang lagi.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Thank you very much, Tuan Speaker. I wish to stress on the point of mutual respect which was brought up by the Honourable Member for Kelawei, regarding the lack of respect by the Speaker to another Member. At the First Sitting of the last Session I searched my conscience, and I had to cross the floor. I asked the Speaker's permission to sit right there, the last seat on my left; and the Speaker made the ruling that I had to go to the back. I was quite happy that I had to go to the back; and I was named the only back-bencher of the Opposition. But it did not really matter at all. I was quite happy to sit there. Then all of a sudden, in the next Sitting, without even notifying me at all, he moved me to the place I had asked for earlier. Tuan Speaker, I did not mind having to sit at the back. The only thing I wanted was a chance to explain, and to ask for clarification. But what did the former Speaker say? When I rose to open my mouth he said, "Kalau Ahli Yang Berhormat tak suka boleh keluar". What is this? You are insulting a Member. I was only asking for a few minutes to explain my situation, and to

ask for clarification. And that he said three times—"Kalau Ahli Yang Berhormat tak suka boleh keluar". It means that the whole House belongs to him—you like you sit; you don't like you get out. Is this the respect for one another in this House? I don't come here as Ong Yi How or Encik Ong Yi How. I come here to represent 13,000 voters in Bagan Ajam. And you say, "Kalau you tak suka boleh keluar". I asked for permission to speak. "Tidak", three times.

Tuan Speaker, just now two Members have cited the incident of the Speaker not allowing two Opposition Members to speak at the first Sitting of the last Session of this Assembly when we were debating on His Excellency the Governor's speech.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Saya tidaklah suka masa Dewan ini kita buang dengan tiba-tiba bangun bercakap mengulang balik perkara yang telahpun dicakap oleh seorang yang mula tadi. Saya nampak tuan telahpun bercakap seperti yang diberi oleh Ahli Kelawei—kalau hendak ulang lagi, saya tidak benar.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): But I am approaching it from a different angle.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Sedikit boleh.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker, Sir. I appreciate that very much. And I join my colleagues in paying you a compliment for the fairness and impartiality with which you have conducted this Session. And I am happy with your ruling. Mr Speaker, Sir, I am not repeating that incident. I am only quoting the incident. I am not going to "ulang" it. I think that should be allowed. What the Speaker had done by not allowing the two Opposition Members to speak was to help the Honourable the Chief Minister cover up all the dirty lies he had been saying at that time. He called me a political rat. He even referred to my father who had died two years ago,

and resorted to calling me names. But what the Speaker had done by not allowing the Opposition Members to speak was to help cover up all the lies the Honourable the Chief Minister had been saying in this Assembly.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Saya benarkan tuan bercakap.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): The Speaker should be impartial. He should be fair, and adopt a just attitude towards all Members; and he should have respect for everybody. That incident is a very clear case where such did not exist.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I am not going to repeat the incident. I am going to refer to the incident of suspension of the Honourable Member for Kelawei. In that incident the Speaker was trying to help the Honourable the Chief Minister take revenge on the Honourable Member for Kelawei because the Honourable the Chief Minister thought that I had exposed him with that blackmailing attitude, that betraying attitude, and that lying attitude; because he thought that the Honourable Member for Kelawei had taught me all that. And all the time I took it that he had already planned to suspend the Honourable Member for Kelawei. I was in fact really shocked when the experienced Member of this House could quote the wrong Standing Order. And he quoted it twice. And afterwards, when the Speaker at that time quoted 51, I knew that was a signal.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Ini sudah tiga orang bercakap. Semua orang sudah dengar. Saya tidak mahu perkara ini diulang-ulang. Saya tidak benar pergi lagi jauh.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Because I am quoting that incident.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Tuan tidak minta kebenaran pun.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Terima kasih. I will not go further than that.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I am quoting the incident on the rejection of the questions. I am not going through that incident, but merely quoting it. Why did the former Speaker reject the questions? He was only trying to help the Honourable the Chief Minister cover up the "Watergate" of Butterworth and the "Watergate" of Penang. (*Ketawa*). Mr Speaker, Sir, as the previous speakers have said, the same Speaker who allowed the question before had rejected the question afterwards. Why? Here is a scandal of Butterworth; "Watergate" of Butterworth. I asked in my Question 8 which was rejected: "Is it a fact (*gangguan*)".

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Tuan tak minta kebenaran hendak baca.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Saya minta kebenaran. I saw they could read just now so I took it for granted. I am sorry.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I ask your permission to read that. My Question 8 says: "Is it a fact that the District Council North, Seberang Perai, has awarded the scavenging contracts to the former Chairman of Parti Gerakan, Bagan Division? The name is Mr Tan Chai Kin who was also appointed a Justice of the Peace by the Gerakan Government. If it is, will the Honourable the Chief Minister tell the House whether or not there was any undue influence when the Council awarded the contracts to this gentleman whom I know very well has no previous experience in scavenging at all". With your permission, Sir, again I like to read a little question in connection with this scavenging contract—No. 17 which was rejected: "Will the Honourable the Chief Minister, as the sole administrator for District Council North, furnish the House with a list of scavenging contractors tendering for the scavenging contracts in the District North of Seberang Perai for the years 1972 and 1973? Please give figures for each of the contractors tendering for this contract". This is the "Watergate" of Butterworth. And I am sure that the Honourable the Chief Minister (*gangguan*).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: "Watergate" sudah banyak kali, saya tidak mahu.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): This is the scandal in the District Council. And therefore I feel that this might be the reason the former Speaker rejected my questions—because he wanted to help the Honourable the Chief Minister to cover up all the tendering on how to award this contract to the former Chairman of Parti Gerakan, Bagan Division.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I think the previous two speakers had spoken enough on the Penang Development Corporation; and I do not wish to go any further. But my question on Penang Development Corporation has been rejected; and the reason cannot be aired in this House. I feel that is to help the Honourable the Chief Minister cover up all the pleasure trips he has given to his Members overseas, and the Government officers here.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Itu tidak ada kena-mengena dengan Tuan Speaker. Wakil pergi ke luar negeri.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): He has helped to cover up the things and wrong doings of the Government. It is connected, isn't it?

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Cakap.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Thank you very much. As a great respect to you I would not like to continue any further. Terima kasih.

Ahli Kawasan Nibong Tebal (Encik Teoh Kooi Sneah): Tuan Speaker, dengan izin bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris:

Mr Speaker, Sir, I think the Motion that this Assembly has no confidence in the Speaker, moved by the Honourable Member for Kelawei is most regrettable and unwarranted. It is a very serious attempt to undermine the decorum of this House, and to make a mockery of parliamentary democracy.

Honourable Members will recall that the Member for Kelawei is suspended for two days during the last Assembly because of his deliberate attempts to wilfully obstruct the business of the Assembly, and his show of disrespect for the Chair, after a Motion was passed. According to Standing Order 51 (1) of the State of Penang, Mr Speaker, Sir, I think Honourable Members and the people of Penang will agree with me that our Tuan Speaker has been very generous and patient to the Members, allowing them to deliver their speeches which concerned the interests of the people, particularly matters concerning their own constituencies. He even allowed the Honourable Member for Kelawei to say whatever he liked, whether it was right or wrong; and even repetition after repetition for hours. This goes to show how democratic we are in the State of Penang under our Tuan Speaker. The actions demonstrated by the Honourable Member for Kelawei are understandable. They only reflect the immaturity and the childishness of the type of leaders in the D.A.P. This contemplated attempt to move a Motion of this nature is to satisfy his desire for individual heroism. The D.A.P. is trying to describe to the people at large that (*gangguan*).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Jangan banyak sebut "D.A.P." dalam Dewan ini.

Ahli Kawasan Nibong Tebal (Encik Teoh Kooi Sneah): the Member for Kelawei is capable of doing anything under the sun to suit his political ends, regardless of the interests of the people. He has never ventured in this House to fight for the people in his constituency. I would expect the Member for Kelawei to bring up important matters concerning the future of the State. If Honourable Members think that they do not have any important matters to bring up, I think we are wasting the people's money and time. I feel very sorry for the people they represent.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya minta kebenaran bercakap

dalam Bahasa Inggeris. Usul inipun sudah dibahas beberapa jam. Saya fikir Yang Berhormat Ahli-ahli dari Parti Pembangkang di hadapan saya macam mana mereka berkata demokrasi tidak lagi ada di dalam Dewan ini, itu saya ingat tidak bolehlah lagi sangkut. Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya minta kebenaran bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris sebab saya fikir jika saya jawab balik perkara-perkara yang berbangkit di dalam ucapan Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Kelawei, Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Sungei Bakap dan Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bagan Ajam, barangkali saya haraplah apa yang kita ucapkan di sini bolehlah masuk hati dalam fikiran mereka.

Saya minta kebenaran bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

Mr Speaker, Sir, there is no question in my mind, because I rise with no mixed feelings. I rise with an absolutely clear conscience to oppose this Motion. You have, Sir, throughout the course of this debate exercised all the powers that are entrusted upon you as the Speaker of this House. And I am sure that although your service in this House is probably not less than mine you will appreciate that we learn even as we go on. And in the course of these few hours many Standing Orders have been brought to my attention which I myself was not fully conversant with. Certainly the Honourable Member from Kelawei cannot attribute to me an expertise on the Motion, and at the same time attribute to me in almost the same sentence and in the same speech that we had erred in the application of 51 (1), because, Sir, if we chose actually, and we had planned to do so, we would not have erred. We would certainly have done it completely, utterly and absolutely, (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): In attitude.

Ketua Menteri: because what arose in that incident must have rankled the heart of the Honourable Member from Kelawei. And sincerely I think few people really would relish the idea that their record in parliamentary behaviour should be blackmarked

so unfortunately by an application of such a drastic nature as 51 (1). That obviously must have been the stimulating point. And we listened to him very carefully with great attention. And this is the great tediousness of this House—having to pay a great attention to a lot of verbiage, a lot of rubbish. There is a saying, Sir, that a good painting is worth ten thousand words. Perhaps if I could illustrate quickly, what passed in my mind as I listened to this enormous outpouring from a psychological hurt and trauma is a picture of a person vomiting into a can which eventually led into the rectal tube. So, it is that kind of situation which gives us a great deal of strain. However, we have to listen to the Honourable Member with attention. He said, Sir, that this did not really affect him, because in actual fact he was not suspended by the Speaker. It was the might of the House supporting the Speaker which suspended him.

Mr Speaker, Sir, 51 (1) reads :

“If a Member shows disregard for the authority of the Chair, or abuses the Standing Orders of the Assembly by persistently and wilfully obstructing the business of the Assembly or otherwise, the Speaker shall direct the attention of the Assembly to the incident, mentioning by name the Member concerned.”

That, Mr Speaker, Sir, is the initiating move to the application of 51 (1). Mr Speaker, Sir, this deliberate attempt not to read the very important words of this particular paragraph of this particular Standing Orders indicates precisely what happened at that time, Sir. Although in the course of the debate one only expects a certain degree of heat, a certain degree of pomposity; a certain degree also of the need to express the egotistical immaturity, even if the immaturity is worthless, that we understand. But I think everyone in this House must agree that personally the Speaker is a very gentleman. And if any weakness had been shown by the Speaker, I think his weakness was to err on the side of gentleness, being not too tough, and then suddenly swinging to being very tough.

I think the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap himself began his speech in his usual manner, as I said; very careful of his tacking by saying that the Honourable Speaker is—he expressed simplicity—a good man. The imputation, however, is that the Speaker is exploited; and so the whole issue of the debate I can't quite understand because the Honourable mover says that the Speaker is inefficient, inept, and gives a whole long list of citations for ineptness. The Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap says he is a good man, but he is exploited. That we can understand also, because the Honourable Member from Kelawei was in actual fact not attacking even the Speaker. All the time the imputation had been that the Speaker is a good man. I think everyone in this House agrees on that. Even I agree he is a good man, not even pointing to any fellow. I think he is a good man.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): He is a mad man.

Ketua Menteri: However, Sir, whether or not the Speaker has acted correctly or otherwise has been interpreted in different ways. Now, we understand that the Honourable Member from Kelawei and his colleagues in the D.A.P. have little to support the Speaker because right from the very inception of this Assembly they had already broken tradition by proposing an alternative. And not having accepted the Speaker in the first instance I think to some extent they are quite logical to go on pursuing to say that the Speaker is not good, they have a better man, and so on.

But for the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap and the Member from Bagan Ajam, and indeed probably some other Members yet, to now change their views just because they are feeling hurt, they feel the pricks of conscience, and they feel the uncertainties of sitting over the other side, I think is a turn-about. Whereas on the one hand we accept the logical kind of development, on the other side it is—How do we mix these two, Mr Speaker sir,—very different. Hence I would ask

you to bear with me if I try my very best first to point out why we consider the Motion here to be not worth our supporting; but also in so doing to, I think, attempt to rebut certain insinuations, and the certain subjective subversion of authority in this House.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member from Kelawei began with the prayer. And I think he began rightly, because the role of the Speaker is to maintain precisely what is mentioned in this prayer; and not as in the words of the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap—either to protect the minority, or to ensure that the Opposition has a role to play, and so on—because the prayer itself goes on to read “our deliberation in so just and faithful a manner as to advance Thy Honour and Glory, and to advance the peace, prosperity and welfare of the State of Penang and of its inhabitants.” That, Sir, I think must be a primary concern of the Speaker: How best can he—especially exercising his powers under the Standing Orders, confused as they are when the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap mentioned that they are all unproductive—exercise his powers in order to advance the peace, prosperity and welfare of the State of Penang and its inhabitants?

Mr Speaker, Sir, in the Standing Orders the Speaker has wide latitude. For example, Sir, throughout this evening there had been many a time when Honourable Members who had spoken could have really been brought up under Standing Order 46 (xiii)—

“A Member must not—(a) impute improper motives to any other Member;
(b) make a personal charge against any other Member;”

and so on. However, Sir, that is not what I mean by cut and thrust, if the Speaker allows all the debate to go through under his Chairmanship. The Members of the House like to accept the thrust and the cuts in the House because they have been allowed by the Speaker. For example, the Honourable Member from Kelawei referred to the point where the Speaker allowed me. And this is an illustration of what he

referred to as the Speaker being biased on behalf of the Government, and not so biased on behalf of the Opposition; that is to say treated the Opposition so badly that the Speaker virtually— I mean the words are not being used, but the meaning is clear—“kowtows” to the Chief Minister, whereas he suspends the Honourable Member from Kelawei. That is the kind of see-saw situation to which the Honourable Member from Kelawei says. “Mana ada keadilan?” That we can understand. But when he refers to this question of ‘bodoh’, well, Mr Speaker, Sir, everyone in this House remembers that, I think, the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam did not like the term being used because he felt it was a bit crude. But however, I think in part of the proceedings of the House I indicated that under the present Standing Order 66 (2) the word ‘bodoh’ is referred to in the English translation as ‘frivolous’. As the word ‘bodoh’ itself appears in the Standing Orders, I shall be allowed to use it. And so that was part of the cut and thrust. Some of the cuts hurt a bit. They went nearer home; I do not know. But when the Speaker drew my attention to the fact, and asked me not to persist in using the word, then naturally I refrained from using that word. But just the Honourable Member from Kelawei managed to use it about five times, I think, in the last two seconds I used it also five times. Mr Speaker, Sir, that is precisely part of debating in an Assembly where one debates without notes.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the powers of the Speaker are tremendous. They are derived, however, by his constitutional position. The Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap asked whether the Speaker’s confusion does not arise from the fact that it was the Governor who appoints the time and date of the Assembly Meetings. That the Governor does under the Constitution of the State—

19. (1) The Governor shall from time to time summon the Legislative and shall not allow six months to elapse between the last sitting in one session and the date appointed for its first sitting in the next session.’

Sir, I think the Constitution is specific on that. The Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap need not try to equate that with the position of the Governor-in-Council where the Chief Minister and the State Executive Council would prevail. Mr Speaker, Sir, that particular provision in the Constitution leads on to the provision in our Standing Orders—6 (1), I think. And all these I have been doing since I have been listening to the Honourable Members.

“6. (1) Sittings of every session shall begin on such days and at such hours as the Governor may appoint.”

(2) An order of the day not disposed of before”, and so on, and so on.

“(3) There shall be a session of the Assembly once at least in six months, so that a period of six months shall not intervene between the last sitting in one session and the date appointed for the first sitting in the next session.”

Mr Speaker, Sir, our attention has also been drawn to Standing Order 9 where the powers of the Speaker are such that, “A meeting of the Assembly may be adjourned at any time by the Speaker or by a majority of the Members present and voting.” And so it goes on, Sir, that the State of provision of the Speaker is translated into the Standing Orders. And in these Standing Orders the Speakers are given a wide latitude of powers. Whereas we in this House have accepted the Standing Orders, even though we do not claim absolute knowledge of the Standing Order, and even though we are learning all the time about how the Standing Orders can be used, and in what manner the Standing Orders are applicable, even today I think this is a good lesson to me who has learned quite a lot about Standing Orders which I did not know before. It goes to show that a small document like this is a dynamic and vital one. It has got a life, and it has got a purpose. It moves on with time. And its capability of being interpreted are translated in many aspects of the Standing Orders which I myself had never understood previously. For example, there has been reference to this question of me referring to Standing Order 15, and that being changed to “51”. That, Mr Speaker, Sir, is complete

imputation on the part of Honourable Members—a malicious type of imputation—that I had any kind of signal orders to give. Mr Speaker, Sir, if I honestly felt that the Honourable Member for Kelawei deserved a scrubbing I wouldn’t hesitate standing up; and without having to call any signals or otherwise I will stand up, and I will scrub him in accordance with the Standing Orders.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I think at the time what actually happened was that I was standing up on a point of order; and I referred to the question that the Orders of Business in 15 (1) included, “Questions of which notice has been given and answers thereto.” The Honourable Member from Kelawei had a point which he elaborated just now. He wanted to indicate that under 26 (5)—

“Any Member may ask a supplementary question for the purpose of elucidating any matter of fact regarding which an oral answer has been given.”

And he stressed this point just now. Obviously, that was the thing which rankled. That was the psychological stimulant. This matter, Sir, was what he was trying to bring to the Speaker’s attention. And what he stressed was that question time need not necessarily be confined to three hours. That I think we accept, because it could be less than three, and it could be slightly more than three. And the Speaker has the right actually to allow the proceedings to go on a little bit more than three hours if he felt it was necessary. But to stretch the imagination of this House to the extent that just because of a supplementary question the time for oral answers could go on another five hours, I think, is just an expression by a distorted mind. Sir, just as one straightforward, simple picture, you see an apple is an apple. You can get somebody—I mean the term “crazy” has been used by the Member from Kelawei before; “somebody rabidly crazy”—painting something. And you look all round the place, and you ask why he said it is an apple. Only he can understand it is an apple. Nobody else can because, Sir, it is quite clear that the next parts of

26 (5) and (6) have been brought up many a time in this House. Honourable Members of the Opposition are wont either to read one end of a paragraph or another end of a sentence, and forget the top or forget the bottom. It depends on which side they want to go—whether it is topless or bottomless (*Ketawa*)—because it goes on to say: “elucidating any matter of fact regarding which an oral answer has been given, but a supplementary question must not be used to introduce matter not included in the original question.” So obviously, Sir, unless the question was so illdyed, and the Honourable the Chief Minister or the Member so appointed by the Honourable the Chief Minister felt like taking 5 hours to explain one supplementary question, and if the House would tolerate the answering to a supplementary question for five hours, and if the Honourable Members have pointed out this new trick to me, Sir, I could use it because in future I would ask that supplementary questions should take five hours, and talk all round the room and back again, up to Watergate, and otherwise.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I am learning quite a lot. However, under the constraints of this House the general interpretation that one would expect the Speaker to make would be that he had the right to terminate question time when he considered that the time had come. Then the Honourable Member, I think, went into a state of heated argument; and this led to a position where tempers became frayed. They had already been frayed earlier in the morning, as displayed by the Member for Bagan Ajam—Even you and I, I think, would get a little bit upset—when he, from his explanation, had said he had asked the Speaker previously to seat him there. He was very unhappy when the Speaker sat him behind. And although now he says he is quite happy to deliver some echo the Speaker eventually obliged him and sent him back. He didn't want to go. So I think the Speaker must have got all his signals crossed. Oh yes, the signals from the Honourable Member from Bagan

Ajam, his very good friend. As far as I can understand personally, I don't think the Honourable Member from Bagan Ajam has got anything against the Honourable the Tuan Speaker. But, Mr Speaker, Sir, obviously there was a misunderstanding, and tempers were frayed. Now, we can understand all this a little bit better if we accept it as a fact that the whole session of this Assembly, from the very first day it was resumed till today, has been a very rough kind of Assembly. Almost from the very first day Honourable Members in the Opposition have wanted to throw screw balls in this House. And the Honourable Speaker had a rough time learning his job under the circumstances. He was a man who had a good record. He has also, like other Members of this House, gone through the process of elections, being appointed also, and elected by members of a Constituency. I do not think the Honourable Member from Bagan Ajam who talks about us having to respect one another would fail to realise that the Honourable Speaker was himself an elected Member. And as such he had to learn his Standing Orders.

Now, I honestly said that I was taken aback when 51 (1) was used in December last year. It was to my mind personally a very unfortunate incident. But it had happened; and I only hope that the Honourable Member from Kelawei would accept it in that spirit. I can assure this House with full conscience, I can assure the world at large with full conscience, and I can assure anyone who so wishes to ask me that there was never at any time any signalling to the Speaker that he should try on that particular occasion to use 51 (1). It came rather as a surprise. As I said earlier, if we had in actual fact planned this and engineered this you can be very sure that we would have screwed it very well. But this came. It was taken as part and parcel of the process of Assembly. But I think it led to unnecessary tension in this House. And that tension has obviously led to a position where a Vote of No Confidence had to be brought up. At least the Honourable

Member from Kelawei is to be congratulated for having said that he wanted to bring a Vote of No Confidence, and for bringing it, whereas the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap had at best played an incidental part in seconding this Motion entirely in his own manner and style.

Mr Speaker, Sir, if we look at Standing Order 25 (4)—and these are figures that have been brought up to me—quite honestly, Mr Speaker, Sir, it is news to me to hear that so many questions of the nature that was brought up just now were brought up this way, and had been discarded, because, quite frankly, there was nothing in those questions that could not be answered; absolutely nothing at all, I assure you; even on this question which the Honourable Member from Bagan Ajam had submitted—loyalty to the scavenging contract, or something like that.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Why not answer it?

Ketua Menteri: Mr Speaker, Sir, the powers, however, of accpeting the questions are left to the Speaker. Now, the Speaker in so directing the Clerk under 25 (6) to give his reasons have, I think, perhaps given reference to other sections of this particular Standing Order. It is a fact that 25 (4) permits the Speaker alone to decide whether a question is or is not admissible under Standing Orders. Mr Speaker, Sir, it goes on further that if we go to Standing Order 42, on the question that was raised by the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap about his not being allowed to move an amendment, and his suggestion that he has the right to bring a substantive Motion to challenge the ruling within two days, I expect that under 42 the Speaker shall be the sole judge of the admissibility of any amendments.

There, there is also 447 (4). My attention has been drawn to 47 (4):

“Any question arising as to whether a Member is or is not in order shall be decided by the Speaker whose rulings shall be final upon all questions of order and procedure.”

Mr Speaker, Sir, I am just quoting these various Standing Orders to indicate that these Standing Orders give a great account of the manner whereby the House is to be conducted by the Speaker. And if the Honourable Members of the House accept that the Speaker has his powers, and the Speaker uses these powers in order to ensure that the conduct of this House is becoming, and that the matters that are conducted in this House lead to the welfare and well-being of the State of Penang and its inhabitants, I think there can be no doubt whatsoever in the minds of everyone that the Speaker is a very simple man trying his very best to carry out what he thinks is fit and proper for this House.

Then there arises this other sinister aspect of it, I think, it is being put most bluntly by the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap when he says that the official Speaker failed to exercise impartiality, and displayed dispicable bias. Those are the terms used. The Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap went on further as he waxed eloquent; and he managed to get through the cut and thrust and say, “you, you, you,” with the normal kind of parliamentray procedure which I am certain the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap, with his wide experience of legislature, is very capable of doing when he so wishes. So I had to assume that he was deliberately trying to be impolite at that particular time. I think I will give him the benefit of the doubt. He was just carried sway by his eloquence. He was not trying to be rude at all. But he went on to say that the Chief Minister is nothing in this House. Mr Speaker, Sir, at least all the other Members of the House agreed that all of us should be treated equally and impartially by the Speaker. Now, here is a man trying to say from the beginning that the Speaker is a good man, but unfortunately he does not give due regard to the minority, and he fails to exercise impartiality. He must protect the minority; but he must treat the Chief Minister as nothing. Mr Speaker, Sir, when you have this type of attitude being displayed you can understand how the

Speaker finds it very difficult to understand how the different Members of this House and the different Committees approved by this House are to be taken into judgement, and how he can best conduct the House in a manner which he would consider impartial.

Mr Speaker, Sir, as I said, the House started in a very rough manner; and it went through its ups and downs. And I suggested it might be best for the House if the House can have a Committee whereby it could discuss ways and means of getting order in the House; and certainly having goodwill in the House. Now, the fact that this was left to Members of the House, and this was left to the Speaker indicates clearly that the Government had at no time enforced a process of this House, and at no time influenced the functions of the Speaker. Now the Members of the Opposition imply that in every decision that the Speaker makes the Government tries to coerce the Speaker into making decisions against his own judgement.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the second part of the points raised by the Honourable Member from Kelawei and the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap to support their Motion, namely that although the Speaker was alright, there was Government interference in the functions of the Speaker, I think is unfair to a man whom we all know has a mind of his own. And admittedly, as I say, even though he exercises his individual personality in a much less tough manner than most people would wish he has also in the course of the last three years tried very hard to learn more and more about his position and his role as Speaker of this House. As I said, it did lead him to the interpretation of 51 (1) last December—so unfortunate. But I think this House will agree with me that the circumstances leading to the invocation of 51 (1) were such that I think it would take a real superman not to have been provoked to that extent. And I think the Speaker, being a very gentle person, must have considered that the manner whereby proceedings in the House were going at that stage had reached a point where

there was—on the verge of 51 (1)—disregard for the authority of the Chair. That, I think, is what has irked the Honourable Member from Kelawei—that there should be anyone in this House who should have a little bit more authority than he has. I am sure that if every other Member who wishes the proceedings of this House to be carried out in a dignified manner—which the Honourable Members opposite me, I am sure, have also expressed so many times—were to respect the authority which is inherent in the Speaker's office I do not think that today we would have heard such ignoble sentiments made against the Speaker. Mr Speaker, Sir, I am certain that every single sentiment expressed against the Speaker today indicates the kind of attitude which Honourable Members held towards the authority of the Chair. Almost throughout I would say—in particular regarding Standing Orders 46 and 47—things were such that the Honourable Speaker must have been on many occasions really superhuman to control himself against propagations that have been carried out by the Honourable Members from the opposite side. If everyone in this House were to accept this authority in good sense, in good faith, and in the spirit of the prayer with which the Honourable Member from Kelawei began his speech I am sure that the conduct of this House would have been much, much better than it had been before. But to say that the conduct of this House has not been so because the Speaker does not have the confidence of this House is not true. What this House has to do is to right itself. What Honourable Members have to do is to adjust themselves to the fact that the Chair is the authority in this House. And just because Honourable Members feel that they have gone past the stage of kindergarten, and reached the stage of being a member of the learned profession, a solicitor and lawyer, just as the Honourable Member from Kelawei—I must say that it is not an opinion that is completely reflected throughout the other side opposite me—don't think that you can rebuke somebody, and downgrade him,

and speak to the Speaker as though he is nothing. And you always have the time to challenge his authority, bringing Motion after Motion to delay the proceedings of this House, and making use of the Speaker's own weakness and his own gentleness of personality.

Mr Speaker, Sir, everyone in this House appreciates the fact that the Speaker is a man who tries very hard, and tries to be very fair. He may be a bit slow. But there have been occasions in this House when the Honourable Member from Kelawei right down to the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap, and the Honourable Member from Bagan Ajam, because they think their minds can move a little faster, and their tongues can wag a little faster seized every opportunity to have this cut and thrust of debate. But the Speaker has learnt some of the tricks of the trade. He has learnt about the powers that he has under the Standing Orders of the House. Mr Speaker, Sir, I was, as I stated, a little perturbed when 51 (1) was applied against the Honourable Member from Kelawei. But that it did happen indicated to some extent that the Honourable Speaker has learnt part of his authority. He has just found his authority, I personally feel that if he has not, and if he has no experience he would not have invoked this on the Honourable Member from Kelawei. The Honourable Member from Kelawei, after nearly six months of thinking about it, milling about it, getting sick about it, and feeling frustrated about it, was so frustrated that he took six hours to get it out. We allowed him that much time. But as far as I think, Mr Speaker, Sir, this experience will allow him a chance to be a better Member of the House. Otherwise the Speaker could have used 51 (5).

Mr Speaker, Sir, for the Members of the Opposition to say that I signalled the Speaker to use 51 (1) by referring to 15 (1), I think, is a despicable imputation because, as everybody will recall, the particular incident at that time was that the Speaker was confronted by the Honourable Member

from Kelawei, standing up and gesticulating. And I myself was standing up, trying to use 15 (1). But when the Speaker started speaking I sat down. But the Honourable Member from Kelawei went on. And he went on provoking the situation until the Speaker could not get any further. When the Speaker invoked 51 (1) I was astonished. Now when I come to think about it, if I knew about it at that time in December I would not have hesitated to invoke 51 (1). There was no need for any kind of cross signal. Mr Speaker, Sir, I did not know that the Speaker intended to take that action. But once the Speaker did take that action I think it was a matter for the House to abide by its decision following the consequences of 51 (5). As the Honourable Member from Kelawei indicated, it was done in such a manner that he could have come back on the 4th and created more disorder. But he himself, I think, was taken by shock; so much so he went out. The other Members also went out.

And he referred to his study of my previous speeches and records in this House. I would like to remind him that at least we did one thing when we walked out in—I cannot remember—1964 or 1965. We made our speech on the Budget first before we walked out. We did not walk out before the Budget speech.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we do not allow a situation to be such that it carries us personally away from our responsibilities to our electorate. We do not feel ourselves so egotistical that we have only one thing in mind—to punish and challenge the authority of the Speaker; and in doing so forget the people who elected us, and walk out just to show them who I am, Honourable Member from Kelawei, and who are you, Mr Speaker. And this has come to a point where a Motion of no confidence has to be moved. As the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap said, list out any precedence in the history of legislature in our country. Only a man so egotistical as the Honourable Member from Kelawei, so incapable of restraining his

personal emotions, would have moved in this manner. Mr Speaker, Sir, only a man who could lose sight of his responsibilities to the State, and to the people of the State, and to that faction of the people of the State in his constituency that he happens to seek his own personal egotistical position, could move this Motion today. And only a coward would second it in the name of piety.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, one objection. It is an unparliamentary word to use here. I would ask him to withdraw it. Saya ingat mesti tarik balik. (*Ketawa*).

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Tarik balik. (*Ketawa*).

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Show respect to the Chair. (*Ketawa*).

Ketua Menteri: The behaviour of the Honourable Members does not even allow me to take back the word, as though they wish the word would stick. Mr Speaker, Sir, I cannot help it. There are people who are born that way. (*Ketawa*).

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Mr Speaker, Sir, saya tak dengar "withdraw" ini.

Ahli Yang Mampengerusikan: Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat, saya suka menarik perhatian kepada Peraturan 116 (e). Saya harap supaya dapat kerjasama daripada Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat.

Ketua Menteri: Mr Speaker, Sir, I said I would take on the ruling; but I was interrupted. But, Mr Speaker, Sir, you do not deem the word unparliamentary. I would say this is the only manner whereby snakes in the grass function. Mr Speaker, Sir, I hope this is not unparliamentary too. But we know of sources and ways of cut and thrust. I think the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap accepts this. I know he enjoys it too; just as he expects me to enjoy it.

I really think the Honourable Member thoroughly enjoys this kind of thing. But please do not enjoy yourself at the expense and honour of an old friend—the honour and source of authority of this House—the Speaker.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I am not very sure at all about the tone and the manner of presentation of the support given to the Motion by the Honourable Member from Kelawei. I have to restrain myself because I suddenly remember that in the course of the speech by the Honourable Member from Kelawei he referred to the Speaker as one lower than a skunk. Mr Speaker, Sir, I can only think of a toad. You know, the toad is that rarity animal belonging to the rat race with a beard just like his. (*Ketawa*). But I do not think the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap really wanted to join in the pernicious attack on the Speaker as was lashed out by the Honourable Member from Kelawei.

There are two distinct aspects of this debate: One, the Honourable Member from Kelawei; and the support presented by the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap. There are only three important aspects of both of them: (1) It is certain that they are not happy with the Government. That is absolutely certain; (2) They do not like me. And that is also very certain. Personally, where we are in this House, they do not like me; and (3) What they were trying to do was not to attack the Speaker—not really—but to attack me. And if they want to attack me they can move another Motion of no confidence on me, rather than attack the Speaker.

Throughout the whole of this debate I have the feeling that Honourable Members of the Opposition feel that in the order of things there should be orderliness. Someone has got to bear the burden of authority. Whether the person is popular or otherwise is a separate matter; but have a person to exercise that authority to the best of his ability. Whatever immediately ends up in the logical way they think, or in the special type of logic that the Members opposite

me think, it must lead to a "no confidence" in him. I do not think they will be persuaded by me because they have come to this House perfectly made up in mind what to do. They have come to this House absolutely certain to discredit the Speaker.

Mr Speaker, Sir, one point I would like to end up with is this: The Honourable Member from Kelawei went on to say that if the Motion in this House is defeated because of the majority of this House it does not mean that the House has any confidence in the Speaker. Sir, you can understand the kind of logic that prevails opposite us—that even if the majority will prevail. And mind you, here is a man who tries to learn from me, asking me, about democracy. But do not try to learn my mistakes. I mean, you must eschew my mistakes. Learn from the things that I have told you that are right. But don't learn from my mistakes in order to make more mistakes. It is very bad. Even I cannot advise you not to make mistakes twice. Mr Speaker, Sir, the point is this: Here is a situation where the Honourable Member tries to ask this House to display a democratic spirit so that there is Government and Opposition. He asks: Why is it that the Speaker treats us so badly, whereas the previous Speaker—even an Alliance Speaker. I hold no torch for him just like some torch bearer—was so kind to you when you were in opposition? Why is it that the present Speaker cannot be kind to us? Mr Speaker, Sir, I suggest one thing: that the Honourable Member from Kelawei forget what has passed, and accept the cut and thrust of debate. I realise that he is not feeling too happy with the things I said. Just as he has his time so do I. Some of the things he put across to me were sharp. But I think this will pass. What I mean to say is that it is a remarkable achievement for a person to be able to stand up straightaway, and to go on for five to six hours, although sometimes it could be a display of a lot of stamina. The points put across were good in some instances. But on

the whole they indicated a lack of certainty of what exactly was happening, because if the Honourable Member were to go back and through the generosity of his heart, and through his own discussions and conversation with parliamentarians, and in his own thoughts find out his own uncertainty, and let what had happened be an unhappy episode of his life, and let bygones be bygones, he will learn something. That is the reason why we received very good treatment from the Speaker when we were Members of the Opposition. Never at any time did we abuse our position, or challenge the authority of the Speaker. Mr Speaker, Sir, one's personal conduct also has a bearing upon the way whereby others treat one. And I hope the Honourable Member will take this in good faith. I think some of the things he is trying to impute is not really bad. The Speaker can err. But he does not err because he is a fool or a superhuman person. He errs because he is very human, and because this House itself has been a rather unruly House from the beginning. I think the Speaker has much to be tolerant about.

I urge the Honourable Member from Kelawei to accept that in a democracy, particularly in parliamentary democracy, we do not accept absolute majority in everything that we do. But parliamentary democracy does mean that if a majority, working under the free process of free debate, has expressed against itself the Motion then it should be accepted in good faith as confidence in the Speaker because we on this side of the House, having discussed the Motion by the Honourable Member from Kelawei, cannot come to a point where we even see a situation where we could recommend a review of the points that are raised by the Honourable Member from Kelawei. In fact there is in this House a House Committee. There is also established a Committee comprising the Speaker and Members of this House. There is also a Standing Orders Committee and a Privileges Committee to which

many of the points that are raised, which have caused a little bit of unhappiness on the other side, can be raised without this bitterness of debate of no confidence. I think the Motion is as unwarranted as perhaps the imposition of 51 (1). But I think what has happened has happened. And we have allowed this situation to lead to this stage—that the Honourable Members opposite me have had a chance to speak at great length against the Speaker. I hope that they will accept whatever the decision of this House is; and that whatever decision taken by the majority will be accepted as a decision of parliamentary democracy in practice. That Mr Speaker, Sir is very important. Unless we so do then there shall never be a situation where the Standing Orders of this House can prevail. And without these Standing Orders, and a person to implement these Standing Orders, Mr Speaker, Sir, there can be no order in this House.

In the final analysis what we have heard in the speech of the Honourable Member for Kelawei over 6 hours is a cry—a cry to belong and to love. We must tell him that we respect him as a Member of this House. But having listened to him, with very great attention to the points that he has raised, I hope he does not feel unhappy that the points he raised do not receive the support of this House. I certainly, Sir, will not be able to support his Motion; and I will oppose the Motion.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): Tuan Speaker, saya minta kebenaran bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris. Tuan Speaker, Sir, I rise not only to oppose the Motion but to condemn it as one of utmost irresponsibility. Tuan Speaker, Sir, this Motion is a very serious one for it reflects the mentality of the mover towards the Honourable Speaker of this House; and in short is tantamount to condemning the Honourable Speaker of the House and all that this House stands for. Tuan Speaker, Sir, this unprecedented (*gangguan*).

USUL DI BAWAH PERATURAN MESYUARAT 9

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Tuan Speaker, Sir, may I rise on Standing Order 9. I notice that the Tuan Speaker is feeling too strained by the proceedings of this House. And in view of that I like to move that this House adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, as there are still a lot of speakers wanting to speak on this Motion; and if we go on it might take the whole night. I also notice that Tuan Speaker is feeling strained. And I think a lot of other Members feel the same. (*ketawa*). I therefore formally move that this House adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Saya tidaklah, kalau tuan-tuan membawa Usul kerana fikirkan saya letih.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Bukan tidak apa. Okay, saya tarik balik, Tuan Speaker, sebab ada banyak Ahli-ahli yang mahu bercakap. Sebab itu, saya cadang Dewan ditangguhkan hingga pukul sepuluh esok pagi.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Tuan Speaker, saya menyokong.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat, masaalah yang dihadapan kita sekarang ini ialah satu Usul meminta Dewan ini ditangguhkan sekarang dan disambungkan semula esok pada pukul sepuluh. Cadangan ini ada sokongan. Adakah Ahli-ahli yang hendak bercakap?

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tuan Speaker, dengan kebenaran bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris. I just wish to say a few words. I think all reasonable men can see that it is 11.15 at this moment. I think 90% of the population are asleep. Parliament has never met at such late hours. But the Penang Assembly seems to have that distinction. I think any reasonable person should consider not only the matter of the Assemblymen here but the welfare of the people who work for

this Assembly. And I think it would be highly regrettable if this Motion is rejected. At this late hour there are people appealing for sense. We should exercise sense, and demonstrate sense.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya tidak fikir hendak bercakap di dalam Usul ini tetapi sebab Yang Berhormat Ahli dari Kelawei sudah membawa beberapa perkara, saya fikir jika Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat dari Parti-parti Pembangkang fikir perkara ini sudah bahas dengan panjang sekali dan Usul ini tidak diaturkan dengan lebih baik. Kita semua terima apa yang Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Kelawei sebut tadi dan Ahli-ahli yang bercakap lagi bercakap dengan terus dan pendek supaya perbahasan ini bolehlah habis malam ini.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Dengan izin saya mahu bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Tuan mahu cakap fasal apa?

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Usul ini saya mahu cadang, saya mahu reply kepada Ketua Menteri. Dengan izin bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris. I think you understand that the Honourable Chief Minister is wanting to curb us, especially on this particular Motion, by saying that the Honourable Members should speak briefly on this subject so that the debate will be over tonight. But I notice that there are quite a number of Honourable Members on this side of the House and the other side of the House who have not completed speaking on this Motion. And in view of what the Honourable the Chief Minister said just now it is only fair that Members "from the other side" should be given the opportunity to reply to some of the allegations made by him. And I for one feel that we cannot do justice by being brief. We must be clear enough to put our points across. And with so many speakers still waiting for an opportunity to speak I feel that if the Honourable Chief Minister or the Members of the other side of the House insist on pursuing this particular subject

to its logical conclusion they should agree to this adjournment.

Soalan dikemukakan dan Usul tidak dipersetujui.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Minta division.

Ketua Menteri: Bukankah buang masa?

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Apa buang masa? Saya minta division kita ada right. Apa buang masa? Mahu bagi dia lebih!

YA

Encik Tan Phock Kin
Encik V. Veerappen
Encik Ong Yi How
Encik Yeap Ghim Guan
Encik Khoo Soo Giap
Encik Koay Boon Seng.

TIDAK

Ketua Menteri
Timbalan Ketua Menteri
Encik Teh Ewe Lim
Encik Tan Gim Hwa
Encik Wong Choong Woh
Encik S. P. Chelliah
Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Haji Abdullah
Encik Ooi Ah Bee
Encik D. C. Stewart
Tuan Haji Mohamad Nor bin Haji Bakar
Encik Khoo Teng Chye
Encik Teoh Kooi Sneah
Tuan Haji Abdul Kadir bin Haji Hassan
Encik Khoo Kay Por
TIDAK HAZIR
Encik Abdul Rahman bin Haji Yunus
Encik Mustapha bin Hussain

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat sekalian, mengikut keputusan undi, 6—"ya", 14—"tidak", 2—"tidak hadir". "Tidak" lebih banyak.

Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat sekalian, Usul di hadapan kita sekarang ialah Usul yang telah dibawa oleh Ahli daripada Kawasan Kelawei. Adakah di antara Ahli-ahli yang hendak bercakap lagi?

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya minta kebenaran bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris. Tuan Speaker, as I have mentioned just now, the Motion is a very important one because it is unprecedented in the history of our country, and because of its very serious implication on the authority of the Speaker of the House, I must call upon the people of the State of Penang to judge the actions, deeds and conduct of the mover of this Motion, who is none other than the Honourable Member from Kelawei. Tuan Speaker, Sir, as already mentioned earlier by the Honourable Chief Minister, right from the very first day of the holding of the State Legislative Assembly Meeting in April, 1971, this House has been constantly subjected to all sorts of obstructions and hindrances in its proceedings. In fact, just a moment ago we were witnesses to the sort of obstructions that we are encountering from the Opposition.

Tuan Speaker, Sir, nowhere in the other State Assemblies of our country would a minority in the House have been so foolhardy and thick-faced as to put up a nomination of one of their men, knowing that without any majority he could never succeed in being elected to the chair. These are all instances by which I am going to prove that the Opposition, instead of helping in the proceedings of this House, are in fact putting obstructions and hindrances. Tuan Speaker, Sir, what was the Motion then? Very obvious! It was very clear that the main intention was to obstruct and to hinder.

Tuan Speaker, Sir, as I mentioned before, as the Government's Members on this side of the House we always welcome and invite constructive, responsible and helpful criticisms from the Opposition, so that the people of the State can benefit by whatever proceedings in this House; but certainly

not obstructions, hindrances and irresponsible criticisms which the Oppositions, especially those from the D.A.P., are capable of, which in no way bring any benefit to this House or to the people of Penang. Tuan Speaker, Sir, I have been a member of this Assembly for almost ten years and throughout these ten years I have yet to come across such irresponsibility. And I am deeply ashamed to say here that the ill-mannered conduct of the members of the D.A.P. is a discredit to this Assembly. Tuan Speaker, Sir, as my colleague, the Honourable Chief Minister, mentioned earlier, we had the opportunity and the privilege of sitting across the floor, in the Opposition; yet we did not stoop so low as to resort to the level of D.A.P.'s irresponsibility and misconduct.

Tuan Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Speaker of this House was elected at the very outset through popular election, just like any other Honourable Speaker of the other Assemblies in our country; and therefore he commands the confidence of this House. His authority within this House while in session is supreme; and his decision or ruling, if any, is final. The prerogative for allowing or disallowing a question or Motion is at the discretion of the Honourable Speaker, and therefore cannot be challenged. So, in the course of this whole day we have seen for ourselves how, in spite of the authority of the Speaker, Honourable Members of this House have been challenging the Honourable Speaker. And to make things worse they have gone a step further by putting the blame on to the Honourable the Chief Minister for such disallowances. I do not know from where they got the idea that the Honourable the Chief Minister is also the Honourable Speaker of this House. I am afraid this sort of set-up could never be possible unless it is under a D.A.P. Government, if ever there will be one in this country.

Tuan Speaker, Sir, for two years this House has been subjected to a series of abuses, disrespect and contempt for the chair on which the Honourable Speaker sits. Whenever the

Honourable Speaker makes a ruling or order to Honourable Members from the D.A.P., especially the Honourable Member from Kelawei, we very seldom see that such rulings are being gracefully accepted or respected. Hence, Tuan Speaker, Sir, this was the very reason why the Suspension Order was meted out to the Honourable Member from Kelawei. This is the very reason.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tell more.

Ahli Kawasan Sungai Pinang (Encik S.P. Chelliah): You deserve to hear some more.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): Especially now, Tuan Speaker, Sir, I for one would jolly well say that he thoroughly deserves it; and I would not hesitate to give my full support to the Honourable Speaker for having taken the action. In fact there were other occasions on which the authority of the Honourable Speaker was even challenged; and which I must say is most deplorable, as these were very glaring instances of open defiance and disrespect. And the manner in which they conducted themselves in debate has confirmed what I am saying now. Tuan Speaker, Sir, in any other State Assembly the Speaker would not have tolerated such defiance or disrespect; nor he would not hesitate to apply the appropriate Standing Order, which in our case is Standing Order 51, which I believe the Honourable Member from Kelawei will always remember throughout his lifetime.

Ahli Kawasan Sungai Pinang (Encik S.P. Chelliah): It is a good lesson to him.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): A good lesson. However, Tuan Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Speaker is new to this House. And so are three-quarters of the Members of this House. But that doesn't mean that any Member can defy or show disrespect to the Honourable Speaker, which in fact has been persistently perpetrated by the Honourable Member from Kelawei and his D.A.P. colleagues.

Tuan Speaker, for these two long years the Honourable Speaker of this House has tolerated the insolent attitude of the Member from Kelawei and his colleagues with, I would say, patience and forbearance. He even tolerated the Honourable Member for Kelawei's tedious repetitions and ulang-ulang in his long-winded speeches which all of us were subjected to this afternoon, and to which, if the Honourable Speaker had not been fair, he could have easily applied Standing Order No. 51 (4) to stop him if he had wanted to. The Honourable Speaker could also have applied Standing Order No. 46 (ii) on the Member for his very frequent interruptions and interjections when other Honourable members were delivering their speeches. However, as I have mentioned, the Honourable Speaker, being new, tolerated him. And with warning after warning being issued by the Honourable Speaker, I regret to say that all these fell on deaf ears, until finally the Honourable Speaker had no alternative, but was compelled to take a firm stand to stop this nonsense of persistent misconduct. I for one congratulate the Honourable Speaker for taking this very firm stand to stop this nonsense of persistent misconduct in order to prevent this House of dignity, transacting important affairs of the State, from being turned into a mad house, which in fact the Honourable Member from Kelawei and his colleagues committed right from the very beginning.

Tuan Speaker, it is evidently clear that the Honourable Member from Kelawei is moving this Motion for the purpose of getting his own back at the Honourable Speaker for having suspended him towards the end of the last State Legislative Assembly Meeting for his most unbecoming behaviour. It has been found that the Honourable Member, Sir, has complete disrespect for the House. I would even go further to describe this Motion as "revenge of happiness" on the Speaker.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tuan Speaker, di atas Peraturan 46 (v). On a point of order—Order 46 (v).

I think the speaker, if I am not mistaken, is reading from a text. Order 46 (v) says that no Member shall read his speech.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Saya tidak tengok dia baca.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): I am surprised, Tuan Speaker, that there is another new Speaker in this House. Thank you.

Tuan Speaker, those of us who have been attending the Meeting here, including the ladies and gentlemen of the Press, and spectators, will fully agree that the Honourable Speaker was more than fair and lenient to the Honourable Member for Kelawei, especially when he could permit him to indulge in tedious repetitions lasting for hours at any one time. Therefore it doesn't arise, when the Honourable Speaker in taking firm action against the Honourable Member from Kelawei, that he could be considered unfair and unjust in his actions. I would like to say here that all the Honourable Members from the Opposition are playing, including the Honourable Member from Kelawei, (*gangguan*).

Dewan ditangguhkan pada jam 11.40 malam.

Dewan bersidang semula pada jam 11.47 malam.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat, sekarang Dewan disambung semula dengan Usul dibawa oleh Ahli daripada Kawasan Kelawei.

Yang Berhormat daripada Kawasan Tanjong Barat.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): Terima kasih, Tuan Speaker.

Saya minta kebenaran bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

Tuan Speaker, I would like to say here that Honourable Members of the Opposition have got away in the past with their misconduct due to the lenient, patient and tolerant attitude of the Honourable Speaker. But this should not be taken or misconstrued as a sign of weakness of the Speaker,

or, for that matter, that any of their misconduct in the past could be accepted as part and parcel of the code of conduct within this House. Also, it should not be taken that since the Honourable Speaker, in upholding the dignity of this House, and in exercising his authority to ensure the proper code of conduct, meted out a Suspension Order on the Honourable Member for Kelawei that warrants a vote of no confidence. The Honourable Member for Kelawei in the early part of his speech called for a searching of conscience. Here I would like to ask him to search his own conscience, and to ask himself why he was punished; and why not the other Members of this House. It is because he misconducted himself. Tuan Speaker, Sir, if he has his conscience then he will know why. And as a real gentleman—I will give him credit as a real gentleman—he would have accepted the punishment gracefully. But the trouble is he has not. And that is why he is moving this Motion in order that he could be made to appear as a martyr; and the Honourable Speaker the brutal tyrant, which were exactly the words used by him. Tuan Speaker, Sir, it is also very obvious that by this action he hoped to browbeat the Honourable Speaker into fear, so that he could continue to misconduct himself without any restraint. Tuan Speaker, Sir, like a naughty, crying schoolboy, having been caned by the Master he goes about crying. And he and his Party held a few public rallies in order to twist the full fact of the suspension. But then they just had not the guts to tell the truth, for they fear the truth. However, Tuan Speaker, Sir, in spite of holding this series of public rallies, what did they receive? Cold response and poor attendance.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): You hold one and see what you get.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Nothing.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): The cold response and poor attendance of their public rallies

speak for themselves, and reveal in no uncertain terms how much the people trusted and believed them and their pack of lies. In one of the public rallies at a car park near the Pulau Tikus market it attracted a miserable crowd of 30 odd souls, of which half (*gangguan*).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Ini tidak ada kena-mengena.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): It is a guess-work.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): He is bluffing. Irrelevancy.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): It might have been 31.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): Tuan Speaker, Sir, I am bringing this because it was their attempt to tell the people about the unjust suspension. It is not because of anything else. And in so saying that was my description of the crowd.

Tuan Speaker, Sir, some months back the Honourable Member for Kelawei moved a Motion of no confidence on the Honourable the Chief Minister at a time when we in the Gerakan were beset with our difficulties and internal problems. Now he moves a no-confidence Motion on the Speaker. And I will not be the least bit surprised if some time later he moves another no-confidence Motion. And this time on yourself for being a nuisance and a nut.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): You must be mad.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): Tuan Speaker, Sir, from the conduct and the performance of some of the Members of this House, especially those on the opposite side, I feel there is a real need for this House to conduct lessons and courses on parliamentary proceedings (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): With you as the teacher?

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): and on the code of conduct within this Assembly. The attitude, behaviour and conduct of some of the Members, especially from the D.A.P. are shameful and disgusting. And in fact they are a discredit to the people who have placed their confidence on them with the hope that they could serve them and their interests within this Assembly as their worthy representatives. Tuan Speaker, Sir, if only their constituents could see with their own eyes (*gangguan*).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: (Kepada pemerhati-pemerhati) Saya tidak suka tengok pemerhati-pemerhati angkat lutut tinggi macam itu.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): Can I continue? Thank you.

If only their constituents could see with their own eyes how they have conducted themselves I am sure the people who elected them would have hung their heads in shame.

Tuan Speaker, Sir, all of us here can freely participate in the proceedings of this House, and can still have their views heard without the necessity of being discourteous, disrespectful, or in defiance of the Honourable Speaker, or interrupting the proceedings of the House like a madcap, unless he is uncultured. Tuan Speaker, if you ask me I will not hesitate to say that there is no justification in this revenge-seeking Motion on the Honourable Speaker. And I therefore place my very strong opposition to this Motion that is now before the House.

Thank you.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Tuan Speaker, saya minta izin bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I have been listening patiently for the whole of this afternoon and tonight to speeches given both by the proposer and the seconder to the vote-of-no-confidence Motion, as well as replies from Members of the opposite side. I said I listened patiently

with an open mind because we in the PEKEMAS came here without the whip because we feel that this is an issue which is not necessarily a Party issue. No ideological issues are involved. It merely involves the dignity of this House, in matters pertaining to procedure in this House, and also the conduct of affairs in this House. So it is because of that that we agreed to withdraw the whip on this particular issue. So, because of that I listened very patiently to the speech that has been given by the proposer, and which was described by the Honourable Chief Minister as being verbiage, nonsense. However, there are quite a number of pertinent points being raised.

Admittedly, the issue on which the Honourable Member for Kelawei was suspended is not the issue involved. And the Honourable Member for Kelawei has pointed that out to this House. The vote of no confidence is based not on that particular issue alone, but on a number of other issues. However, the Honourable the Chief Minister in replying has deliberately evaded the crucial issues that have been brought up by Members on this side of the House. He has deliberately evaded answering points with respect to Standing Orders 25 (2), 24 (a) and 46 (xi). Those are very pertinent issues—issues which concern the Speaker striking out questions at his own whims and fancies. I will come to this in a few minutes.

At this juncture I would like to deal first of all with the speech of the Honourable the Ketua Menteri. The Honourable the Ketua Menteri said with regard to the suspension Motion under Standing Order 51 that it was unfortunate. And he told this House that he was perturbed. In that respect I cannot agree more with him. But is that a statement made in all sincerity? Or is that a statement made merely to hoodwink Members of this House? As I see it, if we want another example of hypocrisy I think we have it in this very speech of the Honourable the Ketua Menteri. I say it is hypocrisy because on the very next day I was in this House; and I informed the

House that if the Honourable the Chief Minister really feels perturbed about it, and if he really feels that it is unfortunate that the Honourable Member for Kelawei should be suspended under the Standing Order 51, he could have easily remedied it under the Standing Order 51 (3) where it is stated that if a Member be suspended under the provisions of this Order his suspension shall last until determined by the Assembly. And I called upon him to move a Motion to determine the suspension. But true to his colours he refused to do so. And for him to come to this House today and tell us it is unfortunate, and that he is perturbed is an act of hypocrisy. He went on to say that the Speaker has absolute powers; the Speaker can exercise his power under Standing Orders 42, 46 and 47, and what have you. True enough, nobody argues with him as to the fact that the Speaker has absolute powers. But the powers of the Speaker must be exercised not arbitrarily or indiscriminately, but exercised judiciously. The Speaker of this House cannot ignore the provisions of the Standing Orders. Standing Orders 25 (2), 24 (a) and 46 (xi) are clear and unequivocal. If the Honourable the Speaker does not understand the purport of those Standing Orders he always has the Clerk of the Council to assist him, or the Legal Adviser. But it is open knowledge that these are not the people that he went to for advice. As the Honourable the Chief Minister puts it, he is a simple man and because of his simplicity he is being used by or being abused by the Honourable Member for Kelawei or for Sungei Bakap. On the contrary, he is not being abused by them, but being misused by Members of the Government bench because his deliberate refusal to conform to the provisions of Standing Orders 25 (2), 24 (a) and 46 (xi) is done not for the benefit of the Opposition. They are being utilized to the disadvantage of the Opposition, but to the benefit of the Government, to enable the Government to evade answering questions on matters on which they couldn't possibly give a logical reply. This is the state of the

situation we have. When I say unfortunate, and when I say I am perturbed I mean it. I made attempts at the last session to reconcile the differences in the hope that the Speaker may repent; or in the hope at least that Members on the other side may repent and move a motion to determine the suspension. But events have proved that I have failed in my mission. People will judge this Assembly on the manner in which we run this House.

The Legislative Assembly in this country, and in fact the whole parliamentary system in this country is based on the British parliamentary system. And in the British parliamentary system it is essential for the Speaker, the moment he is elected Speaker, to divorce himself from all Party activities. And I say that if the Honourable the Chief Minister is really sincere in wanting to preserve parliamentary democracy in its true tradition, to make parliamentary democracy work in this country, then it is incumbent on him and members of his Party to realise this very carefully, and to allow the Speaker to divorce himself from all Party activities. It is only in this broad light of looking at things that we can make the Assembly work. They should refrain as far as possible from utilizing the Speaker for personal, Party, political advantage. This is absolutely necessary. The Speaker, if he is a weak Speaker—he is likely to be led astray. He is likely to feel that he is obliged to that Party that puts him up as Speaker. But this particular attitude should as far as possible be dismissed from the minds of whoever it is that will be appointed Speaker. And that is the very reason why consultation with Members of the Opposition is important. And it is very necessary for purposes of electing a Speaker, so that we can have a Speaker who will enjoy the confidence of both sides of the House. This is a very small sacrifice for any Political Party in power to make. And I appeal to Members of the Government bench to give very serious consideration to this particular point. It is very well in the course of debate to touch on

points that are not crucial, that are unimportant; and to castigate the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap for some of his statements. But the point is this: It does not matter who is appointed the Speaker. It does not mean that if the Honourable Member for Kelawei did not agree to the appointment of the Speaker then you can take it that he will be going against the Speaker all the time. At the same time it is not true to say that the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap, or even myself, who agreed to the appointment of the Speaker should at a subsequent date not participate in any debate or any vote of no confidence against the Speaker. That sort of argument is illogical, and does not make sense at all.

The Ketua Menteri talked of the Speaker as a good man. But whether the Speaker is a good man or a bad man is quite irrelevant. What is important is whether the Speaker is a good Speaker. That is the important thing. A Speaker may be a good Speaker. Or we may not know whether a Speaker is a good Speaker or not. But the moment the Speaker abused the Standing Orders, and makes decisions which are arbitrary, which are biased, then he does so at his own peril. And this is exactly what is happening to the Speaker of this House.

We all agree that this is a serious Motion. We all agree that it is unprecedented. But I must say here that the action of the Speaker in his interpretation of a Standing Order which is clear and precise by deliberately giving it a twist is also an action which is unprecedented. So an unprecedented action naturally calls for unprecedented reaction. And this is exactly what is happening in this Chamber today.

The Honourable the Chief Minister in the course of his reply touched on a host of issues which are not of fundamental importance as far as this Motion is concerned. What is important is the provision of Standing Order 25 (2)—and Standing Order 25 (2) has been elaborated with examples by the Honourable Member for Kelawei and the Honourable Member for

Sungei Bakap—with regard to questions pertaining to Federal matters. And there the Speaker chose to ignore the provisions of 25 (2) in rejecting. And also on 24 (a) regarding affairs of State in which the Chief Minister is officially connected. And here is a very blatant and a very glaring abuse of power by the Speaker. And the other example, as pointed out, was Standing Order 46 (xi), with which he refused to allow Opposition Members to speak even without an actual Motion having been moved. Those are what I would describe as very fundamental rights of the Opposition. If the Speaker abused that right once because he is unaware of it I say that we should excuse him. But to consistently and deliberately abuse the provisions of Standing Orders 25, 25 (a) and 46 (xi) is to invite trouble. And this is exactly what is happening today. And the Honourable the Chief Minister seems to take the view that as far as the position of the Speaker is concerned in this House if he has majority support that is the end of it. And he says everybody should accept it. In theory that may be so. But even in parliamentary practice in every other country I feel that a Speaker who is put in that position will himself refuse to act if he does not enjoy the confidence of the Opposition as well. And these are things which are crucial to the workings of a parliamentary system. So it is not for the Honourable the Chief Minister to be so cocksure about it all. And if he is very sincere about running a parliamentary system in this Chamber then I would appeal to him to give very serious consideration to what I have said. And it is not too late to remedy whatever defects and whatever shortcomings this Chamber has been suffering since its inception. And the person to initiate the move is none other than the Chief Minister himself. Whether he is prepared to do so or not I do not know. But I have this to say: that if he really believes in the democratic system, and if he really wants proceedings in this Chamber to proceed smoothly, then his first duty will be to make this very decisive

decision of asking the Speaker, whoever he may be, to cut himself off from the Party. And it is only by so doing that we can have a Speaker who will be able to command the confidence of Members on both sides of this House.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Selatan (Encik Wong Choong Woh): Tuan Yang Dipertua, mengenai Usul yang baru saja dimajukan oleh Yang Berhormat Encik Yeap Ghim Guan bahawa Dewan Undangan tidak menaruh keyakinan terhadap Tuan Speaker, saya ingin menyatakan sepatutnya Usul ini harus terlebih dahulu dibuang tanpa perbahasan. Usul ini tidak mempunyai nilai. Hanya membuang masa dan perhatian Dewan yang begini terhormat.

Tujuan utama persidangan Dewan Undangan ialah untuk membincangkan perkara-perkara yang melibatkankan kebajikan rakyat Negeri Pulau Pinang dan bukannya untuk mempertahankan nama baik ataupun menjaga maruah seorang yang bergelar Yang Berhormat Encik Yeap Ghim Guan. Saya percaya bahawa dalam mengemukakan Usul seperti ini Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Kelawei adalah berpandukan semata-mata kepada keinginan untuk mempertahankan maruahannya dan air mukanya yang telah dijatuhkan semasa persidangan terakhir Dewan ini pada bulan Disember, 1972.

Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Kelawei telah digantung daripada perkhidmatannya di dalam Dewan ini selama dua hari kerana beliau telah benar-benar tidak memperdulikan kuasa Tuan Pengerusi. Dan apabila persidangan Dewan ini berakhir di hari kedua pergantungannya itu, Ahli Yang Berhormat telah tidak berpeluang untuk membela maruahannya yang telah dijatuhkan.

Oleh yang demikian semasa persidangan ini Ahli Yang Berhormat tidak melepaskan peluang untuk menekankan hak-hak kebenarannya. Dengan itu adalah sungguh jelas bahawa Usul oleh Yang Berhormat itu ditujukan semata-mata terhadap kepentingannya sendiri dan bukanlah menulung pengundi-pengundinya di Kelawei.

Beliau membuat Usul seperti ini ialah untuk menaikkan kembali gambaran dirinya setelah mencemarkan dirinya di dalam pandangan rakyat. Ahli Yang Berhormat perlu membuat suatu Usul membetulkan dirinya. Untuk membuat demikian Ahli Yang Berhormat itu telah menuduh bahawa pihak yang lain iaitu Tuan Speaker tidak bertindak secara adil dan ini membawa kepada Usul tidak menaruh keyakinan terhadap Tuan Speaker yang dikemukakan kepada kita dalam Dewan ini. Perkara ini keseluruhannya merupakan satu Usul yang sangat mentah dan yang dikasihani bagi memperbaiki gambaran seseorang bertentangan dengan gambarnya sendiri bahawa beliau telah menjadi mangsa oleh pihak Kerajaan.

Saya adalah berpendapat bahawa tindakan pergantungan itu sesungguhnya sesuai bagi Ahli Yang Berhormat ini. Saya yakin bahawa kebanyakan daripada mereka yang mempunyai fikiran-fikiran yang rational, waras dan matang di dalam Dewan ini akan bersetuju dengan saya bahawa kelakuan Ahli Yang Berhormat di persidangan yang dahulu itu sungguh-sungguh biadap. Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Kelawei tidak menunjukkan hormat yang perlu diberikan oleh kita terhadap Tuan Speaker. Urusan-urusan yang bersopan-santun di Dewan ini tidak dapat dijalankan dengan kelakuan biadap dan cara samseng. Sikapnya yang mahu melawan sebenarnya tidak layak ditunjukkan oleh seorang Ahli Dewan Negeri yang memakai kot dan tai serta dipilih oleh rakyat. Ahli Yang Berhormat masih perlu mempelajari cara-cara bersopan-santun, tata-tertib dan diplomasi apabila mengemukakan pandangan-pandangan dan kritik-kritik yang sebaliknya menggunakan fikiran yang tenang. Ianya selalu menggunakan hujah-hujah yang ganas, garang dan yang tidak harus dikeluarkan.

Tuan Speaker bukanlah seorang yang suka menggantung perkhidmatan orang-orang seperti Yang Berhormat Encik Yeap Ghim Guan. Dan dengan itu menghadapi tuduhan sebagai melemahkan demokrasi oleh puak D.A.P.

Tindakan yang tidak mempunyai precedent itu telah diambil oleh kerana Tuan Speaker memikirkan bahawa ia sudah semestinya mempunyai hak terhadap kesabaran seperti itu mengenai perangai yang bantah dan tidak bersopan-santun.

Saya cadangkan bahawa Dewan ini dengan sebulat suara membangkang Usul tidak menaruh keyakinan terhadap Tuan Speaker. Sebenarnya kita pada masa ini membuang masa dan wang rakyat dengan melibatkan diri di dalam satu perbahasan yang sungguh kecil. Saya ulangi Usul Ahli Yang Berhormat adalah semata-mata berasakan maruahnyanya yang telah jatuh, menekankan hak-hak dan keperluan untuk memperbaiki kedudukan yang tercemar di dalam pandangan rakyat dengan menuduh bahawa beliau telah menjadi mangsa tindakan Kerajaan.

Akhirnya marilah kita semua mengulangi keyakinan dan kepercayaan kita kepada Tuan Speaker dan membangkang Usul ini. Lepas itu dapatlah Dewan bersidang dan membincangkan perkara-perkara yang lebih penting dan berguna.

Terima kasih, Tuan Yang Dipertua.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap): Tuan Speaker, dengan izin hendak bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

Actually the world outside this Chamber is—excuse my saying it—all facing the stillness of the night. But right in this chamber we are still having these fireworks. I would like to deal with the replies given by the Members of the Government. I can only gather one main reason for the Member for Kelawei to move this Motion. The main reason that comes from the Members on the opposite side is that the Member for Kelawei moved the Motion of no confidence against the Speaker for the simple reason that he was suspended in the last Sitting. The Member for Ayer Itam, apart from the mover of the Motion, has made it clear enough in this House that the suspension order meted out against the mover of the Motion has got no bearing whatsoever with the Motion that

was moved originally by the Member for Kelawei. In spite of that, Mr Speaker, Sir, Members on the opposite side have been toeing the line that the suspension order indeed had got something to do with it. I personally feel that the suspension order has got nothing to do with this Motion.

I rise, Mr Speaker, Sir, in support of this Motion with a sad feeling. It pains me to have to speak for this Motion, which is the first time in the history of Legislative Assemblies in the country, and indeed in the State of Penang, whereby a Speaker of the State Legislative Assembly faces a Motion of no confidence against him. As I said, I rise; and it pains me to speak in support. But based on all the ill-will that have been prevailing in this chamber through manipulators and through the Speaker for approximately a period of 3 years that we have been in this Chamber, with the tolerance that we have had—Indeed we have had a lot of tolerance. We have been tolerating all the nonsense that had been going on in this chamber—I might as well add that the last straw had broken the camel's back. That is why we are having the Motion of no confidence against the Speaker in this session of the Assembly. It is no fun, I assure you, Mr Speaker, Sir, and indeed I assure Honourable Members, from the Ketua Menteri to the ordinary backbencher of the opposite side, that it is no fun to come here to move a Motion of no confidence against the Ketua Menteri; and followed by a Motion of no confidence against the Speaker. It is no fun, and I tend to agree with the Ketua Menteri that is a very important Motion, to the extent that he has chosen it to be debated with priority over the other Motions and Questions and Bills. Yet he turns around and says that this Motion is not worth supporting. On the otherhand he considers it a very important Motion. This is the kind of tongue twisting that we can expect from the Ketua Menteri.

And here we find the Member for Tanjong Barat going to the extent of criticizing political rallies, which has

got no bearing on, and is entirely irrelevant to the Motion in question. But Mr Speaker, Sir, with your permission, I would like to rebut whatever the Honourable Member had raised with regard to our public rallies. Public rallies were held regularly by our Party.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan:

Jangan banyak sangat bercakap berkenaan dengan *public rally*. Tadi saya sudah tahan tuan jangan bercakap. *Public rally* tidak ada kenamengena dengan Usul kita ini. Saya tadi tidak benarkan tuan bercakap *public rally*. Saya minta tuan jangan bercakap berkenaan dengan *public rally*.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap):

I abide by your ruling, Tuan Speaker, but the Honourable Member said that this was a revenge-seeking Motion. I feel that the Member for Kelawei here is not that vindictive as to move a Motion just for the sake of revenge. This accusation from the Member for Tanjong Barat is typical of the low mentality that he possesses. 'Childish' was the word used by a member of the opposite side. Indeed "childish" should be applied to the Member for Tanjong Barat.

The Chief Minister went on to say that the Speaker has got tremendous powers. True, we agree with the Honourable Chief Minister that a Speaker of the State Legislative Assembly has got tremendous powers. And it is equally true that because of these tremendous powers manipulators have made use of them in order to subvert and sabotage the proceedings of this Assembly. Mr Speaker, Sir, a Member of the Government benches said that we contested the seat of the office of the Speaker. We contested, yes. We contested for the seat of the Speaker, not because we are craving for the seat of the Speaker, but because we wanted to demonstrate to the Party in power that we had very little confidence in the Speaker that they selected because we anticipated and we foresaw partial treatment in this Assembly.

Ahli Yang Mmpengerusikan: Mana tuan tahu Speaker belum lantik lagi tuan tidak dapat percaya kepada dia pada masa itu?

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap): Tuan Speaker, the Speaker is an elected member of the Gerakan Party which is in power. And it is only human, especially to a man who is simple, humble, and what not, as described by Members of the opposite side, and it is only natural that he will owe, as the Member for Ayer Itam mentioned earlier, some obligation towards the Party that elected him into the office of Speaker of this Assembly. Because of his simple, humble character it is easier for Members of the opposite side to take advantage, and to seek shelter through the Speaker. I have personally found it very impossible to speak on certain matters which in the opinion of the ruling Party are sensitive. I have found it very difficult even to illustrate to the Party in power, and to the State Government what little wrong they have done with regard to developments in this country, in this State, etc., for the simple reason that I was cut off for being irrelevant—even illustrations, etc., leading to new ideas to enlighten the State Government. These were cut off as irrelevant simply because those who are in power in the State today find these little disclosures by me will damage their office. For that simple reason they have to seek shelter through the Speaker; and I was cut off for being irrelevant by the Speaker.

Ahli Yang Mmpengerusikan: Saya rasa itu salah faham. Kalau tuan bercakap betul dan ada *point* yang baru Speaker boleh benar tuan bercakap. Ahli daripada Kawasan Kelawei bercakap lebih kurang 3 jam. Dia bercakap kita benar. Tetapi kalau tuan bercakap berulang-ulang dan tidak kena *point*-nya, yang itu Speaker boleh tahan. Dan saya nampak yang tuan bercakap itu berulang-ulang.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap): Mr Speaker, Sir, a Speaker of a State Assembly should be able to conduct the affairs

in the House with a strong sense of impartiality. He should know or understand that the position of a Speaker in this House is, as a Member said earlier, similar to that of a Magistrate or a Judge of a court. A Speaker needs a very strong sense of impartiality. I personally know that the affairs of this House have been during the past conducted in three different languages, namely Bahasa Malaysia, English, and a very popular sign language. We found the electronic eyeballs of the Ketua Menteri always very efficient. When the electronic eyeballs of the Ketua Menteri catch the eye of the Speaker the Speaker has to act immediately, rightly or wrongly, just to satisfy the Ketua Menteri.

Ahli Yang Mmpengerusikan: Itu Speaker mana? Aku?

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap): The Speaker concerned with the no-confidence Motion.

This has been happening. Where the question of impartiality is concerned, Mr Speaker, Sir, I can substantiate. When the Member for Tanjong Barat was speaking during the First Sitting I rose on a point of order; but I was immediately asked to quote the Order number by a Member of the Government. And this was immediately followed by the Speaker who asked me to quote the Order. And I quoted the Order number. The next moment the Member for Bukit Mertajam, the Timbalan Ketua Menteri, stood up and spoke on a point of order. When he was asked by the Member for Kelawei to cite the Order number he spoke on a point of order without citing the Order number. The Speaker did not insist on the Order number; but instead, after that, asked the Member for Tanjong Barat to continue with his speech without insisting on the Timbalan Ketua Menteri to cite the Order number. Whereas I, when I stood on a point of order, had to cite the Order number. This is a simple case of how biased the Speaker was when conducting the affairs of this House. There are indeed many more examples but I do not wish to spend the time of this

House, and lead all of you on to sunrise. I do not wish to cite any more examples. But there are, I can assure you, Mr Speaker, many such examples of complete biased behaviour by the Speaker for the last three years that we have met in this House. As I have said earlier, it is because of this accumulation of biasness against us that the day has come when the back of the camel has been broken by the last straw. And indeed it was not because suspension order. It was because of the last straw. The Ketua Menteri, together with his colleagues on the opposite side—of course, his colleagues have got to play the same gramophone record that he plays—blamed the suspension for the Motion.

The Ketua Menteri almost swore that the Government Members, and indeed the Ketua Menteri himself, have got no influence whatsoever over the Speaker. I would like, Sir, to challenge the Ketua Menteri to swear that he has at no time during the past ever influenced the Speaker to try and block Members of the Opposition; and at no time has he given the Speaker any instructions. I would like the Ketua Menteri to swear by cutting a cockerel. If he is prepared we will supply him with a cockerel. We will deliver here the cockerel if he is prepared to cut and swear. And also, Sir, to the Speaker involved in the Motion of no confidence against him; that if he is willing to swear on the Holy Quran that he has at no time in the past taken any instructions from the Ketua Menteri or any Member of the Government side; that he has on no occasion in the past taken instructions, or he had on no occasion during the past received signals, or rather interpreted the sign language that came out from the Ketua Menteri and the Honourable Members of the opposite side and if the Honourable Dato Speaker can swear on the Holy Quran I promise this House that my colleague, the Member for Kelawei will withdraw totally this Motion of no confidence moved against the Speaker. I dare the Ketua Menteri and the Speaker concerned to swear. I dare the Ketua Menteri again to cut the cockerel. We will supply the cockerel.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Berapa kali *challenge* juga? sekali cukuplah.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah: (Encik Khoo Soo Giap): Mr Speaker, Sir, this is only to place emphasis on the challenge.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: One emphasis is enough.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap): Thank you.

Ahli Kawasan Jelutong (Encik Koay Boon Seng): Tuan Speaker, dengan izin bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

Tuan Speaker, I support the Motion moved by my colleague before this House. It is regrettable that Honourable Members of the Government have failed to give any concrete replies. All of us in this House have seen the unjust decisions made by the Speaker at previous Meetings. In fact Members of the Government have only indulged in personal abuse, without dealing in any way with the serious examples of unjust and derogatory rulings. Unless the Speaker can cut himself away from the evil influence of the Honourable Chief Minister he can never carry out his duties. It is sad that the Government who should be the first to respect the Speaker have exploited his position.

Tuan Speaker, the unreasonable attitude of the Government, given by this example of midnight session, shows how they abuse their position before all of us. I therefore wholeheartedly endorse all that has been said by all Members on this side of the House. And we advise the Government to mend their ways before it is too late. Tuan Speaker, the Honourable Chief Minister must stop trying to play two ways.

Thank you.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tuan Speaker, saya mesti ucap terima kasih kepada semua Ahli-ahli sini yang ada campur dalam bahas ini. Dengan izin:

This debate itself is unique. This session up to one o'clock in the morning is also unique. This House is full of unique examples.

I would first deal with the points raised. And I do more than justice to the Members who spoke from the Government benches in describing them as points. I think rather that whatever they had to contribute was mere frivolity. But I think I have to rebut a bit what they managed to put across, difficult as it was for them; especially the Member for Nibong Tebal who did not actually participate in this debate. He had a text which was written days ago; and he did not know what actually was going to happen today. So he just read it out. For him I am very sorry. I am very sad about him because this kind of records don't go down well in Assemblies. In any event I do not think they contribute anything substantial. As my friend on my left has already said, they sound like gramophone records. But I would go to say that listening to the two or in fact the three of them is rather like the poor echo of a gramophone record. Not a gramophone record itself, because they were very much trying to imitate the Honourable the Chief Minister who, to give him some credit, did at least say something of some substance; something that has some meaning. But the rest of them, particularly I regret to say our experienced Member from Tanjong Barat who claims to have 10 years experience in this House, thereby entitling him to his pension, have only managed, Sir, to deal in personalities. I agree that in the cut and thrust of debate one may get carried away. The Chief Minister also does get carried away. And this in fact is a habit of the Member for Tanjong Barat. I remember a previous debate about the Sungei Kluang problem when he stood up and just went rattling away adjectives. And these adjectives recur in his speeches time and again. I like to bring these famous words of his to memory again, so that he would attempt next time not to use them over and over again. The over-use of one or two words is rather deplorable. And those are his

words. He likes to use words like "irresponsible", "deplorable", "insolent attitude", "shameful", "disgusting", "madcap", "uncultured". That is all his vocabulary extends to. Sir, I think he is entitled to his opinion. We would be the first to defend his right to express himself. But if we are uncultured, we are madcaps, we are foolhardy—another one of his words; imputation—the Chief Minister says we shouldn't impute on persons here. But there on his right there are people doing so. He can't control them; much less control us on this side. But there you are, if they wish to describe us as shameful, disgusting, tell us in what way we are shameful. Tell us in what way we are disgusting, because we have raised substantial points. I cited the Member for Tanjong Barat with good cause. I cited the question he asked when he was on this side of the House—questions which I am also asking today. Has he advanced the reasons why questions that he asked could be asked, and the questions which I asked, which are similar, cannot be asked? Sir, these are personal matters personal to him. But he just says, "uncultured", "disgusting", "shameful", "madcap", "foolhardy". And I can go on. Sir, this is not contribution to the debate—adjectives. If you want we can buy him a copy of the Oxford Dictionary. All the adjectives are there. It is a waste of time to come here, sprinkling this House with adjectives. Give us the facts. That is why we say mere numbers mean nothing. Nor, as the Chief Minister has expressed in debate, "Oh, if they lose the Motion they will not accept the decision." No, that is not what I said. And it has been said more than once that the Chief Minister would like to twist and turn. And I say so. I never said that. Neither did I imply that. I am sure the Chief Minister is cultured—to use the word of the Honourable Member for Tanjong Barat—enough to understand what I mean, or I intend to mean. I said that sheer numbers is not sufficient. I said that I would like to hear from the Honourable Members of the Government concrete points and arguments to show

why what we say is wrong; why the points that we have raised have no basis; why we are wrong when we say that the Speaker has not gone in accordance with Standing Order 25, and that he has no right to cut out our questions. Tell us. Not to rattle away, and say that this Motion is a useless Motion—"don't waste your time with it", like the Member for Tanjong Selatan says. And he does not do a good job of it, Sir, because he contradicts the Chief Minister. The Chief Minister says it is of substance. Of course he says something else, I agree.

Sir, the Member for Ayer Itam is rather sceptical about the sincerity of the Chief Minister. I do not know because I haven't had, and I hope not to have such a close association with the Chief Minister to judge his sincerity. I have to take the person on face value. But the Chief Minister said that he was perturbed at the suspension. And there was the Member for Tanjong Barat. He was so happy, elated, and said, "You should remember it for the rest of your life." Sir, I have a lot of things to remember. This is not one of those things I would bother to remember. But it is something that the Members of the Government should think about seriously, instead of coming here with a prepared text, and just rattling away, and wasting everybody's time.

Sir, it is no point just using adjectives and saying, "mentality of the mover". This goes on like a disease down on the Government benches. What mentality, Sir, may I ask, are you referring to? What is this mentality that you are downgrading on our side? Tell us. Here again I would use the word "mentality" that pervades on the Government benches. The Speaker rules out our questions without basis. That is the mentality. Here again is a Member who describes us, and then it is not substantiated, with due respect to yourself. Do come to this House and substantiate what you say. Even in the early hours of the morning you should be sober enough. It is very sad, Sir, that a senior Member

like the Member for Tanjong Barat should go to such depths and reveal that he has nothing to contribute, except to come and say, "He deserved it. He deserved the suspension." Tedious repetition. He said I repeated myself tediously in this Assembly. Give me some examples. Why don't you? Are you incapable of substantiating your points? Or are you just an old gramophone record? Sir, I would accept the cut and thrust in this House. He is very angry with my interruptions. He said, "You know, the Speaker has been very kind to you without pulling you up for interruptions." The Chief Minister interrupts me too. But I take it in my stride. They may be small strides, but I take it. And this is the beautiful part, Sir: He calls it a punishment. These are his words; not mine. Oh, punishment! Now, when the Member for Bagan Ajam said that it was a punishment I was rather sceptical and said, "I think maybe he is pulling things a bit far." I don't think the Chief Minister, nor the Government, nor the Speaker is so vindictive as to consider that what I may have done in one session is something for vengeance in another session. That thought never crossed my mind. But it begins to cross my mind when the Member for Tanjong Barat says it is a punishment. Oh, I did something in a session, so you are going to punish me in this by suspending me. Well, that has logic. Well, I congratulate the Member for Tanjong Barat. As I said earlier, when I interjected, say some more and let us know more about what is going on, because the Member quite often says he is talking hog. In one session he said, "I am talking hog." I am not surprised. And one thing, Sir, that is very common to his speech: the word recurs all the time—"tolerance". "The Speaker has been very tolerant." Sir, we don't come here on your tolerance, get it very clear. We come here by right of the electorate. We may represent our individual constituencies; but we are not tolerated by you. Don't ever say, "We tolerate you people." It is not for you to tolerate us. So I am very

disappointed with the Member for Tanjong Barat. After 10 years I would have expected something better.

Same with the Member for Tanjong Selatan. He has nothing better to add than allegations which are not substantiated. So I don't think that these two Members warrant much consideration.

And as for the other Member from Nibong Tebal, I think we need not bother about his speech because he really did not know what he was talking about.

I would just like to refer only to one matter raised by a Member on this side of the House; and that is by the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam. He said that in fact if the Chief Minister is really sincere in saying, "Oh, the Speaker should be independent, and is independent," then he should divorce the Speaker entirely from the Parti Gerakan. And that I feel is a valid point. And I would add that what the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam says is true. The Speaker has been used by his Party members for Party purposes, aside from being in this House. I recall a newspaper report that our Speaker was the Chairman of a fund-raising effort by the Member for Sungei Pinang—a cinema show. In what way can the Speaker do that? He shouldn't do that. It was done. So, what was raised by the Member for Ayer Itam is not entirely without substance. It is substantiated by fact. And that again is very unfortunate.

Now I come to the bigger fish, the Chief Minister. He has raised a lot of points; but I regret that these points which he has raised, as usual, are red herrings. He is a big fish; but he is a red herring anyhow. And that is very unfortunate, Sir, because we are dealing with a very serious Motion. And it is our own doing that we are here at 1 o'clock in the morning. And if he is not sober enough to answer all the points that have been raised that is his problem. But he has failed, Sir—utterly, dismally, ineptly. He has failed to answer a single point

that I have raised, or any Members on this side of the House have raised. He has failed to repudiate any comments. He always says, "I don't like to deal with personalities and imputations." He goes on. He is also suffering from that disease of his other colleagues. He uses a lot of words—"distorted mind". And he has used personalities—"this learned Member", "advocate and solicitor". I do not know how these things came inside. He said all these things. He said, "egoistic immaturity", "committing", and so forth. Sir, we have got pretty used to all these words—"vomiting" and all that. If anybody, Sir, is vomiting in this House it is the Member for Kota. And not only vomiting; eating his vomit, because everything that I have quoted in this House are his own words. It is very sad. You may be the Chief Minister of Penang. You may say that the world will believe you—"I sincerely say this. I sincerely say that. And I hope the Members of the House will believe me." Sir, we may believe you. That is not good enough. You must believe yourself.

Ketua Menteri: I do.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): That is the question. You have to say that here, I know. But maybe in the quiet of the night your conscience may prick you. Can I ask you?

Ketua Menteri: Never.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Well, perhaps you are privileged in not having a conscience. (*ketawa*).

Sir, I am very sad that the Chief Minister does no justice to himself or to the Party, or even to the Speaker in not trying at least to rebut the matters that we have raised. We, of course, accept that he would say that "this Motion is not worth our supporting". Sir, the heavens would collapse if the Chief Minister were to stand up in this House and say, "I support this Motion." It is a foregone conclusion that he wouldn't support

it. He need not strain himself to say, "We on this side will not support it." That is something that we well expect.

What the Chief Minister has said in this House tonight in reply to the debate reminds me, Sir, of a cartoon that I saw recently. Our friend from Kawasan Glugor is very famous for his cartoons. I would like to add a cartoon for him to put in his collection. And that cartoon, Sir, is in connection here again with the Watergate affair in America. It shows President Nixon hiding under the desk and saying, "The buck passes here." And that is what I sum up as the sum total of what the Chief Minister has to say. He is passing the buck. He will not accept the responsibility.

I am sad to say that I never raised in this debate that signals were given by the Chief Minister; not that I overlooked it. But I thought that it was perhaps not in good taste. We have gone to the extent of having come out quite clearly and saying that there is influence. But I think we don't have to descend to the level of this. But I say so, Sir. I say that signals have been given. And I have seen them with my own eyes. Maybe it is not the electronic eyes of the Chief Minister; but at least there were signals given. It is a fact of Assembly life here. I had one occasion to return a slip of paper to the Speaker in the open House itself—a note telling him what to do. This much I have produced. Don't look at me. It is in the records. I had to do that one day. So we need not try to kid ourselves and say there is absolutely no influence. He says that I would like to say that the Speaker kowtows to him. I do not know whether physically he does kowtow; but definitely he does bend the Standing Orders in favour of the Chief Minister. And I say honestly that if there is going to be a beginning of any sort of understanding, any sort of fair play in this House, that has to stop. It is not for us here. We are in no position to influence anybody, you can see. We are in no position to influence the Speaker. And we are in no position to "jack" the Speaker as

well. That is the word that has been used by the Chief Minister tonight in front of the present Speaker's nose, Sir. We are not attempting to "jack" anybody. For us it is a cause of hardship. We can't grant any favour. We cannot send you on any tours; so don't imply about "jacking", and about a lot of other things. It is not nice.

And this reference to Orders 15 and 51. The Chief Minister says, "If I wanted to move it I would myself do it." Sir, it takes moral courage to move that. If the Chief Minister honestly believes what he believes, as the Member for Ayer Itam said, he had a course to take; but he did not want to. So don't tell us, "I would have moved it if I wanted to". It is a matter of moral courage. Have you got that moral courage? Let us face that. Perhaps you don't have it.

Citing the wrong Order: As I said earlier, the Chief Minister said, "Oh, I could have cited the wrong Order." He gives me credit for being experienced in the Standing Orders; and yet he says, "I cited the wrong Order." No, I didn't say you cited the wrong Order. I said you cited the wrong Order deliberately, because if you had stood on a point of order—And the records will speak. You stood on a point of order—how can you stand on Order 15? It is as simple as that. It is the Order of business—how the business of the day should be arranged. It has nothing to do with a point of order; so you couldn't have made a mistake. It is very obvious. A man of your experience definitely cannot make that mistake.

He went on, Sir, to mislead on Standing Orders again. As I said, the Chief Minister would draw red herrings. He referred to Order 26 (7), and he said that the Speaker—And this is wonderful. This shows what really goes on—has the right not to allow supplementary questions. Sir, I drew the example that for 5 hours we can go on with the supplementary questions. Of course, provided that it is relevant, I agree. That was only an illustration. It need not be taken

seriously by the Chief Minister. But I have given the example that we can go on for 5 hours. Technically we are still in the right. That is all I mean. And the Chief Minister has the cheek now to say that the Speaker has absolute power; that he can cut you out even if you comply with 26 (7). That is an admission more than anything else before us today that there is manipulation; there is a tendency, a propensity to do so in this House. And we must mark the words of the Chief Minister. We have to be careful with the Ketua Menteri because he is a slippery fish. He may be a red herring; but still quite slippery.

And I would like the House to note that in connection with his denial that signals were given he said—These were his actual words because he is very shifty. When you ask him about jobs he says, “It is job opportunities. I didn’t say “jobs”; job opportunities. Given a chance he can run. The words he actually used, Sir—that there were no signals on that particular occasion. Now, I find that those words are very damning. Is it admitted that on other occasions signals were given, but only on that particular occasion which I pointed out no signals were given? Is that what the Chief Minister says? I wonder whether he really knows what he is talking about tonight.

And I am very perturbed in fact by what he goes on to say further in connection with powers of the Speaker. He said those powers are absolute powers of the Speaker. I am sure he relishes this absoluteness of the powers. He said these are absolute powers. And 42 and 47 (4) give him absolute powers to decide either way. I say that is not so, Sir. And the Member for Ayer Itam has also pointed that out. The powers of the Speaker to reject questions and other things are based on the Standing Orders. Why do you set out Standing Orders then in connection with what can or cannot be asked—24—of the Chief Minister if it is not to be complied with by the Chief Minister himself? Why say that questions may be put to the Chief Minister relating to all affairs of State with

which the Chief Minister is officially connected? Why say that if it is not to be carried out? I say that if it is so, if the Speaker has the discretion that the Chief Minister says he has, the wording of this Standing Order should be as follows:

“Questions may be put to the Chief Minister relating to all affairs of the State with which the Chief Minister is officially connected if the Speaker so allows.”

That should be it. That does not solve anything—“if the Speaker so allows”. So if he does not allow, full stop! That is what is happening today. He just does not allow it. And it is interesting that in the course of his long reply to us, leading his merry band of sheep, he makes no reference to all the questions which I have raised—whether a particular question that has been ruled out (*gangguan*).

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Per-kataan “merry”.

Ahli Kawasan Keiawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Oh, all right. Then they are not so merry. They probably are not sheep. Maybe something else. But the point is this: I have raised specific instances where my questions and the questions of other Members have been rejected. And I had said that these were in accordance with Standing Orders. And did the Chief Minister try to say something; or say he would look into it; or say, “Oh, I agree with you”, or “I disagree”, full stop? No, he doesn’t want to talk about it. He just glosses over it, and goes into generalities. And he feels hurt when somebody says he is nothing. Oh, I don’t say the Chief Minister is nothing. Maybe that was a slip of the tongue. He cannot justly be here if he is nothing. He is something. He is the Chief Minister, fair enough. But always remember you are the Chief Minister; but we are also representatives over here. So if you are nothing we are also nothing. We are also something over here. So if you feel hurt at being nothing you must consider what we feel by the kind of things that are going on in this Assembly. You say, “Oh, the Member for Kelawei must realise that he also must

be master of his own difficulties". But if we in this House are big enough to accept, let us say for the sake of argument, 25% of the responsibility, is the Chief Minister able to accept even 5%? As I said, "the buck passes here". He will never admit anything. And he likes to bring in this point. He says they had a big walk-out, Sir, when you were in the Government. They had a big walk-out over the Budget debate; "and we made a speech before we walked out". Sir, they made a speech, I know. I read that speech by the Honourable Chief Minister. But it had nothing to do with the Budget. All he said was that it was an insult to this House that a Budget of the City Council could be passed without debate, and that we should come to this House and discuss the Budget of the Assembly which was half the size of the City Council Budget. And in view of that and as a protest on democracy and the rest of it he walked out. And the Honourable the Chief Minister at that time had to describe it as a poor strategy by people who had not prepared their work on the Budget. That was what was said. So don't come and tell us—we have got the records here—and say they made a speech. This is very childish. In any event it is of no value.

Sir, the Chief Minister tells us to adjust to the Chair. Those appear to be very consoling words. Adjust to the Chair to what extent, Sir, we would like to know. To the extent that questions about the City Council should be rejected arbitrarily? Is this the adjustment he is talking about? Is there no adjustment to be made by the Chair? Adjust to the Chair? Submit? Accept arbitrary decision? That is the adjustment? The adjustment of slavery? That sort of adjustment, Sir, the Speaker and the Chief Minister can wait for till the cows come home. We will not adjust. It is as clear at that. You can try another suspension.

So, Mr Speaker, Sir, in fact what we have seen tonight, and this afternoon, and this evening is a complete failure on the part of the Government Members, led by the Honourable Chief

Minister, to try to justify or even to defend the Speaker. It is no point saying that he is a good man. We have never said he is a bad man; so by implication he should be quite a good man. But it is no point saying he is a good man. That is not the issue, Sir. The Motion is not that we have no confidence in Datuk Harun. We never stated that. We have no confidence in the Speaker. We have nothing personal against him. That is very clear. I know the Chief Minister would like to bring this to a personal level. And that is why he has instructed his boys to take that line. That is the line taken by every single Member who spoke, apart from the Chief Minister. And that line is that vendetta; because of the suspension. That is all.

Sir, we on this side of the House undergo a lot of sacrifice here, in the day and in the night time. Most of us, as the Chief Minister says, are gainfully employed. The same cannot be said of many Members of the Government who rely and depend on the present existence of the Government. We are gainfully employed. And every day that we spend here not only means our time; it does mean our money. And we have a duty to this Assembly and the people of Penang. We are not particularly concerned as to whether the people think one way or the other. But if we feel that what we do is right we will do it. So don't threaten us one way or the other. The Honourable Members of the Government, I feel, should at least do justice to this debate. Do justice to a man whom they put up as Speaker. But not to turn tail and ditch him. And I say, Sir, the standard of replies tonight is tantamount to ditching the absent Speaker.

And I have said in this House more than once that I know the Speaker is being used. I said that I know he is doing things against his better judgment. But I have also said that if a man will not help himself we are not prepared to allow the situation to go on, because the Chief Minister will be the first to exploit the generosity of a man who is prepared to go to any extent, and who has more than once publicly declared

that he owed a lot to the Chief Minister. It is true. Let us face it on this sober morning. He owes a lot. He was nobody. He was in fact a petition writer, let us be frank. And now he has become the Speaker. He has become a Datuk.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Itu personal.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Itu personal tetapi bukan dengan hati marah.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: No personal. Saya tidak mahu bawa itu.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Baik.

Ahli Yang Mempengerusikan: Jangan kata "baik". Kata "Ya".

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tuan Speaker, the point is that we are very clear that the absentee Speaker owes a lot to the Chief Minister. But the point that we are concerned with is not that he owes a lot to the Chief Minister. The point is whether he understands that in spite of the fact that he owes a lot to the Chief Minister he owes more to the State of Penang. He owes more to this Assembly. That is what we are concerned with. And if he is unable to devote himself to his responsibilities he is of no good to anybody.

Therefore, sheer denials and adjectives do not do justice to the replies in this House. The Chief Minister talks about being sensible; coming to your senses. I say that we on this side of the House have always been ready and prepared to come to our senses. But the same cannot be said of the Chief Minister. And I would give all illustration that in this very House yesterday, Sir, the Chief Minister himself was not able even to be sincere when we were discussing the issue of timing of Sittings in this House. In his usual implacable style, when I was trying to talk to him about the timings of Sittings he was trying to talk to me about something else to divert me because he knew that he wanted to drag this House up to

one or two o'clock if necessary. And this demonstrates more than anything else that we can say in this House that this is the manner in which the Chief Minister runs the State of Penang. He stands for no criticism. He does not tolerate criticism. Sir, the strength of the Government depends and is indicated by its capacity to take any sort of criticism. A Government which is unable to accept criticism in a free democratic society has no business to continue in power. And I have said when I commenced the debate that the centre of the whole problem here is that no matter how difficult it is, no matter what personal allegations may be raised by the Members of the Government benches, we have to carry out our duties because democracy, Sir, is at stake. The democracy as practised by the Honourable the Chief Minister is a mockery of the real thing; a mockery. And through the manipulation of the Speaker you undermine the free democratic process. It is the responsibility of every Member in this House, as I said earlier, whether you are able to implement development plans in one way or the other, to make sure that the legacy of democracy passes on not in any way devalued. But we have seen from the exhibition by the Speaker, and by the Members of the Government that they do not understand what we may be driving at. There may be some who understand.

I say it is significant that only a few Members of the Government are taking part in this debate. It is very significant. And those Members who took part are predominantly of the Ex. Co. And it is also significant that not a single Member of the Coalition Party has taken part in this debate. It is very significant. As I said, you may win by mere majority. That is understandable of the image of the Government. But it is significant that not a single Member of the UMNO has spoken. That I think is significant. And I am glad that there are people here who have some principles. They may not agree perhaps, and will not be prepared to be pulled by the nose like a bullock. But I would have been happier to see more backbenchers standing up and expressing

themselves. The Member for Tanjong Utara, for example, because he was cited.

Sir, more than any words can say what has gone wrong in this House, what has not been said has more bearing. And I am very sad for the Chief Minister that on a Motion of no confidence in his Speaker half his Members have not spoken; and his Coalition partners have not said a word. So it is condemnation; a very severe condemnation. And I would join the Chief Minister in his words. "Let us leave all this behind after tonight's debate". But, Sir, we can never leave these things behind if the Chief Minister does not himself take the first initiative. But if the Chief Minister wants to play his old game I say we are not going to leave anything behind.

And we, Sir, have nothing to deny. The Chief Minister, as already mentioned by the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap, is aspiring for greater things in this country itself. But build a strong foundation; a foundation of democracy. You can never go to bigger things when even the small things you cannot handle. The people at higher places will consider what is going on tonight, at 1.30 in the morning. And I say that the friends of our friends are here tonight too. They have not participated. It is significant.

Thank you.

Soalan dikemukakan dan Usul tidak dipersetujui.

Dewan ditangguhkan pada jam 1.30 pagi 22hb Mei, 1973, hingga jam 10.00 pagi.