

REPORT OF THE
PROCEEDINGS
OF THE FIRST
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
PENANG

2 ND SITTING OF THE
THIRD SESSION WEDNESDAY
11 TH, OCTOBER 1961

KPP
328.595123
PEN





127451

PPAPP



1000761632

H/R
328.595123

Pen



REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE FIRST LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, PENANG.

SECOND SITTING OF THE THIRD SESSION
WEDNESDAY, 11th OCTOBER, 1961

PRESENT:

- The Hon'ble Mr. Speaker (Tuan Haji Sulaiman bin Haji Ahmad, P.J.K.)
„ the Chief Minister (Dato Wong Pow Nee, P.M.N.)
„ the Legal Adviser (Enche Wan Suleiman bin Pawan Teh)
„ the Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik, A.M.N.)
„ the Member for Sungei Bakap (Mr. Kee Yong Chin)
„ the Member for Butterworth (Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan, J.P.)
„ the Member for Dhoby Ghaut (Enche C. D. Ismail, A.M.N.)
„ the Member for Tasek Glugor (Enche Hashim bin Awang, J.P.)
„ the Member for Tanjong Bungah (Mr. Cheah Seng Khim, J.P.)
„ the Member for Kapala Batas (Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Haji Abdullah, A.M.N.)
„ the Member for Permatang Pauh (Enche Ariffin bin Shariff)
„ the Member for Nibong Tebal (Tuan Haji Sahid bin Hassan)
„ the Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang)
„ the Member for Tanjong Tengah (Mr. Wong Choong Woh)
„ the Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Tan Chong Bee)
„ the Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan, J.P.)
„ the Member for Tanjong Selatan (Mr. C. Y. Choy)
„ the Member for Kelawei (Mr. Tan Khim Hoe)
„ the Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Chor Sin Kheng, J.P.)
„ the Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew)
„ the Member for Balik Pulau (Tuan Haji Mohamed Hassan bin Haji Kassim)
„ the Member for Bayan Lepas (Tuan Haji Rifaie bin Haji Salleh).

ABSENT:

- The Hon'ble the Member for Glugor (Enche Aziz Ibrahim, J.P.)
„ the Member for Tanjong Utara (Mr. Yuen Fook Cheong)
„ the Member for Bagan Ajam (Mr. Phee Joo Teik)

1. THE PRAYER.

2. PRESENTATION OF PAPERS.

Chief Minister: (in Malay) Sir, I beg to lay on the table of Assembly the following Papers:—

No. 10 of 1961 — The State of Penang Second Supplementary Development Estimates, 1961.

No. 11 of 1961 — The Annual Report and Accounts of the Penang State Scholarship Board for the year 1st January, 1959, to 31st December, 1959.

(continuing in English)

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to make the following comments on Paper No. 11 of 1961. The Auditor-General, Federation of Malaya has made three observations on the accounts of the Fund.

The first observation refers to Baggage Allowance paid to Miss Lee Kooi Jong. This Baggage Allowance of £25 (\$214.29 Malayan) was paid to Miss Lee Kooi Jong in respect of her journey from the United Kingdom to Penang, after completing a year's course in Audiology. It was subsequently discovered that this allowance was paid to her without authority. Under the terms of her scholarship she was only eligible for free air passage Penang/United Kingdom and United Kingdom/Penang. No baggage allowance was payable. This amount has since been recovered.

As regards the second observation, a sum of \$165 was paid to Mr. Lim Say Hup, an Arts student of the University of Malaya, Singapore, for the period 15.2.59 to 31.3.59, when he was on a badminton tour. This sum of money has since been recovered.

The third observation refers to the amount of \$2,851.32 appearing as "Sundry Debtors" in the Balance Sheet. This sum of money is due from the Central Electricity Board on account of pupilage allowance paid by the Crown Agents to Mr. B. Manasseh and debited to our account. Mr. B. Manasseh was awarded a State Scholarship in 1953 to study Engineering in the United Kingdom, and in 1955 he obtained his Higher National Diploma in Electrical Engineering. He then commenced practical training under pupilage to Messrs. Metropolitan Vickers Electrical Company Limited.

In the meanwhile the Department of Education had requested the Central Electricity Board to take over the practical training of Mr. Manasseh, if and when he passed the examination for which he was sent to the United Kingdom. As a result, in September, 1955, the General Manager, Central Electricity Board, wrote to the Settlement Secretary requesting the Settlement Scholarship Board to release Mr. B. Manasseh to permit the Central Electricity Board to take over the practical training of Mr. Manasseh with a view to his employment with the Board. The Central Electricity Board was prepared to assume financial responsibility for Mr. Manasseh's two years' practical training in the United Kingdom. This arrangement was agreed by the Settlement Scholarship Board, and the Central Electricity Board was to have assumed financial responsibility as from September, 1955, and paid pupilage allowance as from this month. The Crown Agents were not informed of this for some time by the Federation Establishment Office, which office is responsible for all Overseas scholars from the Federation. As a result, the Crown Agents continued to pay pupilage allowance

to Mr. Manasseh from the Penang Account up to September, 1956. The Central Electricity Board was approached through the Federation Establishment Office for refund of the monies paid by the Crown Agents and wrongly debited to the Penang Account. Due to the lapse of time, and the complicated nature of the various payments made by the Crown Agents on behalf of Central Electricity Board and the Settlement Scholarship Board, only part of the money due to the Settlement Scholarship Board was recovered. We are still pressing Central Electricity Board through the Federation Establishment Office for the balance of the money due. It is understood that a certain portion of this outstanding debt is due from Mr. Manasseh to the Central Electricity Board, and the former is disputing it. However, from a recent communication from the Central Electricity Board it is anticipated that the whole matter may be satisfactorily resolved in the near future.

3. (A) ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew) asks the Chief Minister:

1. Will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please reply how many low-cost housing projects the State Government has?

Chief Minister: (in Malay) Sir, the answer is 'three.'

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew) asks the Chief Minister:

2. Will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister give in detail each project the State Government has in mind and the total cost of each project, the details to include the number of units in each project and whether they

are to be sold on hire purchase terms or whether they are to be rented out.

Chief Minister: Sir, State low-cost housing schemes which the State Government has in mind are as follows:

- State Low-Cost Housing Scheme, Telok Bahang;
- State Low-Cost Housing Scheme, Rifle Range, Phase I;
- State Low-Cost Housing Scheme, Wellesley Village, Nibong Tebal;
- State Low-Cost Housing Scheme, Ayer Itam, Penang;
- State Low-Cost Housing Scheme, Berapit, Phase II.

All these schemes are still in the planning stage and investigations are still being made and have not been completed. It is therefore not possible to give details of cost, number of units and terms of sale in respect of each project.

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, a supplementary question:

I notice that the Honourable the Chief Minister stated in reply to question 1 that there are three schemes; and under question 2 he has listed six. May I have a clarification, please?

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, my answer to question 2 is the schemes which the State has in mind, not the schemes which have been approved, because question 2 asked, "... the State Government has in mind."

The Member for Kota (Mr Lee Kok Liang): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, Sir:

Does it mean, therefore, the State has not in mind the Kampong Herriot Scheme? I see that is not listed here.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, that scheme has already been approved.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew) asks the Chief Minister:

3. Will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please reply which of these projects have received the approval of the Federal Government and at what rate of interest the Federal Government has approved the loan.

Chief Minister: Sir, all these schemes are still in the planning stage and investigations are still being made. Therefore approval has not been sought.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew) asks the Chief Minister:

4. Will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please reply whether the approved loan funds are available this year or whether they are spread over a number of years. If it be the latter, will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please give the loan figures available for each year.

Chief Minister: Sir, the approved loan funds for the State Low Cost Housing Scheme, Kampong Herriot, and State Low Cost Housing Scheme, Butterworth, Phase I, are available this year.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Mr. Speaker, Sir, how much? How much is available?

Chief Minister: Sir, I require notice of that question.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is the second part of my question — "If it be the latter, will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please give the loan figures available for each year." If available for one year then he should give the available figure for this year.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, part 2 of the question — "If it be the latter, will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please give the loan figures available for each year." May I ask the Honourable Member, what does he mean by the latter? Because the scheme has been approved this year.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, arising from the reply that the scheme has been approved this year: In that case can we have the loan figures for this year? Supplementary question.

Chief Minister: Sir, I require notice of that question.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew) asks the Chief Minister:

5. When the Loan — Low-Cost Housing Schemes Enactment, 1961 was presented in the State Assembly on 9th August, 1961, as a Bill, and during the debate the Hon'ble the Chief Minister said that the rate of interest for this loan would be 2%. In the Enactment, "Low-Cost Housing Schemes" means "Schemes for the erection of dwelling houses and flats *let out at gross rents* not exceeding \$50 p.m." The Minister of Internal Security and the Interior, Dato (Dr.) Ismail bin Dato Abdul Rahman, in a press release, stated that the loans for houses for rental would be charged interest rates of 5%. Will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please inform us whether his statement is correct or whether the Minister's statement is correct, and which of these rates of interest is applicable to housing schemes which the State Government may have and which receive the approval of the Federal Government?

Chief Minister: Sir, because of the length of the question I shall deal with it in parts. Incomplete as the first sentence appears to be, my answer to this is that when the Low-Cost Housing Schemes Enactment, 1961 was presented in the State Assembly on 9th August, 1961, as a Bill, I did not during the debate on this Bill make any statement pertaining to the rate of interest to be charged. The Report of the Proceedings will, I am sure, bear me out. The contents of the second sentence is admitted. The contents of the third sentence is also admitted. In view of the fact that I did not make any reference to the rate of interest during the debate—I repeat, during the debate—on the Bill just referred to, the question as to the correctness of my statement does not arise.

However, during the debate on the Motion thanking the Governor at the Assembly Meeting on the 9th of August, I did, in reply to the Honourable Member for Jelutong, say that the rate of interest for loans in respect of low cost housing schemes will be 2%. When I said this I was under the impression that loans for low-cost housing schemes, whether for purchase or for rental, would be given by the Federal Government on 2% interest. When the Minister of Internal Security and Interior visited Penang recently the position was clarified that the rates of interest to be charged for Federal low-cost housing loans will be 2% for loans in respect of houses for sale on hire purchase terms provided the monthly instalments do not exceed \$35, and 5% for loans in respect of houses for rental provided the monthly rentals do not exceed \$50. For the State Low-Cost Housing Scheme (Kampong Herriot) and the State Low-Cost Housing Scheme (Butterworth, Phase I) loans have been approved by the Ministry of Interior at an interest rate of 2%.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, a supplementary question arising from the reply:

Are we to take it then that both the Kampong Herriot Scheme and the Butterworth Scheme are low-cost housing schemes for purchase, and not for rental?

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the first one, Kampong Herriot, is correct. For Butterworth—it should be Phase I—it is correct.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang) asks the Chief Minister:

1. With respect to the Committee on the Penang Hill Road—
 - (a) When was it formed?
 - (b) Who were its members—name them?
 - (c) Who was its Chairman or were its Chairmen?
 - (d) How many sittings or meetings did it hold?
 - (e) When did it stop functioning?
 - (f) Why did it stop functioning?

Chief Minister: (in Malay)
Mr. Speaker, Sir, the answer to (a) is 6th November, 1957.

- (b) The Committee consisted of the following members:—

Hon'ble Mr. Cheah Seng Khim,
J.P.

Hon'ble Enche Aziz Ibrahim,
J.P.

Mrs. Cheah Inn Kiong, J.P.

Mr. Koh Sin Hock, J.P.

Enche Nyak Hashim bin Nyak
Puteh, A.M.N.

The State Engineer

The State Drainage & Irrigation
Engineer

The State Forest Officer

The State Agricultural Officer.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): (in Malay) There is some more.

Chief Minister: I am sorry. [Continuing in Malay]. (c) The Hon'ble Mr. Cheah Seng Khim, J.P. was the Chairman. (d) Three meetings were held.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Is Mr. Cheah Seng Khim the only Chairman of that Committee or were there other Chairmen?

Chief Minister: He is the only Chairman.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Since 1957?

Chief Minister: (in Malay) Question 1(e).... [Interrupted].

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): (d), (d).

Chief Minister: (in Malay) Question 1(d) — three meetings were held. (e) — 9th February, 1960.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): (in Malay) 1960?

Chief Minister: (in Malay) Yes — 1960. [Laughter]. The 9th, 1960.

Chief Minister: (in Malay) (f) The submission of the Report to Government completed the business of the Committee and therefore the Committee was opened.

Mr. Speaker: (in Malay) Has been opened or has been dissolved?

Chief Minister: (in Malay) Has been opened.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang) asks the Chief Minister:

2. Had the abovenamed Committee dealt with the question or problems of:—

- (a) the terrain of the area and gradient of the routes,
- (b) the best possible route,
- (c) the availability of water and electric power,
- (d) the number of building sites to be allotted to private investors,
- (e) the transport system up and down the hill,
- (f) whether the opening up of the Penang Hill Road be undertaken by the P.W.D. solely or jointly with other engineering and constructing firms,
- (g) obtaining data of the costs of such works, durations and completions of such works,
- (h) compensation for the removal of squatters along the proposed routes or alternatively building of a model farming estate for squatters so affected,
- (i) setting up model Malay villages along or near the proposed routes,
- (j) whether to allow private building along or near the proposed routes,
- (k) whether to place restriction on private building development within a certain number of yards from either side of the route,
- (l) whether to consider possible future expansion of side roads and tributary routes,
- (m) whether to preserve the natural beauty of the Hill.

Will the Chief Minister kindly reply in the alphabetical order? What are the recommendations made in respect of any of the above items? What recommenda-

tions if any had been made, apart from those in respect of the above items? Has the State Government accepted any recommendation so made?

Chief Minister: (in Malay)
(a) The answer is: Yes.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): (b) ?

Chief Minister: (in Malay)
(b) No. The Committee made certain recommendations but did not make any on the best possible route.

(c) [Interrupted].

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): You continue with (a), (b), (c). I will stop you when I want to ask.

Chief Minister: (in Malay)
(c) The answer is: Yes.

(d) The answer is: No.

[Continuing in English].

(e) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I seek clarification from the Honourable Member. What does he mean by 'transport system' ?

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): What answer have you got there? [Laughter].

Chief Minister: My answer is "seek clarification" !

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): By bus or one-way route, or whatever it is. What transport system? Is it joint rail or bus?

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, it is a road—should be for vehicles, not for trains.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Maybe a train going up to [Interrupted].

Chief Minister: On a road?
[Laughter].

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): So what is your answer?

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think we cannot be specific.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): All right, you can go to (f).

Chief Minister: (in Malay)
(f) The answer is: No.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): It has not been considered, you mean, or it is not undertaken by the P.W.D.—'tidak' to what? To the fact that the Committee never considered (f) or 'tidak' in the sense that the P.W.D. is not going to undertake it solely or jointly?

Chief Minister: "Tidak" here refers to "not taken into consideration by the P.W.D.".

(g) Only the estimates of costs were dealt with, but not duration and completion of works.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): How far have they gone?

Chief Minister: Gone which way?

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): What you have said—how far have they gone as to the data?

Chief Minister: They have put up an estimate, but not the duration or completion of the works.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): That is why I want to know how far have they gone with the estimates of the cost—supplementary question.

Chief Minister: Well, for each proposal there is a rough estimate.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): (h).

Chief Minister: The answer for (h), (i), (j), (k) and (l) is that, as the Committee did not make a recommendation on the best possible route, these questions do not arise in so far as this Committee is concerned.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Supplementary question: may I take it that the operative words in your answer are "in so far as this Committee is concerned"? No consideration was given to these matters?

Chief Minister: By this Committee.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): It may have been discussed by other Committees.

Chief Minister: There is no other Committee.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Huh?

Chief Minister: There is no other Committee.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): No other Committee? By other arms of the Government?

Chief Minister: Possibly.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): That is why I want to know because I may ask you certain questions.

(m).

Chief Minister: (in Malay)

(m) The answer is: Yes.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Then the question of the recommendations, if any, that had been made apart from

those in respect of the above items?

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the answer for the last part of the question is that the Committee's Report is still confidential and, therefore, cannot be publicised.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, supplementary question. From the reply coming from the Hon'ble the Chief Minister, he said that the Committee did not make recommendations for the Hill Road. Is that correct?

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, they did make certain recommendations.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): But not for the best road.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Not for the best road. They did make certain recommendations. In that case, will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please tell us what the terms of reference of this Committee are?

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, I require notice of that question.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Can't you cut short your notice and say [Laughter].

Chief Minister: I would not like to mislead the Members of this House.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): My last question then. Has the State Government accepted any recommendations so made?

Chief Minister: As I answered earlier, this report is still confidential: therefore, it cannot be publicised.

(B) WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Chief Minister: (in Malay)
Mr. Speaker, Sir, the answers to questions that have been asked to-day are laid on the table of the Assembly.

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew asks the Chief Minister:

1. Will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please table for the information of this Assembly matters referred to the State Government for confirmation or approval which are outstanding to date, from —

(A) THE CITY COUNCIL OF GEORGE TOWN.

(B) THE RURAL DISTRICT COUNCIL, PENANG ISLAND.

(C) PROVINCE WELLESLEY (NORTH) DISTRICT COUNCIL.

(D) PROVINCE WELLESLEY (CENTRAL) DISTRICT COUNCIL.

(E) PROVINCE WELLESLEY (SOUTH) DISTRICT COUNCIL.

Chief Minister:

1. As on 26.9.61 (date of receipt of questions):

(A) THE CITY COUNCIL OF GEORGE TOWN:

1. Questions of items which can be considered in Supplemental Budgets.

2. Extension of City Limits, Rifle Range Road.

3. Application to State Government for contribution towards impounding reservoir.

4. Children's playground near Fort Cornwallis.

5. Proposed 7' 0" Pavement fronting Crown Property in Light Street and Beach Street.

6. Federal Government Loans.

7. Water Supply to the South East of Penang Island.

8. Compensation for Site for new Power Station.

9. Status of Sungei Pinang.

10. Application from City Council of George Town to create a post of Temporary Pupil Engineer, Electricity Supply Department, for confirmation of State Authority under Section 16(4) of the Municipal Ordinance.

11. Proposal to amend Section 229 of the Municipal Ordinance—Sewerage Development Charge.

12. Draft Plan TP. & BD. 310/60 (Amendment to part of Approved Town Plan).

13. Approval of State Authority under Section 16(4) of the Municipal Ordinance to upgrade the post of Office Assistant, City Secretariat, from Clerical Superscale 'B' (\$688/- p.m.) to Superscale 'A' (\$788/- p.m.).

14. Approval of State Authority under Section 16(4) of the Municipal Ordinance for the creation of an additional

post of Shift Charge Engineer, Power Station.

15. Application from City Council of George Town, Penang, for confirmation of State Authority under Section 16(4) of the Municipal Ordinance to create one Temporary Assistant Engineer and two Temporary Engineering Assistants.
16. Application from City Council of George Town, Penang for sanction under Section 16(4) of the Municipal Ordinance to upgrade the post of Chief Fire Officer from \$605 x 24 — 835 to Under Qualified Professional Officers' salary scale of \$614 x 28 — 838/863 x 28 — 1,087.
17. Application from City Council of George Town, Penang for sanction under Section 16(4) of the Municipal Ordinance to create three posts of Assistant City Engineers.
18. Purchase of Lot 554, T.S.6, N.E.D. Penang by City Council to provide alternative access and open space in conjunction with Council's Trengganu Road Housing Scheme.
19. Downing Street, Weld Quay, King Edward Place and Beach Street Planning.
20. Car Parking Areas.
21. Approved road between Gladstone Road and Maxwell Road and parallel to Penang Road.
22. Amendment to Sections 16(4) and 16(5) of the

Municipal Ordinance (Chapter 133).

23. Application for a grant of \$40,000 for the laying of a feeder main to supply water to houses to be built on Lots XLIII and XLIV, Boundary Road.

(B) THE RURAL DISTRICT COUNCIL, PENANG ISLAND.

1. Medical Treatment for Council's Employees.
2. List of Privileges for Councillors.
3. Refund of Rates — Amendment to Establishment Notification of Rural District Council. Penang Island.
4. Supplemental Budget No.2/61.

(C) DISTRICT COUNCIL NORTH, PROVINCE WELLESLEY.

1. Sampan Landing Stage at Ujong Batu and Prai.
2. 50 acres of State land to be set aside for resettlement of squatters who are affected by development schemes of the Council.

(D) DISTRICT COUNCIL CENTRAL, PROVINCE WELLESLEY.

1. Medical Facilities for Councillors.
2. Bukit Mertajam Town Council Itinerant Hawkers (Amendment) By-laws, 1960.
3. Bukit Mertajam Town Council Licensing and Management of Street Stalls (Amendment) By-laws, 1960.

4. Bukit Mertajam Town Council Market (Amendment) By-laws, 1960.
5. Income Tax on allowances to Councillors.
6. Identification Cards for Councillors.
7. Supply of Government Gazettes to Councillors.
8. Assessment on Rubber Lands.
9. Membena sa-buah ibu pipe ayer kechil di-Kampong Pertama.
10. Footbridge at Kampong Pertama.
4. Government Contributions.
5. Entertainment Allowance for Secretary, District Council South, P.W.
6. Appointment of an Assistant Secretary, District Council South, P.W.
7. Rural District Council South, P.W. Supplemental Budget No. 2/1960.

Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew asks the Chief Minister:

(E) DISTRICT COUNCIL SOUTH, PROVINCE WELLESLEY.

1. Refund of Rates—Amendments in Establishment Notification of District Council South, P.W.
2. Annual Value -- The Rating of Industrial Properties under the Municipal Ordinance.
3. Overtime Allowance for Council Staff.
2. Will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please table, for the information of this Assembly, the approved revised Development Estimates for 1960 and the actual expenditure for the following Heads of Expenditure:—
- Head 101 Chief Minister and State Secretariat
- Head 103 Drainage and Irrigation
- Head 107 Public Works
- Head 108 Public Works — Water Supply

The Chief Minister:

2

	<i>Revised Development Estimates, 1960</i>	<i>Actual Expenditure, 1960</i>
Head 101 Chief Minister and State Secretariat ...	\$ 858,716	\$ 521,098
Head 103 Drainage and Irrigation ...	\$ 592,335	\$ 484,724
Head 107 Public Works ...	\$4,758,417	\$1,092,958
Head 108 Public Works -- Water Supply ...	\$2,035,165	\$ 608,758

Enche Ariffin bin Shariff asks the Chief Minister:

1. Where does the Government propose to build Clinics, in the State and when will these projects commence?

1. The list of clinics which Government proposes to build is as follows and the approximate dates on which construction is expected to commence in 1961 are shown opposite each item:—

<i>Serial No.</i>	<i>Locality.</i>	<i>When construction is expected to commence.</i>
<i>Penang Island</i>		
1.	Health Sub-Centre Balik Pulau	December, 1961
2.	Midwife Unit Pulau Betong	December, 1961
3.	" " Sungei Burong	December, 1961
4.	" " Sungei Pinang	November, 1961
5.	" " Telok Kumbar	November, 1961
6.	" " Telok Bahang	October, 1961

P.W. North

7.	Midwife Unit Permatang Janggus	October, 1961
8.	" " Pinang Tunggal	October, 1961
9.	" " Lahar Kepar	December, 1961
10.	" " Simpang Ampat Pmtg. Buloh	October, 1961
11.	" " Pekan Darat	November, 1961
12.	" " Padang Menora	November, 1961
13.	" " Telok Ayer Tawar	November, 1961
14.	" " Permatang Sintok	November, 1961

P.W. Central

15.	Health Centre Kubang Semang	December, 1961
16.	Midwife Unit Bukit Indra Muda	October, 1961
17.	" " Alma	November, 1961

P.W. South

18.	Health Sub-Centre, Sungei Bakap	September, 1961
19.	Midwife Unit Sungei Acheh	December, 1961
20.	" " Kg. Besar (Nanas)	November, 1961
21.	" " Sungei Bakau	November, 1961
22.	" " Pulau Aman	November, 1961
23.	" " Tassek	November, 1961

Inche Ariffin bin Shariff asks the Chief Minister:

2. Where does the Government propose to construct playing fields (football) and Community Centres in the State and when will these projects commence?

2. In accordance with the Rural Development Plan, it is proposed to provide playing fields and community centres in this State as specified below:—

Proposed construction of Playing Fields.

<i>District</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Year of implementation</i>
P.W. North	Kepala Batas	1961
P.W. Central	Kubang Semang	1961
P.W. South	Sungei Kechil	1961
Penang Island	Permatang Damar Laut	1961

Proposed Establishment of Community Centres.

<i>District</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Year of implementation</i>
P.W. North	Penaga	1961
P.W. Central	Kubang Semang	1961
P.W. South	Sungei Bakap	1961
Penang Island	Telok Bahang	1961

Inche Ariffin bin Shariff asks the Chief Minister:

- When will the Kampong Tassek electricity supply scheme commence?

The Chief Minister:

- A sum of \$84,000/- has been made available for this scheme and it is anticipated that work will commence very soon.

Enche Ariffin bin Shariff asks the Chief Minister:

- Does the Government propose to provide water supplies to kampongs or localities in the State which have no water supplies at present. If there is such a proposal please state the names of the kampongs or localities and when will the schemes commence?

The Chief Minister:

- Yes. The total provision for water supplies to kampongs for the current year is \$342,000 and the kampongs to be supplied with water are:—

Penang Island

Kampong Titi Tras
Pondek Upeh

Paya Kongs
Sg. Rusa — Ptg. Pasir
Ginting Plain
Pulau Betong — Kebun Besar
Relau/Sungei Nibong Kechil

Province Wellesley North

Ptg. Toh Bidan/Pekan Darat
Kg. Toh Oteh/Sungei Kedah
Padang Bengali/Kuala
Bekan/Ptg. Tinggi
Ptg. Janggus/Kg. Lima
Kg. Bakau Tua
Bagan Serai
Lahar Tabot/Ptg. Maras
Kg. Selamat (Village)

Province Wellesley Central

Kg. Pertama
Ptg. Ara/Ptg. Pasir
Bukit Indra Muda
Sungei Rambai/Bukit Kechil
Sungei Rambai/Ptg. Rawa
Jalan Bahru/Kg. Jawa
Ptg. Pauh/Samagagah

Province Wellesley South

Changkat & Changkat Estate
Sungei Udang
Bagan Buaya
Kampong Sethu, Jawi
Badak Mati Road/Ptg. Ara
Methodist School Road Area

Enche Ariffin bin Shariff asks the Chief Minister:

5. In one year how many midwives can be trained by the Government until they are qualified and do these qualified midwives work only with the Government or are they allowed to work privately in the 'Kampong'?

Chief Minister:

5. Twenty Midwives can be trained at a time by the Government in Penang. The training takes two years to complete.

Qualified Midwives work for the Government if vacancies exist and are regarded as Government servants. They may resign from Government service and work as private midwives in the Kampongs if they so choose.

Mr. Tan Chong Bee asks the Chief Minister:

1. In which year and at what cost was the Permatang Pauh

Pontoon Bailey Bridge constructed?

2. Will the Chief Minister please state year by year, the number of times it was closed to traffic for repairs since the time it was constructed?
3. How much has been spent on these repairs?
4. What is the average cost of maintenance per year?
5. How much will it cost to construct a permanent bridge to replace it?

The Chief Minister:

1. The Permatang Pauh Pontoon Bailey Bridge was constructed in 1948. The exact cost of its construction was not known. It is estimated that the total cost of the complete bridge and pontoons would have been in the region of \$350,000/-.
2. The number of times the present bridge has been closed to traffic for repairs is as follows:—

Year	FROM		TO		Closed To
	Time	Date	Time	Date	
Prior to 1959	No	Record	No.	Record	
1959	4.20 p.m.	9. 6. 59	12.30 p.m.	10. 6. 59	All Traffic
	9.30 a.m.	20. 7. 59	4.30 p.m.	21. 7. 59	All Traffic
	12.30 a.m.	9. 9. 59	6.00 a.m.	9. 9. 59	All Traffic
	6.00 a.m.	1. 10. 59	6.00 a.m.	23. 11. 59	Lorries & Buses
	6.00 a.m.	23. 11. 59	6.00 a.m.	7. 12. 59	All Traffic
1960	NIL		NIL		
1961	1.30 a.m.	27. 3. 61	3.00 a.m.	27. 3. 61	All Traffic
	Midnight	1. 6. 61	6.00 a.m.	2. 6. 61	All Traffic
	10.00 a.m.	13. 6. 61	6.00 a.m.	14. 6. 61	All Traffic
	6.00 a.m.	14. 6. 61	Midnight	28. 6. 61	Buses & Lorries
	Midnight	28. 6. 61	6.00 a.m.	29. 6. 61	All Traffic

3. It is difficult to assess with some degree of accuracy the cost of repairs because the materials used have been in stock for many years and no records are available as to their cost. The materials used were obtained by salvaging from disused Bailey bridges elsewhere. Repairs were carried out by normal departmental labour.
4. The average cost of maintenance per annum is about \$37,000/-.
5. There are many types of permanent bridges and cost, of course, varies according to type. However, a reinforced concrete bridge on piers will cost between \$2 million to \$3 million.

Mr. Lee Kok Liang asks the Chief Minister:

1. Will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister set out in detail:—

- (1) the number of Committees set up by the State Government since it took office;
- (2) the number of Committees in which representative or representatives of the State Government participates or has participated in since it took office;
- (3) the names of such Committees or designation thereof;
- (4) the function and purpose of such Committees;
- (5) the duration of each of such Committees;
- (6) whether any of the Committees has been amalgamated with other Committee or Committees. If so with what Committee?

- (7) the names of members on each of the Committees so set up or participated in by the State Government;

- (8) the position held by the members in these Committees.

The Chief Minister:

1. (1) As far as can be ascertained after a very thorough and time-consuming search into the files and records, the number of Committees set up by the State Government since it took office is 39. However, it must be explained that due to the little time available between receipt of notice and the Assembly Meeting, it is possible that some of the Committees set up by the State Government since it took office may have been inadvertently left out owing to relevant files or records not being available despite search. The figure given above is therefore subject to further verification.

- (2) The answer to this question is one. The same observation as for above answer also applies to this answer.

- (3) The answer is provided in column 1 of Appendix 'A'.
(see back of Report)

- (4) The answer is provided in column 2 of Appendix 'A'.

- (5) The answer is provided in column 3 of Appendix 'A'.

- (6) The answer is provided in column 4 of Appendix 'A'.

- (7) The answer is provided in column 5 of Appendix 'A'.

- (8) The answer is provided in column 6 of Appendix 'A'.

Mr. Lee Kok Liang asks the Chief Minister: **The Chief Minister:**

2. According to a news item published on August 17th 1961 in the Straits Times, under the caption of "Millionaire gives land for hostel," it is reported that the State Government had promised a site at Telok Bahang to the Malayan Youth Hostels Association. Will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister confirm that this is correct? Under what circumstances and for what reasons was the promise made?
3. Where is the actual site of the promised land or the land under discussion, if it has not been actually promised? Kindly also give the Lot number of the said land? Is this State land?
4. What does the State Government propose to do or has the State Government already done anything to the land or site so originally offered or promised to the said Association?
5. With regard to the alternative site donated by the Millionaire mentioned in the report and accepted by the said Association, will the State Government or the Federal Government be involved in any public works connected with the improvement, installation, road-making etc. on or about the said site. If so, what would the estimated cost be? And what are the installations or improvements to be made?
6. At the time when the site at Telok Bahang was suggested or promised to the said Association, was the factor of the deepness and dangerous quality of the sea considered (in view of the fact that as reported the site was not accepted because the Millionaire told the President of the Association that the sea off Telok Bahang was deep and dangerous)? If not, why not?

2. It is not correct that the State Government had promised a site at Telok Bahang to the Malayan Youth Hostel Association. An application for alienation of 1 acre of land at Telok Bahang to be used as a site of a Youth Hostel was approved by the State Government on the following terms and conditions:

Title: 66-year lease

Premium: 20 cents per sq. ft. = \$2,875/-

Quit Rent: \$261/- per annum

Survey Fees: \$84/-

Preparation & Registration of Title: \$12/- .

Special Conditions:

- (i) The land hereby leased shall be used solely for the purpose of building a Youth Hostel and for no other purpose;
- (ii) No other building shall be erected on the land hereby leased except with the permission in writing of the Chief Minister, Penang;
- (iii) The building to be erected shall be in accordance with plans and specifications approved by the Rural District Council, Penang Island, and shall be maintained to the satisfaction of the C.L.R. Balik Pulau;
- (iv) the building to be erected shall be completed within two years from the date of this lease;
- (v) The Lessee shall pay and discharge all taxes, rates, assessments and charges whatsoever which may be payable for the time being in respect of the land hereby leased or any part thereof levied by the R.D.C. Penang Island or any other authority;

- (vi) Usual conditions II, III & IV on lease form.

The Malayan Youth Hostels Association has confirmed that the terms and conditions of alienation of this land are acceptable.

3. The land referred to in the answer to question 2 above is part of Lot 248 Mk. 2, S.W.D. situated at the 13th mile post at Telok Bahang. It has a road frontage and is on the landward side of the road. is State land.
4. The State Government does not propose to do anything to the land because it is the entire responsibility of the Malayan Youth Hostels Association to develop it.
5. The State Government is not aware of the site donated by the Millionaire.
6. When the State Government considered the application for alienation of 1 acre of land to the Malayan Youth Hostels Association the deepness and dangerous nature of the sea was not considered as this land does not have a sea frontage.

Mr. Lee Kok Liang asks the Chief Minister:

7. With respect to the Constitution of the State of Penang (Amendment) Enactment 1960 in which the membership of the Legislative Assembly was increased from 24 to 27 on the dissolution of this Assembly, will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please clarify:—

- (a) whether there would be any changes either towards further increase or towards decrease of the number of 27 members;

- (b) whether the Federal Government has signified its agreement, acceptance, or blessing, on the proposed increase to 27;

- (c) whether the Elections Commission has or has not indicated that it proposes to deal again with the question of State constituencies before the month of July, 1964;

- (d) what would be the position vis-a-vis State Constituency if the Federal Parliament decides not to accept the recommendations of the Elections Commission or if the Federal Parliament decides not to increase the Federal constituencies to 9 within this State?

The Chief Minister:

7. (a) The Constitution of the State of Penang (Amendment) Enactment, 1960 which amends Article 11 of the Constitution of the State of Penang by increasing the membership of the Legislative Assembly from twenty-four members to twenty-seven members with effect from the date of the next dissolution of the State Legislative Assembly, was passed by this Assembly on 17th day of August 1960. There is at present no proposal to further increase or to decrease this number of 27 members.

- (b) Paragraph 4 of the Eighth Schedule to the Federal Constitution reads as follows:—

“The Legislative Assembly shall consist of such number of elected members as the Legislature may by law provide and, until other provision is so made, the

number of members shall be the number specified in Article 171 of the Federal Constitution."

The agreement, acceptance or blessing of the Federal Government is therefore not legally necessary and therefore has not been sought.

(c) The Election Commission has so far not indicated that it proposes to deal again with the question of State constituencies before the month of July, 1964.

(d) The answer to this part of the question would in effect be the expression of an opinion on an abstract legal matter. The Hon'ble Member is therefore invited to examine the contents of Part VIII of the Federal Constitution, and in particular Article 113 and 116 thereof and to draw his own conclusion.

4. BILLS

(A) The Civil List (Penang) (Amendment) Bill, 1961.

First Reading

Chief Minister: (in Malay) Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled 'An Enactment to amend the Civil List (Penang) Enactment, 1957' be read a first time.

The Member for Kelawei (Mr. Tan Khim Hoe): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

Bill accordingly read a first time.

Chief Minister: (in Malay) Sir, I beg to move that the Standing Orders be suspended in so far as it is necessary to enable this Bill to be taken through all its stages at this meeting.

The Member for Kelawei (Mr. Tan Khim Hoe): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

Question put and agreed to.

Second Reading

Chief Minister: (in Malay) Sir, I beg to move that the Bill intituled 'An Enactment to amend the Civil List (Penang) Enactment, 1957,' be read a second time. (continuing in English:)

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Bill seeks to make a minor amendment to Section 4 of the Civil List (Penang) Enactment, 1957, so that whereas it now reads:—

"The sums required for the payments under section 2 shall be charged on the Consolidated Fund of the State."

it will after amendment read:—

"The sums required for the payments under sections 2 and 3 shall be charged on the Consolidated Fund of the State."

The object of the amendment is fully explained in the "Objects and Reasons" of this Bill, but I will reiterate that it is to make the remuneration of the Officer Administering the Government a charge on the Consolidated Fund of the State.

Honourable Members are, of course, aware that the sums paid under the Civil List to His Excellency the Governor, including the Privy Purse, are charged on the Consolidated Fund of the State. This means that not only are the amounts payable laid down by the Civil List (Penang) Enactment, 1957, but the Enactment is itself authority for the withdrawal of sums from the Consolidated Fund to make the payments.

As the law stands, the availability of funds for the payment of the emoluments of the Officer Administering the Government must await the passing of a Supply Bill. In practice this means that advances must be made from the Contingencies Fund for that pur-

pose wherever the Officer Administering the Government exercises the functions of the Governor, such advances being then recovered on the passing of a Supply Bill.

Since Section 3 of the Enactment gives authority to the Executive Council to decide upon the amount to be paid as remuneration to the Officer Administering the Government during any period in which he exercises the functions of the Governor, the need to seek authority in the form of a Supply Bill for expenditure of funds is considered redundant. The Bill before the Assembly seeks to dispense with such procedure by making the remuneration of the Officer Administering the Government a charge on the Consolidated Fund of the State, as is the Civil List of His Excellency the Governor.

Sir, I beg to move.

The Member for Kelawei (Mr. Tan Khim Hoe): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to speak on the merits of this Bill, by saying that the Government seeks to inform this Assembly that the amendment is a minor one, but I assure you, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the amendment sought is not a minor one, but in fact is a major one in view of and taking into regard the authority of this Assembly and in view of its political importance.

The Civil List Ordinance allows the Executive to fix a sum to be payable to the Officer Administering the Government. And wisely, in the original Ordinance the authority given to the Executive Council must be endorsed by the Assembly by way of a Supply Bill. In other words, there can be a debate on the sum payable to the

Officer Administering the Government in future as it could be debated last time. And it is of importance that in the case of the Governor the Executive Council has no such power to pay the sum, but the sum is fixed by way of Enactment. And therefore what the Government seeks to do now is to take away the power of this Assembly to discuss the worth—in other words the price—of the O.A.G. Now, this is a very important thing, because public monies are involved; and that to pay anyone any sums from the public money it must come before the Assembly. It couldn't just be taken out from the Consolidated Fund without the approval of the Assembly by way of a Supply Bill. Even in our instance, raising our allowances has got to come to this Assembly for approval by way of a Bill. It is because public money is involved. And that is of major importance in the democratic control of the Executive. If the Executive seeks to pay a small sum to the O.A.G., or if it seeks to pay a big sum to the O.A.G., the Assembly must approve. It does not mean that the Assembly has dictatorial power. If the O.A.G. is paid a very low sum, to whom have you to appeal to? Because the Executive Council says, "I pay you \$10 a month." you take \$10 from the Consolidated Fund; whereas if it comes by way of a Supply Bill the Assembly may discuss the merits of the worth of an O.A.G. And that is not a minor thing. It can be a very major thing. Therefore I cannot support this amendment.

Mr. Speaker: (to Chief Minister) You wish to reply?

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, in my introductory speech I said it is a minor amendment because under section 3 of the Enactment this Assembly has given authority to the Executive Council to decide upon the amount.

Now, if the Executive Council has the power to decide on the amount, I think it will be ridiculous that this position should be ridiculed. If the authority to decide has been given, what does it imply? Therefore I say that this is redundant. To mention that the Government may foolishly pay the O.A.G. \$10 for his service, I think, is rather unreasonable. Therefore, Sir, I hope that this Bill will get the support from every one.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time.

Committee

The Assembly resolves itself into Committee.

The Bill is considered clause by clause and agreed to without amendment.

The Assembly resumes

Third Reading

Chief Minister: (in Malay) Sir, I beg to report that the Civil List (Penang) (Amendment) Bill, 1961, has been considered in Committee clause by clause and agreed to without amendment. I beg, therefore, to move that the Bill be now read a third time and passed.

The Member for Kelawei (Mr. Tan Khim Hoe): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a third time and passed.

(B) The Speaker (Remuneration) (Amendment) Bill, 1961.

First Reading

The Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): (in Malay) Sir, I beg to move that a

Bill intituled 'An Enactment to amend the Speaker (Remuneration) Enactment, 1959' be read a first time.

The Member for Tasek Glugor (Enche Hashim bin Awang): (in Malay) Sir, I beg to second.

Bill accordingly read a first time.

The Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): (in Malay) Sir, I beg to move that the Standing Orders be suspended in so far as it is necessary to enable this Bill to be taken through all its stages at this meeting.

The Member for Tasek Glugor (Enche Hashim bin Awang): (in Malay) Sir, I beg to second.

Question put and agreed to.

Second Reading

The Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled 'An Enactment to amend the Speaker (Remuneration) Enactment, 1959' be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Hon'ble Members will recall that at the sitting on 10th August, 1961, the Assembly, by a Resolution, adopted the Report of the Standing Committee on Standing Rules and Orders and Privileges on allowances payable to the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly, Penang, as set out in Legislative Assembly Paper No. 9 of 1961.

One of the recommendations in the Report was to the effect that the remuneration of the Speaker should be increased from \$250/- to \$350/- per month with effect from 10th August, 1961. This Bill therefore seeks to provide statutory authority for such increase by way of amendment to the principal Enactment.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is hardly necessary for me to repeat the reasons for the necessity to increase the Speaker's remuneration from \$250/- to \$350/- per month as they have been brought out and debated by the House at the sitting on 10th August. The Bill before us to-day is only to give legal sanction to a matter which has received the approval of the Assembly at the August meeting. It is therefore my duty to ask the House to give their whole-hearted support to this Bill so as to enable the Speaker, to be paid remuneration according to the new rate.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move.

The Member for Tasek Glugor (Enche Hashim bin Awang): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time.

Committee

The Assembly resolves itself into Committee.

The Bill is considered clause by clause and agreed to without amendment.

The Assembly resumes

Third Reading

The Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to report that the Speaker (Remuneration) (Amendment) Bill, 1961, has been considered in Committee clause by clause and agreed to without amendment. I beg, therefore, to move that the Bill be now read a third time and passed.

The Member for Tasek Glugor (Enche Hashim bin Awang): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a third time and passed.

(C) The Legislative Assembly (Members' Remuneration) (Amendment) Bill, 1961.

First Reading

The Member for Muda Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled 'An Enactment to amend the Legislative Assembly (Members' Remuneration) Enactment, 1959' be read a first time.

The Member for Tasek Glugor (Enche Hashim bin Awang): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

Bill accordingly read a first time.

The Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that the Standing Orders be suspended in so far as it is necessary to enable this Bill to be taken through all its stages at this meeting.

The Member for Tasek Glugor (Enche Hashim bin Awang): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

Question put and agreed to.

Second Reading

The Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled 'An Enactment to amend the Legislative Assembly (Members' Remuneration) Enactment, 1959' be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, like the previous Bill, the need for this Bill has arisen out of the adoption by this Assembly on 10th August, 1961, of the Report of the Standing Committee on Standing Rules

and Orders and Privileges on allowances payable to the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly, Penang, as set out in Legislative Assembly Paper No. 9 of 1961.

This Bill however seeks to provide statutory authority for the increase of the remuneration and subsistence allowances of the Members of this Assembly by way of amendment to the principal Enactment whereas the previous Bill seeks to provide statutory authority for the increase of the remuneration of the Speaker. Such increase will be retrospectively effective from the 10th day of August, 1961 and this is provided for in Clause 1. Clause 2 provides for an amendment to Section 2 of the principal Enactment so that Members' remuneration will be altered from \$200 to \$250 per month. Clause 3 amends Item 8 of the Schedule to the principal Enactment by substituting new paragraphs for the existing paragraph on subsistence allowances. Hon'ble Members will of course notice that the new rates of remuneration and of subsistence allowances are in accordance with the recommendations contained in the Report of the Standing Committee which were adopted by the Assembly on 10th August, 1961. As in the case of the previous Bill it is hardly necessary for me to mention once again the reasons for the increases in the remuneration and subsistence allowances for members of this Assembly as these have been very thoroughly gone into by the House at the last sitting.

I only wish here to ask members to pass this Bill as expeditiously as possible so that members may all draw their remuneration and subsistence allowances according to the enhanced rates.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move.

The Member for Tasek Glugor (Enche Hashim bin Awang): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): At first I had no intention of speaking, Mr. Speaker, Sir; but before I speak I must disclose that I have a direct pecuniary interest in this Bill; that it has increased my allowance from \$200 to \$250; that it has provided me with certain allowances of \$12 per day, \$15 per night—I do not know why night is more expensive than day—\$35, and other allowances.

I will not oppose this Bill, but I would like to stress the fact, or some may even say I have already belaboured the point of the Assembly or State Government being a sleeping beauty or slow tortoise. But now we have the Minister of Agriculture calling us, not 'sleeping beauty' or 'slow tortoise,' but something bluntly; calling the State Government lethargic.

Mr. Speaker: May I know what the Minister of Agriculture has to do with this Bill?

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): It has importance to do with the sum, the money concerned.

I only say that if we increase our allowance according to the objects of this Bill, for the sake of uniformity, may I also stress that increase of allowance should also be concomitant with the increase of labour on each and every part of us, each and every Member of this Assembly; that we must work harder, because the general tenor of the public, whether it is deliberate or has been fostered by others, is another matter, but the general tenor of public opinion is that Assemblymen, not only of this State,

although I confine my remarks to this State, is that they are drawing an easy sort of allowance without hard work. This is not to say that none of the Assemblymen really do work hard in their constituencies; but as far as the public is concerned they sort of mark, or they take note of our meetings. And there seems to be a general impression that there are so few meetings a year, and yet we are drawing \$200 a month. And we are now increasing it to \$250!

What I am trying to urge on the Government is that the Government should devise, or the Government should, as I have stated in one or two Motions on this matter, hold more meetings; in fact should either encourage more participation of Assemblymen in Committee Systems, or hold more meetings. And therefore we would be justified in the eyes of the public to get what we should. That is the only remark I have to preface on this Bill.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, to say that if we approve this Bill increasing the allowance of the Assemblymen we should work harder, I think that is really a shame because Assemblymen are elected to work for their constituencies, not because of their allowance. This allowance is only an allowance; it is not a salary.

To say whether Members have worked hard or not it is the public who are to decide. Some may work hard; some might have worked harder. I know there may be some who did not work at all. But to call for more meetings, I think, is a different matter. Meetings of this Assembly are called not to come here just to babble or talk but we come here for a specific purpose. For example, today's meeting is called

only two months from the last meeting. We called this meeting because there are six Bills in the Orders of the Day. There is business for this meeting, so this meeting is called. But Government will not waste public money, neither the time of Honourable Members, to invite Members to meet here to yarn or to argue on unnecessary topics or, worse of all, to talk unreasonable politics. We are here to work for the people.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members of this House may rest assured that more meetings will be called if there is business to transact. I repeat: Government will not call unnecessary meetings if there is no business to transact.

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I had not intended to speak on this Bill because I have always accepted my responsibility for being one of the Committee making recommendations which have been embodied in this Bill. But I must say that I find the remarks of the Honourable the Chief Minister amusing. He says we do not come here to talk

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I did not say we do not come here to talk. You can talk what is necessary.

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we all come here to talk what is necessary. In fact, if the Honourable the Chief Minister knows the meaning of the word usually associated with Assemblies of this kind, that is the word 'Parliament,' he will also know that Parliament means a place for talking. A Parliamentary body like this is a body for talking. Of course the Honourable the Chief Minister with

his own sound and sensible ideas may think other people babble. I am not sure that he is correct, because the people of Penang and Province Wellesley thought that all the 24 Members they sent here were able to talk. If they thought they were able only to babble I am sure none of us would be present here.

Secondly, he says we must not talk politics here. That is an even more astounding statement, because I am sure I am right in saying we are all here to talk politics. This is the highest meeting place or the highest point where politics is discussed. We are here as political groups. If we were not in politics we would not be here. According to him we are here not to talk politics but we are here to transact business. What business? Political business. That is why I associate myself with my colleague's remarks. We on this side are not opposed to the proposed increase as we think they are quite reasonable and bring Penang State Assemblymen's allowances into uniformity with those obtaining in most of the other States of this Federation but all the same we have always felt that we should have more meetings so that we can come and talk, or perhaps, as the Chief Minister thinks, "babble" a little bit more, so that the people will know what we are "babbling" about.

Chief Minister: At public expense.

The Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, permit me to give a brief reply to the Hon'ble Member for Kota who touched on the speech made by the Hon'ble Minister for Agriculture. I am of the opinion that the Hon'ble Minister for Agriculture misunderstood the point as

he received the information from unofficial sources [Interrupted].

Mr. Speaker: (in Malay) I think it would be better for us not to mention the Minister for Agriculture in this Assembly. As I have said before, the Minister for Agriculture has nothing to do with the proposed increase of allowances for members.

The Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, that is why I am seeking your permission. This subject has been brought up because the press has made wide publicity of it. It is therefore proper for me to give a brief reply on behalf of the Penang State Government.

Mr. Speaker: (in Malay) Briefly.

The Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): (in Malay) The Penang State Government has done for the people of this State all it could possibly do for them. The Government could only be expected to do what is humanly possible: the Government could not perform the work of angels. According to my friend, the Hon'ble Member for Sungei Pinang, the Hon'ble the Chief Minister in his reply just now stated that we have come here to discuss politics — not just mere politics; in fact, what he meant was that we might discuss politics provided that this Assembly deemed it constructive. It is certainly not politics in the form of a political forum or politics on stage, with the purpose of propagating the beliefs of certain political parties. Well, that is what he really meant.

That is all. Thank you.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time.

Committee

The Assembly resolves itself into Committee.

The Bill is considered clause by clause and agreed to without amendment.

The Assembly resumes

Third Reading

The Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to report that the Legislative Assembly (Members' Remuneration) (Amendment) Bill, 1961, has been considered in Committee clause by clause and agreed to without amendment. I beg therefore, to move that the Bill be now read a third time and passed.

The Member for Tasek Glugor (Enche Hashim bin Awang): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a third time and passed.

(D) The Age of Majority (Adoption) Bill, 1961.

First Reading

The Member for Dhoby Ghaut (Enche C. D. Ismail): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled 'An Enactment to adopt the Age of Majority Act, 1961, insofar as it relates to persons professing the Muslim religion' be read a first time.

The Member for Tanjong Bungah (Mr. Cheah Seng Khim): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

Bill accordingly read a first time.

The Member for Dhoby Ghaut (Enche C. D. Ismail): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that the Standing Orders be suspended insofar as it is

necessary to enable this Bill to be taken through all its stages at this meeting.

The Member for Tanjong Bungah (Mr. Cheah Seng Khim): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

Question put and agreed to.

Second Reading

The Member for Dhoby Ghaut (Enche C. D. Ismail): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled 'An Enactment to adopt the Age of Majority Act, 1961, insofar as it relates to persons professing the Muslim religion' be read a second time.

Sir, before I formally move the Second Reading, I would like to explain that the object of this Bill is to fix the age of majority at 18 years for persons professing the Muslim religion. I shall now briefly explain the reasons for this. Under pure Muslim law, the terms puberty (baligh) and age of discretion (rushd) are synonymous and any person professing the Muslim religion is allowed to take charge of his or her property and exercise discretion over such property on attaining the age of puberty. The position, therefore, under pure Muslim law, as it stands, is that any Muslim on attaining puberty is vested with the power or capacity of entering validly into legal transactions of every kind affecting his or her status and property.

Among the Sunnis and Shiah's, it is held that puberty is attained on completion of the 15th year after birth and, therefore, under the Sunnite Schools of Muslim Law the age of majority is reached after the 15th birthday. There may, however, be instances where a boy or a girl on attaining puberty may not yet have sufficient knowledge or understanding

to be able to exercise discretion in respect of his or her property. For this reason it is felt that the age of majority should be fixed at 18 years at which age it is reasonable to expect any individual to be able to exercise discretion in respect of his or her property. In all the former Malay States of the Federation the 18th year has been adopted for the purpose of determining the age of majority in respect of persons professing the Muslim religion.

I am entirely in agreement with this position having regard to the climatic conditions, social environment and other circumstances in Malaya and I hope Hon'ble Members will support me in giving legal recognition to what is now the existing practice, i.e. regarding the completion of the 18th year as having attained the age of majority, among Muslims residing in the State. I am glad to say that the Federal Parliament has recently passed the Age of Majority Act, 1961, under which the Age of Majority of persons professing the Muslim religion is fixed at eighteen years, and that of other persons at twenty-one years.

This Act which consolidates and repeals existing legislation in force in the States of Johore, Negri Sembilan, Pahang, Perak, Selangor and Trengganu cannot, however, operate in any State until it has been adopted by a Law of that State, since legislation relating to persons professing the Muslim religion is a matter for the State and not the Federal Legislature.

Accordingly it is proposed, by Clause 2 of the Bill, to adopt section 4 of the Act within the State. Section 4 provides that "the minority of all Muslim males and females shall cease and determine within the Federation at the age of eighteen years, and every such male and female attaining

that age shall be of the age of majority." It must be emphasised, however, that this section is subject to the provisions of section 5 of the Act, by virtue of which nothing in the Act shall affect any of the following matters:

- (a) the capacity of any person to act in the following matters, namely, marriage, divorce, dower and adoption;
- (b) the religion and religious rites and usages of any class of persons within the Federation;
- (c) the capacity of any person who, before the act came into force, had attained majority under any law applicable to him;
- (d) any provision in any other written law fixing the age of majority for the purposes of such law.

Sir, I beg to move.

The Member for Tanjong Bungah (Mr. Cheah Seng Khim): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time.

Committee

The Assembly resolves itself into Committee.

The Bill is considered clause by clause and agreed to without amendment.

The Assembly resumes

Third Reading

The Member for Dhoby Ghaut (Enche C. D. Ismail): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to report that the Age of Majority (Adoption) Bill, 1961, has been

considered in Committee clause by clause and agreed to without amendment. I beg, therefore, to move that the Bill be now read a third time and passed.

The Member for Tanjong Bungah (Mr. Cheah Seng Khim): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a third time and passed.

(E) The Guardianship of Infants (Adoption) Bill, 1961.

First Reading

The Member for Dhoby Ghaut (Enche C. D. Ismail): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled 'An Enactment to adopt the provision of the Guardianship of Infants Act, 1961, to persons professing the Muslim religion within the State' be read a first time.

The Member for Tanjong Bungah (Mr. Cheah Seng Khim): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

Bill accordingly read a first time.

The Member for Dhoby Ghaut (Enche C. D. Ismail): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that the Standing Orders be suspended in so far as it is necessary to enable this Bill to be taken through all its stages at this meeting.

The Member for Tanjong Bungah (Mr. Cheah Seng Khim): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

Question put and agreed to.

Second Reading

The Member for Dhoby Ghaut (Enche C. D. Ismail): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move

that the Bill intituled 'an Enactment to adopt the provisions of The Guardianship of Infants Act, 1961 to persons professing the Muslim religion within the State' be read a second time.

Sir, before I move for the Second Reading, I would like to explain the purpose and reasons of the Bill. The Guardianship of Infants Ordinance (Cap. 50) of the Straits Settlements operate in the States of Penang and Malacca only and there is no special enactment in other States governing the guardianship of infants, although by virtue of the Civil Law Ordinance, 1956, resort may be made to the common law of England. The Common Law of England with regard to guardianship and custody of infants has, however, been greatly changed by legislation, the underlying principle of which is that the welfare of the child should be the paramount consideration and that the rights of the father should not be considered superior to those of the mother, if they operate to the detriment of the child.

This Bill is designed to adopt the provisions of the Guardianship of Infants Act, 1961 which has recently been passed by Federal Parliament. Based on the existing Straits Settlements Ordinance, in force in Malacca and Penang, the Bill seeks to remedy the difficulties in matter of procedure, detail and definition as regards to governing the question of guardianship. It is emphasised, however, that the measure can only apply to persons professing the Muslim Religion if the Act is adopted by a law made by a State Legislature; and any such law may provide that nothing in the measure which is contrary to the Muslim religion shall apply to any child of parents professing the Muslim religion.

Clause 2 contains the necessary definitions, and in clause 2(2) (a) "majority" is given the same meaning as in the Age of Majority Enactment of the Federated Malay States. Clause 3 places upon the guardian of an infant the duty of caring for the infant and it will be noted that, by definition in clause 2, an infant is any person who has not attained his age of majority.

Clause 4 defines the duties of the guardian with regard to an infant's property, and clause 5 appoints the father of an infant as its guardian but power is reserved in the same clause to the High Court or a Judge thereof to protect the right of custody or access by the mother and, by clause 10, to appoint another person as guardian if circumstances so require. If an infant's father is dead, or if an infant is illegitimate, the mother will be the guardian (clause 6), subject to the power of the Court to appoint another person to act with (proviso to clause 6) or in place of the mother (clause 10) if the interests of the infant so require.

Clause 7 provides that if an infant is left an orphan, and his last surviving parent appointed a guardian by will, that guardian shall be the infant's guardian, unless and until the Court shall appoint another (clause 10); and clause 8 sets out the persons empowered to bring an orphaned infant before the Court, where there is no parental or testamentary guardian, in order that a proper guardian may be appointed. Clauses 9 to 14 set out the powers of the Court, clause 11 in particular emphasising that the fundamental object of the measure is the welfare of the infant. Clauses 15 and 16 limit the guardian's powers with regard to an infant's property: he may

not sell any property or give long leases of any immovable property of the infant, without leave of the Court. Clauses 17 and 18 permit a guardian to use an infant's income, subject to certain safeguards, for the infant's maintenance, and empower the Court to permit in appropriate circumstances an infant's capital to be applied for his education or maintenance. Clause 17 requires the leave of the Court or a Judge for provision out of income in excess of \$300 per month: this figure of \$300 is an increase of \$200 over the sum at present allowed under existing law, but it is considered that in view of the change in the value of money since the law was first promulgated, the figure of \$300 per month is a reasonable one. Clause 19 gives a guardian the right to seek the advice of a Judge upon the management of an infant's property; clause 20 excepts from the Bill money paid into a subordinate court to the credit of an infant; clause 21 confers a power to make rules and clause 22 repeals the Guardianship of Infants Ordinance of the Straits Settlements.

Sir, I beg to move.

The Member for Tanjong Bungah (Mr. Cheah Seng Khim): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time.

Committee

The Assembly resolves itself into Committee.

The Bill is considered clause by clause and agreed to without amendment.

The Assembly resumes

Third Reading

The Member for Dhoby Ghaut (Enche C. D. Ismail): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to report that the Guardianship of Infants (Adoption) Bill, 1961, has been considered in Committee clause by clause and agreed to without amendment. I beg, therefore, to move that the Bill be now read a third time and passed.

The Member for Tanjong Bungah (Mr. Cheah Seng Khim): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a third time and passed.

(F) The State of Penang Emblems and Names (Prevention of Improper Use) Bill, 1961.

First Reading

Chief Minister: (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled 'An Enactment to prevent the improper use of the State of Penang emblems or any part thereof for professional and commercial purposes' be read a first time.

The Member for Tasek Glugor (Enche Hashim bin Awang): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

Bill accordingly read a first time.

Chief Minister: (in Malay) Sir, I beg to move that the Standing Orders be suspended insofar as it is necessary to enable this Bill to be taken through all its stages at this meeting.

The Member for Tasek Glugor (Enche Hashim bin Awang): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

Question put and agreed to.

Second Reading

Chief Minister: (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled 'An Enactment to prevent the improper use of the State of Penang emblems or any part thereof for professional and commercial purposes' be read a second time.

(continuing in English):

Sir, before I move that the Bill be read a second time, I would like to bring to the notice of Hon'ble Members that there is no legislation in the State which prohibits the improper use of the State of Penang Emblems. I believe Hon'ble Members are aware that there have been instances in the past in which the State of Penang Emblems, or any part thereof, have been improperly used by certain commercial interests. To avoid this unhappy state of affairs, legislation to prohibit the improper use of the State of Penang Emblems is necessary, for there can be little doubt that unrestricted use of the State emblems will not add to the honour and dignity of the State. On the passing of this Bill, it will be an offence for any person to use or continue to use the specified emblems of the State of Penang, or any colourable imitation of it, or to make for the purpose of sale or to sell or to expose for sale any part of the emblems without the permission of the Hon'ble the Chief Minister, Penang.

The Bill also seeks to prohibit the registration of any company, firm or other body of persons under the name as specified in the Schedule to the Bill, or any abbreviations of such name. It also prohibits the registration of a trade mark or design which bears any emblem or name as specified in the Schedule, or any part thereof; or the granting of a

patent in respect of an invention which bears a title containing any emblem or name or any part thereof, without the permission of the Hon'ble the Chief Minister, Penang.

Sir, I beg to move.

The Member for Tasek Glugor (Enche Hashim bin Awang): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to ask for a clarification from the mover of this Bill.

I notice that in various schools of Penang there are already parts of the school crest which can be said to be a colourable imitation of the portrait or design of the State Crest. These crests have been in existence for some time. What would be the position now if we pass this Bill with regard to the existing school crests. As example, I would just cite the crest of the Malayan Teachers College. One portion of the shield contains a design very similar to a portion of our State Crest.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, if this Bill is approved then permission must be sought from the Chief Minister, Penang.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time.

Committee

The Assembly resolves itself into Committee.

The Bill is considered clause by clause and agreed to without amendment.

The Assembly resumes.

Third Reading

Chief Minister: (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to report

that the State of Penang Emblems and Names (Prevention of Improper Use) Bill, 1961, has been considered in Committee clause by clause and agreed to without amendment. I beg, therefore, to move that the Bill be now read a third time and passed.

The Member for Tasek Glugor (Enche Hashim bin Awang): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a third time and passed.

5. MOTIONS.

(A) Motion by the Honourable Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the motion standing in my name is to request that this Assembly approves the construction of a landing stage on the river bank at Prai, some 100 yards away from the Prai Railway Terminal. It is proposed to construct this landing stage where the masonry ramp is now situated. This masonry ramp has for many years served as a jetty for the embarkation and disembarkation of passengers using sampans. However, due to the silting of Prai River it becomes impossible for sampan operators to come alongside the masonry ramp at low tide. Planks are therefore laid on the mud to enable people to embark on to and disembark from sampans. These planks often become slippery and muddy and are a source of danger to the people walking on them.

The majority of people who use this masonry ramp daily are dockyard employees, railway employees and school children. A few sampan operators and fishermen also use this ramp. It is estimated that about 1,000 people use this masonry ramp daily, and about 52 sampans ply between Prai and

Bagan Dalam. The construction of a landing stage measuring 5 feet wide and 180 feet long, costing approximately \$6,000/-, will alleviate the difficulties experienced by people travelling to and from Prai and Bagan Dalam.

In order to forestall any argument in favour of desilting or dredging the river as opposed to the construction of a landing stage, I would like to inform Hon'ble Members that the silting of the Prai River estuary is an age-old problem, and technical experts have advised that any large-scale dredging, the cost of which would be prohibitive, would do little more than give temporary relief. It has been pointed out by these experts that even if a programme of large-scale dredging is contemplated, it would certainly have to be repeated at regular intervals to keep the masonry ramp and the estuary free of silt. Considering the limited use of the masonry ramp, the expenditure on dredging to keep the ramp free of silt would be out of all proportions to the use to which the ramp is put to. I say limited use in the sense that the ramp is only used by foot passengers and cyclists and for no other purpose. For this reason it would be far more economical to construct a landing stage as proposed at a relatively small cost of \$6,000/-.

The Government has been advised that this landing stage will meet the requirements of the people using sampan transport, and will serve a considerable number of years. There are strong possibilities that this landing stage will not silt up to the same extent as the masonry ramp. The sum of \$6,000/- to be spent on the construction of the landing stage represents a small outlay compared with the immense benefits and convenience that will accrue to the large number of passengers using this landing stage, as well as the

sampan operators. The annual maintenance cost will be negligible.

I would also like to mention that although it is proposed in the Federal Five Year Development Plan to construct a permanent bridge over the Prai River, and to extend the railway terminal to Butterworth, these developments will not detract the use of the landing stage to any appreciable degree.

Under the provisions of section 4(a) of the Foreshores Ordinance (S.S. Chapter 122) it is necessary for this Assembly to approve the construction of the proposed landing stage, and I therefore — (continuing in Malay): — Mr. Speaker, beg to move:

"That this Assembly pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of the Foreshores Ordinance (S.S. Chapter 122) approves the construction of the landing stage at Prai."

The Member for Permatang Pauh (Enche Ariffin bin Shariff): (in Malay)

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like a clarification from the mover of the Motion as to the sum of \$6,000, whether provision has been made, and from which Head or Subhead, or whether it is the intention of the State Government to ask for the provision in a Supply Bill again.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think there will be saving by virement to provide for the necessary money.

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise not to oppose this Motion because it is clear that it is likely to be of some benefit to the passengers who use the boats in this particular area. However, the honourable mover referred to

the silting of the river; and I am wondering whether the erection of this platform is likely to be of very much or lasting use, because when I go across the river in the Railway ferry I note that silt has narrowed down the navigable part of the river to a very small portion indeed. It may be true that the problem is a major one; but still I cannot really see how that river can continue to be of use to the State if something is not done to dredge the river. Perhaps, as the mover said, it may not be feasible to spend large sums of money to make the whole river navigable. That is an argument that we can admit. But I have not seen a dredge on that river for years and years; and if the present rate of silting continues it is obvious that within the next few years, perhaps within the next decade, the whole river is going to be completely blocked up — an experience which is not uncommon in this part of the world. Therefore I do feel that while the provision of such temporary measures, of such a landing stage, may be all right we are merely fiddling with the problem of the Prai River. And the State Government should give greater consideration to making that river really a navigable river, because I fear greatly that if that silting is allowed to go on very much longer ultimately the river will have to fold up. I am afraid I have rather a mixed analogy — the river cannot fold up; but the river will be closed to the ordinary kind of traffic. And therefore, although, I will not oppose the Motion, I would ask the Government to have in mind the question of silting of the Prai River.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification, I can assure the Honourable Member that the de-silting of the Prai River is receiving the active consideration of the State Government.

The Member for Butterworth (Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, before I move the Motion standing in my name I gave a talk explaining why it was moved, and in that talk I have already assured the Members that expert opinion has been obtained that the silting may not occur for many more years. Even though it occurs, it may not be to the same extent as at the masonry ramp. The masonry ramp is already in use; but this Motion is moved to get the approval of this Assembly to spend a certain sum, that is \$6,000, to improve the existing conditions and to alleviate the dangers that may occur to the passengers who use it.

Question put and agreed to.

(B) Motion by the Hon'ble the Chief Minister.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to ask this Assembly to approve by resolution the appropriation of the sum of \$1,800,790 shown in the State of Penang Second Supplementary Development Estimates, 1961, for expenditure for the purposes specified in Assembly Paper No. 10/1961 tabled in this House this morning.

This resolution is required under sub-section 5 (2) of the Penang State Development Fund Enactment, 1958, which reads:—

“If in respect of any financial year, it is found that the amount appropriated under any Head of Expenditure is insufficient or that a need has arisen for the expenditure for a purpose for which no amount has been appropriated by a resolution of the Legislative Assembly, a supplementary statement showing the sums required to be spent shall be laid before the Legislative Assembly, and the Legislative Assembly may by resolution approve all or any such expenditure, or part thereof, and

shall by such resolution appropriate the sums necessary to meet such approved expenditure for the purposes specified in the resolution."

Sir, there are only two subheads of expenditure in the Second Supplementary Development Estimates, 1961. Against Head 101, Subhead 12, supplementary provision of \$1,800,000 is entered for Industrial Development which, when added to the \$200,000 already provided in the 1961 Development Estimates, makes a total sum of \$2,000,000 available for expenditure this year. Hon'ble Members will also note that the estimated cost of the project has been raised from \$1 million to \$2.5 million. The supplementary provision of \$1,800,000 will be used mainly for land acquisitions.

Originally the State Government intended to establish an industrial estate of modest dimensions and, therefore, when the 1961 Estimates were being prepared it was envisaged that the total cost of the project would not exceed \$1,000,000. Since then circumstances have changed, which make it incumbent upon Government to plan it on a much larger scale. Although the State Government was previously aware that the Federal Government had intentions of constructing deep water wharves in Butterworth, and extending the railway terminal to this town, we now know for certain that these intentions will definitely materialize during the course of the Federal Five-Year Development Plan.

In revising the original plan for the industrial estate, the State Government also took into consideration the Federal Government's proposal to construct a road linking the West Coast with Kota Bahru on the East Coast. This road, which will eventually connect

Province Wellesley, it is hoped will be built in the not too distant future.

Apart from the above developments, the response to our advertisement for industrial sites has proved to be beyond our expectations. We have now received about 115 applications for industrial sites. It is proposed to acquire 173 acres of land at Mak Mandin. Together with State land, there will altogether be 320 acres available for allocation to successful applicants, and also to future developers.

This expenditure represents a sound investment in that it will create new employment opportunities and generate greater economic activity in our State.

The only other provision in these Estimates is a sum of \$790 against Head 107, subhead 24, for purchase of technical equipment required by the P. W. D. The equipment to be purchased are one autoset level, one plan printing machine, one lapping machine and one microscope. As the tempo of development increases shortages of equipment make themselves apparent from time to time. It is our duty to see that shortages do not hamper the P. W. D. who have to bear the brunt of development work. One autoset level was purchased earlier in the year from funds provided in the 1961 Development Estimates. It has become necessary to acquire another instrument. A plan printing machine has become an urgent need because with present increased volume of work, prints of buildings, etc., cannot at present be obtained with sufficient speed for contract purposes and other needs. The remaining two items are accessory equipment necessary in order that the best use may be had of the fuel pump testing equipment which was purchased last year.

Honourable Members will note that although the total cost of the equipment to be purchased is \$7,985, savings are available from the amount of \$34,200 provided against the same subhead in the 1961 Development Estimates to meet almost the whole of the total cost. It will be recalled that among the equipment to be purchased with the funds provided was a Spring Power Hammer. Thanks to the generosity of the Federal Government, a new spring power hammer was obtained free from P. W. D. Federal Workshops, and the State Government was saved the cost of a spring hammer. Only expenditure incurred was in respect of installation of this hammer.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move—

“That this Assembly approves the expenditure of \$1,800,790 shown in the Second Supplementary Development Estimates, 1961, tabled as Legislative Assembly, Penang, Paper No. 10 of 1961, and resolves that the said sum shall be applied for the purposes specified in the said Second Supplementary Development Estimates, 1961.”

The Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Chor Sin Kheng): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to second the Motion.

I have listened with a certain amount of interest to the explanations of the Honourable the Chief Minister regarding the two sub-heads of expenditure in the Second Supplementary Development Estimates, 1961. Against Head 101, subhead 12, the amount of \$1,800,000 will be used mainly for land acquisitions. It is proposed to acquire 173 acres of land at Mak Mandin. If this acreage is added to the existing State Land, there will be a total of 320 acres available for allocation to successful applicants and future developers in our planning of the industrial estate.

Sir, industry not unnaturally tends to develop in areas where communications and supplies of power, water and other facilities are most readily available. However, it is probable that the most important single factor that has influenced the location of new industry is the availability of land. The prospective industrialist wants to be able to own a suitable serviced site for his factory with the minimum of fuss and delay. The immense success of Petaling Jaya, a satellite town of Kuala Lumpur, clearly illustrates this point. We have just heard from the mover of the Motion, the Honourable the Chief Minister, that the Federal Government will definitely construct deep water wharves in Butterworth, and extend the railway terminal to this town during the course of the Federal Five Year Development Plan. In the State Second Five Year Development Plan ample supplies of power and water have also been made available to that area. With all these essential facilities available, and the important developments coming up, I agree wholeheartedly with what the Chief Minister has said. To quote his own words, this expenditure represents a sound investment in that it will create new employment opportunities and generate greater economic activity in our State.

Sir, today foreign business-men and industrialists are beginning to appreciate the favourable business opportunities offered by Malaya's stable political and economic conditions, and by the Government's policy of creating a sunny and healthy climate, as we can judge from the many foreign and Malayan combined enterprises and ventures that have been established recently in our country.

The second item of expenditure of \$790 is a small amount, considering the many development

projects and works that are now being entrusted to the Public Works Department. More new technical equipments have to be purchased to enable the Department to carry out works properly and satisfactorily. This item of expenditure is both justifiable and necessary. Thank you.

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to comment on the speeches made by the Honourable the Mover and the Honourable the Seconder of this Motion. The total sum asked for is \$1,800,790. I will refer first to Head 107 where the sum of \$790 was asked for. This is a mere flea-bite to which no-one in his senses would have any objection whatever. And after all it is for equipment which is always necessary. But it is the other item under Head 101 where we are asked to vote for a sum of \$1,800,000 that I think I should comment upon, and even oppose, not merely for the sake of opposition — not because we on this side are not in favour of further industrialisation. In fact we are very greatly interested in seeing that more industries are opened up as quickly as possible. But the point of comment that I would like, Mr. Speaker, Sir, Honourable Members of this Assembly to note is this: How does a Government set about the formation of an industrial site? I presume any sensible Government would consider the matter in its long-range aspects and decide, "This area is a good area. There is plenty of all kinds of telecommunications available, as well as transport communications available. There is plenty of water. There is plenty of power, and so forth." But the very first thing that any Government would look into is the question of the availability of land.

Jaya. Petaling Jaya has been a great success. But I believe the Seconder never realised that that was because the Central Government looked so far ahead that they were able to acquire the land at such a cheap rate that all kinds of development could take place at very economic prices.

When some months ago reference was first made to the industrial site in Province Wellesley, the Government claimed that it was farsighted, and that it was looking ahead for the future development of the State. And yet today's Motion clearly indicates that they have only 147 acres available; and they are now coming to this Assembly to ask for \$1,800,000, primarily, if I understand the mover of the Bill correctly, for the purchase of land — 173 acres of land. Now, this is to put the cart before the horse with a vengeance. Everybody knows now where our industrial site is. Now Government is belatedly trying to buy the land in that area. Naturally Government will be asked to pay through the nose for it. That I submit, Mr. Speaker, Sir, is the wrong way to approach this problem. Everything should have been done first if it was felt that 300 acres was the minimum area required for setting up such an industrial site. Government should have first seen to it that 300 acres was available; not just buy 100 acres, or allowing for 150 acres and then go round and try to buy a further 150 acres. Therefore this is my point of contention: we are not opposing this Bill because further provisions are being sought for industrial purposes. That is not the point of our opposition. The point of our opposition is that Government has been shortsighted as not to look far ahead in time, and has ventured into a scheme without considering all the consequences. And now it would appear that we are going to buy this land at

Now, the Seconder in seconding the Motion referred to Petaling

approximately the cost of about \$14,000 or \$15,000 an acre. I have not worked it out arithmetically, but I must quote the approximate figure. If that is so then I feel, as a protest, that we should oppose this Motion for this amount.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Mr. Speaker, Sir, this side of the House is always for the setting up of industrial estates. In fact during the last elections in 1959 the Socialist Front had in its election manifesto provision for setting up industrial estates. We are not opposed in principle to the setting up of industrial estates. And although the seconder to this Motion urged upon this Assembly that it is sunny, it is healthy, yet I must constrain to disagree with him by saying that whereas in this Assembly it is gloomy. I say that it is gloomy precisely because of the fact that such a gloom shrouds the activities of the Government with respect to this particular matter. When the proposal of Sungei Mak Mandin was first mentioned in this Assembly there was a loud clap of cheers saying that the Government has done something good, etc. etc. And if my memory does not fail me I believe the Government went as far as to say that it has the thing more or less under control. But this Motion asking for an increase admits a singular fact that the Government, our State Government, has not got control over the movement, the direction, the growth of this industrial estate. Government is supposed to set up an economic planning committee for the whole State, but there is none at present; and the system of the Government is piecemeal. It is piecemeal: it is urged by circumstances, not by planning. In other words it is piecemeal in the sense it has become patchwork. It is not — to use the Honourable the Chief Minister's expression — cutting the shape of the dress according

to the cloth. It is no more cutting the shirt according to the cloth; but of hunting for pieces of cloth to make up some sort of a cloth. I say this because we have now a provision asking for \$1,800,000 for land. What about provisions for setting up the factories, the buildings, the access roads? Surely one of the first objects of the Government in trying to set up an industrial estate is to have a plan in mind, worked out as far as possible in detail, giving estimates. The estimates are not revealed to this Assembly. And I suppose the reply the Honourable the Chief Minister would give is, "Such plans are confidential, and should not be revealed." And yet, when it comes to terms of money it is not confidential. We are supposed to pay out of our pockets for something which is confidential, which we cannot know. This is a bad principle. And it is precisely because of this that we oppose.

May I ask for clarification from the Honourable the Chief Minister: How much does the Chief Minister think the whole estate would cost? And would the Chief Minister also give an assurance that there would be no more extension? Would the Chief Minister also give an assurance that the money asked for now is within 10% correct? Or the Chief Minister cannot give any assurance? I feel — and I am certain — that in the end the industrial estate will be taken over by the Federal Government who has financial resources, who has planning departments to do it, and that the State is a mere agency. If that is so, will the Chief Minister admit that the State Government is a mere agency for the purpose of acquiring land, whereas capital outlay on factories and power lines and roads will have to be undertaken by the Federal Government? If all these assurances were given in the first stage

when this thing was coming then we could have a proper estimate. But as it is, it is asking for something which is against the principle of a responsive and responsible Government.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew):. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support my two colleagues in opposing this Motion.

This Assembly has always been told by the Honourable the Chief Minister that the State Government is always responsible, is sincere, that it never does things in a rush, and that all aspects of planning will have to be considered by the State Government before it takes a decision. Yet today we have been called upon to provide an additional provision for a project which the State Government has already thought of. And the provision is not just a slight sum of a few hundred dollars or thousand dollars to add to one million; but we are supposed to add $1\frac{1}{2}$ million to 1 million, making a total of $2\frac{1}{2}$ million. The explanation given by the Honourable the Chief Minister is that the intention of the State Government was originally to have an industrial estate on a modest scale. Then it would appear from his explanation that the State Government originally intended to use only State land. There was no intention whatsoever to acquire this 173 acres for the industrial estate. Now, having planned so far, today we have been told that we require another 173 acres to expand this industrial estate at Mak Mandin. If we are to take the reasons of the Honourable the Chief Minister to his logical conclusion it would appear then that the State Government requires this $1\frac{1}{2}$ million to pay for the cost of these 173 acres of land. If that is the logic of it — which I feel, arising from the reasons given by the Chief Minister, it seems to be — then the State Govern-

ment is being asked to pay over \$8,000 an acre of land in Mak Mandin just to provide an industrial estate over in Province.

While I was in Perak I was rather surprised to see that in the industrial estate at Tassek which the Perak State Government handed over to the Ipoh Town Council, I was given to understand that the land in Tassek was acquired by the Perak State Government under compulsory acquisition, and that the sum per acre paid in that acquisition is not more than \$3,000. And I was also given to understand that in Tassek Industrial Estate neither the State Government nor the Ipoh Town Council made any provision for the purchase of that land, because it was their intention after having acquired that piece through compulsory acquisition to piece it to those who required those lands to have industrial sites in that area. It is rather surprising that the Penang State Government could not even realize what it intends to do. First, after getting the land, then they straightaway call for applications; and, as mentioned by the Honourable the Chief Minister, 115 applications have been received. Had the State Government ever considered the question of whether this 115 applicants are really those who sincerely desire to develop that piece of land for industrial sites? Now, has the State Government ever considered getting deposits from these applicants to make sure that only legitimate and sincere applicants are being considered by the State Government? This the State Government has not done. I would like to bring to the notice of the Honourable the Chief Minister, that that was done by the Ipoh Town Council and the Chairman is Mr. Waller.

Now, we expect the Government to do things which while

encouraging the development of industrial sites, will safeguard the finances of the Government. As I have actually mentioned just now, the cost of land over at Tassek is not over \$3,000. And if we are to take it that the State Government is providing 1½ million for 173 acres of land, I would say it is money going down the drain, without ascertaining the real facts as to whether such an industrial site at that place is really necessary or in the interests of the people.

We are not being told, after spending this 2½ million, how we are going to recoup the 2½ million. Has the State Government got to subsidize these industrial estates? Well, if it is the intention of the Penang State Government to subsidize these industrial estates just because it wants economic activity, as mentioned by the Honourable the Chief Minister, then we say it is a shame on the State Government to subsidize capitalists, because I feel sure, as has been explained by the State Government that in the Federation of Malaya and in the State we have a stable Government, money will keep flowing in whether you like it or not, and there is no necessity of subsidizing capitalists.

And just for information, in Ipoh, at Tassek, while they are purchasing land at a sum not more than \$3,000, when the land is subdivided it is being sold for more than \$3,000, and there are still applications for industrial sites at Tassek.

What I feel is that the Government should not waste the people's money unnecessarily, but plan ahead—have careful planning. In this case, they have not done so. I will conclude that this is just a case of a slap in the face for the State Government because they say things which they cannot do. Thank you.

The Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik) (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to reply to all the points raised by Hon'ble Members of the Opposition.

The Hon'ble Member for Sungei Pinang said that it was necessary to have an industrial estate but he wondered whether Government has carried out a proper development scheme. 173 acres of land have to be acquired and it appears that the Penang State Government lacks foresight. Mr. Speaker, Sir, that's what he accused the State Government of — lack of foresight. From what he said, it is obvious that the Hon'ble Member is ignorant as to what is actually happening. The State Government is responsible to the people of Penang and Province Wellesley, and therefore it cannot carry out any scheme in haste and without careful planning. The State Government had appointed a Working Committee which, in turn, has examined the possibility of establishing Industrial Estates in this State. In its report the Committee has recommended that Mak Mandin should be selected as the site for the Industrial Estate. The allegation that the State Government lacks foresight, I presume, has been made with the sole purpose of discrediting the Government.

The Hon'ble Member for Kota said that the Socialist Front has included in its Manifesto the development of Industrial Estates in this State. Hon'ble Members would also be aware that the Alliance Party has included the development of Industrial Estates in its Manifesto, both at Federal and State levels. In order to fulfil our promises to the ra'ayat, we have carried out investigations and established an Industrial Estate.

As regards land, the Member for Sungei Pinang said that

further investigations should be carried out because 173 acres of land have to be acquired whereas State land in the area amounts only to 147 acres. Since I have lived in Butterworth for 34 years, with all due respects, I know probably more about Butterworth than any other member of this Assembly. I know exactly what the position in Butterworth is. That particular piece of land was useless and Government acquired it because the rent was not paid up, but to-day the land has been improved and at present it is not easy to get a piece of land in Butterworth. My friend, the Hon'ble Member for Jelutong, however, compared the land with the rubber land at Tassek which is about \$3,000/- per acre. I have personally seen the land and am aware of its distance from Ipoh. There is no doubt that the cost of the land is \$3,000 per acre—I have also been told so — but to compare Ipoh (in the State of Perak), which is a very big town, with Butterworth is not a fair comparison at all. It has also been said that the State Government has not invited applications. Actually, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the purpose of advertising in the Press was to assist Government in finding out the number of industrialists who would be interested in the Scheme. As the number of applications received was numerous, the State Government has sought the advice of Mr. Marsh, the industrial expert of a recognised firm. The Member who said that the State Government lacks foresight is, therefore, in the wrong. Thank you.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very glad to hear the sincerity for once from the Opposition side that they support the idea of establishing an industrial estate in Penang. But today we heard that they oppose this request or Resolution for money to purchase land. Does it mean that

they intend to scrap the establishment of this industrial estate? I believe they appreciate the main object of establishing this industrial estate is, as I quoted earlier, to create opportunities for employment, and also to generate greater economic activity in our State. Now, if there is an opportunity to enlarge our plan, thus enlarging the opportunity for employment and economic development of our State, may I ask the Opposition, "Is it right or wrong to spend more money for such a development?"

The Honourable Member from Sungei Pinang asked the question how Government decides on the site. It is a very interesting question. But if the Honourable Member for Sungei Pinang had taken a little trouble to study from the various discussions in this Assembly or in the newspaper he would have learned that a number of Committees had been established at Federal level, and also at State level, to consider such a problem.

I am happy to hear the Honourable Member from Jelutong remembers that this Government, the Alliance Government, is a Government which does not rush at conclusions. It is a fact. We never rush at conclusions. This site was accepted or agreed after a very long and careful deliberation, both from the Federal and State authorities.

Now, to mention that the Government is putting the cart before the horse, I think, is not a very sincere opinion. The Alliance Government always moves very cautiously.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Hardly moves.

Chief Minister: If we hardly move you will not see the development that is taking place in our country. I admit we move slowly, cautiously. That is because we

want to safeguard public money. Whatever money we have in our kitty we treasure very, very carefully, unlike one particular authority in Penang which builds castles in the air, plans many projects, but is without a penny in the kitty to carry out the projects.

Now, the Member for Jelutong is concerned that Government may have to pay for the purchase of land through the nose. If that Honourable Member had taken a little more pains — and this I hope Members of the Opposition will do by getting \$250 allowance now — to read the Gazette Notifications every month. If he were to take a little trouble he will notice that on the 18th of August, 1960, Government published a Notification gazetting under section 4, I think, all these lands which are earmarked for such a purpose. Now, what is the implication of that Notification? It freezes the value of that land; and so if Government now acquires the land the value of the land will be according to the valuation set up by the Collector of Land Revenue, fixed according to that date. Is that not a step taken by the Government to safeguard public money? It is almost after more than a year that the Government now decides to go ahead with acquisition. It is a fact, as mentioned by the Honourable Member for Jelutong, that it was the original intention of the Government to use only State land. But is it right or wrong to enlarge our programme now if the response is so encouraging? Is it right or wrong to spend more money to provide more opportunities to establish industries here, and thereby create opportunities for employment, which I believe Members of the Opposition are interested in—either sincerely or not, I am not very sure from what I have listened to from the Op-

position regarding this request for money.

What does it mean if we were to refuse to approve this application for \$1.8 million? It means we have got to curtail or cut down the number of industries to be established in our State. Does it create more employment by cutting down industries? And therefore I appeal to the people of Penang to examine the sincerity of the Opposition when they always preach the principle of providing employment for our people.

To compare the price of land at Tassek in Perak and the land in Butterworth: May I ask the Honourable Member for Jelutong, "Does he expect the value of land in the City of George Town to be equal to the value of land in Balik Pulau?" Again, I expect the people of Penang to judge for such a conclusion that if the Member of the Opposition considers the valuation of land in Tassek, Perak — \$3,000 — is reasonable or should be charged on the value of land in Butterworth. The Government of Penang, that is, the Alliance Government, always values the land according to the reasonable market value of the area concerned. The Member for Jelutong..... (interrupted).

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification: Is the Honourable the Chief Minister implying that a land which is about 3 miles from a town is less valuable than a land which is 7 miles from a town?

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am not an expert land valuer, but I think many factors have to be taken into consideration. It is not only the distance, but the services available, the nature of the land, and the proximity of the land.

Now, coming to another point, a very interesting point raised by the Member from Kota, if I am not mistaken; yes — Government will have to hunt for pieces of cloth to cut the coat. I can assure the Honourable Member for Kota that the State Government of Penang not only has pieces of cloth; they have yards and yards and bales of cloth. They do not have to seek or look around for money. The money is there for us to spend if it is for the good and benefit of our people. This provision of \$1.8 million, as I mentioned in my introductory speech, is for acquisition of the land. Now, if Members from the Opposition were to study carefully, if you approve this \$1.8 million it will bring the original estimate to \$2.5 million. Thus we will notice that there is a balance of half a million for other purposes.

Now, how are we to recoup the price or the cost of this development? That is a detail of administrative work which is being studied by a Committee which the Member will notice has been established by Government in the Written Answers to Questions. If it is necessary, Government may have to subsidize certain sites.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Shame!

Chief Minister: It is not a shame to subsidize for industrialisation. But the problem is, are we subsidizing the capitalists or the industrialists? I take it from Members of the opposite side that industrialists are not capitalists. May I remind Members of the Opposition that there are applications submitted from people who are labourers themselves, forming into a sharikat to run a factory. Is it wrong to subsidize such an application? The Federal Government, that is the Alliance Government, has been subsidizing such industries through R. I. D. A.

This is a detailed instruction which Government would not like to reveal in this House before we come to a decision.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Confidential?

Chief Minister: I admit there are many matters which we have to treat as confidential, because I believe that the Opposition will agree with me that speculation has got to be prevented. Now, if this secret is to be let out, what does it implicate? One day the Opposition says we have to be careful: we do not want to have speculation. Another day they come to this House and say, publicize what we intend to do, and don't worry about speculation. I leave it to the public to judge.

Points raised by the Honourable Member for Kota: About the question whether Government would have to come back to this House for more money. If it is not the job of this House to consider such applications, what are we here for? As I mentioned, are we here to babble or talk mere politics; I should have said 'to talk dirty politics'; but I reserve that term 'dirty politics'. We have come here to talk politics which is constructive. Today, whether the politics as spoken in this House is constructive or destructive politics (interrupted).

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker,

Sir, on a point of information: May the Honourable the Chief Minister define what is actually dirty politics?

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, my definition of dirty politics is politics which will destroy human beings.

Now, the destructive politics (interrupted).

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of information again: Are we to take it then that whatever the Honourable Members of the Opposition say will destroy human beings?

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I never said that, and I pray it will not happen.

To continue, Sir: To raise concern about the application for \$1.8 million is I think reasonable. It is a big sum of money. But to oppose it, I could never imagine such a move. As I mentioned earlier, to oppose it is to cut down the programme of industrial development. Do the Opposition Members realize what it implies? One day they ask for employment. Now there is an opportunity for employment for the young boys and girls who are leaving schools by thousands every year. We heard many adjournment speeches, and today you will hear one about further education for our children in the country. What is the use to promote further education when there are no opportunities for employment? I say it is a shame for anybody to turn down such a request for more money, not to be thrown into the drain as mentioned by the Opposition but to acquire useful and valuable land for the promotion of more industries which will create better and more opportunities for our thousands of boys and girls for employment.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I hope at least the Members of the Opposition here will realize the folly that they have made this morning; and now I hope that they will support this Motion.

Question put and agreed to.

The Assembly Adjourns at 1.10 p.m.

The Assembly Resumes at 2.45 p.m.

(C) Motion by the Hon'ble Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik.

The Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Motion standing in my name is to specify by resolution the particular purposes of the Padi Fertiliser Scheme Fund.

Honourable Members will remember that this Fund was created by resolution of this Assembly at its meeting on 29th December, 1960, and a sum of \$300,000 has been provided as a working capital. The objects of this Padi Fertiliser Scheme Fund were explained to Honourable Members broadly when the resolution to create this fund was brought up before the Assembly, and I need not recapitulate them.

Unlike other Trust Funds, the titles of which in themselves adequately describe the general purposes of such Funds, the title "Padi Fertiliser Scheme Fund" does not describe the general purposes of this Fund. The particular purposes of this Fund were not incorporated in the resolution brought up before the Assembly on 29th December, 1960, as the Padi Fertiliser Scheme was then in an embryonic stage.

The application of Trust Funds is governed by section 26(2) of the Financial Procedure Ordinance, 1957, which reads;

"The State Financial authority may apply the fund for the general purposes thereof or, subject to the provision of any written law, for such particular purposes as may from time to time be specified by resolution of the State Legislative Assembly."

It was only subsequent to the creation of this Fund that the particular purposes and the exact manner in which the Fund is to

be operated have been worked out. It is therefore now necessary, under the above-quoted section of the Financial Procedure Ordinance, to specify the particular purposes by resolution in this Assembly. As this is the first time that a Padi Fertiliser Scheme is being undertaken in the State, discussions and deliberations were somewhat protracted in order to work out procedure and the manner of operation to the satisfaction of Government and others concerned. Consultation took place between the Banking Union and the State Government with a view to the former acting as distributing agents of Government. It has also been decided that the State Agricultural Officer should administer this Fund. Specifying the particular purposes of the Fund by resolution in the Assembly will protect the officer administering the Fund against charges of misuse or maladministration of the Fund.

I would now like to briefly elaborate how fertilisers are to be distributed to the padi growers. The Ministry of Agriculture and Co-operatives calls for tenders for the supply of fertilisers, and since competition will be on a Federation-wide scale prices will be as low as possible. The State Government has therefore decided to accept the tenders accepted by the Ministry of Agriculture and Co-operatives. The State Government will purchase fertilisers by making immediate payment and then hand over the fertilisers to the Banking Union for the latter to distribute to padi growers. The fertilisers will be purchased and distributed at the commencement of each padi season, and the Banking Union will repay the Government in full for the cost of the fertilisers one month after the completion of each harvest.

The Banking Union will offer short term credit to members of

the Union, and will sell on cash terms to non-members. The selling price to members and non-members will be the same, and it is expected that the price per bag will be about 20 cents below the ruling market price. It would be unreasonable to expect the Banking Union to provide short term credit to non-members because the Union will most certainly find difficulty in recovering the money. Insofar as members of the Union are concerned, the machinery already exists for the recovery of the money.

I do not wish to go into the benefits of Co-operation and the Co-operative movement, but the provision of short term credit facilities in this instance is an example of the good that can come from being a member of a Co-operative Society. It is hoped, however, that with the short term credit facilities offered by the Banking Union more padi growers will be encouraged to join the Banking Union or form themselves into co-operative societies and thereby enjoy more benefits.

The Banking Union will sell fertilisers at cost, but will be permitted to add a small commission for services rendered as distributors, and also to cover losses arising during storage and from bad debts. I am to emphasize at this juncture that in distributing these fertilisers the Banking Union undertakes to bring fertilisers to the doorsteps of the padi growers. The State Government will enter into agreements with the suppliers of fertilisers as well as with the Province Wellesley Banking Union to ensure that Fund is adequately protected. The State Government is satisfied that the Banking Union has sufficient experience and the necessary machinery to act as agents for the Government to distribute fertilisers to the padi growers.

Once the Motion standing in my name is approved, it will be possible to bring into operation the Padi Fertiliser Scheme as from the current padi season. It is therefore in the interest of the State Government that the State Agricultural Officer and the particular purposes of the Padi Fertiliser Scheme Fund should be specified by resolution of this Assembly. Honourable Members are aware that the State of Penang leads the Federation in double cropping. The padi yield of the State is something which we can all be proud of. The distribution of padi fertilisers at low cost will further enhance the economic conditions of our padi growers, and will also, I am sure, prove to be a stimulus for increasing the padi yield.

Before I move this Motion I would like to assure Members of the Assembly that every detail has been gone into to ensure the proper use of this Fund. Honourable Members, I hope this Motion will receive the full support of this House.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move —

“That this Assembly resolves:

- (i) that the Padi Fertiliser Scheme Fund created by Resolution of this Assembly on the 29th December, 1960, be applied for the purpose of assisting padi growers in the State of Penang to obtain fertilisers needed by them;
- (ii) that the said Padi Fertiliser Scheme Fund be used for the purchase of fertilisers for subsequent sale to padi growers in the State of Penang through the Province Wellesley Banking Union who shall be appointed to act as Agents of the Government of Penang;
- (iii) that, with the object of the Fund in view, the Agents of the Government shall be re-

quired to sell the fertilisers at cost but shall be permitted to add a commission at rates approved by the State Authority for their services and to cover losses arising during storage and distribution, and from bad debts;

- (iv) that the Government of Penang shall purchase the fertilisers and hand them to the Province Wellesley Banking Union at the commencement of each padi season and the Province Wellesley Banking Union shall be required to pay the Government of Penang the cost of the fertilisers in full, one month after the completion of each harvest, the date of the completion of harvest to be determined by Government from padi season to padi season.”

The Member for Permatang Pauh (Enche Ariffin bin Shariff): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise up to speak, more or less seeking clarification, and giving a few thoughts to this Motion.

The first point that struck me is whether the Government has looked into the Constitution or Objects of the Province Wellesley Banking Union. I have a copy of the Constitution of the Banking Union, and under the section of Objects, which translated roughly for me in English, there are five listed Objects. Objects of this Union:

The first Object is doing the work of banking and of giving loans.

Second, purchasing and selling for general accounts of all agricultural implements for planting padi and produce, and also household needs and fishing equipments.

Third, controlling and auditing registered Co-operative Society accounts.

Fourth, providing assistance to educate members of the said Societies.

Fifth, providing other advice and/or ways for the improvement of the work and extension of the usefulness of the Societies.

These are the five listed Objects. What this Motion proposes to do is to turn or to make the Banking Union into a selling agent, which is not only concerned with sale, but apparently with storage, distribution, and also concerned with bad debts and other services. I would inquire from the Government whether in view of the Objects listed here, whether the Union would have the power to act as an agent for the Government in this instance, or whether the Union will be seeking to amend or to add to its Objects before they accept appointment as agent of the Government, because I believe — although I am not a Trade Unionist, I believe — that a Union, a Co-operative Society cannot act out of the purview or out of the boundaries of the Objects. It must act within the Objects. And here I see nothing about purchasing or selling of fertilizer. It appears that only purchase or selling of agricultural implements — it is not 'baja'; there is no word of 'baja' in the Objects. It is 'perkara perkara'. And this is the first point that struck me.

Another point that struck me is that on one hand we give them the power to act as agents, and yet on the other hand we sort of tie them down to payment within one month of the completion of the harvest. May I ask the Honourable the Chief Minister or any Member of the Government whether the State Government has

gone into the Liabilities and Assets of this Union. From the Balance Sheet so quickly offered to me, for which I thank the State Secretary, it appears that there are outstanding loans incurred by this Society or this Union to the extent of over two or more million, as well as interest thereby incurred. One of the big items this Union incurred was for the purchase of Bertam Estate.

We are now asking this Union to be our agents. At the same time we are asking them to pay back within one month. Surely I think the restriction of one month is a bit too narrow in a sense that we could have given three or four months in view of the fact that padi planters in this State may take some time, even through the assistance of Co-operative Societies, to obtain money, because I believe the sale of padi is not only to the State, but to private enterprises. And therefore there may be arrangements made between the Co-operative Society and other padi planters and the purchasers of padi, not for immediate payments of padi but for payments that may be stretched over one or two months. This is I believe unduly short, and will add greater strain to the financial position of the Union as it is.

At the same time I have to make inquiries as to whether the sale of these fertilizers will be made at the direction of the State Government, or is the State Government going to give a free hand to this Union as to whom to sell these fertilizers to. And also further, whether the sale of fertilizers are meant only for the members of this Co-operative Union or for other padi planters who may not join the Union. There is also another vital aspect, whether in fact the Constitution of the Co-operative Society or even of this Banking

Union allows it to direct sales or give sales of fertilisers to non-Union members — whether the State Government has gone into this matter.

And another point that also struck me is: In view of the fact of the financial position of this Union, is the Government seeking any security on the matter of return of the expenses?

These are the few points that struck me. I would like to have this clarification.

The Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, to clarify the points raised by the Hon'ble Member for Kota — Government has studied the By-laws governing the Banking Union and the By-laws permit the Union to purchase and sell agricultural equipment on behalf of public bodies. Fertilizer is a part of agricultural equipment. We add fertilizers to the soil to make the padi plants grow well.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Mr. Speaker, Sir, equipment, not fertiliser — 'baja' is different.

The Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, everything mentioned here is in general terms. Equipment referred to here means to purchase and sell agricultural equipment. To add fertilizer to the soil is also a part of agricultural activities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Sir, we come to its Balance Sheet. Although it has been examined, it is still being considered by the Auditor. When the Balance Sheet as at the end of 1959 was audited by the Auditor of the Department of Co-operative Development, Federation of Malaya, it was found that the debt incurred by the Banking Union was \$2,271,806.55

but this figure should not surprise us as the Union has 6,790 acres of land as its assets. Considering the value of the land, we can say that the Bank is quite well-off — as such, there is no cause for alarm.

As regards the other question, we give them a period of one month. Although the prescribed period is only one month, the State Government has, after consultation with the Department of Agriculture, decided that the period of one month should be one month after the harvest. Even though the period laid down is one month, it does not mean that, if the harvest at Permatang Tinggi (which is in my constituency) has already been completed, people in other areas have to finish their harvest, too. No — it is a month after the period which has been decided upon by the State Government. The State Government will naturally consult the Agricultural Department and, therefore, it will not result in hardship to the farmers.

Cheap fertilizers will be sold not only to members but also to all padi planters and the Bank can, at its discretion, impose any condition. Those who are not members of the Co-operative Society or of the Bank will have to pay cash whereas those who are members may get them on credit: this is left to the discretion of the Bank. It is obvious that this scheme is for all padi planters in the State.

That's all.

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, will the Honourable Member for Muda give us an idea of what the commission is likely to be as mentioned in paragraph (iii) of this Motion?

Mr. Speaker: Seeking clarification?

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Yes.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the terms of the loan or the commission to be levied by the Banking Union is still under investigation and consideration between the State Government and the Banking Union. There is a proposal to charge 12% interest, 12%, but that is not decisive.

Mr. Speaker: (in Malay) Honourable Members.....
[Interrupted].

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): A point of clarification — may I ask whom does the State propose to buy the fertiliser from? By tender?

Chief Minister: Sir, in the introductory speech by the Member for Muda, he has explained that the fertiliser was accepted. The suppliers for this fertiliser have been decided by the Ministry of Agriculture, by tender.

Question put and agreed to.

(D) **Motion by the Hon'ble Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew.**

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, before I move the motion standing in my name, I would like first of all to touch on the events and the reasons which prompted me to move this motion.

We, on this side of the House, have time and again been reminded by the Alliance State Government that political consideration should never influence Governments and Local Authorities in the exercise of their duties for the good of the people. In spite of what the State Government has said, it is my intention to prove by this series of events that the Alliance State Government had in fact allowed its

judgment to be clouded by political considerations. Since my motion touches on Low-Cost Houses, I shall only endeavour to speak on what the State Government has done to seek a political advantage over this issue, throwing overboard democratic practice, legal implications and traditional conventions.

I feel sure that the Hon'ble the Chief Minister and other Honourable Members will agree that the Federal Constitution is the main and primary law of the country, from which all legal powers and duties derive. Let us refer to Article 74 (2) of the Constitution.

The language of the Article cannot be clearer. It says that the Legislature of the State may make laws with respect to any of the matters enumerated in the State List. Acting, presumably, under this Article, the State Legislature passed Enactment No. 1 of 1961 enabling the State Government to borrow certain sums of money for the purpose of financing housing schemes in the State. My submission, Sir, is that that Enactment comes within the purview of Item 7 of List II in the Ninth Schedule of the Constitution. That item speaks of "borrowing on the security of the State Consolidated Fund" and "loans for State purposes."

The argument has been put forward that the State has some sort of inherent right to build houses comprising what are known as low-cost housing schemes. Ours, Sir, is a written Constitution and for every act of State there must be express provision therefor in our Constitution. I fail to see where in the Constitution it is laid down that the State has the power to build houses as low-cost housing schemes.

I would, Sir, with respect, point out where the fallacy lies. The

State Government has misread List II in the Ninth Schedule of the Constitution as conferring certain executive powers upon the State. My submission is that it does not, for it is expressly stated in Article 74 (2) that the State may merely make laws with respect to the matters enumerated in this List.

Now let us look at the State List. Item 4 reads "Local Government." This is the main heading. In other words, the State has power to make laws with regard to Local Government. Then, Local Government is given a fairly extensive definition by including thereunder subjects such as Local Government Elections, Obnoxious Trades and Public Nuisances and then we have "Housing and Provision for Housing Accommodation, etc."

To my mind, the confusion arises in confusing the sub-item for the main item. If it was the intention of the makers of the Constitution to give direct power to a State to indulge in housing, I submit that you would have found a separate item in the List with a main heading "Housing." The intention here seems to be quite to the contrary. Housing comes within the main subject matter of Local Government just as Obnoxious Trades, Public Nuisances and Elections do. These can be generally regarded as matters common to Local Government. If the State Government is right in claiming that it has authority "to implement housing schemes" then the *reductio ad absurdum* would be — "You will reach the absurd conclusion" — that it also has power to deal with and regulate obnoxious trades and public nuisances in the Local Authority areas.

Now, Sir, my point is that the State has every right to make laws with regard to these subjects.

It has the right to make laws for instance for the control and regulation of obnoxious trades and public nuisances in the Local Authority Areas. And, having made these laws, it seems to me a perfectly sensible thing to require that Local Authorities shall enforce these laws. In the same manner, I say that if the State Government had made a law empowering itself to provide low-cost houses in the State it seems to me to be a logical step in public administration to ask a Local Authority to provide low-cost housing schemes in its own area.

I now come to what is perhaps the most important part of my submission. I say that the State Government is acting in breach of the Constitution by building houses in the State when the only power it has given itself is the power to finance these schemes.

Under the Municipal Ordinance, however, the City Council of George Town, for example, is empowered to provide, out of its funds, houses for sale or for rent, true, with the sanction of the State Authority. That, Sir, is the statutory policy laid down in the Municipal Ordinance. But this new claim of the State Government that it has concurrent powers with a Local Authority, within the area of the Local Authority, to provide housing would make the provisions of Section 29 (m2) of the Municipal Ordinance a dead letter.

In view of this, the State Executive Council, on receipt of a directive from the Federal Government as to the State's requirements, and plans for low-cost housing, should have called on all local authorities in the State of Penang to submit their five-year plans for low-cost houses to be considered by the State Government when applying for loans

from the Federal Government. This, the State Executive Council, has never done.

In my conversation with Dato (Dr.) Ismail bin Dato Abdul Rahman, Minister of Internal Security and the Interior, he expressed surprise that our schemes for low-cost houses and slum clearance had not been put up through the State Government. He said that the procedure for seeking loans from the Federal Government by local authorities to build low-cost houses should be made through the State Government and that circulars to that effect were sent out to all State Governments. If this is correct, then this Assembly has every reason to deplore the lack of foresight of the State Executive Council in not requesting all local authorities to submit their five-year plans for low-cost housing in their areas for consideration by the State Government for redirection of the application for loan funds to the Federal Government.

Instead of doing this, the State Government has become a Shylock getting loans from the Federal Government at subsidised rates of interest, which is 2%, and charging the local authorities higher rates of interest than what the State Government is paying to the Federal Government. Such an attitude can only come from one who tries to seek an advantage at every opportunity.

I accuse the State Government of being a Shylock because at the Assembly Meeting on 29th March 1961, the Hon'ble the Chief Minister, in moving his motion seeking authority from the Assembly to grant a loan to the Bukit Mertajam Town Council "for the purposes of implementing a low-cost housing scheme" charged that local council no interest for the first year, but a 3% rate for the second and third years and

5% per annum for the fourth and subsequent years. If this rate of interest is worked out for 10 years and over, one can gather the magnitude of the profits that the State Government is making from the local authorities.

Stranger still is the fact that the State Government approved the Malaya Borneo Building Society to act as Agents for the Bukit Mertajam Town Council (now the Rural District Council, Province Wellesley Central) to implement the scheme. The State Executive Council should be aware of the fact that the rate of interest charged by this Society, although comparatively low, is nevertheless at least 4% higher than the rate on loans obtained from the Federal Government of 2% for low-cost houses. Hence, there is every justification for me to accuse the State Government of being worse than a moneylender.

In the debate at that meeting the Hon'ble the Chief Minister said that the loan given to the Bukit Mertajam Town Council "follows the same pattern as the loan given to the Butterworth Town Council a few years back—same period, same term". From his statement, local authorities, instead of receiving the guidance and help from the State Government, are being exploited by the State Government.

As one eminent writer on local government said, "if local government is to be established in the proper spirit, inspection and control by the central government would be better described as guidance and help". He further states that "it becomes bad when guidance and policy degenerate into interference in details which local authorities can very well settle for themselves". The actions of the State Government show that these actions have degenerated into interference. It is true that local

authorities cannot from their own financial resources meet more than a fraction of the capital and maintenance costs for housing schemes and for that matter all other municipal services, and therefore they have to depend largely on government loans and grants. They are, however, restricted by the Federal Constitution to float loans and can only approach the Federal Government for loans and, as expressed by the Minister of the Interior, such loans can only be made through the State Government. It is therefore incumbent on the State Government to seek the requirements of local authorities and act as their agent for loans, and not to act as money-lenders to local authorities.

Furthermore, it is difficult for me to understand why, at the State Assembly Meeting on 9th August 1961, the Hon'ble the Chief Minister stated that the loan from the Federal Government would be at 2% per annum since it was for low-cost houses either for purchase or for rental. According to the statement by the Minister of the Interior, as published in the newspapers, the rates of interest charged on loans is 2% where these loans are for low-cost houses for purchase, and 5% per annum where the houses are for rental. It would appear to us that either the Hon'ble the Chief Minister was telling an untruth or else the untrue statement came from the Minister of the Interior. A clarification of this point would be welcome from the Hon'ble the Chief Minister in his reply.

The second part of my motion calls upon the State Government to take immediate action to verify from local authorities the various schemes approved by them for immediate consideration and attention of the State Government. It is only when such action is taken that the State Executive

Council can really know the housing needs of all local authorities, which reflect the housing needs of the people throughout the State. By tackling the housing situation themselves the State Executive Council cannot gauge the needs of the people. Hence my suggestion which reflects co-operation between the State Government and local authorities in the discharge of their duties towards the people to solve the housing situation. It is time the State Government confined its function regarding housing to that of financing these schemes. If it had done so, it would have done its duty.

Regarding the implementation of housing schemes the State Government should allow those local authorities which are capable of doing so to do the implementing, and the State's function should only be confined to "guidance and help." This then is the true essence of relationship between the State Government and the local authorities in a democracy, each having its function to perform. If the State Government had done that, my motion would be meaningless. It is because of the inability of the State Government to comprehend the real functions of each authority and their relationship to each other that it becomes necessary for me to move the motion standing in my name. I therefore move:—

"This Assembly deplores the lack of foresight of the State Executive Council in not requesting all local Authorities to submit their Five-Year Plans for low-cost houses in their areas for consideration by the State Government before the decision was taken to seek loans from the Federal Government to implement low-cost housing schemes. Therefore, it is hereby resolved that the State Government takes immediate action to verify from

Local Authorities the various schemes approved by them for immediate consideration and attention by the State Government."

Thank you.

The Member for Tanjong Tengah (Mr. Wong Choong Woh): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I second the motion of the Hon'ble Member for Jelutong.

Chief Minister: (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I feel the Hon'ble Member for Jelutong does not clearly understand the meaning of the term "Low-cost housing". By "Low-cost housing" is meant those houses which are constructed with cheap loan funds provided by the Federal Government on the condition that the State Government or the Local Authority could provide the following subsidies: firstly, land on nominal terms — I don't know what it is called in the National Language; secondly, free access and service roads; and, thirdly, free electricity supply and water mains. I therefore hope that our friends on the opposite side would now clearly understand the meaning of the term "Low-cost housing scheme" so that they would not create any further fuss whenever a low-cost housing scheme is being implemented.

When I observe the accounts submitted by the Local Authority, that is, the City Council, I find that it has already borrowed approximately \$60 million and that would render it eligible for a further loan of \$8 million only. As such, I wonder how it would be able to obtain further funds for providing free roads, electricity and water supply for implementing the low-cost housing scheme. I agree that in the Constitution or the Municipal Ordinance there are provisions for the implementation of low-cost housing schemes, but neither the

Constitution nor the Municipal Ordinance specify the exact authority which should implement such a scheme. The State Government has reasons why it considers that it should take over the low-cost housing scheme in the City area, the reason being that the City Council is unable to implement such a low-cost housing scheme. If it has the means for doing so, naturally we shall give our blessing.

The Member for Jelutong has also not clearly understood the point as regards money lent to the Town Council, Bukit Mertajam, by the State Government. That housing scheme does not come under the term of "Low-cost housing" which I explained just now since there are no subsidies on land and roads. It is not a low-cost housing scheme in the true sense of the word. It is a low-cost housing scheme in the sense that the price is somewhat cheaper and the money given to the Town Council by the State Government is not part of the \$2 million loan. In the circumstances, I hope the Hon'ble Member for Jelutong would not just say anything at random and exaggerating since this might mislead the ra'ayat. If the people in Bukit Mertajam were to hear what the Hon'ble Member had said — that the State Government had received a loan of \$2 million from the Federal Government with 2% interest, and then lent this money to that local government with a view to making a profit — they would certainly criticise the State Government. Such an accusation is indeed sinful. I hope the Member for Jelutong would refrain from making such wild accusations in future.

As this matter is of utmost importance, and since it has often been raised in the Councils in the State, it is therefore incumbent

upon me to give a little explanation on the Constitution or the Municipal Ordinance. I shall be grateful if I may be allowed to speak in English.

(continuing in English:)

Mr. Speaker, Sir; Honourable Members of the Assembly, I beg your pardon to allow me first to speak the legal position as regards the provision of housing in the State.

Local Authorities are empowered to undertake housing schemes under section — as mentioned by the Honourable Member, that is— 29 (m2) of the Municipal Ordinance which reads:

“29. The Commissioners are authorised to expend the Municipal Fund for the following purposes:—

* * * * *

(m2) provision with the sanction of the State Authority and maintenance of housing either for sale or on lease and the acquisition of land required therefor;”

As for the State Government, by virtue of paragraph 4 (c) of List II of the Ninth Schedule of the Federal Constitution, the State Legislature is permitted to legislate in respect of Housing and Provision for Housing Accommodation and Improvement Trust. The fact that the State Legislature has been conferred with powers to make laws with respect to these matters carries with it, as a corollary, the overall and unrestricted right of the State Government to engage itself in undertaking housing projects, if it wishes to do so.

The first point I wish to make is that the State Government is legally not bound nor obliged to consult Local Authorities on the subject of housing. There is

nothing to prevent parallel development in housing by the State Government and the Local Authorities. In fact, the City Council, for instance, undertook the housing schemes in Green Lane, Pinhorn Road, Campbell Street, Jelutong, Rifle Range, Kampong Selut, Thean Teik Road and Cantonment Road with loans provided by the Federal Government. The State Government until recently undertook only to provide housing for Government officers. I would like Honourable Members to note that I have so far referred to housing in general.

Let us examine then the housing provided by the City Council. Except for the Green Lane and Pinhorn Road Housing Schemes, most, if not all, are flats for rental. Flats for rental can be regarded as assets because they belong to the City Council, and the City Council will be able to obtain these rentals, low as they may be, for many, many years to come. The City Council will be able to recover capital expenditure, interest and maintenance costs in the course of time. In the Green Lane and Pinhorn Road Schemes, the City Council provided houses for purchase, but then, as Honourable Members of this Assembly will agree, these houses are beyond the means of those earning \$300 a month and less. In short, these two schemes did not cater for the poorer sections of the community. What has happened to the City Council's attempt to provide a low-cost housing scheme at Kampong Selut? Have those houses been occupied? As far as I am aware, subject to correction, no-one lives in these houses yet.

The Butterworth Town Council also undertook a housing scheme to provide houses ranging from \$5,000 to \$13,000. Construction was undertaken by the Malaya Borneo Building Society which pro-

vided the loans to applicants. This scheme also did not fall within the category of a real low-cost housing scheme as envisaged by the State Government.

What I would like to stress now is that I am not criticising the Local Authorities for providing the housing schemes which I have just mentioned. In fact, some of the schemes undertaken are commendable in many respects. The Local Authorities undertook these housing schemes because there was a demand for such type of housing, and also because the schemes were not unremunerative. Again in short, the element of subsidy was absent. What the State Government aims at is to provide low-cost houses for sale to people who earn \$300 per month and less. It is the State Government's intention to fall in line with Federal Government's policy of creating a "property owning democracy." Such a policy cannot come to fruition if the poorer section of the population is excluded from purchasing and consequently owning houses. In fact it was the foresight of the State Government that provision was made in the 1961 Development Estimates at Head 101, Subhead 11, for low-cost housing schemes. From the outset it was not the intention of the State Government to collaborate or to interfere with Local Authorities in the provision of low-cost housing schemes. The reason for this was simple in that State Government realised that it was not within the financial ability or capacity of the Local Authorities to undertake such schemes. When the Federal Government made known its intention of providing cheap loan funds for Low-Cost Housing Schemes, the State Government decided to take advantage of such funds. When the State Government borrows it does not imply that the State Govern-

ment is bankrupt; it borrows because these are subsidized loans in the sense that the rate of interest is below what the State Government can obtain from its funds placed on fixed deposits with the banks. I hope this explanation will clear the mind of members of certain Local Authority why the State Government accept this loan.

I am not for a moment suggesting that Local Authorities should not undertake low-cost housing schemes; but the big question is, "Can they?" Unless Local Authorities are able to provide subsidies in the form of land at nominal terms, free services such as roads, water supplies etc., I am afraid it will be beyond their capacity to undertake low-cost housing schemes. I wish to stress that cheap loan funds or 'subsidized' loans in themselves are not enough to implement a low-cost housing project, if such a project is intended for squatters, fishermen and the like. Honourable Members of the Assembly will perhaps be wondering why Local Authorities cannot undertake low-cost housing schemes. I shall try to explain by giving illustrations. Let us, for example, take the Kampong Herriot Scheme which the Government was compelled to undertake. This scheme, as you all know, was first mooted in the City Council in about 1956. After a period of nearly 2 years the City Council wrote to the State Government requesting the State Government to —

- (a) obtain the sanction of the Governor-in-Council under section 363 of the Municipal Ordinance to acquire the land known as Kampong Herriot;
- (b) obtain the sanction of the Governor-in-Council under section 365 of the Municipal Ordinance to sell the land to the present owners within 2

years from the date of purchase, should the Council fail from any cause whatsoever to proceed with the housing scheme;

- (c) obtain the sanction of the Governor-in-Council under section 29 (m2) of the Municipal Ordinance to expend the Municipal Funds for the provision of housing on the said land;
- (d) obtain the approval of the Governor-in-Council to amend the approved plan for this area from Class C housing to low-cost housing under section 144 (1) (b) of the Town Planning Provisions (Extension) Ordinance.

The Governor-in-Council gave sanction and approval as requested to proceed with the Kampong Herriot Scheme. After approval had been conveyed the City Council then wrote to the State Government asking the latter to purchase the land and lease it to the City Council on nominal terms.

This request was refused. The point I would like to make here is that one cannot fail to detect a vacillating attitude to this scheme by the City Council.

I would now like to make reference to the Minutes of the City Council of 11th January, 1960, wherein the chairman of the Council in reply to a question whether there was money for the Kampong Herriot Scheme, replied as follows:—

"We already have the money. If you had taken the trouble to study the 1960 Estimates, you would have found that there is a credit balance in the Council's finance, which can be partly released to implement the Council's decision to proceed with the Kampong Herriot scheme even if the \$1.25 per sq. ft. for the land fixed by the Collector of Land Revenue is agreed upon."

From the above reply, it would appear obvious that the City Council had the necessary funds for the scheme. At a subsequent meeting on 26th January, 1960, in answer to the following question:

"Could we not purchase the land in Kampong Herriot for the people?....."

The Mayor replied:

"Whether the Council could or could not purchase the piece of land — as has been already stated, Council could purchase the piece of land but being uneconomic the Kampong Herriot residents cannot afford to pay for it. Unless it is the Council's intention to subsidise low-cost housing for one section of the people, then Council must be prepared to subsidise low-cost housing for other sections of the people. That is the point we have to consider. Council has not yet taken any decision on this."

Honourable Members, within a matter of two weeks the position changed from one of confidence to one of uncertainty. As far as I am aware, the City Council has not yet taken a decision as to whether to subsidise low-cost housing schemes or not. This, Hon'ble Members of the Assembly, is the very crux in the provision of low-cost housing schemes.

On the 22nd of March, 1960 the Hon'ble Member for Sungei Pinang moved a motion in this Assembly asking the State Government to undertake low-cost housing schemes, and in the course of his address said:

"Now, it may be asked, 'Why cannot local authorities go into these schemes of putting up low-cost houses?' The simple answer is that it is beyond the financial capacities of local authorities. Even such a large local authority as the George Town City Council

finds itself in a very difficult position with regard to the raising of funds for low-cost housing schemes."

Later in the same address the Honourable Member said.

"Now I repeat, therefore, that it is only the State Government that is in a position to undertake schemes (that is meaning low-cost housing schemes) of this nature."

Towards the end of his address he said:

"There is one other reason why I feel it is the State Government which should undertake this (meaning low-cost housing schemes)—because according to our Constitution the land authority is the State Government, and therefore if there is any difficulty about land, which as Honourable Members will realise is one of the crucial points in any housing scheme, the State Government has powers at call to acquire the necessary land."

I need not go into the amendment of the motion brought about by me at this meeting but suffice it to say that from the above an Hon'ble Member on the Opposite side of the House has admitted that low-cost housing is something within the realm of the State Government.

At an earlier meeting of the Assembly on 29th October, 1959, the same Member for Sungei Pinang moved a motion asking the Assembly to acquire the land at Kampong Herriot, and in the course of his speech said:

"That the matter has now become urgent but the financial position of the City Council is still as bad as it had been during the last two years."

What is the financial position of the City Council today? The nett debt of the City Council is over \$60 million and the unexer-

cised borrowing powers remain at about \$8 million. In other words, the City Council would have reached its limit of borrowing powers if it takes a loan or loans amounting to \$8 million. Can the City Council with such a heavy loan commitment — I repeat 'heavy loan commitment' — undertake to provide low-cost housing schemes which would require subsidies? Hon'ble Members of the Assembly, I leave it to you to judge whether the City Council can undertake low-cost housing schemes. I think I have said enough on the limitations of the City Council in providing low-cost housing schemes.

Now I would like to touch on the procedure adopted by the City Council in the matter of housing which, in fact, reflects this Council's attitude towards the State Government. Again, I would like to explain by way of illustration. On the 5th of July, the City Council wrote to the State Government on the subject of the Trengganu Road Housing Scheme. The State Government was informed in this letter that "The total estimated cost of the project is \$2 million and a loan for that amount has been obtained from the Federal Government". What does this imply? The City Council had apparently drawn up a scheme, and without any consultation whatsoever with the State Government had approached the Federal Government directly for a loan, although the City Council is obliged under section 29 (m2) to obtain the sanction of the State Government for implementing any housing scheme and, further, is legally bound to seek the authority of this very Assembly under section 344 of the Municipal Ordinance to obtain a loan.

The land for this housing scheme was originally acquired for the purpose of building thereon quarters for Municipal subordinate

staff; and although records pertaining to this acquisition of land were lost, the City Council was at least morally obliged to consult the State Government in respect of the change of the use of this land for quarters for Municipal subordinate staff to one for public housing. The City Council did not deem it fit to consult the State Government on the merits or demerits of the scheme prior to seeking the loan. In drawing up the scheme and obtaining the loan, the City Council put the 'cart before the horse' and expects the State Government to give formal approval in accordance with the Municipal Ordinance. It would appear to me that the City Council does not have any respect for the Municipal Ordinance, nor the State Government. Perhaps the City Council is too proud to consult the State Government or perhaps indifferent to the State Government. I would also like to add that in respect of all the previous housing schemes undertaken by the City Council the State Government was also not consulted. Of all the Local Authorities, the City Council alone has been adopting this attitude. The other local authorities have consulted the State Government from time to time on their housing schemes prior to embarking on such schemes. The District Council North, Province Wellesley, has, for example, signified its wish that the State Government should proceed with the low-cost housing scheme in Butterworth. The Rural District Council, Penang Island, has also approached the State Government with respect to the low cost housing scheme at Rifle Range.

The motion before the House, to say the least, is frivolous to the extreme. It is neither constructive nor intelligent. It is a pathetic attempt at bringing dis-

credit upon Government. If one goes by common sense and elementary logic, a local authority, being a lesser authority, having regard to its own limitations and also the interests of the public at heart, should make requests of the State Government to undertake certain low-cost housing schemes which the Local Authority cannot undertake itself. It is clear as day follows night as to who should take the initiative. It is not the State Government which lacks foresight, but the local authorities which did not think fit to submit their schemes to the State Government. In drawing up its Five Year Development Plan the State Government plans what it thinks is in the best interests of the people in the State. If local authorities have any plans or suggestions to offer to Government they are welcome to do so. The State Government does not ask Local Authorities to submit their plans simply because the functions of Local Authorities are not on all fours with that of the State Government, but if the local authority has a scheme which will bring the "greatest happiness for the greatest numbers" by all means approach the Government. If the City Council, for instance, had really the interest of the people of Kampong Herriot at heart, it could have asked the State Government to undertake the scheme when they found they were not in a position to do so. The City Council instead adopted 'a dog in the manger attitude' in that it could not undertake the scheme, and yet was unwilling to request the State Government to take over the scheme. True that the State Government was not prepared to purchase the land and lease it to the Council on nominal terms — to have done so would have meant violating an important principle and setting a precedent. But I emphasize, the State Government would have been prepared to undertake the scheme

if the City Council had the courage and honesty to divest itself of its political motives and sought Government's aid to undertake the scheme.

I say to Hon'ble Members of Opposition, please bring forth motions which are constructive, intelligent and meaningful—motions which can contribute to the welfare of our people, to the well-being of the State. I have not failed to detect the note of envy in the motion. Criticise by all means, but criticise well in accordance in the art of criticism. This motion, I am afraid, has been ill-conceived, to find fault with Government where fault there is not.

I leave it to the Assembly to judge who is playing politics in bringing about this motion.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I oppose this motion.

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to comment on just one of the matters touched upon by the Honourable the Chief Minister in his speech, and that is the Kampong Herriot Scheme. I feel highly gratified that he spent such a long time quoting from my past speeches on this matter in this Assembly. But I would like all Members, Mr. Speaker, Sir, to get their facts correct. In the course of his speech the Honourable the Chief Minister has accused the local authority in charge of the City Council of vacillating, of being dishonest about some point of principle, of in fact having no respect for the Municipal Ordinance. I thought that was an extraordinary charge to make as a Chief Minister, because if I were the Chief Minister and found the local authority disrespecting the Municipal Ordinance I would throw the Municipal Councillors out of the Council because they have no business under any circumstances

to disrespect the Municipal Ordinance. And I call upon the Chief Minister to make good his charge that the Municipal Councillors have disrespected the Municipal Ordinance.

Apart from that, let us go back to the history of this Kampong Herriot case. It is true that I am not quite sure of the dates because I speak offhand, and do not have the files on hand. The City Council passed a Motion to buy the land at an economic price. It is also true that in 1958 and 1959 the Federal Government suddenly stopped all loans because of the loan freeze. I am stating merely facts, and I challenge anyone to question them.

Now, in 1958 and 1959, therefore, it was not possible to find money to buy the land. Then in 1960 things improved a bit, and perhaps money could have been found. The Chief Minister quoted from two minutes of City Council Meetings and said within the space of a fortnight or so there was a change in the attitude. That is easily explained because the City Council has a habit of keeping in touch with the people to whom we are trying to render some assistance. There was a Kampong Herriot Committee, and they were kept constantly informed of developments. When they were informed that purchasing the land at about \$1 or \$1.25, which is what the landowner wanted, would make the houses at the lowest cost about \$7,000, none of the Kampong Herriot people said they would be able to afford houses at that cost. Subsequently I did bring in a Motion. Of course the Chief Minister has every right to question the sincerity of his opponents. But when we brought in that Motion we were absolutely sincere. It is true that we asked that the land be leased to the City Council at a nominal rate.

I now charge the Chief Minister with insincerity because at the time he defeated the Motion. If he turned and said, "Let the land be leased at a reasonable rental", we would have been agreeable: that would have been all right. But the whole Motion was turned down flat, with the result that the City Council was not able to proceed with the scheme. I stand by every one of the words I spoke on a previous occasion. And I think the Chief Minister is right in saying that the City Council or any other local authority is not in a position to build subsidized houses. The answer to that is very simple; it is in the Municipal Ordinance. The City Council, or any other local authority for that matter, is, as they say, "a creature of statute." They cannot go beyond the statute. A Government can because a Government can legislate. That is why the City Council was not able to carry on with the Kampong Herriot scheme. But I believe that the Government was completely insincere in its attempts last year to turn down our request without giving due attention to it.

Now, suddenly, after a space of a few months the Government has a change of heart. What the reasons are, I do not know: but I suppose some people at least will guess. And they now say, "We are now going to undertake the Kampong Herriot scheme." Well, if it will provide poor people with houses then we on this side are all for it. What we would like to know is this: Why would not the State Government help the City Council to go ahead with the scheme by leasing the land to the City Council? Why is it that they are now suddenly able to find the money and build subsidized low cost housing right in the centre of the town? Now, that is a question which many

people are going to ask. And to that they will also add a corollary. They will try to reply to the Honourable the Chief Minister's question as to who is playing politics — Is it this side that is playing politics, or is it the other side? And I think the public will be shrewd enough to give the correct answer to that.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the last remark or the parting shot delivered by the Honourable the Chief Minister was a question — Who is playing politics? I am standing up here to answer him.

The point that struck me in the course of my patient listening to the speech of the Honourable the Chief Minister is that he admits that housing or low cost housing can also be in the purview of the local authorities. But the point he stressed in using as an illustration is, first of all, the attitude of a particular local authority towards the State Government.

We must go into the history of housing and low-cost housing in this State. By convention and by principle I would have said that housing and low-cost housing have been carried out or should have been carried out by local authorities. They have the Departments for that. For instance, we take a particular example — the City Council. It has a Planning and Building Department. It has its contractors, and it has years of experience in housing and building of houses.

The point I stress is that by convention the schemes for housing are implemented in the City of George Town by the City Council, or the Municipal Council in those days. But we must examine the reason or the motives behind the move to take away, in essence, the means of building

cheap houses from local authorities, and to give it to the State authority; not to finance only, but actually to build the houses, through its agents or by creation of certain Departments. We must examine this motive and question it; whether, even if it is legally correct, whether it is morally advisable, or whether it is not politically a move to win back the votes of the disillusioned supporters of the Alliance Party. I would state that the State, as it is, is an organ with certain powers for legislation. As we conceive it in the Malayan tradition, the Central Government, the Federation, has vast powers of legislation; in fact all the powers of legislation in respect of very important matters of taxation, customs, etc., etc., and a huge amount of executive powers are with the Federation, leaving a very tiny pool of legislative powers to the State. And further than that, the executive powers in the State are shared by the local authorities in the sense that the function of local authorities touches on a large sphere of the social activity within the State. The position is that the State is a very weak body because the Federal Constitution has stripped it of its clothing, leaving a few rags and tatters for the State to put on. It is at this stage that the State Government seeing, "A very attractive piece of garment on the City Council (or local authority)", tend to pounce upon it, seize that garment, try it on and say, "How very nice. It suits me. I am going to wear this garment. Although you have worn it before, I still have the right to wear it now". That is, in fact, a political move and why I say it is a political move, again, is the remark made by the Hon'ble the Chief Minister on the creation of a property-owning democracy. Now, I have heard of this word before but the first time I heard

of it in Malaya was some time, I think, towards the end of the Emergency when these magic words were pronounced by the Finance Minister, Tan Siew Sin, before a certain M.C.A. Youth Section. It was at that time that these words caught my eye in Malaya; and because of this magic formula the Federal Government, as stated in His Excellency the Governor's speech at the last Sitting, revised its policy by giving cheap loans to the State Government instead of to the local authorities. It is because, again I would say, that the measure of the State Government to undertake to implement, to construct houses, is a political move on their part. They cannot just wash their hands and say they are not making a political move. They are not saints, they are not angels—they are politicians. This may be good, clean or dirty — I do not know, but the fact is that they made it a political move.

Another fact that also struck me is the argument urged by the Chief Minister that the City Council has not the means to do it in contrast to the State Government. I am sure the State Government and the Hon'ble the Chief Minister would realise who actually does the cheap low-cost houses, in fact who was the sort of promoter behind all low-cost housing. It is the Federation Government. It is not the State Government at all. Without a loan of \$2,000,000, can the State Government carry on? Has it the means at all within its own facilities, its own private pocket? Without going for loans, can the State Government carry out low-cost, cheap housing estates? The argument that is urged against local authorities, or the City Council in particular, tells against the State Government as well. If we can carry on low-cost houses, why should we oppose an enact-

ment to finance low-cost housing schemes? By the way, I may remark that the enactment we opposed at the last Sitting is on the Low-Cost Housing Scheme Enactment — it is with regard to finance. I could see nothing in this Ordinance about the words “to implement” or “to undertake to construct low-cost houses”. It is to finance and, therefore, the Mover was correct in urging upon this Assembly that we have under the Constitution certain borrowing powers, that we do borrow from the Federation and pass it or channel it to the local authorities. This is precisely what this Motion asked for. And the comment that the City Council or whatever it is called—local authorities — cannot do things without a loan and all those things is a red herring. Remember—the only country or the only authority that can do anything without loans is the United States of America. The whole of the Western world and the free democracies are debtors to U.S.A., the Federation Government as well. All the main roads have been built partly with the money from the United States. Is it such a bad thing to ask a loan to do a good thing? I am sure the Chief Minister will agree with me that to do a good thing by borrowing money, to send up a soul to Heaven, it is not ‘dosa’ at all! That argument is fallacious. The City Council in every State, in every local authority, must borrow money — in England, everywhere, you cannot exist without borrowing money because you do not have the capital but you can pay back slowly as years go by.

I wish also to end my short, little speech with the remark: does the Hon’ble the Chief Minister now agree that he is playing politics?

The Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Chor Sin Kheng): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose the Motion.

The primary object of planning is to guide and help development along sound lines, and the word ‘planning’ is well defined as the best use of the land in the interest of the community as a whole, a matter in which each and every one of us has a special interest.

There are two forms of low-cost housing now being implemented by the State Government and local authorities in the State of Penang. One is rental housing, and the other is hire-purchase housing. In order to carry out low-cost housing schemes adequately and successfully there are a few difficult problems to be tackled and solved. Now, let us consider the first category, that is, rental housing. The first problem that has to be tackled — I think all of us will agree — is finance. The next and equally important one is land. Land belonging to the State is controlled by the State Government. The local authorities will have to acquire land or ask for land from the State Government for public housing. They cannot carry out a genuine low-cost housing policy on acquired land without having a substantial subsidy from the Government. We now come to the third problem. Having provided money, having provided the land, and having built the houses, the maintenance and upkeep of these houses will present many difficulties. The fourth problem is to determine the gross rent which must be charged on rental housing.

Now we turn our attention to the other form of low-cost housing, that is, hire-purchase housing. The problems of finance and land remain the same, but the problems of maintenance and the fixing of gross rent are removed. Sir, we are aware that the Fe-

deral Government in giving loans to the State Government at the low rate of 2% is indeed a subsidy for low-cost housing schemes. But on the other hand the State Government is giving subsidy in the form of providing land at nominal terms, while roads and water mains are made and installed at no extra cost to the schemes.

From the views just expressed by me, we cannot deny that only the State Government is in the position to undertake genuine low-cost housing schemes; and that is the considered opinion of the Honourable Member for Sungei Pinang, as the Honourable the Chief Minister has mentioned just now

Where there is failure or inability on the part of any local authority to implement its low-cost housing schemes, it is only right that the State Government steps in and takes action to implement the schemes for the sake of the welfare and interest of the poorer people.

Sir, I maintain that the State Government should tackle the question of low-cost housing seriously in order to relieve overcrowding, provide for slum clearance, encourage house-ownership, and improve the housing conditions in the State of Penang. Thank you, Sir.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I heard with interest the reply given by the Honourable the Chief Minister. First of all, he stated that Members of the Opposition seem to be confused regarding low-cost housing and what is actually housing schemes. If we are to take his word for it, then our confusion is not of our own making, but I feel we are being misled by the Honourable the Chief Minister himself for

delivering an untruth. He referred just now to the Bukit Mertajam Town Council's housing scheme as not a low-cost housing scheme.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I confirm that the Bukit Mertajam Town Council's housing scheme is not a low-cost housing scheme in the real sense. It is nothing untrue.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, if it is not a low-cost housing scheme, I would refer the Honourable the Chief Minister to what he said at the meeting of this Assembly on 29th March, 1961. And these are his words, not mine, in moving that Motion:

"..... in order to develop Bukit Mertajam town the Council had to clear slum areas in the town, To enable clearance of slum areas the Council decided to launch a low-cost housing scheme."

And I am rather surprised that he would refute that the scheme in Bukit Mertajam is no more a low-cost housing scheme.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification: This term of 'low-cost housing scheme' has been used all over the State. Even the Butterworth scheme, they called a low-cost housing scheme; even Penang — Jelutong low-cost housing scheme. But please do not be confused with the proper terms. A true low-cost housing scheme is a subsidized housing scheme. In Bukit Mertajam in fact there are now two schemes: one is the scheme with the loan from the State Government, and the other the low-cost housing scheme in Berapit. That is the one which is a true low-cost housing scheme. And as such I am not stating anything that is untrue.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very happy that the Honourable the Chief Minister has seen fit to clarify now what he said on certain occasions as low-cost housing schemes are not in fact low-cost housing schemes which the Federal Government would like to subsidize by giving loans at 2%. And it is in that respect that my Motion was brought forth. In my conversation with the Minister for the Interior he said that past practice which the City Council then was adopting is to seek loans direct from the Federal Treasury, and at some time during the year the Federal Treasury usually writes to the City Council as to what loans they would like to have for the next year, and also to submit its Five Year Development Plans. But arising out of my discussion, as I said, with the Minister for the Interior, he definitely stated that that procedure is not accepted any more. And if local authorities would like to apply for loans from the Federal Government in respect of low-cost housing or any housing schemes it should be done through the State Government; hence this Motion standing in my name.

It would appear from the objection coming from the State Government that the quarrel lies now not between the City Council, which they may think is Socialist Front hence it must be wrong, and the Alliance State Government; but the difference of opinion now is a matter between the Alliance Federal Government and the Alliance State Government. Is that the procedure that the local authorities have to adopt in future or not? Well, if, as the State Government stated, it is not then let us have that clarification so that local authorities can do so through the various channels wherein they can take up the matter further.

In the speech just given by the Honourable the Chief Minister he seems to say that the City Council is inefficient, irresponsible, that it even showed disrespect regarding the Municipal Ordinance and the State Government. And, as has rightly been quoted by the Honourable Member for Sungei Pinang, we would like to know when, and how did the City Council show disrespect to the Municipal Ordinance or to the State Government. If we are going to carry politics further, he would be surprised that the State Government's plans for Kampong Herriot which were passed through our Town Planner were given every co-operation to see that the scheme from the State Government would come to fruition. He would be even surprised to know that at the Committee Meeting of the City Engineer's Department, the City Council gave its full blessings to allow the City Engineer's Department to undertake certain work which the State Government is incapable of doing. And that would disprove the extent of disrespect we show either towards the State Government or towards the Municipal Ordinance.

The Honourable the Chief Minister in his speech touched on the question of the 24 houses in Kampong Selut which at the present moment are still vacant. I am sure the State Government would not like the City Council to take a decision that is likely to create racial tension or trouble arising from the occupation of those 24 houses by people other than the folks in Kampong Selut. It is on account of the people there and since that scheme is for the people in Kampong Selut, the City Council should not do anything to cause ill-feeling between one section of the community and another. The State Government would be well advised to think

carefully whether it is not possible for the City Council to rent those houses at a rental of \$50, and that the houses would be taken up immediately by other people in the City. The City Council did not do so because they would like to be a responsible City Council looking into the interests of the people in the City.

Just now, I spoke of past practice. It is not a matter wherein the local authorities would like to fight with the State Government; but certainly the local authorities would like a clarification either from the State Government or from the Federal Government how loans of such kind are to be sought in future. And it is on account of that, which makes me expect that Government would be aware of what is taking place in this State Assembly. It would also appear to me that this relationship which seems to be deteriorating between the City Council and the State Government is not of our own making but the making of the State Government. The State Government seems to think that it can overrule the suggestions and the procedure coming from the Alliance Federal Ministers. And if they were to look back, even the Minister of Agriculture had called our State Government [interrupted].

The Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order, is that relevant?

Mr. Speaker: It is not relevant. I mentioned earlier I don't like any mention of the Minister of Agriculture's statement regarding what he said because it has nothing to do with the Motion in front of us today.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): 'The Motion in front of us today.'

I am just quoting to prove that the State Government is just as irresponsible [interrupted].

Mr. Speaker: Yes, but the comment by the Federal Minister of Agriculture entirely has nothing to do with the housing scheme or the planning of housing.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): It has got to do with 'property-owning democracy.'

Mr. Speaker: Well, you can move another Motion or something like that at the next meeting if you like to. But I allow no more mention about that.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I withdraw that remark.

But what we are more concerned with is that the State Government could even override the written Constitution. And I have stated in my speech that our Federal Constitution is a written Constitution, and that for every act by the State, there must be express provision. Therefore in our Constitution [interrupted].

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification, I would like the Honourable Member to state clearly in what way the State Government acts contrary to the Constitution.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would wish the Honourable the Chief Minister to allow me to make my comments, and if he feels that after my comments he will still like to have the clarification I am prepared to clarify for him. But as I said, I fail to see where in the Constitution it is laid down — in the written Constitution — that the State has the power to build houses as low-cost housing schemes.

Regarding the question of loan funds borrowed by the City Council, I am rather surprised that the Honourable the Chief Minister at every meeting is so obsessed with the loans being obtained by the City Council without realizing who obtained those loans, and for what purpose. And since, as he always said, the overriding authority to sanction them is the State Government, since the State Government has sanctioned it, then the State Government would be condoning matters on loans which are not in the interests of the people.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification: It is within the Ordinance that they can apply for such loans; and we are bound to approve.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): 'Bound to.'

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): 'Bound to.' Thanks very much for that clarification.

Chief Minister: I repeat that Sir, on a point of clarification — if it is within the Municipal Ordinance.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): 'If it is within the Municipal Ordinance — the State Government is bound to'.

And it seems rather strange that in spite of the fact that the Chief Minister keeps on harping on the loans that are obtained by the City Council yet in the last local elections the people in the City have full confidence in the Socialist Front, thereby returning 14 Councillors — gaining for them seven seats in the City Council. Whether we are able to manage the City Council better than the Alliance, well, the people have proved that they have confidence in the Socialist Front and not the Alliance. I would not like to speak more.

Thank you.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification— I would like to seek clarification from the Honourable Member to point out clearly which Constitution has the State Government overridden?

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): To answer that question, I will ask another question: under which part of the Constitution, the written Constitution, was that power given to the State Government?

Mr. Speaker: This is a matter of clarification sought by the Chief Minister. If you ask another question, that is not a clarification. If you are able to clarify the matter, please clarify it. If you cannot, say you can't.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): I have seen that there is nothing in the written Constitution which gives such powers to the State Government, and it is because of that that I am maintaining that the State Government has got no such powers.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, may I invite the Legal Adviser to give his opinion of the Constitution?

Legal Adviser: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the right to legislate on the part of the Federal Government and of the State Government and the Concurrent List, as Honourable Members all know, are to be found in the Ninth Schedule of the Federal Constitution. As the Hon'ble Member for Kota has said, the Federal List, which is very wide and exhaustive, sets down the matters on which the Federal Government can legislate. A shorter list applies to the State and in that shorter list, in paragraph 4 of the shorter list, the State List, is this item 4(c), "Housing and provision for housing accommodation, improvement

trusts". As the constitutional position stands, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the State Government is entitled to legislate on the matters mentioned in the State List and that includes for our purposes, the matters mentioned in paragraph 4(c) of the State List. With this power to legislate, Mr. Speaker, Sir, comes the power which flows from it, the power of the State Government to do things which the State Legislature can empower it to do, and that would include the power to embark on housing schemes and low-cost housing schemes, and such like.

The Municipal Ordinance lays down the rights of the City Council; and in regard to housing as well as in regard to many other matters, the City Councillors can only spend money out of the Municipal Fund subject to the Municipal Ordinance; sometimes subject to the control of the Legislative Assembly and sometimes subject to the control of the Governor-in-Council, the purpose there being that there should be no expenditure of a certain sort out of the Municipal Fund without the proper control of the State Authority or the Legislative Assembly since the Municipal Fund comes from various public sources. It is a public fund.

As I see in the Constitution, Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is no prohibition anywhere, no Article, no provision anywhere in the Schedules, which says that the State Government cannot embark on housing projects; and there not being any prohibition, I would say, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that the State Government is therefore entitled to embark on housing projects. Of course, in trying to obtain funds for housing projects, the State Government would under Article 111 of the Federal Constitution. Article 111(2), I believe, has to pass State law as it has done in this case — Enactment No. 1 of

1961. In the manner of spending of money which the State Government has raised under that Enactment, or can borrow under that Enactment, the State Government is free within the bounds, of course, of financial and governmental procedure. There does not have to be any positive provision in the Federal Constitution to enable the State Government therefore to engage in housing projects.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification about my mentioning that the City Council does not have any respect for the Municipal Ordinance, I stand on what I said. I shall be able to produce facts before this Assembly that the City Council has been borrowing money from the Federal authority without the sanction of the State Government, neither this Assembly. Under the Municipal Ordinance, section 343, it reads as follows:-

"The Commissioners may, with the sanction of the Legislative Assembly and subject to"

"Subject to", provision must have authority. I shall be able to prove that there have been instances where on our request they now make a formal approach to rectify the irregularities.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification — I am sure the Hon'ble the Chief Minister will be aware that such irregularities arose from the past and it has never been brought to notice until now. If there is any mistake, it has been the mistake of the Colonial masters, the Alliance Municipality then.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification — I never said "the Socialist Front" or "the Socialist Council": I said "the Municipal Council", the City Council.

Mr. Speaker: I allow no more on any kind of clarification.
[Laughter].

Question put and Motion is defeated.

6. ADJOURNMENT.

Chief Minister: (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that the Assembly do now adjourn.

The Member for Permatang Pauh (Enche Ariffin bin Shariff): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, may I, with your permission, withdraw my Adjournment speech because of my Motion today?

Mr. Speaker: Certainly.

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I submitted a Motion — Provision for further educational facilities—which you, Sir, allowed me to turn into an Adjournment speech. I am very grateful for that because whatever I am going to say I would have put in the form of a Motion, and those on the other side would have been placed in opposition to defeat my Motion without really wanting to do so.

Now, my subject is the provision of further educational facilities in our State. I quite realise that under Schedule 9, paragraph 13, all education — elementary, secondary, university, technical — comes under a Federal Head. And even when I brought the Motion it was not my intention that we should ask the State Government to take any positive action on a matter which comes under Federal responsibility. But still I have sufficient reasons as to why I would like this Assembly to take note of what I have to

say about providing further educational facilities in the State of Penang.

I am sure most Honourable Members here are aware that the torch of modern education was first lit in Penang. We are in the proud position in this State of having the oldest school in the country. Nearly — I should say 'more than' — 150 years ago Hutchings came to open the school which later became the first school in the country — the Penang Free School. It is therefore needless for me to press this point, that our education in Penang has always been in the lead. I believe everyone will accept that. We have in the State an excellent system of primary education, and even of secondary education. I cannot quote for you all the statistics and figures to show whether we have more schools in proportion to the other States, but I believe it is generally accepted throughout the country that Penang leads in education. But I find that we have not given thought in this Assembly to the crown of education of which or for which primary and secondary education forms the base. What is the apex of all education? The apex of all education is the University. I do not know if Honourable Members think that in suggesting that Penang should have a University I am being presumptuous or running too fast. But even if I am accused of being presumptuous I shan't mind because I have already this morning been accused of being insincere. I was not here when the word 'dirty' was used so I ignore it.

Now, it may be asked, "How can we think of a University for Penang when only now our Bill is going to come before the Federal Parliament about a University for the Federation?" That is quite true. But then the Bill is merely setting the position

correct because a University has already been established in Kuala Lumpur. Our country has a population of 7½ million — probably it has now already reached the 8 million mark — and three Universities for a country of this size and this population are by no means excessive. I need only refer you to Australia which has a population a little more than ours, though of course the country is vastly bigger. And yet there are no less than seven Universities in Australia; in other words — almost one University for one million people!

In all progressive countries now the tendency is to provide the highest possible education as much as possible. It is sometimes argued that Universities are expensive: and it must be admitted that they are expensive. But in the modern world without Universities we really will not be able to give our people the kind of training that fits them for modern life.

Now, therefore, what I am really suggesting is that the State Government should give an occasional thought at least to this question. Perhaps it can be raised with the proper authorities — the Federal Government. Perhaps our learned Senators from this Assembly should raise it in the Senate, and make lengthy and extensive speeches which will make the Senate last longer than the usual 45 minutes for a meeting!

However, there are one or two other things that we can reasonably ask the Federal Government to do almost immediately. This morning we spent a lot of time about the proposed industrial site. That is all well and good. But how does industry develop unless you have technicians? You cannot have a developing industry

unless you provide the means with which it can function. What is therefore necessary is to take a leaf out of Singapore's example, and press for the establishment of a Polytechnic in Penang. I think our record in education — the fact that we have some of the best schools in the country in Penang — will easily allow such a scheme to be initiated. And a Polytechnic would be a source for higher education for at least a good proportion of our youngsters who pass through our secondary schools. Perhaps it may even be possible to have established in Penang a University College under the aegis of Kuala Lumpur University as a first step towards the ultimate establishment of a University at Penang.

Now, these are things that can be done; And I feel sure that if the State Government would consider this matter seriously and make representations to the Central Government they would pay not only attention, but give it sympathy, because after all we should never forget that our present Prime Minister received his secondary education in Penang, and therefore he has a soft spot for our schools, I am sure.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I therefore urge that the State Government should give consideration to the question of providing further educational facilities for higher education in Penang.

The Member for Permatang Pauh (Enche Ariffin bin Shariff):
(in Malay) Honourable Mr. Speaker, Sir,

The existing labour lines in the State are the vestiges of Colonial rule in this country. They are small, badly ventilated, and have no rooms, and are in such a condition that the occupants can hardly live in comfort.

It is not my intention in this Assembly today to ask the Government to improve these labour lines to the standard of senior officers' quarters. I feel, however, that the time has come for the State Government, and also the Federal Government, to take a serious view of this matter.

When Government proposes to put up labour lines in future, I hope they will not be of the same type as what we have today, where the occupants have to eat and sleep in the same place. What I have said just now also applies to Police barracks.

I feel Government should also do something to the Attendants' Quarters at the Bukit Mertajam and Butterworth Hospitals as these are very old buildings and are no longer fit for occupation. This also applies to many other Government quarters in this State, including Police Barracks, particularly those at the Beach Street Police Station.

In its efforts to develop the country the Government has made many facilities available to the ra'ayat in this country, but Government should not also neglect the daily-rated workers, particularly their accommodation.

Thank you.

Honourable Mr. Speaker, Sir, at present Government gives subsidies only for the replanting of rubber and cloves.

In the interests of this country, I hope Government will also grant subsidies to those who want to replant their orchards with fruit trees such as durian, rambutan, chiku, langsat, pala, jambu, etc.

By giving this encouragement the fruit production in this country will increase and the

ra'ayat will be able to enjoy fruits produced in this country; and there may come a time in future when it will not be necessary to import fruits from other countries.

I would also like to request that subsidies similar to those for the replanting of rubber should be given to coconut planting which is of no less importance than rubber to the people of this country.

The Member for Nibong Tebal (Tuan Haji Sahid bin Hassan): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to take this opportunity to address this Assembly with the hope that the State Government would give its attention and consideration to what I have to say.

The first topic is in respect of animal husbandry. As we are aware, the 'bagi pawah' system has already been in operation in some States in the Federation. Under this scheme, cows, buffaloes and goats are given to farmers so that they would be able to augment their income. The number of animals would also increase, thus meeting the needs of the people of this country. As far as I am aware, such a scheme has been introduced in Penang and Province Wellesley. I hope the State Government would take early action to start this scheme as I believe this is one of the most effective ways by which we can help to improve the standard of living of the farmers in this State.

The second topic is in respect of land for the landless in the State. There is no land development scheme for the landless in Penang and Province Wellesley. We are aware that people from this State have applied for land in the F.L.D.A. schemes. According to the reply given by

the Hon'ble the Chief Minister to my question last year, the number was approximately 1,000. This is a clear indication that the ra'ayat in this State are in need of land. I therefore hope that Government will do its best to meet the demand of the people either by carrying out further investigations on lands we have in this State or by approaching the Federal Government for certain allocations in the Federal schemes. Unlike other States, this State has very little land which could be given out for general alienation.

The Member for Tanjong Tengah (Mr. Wong Choong Woh): (in Malay) Honourable Mr. Speaker, Sir,

My speech today concerns Fort Cornwallis at the Esplanade.

Fort Cornwallis at the Esplanade is one of the historic places in this City where the people of the City and kampongs go for recreation in the evenings. As the Fort is surrounded by open spaces, and is situated close to the sea, the air there is fresh and breezy, and people from all walks of life go to this place for their recreation after the day's hard work. It is an ideal place for quiet relaxation.

As the Esplanade is separated from Swettenham Pier by the Clock Tower, and since passengers of big liners and pilgrim ships embark and disembark at Swettenham Pier, the place is overcrowded with well-wishers and relatives who always gather underneath the big trees adjacent to Fort Cornwallis. The Malay people sometimes have to wait for morning till evening, and for a period of such duration they certainly need public conveniences. As there are no public conveniences at this place at present, these people, including those who go

there for their recreation, ease themselves wherever they like. This beautiful place therefore becomes filthy, and the air is filled with unsavoury and nauseating odours. This is particularly so behind the General Post Office and the area adjacent to Fort Cornwallis. These people do not know whom to approach.

This Assembly, therefore, should propose that the State Government construct public conveniences immediately adjacent to Fort Cornwallis. This is essential if the general health of the public is to be safeguarded. If the State Government were busy with other commitments, and they had no time and were unable to attend to this, the matter should be passed over to the appropriate department of the City Council. Though this is a small matter, nevertheless it is still important and should not be delayed.

That is all I have to say, today, and I have every confidence that whatever I have said just now will produce some results which will benefit the people in this country.

Thank you.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would thank the Honourable Member for Sungei Pinang for his Adjournment Speech on further educational facilities in the State of Penang. You may have at least my support by saying that the educational facilities up to Secondary level in Penang are second to none in the Federation. New schools and additional classes have been built to cope with the increasing demand for education. It is also relevant to mention that the high educational standards have been maintained.

Further Education Classes at all levels covering a wide range of subjects are held at various

centres. Altogether there are 141 classes and 4,226 pupils are attending these classes. It will therefore be seen that full facilities up to University entrance standard are already in existence in Penang, and that students who have not been able to complete their full school education can achieve the same level of attainment in Further Education Classes.

As for the establishment of institutions of higher learning in Penang, this is a matter which is not within the jurisdiction of the State Government. Nevertheless we do have a large Teachers Training College as well as a Day Training College training teachers for the country.

To cope with the requirements of our industrial estates, as raised by the Honourable Member, I am glad to report that the proposal to establish a new or another Secondary Technical Institute in Penang has been planned. The site required by the Ministry of Education is approximately 1,195,000 square feet. Of this area, 868,056 square feet are State land; the remaining area is private property. The State Government has offered the area of State land to the Ministry of Education at a reduced rate of premium by half, which amounts to many thousands of dollars. That portion of the premium which State Government is prepared to forego will be the State Government's contribution towards the cost of this project.

As for the establishment of Faculties of the University, I am to say that Universities, as you know, are not Government Departments, and the establishment of facilities for University study in Penang must be the concern, initially, of the University of Malaya. Now, the centralisation of the University of Malaya in Kuala Lumpur has obviously certain ad-

vantages. However, I do agree with the Honourable Member that there is merit in the argument that perhaps certain Faculties of the University should be established in the State of Penang. Now, the Federation of Malaya is a young nation, and the Federation Division of the University of Malaya has only just been established in Kuala Lumpur. Perhaps in the course of time, with the growing demand for University education, the University authorities will, we hope, consider the question of establishing Faculties in Penang.

I would like to assure the Honourable Member for Sungei Pinang that the State Government is very interested in the expansion of educational facilities at all levels in the State. The offer of State land at reduced premium for the Secondary Technical Institute is one example of our Government's attempt to improve and increase technical educational facilities in Penang. The State Government will do all in its power to attract the establishment of educational institutions in Penang.

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, may I thank the Honourable the Chief Minister for having accepted a suggestion from this side.

The Chief Minister: (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to thank the Hon'ble Member for Permatang Pauh for the interest he has shown in respect of the quarters allotted to the lower grade of Government employees. All along these quarters have been referred to as "Labourers' Lines" but the appropriate term for them is "Class X Government Quarters", i.e. housing units provided for Government employees whose basic salary is \$160 per month and below. But I hope I may be permitted to use the term "labour lines" in my reply.

At present, the State Government maintains about 1,051 labour lines in the State. About 55% of these are in Penang Island and 45% in Province Wellesley. More than 38% of the labour lines are maintained and improved from Federal funds, and the rest, i.e. 62%, from State funds. Government is aware that the quarters provided for the lower grade of Government employees are sub-standard and small: some of them have had to make use of a common kitchen, bathroom and toilet. Government has adopted the policy of improving the existing labour lines, or erecting new housing units, each with its own kitchen and toilet, so that these Government employees may be able to live in comfort and with privacy.

This year Government has set aside approximately \$54,180 in order to provide electricity, water supply and waterborne sanitation. The Federal Government and the State Government jointly propose to spend about \$680,000 for the improvement of these labour lines. There are some labour lines which are too small — such units will be demolished or, in some cases, two of these units will be combined, thereby enlarging the rooms. This year Government proposes to improve about 117 housing units, namely —

- 18 in Trengganu Road, George Town;
- 8 in Ayer Itam;
- 8 in Bukit Panchor, Province Wellesley South;
- 38 in Glugor;
- 2 in Batu Uban;
- 18 in Bayan Lepas;
- 5 in Balik Pulau;
- 5 in Permatang Pauh, Province Wellesley;
- 6 in Bukit Mertajam;
- 2 in Telok Bahang;
- 4 in Sungei Bakap; and
- 3 in Butterworth.

Government intends to demolish old buildings and in their places new ones will be built. A case in point are the 18 units in Trengganu Road. The present occupants have moved into these units from Sungei Pinang.

The State Government also intends to convert about 73 labour lines into good modern housing units, i. e. at the following places:—

Ayer Itam	...	4
Glugor	...	34
Sungei Nibong	...	2
Bayan Lepas	...	8
Balik Pulau	...	6
Permatang Pauh	...	6
Bukit Minyak	...	5
Bukit Mertajam	...	6
Telok Bahang	...	2

Despite the heavy programme, about 450 housing units still remain to be improved on, but Government hopes that under its Five-Year Development Plan reasonable housing units for Government employees will be provided.

I would now like to reply to the second speech made by the Hon'ble Member for Permatang Pauh in respect of fruit orchards. We are aware that a high percentage of the trees are old and unproductive. Those trees were planted without good agricultural husbandry—too close together—and this is unsatisfactory. Government has, therefore, taken the matter into consideration and has also made arrangements to provide subsidies so as to improve the orchards. Government will carry out a general survey of the fruit orchards in order to determine what fruit trees they are best suited for. Government is aware that there are about 4,165 acres of land which are planted with fruit trees, 1,000 acres of which are under semi-permanent fruit crops like bananas, pine-

apples and papayas. These fruit trees have to be planted from time to time. About 3,000 acres are under permanent tree crops like rambutans, durians, chikus, langsats, etc.

In an endeavour to improve fruit crops, the Ministry of Agriculture has included a "Fruit Rehabilitation Scheme" in the Five-Year Development Plan. Under this Scheme, smallholders with 3 acres and less will be given assistance in kind to the value of \$100 per acre in the form of planting materials, fertilizers and barbed wire fencing. For rehabilitation work, the smallholder will receive assistance in kind to the value of \$50 per acre for other expenses.

The Federal Government will allocate a sum of \$20,000 for the rehabilitation of about 200 acres of land under fruits in the State of Penang. \$200,000 will be spent during a period of 10 years. In the next 10 years many of our fruit orchards will have been rehabilitated. In order to obtain the aforesaid assistance, the State Agricultural Officer will have to be consulted so that he may be able to select and determine the type of fruit trees to be planted, and also the type of fertilizers to be used. The smallholders, on their part, should maintain the orchards accordingly. Advice given by the Department of Agriculture is free of charge.

As regards coconuts, I am happy to say that the Federal Government is now investigating into the matter so that our coconut plantations, either in this State or in the Federation, can be made more productive.

I would also like to thank the Hon'ble Member for Nibong Tebal who has touched on the rearing of domestic animals in the State.

According to the livestock census for 1961, there is an increase

in all classes of livestock in the State. This is the result of the implementation of a policy for strict control on the slaughter of female cattle and also the restriction of the removal of female cattle out of the State. Government has also taken steps to help farmers in the State and has accordingly introduced the 'bagi pawah' system so that the number of buffaloes, cattle or goats may increase.

The 'bagi pawah' system works as follows: The State Government gives on loan either a cow or a female buffalo or goat to a farmer, and the farmer undertakes to feed and take proper care of the animal until the animal gives birth. If the first-born is a female calf, the farmer looks after it for two years and then hands it over to the Government. The cow then becomes the absolute property of the farmer. Should, however, the first-born be a male, the farmer is also obliged to look after it for two years and then surrenders it to the Government. Government will then consider what is best to be done to the calf, i.e. whether it should be made to pull carts or be disposed of. The proceeds from the sale of the male calf are divided equally between the Government and the farmer, after deducting the expenses that had been incurred. The original cow continues to be the property of the Government until such time as the farmer is able to give the Government in exchange a 2-year old female calf. The same applies to buffaloes.

I would like to take this opportunity to inform you that goats, sheep and poultry have increased in numbers. As for poultry, not only do they produce eggs in abundance but about one million birds are exported.

As for pigs, Government is taking a keen interest to enable Chinese farmers who rear pigs to derive a big income from them. Government imports pure bred in-gilt (i.e. pregnant) pigs from overseas and within a short period, the imported pigs will give birth and the offsprings will then be sold to farmers who rear pigs.

The State Government has provided \$50,000 in the Second Five-Year Development Plan for the improvement of cattle and goats, and it is estimated that a sum of \$10,000 will be spent per annum. It is hoped that it will be possible to lend out in a year 20 female goats, 10 female buffaloes and 10 cows.

The 'bagi pawah' system is now in operation and Government has every confidence that our cattle and goat population will increase.

The Hon'ble Member for Nibong Tebal had also spoken in respect of land which the landless residents in this State have applied for. So far, the State Government has received about 987 applications from applicants who are prepared to migrate to the other States where land is available. In 1959, 36 settlers were given land in Pahang. These settlers submitted their applications for land direct to the Federal Land Development Authority but in 1961 all applications were forwarded to the State Government. In 1961, only five applications were accepted and this was due to the fact that there appeared to be a tendency among many of the applicants to be selective as to which State they would like to settle in. If the applicants continue to be so, the F.L.D.A. will certainly encounter difficulties for, although its schemes are implemented by the Federal Government, priority is given to applicants from the land-

providing State. I hope applicants for land will not be too selective: otherwise, they may have to wait for a longer period. This year Government has been informed that about 48 places will be made available for settlers from our State. I would therefore like to take this opportunity to thank the F.L.D.A. The land offered to settlers from our State is in Pahang.

The State Government has always given this matter its serious consideration and I hope that applicants for land will not be selective when they are offered land. The State Government is also considering measures to assist the successful applicants when they are required to migrate to the other States.

As regards the speech made by the Hon'ble Member for Tanjong Tengah, I would also like to thank him for his concern over the welfare of passengers. If the Hon'ble Member goes through this year's Estimates, he will be able to see that Government has provided a sum of \$225,000 for the improvement of King Edward Place and for the construction of shelters, toilets — now, what is toilet in Malay?

The Member for Dhoby Ghaut (Enche C. D. Ismail) & Others: 'Tandas.'

Chief Minister: (continuing.) well, toilets, shelters and hawkers' stalls. This will make the area look more attractive when Government makes use of the new Government Office Building in the very near future.

I would like to invite City Councillors to take note of the matters arising from the speech of the Hon'ble Member because some of them are related to section 29(i) of the Municipal Or-

dinance. These matters are the responsibility not of Government alone, but of all of us. Some are the responsibility of the City Council as stated in section 29(i) of the Municipal Ordinance. Nevertheless, it does not mean that Government intends to shirk its responsibilities. We have to be patient as the Committee appointed for the purpose is still considering the matter and has not yet made any decision. It requires time as the matter is connected with the Penang Port Commission, i.e. in respect of its Headquarters. Land will be provided to the State Government for

the construction of roads for the use of passengers. I believe the Committee will soon be able to submit a report on the matter and the State Government will make its decision as early as possible so that the matter can be expedited. I would like to give my assurance that, if the State Government is not able to spend the \$225,000 this year, it will certainly do so during the following year so that the public in the State will benefit.

Thank you.

The Assembly adjourns at
5.44 p.m.

APPENDIX "A"

(1) To assist the Protection Officers

(2) To assist in the removal of the
Houses for removal to London
and in the removal of the
Houses for removal to London

(3) To assist in the removal of the
Houses for removal to London
and in the removal of the
Houses for removal to London

(4) To assist in the removal of the
Houses for removal to London
and in the removal of the
Houses for removal to London

(5) To assist in the removal of the
Houses for removal to London
and in the removal of the
Houses for removal to London

(6) To assist in the removal of the
Houses for removal to London
and in the removal of the
Houses for removal to London

(7) To assist in the removal of the
Houses for removal to London
and in the removal of the
Houses for removal to London

(8) To assist in the removal of the
Houses for removal to London
and in the removal of the
Houses for removal to London

(9) To assist in the removal of the
Houses for removal to London
and in the removal of the
Houses for removal to London

(10) To assist in the removal of the
Houses for removal to London
and in the removal of the
Houses for removal to London

(11) To assist in the removal of the
Houses for removal to London
and in the removal of the
Houses for removal to London

(12) To assist in the removal of the
Houses for removal to London
and in the removal of the
Houses for removal to London

APPENDIX 'A'

(see page 151)

COMMITTEES SET UP BY THE STATE GOVERNMENT SINCE IT TOOK OFFICE

Name or Designation of Committee	Function and Purpose of Committee	Duration	Whether Committee has been amalgamated with other Committee or Committees, etc.	Names of Members on the Committee so set up or participated in by the State Government	Position held by Members in the Committee
1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Juvenile Welfare Committee	(a) To assist the Probation Officers in finding guardians and employment for Juveniles under their supervision.	Term of appointment not specified	No	1. The Hon'ble Mr. Tan Cheng Bee, J.P. 2. Mrs. Goh Heng Chong, P.J.K. 3. Mr. Khoo-Yeoh Gan Hong 4. Puan Dasimah Dasir, A.M.N., J.P. 5. Mr. E. P. Balhetchet, A.M.N., J.P. 6. Mr. C. J Sundram 7. Dr. Khoo Kim Cheng, A.M.N. 8. Che Din bin Pawanteh 9. Mr. K. Govindasamy 10. Mrs. Ng Mann Sau	Chairman Member " " " " " " " "
	(b) To assist the Probation Officers in carrying out their functions of supervision of Probationers and in the after care of persons discharged from Approved and Sir Henry Gurney Schools.			11. Mrs. Ong Kee Yeam 12. Mrs. Amra Singh 13. Mr. Robert David 14. The Hon'ble Mr. Kee Yong Chin 15. Mr. K. M. Rashid (since deceased) 16. Mr. Lim Jin Kooi 17. Mr. Ooi Kar Seng 18. Enche Yahaya bin Ahmad 19. Enche Wanchik bin Md. Ariff	Pro-tem Hon. Secretary Hon. Treasurer Member " " " " " "
	(c) To assist in the welfare of the boys in the Remand Home and Hostel for Juveniles in Penang.				
	(d) To assist the Probation Officers generally in the discharge of their duties.				

2. State World
Health Day
Committee
1960

To make arrangements for
celebrations in Penang for World
Health Day, 1960.

8.12.59
7.5.60

No

1. The Hon'ble Dr. M. P. L.
Yegappan, J.P. Chairman
2. Senior Health Officer, Penang
& Province Wellesley Member
3. Port Health Officer, Penang "
4. Medical Officer of Health (Rural) "
5. City Health Officer, Penang "
6. State Information Officer, Penang "
7. Chief Education Officer, Penang "
8. The State Commissioner of
Lands & Mines "
9. The State Social Welfare Officer,
Penang Secretary

3. State World
Health Day
Committee
1961

To make arrangements for
celebrations in Penang for World
Health Day, 1961.

5.4.61 —
1.5.61

No

1. The Hon'ble Dr. M. P. L.
Yegappan, J.P. Chairman
2. The Medical Officer of Health,
Province Wellesley Member
3. Port Health Officer, Penang "
4. Medical Officer of Health,
(Rural), Penang "
5. City Health Officer, Penang "
6. State Information Officer, Penang "
7. Chief Education Officer, Penang "
8. State Commissioner of Lands
& Mines "
9. Representatives of the Police
Department "
10. Representative of the Labour
Department "
11. State Social Welfare Officer
Secretary

Name or Designation of Committee	Function and Purpose of Committee	Duration	Whether Committee has been amalgamated with other Committee or Committees, etc.	Names of Members on the Committee so set up or participated in by the State Government	Position held by Members in the Committee
1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Local Government Liaison Committee, Penang	To discuss matters of interest common to all Town Councils and Rural District Councils and to make recommendations on matters of policy for the consideration of such Councils.	5.2.60 — 31.3.61	No	1. The Hon'ble Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik, A.M.N., Chairman, Rural District Council, Penang Island (Tuan Haji H. A. Azyze, A.M.N.) 2. Chairman, Town Council, Bukit Mertajam (Mr. Ooh Chooi Cheng) 3. Chairman, Rural District Council North, P.W. (Tuan Haji Abdul Kadir bin H. Hassan, P.J.K., J.P.) 4. Chairman, Rural District Council Central, P.W. (Enche Megat Haron bin Megat Aziz) 5. Chairman, Rural District Council South, P.W. (Enche M. Mohamed Ismail) 6. Secretary, Rural District Council, Penang Island, (Enche Abu Hassan bin Abdullah) 7. Secretary, Town Council, Butterworth & Rural District Council North, P.W. (Enche Abu Mansor bin H. Hassan) 8. Secretary, Town Council, Bukit Mertajam & Rural District Council Central, P.W. (Enche Abdul Kadir bin Talib) 9. Secretary, Rural District Council South, P.W. (Enche Ahmad bin Abdul Rahim)	Chairman Member " " " " " " " " "

5. As above

To discuss matters of interest common to all three District Councils in Province Wellesley and Rural District Council, Penang Island and to make recommendations on matters of policy for the consideration of such Councils.

1.4.61 —
to date.

No

1. The Hon'ble Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik, A.M.N. Chairman
2. Chairman, Rural District Council, Penang Island (Tuan Haji H. A. Azyze, A.M.N.) Member
3. Chairman, District Council North, Province Wellesley (Hon'ble Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid) "
4. Chairman, District Council Central, P.W. (Enche Megat Haron bin Megat Aziz, P.J.K.) "
5. Chairman, District Council South, P.W. (Enche Chin Fook Gooi) "
6. Secretary, Rural District Council, Penang Island (Enche Abdul Manaf bin Mohd. Nor) "
7. Secretary, District Council North, P.W. (Enche Abu Mansor bin Haji Hassan) "
8. Secretary, District Council Central, P.W. (Enche Rozhan bin Haji Kuntom) "
9. Secretary, District Council South, P.W. (Enche Ahmad bin Abdul Rahim) "

Name or Designation of Committee	Function and Purpose of Committee	Duration	Whether Committee has been amalgamated with other Committee or Committees, etc.	Names of Members on the Committee so set up or participated in by the State Government	Position held by Members in the Committee
1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Committee for the Celebration of His Majesty's official birthday, 1960	To organise State Celebrations for His Majesty's official birthday	9.5.60 — 1.6.60	No	1. The Hon'ble Enche Aziz Ibrahim, J.P. 2. " " Inche C. D. Ismail, A.M.N. 3. " " Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan, J.P. 4. " " Mr. Phee Joo Teik 5. " " Mr. Tan Chong Bee 6. " " Mr. Tan Khim Hoe 7. " " Mr. C. Y. Choy 8. Mr. Goh Hock Jin, Asst. State Secretary 'B'	Chairman Member " " " " " Secretary
7. Committee for the Celebration of His Majesty's official birthday 1961	As above	9.5.61 — 7.6.61	No	1. The Hon'ble Enche Aziz Ibrahim, J.P. 2. " " Tuan Haji Ahmad bin H. Abdullah, A.M.N. 3. " " Tuan Haji Sahid bin Hassan 4. " " Mr. C. Y. Choy 5. " " Mr. Tan Khim Hoe 6. Mr. Chua Khye Guan, Asst. State Secretary, 'B'	Chairman Member " " " "

8. Committee of the official birthday of H.E. the Governor, 1959 —
To organise celebrations for the 14.11.59 —
official birthday of H.E. the 15.12.59
Governor.

- | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------|
| 1. | The Hon'ble Enche Aziz Ibrahim, | J.P. | Chairman |
| 2. | " | Tuan Haji Ismail bin | |
| 3. | " | Che Chik, A.M.N. | Member |
| 4. | " | Enche Hashim bin | |
| 5. | " | Awang, J.P. | " |
| 6. | " | Dr. M. P. L. | |
| 7. | " | Yegappan, J.P. | " |
| 8. | " | Mr. Tan Chong Bee | " |
| 9. | " | Mr. C. Y. Choy | " |
| 10. | " | Mr. Chor Sin Kheng | " |
| 11. | " | Mr. Goh Hock Jin, Asst. State | " |
| 12. | " | Secretary, 'B' | " |

As above.

9. Committee for the Celebration of the official birthday of H.E. the Governor, 1960 —
23.11.60 —
15.12.60

- | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. | The Hon'ble Enche Aziz Ibrahim, | J.P. | Chairman |
| 2. | " | Mr. C. Y. Choy | Member |
| 3. | " | Mr. Tan Khim Hoe | " |
| 4. | " | Enche C. D. Ismail, | |
| 5. | " | A.M.N. | " |
| 6. | " | Mr. Chor Sin Kheng | " |
| 7. | " | Mr. Lee Kok Liang | " |
| 8. | " | Mr. Chua Khye Guan, Asst. State | " |
| 9. | " | Secretary, 'B' | Secretary |

10. Commonwealth Technical Training Week in Penang. 31.5.61 —
10.10.61

10. Commonwealth Technical Training Week Committee, 1961

- | | | | |
|----|-----------------------------------|--------|-----------|
| 1. | State Commissioner for Labour, | Penang | Chairman |
| 2. | State Engineer, Penang | | Member |
| 3. | Chief Education Officer, Penang | | " |
| 4. | Principal, Technical Institute, | | " |
| 5. | State Information Officer, Penang | Penang | " |
| 6. | Station Manager, Radio Malaya, | Penang | " |
| 7. | Asst. State Secretary, 'B' | Penang | Secretary |

14. The District Traffic Supt., Malayan Railway, Prai (Mr. S. Seenivasagam)				Member
15. The Manager, Penang Hill Railway, (Mr. R. K. Bogle)				"
16. The O.C. Traffic Branch (Mr. P. J. D. Guest)				"
17. P.S. to H.E. the Governor (Che Noordin Arshad)				"
18. The City Secretary (Mr. Ong Hock Chuan)				"
19. Principal Asst. Secretary (Adm.) (Y.M. Raja Muhd. Alias bin Raja Muhd. Ali)				"
20. The Asst. State Secretary 'B' Mr. Chua Khye Guan				"
1. The Hon'ble Enche Aziz Ibrahim,	No			Chairman
2. " " Mr. Kee Yong Chin				Member
3. " " Enche Ariffin Shariff				"
4. " " Mr. Tan Chong Bee				"
5. " " Mr. Chor Sin Kheng,				"
6. Mr. Chua Khye Guan, Asst. State Secretary, 'B'				J.P.
1. The Hon'ble Enche Aziz Ibrahim,	No			Secretary
2. " " Dr. M. P. L.				Chairman
3. " " Yegappan, J.P.				Member
4. " " Mr. Lee Kok Liang				"
5. " " Mr. Tan Chong Bee				"
6. " " Mr. Chor Sin Kheng,				J.P.
7. Mr. Chua Khye Guan, Asst. State Secretary 'B'				"

12. End of Emergency State Celebrations Committee

To organise State Celebrations of the end of the Emergency.

21.6.60 —
4.8.60

13. State Committee for Merdeka Day Celebrations on 31.8.60

To organise State Celebrations of Third Merdeka Day Anniversary.

29.7.60 —
31.8.60

Name or Designation of Committee	Function and Purpose of Committee	Duration	Whether Committee has been amalgamated with other Committee or Committees, etc.	Names of Members on the Committee so set up or participated in by the State Government	Position held by Members in the Committee
14. State Committee for Merdeka Day Anniversary Celebrations on 31.8.61	2 To organise State Celebrations of Third Merdeka Day Anniversary.	3 2.8.61 — 31.8.61	4 No	5 1. The Hon'ble Enche Aziz Ibrahim, J.P. 2. " " Dr. M. P. L. 3. " " Yegappan, J.P. 4. " " Mr. Tan Chong Bee 5. " " Mr. Chor Sin Kheng, J.P. 6. " " Mr. Lee Kok Liang 7. " " Mr. Tan Khim Hoe 8. Enche Ismail bin Ahmad, State Information Officer 9. Mr. M. Thilagadurai, District Officer, Balik Pulau 10. Enche Abu Mansor bin Abu Hassan, District Officer, Butterworth 11. Enche Rozhan bin Haji Kuntom, District Officer, Bukit Mertajam 12. Enche Ahmad bin Abdul Rahim, District Officer, Nibong Tebal 13. Mr. Tan Teik Hock, Education Department 14. Mr. Teoh Chooi Hor, Westlands School 15. Mr. Cheah Boh Eye, Dy. Collector of Land Revenue 16. Mr. Chua Khye Guan, Asst. State Secretary, 'B'	6 Chairman Member " " " " Member " " " " " " " " "

15. Penang Hill Railway Advisory Committee	To advise the Executive Council on any matters connected with the Penang Hill Railway.	2 years	No	1. The Hon'ble Enche Aziz Ibrahim, J.P. 2. " " Mr. Chor Sin Kheng, J.P. 3. " " Mr. Tan Khim Hoe, J.P. 4. The State Secretary	Chairman Member " "
16. Paya Terubong/Relau Road Committee	To make a detailed study and inspect the site of the proposed Paya Terubong/Relau Road, and submit a report to Executive Council.	8.10.59 — 4.8.60	Yes—amalgamated with the Roads Committee from 5th August, 1960.	1. The Hon'ble Enche Aziz Ibrahim, J.P. 2. " " Enche Hashim bin Awang, J.P. 3. " " Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik, A.M.N. 4. " " Mr. Chor Sin Kheng, J.P. 5. The State Engineer 6. The State Commissioner of Lands & Mines	Chairman Member " " " "
17. Roads Committee	To consider and make recommendations on all road proposals.	5.8.60 — 25.4.61	No	1. The Hon'ble Mr. Kee Yong Chin 2. " " Enche C. D. Ismail, A.M.N. 3. " " Mr. Phee Joo Teik 4. The State Engineer, Penang	Chairman Member " "
18. Budget Committee	(1) To examine the proposals for the Estimates of Ordinary Expenditure and the Development Estimates which have been submitted by Heads of Departments. (2) To prepare the Draft Estimates of Revenue and Ordinary Expenditure and the Development Estimates.	Yearly for 1960 and 1961	No	1. The Hon'ble The Chief Minister 2. " " Mr. Kee Yong Chin 3. " " Dr. M. P. L. 4. " " Yegappan, J.P. 5. " " Enche Aziz Ibrahim, J.P. 6. " " Enche C. D. Ismail, A.M.N.	Chairman Member " " " "

Name or Designation of Committee	Function and Purpose of Committee	Duration	Whether Committee has been amalgamated with other Committee or Committees, etc.	Names of Members on the Committee so set up or participated in by the State Government	Position held by Members in the Committee
19. State Committee for Minggu Bahasa	2 To encourage and promote the use of the National Language among the citizens of the country and also to strengthen the spirit and confidence of the people towards it.	3 18.12.59 — 31.12.60	4 No	5 1. The Hon'ble the Chief Minister 2. The District Officer, North East District 3. The District Officer, Balik Pulau 4. The District Officer, Bukit Mertajam 5. The District Officer, Nibong Tebal 6. The District Officer, Butterworth 7. Chairman, State Education Board 8. One representative from each Chamber of Commerce 9. State Information Officer 10. Station Manager, Radio Malaya, Penang 11. Economic Officer, Penang	6 Chairman Member " " " " " " " " "
20. State Committee for Bulan Bahasa	As above.	1.1.61 to date	No	1. The Hon'ble Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan, J.P. 2. The District Officer, North East District 3. The District Officer, Balik Pulau 4. The District Officer, Butterworth 5. The District Officer, Bukit Mertajam 6. The District Officer, Nibong Tebal 7. One representative from each Chamber of Commerce	Chairman Member " " " " "

				8. State Financial Officer	Member
				9. Chief Education Officer	"
				10. State Information Officer	"
				11. Economic Officer	"
				12. Station Manager, Radio Malaya, Penang	"
21. Water Supplies Committee	To consider and make recommendations on all matters relating to water supplies.	23.11.59 — 25.4.61	No	1. The Hon'ble Mr. Kee Yong Chin	Chairman
				2. " " Mr. Phee Joo Teik	Member
				3. " " Enche C. D. Ismail, A.M.N.	"
22. As above	As above.	26.4.61 — to date	No	4. The State Engineer	"
				1. The Hon'ble Mr. Kee Yong Chin	Chairman
				2. " " Enche C. D. Ismail, A.M.N.	Member
23. Public Works Committee	To consider and make recommendations on all public work proposals.	26.4.61 — to date	No	3. The State Engineer	"
				1. The Hon'ble Mr. Kee Yong Chin	Chairman
				2. " " Enche C. D. Ismail, A.M.N.	Member
24. Electricity Supplies Committee	To consider and make recommendations on all works relating to electricity.	23.11.59 — 25.4.61	No	3. The State Engineer	"
				1. The Hon'ble Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik, A.M.N.	Chairman
				2. " " Enche Aziz Ibrahim, J.P.	Member
25. As above	As above	26.4.61 to date	No	3. The State Engineer	"
				As above	
26. Committee on Housing	To consider and make recommendations on all matters relating to Government housing.	23.11.59 — 25.4.61	Yes—amalgamated with the State Roads Committee to form the P.W. Committee w.e.f. 26.4.61	1. The Hon'ble Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik, A.M.N.	Chairman
				2. " " Mr. Kee Yong Chin	Member
				3. The State Engineer	"

Name or Designation of Committee	Function and Purpose of Committee	Duration	Whether Committee has been amalgamated with other Committee or Committees, etc.	Names of Members of Committee so set up or participated in by the State Government	Position held by Members in the Committee
1	2	3	4	5	6
27. Penang Hill Road Committee	To advise and make recommendations on (a) the feasibility of construction of two-way traffic motorable roads from— (i) a suitable point on the East Coast plain to a suitable point near the summit of Penang Hill; and (ii) Ayer Itam to Balik Pulau; (b) the cost of construction of such roads and the method of financing the construction, <i>inter alia</i> , considering (i) Government funds; (ii) private enterprise; (iii) a combination of (i) and (ii) and (c) the imposition of toll fees; the benefits which could be expected to accrue from the construction of such roads with reference to (i) farmers to the west of the hills; (ii) the tourist trade; and (iii) possible dormitory areas for George Town	6.11.57 — 9.2.60	No	1. The Hon'ble Cheah Seng J.P. 2. " Enche Aziz Ibrahim, J.P. 3. Mrs. Cheah Inn Kiong, P.J.K., J.P. 4. Mr. Koh Sin Hock 5. Enche Nyak Hashim bin Nyak Puteh, A.M.N. 6. State Drainage & Irrigation Engineer 7. State Forest Officer 8. State Engineer 9. State Agricultural Officer	Chairman Member " " " " " " "

(d) increase in land values as a result of the road construction and methods by which Government can derive financial benefit from any increase;

(e) the effects, if any, upon water catchment areas.

(f) the effects, if any, upon soil erosion by virtue of construction of the roads and further development which can be expected to follow the roads together with the methods of preventing erosion.

28. Committee to consider Scheme II for Bertam Estate

(a) To consider and make recommendations on Scheme II to date

No

(b) To make a detailed study of the report on Scheme I and submit recommendations for consideration of the Executive Council.

29. State Committee on Low-cost Housing

To assist the State Government in implementing and administering Low-Cost Housing Schemes in Penang.

No

30. Local Government Committee

To consider and make recommendations on matters relating to Local Government Authorities.

As above

No

1. The Hon'ble Enche Hashim bin Awang, J.P. Chairman
2. " Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik, A.M.N. Member
3. " Mr. Kee Yong Chin "
4. The State Commissioner of Lands and Mines "
5. The State Financial Officer "
1. The Hon'ble Enche C. D. Ismail, A.M.N. Chairman
2. " Mr. Kee Yong Chin Member
3. The State Commissioner of Lands and Mines "
4. State Financial Officer "
5. State Engineer "
6. State Planning Officer "
1. The Hon'ble Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik, A.M.N. Chairman
2. " Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan, J.P. Member

11. State Financial Officer				Member
12. Chief Education Officer				"
13. Chief Medical & Health Officer				"
14. State Information Officer				"
15. Chief Surveyor, Penang				"
16. Asst. State Secretary				"
			(Development)	
1. Legal Adviser				Chairman
2. Enche S. M. Hussain, J.P.				Member
3. Mr. Chee Tiang Seng				"
4. Mr. N. Ponnudurai, J.P.				"
5. Mr. E. P. Balhetchet, A.M.N., J.P.				"
1. Legal Adviser				Chairman
2. The Hon'ble Mr. Tan Cheng Bee, J.P.				Member
3. Tuan Haji S. M. Zainal Abidin, J.M.N., J.F.				"
4. Mr. N. Ponnudurai, J.P.				"
5. Mr. E. P. Balhetchet, A.M.N., J.P.				"
1. Hon. Chief Minister				Chairman
2. Mr. Teoh Cheng Hai				Member
3. President, Penang Gardening Society (Mr. Chang Min Tat)				"
4. State Engineer				"
5. State Agricultural Officer				"
6. Horticultural Officer				"
1. Hon. Enche Aziz Ibrahim, J.P.				Chairman
2. Hon. Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan, J.P.				Member
3. State Drainage & Irrigation Engineer				"
1. Hon. Enche Aziz Ibrahim, J.P.				Chairman
2. Hon. Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik, A.M.N.				Member
3. State Drainage & Irrigation Engineer				"
33. Advisory Committee to examine Jury List	To examine the Jurors List for 1960 and make recommendations thereon.	1960	No	
34. As above	To examine the Jurors List for 1961 and make recommendations thereon.	1961	No	
35. Penang Waterfall Gardens Committee	To manage Waterfall Gardens, Penang.	Term of appointment not specified	No	
36. Agricultural & Drainage Works Committee	To consider and make recommendations on proposals for Agricultural & Drainage works.	23.11.59 to 25.4.61	No	
37. - do -	- do -	26.4.61 to date	No	

15. Mr Ooi Kar Seng	Member
16. Mr. Yeap Hock Hoe, P.J.K.	"
17. Tuan Haji C. M. Hashim,	"
18. Tuan Haji K. Mushir Ariff, J.P.	"
19. Mr. Chow Deh Kong	"
20. Mr. S. Letchumanasamy, P.J.K.	"
21. Mr. M. Doraisamy Thevar, J.P.	"
22. Mr. Gurcharan Singh, J.P.	"
23. Mr. Thakorlal Shivlal	"
24. Mr. Soon Cheng Sun, J.M.N., J.P.	"
25. The Hon'ble Enche Hashim bin Awang, J.P.	"
26. Mr. Chew Beng Teik	"
27. Mr. Tai Yun Feng	"
28. Mr. L. Lakshamanan	"
29. Mr. F. J. Steggall	"
30. Mr. M. C. Liddell	"
31. Capt. Mohd. Noor bin Mohamed, P.J.K., J.P.	"
32. Mr. Lee Guat Cheow	"
33. Mr. Ong Keng Seng, P.J.K.	"
34. Mr. Saw Seng Kew, J.P.	"
35. Mr. Teoh Thye Moh, P.J.K., J.P.	"
36. Mr. N. Rengasamy Pillai	"
37. Mr. Choong Han Leong	"
38. Mr. Lim Seong Wah	"
39. Mr. Lim Eng Hooi	"
40. State Information Officer	Hon. Secretary

Name or Designation of Committee	Function and Purpose of Committee	Duration	Whether Committee has been amalgamated with other Committees or Committees, etc.	Names of Members on the Committee so set up or participated in by the State Government	Position held by Members in the Committee
1	2	3	4	5	6
40. Penang Library Committee	To manage the affairs of the Penang Library.	Term of appointment of State representatives not specified	No	1. The Hon'ble Mr. D. S. Ramanathan, J.P. 2. " " Mr. Tan Chong Bee 3. " " Mr. Lee Kok Liang 4. Enche Mohd. Arshad bin Mohd. Yusoff 5. The Hon'ble Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik, A.M.N. 6. " " Dr. M. P. L. 7. " " Yegappan, J.P. 8. Mr. W. J. K. Mandy 9. Dr. Cheah Cheng Poh 10. Rev. S. S. Jesulthasan 11. Mr. K. H. Khaw	Chairman Member " " " " " " " " " "

