

REPORT OF THE
PROCEEDINGS
OF THE SECOND
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
PENANG

3 RD SITTING OF THE
SECOND SESSION MONDAY
29 TH, NOVEMBER 1965

KPP
228.595123
PEN



127B26

PPAPP



1000761617

makin hebat dan ra'ayat di-Negeri ini makin susah. Nampak-nya, Kerajaan tidak bersungguh, berikhtiar untuk mengurangkan desakan soal ini. Kalau saya tidak silap, Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam dan Ahli Kawasan Kota pada hari kelmarin pernah berkata — untuk mengatasi soal penganggoran, perniagaan di-Negeri ini, perusahaan di-Negeri ini dan pelanchongan di-Negeri ini harus di-kembangkan. Perniagaan harus berkembang dan perkembangan perniagaan di-Pulau Pinang tidak ada harapan yang baik dengan hilangnya taraf pelabohan bebas dengan sechra beransor ansoran. Sungguh pun Kerajaan sering memberi jaminan bahawa sa-lagi taraf pelabohan bebas Pulau Pinang berfaedah kepada penduduk Negeri ini, maka taraf pelabohan bebas ini tidak akan di-batalkan. Akan tetapi kerana bilangan jenis barang, yang kena chukai bertambah. Maka dengan sechra tidak langsung, taraf pelabohan bebas yang sudah lama di-nekmati oleh ra'ayat Negeri ini telah di-rampas.

Berkenaan dengan perusahaan, Y.A.B. Ketua Menteri mengatakan kelmarin bahawa mengikut satu kajian yang baru, Negeri Pulau Pinang ini ada-lah sa-buah Negeri yang ulong dalam lapangan pembangunan perusahaan. Sa-telah 5 tahun dan sa-telah di-banggakan dan di-agongkan oleh Kerajaan Perikatan bahawa ranchangan perusahaan di-Mak Mandin akan mengatasi kesulitan, ini, tetapi hingga hari ini hanya 5 buah kilang, sedang di-dirikan dan kilang, ini hanya dapat memberi peluang bekerja kepada lebih kurang 1,500 orang sahaja. Dan saya dapati daripada satu jawapan kepada soalan yang di-kemukakan oleh salah sa-orang Wakil dari Pehak Pembangkang, Ketua Menteri telah berkata — selain daripada Ranchangan Perusahaan di-Mak Mandin, Kerajaan Negeri ini

tidak ada alain, ranchangan yang konkret dalam lapangan perusahaan ini. Dengan ini Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bagaimana Kerajaan harap mengatasi soal penganggoran ini melalui perkembangan perusahaan di-Negeri ini?

Mengenai pelanchongan, Kerajaan tidak ada juga ranchangan, yang berkesan untuk mengembangkannya. Ketua Menteri dari jawapan-nya yang di-tanya oleh saya dua hari dahulu mengatakan, Kerajaan mengadakan kemudahan, untuk perusahaan pelanchongan. Di-kata-nya, Kerajaan mengadakan lapangan terbang untuk kapal terbang jet, Kerajaan mengadakan car park di-tepi laut, Kerajaan mendirikan signboard di-tempat, kenamaan, sa-olah, dengan langkah, ini Kerajaan sudah mempunyai chukup ranchangan untuk memajukan pelanchongan. Saya ingat lagi dalam ucapan-nya, Dewan Sri Pinang di-sebutkan, kata beliau Dewan ini akan menjadi satu Dewan untuk di-gunakan oleh Konferansi International. Dan dari jawapan kepada soalan saya yang lain, beliau berkata Kerajaan tidak ada wang yang chukup untuk mendirikan Dewan ini. Saya tidak ingin menyentuh perkara ini kerana saya ada kesempatan untuk membangkitkan perkara ini dalam usul yang kita akan hadapi itu.

Mr. Speaker: Ada banyak lagi? Saya berchadang hendak menangguhkan messhuarat ini pada pukul 4.30 petang.

Member for Jelutong (Mr. Tan Hock Hin): Saya pulangkan kepada tuan.

Mr. Speaker: Ahli, Yang Berhormat Dewan ini di-tanggohkan kepada hari Ithnain, jam 10.00 pagi.

The Assembly adjourns at 4.25 p.m. to 29th November, 1965, at 10.00 a.m.

29th 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 (Enche Kee Yong Chin, J.P.)
- “ “ Kawasan Permatang Pauh (Enche Ariffin bin Shariff, P.J.K.)
- “ “ Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Enche D. S. Ramanathan, J.P.)
- “ “ Kawasan Kelawei (Enche Tan Khim Hoe)
- “ “ Kawasan Dhoby Ghaut (Enche M.S.A. Zachariah)
- “ “ Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Enche Cheah Seng Khim, J.P.)
- “ “ Kawasan Kapala Batas (Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Haji Abdullah, A.M.N.)
- “ “ Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Enche 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 (Enche Williams David)
- “ “ Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Enche Ismail bin Hashim)
- “ “ Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Enche Teh Ewe Lim)
- “ “ Kawasan Tanjong Utara (Enche Khoo Kay Por)
- “ “ Kawasan Ayer Itam (Enche Lim Kean Siew)
- “ “ Kawasan Tanjong Selatan (Enche Khor Peng Seah)
- “ “ Kawasan Jelutong (Enche Tan Hock Hin)

TIDAK HADZIR:

- Yang Berhormat Ahli Kawasan Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu)
- “ “ Kawasan Tanjong Utara (Enche Teh Geok Kooi)

The Assembly resumes at 10.00 a.m.

Member for Jelutong (Mr. Tan Hock Hin): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, memajukan perniagaan, perusahaan dan pelanchongan ada-lah langkah₂ yang penting dan practical untuk mengatasi soal penganggoran di-Negeri Pulau Pinang ini. Pada hari Juma'at yang lalu saya telah memberi kechaman₂ terhadap dasar Kerajaan dalam lapangan tersebut dan kawan saya Y. B. Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam telah pun dengan sechara teliti mengemukakan chadangan₂ - nya mengenai soal perniagaan, soal perusahaan dan soal Universiti. Maka pada hari ini saya ingin memajukan chadangan₂ kami mengenai soal pelanchongan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, masa'alah Pulau Pinang ada-lah masa'alah yang istimewa dan maka chara₂ dan ikhtiar₂ yang istimewa harus di-gunakan untuk mengatasi soal Pulau Pinang. Taraf Pelabohan Bebas ada-lah di-beri kepada Pelabohan Pulau Pinang pada masa penjajahan British. Pulau Pinang telah di-kembangkan bersesuaian dengan ada-nya taraf Pelabohan Bebas — saperti Negeri Perak dan Selangor berkembang bersesuaian dengan ada-nya lombong₂ timah dan kekayaan alam di-Negeri₂ Perak dan Selangor. Taraf Pelabohan Bebas kepada Pulau Pinang ada-lah saperti timah dan lain₂ di-Negeri Perak dan Selangor. Jika Perak tidak boleh hidup dengan tiada-nya lombong₂ timah dan kekayaan alam, maka saya kata Pulau Pinang tidak boleh hidup jika Taraf Pelabohan Bebas tidak ada di-Pulau Pinang. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Taraf Pelabohan Bebas ada-lah sangat mustahak kepada pelanchongan. Jawatan-

kuasa Pelanchongan telah mengeluarkan iklan₂ dalam Majalah Readers Digest dan Majalah₂ lain untuk menarek pelanchong₂ datang ka-Pulau Pinang untuk membeli barang₂ yang murah dan se-bagai-nya. Ini telah menunjukkan betapa penting-nya taraf Pelabohan Bebas kapada perkembangan pelanchongan Negeri ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, selain daripada mengekalkan Taraf Pelabohan Bebas untuk memajukan pelanchongan Negeri ini, langkah₂ yang sebegini harus di-adakan. Kami menchadangkan satu Kesatuan Pelanchongan harus di-tubuhkan. Kesatuan ini harus mengan-dongi pekedai₂, hotel, kedai₂ kopi, restaurant dan lain₂ yang kedai₂ ini dan hotel₂ ini harus mengikut dengan sharat₂ dan undang₂ Kesatuan ini. Semua orang yang menjadi anggota Kesatuan ini boleh mendirikan signboard yang menyatakan mereka ada-lah anggota kesatuan ini. Semua anggota kesatuan ini dapat menikmati hak₂ dan faedah₂ dalam kesatuan ini. Kesatuan ini harus memberikan risalah₂ menerangkan nama₂ kedai, hotel dan restaurant dan juga barang₂ yang di-jual oleh kedai₂ tersebut dan harga₂-nya. Mengenai harga barang₂ yang di-jual oleh kedai₂, hotel₂ dan restaurant, harga ini harus di-jamin dan ditentukan oleh kesatuan ini. Dengan langkah ini pelanchong₂ akan yakin mereka tidak akan membeli barang₂ yang mahal atau belanja lebeh daripada yang sepatut-nya bila mereka melawat Pulau Pinang.

Pantai₂ yang tertentu di-Pulau Pinang harus di-perundangkan sebagai tempat lapangan dan bangunan₂ tidak di-benarkan untuk di-dirikan di-tempat itu — hanya gerai₂ atau stall dapat di-izinkan

di-tempat₂ yang tertentu dan stall₂ harus di-galakkan menjual makanan atau kueh₂ tempatan yang istimewa untuk menarek pelanchong₂. Rumah₂ yang sudah ada pada masa ini di-tepi₂ pantai harus di-suroh ambil langkah₂ supaya barang₂ yang kotor tidak mengotorkan pantai₂ kita yang indah itu.

Selain daripada itu semua rumah₂ yang akan di-dirikan, pada masa hadapan, harus di-dirikan di-sebelah sana yang bukan tepi pantai. Kalau langkah₂ ini tidak di-ambil, maka dalam masa 10 tahun pantai₂ ini akan di-penuhi oleh rumah₂ dan keindahan-nya akan hilang. Maka ini boleh jadi satu halangan kepada perkembangan pelanchongan di-negeri kita ini. Di-tempat₂ yang indah satu zone harus di-perundangkan supaya rumah₂ tidak terlampau banyak di-dirikan di-situ dan juga membiarkan rumah₂ itu menghancurkan keindahan alam di-negeri ini.

Kedai₂, restaurant₂ dan kedai₂ kopi dan juga kedai₂ makan harus di-galakkan menjual barang₂ yang istimewa atau makanan₂ tempatan ia-itu makanan Pulau Pinang yang istimewa supaya pelanchongan₂ yang pernah makan makanan Pulau Pinang ini teringat apabila mereka melawat Pulau Pinang mereka makan makanan yang istimewa. Selain daripada itu layanan terhadap pelanchong₂ yang melawat Pulau Pinang harus diadakan dengan sechra beranchangan. Pemandu₂ harus bersopan santun dan membawa pelanchongan₂ yang melawat Pulau Pinang ka-tempat₂ kenamaan di-Pulau Pinang dan mereka harus menasihatkan pelanchong₂ supaya mereka tinggal di-Pulau Pinang lebih lama dan membelanjan

wang yang lebih banyak di-Pulau Pinang dan pemandu₂ ini harus memberikan pelanchongan₂ ini satu impression yang baik supaya mereka maseh ingat lagi apabila mereka balek ka-tempat₂ mereka datang.

Mengenai perkembangan pelanchongan, gerakan₂ kebudayaan harus di-galakkan. Kita harus mengadakan panggong₂ yang terbuka di-tempat₂ seperti Ayer Itam Dam dan tempat₂ lain yang sesuai untuk tujuan ini. Panggong₂ ini dapat membolehkan badan₂ kebudayaan mengadakan pertunjukan sendiwarra, tarian₂ tempatan, joget, band, orchestra dan lain₂ dan ini dapat juga menarek pelanchong₂ ka-tempat₂ ini. Dan Dewan Sri Pinang yang di-ranchangkan oleh Kerajaan harus di-dirikan dengan sa-chepat₂ mungkin dan Dewan ini saya perchaya dengan ada-nya gerakan kebudayaan akan dapat di galakkan dan badan₂ kebudayaan akan mendapat tempat yang sesuai untuk mengembangkan gerakan₂ mereka.

Selain daripada itu festival₂ ugama seperti festival Buddhist, festival ugama Catholic dan festival ugama Islam harus di-gunakan untuk memajukan pelanchongan — harus di-gunakan untuk menarek pelanchong₂ atau orang₂ dari negeri lain melawat Pulau Pinang. Badan₂ kebudayaan harus di-galakkan dan Dewan yang perchuma harus di-beri atau di-sediakan kepada mereka untuk mereka mengadakan pertunjukan. Selain daripada itu gerakan₂ lain seperti sports dan lain₂ harus di-galakkan untuk maksud memajukan pelanchongan. Ini ada-lah chadangan₂ kami terhadap perkembangan pelanchongan dan chadangan ini ada-lah untuk kebaikan ra'ayat dan juga kepada Kerajaan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, bukan sahaja Kerajaan harus mengubah sikap-nya yang passive terhadap perkembangan perusahaan, perkembangan perniagaan dan pelancongan. Sikap yang passive, yang lemah, terhadap Kerajaan Pusat juga harus di-ubah, sebab wang pemberian Kerajaan Persekutuan kepada Negeri ini ada-lah kurang daripada sepatut-nya. Kita harus menuntut lebih banyak wang daripada Kerajaan untuk mengembangkan negeri kita dan untuk kebaikan Ra'ayat Negeri kita; sebab Kerajaan Pusat mengambil chukai₂ yang lebih banyak daripada ra'ayat negeri kita — umpama-nya, tahun ini chukai₂ telah naik, seperti chukai talipon juga di-naikkan oleh Kerajaan Pusat. Tentu sekali pada tahun hadapan Kerajaan Pusat akan mengutip lebih banyak chukai daripada ra'ayat Pulau Pinang. Ada-lah patut Kerajaan Negeri Pulau Pinang meminta wang yang lebih banyak daripada Kerajaan Pusat. Ini ada-lah nasihat₂ kami terhadap Kerajaan Negeri supaya mereka dapat mengadakan sikap yang betul dan mengadakan satu dasar untuk kemajuan Negeri ini dan untuk kepentingan ra'ayat negeri ini. Sekian.

Member for Sungei Bakap (Mr. Kee Yong Chin): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, we have listened to the criticisms on our Budget by the members of the Opposition. To my mind they are all playing the same game of "Heads I win, tails you lose." To substantiate my statement, allow me to refer to the criticisms of the Honourable Member for Kota on the increase of the Personal Emoluments. As a seasoned politician he should realize that it is not possible to

cut it down. There are salary scales for our employees, and normal increments in salaries, and revisions of salaries. All this is not within our power to control. An example of this is the recent revision of salaries for the Penang Hill Railway workers. The Honourable Member for Kota, I am sure, fully supports this. As a matter of fact, in his Adjournment speech at the Fourth Sitting of the First Session he remarked that these workers had not had a revision of their salary scales for a long time. He also said, "It is, I think, always a good policy to plough back our profits into the Administration." We on this side of the House fully agree with this.

It is also interesting to see that we now have another orator from the Socialist Front. He is absent now, Mr. Speaker, Sir. I pray and hope he will follow the footsteps of his former colleague who was then the Honourable Member for Kota. His comments on the allowances for Executive Council Members are unwarranted and uncalled for. It is not for him to judge whether we are worth the salt. Our constituents appreciate our good work; and I can assure the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam of this.

Tuan Speaker, may I now touch on some of the Subheads of the P. W. D. Estimates so that I may clear the doubts of the Honourable members on the opposite side on the necessity for such increases? At Head 12, Subhead 11, that is, Maintenance of State Roads and Bridges, and Subhead 17, Renewals and Replacements of Penanti Quarry Plant and Equipment; and Head 14, Subhead 3, Maintenance of Water Supplies.

Tuan Speaker, the Chief Minister has in his speech commented on these increases. I wish to add only a few other remarks. The increase of \$121,142 in the provision for maintenance of State roads and bridges is due to the construction of approximately 15 miles of new roads, and also on account of our specific programme of repair and maintenance of roads and bridges. The increase in expenditure is offset to a large extent by an increase in the amount of State road grant receivable from the Central Government under Article 109 of the Federal Constitution. The amount of this grant has been fixed at \$4,500 per mile. The Central Government has been asked to increase the rate of this grant, and it is carefully considering this request. The Central Government has, however, agreed to treat common-user roads, such as approach roads to Government buildings, e.g. in the District Offices which are used by the public, as qualifying for the State road grants. This is why although the increase in the mileage maintained is 15 miles the increase reflected in the State road grant is approximately 23 miles.

'Renewals and replacement of Penanti Quarry plant and equipment' is a Subhead which was created in the Second Supplementary Bill at the last Meeting of this Assembly. It has become necessary because of the expansion of the productive capacity of the Penanti Quarry by the installation of plant and machinery costing over \$1.5 million. Though expenditure on renewals and replacements is expected to be \$100,000, this will be more than offset by profits received from the operation of the quarry.

The provision for the Subhead "Maintenance of Water Supplies" has increased from \$900,000 to \$1,050,000. This is due to the fact that consumption together with production of treated water in Province Wellesley is expected to increase from 5.8 million gallons a day to 8 million gallons a day sometime during the course of next year. The increase in revenue expected to accrue as a result of this is approximately \$300,000.

Tuan Speaker, I would like also to proceed to another item under Head 17, that is, Social Welfare. Although the State Government is so preoccupied with plans and activities to bring about improvement in the living standards of the people it has not forgotten the unfortunate and the poor amongst us. It has consistently been making provisions for providing relief to them. I am very glad to say that in 1966 we are increasing the amount that has been set aside for providing relief by another 20%. The total now becomes \$150,000. Considering that our financial resources are limited, this is a big sum. We are also providing for one more Social Welfare Assistant so that the needs of the poor may be ascertained, and assistance given faster.

The Government is always responsible to the needs of the really deserving ones. For instance, early this month when floods affected several kampongs in Province Wellesley North some 1,200 people had to be evacuated and temporarily looked after. Assistance was provided immediately and, as the Chief Minister explained, funds for this were included in the Third Supplementary Supply Bill.

As we have said before, the people's welfare is the sole concern of the State Government; and we shall do all we can to assist the people.

I wish to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the public who helped to provide relief to the people affected by the flooding of the Sungei Muda, and to the various voluntary organizations which are doing welfare work in one way or another.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish therefore to say that the Budget has been very carefully prepared. There is no place in it for unnecessary expenditure. I therefore wish to recommend it for the approval of this Assembly.

Thank you, Tuan Speaker.

Member for Tanjong Selatan (Mr. Khor Peng Seah): Dalam Peranggaran Hasil dan Perbelanjaan Biasa bagi tahun 1966 ini, menunjukkan kekurangan wang sebanyak \$1,537,740. Ini ada-lah satu ramalan kami sejak dahulu, kerana selagi Kerajaan Perikatan maseh mengikut jejak langkah Penjajahan Barat, maseh menye-belahi pehak Kapitalis, asing, maseh mementingkan kepentingan, persaorangan, dan tidak menggalakkan perkembangan perindustrian serta tidak menambahkan pendapatan, ra'ayat, malah memboroskan wang untuk kemewahan Pehak Pemerintah, maka sama ada Parti Perikatan memegang teraju pemerentahan Negeri atau pun Negara, mereka pasti menghadapi kekurangan wang perbelanjaan. Oleh kerana itu Kerajaan mesti menaikkan chukai, dan bayaran, yang lain saperti chukai

perolehan perniagaan di-ishtiharkan oleh Kerajaan Pusat dan Lesen Petition Writer di-tetapkan oleh Kerajaan Negeri.

Tidak setimbangan Peranggaran Hasil dan Perbelanjaan bagi tahun 1966, bukan-lah kerana Kerajaan memberi lebeh banyak perkhidmatan kepada ra'ayat, tetapi ada-lah di-sebabkan Kerajaan tidak dapat menganjorkan ranchangan, untuk menambah hasil negeri kita ini, dan memboroskan wang yang tidak perlu di-belanja. Mithal-nya, hampir \$3,000 untuk penyenggaraan Bangunan Ketua Menteri, sebanyak \$6,000 untuk Elaun Ra'i Ketua Menteri, sebanyak \$9,600 untuk gaji Setia Usaha Politik, sebanyak \$6,500 untuk gaji Setia Usaha Sulit, sebanyak \$3,204 untuk gaji kaki-tangan di-Rumah Ketua Menteri. Jumlah-nya \$28,304. Saya tidak membantah wang sebanyak mana pun di-belanjakan sekira-nya wang yang di-belanjakan itu ada memberi faedah kepada ra'ayat. Tetapi apa-kah mereka telah buat dan apa-kah ranchangan yang telah di-kemukakan kepada Kerajaan oleh mereka.

Dalam Perlembagaan kita pun terchatit, Kerajaan berhak memileh hingga 8 orang Ahli, Ex. Co. — melantek 8 orang Ahli Ex. Co. dengan perbelanjaan sebanyak \$36,000 untuk elaun mereka. Dan apa-kah ranchangan yang telah di-chadangkan atau apa-kah ranchangan yang telah di-jalankan oleh Kerajaan Negeri? Kalau Kerajaan dapat kurangkan Ahli, Ex. Co., maka juga dapat jimatkan wang Negeri kita. Tetapi mengikut pada hari ini mereka hanya mengadakan meshuarat dan mendapat elaun dan tidak ada ranchangan yang di-kemukakan oleh mereka.

Saya merasa juga, jika sekiranya Y. A. B. Ketua Menteri mencontohi Dato Bandar, ia-itu dengan sendiri-nya ia menchadangkan sebahagian hak₂ istimewa-nya dibatalkan, maka hampir \$30,000 dapat di-chermatkan. Pada hal Y. A. B. Ketua Menteri memperolehi gaji sebanyak \$2,150 tiap₂ bulan. Jika di-perlukan kakitangan di-rumah atau pun Setia Usaha Politik dan sebagai-nya, Y. A. B. Ketua Menteri pun mampu mengupah mereka. Dan lagi, sebanyak \$5,118 untuk perbelanjaan "Rumah Pulau Pinang" di-Kuala Lumpur, sebanyak \$41,500 untuk perbelanjaan Kursus₂ Tata Ra'ayat dan penyiaran. \$5,000 untuk chenderamata dan hadiah untuk Kedutaan dan Pejabat Surohanjaya Tinggi. Sebanyak \$2,500 untuk Ra'i Pejabat Daerah dan Tanah, sebanyak \$1,300 untuk membeli sa-buah 12 kaki padu peti sejok untuk Rumah Persinggahan Bukit Mertajam. Sabenar-nya wang ini boleh di-jimat dan ta'perlu di-belanjakan. Ini-lah tabiat Kerajaan Perikatan yang mempergunakan wang ra'ayat dengan sedaya upaya untuk kemewahan dan kehormatan pehak pemerentah, lebeh₂ lagi wang itu di-gunakan untuk penerangan parti. Mithal-nya, Kerajaan menganjorkan Kursus Tata Ra'ayat dan penyiaran semata₂ menggunakan wang sebagai umpan untuk menarek mereka menyertai Kursus Perikatan dan undi kepada Perikatan. Saperti Pejabat Penerangan Kerajaan ada-lah sebok sekali pada masa pilehan raya. Pejabat ini sengaja₂ mempertunjokkan wang gambar berhampiran dengan rapat umum parti pembangkang supaya mengurangkan orang₂ menyertai rapat umum parti pembangkang. Ini dapat terbukti pada pilehan raya kechil (interrupted)

Mr. Speaker: Saya hendak membetulkan sedikit. Pejabat Penerangan ini di-bayar di-bawah kepala budget yang tertentu dalam Federal Budget. Betul-kah tidak?

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, Gaji₂ semua di-bayar oleh Kerajaan Pusat.

Mr. Speaker: Jadi kalau tuan buat sebok sekali pun tidak ada guna.

Member for Tanjong Selatan (Mr. Khor Peng Seah): Selain dari itu setengah angka peranggaran yang besar itu sangat-lah mengejutkan saya. Mithal-nya sebanyak \$17,249 untuk penyenggaraan kawasan Bukit Bendera, sebanyak \$66,158 untuk Penyenggaraan Kawasan Kebun Bunga Ayer Terjun, sebanyak \$31,000 untuk Penyenggaraan Rumah₂ Tumpangan dan Bungalow hak Negeri, sebanyak \$43,000 untuk Penyenggaraan memasokkan bekalan letrika-rumah₂ dan bangunan₂ Kerajaan. Walaupun saya memang bersetuju dengan beberapa jenis peranggaran tersebut, tetapi bilangan besar yang akan di-belanjakan itu merupakan Kerajaan tidak bertanggung jawab terhadap wang ra'ayat. Pada tahun 1963, Kerajaan Negeri telah memboroskan wang sebanyak \$102,520 untuk menchetak "Pulau Pinang Hari Ini." 'Apa-kah yang ra'ayat terdapat daripada naskah ini? Ini ada-lah satu kenyataan yang terang₂ membuktikan Kerajaan Perikatan membelanjakan wang ra'ayat berlebeh-lebehan. Saya berpendapat Kerajaan harus mematohi satu prinsip supaya menjimatkan wang yang di-kutip daripada ra'ayat. Jikalau Kerajaan menggunakan wang ini untuk per-

khidmatan pemerintah atau penerangan parti ada-lah perbuatan yang amat burok. Terutama-nya sa-lepas pembentokan Malaysia, ra'ayat Pulau Pinang menderita mala benchana yang terok dan menanggung berbagai chukai. Maka dalam keadaan penderitaan ra'ayat yang makin sa-hari makin susah, Kerajaan Negeri harus menjimatkan wang ra'ayat.

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, point of clarification — Kerajaan Negeri tidak ada menaikkan chukai sekali pun.

Member for Tanjong Selatan (Mr. Khor Peng Seah): Saya katakan, harus menjimatkan wang ra'ayat. Siapa pun tidak berani menafikan sejak tertuboh-nya Malaysia, ra'ayat Malaysia telah menempohi kesangsaraan terutama-nya Pulau Pinang. Kita semua sedar bahawa sejak Indonesia melancarkan konferantasi-nya terhadap Malaysia, perdagangan antara kedua negara telah putus, buroh₂ pelabohan telah menganggor, kilang getah telah di-tutup, sharikat perniagaan dengan Indonesia pun turut berhenti. Pergaduhan di-antara nelayan₂ kechil dan towkay pukut harimau pun telah berlaku, tambahan pula Kerajaan melarang import beberapa barang dan kenaikan chukai₂. Segala peristiwa ini menyusahkan ra'ayat dan merupakan satu chabaran kapada Kerajaan Negeri Pulau Pinang. Ada-kah Kerajaan Negeri menyiasat keadaan ini dan ada-kah Kerajaan berani dan tidak gentar menyampaikan tuntutan₂ ra'ayat kapada Kerajaan Pusat? Langkah apa-kah yang telah di-ambil oleh Kerajaan Negeri untuk mengatasi kesulitan ra'ayat yang di-alami oleh mereka itu? Sa-benar-nya, ra'ayat Pulau Pinang amat keche-
wa terhadap pemerentahan Kera-

jaan dalam tempoh 8 tahun ini — terutama-nya, baharu₂ ini beberapa langkah yang merugikan ra'ayat Pulau Pinang telah di-ambil oleh Kerajaan Pusat — saperti chuba membatalkan taraf Pelabohan Bebas. Bagaimana ra'ayat Negeri ini dan peniaga₂ Pulau Pinang membantah langkah₂ yang tidak adil ini pun Kerajaan Negeri cuma membisu sahaja dan membiarkan ra'ayat Pulau Pinang di-permainkan oleh Kerajaan Pusat. Akan tetapi Kerajaan Negeri telah lupa akan tanggung jawab, akan hidup mati-nya ra'ayat Pulau Pinang. Kalau-lah Kerajaan Negeri tidak berani membantah Kerajaan Pusat dengan keras, maka sa-tidak₂nya hendak-lah menyampaikan tuntutan₂ ra'ayat atau pun mengadakan pungutan suara supaya Kerajaan Pusat sedar akan kehendak₂ ra'ayat Pulau Pinang. Yang Berhormat Ketua Menteri mengatakan bahawa daripada jumlah 1,000 orang buroh pelabohan itu tidak sa orang pun mahu menerima kerja₂ yang di-beri oleh Jabatan Kerja Raya. Apa-kah sebab₂nya mereka tidak mahu kerja₂ itu?

Mr. Speaker: Saya hendak membetulkan sedikit. Bukan-nya semua tidak mahu bekerja — ada yang tidak ada yang mahu. Itu kata Ketua Menteri — bukan semua yang tidak mahu — ada yang mahu ada yang tidak mahu.

Member for Tanjong Selatan (Mr. Khor Peng Seah): Mengikut yang saya tahu, dia kata tidak ada sa-orang yang mahu.

Mr. Speaker: Saya minta keterangan daripada Ketua Menteri — yang mana satu yang benar.

Chief Minister: Saya tidak kata semua tidak mahu. Bukan semua tidak mahu. Ada yang mahu dan

ada yang tidak mahu.

Member for Tanjong Selatan (Mr. Khor Peng Seah): Kebanyakan tidak mahu?

Chief Minister: Banyak kurang saya tidak berani kata. Kerajaan harus siasat dahulu.

Member for Tanjong Selatan (Mr. Khor Peng Seah): Kerajaan mesti tahu berapa orang dapat kerja?

Chief Minister: Itu saya minta notis-lah.

Member for Tanjong Selatan (Mr. Khor Peng Seah): Tetapi mengikut apa yang saya tahu daripada Kerajaan, kebanyakan tidak mahu. Saya merasai ini adalah satu peristiwa yang ganjil, kerana saya tahu banyak orang yang tidak ada kerja hari ini dan dalam masyarakat kita ini sekarang, saya tahu, banyak orang tidak mempunyai kerja dan tidak ada orang yang tidak mahu pekerjaan. Perkara ini susah diperchayaan ia-itu banyak orang tidak mahu kerja yang di-beri oleh Kerajaan. Saya hendak memberi tahu kepada Dewan dan ra'ayat bahawa Kerajaan ada-lah tidak mementingkan kepentingan mereka. Mengikut saya, sejak konferantasi dua tahun ini sebilangan kechil sahaja penganggor₂ buroh pelabohan ini dapat bantuan Kerajaan wang tidak lebeh daripada \$30.00. Kerajaan tidak peduli sama sekali sama ada mereka hidup atau mati. Ini-lah sikap Kerajaan Negeri yang sa-benar-nya terhadap buroh₂ ini.

Mengikut ucapan Y. A. B. Ketua Menteri, "seramai 14,000 orang berdaftar berkehendakkan kerja₂ pada tiap₂ bulan. Banyak dari-

pada mereka mempunyai kerja atau pun hendak menchari pekerjaan yang lain yang mendapat gaji lebeh. Pada hakikat-nya saya yakin kebanyakan mereka tidak ada kerja. Banyak orang merasa kechewa terhadap Pejabat Pendaftaran Pekerjaan kerana ramai daripada mereka tidak mendapat pekerjaan walaupun telah mendaftar berkali₂. Oleh kerana banyak penganggor₂ tidak mendaftarkan diri mereka, maka angka₂ yang di-beri oleh Pejabat Pendaftaran Pekerjaan itu tidak boleh menggambarkan keadaan penganggoran yang sa-benar-nya.

Mengikut angka yang di-beri oleh saudara Lim Kean Siew, seramai 48,000 orang telah menganggor, tambahan pula seramai 5,000 orang murid₂ tamat sekolah pada tiap₂ tahun dan beribu₂ pemuda tidak berpeluang masuk sekolah ini memerlukan kerja. Apakah pekerjaan yang akan memberi kapada mereka tanpa ranchangan yang lengkap? Sebagaimana yang kita tahu kedudukan Negeri Pulau Pinang berlainan daripada negeri₂ yang lain. Negeri₂ lain mempunyai hasil bumi seperti getah, bijeh timah, padi dan sebagai-nya, tetapi Negeri kita bergantung kapada Pelabohan Bebas khas-nya perdagangan dan pelanchongan. Sekarang perdagangan menghadapi pukulan yang hebat di-sebabkan putus-nya hubungan dengan Indonesia dan kenaikan chukai. Perindustrian dan pelanchongan juga tidak dapat di-majukan. Jika sekira-nya taraf pelabohan bebas tidak dapat di-kekalkan, ra'ayat Pulau Pinang akan mengalami azap sengsara yang tidak dapat di-cheritakan. Pada masa dahulu sedangkan kami memperjuangkan untuk mengekalkan taraf pelabohan bebas, Y. A. B. Ketua Menteri telah berkata sejak ada-nya pasar-

an bersama, dari segi undang₂ taraf pelabohan bebas telah di batalkan. Sekarang dia berkata pula, "Kami Ahli₂ Kerajaan Negeri akan berusaha sa-daya upaya untuk mengekalkan taraf pelabohan bebas ini jika sekira-nya keadaan ini adalah untuk kepentingan penduduk₂ di-negeri ini. Bagaimana pun, kita tidak-lah se-patut-nya memikirkan perkara ini dari segi jangka pendek, malah ada-lah menjadi tanggung jawab kita memandang perkara ini atas dasar pada hari hadapan supaya kita dapat menentukan yang Pulau Pinang akan terus ma'amor dan maju." Apa-kah arti jika sekira-nya keadaan ini ada-lah untuk kepentingan penduduk₂ Negeri ini? Tidak-kah Kerajaan mempunyai satu pendirian yang tetap? Apa-kah arti-nya tidak memikirkan dari segi jangka pendek, dan memandang pada hari hadapan terus ma'amor dan maju itu? Ini adalah alasan Kerajaan yang berchadang membatalakan pelabohan bebas.

Y. B. Menteri Kewangan Enche Tan Siew Sin di-Dewan Ra'ayat baharu₂ ini berkata bahawa Pulau Pinang patut menjadi kawasan kawalan kastam Malaysia. Maka kami mengshaki pendirian Kerajaan akan mempertahankan taraf pelabohan bebas demi kepentingan ra'ayat Pulau Pinang. Y. B. Ketua Menteri mengatakan lagi "Lebeh daripada 1,300 kilang₂ di-dapati di-Pulau Pinang dan Seberang Perai. Ini menunjukkan Pulau Pinang ada-lah sa-buah negeri yang ulong dalam lapangan perusahaan." Tetapi dalam jumlah lebeh daripada 100 buah pioneer industries dalam Negeri kita, Pulau Pinang hanya dapat 4 buah sahaja. Hanya 5 buah kilang sahaja telah di-dirikan di-Mak Mardin dalam tempoh 5 tahun ini. Ada-kah ini boleh

di-katakan sa-buah negeri yang ulong dalam lapangan pembangunan perusahaan? Mengikut Y. A. B. Ketua Menteri — ada-kah perusahaan₂ Petaling Jaya dan Tasek telah ketinggalan dan tidak sating dengan kita? Ini ada-lah angka₂ Y. A. B. Ketua Menteri sahaja — angan₂ Y. A. B. Ketua Menteri sahaja. Dalam ucapan Y. A. B. Ketua Menteri dia sendiri mengaku tidak ada apa₂ ranchangan pembangunan perusahaan sama ada di-Pulau Pinang atau pun di-Seberang Perai selain dari ranchangan Mak Mandin yang gagal itu. Ini ternyata sekali Kerajaan tidak jujur atas ranchangan pembangunan perusahaan. Pada beberapa hari yang lalu, saudara Lim Kean Siew telah mengemukakan banyak chadangan₂ yang berguna untuk pembangunan perusahaan. Jika Kerajaan maseh berkepala batu dan bersikap pelok tuboh atas chadangan₂ parti pembangkang, maka sudah tentu Pulau Pinang akan menjadi sa-buah kampung nelayan.

Sudah 8 tahun membuktikan Kerajaan tidak ada sama sekali satu ranchangan yang sempurna untuk pembangunan ekonomi negeri ini dan mengatasi masa'alah penganggoran yang kian hebat ini. Hingga sa'at ini Kerajaan maseh ternanti₂ akan ketibaan rombongan pakar₂ dari luar negeri untuk mengkaji dan memberi pendapat₂ tentang pembangunan ekonomi negeri kita. Saya berasa terperanjat Kerajaan tidak terdaya menchari pakar₂ anak negeri kita untuk menjalankan tugas₂ tersebut. Di bawah pemerentahan Kerajaan Perikatan yang tolol dan tidak tahu bagaimana mengembangkan ekonomi negeri (interrupted)

Mr. Speaker: Saya suka hen-

dak menyatakan perkara "tolol" itu bukan-lah satu perkara yang di-gunakan dalam Parliamen atau Dewan Ra'ayat.

Member for Tanjong Selatan (Mr. Khor Peng Seah): Yang bodoh!

Mr. Speaker: Bodoh lebeh lagi-lah.

Member for Tanjong Selatan (Mr. Khor Peng Seah): Kehidupan ra'ayat memang sudah tentu semakin tahun semakin susah. Oleh yang demikian saya mengatangkan peranggaran hasil dan perbelanjaan tahun 1966 ini ada-lah omong kosong. Tahun 1966 ini bukan-lah satu tahun yang berm'ana tetapi ada-lah satu tahun yang sedeh dan sengsara. Sekian.

Member for Dhoby Ghaut (Enche M. S. A. Zachariah): Tuan Speaker, saya suka memberi sapatah dua kata mengenai Jabatan Bomba kita.

Jabatan Bomba kita sekarang ini ada-lah memberi khidmat kepada seluruh kawasan Seberang Perai. Dahulu chuma ada dua buah balai bomba sahaja, ia-itu di-Butterworth dan Bukit Mertajam. Tetapi sekarang ini ada 4 buah semua-nya. Balai2 bomba yang baharu di-adakan itu ia-lah di-Kepala Batas dan Nibong Tebal. Keadaan begini-lah yang sepatutnya kerana sa-makin hari sa-makin banyak kilang2 perusahaan di-dirikan di-kawasan Seberang Perai. Di-Seberang Perai, kemajuan pada umum-nya juga ada-lah pesat terutama sekali dalam kawasan Butterworth. Dengan sebab wujud-nya keadaan ini-lah maka Keputusan menaikkan taraf Pegawai Seteshan atas "Station Officer" Negeri telah mengambil

cer" itu menjadi Penguasa dan juga melantek empat orang pemandu atau dereba yang baru. Selain daripada itu Kerajaan Negeri juga telah mengambil keputusan hendak membeli "pick-up van" — harga-nya \$7,500. Van ini boleh-lah di-gunakan untuk berbagai2 maksud seperti menarek jentera pam, membawa alat2engkapan menchegeh kebakaran yang di-perlukan dengan segera ka-satu2 tempat yang tertentu dan juga untuk membawa paip2 penyembor ayer. Paip2 ini ada-lah berguna untuk memadam api yang membakar minyak dan tar.

Tuan Speaker, sa-belum saya mengakhiri ucapan saya ini saya suka merayu kapada sebahagian Ahli2 Pembangkang terutama sekali kapada Ahli baru — Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam yang tidak hadir di-sini — supaya mengikut peratoran Parliamen jika berbahath di-atas satu2 perkara dan hendak-lah berkelakuan baik kalau tidak akan menjadi seperti kata orang "Meludah ka-langit kena pada hidong sendiri." Dengan ini, saya menyokong peranggaran yang di-bawa oleh Y. A. B. Dato Ketua Menteri kita.

Member for Permatang Pauh (Enche Ariffin bin Shariff): Tuan Speaker, Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Selatan telah pun meramalkan berkenaan dengan perbelanjaan tahun ini. Tetapi kami pun juga telah meramalkan bahawa manakala Rang ini di-kemukakan maka akan datang-lah kritik2 daripada pehak Pembangkang. Ini juga ramalan kita.

Daripada mula Rang ini di-bahathkan kita telah jenoh mendergar daripada pehak di-sebelah sana mengemukakan pendapat dan kritik2 yang begitu panjang, terka-

dang2 kita berasa Dewan ini penuh dengan sharahan2 sa-orang ahli teori. Tetapi kalau-lah pehak sebelah sama mengatakan kami tadi bodoh kata-nya — kalau pun Tuan Speaker telah menegor — tetapi rasa saya dia telah menggunakan perkataan “bodoh” atau “tolol.” Kalau saya kata begitu juga kepada Pehak Pembangkang pun saya rasa kena-lah juga pada tempat-nya, kerana sebagaimana yang telah di-ulang berkali2 tidak lain ada-lah itu sahaja dari pelabohan bebas, penganggoran, pelanchongan, yang semua-nya telah pun di-jelaskan oleh pehak Kerajaan — oleh Ketua Menteri pada masa soalan2 di-kemukakan. Tetapi Walaubagaimana pun, orang2 ini tidak pernah mahu faham. Walaubagaimana pun ada-lah juga shor2 daripada Pehak Pembangkang itu berguna. Mithal-nya, berkata-lah sa-orang Ahli daripada pehak sana — chuba2-lah Ketua Menteri mengikuti Dato Bandar dalam perkara menggunakan wang. Wah! Kalau begitu agak-nya, Ketua Menteri akan di-naikkan gaji-nya daripada \$2,150 menjadi \$3,000 agak-nya. Kerana apa yang saya tahu bukan-lah kurang — tolong balek tanya Majlis Bandar Raya bagaimana kedudukan Dato Bandar sekarang makin tambah atau makin kurang. Saya rasa makin tambah kut. Jadi kalau hendak suroh Ketua Menteri mengikuti Bandar Raya, saya rasa Ketua Menteri setuju-lah hendak terima itu — bukan makin kurang makin bertambah.

Kemudian di-kecham-nya-lah pula berkenaan dengan gaji2 kaki-tangan rumah Ketua Menteri. Walaubagaimana pun, kalau Ahli Kawasan Jelutong, Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Selatan atau Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam jadi Ketua Menteri ta'kan-lah hendak goreng ikan sendiri. Ini saya rasa kalau kita

hendak menghormati sa-sa-orang yang di-beri taraf Menteri mithal-nya, tentu-lah juga sekadar dengan keadaan-nya. Kalau hari ini, kalau Dewan Persidang agak-nya datang-lah pula Ahli2 di-sebelah sana mengatakan Ketua Menteri tidak payah pakai derebar — bawa kereta sendiri. Jadi saya rasa kalau begini-lah keadaan kechaman2 yang datang boleh-lah saya katakan satu kechaman yang sa-rupa dengan dia tuduh kita tadi.

Berkenaan dengan penganggoran dan sebagai-nya, sampai2-lah hari Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Selatan mengatakan Kerajaan Negeri Pulau Pinang ini tidak mengambil tahu hal ehwal ra'ayat Negeri ini biar hendak mati atau hendak hidup. Ini saya rasa tuduhan ini telah keterlaluan. Jadi pada keseluruhan-nya gambaran yang di-beri oleh Pehak Pembangkang ialah bahawa pehak Kerajaan tidak membuat sa-suatu apa pun untuk kebaikan ra'ayat dan penduduk2 Pulau Pinang ini. Tetapi apa-kah pula yang di-buat oleh Pehak Pembangkang? Hanya mendatangkan kechaman2 sahaja. Jika dengan kechaman2 sahaja, saya rasa, ra'ayat tidak akan mendapat apa2 pun.

Di-dalam banyak2 kechaman itu, hanya yang saya dapati bagus sedikit ia-lah shor daripada Ahli Kawasan Jelutong berkenaan dengan pelanchongan. Itu saya rasa ada-lah juga istimewa sedikit. Yang lain2 hanya-lah kechaman yang tidak membawa arti apa2. Berkenaan dengan mengatakan Kerajaan Negeri tidak membuat apa2 saya merasa barangkali Ahli2 ini tidor siang — tidak tahu-lah, kerana saya rasa banyak perkara2 yang patut dia melihat dan mendengar — tidak pernah

di-lihati dan di-dengari barangkali. Termasok-lah kata-nya ranchangan Mak Mandin yang gagal itu. Barangkali oleh kerana sekarang titi di-Prai itu telah ada dia ta'pernah lagi-lah kalau pergi ka-Tanjong Piandang melalui Kawasan Mak Mandin — jadi main terus sahaja — sedap naik jambatan Pembangunan Luar Bandar Kerajaan Perikatan — jadi bila lalu jalan itu tidak pernah kerling2 ka-kawasan Mak Mandin. Saya rasa lepas meshuarat ini elok-lah buang2 masa sedikit pergi tengok ada-kah atau tidak ranchangan itu berjalan atau pun gagal.

Maka berkata-lah lagi Ahli Kawasan Jelutong bahawa Kerajaan Negeri ini tidak mempunyai kekuatan dalam menghadapi Kerajaan Persekutuan. Lemah atau kuat menghadapi Kerajaan Perikatan yang sechara mana saya tidak mengerti. Tetapi yang berat sekali ia mengatakan ia-lah berkenaan dengan peruntukan wang daripada Kerajaan Persekutuan mengikut hetong penduduk2. Kerana, kata-nya, tahun dahulu pun sebanyak itu juga, tahun ini pun sebanyak itu juga. Kalau sekali2 di-pandang orang2 ini bijak2 orang-nya. Tetapi kalau di-fikirkan sekali lalu sebak-nya pula. Hetongan ra'ayat saperti mana yang di-kehendaki oleh Ahli Kawasan Jelutong itu. Kerajaan Persekutuan tidak tahu berapa banyak ra'ayat Negeri ini telah bertambah hanya-lah mengikut teori. Mengikut pendapat Kerajaan, kalau Kerajaan kata 45,000 dia kata 45,000 — ini main agak2, tidak akan di-bayar oleh Kerajaan Pusat. Kerajaan Pusat membayar ia-lah di-atas perhetongan rasmi. Perhetongan rasmi, saya rasa kalau tidak silap di-adakan banchi kalau tudohan2 yang saperti ini

di-datangkan kapada Kerajaan Negeri ini. Kebanyakan tudohan2 yang di-datangkan hari ini adalah juga yang setengah2 itu tidak ada kena mengena dengan Kerajaan Negeri ini ia-itu ia-lah berkenaan dengan Kerajaan Pusat sa-mata. Tetapi walau macham-mana pun, di-bangkit2kan juga perkara itu — saperti sejok di-rumah rehat Bukit Mertajam mithal-nya — saya rasa ini bukanlah satu perbelanjaan yang membazir. Peti sejok itu di-gunakan untok Rumah Rehat — Rumah Rehat itu di-sewakan dan ada pendapatan-nya. Dan kalau peti sejok yang lama itu di-biarkan dan orang yang bekerja di-situ terkena current dan mati susah pula.

Semalan kalau tidak silap dalam ucapan Ahli Kawasan Jelutong di-bayangkan bahawa Kerajaan Negeri ini harus-lah tidak mewakili keseluruhan dan tidak bekerja untok keseluruhan ra-ayat. Tetapi apa yang kita dengari beberapa hari ini Pehak Pembangunan juga harus berchakap tidak pernah mewakili seluroh Negeri Pulau Pinang ini. Hanya apa yang kita dengari ia-lah membela di-pehak Bandar Raya sahaja — wakil2 ini tidak pernah menyentuh hal2 yang bersangkutan dengan kawasan Seberang Perai mithal-nya. Tetapi Ahli2 yang bangun hanya berchakap demi kebajikan penduduk2 Bandar Raya — tidak pernah menyentuh walau pun sa-detik penduduk2 yang tinggal di-kawasan luar bandar.

Kalau berchakap berkenaan dengan perkara Pelabohan Bebas pun saya rasa ada di-antara ahli2 ini faham dan saya rasa semua-nya faham bahawa Ahli yang bijak tidak harus tidak faham bahawa sebelum perang dahulu kawasan

Negeri Pulau Pinang ini seluroh-nya ada-lah Pelabohan Bebas, tetapi entah mengapa pada hari ini bila kedudokan itu berlainan sa-lepas Inggeris datang ka-mari, dan bila perkara Pelabohan Bebas ini timbul maka Pehak Pembangkang tidak pernah peduli atau tidak pernah memperkatakan walau pun sa-detik dan juga berkenaan dengan kawasan Seberang dan harus ba-rangkali Ahli2 itu datang daripada Pulau Pinang semua-nya. Seberang Perai juga ada-lah satu daripada wilayah Negeri ini. Lagi satu yang menghairankan kita — Pehak Pem-bangkang selalu mengingatkan kita supaya membelanjakan wang den-gan sebegitu sedikit — jimat cher-mat kata-nya. Tetapi dia juga menghentem dengan begitu kuat jika projek2 yang berharga berju-ta2 ringgit tidak di-laksanakan. Jadi ini ada-lah satu perkara yang saya fikir bukan mengisikan kita tetapi menyusahkan dia sendiri. Chuba tolong fikir, kalau hendak di-gunakan wang yang sedikit, te-tapi kalau satu ranchangan yang lambat sedikit perjalanan-nya, ma-ka Kerajaan akan di-hentam den-gan habis-habisan. Maka bagaima-na-kah hendak di-buat dengan wang yang sedikit dengan projek2 yang sebegitu banyak.

Dan lagi, akhir-nya saya suka-lah mengingatkan kembali bagaima-na saperti kata Ahli Kawasan Jelutong — biasa dia berucap dahulu — mengatakan Ketua Men-teri selalu mengatakan bahawa tiap2 peranggaran perbelanjaan Ne-geri ini berpandukan “ukor baju di-badan sendiri.” Kesimpulan-nya mahu atau tidak mahu biar-lah tuan2 apa yang hendak katakan, tetapi kepada kami ini-lah satu anggaran perbelanjaan yang paling baik yang saya perchaya tuan2 sendiri pun mengaku mengatakan baik. Tetapi apa boleh buat kerana sudah menjadi Pembangkang mes-

ti-lah menunjokkan kepada ra'ayat bahawa kami ini pandai membang-kang. Tetapi pada saya rang per-belanjaan ini ada-lah rang perbe-lanjaan yang di-buat mengikut “ukor baju di-badan sendiri.” Te-rima kaseh.

Member for Glugor (Enche Aziz Ibrahim): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun hendak memberi ucapan sedikit atas Anggaran Perbelanjaan tahun 1966 yang di-bawa oleh Y. A. B. Ketua Men-teri yang mana banyak perbelan-jaan ia-itu berkenaan dengan ka-kitangan2 Kerajaan. Ada Jabatan2 yang Kerajaan kena tambah ia-lah kerana beberapa sebab. Jadi dalam ucapan Ketua Menteri be-liau telah memberi alasan2-nya Di-sini saya boleh kata lebeh kurang, walau pun negeri ini kechil, keadaan pendudok2 di-da-lam negeri, perjalanan pentadbi-ran — jika di-bandingkan dengan negeri2 lain di-Malaysia, Pulau Pinang ini walaupun kechil, tetapi ada-lah menjadi keagongan kapada negara Malaysia. Negeri Pulau Pinang ini bukan sahaja terkenal di-Malaysia sahaja, bukan di-se-belah timor ini sahaja, tetapi di-seluroh dunia. Seluroh dunia tahu di-mana Negeri Pulau Pinang, apa kemashhoran-nya, siapa yang ada di-Pulau Pinang, Kerajaan yang macham mana yang ada berjalan di-Pulau Pinang — saya boleh kata seluroh dunia tahu — bukan kata di-Malaysia sahaja.

Tuan Speaker, kalau di-bandin-gkan dengan kemajuan2 yang te-lah di-chapai dan yang sedang di-chapai, peranggaran perbelan-jaan ini ada-lah sangat sedikit. Saya nampak sendiri, perbelanjaan yang di-bentangkan oleh Y. A. B. Ketua Menteri ini sangat sedikit — satu masa kita kena lebehkan kakitangan — tetapi kita kena-lah berbelanja mengikut keadaan wang

ringgit dalam negeri, jadi buat sementara elok-lah kita memakai perbelanjaan sapertimana yang boleh. Tuan Speaker, perbelanjaan ini telah bertambah di-tempat2 yang patut sahaja. Ada dua tiga orang ahli2, termasuk Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam mengatakan beliau tidak puas hati, marah bermacam2.

Di-sini saya suka menyebutkan jabatan di-mana kita patut tambah perbelanjaan ia-itu Jabatan Pertanian dan Jabatan Parit dan Taliayer Negeri Pulau Pinang. Dalam Peranggaran Perbelanjaan tahun 1966, kalau kita semak balek, kita ada State Agricultural Officer (Pegawai Pertanian Negeri) sa-orang kakitangan Kerajaan yang bertanggung jawab atas pertanian. Di-bawah-nya tidak ada penolong atau assistant saperti di-lain2 tempat ada berbagai2 kakitangan.

Kita ada Junior Agricultural Assistants, tetapi tidak berapa menchukupi bagi Negeri Pulau Pinang yang menanam padi sa-luas 40,000 lebeh yang mana pada hari ini kita boleh tanam padi — dengan kakitangan ini — dua kali sa-tahun lebeh kurang 32,000 ekar lebeh. Nanti satu hari Negeri Pulau Pinang yang boleh tanah padi ia-lah 42,000 ekar — boleh tanam dua kali. Jabatan Pertanian ini chuba menchari jalan supaya jika-lau boleh kita tanam pada tiga kali sa-tahun dan juga boleh berchuchok tanam pokok buah-buahan. Jadi kalau begitu Tuan Speaker, kita mesti-lah ada Jabatan Parit dan Taliayer yang sempurna yang boleh menjalankan tugas2 yang mana boleh memberi faedah kapada Jabatan Pertanian — Jabatan Parit dan Taliayer pula mesti menjaga kawasan2 ini berkenaan dengan memasukkan ayer dan membuang ayer, supaya ka-

wasan itu boleh di-jadikan kawasan yang boleh di-tanam dua kali sa-tahun sampai habis segala kawasan yang ada itu — supaya dapat di-tanam dua kali sa-tahun — ini-lah tujuan Kerajaan. Dan boleh jadi dengan chara bagaimana kita boleh tanam pula tiga kali sa-tahun.

Jadi, Tuan Speaker, kakitangan yang lebeh kita letak dalam Peranggaran — dalam Jabatan Pertanian — supaya kita hendak ada satu penolong lagi State Agricultural Officer yang ada pada masa sekarang dan juga empat lima orang lagi J. A. As ia-itu Pembantu Pertanian Muda dan tugas2 diberi dan di-tempatkan mereka di-tempat2 yang kawasan2 padi luas supaya senang bagi orang2 kampung berjumpa dengan mereka jika mereka mahu pertolongan daripada Pembantu2 Pertanian Muda. J. A. As ini akan bertanggung jawab di-atas mukim/daerah di-mana mereka di-tempatkan — seluruh Negeri Pulau Pinang ini di-bahagi2kan supaya orang2 dalam kampung2 berhubung dengan J. A. As ini dalam Jabatan Pertanian dengan chepat dan segera. Ini tuan2 boleh lihat dalam Peranggaran bagi tahun 1966 — di-bawah Pertanian.

Berkenaan dengan Jabatan Parit dan Taliayer di-sini di-adakan satu jawatan baharu ia-itu jawatan Penjaga Jentera Grade II, yang mana kita minta di-luluskan. Sunggoh pun di-bawah Kepala 4 dalam Anggaran Perbelanjaan ditunjukkan 5 jawatan tambahan lagi, jawatan2 yang lain itu sekarang ini semua-nya di-bayar daripada peruntokan wang dalam Anggaran Pembangunan belaka. Akan tetapi jawatan2 itu di-masokkan dalam Peranggaran Biasa kerana Kerajaan Pusat bertanggung jawab mengenai soal2 pen-

sion, ganjaran dan sebagai-nya jadi Kerajaan Pusat telah meminta supaya jawatan2 yang diperlukan untuk melaksanakan rancangan2 pembangunan yang tempoh-nya lebeh daripada 3 tahun di-tunjokkan di-bawah peruntokan wang gaji di-dalam Peranggarar Biasa.

Jawatan Penjaga Jentera itu diadakan untuk menjaga di-atas station2 pam taliayer. Luas kawasan yang mendapat faedah taliayer — saya suka hendak menyebutkan kepada tuan2 Yang Berhormat — luas kawasan ini ia-lah 35,000 ekar. Sekarang Kerajaan sedang menchari supaya kawasan ini cukup menjadi 40,000 ekar. Jadi perkara ini 35,000 ekar telah mendapat faedah di-bawah ranchangan parit dan taliayer Kerajaan Negeri Pulau Pinang. 21,500 ekar daripada-nya ada-lah di-beri ayer melalui station2 pam. Di-dalam tahun 1966 kawasan yang mendapat ayer melalui station2 pam ini dan juga seluroh kawasan yang mendapat faedah taliayer di-jangka akan bertambah luas lagi. Jadi sa-orang Penjaga Jentera ada-lah sangat perlu dan ada-lah di-masokkan di-dalam Peranggaran Perbelanjaan.

Tuan Speaker, di-sini saya suka menambah sedikit kepada ucapan Y. A. B. Ketua Menteri mengenai harga menyelenggarakan kawasan2 taliayer. Harga untuk menjaga taliayer2 ini sangat-lah banyak perbelanjaan-nya dan kita kena menjaga kawasan2 ini. Jumlah-nya ia-itu kawasan2 taliayer kedua2-nya sekali baik yang berhukai atau yang tidak berhukai — yang tidak berhukai jumlah harga-nya dalam tahun 1965 ia-lah \$717,250 akan tetapi pada tahun 1966 angka itu akan bertambah menjadi \$771,610. Jadi chukai taliayer ia-lah chuma \$103,-

400 sahaja. Ini jika di-bandingkan dengan angka mengenai harga-nya yang saya sebutkan tadi harus $\frac{1}{2}$ sahaja. Jadi berarti-lah bahawa kerajaan memberi bantuan yang banyak lebeh2 lagi berke-naan dengan perkara taliayer. Akan tetapi dalam pada itu pula, kawasan yang boleh di-tanam dua jenis tanaman sa-tahun telah bertambah luas, kedua kawasan ini chuma boleh di-tanam sa-jenis tanaman sahaja. Sebak-nya pula dalam soal mengadakan parit2 dan taliayer, peranggaran-nya dengan chukai yang di-perolehi ada-lah lebeh kurang sama banyak.

Kerajaan Negeri yang di-pegang oleh Parti Perikatan telah pun menjalankan banyak kerja2 yang berfaedah untuk menambahkan lagi kema'amoran kaum peladang dari segi ekonomi. Kita bertujuan hendak bekerja lebeh kuar lagi supaya kema'amoran akan terus kekal di-kawasan2 luar bandar. Telah pun di-tegaskan oleh Y. A. B. Ketua Menteri dalam ucapan beliau ia-itu Anggaran yang telah di-sediakan oleh Kerajaan Negeri ada-lah dengan tujuan hendak mencapai matalamat itu patut-lah mendapat sokongan penoh dari Dewan ini.

Jadi, Tuan Speaker, di-dalam ucapan2 yang di-sebutkan oleh Ahli2 Pembangkang, saya sangat tidak puas hati mendengar — ada Ahli Pehak Pembangkang yang berchakap ia-itu samenjak Parti Perikatan memegang teraju Kerajaan — kalau kata semenjak itu, saya patah balek-lah — dah memang Ahli2 Opposition, saya tidak hairan — patut-lah dia pun membangkang apa2 kerja yang patut di-jalankan — tetapi sebagai parti yang pembangkang dia kena sebut-lah begitu. Jadi samenjak Parti Perikatan memegang tanggung jawab daripada tahun 1955 — tahun

1955 walau pun ada Kerajaan British — sampai tahun 1957 Parti Perikatan ada Ahli2 banyak, suara lebeh — semua kuasa2-nya Parti Perikatan yang menjalankan walau pun ada ketua2 Kerajaan British di-sini. Jadi dalam Anggaran Perbelanjaan tahun 1955, '56, '57, walau pun wakil2 Kerajaan British Anggaran Perbelanjaan telah dibentangkan di-situ — saya boleh kata, ahli2 yang ada dalam Dewan pada masa itu — tidak ada-lah Ahli2 yang menyebutkan Peranggaran Perbelanjaan ini bohong, tidak betul, unrealistic, tidak ada, kerana Ahli2 itu ada yang biasa menjadi Ahli2 Dewan Negeri tahun 1955, 1956 dan 1957 ada juga dalam Dewan kita sekarang — jadi dalam itu kalau semak boleh di-situ kita boleh dapat semua ucha-pan2 dalam meshuarat itu. Tetapi bila sampai tahun 1957, bila kita sudah Merdeka, ada yang tidak puas hati pula — dari tahun 1957, 1958 dan 1959 hingga sampai pilihan raya — saya ingat lagi, banyak yang chuba hendak menghanchor-kan parti yang memegang teraju Kerajaan. Bermachan2 soal Anggaran Perbelanjaan di-bangkang oleh Ahli2 Pembangkang, ada kata-nya Anggaran Perbelanjaan ini di-korek lubang dan di-tanam, yang ini pun ada. Jadi tahun 1959, walau pun begitu ra'ayat Negeri Pulau Pinang chukup faham dan Parti Perikatan yang mendapat tudohan2 begitu datang balek ka-dalam Dewan Negeri. Tahun 1959, tuan2 tahu, Parti Perikatan memegang teraju Kerajaan. Pada tahun 1960, '61, '62, '63 dan datang pula tahun 1964, Anggaran Perbelanjaan tiap2 tahun pun begitu juga di-marah oleh Parti2 Pembangkang dan yang habis terok sekali pada tahun 1964 punya Anggaran, bukan main hebat lagi meshuarat pada kali itu. Tetapi inshallah, pada tahun 1964 orang ramai semak balek semua

cherita2 Parti Perikatan dan telah memberikan tugas balek kepada Parti Perikatan memegang jawatan pada tahun 1964. Jadi tahun 1969 akan datang pula. Tahun 1964 sudah habis, tahun 1965 sekarang dan tahun 1966 tahun depan — saya tidak bimbang. Tetapi saya akan bimbang lebeh2 lagi tahun 1968 ia-itu kita kena jaga balek macham mana kita tahun 1963—1964 dahulu. Jadi kalau begitu tuan2 Yang Berhormat bukan tahun 1966 ini sahaja, satu masa nanti tahun 1969 akan sampai.

Parti lain — parti di-hadapan kita — mengatakan semanjak Kerajaan Perikatan memegang teraju Kerajaan Negeri sejak 8 tahun yang lalu, chuma ada satu projek sahaja yang di-jalankan. Projek yang mereka nampak itu ia-lah di-Mak Mandin sahaja, yang lain2 tidak ada langsung sejak 8 tahun ini. Jadi yang ini pun satu perkara yang menghairankan kita kerana boleh-kah Kerajaan menang pilihan raya - mendapat tugas daripada ra'ayat kalau projek2 ini tidak di-luluskan yang mana perjanjian wakil2 ra'ayat kepada orang ramai itu tidak di-jalankan. Kalau begitu tetap ini hari Parti Perikatan — Parti Kerajaa — tidak boleh ada di-dalam Dewan ini.

Banyak projek2 — kita semak dari satu masa ka-satu masa, dari satu kawasan ka-satu kawasan — berpuloh2 projek yang telah di-siapkan, yang sedang di-naikkan dan yang akan di-jalankan oleh Kerajaan Perikatan ini. Jadi banyak senarai2-nya, kalau saya hendak cheritakan satu lepas satu tentu akan memakan masa satu dua jam.

Jadi Tuan2 Yang Berhormat, berkenaan dengan kata Yang Berhormat Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam —

beliau kata, "There is no planning at all." Dia keriau, dua hari sudah, "What is your plan?" "There is no planning behind you" dia kata. Di-sini saya hendak bagi tahu kepada Y. B. Ahli Kawasan. Ayer Itam — dia banyak chakap fasal tourism — jadi di-sini saya hendak bagi tahu, kalau tidak ada planning, kalau negeri ini tidak ada planning, kalau Kerajaan tidak ada planning — saya hendak tanya, dengan tidak ada planning boleh-kah Negeri Pulau Pinang — dengan tidak ada planning — mashhor dalam soal tourism diseluruh dunia? Pelanchong2 dari negeri2 lain telah singgah di-Pulau Pinang — sa-telah mendapat keterangan sedikit sebanyak di tempat2 lain mengenai Pulau Pinang — mereka tolah sampai di-sini. Kalau sampai begini orang boleh tahu kita punya penerangan, jadi kalau tidak ada planning, kalau tidak ada publisiti, kalau tidak ada liaison, kalau tidak ada perhubungan luar daripada Pulau ini, tetapi orang2 itu tidak boleh tahu Pulau Pinang ini. Jadi, Tuan Speaker, kita ada planning, sebab ada planning-lah kita boleh ada extension of Aripport. Sebab ada planning-lah kita boleh ada kita punya wharves — kita hendak bagi elok negeri kita ini. Sebab ada planning-lah kita ada first class ferry service, sebab kita ada planning-lah bangunan2 di-naikkan, sebab ada planning kita hendak preserve historical buildings, sebab ada planning-lah kita adakan tempat2 seperti Dewan ini, ini ada-lah "preservation of a historical building" Sebab ada planning for the future kalau tidak tentu sekali ini semua sudah runtoh. Historical buildings seperti Fort Cornwallis, King Edward the 7th Place, Clock Tower, City Council punya building, ini semua historical buildings — macham

mana Hutching School, Free School building, Museum and Arts Gallery ini tempat kita hendak preserve, hendak taroh — supaya orang2 boleh tengok history yang ada di-belakang-nya.

Juga, kalau tidak ada planning, kita tidak boleh adakan pilot track di-Penang Hill, na'adakan jalan naik Penang Hill. Mesti ada planning baru boleh di-jalankan ini semua. Kalau tidak ada planning tidak boleh naik langsung. Boleh jadi lepas itu adakan jeep track, lepas itu kita adakan jalan yang elok — kalau tidak ada planning mana boleh.

Ada lagi lain2 tempat, seperti beaches (tepi2 laut) di-mana kita boleh tengok scenery yang habis chantek. Kalau tidak ada planning, mesti berpuloh2 hotel, night-clubs di-dirikan "on the whole stretch." Fasal kita ada planning-lah kita ada preservation of beaches .. kita ada Committee dulu. Kita tidak mahu macham Waikiki Beach Honolulu, Long Beach California, Miami Beach di-Florida, kalau mahu macham itu punya beaches, tight through the beaches semua hotel. Tidak ada privacy, na'mandi pun ta'boleh, na'buat apa pun ta'boleh. Tetapi Penang Island, ramai orang datang daripada Amerika, United States, Australia, New Zealand — mereka datang tengok beach kita — ada antara mereka yang berkata "This is the thing that you must keep for Penang Island" "Keep your beach beautiful." "Keep your sea like this." "Keep your hills like this." "Don't put up buildings along the sea-side like what we see along Waikiki Beach, like what we see in Long Beach California, like what we see in Miami Beach in Florida. Keep it like this you all are

very clever. This is what we want to see." This is planning, if there is no planning, tentu naik night-clubs, atap huts — bagi kotor ini beach. Because there is a plan ning, kita simpan the beauty of the beach like this.

Berkenaan dengan kita punya "other centres of attraction," kita ada Penang Tourist Association, Kerajaan hendak ambil bahagian dalam Tourist Association, Kerajaan beri sedikit Peranggaran dalam Development Estimate. Kita boleh tengok estimate ini. Bantu kapada Tourist Association, lain2 Council pun ada. Jadi melalui Tourist Association, ini beribu2 di-belanjakan untuk publisiti, buat booklet, leaflet buat bermacam, bagi satu dunia tahu. Adakan connection with the Shipping Companies throughout the world. Walau Kerajaan Negeri tidak ada connection, dia ada connection melalui Tourist Association didalam Pulau Pinang. Jadi melalui Association kita boleh dapat connection dengan negeri2 luar. Walau pun kita tidak ada Department of Tourism, kita tidak ada Tourism Development Officer, tetapi kita ada melalui this Association banyak dia punya suggestion, reports scheme — bagi tahu kapada State and Federal Government supaya bersama2 champor tangan. Jadi sampai ini hari, saya boleh kata, dalam perkara tourism (pelanchongan) kita dapat nama, yang mana World Tourism, World visits of Big Ships, Big connections, Airways — ada masuk Penang dalam satu itinerary. Penang sebagai Port-of-Call. Jadi ini semua di-sebabkan ada planning. Itu-lah sebab-nya kita boleh dapat connection ini. Sebagai kata Y. B. Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Selatan, Pulau Pinang boleh jadi fishing village — I'll bet with him

that it will never be a fishing village — I'll bet with him any amount. I'll bet with him, it will never be a fishing village. It will never be (interrupted)

Mr. Speaker: Betting is not allowed in this Assembly.

Member for Glugor (Enche Aziz Ibrahim): Sorry. Jadi yang inilah tuan2 berkenaan dengan tourism yang saya kata tadi yang Ahli Parti lain yang kata begitu begini, yang mana kalau tidak ada planning — planning its road improvements — yang ini pun satu tourism development juga — road widening, road building, road construction, bridge building — yang ini pun planning juga, yang ini pun tourism. Widening of the road around Penang Island — Jalan Keliling Pulau Pinang — supaya bagi elok lagi Jalan itu. It is for the purpose of tourist attraction. Jadi yang mana ranchangan2 yang sedang di-jalankan semua-nya planning by the State for tourist attraction.

Dah lepas, kita minta banyak private building, private historical areas, yang mana Government has no direct control — Government will give advice — Government boleh bagi nasihat — macham mana Kek Lok Si Temple — Government tidak ada direct connection, tetapi ada connection melalui Tourist Association — Kerajaan bagi advice. Macham mana the leaning Buddha — that one is a tourist attraction. It is the third biggest in the whole of Asia. Yang ini, Kerajaan through the Tourist Association beri nasihat (advice) keep all these places of interest. Make this building clean, keep the Kapitan Kling Mosque beautiful, yang ini advice,

through the Tourist Association and through other bodies. Jadi, dapat tempat2 ini semua di-serve.

Kita punya connection berke-
naan dengan chadangan2 Univer-
siti or University College for
Penang untok hari hadapan. Fasal
apa? It is what we call planning.
Kalau tidak ada planning tidak
boleh jadi. Yang ini nanti boleh
jadi tourist attraction centre. Le-
pas itu kita hendak adakan kita
punya aquarium, fish centre, hen-
dak lebehkan ini semua — yang
ini planning. Kalau tidak ada
plannini yang ini tidak boleh naik.
Di-Glugor, the Fish Research Cen-
tre sudah naik — foundation is
half-way now. Yang ini satu tou-
rist attraction nanti. Ini kita bo-
leh compete dengan Singapura,
boleh jadi ini lebeh bagus.

The State Museum and Art
Gallery — we do not want to
build like London Art Gallery,
we do not want to build like
Singapore Art Gallery or like in
any part of the world, like Ams-
terdam or Paris Art Gallery, we
cannot compete — kita tidak bo-
leh compete. Tetapi though it is
small (kecil), the State Museum
and Art Gallery — the interest
inside the Museum and Art Gal-
lery — Tuan Speaker dan tuan2
Yang Berhormat boleh pergi ten-
gok — what is the interest there.
Walau pun kecil, tetapi banyak
orang kata, the interest the his-
tory, the story behind the small
building is very great to all of
us. Kita dapat ini comment from
tourists. Kita dapat ini comment
from visitors. We do not want a
big building, we do not want to
see big pictures, we do not want
to see big big things, no, — yang
ini tourists sendiri yang kata —
what we want to see is these
small things — what is the story

behind this Island. Jadi yang ini
semua — there is a very interest-
ing subject in that little museum
— boleh jadi estension later on.
But for the time being, we have
everything in a small way. Penang
has been noted as we have every-
thing in a small way as regard
tourism.

Now, one more thing, may be
Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam may
think of tourism in another way.
I also agree, tourism may be
night-clubs, dances at night, city
never sleeps, gambling, strip tease
— that is another form of tou-
rism. I agree, that is another part
of tourism. I agree too we can
have that too but we must choose.
From another city to another city,
we go to that city because we
want to see night life, which we
do not see here, like Macau in
Hongkong. What do they have in
Hongkong? Is it more beautiful
than Penang? No never — it is not
more beautiful than Penang. But
when we go to Hongkong, we go
to Kowloon — first class night
life, we go to Makau better still,
and so on. So, there are two
things behind it. In fact, what we
should see in Hawaii we have got
it here, what we want to see in
Waikiki, Honolulu, we have got
better things here. Why? Because
they have commercialised the
whole Island — the whole Waikiki
Beach, Hawaii and so on — spoil
the name up to now, up to the
present moment because hotels —
because hotels are built in such a
way, because night-clubs are put
up in such a way — orang makan
dengan ta'tentu hala, hingar sana
sini, depa kata — “there is no
attraction” — “so you don't do
that here.” “Keep your Island as
it is.” So to me, tourism up to
now, tourism as it is in this part
of world, Penang can be proud
of what it is doing. Jadi chukup-

lah takat ini. Tapi kalau mahu lebeh2 lagi, kalau mahu Penang as a playground of Malaysia, kalau mahu Penang as a 'de-Tourism' centre of Malaysia, yang itu kalau boleh buat lain macham sedikit. Boleh minta bantuan daripada lain2 tempat — buat ramai — malam jadi siang, siang jadi malam — the City never sleeps like Newyork City. Yang itu, tetapi yang itu lain macham. I do not know what will happen to the beautiful beach, what is going to happen to the hill, apa2 lain scenery, semua saya tidak tahu-lah — the city never sleeps, like New York, London, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Paris — if you want that, we can do it. But that is a different kind of tourist attraction.

Now, another thing, Tuan Speaker, berkenaan dengan Industrial Estate, banyak Ahli2 Parti Lain yang tidak puas hati dengan perkara Industrial Estate. Jadi di-sini saya suka hendak bagi tahun, bukan kerana Industrial Estate di-Mak Mandin yang orang2 Pulau Pinang baru survive, bukan Mak Mandin punya fasal sahaja, industries, factories boleh survive. Kita dalam Negeri Pulau Pinang, sebelum Mak Mandin ini jadi industrial area, beratus2 industry ada, beratus2 factory ada. Mak Mandin is one more added to what we have — tambah kapada lain2 factory yang kita ada. Jadi bukan kerana sebab Mak Mandin, jadi betul kalau kita kata perkara factory2 hendak mai, na'buka, yang ini tempat sudah ada — tetapi ini bukan Government punya factory, bukan Government punya duit, tetapi Government bagi amenities, facilities, tetapi kalau factory hendak naik, ini mengikut capital (duit). Banyak mana duit yang mereka ada. Ini bersangkutan dengan orang2 yang hendak diri-

kan factory itu sendiri. Tetapi Kerajaan memans sudah sedia bila2 masa mahu 24 jam, 48 jam, sa-minggu, 2 minggu, sa-bulan bila2 masa pun boleh jalan — tetapi orang2 yang hendak datang itu berapa banya dia punya capital yang di-perlukan — itu Kerajaan ta'tahu, tetapi kalau tempat2 itu bila masa boleh naikkan factory — ada dia punya facilities — roads, electricity, water supply semua ada. Bukan kita kata yang Government hendak sekat. Apa2 dia hendak buat kita sokong — kata kita kachau orang2 itu, tidak. Jadi facilities semua terbuka kapada dia tetapi dia ada kesanggupan atau tidak dia punya fasal — the owner punya fasal. Inside story dia kita tidak boleh tahu — dia punya fasal dia punya capital. Lain2 factory kita ada banyak — lain2 daripada Mak Mandin ini semua doing well — kalau mahu di-dalam Penang Island saya boleh bagi list, banyak factory — mana barang2 masuk keluar all sold — mana barang2 ada dia punya ready market. Apa yang hendak beli boleh order daripada dia daripada Pulau Pinang atau daripada Island punya factory — ada siap. Jadi (interrupted)

Mr. Speaker: Saya hendak bagi tahu kapada Ahli2 Yang Berhormat, kerana di-depan kita ini ada Seteno yang berbahasa Melayu dan ada Seteno yang berbahasa Inggeris, kalau berchampur kedua2 bahasa, macham mana mereka itu hendak buat.

Member for Glugor (Enche Aziz Ibrahim): Baik-lah. Jadi Tuan Yang di-Pertua dan tuan2 sekalian, berkenaan dengan Ahli2 Parti Lain marah sangat kapada Ahli2 Ex. Co. Anggaran Perbelanjaan ada di-tulis perbelanjaan-nya, beribu2 ringgit ada di-tulis. Saya

hendak bagi keterangan sedikit, saya harap Y. A. B. Ketua Menteri akan memberi keterangan yang lebeh lagi. Tetapi perkara2 ini kalau hendak kata meshuarat Ahli2 Ex. Co. (Ahli2 Kerajaan) satu minggu sekali — kerja apa dia buat — dia tidak buat apa pun — apa guna ini duit kapada dia atau bagi bantu kapada dia? Tetapi saya suka hendak bagi tahu kapada Ahli2 kita yang di-hadapan berkenaan dengan kerja2 Ahli2 Ex. Co. — kerja ini boleh di-katakan full-time. Saya boleh kata-lah dengan terus terang, hari2 ada kerja. Boleh jadi full-time ..
..... (interrupted)

Mr. Speaker: "Full-time" — itu Bahasa Inggeris lagi itu.

Member for Glugor (Enche Aziz Ibrahim): Jadi kerja dalam Kerajaan nampak-nya tanggung jawab itu hari2 kena buat kerja, kena perga ka-pejabat. Tiap2 ahli ada dia punya tanggung jawab. Saya bertanggung jawab berkenaan dengan Pertanian, Perikatan, Pejabat Parit dan Taliayer dan berkenaan dengan Pelanchongan yang mana ada Jawatan2-kuasa. Jadi saya punya Jawatan-kuasa dalam Kerajaan ini banyak, jadi hari2 saya ada kerja. Meshuarat Majlis Meshuarat Kerajaan Negeri (Ex. Co.) itu tiap2 minggu. Selain daripada itu, kena jalan kerja dia dalam Jawatan-kuasa dalam banyak perkara. Jadi na'kata satu minggu sekali sahaja tidak begitu.

Jadi dalam kerja2 ini saya kata lagi sekali ia-itu kerja2 Government — Ahli2 semua di-pileh oleh orang ramai — mereka mahu Ahli2 ini pergi ka-tempat2 mereka, melawat2 ka-tempat2 mereka, kawasan2 mereka — sebagai kakitangan yang di-pileh oleh orang ramai. Jadi mesti ada dalam of-

fice, Government office pun ada, di-luar pun ada tempat2 yang kena pergi hari2.

Berkenaan dengan lagi satu soalan daripada Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam — dia tidak ada di-sini — yang bertanya berkenaan dengan Jalan Aziz Ibrahim, yang ini saya hendak bagi tahu kapada Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam, kerana dia salah faham — jadi Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Selatan dan Ahli Kawasan Jelutong boleh bagi dia tahu — Jalan yang di-buat itu di-Sungei Nibong — Ahli Kawasan Jelutong pun dudok di-Sungei Nibong — depan Jalan itu ada satu Pulau, Pulau Jerejak — jadi bukan-lah sebab satu orang harta dia ada di-depan, di-sebelah, Kerajaan hendak buat jalan — bukan tujuan-nya begitu — tidak sekali2. Kalau begitu lebeh baik tutup jalan itu, saya chadangkan semua jalan2 itu di-tutup. Kerana sa-belah itu ada orang punya tanah, kalau begitu ta'usah-lah buat jalan, buat apa pun ta'usah. Kita jangan buka jalan itu — tutup. Kalau macham itu macham mana Kerajaan hendak jalan. Tetapi kalau ada ranchangan Kerajaan di-situ, siapa punya tanah pun Kerajaan akan ambil tanah dia kena acquire jikalau berfaedah kapada orang ramai. Jadi, di-Pulau Jerejak ada empat ratus lima ratus orang — itu saya punya kawasan. Kakitangan2 Kerajaan pun ada, jadi champor semua ada lebeh kurang tujuh ratus lapan ratus orang pada masa sekarang — boleh jadi lebeh. Jadi semua benda2, barang2 yang hendak dibawa balek ka-Pulau — orang di-Pulau itu pun ada mati juga, macham mana hendak angkat — itu barang kali susah. Dari Pulau itu kita pergi di-Marine Base di-Glugor punya jetty, marine pun pakai jetty itu. Di-situ pula kita

boleh menia kebenar daripada Pejabat itu, boleh-lah mereka beri, tetapi dia punya distance — jauhnya daripada Glugor Marine Base sampai Pulau Jerejak — ada tiga kali lebeh jauh daripada Sungei Nibong pergi Pulau Jerejak. Jadi orang2 yang hendak beli barang2, hendak pergi balek bila2 masa, pagi sekali, tengah hari, petang sekali — Kerajaan punya marine boat yang pergi balek, dia beri 10 orang atau 20 orang sahaja naik. Kalau banyak orang na'pergi balek, yang bawa barang2, yang hendak bawa makanan, kalau hendak pergi bila2 masa dalam 24 jam tidak boleh. Jadi mereka mahu ada tempat yang boleh mereka pergi balek pada bila2 masa juga, kadang2 hendak bawa dead bodies — kita tidak boleh berapa jauh — merti pergi "nearest spot" tempat yang dekat dengan Pulau itu. Jadi Kerajaan chadangkan kita bawa melalui Roads Development Plan buat satu jalan di-situ — dekat dengan tempat yang tidak kena rumah, tempat yang tidak kena squatters, tempat yang dekat sekali itu jalan boleh-lah di-buat — jadi tidak kachau orang kampung-lah. Orang kampung tidak kena banyak, kita jaga jangan orang kena orang2 kampung dan tempat itu depan dengan Pulau itu. Ini-lah jalan yang di-pakai untuk membara barang2 pergi balek ka-Pulau itu. Itu-lah kegunaan Jalan itu. Saya hendak bagi tahu kepada Ahli Kawasan Jelutong dan Ahli Kawasan Selatan, bagi-lah tahu kepada Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam.

Lagi satu Tuan Speaker dan tuan2, banyak dalam ucapan saya tengok berkenaan dengan orang2 yang tidak dapat kerja dalam Negeri ia-itu unemployment, orang2 yang tidak dapat kerja, yang daf-tar hendak masuk kerja bukan soal

Pulau Pinang sahaja, bukan soal sini punya Kerajaan sahaja. Soal soal Kerajaan seluroh dunia. Amerika Sharikat sa-buah negeri yang besar, soal fasal penganggoran, fasal orang2 yang tidak dapat kerja pun satu soal yang besar. Amerika Sharikat yang kaya, bermillion2 factory pun, soal yang besar sekali ini hari unemployment juga. Bukan-nya di-Pulau Pinang ini sahaja tetapi Kerajaan sedang menchuba hendak memasokkan mereka di-mana2 yang boleh. Tetapi soal ini tidak boleh di-selamatkan, bila2 masa pun ada, saya berani kata kepada Ahli2 Yang Berhormat. Saya tidak berani kata mesti berjaya — satu hari orang2 ini semua akan dapat kerja saya tidak berani. Ini tidak boleh mati, mesti hidup selalu — unemployment ini. Jadi saya hari ini saya bagi tahu kepada Ahli2 Parti lain, soal ini ia-lah dunia punya soal. Jadi Tuan Yang di-Per-tua dan tuan2 sekalian, itu-lah sedikit sebanyak ucapan saya di atas Peranggaran Perbelanjaan Biasa bagi tahun 1966, terima kaseh.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Penang State Supply (1966) Bill proposed by the Honourable Chief Minister on the 1st day of this Assembly. I wish first of all to reply to certain points raised by the Honourable Member for Kota. He started off with vague prognostications of disaster; and I assumed that as an Opposition Member he was making the usual Opposition speech. But later on he went on to develop his speech, and used the phrase "that the State was preparing to go into a state of liquidation or bankruptcy"; and he ended up by saying that this was the beginning of the end — the first milestone of decay. I feel that on behalf of the Government I must not only contradict

him but refute him. Why such an experienced parliamentarian should suddenly become a prophet of doom and gloom on a budget as reasonable and sensible as this cannot understand. Let me take his points one by one.

He referred to the budget discussions that is now going on in Dewan Ra'ayat; and he said that the First Malaysian Plan requires a huge sum of money, 42% of which will have to be foreign assistance. This, according to him, was what the Minister of Finance said. Now, in the modern world it is an accepted fact that the newly developing countries — the newly independent countries — should be helped by the well-developed countries — the highly industrialized countries. In fact, under the aegis of the United Nations they have developed certain agencies whose sole function is to help the newly-independent developing countries. So, if some help is sought from outside, I do not certainly think that it indicates going into a state of liquidation or bankruptcy; nor is it the milestone of decay. Then there were other points which he tried to bring in to support his main plea. He said this is a deficit budget. He said also that our revenue has decreased. Here he was actually making a big mistake. He pointed out to item 4 on page 6 — licences have declined from \$3,400,000 odd to \$3,019,000 odd. Today, he said, has declined from \$1,192,000 to \$1,160,000. And he quoted various other figures. But, Mr. Speaker, Sir, on page 2 of the Honourable the Chief Minister's speech introducing the Supply Bill he made it very clear — and I quote from his speech — that "If the contribution made to the State Development Fund is excluded from the estimated expenditure" — that is a very clear statement —

"it will be found that revenue is ahead of expenditure by \$1,371,523." Now, that would show that actually income is more than expenditure. And I continue: "and this will show that we are still able to maintain a surplus of revenue over expenditure. It is the intention of the State Government to carry on with the practice of contributing to the State Development Fund. It is needless for me to enumerate the large number and variety of projects which have been undertaken from this Fund. The deficit should not, however, be taken to mean that the State Government is already in difficulty. I am happy to state that through careful budgeting and prudent spending we have been able to improve on our reserves." Therefore, Sir, all this talk of going into liquidation and being the first milestone of decay is not really a factual approach to the problem of budgeting, but merely a political approach intended to catch votes.

After having started off like that he went on to say that Government is complacent about the revenue structure, and made one or two suggestions as to how we should set about improving the position. May I quote again from the speech of the Honourable the Chief Minister to say that Government is not complacent. I refer to page 11 of the Chief Minister's speech in which he states that "it may be necessary for the Government to consider ways and means of increasing State revenue. These increases, you can be rest assured, will only be levied after the Government has thoroughly satisfied itself that such action will not seriously affect the living

standards of the people." We are not complacent at all. We are keeping under consideration the possibility of increased revenue; but we do not want to take any hasty steps. It is not the practice of this Government to do things in a hurry, and then repent at leisure.

The Honourable Member for Kota also asked us to look into the relationship between the State and the Federal Governments. He particularly wanted us to ask for a review of the Tenth Schedule, Part III. Mr. Speaker, Sir, that was a suggestion which is something perhaps constructive — not much; but I must point out to one or two snags in that suggestion. May I quote to this House the main provisions of the Tenth Schedule, Part III; and also Parts I and II, because it should help this House to understand what we are talking about. The revenue of the State is obtained in three main ways. Part I says how much capitation grant is to be given; Part II states how much road grant is to be given; and Part III states what are the sources of revenue assigned to the States. I noticed that the Honourable Member for Kota specifically mentioned Part III; in other words, the sources of revenue assigned to the States. But another Member — I believe the Member for Ayer Itam also wanted to go into the question of a capitation grant.

Let me take this question of capitation grant. I believe it was the Member for Jelutong who referred to an earlier speech made by me, when I was on the other side of the table, with reference to this capitation grant. I think, if my memory is correct, I did make such a speech. But once

the Honourable Chief Minister had given a reply I was satisfied, because if our Constitution is understood then any Member of this House would know that capitation grant is related to the population census. And the population, according to the laws of the country, is taken once in every 10 years. The last date on which a census was taken was 1957; and therefore in 1967, 10 years after that, another population census would be taken, and the capitation grant would be revised. If the Honourable Member of the Opposition who raised this point wants us to revise every now and then, then there will have to be a revision every day because every day babies are being born, and the capitation grant is based on the number of people living in the State — which would be an impossibility. And therefore capitation grant cannot be revised at this stage but only at a set interval of so many years. I have not heard any mention of the State road grant, so I will not comment on that.

But there was a suggestion by the Honourable Member for Kota that Part III of the Tenth Schedule should be revised; and he asked the Government to fight hard for Penang. He said, "You have not fought hard enough for Penang." Let me point out, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that Part III of the Tenth Schedule is part of the Constitution of the country. It affects not only the State of Penang, but affects every State in the country — the 11 States of Malaysia and the two States across the sea. Therefore, if there is going to be any revision in this it is a matter not only for the State of Penang but for all the individual States, because they

too are concerned in these State revenues. Whether there is a case for revision or not is another matter. But it is certainly not a matter in which Penang alone can take single or individual action. If it is the idea of the Opposition, in bringing up this, that we should take independent action then, of course, that is another matter. And that is a matter on which those who have such ideas should go to the people. And whether such a proposition conflicts with the laws of our country or not I cannot say at this stage.

Now, he also referred to certain paragraphs in the Auditor's Report, and specifically referred to paragraph 24; and he wanted clarifications to be made. Actually, however, I found that he was not very clear in what he was referring to, and how he wanted improvements to be made. But he was trying to show that there was waste. And referring to page 11, Appendix I, and the number of posts shown in the State Estimates, the Member for Kota suggested that there was a large number of posts which had increased from 977 in 1962 to 1,021 in 1964. Now, I just couldn't see how this indicated any waste. And it really seemed that he was trying to find a fault where there was indeed no fault, because if in 1962 the number of posts was 977, and if three years later it had increased to 1,021, one would imagine that normal development would account for this slight increase of about 40 or 50 posts. After all there is a great deal of development going on in the State; and you cannot carry out your development without an increase in the number of officers who are going to do the work

which the development requires.

He also made certain other references to the State Civil Service which he said should be confined to the State, and the members of which should not be transferred outside Penang at all. These are, of course, matters on which the exigencies of the Service must take priority; and it sometimes in the officer's own interests to be promoted to another station so that he could improve in his official position.

And he referred to Housing Loans, and said that the Government has collected \$90,000 where payment due was \$143,000. Now, this is of course possible. But in certain cases the Government has to treat people with consideration; and it is not always possible to insist on the 'last ounce of flesh' in dealing with people who are behind in their dues or in arrears.

Finally, in his conclusion he referred to the fact that the Alliance State Government had been in power for 8 years; and he went on to make various complaints, and said that it was time that the Government should give up because they had not, as he put it, the vitalith. The point to remember in this connection is that until 1959 the Honourable Member for Kota was himself a member — and a leading member — of the Alliance Government. If mistakes have been made then he himself is to some measure responsible for what happened then. And therefore it is now very strange for him to say that the Alliance Government has been in power for 8 years, because for two years of that failure he was one of the leading members; and, if I am not mistaken, he

was the Whip. And for him to criticize the Government for the failure is a little bit unjustified.

Now, there are other matters on which he touched; but I am going to refer to them when I take up the criticisms made by the Member for Ayer Itam.

The Member for Ayer Itam — I am sorry he is not here — is, of course, our new Member. He started off in his usual way which is very well known, and he referred to the Government bench and the Government back bench as Lilliputians, presumably asking us to imply that he was a Brobdingnagian. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am sure Honourable Members will understand this reference. Remember the famous story on the Lilliputians and the Brobdingnagians — “Gulliver’s Travels?” The Lilliputians are small, little fellows only six inches high, and the Brobdingnagians are giants about sixty feet high. I do not know why exactly this new and honourable Member introduced this. But probably he wanted to sort of show how much he excelled the others, though I have very serious doubts as to whether the Member for Dhoby Ghaut in comparison with him is Lilliputian or Brobdingnagian. I am not quite sure which is which. And he also went on and introduced himself to this Assembly as a great lawyer and a great M. P. Well, these are matters of opinion. If he thinks he is a great lawyer he is welcome to it; and if he thinks he is a great M. P. it is also his opinion. However that may be, we would certainly I am sure all admit that excessive modesty is not a fault of his. Now, when I deal with some of the points that he raised, I hope, Mr. Speaker,

Sir, the House would forgive me if I jump about a bit because that is exactly what the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam did. He was jumping about like a grasshopper from spot to spot; and it may be possible that I too will have to jump about because I have taken down notes on points about which I would like to reply to him. At the outset I must say I did rise to intervene in the debate; but since the Honourable Member would not give way I had to keep quiet. All I wanted to do, Mr. Speaker, Sir, was to point out that this Bill which we are discussing — the State Supply Bill — has 21 Subheads; and I notice that not even once did he touch on any one of the Subheads. He did talk about tourism; he did talk about development and University site, and so on, and so forth. But what he forgot was that that is the next Bill which we are going to debate in this House. I presume when we come to debate that Bill he will skip that Bill and go on to the next Bill on the agenda, and so forth.

Now, much of his time — and he took a great deal of time, Mr. Speaker, Sir — was spent on the Auditor’s Report. He read it almost verbatim, from paragraph to paragraph; and he listed 39 complaints out of 67 paragraphs. And he made it out as if this was — and I use his exact words — an indictment. Honourable Members will be aware what is the meaning of the word ‘indictment.’ It means a very grave charge. All Honourable Members have had this Report in their hands. They will know for themselves whether this is really an indictment. This is an Auditor’s Report. And an Auditor is supposed to make very precise

expressions of opinion on all points; and even a thing like this — paragraph 3:

"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."

That is an indictment. According to the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam that is one. And I can go on to several paragraphs; but I will not waste the time of this Assembly as the Honourable Member has the capacity to waste other people's time. I will then go on to certain other points that he raised. And he gave, after juggling with figures here and there — he is extremely good at juggling — unemployment figures for Penang, according to his estimate, as 48,000.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): 48,500. Read the Munro Report.

Mr. Speaker: No interruption, please.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): It is very important.

Mr. Speaker: Will you please stand if you want to point out something.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Will he give way?

Mr. Speaker: You ask him first before you address me.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, will the Honourable Member give way for a point of clarification?

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr.

D. S. Ramanathan): Oh yes, I am prepared to give way.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, my figures, as I said before, already are given by Munro himself. If they wish to challenge my figures let them publish the Munro Report.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will presently come to this famous Report of which nobody seems to know except the Honourable Member. (..... struck off) It has not been published by the Federal Government. It has not been published by the State Government. It is not, as far as I know, a State Government Paper. And whether it comes under the Official Secrets Act, that again is another matter about which I know nothing. But presumably the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam has access to information which other ordinary Members like us do not have. However, that is a matter not for me to investigate.

Now, he quoted a figure of 48,500. He juggled with figures and he produced these figures. I went to the trouble of going through the number of job-seekers registered at the Employment Exchanges, starting from October, 1964, up to May, 1965. These are the only figures that are printed and available. And I find that the total for the State of Penang would be 14,610, a figure approximately mentioned by the Honourable Minister as 14,000. And the total number of people seeking employment in the whole country is 96,162. Here comes the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam (interrupted).

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): On a point of clarification, Mr. Speaker, Sir.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not want to be interrupted.

The number for the whole country is 96,162. Yet the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam comes here and gives us all his juggled figures of 48,000 people who are unemployed. It is not the intention of the Government, Sir, to deny that there is unemployment. As the Member for Glugor said earlier, unemployment is not a problem only found in this country. It is a problem all over the world. And I remember reading in the paper two or three days ago that our Finance Minister claimed that the unemployment figure for the whole country was only 6%. And yet here comes a Member who says that half the unemployed people in the whole country are here in Penang. Whether one can believe a statement like that or not, and whether it does credit to the judgment and good thinking of the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam is a matter, I am sure, on which people will have their own opinions. He also touched on the (interrupted).

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order: Where a member misquotes another Member, can the Member who has been misquoted rise on a point of order that statements are mis-statements of facts? Because I did not say that half the unemployed are in Penang.

Mr. Speaker: Wait a minute.

You ask me for my ruling regarding the statement. You rise up on a point of order. May I know which Order?

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): It is under the Rules of Debate. It says that a Member may not make a personal charge against another Member, and may not make statements which cannot be substantiated or which are not factual.

Mr. Speaker: What section?

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Under section 46.

Mr. Speaker: Under 46 of the Rules of Debate?

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Yes, Mr. Speaker, Sir. I know that in a Parliament if a Member makes an allegation or fact or statement of or on an Honourable Member which is not true he has got to substantiate it. Otherwise he can allege me saying things I haven't said. Then you are alleging that I am a liar.

Mr. Speaker: Whatever the Honourable Member has been saying — from both sides; whatever you said or he said; or he didn't say and you say — in this Assembly is all recorded. If you challenge one another as to whether a statement is true or not, it is my duty to refer back to the speeches which have been recorded in this Assembly before allowing any Honourable Member to make any interruption. I can always call back for the record.

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

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr.

D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would only point out that in my notes I have put down 48,000 as the figure he quoted; and this was corrected by the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam as 48,500. And from the figures that I have just quoted I have pointed out to you that the total figure of those registered for employment is 96,162 for the whole country, not for Penang.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was not talking about registered unemployment.

Mr. Speaker: Alright, on what point are you rising?

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): On the same point, Mr. Speaker, Sir.

I am not talking about registered unemployment. Many people do not register who are unemployed because they cannot get jobs.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to know on what point you are standing up to interrupt, first of all. Whether you agree or disagree with his statement, you can ask me to refer to the record which we have in this Assembly.

No further interruption, please.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Sir.

I now go on to other matters raised by the Honourable and Learned Member from Ayer Itam. He touched on the Ayer Itam Election. What that has to do with this Budget, I do not know. He probably knows. But the point

that he was trying to make was that it was a great victory for his Party.

Mr. Speaker: I have already said, when the Honourable Member mentioned the Ayer Itam Election, that it has nothing to do with the merits of this Bill which is being discussed before this House. No mention about that Election any more.

Member for Sungei Pinang Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Alright, Mr. Speaker, Sir.

I would apologize to this House if I have to jump about a little bit because, as I said earlier when I started, the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam jumped about like a grasshopper from subject to subject. So since I have noted down his points one by one it is possible that (interrupted).

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, you have ruled him out of order, I believe. Is he still proceeding?

Mr. Speaker: I did rule him out of order on the matter of the Election, but not on the matter of the merits of the Bill discussed before this House.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Yes, Mr. Speaker, Sir. He is trying to continue.

Mr. Speaker: It is up to him to decide whether he continues or not. Please!

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): I should like, Mr. Speaker, Sir, if the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam would restrain himself, and not jump up like a Jack-in-the-box. I will there-

fore not say much about the Ayer Itam Election. I go to this question of free port status.

This was a subject on which the Member touched at great length — I can almost say, at great boring length — and he made use of (interrupted)

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise under Order again — Order 46 (xiii) (d)

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): If the word "boring" is offensive. I was just stating a point of fact.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): It is not that.

Mr. Speaker: (d) is indulging in personalities. I didn't see any indulging in personalities yet, and I don't feel any offensive word has been used yet.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

He touched on the free port status, and made great play with it. If he had only restricted himself to that point I would really not have very much to say, because after all free port status is something which the people of Penang have had for a great length of time. But he also linked it up to the question of industrialization.

Now, industrialization is something that we all desire for Penang. But the Honourable Member never pointed out — because he does not want to do so, I think — that there is a clear conflict between industrializing

and trading, as embodied in free port status, unless it is assumed, as some have, that most industrialization can be for export. Mr. Speaker, Sir, that is a quotation which I have taken from the Economic Review of the University of Malaya.

Now, we must be very clear about what we are speaking when we speak. What is it that the people of Penang want? Is it free port status, or is it industrialization? There is, as I have just said, a conflict between the two. Free port status has come to Penang, as it has to many other cities in the world, out of historical events. There was a time when free port status benefitted Penang greatly. No-one can question that. It was part of all colonial empires to develop certain areas with natural harbour facilities as free ports. And in those days there was little question of nationalism involved. And everybody naturally went to the best harbour with the best harbour facilities. And it became a port if it served a useful purpose. That is how Penang grew. That is how Singapore grew and outpaced Penang. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that since 1957, since independence came to us, conditions have changed; and these conditions have now been focussed very clearly because of the confrontation of our neighbour. To those, therefore, who hanker for free port status I must clearly say, "Please think again. What is it you want? You want a free port status only for the Island of Penang?" Yes, it is a popular appeal. It is the kind of popular appeal that demagogues love to use. And I think demagogues are using it in Penang. But we must be clear in our minds as a responsible Government. We must indicate to the people what are the real issues in-

volved — whether we want unlimited free port status, or whether we want industrialization. A free port is only good if one's neighbours would bring their goods to the free port and use it as an entreport centre. But the moment a country is bitten by the bug of nationalism it says, "Why should I send my goods to that place? I will put up my own habuor. I will put up my own berthing facilities to handle the goods from my own country, not from another country." So where is your free port? And that is where we have to think seriously on this question of free port status of Penang. And this is a point to which the Government is giving consideration in order to educate the public in all its broad implications.

Mr. Speaker: You have much more to reply?

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Yes, Sir, I have.

Mr. Speaker: Because I intend to adjourn the meeting to 2.30 p.m.

The Assembly adjourns at 12.32 p.m.

The Assembly resumes at 2.30 p.m.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, touching on the Auditor-General's Report which has about 67 paragraphs, the Member for Ayer Itam claimed that it contained no less than 37 criticisms, some of which he said were indictments. Of course, that is a very serious charge, because indictment could be a serious charge. But, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that mments on the 1964 Accounts; and this was the Auditor-General's co-

many of the so-called criticisms or indictments are nothing more than accounting points regarding financial procedure. It is the practice of the Government to submit the Auditor-General's Report to our own State Public Accounts Committee has dealt with the points raised by the Auditor-General. In the course of his comments on the Auditor-General's Report — in fact he spent nearly an hour and a half just reading through this thing — he went on to compare the State Government's Accounts with the City Council's Accounts. I find that rather amusing because in the latest minutes which I received from the City Council there is a paragraph here which, with your permission, Sir, I will quote:

"The Honourable Mr. Teh Ewe Lim refers to item 4 (a) and (b) with regard to loss of brass nozzles and hydraulic brake fluid and states that he was a member of the Committee of Inquiry into this loss and he remembers that the Committee after the visit to the site arrived at a decision that the security set-up in the Store was very unsatisfactory."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the State Government has many Departments. The Bill has 21 Subheads, and many of these Departments have stores materials, especially the P. W. D., lying on the road. It is possible some of these are lost. It is also possible that the loss was not immediately detected. But to magnify that into an indictment, a crime, is the kind of exaggeration in which the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam is very clever. So much for his comments on the Auditor-General's Report, because almost all the other comments were such exaggerated criticisms.

Let me pass on now to another point. He remarked about an earlier site for the University at Glugor, I think. Then he went on to allege that this had been later sold or not accepted; and he made it appear as if something had been done which should not have been done. May I point out to this House, Mr. Speaker, Sir, (interrupted)

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification again.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): No. This is the sixth interruption.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Well, I will go on if you keep on misquoting me.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to make one particular remark. If any Honourable Member wants to refer to or to make a remark on the speeches made by Honourable Members just be sure about it.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Sir, this so-called first University site at Glugor is nothing but a figment of the imagination of this Member for Ayer Itam.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, again I wish to stand up. This is a matter which was published in the Government Gazette.

Mr. Speaker: On what point again?

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a question of order. Again he is not stating facts. The acquisition of the site behind Bukit

Glugor was published in a Government Gazette Notification. It is not a figment of imagination.

Mr. Speaker: Wait. I will ask the Honourable Member for Sungei Pinang: Will you be able to substantiate what you say about the remark of the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam?

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): I will explain now further, Sir. It is correct to say that several sites were looked at; but no site was chosen except the present site.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, again on a point of order. He is making an allegation.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, if he wants a point of order let him quote.

Mr. Speaker: I wanted to know that. Let me ask that. What Order are you asking me to quote?

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, he is alleging that I am not speaking the truth; that in fact it is a figment of my imagination. It is, Mr. Speaker, Sir, an indulgence upon personalities of the speaker under Order 46(xiii) (d). Now, Mr. Speaker, Sir, if he has a point to make about a speech of mine or statements of mine which are not correct then he may do so. But where I have stated that it is a Gazette Notification for zoning for a University site then he has to say whether or not that is true. If it is not true he can abuse the privilege of this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker: Honourable Members, please take note of this: It is rather difficult for me to give a ruling offhand to say whether one Honourable Member said the correct thing, and another Honourable Member did not say the correct thing. That will depend on the records of this Assembly if we are going to be proper with it. And if any Honourable Member feels that he was charged not in accordance with what he did say I will be glad to deal with it in the Privileges Committee. So the speech must continue without interruption.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Yes, Mr. Speaker, Sir. On a point of order, I have already written a complaint to you.

Mr. Speaker: I will take the matter up.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Yes, Mr. Speaker, Sir.

On this matter I said "zoning." And I say it is in a Gazette Notification. It is a notification of the zoning for a site. Now, if he says that is not true then he has to substantiate it, because he is alleging me of making a statement which is not correct in this House.

Mr. Speaker: This will be determined when you write to me.

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

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, to continue: It is true that two or three sites were looked at. The final site that was chosen

was the site that has now been acquired. Again, I will therefore say it is wrong on the part of the Member (interrupted).

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, again on a point of order. I said "zoned." It is zoned under Gazette Notification.

Mr. Speaker: This is not on a point of order. This is the only point. I have already given my ruling. If you do not agree to what he has said against your statement that can only be determined by examining the record. And I have no time to examine the record today.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am not rising on what I say. I am saying that it is a Government publication; that that place was zoned for a University site in a legal notification published on authority of the State Government of Penang of which he is an Ex. Co. Member.

Mr. Speaker: It is up to me to determine whether it is right or not.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I can only say I am amazed at the ignorance of the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam. When a project is being proposed a certain area may be zoned or may be declared as being required.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of (interrupted)

Mr. Speaker: Will you please allow the Honourable Member to

finish his sentence.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): It does not mean, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that the entire area would be acquired. Only that part of it which is required for the purpose in hand would be required. This is simple, elementary knowledge which a great Parliamentarian like him should know.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, if I may continue (interrupted)

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order again. You heard just now; my statement was "zoned." He uses the words "Several sites were looked at." I am saying the Bukit Glugor site was zoned; and then the zoning was lifted. Is it actual, or is it false? Don't call me a great Parliamentarian. I don't need you to flatter me.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): If he takes that for flattery he will believe anything. And such stupidity I cannot understand.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, is he not indulging in personalities?

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the word "stupidity" was used by him only two days ago; and it was not considered unparliamentary.

Mr. Speaker: I have given my ruling to the Member for Tanjong Selatan today that the word "tolol" is tantamount to the word "stupid," which I think is very unparliamentary. And I am not al-

lowing that any more.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Right, Mr. Speaker, Sir.

I next move on to his remarks about agriculture, and his reference to the Forest Reserve on the Island of Penang which he suggested should be turned into something or other. You know, it is so difficult to follow the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam because of his tendency to jump from subject to subject. But I do remember very clearly that he wanted to use this Forest Reserve for either agriculture or some other purpose. Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is one of the duties of a Government in any country to see that forests are preserved in certain places because in those countries where undue or rather excessive clearance of forests took place the place became a howling desert. Therefore a suggestion to clear all our Forest Reserves and make them into some other type of land is something that is not acceptable.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, he is misquoting again.

Mr. Speaker: On what point again?

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): On a point of clarification. I never asked you to clear the Forest Reserve.

Mr. Speaker: If you want a clarification, I would like to ask the Honourable Member for Sungei Pinang whether he likes to give way for your clarification.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): No, Mr. Spea-

ker, Sir.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order, would you rule it that if a person persistently and consistently misquotes then he is deliberately making charges against other Members without foundation?

Mr. Speaker: I cannot determine misquoting by a Member — I have told the House before — unless I go back to the record, which it is not possible for me to do now. If the Honourable Member feels that he was misquoted, and he wants to charge the Honourable Member for misquoting him, then he will always write to me, and I will be happy to consider that.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, if that were to happen then it will be too late. Then let us look at the records now.

Mr. Speaker: It is not going to be too late. This Assembly is going to be longer — until 1969.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Then, Mr. Speaker, Sir, can I have a transcript of the text immediately?

Mr. Speaker: It is not possible to give a transcript immediately; otherwise I will make that ruling — immediately. We are not in a position to do that; that is why I cannot look at the record.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, does the Hon'ble the Chief Minister know that in 1961 they wanted to zone it as a park?

Mr. Speaker: I am not interest-

ed in all that — whether zoning or not zoning: it is your problem. What I am interested in is my own ruling. Then I will tell the House, make it very clear again to the House that, if any Honourable Member finds himself being misquoted by other Honourable Members — and it is not easy for me to determine and make a ruling now unless I have to go back to the records of the Assembly — he can always write to me and refer that to the Privileges Committee.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, if a point of clarification arises when one quotes another Honourable Member, then that Member should be given a chance to explain.

Mr. Speaker: On a point of clarification — I have made it very clear that the Honourable Member speaking should give way. If the Honourable Member refuses to give way, I cannot force anybody to sit down when speaking when he has a right to speak.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, that was the eleventh interruption. I draw your attention to this, Mr. Speaker, Sir, for just one reason. When the Hon'ble Member for Ayer Itam occupied the floor for four hours, we on this side of the House gave him a patient hearing even though — and I must emphasize this point — even though we did not agree with what he said. There were many, many points on which we did not agree. . . . (Interrupted).

Mr. Speaker: I do not need to go back to that. What we want is to confine all the speeches

to the merits of the Bill and right to the reply of anything that has been quoted by the Member of this Assembly.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Sir. Well, I have already touched earlier on the contradiction, or rather the conflict, between free port and industrialisation. Again I have to quote from the speech of the speaker — I made notes at the moment he was speaking. He claimed that there was a loss of jobs for 25,000 people involved. I do not know — he may now get up to say that it was not 25,000. I have already quoted for you, Sir, the number of job-seekers from September up till May of this year, and it shows clearly that only about 14,610 people are involved. Therefore I submit, Sir, that this kind of exaggerated figures is given here merely to discredit — not for the purpose of discussing the merits of this Bill, but for discrediting the Government.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, for the last time, may I rise on a point of clarification and distinguish between employment deficit, employment and registered employment?

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have not (interrupted).

Mr. Speaker: Again I have to ask the Hon'ble Member for Sungei Pinang whether he would like to give way.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker,

Sir, to substantiate many of these (interrupted).

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, let him say to us for the last time.

Mr. Speaker (to Member for Sungei Pinang): Are you giving way?

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): No, Mr. Speaker, Sir. I would do so if he had had the courtesy to do it before.

[Member for Ayer Itam leaves the chamber.]

Chief Minister: Shame — Parliamentary Member! Disgraceful!

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the figures, the allegations made here were all supposed to have been substantiated by some report. What is it? The Munroe Report?

[At this stage, Mr. Speaker rules that the word "Marilyn" used in conjunction with the Munroe Report, be struck off].

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to say is this: This is supposed to be a Report from which the Honourable Member looks down and makes quotations. Now, I have been racking my brains as to how to get a copy of this Report. I want to know whether it is a State Paper or a Federal Paper. As far as I am aware it is not a State Paper, nor is it a Federal Paper. Then, for him to use a Report that has not been printed or published — perhaps it is still under the Con-

fidential List; perhaps it still comes under the Official Secrets Act; we do not know. But for him to quote those figures and present a point of view to discredit the budget — is I submit quite erroneous, and wilfully wrong.

One point on which both the Honourable Member for Kota and the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam touched was that nothing has been done since 1957 — for the last 8 years nothing has been done. I believe my colleague here, the Member for Glugor, has already pointed out that many of the things now going on in the State could not have been done or started had there been no planning at all. But what I really want to point out is this: there was a great deal about industrialization, and about the Government's role in industrialization. And at one part of an Honourable Member's speech he accused the Government of being under the influence of capitalists. That is something which the Honourable the Chief Minister denied or contradicted at the time, because many Parties could be under the influence of capitalists. And I know of capitalists who are in the vanguard of the so-called Socialist Movement.

However, what is the role of Government in private enterprise? What is the role of Government in industrialization? Mr. Speaker, Sir, may I quote from this book of which I make no mystery — "The Economic Development of Malaya" which was done by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. I quote:

"We conceive of the role of Government in relation to manufacturing

enterprise as twofold: To provide adequate basic services, electric power, water supply, transport and communications, etc. In these respects Malaya is relatively well equipped. The expansion of these services is discussed elsewhere.

Secondly, to foster individual enterprise and to create a favourable climate for its development through reinforcement and extension of measures already being undertaken by Government. Specifically we have in mind the following

And the Report goes on to list various steps which should be taken to help stimulate private enterprises. And all these steps have in fact been taken by Government. And what the Honourable Member was trying to say to this House — at least as far as I understood it — was that there should be some form of State capitalism. Now, that is a point of view which some people hold; that is a point of view which some people do not agree with. But because there is no State capitalism it does not mean that the Government of a State is not interested in industrialization. We have done what we can; and we are going to do what we can to help stimulate industries and enterprises. But we do not want at this stage to enter into the field of private industrial enterprise. That is a point which I would like to counter to the points raised by the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam. Now, on this same point I must at this stage say something about the remarks of the Honourable Member for Kota. He specifically mentioned the date 1957, and said that since 1957 there was a decline, and this budget marks the first milestone of decay, and

so on; but which started back in 1957. It strikes me as being rather odd, especially for the Member for Kota to say that, because, if I am not mistaken the Member for Kota was at that time a member of the Alliance State Government. And for him to quote that year as the year when the decline started is really in my opinion something absurd.

Now, there were other points on which the Member for Ayer Itam touched. For example, he says the East-West Road should be here; and he almost spoke as if it was just started in the State Assembly two days ago when we first began to discuss this matter, whereas the fact is that the Government and the Chief Minister have been making representations to the Central Government about re-routing this East-West Road. Several representations have been made. And I believe the Chief Minister has already given assurance to this House that the matter is now receiving the serious and favourable consideration of the Central Government.

The Member for Ayer Itam also went on to touch on the Ayer Itam Dam, and the possibility of it being made into a beauty spot so that it could be a tourist attraction. With that part I have no quarrel. But when he went on further to say that the State Government has not supported it, and that the State Government had done nothing about it, he places us in a predicament because that is a City Council project, and that is a City Council responsibility. If the City Council had approached the State Government at least I am not aware of it; not since I have entered the Executive Council. I have not

seen any Paper with regard to this particular item.

I must at the same time make a point about another matter which strictly does not perhaps come under the purview of this Assembly, because the Member for Ayer Itam went out of his way to praise the City Council for the projects it was undertaking within the City. I am not here to decry the City Council, or anything like that. But about three years ago I think in 1962 or early 1963 — the City Council approved a Motion and set aside a sum of \$50,000 for organizing a Penang Festival every year, with the main purpose of attracting tourists to our Island; and I know definitely that a sum of \$50,000 was set aside. Almost three years have passed, and nothing has been done. So much for the wonderful efficiency of the City Council.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Member for Ayer Itam also touched on various points like tourism, University site, and so forth. But presumably since the Memorandum on the University is going to be tabled at this Assembly there will probably be a debate and discussion on that, so I am not going to discuss that at this stage.

One point which I must emphasize here is that our budget has been prepared very carefully; and the Chief Minister's speech is very explicit in declaring the purposes for which this 1966 budget has been drawn up. The criticism of the Member for Kota that there is an increase in the number of Government employees, from 977 in 1962 to 1,021 in 1964, is again quite ineffective from the

point of view even of the Opposition because it belies the fact, it contradicts the fact of what they are saying. They are saying that this budget is not a progressive budget. But here, what does this increase really mean? If there were an increase of 200 or 300 I would perhaps say it is extravagance. But no, there is an increase of 5% — 50 new employees. There is a small increase. But this is an increase which is necessary because when the State Government begins to expand, to carry on with more projects, it needs more employees, more officers to carry out its projects. If there is no expansion here then it really means that the work will not be carried out. Surely that is not what the Opposition wants. Take for example Veterinary. Plans are now being made to take the services of the Department right to the householder instead of waiting for him to come to us. This I would have thought would be welcomed by the Opposition, instead of their mentioning this 'horrible' fact that there is a slight increase of about 40 new officers in the Government service.

Mr. Speaker, I will finally conclude with just one point. I feel a little lost because most of the points I am trying to reply to are to the Honourable Member for Kota and the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam, and they are not here to listen to me. In any case I will just conclude by presenting one point. The Member for Kota was unhappy when we were diverting some of our surplus funds to the Development Estimates. But that is an argument which I find difficult to follow, because admittedly there has been an increase in unemployment after this confrontation

policy which was quite an unexpected thing. And it is now considered economically sound at a time of decline in trade or employment to do what the economists call "priming the pump" — supplying new capital projects. Start development projects here and there, and in that way alleviate to some extent unemployment; and then let the flow of money carry on so that the prosperity gets started again. Therefore I should have thought that the Member for Kota would have welcomed this proposal in order to transfer some of our surplus funds into the Development Fund. But no, he says it is all bad. He says it is the first stage in the milestone of decay. I, Mr. Speaker, will strongly oppose that; and I say that this budget is a realistic and a reasonable budget, well fitted for the resources that we have, and suited for carrying Penang forward a step in our progress.

Thank you, Sir.

Member for Kelawei (Mr. Tan Khim Hoe): Tuan Speaker, I wish to say a few words about Head 20.

Our veterinary services are proving very popular. With the increase in the number of animals (cattle, goats, pigs, etc.) and poultry reared in response to the great encouragement and support given by the State Government, more and more people are taking advantage of the services of the State Government's Veterinary Department. This is very satisfactory, and shows that our policies of improving the rural economy by this means are working very well. Due to the great demand for our veterinary services, two new veterinary sub-centres were opened

in 1965 — one at Penaga, Province Wellesley North, and the other at Sungei Bakap, Province Wellesley South.

The activities of the Veterinary Department have been so successful that Penang State is an important exporter of poultry and pigs to other States.

Recently the Central Government has decided to help our farmers further by acting against the dumping of eggs into the mainland from abroad by increasing the import duty on eggs from 1 cent to 3 cents per egg. The State Government hopes that our farmers will avail themselves of this opportunity to increase their production of eggs, and their prosperity.

The money spent on veterinary services is really worthwhile and well spent. Therefore, Sir, I support the Supply Bill for 1966.

Member for Bagan Ajam (Mr. Phee Joo Teik): Mr. Speaker, Sir, as expected, when the Government tables the budget proposals at the end of each year we always find that there are always criticisms from the opposite side of the House. Even if the State Government is in possession of a magic wand, and is able to produce or provide whatever has been asked for by the Opposition still there will be complaints. They will then say, "Oh yes, you have given us what we have asked for, but you have not given us enough." The Opposition has stated that the Government is not vigorous enough. That is the usual thing which we have heard year in and year out.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, during the last two days of debate on the

Budget proposals the Opposition has gone through para. by para. on the Report by the Auditor-General; and we have just heard the explanation given by the Honourable Member for Sungei Pinang who has replied point by point. But I wish to draw the attention of this Assembly to Item 65 of the Auditor's Report. Last Friday the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam stood up to say that the four District Councils in the State of Penang had been treated by the State Government as pet children, and they have allowed especially the Butterworth District Council to accumulate arrears amounting to \$664,874. I wish to clarify here that in point of fact this amount is due from ratepayers to the District Council North, and it is not arrears due to the State Government. This is on a point of clarification. And if you look at page 10, under paragraph 65 the Auditor-General says, "The financial position of the four District Councils in the State, particularly the District Council South, Nibong Tebal, must be viewed with concern." Mr. Speaker, Sir, in point of fact the last local elections were held in July, 1963, and the District Council South was controller by the Socialist Front from 1963 for the term of one year to 1964. And I do not know who is to be blamed for the present state of affairs in Province South until after their term of one year when they had to give up control of the Council, and the Alliance had to take it back. And this will only signify how able the Socialist Front are in the administration of only a small Council. And they call upon the Government to resign because the Government has presented an unrealistic Budget and the Government has been incompetent! I do not know how

they are able to form this opinion.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam, when he came to the subject of the Mak Mandin Industrial Estate, said that of all places the State Government has chosen a swampy area for an industrial estate; and that some of the foundations of the factories there are beginning to sink; and in some instances the floor has sunk one foot. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the industrial estate is in my constituency. I have been to all those factories there; and I have never heard of any complaint from the industrialists there. And I do not know how the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam is able to make such representations in this Assembly.

And when we talk about industries I hope the Honourable Members will not only think of Mak Mandin Industrial Estate. I can safely say that it is through the initiative of the State Government in providing the basic necessities for the industrialists that so many industrialists have been drawn to Butterworth. I am fully aware that during the last two or three years we have formed a new Biscuit Factory in Jalan Raja Uda, a Tiles Factory at Sungei Puyu, a Brick Factory at Sungei Dua, a Plastics Factory, and many, many other factories which are providing employment for hundreds of residents in our area. I therefore hope that in future, should reference be made to the industries in Butterworth, the Members opposite will not always think of Mak Mandin. They must also think of the other industries that are being created in private lands or private property.

On the second day of the debate, Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Hon-

ourable Member for Kota said that the State Government is incompetent and, when I go to Butterworth I see nothing, only vacant lands.' I wish to say here, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that as far as I am aware two-thirds of Butterworth has been planned. They have got a plan. But in view of the fact that the State Government has no power to enforce the ruling that owners of vacant land have to develop their area that is the reason why you find many vacant plots in Butterworth town that have not been developed. But I hope that with the introduction and implementation of the National Land Code — if I am not wrong, in one of the clauses there it says that if owners of vacant land do not develop it within a period of 2 years after the implementation of the National Code the State Government has the power to acquire the land — we will be able to see more development in Butterworth. But I wish to emphasize again that it is very wrong to say that nothing has been done in respect of planning for the town of Butterworth.

Regarding the question of provision in the Estimates for Entertainment Allowances of Executive Council members, Opposition members have said that Executive Council meets once a week, and this money is simply being wasted; and we could have utilized the money for better purposes — for the welfare of the people. Mr. Speaker, Sir, to be an Executive Council member is not so easy as our Honourable Member for Jelutong seems to think.

Mr. Speaker: So too the Speaker.

Member for Bagan Ajam (Mr. Phee Joo Teik): Thank you, Mr

Speaker.

I am fully aware that Executive Council meetings started early in the morning and finished late at night. They have no time to go out for lunch. They have no time to go for dinner. And there were a few occasions when the Executive Council meeting terminated on New Year's Eve when the clock struck twelve. Only then did the Executive Council meeting adjourn. We must not forget that the members of the Executive Council are responsible to this Assembly for the various projects and duties of the State Government. It is not only that they have to attend Executive Council meetings. They have their own Committee meetings; they have to make investigations on the spot. And I can quote one occasion when investigations were made on the proposal of the Penang Hill Road. The member concerned had to walk up the hill through the hill jungle to inspect the site.

The Opposition also said that money is being thrown away; that money is being wasted. I wish to emphasize that such remarks are most uncalled for.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am glad to hear from the speech made by the Honourable the Chief Minister that the pontoon bridge is to be replaced by a causeway similar to the one now being constructed at Juru. In point of fact the pontoon bridge has prevented a lot of land on both banks of the Prai River, north of the pontoon bridge, from being developed. But I wish to request that when plans are submitted to the State Government for consideration provision will be made for river transport to go underneath without interruption. Only then will you be able to develop both sides of

the river which are now swamp land and wasted.

Coming to Waterworks, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I note that for the year 1966 the Water Department will have an increased revenue of \$400,000. And I hope that with more revenue coming in water will be provided for all the kampong areas which are lucky enough to have roads constructed in the kampong, especially the road joining Jalan Raja Tun Uda and Jalan Bagan Luar.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the new bridge across the Prai River which we call Jabatan Tunku Abdul Rahman has been completed. Traffic is using that road now. But because most of the traffic is coming on the new road I feel that Siram Road and Sungei Nyor Road, which are used as a by-pass by lorries running from South to North, should be widened, and a new by-pass should be made joining Mak Mandin Estate to Chain Ferry Road. And again, if the Government has any future intention of widening Chain Ferry Road to join up the road with the deep-sea harbour and the ferry terminal I hope that provisions will be made for the resettlement of the business people, and alternative accommodation provided for the residents who may be affected by any future schemes of widening the roads, or new roads.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, before I end I wish to congratulate the State Government for tabling a very balanced budget for 1966, although we have reduced the licence fees for fishermen, which is reduced from \$11,000 to \$1,160 — a difference of \$10,000, and for the year 1966 there is no increase of rates, taxes or other fees in the State. With all this the State Go-

vernment is still having an increased revenue of \$570,438. And I wish to congratulate the State Government for all the good work that they have done for 1965. I am sure that they will do all possible to implement all the budget proposals for 1966; and I am sure the people in the State of Penang will have a very bright future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Sir.

Chief Minister: Alarm has been expressed by the Opposition over the deficit in the year 1966 Budget, and that we are utilizing 25% of our reserves, and they also warned us that if we were to plan our future budgets in this manner our resources would be completely depleted before 1969. This has been described as the first milestone of the decay of the Alliance Government.

The Opposition has tried to paint a very gloomy picture of the future of our State. "The future of penang is bleak;" "Let Penang survive" are some of the slogans of the frustrated or puffed-up Opposition.

To us, however, and to most sensible people the future of Penang is very bright and hopeful under the Alliance Government.

It is to be admitted that there is a deficit this year and our reserves have been utilized to meet this deficit. As explained when moving the Supply Bill, I indicated that there was no necessity for this undue concern. I mentioned that through careful budgeting and prudent spending we have been able to improve on our reserves. This can be seen from page 1 of the Estimate Book which shows the Assets and Li-

abilities of the State as at 31st December, 1965. At the end of 1964 there was an uncommitted reserve of over \$4 million, and during the course of this year we hope to be able to increase this amount by an additional \$450,000.

Hon'ble Members may recall that in 1961 and 1962, the commencing years of the Second Five Year Plan which is now coming to a successful completion — we also contributed large sums of money towards the State Development Fund. This is a very natural sort of event as in the first year of any plan a greater expenditure is involved in view of the preliminary expenditure incurred in relation to the acquisition of land, site works and initial preparations. Therefore, if the Government has to undertake a programme of development so as to increase the facilities and amenities for the people, thereby improving their standard of living, the reserves must be utilized if necessary. As I see it, reserves must be utilized if necessary. As I see it, reserves are there as a safeguard to the income and expenditure pattern of the Government. It is not something which should be left alone. The necessity of withdrawing on this amount has been justified; and I therefore feel that the people of Penang should not be unduly concerned over this. The fact that the Government has been able to put aside well over \$5 million over the last few years is indicative of the sense of economy exercised by the Government with regard to the expenditure of public funds.

The Oppositions' concern for this drawing seems to indicate that there is a lack of desire on their part for development projects to be implemented. In fact

the Hon'ble Member for Kota suggested that we should not contribute to the Development Fund as he felt the \$5 million reserves will go down the drain. However, another opposition member has accused the Government of a complete lack of interest in providing for the future of Penang. This is an old tune which has been played again and again in this Assembly. If we are to carry out a programme of development in the State for the benefit of the people it is imperative that we should obtain the necessary funds. We have been doing it. The Government has been exploring ways and means of increasing our State revenue. We have also submitted our recommendations to a Committee set up by the National Finance Council to investigate into the financial position of all States for consideration.

Members of the Opposition are also very concerned about the increase in Personal Emoluments and the expenditure on housing and hotel accommodation. I would like to clarify that the rates of housing allowances and salary scales are determined in the Whitley Council machinery at which State Government, Central Government and workers are represented. There have been revisions in salary scales and housing allowances. These together with the annual increase brought about by the usual increments have coupled to make the figure set aside for Personal Emoluments higher than in previous years. To my mind this is a very natural sequence and as the years go on this amount will have to be increased progressively. If the Hon'ble Member feels that we are spending or providing far too much in this respect surely he must imply that we should not

accord these increases to the civil servants in the State. Another fact which has to be mentioned here is that with the development programme the volume of work has increased considerably. This has meant creation of certain new appointments to cater for this increased volume of work. The increase expressed as a percentage of the total number of posts in the State is slightly more than 2% in 1966. This is a negligible increase if you correlate it to the increased volume of development work in the State.

There has been some comment on the various provisions in Personal Emoluments for posts which have been made personal to holder. Most of these posts are outmoded and are in respect of appointments such as peons, office-keepers, shroffs, Assistant Penghulus and Supernumerary Clerks. These posts will be deleted from the Estimates as the incumbents retire or are promoted.

The Hon'ble Member from Kota has suggested that all development projects should be productive. Frankly, I do not quite understand what the Hon'ble Member has implied. What is actually meant by the term 'productive'? As I see it, productive values vary with particular projects. If he means that projects should be revenue-producing, then he is certainly not being fair to the public. The Government's efforts in the field of development are aimed at promoting the welfare and preserving the interests of the people. It is, therefore, its duty to provide amenities and facilities of daily life to all its people. Until the Alliance Government started implementing development projects there were in many areas in this State which lacked the basic necessities and

facilities such as a clean water supply, electricity, and an appropriate system of communications, etc., etc. This situation has been rectified to a considerable extent through the efforts of the Alliance Government. Therefore, any statement that the expenditure on development projects has been a waste is certainly most unjustified, and can only come from a person who does not have the interests and the welfare of the people at heart. If the Hon'ble Member still feels that the Government should only concentrate on, as he termed, productive projects then I am afraid he would want the Government to work on the same lines as a commercial organization which bases its criteria of operation on a 'Profit and Loss Account' system. This is something that the Government can ill afford to do, as, if it were to concentrate only on such projects instead of improving the standard of living of all the people, such projects would only benefit a small number.

At this stage I would like to emphasize that all development projects are productive in the wider context of welfare economics. As I have said previously, the term 'productive value' varies with each project. To my mind, if a particular project provides some form of benefit to the people it can also be termed a productive one. I would illustrate this by referring to some of the projects, and to emphasize their productive value to the State. One clear example is the setting up of an industrial estate. The direct benefits derived would accrue in the form of increased employment opportunities, collections for the local authorities, and the increase in revenue in the form of taxes for the Central

Government. It is the desire of every progressive Government to provide employment opportunities for its citizens. Surely the Hon'ble Member does not dispute the fact that the establishment of an industrial estate which makes it necessary for the Government to incur vast sums of expenditure, and obtain no direct benefit accruing to itself, is also productive. Looking at development projects and their implementation of them, to raise the standard of living of the people certainly brings out the productive value of such projects as increased prosperity is reflected by the people in the form of better living conditions, good health, and the like. Therefore, a whole range of projects which provide a service or a facility to people, even though they do not produce revenue in the strict sense of the word are really productive ones. To quote another example, the supply of water involves not only capital but also annually recurrent expenditure. The production and sale of water in this State cannot strictly be described as a revenue-producing project; but all the same this is something which has to be undertaken. Water in any man's language is a basic necessity of life. It is, therefore, the duty of the Government to ensure that a clean supply of water is readily available to the citizens of this State. The water rates and water charges which are being collected in the State are utilized for the maintenance of the works and the purchase of chemicals involved in the processing of water. The revenue derived is used to meet the capital expenditure incurred for such work. I am very happy to announce that so far it has not been necessary for the State Government to have obtained loans in carrying out

its programme of providing water. This has therefore meant that no interest payments and the like have been involved. I have referred to the Muda River Water Supply Scheme which will be undertaken by the State Government to meet the increased demands for water in our State. It is expected that loan funds will have to be sought to meet expenditure of approximately \$26 million during the period 1966 — 1970. The development of the entire project is estimated to cost \$65 million. This scheme when completed will not only provide water to meet the domestic consumption of the State, but also the requirements of all factories to be established in the State for some considerable time to come. As a great deal of capital expenditure is involved, the Government will have to seek alternative sources to meet the repayment of the loan. So far our State has not included the recovery of capital expenditure from water rates and water charges. However, in view of the vastness of the project which will be undertaken it may be necessary for people in this State to contribute towards the meeting of this capital expenditure. We also have numerous drainage and irrigation projects which bring some revenue to the State. The revenue obtained, however, is not really significant as a more direct and productive value is obtained from them. The drainage and irrigation projects have enabled vast areas in the State previously not suitable for agricultural production to be opened up. This has not only enhanced the prosperity of the people in such areas, but has also provided fresh avenues of employment, and the agumentation of incomes in the rural areas. I can, of

course, go on in this manner relating to various projects and how they benefit the people in a productive way. This is not my intention as I am confident that the people who have benefitted from the development projects in our State have appreciated our work and have given us consistent support in the implementation of our projects. There are, of course, revenue-producing items. One example of this is the revenue derived from toddy.

It has been said that over the last eight years the Government has done absolutely nothing in respect of development. This either shows a stubbornness not to accept the fact that we have done well, or a political gimmick to hide behind the phrase, "The Government has not done anything, so back us in the next elections." This is something to be expected from an opposing political party; and we the members of the Government have got accustomed to slogan-crying and promises of a land of vision and splendour. However, I would like once again to clarify for the benefit of the Hon'ble Members that the development of the State of Penang has been publicized through numerous media. A good example is the publication of a book called "Penang Today" which elaborated the work in the field of development. Therefore it is quite ridiculous to say that nothing has been done. One Hon'ble Member has further indicated that as the Government has done nothing in the field of development it should resign. If the people in the State of Penang will remember very vividly 1964, the year when we went back to the people for a mandate to remain in office for a subsequent term, the fact

that the Alliance Government was returned not only in this State but in most of the States of Malaya, they will realize that they only re-elected us because they were satisfied with the progress and the development of this State. Even at the Federal Parliament, the Alliance Government has been returned with an increased majority. If this does not indicate the confidence of the people, then frankly I do not quite know the answer. As regards the by-election at Ayer Itam, I am sorry I am not going to quote this as Mr. Speaker, Sir, has ruled that we should not quote the election in Ayer Itam. I only say we respect the wishes and the decision of the people there.

Over the last few days we have been listening very patiently to the various criticisms made on the Mak Mandin Industrial Estate. Before I go any further on this subject, I would like to clarify that the Mak Mandin Industrial Estate is a pilot scheme and, as such, was designed to gauge the potential of industrial growth in the State. The Honourable Members from across the floor have compared Mak Mandin with other industrial estates such as those at Tasek and Petaling Jaya. May I remind them that it is not always possible to get land adjacent to all the facilities necessary for the efficient functioning of industries. As the selection of the site has been criticised, I would like to assure Honourable Members that this particular aspect was studied very thoroughly by the Government. A Working Party comprising of Federal and State officials was set up in July, 1960, by the Federal Government to consider the establishment of an industrial estate in the State of Penang.

This Working Party, after having carefully studied all the issues involved closely, recommended that the Sungei Mak Mandin was the most suitable area for development as an industrial estate. It also commented on the fact that the Mak Mandin area was not only technically suitable but also contained within its boundaries the only large compact area of State land in Butterworth. This is a very pertinent point as I have previously emphasized the lack of State land available for such purposes in the State. It is not just a question of selecting a site and setting up an industrial estate wherever you feel like it. Before an industrial estate can be established, numerous factors will have to be considered. Important points to consider are the accessibility of the area and the proximity of facilities and services. Surely the Honourable Member does not suggest that the Mak Mandin Industrial Estate was set up without examining all these issues. He has constantly harped on the theme that there is no planning. This is certainly most unjustified and unrealistic as the Member himself would be aware that the establishment of any industrial estate cannot be considered without a basic plan. The fact that the Mak Mandin Industrial Estate was established after consideration by a Working Party and the examination of the recommendations by a special committee appointed by the State Government should indicate that considerable planning went into this project. It is quite obvious to anyone who has been following the development of the Mak Mandin Industrial Estate and that of Butterworth that millions of dollars are being spent for purposes which are designed to accelerate the growth of industrial develop-

ment in the area. I have previously referred to the projects which are being implemented by the various governmental authorities in this area. Surely the Honourable Member does not suggest that organisations like the Penang Port Commission, the Central Electricity Board and the Railway Administration have come here by accident? The fact that well over a hundred million dollars are being expended should, and must, indicate that there is co-ordination between the State Government and these authorities. The fact that all this work is going on should repudiate the allegations of the Opposition that no planning has taken place.

In this connection, I would like to express regret that the Opposition has seen it fit to criticise the Budget as irresponsible and has attempted to bring the Government into contempt and ridicule. This attack on the Budget proposals has therefore been intended to smear and belittle the Government. Even the Hon'ble the Prime Minister has commented on this attitude of the Opposition in the House of Representatives. The Alliance Government is one which respects the parliamentary institutions and the role that parliamentarians can play in consolidating the nation towards progress. The role of the Opposition in this context should be one in which the members offer constructive criticism. This is the very essence of parliamentary democracy. It is the duty of the Opposition to criticise the measures of the Government in a constructive manner and we do not deny them this opportunity. However, in recent meetings, the Opposition has not done this but has instead concentrated on empty slogans such as "No planning,"

"resign." Surely, if the Opposition desires to work for the progress and the development of this State, it should be more constructive in its remarks instead of singing unrealistic and empty slogans. This slogan-singing has only come into prominence over the last one or two years, and it is certainly does not speak well for the proper development of the practice of parliamentary democracy in our State.

The Opposition's theme throughout the entire Session has been the lack of planning on the part of the State Government. This indicates to my mind a lack of knowledge on the part of such Members that various planning and development committees are in existence in this State. One major committee in this respect is the State Rural and National Development Committee which comprises all Heads of State Departments and also Federal Departments, technical officers and Federal and State Legislative representatives. In addition to this, there are also other committees which examine and study issues pertaining to other aspects of development. The Hon'ble Member for Ayer Itam has also commented on the fact that we are unable to solve our problems and that is why we have sought the services of the international team of experts. In the Dewan Ra'ayat the Hon'ble Member for Dato Kramat has also mentioned that the services of this team were sought by the Hon'ble the Minister of Finance himself whilst attending the meeting of the World Bank in Washington. The Honourable Member went on to state that that was an indictment on the State Government, and they should therefore resign. I would like to clarify, once and for all,

the exact position regarding the survey for the benefit of not only the Members of this Assembly but also for the people in the State of Penang. Shortly after the separation of Singapore, officials from the Economic Planning Unit of the Prime Minister's Department came down to Penang on the 3rd September this year, on the invitation of the State Government, to discuss the formulation of an economic plan for the State in the light of the new developments. At this meeting, it was decided that an approach be made to the Central Government regarding the possibility of requesting the world Bank to provide a team to conduct an economic survey of Penang. This request was discussed by the Cabinet and the Hon'ble Minister, when attending the meeting of the World Bank in Washington, made an approach on behalf of the Central Government at the request of the State Government. For the Honourable Member to have suggested that the State Government did not have any interest in this project shows a complete lack of understanding of procedure and the abuse of the sacred duty of parliamentary opposition, that is, to criticise constructively. This unwarranted attack on the State Government was made by the Honourable Member without even verifying the facts — and it is the sincere hope of this Government that Members who desire to criticise the Government should equip themselves with concrete facts relevant to the matters with which they wish to concern themselves, and not to base their statements on puerile assumptions.

There is one point which has been raised by the Hon'ble Mem-

ber for Ayer Itam for which due credit must be given, that is, that there was no land for development and no mining deposits in the State. This, again, is not something new and it has been raised by me on numerous occasions in the past. I have also contended that the State's future is tied up with its industrialisation programme. The fact that the Government has in the course of its Budget speech admitted that there is a problem of unemployment is indicative of the sincerity of the Government in not hiding the true facts from the people. Unemployment, we realise, is a very serious problem — to solve it various measures designed to stimulate the entry of industrial concerns must be adopted. In this respect, I am happy to state that the Government in the State of Penang has been most energetic in providing for an environment conducive to these purposes. There are at the present time some 1,300 power-driven factories operating in Province Wellesley and Penang Island, producing a range of 298 items. In addition to the number of new factories, various other factories are in the process of establishment. The Honourable Member has referred to the establishment of heavy and light industrial sections. It is our hope that what factories there are in the State will now form the nucleus for the rapid transformation of our State into an industrial one. I have previously touched extensively on the developments taking shape in Butterworth, and I am confident that this area will be the centre of industrial activity in the many years to come. Therefore, the Honourable Member's contention

that the policies of the State Government have retarded progress in the State is most unjustified. He has used this argument to demand the resignation of the State Government — this is not the first time that such a call has been made but we, the members of the Alliance Government, are responsible men and it is therefore not necessary for us to follow the dictates of the Opposition as we have a duty to the people and the State to provide for its future.

The subject of the Causeway arose shortly after the Central Government's decision to establish a Common Market in Malaysia. In May, 1965, a private venture submitted its application through the Hon'ble the Prime Minister for consideration by the State Government of Penang. From that time this project has been referred to by various names, and has been discussed very widely in different circles. To suggest that this project was used to win votes would be tantamount to underrating the intelligence of the Ayer Itam electorate. The Alliance Government respects the views of the people. In this connection, I would like to state that we respect the decision of the people at Ayer Itam. Surely, if the State Government or the Central Government had committed itself to carrying out this project Hon'ble Members would not have asked for clarification in the State Assembly as to the policy regarding the implementation of this project. This in itself is indicative of the fact that the matter is still under serious consideration. I have stated in my speech car-

lier that the project would have to be evaluated in the light of its technical and economic feasibility.

The American Trade Mission which visited Penang recently discussed a number of projects, and the Causeway was one of the items. The Hon'ble Member for Ayer Itam has described the personnel of this Mission as merely sellers of heavy machinery. I personally am not sure whether this indicates a lack of interest on the part of the Member or an attempt by him to ridicule the work of the Mission.

The Hon'ble Members from across the floor have commented on the lack of tourist facilities and tourist promotional activities in the State. One Hon'ble Member has gone on to describe how numerous projects can be undertaken in this context. Of course it is well and good for the Hon'ble Member to stand up and offer various projects for implementation in connection with this particular item.

The State Government is aware of the importance of tourism in its relation to the economy and well-being of the State in particular that of Penang Island itself. Tourist promotion is therefore receiving the careful attention of the Government.

In the past, both the State and Central Governments and other authorities, such as the Penang Port Commission, have provided facilities to attract or induce visitors from overseas and the Mainland. The Airport at Bayan Lepas has been expanded at a

cost of approximately \$2.5 million to enable Jet aircraft to land there, thereby placing the State on the international air route. The following are figures in respect of air passengers:—

Year	Total number of Passengers	Total number of transit passengers
1963	56,464	2,452
1964	75,385	6,055
1965 (up to October)	74,375	7,839

It shows a big increase in air travel using the facilities of Penang's airport. The Penang Port Commission's ferry service between the Island and the Mainland has also been improved in recent years to provide a fast and efficient service. A new vessel was moved to the existing fleet at a cost of \$1.7 million, to make the number of vessels operating six. In all probability when the new Railway Station at Butterworth is completed, an additional ferry will be provided. The service which operates at the moment is run at intervals ranging from 10 to 20 minutes, depending on the time and the demand for the service. On weekdays the service from Penang to Butterworth extends from 6 00 a.m. to 1.00 a.m. the following morning. On Saturdays, the last launch operates till 1.40 a.m. On public holidays and festivals, when an increased volume of traffic is expected, a more frequent service is provided to accommodate this. The figures in respect of passengers and vehicles using the services of the Penang Port Commission are as follows:—

Ferry services passenger traffic:

1961		9.4 millions
1962		9.5 millions
1963		9.97 millions
1964		10.11 millions

Motor vehicles carried:

Year	Total
1961	1,408,600
1962	1,552,200
1963	1,405,600
1964	1,537,200

A fresh-water and marine-life aquarium costing approximately \$1.2 million is now under construction at Glugor which, when completed, will not only provide facilities for research but will also be a major tourist attraction. The State Government has contributed a site for the project and is providing an additional sum of \$80,000. Honourable Members may perhaps be aware that the State Government has now established a combined Museum and Art Gallery in the old Hutchings School building. This project is already a big tourist attraction and is costing the Government between \$30,000 to \$40,000 a year in maintenance costs. Visitors to the State Museum and Art Gallery are as follows:—

1965	Number
April	9,493
May	11,554
June	5,225
July	5,665
August	9,277
September	5,773
October	7,965

Before we come to the end of the year the figure will come to more than nine thousand. Work is also expected to commence next year on the development of the area within Fort Cornwallis. This project incorporates the provisions of eating-stalls, shelters,

public conveniences and other necessities at a cost of approximately \$170,000. Apart from being a tourist attraction, the project will also be of great benefit to Mecca-bound pilgrims and passengers plying between Malaysia and the South Indian ports. When such ships are in port, large numbers of relatives and friends usually go to see the pilgrims or passengers off or to receive them on their return. The Government has also prepared plans for a proper conference hall or cultural centre — the proposed Dewan Sri Pinang, for which it has already set aside the Renong Ground as the site. The cost of the building has been estimated to be approximately \$2 million. However, the sum available in the Dewan Sri Pinang Trust Fund is only \$215,000. As the financial resources of the State Government are limited, it is therefore making every effort to obtain other sources of funds for the implementation of this project.

Numerous minor projects in the form of name boards for places of interest or popular beaches have also been provided by the State Government. Parking bays and accesses to beaches have been provided, particularly along the coast road of Penang Island. The Government also makes an annual grant to the Penang Tourist Association to enable it to carry out tourist promotional activities. It is therefore not correct for the Hon'ble Member to suggest that nothing has been done to attract tourists to the State. The Government cannot be said to be complacent but, as you are all aware, the promotion of tourism is something which cannot, and should not, be borne by Government alone.

Of course, a great deal more can be done in this direction and I would like to refer to two other projects which we have been considering. There is a proposal to establish a National Park on Penang Island. A suitable site for this project has been selected in the Pantai Acheh Forest Reserve. However, in view of the cost involved, about \$2 million, it is not possible for the State Government to implement this project at the present time but an approach has been made to the Central Government for assistance.

The Hon'ble Member has commented that Penang's position is ideal in the sense that it has international hotels, entertainment, educational and historical places of interest and is readily accessible by air, road and rail. All the projects which I have mentioned previously have been undertaken in the context of this pre-eminence of Penang in the International Tourist Map. I do feel that the Hon'ble Member has been most unfair in his remarks about the Penang Tourist Association and its work. I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of the State Government to thank the Penang Tourist Association for the good work it is doing in promoting tourism in the State. Of course a great deal more can be done to enhance the contribution of tourism towards state revenue. Surely the Hon'ble Member is aware that any such work involves expenditure and it is necessary therefore for us to explore various possibilities to raise money needed for this purpose. So what the Hon'ble Member has said is not new. The development of tourism should not and cannot be the responsibility of Government alone. I have previously

spoken on the role, that those who would be reaping direct benefits from tourism, could play towards the promotion of measures designed to accelerate the growth of the tourist industry in the State. One possible avenue would be for such persons to contribute and pool their resources together towards this objective. The State Government, for its part, is prepared to assist them in every way possible. Further, I would like to emphasise that, though the Government will continue to take a great interest in the field of tourist promotion, the development of this industry is contingent on the efforts of all concerned. Therefore we must get support from the private sector and if this is not forth-coming, then it would be extremely difficult for the Government to do very much.

Education is primarily a Federal responsibility. Due to the excellent co-operation between the State and Federal Governments satisfactory progress has been made in the field of education. Penang has always been considered an advanced centre in the educational field. This is illustrated by the fact that in addition to all types of schools the State also has numerous other institutions which cater for specialized training. One such facility is the construction of the new Technical Institute at Batu Lanchang at a cost of approximately \$2.5 million. This will be an important institution in the light of the State's progress in the field of industrial development. Students showing an aptitude for technical skill will be trained in this Institute for absorption into industry. The University College/University in Penang too is a project which I

have referred to earlier; and therefore there is no necessity for me to go into details once again. There is another institution which has helped to enhance the prestige of Penang as a centre of learning. This is the Dental Training School which will provide training facilities for Dental Nurses and Dental Technicians. The building costing approximately \$1 million will incorporate two large Children's Dental Clinics with facilities to treat a total number of 100 children at a time, a School for Dental Nurses, and a Department for Dental Health Education. Recently I also made an announcement that the Central Government had agreed to develop a Fisheries College in Penang costing initially approximately \$2 million, in addition to the Fisheries School at Glugor. For nearly all the projects State land has been involved; and due to the excellent co-operation and support given by this Government all these facilities have been made available to the people of Penang. Therefore, both historically and in present-day context the State of Penang will be in the forefront in so far as educational facilities are concerned. It is the aim of the Alliance State Government to carry on with this tradition, and to maintain Penang's leading position in this field.

All these new projects, Mr. Speaker, Sir, are productive projects in spite of the fact that no direct revenue is obtained. The benefit which accrues to the nation is that education provides the framework in which progress and development can take place. Hon'ble Members in the Opposition have referred to the difficult times and the challenges that lie ahead. It is our contention that

educational facilities and the training which these institutions will give will equip our young generation to face the tasks ahead with greater confidence, and in a more realistic manner. Surely all this work could not have been undertaken if there had not been a concerted planning programme between the State and the Central Governments. It must be quite obvious to the Hon'ble Members who have criticized the lack of planning that all these achievements could not have taken place if planning had not been in existence.

The Hon'ble Members from the Opposition have quoted very extensively from the Auditor-General's Report for the year 1964 which has been tabled as Paper No. 16 of 1965. Their activities have ranged from picking out certain points and commenting on nearly every paragraph contained in the Report. As far as I can see, the comments of the Auditor-General as regards the Estimates being unrealistic should be taken to mean that we should not provide money if we are unable to spend it. However, the Opposition has used this Report to suit its own ends by pointing out that not only have the figures been unrealistic but the projects undertaken are useless, and that we are wasting public funds. On a point of clarification I would like to state that the Report submitted by the Auditor-General is tabled before the Assembly for information. This Report is then submitted to the Public Accounts Committee which is appointed by a Motion of the State Legislative Assembly under Standing Order 109A(2) to examine matters set out in Standing Order 109A(1).

At the meetings of the Public Accounts Committee, Heads of Departments are required to give explanations on the points raised in the Auditor-General's Report pertaining to their respective Departments. It is most unfortunate that the Opposition has seen fit to use this Report in order to attack the budget proposals for 1966 even before the Report had been considered by the Public Accounts Committee. The Government has been most sincere in tabling this Paper. I would also like to point out that the Report for the year 1963, with the comments of the Public Accounts Committee was also tabled at this Meeting; but the members of the Opposition have seen it fit not to refer to that particular Paper. Instead they have directed their attention to the 1964 Report which, as I have said, has not as yet been examined by the Public Accounts Committee.

I would like to make it quite clear that I have no intention to interfere with the work of the Public Accounts Committee. However, in view of the fact that there has been an unrestrained attack on the various items incorporated in the 1964 Report it is only fair that I should comment on one or two aspects. The most persistent criticism has been made on the unrealistic estimation as regards development expenditure. If the Hon'ble Members had taken the trouble they would have read the explanation provided by the State to the Public Accounts Committee on the 1963 Report. The fact that this was accepted by the Public Accounts Committee, in which the Opposition is also represented, certainly repudiates the charges that the Go-

vernment has been inefficient or dishonest. In like manner I feel confident that when the 1964 Report is referred to the Public Accounts Committee satisfactory explanations will be provided which will demolish the case that the Opposition has tried to make against the Government in this matter.

It is common knowledge that organizations responsible for the collection of monies usually show balance outstanding at the end of the financial year which are collected soon in the new year. The Hon'ble Member for Ayer Itam referred to the position of the District Councils in the State, and has stated that the City Council has not been mentioned in this Report. This certainly does not imply that the City Council is free from errors. I had no intention of bringing the City Council to this Assembly; but since the Hon'ble Member has raised the subject in this House it is fair for me to reply to this point. The Auditor-General has also made various observations on the Accounts of the City Council. These relate to expenditure in excess of that authorized in its budget, the creation of posts without prior approval, the unsatisfactory financial position of the Transport Department, etc., etc. Therefore the Hon'ble Member is most unjustified in singling the District Councils for attack. However, I would like to assure this Assembly that the Auditor-General's comments for 1964 will be considered by the Public Accounts Committee and the Report of that Committee will be tabled in this Assembly.

The Hon'ble Member for Ayer Itam has also spoken on the need

for the reduction of customs duties and Federal Taxes. As these are Federal subjects they should be more appropriately raised in the Dewan Ra'ayat. The Hon'ble Member is instead barking at the wrong tree by raising all these issues here. However, I would like to assure him that the Government is fully aware of the problems and its responsibilities.

The comments made by the Hon'ble Member as regards the opening of Jalan Kampong Pisang by the Hon'ble the Deputy Prime Minister are most unfair. It is not quite clear in my own mind the motive which led the Hon'ble Member to speak on the subject. Surely it is not wrong for school children to greet the Deputy Prime Minister when he visits any State. In fact, Tun was so pleased with the school children on that day, that he walked the entire length of the road to personally thank them. For the benefit of the Hon'ble Member I would like to point out that the opening of Jalan Kampong Pisang was not the only ceremony performed by the Deputy Prime Minister that day. Earlier in the morning Tun inaugurated the MARA Bus Service which runs along Pinang Tunggal Road and the Pekan Sahari at Permatang Sintok, Province Wellesley North.

The Hon'ble Member has also compared Penang with the State of Selangor in the field of development. All the States in Malaysia are now undertaking a vigorous programme of development. Therefore, we should not envy or grudge when we see development in another State. After all development in any State will contribute towards the progress of the

Nation and this is the objective of the Government — to develop the Nation as a whole. The State Government has and will continue to create the climate conducive to the establishment of industries here. It is, therefore, left to the industrialists to take advantage of these facilities and contribute their share towards the increased prosperity of the State and the well-being of the people.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the members of this Assembly have had to listen to the comments of the Opposition on the budget for the last few days. I have always maintained that the State Government of Penang is prepared to listen to constructive criticism. Unfortunately so far we only have had slogan singing on the part of the Opposition. I am now able to understand why the Hon'ble Member for Kota keeps referring to harmonic notes and musical tempo.

Sir, I have today replied to all the points raised by the Opposition and I believe it is parliamentary practice for the Hon'ble Members to be present in the Assembly and follow its proceedings when the House is in session. It is regretted that some of the members from the Opposition, particularly the main speakers

have seen it fit not to uphold this tradition. It is but fair to expect them to listen to the Government's reply or clarifications on points raised by them. However, the members of the Government are now quite accustomed to this sort of unparliamentary behaviour. Sir, the picture of unadulterated gloom which has been painted by the Opposition over the last few days has been dispelled. It is my hope that all members of this Assembly will now give their support to the Supply Bill for 1966.

Thank you.

Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification: I don't know whether he said "all Members of the Opposition are present" or "some," because I am here.

Chief Minister: Some.

Question put and agreed to.
Bill accordingly read a second time.

Committee.

The Bill is considered clause by clause.

The Assembly adjourns at 4.35 p.m. to 30th November, 1965, at 10 a.m.



