

REPORT OF THE
PROCEEDINGS
OF THE SECOND
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
PENANG

3 RD SITTING OF THE
SECOND SESSION THURSDAY
25 TH, NOVEMBER 1965

KPP
328.595123
PEN



127523

PPAPP



1000761616

25th November, 1965.

HADZIR:



Yang Berhormat Tuan Yang di-Pertua (Tuan Haji Sulaiman bin Haji Ahmad, P.J.K.)

Yang Amat Berhormat Ketua Menteri (Dato Wong Pow Nee, P.M.N.)

Yang Berhormat Penasihat Undang₂ (Enche Ibrahim bin Abdul Manan)

Yang Berhormat Ahli Kawasan Glugor (Enche Aziz Ibrahim, J.M.N., J.P.)

„ „ Kawasan Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik, A.M.N. J.P.)

„ „ Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Mr. Kee Yong Chin, J.P.)

„ „ Kawasan Permatang Pauh (Enche Ariffin bin Shariff, P.J.K.)

„ „ Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan. J.P.)

„ „ Kawasan Kelawei (Mr. Tan Khim Hoe)

„ „ Kawasan Dhoby Ghaut (Enche M. S. A. Zachariah)

„ „ Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Mr. Cheah Seng Khim, J.P.)

„ „ Kawasan Kepala Batas (Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Haji Abdullah, A.M.N.)

„ „ Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Mr. Phee Joo Teik, P.J.K.)

„ „ Kawasan Nibong Tebal (Tuan Haji Sahid bin Hassan, P.J.K.)

„ „ Kawasan Balik Pulau (Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Mohamed Taib)

„ „ Kawasan Tasek Glugor (Enche Ahmad bin Haji Jamil)

„ „ Kawasan Butterworth (Mr. Williams David)

„ „ Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Enche Ismail bin Hashim)

„ „ Kawasan Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu)

„ „ Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Mr. Teh Ewe Lim)

„ „ Kawasan Tanjong Utara (Mr. Teh Geok Kooi)

„ „ Kawasan Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew)

„ „ Kawasan Tanjong Selatan (Mr. Khor Peng Seah)

„ „ Kawasan Jelutong (Mr. Tan Hock Hin)

TIDAK HADZIR:

Yang Berhormat Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Utara (Mr. Khoo Kay Por)

The Assembly resumes at 10.00 a.m.

Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Teh Ewe Lim) asks the Chief Minister:

1. (a) What is the area affected by the recent Kuala Muda Flood?
- (b) How many houses and how many people were affected by the flood?
- (c) What is the total area of padi-land affected by the flood?
- (d) How many of the victims are Malays and how many are non-Malays?
- (e) How many were given temporary accommodation?
- (f) What is the total temporary accommodation given for Malays and that for non-Malays?
- (g) What relief did the State Government give to the victims of the food, and what was the total relief given?
- (h) Has Government any plan to combat or to prevent any future recurrence of the flood?

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, bagi menjawab soalan 1(a), lebeh kurang 836 ekar; (b) sebanyak 249 buah rumah dan lebeh kurang 1,600 penduduk telah terlibat; (c) lebeh kurang 600 ekar; (d) 1,300 orang Melayu dan 300 orang bukan-Melayu; (e) 1,234 orang; (f) tempat tinggal sementara telah di-beri untuk 1,194 orang₂ Melayu dan 40 orang bukan-Melayu; (g) sebanyak \$5,000 telah di-beri oleh Kerajaan Negeri dan sebanyak \$5,000 lagi di-beri oleh Kerajaan Pusat. Selain daripada bantuan wang yang di-beri oleh Kerajaan Negeri dan Kerajaan Pusat itu

derma₂ juga telah di-beri oleh orang₂ ramai. Masakan sechara kaum telah di-adakan di-tujuh buah tempat ia-itu untuk memberi makan kepada mangsa₂ yang ber-kenaan dari 1hb. hingga 13hb. November. (h) Kawalan yang terlibat itu ia-lah satu kawasan dataran yang memang tidak asing lagi kepada banjir.

Banjir di-jangka berlaku pada tiap₂ tahun di-kawasan tersebut. Dari segi teknik, nampak-nya banjir ini tidak mungkin dapat di-chegah. Pehak Jabatan Parit dan Taliayer telah pun membena sa-batang batas dan bagi mengawal banjir di-kawasan yang mendapat banjir yang letak-nya di-luar kawasan yang di-kawal. Oleh yang demikian, soal menempatkan semula mereka itu di-tempat₂ yang lain akan di-pertimbangkan.

Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Teh Ewe Lim): Supplementary question, Sir. Could the Honourable the Chief Minister explain why only a small percentage of the non-Malays were given temporary accommodation?

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, sebab orang₂ itu tidak mahu tempat sementara.

Member for Tanjong Selatan (Mr. Khor Peng Seah): Apa-kah sebab-nya ayer bah itu tidak dapat di-chegahkan?

Chief Minister: Itu mengikut nasihat daripada Pejabat Teknik.

Member for Tanjong Selatan (Mr. Khor Peng Seah): Apa-kah alasan Pejabat Teknik itu?

Chief Minister: Saya minta notis soalan itu.

Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr.

Teh Ewe Lim) asks the Chief Minister:

2. (a) What plan so far has the Government in tackling flooding of the Sungei Pinang area?
- (b) When will such plan be implemented so as to remove once and for all this constant threat to the residents living in the Sungei Pinang area?

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, bagi menjawab soalan 2(a), Ahli Yang Berhormat itu tentu sudah tahu bahawa Kerajaan Negeri telah membentok sa-buah Jawatan-kuasa yang anggota₂-nya termasuk juga pegawai₂ dari Majlis Bandar Raya ia-itu untuk mengkaji masa'alah banjir dalam kawasan George Town dan seterusnya membuat perakuan₂.

Jawapan kepada soalan 2(b), sebaik₂ sahaja laporan Jawatan-kuasa itu siap dan wang boleh di-dapati.

Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Teh Ewe Lim): Supplementary question, Sir. Could the Government enlighten this House as to the area, and how many houses and families are normally affected by the flood?

Chief Minister: Di-k a w a s a n George Town?

Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Teh Ewe Lim): Sungei Pinang.

Chief Minister: Sungei Pinang, saya minta notis soalan itu.

Member for Tanjong Selatan (Mr. Khor Peng Seah): Mengikut Yang Amat Berhormat Ketua Menteri, bila-kah Kerajaan boleh dapat laporan daripada Jawatan-kuasa itu?

Chief Minister: Bila Jawatan-kuasa itu dapat menyampaikan laporan, serah-lah kepada Jawatan-kuasa itu.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir is it not a fact that since 1962 there have been conferences between City Council officials and State Government officials? And is it not a fact that a sum of \$970,000 has been provided for, and that the State Government is prepared to lend money to the City Council, and has in fact loaned \$200,000; and is not prepared to contribute from State funds for the flood alleviation project?

Chief Minister: Betul.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, since rivers are a State responsibility, and since these rivers flow from the rural areas, has the State Government considered whether or not it should contribute as well to the widening of Sungei Pinang River as to the flood alleviation scheme in order that this project can be put to hand and executed as early as possible?

Chief Minister: Saya fikir soalan itu ada-lah di-dalam siasatan Jawatan-kuasa itu.

Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Teh Ewe Lim): Tuan Speaker, Sir, as the question of flooding is a very pressing problem which has been outstanding for so long, could the Honourable the Chief Minister explain why no concrete effort has been made so far?

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, saya rasa Kerajaan ada ambil tindakan tetapi apa yang tindakan yang Kerajaan jalankan kena-lah

tunggu sampai Jawatan-kuasa itu menyampaikan laporan. Tunggu sampai laporan Jawatan-kuasa itu siap.

flood alleviation scheme without getting the full sum in hand. And obviously there is a shortage of money.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have in our Development Estimates a sum of \$970,000 set apart for flood alleviation of Sungei Pinang area, although some \$200,000 was offered, I believe, to the City Council in 1962. Since then the City Council has been asking the State Government whether or not it would help by contributing some sum of money towards the total cost of flood alleviation. As I can understand it, it would appear that what the State Government wants the City Council to do is to accept the full responsibility of the \$970,000 — which apparently the City Council cannot afford. If the State Government would or is prepared to contribute even a certain percentage for this flood alleviation then perhaps the thing can be put to hand faster.

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, saya tidak dapat tahu Yang Berhormat katakan ada \$970,000 didalam Budget. Budget mana?

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): It is in the Development Estimates — \$970,000 for the relief of flooding in urban areas; \$200,000 loan to the local authority. The \$200,000 loan to the local authority was made, I believe, in 1962 or 1963. No provisions have been made since then, obviously because the City Council cannot afford to borrow the money. But the \$200,000 has been provided in the Development Estimates for the relief of flooding in the urban area. And this money unfortunately has not been used because you cannot start the

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, \$200,000 yang di-dalam estimate itu ia-lah untuk pinjaman kepada Majlis Bandar Raya yang mana Majlis itu minta pinjaman dua tiga tahun dahulu. Jikalau Majlis Bandar Raya hendak minta pinjaman lebeh lagi Kerajaan boleh siasat dan timbang.

Member for Tanjong Selatan (Mr. Khor Peng Seah): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, mengikut jawapan Yang Amat Berhormat Ketua Menteri itu, maka jikalau Jawatan-kuasa itu tidak memberi laporan, Kerajaan tidak akan membendung banjir di-dalam Kawasan Sungei Pinang itu sampai bila pun. Benar-kah maksud Yang Amat Berhormat Ketua Menteri itu bagitu?

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, jikalau laporan tidak dapat, apa tindakan yang boleh di-ambil, selain daripada dengan tidak ada pelan. Jawatan-kuasa Kechil itu yang hendak chadang apa tindakan yang patut di-ambil.

Member for Tanjong Selatan (Mr. Khor Peng Seah): Ada-kah Yang Amat Berhormat Ketua Menteri akan menentukan satu masa yang tertentu kepada Jawatan-kuasa itu supaya menghantar laporan Jawatan-kuasa itu kepada Kerajaan Negeri?

Chief Minister: Kerajaan boleh minta Jawatan-kuasa itu menghantar laporan dan saya ada katakan ada pegawai₂ daripada Bandar Raya di-dalam Jawatan-kuasa itu. Bukan pegawai₂ Kerajaan sahaja. Kerajaan boleh minta Jawatan-kuasa ini chepat menyiapkan laporan-nya.

Member for Tanjong Selatan (Mr. Khor Peng Seah): Boleh-kah Yang Amat Berhormat Ketua Menteri memberi masa yang tertentu — memberitahu Dewan ini masa yang tertentu — Jawatan-kuasa itu akan memberi laporan itu?

Chief Minister: Saya rasa itu satu perkara yang Kerajaan tidak boleh sanggup.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, in 1955 the State Settlement Council put up a Paper which was called the Report to Examine the Problem of Flooding in the Settlement of Penang which dealt with the flooding of the Sungei Pinang River. In 1957 the present Honourable Member for Sungei Pinang moved a Motion in the City Council to deal with the problem of flooding. Since then there have been many meetings and many proposals. As far as I can remember, the City Council had a proposal which was finalized some time in 1962, and was subjected to minor adjustments. And I believe this scheme has been submitted to the State Government, and in fact has been put before the Committee since 1962, which is 3 years ago, namely that, first of all, they should establish pumps at the Prangin Road Canal. This has been done. Secondly, the channel of Sungei Pinang River should be straightened and dredged. Dredging is a matter for the State because the river belongs to the State. And dredgers are obtainable from the Ministry of Irrigation and Drainage. The third part of the scheme is to open up (interrupted).

Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise on a point of

order. This is question time. Is the Honourable Member making an adjournment speech?

Mr. Speaker: Will the Honourable Member put a direct question?

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is so long. If I put a question he will say that I ask so many questions that it is difficult for him to remember them. Well I can put it in a form of question, and he can note it down. Is it not a fact that the third part of the scheme is the straightening of the Makloom Canal, cutting through to Bakau Street, with an outfall in Bakau Street, which would cost some \$650,000 to \$900,000? And is it not a fact that the fourth phase of the scheme is to tack away the Ayer Terjun at Waterfalls, down Gottlieb Road, into the sea, so that the two big tributaries of the Sungei Pinang River would not flow into the Sungei Pinang channel itself but into the sea to the South and to the North of Sungei Pinang River? Is it not a fact that these proposals in fact are detailed proposals and can be carried out if only the State Government would find sufficient funds, or is prepared to assist the Council?

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, Kerajaan sentiasa sedia menolong jikalau City Council hendak minta pinjaman itu.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, is it not a fact that in fact the City Council has been pressing the State Government to come to a definite decision on this matter since 1962?

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, keputusan sudah chukup terang.

Jikalau Majlis Bandar Raya hendak minta pinjaman \$2 juta lagi pun boleh bagi. Jangan kata \$200 ribu sahaja.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, this question of flooding involves the Sungei Pinang River; and riverine rights and the dredging of rivers is a State responsibility. Only the State has authority over rivers. Is not the Chief Minister aware that the City Council has no authority or power over rivers themselves?

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, itu saya rasa saya minta notis soalan itu.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, is it not a fact that as far back as in 1962 the City Council had in fact sent a detailed Memorandum and Report to the State Government for consideration?

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker saya rasa ada.

Member for Ayer (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): "Saya rasa ada". But Mr. Speaker, Sir, (interrupted).

Mr. Speaker: Ahli Yang Berhormat, saya suka menarek perhatian, mengikut Atoran dan Peratoran Meshuarat yang ada di Dewan Ra'ayat, ada-lah masa untuk soalan ini di-tentukan. Tetapi malang-nya, di-dalam Standing Order kita ini tidak ada. Saya mintalah kerjasama Ahli₂ Majlis ini supaya kita dapat mengikuti Atoran dan Peratoran yang di-jalankan di-dalam Dewan Ra'ayat untuk menyelamatkan masa Majlis Meshuarat ini.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim

Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, will the State Government inform this Assembly how frequently meetings on this matter are being conducted at the moment?

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, saya mahu tahu — meeting mana? Meeting apa?

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, Meeting of the Technical and Legal Committee appointed jointly by the State Government and City Council to deal with this flood problem in 1962.

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, saya minta notis soalan itu.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, will the Honourable the Chief Minister give this Assembly an assurance that this matter will be pursued with as much vigour as possible, as three years have already elapsed?

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, this matter will be pursued. What matter? Is that the Committee proceeding?

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Sir, I cannot ask any further questions on the Technical and Legal Committee appointed jointly by the State Government since he says he is not aware of it. But this problem which is supposed to be under the consideration of this Joint Committee should be pursued as vigorously as possible.

Chief Minister: Sir, I seek clarification When the Honourable says I am not aware of what is the Technical Committee, I don't remember I said that. I don't remember that I said I am

not aware or I don't know what is the Technical Committee.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): I think, Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the last reply the Honourable the Chief Minister said that he did not know the position at the moment of this Committee.

Chief Minister: Which reply? What position? May I know, Mr. Speaker, Sir?

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Well, Mr. Speaker, Sir, perhaps the reply can be read out from the shorthand notes.

Mr. Speaker: I remember. The Honourable the Chief Minister said he cannot do anything until the Committee submits a Report. He did not say he is not aware or he did not know.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): In that case, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will re-phrase my question. Will the Honourable the Chief Minister pursue this matter as vigorously as possible?

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, saya menjawab kepada soalan yang di-bangkitkan oleh Ahli Kawan Tanjong Selatan saya katakan Kerajaan minta Jawatan-kuasa ini menyiapkan laporan itu dengan lebih chepat — supaya kita boleh dapat laporan itu dengan chepat.

Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Teh Ewe Lim) asks the Chief Minister:

3. (a) In the absence of a body such as the State Economic Development Planning Board, can the State Government inform what plan has it to improve the well-being and prosperity of Penang Island?

(b) In view of the indication given by the Hon. the Chief Minister on the industrialisation of Penang Island, could the Government inform whether it has any plan to this effect?

(c) Has the Government taken any step to acquire the necessary land to provide industrial site on Penang Island?

Chief Minister: Jawapan kepada soalan 3(a) — Kerajaan mempunyai sa-buah Rancangan Pembangunan yang meliputi bukan sahaja Pulau Pinang bahkan seluruh Negeri kita ini.

3(b) — Perkara ini sedang ditimbangkan oleh Kerajaan dengan teliti.

3(c) — di-Pulau Pinang ini memang ada tanah Kerajaan boleh di-gunakan untuk mendirikan kilang₂ perusahaan. Kalau perlu maka langkah₂ akan di-ambil untuk membeli milek tanah₂ yang lain itu.

Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Teh Ewe Lim): Tuan Speaker, Sir, supplementary question. Could the Honourable the Chief Minister enlighten this House as to who are the members of the State Economic Development Committee?

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, nama₂ itu, saya minta notis juga.

Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Teh Ewe Lim): Tuan Speaker, Sir, supplementary question. In view of the fact that the economic development of Penang is a very important matter, does not the State Government deem it advisable or necessary to engage experts to tackle or to assist in such planning rather than to leave it in the hands of amateurs?

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, saya rasa Jawatan-kuasa₂ yang Kerajaan ada hari ini untuk menjalankan ranchangan₂ itu ada-lah bagi pehak atau pakar yang ada di-dalam Kerajaan.

Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Teh Ewe Lim): Tuan Speaker, Sir, how does the State Government expect aid from the Federal Government in the economic development of Penang when they show they could not tell me in my questions in one of the meetings the number of factories that could be set up in the Mak Mandin site, and the number of persons that could be benefited with employment, as all the State Government could do was to forecast, and not to plan.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think I did not say that I could not tell the number of factories that could be set up. I said it is not possible to say how many factories can be put up in Mak Mandin because that depends on the size of the area required by the factory. We have Lots of half an acre. Now, if each factory requires half an acre I think hundreds of factories can go in. But if a factory requires five or ten acres the number of factories that can be accommodated in Mak Mandin depends on the size of land the factory requires. And how many people can be employed also depends on the type of factories. In my answer previously I did mention that if all these 15 factories start functioning we may expect them to employ about 1,500 workers. That is a rough estimate. To give an exact figure as to how many workers can be employed in Mak Mandin is something that we are not able to do.

Member for Tanjong Barat

(Mr. Teh Ewe Lim): Tuan Speaker, Sir, is the Honourable the Chief Minister aware that in the case of the Tassek industrial site the number of factories as well as the number of persons employed could be furnished?

Chief Minister: I think that is a wonder. They to anticipate, or count the chickens before they are hatched.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): Supplementary question, Sir. May we know how the State Development Committee functions in relation to the National Central Planning Committee? Is there constant liaison between the two; and whether the initiative comes from the State or from the Central Government?

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is close liaison; and most of the projects put up are initiated by the State.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): Sir, are we to take it, therefore, that the State Development Committee will be really held responsible; and the credit — if there is any credit — should be given to the State Development Committee?

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, Kerajaan yang ambil kuasa itu. Jikalau ada apa₂ "credit" atau keredak, Kerajaan Negeri yang bertanggung-jawab.

Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Teh Ewe Lim): Tuan Speaker, Sir, what are the qualifications of the members of the State Economic Development Board? They are entrusted to tackle the economic development of Penang, which is a very important matter as it not only affects the economic development but also the

livelihood of the people.

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, tidak ada "definite qualification" tetapi di-dalam Jawatan-kuasa itu ada pakar₂ yang Kerajaan ada pada hari ini.

Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Teh Ewe Lim): asks the Chief Minister:

4. (a) Is the State Government aware that the filling of red earth on state land at Trengganu Road has caused destruction and losses to properties of authorised squatters?
- (b) Is the State Government aware that contrary to usual procedure no notice was served on the squatters prior to the filling of red earth, as a result of which the squatters incurred losses to their properties?
- (c) Does the Government contemplate compensating these squatters for their losses?
- (d) How would the Government compensate the squatters?

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, bagi menjawab soalan 4(a) — tidak, tidak ada squatters yang di-beri kebenaran tinggal di-atas tanah Kerajaan di-Trengganu Road yang sedang di-tambun itu. Walau bagaimana pun ada beberapa orang penduduk yang menduduki tanah Kerajaan sechara haram. Rumah₂ mereka itu-lah yang akan terlibat.

4(b) — penduduk₂ yang menduduki tanah Kerajaan sechara haram itu telah pun di-beri notis supaya pindah dari situ pada 28hb. April, 1961 sekali dan sekali lagi pada 29hb. Ogos, 1963.

4(c) — Tidak. Akan tetapi Kerajaan akan membuat timbangan memberi bayaran ehsan kepada mereka bila mereka pindah dari situ kelak.

4(d) — sechara memberi bayaran ehsan.

(B) WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, jawapan₂ kepada soalan₂ yang telah di-kemukakan itu ada-lah di-bentangkan di-atas meja Dewan.

Mr. Khor Peng Seah asks the Chief Minister:

1. (a) Is the development at the Industrial Trading Estate at Mak Mandin undertaken by the State Executive Council?
 - (b) What are the steps taken by the Government to encourage industrialists to start their business at this Mak Mandin Industrial Estate?
 - (c) Will the Government set up an Investigation Committee to survey the conditions in the Mak Mandin Industrial Trading Estate?
 - (d) In the interests of the people and the success of the Industrial Estate, will the Government include in the Committee representatives from the Government, Opposition Members and the chambers of commerce?
2. (a) Has the Government any plan to establish industrial estates on Penang Island?
 - (b) If there is, where would it be sited?

- (c) How does the Government propose to attract the industrialists?
 - (d) When will this industrialisation take place?
3. (a) In view of the shortage and the high price of locally-made products, has the Government submitted representation to the Central Government for the lifting of import controls and of the abolition of import quota on certain goods after the formation of Malaysia?
- (b) If the Government has done so, what are the replies from the Central Government?
 - (c) If not, why it has not done so?
4. (a) Has the Government received any petition from the people of Caunter Hall area on flooding which occurs there frequently?
- (b) If there is any such petition, what are the fresh actions taken by the Government?
 - (c) Could the Government assure the people in Caunter Hall and Bridge Street areas that flooding would be alleviated within a specific time?

Chief Minister:

- 1. (a) Yes.
- (b) The following projects have been constructed or are under construction:—
 - (i) Deep-water berths at Butterworth costing \$52 million;
 - (ii) A Power Station at Prai costing about \$57 million;
 - (iii) Extension of the railway from Prai to Butterworth costing \$11 million;

- (iv) A new road bridge across Prai River which was opened last month by the Prime Minister.

The following projects are to be implemented under the First Malaysia Development Plan:—

- (a) Muda River Water Supply Scheme estimated to cost \$65 million.
- (b) A causeway across the Prai River to replace the pontoon bridge at Permatang Pauh at a cost of \$4 million. Besides speeding up traffic this project will make possible the provision of untreated water to industries.

Apart from these measures, a booklet which sets out the pre-eminence of the location, the facilities available thereat, and the terms and conditions on which land is available has been printed and widely distributed. It has been sent to all Chambers of Commerce in Penang, to Malaysian High Commissions and Embassies overseas, and to the Ministry of Commerce and Industry for distribution to interested merchants and businessmen throughout the country. Consideration is also being given to sending delegations overseas to attract industries to our State.

- (c) No.
 - (d) In view of the answer given to question (c), this question does not arise.
2. (a) At this moment, there is no definite plan yet.
- (b) This question does not arise.
 - (c) This question does not arise.

(d) This question does not arise.

3. (a) There is no general shortage of locally-made goods. Their prices are not unreasonably high either. It is presumed that the import controls and quota restrictions which the Hon'ble Member refers to are the import controls and quota restrictions introduced in anticipation of the establishment of the Common Market. Import control is a precautionary measure and has been introduced temporarily so as to prevent speculation in items likely to be included in the Common Market. As this is a necessary measure and of a temporary nature, there is no justification for the State Government to request that the controls be lifted.

Since 9th October, 1965, import controls have been lifted from a total number of 103 items in the Principal Customs Area, and 178 items in Penang Island. These goods may now be imported without requiring import licences. Import controls still apply to 15 classes of goods entering the Principal Customs Area, and another 15 classes of goods entering Penang Island. A few of these have been retained to protect goods made in Malaysia which are not yet produced in sufficient quantity to meet domestic demand in full, particularly as no protective tariffs have been imposed so far, although expansion of production is under way. Other cases relate to goods on which new protective duties have been introduced, but the precautionary import controls are still being retained because it has still not yet been determined whether the new rates of duties are appropriate. In such cases, however, the quotas have been increased to a higher percentage. As the Minister of Finance

stated recently all these precautionary import controls will be abolished as soon as appropriate rates of protective duties have been established.

- (b) In view of the answer to part (a), this question does not arise.
- (c) Please see answer to part (a) of this question.
4. (a) Yes.
- (b) From a reply I gave at the last meeting of this Assembly, the Hon'ble Member will be aware that the State Government has set up a Committee comprising officials and technical experts of both the State Government and the City Council to study the problem of flooding within George Town and make recommendations. No fresh action is intended to be taken until the Committee submits its report.
- (c) First the report of the Committee must be ready. Second we must have the necessary funds. Therefore it is not possible to say at this moment when the problem of flooding can be alleviated.

6. BILLS.

(A) The Penang State Third Supplementary Supply Bill, 1965.

First Reading.

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, saya mohon menchadangkan supaya Rang Undang₂ yang di-namakan "Undang₂ untok mengadakan peruntukan wang yang di-keluarkan daripada Kumpulan Wang yang di-Satukan untok perbelanjaan tambahan bagi perkhidmatan₂ di-dalam tahun 1965" di-bachakan bagi kali yang pertama.

Member for Bagan Ajam (Mr. Phee Joo Teik): Tuan Speaker, saya menyokong.

Bill accordingly read a first time.

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, menurut syarat₂ Peratoran Majlis Meshuarat 59, saya mohon memberi kenyataan bahawa Bacha₂an kali yang Kedua Rang Undang₂ ini akan di-chadangkan dengan serta merta.

Second Reading.

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, saya mohon menchadangkan supaya Rang Undang₂ yang di-namakan "Undang₂ untok mengadakan peruntokan wang yang di-keluarkan daripada Kumpulan Wang yang di-Satukan untok perbelanjaan tambahan bagi perkhidmatan₂ di-dalam tahun 1965" di-bachakan bagi kali yang kedua.

Tuan Speaker, tujuan Rang Undang₂ ini ia-lah hendak memberi kuasa berkanun mengenai peruntokan wang tambahan sebanyak \$131,085 untok perkhidmatan awam di-dalam Negeri Pulau Pinang ia-itu sebagaimana yang di-sharatkan oleh Atikal 32 dalam Perlembagaan Negeri Pulau Pinang. Butir₂ keterangan mengenai peruntokan wang bagi perbelanjaan itu ada di-huraikan di-dalam Anggaran Perbelanjaan Biasa Negeri Pulau Pinang Tambahan Yang Ketiga, Tahun 1965, yang telah di-bentangkan sebagai Risalat Dewan Negeri Pulau Pinang Bil. 9 tahun 1965.

Peruntokan wang tambahan sebanyak \$10,386 ada-lah di-kehendaki bagi Kepala 1 — Ketua Menteri dan Pejabat Setia Usaha Negeri. Ini ia-lah kerana tangga gaji Pegawai₂ Perkhidmatan Tadbir Negeri, Pegawai₂ Urusan China dan Jurutaip₂ telah di-naikkan.

Pegawai₂ Perkhidmatan Negeri dan Pegawai₂ Urusan China mendapat gaji tambahan mulai daripada 1hb. Oktober, 1964 dan Jurutaip₂ pula mulai daripada 1hb. April, 1964.

Kepala 3 — Pejabat₂ Tanah dan Daerah — berkehendakkan peruntokan wang tambahan sebanyak \$28,074 ia-itu kerana gaji dan elaun rumah pekerja₂ Kerajaan di-ubah. Pihak₂ yang mendapat tambahan gaji ini ia-lah Pegawai Petempatan, Penghulu₂ dan Kerani₂ Sementara ya'ani selain daripada Pegawai₂ Perkhidmatan Tadbir Negeri dan Jurutaip₂. Tambahan gaji bagi Pegawai₂ Petempatan bermula daripada 1hb. Julai, 1963; Penghulu₂ mulai daripada 1hb. April, 1964; dan Kerani₂ Sementara pula mulai daripada 1hb. Januari, 1964. Tambahan elaun rumah ia-lah mulai daripada 1hb. April, 1964.

Peruntokan wang tambahan sebanyak \$6,300 perlu di-adakan bagi Kepala 6 — Jabatan Bomba — oleh kerana anggota₂ Pasukan Bomba juga telah di-beri tambahan gaji. Perubahan gaji mereka itu ia-lah mulai daripada 1hb. Januari, 1965.

Tambahan sebanyak \$59,000 bagi Kepala 14 — Kerja Raya — Bekalan Ayer Berulang Tiap₂ Tahun — ada-lah di-kehendaki kerana sebab₂ yang berikut:—

- (a) di-dalam Anggaran Tahun 1965, kita telah mengadakan peruntokan wang bagi mengeluarkan ayer yang sudah di-tapis ya'ani ayer yang berse₂h sebanyak 5.8 juta gelen sa-hari di-Seberang Perai, akan tetapi pengeluaran ayer kini sudah meningkat menjadi 7.1 juta gelen sa-hari — ini ia-lah kerana lebih banyak yang di-gunakan. Tambahan hasil yang

di-jangka di-perolehi di-sebabkan oleh bertambahnya penggunaan dan pengeluaran ayer ini ia-lah lebeh kurang \$100,000.

- (b) Oleh sebab Konferantasi, kita telah mengambil seramai 10 orang lagi Penjaga bagi mengawal, memperlindongi serta menjaga keselamatan tempat bekalan ayer kita. Sewaktu membuat Anggaran Tahun 1965 dahulu keperluan mengambil mereka bekerja tidak timbul.

Kepala 15 — Hal Ehwal Ugama dan Mahkamah₂ Shariah — berkehendakkan peruntokan wang tambahan sebanyak \$5,923 ia-itu kerana gaji Kerani₂ Kathi telah di-naikkan mulai daripada 1hb. Januari, 1964. Di-Negeri ini ada 6 jawatan Kerani Kathi.

Peruntokan wang tambahan sebanyak \$5,000 ada-lah di-kehendaki bagi Kepala 16 — Kebajikan Masharakat — kerana pada awal bulan ini banjir telah berlaku di-beberapa buah kampung di-Seberang Perai Utara. Sa-jumlah 247 buah keluarga terdiri daripada 1,200 orang semua-nya telah terpaksa di-pindahkan daripada rumah tangga mereka dan seterusnya di-jaga sehingga banjir itu surut semula. Kerajaan Negeri telah memberi bantuan wang sebanyak \$5,000 dalam hal ini dan Kerajaan Pusat sebanyak \$5,000. Orang ramai juga tidak ketinggalan memberi bantuan. Di-sini saya mengambil kesempatan menguchapkan berbanyak₂ terima kaseh kapada Kerajaan Pusat dan orang rami sekalian kerana bantuan₂ itu.

Tuan Speaker, oleh kerana bekalan ayer semakin bertambah banyak di-kehendaki maka di-dapati peruntokan wang perlu di-

tambah sebanyak \$9,200 kapada Kepala 18 — Perbendaharaan. Bila penggunaan ayer bertambah maka hasil yang di-perolehi daripada bayaran₂ ayer juga ta'dapat tidak akan bertambah. Pada masa ini hasil daripada bayaran₂ ayer dan chukai₂ ayer ada-lah di-pungut oleh empat buah Majlis₂ Daerah di-dalam Negeri ini bagi pehak Kerajaan Negeri. Kerajaan membayar komishen sebanyak 5% kapada Majlis₂ itu kerana perkhidmatan tersebut. Oleh kerana hasil yang akan di-perolehi itu bertambah maka jumlah komishen yang kena di-bayar kapada Majlis₂ Daerah itu pun terpaksa-lah di-tambah juga. Maka dengan sebab itu-lah peruntokan wang tambahan sebanyak \$9,200 itu di-perlukan.

Kepala 19, Haiwan, berkehendakkan peruntokan wang tambahan sebanyak \$2,202. Sebab₂-nya ia-lah kerana perubahan tangga gaji bagi Jurutaip₂ dan juga kerana pada masa ini orang lain pula yang memegang jawatan Pegawai Haiwan Negeri. Pegawai yang dahulu sudah bersara. Beliau mendapat elaun rumah kadar biasa sahaja kerana beliau tinggal di-rumah-nya sendiri akan tetapi pegawai baru yang ada sekarang ini tinggal di-rumah sewa — jadi, beliau ada-lah di-beri bantuan sewa rumah — bantuan ini pula ada-lah jauh lebeh banyak jumlah-nya daripada jumlah Elaun Rumah yang biasa.

Tuan Speaker, sebanyak \$5,000 ada-lah di-untukkan bagi Kepala 20 — Charum kapada Kumpulan Wang Berkanun — guna menambahkan lagi jumlah wang yang ada di-dalam Kumpulan Wang Amanah Pendahuluan Diri (Pegawai₂ Kerajaan) dari \$5,000 menjadi \$10,000. Kumpulan Wang ini tiada di-tunjokkan di-dalam Anggaran — chuma dalam penyata harta dan tanggungan Negeri sa-

haja. Walau bagaimana pun, penyata ini ada di-masokkan ka-dalam buku Anggaran.

Kumpulan Wang ini ada-lah untuk memberi wang pendahuluan kepada pegawai₂ untuk perbelanjaan₂ bertukar atau perbelanjaan₂ berjalan ataupun untuk membayar balek sebarang bayaran yang telah terlebih di-beri kepada mereka oleh Kerajaan Negeri. Wang₂ pendahuluan yang di-beri itu, kemudian-nya di-perolehi balek daripada pegawai₂ yang berkenaan kesemua-nya sekali gus atau sechara beransor₂ daripada wang tuntutan mereka atau sechara memotong gaji mereka. Jumlah sebanyak \$5,000 di-dalam Kumpulan Wang ini ada-lah di-dapati tidak cukup kerana jumlah yang di-perlukan oleh pegawai₂ yang berkenaan itu lebih banyak. Jadi, di-chadangkan-lah supaya jumlah yang ada di-dalam Kumpulan Wang Amanah itu di-tambah menjadi \$10,000.

Tuan Speaker, saya mohon men-chadangkan.

Member for Bagan Ajam (Mr. Phee Joo Teik): Tuan Speaker, saya menyokong.

Mr. Speaker: Does any Honourable Member wish to speak on the Second Reading of the Bill? The Bill has been seconded — it is open to debate now.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): Sir, I have only one minor observation to make over this Supplementary Estimates expenditure, that is, if you look on page 2 — out of this \$131,085, \$52,885 goes to Personal Emoluments. We have just listened to the Hon'ble the Chief Minister give one of his leisurely accounts, which reminds me of the good old days when the Alliance State

Government could go on plodding in this pleasant gentle manner. But, Sir, it was a great pity that the publication of Paper No. 9 of 1965 carried with it no remarks at all. Otherwise, it would have given us a little more time to consider what the various items were for. The Hon'ble the Chief Minister has now given us what they are specifically for. But, at least, if we understood that the Personal Emoluments were increased **vis-a-vis** raise in salaries, or whatever it is, at least Government would not be giving away any secrets but it would help the Assembly considerably.

The only remark that I would like to make — and a remark which I would continue to make later on when we come to the actual Budget for 1966 — is to remind this House of a statement which was made by the Hon'ble the Minister of Finance in his last Budget Speech that he was particularly alarmed for the last two years at the rate of increase in the annual salaries bill; and that he had advised accordingly that wage increases can only be justified by corresponding increases in productivity. He went on further to say that you should not spend beyond your means. With regard to this elementary but vital principle, we can only postpone but not avoid the inevitable day of reckoning. Under the circumstances, Sir, when we have a Supplementary Budget, the estimates presented to us were very nearly half the total amount; slightly more than a quarter of it was entirely due to increases in Personal Emoluments. I feel that it is high time we take stock over our position — and we shall have more cause to refer to this later on in the Budget debate itself. Sir, apart from this, this particular Bill only justifies

what we had said last year about the necessity of Government controlling expenditures and producing more revenue. Apart from these minor comments on this particular Bill, we have nothing else to add.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time.

Committee.

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

The Assembly resumes.

Third Reading.

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, saya mohon melaporkan bahawa Rang Undang₂ Bekalan Tambahan Yang Ketiga Negeri Pulau Pinang, Tahun 1965, telah pun di-pertimbangkan sa-fasal demi sa-fasal di-dalam Jawatan-kuasa dan telah di-persetujui tanpa pindaan. Oleh itu, saya mohon menchadangkan supaya Rang Undang₂ ini di-bachakan bagi kali yang ketiga serta di-luluskan.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a third time and passed.

(B) The Penang State Supply (1966) Bill, 1965.

First Reading.

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, saya mohon menchadangkan supaya Rang Undang₂ yang di-namakan "Undang₂ untok mengadakan peruntokan wang yang di-keluarkan daripada Kumpulan Wang yang di-Satukan bagi perkhidmatan₂ di-dalam tahun 1966, dan menguntokkan wang tersebut

bagi perkara₂ yang tertentu" 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.

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, menurut syarat₂ Peratoran Majlis Meshuarat 59, saya memberi kenyataan bahawa Bacaan kali yang Kedua Rang Undang₂ ini akan di-chadangkan dengan serta merta

Second Reading.

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, saya mohon menchadangkan supaya Rang Undang₂ yang di-namakan "Undang₂ untok mengadakan peruntokan wang yang di-keluarkan daripada Kumpulan Wang yang di-Satukan bagi perkhidmatan₂ di-dalam tahun 1966, dan menguntokkan wang tersebut bagi perkara₂ yang tertentu" di-bachakan bagi kali yang kedua.

Tuan Speaker, Rang Undang₂ Bekalan yang di-bentangkan pada persidangan ini ada-lah bertujuan hendak memberi kuasa berkanun kepada Kerajaan Negeri untok mengeluarkan perbelanjaan biasanya bagi tahun 1966.

Sesungguh-nya tahun 1966 ada-lah satu tahun yang mempunyai ma'ana yang besar kerana pada tahun ini akan di-lancharkan satu lagi ranchangan pembangunan ia-itu Ranchangan Pembangunan Malaysia yang Pertama — tahun 1966-70. Sejak kita menchapai kemerdekaan dalam tahun 1957, negara kita yang muda ini telah memperolehi bagitu besar-nya kejayaan dalam lapangan pembangunan. Kerajaan Perikatan telah mendapat kejayaan yang penoh memberi perubahan₂ yang jelas

dan berkesan bagi kema'amoran hidup ra'ayat dan kejayaan ini telah di-chapai melalui ranchangan₂ pembangunan yang pertama dan yang kedua yang sedang berakhir ini. Kejayaan yang telah terchapai dalam kedua₂ Ranchangan Pembangunan ini ada-lah menjadi bukti yang chukup terang yang menunjukkan bahawa Kerajaan ada-lah berazam untuk menjalankan sedaya upaya-nya segala tanggung-jawab₂-nya dalam lapangan ekonomi dan pembangunan negara. Ranchangan Pembangunan Malaysia yang Pertama yang akan di-mulakan ini ada-lah ranchangan raksaksa yang terbesar sekali di-antara mana₂ ranchangan yang telah di-selenggarakan oleh Kerajaan sehingga hari ini dan Kerajaan Negeri sunggo₂ berazam berusaha dengan segala daya upaya-nya memajukan lagi penduduk-nya dalam lapangan ekonomi dan sosial, bukan sahaja bagi mereka yang tinggal di-luar bandar akan tetapi kapada mereka yang tinggal di-kawasan₂ bandar juga.

Ahli₂ Yang Berhormat tentu sudah dapat melihat bahawa Peranggaran Perbelanjaan bagi tahun 1966 menunjukkan kekurangan sebanyak \$1,537,740. Hasil perolehan ada-lah di-taksirkan kira₂ \$14,075,734 dan perbelanjaan di-taksirkan kira₂ \$15,704,211. Kekurangan ini ada-lah di-sebabkan terutama-nya oleh ketetapan Kerajaan hendak memperuntukkan wang sebanyak \$2,909,263 kapada Kumpulan Wang Pembangunan Negeri. Walau pun kita memberi peruntukan yang saperti ini pada tiap₂ tahun, wang ini ada-lah bertujuan bagi perbelanjaan untuk ranchangan₂ asas dan ranchangan₂ pembangunan dan bukan-lah sebagai satu jenis perbelanjaan yang berulang₂ pada tiap₂ tahun. Lebih jelas lagi, perbelanjaan ini bukan-lah untuk menjalankan pentadbi-

ran Negeri. Jika sekira-nya wang peruntukan kapada Kumpulan Wang Pembangunan Negeri ini tidak di-masokkan di-dalam Peranggaran Perbelanjaan ini, maka akan di-dapati bahawa hasil perolehan Negeri ini ada-lah lebih daripada jumlah perbelanjaan-nya sebanyak \$1,371,523 dan ini menunjukkan bahawa kita boleh mempunyai kelebihan₂ wang hasil perolehan daripada jumlah perbelanjaan. Kerajaan Negeri bertujuan akan terus memberi peruntukan yang saperti ini kapada Kumpulan Wang Pembangunan Negeri. Rasanya ta'payah-lah saya huraikan satu persatu ranchangan₂ yang berbagai₂ rupa yang telah di-belanjakan daripada Kumpulan Wang Pembangunan Negeri ini. Kekurangan wang yang di-sebutkan tadi akan dapat di-ambil daripada wang simpanan kita. Saya suka menyatakan di-sini bahawa Kerajaan telah membelanjakan wang dengan chermat dan membuat ranchangan₂ perbelanjaan-nya dengan teliti dan dengan jalan ini kita dapat memperbaiki kedudukan wang simpanan kita. Saperti yang dapat di-lihat pada muka 1 dalam Buku Peranggaran Hasil dan Perbelanjaan Biasa ia-itu muka surat yang menunjukkan penyata "Harta dan tanggungan Negeri Pulau Pinang yang sebenarnya pada 31hb. Disember, 1964 dan taksiran harta dan tanggungan Negeri Pulau Pinang yang sebenarnya pada 31hb. Disember, 1965" ada menunjukkan kita mempunyai wang simpanan yang belum tersentuh sebanyak \$4,657,717 pada 31hb. Disember, 1964. Saya berasa sukachita menyatakan bahawa tahun 1965 ada-lah tahun yang baik dan oleh sebab itu ada-lah di-jangka yang wang simpanan kita akan bertambah lagi sebanyak \$450,000 pada hujung tahun 1965. Ini berma'ana bahawa hingga akhir tahun ini kita akan mempunyai wang simpanan kira₂

di-kira mengikut Jadual ini. Jumlah wang pemberian mengikut banchi penduduk₂ ia-itu "Capitation Grant" tidak akan di-rombak sehingga selepas di-adakan semula satu banchi penduduk₂ Negeri ini. Hasil perolehan daripada Chukai Hiboran di-jangka akan bertambah sebab lebih ramai lagi orang₂ membelanjakan wang mereka untuk hiboran pada masa ini. Ini membuktikan bahawa penduduk₂ Negeri ini mampu membelanjakan lebih banyak wang untuk hiboran dan ini menunjukkan bahawa dasar₂ Kerajaan telah berjalan dengan jaya-nya. Pada umum-nya boleh-lah di-katakan bahawa jumlah kelebihan yang di-dapati daripada jenis chukai ini ada-lah menunjukkan kemewahan. Kerajaan juga sedar bahawa ada-nya penganggoran di-negeri ini dan angka₂ yang di-sampaikan oleh Pusat Pendaftaran Pekerjaan menunjukkan bahawa hetong panjang mereka yang berdaftar berkehendakkan pekerjaan pada tiap₂ bulan ada-lah kira-kira 14,000 orang. Hal ini tidak seharusnya di-anggap bahawa kesemua daripada mereka itu tidak mempunyai pekerjaan. Banyak juga daripada mereka yang mendaftarkan itu sama-ada mempunyai pekerjaan sementara atau pun hendak menchari pekerjaan lain yang akan mendapat gaji lebih. Kebanyakan daripada mereka itu bagaimana pun ada-lah buroh kasar dan oleh yang demikian amat-lah susah bagi mereka menchari pekerjaan yang lebih berupa teknikal dan sebagai-nya. Kita terhutang budi kepada Kerajaan Pusat kerana mengadakan kemudahan₂ bagi melateh pekerja₂ dalam lapangan kerja₂ yang berkehendakkan kecekapan dan kemahiran. Untuk mengatasi kehendak₂ yang ternyata ini, Kerajaan telah mengambil berbagai-bagai langkah, yang penting-nya ia-lah memberi galakan dan kemudahan₂ bagi mendirikan

kilang₂ perusahaan dalam negeri ini. Saya suka menyatakan bahawa mengikut satu kajian yang baru, Negeri Pulau Pinang ini ada-lah sa-buah Negeri yang ulong dalam lapangan pembangunan perusahaan. Pada masa ini, lebih daripada 1,300 buah kilang₂ yang menggunakan jentera injin adalah di-dapati di-Pulau Pinang dan Seberang Perai. Oleh sebab kita tidak ada banyak tanah yang kosong, maka ranchangan pembangunan tanah tidak-lah dapat di-selenggarakan. Oleh yang demikian, tidak-lah dapat kita membuka peluang kepada mereka yang tidak mempunyai pekerjaan untuk bekerja di-dalam ranchangan₂ tanah. Sunggoh pun kita menghadapi konferantasi kita ada-lah menchapai kemajuan di-Kawasan Perusahaan di-Mak Mandin yang di-selenggarakan oleh Kerajaan itu. Polisi, langkah₂ dan galakan₂ yang di-beri oleh Kerajaan telah pun menarek beberapa banyak kilang₂ bukan sahaja ka-Kawasan Mak Mandin itu, akan tetapi kakawasan₂ di-sekeliling-nya di-daerah₂ Seberang Perai Tengah dan Seberang Perai Selatan. Kita terhutang budi kepada Kerajaan Pusat dan juga Lembaga₂ yang berkenaan atas bantuan mereka dalam lapangan perusahaan itu. Ada-lah menjadi tujuan Kerajaan hendak meneruskan beberapa dasar₂ dan langkah₂ dengan lebih giat lagi pada masa hadapan untuk menarek minat banyak lagi ahli₂ perniagaan membuka sharikat₂ perusahaan di-sini dan dengan ini lebih banyak lagi mereka yang tidak ada pekerjaan berpeluang menchari kerja. Ada-lah di-anggarkan kira₂ 5,000 orang murid₂ yang tamat sekolah pada tiap₂ tahun akan menchari pekerjaan. Kita memang sedar bahawa kemudahan₂ mendapat pekerjaan tidak-lah begitu banyak bertambah seperti yang di-harapkan. Kerajaan telah berusaha dengan sepenoh₂

nya bagi menimbulkan suasana yang menarek supaya sharikat₂ perniagaan mendirikan kilang₂ perusahaan dan dalam lapangan ini berbagai₂ galakan telah di-beri kepada golongan₂ sharikat private supaya dapat mereka membantu Kerajaan mengatasi satu masa'alah berbagai₂ galakan telah di-beri sosial yang penting ia-itu masa'alah penganggoran.

Kerajaan juga berchadang hendak melaksanakan satu atau dua projek yang lain. Dengan permintaan Kerajaan Negeri, Kerajaan Pusat telah pun bersetuju untuk membena sa-buah jalan tambak bagi menggantikan Titi Timbul di-Permatang Pauh. Jalan tambak ini ada-lah serupa dengan yang melintangi Sungai Juru. Projek ini di-anggarkan akan memakan belanja sebanyak \$4,000,000 dan apabila siap kira-kira 3,700 ekar tanah akan dapat di-buka untuk pertanian. Ada-lah juga di-jangka sa-buah kolam ayer tawar akan dapat di-bena di-hulu sungai dan projek ini tentu akan memberi kemudahan yang berguna untuk kilang₂ perusahaan kemudian kelak. Saya perchaya semua Ahli₂ Yang Berhormat sudah pun mengetahui akan permintaan Kerajaan Negeri kepada Kerajaan Pusat tentang betapa mustahak-nya di-bena sa-batang jalan raya Timor ka-Barat daripada Kota Bharu ka-Butterworth. Perkara ini pada masa ini sedang di-kaji oleh Kerajaan Pusat. Saya berharap Kerajaan Pusat akan dengan seberapa segera-nya mendapat wang₂ yang di-perlukan untuk melaksanakan projek ini — satu projek yang akan memberi faedah bukan sahaja kepada Negeri Pulau Pinang akan tetapi kepada negeri₂ yang berhampiran. Semua yang saya sebutkan ini ada-lah menunjokkan bahawa Kerajaan sedar atas tanggung-jawab-nya untuk mengadakan peluang₂ yang baru bagi pen-

dudok₂ di-Pulau Pinang ini mendapat pekerjaan. Sa-imbang dengan langkah₂ Kerajaan dalam lapangan pembangunan perusahaan, maka Kerajaan telah berusaha mendirikan berbagai-bagai pusat pelajaran di-Negeri ini. Pernah terdahulu daripada ini baik di-dalam Dewan ini atau pun di-luar saya telah menyentoh berkenaan dengan Sekolah Teknik. Kali ini saya suka hendak menyentoh berkenaan dengan chadangan mendirikan sa-buah lagi pusat pelajaran di-Pulau Pinang ia-itu Maktab Perikanan yang di-taksirkan akan memakan belanja pada permulaannya sebanyak \$2 juta. Maktab ini ada-lah sebagai tambahan lagi kepada Sekolah Perikanan yang ada sekarang di-sini. Saya juga perchaya Ahli₂ Yang Berhormat sekalian sudah mengetahui berkenaan dengan langkah₂ mendirikan sa-buah Maktab Universiti di-Negeri kita ini. Rancangan ini telah pun di-persetujui pada dasar-nya oleh Kerajaan Pusat dan saya berharap Maktab Universiti ini akan dapat di-dirikan tidak lama lagi.

Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan waktu membuat ucapan mengenai Peranggaran Hasil dan Perbelanjaan baru₂ ini telah menarek perhatian Kerajaan dan juga penduduk₂ di-Pulau Pinang supaya menentukan sikap mereka terhadap rancangan kawasan kawalan kastam. Beliau telah menyebut bahawa perdagangan entrepot di-Pulau Pinang boleh dan patut di-beri perlindungan dalam kawasan kawalan kastam Malaysia. Soal yang kita hadapi sekarang ia-lah sama ada taraf pelabohan bebas patut di-kekalkan atau tidak. Yang Berhormat Menteri itu telah menunjokkan bahawa oleh sebab penting-nya perkara₂ yang berkaitan dengan ini, maka satu keputusan hendak-lah di-ambil dengan segera. Kami Ahli₂ Kera-

jaan Negeri akan berusaha sedaya upaya untuk mengekalkan taraf pelabohan bebas ini jika sekiranya keadaan ini ada-lah untuk kepentingan penduduk₂ di-Negeri ini. Bagaimana pun, kita tidak-lah sepatut-nya memikirkan perkara ini dari segi jangka pendek, malahan ada-lah menjadi tanggung-jawab kita memandangkan perkara ini atas dasar pada hari hadapan supaya kita dapat menentukan yang Pulau Pinang akan terus ma'amor dan maju.

Kita juga sedar akan beberapa perubahan yang telah berlaku di-Negeri ini pada sedikit masa yang lalu dan perubahan₂ ini telah mengubah keadaan dan peranan Negeri Pulau Pinang ini sebagai sa-buah Negeri di-Malaysia. Dengan perubahan₂ ini maka amat penting bagi kita mengkaji semula rancangan dan program pembangunan ekonomi. Berpegangan dengan pendapat ini, maka Kerajaan Negeri telah pun meminta daripada Kerajaan Pusat perkhidmatan₂ sa-kumpulan pakar₂ untuk menjalankan satu penyiasatan ekonomi bagi seluruh Negeri ini. Saya percaya Ahli₂ Yang Berhormat maseh ingat akan satu perjumpaan dengan Enche R. F. Goodman ia-itu Timbalan Pengarah Bank Dunia bagi kawasan Timor Jauh yang pada masa ini ada di-Pulau Pinang berkenaan dengan rancangan penyiasatan itu. Usaha ini ia-itu satu usaha yang amat penting sekali dan akan dapat menolong Kerajaan mengator segala rancangan₂ pembangunan ekonomi-nya selaras dengan dasar dan tujuan negara. Kumpulan pakar₂ ini yang tidak akan menyebelahi mana₂ pihak akan dapat memberi nasihat kepada Kerajaan Negeri ini chara₂ bertindak dalam soal kemasokan Pulau Pinang dalam kawasan kawalan kastam Malaysia. Jika sekiranya pakar₂ international ini berpendapat ba-

hawa Pulau Pinang akan mendapat faedah₂ yang banyak dengan memasoki kawasan kawalan kastam Malaysia ini, maka tindakan ka-arrah ini ada-lah satu perkara yang perlu sekali di-beri pertimbangan. Bagaimana sekali pun, saya suka menegaskan di-sini bahawa kepentingan istimewa dan kebajikan penduduk₂ Pulau Pinang akan sentiasa di-pertimbangkan dahulu daripada lain₂ hal sebelum di-buat sa-suatu keputusan yang muktamad.

Jumlah wang sebanyak \$400,000 yang di-tambah daripada (di-ganggu).

Mr. Speaker: Ahli Yang Berhormat, saya hendak bertanya, banyak lagi-kah ucapan ini?

Chief Minister: Lebih kurang setengah jam.

Mr. Speaker: Saya minta mesuarat ini di-tangguhkan selama setengah jam.

The Assembly adjourns at 11.30 a.m.

The Assembly resumes at 12.00 noon.

Chief Minister: Jumlah wang sebanyak \$400,000 yang di-tambah daripada hasil perolehan bekalan ayer ada-lah di-sebabkan bertambah-nya permintaan menggunakan ayer. Anggaran asal sebanyak \$1,300,000 bagi tahun 1965 menjokkan permintaan₂ yang baharu di-Seberang Perai sebanyak 5.8 gelen sa-hari. Pada masa ini bekalan ayer ada-lah kira-kira 7.1 juta gelen sa-hari dan hal ini telah saya sebutkan dalam ucapan saya waktu membentangkan Rang Undang₂ Perbekalan 1965 (Tambahan yang Ketiga). Pada akhir tahun hadapan ada-lah di-jangka kita akan dapat membekalkan ayer sebanyak 8 juta gelen

sa-hari. Jumlah yang bertambah daripada hasil perolehan ayer ini tidak-lah sama seperti jumlah yang bertambah bagi Chukai Hiboran. Ini ada-lah di-sebabkan bahawa sebelum kita boleh menambah hasil perolehan daripada chukai atau harga ayer, kita hendak-lah terlebih dahulu menambahkan bekalan ayer yang berseih itu dan kerja ini ada-lah memakan belanja. Oleh yang demikian, sambil kita menambah \$400,000 daripada hasil perolehan bekalan ayer kita akan mengeluarkan belanja sebanyak \$150,000. Tambahan perbelanjaan ini ada-lah di-tunjukkan di-bawah pechahan kepala 5 di-bawah Kepala 14 dalam peranggaran perbelanjaan.

Kuari di-Penanti yang baru diperbesarkan dengan di-tambah jentera₂ yang memakan belanja lebih daripada \$1.5 juta itu telah mula mengeluarkan hasil₂-nya pada beberapa bulan yang lepas. Ahli₂ Yang Berhormat tentu ingat di-persidangan Dewan yang lalu satu kumpulan wang telah di-khaskan untuk perkhidmatan Kuari di-Penanti. Kuari ini di-jangka akan mendatangkan wang perolehan sebanyak \$150,000. Tetapi dalam pada itu, ada-lah di-jangka kita akan membelanjakan sebanyak \$100,000 untuk menukar dan membaharui beberapa buah jentera dan perkakas₂ yang lain (lihat Kepala 12, pechahan Kepala 17).

Kita berharap mendapatkan peruntukan tambahan sebanyak \$100,980 daripada Kerajaan Pusat atas pemberian jalan Negeri kerana sepanjang 23.25 batu jalan₂ baharu telah di-bena yang membolehkan kita menuntut wang pemberian ini. Tambahan₂ jalan ini termasuk-lah 14.88 jalan baru dan yang lain yang telah lama ada tetapi tidak dapat di-masokkan di-bawah pemberian wang ini. Jumlah yang bertambah daripada

wang pemberian jalan ini ada-lah tidak sa-imbang dengan jumlah yang bertambah bagi perbelanjaan menjaga dan membaiki jalan₂ negeri ia-itu sebanyak \$121,142 (Kepala 12, pechahan Kepala 11). Jika di-kira perbelanjaan pentadbiran Jabatan Kerja Raya, maka perbelanjaan menjaga dan memperbaiki jalan₂ ada-lah lebih daripada jumlah pemberian yang di-dapati atas dasar pada tiap₂ batu. Perkiraan wang pemberian jalan₂ negeri ialah \$4,500 sa-batu dan dasar ini ada-lah di-tetapkan oleh Kerajaan Pusat selepas berunding dengan Majlis Kewangan Negara sebagai mana yang di-tentukan oleh bahagian II Jadual yang Kesepuluh dalam Perlembagaan Persekutuan. Kerajaan Pusat telah pun di-minta supaya menambahkan jumlah wang pemberian bagi tiap₂ sa-batu ini, memandangkan perbelanjaan menjaga jalan₂ ini telah bertambah. Perkara ini sedang di-pertimbangkan.

Jumlah bagi beberapa item hasil perolehan telah bertambah, tetapi kita juga dapati jumlah hasil perolehan bagi beberapa item telah berkurangan — yang nampak jelas sekali ia-lah item 18 ia-itu Pajak Gadai. Kuasa membuka Pajak₂ Gadai di-Negeri ini ada-lah di-tentukan dengan chara pekedai₂ itu menghantar masuk tawaran₂ ia-itu bagi tempoh 3 tahun. Tawaran₂ pada waktu yang ada sekarang ini hanya chuma membolehkan wang perolehan sebanyak \$464,720 pada sa-tahun berbedza dengan \$160,992 pada sa-tahun pada 3 tahun yang lalu. Selain daripada harga tawaran menjalankan kedai₂ Pajak Gadai, item hasil perolehan ini ada-lah termasuk juga bayaran harga₂ lesen bagi pelelong₂ barang₂ pajak gadai. Oleh sebab puncha dari segi ini hanya kecil sahaja, tidak-lah di-masokkan dalam Peranggaran Hasil dan Perbelanjaan tahun 1966

dan sebab itu di-dapati sebanyak \$112 berbedza dengan peranggaran tahun yang lalu.

Kerajaan Negeri tidak menambahkan beban, chukai kepada penduduk, malahan telah mengurangkan-nya dalam beberapa jenis chukai. Perkara ini tidak-lah seharusnya di-angap bahawa Kerajaan tidak berkehendakkan hasil perolehan, atau pun Kerajaan mempunyai wang simpanan yang banyak. Sesungguh-nya, memang-lah Kerajaan berkehendakkan wang yang banyak lagi untuk melaksanakan ranchangan, pembangunan di-Negeri ini. Perbelanjaan yang berulang, dalam Negeri ini ada-lah bertambah lebeh chepat lagi daripada hasil perolehan. Jumlah hasil perolehan bertambah hanya sebanyak \$570,438 sahaja, tetapi jumlah perbelanjaan yang berulang pada sa-tahun ia-itu perbelanjaan yang tidak termasuk peruntukan wang kepada Kumpulan Wang Pembangunan Negeri ada-lah bertambah sebanyak \$935,593. Mengikut keadaan ini, ia-itu jumlah perbelanjaan yang berulang pada tiap, tahun makin bertambah, maka tidak dapat tidak Kerajaan tidak akan dapat meneruskan pemberian wang kepada Kumpulan Wang Pembangunan Negeri pada masa yang panjang melainkan langkah, hendak-lah di-ambil untuk menambahkan hasil perolehan. Saya perchaya tidak ada sa-orang pun yang mahu Kerajaan Negeri memberhentikan pelaksanaan Ranchangan, Pembangunan. Oleh yang demikian, kita sangat, berkehendakkan wang terutama oleh sebab wang simpanan kita walau pun banyak, tentu juga akan berkurang. Kehendak, ini dapat di-lihat jika saya memberi beberapa angka disini. Dalam tahun, 1961 hingga 1964, kita telah membelanjakan lebeh daripada \$35,000,000 daripada wang Kumpulan Pembangunan Negeri untuk berbagai, ran-

changan dalam Negeri ini. Pada tahun 1965 di-janka di-belanja sebanyak \$7.5 juta lagi, dan ini menjadikan jumlah perbelanjaan sebanyak \$42.5 juta. Daripada jumlah ini kira-kira \$27.5juta datang daripada Kumpulan Wang Kerajaan Negeri semata-mata. Jumlah yang saya sebutkan ini tidak pula termasuk berjuta-juta ringgit yang telah dibelanjakan terus oleh Kerajaan Pusat bagi Ranchangan, Pembangunan di-Negeri ini. Saya suka mengambil peluang ini menegaskan kepada penduduk, di-Pulau Pinang bahawa Kerajaan saya tidak akan berpelok tuboh atau berpuas hati dengan sebab kita tidak mempunyai sebgitu banyak wang yang pernah kita dapati pada masa yang lalu. Sebak-nya pula, Kerajaan berazam akan menjalankan peranan-nya dengan bersungguh, sapertimana yang telah di-jalankan pada masa yang lalu untuk melaksanakan projek, pada masa hadapan. Tetapi untuk perkara ini amat-lah mustahak bagi Kerajaan berusaha dan menchari puncha, baharu untuk menambahkan hasil perolehan Negeri ini. Chara, hendak menambahkan hasil perolehan akan di-kaji sedalam-nya dan Kerajaan tidak akan menaikkan hasil Negeri melainkan setelah berpuas hati bahawa kenaikan chukai, dan sebagai-nya itu tidak akan menyusah dan merendahkan taraf hidup penduduk, di-Negeri ini. Jumlah perbelanjaan yang telah bertambah sebanyak \$935,593 itu tidak dapat di-elakkan. Jumlah perbelanjaan bagi pegawai, dan kakitangan, telah bertambah daripada \$4,365,874 pada tahun 1965 menjadi \$4,624,113 pada tahun 1966. Kita telah mengadakan beberapa jawatan baru tetapi jumlah gaji, bagi jawatan, ini hanya sedikit sahaja menyebabkan perbelanjaan kita bertambah. Jawatan, baru ini diadakan kerana banyak ranchangan, telah di-jalankan dalam Ne-

geri ini dan kerja₂ yang bersangkutan dengan-nya sangat bertambah. Jumlah perbelanjaan ini bertambah ada-lah di-sebabkan oleh (a) kenaikan gaji tahunan, (b) perubahan tangga gaji dan (c) juga sewa₂ rumah bagi kakitangan₂ Kerajaan. Sejak daripada Peranggaran Hasil dan Perbelanjaan yang di-bentangkan pada tahun lalu, kenaikan gaji₂ telah berlaku bagi jawatan₂ saperti dibawah ini:—

- (1) Kerani₂ Sementara
- (2) Kerani₂ Tambahsentina
- (3) Kerani₂ Ex-Chandu
- (4) Machine Operators
- (5) Pegawai₂ Petempatan
- (6) Penghulu₂
- (7) Kerani₂ Kathi
- (8) Pegawai₂ Tadbir Negeri
- (9) Pengawal Urusan China
- (10) Jurutrengkas₂
- (11) Jurutaip₂
- (12) Kakitangan₂ perkhidmatan bomba.

Selain daripada itu kita juga telah menambahkan kadar sewa rumah bagi semua jenis kakitangan₂ Kerajaan. Di-sini saya suka menambahkan, walau pun penyata kewangan perbelanjaan dan perolehan Keretapi Bukit Bendera tidak termasuk dalam Rang Undang₂ Bekalan ini, tetapi Kerajaan Negeri telah pun menaikkan gaji kakitangan₂ Keretapi Bukit Bendera yang sama jenis dengan yang tersebut tadi. Tentu juga akan ada lagi perubahan₂ tangga gaji bagi beberapa jenis Pegawai₂ Kerajaan pada masa hadapan kerana Surohanjaya Gaji telah pun di-bentok oleh Kerajaan Pusat untuk mengkaji perkara ini. Kerajaan Negeri bersedia akan menjalankan sedaya upaya-nya untuk faedah kakitangan-nya yang telah menjalankan tanggung-jawab mereka dengan chekap-nya. Saya suka mengucapkan terima kaseh kepada mereka dan yakin bahawa mereka

akan terus memberi perkhidmatan₂ yang gemilang bagi menayakan Ranchangan Pembangunan yang akan datang ini.

Kenaikan gaji pada tiap₂ tahun dan perubahan tangga gaji adalah satu daripada sebab₂-nya yang perbelanjaan yang berulang pada tiap₂ tahun bertambah menjadi \$935,593 bagi Kerajaan Negeri ini pada tahun 1966 ini. Sebab₂ yang lain termasuk-lah saperti berikut:—

- (a) Perbelanjaan menjaga dan memperbaiki 14.88 batu jalan baharu. Kerja ini termasuk juga ranchangan memperbaiki yang akan dijalankan oleh Jabatan Kerja Raya telah menyebabkan, sapertimana yang saya sebutkan dahulu, bertambahnya Kepala 12, pechahan kepala 11 — menjaga jalan₂ raya negeri dan ranchangan₂-nya — menjadi \$121,142. Jumlah tambahan ini bagaimana pun di-kurangkan sebab kita mendapat tambahan sebanyak \$100,960 daripada wang pemberian jalan₂ negeri.
- (b) Perkhidmatan Kuari di-Penanti. Jumlah sebanyak \$100,000 bagi menukar dan memperbaharui jentera₂ dan perkakas₂ lain di-Kuari tersebut.
- (c) Bertambah-nya jumlah bekalan ayer yang di-kehendaki ya'ani kita terpaksa melebehan lagi bekalan₂ ayer di-Seberang Perai daripada 5.8 juta gelen sa-hari menjadi 8 juta gelen sa-hari pada tahun 1966 nanti. Jumlah perbelanjaan menambahkan bekalan ayer ini akan bertambah sebanyak \$150,000 lagi.

(d) Kenaikan kadar sewa rumah bukan sahaja untuk kakitangan. Kerajaan yang jawatannya di-tunjokkan di-bawah item Gaji Kakitangan. Kerajaan, tetapi juga kakitangan. Kerajaan yang di dalam Kumpulan Pekerja Perusahaan dan Buroh Kasar. Kumpulan kakitangan yang di-sebutkan ini dahulunya ada-lah kakitangan yang bergaji hari tetapi sekarang telah menjadi kakitangan yang bergaji bulan. Gaji mereka ada-lah di-bayar daripada puncha atau peruntokan wang bagi kerja atau ranchangan yang mereka jalankan. Oleh sebab jumlah sewa rumah bagi mereka ini telah bertambah maka wang peruntokan bagi sesa-buah ranchangan atau sa-suatu pechahan kepala hendak-lah juga di-tambahkan. Sebagai satu contoh, perbelanjaan menjaga satu kawasan perayeran (yang berchukai) yang di-tunjokkan di-bawah Kepala 5, pechahan kepala 3 — muka 79 dalam Buku Estimate). Jumlah ini bertambah daripada \$714,250 dalam tahun 1965 menjadi \$768,250 dalam tahun 1966, ia-itu sebanyak \$54,000.

(e) Bertambah-nya bilangan ranchangan rumah murah, Ahli Dewan sudah terma'alum bahawa Ranchangan Perumahan Murah ini ada-lah sebahagian-nya di-belanja oleh Kerajaan Negeri dan sebahagian lagi oleh wang pinjaman daripada Kerajaan Pusat. Oleh sebab ranchangan ini kian bertambah maka wang pinjaman pun hendak-lah juga di-tambahkan. Ahli Yang Berhormat

maseh ingat lagi pada Persidangan kita yang lalu kita telah memberi kuasa membolehkan Kerajaan menambahkan lagi kuasa meminjam oleh Kerajaan Negeri bagi menjalankan ranchangan perumahan murah daripada \$4.5 juta menjadi \$7.5 juta. Lagi banyak kita meminjam lagi bertambah-lah jumlah wang membayar balek jumlah pokok dan juga faedah. Sekshen 3(c) dalam Undang. Kumpulan Wang Pembangunan 1958 (Development Fund Enactment 1958) memberi kuat-kuasa bagi memasukkan bayaran wang pinjaman kepada Kumpulan Wang Pembangunan Negeri. Oleh yang demikian, bayaran daripada mereka yang membeli rumah itu ada-lah di-masokkan di-dalam Kumpulan Wang Pembangunan Negeri. Ada perbezaan-nya antara jumlah yang di-bayar oleh Kerajaan Negeri dengan jumlah yang di-jangka akan di-dapati daripada bayaran ansoran bulan kerana wang pinjaman bagi rumah murah ada-lah boleh di-bayar balek oleh Kerajaan Negeri daripada tarikh mula di-pinjam, akan tetapi Kerajaan hanya boleh mendapat balek wang ansoran bulan apabila rumah itu siap dan di-bahagikan. Dalam tahun 1966, jumlah pembayaran balek di-anggarkan sebanyak \$143,000 berbanding dengan anggaran sebanyak \$96,000 pada tahun 1965. Jumlah ini bertambah sebanyak \$47,000 dan jumlah yang di-jangka akan di-kutip daripada pembeli rumah hanya \$90,000 sahaja. Jumlah ini bagaimana pun tidak di-tunjokkan da-

lam Peranggaran Hasil dan Perbelanjaan tetapi ada-lah di-tunjukkan dalam penyata Kumpulan Wang Pembangunan Negeri bagi tahun 1966.

Tuan Speaker, dengan izin tuan saya suka menyentuh berkenaan dengan beberapa perubahan yang kecil dalam beberapa item dalam Estimate ini. Di-bawah Kepala S.1, Ketua Menteri dan Pejabat Setia Usaha Negeri, ada-lah di-chadangkan untuk membeli sa-buah motokar bagi Tuan Yang Terutama Gabnor yang berharga sebanyak \$13,000, ia-itu untuk menggantikan sa-buah motokar yang di-beli pada tahun 1957 yang mengikut Jurutera Mekanik Negeri tidak akan menguntongkan jika di-perbaiki pun. Di-bawah Kepala 10, Kedai₂ Tuak Kerajaan, kita akan menambahkan sebanyak \$31,228 bagi pechahan kepala 4, Membeli Tuak. Kontrek untuk membeli tuak ada-lah berjalan selama dua tahun sa-kali. Tawaran₂ bagi tahun₂ 1966/67 telah pun di-terima dan harga₂ yang di-tawarkan ada-lah tinggi daripada harga₂ yang ada sekarang. Hasil perolehan daripada jualan tuak bagi tahun 1966 ini di-anggar-kan kira-kira \$1,140,000. Bagaima-na pun perbelanjaan bagi perkara ini di-jangka berjumlah sebanyak \$806,538. Di-bawah Kepala 19, Perbendaharaan, di-untokkan di-bawah pechahan kepala 3, komishen untuk mengutip chukai dan harga ayer telah bertambah sebanyak \$24,500. Saya telah menerangkan dalam ucapan saya waktu membentangkan Rang Undang₂ Bekalan (Tambahan yang Ketiga) tahun 1965 bahawa ka-empat₂ buah Majlis Daerah di-Negeri ini ada-lah menjadi wakil kapada Kerajaan Negeri bagi mengutip segala chu-lai₂ dan bayaran₂ ayer. Oleh sebab permintaan bekalan₂ ayer

ini makin bertambah dan hasil perolehan daripada-nya pun bertambah, maka jumlah komishen yang akan di-bayar kapada ka-empat₂ buah Majlis Daerah ini akan juga bertambah. Ini-lah sebab-nya kita mengadakan per-untokan tambahan bagi memba-yar komishen ini. Teman₂ saya yang lain dalam perbahathan nanti tentu akan memberi keterangan₂ berkenaan dengan perubahan₂ bagi peruntokan dan perbelanjaan₂ yang lain.

Tuan Speaker, walau pun ne-racha perolehan hasil dan perbe-lanjaan ini tidak sa-imbang, ya'ani hasil perolehan kurang daripada perbelanjaan, saya berpendapat tidak-lah seharus-nya kita seke-lian berasa bimbang. Sapertimana yang pernah saya terangkan ba-hawa Kerajaan mempunyai wang simpanan yang chukup untuk me-menohi kekurangan ini. Kekura-ngan₂, saya suka menegaskan di-sini, ada-lah di-sebabkan teruta-ma-nya oleh keputusan Kerajaan untuk melaksanakan segala ran-changan₂ pembangunan-nya Kera-jaan Perikatan di-Negeri ini se-sungguh-nya ada-lah sentiasa ber-usaha sedaya upaya dan bersung-goh-sungguh menjalankan tang-gong-jawab-nya untuk faedah pen-dudok₂ negeri ini. Dasar-nya ia-lah bertujuan untuk menghasilkan sebanyak₂ faedah kapada ra'ayat bukan sahaja dengan chara me-nambahkan kemewahan dan ke-ma'amoran tetapi juga untuk men-chapai keamanan dan kebaha-giaan di-negeri ini. Dasar₂ dan polisi ini-lah yang menjadi pan-duan pada sebarang waktu apa-bila sesuatu tindakan di-ambil oleh Kerajaan dan dengan dasar dan semangat ini juga kami telah menyediakan Rang Undang₂ Be-kalan Negeri Pulau Pinang bagi tahun 1966.

Tuan Speaker, saya mohon men-
chadangkan.

**The Assembly adjourns at
12.30 p.m.**

**The Assembly resumes at
2.30 p.m.**

Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): Tuan Speaker, berhubung dengan anggaran perbelanjaan bagi Pejabat₂ Daerah dan Tanah, maka di-sini suka saya menyatakan bahawa Pejabat₂ Daerah dan Tanah kita itu selama ini ada-lah berjalan dengan lincis dan sangat terator. Dasar Kerajaan mengenai pertad-biran tanah ada-lah berasaskan kapada pengakuan atau kesedaran bahawa tanah sangat mustahak sebagai satu puncha hasil mahsul. Dasar ini di-susun bukan sahaja untuk membolehkan urusan pen-tadbiran tanah di-jalankan dengan pantas dan sempurna, 'adil dan bertolak ansor dari segi undang₂ bahkan juga untuk memberi khid-mat₂ dengan segera; dan sambil bekerjasama dengan rapat-nya dengan jabatan₂ yang lain, mem-bantu mengadakan keperluan₂ bagi menjayakan pelaksanaan rancan-gan₂ pembangunan luar bandar dan rancangan₂ kemajuan dalam bandar. Semua Pemungut₂ Hasil Tanah ada-lah memikul bebanan yang berat menjalankan tugas₂ resmi mereka dan tugas₂ lain yang ada hubungan-nya dengan orang ramai dalam bidang pen-tadbiran daerah ia-itu seperti menganjorkan Pasokan₂ Kawalan, Bulan Bahasa Kebangsaan, Minggu Perpaduan, Ulangtahun Hari Mer-deka dan beberapa lagi yang sa-umpama-nya. Memandangkan hal ini maka memang-lah tidak boleh di-sangkal lagi bahawa Pegawai₂ Daerah atau Pemungut₂ Hasil Ta-nah kita itu telah menjalankan tugas kewajipan mereka dengan baik dan chekap.

Kita semua harus gembira ke-rana pada akhir-nya kita akan menempoh satu peristiwa baharu dalam sejarah pentadbiran tanah kita. Apabila Undang₂ Tanah Ne-gara, Tahun 1965 dan kuatkuasa Undang₂ (Pembahagian) Kawasan₂ Tanah Kechil Tahun 1955 itu berjalan kelak maka suatu sistem pentadbiran tanah yang baru dan yang lebeh baik akan di-jalankan di-dalam Negeri ini — mungkin, pada awal tahun 1966. Saya be-rasa sungguh gembira memberi-tahu Dewan ini bahawa tugas besar membuat persediaan₂ bagi perubahan Pentadbiran tanah yang bersejarah ini sudah pun selesai dan memberi puas hati. Di-antara persediaan₂ yang saya maksudkan itu termasuk-lah mengadakan lebeh kurang 120,000 buah geran₂ se-mentara, dan melateh semua pe-hak yang bertanggung-jawab bagi melaksanakan undang₂ baharu ia-itu Undang₂ Tanah Negara (Gera-n₂ Tanah Pulau Pinang dan Melaka₂) Tahun 1963. Saya penoh yakin bahawa sistem baru itu bukan sahaja akan meninggikan lagi mutu kecekapan anggota₂ yang menguruskan pentadbiran tanah di-Negeri ini, menyamakan sistem di-Negeri ini dengan sistem yang di-pakai di-Negeri₂ Tanah Melayu yang lain ataupun mengekalkan kuasa geran₂ itu akan tetapi juga sistem ini akan menyenangkan ra'ayat. Dengan sistem ini semua urusan₂ tanah lebeh mudah, mu-rah dan boleh pula di-daftarkan di-Pejabat Tanah dalam Daerah tanah₂ itu.

Kerajaan Negeri telah menerus-kan lagi usaha₂-nya bagi menga-dakan rumah₂ murah. Di-samping itu, orang₂ yang ta'bertanah juga di-beri peluang memiliki tanah. Oleh kerana di-Negeri ini tidak ada lagi tanah Kerajaan yang sesuai untuk pertanian, maka hen-dak-lah di-chari tanah₂ di-tempat₂ lain untuk anak Negeri ini. Pehak

Lembaga Kemajuan Tanah Persekutuan dan Kerajaan Negeri Pahang sangat-lah banyak memberi pertolongan kepada kita. Baru₂ ini sa-ramai 110 keluarga telah bertolak ka-Pahang untuk mengambil bahagian dalam Ranchangan₂ yang di-selenggarakan oleh pihak Lembaga Kemajuan Tanah Persekutuan — mereka itu kini sedang menempoh hidup baru di-sana.

Tanah seluas 5,000 ekar telah pun di-sediakan oleh pihak Lembaga Kemajuan Tanah Persekutuan khas untuk orang₂ Pulau Pinang — ini ia-lah sebahagian daripada ranchangan kemajuan tanah Jenka Triangle di-Pahang yang seluas 150,000 ekar itu. Sebagaimana yang telah di-nyatakan oleh Timbalan Perdana Menteri di-Dewan Ra'ayat baru₂ ini tatkala menjawab suatu soalan bahawa projek ini akan di-lancarkan setelah selesai pihak₂ yang berkenaan menjalankan siasatan mereka mengenai sesuai atau tidak tanah di-situ dan lain₂ lagi dan sa-sudah Kerajaan Pusat meninjau serta mengkaji kemungkinan₂ bagi melaksanakan perakuan₂ mereka itu.

Tuan Speaker, saya minta izin untuk memberi sedikit penjelasan mengenai Kepala 15 dan 16 — kedua₂-nya ia-lah berkenaan dengan Jabatan Hal Ehwal Ugama.

Kepala 16 — ia-itu peruntukan bagi pengajaran Ugama Islam di-sekolah₂ rendah yang mendapat bantuan ia-lah satu Kepala yang baru, akan tetapi perbelanjaan yang di-untukkan di-bawah-nya memang telah sedia ada, ia-itu dahulu-nya di-keluarkan daripada peruntukan bagi Kepala 15. Walau bagaimana pun, ada-lah di-fikirkan lebeh sesuai peruntukan wang ini di-masokkan ka-dalam satu Kepala Perbelanjaan yang berasi-ngan.

Orang₂ yang menganut Ugama Islam tentu akan berasa sukachita mendapat tahu bahawa bilangan murid₂ yang di-beri ajaran Ugama Islam sekarang sudah bertambah ramai — dengan sebab itu-lah kita mengambil keputusan bagi menambahkan lagi sebanyak empat jawatan guru ugama — dua orang lelaki dan dua orang perempuan.

Satu lagi berita yang mengembirakan yang suka saya nyatakan di-sini ia-lah dalam tahun 1966 peraduan membacha Quran akan di-adakan dua kali — ini ia-lah kerana bulan puasa jatohnya dua kali dalam tahun 1966 — sekali di-awal tahun dan sekali lagi di-hujung tahun. Jadi, peraduan membacha Quran mungkin akan di-adakan pada bulan Januari, 1966 sekali dan pada penghujung tahun 1966 sekali lagi. Peruntukan wang bagi mengadakan kedua₂ peraduan ini telah pun di-gandakan — ini boleh di-lihat di-bawah Kepala 15. Dulu, peruntukan wang bagi peraduan membacha Quran di-masokkan di-bawah Kepala S.1.

Tuan Speaker, saya perchaya anggaran wang perbelanjaan yang di-untukkan di-bawah Kepala 15 dan Kepala 16 akan mendapat sokongan Dewan ini.

Tuan Speaker, saya sokong Rang Undang₂ Bekalan untuk tahun 1966 ini di-luluskan.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): Mr. Speaker, Sir, although we have had only this lunch break to go through the Hon'ble the Chief Minister's speech presenting the State Supply Bill for 1966, I feel that even in the short space of time available to us we can make an immediate assessment of the nature of the Budget that has been presented

to the State of Penang through this Assembly.

Sir, I do not know what the effect of the off-the-cuff remark recently made by the Hon'ble the Prime Minister of this country that he did not understand what the attitude of the American Government is with regard to aid to Malaysia will be; and, if I might paraphrase what he said to the press, he was under the impression that if only Malaysia were a bankrupt nation or were going bankrupt, then and only then could we expect to have aid from America. Sir, since that statement, this country, and this State in particular, have had the privilege of listening to the Budget presented by the Central Government and now we have had the privilege of listening to the Budget as presented by the Hon'ble the Chief Minister — and in both instances I think it is fair for us to say that it appears as though both the Central Government as well as the State Government are already preparing themselves for qualifying for aid from America or from foreign countries and, therefore, they are preparing to go into a state of liquidation or a state of bankruptcy. Sir, I have taken the Central Government's Budget in relation to the State Budget because of the opening paragraphs of the speech made by the Hon'ble the Chief Minister where he links our present State Budget with the First Malaysia Plan which was presented by the Hon'ble the Minister of Finance. Sir, although the concluding remarks of the Hon'ble the Chief Minister are not rather hopeful — that there should be no cause for alarm; that our policies will produce the maximum good for the people, not only in the form of increased prosperity and so forth and so on —

if we look through this speech carefully. The first reaction, and I think the only reaction, that we can gather from the speech is that this Budget marks the beginning of the need of balanced economy in the State of Penang. If we were to use an analogy in a debate which was conducted earlier on this year in this House, we might say that this Budget is the first milestone of decay of the Alliance Government. Throughout the speech we note that the Hon'ble the Chief Minister enjoins us that he is not complacent, the State Government is not complacent, the State Government would want to do more and the State Government is preparing to do more — and urges the people to appreciate the fact that the State Government virtually intends to do more although there is not as much money available as in the past. However, Sir, the people are not going to be complacent either because the people are going to awaken to the fact that the Alliance State Government has already steadily decreased in vitality to the extent that our future is already in jeopardy. If the State Government were to resign to-day and hold new State elections, you will see clearly what the people's reactions would be because the people not only may not be complacent, but the people will know where the fault lies. I am quite sure you will see the ranks on this side swelling. It will swell much more. One addition we already have — of course, this one addition is a little cloud in the future — and it will show you what actually the people think.

Mr. Speaker: A little clown, or a little cloud?

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu):..Sir, cloud. I hope

you will not misinterpret me. Well, the clowning is over the other side. We could also say to some extent that this Budget is clowning around with basic issues. But the opening passages refer to the First Malaysia Plan. The First Malaysia Plan is described as the greatest of all development plans undertaken so far. Sir, I would like to refer Honourable Memers to the part of the Budget Speech of the Hon'ble Minister of Finance where he refers to the First Malaysia Plan and the dire peril this country faces before we go on to talk about the greatest of all development plans that can advance the economic and social well-being of this country. Because (interrupted).

Mr. Speaker: Before you refer to any part of the Minister's speech in Parliament, I must be sure whether such speech is linked with the Budget in this Assembly.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): The First Malaysia Plan has been described as "the greatest of all development plans undertaken so far, and the State Government is determined to do all it can under this Plan"

Mr. Speaker: That is what I want to know — if any part of his speech is linked with this Budget.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): Is not that linked?

Mr. Speaker: I think permission must be asked from the Speaker before you can refer to any speech made outside this Assembly.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): Then I would refer

to the Hon'ble the Finance Minister's speech as published in the newspapers. The reference to the First Malaysia Plan says quite clearly that the First Malaysia Plan has got to be assisted to the extent of nearly 42% by loans from foreign sources, and it is crystal clear that such a Plan — which depends for its successful implementation on obtaining nearly 42% of the total resources required from foreign sources — would fail unless this scale of assistance is forthcoming, or something near it is forthcoming. It refers, under those circumstances, to the formation of the Aid to Malaysia Club. Sir, therefore, we are tying our State Budget and the future development of our State to a plan which is potentially a perilous one, which could fail if we do not get foreign aid. Sir, the State Government, however, is in no position, *per se*, to raise foreign loans unless we make adjustments to the Constitution. And the State Government, therefore, will depend upon the success of the Federal Government; and the Federal Government will depend for its success on aid from foreign sources. Therefore, our rosy picture which the Hon'ble the Chief Minister presented for our Budget is, after all, not quite rosy. Sir, our immediate remark refers because of this question of a deficit of \$1,537,740. The explanations are given but the Hon'ble the Chief Minister says that we are not to be alarmed by this because this is a small matter. We have been prudent; we have been careful; and, therefore, we have reserves. Sir, what are our reserves? Our reserves, as shown in our Budget on page 1, stands at \$4,657,717 with the expectation of another \$450,000 which will accrue in 1965. Sir, if we take the figure of

to the State of Penang through this Assembly.

Sir, I do not know what the effect of the off-the-cuff remark recently made by the Hon'ble the Prime Minister of this country that he did not understand what the attitude of the American Government is with regard to aid to Malaysia will be; and, if I might paraphrase what he said to the press, he was under the impression that if only Malaysia were a bankrupt nation or were going bankrupt, then and only then could we expect to have aid from America. Sir, since that statement, this country, and this State in particular, have had the privilege of listening to the Budget presented by the Central Government and now we have had the privilege of listening to the Budget as presented by the Hon'ble the Chief Minister — and in both instances I think it is fair for us to say that it appears as though both the Central Government as well as the State Government are already preparing themselves for qualifying for aid from America or from foreign countries and, therefore, they are preparing to go into a state of liquidation or a state of bankruptcy. Sir, I have taken the Central Government's Budget in relation to the State Budget because of the opening paragraphs of the speech made by the Hon'ble the Chief Minister where he links our present State Budget with the First Malaysia Plan which was presented by the Hon'ble the Minister of Finance. Sir, although the concluding remarks of the Hon'ble the Chief Minister are not rather hopeful — that there should be no cause for alarm; that our policies will produce the maximum good for the people, not only in the form of increased prosperity and so forth and so on —

if we look through this speech carefully. The first reaction, and I think the only reaction, that we can gather from the speech is that this Budget marks the beginning of the need of balanced economy in the State of Penang. If we were to use an analogy in a debate which was conducted earlier on this year in this House, we might say that this Budget is the first milestone of decay of the Alliance Government. Throughout the speech we note that the Hon'ble the Chief Minister enjoins us that he is not complacent, the State Government is not complacent, the State Government would want to do more and the State Government is preparing to do more — and urges the people to appreciate the fact that the State Government virtually intends to do more although there is not as much money available as in the past. However, Sir, the people are not going to be complacent either because the people are going to awaken to the fact that the Alliance State Government has already steadily decreased in vitality to the extent that our future is already in jeopardy. If the State Government were to resign to-day and hold new State elections, you will see clearly what the people's reactions would be because the people not only may not be complacent, but the people will know where the fault lies. I am quite sure you will see the ranks on this side swelling. It will swell much more. One addition we already have — of course, this one addition is a little cloud in the future — and it will show you what actually the people think.

Mr. Speaker: A little clown, or a little cloud?

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu):..Sir, cloud. I hope

you will not misinterpret me. Well, the clowning is over the other side. We could also say to some extent that this Budget is clowning around with basic issues. But the opening passages refer to the First Malaysia Plan. The First Malaysia Plan is described as the greatest of all development plans undertaken so far. Sir, I would like to refer Honourable Members to the part of the Budget Speech of the Hon'ble Minister of Finance where he refers to the First Malaysia Plan and the dire peril this country faces before we go on to talk about the greatest of all development plans that can advance the economic and social well-being of this country. Because (interrupted).

Mr. Speaker: Before you refer to any part of the Minister's speech in Parliament, I must be sure whether such speech is linked with the Budget in this Assembly.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): The First Malaysia Plan has been described as "the greatest of all development plans undertaken so far, and the State Government is determined to do all it can under this Plan"

Mr. Speaker: That is what I want to know — if any part of his speech is linked with this Budget.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): Is not that linked?

Mr. Speaker: I think permission must be asked from the Speaker before you can refer to any speech made outside this Assembly.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): Then I would refer

to the Hon'ble the Finance Minister's speech as published in the newspapers. The reference to the First Malaysia Plan says quite clearly that the First Malaysia Plan has got to be assisted to the extent of nearly 42% by loans from foreign sources, and it is crystal clear that such a Plan — which depends for its successful implementation on obtaining nearly 42% of the total resources required from foreign sources — would fail unless this scale of assistance is forthcoming, or something near it is forthcoming. It refers, under those circumstances, to the formation of the Aid to Malaysia Club. Sir, therefore, we are tying our State Budget and the future development of our State to a plan which is potentially a perilous one, which could fail if we do not get foreign aid. Sir, the State Government, however, is in no position, *per se*, to raise foreign loans unless we make adjustments to the Constitution. And the State Government, therefore, will depend upon the success of the Federal Government; and the Federal Government will depend for its success on aid from foreign sources. Therefore, our rosy picture which the Hon'ble the Chief Minister presented for our Budget is, after all, not quite rosy. Sir, our immediate remark refers because of this question of a deficit of \$1,537,740. The explanations are given but the Hon'ble the Chief Minister says that we are not to be alarmed by this because this is a small matter. We have been prudent; we have been careful; and, therefore, we have reserves. Sir, what are our reserves? Our reserves, as shown in our Budget on page 1, stands at \$4,657,717 with the expectation of another \$450,000 which will accrue in 1965. Sir, if we take the figure of

\$4,657,000 odd, this amount of deficit which the State Government plans to offset from General Revenue balance comes to approximately a utilisation of 25.1% of our General Revenue balance; and, if the Government begins now to plan for budgets in the way that it has done to-day — and that is why I call this the first milestone of decay — whereas in the past it had been presenting us with a balanced Budget, the Government is already putting its fingers in the very small kitty of the General Revenue balance which we had. At the rate we are spending, Sir, before the Alliance State Government goes out of term — that is, if they do not resign earlier — what will happen will be that the State will be left with a situation where revenue prospects remain dim and the revenue balances will be depleted. This picture, Sir, is almost a replica of the picture that we have of the whole financial situation throughout the nation under the Alliance Government — depletion of resources, rundown of Current Account and the utilisation of loans to offset our development projects; and, if we are not careful in the State of Penang, it is quite possible that we might even have a situation where current expenditure may have to be offset against borrowings either from the Central Government or elsewhere. Sir, the suggestion that the financial position of the State is good is immediately shown to be untrue and unrealistic when we refer to page 4 of the English text of the Chief Minister's speech where he says, "It is generally accepted that a rise reflected in this item" — namely, in Entertainment Duty — "indicates prosperity." Whether it is or not is a questionable issue. However, he goes on to say that the Government is also aware that unem-

ployment is widespread in the State and the figures supplied by the Employment Exchange indicate that the average number of persons registered on a per month basis is approximately 14,000. Further on we are told that approximately 5,000 pupils will be leaving school each year seeking employment, and we are also told that the Government realises that employment opportunities are not growing fast enough. And from the replies which have been so painfully eked out from the Government during the course of Question Time, we realise that even when the whole of the Mak Mandin project reaches fruition, there will be a potentiality of over 1,000 jobs available for the people of this country as offset by the figures, and the growing figures, of 14,000 per month as registered in the Employment Exchange. Under the circumstances, Sir, we see that there is an absolute contradiction in the presentation of a good happy Budget and the position in the State of Penang where there is, without any doubt, increasing unemployment and Government is unable to solve the unemployment difficulties of this State; and Government is almost in despair over the question of providing for new and increasing employment opportunities. Sir, why should all this be so? The answer is very simple. The answer has been that the Alliance Government has frittered away all our opportunities in the last 7 years, and the Alliance Government has been far too complacent. It is too late for you now to come and tell us that you are not going to be complacent, that you are going to do more.

What has happened in the past has led us to this sorry state of affairs. I would take this oppor-

tunity, Sir — I suppose I can in this instance — to refer back to the proceedings of the last Budget Meeting on Wednesday, 25th November of last year, where I carried this House through an exercise whereby the Government could show more vigour to ensure to the people of this country greater opportunities for the future; and that exercise, as carried out, indicated that if Government were to budget far more carefully and with greater foresight — giving priorities to productive sources of revenue rather than expenditure over developments which are unrealistic, making provision for a State Economic Development Planning Board which could really begin to outline the direction and the needs of the people of this State — then, and only then, can we hope to assure the people of this country greater security and greater prosperity in the future. But, Sir, even when we went through the exercise last year to indicate that Government could balance its Budget and provide for a sum of \$100,000 for the provision of a State Economic Development Planning Board, and which Government rejected, we at that time indicated that we could budget for revenue increases which, when we examined the revenue provisions under the present Budget, indicates that that little exercise which we conducted last year in this House was far more accurate than Government's own Budget presentation in 1965. Sir, there is no need for me to go into absolute details but, if we look through the presentation which we made last year, which is contained in the Proceedings, you will notice that in our provisions for increases in Entertainment Duty, in Toddy Shop Licences and so forth and so on, it is only in the

question of toddy shops that our provisions have failed to meet the actual figures provided under revenue items here. But in every other instance our provisions are very much more accurate. I do suggest to Government that in this present state of austerity, Government should exercise far greater control of the public funds and Government should cut its expenditure to suit what it understands to be depreciating revenue sources. Sir, the Government has very clearly indicated that there are a few areas, or a few items, whereby our revenue has declined — revenue from pawnshops, revenue from licences, and so on. But, Sir, if we look through the Budget proposals, we will realise that the Government is budgetting for depreciating items of revenue in very many areas. And I would like to go through these items — first, in general; then in detail.

Under general, pages 6 and 7 — you will see under **item 4, Licences and Internal Revenue**, in 1964 we provided for \$3,411,969. By 1965 this item of revenue had fallen to \$3,033,000 odd. By 1966 we are providing for a further fall of revenue of \$3,019,483. Sir, I will have more to refer to this later on, more to say about this question of Licences and Internal Revenue when I refer to the Report made by the Auditor-General which was presented as Paper No. 16. If you look at **item 9, Toddy**, you will find that from 1964 revenue was \$1,192,646 and it has fallen all the way down steadily to what it is today — \$1,140,000. Sir, if you offset this particular revenue with the increased cost of purchase of toddy which was mentioned earlier on by the Hon'ble the Chief Minister, which we shall come to later on, we understand that the

revenue provision is not as great even as the figure which is put under the last column.

With regard to **Penanti Quarry**, the Government has clearly indicated to us the failure of the Penanti Quarry project which is supposed to be a revenue-producing project. Because of that, we are budgetting for the first time for a revenue of \$150,000. The Government has very kindly admitted its own defects by saying that the Penanti project requires an expenditure of \$100,000 for the next year for renewals and repairs so that, in actual fact, the out-turn of revenue from the Penanti Quarry project is only \$50,000. And what had we to spend in order to get \$50,000 a year? If you refer to page 10 of the English text, Sir, the Penanti project is part of the development projects of the Government which started from 1961 to 1964. And we talk first of the general development because under general development Government spent a sum of \$35 million between 1961 and 1964; and with what it intends to spend in 1965, we would have spent altogether \$42.5 million on development projects out of which we shall obtain an increased revenue after five years of only \$570,438. Sir, the out-turn of our expenditure of \$42.5 million is \$570,000 odd. With regard to the Penanti Quarry project, **per se**, we spent \$1 million — I think \$1,100,000 odd — on the establishment of the Penanti Quarry project, out of which we now expect a return of \$50,000.

Sir, we turn now to page 7, under **Interest**. This interest comes from fixed deposits. We see a further fall in Government revenue — from 1964 \$640,000 plus, 1965 \$623,000 plus and now 1966 \$450,000 — \$640,000, \$625,-

000, \$450,000. There again we see a decline in potential revenue. Under item 12, **Miscellaneous**, again we see a remarkable drop from \$98,000 in 1964 to \$28,940 in 1966. **Land Sales** is the only one which gives us a little bit of consideration with regard to 1964 but land sales are budgetted at \$193,300 for 1966 as compared to the revised estimate of \$416,500 in the 1965. Sir, it is even more remarkable when we look at this decline in our revenue sources when we go through the various items in detail as they are carried under the Estimates from page 10 on to page 25.

The overall picture therefore, Sir, is that, in spite of the fact that we have an increased revenue of \$530,000 approximately, the whole picture of our Revenue Estimates is one of diminishing power or return. Whether the Government is budgetting for this diminishing revenue with the hope that it can go begging to the Central Government, or borrowing, is a matter of conjecture; but certainly, as presented to us, we cannot accept the fact that the Government has not been too complacent about the whole revenue structure of our State.

Under the circumstances, Sir, there are several issues that immediately come to mind. First is the question of the control of expenditure; second, the question of provision for development and, third, is the attempt to look for stronger and more vigorous measures for production of revenue. We will take them in reverse. It was unfortunate, Sir, that at the last meeting of this House the motion which was put in my name was not allowed by the House because the exercise would have given us an opportunity, following the eviction of Singa-

pore, to look under the Annexures and the Schedules of the Constitution and for the State Government to make representations to the Central Government that the time has come when the relationship between the State and the Central Governments — particularly over autonomy on finance, autonomy over the issue of items of revenue to be reviewed and the provisions under Schedule Ten on the Federal List and the State List, and the Concurrent List — should be reviewed. Sir, it would have been, to our mind, happier for us in the long run if the State Government begins to realise that, particularly for the State of Penang which has got practically no mining resources and, as admitted, no land resources as existing, we have to look for new items of revenue sources. Under those circumstances, I feel that we should present to the Central Government that the future development of Penang depends to a very large extent upon the capabilities of the State Government in raising funds which will provide for rapid and more integrated development of the State. That is to say, the time has come when, after marking time for the so-called backward States in the States of Malaya to catch up with the State of Penang which, at Merdeka, was described as a 'have' State, a forward looking State, the time has come when, in fact, Penang has slid into the back and we are now in the position of a 'have-not' State unless revisions were made in the Concurrent List — for example, very much in the nature of the Concurrent List that was provided for the State of Singapore under List IIIB of Schedule Nine in the Constitution. I do not suggest that we have the same thing but something in that nature, particularly in clauses 11, 12

and 13 — giving us, amongst other things, the right and the power to control our own port and our own shipping. I myself think, Sir, that all the activity in this State — the labour in this State which might have been initiated with funds that were ploughed in from the Central Government — were translated into actual profit by the effort and the labour of the people in the State of Penang. This accruing benefit does not fall back to the State in proportionate degree. That is to say, whilst I notice that the Hon'ble the Chief Minister, after our criticisms last year, has reduced the number of thanks to the Central Government only to one instead of seventeen on the previous occasion, and whilst the Alliance State Government still have to thank the Central Government, the people of Penang have great reason to wonder whether or not all the efforts that we have put to the development of Penang are producing benefits which directly accrue to the people of Penang. Therefore, Sir, it appears quite clear to us that the development projects which are initiated with Federal grants and Federal loans only build up the economy of the State to a situation where there is an apparent picture of prosperity but, in actual fact, the economic development is largely syphoned into the coffers of the Central Government; and Penang's budgetary cupboard remains as bare as it ever was before which, as I have said, indicates that it is going to be bare. Taken in relation to our increasing unemployment problem and our population problem, the revenue cannot be balanced with our increasing expenditure. Sir, this is the sorry state which the Alliance State Government has brought us to — simply because you have

not been effective or dynamic enough and you have not fought for the benefit and the rights of the people of the State of Penang as you should in relation to the Central Government. This is the state whereby every development project that we have has got to be financed largely by loan, or by grant, from the Central Government and the economic benefits are syphoned back to the Central Government. So, whilst we see this development project over at Butterworth, the increasing port facilities; whilst we see this show of plans for new low-cost housing, we realise that the actual economic situation of the people in Penang has become worse. It is virtually a situation whereby the State Government, in conjunction with the Central Government, have used the technique of the white ants and slowly eaten away at the overt structure of the State of Penang, leaving us all this beautiful outer appearance of prosperity but, in actual fact, sapping away our real stability and our old strength of State structure.

Sir, this is very important. We indicated last year the importance of forward planning. This year we want to indicate, Sir, the necessity for the State Government to make very strong constitutional representations to the Central Government that, unless the State Government is given greater powers to provide for the development of funds and for the collection of revenue, unless the State Government has the increased power to retain more of the revenue collected in the State of Penang which is now being syphoned into the Central Government, then the State of Penang will slowly wither away. That, Sir, is why we called this Budget the first milestone of de-

cay. The signs are absolutely clear. Secondly, Sir, with regard to the Development Fund, the Hon'ble the Chief Minister has made a rather naive plea — not impassioned, nor is it particularly strong; just a plea — as of habit. It has become a habit for the Alliance Government to sing old songs; and not with increasing tempo, probably always in tune, but with diminishing vigour and with diminishing force. Sir, it is true that we should make every effort to contribute to our Development Fund. But what has been the description of our Development Fund? I do not know what the description of the Auditor-General in previous years was but I do know that his description in 1964 of the 1963 Development Fund was that it was not realistic, and so I quoted his views at the last Budget debate. And we see again, Sir, that in the Auditor-General's Report for this year, first of all on page 4, paragraph 24 of this Paper No. 16, he says, "As mentioned in my last two Reports" — this one deals with 1964; so it must deal with 1962 and 1963 — "I am doubtful whether the State Legislature has adequately defined by resolution the purposes for which the Development Fund may be used." Sir, we have to take very serious consideration when we read the statement made by the Hon'ble the Chief Minister with regard to the provisions for the Development Fund. Off-hand I cannot find the actual reference but the Hon'ble the Chief Minister said that we should contribute to the State Development Fund. We have been contributing to the Fund every year and the contribution is for meeting expenditure in development and capital projects, and so forth and so on. If the contribution made to the State

Development Fund is excluded from the estimate of expenditure, and so forth and so on, Sir, all these references to the contribution to the State Development Fund are completely nullified by the statement for the last three years — not just this year: I am saying three years — by the Auditor-General that he is doubtful whether the State Legislature has adequately defined by resolution the purposes for which the Development Fund may be used. Further, Sir, if you turn to page 8 of Paper No. 16, paragraph 46, the Auditor-General again makes the remark which he made the previous year — “As already stated, the Development Estimates were unrealistic.” Sir, if the Development Fund has not been properly defined, if the Development Estimates have been unrealistic, I suggest that this year’s great leap backwards by the State Alliance Government by providing \$2,909,263 to our State Development Fund is the height of budgetting folly. I do suggest to you, Sir, that by stretching your fingers into the General Revenue balance to take out more than \$1,500,000 for a deficit simply because we want to present this show is a — I stand open to correction — “kasut kilat, nasi kandar” kind of attitude and is, I think, highly unjustified. It may show to the Alliance followers that we are strong, that we have a good Budget, that we are brave. Sir, you are cutting in and resigning one quarter of our revenue and, if that is not a sign of decay, I do not know what is.

The other factor which I said we should consider was this question of control of expenditure. The Hon’ble the Chief Minister has dealt with this question of control of expenditure to some extent in his speech but I feel,

Sir, that it would be easier for me to turn to my own observations made from the Budget as presented. The first thing, Sir, we notice is that under Personal Emoluments we have an increase in the P. E. for this year, as compared to last year, of \$258,239. Sir, my figures are slightly different from the Hon’ble the Chief Minister’s but I am calculating from the figures which I have made from my own calculations. I do not know whether the figures quoted in his speech include those from the Civil List or not but our increased P. E. expenditure, as compared to 1965, represents an increase of 5.6%. But much more important than this, Sir, is the fact that, in spite of what we advised the Government last year with regard to housing and hotel provisions, the increase for Housing and Hotel Allowances this year is \$121,115. The total expenditure that we are going to allocate for Housing and Hotel Allowances is \$252,655, Sir, and that is out of a total of \$4,624,113 for P. E. These figures appear on page 1, I think — right in front. Sir, we have commented many times. Earlier on to-day I have quoted from the advice by the Hon’ble the Finance Minister that any increase in P. E. will cause alarm; and the alarm will be even greater if the increases in Personal Emoluments are not equated with productivity.

So we note with very great concern three entries. First, throughout the whole of this Budget there are 35 provisions of Personal Emoluments for ‘Personal to Holder’ posts. We do not know whether these ‘Personal to Holder’ posts indicate an increase or decrease but at least half of that figure of 35 which I quoted are new provisions. On top of that, Sir, we have provi-

sion for 25 new posts under the provision for the State establishment and here, Sir, I think we can refer again to the Auditor-General for guidance as an indication of how much the State Government squanders in order to produce so little. The Auditor-General was very upset and I think he had been upset for many years with regard to the provision for establishment. If you refer, Sir, to Appendix I and just make a short analysis by referring to the totals — in 1962 we had 977 posts in the State of Penang. But by 1964 we had already increased the number of posts to 1,021, and in 1965 further increased it; and now for 1966 we are further increasing it by another 25 new posts. Whether these posts are productive to the good of the State or not we wish the State Government to elaborate. But in so far as we are concerned, we feel that, taking in conjunction the development expenditure of very nearly \$42.5 million, the increased number of posts, the production of an estimated increase in revenue of \$570,000 and the decline showing in the several sectors in our revenue-producing items gives us every concern that the Government is not controlling its Personal Emoluments in the way it should. There must be an absolute check in this constant trend of rise in the provision for Housing and Hotel Allowances, especially if you are budgeting for a deficit of this size.

Sir, if you refer to O. C. A. R., the annually recurrent expenditure, we are providing for an expenditure of \$7,888,616 this year. With an increase of \$910,482, it represents an increase of 11.6% as compared to last year. Now, under the expenditure under O. C. A. R., one item which we

had commented on before was the question of provision for transport allowances. I understand, Sir, that in giving these figures I have not properly allocated the amount that is spent on repairs and maintenance but they come under general transport and travelling and the breakdown is a minor matter. But we are providing for \$34,206 increase in expenditure for transport and travelling as compared with last year, and we are providing \$305,716 for transport and travelling. Sir, in this small State of Penang we are providing for this enormous expense account and this thing has gone on year after year. The Government sometimes awakens to comment and sends out circulars that officers are to share travelling facilities, and so forth and so on. But, if you are providing for a deficit, how can the Government go to the people of the State of Penang when it shows it is expending money with little restraint in areas where a little bit more careful administration could have kept the figures down?

Sir, we note also that in the increasing annual salaries bill there is provision of \$9,600 for a Political Secretary. Thanks to the Opposition, Sir, last year for vigorously opposing the provision of the post of a Political Secretary, the Alliance State Government has either thought it fit or got frightened and never appointed a Political Secretary. I hope (interrupted).

Chief Minister: Sir, on a point of correction — he has been appointed with effect from 1st December this year.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): In which case, Sir, the Alliance Government, without

paying heed to us, has appointed a Political Secretary in spite of the fact that it is spending more and more of the State's money. This provision of a Political Secretary, we have indicated, has been one of political controversy. The explanations given at the last Budget debate were clear but still were unacceptable to us. Whether or not they will reduce the commitments of the Hon'ble the Chief Minister in social matters so that it will help him reduce his waistline is a matter of controversy but it certainly is not reducing the waistline of our Budget. It is increasing our Budget by \$9,600. So, when we are talking of Personal Emoluments, under-expenditure — especially when we are budgetting for a deficit — we have to take into consideration this issue.

Sir, there is another factor. There has been growing dissatisfaction in the Penang Clerical Service with regard to the question of postings and with regard to the relationship of the Penang General Clerical Service to the secondment of Federal officers to the State of Penang. Sir, I feel that members of the Penang State General Clerical Service who have to be transferred outside the State of Penang, and who have shown an indication that they want to come back, should be given priority listment so that they can come back. Secondly, Sir, with regard to secondment of Federal personnel to positions in the State, I suggest that, in order to keep down our Personal Emolument expenditure and particularly to cut down our hotel and housing expenditure, the Government could well take up the matter with the Central Government that the expenditure in respect of all these postings of Federal personnel to the State

should be refunded by the Central Government. Sir, we cannot be too kind with the Central Government and we cannot just give thanks to them and expect more. We really have to insist upon what is right for the State.

Sir, another issue which gives us great concern is this question of repayment of loans. The Hon'ble the Chief Minister has touched upon the fact that our public debt due to borrowing has increased from \$96,000 to \$143,000 this year, representing an increase of approximately \$47,000; and it is interesting to note in this speech by the Hon'ble the Chief Minister that, although this repayment amounts to \$143,000 compared with the estimate of \$96,000 for 1965, which is an increase of \$47,000, the amount expected to be collected from the purchases of houses is only \$90,000 so that, again, on this item of repayment of loans and increasing public debt, cutting into the General Revenue reserves, these are indications of a failing and a weakening economy rather than a strong one and we have to take this into consideration with particular regard, again, to the Report by the Auditor-General.

I refer to the Auditor-General's statement with regard to the question of collection of arrears and the payment of sums of money. The sums of money involved are not very great but under page 9, paragraph 51, we notice that the Auditor-General comments that hire purchase instalments were not collected promptly from the purchasers of houses in the various low-cost housing schemes; and, as a result, \$4,500 was in arrears at the end of 1964. In some instances, the arrears accumulated for more

than three months. Sir, this question of a public debt in relation to collection of arrears, particularly out of projects which are revenue-producing, must give us considerable concern. I do not know what the figures for 1965 will be but, since we have touched upon this question of increasing arrears of revenue collection, Sir, it might be worthwhile at this stage to touch upon the question of arrears in general and the position of the District Councils because I think this is a matter of extreme concern. Sir, if we refer to page 10, paragraph 65, of the Auditor-General's Report, he himself expresses the opinion that the financial position of the four District Councils in the State, particularly the District Council South, Nibong Tebal, must be viewed with concern — and he gives his table on page 11 on the increasing arrears in the various District Councils. In every one of them there is an increase. Penang Island Rural District Council — in 1960 arrears were \$110,124 and by 1964 arrears had gone up to \$157,215; and the same sad story goes on in every single Council. But with regard to the State revenue, it is much more interesting to refer to Appendix II of this Paper No. 16 because the total arrears in State revenue make this terrible show of inefficiency of the State Government. In 1961 the total arrears of State revenue was \$99,204.60. In 1962, Sir — it is worthwhile repeating every year — I am afraid it shows this wonderful decline and fall, we hope, of the Alliance Government in the State of Penang. In 1962 the arrears of the State revenue had gone to \$286,212.43. By 1963 it had gone up some more — \$355,092.13. In 1964 it had gone up further to \$371,223.69. Sir, this is in respect of the increasing number of

posts which have been asked for and provided for. What is the State Government doing? What audacity does the State Government have to come and tell us that this is a happy Budget and we need not be alarmed by the deficit provided for when the sorry state of affairs is actually presented for us to see? Sir, I have only had the opportunity to go through the figures in the last 48 hours: the Government has had the opportunity to look through its Budget for the last one year — and, if the product of one year shows a deficit of the amount that you are showing, I suggest that we cut down our development expenditure and try and present a balanced Budget — preserve that small General Revenue balance of \$5 million to the best of our ability because with one little puff that \$5 million will disappear. And if the Alliance Government goes on spending in the way it does, with a degree of unrestrained control of public monies, that \$5 million will be down the drain before the people have a chance. That is why I say that, if you think you are not complacent, understand, too, that the people are not complacent. Resign and you will know what the result will be. Resign before it is too late for us to do something for the State of Penang.

Sir, there are certain other features of our Budget which I think it is necessary for us to touch upon. The Hon'ble the Chief Minister referred to the presence of Mr. Goodman in the State of Penang, which probably indicates that the last parts of the Budget Speech were written just two days ago or inserted two days ago. As far as we know, Mr. Goodman is not here in any direct relationship with any survey connected with the future

prosperity of the State of Penang. He happened to be in Penang **en route** on his on-the-spot check on projects which the World Bank had previously financed. Sir, I do hope that by these indirect means the State Government of Penang could show to the World Bank, before the actual team comes to the State of Penang, that we are going bankrupt; maybe if we say that we are bankrupt, as I said earlier, we may qualify for aid easier. However, Sir, I do not know whether the Budget has been trimmed down specifically to show a sad state of affairs to bluff the people from the World Bank. But I am sure they are tougher-minded than I am: in fact, their capacity to look through this shilly-shally type of Budget will be even greater than mine. The fact that we are dependent upon the World Bank team to come here to solve our economic problems, and particularly the integration of Penang Island with the Principal Customs Area, indicates two things — first, that out of eight years of administrative experience, the Alliance State Government and the Alliance Party in power in the State of Penang have not been able to find a solution to the problem of the people in the Island of Penang. And do you wonder, Sir, why the people in the Island of Penang are very chary about any promises that are made by the Hon'ble the Chief Minister in his capacity outside when he makes press statements, or even when his statements are backed by statements made by the magicians from Kuala Lumpur — the Hon'ble the Prime Minister, the Hon'ble the Finance Minister, the Hon'ble the Deputy Prime Minister, and so forth and so on — because all that the people in the Island of Penang have to do is to look

across at Province Wellesley — eight years of Alliance rule; the Chief Minister's hometown, Bukit Mertajam. And what do we see coming down from B. M. Town to Penang? You have to travel (interrupted).

Chief Minister: Plenty.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): Oh yes, plenty of nothing. Whether you come from the south, or whether you come from the north, the best part of the State of Penang still remains in the Island of Penang. What has been done at Mak Mandin? What is happening at Butterworth? What kind of confidence can the people of Penang have in this State Government if at Butterworth — with all the help of the Central Government; the provision for 5 deep-water wharves, the transfer of the Railway Station with a new bridge across Prai River; reclamation in that area; as we see, reclamation also or a causeway in the Juru Scheme — there is no control of Butterworth land prices, no actual town planning for the town of Butterworth, no integration of development for the future development of the town of Butterworth? Sir, what prospects do we see across the straits? However, Sir, I do urge the State Government that it is not too late to admit that they have not got the vitality nor the resources to provide the people of Penang with a vision, and a realisation that they can accomplish this vision of the future.

Member for Dhoby Ghaut (Enche M. S. A. Zachariah): We have more vitality than the other side.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): Have another election in the State.

But the trouble is, Sir, I am trying to say that by 1969 the General Revenue balance will all have been eaten up. We will have a terribly sorry state of affairs. The position is this: even if the World Bank Mission were to send an expert team to the State of Penang, and if the State Government just holds this team back to consult with its so-called Economic Development Committee, the names are unknown. If I were a member of the State Development Committee and did a good job, Sir, I would be proud to say I am a member of the Committee; but, as it is, the Chief Minister would not reveal the names of the members of the State Economic Committee — understandably so (interrupted).

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification — I did not say I won't reveal. I said I won't be able to give you the names now because I do not want to give you the wrong names. I shall give them to you.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): Good, Sir, 'dan jika perlu.' We will have the situation where we will have all the names as people who sold us down the drain. Sir, even when this international World Bank Mission comes here, what plans have you got for the State of Penang? What economic plans have you got? Has the State Government in 8 years made any kind of feasibility surveys of what you want? Have you any alternative plans of what you want to do? You cannot even provide for the development of tourism in this country. You cannot even control the situation of the beggars in Ayer Itam until the Hon'ble Member for Ayer Itam managed to defeat the Alliance member. Then the Police started clearing

the beggars away, and the hawkers away. But for 8 years you did nothing. So, Sir, even if we were to send or we were to have the expert advice of the best economic mission in this country, I am quite sure that the final conclusion will be that the schemes are possible only if the people are able to carry them out. Hitherto industrialists, capitalists, people who want to come to the State of Penang, have come here. They have looked at our various sites for factory buildings in Penang — unintegrated, unplanned. "Oh, we have got land any time you want to come. Come — we have entrepot trade, a shirt factory; we import raw materials from one country, re-pack it or remake it and re-export it to another foreign country. Apart from these people, who wants to come to the State of Penang? Whose fault is it? The State Alliance Government — as simple as that.

Sir, this Budget, bad as it already is, has now been completely knocked into a cock-hat ever since the revelations by the Minister of Finance in his Budget Speech. Certainly, Sir, all the provisions for telephone charges would be completely wrong. We do not know what degree of increase for telephone bills will come to, or how the State Government proposes to control the use of telephones, or whether the State Government intends to improve the efficiency of its own departments from a situation where, when you ring up to talk to some member in the Government service or some member of the Government, he is either out or he is not in or you are put to the wrong telephone extension. Whatever it is, I urge the State Government seriously to protest to the Central Government against

the imposition of the new telephone tax because you cannot bear any increases to your telephone taxes. Sir, that involves only the Government and the Budget in reference to State Government departments.

The other matter which I would wish to talk about — I would urge the State Government to carry it out because during the last By-election in Ayer Itam, you went around telling people in Penang that the turnover tax was going to be repealed. So now carry it out. Instead of being repealed, the turnover tax has made matters worse for the traders and exporters in the State of Penang, particularly those in the Island of Penang, because this turnover tax of 2% at source on imported goods now is 2% and $\frac{1}{2}\%$ (interrupted).

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wonder if turnover tax has anything to do with this Dewan.

Mr. Speaker: It has nothing to do with this House.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): Sir, the livelihood of the people of Penang (interrupted).

Mr. Speaker: There is a place where you can bring this up — not in this Assembly.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): I am urging that the State Government puts it to the Central Government.

Mr. Speaker: Put it in a proper motion.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): Sir, the Hon'ble the Chief Minister of Sabah has

thought it fit to publicly protest on behalf of the people of Sabah. Are we to take it that the Hon'ble the Chief Minister of Penang is not interested in the welfare and livelihood of the people of Penang?

Mr. Speaker: It is not a question of whether the Chief Minister is interested or not. It is a question of this matter being entirely under Federal jurisdiction. This State cannot do anything unless you move a proper motion asking for a representation of this House to protest against such tax. I may consider that motion.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): Sir, it obviously has a connection. The trouble is that the Alliance Government cannot see connections when connections are so clear.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to point out that the Chief Minister of Penang is not a Member of the Dewan Ra'ayat. Whatever protest you have should be put through the proper channels, and I can assure the Honourable Member that the State Government has always the interest of the people of Penang at heart.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): Each year we go on being assured. All these years we have been assured until, unfortunately, the Opposition has taken the shape it has.

Sir, the turnover tax has an absolute direct connection with the entertainment tax because the prosperity of the people of Penang will enable them to contribute to the most important revenue-producing item in our State short of Federal grants; because, according to the speech by the

Hon'ble the Chief Minister, entertainment duties produced 24% — if I remember correctly, what I read at lunch-time — of our revenues. If the turnover tax makes it difficult for the people of Penang even to enjoy themselves, they will stay at home and look at T. V. Maybe they do not have enough money to look at T. V. But, if many people go on looking at T. V., the future revenues of the State will go down. Therefore, we urge the State Government to protest in as strong terms as possible against the new form of the turnover tax; and, better still, you have openly told the people in Penang that it was about to be repealed — repeal it!

Chief Minister: I think the turnover tax has nothing to do with Penang, and I do not think it will affect Entertainment Duty because the increase in Entertainment Duty started this year, as I mentioned earlier. And the turnover tax also was known to the people early this year. So, if there is any increase, we will certainly take it up strongly.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): In any case, I am very happy. Although the Chief Minister (interrupted).

Mr. Speaker:..I again want to point out that the question of tax will be a Federal matter. Whether we have connection here or not is not clear. Sometimes we can see something which we cannot touch.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): Sometimes you can see something which you dare not touch, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: You cannot touch also.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): That is a matter which we doubt very sincerely with all great deference to you because if we are concerned about the people of the State of Penang, half of whom live in the Island of Penang, it is for the first time. Although the people in the Island of Penang have hitherto been exempted from import duties, this is the one tax — the new imposition of the 2% tax on imports, the so-called amended turnover tax — that will hit the people of Penang more than it has ever done before.

Sir, under those circumstances, we do not foresee for 1966 the kind of revenue outturn which has been predicted by the Budget. In view of the unrestrained, and certainly increasing, expenditure because of telephone expenses and so on, and Government's great desire to appear bigger than its own shoes by providing too big a sum for allocation to the Development Fund, we say that this tax is the first sign of decay. It is a bad and unrealistic tax, and we oppose this particular Budget and this Supply Bill.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise in full support of all the criticisms made by my honourable friend the Member for Kota. If he has lacked anything perhaps he has lacked a fuller criticism of the budget which would certainly have been very justifiable.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, we all know that until 1957 Penang was a premier port for the States of Malaya. It stood second to Singapore in importance, in revenue and in turnover. Next to Singapore, Penang Island together with its port stood as a pinnacle of

development of the States of Malaya. It has the greatest industrial potential. It had communications, both international and national. It had water supply, it had finance, it had education, it had a labour potential, it had labour ability and it had a whole network for the establishment of Penang as a vast industrial site standing perhaps next to Singapore. What do we have today, seven or eight years after? We have a lot of blowing of trumpets and we have nothing else but the presentation of a budget which is so small, it is almost a flea bite compared to that of the budget of Singapore. Singapore expects to have a budget of at least \$1,000 million. We have a budget of something near the figure of \$14 million. And can the Government boast that Penang still stands as the premier State of the States of Malaya? Instead of fighting for the development of Penang we have allowed Penang to be overtaken by Selangor.

Mr. Speaker: When you mention Selangor it does not include the Federal capital of Kuala Lumpur?

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Well, maybe including the Federal capital. But we can boast of maybe two skyscrapers.

Mr. Speaker: The Federal capital is not run by the State of Selangor.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, whether you compare with the Federal capital or the State of Selangor without the Federal capital, I think there can be no comparison whatsoever. Both the Federal capital has grown, and

the State of Selangor has grown to such an extent that Penang in fact cannot be compared to them at all.

Mr. Speaker. Sir, after eight years what have we got? We had the best port, we had the best education, we had the best communication network, we had the best labour potential, we had the best industrial potential, we had the best water supply. We were the most advanced State. And today what are we presented with? No plan for a causeway. No plan for a University College except for a memorandum. No plan for the completion of the Hill Road except a pilot track. No plan for tourism except people and black signboards along the beaches which are fast being overcrowded with a lot of rubbish. No plan for industrial development or industrial estates except for the Mak Mandin scheme, which we are told when completed will contain, at the present figures, only some fifteen factories to employ approximately 1,500 people.

Mr. Speaker: I must correct that statement. I think the Chief Minister has said that fifteen factories have already been established. There is space for some more.

Chief Minister: Yes.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am glad for that correction. What he said was this: at the moment there are fifteen factories to be built and to be completed. At the moment there are other factory sites, but at the moment there are no further applications for factories. Well, since factories must be built if there are applications from people, we can as-

sume that nobody else is interested except for the fifteen applicants.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, so we live for today only, according to the Honourable Member? No future?

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): It looks like it, Mr. Speaker. And what do we have for future planning? We have in the Development Estimates a sum of \$30,000 to be provided for establishing a proper survey. No proper department has been put up. Nothing has been put in motion except for this \$30,000 which is going to be used for the purpose of survey. Mr. Speaker, Sir, perhaps the most damaging indictment of this Lilliputian State Government comes from three factors: the first from the Honourable the Finance Minister in his budget speech when he said that it was about time the State Government made up its mind as to whether Penang was to retain its free port or not.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification: I would like to hear again the word used — **militant State?**

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Lilliputian.

Chief Minister: Lilliputian — not militant?

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): No — Lilliputian State Government. It is in "Gulliver's Travels" — those six-inch-high men. And the fact that he had himself to make representations to the World Bank to have the services of a team of experts to come and investigate the situation. The second perhaps is the suppression of what we have

been told had taken three years to write or to formulate — the master plan for the State of Penang by Mr. Munro, the town planning expert sent by the Colombo Plan for in fact the sole purpose of finding out, and to make suggestions as to how Penang should meet its future. If I am wrong in my criticism of the State Government, and if my honourable friend from Kota is wrong in his criticism of the State Government, then let the State Government reply. Publish the Munro Report. Publish it and let the people say whether or not what we say is right. If what we say is right then, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Government stands accused of suppression of a Report which by suppression would lead by default of the State Government to the collapse of Penang's economy and the sinking of Penang into the doldrums of unemployment.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification. The State Government is not responsible for the Munro Report. We would very much like to have a copy of that Report too.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is indeed most surprising that the Alliance State Government, with a friendly Central Government, also of the Alliance, should make it known in this Assembly that a Report which was supposed to have been made for the benefit of Penang has been removed from the power of the State of Penang.

Chief Minister: A sincere Government.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): A sincere Government, Mr. Speaker, Sir, so I am

told; sincere, maybe — but stupid, perhaps.

Chief Minister: Honesty is the best policy.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, that is what I hear in one of the music halls in England at one time.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, if it is the honest intention of the State Government that it intends to see to the future development of Penang then at least make an attempt, a genuine attempt, to obtain from the Federal Government a copy of the Munro Report which took three years to formulate. If the State Government can show this Assembly that they have done all within their power to obtain it, and the Federal Government has not done so, then the Federal Government is guilty of — perhaps I would not say fraudulent because it would be unparliamentary. But the Federal Government would be guilty of — irresponsibility to the Colombo Plan who had the decency of sending for our use the Colombo Plan expert, who perhaps has now wasted three years of his life in formulating this Report which is being relegated to the archives of some State room or Federal room.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the provisions of the budget we find that the people of Penang have to pay \$36,000 a year for members of the Executive Council — \$36,000 a year for eight members. I understand the Honourable the Chief Minister does not get remuneration from this sum. Now, this money, \$36,000 which is distributed among eight members of the Executive Council, is over

and above the \$500 a month which an Executive Council member gets as a member of the State Assembly. Thirty six thousand divided by eight members comes to \$375 a month, which together with \$500 make it \$875 a month. Mr. Speaker, Sir, we expect at least a more active Executive Council at \$875 a month. And if it is not enough I suppose, on the basis of the work done, we can increase that sum. At least let there be work done. I understand they meet on the average once a week. Once a week is 52 times a year. Thirty six thousand dollars a year divided by 52 meetings gives us a sum of \$650 a meeting. So approximately \$650 is spent on each meeting of the Executive Council. Mr. Speaker, Sir, in the light of the fact that there are over 600 thousand people depending upon the Executive Council, we must wonder whether or not the Executive Council is “awake” to its responsibilities.

In 1963 when Malaysia came into being an Annexure ‘J’ established the frame-work for a Common Market but with reserves that Singapore shall have a “kick-back” of 60% of income. In other words, when Singapore moves into the Common Market revenues obtainable at the Singapore source will be kept by the Singapore Government, except for a 40% contribution to the Central Government. There was no provision provided for the State of Penang. Penang was supposed to move into the Common Market when Singapore was prepared. And according to the goods which would be manufactured in Singapore it would come into the Common Market proposals. Penang had to move into the Common Market

together with Singapore step by step; but Singapore had 60% of its revenue kept to itself. Penang had no such reserve. Do we hear a squeak from the State Government? Not a squeak. Do we hear a word of protest from the State Government? Not a word of protest.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I think it is wrong for the Honourable Member to assume that there was no protest.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, if there was a protest, I am sure the Central Government would be very pleased to hear what form the protest took, and when the protest was made. If I am not wrong, the protest from Penang came from the people of Penang themselves. The protest from Penang came from the businessmen Penang; came from the poor people of Penang. No representation whatsoever was made by the State Government at the time of the signature of the Malaysia Agreement which came into effect on 16th September, 1963. And Mr. Speaker, Sir, (interrupted).

Mr. Speaker: May I have one clarification on the formation of Malaysia? Is it not right that the Federation of Malaya, including Penang and eleven other States, came together with Singapore, Sabah and Sarawak? So the signature for that Malaysia Agreement was signed by one person at Federal level, not by any individual State in the Federation of Malaya. Am I right?

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): That is correct, Mr. Speaker, Sir, absolutely correct.

Mr. Speaker: Am I correct to say that the Federation of Malaysia was formed by one State of the Federation of Malaya as a whole, with Sabah, Sarawak and Singapore in another State?

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): No, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Am I correct? May I have a clarification?

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu) Yes, Sir. Article 1(1) of the Federal Constitution states that the name of the new Federation shall be the Federation of Malaysia. Under (2)(a) the eleven States of Malaya are all listed, including Penang; (b) the Borneo States; and (c) the State of Singapore. I think that was how it was formed. In any case the Hon'ble Prime Minister had never been able to define whether this is a four-State Federation or a fourteen-State Federation.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Agreement was in fact signed by three Governments — the Federation of Malaya Government, the Singapore Government, and the British Government on behalf of the States of Borneo. Before the signature of the Malaysia Agreement, solidarity committees were formed which investigated and listened to the various Governments of the Borneo States. The final discussion between Singapore and the United Kingdom and the Federation of Malaya actually took place in London. At no time did the State Government of Penang voice any objections to Penang's entry into the Common Market. We all know that the Federation of Malaya was formed as a Federation of States, with States having

powers especially over land and certain other matters, like entertainment and so on. There is a concurrent list; there is a State list, and there is a Federal list. But the free port status would affect the State list and the concurrent list, and as such the State Government of Penang had that duty to make representations to the Federal Government which would affect the future of the free port status of Penang. Mr. Speaker, Sir, (interrupted).

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification — when the Agreement was signed bringing Penang into the Common Market, Penang was not consulted and we sent a protest.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Yes, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that is what I said. Penang was **not** consulted and we would like to know the form of protest with regard to the question of the Common Market proposals and the free port.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like the Hon'ble Member to know more about the constitutional standing of Penang. We have no power over Customs.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, in fact I am getting tired of this old gramophone record going — We have no authority over this; thanks to the good wishes of the Central Government; or the Central Government does not permit us to do such a thing; or we will have to refer the matter to the Central Government. I mean it is almost like an old nursery rhyme, like "The Sound of Music," 'doh, ray, me, fah, soh.' If it is not a 'doh,' it is a 'la,' if it is not a 'la,' it is

a 'me,' and it goes on like that, and it repeats itself. When I say, "Is there a proper protest? What form does the protest take?", we are told, "Sir, we have no power over Customs."

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have explained quite clearly that the power lies with the Central Government. It does not mean that we are complacent with them. But what else can we do?

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): Protest.

Chief Minister: Protest only? Is that the only solution? Does the Hon'ble Member suggest that something should be done more drastically?

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): No, Sir, I can give you a suggestion. Put us in your protest committee; have a joint committee.

Chief Minister: Mr. Speaker, Sir, then I would like to appeal to the Honourable Member to raise this matter in Parliament. That is the proper place for such a course.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): I am asking the State Government to form a protest committee. Put Members of the Opposition in the protest committee. Let us have a joint memorandum. If the Hon'ble the Chief Minister's advisers or his Political Secretary are unable to tell him how to proceed, at least allow us the honour of advising him — free of charge.

Chief Minister: Bring a serpent into the basket!

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): I will ignore that remark — maybe that is the best he can do — to insult.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Singapore Government, after its separation on August 9th, had made other plans for Singapore's survival. We have made no plans since on the Common Market, since 1963 and since 1957. We have, in fact, been sleeping.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Sir, perhaps the most important aim of all budgets, the most important end of all planning, is to deal with the question of unemployment. The test of all budgets is its effect upon unemployment. But before we come to the question of unemployment, we have got to know first whether the organisation, or the Government, has the ability or the capacity or the willingness to carry out the programme. Mr. Speaker, Sir, in my speech I will deal with unemployment, free port, industrialisation, flooding, Hill Road, causeway, University planning and so on, point by point. But before I can even touch on those things, I must first question the State Government's ability to administer the State properly. I must first enquire if the State Government has the mental willingness or capacity to administer the State, and in this I have also to refer to the Auditor-General's Report on the Accounts of the State of Penang for the year ending 31st December, 1964 which my honourable friend from Kota has referred to.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, there are 67 paragraphs in this Report and 39 complaints — 39 out of 67 paragraphs; and practically the rest of the paragraphs are merely

figures. What is a stronger condemnation of the ability of the State Government to administer than this Auditor-General's Report. Fortunately, the Auditor-General cannot be dismissed and he stands as a High Court Judge: otherwise, I doubt whether he would dare publish such a report, such a strong indictment on the State Government as I have ever seen.

The **first paragraph** talks about the accounts he is auditing. The **second paragraph** deals with a copy of his certificate. The **third paragraph** starts off:

"The accuracy of the Statements is affected by a number of errors of classification, the more important of which are mentioned in subsequent paragraphs of this Report."

This is how it starts off — "The accuracy of the Statements is affected by a number of errors of classification;" and we are told we are making a lot of money, we have a lot of revenue, we have a balanced Budget. But the Auditor-General starts off by saying that the accuracy of the Statements is in doubt because you cannot classify properly. The **fourth paragraph** says: "The accounts have been charged with \$520 for which evidence of proper disbursement has not been produced to me." A small sum of \$520 and there is no proper disbursement account! **Paragraph 5** puts down the total revenue in figures. **Paragraph 6** goes on:

"Refunds of revenue arising from over-collections in the same year were debited to the revenue items concerned in accordance with past practice. Legal opinion has recently been given that this is incorrect and that the law requires such refunds to be met from expenditure like

refunds of previous years' revenue. This opinion has been brought to the Federal Government's attention for general action."

Paragraph 10, Reimbursements on Account of Fire Brigade —

"This item was opened to receive reimbursements from the District Councils for the cost of the Fire Brigade but, as in 1963 too ("too," he says — common practice) it was also credited with \$585 on account of fees received for services rendered. I have not seen authority for the collection of such fees."

Paragraph 12:

"The Grant received towards the cost of Muslim Religious Instruction in accordance with the Education (Amendment) Act, 1963, amounted to \$95,641, equal to half the cost to the State of the instruction given during 1963. No adjustment has yet been made on account of the cost of the instruction given in 1961 (\$77,344), which was wholly borne by the Federal Government, or on account of the 1962 Grant (\$145,691.66), which was provisional and was to have been finalised later."

Since 1962 no finalisation; since 1961 no adjustment had been made! **Paragraph 16 — Chief Minister and State Secretariat; Contributions to Local Authorities in Aid of Rates:**

"As in previous years, the payments made as contributions in aid of rates were provisional only. The contributions actually due have not yet been agreed. In 1965, the Penang City Council has been paid \$100 more than in recent years."

Chief Minister: \$100,000.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim

Kean Siew): What did I say? You are lucky. You should not have corrected me.

Chief Minister: We are honest. **Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, since 1957 — for 8 years — there has been this dispute which the State Government cannot even solve. How can it solve this problem of unemployment in the State of Penang? At least settle these small things and then we have time to deal with the big things.

Paragraph 18, Water and Conservancy for Labour Lines:

"Bills totalling \$2,545.20 for the supply of water to labour lines for part of 1964 were not paid until 1965, contrary to regulations. If they had been paid in 1964, the authorised provision in this subhead would have been exceeded by \$101.42."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this criticism goes from paragraph to paragraph. If I were to read it all, it would be tedious. I would just refer to **paragraph 19**, which deals with the question of Muslim religious education, and says that "the matter is still being considered by the State Government" although there has been past expenditure.

Paragraph 21 says —

"These 'Revotes' totalled \$981,563. Five of them, totalling \$690,861, do not appear to have been required. The desirability of restricting the use of this form of authorisation has been mentioned in previous Reports."

Monies put have been revoted again and again because they have not been used. Is that proper budgetting? Nearly a mil-

lion dollars; nearly 15% of the total Budget! **Paragraph 22** talks of: "\$126,306.16 which was outstanding at the date of my last Report is still unsettled." Expenditure from Federal funds; the State's claim for reimbursement thereof of \$126,306.16 is still unsettled! And under the paragraph on **General Revenue**, Mr. Speaker, Sir, "the State's counterclaim for licence fees amounting to approximately \$54,000 which were credited to Federal Revenue a number of years ago has not been settled."

With regard to **District and Land Offices, paragraph 29**: "As a result of these misallocations" — that is, allocations for the Industrial Estates in Mak Mandin and Miscellaneous Deposit Ac-

count — it would appear that misallocations arising therefrom came to the expenditure of \$210,917.50 and that this amount for 1964 was understated.

Mr. Speaker: Ahli² Yang Berhormat, saya berchadang menanggohkan meshuarat ini sekarang. Ahli Yang Berhormat boleh-lah menyambong ucapan-nya besok dengan tidak mengulang balek apa yang telah di-ucapkan pada hari ini.

Ahli² Yang Berhormat Persidangan ini di-tanggohkan hingga pukul 10.00 pagi besok.

The Assembly adjourns at 4.32 p.m. to 26th November, 1965, at 10.00 a.m.



