

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS
OF THE FIRST LEGISLATIVE
ASSEMBLY, PENANG

3 RD SITTING OF THE
FOURTH SESSION WEDNESDAY
28 TH NOVEMBER, **1962**

KPP
328.595123
PEN



0-117962

PPAPP



1000761410

PERPUS
12✓
*
PULAU

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

THIRD SITTING OF THE FOURTH SESSION
WEDNESDAY, 28th NOVEMBER, 1962.

PRESENT:

- The Hon'ble Mr. Speaker (Tuan Haji Sulaiman bin Haji Ahmad, P.J.K.)
" the Chief Minister (Dato Wong Pow Nee, P.M.N.)
" the Legal Adviser (Enche Wan Suleiman bin Pawan Teh)
" the Member for Glugor (Enche Aziz Ibrahim, J.M.N., J.P.)
" the Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik, A.M.N., J.P.)
" the Member for Sungei Bakap (Mr. Kee Yong Chin, J.P.)
" 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 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, P.J.K.)

ABSENT:

- The Hon'ble the Member for Tanjong Bungah (Mr. Cheah Seng Khim, J.P.)
" the Member for Bagan Ajam (Mr. Phee Joo Teik)

1. THE PRAYER.

2. PRESENTATION OF PAPERS.

Chief Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon membentangkan di-atas meja Dewan, Risalat2 yang berikut:—

Bil. 12 tahun 1962 — Laporan Pentadbiran Tanah Negeri Pulau Pinang bagi tahun 1961.

Bil. 13 tahun 1962 — Laporan Pemangku Juru Odit Negara mengenai Kira2 Negeri Pulau Pinang bagi tahun 1961.

Bil. 14 tahun 1962 — Peranggaran Perbelanjaan Biasa Negeri Pulau Pinang Tambahan yang Ketiga, tahun 1962.

Bil. 15 tahun 1962 — Peranggaran Pembangunan Negeri Pulau Pinang, tahun 1963.

Bil. 16 tahun 1962 — Peranggaran Hasil dan Perbelanjaan Biasa Negeri Pulau Pinang bagi tahun 1963.

Bil. 17 tahun 1962 — Penyata Perbelanjaan Serta Merta dan yang di-luar Jangkaan yang menyebabkan pinjaman daripada Kumpulan Wang Belanja Mengejut.

3. (A) ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

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

1. Will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please state whether Tuan Haji G. M. Yusoff is still the Temporary President of the Religious Affairs Department, Penang?

If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please reply whether he will be confirmed in his present appointment?

If the answer is in the negative, will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please reply whether he has resigned of his own accord or whether he has been dismissed from office, and who is his successor?

And whether his successor was appointed by the Public Services Commission or by interview with the State Executive Council.

Chief Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jawapan-nya — tidak.

Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, since the reply is in the negative, I think that that the Hon'ble the Chief Minister would have got to reply to the second part of it still.

Chief Minister: I am sorry. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya minta ma'af. Jawapan kepada soalan bahagian (a) ia-lah 'tidak', kepada bahagian (b) jawab-nya — soalan ini tidak berbangkit, jawapan kepada soalan bahagian (c) ia-lah — ia meletakkan jawatan dengan sendiri-nya. Ia-nya telah di-gantikan oleh Tuan Haji Ahmad Maliki. Jawapan kepada soalan di-bahagian (d) pula ia-lah — sebagaimana yang di-sembahkan oleh Surohanjaya Perkhidmatan Awam, Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda Yang di-Pertuan Agong telah menitahkan supaya Tuan Haji Ahmad Maliki di-lantek sebagai Yang di-Pertua Sementara, Jabatan Hal Ehwal Ugama, mulai daripada 13hb. March, 1962.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, arising from the Hon'ble the Chief Minister's reply to part (a), he has not made clear yet whether it was resignation or dismissal in the case of Tuan Haji G. M. Yusoff.

Mr. Speaker: The Chief Minister had replied that his resignation is of his own will.



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

2. Will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please reply whether or not it is that Enche Rahim Khan was transferred from the Treasury Department to the Religious Affairs Department while he was still holding the post of UMNO Secretary, Penang Division, to understudy the Secretary of the Religious Affairs Department?

If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please give the date on which Enche Rahim Khan was transferred to the Religious Affairs Department?

Will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please give the academic qualifications and experience of this officer?

Will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please state whether it is the State Government's intention to confirm Enche Rahim Khan in his appointment of Secretary of the Religious Affairs Department?

If the answer is in the negative, will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please reply whether there are any other applicants more qualified than Enche Rahim Khan for this appointment and also whether this appointment will be made through the Public Services Commission or by interview with the Executive Council?

Chief Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jawapan-nya tidak, perkara ini tidak benar. Jawapan kepada soalan 2(b) jawapan-nya — oleh kerana jawapan kepada soalan di-atas itu ia-lah 'tidak', maka soalan ini tidak-lah berbangkit. Jawapan kepada soalan 2(c) — Tuan Haji Rahim Khan lulus darjah 8 Sekolah Inggeris. Ia telah bekerja dengan Kerajaan semenjak bulan September tahun 1945 dan oleh itu ia mempunyai pengalaman sebagai kerani selama 17 tahun. — Jawapan kepada soalan

2(d) oleh kerana Tuan Haji Rahim Khan belum lagi di-lantek menjadi Setia Usaha, Jabatan Hal Ehwal Ugama, maka soal hendak menetapkan-nya dalam jawatan itu tidak-lah berbangkit. Jawapan kepada soalan 2(e) — oleh kerana jawapan kepada soalan di-atas bukan-lah 'ia' dan bukan pula 'tidak' maka soalan ini sebenarnya tidak-lah berbangkit. Sunggoh pun begitu, i'lan untuk menenahi Jawatan Setia Usaha, Jabatan Hal Ehwal Ugama itu, belum-lah lagi di-siarkan dan oleh itu, tidak-lah dapat di-sebutkan siapa-kah pemohon2-nya dan apakah kelayakkan2 mereka. Lantekan tetap bagi jawatan Setia Usaha, Jabatan Hal Ehwal Ugama terpaksa-lah di-siarkan mengikut chara biasa dan chalun2 akan di-temu-duga oleh Surohanjaya Perkhidmatan Awam.

Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Mr. Speaker, Sir, a supplementary question — are there any other applicants more qualified than Tuan Haji Rahim Khan?

Chief Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jawapan itu sama dengan jawapan saya kepada soalan kedua (e) jawapan saya.

Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Are there more applicants and who are they?

Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, a supplementary question. In view of the reply given by the Hon'ble the Chief Minister, may we ask who is the present Secretary of the Religious Affairs Department.

Chief Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Tuan Haji Ali Rouse.

Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): In view of that reply, a further supplementary question. Since the Secretary of the Religious Affairs Department is Tuan Haji Ali Rouse, will the

Hon'ble the Chief Minister please state in what capacity then Enche Rahim Khan attends the Council meetings of this Department?

Chief Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya minta notis di-atas soalan itu.

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

3. Will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please state in detail, giving the names and the departments to which they are posted, Government employees who are known to hold office in political parties since Merdeka 1957, and who are grouped under "B", under the Circular regulating the conduct of Government Servants in political parties' activities?

Also, whether such officers obtained permission from the Head of State to participate in political activities and to be office bearers in political parties?

If permission had been obtained by them, will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please give the dates when such applications were made by them, and also the dates when the Head of State granted them permission?

If the answer is in the negative, will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please state what disciplinary action he intends to take against such officers?

Chief Minister: Jawapan kepada soalan 3(a) Ketua Menteri tidak mengetahui sesiapa daripada kakitangan2 Kerajaan Negeri yang memegang jawatan di-dalam parti2 siasah semenjak Merdeka kerana Kerajaan Negeri tidak menerima apa2 permohonan di-bawah perenggan 5, Surat Pekeliling Pejabat Setia Usaha Negeri, Bil. 27/54. Jawapan kepada soalan 3(b) memandang kepada jawapan yang di-

beri kepada bahagian pertama soalan ini, maka bahagian2 yang lain itu tidak-lah berbangkit.

Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, a supplementary question arising out of the reply from the Hon'ble the Chief Minister. Is it not the intention of the State Government to find out how many Civil Servants are there, who are actively participating in politics?

Mr. Speaker: I think it is a separate question arising from the original question. In the original question you want to know how many Government servants are taking part in politics.

Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Yes.

Mr. Speaker: Is it not the intention of the State Government — this is a separate question.

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

4. Will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please state whether it is the intention of the State Government to fill vacancies in the Religious Affairs Department through the Public Services Commission or through interview by the State Executive Council?

If the answer is "through the Public Services Commission", then when does the State Government intend to have these interviews?

If the answer is "by the State Executive Council", then please give the reasons for deviating from established Governmental procedure to have such appointments made by the Public Services Commission?

Chief Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jawapan kepada soalan 4(a) — Lantekan2 bagi memenuhi jawatan2 di-dalam Jabatan Hal Ehwal Ugama ada-lah di-buat oleh Surohanjaya Perkhidmatan Awam. Kapada soalan 4(b) — jawapan saya kepada soalan di-atas ia-lah "oleh Surohanjaya Perkhidmatan Awam". Chalon2 tidak-lah ditemu-duga oleh Kerajaan Negeri. Jawapan kepada soalan 4(c) — oleh kerana lantekan untuk memenuhi jawatan di-dalam Jabatan Hal Ehwal Ugama ada-lah di-buat oleh Surohanjaya Perkhidmatan Awam, maka soalan ini tidak-lah berbangkit.

Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, a supplementary question arising out of this reply to 4(c). It would appear, if I take it correctly, the Hon'ble the Chief Minister says that question (c) does not arise. If that be the case, is the Hon'ble the Chief Minister aware that the present employees of the Religious Affairs Department are being engaged, from his reply previously, not by the Public Services Commission, but by the Head of the Religious Affairs Department. Is he aware of that?

Chief Minister: Jawapan-nya Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tahu, kerana kakitangan2 itu ia-lah sementara.

Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, another supplementary question arising out of the reply by the Hon'ble the Chief Minister. Is the Hon'ble the Chief Minister aware that Government Regulations state, whether the appointments are temporary or permanent, such appointments which are to be interviewed by the Public Services Commission, should still be interviewed by the Public Services Commission.

Chief Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak tahu peratoran ini.

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

5. Will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please state what is the City Council's contribution for each of the following Rural Electrification projects now completed:—

- (a) Sungei Kluang
- (b) Kampong Java (Roadside)
- (c) Titi Tras
- (d) Permatang Pasir and Ayer Puteh
- (e) Permatang Damar Laut
- (f) Batu Maung?

Chief Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, charum2 yang di-beri oleh Majlis Bandar Raya ada-lah seperti berikut:

- | | |
|------------------------------------|----------|
| (a) Sungei Kluang | \$11,446 |
| (b) Kampong Jawa (tepi-jalan) | 6,536 |
| (c) Titi Teras | 3,108 |
| (d) Permatang Pasir dan Ayer Puteh | 7,725 |
| (e) Permatang Damar Laut | 13,808 |
| (f) Batu Maung | 9,720 |

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Chor Sin Kheng): Mr. Speaker, Sir, a supplementary question. Is the contribution made by the City Council sufficient to complete all the projects mentioned.

Chief Minister: Tidak cukup, Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, a supplementary question. Electrification of the rural areas, is it the responsibility of the City Council or of the State?

Mr. Speaker: I think that electrification of the rural areas is not relevant to this question. 'Whether it is the responsibility of the City Council or the State Government' is a different question. It is very clearly stated in the original question that you want to know what is the contribution of the City Council. I hope that, if Hon'ble Members wish to put any question, they will go straight to the point of the contribution and not on the question of whether it is done by another authority, please.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): May I then have your clarification as to how the question by the Hon'ble Member for Ayer Itam arose.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon'ble Member asks, whether the contribution is sufficient. As long as the word contribution is there—whether the contribution is sufficient or not, it is relevant to this question.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Chor Sin Kheng): Another supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, Sir. Why doesn't the City Council pay the full contribution for these projects?

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): I am waiting for an answer by the Hon'ble the Chief Minister.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the reply to that, is that Government contributes towards the unremunerative portion of the total cost of the scheme, and the City Council, I think, if I am right, only contributes that portion which makes the scheme economic to the City Council.

Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, arising out of the reply by the Hon'ble the Chief Minister, is it

then the policy of the State Government in connection with electrification of the rural areas—whether the electricity is being supplied by the City Council or by the Central Electricity Board? Is not that then the policy?

Mr. Speaker: Saya mohon mengulang bahawa masa'alah di hadapan kita ia-lah berapa banyak yang di-bagi oleh City Council kepada ranchangan2 yang di-sebutkan di-dalam soalan ini. Saya tidak-lah dapat membenarkan soalan membedzakan kepada satu2 policy.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Chor Sin Kheng): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, Sir. Who contributes the balance towards the completion of these projects?

Chief Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jawapan-nya ia-lah — charum2 yang di-beri oleh Kerajaan Negeri mengenai ranchangan tersebut ada-lah saperti berikut:

(a)	Sungei Kluang	\$ 39,394
(b)	Kampung Jawa (tepi jalan)	2,000
(c)	Titi Teras	4,152
(d)	Permatang Pasir dan Ayer Puteh	40,338
(e)	Permatang Damar Laut	29,502
(f)	Batu Maung	40,000
Jumlah Charum Kerajaan Negeri		\$115,386

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, a supplementary question. I see that these areas are all in the rural areas which fall under the control of the State Government. Should it not have been for the State Government to contribute the entire amount for the electrification of these areas?

Chief Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, itu pulang balek kepada City Council. Tetapi jawapan saya yang terlebih dahulu, City Council bagi bantu, jikalau tempat itu boleh bawa untong. Kalau tidak memberi keuntongan Kerajaan pula yang kena bantu.

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

6. Will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please state when the State Government intends to provide electricity for the following areas:—

- (a) Jalan Titi Tras
- (b) Pondok Upeh
- (c) Kampung Naran
- (d) Kampung Jawa (Seaside)
- (e) Sungei Tiram & Bukit Ayun
- (f) Telok Awak
- (g) Kampung Batak
- (h) Telok Tempoyak
- (i) Telay Road (Between Court House, Bayan Lepas, and Sungei Ara Quarry)
- (j) Pantai Aceh
- (k) Paya Terubong Road
- (l) Gertak Sanggul and Kampung Sulop?

Chief Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jawapan kepada soalan keenam ia-lah — Kerajaan Negeri akan menyambong bekalan letrik ka-kawasan2 itu saperti berikut:—

- (a) Jalan Titi Teras
— Dalam tahun 1962
- (b) Pondok Upeh
— Dalam tahun 1962
- (c) Kampung Naran
— Dalam tahun 1962
- (d) Kg. Jawa (sebelah pantai)
— Dalam tahun 1962
- (e) Sg. Tiram & Bukit Ayun
— Dalam tahun 1962

- (f) Telok Awak
— Dalam tahun 1963
- (g) Kampung Batak
— Dalam tahun 1963
- (h) Telok Tempoyak
— Dalam tahun 1963
- (i) Jalan Relau
(di-antara Bangunan Mahkamah, Bayan Lepas dan Pechah Batu Sungei Ara)
— Dalam tahun 1963
- (j) Pantai Aceh
— Dalam tahun 1963
- (k) Jalan Paya Terubong
— Dalam tahun 1963
- (l) Gertak Sanggul dan Kampung Sulop
— Dalam tahun 1964

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Chor Sin Kheng): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, Sir. Has the State Government contributed any sum of money to the authority concerned for these projects.

Chief Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jawapan kepada soalan itu ia-lah — Kerajaan Negeri sudah beri bantuan kepada City Council ia-itu:—

Jalan Titi Teras	\$11,450
Pondok Upeh	2,050
Kampung Naran	9,410
Kampung Jawa	5,500
Sungei Tiram dan Bukit Ayun	57,800

ia-itu kerja2 yang di-jalankan di-dalam tahun 1962.

Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, a supplementary question. When did the State Government send their contribution to the City Council?

Chief Minister: Wang berjumlah sebanyak \$86,210/- telah diberi kepada Majlis Bandar Raya pada 13hb. November, 1962.

Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Just this month? After the question went in? Thank you.

Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Fasal apa lambat bagi duit?

Chief Minister: Fasal lambat ambil keputusan.

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

1. Has Government any plans to put up a low-cost Housing Scheme at Telok Awar in Telok Bahang?

Chief Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dengan persetujuan tuan saya menjemput Tuan C. D. Ismail memberi jawapan kepada soalan2 ini.

Member for Dhoby Ghaut (Enche C. D. Ismail): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soalan yang pertama, jawapan-nya 'ia'.

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

2. If the answer to No. 1 is in the affirmative how many houses is it intended to put up?

Member for Dhoby Ghaut (Enche C. D. Ismail): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, rajah2 pelan bagi rancangan perumahan itu sedang diasas dan ada menguntukkan sebanyak 198 tapak2 rumah.

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

3. Will these houses, when put up, be for sale or rent and what, respectively, will be the cost of the house or rent of the house?

Member for Dhoby Ghaut (Enche C. D. Ismail): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, rumah2 itu akan di-jual. Oleh sebab pelan2 rumah itu pada hari ini belum dapat keputusan maka harga bagi rumah itu tidak dapat di-tetapkan lagi.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, a supplementary question. Could the Hon'ble Member tell us approximately of the price it is hoped to sell these houses?

Member for Dhoby Ghaut (Enche C. D. Ismail): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jika sekira-nya harga yang di-chadangkan, boleh jadi kurang daripada \$2,500/-.

(B) WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

Chief Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, jawapan kepada soalan2 yang telah di-tanya itu ada-lah dibentangkan di-atas meja Dewan ini.

3. (B) WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

Mr. Tan Chong Bee asks the Chief Minister:

1. In reply to my adjournment speech, regarding fishing licences for Pantai Acheh residents on 11th April, 1962, the Chief Minister stated that he would discuss this matter with the Minister of Agriculture. Will he please state if he has done so and what the outcome is?
2. In regard to the landing jetty at Pantai Acheh, the Chief Minister stated on 11th April, 1962 that the matter was under investigation and that the State Government would build one similar to that at Telok Kumbar. Will he kindly state (a) whether such investigation has been completed, and (b) whether provision has been made for this item in the 1963 Budget?

The Chief Minister:

1. The matter has been discussed with the Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives. Action is being taken to encourage the formation of a Fisherman's Co-operative Society in the area so that assistance could be given to the fishermen to enable them to use mobile fishing gears as opposed to static gears. It is considered that it is not in the long-term interest of the fishermen themselves for more licences to be issued under the present circumstances.
2. (a) The matter has been explored and it has been found that it is not economical to build a landing jetty at Pantai Acheh similar to that at Telok Kumbar. However, other means to assist the fishermen in the area are being considered.
(b) In view of the answer given in (a) above, the question posed in (b) does not arise.

Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew asks the Chief Minister:

1. Will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please reply whether the State Government has negotiated or consulted with the Kampong Herriot Committee regarding the allocation of Low-Cost Houses to the residents of this Kampong?

If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please reply, giving details of the residents who are being recommended for allocation of houses, including particulars of where they are staying and whether they are homeowners, chief tenants or sub-tenants?

If the answer is in the negative, will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please reply whether the State Government intends to discuss the allocation with representatives of the residents in Kampong Herriot?

2. Is it, or is it not true that certain sub-tenants living in Kampong Her-

riot are being considered for allocation by the State Government while the applications of other sub-tenants in the same area are being rejected?

If the reply is in the affirmative, will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please give reasons for such rejection, when it was stated at the previous Assembly Meeting that there would be no discrimination at all?

If the reply is in the negative, will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister then direct that letters of assurance be sent to the eight sub-tenants who have sent in their petition to the State Government?

3. Will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please state whether the State Government has already taken a decision regarding the allocation of these 35 low-cost houses in Kampong Herriot?

If the answer is in the affirmative, will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please give particulars of those to whom the houses have been allocated and other details, for example, the address, occupation, family circumstances of the successful applicants.

If the reply is in the negative, will the Hon'ble the Chief Minister please answer when the State Government intends to allocate, since these 35 houses are now ready for occupation?

The Chief Minister:

1. Members of the State Low Cost Housing Committee have met the Kampong Herriot Committee and discussed amongst other things, the allocation of houses in Kampong Herriot.

The Allocation Sub-Committee has not yet made any recommendations and I am therefore unable to give the details requested.

This question does not arise.

2. As the Allocation Sub-Committee has not yet submitted its recommendations, I am unable to provide the answer to this question.

In view of the above answer the second part of the question does not arise.

3. No.

The question does not arise.

The 35 houses are not yet ready for occupation. The State Government will allocate the houses as soon as the recommendations of the Allocation Sub-Committee are received. It is expected that the houses will be allocated before the end of the year.

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

1. What progress has been made towards the establishment of a University College in Penang?
2. Have the University Authorities expressed an opinion on the question of establishing a University College and, if so, what is their view?
3. Has a site for the University College been found and if not, what are the difficulties?
4. Has the Federal Government given their views on the question of establishing a University College in Penang and, if so, what are their views?
5. How many Sixth Form Classes (both Arts & Science) are there in Penang?
6. In which schools are they to be found and what is the enrolment in these Classes (according to year Lower or Upper Sixth and according to stream Arts or Science)?
7. Are staffing arrangements in Sixth Forms completely adequate and satisfactory (that is, are there a sufficient number of adequately-qualified Senior Subject Specialists) to do justice to the subjects in the curriculum of the Sixth Form?

8. Is the Government satisfied that the Graduate Teachers (especially Honours Graduates), available in the State at present, are being put to the best educational use, in so far as Sixth Form teaching is concerned?

9. Is it true that 3rd Class patients at the Maternity Hospital have to buy their own soap, paper and other toilet facilities when they become inmates there?

10. As 3rd Class patients are generally from low-income groups, cannot Government arrange for the Hospital to pay for such items, as mentioned above in Question 9 from their Hospital Administrative Funds.

The Chief Minister:

1. A token vote of \$10/- has been entered in the Development Estimates, 1963, under Head 101, Item 28, Chief Minister and State Secretariat, for the site for the University College.
2. As stated at the Assembly Meeting held on 15th August, 1962, in reply to a written question by the Hon'ble Mr. Lee Kok Liang, the Chancellor of the University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, is favourably disposed towards this proposal and the Vice-Chancellor has written asking the State Government to indicate possible sites in Penang for the establishment of a University College.
3. Several possible sites are now under active consideration by the State Government but no definite site has yet been decided on. The establishment of a University College involves the selection of a site, the suitability of which must be considered from many angles such as its size, locality, terrain, easy means of communication, aesthetic value and other factors, and bearing in mind the possibility of future development into a fully fledged University.

4. No. The Federal Government has not been approached on this matter.

5. The information sought has not been made available by the Ministry of Education. It is therefore not possible to give the answer to this question.

6. The answer is the same as that for Question 5 above.

7. The answer is the same as that for Question 5 above.

8. The answer is the same as that for Question 5 above.

9. It is the practice in the Maternity Hospital, Penang, as well as in other maternity units in hospitals throughout the country to request the patient or relative to bring:—

- 2 katties Chinese paper
 - 3 boxes of sanitary pads
 - 1 cake Lux soap
 - 4 pieces washing soap
- on admission to the hospital.

10. A certain amount of Chinese paper is supplied from Government funds for proven indigent cases. It is, however, not possible to meet the requirements of other patients in the Third Class Ward since admission per annum totals an average of more than 4,500 patients, and at the rate of \$4.50 (the aggregate cost of the items mentioned in the answer to Question 9 above) per patient, these commodities would cost some \$20,250/- in the Penang Maternity Hospital alone.

Mr. Lee Kok Liang asks the Chief Minister:

1. Is the State Government aware of the notice given to occupiers of premises at Mukim 13, Paya Terubong, for them to demolish and vacate their premises to make way for road building purposes?
2. Has the Honourable the Chief Minister received any letter from the occupiers of these premises in

respect of the proposed demolition? If so, what are the contents of this letter? And what action has the State Government taken on it?

3. Is it correct that Enche Aziz Ibrahim, J.P., when he was the Chief Minister of this State gave assurance to the occupiers that their interests would be safe-guarded and that no hardship would be inflicted on them?

4. How many houses, either temporary or unauthorized, along Weld Quay or its waterfront, have been served with notices to demolish by the Collector of Land Revenue? Please give the addresses and names of occupiers of these houses.

5. Is it not correct to say that Enche Aziz Ibrahim, J.P. when he was Chief Minister promised these occupiers that their premises would not be demolished?

6. Of those houses and occupiers so served, how many have been actually demolished? What are the reasons for so demolishing them?

7. Is it not correct to say that the States of Penang and Malacca observe the same land laws with regard to conveyancing, registration, etc., except for a very small portion of customary laws affecting the State of Malacca, for example, the Malacca Lands Customary Rights Ordinance?

8. Therefore, is it not correct to say that, apart from this exception, the land laws of Penang and Malacca are uniform?

9. Is the State Government aware of the proposed Federal Legislation entitled the National Land (Penang and Malacca Titles) Act, 1962? What are the views of the State Government on this Act?

10. Does the State Government realise that the implementation of the proposed legislation once it becomes a Federal Act this year, would cause

great strain on the State and Federal machinery dealing with land titles registration etc? Is the State Government increasing the number of personnel working in such offices so as to cope with rush work which will become a deluge if implementation is adhered to strictly within the terms of this Act?

11. Has the State Government obtained opinions and views from those who are concerned with regard to such legislation whether as lawyers or as owners?
12. In view of the sweeping changes proposed, not only in relation to titles, registration but to the nature of existing interests vested in lands, does not the State Government think that it is its duty to appoint a Select or Special Committee to study the proposed legislation and make recommendations thereon after ascertaining the views of the people, to the Federal Government?
13. In regard to the Sungei Mak Mandin Industrial Estate Scheme, will the Honourable Chief Minister state:—
 - (a) How many applications have been received?
 - (b) Of these how many have been approved?
 - (c) Whether any application has been withdrawn. If so, how many, involving how much amount of proposed capital.
 - (d) Whether how many successful applicants have not replied or kept quiet.
 - (e) Are all vacancies applied for and approved?

The Chief Minister:

1. Yes.
2. Yes, the Honourable the Chief Minister had received a letter signed by 20 persons on behalf of thirty over residents living in Paya Terubong Road, Ayer Itam.

In that letter the Government is informed of the acceptance by them of the proposed road construction scheme. They do not mind the small amounts of compensation paid by Government because the scheme is for the benefit of many. It is pointed out that Government has a duty to safeguard the livelihood of the people who have been asked to demolish their houses. The Government is asked to guarantee that those affected will be given house plots near the present sites of their buildings or be given suitable house plots in another area. They express the hope that Government will give them the good news early. Necessary investigation has been made on the matters raised in the said letter.

3. Yes.
4. Thirty-four house owners occupying areas of State land along Weld Quay have been notified by the Collector of Land Revenue, Penang, to demolish their houses.

The names and addresses of these house owners (occupiers of State land) are as follows:—

Names	Addresses
1. Tan Choon Kim	Chew Jetty
2. Chew Teong Oon	"
3. Chew Ah Keng	"
4. Tan Tat	"
5. Chew Gim Seng	"
6. Chew Thean Geok	"
7. Ong Ewe (f)	"
8. Chew Cheok Por	"
9. Toh Nya (f)	"

Names	Addresses
10. Chew Ah Bah	Chew Jetty
11. Thong Thum Tan	"
12. Soo Ah Ba	"
alias Chew Ah Leng	"
13. Chiew Liew Tuan (f)	90 Seh Tan Jetty
14. Tan Chooi Guan	Seh Lim Jetty
15. Lim Ah Chuah	Seh Chew Jetty
16. Chew Soo Kow	Seh Chew Jetty
17. Lim Ah Geik	Seh Lim Jetty
18. Lim Yew Chin	Seh Chew Jetty
19. Ooi Siew Ee (f)	Seh Chew Jetty
20. Tan Kim Seng	Weld Quay
21. Lim Hai Boey	74 Church Street
22. Lim Seong Wah	64C, Weld Quay
23. Lee Bee Chan	Seh Chew Jetty
24. Chew Ah Lye (f)	Weld Quay
25. Chew Ah Seng	Seh Lim Jetty
26. Lim Swee Seng	Weld Quay
27. Chew Ah Han	Seh Chew Jetty
28. Ngoh Kim Lean (f)	90 Seh Tan Jetty
29. Tan Chooi Eng	
30. Yeoh Thuah	Seh Lim Jetty
alias Yeoh Ah Tuan (f)	Seh Lim Jetty
31. Lim Khok	Seh Chew Jetty
32. Toh Saw Choo	Seh Yeoh Jetty
33. Yeoh Soon Hoe	Seh Chew Jetty
34. Chew Ah Sim (f)	

5. It is not correct.
6. None of the 34 houses has been fully demolished. These houses were erected without authority of the Collector of Land Revenue. Demolition of these houses is necessary because the sites occupied are not to be made available under T.O.Ls. or other forms of title.
7. It is correct that the States of Penang and Malacca observe the same land laws with regard to conveyancing and the law of property. In registration the Registration of Deeds Ordinance applies in Penang and the Mutations of Titles Ordinance applies in Malacca. As regards the land system the Malacca Lands Customary Rights Ordinance applies in Malacca.
8. With the exceptions cited above it is correct to say that the land laws of Penang and Malacca are uniform.
9. Yes the State Government is aware of the proposed Federal Legislation entitled the National Land (Penang and Malacca Titles) Act, 1962. The State Government supports the principles embodied in the Bill.
10. There is at present no State or Federal machinery dealing with land titles registration and this question cannot therefore be answered. Yes the State Government is increasing the number of permanent Staff working in the Registry of Deeds and Land Offices in the State.
11. No.
12. The State Government does not consider that a Select or Special Committee should be appointed to study the proposed legislation and to make recommendations thereon after ascertaining the views of the people.

13. (a) 126 inquiries were originally acknowledged. Of these ultimately only 43 were interested in obtaining sites. Proformas were sent to them and only 25 completed proformas for sites were returned.

(b) 14 applications for sites were approved.

(c) 9 applicants have withdrawn and 2 applications are still under consideration; the total capital involved cannot be ascertained as the information regarding capital was not given on the application forms in all cases.

(d) The 14 successful applicants replied that they will take up sites. (However one has since withdrawn his application and his deposit was refunded).

(e) This question is not understood.

4. BILLS.

(A) The Penang State Third Supplementary Supply (1962) Bill, 1962.

First Reading

Chief Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon menhadangkan supaya Rang Undang2 yang di-namakan "Undang2 mengadakan peruntukan wang yang dikeluarkan daripada Kumpulan Wang yang di-Satukan untuk perbelanjaan tambahan bagi perkhidmatan2 di-dalam tahun 1962" di-bachakan bagi kali yang pertama.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Chor Sin Kheng): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

Bill accordingly read a first time.

Chief Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, menurut syarat2 Peratoran Majlis Meshuarat 59, saya mohon

memberi kenyataan bahawa Bachakan Kali yang Kedua Rang Undang2 ini akan di-chadangkan dengan ser-ta merta.

Second Reading

Chief Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon menhadangkan supaya Rang Undang2 yang di-namakan "Undang2 mengadakan peruntukan wang yang dikeluarkan daripada Kumpulan Wang yang di-Satukan untuk perbelanjaan tambahan bagi perkhidmatan2 di-dalam tahun 1962" di-bachakan bagi kali yang kedua.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tujuan Rang Undang2 ini ia-lah hendak memberi kuasa berkanun untuk mengadakan peruntukan wang tambahan sebanyak \$156,015 bagi perkhidmatan awam Negeri Pulau Pinang mengikut Perkara 32 Perlembagaan Negeri Pulau Pinang. Butir2 mengenai peruntukan perbelanjaan itu boleh di-dapati di-dalam Peranggaran Perbelanjaan Biasa Negeri Pulau Pinang Tambahan Yang Ketiga, tahun 1962 yang telah di-bentangkan sebagai Risalat Bil. 14 tahun 1962, Dewan Perhimpunan Undangang Negeri Pulau Pinang.

Wang sebanyak \$90,000 adalah di-kehendaki untuk menambah peruntukan kepada Kepala B.1, Ketua Menteri dan Pejabat Setia Usaha Negeri. Wang itu adalah di-kehendaki bagi perbelanjaan keberangkatan Duli2 Yang Maha Mulia Baginda Raja dan Permaisuri Negeri Thai (perbelanjaan ini mula-nya telah di-bayar daripada Kumpulan Wang Belanja Mengejut).

Lawatan tersebut tidak di-jangka, dan oleh itu peruntukan tidak-lah di-adakan di-dalam Peranggaran Negeri Pulau Pinang tahun 1962—dengan sebab itu-lah maka tambahan ini di-perlukan. Lebih separoh daripada perbelanjaan mengenai

lawatan itu ia-lah untuk membeli barang2 yang boleh di-simpan bagi di-gunakan di-dalam majlis2 yang akan di-adakan oleh Kerajaan pada masa hadapan.

Peruntukan bagi Kepala B.18, Perbendaharaan, adalah perlu supaya Kerajaan Negeri dapat membayar balek kepada Kerajaan Persekutuan wang sebanyak \$66,015 yang telah di-beri oleh-nya sebagai pemberian2 untuk jalan2 raya kepada Kerajaan Negeri di-dalam tahun 1959 dan tahun 1960. Pemberian2 untuk jalan2 raya itu ia-lah di-buat mengikut kehendak2 Perkara 109(1) (b) Perlembagaan Persekutuan.

Di-dalam bulan May, tahun 1961, Setia Usaha Perbendaharaan telah menulis kepada semua Setia Usaha2 Negeri mengenai Pemberian2 untuk Jalan2 Raya Negeri dan menerangkan bahawa pemberian2 bagi tahun 1958, 1959 dan 1960 itu tidak-lah berapa betul. Pemberian2 mengenai Jalan2 Raya Negeri itu telah di-hetong dengan berpanduan kepada angka2 jumlah panjang-nya jalan2 raya Negeri yang patut mendapat pemberian2 tersebut yang telah di-beri oleh Setia Usaha, Kementerian Kerja Raya, Pos dan Talikom. Angka2 yang di-beri pada masa itu ia-lah chuma 'angka2 yang di-agak2' sahaja oleh kerana tidak dapat di-tentukan dengan tepatnya jalan2 raya yang mana-kah yang boleh mendapat pemberian2 itu. Oleh yang demikian, ada negeri yang mendapat lebih dan ada pula yang mendapat kurang daripada yang patut di-terima-nya. Oleh kerana Perkara 109(1) (b) Perlembagaan Persekutuan menghendaki supaya Pemberian2 mengenai jalan2 raya bagi semua Negeri2 di-buat mengikut jumlah panjang jalan2 raya Negeri yang boleh mendapat pemberian2 ia-itu sebagaimana yang ditentukan di-dalam Bahagian II dalam Jadual

yang Kesepuluh, Perlembagaan Persekutuan, maka sebarang pembayaran yang lebih atau pun yang kurang terpaksa-lah di-betulkan.

Oleh sebab itu, Setia Usaha Kementerian Kerja Raya, Pos dan Talikom telah di-minta memberi angka2 yang betul dan apabila ia-nya di-perolehi, maka wang pemberian itu akan di-kira semula dan pemberian bagi tahun 1961 atau 1962 akan di-betulkan. Berikutan dengan keputusan ini, maka di-dapati bahawa jalan2 raya di-dalam Negeri Pulau Pinang dan Seberang Perai yang patut menerima wang pemberian itu dalam tahun 1959 dan 1960 ia-lah 578.87 batu dan bukan-lah 593.54 batu ia-itu kurang sebanyak 14.67 batu. Oleh kerana tiap2 satu batu mendapat sebanyak \$4,500, ini berm-a'ana-lah Kerajaan Negeri telah menerima pemberian yang lebih sebanyak \$66,015. Oleh sebab itu Kerajaan Negeri telah bersetuju membayar balek wang tersebut.

Jumlah wang yang terpaksa di-bayar balek yang sebigitu besar ia-itu \$66,015 tidak-lah sekali2 di-jangka dan oleh sebab itu-lah ia-nya tidak di-masokkan di-bawah pechahan-kepala perbelanjaan Perbendaharaan Negeri yang sesuai ia- itu "Bayaran Balek Hasil Tahun2 Lepas".

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon menhadangkan.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Chor Sin Kheng): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

In recalling the State Visit of Their Majesties the King and Queen of Thailand to the State of Penang on 24th and 25th June this year, one very pleasant feature was the lining up along the route of the State Drive from the Bayan Lepas Airport to the Residency of many thousand of school children who cheered lustily and waved

their flags gaily in extending a rousing welcome to Their Majesties on that memorable occasion. In addition, thousands and thousands of people were there to join in the warm welcome and to catch a glimpse of Their Majesties the King and Queen of Thailand. I can also say that the Garden Party, together with the entertainment programme, was well organised and it turned out to be quite a success. After all, considering that His Majesty the King of Thailand was the first monarch to pay an official visit to our country since it achieved independence and that much goodwill and close friendly relationship had been attained between the two countries, I am of the opinion that the amount of \$90,000, being expenses in connection with the Visit of Their Majesties the King and Queen of Thailand, has been well spent. The other head of expenditure of \$66,015 has been well explained by the Hon'ble the Chief Minister to Hon'ble Members of this Assembly, and needs no further comment.

Thank you.

Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose this Bill on the grounds that the State Government has rather been extravagant in its expenses relating to the visit of Their Majesties the King and Queen of Thailand.

Mr. Speaker: You are not against the visit of the King?

Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): We are not against the visit—we are against the expenditure. The House may be aware that on one occasion Members of the Opposition took exception to the extraordinary powers to be given to the Chief Minister in connection with expenditure without first reference to the

Assembly Meeting. It was due to the fact that we were rather afraid that the Hon'ble the Chief Minister may misuse his powers and spend as he liked and then report later on. It would appear to us that when the Hon'ble the Chief Minister reported to this House some time in September, he gave us the impression that only \$45,000 was needed in the expenses for Their Majesties' visit to Penang, and somehow or other this sum is now doubled to the present sum of \$90,000. We are wondering how this \$90,000 came to be expended when most of the people in the State came out gladly in helping the celebration—spending their own money, building their own arches—and we are just wondering how the \$90,000 came about. We would not like to accuse that there is something wrong about it, but in the interests of the public we would like to know how the \$90,000 is being spent, to command the confidence of the people. I am sure of it, the Acting Chief Minister would be aware that public co-operation was very good and all the various communities, I know, spent within the region possibly of nearly \$200,000. There is no doubt about it. But because the communities themselves have spent a lot, it would appear that the amount of money which should be spent by the Government could not be to that extent from the various functions which were undertaken by the State for Their Majesties the King and Queen of Thailand. There was no State Banquet even, except for a tea party. So we are wondering how the \$90,000 has been expended and we would like very much for an explanation by the Hon'ble the Chief Minister before we would really like to support this Bill.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: You said you opposed it.

Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Oppose the Bill until we receive clarification.

Another point which skipped my mind is that this expenditure has been treated as annually recurrent expenditure. I am wondering—yes, it is in there—I am wondering whether the State Government expects such visits every year, or whether this is not a special occasion to be treated under Other Charges Special Expenditure.

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

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, in my speech I mentioned that more than “separoh”, more than half the money has been spent in buying materials for decorations; and these materials are stored in the proper place and can be used again for future celebrations. More than half the money has been spent on buying these materials. If the Hon'ble Member for Jelutong wishes to have details of the materials bought, I would be happy to supply all the vouchers. Regarding the annual recurrence of this sort of celebration, I think this is not very true: this is only an ordinary expenditure. I do not know where you got the idea that this is an annual affair. But in the Estimates there is provision for entertainment.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time.

Committee

The Assembly resolves itself into Committee.

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

The Assembly resumes

Third Reading

Chief Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon melaporkan bahawa Rang Undang2 Bekalan Tambahan Yang Ketiga (1962) Negeri Pulau Pinang, 1962 telah di-timbangkan sa-fasal demi sa-fasal di-dalam Jawatan Kuasa dan telah di-persetujui dengan tiada apa2 pindaan. Oleh itu, saya mohon menchadangkan supaya Rang Undang2 itu di-bachakan bagi kali yang ketiga dan di-luluskan.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Chor Sin Kheng): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to second.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a third time and passed.

(B) The Penang State Supply (1963) Bill, 1962.

First Reading

Chief Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon menchadangkan supaya Rang Undang2 yang di-namakan ‘Undang2 mengadakan peruntukan wang yang di-keluarkan daripada Kumpulan Wang yang di-Satukan bagi perkhidmatan2 di-dalam tahun 1963, dan menguntukkan wang tersebut bagi perkara2 yang tertentu’ di-bachakan bagi kali yang pertama.

Member for Tasek Glugor (Enche Hashim bin Awang): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong.

Bill according read a first time.

Chief Minister: Menurut syarat2 Peratoran Majlis Meshuarat 59, saya mohon memberi kenyataan bahawa Bachaan kali yang Kedua Rang Undang2 ini akan di-chadangkan dengan serta merta.

Second Reading

Chief Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon menhadangkan supaya Rang Undang2 yang di-namakan 'Undang2 mengadakan peruntukkan wang yang di-keluarkan daripada Kumpulan Wang yang di-Satukan bagi perkhidmatan2 di-dalam tahun 1963, dan menguntukkan wang tersebut bagi perkara2 yang tertentu' di-bachakan bagi kali yang kedua.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tujuan Rang Undang2 Bekalan yang di-hadapan kita ini ia-lah hendak memberi kuasa berkanun kepada Perbelanjaan Biasa Negeri Pulau Pinang bagi tahun 1963. Perbelanjaan ini, sebagaimana yang telah di-terangkan dahulu, ia-lah untuk mentadbirkan Kerajaan dan menjaga jalan2 raya, kawasan2 parit dan tali-ayer, bangunan2 Kerajaan dan lain2 lagi.

Sebelum Kerajaan Negeri menjalankan Rancangan Pembangunan Lima Tahun yang Kedua, Perbelanjaan Ulang Tahunan ia-lah lebih kurang \$8½ juta. Oleh kerana Rancangan Pembangunan yang telah di-mulakan dalam tahun 1961 itu ada-lah satu rancangan yang amat besar, Perbelanjaan yang Berulang mesti-lah di-tambah dan bagi tahun 1962 perbelanjaan yang di-anggarkan telah di-tambah sebanyak lebih kurang \$1.1 juta. Peruntukkan bagi Perbelanjaan yang Berulang bagi tahun 1963 ada-lah berlebeh daripada tahun 1962 sebanyak setengah juta ringgit. Sebagaimana yang saya terangkan pada tahun sudah, kita tidak boleh menambah Perbelanjaan Pembangunan jika kita tidak menambah Perbelanjaan yang Berulang. Patut juga saya sebutkan di-sini Jabatan Kerja Raya ada-lah menjalankan juga kerja2 dan rancangan2 Kerajaan Persekutuan di-dalam Negeri ini seperti rancangan2 kesihatan dan

pelajaran, membena lapangan terbang dan sebagai-nya dan semua rancangan ini akan mendatangkan faedah kepada Negeri kita. Sunggoh pun kerja2 Pembangunan mengenai projek2 Kerajaan Negeri dan Persekutuan telah bertambah2 banyak, kita telah berjimat2 dengan Perbelanjaan yang Berulang, dan angka yang di-tunjukkan itu ia-lah angka yang paling rendah sekali yang di-kehendaki supaya kerja2 itu tidak tergendala. Tambahan kepada Perbelanjaan yang Berulang di-dalam tahun 1963 jika di-hetong panjang ada-lah lebih rendah lagi daripada tambahan bagi tahun 1962.

Satu perkara lagi yang ternyata sekali berkenaan rang Belanjawan yang ada di-hadapan Dewan ini ia-lah ia-nya tidak seperti belanjawan2 bagi kedua2 tahun yang lepas. Belanjawan bagi tahun ini ia-lah sechukop2-nya. Pendek kata, di-dalam tahun 1963 kita hanya perlu mencharum kepada Kumpulan Wang Pembangunan Negeri daripada hasil tahun ini sahaja dengan tidak payah mengeluarkan wang daripada paki hasil 'Am. Saya akan terangkan berkenaan perkara ini kemudian kelak.

Sekarang saya suka berchakap mengenai Peranggaran Hasil. Susunan bagi tahun 1963 sebagai yang tuan2 perhati tidak-lah berbedza sangat dengan susunan bagi tahun 1962. Kita telah menunjukkan sedikit tambahan kepada chukai hiburan, chukai parit dan tali-ayer, pemberian bekalan ayer dan jalan2 raya dan mengurangkan sedikit hasil yang di-perolehi daripada perkara2 seperti tuak dan faedah. Pada 'am-nya kita telah menunjukkan pendapatan kita akan kurang sedikit. Pada tahun lepas, Kerajaan Negeri telah tudoh mengenakan chukai kebanyakan-nya kepada orang2 miskin sahaja. Terlebeh dahulu saya su-

ka memberitahu Dewan ini bahawa hasil yang boleh di-pungut oleh Kerajaan (Negeri) ia-lah sebagaimana yang di-tentukan oleh Perakara 110 dan Jadual yang Kesepuluh, Perlembagaan Persekutuan. Oleh itu, dari segi undang2, tiada apa pun yang menchegeh Kerajaan Negeri memungut hasil daripada puncha2 yang tersebut di-dalam Peranggaran Hasil. Selain daripada Pemberian Kerajaan Persekutuan pendapatan2 Kerajaan Negeri yang besar2 ia-lah hasil tuak, hiburan, pajak gadai, chukai parit dan tali-ayer, bekalan ayer, faedah dan "premium" tanah.

Berchakap berkenaan tuak, saya bersetuju bahawa kebanyakan daripada pelanggan2 kedai2 tuak ada-lah terdiri daripada mereka2 yang berpendapatan kecil tetapi sebagaimana yang di-katakan oleh salah sa-orang daripada Ahli2 pehak Pembangkang di-dalam satu persidangan yang lepas, orang2 yang meminum tuak mendapat vitamin B yang di-kehendaki mereka daripada minuman ini. Memang senang kalau sesa-orang itu hendak berkata 'tutup-lah kedai2 tuak'. Tetapi dengan apakah kita hendak menggantikan minuman itu? Satu perkara yang menarek hati ia-lah hasil daripada minuman ini ada-lah di-anggarkan akan berkekurangan sedikit kerana ada tanda2 yang menunjukkan bahawa minuman ini tiada sebegitu digemari lagi. Kerajaan sentiasa menjual minuman ini dengan harga yang berpatutan kepada kaum buroh dan yang lain2 lagi dan Kerajaan juga menjamin kebersehan-nya.

Berkenaan hiburan pula, mereka2 yang gemarkan hiburan2 tentu-lah membayar banyak lagi chukai daripada mereka yang tak sukakan-nya. Lebih kurang 85% daripada hasil yang di-perolehi menerusi hiburan ada-lah di-perolehi daripada panggong2 wayang

dan sebagaimana yang Ahli2 Yang Berhormat ketahui, mereka2 yang duduk di-tempat2 yang murah adalah membayar chukai hiburan yang kurang. Chukai ini di-kenakan kepada semua yang sukakan hiburan, mahu pun kaya atau miskin.

Berkenaan kedai2 pajak gadai, saya telah pun menerangkan bahawa pemegang2 lesen kedai pajak-lah yang membayar lesen kepada Kerajaan tetapi bayaran itu tidak di-kenakan kepada orang2 yang menggadai barang2. Undang2 menetapkan kadar faedah yang berpatutan dan kedai pajak gadai tidak-lah boleh mengenakan faedah lebih daripada yang di-tetapkan. Tujuan melesen kedai2 pajak gadai ia-lah hendak mengawal-nya supaya kepentingan orang ramai terpelihara. Kedai2 pajak gadai sangat berguna kepada masyarakat kerana orang ramai boleh meminjam wang dengan senang-nya.

Berkenaan chukai parit dan tali-ayer, Kerajaan patut sangat-lah memungut chukai itu kerana Kerajaan terpaksa menjaga kawasan2 parit dan tali-ayer. Modal bagi menjalankan rancangan2 parit dan tali-ayer tidak-lah dapat diperolehi kembali. Hasil yang di-jangka akan di-perolehi daripada chukai ini ia-lah lebih sedikit \$200,000/- manakala perbelanjaan mengenai Gaji dan Perbelanjaan Ulang Tahunan bagi Jabatan Parit dan Tali-ayer pula ia-lah hampir2 \$1 juta.

Berkenaan Bekalan Ayer, perkara ini telah banyak menimbulkan perbahathan pada masa yang sudah2 Sunggohpun hasil ini di-jeniskan sebagai "Penerimaan kerana menjalankan perkhidmatan yang berchorak perniagaan", tetapi ia-nya tiada-lah berma'ana ayer itu di-jual sebagai satu perniagaan ia-itu Kerajaan mendapat balek semua modal2 yang dikeluarkan-nya. Bekalan ayer yang

di-adakan oleh Kerajaan ada-lah menggunakan pam; oleh itu harga mengadakan bekalan itu sangat-lah mahal. Sebab itu-lah saya mengatakan, sebahagian daripada harga ayer yang di-jual itu di-bayar oleh Kerajaan. Soal-nya di-sini bukan hanya menolak perbelanjaan yang sebanyak lebeh kurang \$1/- juta itu daripada pendapatan yang sebanyak \$1.3/- juta itu dan mendatangkan keuntungan sebanyak \$0.3/- juta. Jika di-kira begitu sahaja tentu-lah nampak-nya Kerajaan mendapat keuntong-an. Bayaran yang di-kenakan bagi tiap2 sa-ribu gelan ayer bagi kegunaan di-rumah ia-lah 60 sen dan untuk kegunaan perdagangan pula ia-lah \$1/- dan lebeh. Jika di-kira daripada gaji, belanja menguruskan-nya, belanja minyak, harga bahan2 kimia dan sebagainya, harga mengadakan sa-ribu gelan ayer ia-lah lebeh daripada 80 sen. Ini tidak-lah termasuk perbelanjaan memasang panchor2, membenakan kolam2 ayer, memasang paip2 ayer yang berbatu2 panjang-nya dan seterusnya. Sebab itu-lah saya katakan Kerajaan membayar sebahagian besar daripada harga ayer itu. Oleh sebab itu Kerajaan telah mengadakan banyak ranchangan2 bekalan ayer, orang2 yang menggunakan ayer paip harus akan bertambah. Oleh itu tentu-lah hasil yang di-perolehi akan bertambah juga. Sunggoh pun begitu patut juga saya menyatakan di-sini bahawa sa-bilangan besar daripada ranchangan2 itu tidak akan mendatangkan keuntong-an.

Berhubung dengan hasil daripada Faedah dan Primiam Tanah, Primiam ada-lah di-perolehi chuma daripada mereka2 yang berkehendakkan Tanah Kerajaan.

Berkenaan dengan perbelanjaan pula, perbelanjaan yang banyak bertambah ia-lah mengenai perkara2 yang berikut:—

- (a) Tambahan Perbelanjaan di-bawah Kepala Bekalan 1 "Bahagian Majlis dan Dewan".
- (b) Belanja2 Pilehan Raya Pe-hak Berkuasa Tempatan (persediaan untuk Pilehan Raya tahun hadapan).
- (c) Kereta untuk Tuan Yang Terutama Gabnor.
- (d) Bahagian Pendaftaran Geran2 Tanah baharu di-bawah Kepala Bekalan 3.
- (e) Jawatan2 teknik yang baharu dan menaikkan tingkat beberapa jawatan di-dalam Jabatan Parit dan Tali-ayer dan Jebatan Kerja Raya.
- (f) Jawatan2 baru di-bawah "Pasokan Bomba".
- (g) Menjaga Jalan2 dan Jambatan2 Kerajaan Negeri.
- (h) Menjaga Bekalan2 Ayer.
- (i) Menjaga dan membeli meter2 di-bawah Bekalan Ayer.
- (j) Elaun kepada guru2 agama yang mengajar di-Kelas2 Uagama untuk orang2 Dewasa.
- (k) Kebajikan 'Am.

Berkenaan t a m b a h a n kepada elaun2 bagi Ahli2 Dewan dan Ahli2 Majlis Meshuarat Kerajaan perkara ini telah pun di-terangkan dengan panjang lebar di-dalam Meshuarat bulan Ogos dahulu.

Kerajaan Negeri berchadang hendak membeli sa-buah kereta untuk Tuan Yang Terutama Gabnor oleh kerana kereta yang ada sekarang ini sudah burok. Patut juga saya sebutkan di-sini bahawa kereta yang ada sekarang ini sudah di-pakai oleh Kerajaan Persekutuan kemudian baharu di-beli oleh Kerajaan Negeri. Kereta ini juga mendapat kerosakan di-dalam ma-

sa Dzarurat dahulu. Sunggoh pun ia-nya telah di-baiki tetapi oleh kerosakan yang saya sebutkan itu dan juga kerana ia-nya sangat-lah tua selalu sahaja ia-nya rosak. Selain daripada itu, kereta ini tidak boleh di-gunakan untuk pergi ka-Kuala Lumpur apabila Tuan Yang Terutama hendak ka-sana kerana urusan2 resmi.

Di-bawah Kepala 3 "Pejabat Tanah dan Daerah" satu bahagian baru yang di-namakan "Pejabat Pendaftaran Geran2 Tanah" telah pun di-tubuhkan. Di-dalam bahagian ini-lah kerja2 untuk menukar sistem tanah di-Negeri Pulau Pinang supaya ia-nya sama dengan sistem di-semua Negeri2 yang lain kechuali Negeri Melaka akan di-uruskan. Kerajaan Negeri telah bersetuju menerima sistem yang baru itu dan ia-nya telah pun mengadakan su a t u perjawatan yang berasingan di-dalam Pejabat Daerah bagi maksud ini. Oleh sebab itu-lah maka bilangan kakitangan tiap2 Pejabat Tanah Daerah perlu di-tambah dengan mengadakan sa-orang kerani dan sa-orang Pegawai Petempatan lagi.

Sedikit tambahan kepada jawatan2 teknik dan menaikkan tingkat beberapa jawatan dalam Jabatan Kerja Raya dan Jabatan Parit dan Tali-ayer ada-lah perlu kerana banyak projek2 baru yang telah di-siapkan di-bawah Ranchangan Pembangunan. Jawatan2 baru telah pun di-adakan di-bawah 'Pasokan Bomba', untuk menguruskan balai bomba yang baru di-Kepala Batas, Seberang Perai itu.

Perbelanjaan mengenai menjaga jalan2 dan jambatan2 Kerajaan (Negeri) di-jangka akan bertambah banyak pada tahun hadapan. Ini ia-lah oleh sebab banyak jalan2 raya yang telah di-bena di-bawah Ranchangan Pembangunan. Perbelanjaan ini tidak-lah sebegitu besar jika kita mengira Pemberian2 mengenai Jalan2 Raya yang

akan di-perolehi di-bawah Perkara 109(1) Perlembagaan Persekutuan. Perbelanjaan menjaga bekalan2 ayer dan pembelian meter2 akan juga bertambah. Ini ada-lah di-sebabkan oleh kerana banyak lagi bekalan ayer akan di-adakan di-kampung2 di-bawah Ranchangan Pembangunan.

Di-bawah Kepala Bekalan 15, di-dapati perbelanjaan yang besar telah di-tunjukkan kepada pechahan-kepala "Elaun bagi Guru2 Uagama yang mengajar uagama di-dalam Kelas2 Dewasa". Ahli2 Yang Berhormat sekalian harus ingat lagi bahawa pada bulan Ogos tahun ini kita telah meluluskan Rang Undang2 Bekalan Tambahan untuk mengadakan peruntukan yang serupa itu bagi tahun 1962—perbelanjaan ini ada-lah di-teruskan dalam tahun 1963.

Akhir-nya saya perchaya Ahli2 Yang Berhormat sekalian suka mengetahui bahawa bagi tahun 1963 kita telah menambah peruntukan bagi Kebajikan 'Am. Tambahan sebanyak \$30,000/- ia-itu lebeh kurang 67% tentu-lah tidak boleh di-anggap sebagai tambahan yang banyak. Sunggoh pun begitu kita jangan-lah lupa, Kerajaan mesti-lah menimbangkan kehendak2 Kebajikan Masharakat dalam Negeri ini dengan kewangan-nya. Dengan bertambah-nya peruntukan ini neschaya-lah ramai lagi orang2 yang akan mendapat bantuan. Sunggoh pun begitu saya perchaya ada juga orang yang akan mengkaji dasar Kerajaan kerana mengadakan bantuan wang chuma sebanyak \$75,000/- sahaja Jawapan saya kepada mereka itu ia-lah kita tidak sa-harus-nya memberi bantuan yang banyak sangat, jikalau kita berbuat demikian harus-lah kita akan membentok satu golongan penduduk2 yang akan bergantung sa-mata2 kepada bantuan Kerajaan. Saya perchaya kita sekalian mengetahui bagaimanakah orang di-dalam negeri2

lain salah menggunakan bantuan yang di-keluarkan oleh Kerajaan. Tujuan mengadakan Peruntukan Kebajikan 'Am ia-lah semata2 hendak mengadakan wang bagi membantu orang2 apabila mereka mendapat kesusahan. Tujuan-nya bukan-lah sekali2 hendak memberi bantuan yang berpanjangan. Ahli2 sekalian harus mengetahui daripada akhbar2 baru2 ini bahawa Kerajaan Persekutuan telah melantik satu Jawatan Kuasa untuk mengkaji bagaimanakah chara yang baik memberi bantuan kepada mereka2 yang mendapat kesusahan. Langkah itu pada akhirnya tentu akan mendatangkan faedah yang berkesan. Saya suka juga menyebutkan di-sini Kerajaan Negeri juga memberi bantuan2 kepada Pertubohan2 Sukarela dan Rumah2 Miskin daripada Peruntukan Pemberian Bantuan-nya (Subventions Vote).

Selain daripada bantuan yang di-keluarkan oleh Kerajaan Negeri, Kerajaan Persekutuan ada juga memberi bantuan2 kepada Pertubohan2 di-Pulau Pinang ini. Oleh sebab itu tiada-lah benar jikalau kita katakan bahawa Kerajaan chuma memberi bantuan sebanyak \$75,000/- sahaja sebagaimana yang di-tunjokkan di-bawah Peruntukan Kebajikan 'Am.

Selain daripada tambahan yang saya sebutkan tadi tambahan kepada perbelanjaan berulang ia-lah oleh sebab gaji pegawai2 telah naik.

Berkenaan Kepala Bekalan 1 "Ketua Menteri dan Pejabat Setia Usaha Negeri", perubahan yang besar di-bawah kepala ini ia-lah pemindahan Perkhidmatan2 'Am Bangunan Tuanku Syed Putra daripada kepala 11 ka-kepala ini. Pertukaran ini ia-lah semata2 untuk senang ia-nya di-tadbirkan. Tiada lain2 pertukaran2 yang benar di-bawah kepala ini.

Bagi penutup-nya patut-lah saya sebutkan di-sini pekerjaan yang penting sekali yang di-uruskan oleh Kerajaan di-dalam beberapa tahun yang lepas ia-lah menchari wang untuk menjalankan Rancangan Pembangunan Lima Tahun-nya. Oleh kerana perbelanjaan yang di-chadangkan itu sangat-lah besar terpaksa-lah kami menggunakan wang2 baki beberapa tahun yang lepas dan juga menggunakan sebahagian besar daripada pendapatan kita bagi tahun 1961 sampai 1963. Pada tahun dahulu kami telah di-tudoh menggunakan wang simpanan dengan boros-nya. Biar-lah mereka itu membuat tuduhan seperti itu—saya tiada ambil hal. Mereka itu "chuma membuat bising dengan ta' tentu arah sahaja". Saya suka menegaskan kepada Ahli2 Yang Berhormat sekalian jika kami telah membelanjakan wang dengan boros dan telah mengalami kekurangan wang tentu-lah kami tidak akan dapat menggunakan Kumpulan Wang Simpanan Negeri yang di-tubuhkan menurut Perkara 109(6) Perlembagaan Persekutuan. Sebagai sa-buah Kerajaan, kami mesti-lah bertanggung jawab dan menjaga wang negeri dengan jimat chermat.

Saya perchaya kejayaan yang telah kita chapai itu sangat-lah chemerlang. Tetapi orang2 yang menudoh kita boros membelanjakan wang tentu-lah tiada mahu mengakuinya. Kerajaan telah berusaha bersungguh2 untuk memungut hasil2-nya supaya jumlah hasil yang di-perolehi itu ia-lah sebagaimana yang di-anggarkan. Bagi tahun 1961 hasil yang di-anggarkan ia-lah sebanyak \$7,028,886 tetapi jumlah yang sa-benar-nya yang telah di-pungut ia-lah sebanyak \$8,353,251.05. Bagi tahun 1962 hasil yang di-anggarkan ia-lah \$12,448,411 dan hasil yang telah di-pungut ia-lah \$15,293,497.65. Oleh itu keku-

rangan yang di-jangkakan sebanyak \$5,632,339 itu telah susut menjadi \$3,333,339 ia-itu sebanyak \$2,299,153. Sunggoh pun kita biasa-nya membuat anggaran yang rendah, kejayaan yang seperti itu patut juga di-beri pujian. Apabila di-tunjokkan di-dalam Belanjawan bagi tahun 1962 dahulu bahawa kekurangan bagi tahun 1961 ia-itu di-bawah Penyata Harta dan Tanggungan ia-lah sebanyak \$3,657,400 Kerajaan telah di-tudoh memberi angka yang "di-buat2 sahaja". Pada hari ini, ia-itu telah ternyata dan sekarang kami membuktikan mengikut kira2 yang telah di-odit, bahawa angka \$3,657,400 yang di-katakan angka yang "di-buat2" itu bukan-lah angka yang hendak mengelirukan keadaan yang sa-benar-nya. Saya suka memberitahu Dewan ini, tujuan saya mengulang-kaji perkara2 yang berlaku sa-tahun dahulu bukan-lah hendak menunjak2kan, tetapi ia-lah hendak membuktikan bahawa angka itu bukan-lah angka rekaan, dan Kerajaan ada-lah sentiasa menchuba sedaya upaya-nya membuat peranggaran dengan sa-terpat2-nya yang boleh. Barangkali juga kita harus telah membuat anggaran yang rendah, tetapi ini tidak-lah boleh di-anggap sebagai satu perbuatan yang tiada sempurna dari segi kewangan — kita jangan-lah lupa Kerajaan mempunyai ranchangan2 pembangunan yang besar dan sebahagian daripada perbelanjaan-nya akan di-bayar daripada pendapatan tahun ini. Di-dalam tahun 1961, charum2 kepada Kumpulan Wang Pembangunan Negeri berjumlah \$9,847,409—ini termasuk-lah wang yang di-perolehi daripada Kerajaan Persekutuan. Pada tahun ini, charum kepada Kumpulan itu ia-lah sebanyak \$6,086,491—kesemuanya daripada Kumpulan Wang Negeri. Charum bagi tahun 1963, sebagaimana yang di-tunjokkan di-dalam rang peranggaran yang di-bentangkan di-hadapan Dewan ini

ia-lah sebanyak \$2,810,313—jumlah ini juga ia-lah semata2 daripada wang hasil Negeri. Saya suka menarek perhatian Dewan ini bahawa di-dalam tahun 1961 dan tahun 1962 kita terpaksa menggunakan wang simpanan kita, tetapi bagi tahun 1963 Kerajaan telah dapat membentangkan Belanjawan yang sechukop2-nya. Ini ia-lah kerana charum kita kepada Kumpulan Wang Pembangunan bagi tahun 1963 tiada-lah sangat banyak. Dengan menggunakan sedikit wang pendapatan2 kita tahun ini Kumpulan Wang Pembangunan Negeri ada-lah chukop untuk menjalankan ranchangan2 bagi tahun 1963 dan juga ranchangan2 yang lain yang belum siap. Kita tidak-lah payah lagi menggunakan wang simpanan kita dan selain daripada pinjaman2 bagi menguruskan Ranchangan2 Perumahan Murah kita tidak-lah membuat apa2 pinjaman yang lain.

Kerajaan juga telah di-tudoh beberapa kali tidak menggunakan dengan sepenoh2-nya peruntukkan di-dalam Peranggaran. Saya tidak hendak menafikan tuduhan ini kerana Ahli2 Yang Berhormat sekalian ma'alom mengikut Peratoran2 Pentadbiran yang berdasarkan demokerasi, Kerajaan tidak boleh membelanjakan wang jika peruntukan-nya tiada atau melebihi peruntukan. Oleh sebab itu Pegawai2 Pengawal sentiasa-lah berjimat2 supaya ia-nya sentiasa mempunyai wang bagi membayar perbelanjaan yang mengejut dan ada pula kalanya wang itu tidak di-gunakan langsung. Saya berharap Ahli2 Yang Berhormat sekalian jangan-lah sentiasa menchari salah sahaja; sebaklek-nya tuan2 mesti-lah mengambil ingatan bahawa semua wang2 yang di-kehendaki bagi ranchangan pembangunan sa-hingga tahun 1963 akan di-adakan di-dalam Kumpulan Wang Pembangunan. Tak usah-lah tuan2 berasa ragu bahawa ranchangan2 itu akan tergendala oleh kekurangan

an wang. Ranchangan Pembangunan kita akan di-laksanakan dengan sa-penoh2 tenaga dan kegiatan dan dengan itu muga2 Negeri ini akan bertambah2 maju lagi. Dengan membentangkan Belanjawan yang sechukop2-nya bagi tahun ini ber-ma'ana-lah kedudukan kewangan kita telah bertambah baik, dan kita harap pada tahun hadapan kita bukan sahaja dapat mengada-kan semua wang bagi mengurus-kan Ranchangan Lima Tahun yang Kedua daripada pendapatan tahun itu bahkan kita juga berharap mempunyai baki dan menambah lagi wang simpanan kita. Ahli2 Yang Berhormat sekalian akan dapati bahawa Baki Hasil 'Am kita pada penghujung tahun ini ia-lah di-taksirkan sebanyak \$1.7 juta. Ada juga orang yang mung-kin berasa susah hati berkenaan keadaan-nya yang sebegitu—tetapi mereka itu tiada-lah patut berasa demikian. Perbelanjaan menjalankan projek2 pembangunan se-makin hari semakin kurang kerana projek2 itu banyak yang sudah siap dan sementara menantikan Ranchangan Pembangunan yang akan datang pula kita mempunyai banyak masa untuk menambah lagi Baki Hasil 'Am kita itu. Sebagai-mana yang saya sebutkan tadi, kita terpaksa mengeluarkan wang simpanan kita kerana mengada-kan ranchangan pembangunan sa-perti mengadakan jalan2 raya, be-kalan ayer, kuasa letrik, parit dan tali-ayer, rumah2 untuk kaum bu-roh dan sebagai-nya. Semua-nya ini memberi faedah dan menda-tangkan kebajikan kepada ra'ayat. Apabila Ranchangan Lima Tahun yang Kedua itu tammam dalam tahun 1965 tentu-lah kita telah banyak menggunakan wang tetapi wang itu tidak di-belanjakan de-ngan sesia sahaja. Kedudukan kewangan kita terus beransor2 menjadi baik dan tiada-lah ana2 yang kita hendak khawatirkan. Oleh sebab itu-lah kita telah melancar-kan beberapa ranchangan2 yang baharu sebagaimana yang di-tun-

jokkan di-dalam Peranggaran Pembangunan dan perkara ini akan kita bincangkan kemudian kelak. Sekali lagi saya menegas-kan kepada Ahli2 Yang Berhormat sekalian bahawa Belanjawan ini telah di-susun dengan chermat-nya dan angka2 yang di-dapati di-dalam Belanjawan ini bukan-lah sekali2 angka2 yang di-reka2 sa-haja.

Sa-belum saya menutup ucapan saya ini saya mengucapkan ber-banyak2 terima kaseh kepada se-mua pegawai2 dan kakitangan2 Kerajaan kerana mereka sekalian telah memberi kerjasama dan so-kongan mereka yang penoh.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mo-hon menhadangkan.

Member for Tasek Glugor (Enche Hashim bin Awang): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong.

Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, notwithstanding what the Hon'ble the Chief Minister said in moving the Second Reading of the Supply Bill for 1963, I would like to say that the State's financial position is very gloomy. The present bud-get proves that the Opposition has been correct all the while and we rather regret that the State Gov-ernment has not heeded our sug-gestions in the past. Is the picture as rosy as the Allaince State Gov-ernment would like the people to believe? I will endeavour to prove later on that the accusation usually made by the Alliance against a local authority of squandermania can best be applied to the Alliance State Government itself.

What has become of the boastful claim of the Hon'ble the Chief Minister that the State Govern-ment 'will not look around for loans for any capital works'? What has happened to his boastful utter-ances that the State Government

will have 'a budget that will cer-tainly cut its coat according to its cloth'? Has the Hon'ble the Chief Minister forgotten what he said about that State Government hav-ing 'a lot of cloth, unlike other Councils', and yet the State Gov-ernment does not make use of the cloth it has in its stock?

It is time for the people to see that the Alliance State Govern-ment is now eating its words. In what way has the State Govern-ment squandered its resources? I shall quote figures from official sources to prove beyond any doubt that the squandering of the Alli-ance State Government has reduced the State's Consolidated fund con-siderably during its administration and that the balance of its Fund at present is in a very precarious position, should any urgent work crop up in the course of the year. This is the dilemma we have to face.

In the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the year 1960, the Consolidated Fund showed an actual Revenue Balance on 31.12.58 of \$4,231,762, and under Assets column, an actual Cash Balance in hand, and in Banks, etc., of \$1,962,388. Surplus funds on fixed deposit in Banks, in United King-dom Treasury Bills, and Federal Government Treasury Bills amounted to \$12,495,386. The financial position then can be con-sidered satisfactory.

In the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the year 1961, the actual revenue balance of the State's Consolidated Fund, at 31.12.59, was \$5,834,667. There was an actual cash balance in Banks, etc., of \$4,080,841. Invest-ments on surplus funds on fixed deposits in banks, in Federal Gov-ernment Treasury Bills and in Federation Stocks were \$16,002,-877. This also appears to be satis-factory.

In the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the year 1962, the actual Revenue balance as at 31.12.60, of the Consolidated Fund was \$7,846,586, of which there was a cash balance of \$1,646,923. In-vestments on surplus funds totalled \$20,317,800.

In the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for next year, the Consolidated Fund shows an actual Revenue Balance as at 31.12.61, of \$4,513,247, of which there was a cash balance in banks, etc., of only \$575,803. Investments on surplus funds totalled \$18,580,937.

In the same Statement one will notice from the Consolidated Revenue Account that the Esti-mated General Revenue Balance as at 31.12.62 is being drastically reduced to \$1,713,247, although the estimated cash in hand on 31.12.62 is being increased from \$575,803 to \$704,105. The investments on surplus funds have been so drasti-cally reduced from \$18,580,937 to \$11,850,000.

The Alliance State Government may consider that the investments on surplus funds of \$11,850,000 as at 31.12.62 are still sound, but it seems to forget that the State Government is committed to capital works, incompleting in 1962, to the tune of \$6,610,895, from the State Development Fund. We have therefore come to a stage where the State Government has already had to dip into its reserves to such an extent that its financial position cannot, under any circumstances, be regarded as sound. It must be borne in mind that loans from the Federal Government, by a decision of this Assembly, have been em-bodied in the Consolidated Fund, thereby reducing the actual Re-venue balance even further.

The imbalance and improper planning are clearly shown by a comparison of figures for the last four years.

In 1961, contribution to the Development Fund was \$8,848,610 of which \$5,632,492 was withdrawn from the Consolidated Fund. That is in 1961.

In 1962, the contribution to the Development Fund was \$6,086,491; the Alliance State Government continues to withdraw from the Consolidated Fund to the extent of \$2,866,359.

The General Revenue Balance of the Consolidated Fund is so precarious that the State Government has found it impracticable to continue to withdraw from this fund for its development projects. Hence it can only provide \$2,810,313 from its revenue of \$13,384,999 for the year 1963.

It is wrong for the Hon'ble the Chief Minister to paint a glowing picture out of this inaptitude and inefficiency of the Alliance State Government, when we have just come to the Third Year of the Five Year Development Plan.

Are we to take it then that it is the Alliance State Government's intention to slow down its Rural Development Plans? From these figures, it would appear to be so. From these figures it would appear that our warnings in the past, which had gone unheeded by the Alliance State Government, are now proved to be correct. There are still many capital works to be done in the State, the most important of which is the provision of electricity and water to every family in this State and we are still a long way off in the achieving of this objective.

Talking of water supply in rural areas, we notice that it is the intention of the State Government to continue with its collection of the water rate. This, as we all know, is imposed on the poor people in the rural areas. This,

we still contend, is against the principle of Government's responsibility to bear the cost of capital works. It is wrong for the Government to ask the ratepayers to pay for the capital works and then charge the normal water tariff in the rural areas. We therefore maintain that the State Government should abolish the water rate.

Turning to the Expenditure Estimates for 1963, it is noticed that recurrent expenditure on personal emoluments keeps rising. We are not against the normal increase in personal emoluments but, in spite of the Hon'ble the Chief Minister's assurance that 'the State Government is consistent in its policy to improve the standard of administration, to maintain staff efficiency for the proper functioning of the administrative and technical machinery', the State Administration leaves much to be desired.

The Reports of the Proceedings of Legislative Assembly Meetings are now being held back for nearly a year. It would appear that the more we criticise, the more the Government seems to fall back in arrears. Are we to take it that delay in presenting these Proceedings means efficiency in Government Administration? In the past we have been told that the Government was short of staff, but notwithstanding the increase in the number of staff in the Secretariat, we are being bogged down with more and longer delays. Besides, I wonder whether it is efficiency in the Government administration when for even a small enquiry, Hon'ble Members of this House have to wait until an Assembly Meeting to get a reply. We are indeed shocked to be told by the State Secretariat that enquiries, even on small issues, cannot be dealt with immediately but will have to await an Assembly Meeting for a reply. I am wondering what the reason is for all these

delays. If there is nothing to hide, if everything is above board, then the Alliance State Government should not be afraid to reply to Members of this House at any time, for they should be respected by the State Government, being the elected representatives of the people. And as elected representatives of the people, whenever they have any problem or criticism, the problem should be dealt with immediately without delay.

In dealing with the Administration, we find that it is the tendency of the Alliance State Government now to refrain from the accepted procedure, that is, to fill vacancies in the Civil Service through interviews of the applicants by the Public Services Commission. We are at times being told, and we are being reminded often, that the Civil Service must be impartial, that the Civil Service is neutral in politics, and yet we find that the Alliance State Government is veering farther away from this accepted procedure. Many of its active members are known to have seeped into the Civil Service, not on the merits of the applicants, but because of party ties. I know of at least one occasion on which a top Alliance leader outwardly boasted to his friends that nothing could remove him from his appointment in the Civil Service, although he has neither the qualification nor the experience to hold that appointment.

I would like to call upon the Alliance State Government to see that Government Regulations are applicable to all and that there should be no discrimination in their application. In this it is understood that there are Regulations concerning the political activities of public servants. I do hope that the Alliance State Government will adhere rigidly to those Regulations. This must be done if the neutrality and impartiality of the Civil Service is to be

maintained. This must be done if democracy in this country is to survive.

Going through the Estimates further, it is surprising to note that whereas the State Government has provided the Rural District Councils in Province Wellesley with Fire Services, it has shirked its responsibility in so far as the Penang Island Rural District Council is concerned. Are we to take it then that the State Government is not aware of its responsibility? Why should it close its eyes to the fact that in the Constitution of the Federation of Malaya Fire Brigade is one of the services of a local character under the State List.

Furthermore, since the State Government has provided an expenditure of \$81,133 in the Estimates for the Fire Services in Province Wellesley, it is not understood why no such provision is being made for Penang Island Rural Fire Services. This, I contend, is downright discrimination. A matter of this nature, which is in accordance with the Constitution, should not be subject to political differences. There is no political ideology involved, and the State Government should be wise to accept what is clearly stated in the Constitution as a responsibility of the State.

I would like to conclude my general observations on this Bill but I have more to say on Rural Development when we debate the motion to be introduced by the Hon'ble the Chief Minister later on. I feel sure that my friends on this side of the House will speak on other matters just as important as those I have already raised, and I hope that the State Government will accept our comments with good grace and implement our proposals for the good of the people in this State.

Thank you.

Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Christmas Season is coming, the Chinese New Year Season is coming, and the shops are full of toys. But I am sure the State Government this time has picked up the wrong toy. In other words, I feel the State Government is like a child who has picked up a balloon and keeps on blowing at it until one day it bursts in its face. The reason I speak in this manner is that there is no necessity for anyone to be trained as an economist, or to be any specialist; an ordinary man in the street, looking at our Estimates, will know that it is impossible to go on at this rate; and that in 10 years time our revenue would not be sufficient to cover part of the Civil Service emoluments and other recurrent emoluments.

I first of all would like to point out that our State revenue from 1961 to 1962 shows an increase of about 9%. But the State revenue from 1962 to 1963 shows not an increase but a minus—remarkable indeed; a minus of about 1%. So for these two years we have an average increase of about 3% to 4% on the State revenue. Now, what about the expenditure? What we are getting is an increase of 3%. What we pay out—that is remarkable; and I am speaking of the annually recurrent expenditure—amounts to 10%. Where are we going to make up for the 7%? You will be dipping into your savings until one day you will have nothing to dip in for. That is the position. I do not know whether the State Government has examined the sources of revenue, or whether they are satisfied that the assessors of revenue could be encouraged to bring in more income, or whether there should be other Heads of revenue, which they can if they want to, or if they can persuade the Federation to allow

them to have. That is the position. What are our chief sources of revenue? It has to do with things of the spirit. First of all, of the chief sources of revenue in this State is toddy. We have got about \$1 million over from toddy. And then we have about \$1,800,000 from entertainment; over \$500,000 from pawnshops; \$127,000 from theatres; \$27,000 from secondhand dealers. We have got \$862,000 from interest on money in the bank—a decrease of interest to the extent of \$100,000. In other words, Members of this Assembly, our source of revenue is so restricted. And yet at the same time by a peculiar logic of bureaucracy our needs for expenses are rising far above our sources of revenue. The only source of revenue which the Chief Minister seems to be confident of, the source of revenue from toddy shops, I am afraid to say is decreasing. If you study the excise duties we get from toddy shops, it shows a decrease of about \$111,000. In 1961 we got over \$1,300,000 from toddy shops excise duties, but today we are estimating for \$1,238,000. At the same time we must also note that the decrease will be more marked in the future years. And this I think is acknowledged by the fact that the Government is prepared to spend less—some \$80,000 to \$90,000—on the purchase of toddy for next year compared to other years. And this is the point that I like to make.

And I was expecting that in our State revenue there would be an increase from the Federal source in respect of Capitation Grant and State Road Grants. Surely our population by the progress of these years would have increased when compared to that of other years. The population increase in the Federation of Malaya of which we are a part is roughly 3.5%, but our Capitation Grant remains the same. Surely our State Road pro-

jects have increased; and yet the State Road Grants remain the same. Now, where are you going to get the money? You cannot increase toddy shops any more because they are going down. You cannot increase pawnshops because there is a limit to pawnshops in this State. You cannot increase secondhand dealers because they are sufficient. And you cannot increase interest from banks unless you have money to put into banks.

Another thing that struck me is the remarkable—unless there is a clarification—Penang Hill Railway. How is it that our revenue is only \$1,840 in 1963, whereas in 1962 it is \$11,884—a decrease of about \$10,000 in the source of revenue? Why is there this remarkable decrease? Does the State Government anticipate that every person will boycott that Railway in view of the projected Penang Hill Road which I hope to see going up the Hill before the next election comes on?

Chief Minister: Go for a holiday.

Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): So this is a point that I would like to stress: that the Government is not constructive; it is accepting its revenue every year without seeking new Heads of revenue, even if it is bound by the Constitution. We would like to know whether the Government has approached the Federal Government to obtain more money for State revenue which we are legitimately entitled to instead of getting it by way of Capitation Grants.

Another point that also struck me, Mr. Speaker, Sir, is that the development projects—the capital projects carried out by the Government—are not revenue-earning. They are, maybe, according to the intentions or according to the estimation of the Government, projects

for the public good. But at the same time a Government must run parallel to whichever projects are for the public good and invest in the works which produce income. I would not like to touch on this subject until we move on to the Development Estimates. At that place I will dwell more thoroughly on what I feel about the Government's ineptitude in their planning. I can only add that I support the remarks of my colleague from Jelutong, and would hope that the Government would not stand up and say we are not constructive, we are destructive, that we are violent, and that we are fire-eaters or hot beds, or whatever it is. I assure that our criticism is never extravagant. It is just as modest as the reply the Chief Minister usually gives in such matters.

Thank you.

Member for Glugor (Enche Aziz Ibrahim): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mengambil bahagian di-dalam Bill ini, saya tahu ta' berapa lama lagi Ketua Menteri beri tahu kepada semua Ahli2 Dewan Negeri dengan memberi ucapan atas soalan2 yang di-bawa. Baru2 ini, Ahli Kawasan Jelutong bangkit marah bukan main, Tuan Pengerusi, saya bangkit, saya kena beri tahu kepada yang Berhormat itu.... (interrupted.)

Mr. Speaker: Dia ta' marah dia chuma tegor.

Member for Glugor (Enche Aziz Ibrahim):sudah keluar dalam Paper banyak kali ada dikeluarkan mengatakan Alliance Government squander people's fund—sangat kita dukachita. Squandering people's fund—dia kata kita buat kepada ra'ayat tipu punya pekerjaan. Kalau hari ini.... (interrupted.)

Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): The term was not coined by us Mr. Speaker, Sir.

Member for Glugor (Enche Aziz Ibrahim): Jadi Alliance Government ini squander people's money. Kalau tengok dalam ucapan Ketua Menteri pada hari ini semua-nya di-bentangkan dan semua-nya di-beri ucapan panjang lebar. Saya fikir Ahli2 pun tahu, kita Ahli2 di-pilih oleh orang ramai dalam Negeri Pulau Pinang. Negeri kita telah mencapai beberapa progress, kejayaan dan kemajuan selepas 31 Ogos tahun 1957—Negara Merdeka, kita sendiri, kita tengok macam mana dahulu yang kerja2 yang mana Kerajaan British sendiri semenjak 170 tahun yang menjaga-nya dan dengan 4, 5 tahun chara2 Kerajaan Perikatan, macam mana kita susunkan kita punya Budget atau pun Perbelanjaan Negeri dan begitu juga wang peruntukan Federal Grant yang telah kita dapat, sedikit sebanyak pinjaman di-champor dan dengan duit ini kita tengok kejayaan yang kita ta' boleh nafi kejayaan2 yang besar dalam 4 tahun ini — sa-lepas Merdeka. Saya sendiri hairan, macam mana kita sudah jalankan, di-manakah duit ini datang, macam mana di-jalankan, macam mana sudah di-habiskan projek2 ini. Dalam sedikit masa lagi dalam ucapan Ketua Menteri dan juga dalam Development Estimate, kita hendak chuba habiskan sebelum 1964 punya Anggaran Perbelanjaan. Jadi projek2 itu tentulah akan di-siapkan setakat mana yang boleh. Pada masa ini saya hendak beritahu kepada Ahli2 Majlis Meshuarat di-hadapan saya ia-itu 75% kerja2 ini sudah di-jalankan. Tetapi kalau hendak di-chatitkan satu persatu akan mengambil masa yang panjang untuk di-beri ucapan yang panjang lebar. Di-sini, berkenaan dengan menjahanamkan duit orang ramai, saya sendiri tidak bersetuju-lah dengan kata2 Ahli Kawasan Jelutong, kerana jikalau dia hendak tengok, patah balek berkenaan dengan lain2 authority juga, kita

tengok dalam Bandar Raya, kita pun susah hati. Penduduk2 di-situ — rate payers, bagi tahu kepada wakil ra'ayat dan Kerajaan juga yang mengatakan ta' puas hati mereka tentang duit yang di-belanjakan di-dalam Bandar Raya. Sapti — Berlin Wall di-Carnarvon Street itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tiga kali naik tiga kali pechah.... (interrupted.)

Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): On a point of order, has Carnarvon Street any relevance to the Budget?

Member for Glugor (Enche Aziz Ibrahim): Tidak, yang saya kata ini bukan dalam Budget. Saya berchakap ini fasal wang, duit ra'ayat Negeri, yang bagi jahanam—siapa yang nak tanggung jawab..... (interrupted.)

Mr. Speaker: Saya ingat kalau begitu perkara itu boleh di-bawakan ka-dalam Budget Bandar Raya bukan di-dalam Budget State.

Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Terima kaseh.

Member for Glugor (Enche Aziz Ibrahim): Saya hendak bagi tahu bukan-lah Bandar Raya, tetapi kita hendak tahu duit ra'ayat di-mana bagi hilang fund dan yang mana yang betul hilang, pechah dan naik, tanam pokok, pokok itu siapa nak jaga? Dengan duit siapa? Duit ra'ayat. Berlin Wall, naik pechah dan naik pechah... (interrupted.)

Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, he is still touching on the Berlin Wall. I would suggest that he asks his Councillor to bring it up at the City Council.

Member for Glugor (Enche Aziz Ibrahim): Tuan Pengerusi ta' bolehkah saya berchakap fasal itu?

Mr. Speaker: Kerana masa'alah yang di-hadapan kita ini tidak bersangkutan dengan perkara itu.

Member for Glugor (Enche Aziz Ibrahim): Kalau boleh saya hendak berchakap fasal Chowrasta Market (laughter). Berkenaan dengan ucapan Ahli Kawasan Jelutong tadi, tentang kata Tuan Yang Berhormat itu kepada perkara development dalam rural areas, dalam luar bandar terlampau slow — kata pelahan sangat. Dalam semua mukim, kampong kita, electricity, ayer, jambatan, tali-ayer dan lain2 perkara semua dalam ranchangan luar bandar, kalau kita semak baik2, tadi Ketua Menteri berchakap apa yang di-dapati di-dalam kita punya Development Estimates dalam Ordinary Estimates saya fikir perbelanjaan dalam luar bandar pada hari ini, saya nampak, Kerajaan sudah jalankan tanggung jawab dan dasar-nya. Saya fikir 75-80% telah sian dan di-sini saya ta' boleh nafi sedikit sebanyak berkenaan authority yang menjaga khas-nya berkenaan electricity dan ayer yang Kerajaan sangkut paut dengan Bandar Raya. Jadi itu-lah sebab-nya development ini jalan dengan lambat. Dia bincangkan semua perkara2 yang di-bawa ka-dalam Dewan Negeri oleh Ahli2 Dewan Negeri terutama-nya oleh Ahli Perikatan yang membuat recommendation kepada Government. Bandar Raya yang jaga ayer, Bandar Raya yang pegang electricity. Hari ini bagi anggaran peruntukan masuk kepada Kerajaan. Barang2 konon-nya kalau hari ini di-order, lagi 8 bulan baharu datang, siapa yang order itu? Bukan Kerajaan Negeri tetapi Bandar Raya. Pipe, wire dan cable-lah, itu dan ini — generator dan lain2 semua ini daripada Bandar Raya, dan bila barang ada boleh-lah jalankan kerja. Jadi jangan-lah Ahli Kawasan Jelutong hendak marah sangat kepada Kerajaan, terlewat, terlambat dalam

rural development projek — electricity and water. Berkenaan dengan sebelah Balik Pulau Kerajaan Negeri yang jaga ayer. Di-Seberang Perai senang sedikit—C.E.B., P.W.D. jaga, satu perintah yang lain, kalau ada main politik, sambong sedikit jadi bersangkutan salah faham dengan orang ramai. Tadi dalam soalan mulut dan soalan Bertulis berkenaan Ketua Menteri bagi tahu berkenaan dengan letrik. Tempat2 yang sudah Kerajaan bantu atau pun City Council punya duit sudah belanja, ini semua sudah di-bagi tahu tadi daripada jawapan yang di-terangkan dan di-mana yang boleh jalankan dan di-mana yang hendak di-buat di-dalam tahun 1963 - 64. Kalau hari ini Bandar Raya bagi tahu kepada Kerajaan dengan chepat Anggaran Perbelanjaan itu dengan tidak kalah sana sini dan termasuk politik sebanyak sedikit tarek politik ka-dalam Mukim chakapkan di-tempat2 yang mana boleh di-lambatkan. Jadi hari ini saya na' beri cherita, sangat panjang, yang ini Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita hendak jalankan ranchangan yang boleh memberi faedah kepada orang ramai, kalau ada masuk politik sedikit sebanyak, susah-lah. Jadi berkenaan dengan peratoran — Government Officers ta' boleh masuk politik, yang masuk di-dalam Usul Ahli Kawasan Jelutong tadi, jadi Tuan Yang di-Pertua dan tuan2 sekalian berkenaan dengan Government Officers masuk politik, yang ini ta' betul. Saya telah beberapa kali kena marah dengan Ketua Menteri "Hai" kata-nya "Enche Aziz, jangan, masuk politik dalam Government". Di-sini saya hendak beri tahu Ahli2 sekalian bahawa Kerajaan Perikatan hari ini, menjalankan perkara Government, dengan betul. Tang mana politik betul ada tempat-nya. Hari ini meshuarat politik ta' boleh jalankan di-dalam bangunan Kerajaan, ta' boleh. Tetapi ada lain2, kita tengok dalam satu Council lain

pula, kalau mahu pergi hari ini saya boleh bawa pergi, tempat-nya jadi political arena.

Berkenaan Tuan Lee Kok Liang pula, Ahli Kawasan Kota, dia kata Christmas shopping akan datang, Chinese New Year pun datang, dia ta' tambah pula Hari Raya pun datang, jadi sama2-lah. Berkenaan dengan December, January — 3 holiday festival, jadi na' kena belanja banyak-lah. Dia kata Christmas shopping, New Year, lepas itu Hari Raya kita, jadi dia nampak susah sedikit, tetapi duit perbelanjaan kita dapat pertolongan dahulu, kita tunjukkan di-dalam hitam putih sahaja, di-dalam Paper sahaja, kata-nya. Macham mana hendak belanja, macham mana dapat duit itu. Tetapi saya fikir Ketua Menteri senang sahaja boleh jawab macham mana chara revenue Kerajaan tunjok 3,000,000 dan dengan semangat kita hendak pusingkan duit ini. Dalam pendapatan Ahli Kawasan Kota daripada todody, entertainment dan lain2. Jadi ini tentu Ketua Menteri boleh jawab.

Berkenaan dengan Penang Hill Railway, ini boleh saya bagi keterangan tetapi Ketua Menteri ada keterangan2-nya dan sebab2-nya. Bukan sebab Penang Hill Road yang kita hendak takutkan, tidak. Ada belanja yang kita hendak belanjakan. Jadi itu-lah sahaja Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by my colleague from Kota because it does seem to me that our revenues have been on the decrease, and I am not convinced that the Government shows any awareness of this fact because I see that there are new posts—and many of them—being proposed in the Budget for next year. I am particularly con-

cerned that in the Capitation Grant which we receive from Federal sources the figure for 1963 will remain the same as the figure for 1962. I have in the past, Mr. Speaker, Sir, referred to this matter. I believe the principle of Capitation Grant is based on the idea of head counting. The word itself derives from "capat" or the "head". Surely the increase in population in Penang must show a reflection in the amount of Capitation Grant we get from the Central Government. I wonder what is the cause of this lack of reflection to increase of population. Is it because that our Government is not pressing this matter seriously enough? It is after all the duty of State Governments to present their case and press for the settlement of their just claim. If they do not press their case the Federal Government would naturally take the easy line and say; "These Penang folks are very easy to deal with. The Chief Minister is a very nice chap, so let us give anything we think is right." Now, that sort of attitude is generally the practice in all Federal set-ups; and therefore it is the duty, I consider, of the State Government to press their case urgently and see that Penang gets an adequate appropriation in proportion to its numbers.

I notice that what I have said about the Capitation Grant can be said to apply equally to the Road Grant. I note that the figure does not show any proportionate increase to the increase in the number of motor vehicles which are registered in the State of Penang. We are all aware that motor vehicles are increasing in number. It is something that we see on the roads every day. But still I suppose the number of cars registered in the State should have some representation in the amount of Road Grant that is apportioned to the State.

Coming now to certain aspects of these Estimates, I would like a clarification from the Honourable the Chief Minister on certain small points. On page 24 there is an item 12—Assessment due to City Council. The assessment paid in 1962 was \$10,000, and the proposed figure for 1963 is \$1,200. I wonder if this is the idea of the Chief Minister to economize. Perhaps he can only think of the City Council when the question of economy arises—"Let's cut down what we give to the City Council". So I would like clarification on that point.

Then on page 26, item 33—Rent on private properties leased by Government. The figure for 1962 was \$13,500, and the figure for 1963 which is being proposed is \$10. Could we have a clarification as to what is the meaning of this sudden very enormous reduction?

Then I go to page 27. I have originally marked here for query 'Motor-car for His Excellency the Governor', but after the explanation given by the Honourable the Chief Minister I do not propose to do so. However, I must really question item No. 48—Crockery for Residency and Bel Retiro. I notice in the Estimates for 1962 we allowed the figure of \$10,000, which perhaps might be necessary. But I notice we are proposing to give another \$10,000 for 1963. Surely I presume that the crockery cannot all be broken within a space of one year, necessitating a further \$10,000 for the next year. So I would like a clarification on that as well.

Then I turn to page 57—Religious Affairs and Courts: item 14—Housing and Hotel Allowances. I notice that the amount allowed for this still seems a little excessive in comparison with other Departments. Perhaps the Hon-

ourable the Chief Minister will give us an explanation as to why such a large figure is necessary for this particular expenditure.

One of the clarifications that I would like to have is: Why is it that there are so many appointments which are marked 'Personal to holder'? I realize that in some Departments it is necessary occasionally to have an appointment in the Budget put down as personal to the holder; but I notice in several Departments a very large number of posts marked 'Personal to holder'. That is not a very desirable state of affairs in any Government or Authority because the more such posts you have the more anomalies are created in the existing Service. I think these matters need to be clarified.

Finally there are two points on which I would like to talk and to say that an alteration in the Budget is called for. The first is found on page 26. It is item 34, and refers to State Scholarships. The figure for 1963 is still the same as the figure for 1962, which is \$85,000, but the amount available for Scholarships for higher studies is \$70,000, which means that the original \$85,000 which was available for higher studies in 1962 before we approved the Minor Scholarships Bill is now not being fully utilized, and that \$15,000 appeared to have been set apart for the Minor Scholarships, which was made law by a Motion in this Assembly some months ago. Now, what I would like to recommend or suggest is that we should have either \$85,000 for Scholarships for advanced studies, or in fact increase it so that the amount available for advanced studies by children born in the State of Penang would be at least \$100,000, because any reduction of this particular Scholarship Fund is highly undesirable because if Penang has

in the past been a leading State of the Federation it was because we had proportionately a large number of educated knowledgeable citizens who were able to take the lead. And therefore I think that that figure should be altered and increased.

And the other general comment that I would like to make is that it seems to me that Government has at last paid heed to our criticism in the past about the lack of adequate funds for Social Welfare. I refer to page 59. Under General Welfare, I notice that the Estimates for 1963 provide for \$75,000 instead of the \$45,000 which we provided in 1962. Since I have hurled a few brickbats at Government, I would like to congratulate the Government on this one improvement. I do not think the figure given is even now sufficient, but anyway it is an improvement; and I should like to congratulate the Government on it.

Member for Butterworth (Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan, J.P.): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I like to remove the wrong impression created by the misconception of the Hon'ble Member for Jelutong..

As regards to the Fire Service that is available from the State, his comparison between Province Wellesley and the Rural District Penang Island and his statement in that there is discrimination between these two areas as far as this Fire Service is concerned is erroneous and quite unwarranted. It will seem that this subject had been discussed in this House several times before, and for several times explanations had been advanced to him on this matter. It appears that there is a certain difference between the Rural District Penang Island and the City Council as regards the fire services requirements. The

State Government is prepared to assist the Rural District Council, Penang Island in establishing its fire service by providing equipments and buildings, but the Rural District Council would be expected to meet the recurrent expenditure in like manner as the other local authorities in Province Wellesley. The provision and maintenance of fire services are the responsibilities of local authorities under the Municipal Ordinance. The Government is providing capital expenditure in the Rural District Penang Island on an ex-gratia basis in order to help the Rural District Council to establish fire services. The Rural District Council, Penang Island, has not yet taken the advantage of this offer and, therefore, the money is revoted for 1963.

It is understood that negotiation between the Rural District Council, Penang Island, and the City Council is still going on and they would come to a settlement very soon. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is erroneous to paint the wrong picture to this House that some discrimination is practised as far as these areas are concerned. I would like to confirm and state that the State Government has never neglected its duties, and that it has never practised this sort of thing.

Coming to the point raised by the Hon'ble Member for Kota and Sungei Pinang as regards to the reduction in the State Revenue and the dwindling nature of the Consolidated Fund, I would like to point out to Hon'ble Members the misconceptions on these.

Before these things could be made in the general form, I think we should have a clear picture of what the Government is contributing. The Government is not a business concern; it is not being done on a profitable basis. Of course, we sometimes profit, and

under such circumstances what has the Government got to do? It has to use the fund in a useful way for the people—so the same things have been done here. So, I think, Sir, to harp on this point and to attack the Government in an unjustifiable way is quite unwarranted and uncalled for.

Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Tan Chong Bee): Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is not the first time that our Hon'ble Member for Butterworth has used these words: "unwarranted" and "uncalled for" in this Chamber.

He said that the Hon'ble Member for Jelutong used the word "discrimination" because the Government was not making a provision for the fire services for the Rural District Council, Penang Island, when it had done so for Province Wellesley. The Hon'ble Member for Buterworth said that that was not discrimination and that it was an erroneous statement made by the Hon'ble Member for Jelutong. He stated that arrangements were going on between the Rural District Council, Penang Island and the City Council so that the City fire brigade service could be extended to the rural areas. He also mentioned that the Government has laid aside a certain sum of money for capital works so that a fire brigade station could be built for the Rural District Council, Penang Island. Am I right in making that statement, Mr. Speaker, Sir? By that statement, he implied there was no necessity for the Rural District Council, Penang Island to have this fire brigade service, because the City Council.....

Member for Butterworth (Dr. M. P. L. Yegappan, J.P.): On the point of clarification, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I never said those words. I never said there was no necessity for the Rural District Council,

Penang Island to have a fire brigade service. I said that it is the responsibility of the local authorities under the Municipal Ordinance, and it is for them to provide and the Government is prepared to help them.

Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Tan Chong Bee): Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, from that clarification the Hon'ble Member for Butterworth is laying the blame on the Rural District Council for not providing a fire service for the district. Why, may we ask, has the Rural District Council not done so? I think the answer is very simple. They haven't got the means to do it. So, what are we here, as Members of the State Assembly, supposed to do? To sit by until one day when fire breaks out both in the Rural District Council and in the City Council at the same time? Where is the fire brigade going to? Rush to Balik Pulau when there is a fire, say in Kelawei?

Member for Kelawei (Mr. Tan Khim Hoe): Why pick on Kelawei?

Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): More bank money there.

Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Tan Chong Bee): So you see the danger of this attitude which we are adopting in not providing a fire service in the rural areas, as I mentioned some time ago in this very Chamber. Very many houses which have been built there—the development that has been taking place outside the City of George Town has been very great. Now, it is time that the State Government does something to help the local authority when it is not in a position to help itself. Thank you.

Member for Sungei Bakap (Mr. Kee Yong Chin, J.P.): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to clarify on

that subject about Fire Services, and I would make it clear that it is the intention of the State Government to release every capital grant to the District Council of Penang Island. We are all quite aware of the efficient service of the fire engines of the City Council—they can be here, they can be there; and they have done very, very good service to the Island, especially in the rural areas during the break-out of a fire. Now we are all aware that Fire Services is rather the responsibility of the local authority. The Government can only give them the capital grant, as for maintenance, as the Hon'ble Member from Butterworth has said, should be from the District Council. Now we gave the other Councils such amenities, and we could see no reason why such amenities could not be given to the Rural District Council, Penang Island.

I would like to touch again on the comments made by the Hon'ble Member from Jelutong that the State Government boasted—that a rosy picture is being painted in the Budget. We would like to assure him that we cut our cloth according to our wear. Opposition Members said that we are extravagant. Now, if we have the revenue and we do not spend it they would also criticise as whatever we spent in the Rural Districts it is for the good of the people.

As to the statement that a certain high Civil Service man boasted of his right to be in the service without dismissal, is his own opinion. I would like to say that the State Government in all services they engaged, have to go through the Public Services Commission and this being done justly and without any discrimination.

And, as for the Member from Kota he said that the revenue from the Penang Hill Railway has

dropped to an average of \$1,000/-. I would like to assure him that, if he looked carefully, we have used the revenue in the Penang Hill Railway Vote to better the Hill Railway amenities. That has caused the reduction of the balance of the net revenue.

As for the Hon'ble Member from Sungei Pinang, we thank him for praising the State Government in raising the General Welfare Vote to \$75,000/-. Now, we assure him that, we would be very cautious not to give subsidy to anybody and everybody—only to these people who are in need. Thank you.

Member for Tanjong Utara (Mr. Yuen Fook Cheong): Mr. Speaker, Sir, when my colleague over this side mentioned about the increase in the provision for Social Welfare, I heard some applause from the Government Side. Of course they thought they were very contented, but let it be known that we, the members on this Side, are still not satisfied with the amount of \$75,000/- allotted to General Welfare work for the State of Penang for the whole of the year 1963. I find that the Government has been static over this matter, in view of what the Government has always boasted and from what we have just heard from the Hon'ble Chief Minister and the Hon'ble Member for Sungei Bakap, both of whom claim that they are always having the interest of the poor people at heart. I am beginning to wonder whether they actually have a heart for these underprivileged people—the people who, through no fault of their own, are unable to help themselves. Surely the Government must realise that the sum of \$75,000 is insufficient to do welfare work. So, I would suggest that the State Government should not be static over this call, but take drastic effort to increase the provision.

I think our Hon'ble friend from Sungei Pinang also mentioned that it requires the Opposition to kick the Government before they would do anything, and I think that this is correct. If I remember rightly, it was in 1961 that they allotted the sum of \$30,000 for General Welfare work. We kicked up a row and they increased the sum to \$45,000 in 1962. We kicked them again and said that the amount was inadequate and they finally increase it to \$75,000 this year. So, I think, if I give another kick they might increase it to a bigger sum next year.

Member for Permatang Pauh (Enche Ariffin bin Shariff): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ingin berchakap di-dalam Rumah ini, ia-itu di-dalam kita banyak mendapat tegoran dan ada pula pujian daripada Pembangkang berkenaan dengan perkara Perbelanjaan Awam Social Welfare. Mengikut Ahli Kawasan Kota yang mengatakan, sebab di-naikkan perbelanjaan di-dalam bahagian Perbelanjaan Awam Social Welfare itu ia-lah hasil daripada tegoran2 daripada Pembangkang... (interrupted.)

Mr. Speaker: Bukan Ahli Kawasan Kota, Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Utara.

Member for Permatang Pauh (Enche Ariffin bin Shariff): Saya minta ma'af Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Utara. Tetapi di-sini biar-lah saya terangkan, ia-itu daripada sa-tahun kasa-tahun perbelanjaan ini ditambah. Berani-lah saya menegaskan bukan-lah tegoran yang di-datangkan daripada Pehak Pembangkang yang telah memberi hasil ini. Kita Ahli2 di-pileh oleh rayat datang ka-Dewan ini dan berchakap. Kita daripada Parti Perikatan telah di-perchayai oleh rayat untuk memerintah Negeri ini dan dari masa ka-sa-masa ada-lah

menchari jalan untuk membantu orang2 di-dalam kawasan luar bandar dan juga di-dalam Bandar di-Negeri ini — ini ada-lah satu tanggung jawab Kerajaan Negeri ini. Kalau-lah Pehak Pembangkang menganggap kenaikan perbelanjaan ini dari hasil Pehak Pembangkang membuat tegoran2 itu ada-lah perkara yang silap sama sekali.

Member for Kelawei (Mr. Tan Khim Hoe): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to clarify a point just mentioned by the Member for Tanjong Utara. I think in the last meeting I spoke in my Adjournment Speech, appealing to the Government for more aid to the Welfare Department. During my tour of the world, I have seen and heard about how the Government helped the people: so, when I returned, I appealed... (interrupted.)

Member for Tanjong Utara (Mr. Yuen Fook Cheong): Join the Socialists.

Member for Kelawei (Mr. Tan Khim Hoe): So a member of the Opposition said they have kicked the Government in 1961 and 1962 but I think it must have been my super kick in the last meeting that got us results! But I can assure the Opposition that we on this side have the welfare of the people, especially of the State of Penang, in our hearts and we can assure them that we will do more for them next year. (Applause.)

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Chor Sin Kheng): I would like to congratulate the mover of the Bill, the Hon'ble the Chief Minister for introducing to this Assembly to-day a balanced Budget for 1963 — a Budget which, in spite of a heavy development programme, has annually to contribute to the State Development Fund from cur-

rent revenue without having to resort to withdrawals from General Reserve balances.

Regarding the proposal to purchase a new motor car for His Excellency the Governor, it has my full support. It is common knowledge that the Hon'ble the Chief Minister has just got a new car, and so has the Mayor.

Mr. Speaker: But not the Speaker.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Chor Sin Kheng): It is indeed very distressing to know of the unreliable and poor condition and old age of the present car of His Excellency, and I feel sure that a new renowned motor car will fit in well with the dignity and prestige of the Head of this State.

The increase in the provision for general welfare next year will be \$30,000 and this increase, in fact, has won the appreciation of the leader of the Opposition himself, the Hon'ble Member for Sungei Pinang. This will no doubt increase the scope of social welfare assistance to the people. We have been told by the Hon'ble the Chief Minister that the provision of \$75,000 is not the limit of welfare assistance by Government. The Federal Government also gives such assistance and grants to other organisations in Penang. After all, I can say that we are making very much progress in the social welfare work in our State.

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker (to Chief Minister): Do you wish to make any reply?

Chief Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya rasa hairan macham mana Wakil daripada Jelutong katakan (saya balek kapada ucha-

saya) ia-itu Kerajaan memang selalu "Potong baju ikut kain yang kita ada" dan dasar Kerajaan, jikalau boleh jangan-lah pinjam wang untuk membuat apa2 ranchangan di-dalam Negeri kita ini. Saya rasa, ucapan saya bukan berchakap boastful atau pun sombong. Sampai hari ini Kerajaan tidak lagi buat kerja potong baju jikalau tidak ada itu kain. Dan apa sebab yang ada pinjam duit untuk buat Rumah Murah. Hal ini saya akan terangkan dengan penoh dan saya fikir jikalau Parti Pembangkang hendak berchakap, saya minta-lah pandang sedikit ka-kiri kanan dan beri ucapan yang patut, yang benar. Pinjaman yang na' buat rumah murah itu, sebab Kerajaan Negeri dapat untong di-atas pinjaman itu. Pinjaman untuk membuat rumah murah di-Kampung Herriot atau pun Bukit Berapit, Bukit Mertajam, bungenan yang Kerajaan Persekutuan kenakan kapada Kerajaan Negeri ia-lah 2% sahaja—two percent only. Kerajaan Negeri boleh menjalankan ranchangan itu dengan duit sendiri, tetapi kenapa begitu bodoh. Kalau duit simpan di-dalam Bank boleh dapat 4%, 5% ambil duit daripada Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu dengan 2% bukannya untong. Ini macham mana, adakah Kerajaan Negeri bodoh? Siapa yang bodoh saya ta' boleh kata, tetapi Kerajaan ta' bodoh.

Saya berasa hairan juga ada sa-orang daripada parti Pembangkang itu berkata Kerajaan Negeri membuang duit dengan ta' tentu hala, belanja duit, sampai duit di-dalam peti kita pun sudah kosong. Bangkit lagi satu Ahli pula, kata belanja banyak lagi, kasi kapada Social Welfare duit lebeh lagi, scholarship pun kasi lebeh. Saya rasa hairan. Satu kata belanja, satu kata jangan belanja. Jadi macham mana kita hendak jalan, satu kata go-ahead satu lagi kata

gostan. Tetapi Kerajaan Negeri memang bukan bengong. Tetapi Pembangkang ini macham orang bodoh satu kata jalan ka-hadapan, satu kata gostan, tapi ta' tahu-lah siapa yang bodoh... (interrupted.)

Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, may I ask whether the word "bodoh" is parliamentary language or not. This side of the House has never use it and it would appear that the Hon'ble the Chief Minister keeps on using it. We have never used the word "bodoh", or any word that is unparliamentary.

Mr. Speaker: Very well, I permit no further use of the word "bodoh".

Chief Minister: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ini memang hendak belajar Bahasa Kebangsaan. Kita baru ni, baru perengkat yang kedua. Selalu Kerajaan minta Ahli2 kita beri-lah ucapan di-dalam Bahasa Kebangsaan di-dalam Dewan ini. Mai2 di-Dewan ini, saya pakai satu huruf "bodoh" dia bagi pula saya.... (laughter).

Mr. Speaker: Kata ta' pandai.

Chief Minister: "Ta' pandai"—bagus.... (interrupted).

Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Sir, he is using it again (laughter)..

Mr. Speaker: He is defining it.

Chief Minister: Saya minta ma'af. Saya ni ta'bilang siapa2 bodoh. Saya ta' tahu siapa yang bodoh. Kalau saya kata siapa2 yang bodoh saya minta ma'af-lah. Tetapi siapa makan chabai dia-lah berasa pedas.

Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): It is not a case of whether the word "bodoh" is use

in relation to anybody. But don't you consider the word "bodoh" is unparliamentary and should not be used in this House.

Mr. Speaker: I have already given my ruling — no further use of the word "bodoh".

Chief Minister: Ta' pandai (laughter). Ini-lah Tuan Yang di-Pertua, memang parti Pembangkang ini hendak bahawa Kerajaan masok ka-longkang, tetapi Kerajaan memang sedar yang Parti Pembangkang ini hendak chari jalan, ta' ada jalan pun dia chari jalan juga.

Jikalau kita hendak buat satu perkara dengan ta' ada duit macham mana kita hendak buat. Kita berkehendakkan duit untuk menjalankan Ranchangan Pembangunan Luar Bandar. Berbatu2 jalan raya yang kita telah siapkan. Beberapa paip2 ayer yang kita sudah bawa ka-kampung2 dan banyak jalan2 kechil di-dalam bendang yang kita buat. Titi rosak kita perbaiki dan banyak lagi ranchangan2. Kalau ta'ada duit macham mana kita hendak buat? Bila kita belanja duit yang kita ada dalam peti itu, salahkah? Di-katakan pula kita "squander" duit ini. Apa yang ma'ana "squander" itu saya ta' tahu-lah... (laughter)....tetapi orang cherdek, orang ta' pandai... (laughter)... Kalau orang ta' pandai, macham mana kita belanja pun salah. Tetapi kalau kita belanjakan wang dengan boros patut juga di-marah atau ditegor. Tetapi saya boleh berkata kapada Ahli itu, melawat-lah di-kawasan2 luar bandar pergi-lah tanya tuan2 punya rumah di-tepi2 jalan itu. Saya boleh kata, tiap2 penduduk2 itu puas hati, jadi macham mana yang Ahli daripada Kawasan (kawasan mana saya dah lupa) kata kita ta' buat apa2 untuk ra'ayat luar bandar. Ada lagi satu Ahli kata banyak lagi perkara yang

hendak di-buat lagi. Memang Kerajaan tahu banyak lagi yang hendak di-buat lagi. Saperti di-dalam Buku Merah kita yang susun semua ranchangan2 yang hendak di-jalankan, dengan kuasa yang kita ada, dengan duit yang kita ada. Tiap2 kakitangan Kerajaan telah bekerja keras kata-nya. Nampak-nya duit tambahan yang kurang, Kerajaan ini sudah undorkah? Kerajaan sudah condemnkah? Bukan Kerajaan undor, Kerajaan selalu berjalan ka-hadapan. Apa sebab kita sekarang duit kurang? Bukan sebab Kerajaan ta' ada duit. Ranchangan2 yang kita susun di-dalam Buku Merah banyak sudah di-jalankan ada sedikit yang tinggal. Saya kata sekali lagi, Kerajaan memang tahu banyak lagi ranchangan2 yang hendak di-buat, Kerajaan belum buat Kerajaan ta' mahu buat. Kita mahu potong baju ikut kain yang kita ada. Jadi macham mana yang katakan Kerajaan selalu sombong. Saya ingat lagi ada satu Majlis di-dalam Negeri kita ini, tiada ada kain dia order lagi, itu pun ta' apa juga, sampai hutang berlekeh lagi dia hendak chakap banyak, tetapi macham ini Kerajaan Negeri tidak sekali2.

Katakan sebab apa yang proceeding Majlis Meshuarat ini lewat? Saya minta ma'af-lah, yang saya dapat tahu proceeding ini lewat saya tanggung jawab. Sebab 6 bulan saya tidak ada di-dalam Pulau Pinang dan di-dalam proceeding itu saya ada banyak beri ucapan. Ucapan saya itu saya kena approve—sampai saya balek baru-lah saya approve. Kalau begitu yang lewat ini, bukan-lah kakitangan Kerajaan ta' bekerja kuat — tetapi saya ta' luluskan... (interrupted).

Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): On a point of clarification, Mr. Speaker, Sir, what was the

then Chief Minister doing, if he does not approve the record of the proceedings.

Mr. Speaker: He was away for 6 months.

Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Yes, but there was some one who was the Chief Minister.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, but he got his own speech to correct.

Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order: isn't it in the Standing Orders that speeches should be sent within a certain time, and after that it should be taken as correct irrespective of whether the Members of the Assembly are present or not.

Chief Minister: Itu betul Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tetapi jangan-lah di-hantar Proceeding itu ka-Amerika dan London dan hambat saya. Saya ni di-satu2 tempat itu chuma satu dua hari sahaja. Kalau na' pusing pergi hambat saya, itu membuang duit orang ramai dan itu ta' patut-lah. Tetapi betul saya yang belum approve saya punya ucapan. Saya mesti periksa ucapan saya itu dahulu.

Wakil daripada Jelutong juga berkata, mengapa di-dalam Estimate itu nampak-nya, Kerajaan ada bagi, ada bahagian dalam Estimate itu, kepada Fire Services di-Seberang Perai. Berkenaan perkara itu saya ucapkan terima kasih, tetapi kalau-lah Wakil daripada Jelutong itu amat usaha sedikit, pandang dalam Budget Sub-head 53 Revenue itu boleh tengok Kerajaan boleh dapat balek daripada Majlis2 di-Seberang Perai.

Yang Berhormat Wakil daripada Kota, mengatakan Kerajaan macham budak — masa ini Christ-mas. Saya mengaku Kerajaan Negeri budak, fasal kita baharu

lima tahun — tetapi budak ini budak cherdek — bukan-lah budak yang bodoh, ta' pandai... (laughter)... Tetapi bagaimana cherdek, pandai pun mesti belajar lagi. Kalau begitu saya minta Ahli Kawasan Kota jangan-lah fikir 5 tahun tu oi dah tua dah — ada banyak kita kena belajar lagi tu. Tetapi saya boleh kata dalam 5 tahun ini yang mana kita sudah berjalan ada juga kadang2, saya boleh mengaku, yang ta' berapa bagus, tetapi saya boleh berkata dasar Kerajaan memang hendak berjalan dengan betul, bukan sengaja hendak berjalan salah tetapi saya boleh janji yang mana saya dapat tahu, ta' ada satu hal yang kita berjalan salah. Dan lagi Yang Berhormat itu berasa bimbang, takut revenue atau duit hasil tiap2 tahun bertambah kurang, ini memang kurang. Fasal orang minum tuak pun kurang. Kalau begitu saya minta-lah Yang Berhormat itu minum tuak lebeh sedikit. Tetapi bukan saya na' minta orang2 buroh minum tuak banyak sedikit, bukan Kerajaan na' pujok orang2 buroh minum tuak lebeh tetapi kerana minuman itu satu yang mustahak kepada orang2 yang bekerja terok saperti orang2 yang bekerja tengah jalan yang panas. Kita tahu di-dalam masa Jepun dahulu, beberapa orang yang ta' dapat tuak, pergi minum — apa kata orang — "hantu bukit" — mampus habis. Tuak ia-lah satu minuman yang ada Vitamin B dan juga satu minuman yang murah. Kalau minuman ini kurang tentu-lah hasil-nya kurang. Kalau orang yang minum pun kurang tentu-lah beli kurang. Kenapa pula Kerajaan hendak beli banyak tuak kalau ta' boleh habis di-minum — buang2 sahaja. Kerajaan bukan harap hasil daripada tuak untuk menjalankan dasar Kerajaan. Tidak sekali2. Tetapi ini ia-lah satu hasil yang Kerajaan dapat, tetapi bukan-nya harapkan ini satu sahaja.

Ada dua tiga Ahli2 Yang Berhormat daripada Pehak Pembangkang itu bertanya — apa langkah yang Kerajaan hendak ambil atas kenaikan hasil Negeri ini. Kerajaan memang sedang menyiasat perkara ini. Tetapi Kerajaan tidak ada dasar atau fikir hendak naikan hasil Negeri dengan jalan yang ta' patut — hendak bagi susah ra'ayat, tidak sekali2. Tuan2 Yang Berhormat tahu, hasil yang kita dapati itu memang-lah "restricted". Bukan macham lain2 Majlis boleh dapat hasil pintu, boleh dapat hasil lesen2, yang ni Kerajaan buat had yang di-dalam Perlembagaan sahaja — tengok boleh tahu. "Restricted" tetapi saperti "Capitation Grant" dengan "Road Grant" memang sengaja minta kepada Kerajaan Persekutuan. Kalau Yang Berhormat Ahli2 usaha sedikit—tengok dalam Budget tahun 1962 sama tahun 1963, hasil yang kita dapat daripada Kerajaan Persekutuan ada naik. Ada naik, saperti tahun 1962, \$5,550,993 — tahun ini kita dapat \$5,617,373. Ada naik, tetapi naik sedikit sahaja, tapi naik juga. Kata ta' naik itu saya rasa pembong. Kalau begitu atas "capitation grant" yang ini ada Kerajaan Negeri bersambung dengan Kerajaan Persekutuan. Soal ini belum lagi di-putuskan tetapi jawapan daripada Kerajaan Persekutuan — ia katakan boleh bagi "capitation grant", mengikut "Census" yang baru2 di-jalankan di-dalam tahun 1957. Kalau begitu Kerajaan Persekutuan fikir, kita ikut census orang, dan kemudian bagi "Capitation Grant" berma'ana itu na' kena tunggu sampai tahun 67. Tetapi saya boleh katakan dalam Negeri Pulau Pinang ada chukup kick bukan-lah tendang tu. Kita na' minta, kita ni Councillor, jangan-lah sepak orang sangat... (laughter)... jangan sepak orang, selalu minta, sebab itu Kerajaan minta dan di-harap boleh dapat.

Yang Berhormat daripada Kota berkata mengapa untong daripada Penang Hill nampak dalam seribu ringgit lebih sahaja. Saya minta Ahli Yang Berhormat itu pandang sedikit di-Appendix III. Appendix III tunjok untong sebanyak \$23,000 bukan \$1,000. Tetapi memang Kerajaan bukan sahaja hendak ambil untong daripada keretapi Bukit Bendera, tetapi hendak ambil untong itu untuk membaiki rumah2 buroh di-situ. Tuan2 yang Berhormat kalau ada masa melawat-lah kasana. Saya suka dengar kalau Yang Berhormat daripada Kota, katakan dia hendak pergi ka-Bukit Bendera dalam bulan December ini. Ta' tahu-lah, dia hendak makan anginkah — fasal apa saya ta' tahu-lah. Tetapi patut dia berchuti di-situ. Sebab itukah dia bising di-sini, chakap ta' tentu ni.

Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Saya hendak berchuti dengan tuan (laughter).

Chief Minister: Boleh-lah, kalau tuan hendak belanja saya ... (laughter).

Mr. Speaker: Saya ingat perkara chuti dan belanja tidak masuk di-dalam Rang Undang2 ini.

Chief Minister: Hendak tempek, ta' apa-lah Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Hasil daripada Bukit Bendera hendak di-buat modal untuk memperbaiki Steshen dan gerabak2 Keretapi Bukit itu. Lebih2 lagi kita hendak memperbaiki rumah2 buroh — quarters untuk kakitangan2 supaya menjadi lebih baggus. Pekerja2 semua na' di-kasi uniform, nampak chantekkah, ta' chantekkah ta' tahu-lah tu (interrupted).

Member for Kelawei (Mr. Tan Khim Hoe): Chantek.

Chief Minister: Bagus. Fasal Ahli daripada Kelawei, dia kata dia bagi "super kick". Saya minta

jangan ikut tauladan yang ta' baik — selalu suka sepak orang sahaja (interrupted).

Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): Kalau sepak raga ta' apa.

Chief Minister: Sepak raga ta' apa. Sepak bola pun ta' apa juga. Tetapi jangan-lah sepak Kerajaan. Kerajaan ni semua orang2 tua2 belaka. Kalau sepak nanti jatuh, patah tulang.

Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Orang tuakah orang muda?

Chief Minister: Orang tua pun ada, orang muda pun ada.

With regard to the request by the Hon'ble Member for Sungei Pinang for clarification of some of the items: page 2, item 12 — why there is such a big reduction. Well, as far as I am aware, this is the more realistic figure and also due to some Government building which has been vacated by the occupier and thus assessment paid to the City Council will be less.

Page 26, item 33 — there is a big reduction in the rent, due to the occupation of the new building; and that amount was paid to the Ban Hin Lee Bank. So there is a saving.

Page 27, item 48 — this a revote. The sum of \$10,000 was not spent this year because the crockery which had been ordered has not arrived yet. So we have to revote this amount, that is, for next year.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, could not a note be put to show that this is a revote?

Chief Minister: Well, we will note that. Thank you.

Page 57, item 14 — why there should be such an excessive amount for housing. This is due to temporary officers who are not entitled to quarters and, therefore, they have been paid Housing Allowances.

The other point is why several items are marked "Personal to holder". Now, I understand that this is due to a sort of dying service where these officers receive a sort of salary and, when they retire, there will be no recruitment.

Then, it is not correct to say that the \$85,000 voted for Scholarships for Higher Studies has been reduced by \$15,000 in order to give it over to Minor Scholarships. It is not very correct to say that. If we were to check up, we will see that the amount for Scholarships for Higher Studies is \$70,000 and I am not very sure of the year that was increased by \$15,000 which was intended for Minor Scholarships, making a total vote for scholarships of \$85,000. There was no reduction for higher studies. Government will certainly consider your suggestion whether there should be more money for scholarships. But I would like to take this opportunity to thank some generous bodies in Penang for contributing towards this Scholarship Fund. We received \$8,000 from two organisations and this increased the number of scholarships which could possibly be awarded to the applicants.

Menjawab kepada Yang Berhormat Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Utara, Kerajaan menguntukkan duit lebih kepada Welfare itu bukan-lah kerana tendang2 itu — kalau na' tendang nanti jadi gaduh. Kita selalu potong baju ikut kain yang kita ada. Kerajaan sudah timbangan, ada lebih \$30,000 bagi kepada Welfare, jikalau ada \$50,000 lebih kita bagi \$50,000. Kalau ada \$1,000,000 kita bagi

\$1,000,000, tetapi kalau ta' ada kena potong-lah — ini memang-lah. Tetapi bukan-lah dengan sengaja hendak potong. Jadi kita bagi banyak mana yang patut-lah, banyak mana yang kita boleh. Saya ulang sekali lagi — jangan-lah meludah kelangit jatuh ka-muka sendiri. Kalau begitu saya fikir, kalau hendak berchakap tengok-lah sedikit diri sendiri. Saya boleh berkata Kerajaan Perikatan Pulau Pinang memang hendak bekerjasama dengan ra'ayat2 dengan seberapa upaya, dengan menjalankan projek2 atau ranchangan2 supaya penduduk2 kita boleh jadi lagi bagus, lagi sehat dan lagi senang. Tetapi tahun 1963 ini nampak duit kurang kepada ranchangan2 yang biasa di-jalankan dalam tahun 1961-62 tetapi ini-lah ranchangan2 yang telah di-susun bagi Ranchangan Lima Tahun Yang Kedua dan boleh2 lagi di-tambah lagi ranchangan di-dalam tahun hadapan. Ranchangan yang kita ator bukan tahun 1964 sahaja tetapi sampai tahun 1965 sampai-lah selama2nya — jikalau ra'ayat perchaya dengan kita untuk memerintah Negeri Pulau Pinang ini. Ini-lah sahaja ucapan saya, jikalau ucapan saya ada kasar, atau silap saya minta ma'af — ucapan saya di-Bahas Kebangsaan bukan-lah pandai. Saya mahu belajar lagi, kalau ta' belajar sampai bila2 pun ta' boleh pandai berchakap Bahasa Kebangsaan. Tetapi begini-lah saya selalu beri ucapan di-kampung2 dan mukim2, saya belum pandai lagi — tetapi saya ta' bilang tuan ni pandai, tuan ni ta' pandai ... (laughter). Ini-lah sahaja ucapan saya. Terima kaseh.

Mr. Speaker: Ahli2 Yang Berhormat, sa-belum saya mengemukakan Rang Undang2 ini di-bachakan bagi kali yang kedua, saya menangguhkan Meshuarat ini sehingga jam 2.30 petang ini.

The Assembly adjourns at 1.05 p.m.

The Assembly resumes at 2.30 p.m.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time.

Committee

The Assembly resolves itself into Committee.

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

The Assembly resumes

Third Reading

Chief Ministers: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon melaporkan bahawa Rang Undang2 Bekalan (1963) Negeri Pulau Pinang, 1962 telah di-timbangkan sa-fasal demi sa-fasal di-dalam Jawatan Kuasa dan telah di-persetujui dengan tiada apa2 pindaan. Oleh itu, saya mohon menchadangkan supaya Rang Undang2 itu di-bachakan bagi kali yang ketiga dan diluluskan.

Member for Tasek 'Glugor (Enche Hashim bin Awang): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a third time and passed.

(C) The Penang Hill Railway Ordinance, 1950 (Amendment) Bill, 1962

First Reading

Member for 'Glugor (Enche Aziz Ibrahim): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon menchadangkan supaya Rang Undang2 yang di-namakan 'Undang2 meminda Undang2 Keretapi Bukit Bendera, 1950' di-bachakan bagi kali yang pertama.

Member for Kelawei (Mr. Tan Khim Hoe): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong.

Bill accordingly read a first time.

Member for 'Glugor (Enche Aziz Ibrahim): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon menchadangkan supaya Peratoran2 Majlis Meshuarat yang berkenaan di-berhentikan kuat kuasa-nya untok sementara bagi membolehkan Rang Undang2 ini di-bawa di-dalam semua peringkat di-dalam majlis meshuarat ini.

Member for Kelawei (Mr. Tan Khim Hoe): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong.

Question put and agreed to.

Second Reading

Member for 'Glugor (Enche Aziz Ibrahim): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon menchadangkan supaya Rang Undang2 yang di-namakan 'Undang2 meminda Undang2 Keretapi Bukit Bendera, 1950' di-bachakan bagi kali yang kedua.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon supaya Rang Undang2 sebelum saya menchadangkan Bachaan yang Kedua, saya suka menerangkan maksud dan sebab2 Rang Undang2 ini. Sekshen 5 yang asal dalam Undang2 Keretapi Bukit Bendera, 1950 ada-lah berbunyi demikian:—

"5. (1) Menurut Fasal 141 Perjanjian Persekutuan, 1948, semua harta2 yang boleh di-anjak di-gunakan bagi menguruskan keretapi ada-lah dikuasi oleh Ketua Setia Usaha, Negeri Selat, tetapi apabila berjalan kuat kuasa Undang2 ini, harta itu akan menjadi hak milek Pesurohjaya Tempatan, Negeri Selat Pulau Pinang.

(2) Pesurohjaya Tempatan bolehlah membeli, memperolehi dan menggunakan sebarang harta2 yang boleh di-anjak bagi mentadbir, menjaga, mengurus dan mengawal keretapi itu.

(3) Pesurohjaya Tempatan bolehlah menjual memberi dan membuat apa2 jua pun yang di-sukai-nya ka-

pada harta2 yang di-gunakan bagi menguruskan keretapi yang di-bawah kuasa-nya, mengikut syarat2 yang di-anggap-nya berpatutan dan wang yang di-perolehi daripada harta itu hendaklah di-masokkan ka-dalam hasil 'am Negeri Selat.

(4) Semua harta2 yang boleh di-anjak yang di-mileki, di-pegang atau di-perolehi oleh Pesurohjaya Tempatan hendaklah di-turunkan oleh sa-orang Pesurohjaya Tempatan kapada sa-orang Pesurohjaya Tempatan di-dalam jawatan dengan tidak payah menurunkan kuasa atau menukar nama."

Menurut Perintah (Pindaan Undang2 dan Pengistiharan) Perlembagaan Persekutuan, 1958 — L.N. 332/58 — Sekshen 5 Undang2 Keretapi Bukit Bendera itu telah di-pinda saperti berikut:—

"5. (1) Semua harta2 yang di-anjak yang di-gunakan bagi menguruskan keretapi, yang di-kuasi oleh Pesurohjaya Tempatan, Negeri Selat Pulau Pinang sebelum Hari Kemerdekaan, hendaklah pada Hari Kemerdekaan di-jadikan hak milek Setia Usaha Negeri, Pulau Pinang.

(2) Ketua Menteri bolehlah membeli, memperolehi dan menggunakan sebarang harta2 yang boleh di-anjak bagi mentadbir, menjaga, mengurus dan mengawal keretapi itu.

(3) Ketua Menteri bolehlah menjual, memberi dan membuat apa2 jua pun yang di-sukai-nya kapada harta2 yang di-gunakan bagi menguruskan keretapi yang di-bawah kuasa-nya, mengikut syarat2 yang di-anggap-nya berpatutan dan wang yang di-perolehi daripada harta itu hendaklah di-masokkan ka-dalam hasil 'am Negeri.

(4) Semua harta2 yang boleh di-anjak yang di-mileki, di-pegang atau di-perolehi oleh Ketua Menteri hendaklah di-turunkan oleh sa-orang Ketua Menteri kapada sa-orang Ketua Menteri di-dalam jawatan dengan tidak payah menurunkan kuasa atau menukar nama."

Berikutan dengan pindaan tersebut, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita dapati bahawa sekshen-kecil (1) Sekshen 5 sebagaimana yang di-pinda oleh L.N. 332/58 ada-lah mensharatkan "semua harta2 yang boleh di-anjak yang di-gunakan bagi menguruskan keretapi itu, yang di-kuasai oleh Pesurohjaya Tempatan, Negeri Selat Pulau Pinang, sebelum Hari Kemerdekaan hendaklah pada Hari Kemerdekaan di-jadikan hak milek Setia Usaha Negeri, Pulau Pinang", walhal di-dalam sekshen2-kecil (2), (3) dan (b) yang berikutan, kuasa tersebut ada-lah di-dalam tangan Ketua Menteri. Sungguh pun pada umum-nya perkataan2 "Pesurohjaya Tempatan" di-dalam berbagai2 Undang2 Persekutuan dan Negeri selepas Merdeka telah di-gantikan dengan perkataan2 "Ketua Menteri" tetapi di-dalam Undang2 ini kuasa2 di-bawah sekshen2-kecil (2), (3) dan (4) patutlah di-beri kapada Setia Usaha Negeri kerana hendak mempersamakan-nya dengan Undang2 (Penubohan) Setia Usaha Negeri Selat, 1953. Apabila Sekshen 5 Undang2 Keretapi Bukit Bendera di-pinda oleh L.N. 332/58 dahulu maka harus perkataan2 "Ketua Menteri" di-dalam sekshen2-kecil (2), (3) dan (4) itu telah terlupa di-gantikan dengan perkataan2 "Setia Usaha Negeri". Peguam Negara bersetuju bahawa sekshen-kecil (1) ada-lah berlawanan dengan sekshen2-kecil (2), (3) dan (4).

Jadi Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tujuan Rang Undang2 ini ia-lah hendak memindahkan kuasa2 dan hak2 di-bawah sekshen2-kecil (2), (3) dan (4) dalam Sekshen 5 Undang2 Keretapi Bukit Bendera yang sekarang ini di-pegang oleh Ketua Menteri kapada Setia Usaha Negeri Pulau Pinang.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon menchadangkan.

Member for Kelawei (Mr. Tan Khim Hoe): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time.

Committee

The Assembly resolves itself into Committee.

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

The Assembly resumes

Third Reading

Member for 'Glugor (Enche Aziz Ibrahim): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon melaporkan bahawa Rang Undang2 (Pindaan) 1962 Undang2 Keretapi Bukit Bendera, 1950 telah di-timbangkan sa-fasal demi sa-fasal di-dalam Jawatan Kuasa dan telah di-persetujui dengan tiada apa2 pindaan. Oleh itu, saya mohon menandatangani supaya Rang Undang2 itu di-bachakan bagi kali yang ketiga dan di-luluskan.

Member for Kelawei (Mr. Tan Khim Hoe): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a third time and passed.

(D) The Constitution of the State of Penang (Amendment) (No. 2) Bill, 1962.

First Reading

Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon menandatangani supaya Rang Undang2 yang di-namakan 'Undang2 meminda Perkara 13 Perlembagaan Negeri Pulau Pinang untuk mengubah syarat2 yang membatalkan

sesaorang daripada menjadi ahli Dewan Perhimpunan Undangan' di-bachakan bagi kali yang pertama.

Member for Permatang Pauh (Enche Ariffin bin Shariff): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong.

Bill accordingly read a first time.

Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon menandatangani supaya Peratoran2 Majlis Meshuarat yang berkenaan di-berhentikan kuat kuasa-nya untuk sementara bagi membolehkan Rang Undang2 ini di-bawa di-dalam semua perengkat di-dalam majlis meshuarat ini.

Member for Permatang Pauh (Enche Ariffin bin Shariff): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong.

Question put and agreed to.

Second Reading

Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sebagaimana Ahli2 Yang Berhormat sekalian ma'alom, pada awal tahun ini Perliamen Persekutuan telah meluluskan Undang2 (Pindaan) Perlembagaan, 1962. Undang2 tersebut membuat beberapa perubahan yang mustahak kepada Perlembagaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu. Satu daripada perubahan2 itu ia-lah berkenaan syarat2 yang membatalkan sa-saorang daripada menjadi ahli Dewan Perhimpunan Undangan disebabkan hukuman yang di-jatuhkan oleh sa-sabua mahkamah kerana melakukan kesalahan. Perubahan ini di-dapati di-dalam Sekshen 28, Undang2 (Pindaan) Perlembagaan, 1962 yang meminda Jadual yang Kedelapan Perlembagaan Persekutuan. Perenggan (b) dan (c) dalam Sekshen 28, Undang2 ini adalah meminda syarat2 yang membatalkan sa-saorang daripada menjadi ahli Dewan Per-

himpunan Undangan Negeri dengan tujuan hendak mempersamakan-nya dengan syarat2 yang membatalkan sa-saorang daripada menjadi ahli salah sa-buah Dewan Parlimen sebagaimana yang terkandung di-dalam Perkara 48(1) (e) dan (3) Perlembagaan Persekutuan ia-itu seperti yang di-pinda oleh perenggan (b) dan (c) dalam Sekshen 7, Undang2 (Pindaan) Perlembagaan, 1960.

Sekshen 6(1)(e) Jadual yang Kedelapan ada-lah di-pinda oleh perenggan (b) dan (c) dalam Sekshen 28, Undang2 (Pindaan) Perlembagaan, 1962 seperti berikut:—

"6. (1) Dengan terta'alok kepada syarat2 dalam Sekshen ini sa-saorang itu tidak boleh jadi ahli Dewan Negeri jikalau —

* * * * *

(e) dia telah di-dapati salah oleh mahkamah ke'adilan dalam Negeri Persekutuan dan telah di-hukum penjara tidak kurang daripada dua tahun atau di-denda sebanyak tidak kurang daripada dua ribu ringgit dan tidak mendapat ampun;"

dan Sekshen 6(2) Jadual itu adalah di-pinda seperti berikut:—

"6. (2) Syarat yang tidak membolehkan sa-saorang jadi ahli Dewan Negeri menurut perenggan (d) atau perenggan (e) dalam cherian kecil (1) boleh-lah di-buang oleh Raja dan, jika tidak di-buang oleh Raja hendaklah mati kuat kuasa-nya sa-telah genap lima tahun mulai daripada tarikh di-kehendaki di-hantar penyata seperti yang di-sebutkan dalam perenggan (d) itu, atau tarikh orang yang kena hukuman seperti yang di-sebutkan dalam perenggan (e) di-bebaskan dia daripada tahanan, atau tarikh denda yang di-sebutkan di-dalam perenggan (e) itu di-kenakan, dan sa-saorang itu tidak-lah tertahan daripada jadi ahli menurut perenggan (g) dalam cherian

kecil (1) dengan sebab telah melakukan apa2 perbuatan sebelum ia jadi warga negara."

Sekshen 6(1) (e), Jadual yang Kedelapan ia-itu sebelum ia-nya di-pinda ada-lah berbunyi seperti berikut:—

"6. (1) Dengan terta'alok kepada syarat2 dalam sekshen ini sa-saorang itu tidak boleh jadi ahli Dewan Negeri jikalau —

* * * * *

(e) dia telah di-dapati salah oleh mahkamah ke'adilan dalam Negeri Persekutuan dan telah di-hukum penjara tidak kurang daripada dua tahun dan tidak mendapat ampun yang membebaskan dia daripada kena penjara;"

dan Sekshen 6(2) dalam Jadual itu sebelum di-pinda adalah berbunyi sebagaimana yang saya sebutkan tadi kechuali perkataan2 "atau tarikh denda yang di-sebutkan di-dalam perenggan (e) itu di-kenakan" sahaja yang tidak ada di-dalam-nya.

Ahli2 Yang Berhormat sekalian tentu-lah faham bahawa sebelum Jadual yang Kedelapan itu di-pinda oleh Undang2 (Pindaan) Perlembagaan, 1962 sa-saorang ahli Dewan Perhimpunan Undangan adalah terbatal daripada menjadi ahli Dewan ini jikalau ia telah di-dapati salah oleh mahkamah ke'adilan dan di-hukum penjara tidak kurang daripada 2 tahun dan tidak mendapat ampun. Selepas pindaan itu di-buat, sa-saorang ahli itu akan terbatal daripada menjadi ahli jikalau ia di-dapati salah oleh mahkamah ke'adilan dan di-hukum penjara selama tidak kurang daripada satu tahun atau di-denda sebanyak tidak kurang daripada dua ribu ringgit dan tidak mendapat ampun. Itu-lah perbezaan utama yang di-buat oleh Undang2 (Pindaan) Perlembagaan, 1962.

Saya suka memberi tahu Yang Berhormat Ahli2 Dewan sekalian, bahawa Sekshen 28 Undang2 (Pin-

daan) Perlembagaan, 1962 telah pun berjalan kuat kuasa-nya mulai daripada 21hb. June, 1962 ia-itu mengikut Perberitahu Undang2 Persekutuan Bil. 164/62. Oleh itu, menurut Perkara 71(4) Perlembagaan Persekutuan maka Kerajaan Negeri wajib-lah meminda Perlembagaan-nya supaya keadaan-nya sama dengan Jadual yang Kedelapan kepada Perlembagaan Persekutuan ia-itu sebagaimana yang di-pinda oleh Sekshen 28, Undang2 (Pindaan) Perlembagaan, 1962.

Ahli2 Yang Berhormat sekalian patut juga mengambil ingatan, bahawa Perkara 35(3) mengkehendaki tidak kurang daripada dua per tiga daripada jumlah ahli2 Dewan mengundi menyokong sesuatu Rang Undang2 bagi meminda Perlembagaan maka baharu-lah Rang Undang2 itu boleh di-luluskan, tetapi fasal (3) mengadakan perkecualian2 yang tertentu. Perkecualian2 itu ada-lah di-hurikan dalam Perkara 35(4). Pindaan yang di-chadangkan ini, ada-lah termasuk di-dalam satu daripada perkecualian2 tersebut kerana ia-nya ada-lah di-buat "dengan tujuan menyamakan Perlembagaan ini dengan syarat2 Jadual yang Kedelapan dalam Perlembagaan Persekutuan yang sedang berjalan kuat kuasa-nya. ...".

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya men-chadangkan supaya Rang Undang2 (Pindaan) (Bil. 2) Perlembagaan Negeri Pulau Pinang, 1962 di-bachakan bagi kali yang kedua.

Member for Permatang Pauh (Enche Ariffin bin Shariff): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong.

Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): Mr. Speaker, Sir, apart from the slight clarification I would seek from the Legal Adviser, I would speak on the merits of this Bill, and in fact make certain suggestions to the State Government on the matter of disqualifications

in respect of Members of this Assembly.

As is well known, my views on politicians have been set out lengthily in one of the Sessions when I brought in a Motion dealing with declaration of assets by State Assemblymen, which Motion unfortunately did not get the support of the Government benches. I would like the Government at this juncture to study carefully whether it could add in one of the disqualifications, to section 13 which is an unlucky section, with the view that every Member of this Assembly should declare his assets truthfully; and if he fails to do so following certain procedures which the Government may think about, and which I set out in my Motion before, he could be disqualified from serving this Legislative Assembly. I feel this is one of the most potent forces against corruption, in the sense that we do not need to find a person corrupt in order to disqualify him; but all that is necessary is for him to declare his assets truthfully, and if he does not do that he will be disqualified. It may be a puritanical measure to some extent; but I feel it would be a measure which could very well fit in to the pattern of this country.

I agree with the need to bring our disqualification clauses in line with the Federal Government; and I should like a clarification whether these disqualification clauses have been added to the Eighth Schedule by the Federal Parliament.

Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): Mr. Speaker, Sir, On a point of order, are we discussing the merits of the Bill?

Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): A clarification. A clarification from you whether this Bill, section (e), has received the

amendment by the Federal Government in its Eighth Schedule for us to bring it into line with the Eighth Schedule, because if it has not been amended in the Eighth Schedule in 1962 then we have two voting procedures under Article 35. Usually any amendment to a Constitution needs a two-thirds majority. Under Article 35(4) it needs a simple majority. Apparently in this case it is not clear whether you want to follow the Eighth Schedule, or if the Eighth Schedule has been amended. I only like a clarification whether the Eighth Schedule has been amended to change the new section (e) for the old section (e).

Legal Adviser: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Jadual yang Kedelapan Perlembagaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu memang telah di-pinda. Oleh sebab itu pindaan yang di-chadangkan kepada Perlembagaan kita ini hendak mendapat chuma separoh sahaja daripada undi Ahli2 Dewan ini. Ta' payah lagi two-thirds. Simple majority.

Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): It has been amended?

Legal Adviser: It has been amended.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time.

Committee

The Assembly resolves itself into Committee.

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

The Assembly resumes

Third Reading

Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): Tuan Yang di-Pertua saya mohon melaporkan

bahawa Rang Undang2 (Pindaan) (Bil. 2) Perlembagaan Negeri Pulau Pinang, 1962 telah di-timbangkan sa-fasal demi sa-fasal di-dalam Jawatan Kuasa dan telah di-persetujui dengan tiada apa2 pindaan. Oleh itu saya mohon men-chadangkan supaya Rang Undang2 itu di-bachakan bagi kali yang ketiga dan di-luluskan.

Member for Permatang Pauh (Enche Ariffin bin Shariff): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a third time and passed.

(E) THE RURAL BOARDS BILL, 1962.

Motion to suspend Standing Order 53.

Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon kebenaran mengemukakan Rang Undang2 yang di-namakan 'Undang2 membubarkan sekshen-kecil (11) Sekshen 399 Undang2 Perbandaran dan mengadakan syarat2 bagi perkara2 yang bersangkutan dengan-nya' kepada Dewan ini. Berkenaan Rang Undang2 ini, kehendak2 di-bawah Peratoran Majlis Meshuarat 53 tidak-lah dapat di-penohi. Oleh yang demikian perlu-lah bagi saya memohon izin daripada Tuan Yang di-Pertua untuk men-chadangkan supaya Peratoran Majlis Meshuarat 53 di-berhentikan kuat kuasa-nya untuk sementara, supaya Rang Undang2 ini dapat di-kemukakan di-dalam Dewan ini dengan tidak payah menyiarkan-nya sa-kurang2-nya 14 hari terlebih dahulu di-dalam Warta Kerajaan untuk ma'alumat orang ramai.

Kerajaan Negeri tidak dapat menenohi kehendak2 Peratoran Majlis Meshuarat 53 kerana Rang

Undang2 ini telah di-luluskan oleh Majlis Kebangsaan Kerajaan Tempatan pada 6hb. November, 1962 dan oleh Majlis Meshuarat Kerajaan Negeri Pulau Pinang pada 14hb. November, 1962. Rang Undang2 ini telah pun di-siarkan di-dalam 'Warta Kerajaan Negeri Pulau Pinang (Tambahan)' yang bertarikh 117hb. November, 1962. Dengan sebab itu-lah maka Peratoran Majlis Meshuarat 53 tidak dapat di-phenoi.

Pindaan yang di-chadangkan ini ada-lah sangat perlu kerana beberapa buah Majlis2 Daerah di-dalam Negeri Pulau Pinang ini telah pun menjalankan ranchangan2 perumahan mereka masing2 dan oleh itu mustahak-lah Undang2 yang di-perlukan untuk membenarkan Majlis2 tersebut meiliki tanah2, di-perundangkan dengan seberapa segera yang boleh. Oleh itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon mendapat keizinan daripada tuan, ia-itu mengikut Peratoran Majlis Meshuarat 118, untuk men-chadangkan supaya Peratoran Majlis Meshuarat 53 di-berhentikan kuat kuasa-nya untuk sementara, supaya Rang Undang2 ini dapat di-kemukakan di-dalam Negeri ini dengan tidak payah menyiarkan-nya sa-kurang2-nya 14 hari terlebih dahulu di-dalam Warta Kerajaan untuk ma'alumat orang ramai.

Mr. Speaker: Saya puas hati dengan sebab2 yang di-beri oleh Yang Berhormat Ahli Kawasan Muda. Saya membenarkan Ahli Kawasan Muda itu men-chadangkan supaya Peratoran Majlis Meshuarat 53 di-berhentikan kuat kuasa-nya untuk sementara.

Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, is there a seconder for his Motion to suspend Standing Order 53?

Mr. Speaker: Every Motion must be seconded. He has not

moved suspension yet. He will be moving suspension now.

Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon men-chadangkan supaya Peratoran Majlis Meshuarat 53 di-berhentikan kuat kuasa-nya untuk sementara, supaya Rang Undang2 ini tidak payah di-siarkan sa-kurang2-nya 14 hari sebelum ia-nya di-kemukakan di-dalam Dewan ini di-dalam Warta Kerajaan untuk ma'alumat orang ramai.

Member for Kepala Batas (Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Haji Abdullah): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon menyokong.

Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose the Motion by the Honourable Member for Muda to suspend Standing Order 53 to allow him to move the Bill under Order 4(E). I would like to read for the information of this House the Standing Order itself. It states:

"Every Bill, other than a private Bill, shall be published for general information in the Gazette at least fourteen days prior to its introduction into the Assembly."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, Standing Orders are being approved by this Assembly to see to it that the public has got a chance to consider all Bills to be introduced in this Assembly. And I am sure that if you look into the Bill you will find it is not a Bill that requires urgent consideration—a Bill that could be foreseen by Members of the Government side for them to take adequate steps for its publication in the Gazette before it is being considered by this Assembly. If we continue to keep on suspending Standing Order after Standing Order it would make nonsense of

the Rules of this Assembly, and would in the end become a farce. Definitely, in the time allowed by the State Government to introduce such a Bill in this Assembly they could have foreseen it; and because they could foresee it it should be for them to have it published in accordance with the Standing Orders for information of this Assembly. And therefore..... (interrupted).

Mr. Speaker: I am seeking a little clarification from the Honourable Member. You are aware of Standing Order 118?

Member for Jelutong (Mr. Ooi Thiam Siew): Yes, I am aware of that. But the language in Standing Order 53 is definite. It says "shall". A Standing Order is being introduced which says that it is in the interest of the public that it be gazetted within 14 days for public information. What I am saying is that this Bill could have been anticipated. If the Bill could not be anticipated by the State Government and it is moved on a matter of urgency it would be quite in order. But for the State Government to make use of another Order for suspension just to get over it is not in the interest of Parliamentary democracy. Thank you.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, On a point of clarification: Standing Order 118—Suspension of any Standing Order. There should be no debate on such Motion. The Honourable Member from Muda moved a suspension of the Standing Order. I wonder if it is proper to debate on this Motion.

Mr. Speaker: That is why I seek clarification from the Honourable Member. I do not have to say 'a big kick' immediately.

Question put and agreed to.

First Reading

Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon men-chadangkan supaya Rang Undang2 yang di-namakan 'Undang2 membubarkan sekshen-kecil (11) Sekshen 399 Undang2 Perbandaran dan mengadakan syarat2 bagi perkara2 yang bersangkutan dengan-nya' di-bachakan bagi kali yang pertama.

Member for Kepala Batas (Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Haji Abdullah): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong.

Bill accordingly read a first time.

Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon men-chadangkan supaya Peratoran2 Majlis Meshuarat yang berkenaan di-berhentikan kuat kuasa-nya untuk sementara bagi membolehkan Rang Undang2 ini di-bawa di-dalam semua perangkat di-dalam majlis meshuarat ini.

Member for Kepala Batas (Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Haji Abdullah): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong.

Question put and agreed to.

Second Reading

Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon men-chadangkan supaya Rang Undang2 yang di-namakan 'Undang2 membubarkan sekshen-kecil (11) Sekshen 399 Undang2 Perbandaran dan mengadakan syarat2 bagi perkara2 yang bersangkutan dengan-nya' di-bachakan bagi kali yang kedua."

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pehak berkuasa tempatan di-dalam Negeri ini telah pun di-beri kuasa kewangan dan oleh itu pehak ber-

kuasa tersebut patut-lah juga di-bagi kuasa meliliki tanah dan lain2 harta tetap. Di-dalam Negeri ini hanya Majlis Bandar Raya sahaja yang mempunyai kuasa seperti itu. Pihak2 berkuasa tempatan yang lain, ia-itu Majlis Daerah, sunggoh pun ia-nya boleh membeli tanah atau lain2 harta tetap, tetapi menurut sekshen-kecil 11 Sekshen 399 Undang2 Perbandaran tanah atau harta2 tetap itu hendak-lah di-pegang oleh Kerajaan. Oleh kerana Majlis2 Daerah itu ia-lah di-akui sebagai perbadanan2 di-bawah Undang2, patut-lah juga ia-nya diberi kuasa memiliki dan menjual tanah. Rang Undang2 ini yang akan membatalkan Sekshen 399 (11) Undang2 Perbandaran akan memberi Majlis2 Daerah kuasa tersebut.

Fasal-kecil (2) atau fasal 2 Rang Undang2 ini mensyaratkan bahawa sebarang harta yang di-pegang oleh Setia Usaha Negeri atau sesiapa juga pegawai Kerajaan Negeri bagi pihak Majlis2 Daerah hendak-lah di-jadikan hak milik Majlis2 tersebut dengan tidak payah menukar milik, memberi kuasa atau menukar nama.

Patut juga saya sebutkan di-sini bahawa sekshen 6(2) Undang2 Perbandaran sebagaimana yang di-sebutkan di-dalam pemberitahu2 penubohan Majlis2 Daerah itu, Majlis2 tersebut ada-lah mempunyai kuasa untuk memiliki harta termasuk-lah tanah. Apabila Sekshen 399(11) ini terbatal kelak maka Majlis2 tersebut akan mempunyai kuasa yang saya sebutkan itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua saya mohon menandatangani.

Member for Kepala Batas (Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Haji Abdullah): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that on many other occasions we on the Opposition have not objected to the suspension of Standing Orders when Bills were proposed on a matter of urgency, to have the First, Second and Third Reading on the same day. But on this occasion it seems to us that the Government is using its majority in a way.... (interrupted).

Mr. Speaker: Honourable Members, I am afraid I cannot allow this to be continued because it is very clear under Standing Order 118 that there shall be no debate. Whether the Government is using the majority for right or wrong I must proceed according to the Standing Orders given to me. Before the Standing Orders can be amended or changed then I think I will not permit any more debate on the suspension of Standing Orders as we are now on the Bill.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): But as a measure of protest the Opposition will leave the Chamber so as not to participate in the proceeding. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, Sir, we wish to withdraw.

Mr. Speaker: I cannot stop you from leaving the Chamber,

(Members of the Opposition leave the Assembly Chamber).

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time.

Committee

The Assembly resolves itself into Committee.

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

The Assembly resumes

Third Reading

Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon melaporkan bahawa Rang Undang2 Lembaga Luar Bandar, 1962, telah ditimbangkan sa-fasal demi sa-fasal di-dalam Jawatan Kuasa dan telah di-persetujui dengan tiada apa2 pindaan. Oleh itu, saya mohon menandatangani supaya Rang Undang2 itu di-bachakan bagi kali yang ketiga dan di-luluskan.

Member for Kepala Batas (Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Haji Abdullah): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon menyokong.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a third time and passed.

(F) The Municipal Ordinance (Amendment) (Penang) Bill, 1962.

Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon kebenaran mengemukakan Rang Undang2 yang di-namakan 'Undang2 meminda Undang2 Perbandaran' kepada Dewan ini. Berkenaan Rang Undang2 ini, kehendak2 di-bawah Peratoran Majlis Meshuarat 53 tidak-lah dapat di-penuhi. Oleh yang demikian perlu-lah bagi saya memohon izin daripada Tuan Yang di-Pertua untuk menandatangani supaya Peratoran Majlis Meshuarat 53 di-berhentikan kuat kuasanya untuk sementara, supaya Rang Undang2 ini dapat di-kemukakan di-dalam Dewan ini dengan tidak payah menyiarkan-nya sa-kurang2-nya 14 hari terlebih dahulu di-dalam Warta Kerajaan untuk ma'alumat orang ramai.

Kerajaan Negeri tidak dapat memenahi kehendak2 Peratoran Majlis Meshuarat 53 kerana Rang Undang2 ini telah di-luluskan oleh

Majlis Kebangsaan Kerajaan Tempatan pada 6hb. November, 1962 dan oleh Majlis Meshuarat Kerajaan Negeri Pulau Pinang pada 14hb. November, 1962 dan ia-nya chuma dapat di-hantarkan kepada Penchetak Kerajaan pada 14hb. November, 1962. Rang Undang2 ini telah pun di-siarkan di-dalam Warta Kerajaan Negeri Pulau Pinang (Tambahan) yang bertarikh 17hb. November, 1962. Dengan sebab itu-lah maka Peratoran Majlis Meshuarat 53 tidak dapat di-penuhi.

Pindaan yang di-chadangkan ini ada-lah sangat perlu kerana semenjak beberapa lama dahulu lagi Majlis Bandar Raya telah menggesa Kerajaan Negeri supaya meniggikan lagi angka perbelanjaan yang boleh di-keluarkan bagi sesuatu perkara yang tiada peruntukan-nya di-dalam Belanjawan. Memandang kepada nilai mata wang pada masa ini maka wang sebanyak \$10,000 itu tiada-lah memadai atau berpatutan, dan oleh itu mustahak-lah Rang Undang2 ini di-kemukakan dengan seberapa segera yang boleh.

Oleh itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon mendapat keizinan daripada tuan, ia-itu mengikut Peratoran Majlis Meshuarat 118, untuk menandatangani supaya Peratoran Majlis Meshuarat 53 di-berhentikan kuat kuasanya untuk sementara, supaya Rang Undang2 ini dapat di-kemukakan di-dalam Dewan ini dengan tidak payah menyiarkan sa-kurang2-nya 14 hari terlebih dahulu di-dalam Warta Kerajaan untuk ma'alumat orang ramai.

Mr. Speaker: Saya benarkan. Sila chadangkan supaya Peratoran Majlis Meshuarat 53 itu ditandatangani.

Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon mencha-

dangkan supaya Peratoran Majlis Meshuarat 53 di-berhentikan kuat kuasa-nya untuk sementara, supaya Rang Undang2 ini tidak payah di-siarkan sa-kurang2-nya 14 hari sebelum ia-nya di-kemukakan di-dalam Dewan ini di-dalam Warta Kerajaan untuk ma'alumat orang ramai.

Member for Tasek 'Glugor (Enche Hashim bin Awang): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong.

Question put and agreed to.

First Reading

Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon mencha-dangkan supaya Rang Undang2 yang di-namakan 'Undang2 me-minda Undang2 Perbandaran' di-bachakan bagi kali yang pertama.

Member for Tasek 'Glugor (Enche Hashim bin Awang): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong.

Bill accordingly read a first time.

Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon mencha-dangkan supaya Peratoran2 Majlis Meshuarat yang berkenaan di-berhentikan kuat kuasa-nya untuk sementara bagi membolehkan Rang Undang2. ini di-bawa di-dalam semua perengkat di-dalam majlis meshuarat ini.

Member for Tasek 'Glugor (Enche Hashim bin Awang): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong.

Question put and agreed to.

Second Reading

Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon mencha-dangkan supaya Rang Undang2 yang di-namakan "Undang2 me-

minda Undang2 Perbandaran" di-bachakan bagi kali yang kedua.

Sambil saya menchadangkan ba-chaan Rang Undang2 ini bagi kali yang kedua-nya, saya suka mene-rangkan tujuan Rang Undang2 ini ia-lah hendak meminda sekshen 48(2) Undang2 Perbandaran de-ngan menggantikan..... (inter-rupted).

(Members of the Opposition re-enter the Assembly Chamber)

Mr. Speaker: Ahli Yang Ber-hormat, saya minta ma'af kerana mengganggu.

For the information of the Opposition, we are still suspending Standing Order 53 for another Bill. I would like to know if you are still in protest.

Member for Kota (Mr. Lee Kok Liang): The other Bill has not been gazetted?

Mr. Speaker: No.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, since we have come back, we will simply sit here and listen.

Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): Terima kaseh. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya sambongkan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sambil saya menchadangkan bacaan Rang Undang2 ini bagi kali yang kedua-nya, saya suka menerangkan tujuan Rang Undang2 ini ia-lah hendak meminda sekshen 48(2) Undang2 Perbandaran dengan menggantikan perkataan2 "sepuluh ribu ringgit" dengan perkataan2 "sa-ratus ribu ringgit".

Sekshen 48(2) Undang2 Per-bandaran sekarang ini membenarkan Pesuruhjaya (Ahli2 Majlis) Bandar Raya membelanjakan, se-lain daripada peruntukan yang te-lah di-masokkan di-dalam Belanja-

wan, wang yang berjumlah semua-nya tidak lebih daripada sepuluh ribu ringgit di-dalam sa-suatu tahun. Sunggoh pun begitu, per-belanjaan ini hendak-lah di-lulus-kan terlebih dahulu oleh Pihak Berkuasa Negeri. Sekshen ini bo-leh-lah di-anggap sebagai Kumpul-an Wang Belanja Mengejut dan oleh sebab angka \$10,000 itu telah di-tetapkan hampir2 50 tahun da-hulu apabila nilai mata wang ada-lah lebih tinggi lagi daripada sekarang ini, dan juga memandang kapada harga barang2 dan peker-jaan pada masa ini, jumlah itu di-fikirkan tiada lagi mencukupi se-bagai perbelanjaan mengejut.

Pindaan yang di-chadangkan ka-pada sekshen 48(2) itu berpuncha daripada pihak Majlis Bandar Raya dan tujuan-nya ia-lah hendak menambahkan jumlah wang itu daripada \$10,000 menjadi \$100,000 supaya pihak Majlis Bandar Raya dapat menguruskan pekerjaan2 yang mustahak dengan segera-nya. Patut juga saya sebutkan di-sini bahawa wang yang di-belanjakan itu hendak-lah mendapat kelulusan daripada Pihak Berkuasa Negeri terlebih dahulu dan kehendak2 yang lain2 yang di-sharatkan oleh sekshen 48 hendak-lah juga di-penuhi oleh Majlis Bandar Raya.

Pindaan yang di-chadangkan itu tidak akan mengubah kuasa ke-tiga2 Majlis Daerah Seberang Perai kerana mengikut Pemberi-tahu Penubohan masing2, syarat2 Undang2 Perbandaran yang di-kenakan kapada mereka ia-lah syarat2 yang di-nyatakan di-dalam Pemberitahu Penubohan-nya dan yang berjalan kuat kuasa-nya pada 1hb. April, 1961.

Berkenaan Majlis Daerah Luar Bandar, Pulau Pinang pula, Kera-jaan Negeri telah pun meluluskan pindaan kapada Pemberitahu Pe-nubohan-nya dan menghadkan

kuasa-nya di-bawah sekshen 48(2) Undang2 Perbandaran kapada \$10,000 sahaja. Pindaan ini akan di-siarkan di-dalam Warta Kera-jaan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mo-hon menchadangkan.

Member for Tasek 'Glugor (Enche Hashim bin Awang): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time.

Committee

The Assembly resolves itself into Committee.

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

The Assembly resumes

Third Reading

Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mohon melaporkan bahawa Rang Undang2 (Pindaan) (Pulau Pinang) Undang2 Perban-daran, 1962, telah di-timbangkan sa-fasal demi sa-fasal di-dalam Jawatan Kuasa dan telah di-per-setujui dengan tiada apa2 pindaan. Oleh itu, saya mohon menchadang-kan supaya Rang Undang2 itu di-bachakan bagi kali yang ketiga dan di-luluskan.

Member for Tasek 'Glugor (Enche Hashim bin Awang): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a third time and passed.

Mr. Speaker: Ahli2 Yang Ber-hormat, saya menangguhkan Maj-lis ini sehingga pukul 10.00 pagi esok.

The Assembly adjourns at 4.02 p.m. to 29th November, 1962 at 10.00 a.m.



