

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS
OF THE FIRST LEGISLATIVE
ASSEMBLY, PENANG

3 RD SITTING OF THE
SECOND SESSION WEDNESDAY
29 TH MARCH, 1961

KPP
328.595123
PEN



0-117946



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

THIRD SITTING OF THE SECOND SESSION
WEDNESDAY, 29th MARCH, 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 (Mr. L. A. Massie, P.J.K.)
" the Member for Glugor (Enche Aziz Ibrahim, J.P.)
" 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 Utara (Mr. Yuen Fook Cheong)
" 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 Bagan Ajam (Mr. Phee Joo Teik)

1. THE PRAYER

2. PRESENTATION OF PAPERS

Chief Minister: Sir, I beg to lay on the Table of the Assembly the following Papers:

No. 1 of 1961 — The Observations of the Acting Auditor-General on the Accounts of the City Council of George Town, Penang, for the year ended 31st December, 1959.

No. 2 of 1961 — The Statement of Items of Urgent and Unforeseen Expenditure for which an advance has been made from the Contingencies Fund.

No. 3 of 1961 — The Position of Councillors on Local Authorities on the expiry of the Order made under section 52 of the Local Authorities Elections Ordinance, 1950.

Sir, regarding Paper No. 3, I have the following statement to make in amplification of what is contained in this Paper for information of Members.

In this State this amendment to the law will apply only to the City Council which will continue to retain its present legal entity. It will not apply to the proposed new District Councils, namely the District Council North, Province Wellesley, the District Council South, Province Wellesley, the District Council, Penang Island, and the District Council Central, Province Wellesley, for the reason that the four new Councils will with effect from 1st April, 1961, become new legal entities distinct from the Councils which they supersede, and which are presently known as the Rural District

Council North, Province Wellesley, and the Butterworth Town Council, the Rural District Council South, Province Wellesley, the Rural District Council, Penang Island, the Rural District Council Central, Province Wellesley, and the Bukit Mertajam Town Council. The new law is intended to apply to Local Councils which continue to retain their present legal entities, and not to Local Councils which acquire new legal entities. Separate subordinate legislation is therefore required in respect of the proposed new Local Councils to enable members to sit on these Councils, and provision for this is being made. The following statement clarifies how this is being done.

The Constitution of the proposed District Council North, Province Wellesley, is contained in District Council North, Province Wellesley, Order, 1961, which comes into force on 1st April, 1961. Clause 3 of that Order provides that the Council shall consist of 18 Councillors. In fact the total number of elected Councillors presently on the Rural District Council North, Province Wellesley, and Butterworth Town Council is 19. During the transitional period between the date of coming into force of the said Order, that is 1st April, 1961, and the date appointed for the first general election, that is 20th May, 1961, it is intended that the State Authority shall appoint 18 of these 19 Councillors by drawing lots. In the event of the number of Councillors exceeding 18 by reason of any candidate being returned unopposed to a particular electoral ward on Nomination Day, that is 18th April, 1961, provision is being made whereby these candidates who have been returned unopposed will replace the members who have been appointed by the State Authority to the self same wards, whereupon such appointed members shall retire. The position in

respect of the proposed District Council Central, Province Wellesley, is somewhat the same. The Constitution of that District Council is contained in the District Council Central, Province Wellesley, Order 1961. Clause 3 of that Order provides that the Council shall consist of 15 Councillors. There are, however, on the two Councils which are being amalgamated, that is the Rural District Council Central, Province Wellesley, and the Bukit Mertajam Town Council, 20 members. In order to implement the same principle as the case of the District Council North, Province Wellesley, it will again be necessary for the State Authority to draw lots from the 20 presently elected members in order to fill the 15 appointed seats, and provision is being made for this. As in the case of District Council North, Province Wellesley, provision will also be made as regards this Council whereby any candidate who is returned unopposed on Nomination Day shall replace appointed members in those wards to which such candidates have been returned unopposed. It is proposed to bring into force similar subordinate legislation to cover somewhat identical circumstances appertaining to the two other proposed new Local Councils, namely the District Council South, Province Wellesley, and the Rural District Council, Penang Island.

3. (A) ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

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

- (1) In the State Assembly Meeting of 24th August, 1959 the Hon'ble the Chief Minister in his reply to the Hon'ble Member for Tanjong Selatan on the question of the landing place at Noordin Street Ghaut said that his Government "will

continue to seek the agreement of the Federal Government to an alleviation of the complete ban which at present exists

Will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please inform the Assembly how far he has been successful in helping the people in Noordin Street Ghaut, after a lapse of nearly two years since then?

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, The question of alleviating the complete ban imposed on Noordin Street Ghaut Jetty is one for consideration of the Federal Government. The State Government has approached the Federal Government to re-open this jetty and the matter is still under consideration by the Federal Government.

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, It would be clear from the question asked that the Government assurance was given at the State Assembly Meeting of 24th August, 1959 — that means it is approximately coming on to two years now. Can the Honourable the Chief Minister give us an assurance that the matter would be settled expeditiously, since the livelihood of 30 or 40 families is concerned in the re-opening of this jetty?

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, May I remind the Honourable Member that this is a subject for the consideration of the Federal Government.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, A supplementary question:

In view of the fact that the State Government, as from the assurance given by the Honourable the Chief Minister, is in sympathy with these people, will the State Government, as the Honourable

Member for Sungei Pinang said, expedite by writing to or reminding the Federal Government to take an early decision?

Chief Minister: Sir, The State Government has done and will continue to do whatever is possible.

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

- (2) Will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please state what is the total cost for primary education budgeted for 1961 in the State of Penang?

Chief Minister: Sir, The Member for Butterworth, the Honourable Dr. Yegappan, will reply to this question.

The Member for Butterworth (Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, The total cost for primary education budgeted for 1961 in Penang is \$17,384,774, which amount does not include capital costs.

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

- (3) Will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please state what sum of this total cost is borne by the Federal Government and what sum the State Government, through the State Education Board, intends to collect from local authorities?

The Member for Butterworth (Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan): Sir, A sum of \$17,021,373 out of the total cost of \$17,384,774 is borne by the Federal Government. This includes school fees estimated at \$1,720,000. The sum to be collected by the State Education Board from local authorities by way of Education Rate is \$363,401.

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

- (4) Will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please give details of such sums to be collected from local authorities?

The Member for Butterworth (Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, The answer to Question 4 is as follows:

The amounts to be collected from the various local authorities are as follows:—

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| (i) The City Council of George Town | \$237,543 |
| (ii) The Rural District Council, Penang Island | \$ 45,857 |
| (iii) The Butterworth Town Council | \$ 29,129 |
| (iv) The Rural District Council North, Province Wellesley | \$ 18,803 |
| (v) The Bukit Mertajam Town Council | \$ 10,065 |
| (vi) The Rural District Council Central, Province Wellesley | \$ 9,925 |
| (vii) The Rural District Council South, Province Wellesley | \$ 12,079 |

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

Can the Honourable Member for Butterworth tell us on what basis this collection of dues from local authorities is done?

The Member for Butterworth (Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, Under Section 106, subsection (3), of the Education Ordinance, 1957, each local authority within the State shall impose a separate annual rate for the purpose of defraying such share of the expenses of the State Education Board as may be determined by the said Board. In 1960 the respective shares of the total education expenses to be borne by the local authorities have

been determined as was given just now, and it is up to the local authorities concerned to impose a separate annual rate for the purpose of meeting their commitments. For 1961 all the local authorities have decided to impose a rate of 2% of the annual value on land and buildings in their respective Council areas.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, A supplementary question:

From the reply by the Honourable Member for Butterworth it would appear that the rate of 2% is the rate given by the State Education Board. If it is not so I stand corrected. If it is not so then the 2% rate could not be levied on the local authorities and there must be some other basis on which all these local authorities are supposed to subscribe towards this fund. We are asking the Honourable Member for Butterworth on what basis the State Education Board calculates this amount to be collected by each local authority. I repeat again on what basis?

The Member for Butterworth (Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, As I have given just now; it has been based on the Section that was quoted just now — 106, subsection (3), of the Education Ordinance, 1957. And as has been clearly pointed out, it is up to the local authorities to decide on the percentage to be collected.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, A supplementary question:

What I am driving at is this. The State Education Board states that the City Council has got to collect \$237,543, and other local authorities certain amounts. What we are asking is: Arising from the Education Ordinance, what is the basis of that calculation?

The Member for Butterworth (Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, As I have already given just now. It will have to be worked out on the basis of 2% for 1961 and the previous years. But the figures given here most probably are worked out on the revenue that was collected.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Now we are coming nearer the truth. As has been admitted (interrupted).

Mr. Speaker: If the Honourable Member (interrupted).

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, Another supplementary question arising out of this:

The Honourable Member for Butterworth said it was based on 2% collected some time before, which according to letters which the local authorities received from the State Education Board is not the basis; and that is why at this moment I would like a clarification from the Honourable Member for Butterworth.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, On a point of information: I think the Member for Butterworth made it quite clear that the basis of working this amount is based under section 106(3) of the Education Ordinance.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, On a point of clarification: we are agreed that under that section [interrupted.]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not think there is need for any clarification in these replies. If you have any direct or supplementary question to be put to the Honourable Member, it may be allowed. No debating is allowed at the time of the question. This is provided in the Standing Rules.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I feel that the Hon'ble Member for Butterworth has not replied to our question, that is, on what basis did the State Education Board calculate the allocation each local authority is to pay under the Ordinance, under that particular section. That has still not been replied to—on what basis?

The Member for Butterworth (Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, It has been clearly answered and the relevant section has been clearly quoted and the calculation has been done under that particular section.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): May I ask a supplementary question? Will the Hon'ble Member for Butterworth enlighten me on that particular section? Can he read it out?

The Member for Butterworth (Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, As I do not have that particular section here, I require written notice.

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, A supplementary question. We are grateful to the Hon'ble Member for Butterworth for giving us some legal basis for collection of these bills. But what we are trying to find out is whether the actual rate collected from each of these local authorities is the same; or is the City Council only being asked to pay 2% of this Annual Value? If he can give us a categorical answer to that, we will be satisfied.

The Member for Butterworth (Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have already clearly stated in my reply that for 1961 all the local authorities have decided to impose a rate of 2% on the Annual Value of land and buildings in their respective Council areas. Under such cir-

cumstances, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think such a question does not arise.

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

- (5) Will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please state whether the Committee on the Penang Hill Road has submitted its recommendations? If it has, please state when. If it hasn't please give an indication when this Assembly can expect its recommendations.

Chief Minister: The answer is: Yes, on 9th February, 1960.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): 1960?

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Is it 1960 or 1961?

Chief Minister: 9th February, 1960.

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, A supplementary question. If this Committee's report was made so long ago as February, 1960, may we know when Government intends to publish this report?

Chief Minister: Government will do that as soon as it has come to a decision.

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, When will Government come to a decision?

Chief Minister: That is left to the Government to decide

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, In view of the great interest of the public of Penang in this matter, will Government give us an assurance that it will soon come to a decision?

Chief Minister: In view of the importance of this decision, the

Government will not like to adopt some Councillors' attitude to rush at decision and repent at leisure.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Mr. Speaker, Sir, What stops the Government from making a decision?

Chief Minister: Nothing stops the Government from making a decision.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, In view of the fact that the State Government itself has put in the Budget for the first phase of this Penang Hill Road, can we expect the decision to be taken some time this year because, I am sure of it, they would be quite aware, since they have put in the Budget, that a decision will have to be made some time this year.

Chief Minister: It will be taken this month, if it is possible.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): How many alternative routes up the Hill are there?

Chief Minister: The recommendations of the Committee are in a confidential report. Government has not come to a decision. I regret I am not able to reveal that.

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

- (6) Since Government is considering such a hill road, will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please state whether Government will consider drawing up a scheme to parcel all State land in the area of this proposed hill road into small allotments for sale to the general public?

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, Such a scheme is one of the many proposals under consideration by the State Government.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): What other proposals, apart from this proposal [Interrupted.]

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I regret to have to repeat again—the report is still confidential and I cannot reveal that.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Mr. Speaker, Sir, Is question 6 one of the recommendations in the report?

Chief Minister: I think my answer is quite clear.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): As it is in the report: therefore it is not confidential.

Chief Minister: Since you raise it—I said “one of the many proposals:” it may be, it may be not—it is up to you to interpret that sentence.

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

- (7) Will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please state whether there were any meetings of the State Education Board since 22nd December, 1959?

Chief Minister: Sir, The Hon'ble Member for Butterworth will answer this question.

The Member for Butterworth (Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, The answer to question No. 7 is: Yes.

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

- (8) If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please state how many meetings and the dates when they were held?

The Member for Butterworth (Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, There have been altogether 16 meetings. The meetings were held on the following dates:—

- (i) 28th December, 1959.
- (ii) 9th February, 1960.
- (iii) (iv) 13th February, 1960 (2 meetings—including one Joint Meeting with Board of Managers of Westlands School).
- (v) 14th March, 1960.
- (vi) 16th March, 1960.
- (vii) 7th April, 1960.
- (viii) 11th April, 1960.
- (ix) 5th May, 1960.
- (x) 2nd June, 1960.
- (xi) 11th July, 1960.
- (xii) 21st July, 1960.
- (xiii) 16th August, 1960.
- (xiv) 6th October, 1960.
- (xv) 18th November, 1960.
- (xvi) 21st February, 1961.

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

- (9) Will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please also state the names of the members present at each meeting?

The Member for Butterworth (Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, The members who were present at the meeting that was held on 28th December, 1959 were as follows:—

The Hon'ble Senator Cheah Seng Khim, J.P. (Ag. Chairman)
The Hon'ble Senator A. M. Abu Bakar, J.M.N.
The Hon'ble Enche Aziz Ibrahim, J.P.
Tuan Haji S. M. Hussain, P.J.K.
Mr. Wong Loh Hun
The State Financial Officer (Enche Abdul Manaf bin Mohd. Nor)
Mr. Yeoh Cheang Seng

In attendance:

The Chief Education Officer (Mr. F. T. Laidlaw)
The Secretary (Mr. Oon Hoot Ewe, A.M.N.)

At the second meeting that was held on 9th February, 1960, the following members were present:—

Dr. N. K. Menon, A.M.N., J.P. (Chairman)
The Hon'ble Senator Cheah Seng Khim, J.P.
The Hon'ble Enche Aziz Ibrahim, J.P.
Tuan Haji S. M. Hussain, P.J.K.
Mr. Wong Loh Hun
The State Financial Officer (Enche Abdul Manaf bin Mohd. Nor)
Mrs. Cheah Inn Kiong, P.J.K., J.P.
Mr. O. L. Phipps

In attendance:

The Chief Education Officer (Mr. F. T. Laidlaw)
The Secretary (Mr. Oon Hoot Ewe, A.M.N.)
Mr. Tan Seng Chye (Organiser of Schools 'A')

At the third meeting that was held on 13th February, 1960, the following members were present:—

Dr. N. K. Menon, A.M.N., J.P. (Chairman)
The Hon'ble Senator Cheah Seng Khim, J.P.
The Hon'ble Enche Aziz Ibrahim, J.P.
Tuan Haji S. M. Hussain, P.J.K.
The State Financial Officer (Enche Abdul Manaf bin Mohd. Nor)
Mrs. Cheah Inn Kiong, P.J.K., J.P.
Mr. Yeoh Cheang Seng
Mr. M. L. Samuel

In attendance:

The Secretary (Mr. Oon Hoot Ewe, A.M.N.)
Mr. Tan Seng Chye (Organiser of Schools 'A'—representing the Chief Education Officer).

At the fourth meeting—that was a Joint Meeting held on 13th February with the Board of Managers of Westlands School—those who were present were:—

Dr. N. K. Menon, A.M.N., J.P. (Chairman)
The Hon'ble Senator Cheah Seng Khim, J.P. (Deputy Chairman)
Mrs. Cheah Inn Kiong, P.J.K., J.P.
The Hon'ble Enche Aziz Ibrahim, J.P.
Mr. M. L. Samuel
Mr. Yeoh Cheang Seng
Tuan Haji S. M. Hussain, P.J.K.
The State Financial Officer (Enche Abdul Manaf bin Mohd. Nor)

Board of Managers, Westlands School:

Dr. C. H. Yeang (Chairman)
Mr. Oh Lock Heng (Vice-Chairman)
Mr. Cheah Teong Lip
Mr. Looi Tian Geok
Enche Ismail bin Abu Bakar
Mr. Ong Liang Ching
Mr. Ong Eng Chye
Mr. Shaik Madar bin A. K.
Mr. Tan Thean Seng
Mr. Zulkiflee Dadameah

In attendance:

Mr. Tan Seng Chye (representing Chief Education Officer)
Mr. Oon Hoot Ewe, A.M.N. (Secretary, State Education Board)

At the meeting that was held on 14th March, 1960, the following were present:—

Dr. N. K. Menon, A.M.N., J.P. (Chairman)
The Hon'ble Senator Cheah Seng Khim, J.P.
The Hon'ble Enche Aziz Ibrahim, J.P.
The State Financial Officer (Enche Abdul Manaf bin Mohd. Nor)
Mrs. Cheah Inn Kiong, P.J.K., J.P.
Mr. O. L. Phipps
Mr. Yeoh Cheang Seng
Mr. Wong Loh Hun
Tuan Haji S. M. Hussain, P.J.K.

In attendance:

The Chief Education Officer (Mr. F. T. Laidlaw)

The Secretary (Mr. Oon Hoot Ewe, A.M.N.)
The Stenographer (Miss Lee Guat Beng)

At the meeting that was held on 16th March, 1960, the following were present:—

The Hon'ble Dato Wong Pow Nee, P.M.N., (Chief Minister, Penang).
The Hon'ble Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan, J.P.
The Hon'ble Enche Aziz Ibrahim, J.P.
The Hon'ble Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid
The Hon'ble Mr. Tan Cheng Bee, J.P.
The Hon'ble Mr. Tan Chong Bee
Mr. C. Y. Choy
Enche H. R. Pawanteh
Dr. N. K. Menon, A.M.N., J.P.
Mr. Tan Choon Hong
Mr. M. Mohamed Ismail
Mrs. Cheah Inn Kiong, P.J.K., J.P.
The State Financial Officer (Enche Abdul Manaf bin Mohd. Nor)

In attendance:

The Chief Education Officer and State Education Officer (Mr. F. T. Laidlaw)
The Secretary (Mr. Oon Hoot Ewe, A.M.N.)
The Stenographer (Miss Lee Guat Beng)

At the meeting that was held on 7th April, 1960, the following were present:—

The Hon'ble Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan, J.P. (Chairman)
The Hon'ble Enche Aziz Ibrahim, J.P. (Deputy Chairman)
The Hon'ble Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid
The Hon'ble Mr. Tan Cheng Bee, J.P.
The Hon'ble Mr. C. Y. Choy
Mrs. Cheah Inn Kiong, P.J.K., J.P.
Enche H. R. Pawanteh
Enche M. Mohamed Ismail
Mr. Tan Choon Hong
Dr. N. K. Menon, A.M.N., J.P.
The State Financial Officer (Enche Abdul Manaf bin Mohd. Nor)

In attendance:

The Chief Education Officer and
State Education Officer (Mr. A.
Halliday)
Organiser of Schools 'A' (Mr. Tan
Teik Hock)
The Secretary (Mr. Oon Hoot Ewe,
A.M.N.)
The Stenographer (Mrs. G. B.
Cheah nee Lee Guat Beng)

At the meeting that was held
on 11th April, 1960, the following
were present:—

The Hon'ble Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan,
J.P. (Chairman)
The Hon'ble Enche Aziz Ibrahim,
J.P. (Deputy Chairman)
The Hon'ble Tuan Haji Ahmad
bin Saaid
The Hon'ble Mr. Tan Cheng Bee,
J.P.
The Hon'ble Mr. C. Y. Choy
Enche H. R. Pawanteh
Dr. N. K. Menon, A.M.N., J.P.
The State Financial Officer (Enche
Abdul Manaf bin Mohd. Nor)

In attendance:

The Chief Education Officer and
State Education Officer (Mr.
A. Halliday)
Organiser of Schools 'A' (Mr. Tan
Teik Hock)
The Secretary (Mr. Oon Hoot Ewe,
A.M.N.)
The Stenographer (Mrs. G. B.
Cheah nee Lee Guat Beng)

At the meeting that was held
on 5th May, 1960, the following
were present:—

The Hon'ble Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan,
J.P. (Chairman)
The Hon'ble Enche Aziz Ibrahim,
J.P. (Deputy Chairman)
The Hon'ble Tuan Haji Ahmad
bin Saaid
The Hon'ble Mr. Tan Cheng Bee,
J.P.
The State Financial Officer (Enche
Abdul Manaf bin Mohd. Nor)
The Hon'ble Mr. Tan Chong Bee
Mrs. Cheah Inn Kiong, P.J.K., J.P.
Enche H. R. Pawanteh

Enche M. Mohamed Ismail
Mr. Tan Choon Hong
Dr. N. K. Menon, A.M.N., J.P.

In attendance:

The Chief Education Officer (Mr. A.
Halliday)
Organiser of Schools 'A' (Mr. Tan
Teik Hock)
The Secretary (Mr. Oon Hoot Ewe,
A.M.N.)
The Stenographer (Mrs. G. B.
Cheah nee Lee Guat Beng)

At the meeting held on 2nd June,
1960, the following were present:

The Hon'ble Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan,
J.P. (Chairman)
The Hon'ble Enche Aziz Ibrahim,
J.P. (Deputy Chairman)
The Hon'ble Tuan Haji Ahmad
bin Saaid
The Hon'ble Mr. Tan Cheng Bee,
J.P.
The Hon'ble Mr. Tan Chong Bee
The Hon'ble Mr. C. Y. Choy
Mrs. Cheah Inn Kiong, P.J.K., J.P.
Enche H. R. Pawanteh
Enche M. Mohamed Ismail
Mr. Tan Choon Hong
Dr. N. K. Menon, A.M.N., J.P.
The State Financial Officer (Enche
Abdul Manaf bin Mohd. Nor)

In attendance:

The Chief Education Officer (Mr.
A. Halliday)
Organiser of Schools 'A' (Mr. Tan
Teik Hock)
The Secretary (Mr. Oon Hoot Ewe,
A.M.N.)
The Stenographer (Mrs. G. B.
Cheah nee Lee Guat Beng)

At the meeting held on 11th
July, 1960 the following were
present:—

The Hon'ble Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan,
J.P. (Chairman)
The Hon'ble Enche Aziz Ibrahim,
J.P. (Deputy Chairman)
The Hon'ble Tuan Haji Ahmad
bin Saaid
The Hon'ble Mr. Tan Cheng Bee,
J.P.

In attendance:

The Chief Education Officer (Mr. A.
Halliday)
The Secretary (Mr. Tan Teik Hock)
The Stenographer (Mrs. G. B.
Cheah nee Lee Guat Beng)

At the meeting that was held
on 6th October, 1960, the follow-
ing were present:—

The Hon'ble Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan,
J.P. (Chairman)
The Hon'ble Enche Aziz Ibrahim,
J.P. (Deputy Chairman)
The Hon'ble Tuan Haji Ahmad
bin Saaid
The Hon'ble Mr. Tan Cheng Bee,
J.P.
The Hon'ble Mr. Tan Chong Bee
Enche M. Mohamed Ismail
The Hon'ble Mr. Chee Swee Ee,
P.J.K., J.P.
Dr. N. K. Menon, A.M.N., J.P.
The State Financial Officer (Enche
Abdul Manaf bin Mohd. Nor)

In attendance:

The Chief Education Officer (Mr. A.
Halliday)
The Secretary (Mr. Tan Teik Hock)
The Stenographer (Mrs. G. B.
Cheah nee Lee Guat Beng)

At the meeting that was held
on 18th November, 1960, the fol-
lowing were present:—

The Hon'ble Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan,
J.P. (Chairman)
The Hon'ble Tuan Haji Ahmad
bin Saaid
The Hon'ble Mr. Tan Cheng Bee,
J.P.
The Hon'ble Mr. Tan Chong Bee
The Hon'ble Mr. C. Y. Choy
Enche M. Mohamed Ismail
Mrs. Cheah Inn Kiong, P.J.K., J.P.
Dr. N. K. Menon, A.M.N., J.P.
The State Financial Officer (Enche
Abdul Manaf bin Mohd. Nor)

In attendance:

The Chief Education Officer (Mr. A.
Halliday)
The Secretary (Mr. Tan Teik Hock)
The Stenographer (Mrs. G. B.
Cheah nee Lee Guat Beng)

The Hon'ble Mr. Tan Chong Bee
The Hon'ble Mr. C. Y. Choy
Mrs. Cheah Inn Kiong, P.J.K., J.P.
Enche H. R. Pawanteh
Enche M. Mohamed Ismail
Dr. N. K. Menon, A.M.N., J.P.
The State Financial Officer (Enche
Abdul Manaf bin Mohd. Nor)

In attendance:

The Secretary (Mr. Tan Teik Hock)
The Stenographer (Mrs. G. B.
Cheah nee Lee Guat Beng)

At the meeting held on 21st July,
1960 the following were present:—

The Hon'ble Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan,
J.P. (Chairman)
The Hon'ble Enche Aziz Ibrahim,
J.P. (Deputy Chairman)
The Hon'ble Tuan Haji Ahmad
bin Saaid
The Hon'ble Mr. Tan Cheng Bee,
J.P.
The Hon'ble Mr. Tan Chong Bee
The Hon'ble Mr. C. Y. Choy
The State Financial Officer (Enche
Abdul Manaf bin Mohd. Nor)
Enche H. R. Pawanteh
Dr. N. K. Menon, A.M.N., J.P.
Enche M. Mohamed Ismail

In attendance:

The Secretary (Mr. Tan Teik Hock)
The Stenographer (Mrs. G. B.
Cheah nee Lee Guat Beng)

At the meeting held on 16th
August, 1960 the following were
present:—

The Hon'ble Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan,
J.P. (Chairman)
The Hon'ble Enche Aziz Ibrahim,
J.P. (Deputy Chairman)
The Hon'ble Tuan Haji Ahmad
bin Saaid
The Hon'ble Mr. Tan Cheng Bee,
J.P.
The Hon'ble Mr. Tan Chong Bee
The Hon'ble Mr. C. Y. Choy
Mrs. Cheah Inn Kiong, P.J.K., J.P.
Enche H. R. Pawanteh
Enche M. Mohamed Ismail
The State Financial Officer (Enche
Abdul Manaf bin Mohd. Nor)

At the meeting that was held on 21st February, 1961, the following were present:—

The Hon'ble Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan,
J.P. (Chairman)
The Hon'ble Tuan Haji Ahmad
bin Saaid
The Hon'ble Mr. Tan Cheng Bee,
J.P.
The Hon'ble Mr. Tan Chong Bee
The Hon'ble Mr. C. Y. Choy
Enche M. Mohamed Ismail
Mrs. Cheah Inn Kiong, P.J.K., J.P.
Mr. Chee Swee Ee, P.J.K., J.P.
Enche H. R. Pawanteh
The State Financial Officer (Mr. N.
Jagatheesan)

In attendance:

The Secretary (Mr. Tan Teik Hock)

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, A supplementary question arising from the reply given by the Hon'ble Member for Butterworth. Will he please state whether there is any member who has been absent for three consecutive meetings?

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, On a point of clarification: I think that question is out of order because the original question is: the members attending the meeting.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, The supplementary question is this: when he refers to members being present at State Education Board meetings, those who are absent—we would naturally like to know whether any one of them has been absent for three consecutive meetings.

Mr. Speaker: I think the Hon'ble Member for Butterworth has given full details of the meetings and the reply can be got from there. This question does not arise.

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

(10) In reply to me at the State Assembly Meeting on 22nd December, 1959, the Hon'ble the Chief Minister stated that nine scholarships were awarded in 1959 and in the details given, the total sum expended for these nine scholarships was \$51,000. Yet in the State Assembly meeting on 22nd March, 1960, the Hon'ble Chief Minister stated that the total sum paid for State Scholarships in 1959 was \$78,623.70. Will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please verify which of his two statements is true and give details of the sums paid to each scholarship winner for verification?

Chief Minister: Sir, I confirm that at the State Assembly Meeting on 22nd December, 1959, I did state in my written answer to the Honourable Member that nine Scholarships were awarded in 1959, but the details in Appendix 'A' of my answer showed the value of the awards made in 1959, and not the total sum expended on these Scholarships in 1959. I am to explain that there is a distinction between total payments to Scholarships holders in 1959 and the total value of Scholarships awarded in 1959. I confirm also that at the State Legislative Assembly Meeting held on the 22nd March, 1960, I did state that the total amount paid in 1959 was \$78,623.70. However, I have since ascertained that there has been a typographical error, and the actual figure should have read \$78,633.70—a difference of \$10. This amount was the actual sum paid to Scholarship holders, and was in respect of Scholarships awarded prior to 1959 as well as in 1959. Except for the small

typographical error showing a difference of \$10, both my statements made at the two Assembly Meetings were true. The statement of the payments made in 1959 to each Scholarship holder as distinct from awards made in 1959 is as follows:

Name	Amount
Enche Abdul Rahim bin Omar	\$ 313.32
Mr. Sion Grand	2,664.69
Mr. Ong Eng Kooi	2,796.30
Mr. Boey Khoon Leong	2,484.32
Mr. Cheah Phee San	658.32
Mr. Choo Kooi Fook	2,883.64
Miss Florence Wang	1,278.32
Mr. Goh Keng Tian	750.00
Mr. Rajaratnam s/o Ponnaiah	430.00
Mr. Lim Say Hup	1,720.00
Mr. Chang Fook Wah	2,120.00
Mr. Michael Lee Ah Chong	2,817.64
Mr. Syed Faidz	300.00
Mr. Alesius Francis Loo Yew Ann	1,732.50
Mr. Patrick Yeoh Khwai Hoh	613.33
Mr. Yeoh Eng Hun	1,686.68
Mr. Prasad s/o Kesavan	2,811.00
Miss Ch'ng Siew Gim	2,811.00
Mr. Yong Wee Chin	2,751.00
Mr. Chee Chin Seang	2,017.00
Mr. Ong-Yeoh Cheang Huat	1,720.00
Miss Tan Boey Geok	2,120.00
Miss Cheang Oi Heng	2,120.00
Miss Chong Swee Fong	2,120.00
Miss Lim Joo Ee	2,520.00
Mr. Tan Beng Cheok	2,180.00
Mr. Lim Say Wan	2,120.00
Mr. Saw Chwee Guan	2,580.00
Mr. Teoh Eng Soon	310.00
Mr. Loh Soon Choy	1,833.64
Miss Lee Kooi Jong	2,120.00
Miss Chuah Kooi Yong	2,120.00
Mr. Khoo Teik Huat	2,120.00
Miss Ong Cheng See	2,120.00
Mr. Mak Joon Jun	2,580.00
Mr. Goh Siew Teong	1,000.00
Miss Foo Tuan Cheng	1,500.00
Mr. Ng Foo Thim	1,000.00
Miss Tan Joo Lan	1,000.00
Mr. Tarcisius Chin Nyet Leong	1,500.00
Miss Woo Quee Heng	1,000.00
Mr. Ong Chin Lee	1,000.00
Mr. Wong Soon Guan	1,500.00
Mr. Koe Eng Jin	1,500.00

\$78,633.70

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, In view of the reply to question 10, question 11 does not arise.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have a supplementary question arising [Interrupted.]

Mr. Speaker: Question 11 has been put.

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

- (12) Is the Hon'ble the Chief Minister aware that the City Council has requested the State Government to agree to the establishment of a Children's Playground near Fort Cornwallis? If he is so aware, will he please give the date of such request?

Chief Minister: Sir, The answer is: Yes. The request was made in July, 1957. In order to consider this proposal, the City Council was requested to submit an overall plan for the area comprising the Fort, the ground and the City Council building on 6th November, 1957. On 29th October, 1959, that is, two years later, the City Council replied that there was no overall plan for the Padang. The City Council was informed in November, 1959 that the future of Fort Cornwallis was bound up with the development in this area and that a new Committee was being established to look into this. A Committee was formed and the City Council was represented on this Committee which examined the question of development of the area including and adjacent to King Edward Place. The report of the Committee is under consideration by the State Government.

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, A supplementary question which is, specifically:

Has the Government considered this question of a children's playground near Fort Cornwallis? The question is not about Fort Cornwallis: it is about having a children's playground near Fort Cornwallis.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, May I ask — is that a supplementary question to the question?

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): That is in the question itself.

Chief Minister: Well, I think my answer is quite clear to that question.

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, With all respect, I say that the answer is so unclear that nobody on this side can understand anything about it except, perhaps, that the City Council did not reply.

Chief Minister: Well, Sir, my answer is: Yes. Is that not quite clear?

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Well, a very long 'Yes.'

Chief Minister: And that 'Yes' has been clarified.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, A supplementary question arising from the reply from the Hon'ble the Chief Minister. He said that the City Council was represented in putting up this plan for this area. Is he aware that the only Committee in which our technical advisers were called is for the development to the Fort and the area adjoining, and has no relevance at all to this children's playground near the Fort? Is he aware of it?

Chief Minister: The Chief Minister should be aware of it.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Well, a supplementary question to that: since the Hon'ble the Chief Minister is aware of it, then the question of a children's playground was never discussed by this Committee and, as such, he has not yet replied to this question 12.

Chief Minister: I am afraid the Hon'ble Member for Jelutong is expressing his opinion.

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

- (13) Is the Hon'ble the Chief Minister aware that the Playing Fields Association is also interested in having this Children's Playground near Fort Cornwallis?

Chief Minister: Sir, The answer is again: Yes. The Chief Minister is aware of this as he is always kept informed of the Penang Playing Fields Association's interests by the President of the Penang Playing Fields Association, Dato Wong Pow Nee! [Laughter.]

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): A supplementary question to that, Mr. Speaker, Sir: I am very happy to note that the Hon'ble Dato Wong Pow Nee is the President of that Playing Fields Association. In view of that, is he aware, then, that the Playing Fields Association has unofficially submitted plans to the City Council for that area and requested the City Council to take up the matter with the State Government?

Chief Minister: I am sure the President of the Playing Fields Association should be aware of what is happening.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): The question is not whether he should, but whether he is aware.

Chief Minister: If he should be aware, he must be aware.

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): It would seem to me that sometimes the President of the Playing Fields Association is not aware of what the Chief Minister is doing. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the question of the Playing Fields Association is not a letter to the City Council asking for this children's playground, and the Hon'ble the Chief Minister is not [Interrupted.]

Mr. Speaker: From the point of clarification: is that a supplementary question?

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): I would like to ask: is the President aware of what the Chief Minister is doing?

Chief Minister: He is one and the same person.

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

- (14) Has the State Government agreed to grant the request of both the City Council and the Playing Fields Association? If it has not, will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please give reasons for the State Government's rejection?

Chief Minister: Sir, The answer is: No. A Committee to examine the question of the development of the areas including and adjacent to King Edward Place was set up in February, 1960. The Committee has completed its report and the Committee has drawn up two schemes for this area. In both schemes there is a provision for a children's playground near the Fort. The two schemes are now being studied by the State Government and a decision will soon be made.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Does the Chief Minister support the decision of the Committee?

Chief Minister: I beg your pardon.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): To refuse granting a children's playground—does the Chief Minister, as the Chief Minister of this State, support the decision of the Committee to refuse to establish a children's playground?

Chief Minister: That is for the Government to decide.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): And what does the President of the Penang Playing Fields Association feel about it?

Chief Minister: If the President of the Penang Playing Fields Association does not support this application, this application will not be submitted.

The Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Tan Chong Bee) asks the Chief Minister:

- (1) Is the Chief Minister aware of the disorderly rush on 1st March, 1961 to get letters of appointment for the renewal of National Identity Registration Cards?

Chief Minister: Sir, The answer is "Yes."

The Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Tan Chong Bee) asks the Chief Minister:

- (2) Is the Chief Minister aware that a woman was injured in the rush mentioned above?

Chief Minister: Sir, The answer again is "Yes," and I wish to take this opportunity to compliment the Honourable Member for Kelawei, that is, Mr Tan Khim Hoe, on his civic consciousness. He took the unfortunate woman to the hospital for treatment.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Mr. Speaker, Sir, Was it the responsibility of the State to guard the door where the woman suffered injury, or was it a Federal (interrupted.)

Mr. Speaker: Is that a supplementary question to Question 2?

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): It is a supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: To Question 1. We are now on Question 2.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): And what was the cause of the rush?

Chief Minister: Everyone wanted to get into the office at the same time.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, A supplementary question to Question 2:

Is the Honourable the Chief Minister aware that attempts were made by the Mayor of the City Council of George Town to contact him even before the accident occurred, to try to have some semblance of order in that area?

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, He might have made an attempt, but unfortunately he went to the wrong queue.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, Another supplementary question:

Is an approach to the Private Secretary to the Honourable the Chief Minister the wrong queue?

Mr. Speaker: I think this question is irrelevant to Question No. 2 which wanted to know the fact whether the Chief Minister knew or not there was an injury or not. The question of the right queue or not does not arise.

The Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Tan Chong Bee): Mr. Speaker, Sir, May we ask the Member for Kelawei how serious was this injury to the woman?

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, May I remind the Honourable Member that questions can only be put to the Chief Minister: and on the direction of the Chief Minister can any Member reply.

The Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Tan Chong Bee): Mr. Speaker, Sir, May we ask the Chief Minister how serious was this injury?

Chief Minister: Sir, May I ask the Honourable Member for Kelawei to reply.

The Member for Kelawei (Mr. Tan Khim Hoe): Sir, The Honourable Member for Tanjong Barat has asked me a question. I am not a doctor, but if he would like a real reply I will get a report from the doctor.

The Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Tan Chong Bee): Sir, I asked that question in order to put another question. The question is: Has the State Government compensated this woman?

Mr. Speaker: Compensation, again, does not arise in this question. It should be in a question—compensation to the woman.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, A supplementary question:

Is the Honourable the Chief Minister aware that the woman suffered a fractured arm?

Chief Minister: I am aware of that, Sir.

The Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Tan Chong Bee) asks the Chief Minister:

- (3) Will the State Government urge the Federal Government to take steps to improve the system of issuing new National Identity Registration Cards?

Chief Minister: Sir, The Commissioner for National Registration has now approved a system for letters of appointment to be issued daily.

The Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Tan Chong Bee): Mr. Speaker, Sir, May we know when this improvement was effected?

Chief Minister: Sir, The new system became effective from 15th March, 1961, and this system it is hoped would have the effect of reducing the number of people seeking appointments on any one day, and shall be preventing a rush.

The Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Tan Chong Bee): Mr. Speaker, Sir, Is it not a fact that after I had submitted my question on the 14th of March that the Registration Department took action and published the news in the "Echo" the next day?

Chief Minister: Sir, The Honourable Member may take the credit if he likes, but action was taken immediately after the accident on 1st March.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, A supplementary question:

Is the present system introduced on 15th March really the old, old system before the rush—the system previous to any system introduced?

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

The Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Tan Chong Bee) asks the Chief Minister:

- (4) Regarding the flooding of certain areas south of Kampong Dalam in the district of

Butterworth, has work been started on the reconstruction of the Mak Mandin Bund?

Chief Minister: Sir, There is no such place called Kampong Dalam in this locality. There is, however, a Kampong Bagan Dalam two miles away from the Mak Mandin area. If this is the kampong referred to by the Honourable Member for Tanjong Barat, I would like to point out that the reconstruction of the Mak Mandin Bund has no connection with the condition in this kampong. However, for the information of the Honourable Member, the work on the reconstruction of the Mak Mandin Bund has started.

The Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Tan Chong Bee): Mr. Speaker, Sir, May I refer to the letter written to me by the Chief Minister on March 11th, 1960, regarding the Mak Mandin Bund. I am afraid there is a word missing in this—maybe a typographical error. It should be Kampong Bagan Dalam. He said there was no such area in the Province as Kampong Dalam. May I ask him if there is such a kampong as Kampong Bagan Dalam? May I ask the Chief Minister if that is correct?

Mr. Speaker: The question should have been put to the Speaker before it comes to the Orders of the Day. If you like, I would refer to your own question which was referred to me. No mention of Kampong Bagan Dalam; it mentions Kampong Dalam.

The Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Tan Chong Bee): Anyway, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I ask if there is such a kampong as Kampong Bagan Dalam.

Chief Minister: Sir, In my answer to the question I said there

was a Kampong Bagan Dalam two miles away from the area.

The Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Tan Chong Bee): Mr. Speaker, Sir, In my question I referred to the Chief Minister's letter to me. That is why this question has been asked. May I ask the Chief Minister to repeat the answer he gave regarding the second part of this question?

Chief Minister: Sir, Is it a supplementary question to that asking when the work was done?

On the 22nd February, 1961.

The Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Tan Chong Bee) asks the Chief Minister:

- (5) If the answer to the above is in the affirmative, when is it likely to be completed?

Chief Minister: Sir, The work is expected to be completed by May, 1961.

The Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Tan Chong Bee): Mr. Speaker, Sir, Question 6 does not arise.

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan) asks the Chief Minister:

- (1) What are the latest unemployment figures for Penang?

Chief Minister: Sir, There are no reliable unemployment figures for Penang as unemployed persons are not required by law to register their names with the Employment Exchanges. However the number of persons who have registered their names with the Employment Exchanges in Penang and Butterworth for work at the end of February, 1961, were:—

Adults.	Males	3,472
	Females	377
		3,849
Youths:	Males	2,612
	Females	337
		2,949

Grand total for males 6,084

" " females 714

6,798

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

How many of this are in Penang Island, and how many are in Province Wellesley?

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

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

Will Government consider adopting legislation to get actual unemployment figures in the State of Penang?

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

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan) asks the Chief Minister:

- (2) Has Government any concrete plans for providing employment for the hundreds of youngsters who have recently passed their Cambridge School Certificate and/or the Federation of Malaya Certificate Examination?

Chief Minister: Sir, The answer is "Yes." The Federal and State Governments have launched their Second Five Year Plans with a view to creating

employment opportunities for a large percentage of those who will be seeking employment, apart from improving the economy of the country and the living standards of the rural population.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Mr. Speaker, What categories of employment are included in this plan for the alleviation of unemployment for school students?

Chief Minister: Sir, All categories.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Specifically, a few examples.

Chief Minister: From lawyers to peons; from doctors to attendants; from managers to toties.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Mr. Speaker, Sir, My question is only in relation to the hundreds of youngsters who passed the 'School Certificate.' Is it the proposal of the Chief Minister then under the Second Five Year Plan that they would give employment to youngsters as peons, as lawyers—under the Second Five Year Plan?

Chief Minister: Sir, There will be ample opportunities.

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

- (1) Is the Honourable the Chief Minister aware that there is a shortage of staff in the Survey Department and that survey work is being held up by such shortage? What does the State Department propose to do?

Chief Minister: Sir, the Survey Department is a Federal Department. However, for the information of the Honourable Member, it is not conceded that there is a shortage of staff in the Depart-

ment, or that survey work has been unnecessarily held up in Penang.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Sir, Is the Chief Minister then aware of a letter written from the Survey Department to another lawyer saying that he must get his survey done not by the Survey Department, due to pressure of work?

Chief Minister: Sir, I am not aware.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Mr. Speaker, Sir, Will the Chief Minister investigate.

Chief Minister: Sir, I shall; but that does not indicate that there is a shortage of staff.

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

- (2) Is the Honourable the Chief Minister aware that the much-vaunted new ferry-boats plying between George Town and Butterworth have taken 8 or more minutes to travel the same distance than previously? What are the reasons and what are the mechanical defects, if any, which has caused this hesitation to finish the journey quickly?

Chief Minister: Sir, The answer is "No." I am not aware of this. I am informed by the Penang Port Commission that the ferry service works to a timetable, and the speed of the vessel is regulated to keep within this timetable. At present the ferry vessel leaves either ferry terminal at intervals of 15 minutes. The new ferry vessels are scheduled to make the crossing under conditions of slack water, that is, when there is no current—this occurs at peak of high tide or trough of low tide—in 12 minutes as against 15 minutes by the old

ferry vessels. The actual crossing is, however, dependent on tide and wind conditions, and whether the ferries have a clear run between the two terminals unimpeded by ships anchored in the roads. Further, marine growth on the hull has the effect of reducing the speed of the vessels. The vessels are scraped regularly in order to remove marine growth from the hulls.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Mr. Speaker, Sir, In other words, the Chief Minister would agree that the new ferry boats have been slowed down in their travel, not because they want to?

Chief Minister: I do not think so, Sir, because they are working according to timetable.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Sir, My reason for asking this under "Supplementary" is because I have timed it. One took about 10 minutes, and another about 15-16 minutes.

Chief Minister: Sir, That may be due, as I have explained earlier, to conditions of slack water.

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very intrigued by the phrase 'slack water.' Could the Chief Minister please explain what that is?

Chief Minister: Sir, I have already explained—when there is no current; peak of high tide or trough of low tide.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Sir, What is trough of low tide?

Chief Minister: Sir, I require notice of that.

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

- (3) Is the Honourable the Chief Minister aware that the lavatory-pans on board these ferry-boats are really cess-pools and cess-pots? What policy has the State Government in this matter?

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am informed that the Penang Port Commission is paying constant attention to the question of keeping the toilets on the ferry service in clean and sanitary condition, but their efforts to achieve this end are being frustrated by misuse of the toilets by passengers. The toilets are frequently blocked by old and discarded articles of clothing, and toilet rolls, paper towels; and liquid soap containers are frequently being pilfered or torn out and removed from the toilets. The Penang Port Commission would appreciate the co-operation of ferry users in keeping the toilet facilities in sanitary condition, and to ensure that the facilities which are provided for the travelling public as a whole are not misused.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Sir, Has the Honourable the Chief Minister visited these toilets?

Chief Minister: Sir, Fortunately I do not have to use it regularly, but I did visit at times; but whenever I visited them they were in quite good condition.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Sir, Is the Chief Minister then aware that the flush systems are automatic systems, and not depressed lever systems?

Chief Minister: I did not pay too much attention to that, Sir.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Sir, Will the Honourable the Chief Minister then assure the public and passengers of the ferry that the flush system will be changed to a depressed lever system.

Chief Minister: Sir, I will convey that to the Port Commission.

I have not yet answered the second part of the question. With regard to the second part, the Penang Port Commission is a statutory authority operating within the portfolio of the Honourable the Minister of Transport, and the State Government cannot therefore formulate a policy on this matter.

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

- (4) Why and for what reasons is the name of the main road in Bukit Mertajam changed or to be changed or proposed to be changed? What name does it carry or what name is it proposed for the road to carry?

Chief Minister: Sir, Under Sections 58 and 65 of the Federation of Malaya Road Traffic Ordinance, No. 49 of 1958, the Bukit Mertajam Town Council is empowered to change the names of any roads within the Town Council area.

If the main road referred to is what was formerly Cross Street, it now carries the following names:

From Town Council limits at Sungei Rambai to the Railway Gate, it is now known as Sungei Rambai Road;

From the Railway Gate up to the junction of Berapit Road, it is now known as Arumugam Pillay Road;

From the junction at Berapit Road up to Town Council limits, it is now known as Jalan Abdul Kadir.

Now, the reason for the change is that the Bukit Mertajam Town Council considers the name Cross Street does not mean anything except that it crosses another street.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Sir, And what do the new names convey — Sungei Rambai, Arumugam Pillay, Jalan Abdul Kadir?

Chief Minister: Sir, The part of the road now known as Sungei Rambai Road is so named because it passes through Sungei Rambai.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Arumugam Pillay Road?

Chief Minister: Sir, Arumugam Pillay Road is in honour of Mr. Arumugam Pillay, a famous philanthropist — a member of the Rural District Council, Bukit Mertajam.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): And a member of the Alliance?

Chief Minister: You have said it.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): The other one?

Chief Minister: Sir, This road is named after the former District Officer, Bukit Mertajam, who rendered invaluable service to the town and to the Council.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Sir, Did the State Government at one time object to these changes?

Chief Minister: Sir, The Town Council is empowered to do that.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): But did the State Government object to these things?

Chief Minister: Sir, I cannot remember that. I require notice.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, Is the Honourable the Chief Minister aware then that that particular Town Council did receive a letter from the Secretariat asking them to reconsider the names to which they have changed?

Chief Minister: Sir, The State Government did ask because some people were opposed to the change.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): To which change?

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

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

- (5) Will the Honourable the Chief Minister inform this Assembly whether there is a population drift from Penang Island to Province Wellesley? Whether certain trades or professions have shifted from Penang Island to Province Wellesley and if so what are these trades and professions and to what extent have such trade and professions shifted?

Chief Minister: In view of the fact that no census has been taken on the movement of population from one area to another within the State, it is difficult to say whether there has been a population drift from Penang Island to Province Wellesley; and for the same reason the State Government is also not aware that there has been any indication of trades or professions drifting from Penang Island to Province Wellesley. However, there might be instances where workers have gone to Province Wellesley looking for employment opportunities, and vice versa.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): And would the Chief Minister say that the goldsmith profession has shifted from Penang Island to Province Wellesley?

Chief Minister: As far as I can see, goldsmiths' shops in Campbell Street have increased tremendously.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): To what extent have they increased tremendously

— from how many shops to how many shops?

Chief Minister: I shall refer that to the City Council.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, Is the Chief Minister aware that the City Council does not issue licences for goldsmiths' shops?

Chief Minister: Well, Sir, at least the City Council must be interested in what is taking place in the City.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Question No. 6 does not arise since the Hon'ble the Chief Minister and the State Government do not appear to know anything about the matter. Therefore, I put question No. 7.

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

- (7) Precisely what policy or plan, if any, has the State Government in hand with regard to the free port status and trade facilities of this island to best secure the economic interests of this State in healthy competition with the growth of Port Swettenham?

Chief Minister: It is the intention of the State Government that the Island should remain in its present status as a free port.

As the Honourable Member is aware, trade is a Federal subject, vide item 8 of the Federal List to the Ninth Schedule of the Federal Constitution. The State Government cannot formulate a policy pertaining to, and connected with, this matter. It is not intended that Penang should compete with Port Swettenham, and neither does the State Government consider Port Swettenham as a rival to the Port of Penang. The State Government considers one as com-

plementary to the other as both of them are serving and fulfilling the needs of the country as a whole. However, the State Government is giving every possible encouragement, within its competence, for the development and the growth of the Port of Penang.

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): A supplementary question, Sir. Has the State Government made representations to the Federal Government for improved port facilities in Penang?

Chief Minister: The Honourable Member might have learnt about the deepwater berth that is coming up in Penang. Is that not an improvement?

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Has the State Government considered a restricted area for free port status in the Island of Penang, or has it not considered that?

Chief Minister: Sir, My answer to the question clearly stated that it is the intention of the State Government that the Island should remain in its present status as a free port — the Island, not a part of the Island.

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

- (8) When will the New Government Buildings be completed? What sort of partitioning would be constructed? In what manner are the floors proposed to be utilised?

Chief Minister: Sir, There are, in fact, three questions in this group. I shall take them one by one.

Firstly, under even conditions the new Government Office Building will be completed in the first quarter of 1962.

Secondly, some brick and cement block partitions are being constructed on the ground floor and around staircases, lift wells and pipe ducts. Partitions generally will be constructed of timber and glass.

For the third part of the question—the floors are to be used entirely for Government offices and necessary amenities. Meeting rooms will also be provided for purposes of official meetings.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Has the State Government decided on partitioning—the sort of partitions on each floor? Is it decided?

Chief Minister: Yes, I think so. **The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang) asks the Chief Minister:**

- (9) What is proposed to be done to the existing Post Office premises and the Government offices sited opposite the Post Office on completion of the new Government Buildings?

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, The future of the existing Post Office premises and the Government offices sited opposite the Post Office is still under correspondence with the Federal Government which, under the Constitution, has a large claim to them.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): What are the correspondence? What nature? Is the State Government prepared to take it over or to lease it to the Federal Government?

Chief Minister: Well, the correspondence deals with the future of these buildings.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): There are so many futures: what sort of future?

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

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

- (10) Has the State Government recovered the monies with respect to the sale of Runnymede Hotel?

Chief Minister: Sir, The proceeds of the sale of the Runnymede Hotel have been paid into State revenue but there has not, in the strict sense of the word, been a recovery of monies and the word "recovery" used is not appropriate in this particular context. The proceeds have all the time been held by the State Government. They were placed in a Deposit Account, pending a decision whether they belonged to the State Government or the Federal Government. Following the decision in favour of the State Government, the monies were withdrawn from the Deposit Account and credited to State revenue.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Was this shown in the Budget?

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

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): A supplementary question. In view of the fact that the Chief Minister requires notice of this question, how can the Chief Minister assure this Assembly that it has been settled?

Chief Minister: It is still to be agreed by the State Government whether it should appear in the Budget specifically or in general. I am unable to tell the Honourable Member now. Therefore, I require notice of that question.

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

- (11) In view of the departure on a pilgrimage to Mecca of His Excellency the Governor and

His Consort, who will be acting as Governor in the absence of His Excellency? Is it the Honourable the Chief Minister? If so, who will be acting as the Honourable the Chief Minister?

Chief Minister: Sir, It is not known yet who will be appointed Officer Administering the Government during the absence of His Excellency the Governor on a pilgrimage to Mecca. The appointment is made by His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong after consultation with the Chief Minister of Penang.

With regard to the second part of the question, the answer is in the negative. Anyone who has made a careful and conscientious study of the Constitution of Penang would have discovered that the Chief Minister of Penang cannot hold the office of the Officer Administering the Government. Now, the provisions of Article 2(2) of the Constitution of the State of Penang, and Section 6 of the Officer Administering the Government (Penang) Enactment, No. 7 of 1958, preclude the Chief Minister, by virtue of his holding an office of profit, from becoming the Officer Administering the Government. Now, the holder of an office of profit can only be considered for appointment as Officer Administering the Government if he resigns from such office of profit.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Sir, Does the Honourable the Chief Minister, as he now is, intend to resign his office of profit?

Chief Minister: Sir, If the people of Penang desire it.

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

- (12) Is the State Government aware that there is a need for a public art gallery in

George Town? Has the State Government any definite views as to whether or not the old Hutchings School be converted into a public art gallery? Or has it in mind other buildings, existing or to be built?

Chief Minister: Sir, The answer is "Yes." The State Government is desirous of converting the old Hutchings School building into a Museum and Art Gallery.

Now, the Federation Government is being approached on this matter as 'Museum' is a Federal subject under Item 13 of the Ninth Schedule of the Federal Constitution, and the building is a Federal building.

Now, some Honourable Members may perhaps recollect that when officiating on behalf of His Excellency the Governor at the Opening Ceremony of the new Hutchings School building on the 8th February last, and also at the opening of the Painting Exhibition on 27th February, 1961, I made reference to the old Hutchings School building and expressed the hope of the State Government to preserve it as a historical building, and that its use as a Museum or the like was receiving active consideration by the Government.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Active consideration! But has it been decided?

Chief Minister: Sir, How can we decide when the building does not belong to us?

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Sir, I am asking a supplementary question. Has it been decided as far as the State Government is concerned.

Chief Minister: Sir, May I ask what decision?

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Decision to use the Hutchings School as a Museum and Art Gallery.

Chief Minister: We have not received a reply from the Federation Government.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Sir, Has the State Government recommended to the Federal Government that this building be made an Art Gallery or Museum?

Chief Minister: Sir, It certainly has.

The Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Tan Chong Bee): Sir, Has the Chief Minister visited this building to find out whether it is fit to house articles of art and museum pieces; or is it not too dangerous for the public?

Chief Minister: Sir, Not only the Chief Minister, but he was accompanied by many of his expert advisers.

(B) WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Chief Minister: Sir, The answers to the questions that have been asked today are laid on the table of Assembly.

Enche Ariffin bin Shariff asks the Chief Minister:

- (1) What action is being taken by Government regarding religious teachers who are teaching in the National Schools and who at the moment receive no remuneration from the Government?

The Chief Minister:

- (1) The question of employment and the salary of religious teachers in primary schools is under active consideration by the Government.

The State Government has recently agreed that the following salary scales should be adopted for religious teachers in Penang:—

Men: \$94 x 4.50 —
157/164.50 x 7.50 — 194.50.

Women: \$90 x 4.50 —
121.50/128 x 6 — 158.

It is hoped very soon that religious teachers employed by the Boards of Managers of these schools will receive appropriate remuneration.

Mr. Tan Chong Bee asks the Chief Minister:

- (1) How many pupils took the Malayan Secondary Schools Entrance Examination in 1960 and how many were superannuated?
- (2) Of the 5,594 pupils who sat for the Lower Certificate of Education Examination in 1960, how many have been promoted to Form 4?
- (3) How many Further Education Classes have been formed in 1961 and how many students are there in each of these classes?
- (4) How much did it cost to run these Further Education Classes in 1960?
- (5) How much will it cost to run these Further Education Classes in 1961?

The Chief Minister:

- (1) 11,347. Superannuation has been abandoned for some years. Of the 11,347 who sat 5,208 have been promoted to fully-assisted or partially-assisted secondary schools, an estimated 2,000 have been retained in Standard 6 in all types of primary schools while the remainder are attending Further Education Centres, private secondary schools or have left school.
- (2) Out of 5,594 pupils who sat for the Lower Certificate of Education Examination in 1960 3,007 were from Fully Assisted Schools. Out of this number, 1,805 were promoted to Form 4

in Fully Assisted Schools. Very many of the remainder have been either retained or absorbed in the Further Education Classes.

- (3) There are 111 classes accommodating 3,949 pupils. Enrolment by individual classes is not available. In addition there are 8 classes for Government Officers.
- (4) These classes are financed by direct grants from the Ministry of Education to the supervisors who submit a requirement to make up the total of fees received to the total cost. In 1960 the Ministry paid out \$86,033.10 cts. by way of such grants to supervisors in Penang.
- (5) It is not possible to estimate the figure at the present moment.

Mr. D. S. Ramanathan asks the Chief Minister:

- (1) What is the procedure for the return of deposit paid by patients at the General Hospital, Penang?
- (2) Why is it that there appears to be a great delay (and consequential inconvenience caused to members of the public) in the refund of deposits after treatment has been completed.
- (3) If the delay is due to the fact that the Medical Department is a Federal Department what steps will the State Government take to speed up the repayment of deposits so that members of the public in Penang may not be put to inconvenience.

The Chief Minister:

- (1) After discharge, a patient will come to the Office of the Hospital, produce his deposit receipt to the Chief Clerk who will then refer to the Clerk-in-charge of Bills to ascertain the amount of balance due and payment is made by cheque.

- (2) It has been ascertained from the Chief Medical & Health Officer that it has been the practice for some years past that claims for refunds of deposits by patients are paid from a Petty Cash Imprest of \$3,000/- maintained by the Hospital authority. At the end of December, 1960, this Petty Cash of \$3 000/- was refunded to the Treasury in accordance with the instructions of the Accountant-General due to a misunderstanding that the Petty Cash Imprest was a 1/12th Imprest, and a Cash Imprest of \$3,000/- was only approved in late February, 1961. Because of the delay in receiving this approval, claims for refund made during January and February, 1961 unfortunately had to be paid in late February.

For 1961, the Accountant-General has decided that the Petty Cash advance shall be treated as a Cash Imprest which does not have to be refunded at the end of the year. It is therefore expected that similar delay will not recur at the beginning of 1962.

- (3) From the answer given to question 2 above, it is obvious that the delay is not due to the fact that the Medical Department is a Federal Department. The question, therefore, does not arise.

4. MOTIONS

(A) Motion by the Honourable the Chief Minister.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, At the last Meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 28th December, 1960, a Motion was passed by this House adopting certain amendments to the Standing Orders of the Legislative Assembly, Penang. Among the amendments made to the Standing Orders was one, now incorporated as Standing Order No.

109A, providing for the establishment of a Public Accounts Committee for the examination of —

- (a) the accounts of the State of Penang, and the appropriation of the sums granted by the Assembly to meet the public expenditure;
- (b) such accounts of public authorities and other bodies administering public funds as may be laid before the Assembly;
- (c) reports of the Auditor-General laid before the Assembly in accordance with Article 107 of the Federal Constitution;
- (d) such other matters which may be referred to the Committee by the Assembly.

Now, paragraph (2) of this Standing Order provides that the Committee shall consist of a Chairman and not more than three other persons to be appointed by the Assembly from amongst its members as soon as may be after the beginning of each Session.

Honourable Members will remember that there is already in existence a Public Accounts Committee comprising of:—

The Hon'ble Mr. Chor Sin Kheng, J.P., as Chairman, and three other Members, namely—

The Hon'ble Mr. Tan Khim Hoe,
The Hon'ble Mr. C. Y. Choy, and
The Hon'ble Tuan Haji Rifaie bin Haji Salleh.

The present Committee was appointed by the Legislative Assembly at its Meeting on 22nd March, 1960, which was the last Sitting of the First Session of this Assembly. In accordance with sub-paragraph (2) of the new Standing Order 109A it is therefore necessary for a new Public Accounts Committee to be appointed 'as soon as may be after the beginning of each Session.' Although this Meeting is the Third Sitting of the Second Session of

this Assembly, this is the first available opportunity for me to move the Motion standing in my name. Honourable Members will recollect that the new Standing Order 109A was only approved by this Assembly at its meeting on the 28th December last.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in this matter of appointing a Public Accounts Committee two courses of action are possible: one is to appoint the existing Committee for another Session, and the other is to appoint a new Committee comprising new members or a mixture of new and old members. In view of the fact that the existing Committee has done excellent work since its appointment, I therefore propose that we adopt the first course of action, that is, to appoint the existing Committee to serve until the sitting of this House immediately after the beginning of the next Session.

Honourable Members will, I am sure, join me in offering our hearty congratulations and thanks to the members of the existing Committee for their excellent work during their term of appointment, and at the same time exhorting them to still greater efforts in their new appointment.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move—

"That this Assembly resolves that the following be appointed as Members of the Public Accounts Committee to examine—

- (a) the accounts of the State of Penang and the appropriation of the sums granted by the Assembly to meet the public expenditure;
- (b) such accounts of public authorities and other bodies administering public funds as may be laid before the Assembly;

- (c) reports of the Auditor-General laid before the Assembly in accordance with Article 107 of the Federal Constitution;
- (d) such other matters which may be referred to the Committee by the Assembly

and to make such report to the Assembly thereon as the Committee may think fit:—

1. The Hon'ble Mr. Chor Sin Kheng, J.P. (Chairman)
2. The Hon'ble Mr. Tan Khim Hoe
3. The Hon'ble Mr. C. Y. Choy and
4. The Hon'ble Tuan Haji Rifaie bin Haji Salleh

of whom the Chairman and two Members shall form a quorum."

The Member for Tanjong Bungah (Mr. Cheah Seng Khim): Mr. Speaker, Sir, Because of the important work that lies ahead of this Committee, and because of the ideal composition, I have great pleasure in seconding the Motion.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to amend the Motion. My amendment would read—

"To delete '(Chairman)' after the words 'The Hon'ble Mr. Chor Sin Kheng, J.P.', and to delete the word 'and' and substitute therefor the word '(Chairman)' after the words 'The Hon'ble Mr. C. Y. Choy'."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is not a frivolous amendment. This is not a jealous amendment. This is not an obstructive sort of amendment. Mr. Speaker, Sir, this amendment arises out of the necessity and the desire to follow the conventions of parliamentary procedure.

As it is well known, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Public Accounts Committee together with the Auditor-General comprises the watchdog over the finances of this State,

over the way money is spent, and over the work of Government offices; and it is more important that the Chairman of such a Committee should not only necessarily be a watchdog but should also be a bulldog; and the best breed of bulldog in parliamentary history always comes from the Opposition.

Chief Minister: May I know, bulldog or bold dog?

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Both. A bulldog is a bold dog, and a bold dog is a bulldog.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, before I go further I would like to state shortly that as far as I can see the finance of this State is run on the following lines: That any revenue that we collect is paid into the Treasury, and it is issued out with the sanction of the Assembly in budgetary Sessions and Sittings with precise Votes. After we have sanctioned it in this Assembly the Treasury will issue it, and the issue will be audited by the Auditor-General. And the Auditor-General himself is an independent officer over whom we have no control. And secondly, the payments are to be issued according to the Votes we grant. It must be issued correctly and there should be no excess expenditure. If there should be excess expenditure then we must sanction that under Supplementary Votes. An account of each year, after the Report of the Auditor-General has been made, is usually sent to the 'watchdog' Committee of this Assembly, the Public Accounts Committee. It has a very precise and very important function. This Committee is not only a purely formal or perfunctory Committee. This Committee must examine the Accounts one by one in very great detail, even to the extent of one dollar, or even 10 cents. There may be long queries on such expenditure.

I can only state that it is usual in parliamentary practice that the Chairman of a 'watchdog' Committee of this nature comes from the Opposition, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to cite a passage to support this principle.

Chief Minister: Is it Parkinson's Law?

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): It is from a well used book, *An Introduction to the Procedure of the House of Commons*, at page 285, with respect to Public Accounts Committee, under Public Accounts Committee. The paragraph I am citing is the third paragraph — "The member elected for the important position of Chairman of Public Accounts Committee is by a convention of long standing a member of the Opposition." And it is because of my desire that we should follow parliamentary practice, and because it is said that it is natural that an Opposition member will be over-zealous — in fact will be very careful — over the way the Government is spending the money that we should therefore appoint a member of the Opposition, Mr. C. Y. Choy, to sit as Chairman of this Committee.

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, In rising to second this amendment, I would like to recall to Members of this House how very often very prominent members of Government, not only the State Government but even the Federal Government, have reiterated the idea that we in this country are trying to form a parliamentary democracy.

The proposer of this amendment has already explained to you the reason why this amendment is being sought. It is not a frivolous amendment, and I don't think that the making of an Opposition member Chairman of this Com-

mittee will in any way hinder or retard the work of this Committee. As a matter of fact I think both sides of this House are equally interested that the Accounts of this State should be kept as perfectly as possible, and that there should be no charge from any quarter that our Accounts are not being kept properly. It would therefore appear that the Opposition request that a member of the Opposition whom the Government has nominated as a member of this Committee should act as the Chairman.

I know that any proposal coming from this side is always looked at askance from the other side, but still I hope that since our request in this case is very reasonable the Government will accede to our request. I therefore beg to second.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, In rising to support the amendment, I would like to call upon this House to remember our own Standing Orders. Our own Standing Order 117(1) says, "In case of doubt the Standing Orders of the Assembly shall be interpreted in the light of parliamentary practice relevant thereto."

Now, it would appear from the mover of the amendment that he has quoted parliamentary practice, and parliamentary practice is to allow a member of the Opposition to be the Chairman of a Public Accounts Committee. I am not charging the Government and stating that they would like always to steamroll any Motion which they move at the Assembly Meeting, but from the measures that they have taken I have a suspicion that if they can stifle the Opposition they would do so. Now, I just quote this for the information of the House. According to our own Standing Order 102, "A Select Committee

shall be appointed on motion and shall consist of such Members as may be chosen by the Assembly and in such manner as shall ensure that, as far as possible, the balance between the Government and the Opposition in the Assembly is reflected in the Committee." I am aware that the Honourable the Chief Minister in moving the appointment of one member of the Opposition has maintained that balance; but in the light of parliamentary procedure he has never consulted the Leader of the Opposition as to that member of the Opposition in this Committee; and I am sure if he were to refer to the Prime Minister he would notice that even in our own House of Representatives whenever members of a Select Committee are being appointed the Prime Minister will consult the members of the Opposition as to which member of the Opposition should be in that Select Committee. It is not my intention to point out the defects of the Government. However, we would like them to consider carefully the points raised by Opposition members since we believe in real parliamentary democracy. Standing Orders and parliamentary practice which serve democracy should not be stifled.

Chief Minister: Sir, I rise not exactly to oppose but I am afraid I am not prepared to accept the amendment.

One Honourable Member said that this Committee is not only a watch-dog but should be a bold and bull-dog; but to the Government, we want it to be a wise and intelligent dog. Bull-dogs sometimes can be stupid: therefore our members in Committee are not only bold but I should say that they are wise and intelligent. Therefore, when I moved the motion, I expressed my appreciation of the good work done by

the members of that Committee. To say that only the Chairman of the Committee should be zealous is, I think, not quite correct. I think every member of the Committee should be zealous and the Chairman is there only to guide. He is not the No. 1 man: neither is he a dictator. He has the members of the Committee to discuss with him and, therefore, whoever is the Chairman makes not much difference to us. Now, saying that we are trying to form parliamentary democracy is, I think, again not very correct. We have been already practising parliamentary democracy. I agree that there is much more improvement to be made but, as far as the Alliance Government in Penang is concerned, we are doing our best to practise this parliamentary democracy.

It is time that this Committee is to watch or to keep a proper lookout on our State accounts but we must not forget that there is an independent body i.e. the Audit Department, with specially-trained people, to examine accounts of the State. I think Honourable Members of this House should have no anxiety over the accounts of the State of Penang.

That Government should discuss with the leader of the Opposition about the appointment of the Committee — may be considered but I think that members of the Opposition should always co-operate with the Government, not to behave like a bull-dog: have the attitude of a wise and courageous dog, treat the Government as your friend, not as a bull-dozer. But, being a responsible Government, we must be firm and sure of our stand.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, Sir, as I said, whoever is the Chairman makes not much difference but, since the existing Committee has done so much good work, I am

sure there is no complaint about any member of the Committee, particularly about the Chairman. I think he has enough experience to carry on for another year.

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): I must object to that. We, on our side, made no complaints about the former Chairman: we only asked that one of us be the Chairman.

Chief Minister: On a point of clarification, I never mentioned that there is any complaint. I said that, since there has been no complaint about any member of the Committee, I feel a change is not necessary.

Mr. Speaker: Before you reply, I would like to remind the Hon'ble Member who would like to speak

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I listened with great interest to the "wise, profound, prophetic" words of the Hon'ble the Chief Minister. I think it is shameful on his part to try to attack the intelligence of a bull-dog. I am sure if a bull-dog were present in this Assembly, the Chief Minister would have found that it is indeed a very wise dog.

I want to stress that we have no quarrel with any member on the Public Accounts Committee but our amendment is on the point of principle and parliamentary practice. Now, if the Hon'ble the Chief Minister were to read Standing Order 109A carefully, it goes to illustrate further my principle. I refer to Standing Order 109A, sub-section (3), where it states that in the Accounts Committee "no member may be appointed or nominated to or act as Chairman or member of the Public Accounts Committee while he is a member of the Executive Council." In other words, the reasons for appointing this Committee is to make it as independent and as impartial a body as possible and this

Accounts Committee would have the benefit and advice of the Audit Department. No one is quarrelling about that. In fact, the Public Accounts Committee depends heavily upon the reports of the Audit Department; and to say that, if the Audit Department is there, there is no need to be careful or to follow that principle in the appointment of the Public Accounts Committee is, I think, a wrong way to look at things. The only right way, I feel, lies in my amendment and I appeal to this Assembly that my amendment be allowed on a point of principle so that we can follow as closely as possible the good practice emanating from Parliament. I therefore appeal to all to allow this amendment to go through and not to use the majority to 'bull-doze' or to 'bull-dog' this amendment.

Question put and amendment defeated.

Mr. Speaker: We are now on the original motion.

Question put and agreed to.

(B) Motion by the Honourable the Chief Minister.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, The Motion standing in my name seeks to confer upon the Chief Minister the authority to alter the proportions assigned to the subheads under a head of expenditure shown in the State Estimates of Ordinary Expenditure, or to create new subheads if the exigencies of the public service render it necessary.

The State Government has accepted the opinion expressed by the Director of Audit and the Solicitor-General that the power to make Virements in respect of the provisions in the State Estimates lies with the Legislative Assembly, which would normally delegate such power to the Chief Minister who would exercise it as and when necessary to meet the exigencies of the public service.

The 1959 and 1960 State Supply Bills each contained a clause empowering the Chief Minister to alter the proportions assigned to the subheads under a head of expenditure, and to create new subheads, but a similar clause was not included in the 1961 Supply Bill. This was not an oversight but a deliberate omission in deference to advice received from the Attorney General that State Supply Enactments should be confined to authorising the issue of sums from the Consolidated Fund and appropriating them to heads of expenditure.

It is known that the Federal Government intends to amend the Financial Procedure Ordinance, 1957, in order to make the matter of Virement in the States clear, but as it is expected that considerable time will elapse before this will come to pass since the Bill will have to go before the National Finance Council before it can go to Parliament it is advisable that authority for the Chief Minister to direct that Virements be made should be sought by means of a Resolution of the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Financial Procedure Ordinance at Section 15(4) makes provision for Virement to be made in respect of Federal Estimates, but this provision is not contained in Part IV, "State Financial and Accounting Procedure" of the Financial Procedure Ordinance. For the benefit of Members, Section 15(4) reads thus:

"15(4) If the exigencies of the public service render it necessary to alter the proportions assigned to the subheads under a head of expenditure shown in the estimates referred to in sub-section (1) or to create a new subhead, the Treasury may direct that there shall be applied in aid of any subhead which may be deficient or any new subhead a further

sum out of any surplus arising on any other subhead of the same head provided that the amount appropriated under any head of expenditure by a Supply Ordinance is not thereby exceeded."

It is held that the Financial Procedure Ordinance does not make provision for Virement in the States, and it is necessary to make such provision in Part IV, "State Financial and Accounting Procedure." However, as I mentioned earlier, amendment to the Financial Procedure Ordinance to include this provision will take some time. It is now necessary to fall back on the advice given by the Solicitor-General in 1958, which is that authority to make Virements should be obtained from the Legislative Assembly, and could be conferred by means of a State Enactment or by a Resolution of the Legislature.

Sir, I beg to move—

"That this Assembly resolves that if the exigencies of the public service render it necessary to alter the proportions assigned to the subheads under a head of expenditure shown in the State Estimates of Ordinary Expenditure or to create a new subhead, the Chief Minister may direct that there shall be applied in aid of any subhead which may be deficient or any new subhead a further sum out of any surplus arising or any other subhead of the same head provided that the amount appropriated under any head of expenditure by a Supply Enactment is not thereby exceeded."

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): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I thank the Chief Minister for his explanation with regard to this Motion, and I must express my

feeling of dismay that he could at least at this stage come to this Assembly, after appearing two or three times in the same matter to put us on a different footing as it were with a different type of explanation. If I remember correctly, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Chief Minister at the Third Sitting of the First Session on 29th October, 1959, moved a somewhat similar Motion, and in his Motion he expressed the view that it has been suggested by the Director of Audit that a more satisfactory method of meeting this situation is by a Resolution of the Legislative Assembly rather than by amendment to the State Enactment, 1958.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Chief Minister has stated categorically that there are powers of Virement given to the Federation Government under Section 15(1), (2), (3) and (4) for the Treasury to use money as it thinks fit if exigencies of public service arise, but under Section 29 of the said Ordinance no such power was given to the State at all. In fact the State relies on Section 32 of its own Constitution for such funds, and these funds, if I may be permitted to read, are thus:

Section 32 of our State Constitution states with respect to the State financial proceedings —

“32. If in respect of any financial year it is found —

(a) that the amount appropriated by the Supply Enactment for that purpose is insufficient, or that a need has arisen for expenditure for a purpose for which no amount has been appropriated by the Supply Enactment; or

(b) that any moneys have been expended for any purpose in excess of the

amount (if any) appropriated for that purpose by the Supply Enactment,

a supplementary estimate showing the sums required or spent shall be laid before the Legislative Assembly, and the heads of any such expenditure shall be included in a Supply Bill.”

The point I am saying is in the manner the State is run. Is it of such importance as in the Federation Government where the Prime Minister has the sole authority to spend money or to transfer moneys from subheads to subheads, and even to the extent of creating subheads? We are a small Government. We do not meet often. In fact we meet once in four to five months. And I think it is because of this reason, precisely because of this reason, that the function of the State Government is not so multifarious that under the original financial procedure no Section of Virement was included or given to the State, whereas such expressed provision was provided for the Federation Government. It is because of this that I have opposed this Motion; and I feel that instead the Assembly could meet as many times — I am prepared to come as many times — for this Assembly to discuss the matter of expenditure, even if it is for one hour. As I said before, the State Assembly is not only the conveyance of democracy but the watchdog of moneys spent by the Government. And because of this I oppose this Motion.

Chief Minister: Sir, In replying to the points raised by the Honourable Member for Kota, I see there is nothing new in the argument raised by the Honourable Member against this Motion — only, as usual, to oppose the Motion.

Question put and agreed to.

(C) Motion by the Honourable the Chief Minister.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, In the year 1957 the Bukit Mertajam Town Council realized that in order to develop Bukit Mertajam Town the Council had to clear slum areas in the town, particularly at Kampong Aston, Kampong Cross Street and Kampong Bahru. To enable clearance of slum areas the Council decided to launch a low cost housing scheme. The Federal Town Planner, Northern Region, and the Malaya Borneo Building Society were consulted. The Malaya Borneo Building Society agreed to act as agent for the Council to implement the scheme. The Federal Town Planner prepared the draft layout plan of the site. Originally it was intended to site the housing scheme on 20 acres of land at Bukit Kechil, but because of the estimated high cost of land an alternative was found at Kulim Road near the Town Council boundary. The area of the site measures about 11 acres.

As the Malaya Borneo Society will only finance the Town Council in respect of construction, and not in respect of purchase of land, the Town Council was faced with the problem of raising sufficient money for the purchase of the land. The Town Council therefore approached the State Government for a loan of \$200,000 to meet the approximate cost of the land. The Town Council has power to borrow money as Section 343 of the Municipal Ordinance has been extended to the Council with certain modifications. Section 343 as modified and applied to the Bukit Mertajam Town Council reads:

“The Commissioners may, with the sanction of the Governor in Council and subject to the provisions of section 344, borrow such sums of money or any part of such sums as are necessary for

the purposes described in subsection (2), and may, with the like sanction, fix such rates of interest and such periods for the repayment of the sums borrowed with interest as they think fit.”

The State Authority gave the application for a loan very careful consideration. As it was felt that the grant of a loan would be in the public interest, the State Government decided to offer the Town Council the loan of \$200,000 on the following terms: at no interest for the first year, at 3% interest for the second and third years, and at 5% interest for the fourth and subsequent years. The Town Council has accepted the State Government's offer. I might also add that the State Authority has given the Town Council sanction under Section 363 of the Municipal Ordinance to purchase the land in question. Section 4 of the Penang State Development Fund lays down that all moneys in the fund shall be applied only to such purposes of development as may be specified by Resolution by the Legislative Assembly. I therefore move the following standing in my name:

“That this Assembly resolves that in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the State Development Fund Enactment, 1958, a sum of \$200,000/- shall be paid out of the provisions in the 1961 State Development Estimates. Head 107, Subhead 25, to the Bukit Mertajam Town Council for the purposes of implementing a Low Cost Housing Scheme by way of a loan repayable in 30 years or when the Bukit Mertajam Town Council has recovered the capital cost from sale of houses, at a rate of interest which will be Nil for the first year, 3% per annum for the second and third years, and 5% per annum for the fourth and subsequent years.”

The Member for Butterworth (Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan): Mr.

Speaker, Sir, In view of the ever-increasing population and the existing shortage of housing accommodation in the Council area, I beg to second the Motion.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, On a point of information, will the Bukit Mertajam Town Council be in existence after 1st April, 1961; and if it is not in existence after 1st April, 1961, to which Council does the State Government intend to grant this loan?

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, If this House approves this Motion today we can give a loan tomorrow, and the Town Council, Bukit Mertajam, can transfer the loan to the incoming Council after the 1st of April if they wish to do so.

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to move an amendment to this Motion. My amendment is the addition of four words, "whichever period is less" after the word "houses" in the seventh line of the Chief Minister's Motion. (Hands in amendment).

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I find this Motion by the Honourable the Chief Minister very interesting because it has introduced a new element in the granting of loans. Obviously Bukit Mertajam is a 'favoured son' of the Government. I have here from past records accounts of various loans granted to various local authorities, but it would appear that in all these cases, and especially where the George Town City Council is concerned, the State Government is just like Shylock, insisting on the pound of flesh which it has estimated to be 5%. Sir, that is why I say the State Government is now, shall I say, becoming more gentle towards local Councils because of Bukit Mertajam. Perhaps that is a good thing because

having set a precedent I believe it is going to be difficult for the State Government to insist on its pound of flesh and fullest extremity of interest. However, that is not the point about this Motion for my bringing in an amendment. The amendment is purely to make this Motion more exact.

It will be noticed that the payment, according to this Motion, will be repayable in 30 years or when the Bukit Mertajam Town Council has recovered the capital cost of the houses. The first alternative is 30 years; but the second alternative gives to the Bukit Mertajam Town Council an indefinite period because it says, "when Council has recovered the capital cost from sale of houses." Of course, it is possible, if the Council is very firm, it might recover the cost well within the 30 years. On the other hand it is also possible that if the Bukit Mertajam Town Council takes a very lax and soft attitude it may go beyond 30 years, to 40 years or 50 years. Then what happens? I am sure that it is not the intention of the Government to give the Bukit Mertajam Town Council a loan on such indefinite grounds; that is why I am trying to move this amendment to limit the period by saying "whichever period is less." It will either have to be 30 years or less. It cannot possibly be more than 30 years. But the Opposition reading of this Motion is that if the second part of the terms for repayment are allowed then Government can only ask back for the money when the Bukit Mertajam Town Council has recovered all the capital cost from the sale of houses. That I feel makes the period very indefinite, and possibly the period may become very prolonged. That is why I moved this amendment which I have just handed over.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

Chief Minister: Sir, In reply to the point raised by the Honourable Member about new elements of loans, I am afraid (interrupted).

Mr. Speaker: I would like to remind Honourable Members that we are on the amendment. If anybody wishes to address the Assembly it should be on the amendment which reads — 'After the word "houses" add the words "whichever period is less".' We are on the amendment.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish to clarify the point raised by the Honourable Member for Sungei Pinang. There are no such new elements in this loan. It follows the same pattern as the loan given to the Butterworth Town Council a few years back; same period, same terms. The Hon'ble Member need not fear that there are new elements just because the Chief Minister comes from Bukit Mertajam.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have to speak on the amendment. The amendment is to give precision to this Motion as stated by the mover of this amendment. We have stated that the Motion as it now stands would allow the Bukit Mertajam Town Council in theory a period to repay the loan in 30 years, or any time after 30 years so long as the capital costs are not yet recovered; that is the condition. 'I can pay within 30 years or at any time, say 50 years, when I recover the capital contribution in 50 years time.' By putting the words "whichever period is less" that means we say that if the Bukit Mertajam Town Council collects the capital cost in 15 years the Council must pay back to the State, but that the Bukit Mertajam Town Council is allowed a furthest limit of 30 years and no more. Whereas the Motion as it now stands allows the Bukit Mertajam Town Council a limit

that is based on recovery of capital cost. They may take 20 years, they may take 30 years, they may take 50 years; no-one can predict. There is no agreement signed. Because on the strength of this Resolution the Bukit Mertajam Town Council is legally entitled to insist that "I can borrow as long as I pay interest to you, for 50 years or even 100 years" and fail to collect the capital cost. That is the point.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, On point of clarification:

As I said just now, the terms are the same as those which we gave to the Town Council, Butterworth; that is to say, that within the 30 years the Council can repay the loan — either within the 30 years or when they recover the capital cost. In other words it may be extended to 40 years, so that the squatters may have the opportunity of paying by more instalments of smaller sums, thus helping the squatters. We are here to help low-cost housing. It is of no use to have to pay \$200 instalment over a shorter period, thereby causing hardship to the people. Now, here is a loan repayable in 30 years; it may be repayable earlier than 30 years or when the Bukit Mertajam Town Council has recovered the capital cost from the sale of houses; What we want is to help the squatters. The object of this loan is to help the Town Council in order to help the improvement of the town and help the squatters.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the amendment. I have listened to what the Honourable the Chief Minister has said about helping squatters by extending the repayment of the loan to even 40 years if necessary. Now, it would appear to us that the State Government is prepared to treat three other

local councils as three real sons. The Honourable the Chief Minister has mentioned that the Butterworth Town Council is receiving the same treatment, and has been given a loan on the same basis, but I am sure he is quite aware that loans being granted to the City Council are based on a different basis.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, On point of clarification:

The State Government of Penang never received any application from the City Council for such a scheme, and for such an amount. They always come to the State Government for millions of dollars which we cannot afford to give.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, The Honourable the Chief Minister is so clever that he has even driven me off my track of mind. I am sure he would realize himself that the City Council has never on any occasion applied to the State Government for a loan in terms of millions. Having said so far, what we are concerned with at the present moment is this: As the Honourable the mover of the amendment says, there is nothing fixed about when the loan is redeemable, and I am sure the State Government will realize, as a responsible Government, that it cannot issue a loan until and unless the State Government will know to what extent or what period the loan would be recoverable. It is quite realized that by having the Motion without the amendment the Bukit Mertajam Town Council may take 40 years. But is there any guarantee that it would not extend to 200 years or 300 years or 400 years as the Motion allows.

I am sure that the State Government will also realize that the life

expectation of even a squatter would not go to even a hundred years; and if, as is being suggested, he would like to help those squatters to see that they can pay in small equal instalments, it is for the State Government then to say either 30 years or even 50 years, which I think could be the life expectation of a squatter. But to have the original Motion as it stands would be a case of an irresponsible Government handing out money without knowing when the payment is going to come.

The Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): (in Malay) Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose the amendment and I am surprised to hear that so much opposition has been levelled against the motion. In compliance with its Manifestoes, it is the intention of the Alliance Government, i.e. the State Government, to encourage the people to build houses of their own. This Assembly should adopt the motion as it would give the people opportunities to have their own houses.

As to the period when the loan could be made payable, that should be left to the local authority. I agree with my friend, the Hon'ble Member for Jelutong, that the owners of these houses would not live for more than a hundred years, because the average life span in this country is only approximately 40 years. Our main aim is to see that the payment of the loan is guaranteed and this could be done by offering the houses as security. The houses would definitely last for more than a hundred years. It is clear, therefore, that the loan would not be given out without any security being offered. As all Honourable Members are aware, the value of the houses, together with the land, is sufficient security for the loan.

That is all, Mr. Speaker, Sir.

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, The Honourable the Chief Minister referred to a loan granted to Butterworth Town Council, but I see from the Minutes of the Fifth Sitting of the Second Session, 22nd March, 1960, in his reply he states that this loan was applied for on the 8th of October, 1956. That would have been before the Opposition appeared in this Chamber. Therefore it is not fair on his part to point out what happened in the case of the Butterworth Town Council. That is why I have said there is a new element.

But it appears to me that the purpose of our amendment is not quite clearly understood by the Government benchers. They have brought in the sentimental argument that it is for squatters, therefore we must help them. If that is the purpose, and it is felt that a longer period should be allowed for the loan, we on this side will say, "All right; make it 40 years or 50 years or 60 years." This morning we have heard that being a bulldog is sometimes stupid, and all the wisdom in the world rests on the other side. Now we find here a Government bringing in a Motion relating to a money matter, and being very imprecise in their terms. We on this side are quite reasonable in not objecting to the loan, but the terms must be precise. The second alternative regarding the period of repayment allowed to the Bukit Mertajam Town Council is most irresponsible because, as various speakers on this side have shown, they can very well say, "It will take us 100 years to recover the capital cost," and they can be perfectly justified legally not to repay the money to the Government. We are not trying to oppose this Motion as a whole. We have not changed even the very favourable terms that the Bukit Mertajam Town Council are being given. We only say that the Motion

should be in precise terms; that there should be no doubt about terms of repayment. I would have thought that that is what any responsible Government would insist on doing.

There is only one thing I wish to add. I wish to refer to the Motion at one of our previous meetings. The Honourable the Chief Minister moved that the City Council of George Town be given a loan of \$200,000 payable in 20 years—very definite period set—bearing interest at 4½% per annum.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, On point of clarification: That was not for a low-cost housing scheme.

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Certainly; I accept that.

There seem to be various ways of dealing with loans to Councils. The Honourable the Chief Minister says this is not for low-cost housing. I would like to reply that this is for flood alleviation, which is a joint responsibility. In fact at that time we made extensive and lengthy speeches pointing out that it is in part (50%) responsibility of the State Government; but I am merely pointing this out in reply to the Chief Minister. Therefore my amendment is merely for the purpose of clearing the ambiguity that is contained in the Motion by the Chief Minister. We have no objections if it is the wish of the Government to extend the period longer to make it 40 years or 50 years; but let us be precise; otherwise I must say that the Government will be open to a charge of irresponsibility in the way this Motion is being framed and moved here.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, On point of clarification:

May I explain again that the reason for the proposed amendment is that there is a doubt in

the terms of repayment. If we were to read the original Motion carefully there should be no doubt at all. So the proposed amendment is uncalled for. Loan is repayable within 30 years or when the Bukit Mertajam Town Council has recovered the capital cost from the sale of houses. We have the Malaya-Borneo Company there. Do you think that the Malaya-Borneo Company will allow 100 years to collect that amount? There should be no such fear.

Mr. Speaker: I think this statement should be made before the Honourable Member winds up his speech.

Question put and amendment defeated.

Mr. Speaker: The amendment is rejected. We are now on the original Motion. (To Chief Minister:)

You wish to wind up on the original Motion.

Chief Minister: No.

Question put and agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Honourable Members,

The Motions are finished. What remains in the Orders of the Day is Adjournment speeches. I think it is proper to adjourn the meeting now until 2.15 p.m. for a lunch break.

The Assembly adjourns.

The Assembly resumes at 2.15 p.m.

5. ADJOURNMENT

Chief Minister: Sir, I beg to move that this Assembly do now adjourn.

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

The Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, In my first Adjournment speech today I wish to refer to a matter in which the Indian population of the State of Penang is very greatly interested. It is the question of having the day of the Thaipusam festival declared a public holiday in Penang. There are very many reasons why it should be fitting and proper for the State Government to declare Thaipusam a public holiday. There is not only a large Indian population in Penang, but Thaipusam in Penang has become a noteworthy festival to which Hindus from all parts of North Malaya flock. While the bearing of kavadis, etc., is of religious significance only to the Hindus, yet one would think from the vast crowds that one sees in Penang on Thaipusam Day that it is now almost a national celebration. I am informed that even Chinese have been known to participate in the kavadi procession, though I have not seen one myself with my own eyes. Besides, until after World War II, Thaipusam in Penang has always been a public holiday, even the colonial Government of the time having been gracious enough to perceive the significance and importance of the occasion to Indians as a whole. I might add that the Thaipusam festival is of special significance to the Tamils, and that it is in Southern India that the Thaipusam festival is celebrated with the greatest fervour. And since most of the Indians in Penang come from Southern India it would be a source of satisfaction to them if Government would consider restoring Thaipusam to its former status as a public holiday in the State of Penang.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, may I speak on my second subject?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish now to speak on the subject of the issue of new Identity Cards. It will be

remembered that there was recently a report in the Press to which some reference was made this morning, that a woman had been hurt in the rush that occurred in the Registration Office over the issue of new Identity Cards. I have been recently up to the Registration Office, not to get a card for myself but to see how conditions are there now, and I found that things have improved and are being done in a more orderly way. Still, I cannot help wondering what necessity there is for Government to insist that people should appear in person to get letters of appointment. Why cannot they simply write and ask for an appointment as is normally done in other circumstances and in other Departments? Why should they appear in person and wait about in a queue for an hour or two to get a simple letter of appointment? The answer that it will greatly increase clerical work is one that cannot be accepted. I have been given the impression that the attitude of Government in this matter is supercilious and inconsiderate in so far as the rights of citizens and their convenience are concerned. I therefore call upon the State Government to take all necessary steps to see that the obtaining of these new Identity Cards is made as easy and simple, and as convenient as possible for our citizens in Penang. I cannot really see why the Registration Department cannot go even further and permit Government officers, large firms and institutions to receive these new Identity Cards through their own departmental heads and senior officers. After all, when national registration first started that was the method adopted by the then Government. Let it not be said that with the coming of Merdeka we care less for the convenience of our citizens than formerly. Besides, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I must point out that since Government has now abolished

the Emergency and celebrated the abolition on a national scale our citizens are to be commended most heartily for their acceptance and tolerance of any system of Identity Cards at all. It is only in dictatorships, and of course South Africa, that Identity Cards and 'Pass' laws exist. Since we are a free and democratic country, the least we can do for our citizens in this matter is to see that in this matter of Identity Cards they do not suffer the least inconvenience or difficulty.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, The people of Noordin Street Ghaut are greatly concerned that the ban on that pier as a legal landing-place has not yet been lifted in spite of the assurance given by the Hon'ble the Chief Minister that the Alliance State Government "will continue to seek the agreement of the Federal Government to an alleviation of the complete ban which at present exists." This assurance was given by the Hon'ble the Chief Minister at the State Assembly Meeting on 24th August, 1959. It is now 29th March, 1961 and still nothing has materialised. The people in Noordin Street Ghaut continue to suffer hardships because their traditional livelihood is taken away.

From this, one wonders whether it is right to accept assurances from the Alliance State Government. From this, one wonders whether the Hon'ble the Chief Minister, who appears very sympathetic towards these people when he says that "it is also tragic that by doing so the traditional livelihood of so many families should have been prejudiced by the selfish actions of probably a small number of misguided and unscrupulous individuals," expects the people to live on sympathy

alone. If not, he should have given this matter "top" consideration and an early and favourable decision expected from the Federal Government.

No amount of visits to Noordin Street Ghaut by the Minister of Finance, by other Ministers or by the Chief Minister himself is going to convince the people in that area that the Government is really looking into their interests when their livelihood is taken away from them. It is for the Alliance Government, both at State and Federal levels, to give them their livelihood by re-opening the pier as a legal landing-place.

The reason for closing the pier, i.e. that a small number of misguided and unscrupulous individuals have used the pier as a means of contravening Customs and other laws and regulations is no longer valid when the majority of the people are prepared to give their undertaking to form "vigilant corps" to help Government and see that the Customs laws are not broken. This co-operation should be welcomed by the Alliance State Government. It should not shun such co-operation.

I, therefore, appeal to the State Government to take up the matter as an urgent one with the Federal Government and the pier to be re-opened, if possible, within the next month or so.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Mr. Speaker, Sir, All of us are agreed that there is unemployment in this State. All of us are agreed that we cannot obtain proper figures of unemployment. All of us are agreed that we cannot fathom the depth of unemployment in this State, neither can we categorize unemployment in this State. From the little we can obtain from the Employment Exchanges we find that in 1957 those registered with

the Exchanges and from the Department of Labour & Industrial Relations, registered there in 1957 — for the State of Penang amounts to 3,067; in 1958 — 3,383; in 1959 — 4,247, and, as the figures given by the Chief Minister this morning, in 1960 — 6,798. There appears therefore to be a tendency of increase of unemployment, or it can be that there is a tendency of people using Employment Exchanges. But the point I want to stress is that we do not have the facts or figures to work on; and the point I want to stress again is: What are we to do in the face of lack of figures in order to start on the problem of tackling unemployment? I would suggest that we carry out a two-pronged attack on unemployment. The first prong will bear an administrative imprint. I would suggest to the State Government that they should seek the assistance of the Federal Government to set up a Commission with terms of reference: to go into the basis of unemployment in this country; to gather information and facts of the numbers of those unemployed on categories of unemployment, and other things; and to make concrete recommendations for this Assembly to work on. I think we have to do this on a State basis because it is easier. To wait for the Federation Government to carry it out on a Federal basis may take a much longer time; and I feel the duty of the State is to seek the assistance of the Federal Government for powers to set up the Commission. We can provide the manpower; we can arrange for finance to come out from the State budget because it is very important we must know whether our unemployment in this country is structural unemployment, or due to recession in the rubber trade or fall in tin exports, or whatever it is. And before we can know that we must get the facts; and it is only when we have the facts

before us that we know in what way to attack this problem, whether we have to use the fiscal method, credit policies, or to provide relief work for unemployment. At the same time, while we carry out on the administration side the fact-finding Commission, we could at least try to have a cash programme to provide relief for those unemployed. Even if it is of a small nature, yet it does help in some little way. I would refer to the fact, as an instance, that whenever money can be spent usefully on a capital improvement project, and a large part of it goes to the payment of labour, we must try to give preference to this type of capital projects.

We say that the Federation Government has carried out rural improvement under the Five-Year Plan. But is that sufficient enough? Have we got certain facts that rural improvement will really solve unemployment in city areas, or help in certain types of trade and industry? Of that we have no facts, and I think a Commission is very necessary.

And I feel, referring to the hundreds of school children who are unemployed because they cannot get jobs, I think the State Government could give them some sort of a service on a wide basis, such as going to people to register changes in identity cards, or to issue new identity cards. This is a case. And if we recollect when we want to stand for election we go to the people and promise them services. Here is a chance, a double edged sort, for employment and training of the youth: and let them carry out the programme of registering new identity cards.

That is all I have to say on the subject of unemployment.

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

3rd August, 1960, the Chief Minister stated that he would consider erecting a shed outside the Registration Office so that members of the public who would have to wait for their turn to go into the Registration Office would be protected from the sun and the rain, but so far nothing has been done.

If at all a shed has been erected, may I know where it is? I suppose the shed would be erected only when issuing of new Identity Cards would be about to be completed!

There is always a big crowd at the Registration Office where members of the public go to get their new Identity Cards and Citizenship Certificates and they all experience many inconveniences. This is very much regretted and the State Government should take steps to remedy this. I am quite sure the State Government is fully aware of the difficulties experienced by these people. They always have to wait for a long time. In my opinion the Government should open an Enquiry Office where the clerks on duty should give assistance and guide the illiterate members of the public, so that they could obtain their new Identity Cards and Citizenship Certificates easily. If the request of the public for an Enquiry Office could be met with by the Government, then Government would have rendered a valuable service to the ra'ayat. If this could be arranged, the public would not have to incur unnecessary expenses.

The State Government should also realize that the public have to face another difficulty in getting their new Identity Cards and Citizenship Certificates in that the staff of the Registration Office do not take their work seriously and they are also discourteous. This has been going on for the last six months.

There has been much delay and the ra'ayat are very dissatisfied. I hope the State Government will take immediate action to remedy the situation.

Thank you.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, While I appreciate the Hon'ble Member's request for Thaipusam to be declared a public holiday in Penang, it is a matter of regret that it is not possible to accede to this request without committing breach of an agreement which exists between the eleven States and the Federal Government. Section 9 of the Holidays Ordinance lays down that the Governor in Council may appoint a day additional to the Federal public holidays to be observed as a public holiday in the State but, by agreement with the Federal Government and the other States, it was decided to restrict the number of additional holidays to four State public holidays in a year. The States were allowed to select their own State holidays. In Penang, the State public holidays are Easter Monday, Wesak Full Moon Day, First Day of Muharram, and His Excellency the Governor's Birthday. It may be argued that one of these holidays should be deleted and Thaipusam be substituted therefor as a public holiday.

As regards the declaration of His Excellency's Birthday as a State public holiday, I am sure you will agree that there can be no argument against this. His Excellency the Governor is the head of the State and the declaration of his birthday as a State holiday is in accord with the status and dignity of his office.

Easter Monday has been declared a holiday not because of its religious significance but to provide a long week-end to facilitate the holding of sports meets at all levels. It is to be noted that Good Friday is already

a Federal public holiday and the long week-end enables sports organisations in Penang and other States to take advantage of this opportunity to stage inter-State sports meetings. For instance, sports enthusiasts will be able to witness the Federation vs. Singapore Cricket 'Test' at Penang during the coming Easter Holidays. You may ask me why sports should be given this prominence: it is the policy of both the Federal and State Governments to give as much encouragement as possible to the organising of sporting activities. We feel that through the medium of sports much good can be achieved for the people and the country. I also wish to add that the long week-end at Easter enables many of us who find it impossible to take vacation leave to obtain some rest during this week-end.

As regards the two remaining State holidays, it was decided that they should be assigned to religious occasions. To enable the selection of two such occasions Government considered the merits of the claims of all communities and religious denominations. The only criterion which Government could use was the population strength of the various religious denominations in the State. As the overwhelming majority of the Chinese are Buddhists and all Malaysians are Muslims, the following religious occasions were selected:—

- (a) Wesak Full Moon Day;
- (b) First Day of Muharram.

For information of the Assembly, the 1957 population census for Penang was as follows:—

(a) Chinese	327,240
(b) Malaysians	165,092
(c) Indians	69,035

I might also add that in Penang a fair proportion of Indians are Muslims. If we combine the Federal and State holidays, it will

be observed that five days are Muslim holidays, three days are Chinese or Buddhist holidays, three are Christian holidays (including the Easter holidays), and one day a Hindu holiday. As I said earlier, Easter Monday has been declared a public holiday principally because of its contribution to sport. In effect, therefore, Christmas would appear to be the only Christian holiday declared for its religious significance. If we take into consideration that the State religion of the Federation of Malaya is Islam and the population strength of the Malays and the Chinese, the number of holidays assigned to each of the major religious denominations would appear to be in keeping with the status of the State religion of Persekutuan Tanah Melayu and proportionate to the numbers professing the various religions. The total number of holidays in the Federation, including State holidays, is fifteen days per year and this is considered a fairly high proportion of holidays compared to many other countries. As I said, it is not that the Penang State Government wishes to reject out of hand the claims of the Hindu community for Thaipusam to be declared a public holiday. As you can see, it is not possible to do so without deleting one of the State public holidays, or without committing a breach of the agreement between the State Governments and the Federation Government. However, Government as a good employer allows its employees a maximum of four days' unrecorded leave per annum, to be taken on occasions of religious significance. Hindu officers can take advantage of this privilege and avail themselves of leave within the limit of the four days, on the occasion of Thaipusam, in order to fulfil their religious obligations. I hope other employers would also willingly grant

a holiday to Hindu employees on the occasion of Thaipusam.

Now, coming to the question of issuing of identity cards. I wish to say that the issue of identity cards was enforced with effect from 1948 under the Emergency (Registration Areas) Regulations, 1948. With the end of the Emergency on 31st July, 1960, the Federal Government decided to continue the system of national registration and the National Registration Act, 1959 was brought into force on 1st August, 1960.

Under this new Act, all persons above the age of 12 years resident in the Federation are required to take out new identity cards. However, in order to avoid a rush of people presenting themselves for registration, it was decided that a period of 2½ years, i.e. from 1st August, 1960 to 31st January, 1963, be allowed for people to re-register themselves.

Now, in Penang there are five registration centres, namely:—

- (a) The Registration Office, Penang;
- (b) Balik Pulau;
- (c) Butterworth;
- (d) Bukit Mertajam; and
- (e) Nibong Tebal.

The scheme envisaged is that the people living in these towns (excluding George Town), will be registered within this year after which the four teams in the districts will become mobile and start registration in the villages on a prearranged and publicised time-table.

The teams in the Balik Pulau and Nibong Tebal districts have almost completed re-registration in these two places and, with effect from 1st May, 1961, they will be registering at certain villages for a certain number of days in each village. The period scheduled for each locality is

based on its estimated population and ranges from 6 working days for Pulau Aman to 150 working days for Bayan Lepas.

Now, the purpose of setting up registration centres in the districts and making the teams mobile is to cause as little inconvenience as possible to people living in the kampongs as well as to save the public transport expenses.

The Registration Office at George Town will not become mobile and will be open for re-registration throughout the period of 2½ years. This, I think, could be brought to the notice of our people by Honourable Members.

Now, coming to the Adjournment Speech by the Hon'ble Member for Jelutong about Noordin Street Ghaut, I wish to remind the Hon'ble Member again that the question of the re-opening of Noordin Street Ghaut is a matter for consideration by the Federal Government. The same reasons I advanced in reply to the Member for Tanjong Selatan at the State Legislative Assembly Meeting held on 24th August, 1959 hold good to-day. However, for the benefit of Hon'ble Members, I would like to set out briefly the history pertaining to the closing of Noordin Street Ghaut Jetty.

When, in 1953, Legal Landing-Places under the Customs Ordinance, 1952 were defined, Noordin Street Ghaut Jetty was not included in the list of such places. Mr. Tan Ghim Lee in 1956 petitioned the Government to vary the First Schedule of the Customs Regulations, 1953, to include Noordin Street Ghaut Jetty as a legal landing-place. This was considered favourably by the Government and Noordin Street Ghaut Jetty was declared a legal landing-place and gazetted as such in L.N. 285 of 13th September, 1956. The licensee, Mr. Ghim Lee, was at the same time informed that

the concession would be withdrawn in the following circumstances:—

- (a) As soon as, in the opinion of the Government, Weld Quay provides adequate facilities for handling cargo to be landed or shipped at George Town;
- (b) If any Customs or related offences are committed either by the petitioner or any other party in connection with the landing or shipping of goods at the pier.

The petitioner was also informed that the concession might be withdrawn, without any reason assigned, at three months' notice.

As a result of offences detected, action was taken in 1957 to withdraw the concession and this was eventually accomplished in L.N. 111 of 18th March, 1958. Before the concession was withdrawn, the Federal Government wrote to Mr. Tan Ghim Lee's solicitors informing the latter of the Customs offences which had been committed in 1957 in connection with the landing or shipping of goods at Noordin Street Ghaut Jetty. The Government informed Mr. Tan's solicitors that in these circumstances it was proposed to withdraw the concession declaring Noordin Street Ghaut Jetty as a legal landing-place, and Mr. Tan was asked to show cause within a period of 10 days from receipt of Government's letter why the concession should not be withdrawn. As far as can be ascertained, Mr. Tan did not show cause nor was any reply given.

After the publication of L.N. 111 dated 18th March, 1958, Mr. Tan Ghim Lee petitioned the Chief Minister to re-open Noordin Street Ghaut Jetty. In his petition it was alleged that the former Settlement Government of Penang had intimated to him that landing facilities pertaining to the use of Noordin Street Ghaut Jetty would not be interfered with until the

year 1959. This allegation appeared to be the only ground for considering this petition. However, the allegation was found to be not correct because the Settlement Government did not make any such promise. It is to be mentioned that, when the concession for the use of the Jetty was granted, a warning was issued that should other facilities for landing and embarking goods become adequate, the use of Noordin Street Ghaut Jetty would cease. In late 1958, the following improvements had been effected:—

- (a) The Penang Port Commission landing area had been extended by the removal of Victoria Pier;
- (b) The area between the Penang Port Commission fenced landing place and the Church Street Pier had been surfaced and landing into and embarkation from lorries directly (rather than along bagans) had facilitated more rapid handling of goods;
- (c) The reclamation between Malay Street Ghaut Pier and the Prangin ditch had enabled goods to be landed direct into lorries at the seaward end of the pier, thereby obviating carrying of cargoes by labourers the full length of the pier.

Thus it will be seen that great improvements had been made by 1958 along Weld Quay to facilitate the landing and shipping of goods.

Again, in March, 1959, Yeoh Boon Cheang and others petitioned the Chief Minister saying that they would do their best to co-operate with Government and that they were prepared to enter into a bond of \$1,000 to be forfeited by the Government if there was reason to believe that the jetty was being misused for illegal traffic within three months of its opening. Earlier, the same persons had also informed Government that more than 200 families total-

ling over 2,000 people were in sore distress because of the closure of Noordin Street Ghaut Jetty. This matter was referred to the Minister of Finance by me. The matter was fully investigated by him and it was concluded that it would not be in the public interest to re-open Noordin Street Ghaut Jetty as a legal landing-place. The following factors were revealed:—

- (a) During 1958 about 20 Customs offences were committed, either on this jetty or in the harbour by residents of the jetty;
- (b) The total population of the jetty was about 400 and not 2,000 as alleged in the petition. Enquiries revealed that most of the adult males, numbering about 100, were employed as casual labourers on Weld Quay, and the suggestion that the families living on the jetty were in "sore distress" was not quite correct.

It was also revealed that in 1959 there were adequate facilities for landing and shipping the trade of Penang across the legal landing-places at Weld Quay. In August, 1959, this matter was the subject of an Adjournment Speech by the Hon'ble Member for Tanjong Selatan. In November, 1959 Mr. Yeoh Boon Cheang and others were informed that, in the light of facts revealed, it was difficult to establish a strong case for re-opening of the Jetty; but, if further grounds could be produced, Government would certainly consider them. No reply was received to this letter. I have had several discussions with the Minister of Finance for the re-opening of Noordin Street Ghaut Jetty. I must remind you again that the matter rests with the Federal Government and I shall bring this matter up again for the Minister's consideration.

The question of unemployment raised by the Honourable Member for Kota:

I am glad to note that the Honourable Member agrees that there is no fool-proof method of measuring actual unemployment. There is no doubt that there is unemployment in the country, as with most other countries, but the degree of unemployment in our country has not assumed such proportions as to cause alarm or panic. The Government is fully alive to the fact that the rate of population growth, that is 3.3%, is one of the highest in the world. However, a study of a few urban areas conducted in 1959 did not show an excessive level of unemployment.

The register of unemployed persons at the Employment Exchange is the only yardstick we have to measure unemployment, but it is not a very effective measure. Let us take a look at the following figures:—

- On 1. 1.60 — 4,762 registered;
- On 31.12.60 — 6,666;
- On 28. 2.61 — 6,798.

On the face of it, it would appear that the number of unemployed persons in the State is increasing. This would be so if it were not for the following factors:—

No unemployed person is compelled to register himself for employment;

Those in employment also register themselves at the Employment Exchange for jobs better suited to their qualifications and ability;

There are those whose names appear on the register but who have obtained employment through other means and have not informed the Exchange of their having obtained employment;

There are those who register themselves temporarily for employment, such as students awaiting admission to colleges or universities, or students on long vacations.

Well, in addition to the above factors it must be borne in mind that a number of persons registered with the Exchange are not bread-winners with families to support. Many register themselves to supplement the family income.

This is not to say that the Government is complacent and prefers to do nothing to abate unemployment in this country. There is no doubt that more and more youngsters are leaving school for whom jobs will have to be found. It is for this reason that the Federation and State Governments have launched the Five Year Plans for the period 1961 to 1965. The Federal Second Five Year Plan aims towards an expansion of 20% to 25% of the total national output of the economy during the next five years; and with this expansion employment opportunities should be created on a sufficient scale to provide jobs for the expected increase of almost 340,000 workers.

Now, Chapter II of the Second Five Year Plan 1961 — 65 on the "Problems of economy in the Federation of Malaya and the objectives of the Second Five Year Plan" sets out in detail what the Federal Government hopes to achieve during this period in abating unemployment. If Honourable Members have not seen the Report, I have the book here. It is available from the Government Printer.

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): At \$2.50

Chief Minister: That is right. Nothing is free in this world.

In so far as the State Government is concerned, the Second Five Year Plan aims to ensure progressive and orderly development of urban areas, to provide proper office accommodation for Government departments and adequate housing for lower paid Govern-

ment employees, to encourage the expansion of trade and industries in the State, to stimulate the expansion of housing development in urban areas, and to improve quarry output in the State to meet future demands. Now, all these economic developments it is hoped will create opportunities for employment in the State. The State Government hopes to attract the establishment of manufacturing industries, and in this context the State Government is actively considering the development of an industrial estate. It will be observed in the 1961 State Estimates that some \$14 million is provided in the Development Estimates. A big proportion of this development is for works and projects which undoubtedly will create opportunities for employment.

Although there is unemployment in the State, and in the country as a whole, I am hopeful that the materialisation of the Federal Second Five Year Plan, the State Second Five Year Plan, and also the Five Year Rural Development Plan will nullify any trend in the increase of unemployment in the country. If anything, it is my belief that there will be a tendency towards fuller employment within the period 1961 — 1965.

I am glad that for once the Members from the Opposition did propose some concrete proposals for the consideration of Government, and that is if possible to set up a Commission to survey or to investigate the problem of unemployment. Although I must say that there is no comprehensive survey of this problem, rest assured the Government is always in touch with the Labour Department and the Labour Minister in this matter.

However, I would like to mention that all that we have heard from Members from the opposite bench is a spate of criticism of

the Government party as to the Government's inability to do this or to do that, why this was not done, and why that will not be done. There is no constructive criticism except this one; and no positive measures have been suggested to combat unemployment, to provide welfare on a wider and more equitable scale, to reduce inconvenience caused to the public in the matter of obtaining new Identity Cards. When the budget for 1961 was debated at the last budget meeting it was described as not realistic, not progressive and not dynamic, and that was just about all.

Now, if any Honourable Member was desirous of putting forward any project which would have brought about greater benefit to the people he should have made concrete proposals with facts and figures, for instance, made concrete proposals as to what should be done to reduce unemployment, how to provide welfare on a wider and more equitable basis. We only hear a few speeches saying this or that is happening. At question time I am asked whether I am aware of this, or am I aware of that, or what Government proposed to do, or what Government has done. Honourable Members are expected to do more than just indulge in criticism and doubt. Whether from the Opposition bench or not, Members of this Assembly are collectively responsible for the development and progress of our State, and the wellbeing of our citizens. Government is also receptive to concrete proposals and responsible, sound advice, supported by facts and figures, as long as such proposals and advice, are for the good of the many and the prosperity of our country. Government operates on a limited budget, and its resources are by no means exhaustive, and for this reason it may not be possible for the Government to implement im-

mediately all the good proposals received; but I am sure much good can be accomplished in the process. As leader of a responsible Government, I invite criticism, but I would appreciate if it took a more constructive form.

(Continuing in Malay:)

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in reply to the Hon'ble Member for Tanjong Tengah's speech, regarding the erection of shelters at the office mentioned, I admit that the State Government of Penang has promised to erect those shelters but we can do nothing if that office does not ask for the work to be done. In fact, I have told the officer in charge that, if those shelters are really needed, the Government is always ready to implement the work. In the speech made by the Honourable Member, he said that the officers of that office were rude — I hope the Honourable Member will. [Interrupted.]

The Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): (in Malay) I beg your pardon.

Chief Minister: (continuing) inform me of that matter, and I will then investigate and take necessary action. But I think it is not sufficient to just say that they are rude. I sincerely hope that the Honourable Member will not be shy or ashamed. I extend an invitation to him to come to my office or to my residence: I will offer him a cup of coffee and we can then discuss on how to improve the organisation of every office, as the Honourable Member said just now.

I think there is no need for me to repeat my speech made in English because I am sure the Honourable Member will be able to understand it. But I would like to stress again that the State Government will strive, in every way possible, to help the ra'ayat to achieve progress and prosperity. Therefore, I am asking the Honourable Member not to be shy but to come to my place and let me know his complaints so that we can consider them.

Thank you.

The Assembly adjourned at 3.15 p.m.



