

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS
OF THE SECOND LEGISLATIVE
ASSEMBLY, PENANG

2 ND SITTING OF THE
THIRD SESSION TUESDAY
22 ND NOVEMBER, **1966**

KPP
328.595123
PEN



99674



22nd November, 1966

PRESENT:

- The Hon'ble Mr. Speaker (Tuan Haji Sulaiman bin Haji Ahmad, P.J.K.)
„ the Chief Minister (Tan Sri Wong Pow Nee, P.M.N.)
„ the Legal Adviser (Enche Ibrahim bin Abdul Manan)
„ the Member for Glugor (Enche Aziz Ibrahim, J.M.N., J.P.)
„ the Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik,
A.M.N., J.P.)
„ the Member for Sungei Bakap (Mr. Kee Yong Chin, J.P.)
„ the Member for Permatang Pauh (Enche Ariffin bin Shariff, P.J.K.)
„ the Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D.S. Ramanathan, J.P.)
„ the Member for Kelawei (Mr. Tan Khim Hoe, P.J.K.)
„ the Member for Dhoby Ghaut (Enche M.S.A. Zachariah)
„ the Member for Tanjong Bungah (Mr. Cheah Seng Khim, J.P.)
„ the Member for Kepala Batas (Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Haji
Abdullah, A.M.N.)
„ the Member for Bagan Ajam (Mr. Phee Joo Teik, P.J.K.)
„ the Member for Nibong Tebal (Tuan Haji Sahid bin Hassan, P.J.K.)
„ the Member for Balik Pulau (Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Mohamed
Taib)
„ the Member for Tasek Glugor (Enche Ahmad bin Haji Jamil)
„ the Member for Butterworth (Mr. Williams David)
„ the Member for Bayan Lepas (Enche Ismail bin Hashim)
„ the Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu)
„ the Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Teh Ewe Lim)
„ the Member for Tanjong Tengah (Mr. Teh Geok Kooi)
„ the Member for Tanjong Utara (Mr. Khoo Kay Por)
„ the Member for Tanjong Selatan (Mr. Khor Peng Seah)
„ the Member for Jelutong (Mr. Tan Hock Hin)

ABSENT

- The Hon'ble the Member for Ayer Itam (Mr. Lim Kean Siew)

— 253 —

The Assembly resumes
at 10.00 a.m.

(B) Motion by the Honourable the
the Chief Minister.

Chief Minister: Usul yang di-bentangkan atas nama saya ia-lah untuk meminta Dewan Undangan ini memutuskan bahawa wang sa-jumlah \$16,963,163 seperti yang terchatet di dalam Anggaran Kemajuan Negeri tahun 1967, hendak-lah di-gunakan untuk tujuan2 yang tertentu dalam Anggaran tersebut. Ketetapan ia-lah mengikut Seksyen 4 dan 52) Undang-an2 Taboh Kemajuan Negeri, Pulau Pinang, tahun 1958, dan apabila telah di-luluskan akan membolehkan Kerajaan Negeri ini menambahkan peruntukan2 yang telah di-masokkan ka-dalam Anggaran tahun 1967.

Ranchangan Kemajuan Kerajaan Perikatan telah pun mendapat kejayaan yang chemerlang. Ranchangan itu telah pun menghasilkan tujuan2 yang di-maksudkan: ia-itu untuk meninggikan taraf kehidupan serta memperbaiki taraf Kebajikan 'am orang2 awam. Sesuatu peningkatan taraf kehidupan ada-lah tergantung kepada satu peningkatan Kebajikan ekonomi; maka dengan yang demikian tingkatan ekonomi ra'ayat negeri ini telah juga meningkat. Keadaan yang menggembirakan telah pun di-chapai oleh Kerajaan Perikatan dengan pelaksanaan beberapa macham ranchangan2 Kemajuan. Pada masa Tuan Yang Terutama Gabnor menyampaikan ucapan-nya di-Dewan ini pada bulan Jun yang lalu, satu laporan yang di-lengkapkan dengan lampiran kepada ucapan-nya telah pun di-bentangkan. Laporan ini ada-lah memberi satu senarai yang sepe-nah-nya atas ranchangan2 yang telah di-laksanakan dan hasil2 yang telah di-perolehi daripada-nya. Kita telah pun menchapai Kemajuan yang banyak, tetapi kita maseh lagi jauh dapat mengejar taraf kemajuan negeri2 yang telah maju. Oleh itu pelaksanaan Ranchangan2 Kemajuan hendak-lah sentiasa berjalan. Dengan tamat-nya Konfrantasi maka Kerajaan Perikatan ada-lah bertujuan hendak menumpukan segala tenaga-nya kepada pelak-

sanaan Ranchangan2 Kemajuan.

Di-dalam lapangan pertanian, khas-nya tanaman padi, perubahan yang bersejarah telah pun di-dapati dengan kemajuan menanam padi "Malinja" dan "Mahsuri", padi yang boleh di-tanam dan di-ketam dalam masa yang lebeh singkat (chuma 135 hari) dan yang boleh mengeluarkan hasil yang lebeh banyak (lebeh daripada 600 gantang satu ekar) daripada yang biasa atau pun daripada beneh2 padi biasa. Sung-gohpun kedua2 jenis padi ini telah di-maju dan di-keluarkan dengan men-chukupi chuma baru2 ini sahaja beneh2 itu telah di-gunakan di-seluruh negeri ini, di-mana tanaman dua kali meliputi lebeh kurang 31,000 ekar daripada jumlah 39,000 ekar tanah yang di-tanam padi; tanaman ini mengeluarkan hasil yang bertambah2 kepada petani2 berkenaan. Sukachita saya menyatakan, dan seperti apa yang telah di-nyatakan dalam akhbar2, satu lagi jenis padi telah pun di-kenalkan, satu jenis yang bermutu lebeh tinggi daripada jenis2 lain. Padi tesebut telah pun di-namakan "Padi Ria". Jenis padi ini ada-lah hasil daripada usaha bersama di-antara Lembaga Penyelidikan Padi Antarabangsa di-Manila dan Jabatan Pertanian kita. Beneh ini boleh mengeluarkan hasil sebanyak 1,200 gantang satu ekar bagi sekali tanam, ia-itu dua kali ganda hasil yang di-dapati daripada "Malinja" dan "Mahsuri." Sekira-nya beneh baharu ini di-gunakan bagi menanam dua kali sa-tahun, dan keadaan membenarkan, hasil sebanyak 2,400 gantang sa-ekar sa-tahun boleh di-perolehi. Maka kaum tani yang sahingga ini telah pun mengambil kesempatan menanam padi dua kali sa-tahun, dengan kemudahan2 yang di-berikan oleh Kerajaan, akan dapat menambahkan pendapatan-nya 100% apakala mereka yang menanam padi jenis "Padi Ria". Ingin saya menambah kata bahawa "Padi Ria" bukan sahaja akan memberi faedah yang lebeh kepada kaum tani bahkan juga kamapa Kerajaan oleh sebab tanaman padi ini ada-lah di-jangka akan menghasilkan chita2 Negara kita untuk menchapai kebolehan mengeluarkan kesemua padi bagi kegunaan sendiri, dan dengan itu dapat-lah juga mengu-rangkan belanja ka-luar negeri. Me-

mandangkan kepada faedah2 tersebut, Negeri ini mengambil keutamaan untuk mengeluarkan benih2 padi yang mencukupi bagi kegunaan kaum tani yang berkenaan di-dalam negeri ini dan juga bagi tempta2 lain di-negara kita. Kerajaan Negeri ini ingin meng-uchap terima kasih kepada Lembaga Penyelidikan Padi Antarabangsa di-Manila dan Jabatan Pertanian kita atas kemajuan yang di-nikmati oleh kaum2 tani di-negara kita.

Berhubung dengan pertanian saya ingin menambah bahawa dengan murah hati dan belas kasehan Kerajaan Persekutuan, ranchangan bantuan baja padai telah pun di-mulakan di-negeri ini. Kadar bantuan baja yang di-luluskan (urea dan basal mixture) dalam tahun 1964 dan 1965 chuma 20% dan 10% sahaja, kadar bantuan bagi tahun ini telah pun ti-tambahkan sa-hingga 30%. Kerajaan Negeri telah pun membuat perjanjian dengan penjual2 runchit supaya petani2 yang berkenaan membayar chuma 70% sahaja daripada jumlah harga baja yang di-beli; baki sebanyak 30% ada-lah di-bayar oleh Kerajaan. Tujuan kita ada-lah untuk meneruskan kadar bantuan yang tinggi ini dalam tahun 1967. Selain daripada tambahan kadar bantuan Kerajaan Negeri ini telah pun mengadakan satu pertukaran dalam sistem pemberian bantuan dalam 1966: Kesatuan Bank Kerjasama atau pun chawangan2-nya tidak-lah lagi menjadi wakil2 pemberian yang tunggal baja2 bantuan; baja2 ini ada-lah juga di-dapati daripada penjual2 runchit. Pertukaran ini telah pun di-buat untuk membolehkan penanam2 padi yang sebenar-nya menikmati kemudahan2 bantuan ini dengan tidak mengira sama ada mereka itu ahli2 Sharikat Kerjasama atau pun tidak. Sistem ini ada-lah juga memberi peluang kepada mereka yang membayar tunai bagi baja2-nya menikmati bantuan yang sepenoh-nya, ia-itu 30%. Ranchangan pemberian baja chara berhutang, yang di-anjorkan oleh Kerajaan Negeri kita maseh lagi dijalankan melalui Bank Kesatuan. Baja2 di-bawah ranchangan ini ada-lah di-beri melalui Bank Kesatuan, dan

oleh sebab ini termasuk perbelanjaan yang berlebihan, maka Bank Kesatuan ada-lah di-benarkan oleh Kerajaan Negeri ini mengenakan sedikit bayaran komishen. Peratoran2 baru ini dan juga kedua2 ranchangan baja tersebut, ia-itu ranchangan bantuan baja dan ranchangan berhutang, akan di-teruskan dalam tahun 1967. Kerajaan Negeri ini telah menyediakan satu peruntokan sebanyak \$240,000 untuk di-berikan sebagai bantuan 1967, dan satu peruntokan pusingan (revolving fund) sebanyak \$300,000 untuk mengadakan baja dengan chara berhutang. Kerajaan Perikatan berharap bahawa petani2 akan menggunakan kemudahan2 ini dengan sepenoh-nya untuk meningkatkan taraf kehidupan ekonomi mereka.

Dalam Ranchangan Kerajaan Perikatan untuk Pembangunan Luar Bandar, bukan-lah penanam2 padi sahaja yang di-beri layanan dan bantuan oleh pihak Kerajaan. Pihak2 lain, sebagai pekebun2 getah kecil, penanam2 pala, chengkeh buah-buahan dan penternak2 ayam itek dan sebagainya ada-lah juga di-beri layanan yang sama. Pekebun2 kelapa di-negeri ini ada-lah pihak yang terakhir sekali mendapat kemudahan dari pihak Kerajaan. Semenjak awal tahun ini ranchangan2 yang mendapat bantuan untuk di-puleh semula atau di-tanam semula dengan pokok2 kelapa telah pun di-mulakan di-negeri ini. Ranchangan yang demikian telah pun di-mulakan di-Seberang Perai Selatan sebagai satu Ranchangan perchutaan, dan kemudian-nya akan di-mulakan di-tempat2 lain dalam negeri ini. Dalam Ranchangan Pembangunan Malaysia yang Pertama lebih daripada satu juta ringgit ada-lah di-belanjakan atas ranchangan ini oleh Kerajaan Persekutuan.

Kejayaan Pertanian tersangat-lah bergantung atas keadaan parit dan taliayer yang sempurna. Ini ada-lah mustahak oleh sebab kekurangan tanah di-negeri ini. Saya yakin bahawa Majlis ini harus bersukachita mendapat tahu bahawa pekerjaan at-

kedua2 Ranchangan Taliayer akan di-mulakan pada tahun 1967 sungguh pun chuma peruntokan tanda sahaja telah di-berikan dalam Peranggaran Kema juan tahun 1966. Ranchangan2 ini, apabila siap, akan boleh membekalkan ayer untuk menjayakan, bukan satu tanaman sahaja, bahkan dua tanaman bagi sa-tahun atas lebih kurang 1,300 ekar tanah. Satu daripada ranchangan ini ia-lah tambahan kepada Ranchangan Pam Ayer, Kubang Semang; ini ada-lah terchatet sebagai perengkat dua dalam Ranchangan Kubang Semang dalam Peranggaran Kema juan tersebut. Pada masa ini ada 300 ekar bendang2 di-antara Sungei Rambai dan Sungei Ara dalam kawasan Tali Ayer Sungei Kulim yang belum lagi dapat mengeluarkan hasil yang tinggal di-sebabkan oleh tanah2 kawasan ini ada-lah tinggi daripada kawasan2 sekeliling-nya. Ranchangan yang baharu ini akan mengadakan taliayer2 yang sempurna bagi kawasan ini. Jumlah perbelanjaan bagi ranchangan ini ia-lah \$120,000 dan \$80,000 daripada-nya akan di-belanjakan dalam tahun 1967.

Ranchangan taliayer baharu yang lagi satu itu ia-lah Ranchangan Taliayer Tasek Glugor. Ranchangan ini akan mengadakan taliayer2 bagi lebih kurang 1,000 ekar yang sekarang ini semata2 bergantung kepada ayer hujan untuk mengadakan satu tanaman sa-tahun. Jumlah perbelanjaan ia-lah \$450,000 dan satu peruntokan sebanyak \$100,000 ada-lah di-buat dalam Peranggaran tahun 1967. Ada-lah perlu bagi pihak Kerajaan mengambil milik tanah untuk simpanan taliayer di-bawah ranchangan ini dan juga di-bawah Ranchangan Kubang Semang, (peringkat dua). Ingin saya menjelaskan kepada tuan2 tanah yang berke-maan supaya memahami bahawa tindakan ini tidak-lah dapat di-elakkan dan terbit-nya ada-lah semata2 dengan tujuan yang membenakan oleh pihak Kerajaan yang bertujuan untuk memberi faedah kepada penduduk2 tempatan.

Sebagai yang termaalom, ternakan ayam-itek dan binatang2 lain ia-lah satu chara hidup yang mustahak bagi penduduk2 luar bandar kita. Kita harus dapat mengkaji kepentingan-nya sekira-nya kita ketahui bahawa harga ayam-itek dan telur2-nya yang dikeluarkan oleh Negeri ini ada-lah di-nilai lebih kurang 18 juta ringgit sa-tahun dan pengeluaran babi2 lebih kurang 25 juta ringgit sa-tahun. Ada-lah di-anggarkan bahawa selain daripada apa yang di-gunakan oleh negeri ini sendiri, kita ada-lah menjual men-jual hetong panjang 10,000 ekor ayam dan itek dan 200 ekar babi sa-hari ka-tempat2 lain seperti Ipoh dan Kuala Lumpur. Maka ini-lah sebab-nya yang perusahaan ini sepatut-nya di-pelihara dan di-majukan. Langkah2 yang tertentu ada-lah di-ambil untuk memujuk Kerajaan Pusat supaya mengadakan di-negeri kita ini satu pusat penyelidekan dan pembiakan ayam itek, satu pusat "artificial insemination" bagi babi2 dan juga sa-buah ma'amal wilayan untuk memberi perkhidmatan kepada perusahaan2 yang semikian dalam Negeri ini dan wilayah ini keselurohan-nya. Di-samping membuat ekonomi luar bandar kita, kita ada-lah juga berharap bahawa pusat2 tersebut akan menjadi chawangan2 Fekalti Haiwan, University College, Pulau Pinang yang di-chadangkan itu pada satu hari kelak.

Di-antara ranchangan2 yang akan di-laksanakan pada tahun hadapan, keutamaan akan terus di-beri kepada benaan jalan2 baru dan untuk memperbaiki jalan2 dan titi2 yang ada sekarang ini. Lebih daripada \$1,500,000 akan di-belanjakan untuk ranchangan ini dalam tahun 1967.

Ada-lah ternyata bahawa negeri kita ini mempunyai jalan2 raya dan chawangan2-nya yang lebih banyak daripada kebanyakan negeri2 lain. Di-samping itu, Kerajaan Negeri ini bershukor atas kepujian yang sebenar-nya ini; kita ada-lah berazam bahawa tidak ada kawasan2 di-negeri ini yang ketinggalan jika di-bandingkan dengan tempat2 yang lain di-sebabkan oleh kekurangan jalan2, ini-lah sebab-nya

yang kita akan terus menjayakan ranchangan2 jalan raya. Tetapi bukanlah semua peruntukan wang itu akan di-gunakan untuk jalan2 di-luar bandar sahaja, sa-bahagian daripada-nya akan di-gunakan untuk jalan2 dan jambatan2 di-kawasan2 bandar. Sa-bahagian daripada jumlah perbelanjaan yang di-chadangkan terlebih daripada \$1,500,000 untuk ranchangan ini, kita jangka akan menerima bantuan wang persekutuan sabagai bayaran ganti belanja (reimbursement of expenditure) sebanyak \$760,000.

Angka ini tidak-lah termasuk harga ranchangan memperbaiki jalan2 raya yang akan di-selenggarakan oleh Kerajaan Pusat di-Butterworth dimana pekerjaan membena satu pelabohan yang dalam maseh berjalan dengan sempurna-nya. Apabila pembenaan pelabohan ini selesai kelak jalan Chain Ferry, sebagai jalan yang terpenting menuju ka-arrah selatan daripada pelabohan tersebut akan menjadi satu jalan yang sebek, dimana lalu lintas akan di-dapati lebeh banyak lagi. Oleh itu jalan ini hendaklah di-bena dan di-perluaskan sa-arah dengan jalan2 raya yang teristimewa, jika tidak ia akan di-dapati sempit dan juga merbahaya kepada orang2 yang menggunakan-nya. Kerajaan Persekutuan telah pun menyediakan beberapa juta ringgit untuk ranchangan ini, dan berharap untuk melaksanakan-nya sebaik2 sahaja tanah di-sepanjang jalan Chain Ferry yang lama telah di-ambilkan. Kerajaan Negeri ini adalah memberi kerjasama yang sepenoh-nya atas perkara ini, dan sementara itu menchuba mengurangkan setakat yang boleh orang yang akan terlibat dalam pengambilan tanah ini. Saya ada-lah berasa kesal yang pengambilan tanah ini terpaksa di-selenggarakan, tetapi saya ingin menyakinkan pihak2 yang berkenaan bahawa bukan-lah tujuan Kerajaan Persekutuan atau pun Negeri ini yang nasib mereka itu tidak di-hiraukan. Oleh yang demikian, selain daripada bayaran sagu-hati yang biasa mereka itu akan di-beri keutamaan sekira-nya mereka ingin membeli rumah2 pangsa yang sedang di-ran-

changkan oleh Kerajaan Negeri ini untuk di-bena di-jalan tersebut tidak lama lagi berdekatan dengan Jambatan Prai yang baru itu. Kerajaan ini ada-lah sanggup menerima bayaran2 sechारा ansor untuk membolehkan mereka memiliki rumah2 sendiri.

Berkenaan dengan perbekalan ayer pula, banyak lagi tempat2 dalam negeri ini akan di-sampaikan bekalan2 ayer pada tahun hadapan. Tempat2 ini ada-lah termasuk kampung2 di-Seberang Perai dan juga tempat2 di-antara bandar dan luar—bandar2 dan kampung2 di-sebelah selatan dan kawasan2 tenggara Pulau Pinang. Tempat2 di-Pulau Pinang ini ada-lah mendapat bekalan ayer-nya daripada Jabatan Ayer Majlis Bandar Raya. Tetapi, perbekalan-nya di-kawasan itu ada-lah di-dapati tidak menchukupi dan bekalan ayer yang bertambah tidak-lah dapat di-sampaikan. Desakan kepada perbekalan ayer yang bertambah2 di-wilayah ini tidak-lah dapat di-tunaikan kechuali perbekalan2 itu di-pertambahkan dan kerja2 lain yang bersangkutan seperti binaan “balancing” atau tangki2 takongan ayer di-laksanakan. Satu ranchangan tambahan yang lengkap untuk meliputi wilayah ini seluruh-nya, ada-lah di-anggarkan ber-harga sebanyak \$2,000,000. Keperluan serta-merta ia-lah untuk memperbaiki perbekalan di-antara Minden Barracks dan Kampung Jawa. Ini ada-lah di-jangka akan membantu perbekalan ayer bagi kawasan perumahan yang besar di-kawasan Sungei Nibong/Sungei Dua dan juga untuk mengadakan perbekalan ayer yang berganda lagi kepada kawasan2 di-sebelah selatan tempat ini. Pertambahan di-perengkat ini ada-lah di-taksirkan akan menelan belanja sebanyak \$540,000. Kerajaan Negeri ini telah pun memutuskan untuk membantu Majlis Bandar Raya dengan memberi satu peruntukan sebanyak setengah daripada jumlah harga tersebut, ia-itu sebanyak \$270,000, oleh sebab tidak-lah patut bagi Majlis Bandar Raya itu di-bebankan dengan bayaran yang sepenoh-nya bagi ranchangan tersebut. Sukachita juga saya

mema'alomkan bahawa kampung2 yang berikut akan di-beri perbekalan ayer pada tahun hadapan selepas sahaja ranchangan memperbaiki itu di-siapkan :—

Jalan Tengah

Sungei Batu

Kampung Mesjid

Kampung Bakar Kapor

Kampung Sungei Tiram.

Saya telah pun menerangkan berkenaan dengan Ranchangan Perbekalan Ayer Sungei Muda yang besar itu di-dalam ucapan saya berkenaan Rang Perbekalan. Kita ada-lah maseh menunggu laporan penyelidikan yang balusi daripada pakar yang berkenaan sebelum membuat sebarang permohonan bagi mendapat wang pinjaman untuk ranchangan ini, dan juga sebelum mengambil langkah bagi pelaksanaan-nya. Ada-lah di-jangka bahawa laporang tersebut akan siap pada satu masa tahun hadapan.

Sekarang ini saya ingin menyentoh hal kemajuan perusahaan. Bagi yang pertama-nya ia-lah Kawasan Perusahaan Perchubaa di-Mak Mandin Butterworth. Saperti yang telah pun saya sebutkan tidak lama dahulu di-Majlis ini, pemilehan tempat ini bukan-lah di-buat dengan buta tuli sahaja oleh pihak Kerajaan kita ini. Tempat itu telah pun mendapat sokongan oleh sa-buah Jawatan Kuasa mengandongi pegawai2 daripada Kerajaan Pusat dan Kerajaan Negeri yang telah pun siasat dengan teliti-nya sebelum membuat sokongan-nya. Saya bukan-lah menchuba hendak menyalahkan mereka atau pun menyinkirkan pendapat mereka. Mereka ada-lah berpendapat bahawa sasunggoh pun keadaan tanah di-kawasan ini tidak begitu memuaskan tetapi memandang kepada yang kahadapan kelak Mak Mandin ada-lah di-jangka akan menjadi satu pusat perusahaan yang maju jaya oleh sebab

kawasan-nya ada-lah berhampiran dengan pelabohan dan kemudahan2 yang boleh di-dapati di-Butterworth. Kerajaan Negeri ini ada-lah bersempati dengan sepenoh-nya atas pendapat ini dan maseh lagi bersetuju penoh dengan-nya. Dan mengapa-kah pula Kemajuan itu lambat? Kawasan ini ada-lah perlu di-tambun terlebih dahulu dan ini akan memakan masa untuk di-kemaskan. Akan tetapi satu lagi faktor yang saya anggap penting ia-lah soal kewangan-nya, manakala faktor yang ketiga ada-lah konfrantasi. Penanam modal sangat-lah berawasi. Ia mahu menentukan bahawa modal-nya akan memberi faedah yang menchukupi, selain daripada berawas2 supaya modal-nya itu tidak dapat kerugian. Oleh itu ia ada-lah meng-ambil masa untuk membuat sesuatu keputusan. Faktor ini-lah, saya per-chaya menjadi puncha utama bagi melambatkan perkembangan perusahaan2 di-Mak Mandin. Tidak-lah ada kesimpulan lain yang dapat sa-saorang itu membuat sakira-nya sa-saorang itu membuat satu kajian dan selidekan yang teliti dan tidak terpengaruh atas kemajuan perusahaan di-kawasan tersebut memandangkan kepada sharat2 yang di-tawarkan oleh kita ada-lah tidak kurang patut-nya daripada sharat2 yang di-dapati di-tempat2 lain dalam Negara ini, dan juga kemudahan2 yang telah pun tersedia di-Butterworth bagi di-gunakan oleh perusahaan2 itu boleh-lah di-anggapkan sataraf dengan yang terbaik di-negara ini. Patut-lah saya menegaskan bahawa kebanyakan tapak2 di-Mak Mandin telah pun di-luluskan untuk perusahaan2. Apa2 yang di-katakan oleh orang2 yang berniat tidak baik tidak-lah langsung menjadi asas bagi memesongkan kepercayaan kita yang tinggi itu atas kejayaan perusahaan2 di-Mak Mandin pada kemudian hari kelak. Boleh-lah saya menambah kata bahawa tanda kejayaan yang terbaharu sekali ia-lah kesemua 16 unit rumah2 terrace untuk kilang2 kechil yang di-binakan oleh Malaysian Industrial Estates Limited telah pun di-jualkan. Kilang2 tersebut telah pun bermula mengeluarkan berbagai2 hasil perusahaan-nya, dan ada-lah juga menjadi

puncha memberi pekerjaan2 kepada raayat. Ada juga di-dapati desakan2 bagi menambahkan unit2 bagi menempatkan kilang2 kecil tersebut dan Malaysian Industrial Estate Limited ada-lah bersedia untuk memulakan binaan 16 unit lagi. Ranchangan tersebut akan mengenakan belanja sabanyak \$2,000,000 kepada Malaysia Industrial Estates Limited.

Yang kedua, saya ingin menarek perhatian kepada kemajuan perusahaan di-tempat lain di-dalam negeri ini. Beberapa banyak perusahaan yang besar dan kecil telah pun tumbuh di-merata2 tempat dalam negeri ini, termasuk Pulau ini. Satu daripada yang terbesar yang hampir siap ia-lah satu kilang besi di-Perai. Tidak-lah perlu bagi saya menyatakan sekali lagi faktor2 atau faedah2 yang boleh menarek perusahaan2 ka-Negeri ini oleh kerana Majlis ini ada-lah terlebih ma'alum lagi. Perkara2 ini telah pun di-jelaskan beberapa kali sechra mulut atau bertulis. Tetapi patut juga saya mengulangkan satu daripada-nya di-sini oleh sebab bakal kepentingannya yang hebat. Ini ia-lah jalan raya Timor/Barat daripada Kota Bahru ka-Butterworth. Apabila telah di-bina ia akan menambahkan bukan sahaja perusahaan2 ini dengan mengejut, tetapi juga ekonomi negeri ini keseluruhan-nya, sebab ia akan membolehkan pembukaan kawasan di-sebelah utara Semenanjung Tanah Melayu ini bukan sahaja kepada perusahaan2 bahkan juga kepada perdagangan negeri Pulau Pinang ini. Kerajaan Negeri ini yang memberi kepercayaan sepenoh-nya atas kebijaksanaan Kerajaan Persekutuan, ada-lah berharap bahawa pembinaan jalan raya tersebut akan di-lancarkan dan di-siapkan dalam masa yang secepat mungkin.

Pada suatu masa dahulu Pulau Pinang ini telah di-fikirkan tidak mampu membantu apa2 perusahaan. Pendapat ini telah pun di-dapati salah oleh Universiti Malaya mengikut butir2 penyelidikan dan siasatan yang di-buatkan oleh mereka atas perusaha-

an2 di-negeri ini. Penyiasatan ini telah pun menunjukkan bahawa sa-jumlah 986 perusahaan2 di-Pulau ini (dibandingkan dengan 639 di-Seberang Prai) mengeluarkan barang2 berharga lebih kurang \$400 juta ringgit setahun. Kerajaan Negeri ini bertujuan hendak menggalakkan supaya banyak lagi perusahaan2 di-mulakan di-Pulau ini, pertama-nya dengan mengadakan sa-bidang tanah di-kawasan Sungai Pinang dengan syarat2 yang menarek bagi perusahaan2. Chara2 galakan yang lain akan juga di-timbangkan jika dan apabila perlu di-buat demikian.

Satu daripada tindakan2 yang telah di-ambil oleh Kerajaan Perikatan ia-lah untuk memberikan rumah2 yang murah lagi molek kepada orang2 awam khas-nya kepada yang berpendapatan rendah. Seperti apa yang telah di-katakan oleh rakan saya Yang Berhormat wakil Kawasan Dhoby Ghaut pada masa ia mengemukakan Bil yang bertajok Loan (Low Cost Housing Schemes) Enactment, 1966, kita telah pun menyiapkan 588 unit dan 1,172 unit lagi pula maseh dalam binaan. Sebagai yang telah saya katakan dahulu Kerajaan ini akan melancarkan satu lagi ranchangan yang sama di-Butterworth; ranchangan ini ia-lah di-Chain Ferry Road. Ranchangan yang akan mengandongi 5 buah bangunan rumah pangsa 4 tingkat tinggi-nya tiap2 satu, akan mengadakan sebanyak 480 unit lagi. Sukachita saya menambah kata bahawa Kerajaan Negeri ini akan melaksanakan satu lagi ranchangan yang demikian dalam tahun 1967. Benaan ini ia-lah untuk bangunan rumah pangsa yang kedua di-Jalan Kampong Melayu, Ayer Itam yang akan menyediakan 400 unit rumah2 pangsa berbilek dua dan tiga. Ranchangan rumah murah ini keseluruhan-nya, termasuk ranchangan yang terakhir sekali, akan menelan belanja lebih daripada \$13,100,000 dan daripada jumlah ini chuma \$11,600,000 sahaja akan boleh di-pungut balik daripada pembeli2 rumah tersebut. Wang yang sebanyak lebih daripada \$1,500,000 itu ada-lah di-gunakan sebagai perbelanjaan kesiapan tapak-

nya, benaan jalan2, dan perit2 yang perlu, dan mengadakan perbekalan ayer. Bantuan2 ini ia-lah daripada wang peruntukan negeri dan apa2 juga perbelanjaan yang di-buat tidak-lah di-pungut balik daripada pembeli2 rumah yang berkenaan.

Bukan-lah ini sahaja yang telah dilaksanakan oleh Kerajaan Negeri ini dalam mengadakan rumah2 murah. Seperti yang terlebih ma'alum, kita telah pun menguruskan dengan Kerajaan Persekutuan untuk melaksanakan satu ranchangan rumah murah yang besar di-Jalan Rifle Rang, Pulau Pinang, Pulau Pinang, yang menelan belanja lebih kurang \$20,000,000. Satu tawaran untuk melaksanakan ranchangan ini telah pun di-terima oleh Kerajaan Persekutuan, dan ada-lah di-jangka bahawa pekerjaan bagi membena beberapa buah rumah pangsa yang tinggi2 mengandongi sa-jumlah lebih kurang 3,750 unit, akan di-mulakan tidak berapa lama lagi.

Tujuan Kerajaan Negeri ini ia-lah untuk menyediakan seberapa banyak rumah murah yang boleh bagi orang2 yang susah. Selain daripada pelaksanaan ranchangan2 yang telah saya sebutkan itu, Kerajaan Negeri ini, mengikut mutlamat yang di-chita2kan itu, ada-lah memberi pertimbangan yang seberat2-nya untuk menggantikan rumah2 boroh yang robek, tua dan tidak setaraf lagi itu di-bandar2 dengan mengadakan rumah2 pangsa yang tinggi di-mana boroh2 itu dan juga orang2 yang susah boleh di-tempatkan, sesungguh pun tanah2 di-kawasan2 tersebut tersangat kurang. Boroh2 yang akan di-tempatkan di-rumah2 ini akan terus menikmati hak2 yang di-beri kepada-nya sahingga ini, dan di-samping itu mereka boleh pula memiliki rumah2 pangsa yang berkenaan itu sekira-nya sanggup mereka menunaikan bayaran bulanan yang biasa. Peruntukan bagi membaharui, atau memperbaiki rumah2 yang robek2 ada-lah di-buat pada tiap2 tahun. Dalam Perancangan Kemajuan 1967 kita telah pun sediakan sa-jumlah \$165,000. Sa-

bahagian atau kesemua peruntukan ini harus di-gunakan untuk menggalakkan boroh2 kita memiliki rumah2 sendiri, dengan chara ini dapat juga kita memberi peluang kepada mereka hidup bersama2 dengan ahli2 masyarakat yang lain.

Kerajaan Negeri ini ada-lah menghadapi kesedaran yang sa-penoh-nya di-atas peri-mustahak-nya bagi kita menggalakkan pelanchongan. Perbelanjaan ada-lah di-buat bagi menchapai mutlamat ini pada tiap2 tahun. Negeri ini tidak mampu menyediakan peruntukan yang besar bagi perkara2 atau ranchangan2 seperti Jalan Bukit Bendera, binaan Dewan Sri Pinang dan sebagai-nya oleh sebab puncha2 kewangan kita ada-lah terhad, dan dengan itu patut-lah kita menggunakan pendapatan kita itu mengikut keperluan segera dan keutamaan, Kita telah meminta bantuan daripada Kerajaan Pusat bagi melaksanakan ranchangan2 ini bagi masa ka-hadapan. Selain daripada ini, Kerajaan Negeri ini ada-lah juga berpendapat dan berkeyakinan bahawa tiap2 sa-buah negeri itu tidak-lah boleh menggalakkan pelanchongan di-wilayah-nya dengan sendiri. Usaha2 ka-araf yang demikian hendak-lah di-buat delaras dengan negeri2 lain yang ingin menggalak pelanchongan dan juga Kerajaan Persekutuan. Sa-buah jawatan kuasa telah pun di-tubuhkan untuk mengkaji perkara ini serta mengemukakan chadangan2 dalam laporan-nya kepada Kerajaan Persekutuan. Sekarang ini kita maseh lagi menunggu laporan tersebut.

Di-sini ingin saya membuat satu penjelasan. Satu peruntukan berjumlah \$2,500,000 dari peruntukan pembangilan tanah, peruntukan (Kepala 101, Kepala Kechil 1) ia-lah satu peruntukan yang di-buat semula. Peruntukan ini ia-lah bertujuan bagi pengambilan tanah untuk melaksanakan satu ranchangan kemajuan yang di-semulakan (re-development) yang telah saya sebutkan apabila saya membentangkan usul di-bawah Perancangan Kemajuan Tambahan yang kedua tahun 1966. Ini ada-

lah di-masokkan ka-dalam kedua2 Peranggaran, Peranggaran Kemajuan Tambahan tahun 1966 dan Peranggaran Kemajuan 1967; oleh sebab kita tidak-lah ketahui dengan tepat-nya bila-kah perbelanjaan ini akan dikenakan, Boleh jadi pada hujung tahun ini atau pun pada tahun hadapan. Bagaimana pun mustahak-lah kita menyediakan satu peruntukan bagi keperluan ini. Tindakan yang demikian ada-lah menjadi perlu oleh sebab mengikut Act Tabong Kemajuan 1966 yang akan di-kuat-kuasakan pada 1hb, Januari, 1967, tidak ada peruntukan bagi melanjutkan kepada tahun yang berikut (revote).

Akhir-nya, saya ingin menyatakan bahawa raayat negeri ini 'am-nya telah pun menyambut baik seruan Timbalan Perdana Menteri merangkap Menteri Pembangunan Negara dan Luar Bandar untuk bergotong-royong, dan sebagai hasil daripada seruan ini banyak ranchangan2 pembangunan masharakat telah pun dapat di-laksanakan. Maka ingin-lah saya menguchapkan terima kaseh kepada mereka yang telah bergotong-royong atas semangat-nya yang di-sanjong tinggi itu, dan saya ada-lah berharap moga2 dengan terbangkit-nya semangat ini, ia akan meningkat lebeh tinggi lagi supaya mungkin bagi kita, raayat dan Kerajaan menchapai kejayaan yang lebeh besar lagi pada masa yang ke hadapan kelak.

Tuan Speaker, sekarang ini saya mohon membentangkan usul yang berikut :—

"Bahawa Majlis ini meluluskan perbelanjaan sa-jumlah \$16,963 sebagai yang terchatet di-muka 1 dalam peranggaran Kemajuan 1967, di-bentangkan sebagai Kertas No. 12/1966, Dewan Undangan Pulau Pinang, dan mengambil ketetapan bahawa peruntukan wang tersebut akan di-gunakan untuk tujuan2 yang tertentu dalam Peranggaran Kemajuan, 1967 yang tersebut."

Member for Butterworth (Enche William David): Tuan Speaker, I beg

to second.

Member for Jelutong (Enche Tan Hock Hin): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Peranggaran Pembangunan yang di-bawa oleh Kerajaan ada-lah hanya memainkan angka2 untuk menipu raayat. Umpama-nya wang peruntukan yang di-anggarkan bagi tahun ini ada-lah \$11,667,402 tetapi kebanyakan wang itu yang di-peruntukan untuk pembangunan di-Negeri ini tidak-lah di-gunakan. Dari angka2 yang di-beri oleh Kerajaan kita melihat wang yang sebenar-nya di-gunakan untuk ranchangan pembangunan bagi tahun itu hanya \$4 juta lebeh sahaja. Angka ini tidak sampai 38% jika di-bandingkan dengan angka yang di-anggarkan bagi tahun ini. Hari ini kita telah dapati Kerajaan memberikan anggaran pembangunan bagi tahun hadapan dan wang di-untukkan dalam ranchangan pembangunan sebanyak \$16,963,163. Nampak-nya wang peruntukan bagi ranchangan pembangunan bagi tahun hadapan tidak-lah boleh di-katakan sedikit tetapi berapa peratuskah sebenar-nya yang akan di-gunakan untuk ranchangan pembangunan itu kita tidak dapat tahu kerana sudah beberapa tahun Kerajaan telah memberikan satu gambaran bagi menerangkan bahawa Kerajaan telah mengeluarkan wang yang banyak untuk ranchangan pembangunan di-Negeri Pulau Pinang. Akan tetapi wang yang sebenar yang di-gunakan tidak sampai 40%. Ada items yang Kerajaan telah memperuntukkan wang yang banyak tetapi dari angka2 yang di-beri oleh Kerajaan kita telah dapati sampai satu sen pun tidak di-gunakan seperti Kepala 101 pechahan Kepala 31 — memperbaiki kampung2 baru yang mana wang peruntukan untuk item ini telah di-anggarkan sebanyak \$25,000 tetapi dalam tahun ini tidak ada satu sen pun di-gunakan serupa juga dalam Kepala 102 pechahan Kepala 8 — Pembinaan Pusat Pertanian Baharu.

Wang sebanyak \$125,000 telah di-untukkan tetapi satu sen pun tidak di-gunakan untuk pembangunan Pusat Pertanian baharu itu.

Tuan Yang di-pertua, ada item2 pembangunan yang raayat berharap Kerajaan dapat selesaikan dengan secepat2 mungkin tetapi Kerajaan tidak mahu membuat demikian. Ini telah mengakibatkan raayat lebeh menunggu lagi ranchangan2 yang raayat minta itu di-selenggarakan umpama-nya bantuan2 untuk di-sambongkan bekalan letrik kepada kawasan luar bandar ia itu Pechahan Kepala 3 di-Kepala 101. Pada tahun yang lalu apabila Kerajaan membawa anggaran Pembangunan untuk tahun ini wang sebanyak \$100,000 di-anggarkan bagi item itu tetapi mengikut Risalat Bilangan 12 tahun 1966 kami dapati wang perbelanjaan bagi item itu di-anggarkan hingga 31hb December ada-lah tidak lebeh daripada \$18,000, tidak sampai 1/5 pun wang itu di-gunakan untuk pembangunan ini. Ini bermaana bukan Kerajaan tidak ada wang menjalankan projek2 ini, Kerajaan tidak menggunakan sepenoh-nya wang peruntukan untuk menyambongkan bekalan letrik kepada kawasan2 kampung. Umpama-nya di-Pantai Acheh, Balik Pulau penduduk2 di-sana telah menanda tangani sechara beramai2 meminta Kerajaan dan pehak yang berkuasa supaya bekalan letrik di-sambongkan ka-Pantai Acheh. Tetapi hingga sekarang permintaan mereka maseh tidak dapat lagi di-penuhi. Ini menunjukkan bukan-lah Kerajaan tidak ada wang, tetapi Kerajaan tidak mahu membuat begitu kerana jika Kerajaan menggunakan dengan sepenoh-nya wang bagi item ini mereka sudah dapat bekalan letrik di-lain2 kampung.

Bagi tahun hadapan wang sebanyak \$100,000 di-anggarkan juga. Sa-harus-nya wang yang di-anggarkan bagi tahun hadapan hendak-lah di-gunakan dengan sepenoh2-nya dan penduduk2 di-kampung2 yang sa-harus-nya dapat bekalan letrik boleh-lah menikmati bekalan letrik.

Mengenai perusahaan pelanchongan, kami dari pehak pembangkang sudah membawa perkara ini ka-Dewan ini dan kami telah memberikan pendapat

kami bahawa perusahaan pelanchongan ada-lah sangat penting kepada Pulau Pinang ini dan kami berpendapat wang peruntukan untuk memajukan pelanchongan ada-lah tidak cukup. Kita tidak boleh membandingkan dengan tempat2 lain seperti Hong Kong, Jepun dan lain2 tetapi kita harus pula berusaha supaya perusahaan pelanchongan di-Negeri ini boleh di-kembangkan dan boleh membawa hasil2 kepada raayat Negeri ini. Kita melihat dalam anggaran pembangunan bagi tahun yang lalu \$30,000 telah di-anggarkan untuk pembangunan pelanchongan tetapi wang yang kecil ini yang di-anggarkan tidak mencukupi itu juga tidak-lah di-gunakan dengan sepenoh-nya. Mengikut angka2 yang di-beri oleh Kerajaan bahawa hanya \$11,000 lebeh sahaja di-gunakan, tidak sampai setengah pun daripada wang yang begitu kurang ini. Dengan ini Kerajaan bagaimana harap mengadakan satu program atau satu ranchangan yang effective serta berkesan untuk memajukan perusahaan pelanchongan di-Pulau Pinang ini. Kami selalu berkata bahawa mahu memajukan perusahaan pelanchongan ini kita harus ada satu ranchangan atau program yang complete dan sampurna dan kita harus meminta kepada Kerajaan Pusat supaya membantu kita menyelenggarakan atau meleksanakan program kita sebab perusahaan pelanchongan bukan-lah semata2 perkara Negeri sahaja dan sebagai pentahuan umum bahawa Pulau Pinang ada-lah tempat2 yang terbaik sekali untuk di-kembangkan menjadi Pusat Pelanchongan di-Negeri kita ini. Sebab itu Kerajaan Negeri harus-lah juga meminta Kerajaan Pusat memberi bantuan wang yang cukup untuk melaksanakan program2 yang sampurna supaya raayat dapat menghasilkan faedah2 dari perusahaan pelanchongan. Sekiar.

Member for Tanjong Selatan (Enche Khor Peng Seah): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya juga menentang anggaran pembangunan pada tahun ini sebab ini bukan-lah satu angka yang benar2 yang akan di-laksanakan oleh Kerajaan. Bukan sahaja tahun sudah begitu,

beberapa tahun yang lalu pun begitu juga. Apa yang di-laksanakan itu hanya $\frac{1}{3}$ daripada Anggaran Pembangunan asal untuk pembangunan. Pada tahun hadapan bukan-lah \$16 juta untuk pembangunan, mungkin hanya \$6 juta sahaja tetapi saya harap perkara ini Kerajaan akan mengambil berat dan tidak akan berlaku pada tahun hadapan. Kami merasa kesal kerana dalam anggaran pembangunan pada tahun hadapan itu sekali lagi Kerajaan tidak menguntukkan wang untuk bendongan banjir dan dalam ucapan YAB ketua Menteri pun tidak di-sebut-nya soal banjir yang berlaku dalam bandar dan luar bandar. Perkara banjir di-Caunter Hall dan kawasan Bridge Street boleh di-katakan satu perkara penting terhadap raayat dan kami telah selalu menimbulkan soal ini dalam Dewan ini. YAB Ketua Menteri mengatakan dahulu bahawa Kerajaan tidak dapat membendung banjir itu oleh kerana pertama pehak Majlis Bandar Raya tidak mahu menanggung semua belanjanya. Kedua Jawatan Kuasa Khas untuk menguruskan soal2 banjir maseh belum memberi laporan. Tetapi YAB Ketua Menteri sekarang telah mengambil alih kuasa Majlis Bandar Raya maka kuasa Majlis Bandar Raya itu telah tidak menjadi soalan lagi dan bagaimana ranchangan pehak Jawatan Kuasa Khas itu sahingakan mereka memakan masa bagini panjang maseh belum dapat satu penyelesaian terhadap perkara membendangi banjir itu. Pada pendapat kami ini menunjukkan Kerajaan tidak pedulikan keselamatan raayat yang tinggal dalam kawasan Caunter Hall dan Bridge Street dan juga di-lain2 kawasan di-luar bandar.

Dalam anggaran pembangunan pada tahun hadapan telah di-peruntukkan wang sebanyak \$312,586 untuk tapak Universiti. Kami tidak membantah mendirikan College Universiti tetapi College ini harus dapat menerima murid2 yang dalam sekolah2 menengah mahu pun Sekolah menengah bantuan Kerajaan atau pun Sekolah menengah private. Saya telah di-beri tahu ada murid2 dari Sekolah Menengah Han

Chiang yang telah dapat grade 1 dalam peperiksaan Senior Cambridge apabila dia pergi hendak mendapatkan saking keping form untuk diri-nya, kaki-tangan2 Pejabat Kerajaan telah berkata mereka tidak melayan budak2 dari Sekolah Menengah Han Chiang. Ini ada-lah satu perkara yang tidak adil kerana perbelanjaan untuk mendirikan College Universiti itu ada-lah wang daripada raayat dan anak2 dari raayat yang mempunyai kelayakan ini harus-lah kita membenarkan mereka mengambil peluang dan masuk ka-dalam Universiti itu dan kalau tekanan yang bagini terus berlaku bermaana kita membelanjakan wang itu tidak ada erti dan juga mungkin raayat tidak akan memberi wang untuk membantu mendirikan College ini.

Dalam anggaran Pembangunan pada tahun hadapan Kerajaan ada menguntukkan wang untuk pembangunan perkampungan baharu. Pendapatan raayat perkampungan baharu pada hari ini ada-lah menjadi satu masa'alah besar pada kehidupan mereka oleh kerana mereka telah di-paksa oleh penjajah yang menghalau mereka ka-satu tempat ia-itu perkampungan baru di-mana mereka tinggal dengan meninggalkan tanah mereka (interrupted).

Member for Permatang Pauh (Enche Ariffin Bin Shariff): Tuan Yang di-Pertua saya meminta penjelasan. Penjajah apa? Ahli Yang Berhormat itu ada berkara Penjajah kuasa

Member for Tanjong Selatan (Enche Kor Peng Seah): Saya kata raayat dalam perkampungan baru yang di-halau oleh penjajah dan mereka terpaksa meninggalkan tanah perusahaan mereka dan tinggal di-satu tempat baharu, oleh kerana mereka kekurangan tanah dan juga tidak ada perusahaan atau kilang2 berhampiran untuk bekerja maka mereka mengalami kehidupan yang susah. Oleh itu juga pemuda2 dan keluarga2 di-dalam perkampungan baharu itu pergi ka-

bandar mencari pekerjaan dan dengan ini juga menyebabkan di-bandar bertambah lagi bilangan penganggoran dalam bandar2. Sebab itu Kerajaan harus mendirikan kilang2 hampir dengan perkampungan baru seperti Permatang Tinggi, Val D'or atau Machang Bubok dan Sungei Bakap dan lain2 tempat lagi supaya dapat meninggikan taraf hidup mereka dan menolong mereka mempunyai pekerjaan2. Dalam anggaran pembangunan pada tahun hadapan, Kerajaan ada menguntukkan wang sebanyak \$31,000 untuk memajukan ternakan. Kulau bantuan ini sebagai membeli anak ayam, itek, lembu, kambing atau babi saya menganggap wang itu lebeh baik di-gunakan untuk membeli ubat buat membantu menjaga penyakit ayam2 atau itek dan lain2. YAB Ketua Menteri ada mengatakan tadi ayam itek dan telur-nya yang di-keluarkan dalam Pulau Pinang pada tiap2 tahun ada-lah sebanyak \$18 juta dan babi \$25 juta. Ini menunjukkan banyak orang2 memelihara ayam, babi dan lain2 lagi dan Kerajaan harus mengambil perhatian yang lebeh berat dan saya merasa Pengawai2 dari Pejabat Haiwan itu harus pergi melawat ka-tempat ternakan tetapi ada orang mengatakan itu tidak mungkin. Kalau Kerajaan benar2 mahu memperbaiki, mahu memajukan ternakan lawatan Pegawai Haiwan ada-lah satu usaha Kerajaan yang penting. Kalau Kerajaan menggalakkan raayat membentuk Sharikat dan membantu mereka saya per-chaya chara yang bagini akan lebeh berkesan lagi.

Dalam perbincangan anggaran perbelanjaan biasa kali ini saya telah mengatakan raayat dalam kampung dan pekebun2 kecil telah di-kenakan cukai lebeh banyak daripada pemilik2 estate dalam Pulau Pinang ini. Untuk meringankan bebanan mereka saya tidak tahu ada-kah Kerajaan akan menukar atau mengubah undang2 ini kerana YAB Ketua Menteri tidak memberi keterangan sama sekali. Tetapi ahli kawasan Permatang Pauh yang mengatakan perkara ini tidak berlaku di-Pulau Pinang ada-lah ganjil. Saya harap Kerajaan dapat menimbangkan perkara yang penting ini.

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, saya suka minta satu clarification — ada-kah Ahli Yang Berhormat dari kawasan Tanjong Selatan itu maksudkan pekebun2 kecil membayar cukai lebeh tinggi daripada pekebun2 besar?

Member for Tanjong Selatan (Enche Kor Peng Seah): Ya.

Member for Tanjong Barat (Mr. Teh Ewe Lim): I have made my own observations on the Development Estimates, and under Head 101, sub-head (1), that is, acquisition of land, the estimated expenditure in 1967 is for a sum of \$2,800,000. I believe that this sum also includes the acquisition of land for the building of roads as under Public Works. I do not see any such estimate for road construction. I would like to know, under this sub-head, whether this amount includes the acquisition of land for the by-pass at Kampong Bahru, Bukit Mertajam, to link up the east/west highway.

And sub-head (4) — tourism development: at least we are very glad to see that this sum has been increased to \$30,000 which shows that the Alliance Government is doing something in the direction of tourism development. But still the amount is too small and we, in Penang, are really keen to develop tourism as an extra source of revenue. I think we should not grudge a little more. I am quite sure that our Honourable Members of this House would have no objection to a bigger sum.

And on this matter, Sir, we are all aware, that a lot of international flights are coming to Penang, and this may be a matter concerning the Central Government. But nevertheless, I request the State Government to draw to the attention of the Ministry of Transport that at our airport, last Saturday, there were many complaints about congestion by the delegation of 31 members of the Associated Chinese Chambers of Commerce who were sent off to participate in the Chinese Traders' Convention in Bangkok. As

it was quite a big party and there was a big crowd, and there was hardly enough space for the people who went there to send off the delegates. And this same thing happened when the Industrial Study Team went on the far-east tour. The same thing happened at that time and I am quite sure that with more and more international flights coming to Penang, this is a very important question, Sir.

And also concerning the runway, we think the State Government has to make another approach to the Federal Government because I am quite sure it is not long enough. I understand the Malaysian Airways will be introducing the Boeing 702 with this sort of runway, I am afraid it may not be able to accommodate some of the bigger flights.

And under sub-head (12) — industrial development: I do not know how much of the land is being reserved for Penang, and how much we are going to spend on Mak Mandin. On page 7, sub-head (32), we have for economic development for the State. We are very glad to see that the Government is taking steps in this direction, but personally, I feel that \$30,000 is too small a sum to have a proper survey for economic development of our Penang State.

And Head 103, sub-head (1), desilting of rivers: here I note that we have got a sum of \$30,000. The question of desilting of rivers is tied up with floods in our State, especially the Sungei Pinang River where it is a yearly occurrence, when during the high-tide and rainy season, with the tide coming in together with the rain, we usually have floods in the city. And in fact, this job is being tackled to a certain extent by the City Council. But I am quite sure the question of rivers is under the jurisdiction of the State although the City Council is trying to tackle by raising some of the roads.

I would like to know whether this \$30,000 includes the desilting of the Sungei Pinang River, because if we go along Sungei Pinang Road, Jelutong, during the low-tide, we see that in fact it is almost dry, and tongkangs and boats are found lying on the river.

Sir, these are the few observations that I have made, and I hope that the State Government would give attention to them and have them inserted into the Estate, if possible, so that all these things could be implemented.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): Mr. Speaker Sir, once again through the indirect courtesy of the Honourable the Chief Minister, I would like to deal with the Project to the presentation of the Development Estimates for 1967 based on the English version of his speech. Sir, I will try my very best to refer to the original speech whenever I can.

Sir, in view of the fact that the Development Estimates have been presented in round figures and on major heads of departments, it was only when we heard the speech of the Honourable the Chief Minister that we begin to have some idea as to the project that are intended for 1967 and a vague glimpse of the ultimate development projects which the State Government intends to undertake.

Before I touch on the point raised in the speech introducing this motion, Sir, I would like to make a few comments on the Development Estimates that is presented. Sir, we are told that the estimated income and expenditure on the State Development Fund total \$15,148,487 which is in page one of the Estimates. And of this, \$4,363,111 represent estimated balance on the first of January, 1967. Then the rest come from

loan recoveries, loan for low-cost housing, loan for acquisition of land amounting to over eight million dollars and Federal grants provide us another two million dollars to make up the total of over fifteen million dollars. Sir, I have said before, I would very much like to see more grants being given to Penang rather than loans and I think we have stressed this on several occasions already. The Honourable Member for Sungei Pinang, for example, skirmished—I think rather scarily — over this question of my persuading our State Government to press the Central Government over the question of revision of Articles 109 and 110 which allow us sources of revenue and sources of obtaining of loans and grants. And I think in so touching upon the point I raised earlier on during the debate on the Supply Bill he indicated that may be he was surprised. He said that I, a person who was associated with the Federal Constitution and the Establishment of the Federation of Malaya should now talk about revision of these particular two articles, and I think hinted at the idea that may be it was a terrible thing for a person like myself to separate — pemisahan (separation) — or break up of Malaysia. I can assure him that is not my idea at all. After all we fought against the Honourable Member and his friends when he was sitting on the wrong side of the House in order to achieve Malaysia.

Mr. Speaker: Which side is the wrong side? I need clarification.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): For him, Sir, that side. But I think Sir, there is considerable feeling not only amongst the members of the Opposition in the State of Penang but through-

out the Federation of Malaysia, not only in Sarawak, not only in Sabah but also in States like Kelantan and even a State like Johore where the different State Governments and Leaders of the State Governments have been bold enough to begin to ask the Central Government what benefits the States derive from the Federation from the point of view of economic development and from point of view of financial expansion. And therefore, Sir, with the stress and strain in the Federation of Malaysia, including borrowing and with the eviction of Singapore and its aftermath, there is great concern as to how the Federation of Malaysia can become a much more unified Federation. And one of the factors is a strange one, and that factor arises much over this question of economic grants and financing loans from the Federal Government to the State, because Sir, a point has been reached now in our experience of independence where the State must develop in accordance to the tempo, especially by the Federal Government. Let us say, Penang, you wait ten years, Pahang, you go up ten years. Perlis you can have an extra-special golf course. Malacca you can have a royal golf course. Penang, you wait for the next \$100,000 that is required for your University College. The time has come, which in the words of the Minister of Finance, that the State must show far more initiative in their development project.

Sir, I am not going around the bush, I am talking about "development", because listening to the speech by the Honourable the Chief Minister of the State, I think we are steadily grinding ourselves to a halt. And if we do not provide the vitality and dynamism, which is necessary for the future, this slow process of deceleration, and not acceleration, that we have

seen from this side of the House in the last three years will continue.

Sir, continuing the provision for the estimate provided for development, we come to the fact that \$1,665,916 is being provided for this year from our own estimate by a Bill. We have had a certain amount of debate on this matter; and during the course of the debate on the Supply Bill, there was no opportunity for me to defend some of the remarks I made which were so adroitly and cleverly twisted by the Honourable Member from Sungei Pinang. Some of the points that were raised by the Honourable the Chief Minister, I accept in good faith and the mistake I made for certain points, I admitted yesterday.

Sir, this question of revenue, of expending sums of money on the Development Estimates, I think must be balanced against three factors:

- (1) the state of our revenue balance;
- (2) the revenue that accrues to the State per year; and
- (3) what is the need, urgency and importance of our development of the State in the future.

From the third point, Sir, we have every agreement that the State must go on developing, and it must provide for development. Where we differ with the State Alliance Government in Penang is that the development projects the channelling of the development projects, the overall planning of the development projects, the strategy of the development projects, we think in the long run will give us a facade of development but not provide us with the really solid basis for an industrial leap-forward and for a proper, firm foundation to be

laid for a higher standard of living for our people in the State of Penang.

What we would like to see in the future, although our State in area is small — the island is only the size of the island of Hongkong — plus Province Wellesley, we are only the size of the State of Singapore. But we would not like to see a situation where we would be providing sums of money in our Supply Bill to enable people from Penang to emigrate from Penang, leave Penang to go to other parts of the country to join F. L. D. A. schemes. We would like to be able to generate as a State of development of economic and of industrialisation where people from other parts of the Federation will want to come to the State of Penang. We would not like to see a state where our children, having received better and a more rounded form of education in the State of Penang emigrate from the State of Penang elsewhere even to a foreign country like Singapore in order to seek jobs and to acquire high posts. We would like to see the State of Penang generate social and economic development to a state where we can retain our own children and the products of our training for the betterment of the future of our State. After all, when you think of it all, it is an irony that the major figures and the most prominent figures in the administration in the State of Singapore and in the Government of Singapore and people who are providing the drive and development of Singapore largely come from Penang and received their education from Penang.

Sir, the other factor is this question of our revenue per year. Sources of our revenue per year have been laid down and we have thrashed this down in the Supply

Bill. But the sources of revenue, as I have said, will come from two main factors: they will come from taxation and from established sources. Sir, the State Government must really look forward for more sources of revenue in order to balance our ordinary expenditure. So under the circumstances, Sir, our State provision for the annual provision for development fund comes in from General Revenue Balance although it appears under General Expenditure which must come from General Revenue Balance because if we do not spend that money our General Revenue Balance will accrue. The Honourable the Chief Minister has said that, and he has asked us in the Opposition, 'do you mean to say that we want to keep plenty of money in the bank, for example, and do nothing for the people?' He told us in the course of the debate that our State has spent \$26,000,000 from our own sources, and we have obtained \$15,000,000 more grants from the Federal sources. And our development projects totaling over \$41,000,000 have come from balances which would have come up to a step where Penang would be a 'large balance' State with more development. My answer is that we want more development. But in wanting development, I would like the State Government to tell us how much will the State Government be prepared to run down our General Revenue Sources. The Honourable the Chief Minister says we are prepared to spend the money for development if it is urgent and necessary "jika perlu" — this is a famous term. We do not understand what it means. Because if we really want and the State has the power and potential to really drive for development — and I repeatedly refer to the Auditor General's Report for 1955 — I would like to see the 1966 report — where money acquired for development is not fully spent in

any one year.

In the speech made by the Honourable the Chief Minister, we are actually trying to short-cut financial control, a Bill which will come into effect in January 1967. I will refer to this later on the question of revotes. So the State Government has not got the drive to use the funds that they ask from this House each year. It is all very well to say sometimes acquisition of land takes time; arrangements have to be made and so forth and so on.

And yesterday, over the debate on the Bill for loan for land acquisition, we were treated with a wonderful example of the Government asking the House for \$2,500,000 on a claim which is not yet completely formulated. I mean, it is still under consideration. So, Sir the position is how much are we willing to spend? For example, this year, with the General Revenue Balance at the end of the year over \$3,000,000, the State Government, if necessary—in the words of the Chief Minister — could have asked not only \$1,665,000 for further development for the State Development Expenditure, but could have provided \$4,000,000 and run down General Revenue Balance to just over \$800,000 bringing us back to a state very much like in 1962 and 1961. So where is the line to be drawn? The money put in the State Development and the question of General Revenue Balance of the State has got to be maintained. And I would like the State Government and the Honourable the Chief Minister to let us know how and where the Government sets the line, because, Sir, development is an important matter. The Honourable the Chief Minister has already said that the development programme has been a great success — "mendapat berjaya yang

chemerlang". And he goes on to say that we cannot stop this development programme of the State. I agree. We in the Opposition agree with them. Not only can we not stop, I am urging the State Government to put more drive to increase this development project that lie ahead, otherwise the future will be quite difficult.

Sir, I would like to take the time of this House to prove my point on this issue. Before we go on again, I would like to turn to page 3 and refer to column (3) and (4). Provision provided for originally or last revised column (3) — \$134,011,322. (4) revised for 1967 — \$140,632,759. Sir, this is an upward revision of nearly over \$6,000,000. Sir, we have heard the Honourable the Finance Minister launching an austerity drive for the whole of Malaysia, including the State of Penang, and now the State Alliance says that Penang should be independent, and think like we do. For the austerity drive, he said he will not allow for any upward revision; no further upward revision. So I hope, Sir, that the State Government in the provisions for its development estimates will take great care to ensure that the control for any upward revision of the estimates must be justified by productivity. Sir, as a matter of fact the Minister of Finance is warning the country of the great need for the austerity drive and the great need for the people to make great sacrifices — sacrifices not only in "gotong royong" which the Honourable the Chief Minister has talked about, but sacrifices even in preventing more babies from coming out. There is Family Planning. Because if you have more children you have less money to spend. And he went so far as to say that it may be necessary for our development projects to go outside this country — to go to

the 'Aid Malaysia Club'. We, of course, do not go that far, we go to Kuala Lumpur for the 'Aid to Penang Club'. And Sir, this question of upward revision has been stressed very firmly and it is no use to 'bagi ribuan terima kaseh' to the Timbalan Perdana Menteri. It is no use praising him and thanking him. If we are going to form part of this overall drive for a concerted move on the First Five-year Malaysian Plan, then we must re-control upward revision of estimates for development and we should control it more stringently.

Sir, at this point, I would like to turn to remarks made by the Honourable the Chief Minister in the course of his speech. I will then come back to the development estimates where I have two subjects, not only the Hill Railway but two other subjects.

Sir, in today's newspapers we noticed that the Honourable the Deputy Prime Minister of this country has informed the visiting Indonesia Military dignitaries that Malaysia has declared a new state of emergency — a state of emergency against poverty. Sir, we hope when we are talking against Government's programmes for fighting against poverty, Government will not turn round and say we are subversives and therefore we are fighting against this emergency — emergency law and you know — and put political stringencies upon us. We now have an emergency situation against poverty. So poverty exists in this country. And I think the Honourable Members from the rural areas will agree with me that in spite of the efforts, and in spite of millions of dollars that have so far been provided, the poverty problems in the rural areas has not yet been solved. We have not yet broken through. From that point of view, Sir, the whole of

the first part of the speech of the Honourable the Chief Minister with regard to provision for more and more aid for the rural-area inhabitants, particularly the agricultural workers, the padi farmers, and so on have our full support. However, Sir, there are certain other factors which Government has to take into consideration — in trying to raise the standard of living of these people. For example, Sir, the Honourable the Chief Minister went on at great length to talk about different types of padi including padi raya and the increase of the yield per year, per acre, the expected increased yield and so forth and so on.

Sir, we would like the Government to make a real survey of what is the existing economic standard of living in the rural areas; and plan Government's development projects that the annual increase in the standard of living from the point of view per capita income, from the point of view of expenditure, from the point of view of livelihood in the rural areas. So we will really know whether the people are benefitting directly or not.

Sir, one of the problems, for example is, Penang is producing more and more padi. We are contributing towards the problem of solving the question of rice-sufficiency in the State. And here I noticed a slight difference of opinion, because the Honourable the Chief Minister says that the cultivation of the padi raya will go a long way towards making our country self-sufficient in rice. Sir, that used to be the cry of a former Minister of Agriculture who was unfortunately put in jail after he left the Alliance Party. That was his cry.

Mr. Speaker: He is released now.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): And his cry was self-sufficiency in rice. However, Sir, we have been told on many occasions, now that self-sufficiency in rice is not a major issue and one has got to consider the question of overall economic development of Malaysia in relation of our neighbouring countries. And although we provide for a greater self-sufficiency in rice, I do not think we are aiming at a 100% self-sufficiency.

Sir, the Honourable the Chief Minister says that we hope that farmers who are already taking advantage of double-cropping facilities made available by Government will be able to increase their income by 100% when they cultivate their padi fields, that is padi ria. Sir, this is a very, very big and important improvement.

Chief Minister: Not padi raya but padi ria.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): My pronunciation is not very good, and I thank the Honourable the Chief Minister for correcting me in my Bahasa pronunciation. People are allowed a little latitude in their pronunciation — words which are not fully formed. However, Sir, this padi ria will double our income. But the farmers will double their income. That is why I say that with no figures, no previous figures, no future figures, the provision of an Assistant State Secretary (economic) but no organisation of a proper Development Board, no organisation of a proper Survey Team, I do not know how to make the statements. We will double, treble, quadruple and we will half. But we would like the Government to make a survey to find out whether, in fact, it will double. And if it is established I think Government can turn round and say

chemerlang". And he goes on to say that we cannot stop this development programme of the State. I agree. We in the Opposition agree with them. Not only can we not stop, I am urging the State Government to put more drive to increase this development project that lie ahead, otherwise the future will be quite difficult.

Sir, I would like to take the time of this House to prove my point on this issue. Before we go on again, I would like to turn to page 3 and refer to column (3) and (4). Provision provided for originally or last revised column (3) — \$134,011,322. (4) revised for 1967 — \$140,632,759. Sir, this is an upward revision of nearly over \$6,000,000. Sir, we have heard the Honourable the Finance Minister launching an austerity drive for the whole of Malaysia, including the State of Penang, and now the State Alliance says that Penang should be independent, and think like we do. For the austerity drive, he said he will not allow for any upward revision; no further upward revision. So I hope, Sir, that the State Government in the provisions for its development estimates will take great care to ensure that the control for any upward revision of the estimates must be justified by productivity. Sir, as a matter of fact the Minister of Finance is warning the country of the great need for the austerity drive and the great need for the people to make great sacrifices — sacrifices not only in "gotong royong" which the Honourable the Chief Minister has talked about, but sacrifices even in preventing more babies from coming out. There is Family Planning. Because if you have more children you have less money to spend. And he went so far as to say that it may be necessary for our development projects to go outside this country — to go to

the 'Aid Malaysia Club'. We, of course, do not go that far, we go to Kuala Lumpur for the 'Aid to Penang Club'. And Sir, this question of upward revision has been stressed very firmly and it is no use to 'bagi ribuan terima kaseh' to the Timbalan Perdana Menteri. It is no use praising him and thanking him. If we are going to form part of this overall drive for a concerted move on the First Five-year Malaysian Plan, then we must re-control upward revision of estimates for development and we should control it more stringently.

Sir, at this point, I would like to turn to remarks made by the Honourable the Chief Minister in the course of his speech. I will then come back to the development estimates where I have two subjects, not only the Hill Railway but two other subjects.

Sir, in today's newspapers we noticed that the Honourable the Deputy Prime Minister of this country has informed the visiting Indonesia Military dignitaries that Malaysia has declared a new state of emergency — a state of emergency against poverty. Sir, we hope when we are talking against Government's programmes for fighting against poverty, Government will not turn round and say we are subversives and therefore we are fighting against this emergency — emergency law. and you know — and put political stringencies upon us. We now have an emergency situation against poverty. So poverty exists in this country. And I think the Honourable Members from the rural areas will agree with me that in spite of the efforts, and in spite of millions of dollars that have so far been provided, the poverty problems in the rural areas has not yet been solved. We have not yet broken through. From that point of view, Sir, the whole of

the first part of the speech of the Honourable the Chief Minister with regard to provision for more and more aid for the rural-area inhabitants, particularly the agricultural workers, the padi farmers, and so on have our full support. However, Sir, there are certain other factors which Government has to take into consideration — in trying to raise the standard of living of these people. For example, Sir, the Honourable, the Chief Minister went on at great length to talk about different types of padi including padi raya and the increase of the yield per year, per acre, the expected increased yield and so forth and so on.

Sir, we would like the Government to make a real survey of what is the existing economic standard of living in the rural areas; and plan Government's development projects that the annual increase in the standard of living from the point of view per capita income, from the point of view of expenditure, from the point of view of livelihood in the rural areas. So we will really know whether the people are benefitting directly or not.

Sir, one of the problems, for example is, Penang is producing more and more padi. We are contributing towards the problem of solving the question of rice-sufficiency in the State. And here I noticed a slight difference of opinion, because the Honourable the Chief Minister says that the cultivation of the padi raya will go a long way towards making our country self-sufficient in rice. Sir, that used to be the cry of a former Minister of Agriculture who was unfortunately put in jail after he left the Alliance Party. That was his cry.

Mr. Speaker: He is released now.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): And his cry was self-sufficiency in rice. However, Sir, we have been told on many occasions, now that self-sufficiency in rice is not a major issue and one has got to consider the question of overall economic development of Malaysia in relation of our neighbouring countries. And although we provide for a greater self-sufficiency in rice, I do not think we are aiming at a 100% self-sufficiency.

Sir, the Honourable the Chief Minister says that we hope that farmers who are already taking advantage of double-cropping facilities made available by Government will be able to increase their income by 100% when they cultivate their padi fields, that is padi ria. Sir, this is a very, very big and important improvement.

Chief Minister: Not padi raya but padi ria.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): My pronunciation is not very good, and I thank the Honourable the Chief Minister for correcting me in my Bahasa pronunciation. People are allowed a little latitude in their pronunciation — words which are not fully formed. However, Sir, this padi ria will double our income. But the farmers will double their income. That is why I say that with no figures, no previous figures, no future figures, the provision of an Assistant State Secretary (economic) but no organisation of a proper Development Board, no organisation of a proper Survey Team, I do not know how to make the statements. We will double, treble, quadruple and we will half. But we would like the Government to make a survey to find out whether, in fact, it will double. And if it is established I think Government can turn round and say

"formerly the average padi farmer — these are figures given by people like Ungku Aziz and research workers of the University of Malaya — earn not more than \$150.00 a month. So if we double it, it goes to \$300.00 a month. You turn round to them and say 'raise the irrigation rates from 16% to 32% — only \$5 more'. That is something. But to make statements like this without further helping the padi farmers, Sir, is a very important point. I think all of us remember the time when the very heavy Padi Kuncha system existed. The farmers worked very hard. Government gives them water, Government gives them controls and help them to make advancement in their work. They do not work in the air-conditioned rooms like ourselves here. They have to work in the sun and rain. They get the padi chaff in their eyes and some of them get blinded, and so on. But the question of the price of padi — how much Government is willing to fix the price of it — is an important one, because if you increase production, but you reduce the price of padi, you reduce the potential income of the padi planters.

The next point, Sir, is that whilst we increase production of the padi planters, we must make sure that our people eat and consume more of our locally produced rice.

Sir, we see that there is a big rice shortage in our stockpile, and not in actual fact. In the press the Minister of Commerce and Industry has said that they will release 460 tons of rice, and we have got to go over to Thailand to make arrangements. Sir, one of the acquired positions that still exist is the fact that the people through years of habit and custom still prefer, and they pay more to buy and eat imported rice from

Burma and Thailand. So, there must be not only a programme for the padi cultivators; there must also be an equivalent programme for the people of the State of Malaysia to consume more local rice. Sir, at the present moment the question of the importation of rice is an important one because Penang happens to be a centre of importation. Sir, the question of how much of the rice production in Penang should be stock-piled and sold in relation to the rice that is imported, and the price of rice for the padi farmers are matters which, I think, should be looked into as part and parcel of our development scheme if they are going to bring in benefits to our people. And I hope that the State Government will look into this problem to ensure that really this provision for development to the padi growers will bring them the benefits that are anticipated.

Sir, on this question of fertilizer subsidy scheme; I am not very certain whether these rumours are correct, or whether in actual fact there have been incidents, or whether it is a question of misunderstanding. However, Sir, I feel that the State Government must take steps to try and ensure that the fertilizer subsidy scheme and the allocation of fertilizer is properly made, because there are rumours and misunderstanding that some of the recipients or the people who are able to receive fertilizer subsidies — nut-meg growers, and so on — whenever they get these fertilizers, they get two bags or the cost of two bags of fertilizers, and they have to return half a bag cost to the person dishing out this fertilizer scheme. I do not exactly know the mechanism of this, but there are rumours in the rural areas, and they are certainly not produced by us, and it is not our intention to spread them, because we hope the

Government will look into this matter. The idea is that this fertilizer is not fully utilized, and the middleman have come into the fertilizer scheme and made use of the fertilizer subsidy scheme to make money for themselves and to harm themselves in and utilize this fertilizer. Whether it is true or not, or whether it is only a question of misunderstanding that a certain amount of fertilizer has got to go into private hands and certain fertilizers kept, which is a possible explanation. I hope the Government will look into the matter to show that the fertilizer scheme is fully implemented, and that there should be no misunderstanding over the implementation of that very big scheme.

Sir, I have spoken a lot now over this question of the rural areas, and I have shown that the Government can still do a fair amount for the people in the rural areas. And the most important point Sir, I think in summary, is that Government should really have a proper index — a proper investigation to have the index of how much re-development schemes bring benefit to the people in terms of per capita income and not in terms of return, so that we will be able to balance the amount of money that we are spending in these areas against the actual improvements and actual benefits and actual increase in standards of living obtained by the people living in these places. After all, Sir, we have a guide and the guide is that under the First Five-year Malaysia Plan, the objective is that by 1972 we will have an annual per capita income of about a thousand and eighty-eight or \$1,300 per year. And so we could work on that kind of basis to know how much of our development benefits are actually accruing to the people to whom this development is directed. So Sir, I feel that one has got to

take with a certain amount of restrain the pride and the choice of words which the Honourable the Chief Minister has used in referring to the rural development programme of the development estimates, because in his original words, he says

"Bukan-lah penam2 padi sahaja yang di-beri layanan dan bantuan oleh pihak Kerajaan."

but the English translation of which will appear in the English Press which is read more by the urban dwellers but who do not know very much about the rural areas will read this:

"The padi planters are not the only group who are lavished with care and solicitude."

Sir, I say that whatever help we are giving to the rural areas, we are by no means lavish, and there is a lot more to be done. The Honourable Member from Jelutong has already indicated that quite apart from giving them subsidies for their planting, they require help in electricity and so forth and so on. So we have by no means occasion to appreciate the state of being lavish. And I hope Sir, that this extravagant use of the word "lavish" at this state of our economy might probably be a choice of words. It might help us better to say that if we have to struggle to provide them with increasing care and ask the Central Government for more help, the Central Government will say "you are spending so much money already."

Sir, another point which is rather interesting is the tie-up in the State Government concept of the provision of a University College in the rural area, because the Honourable the Chief Minister in his only mention of the University project mentioned it in relation to

the provision of a Poultry Research and Multiplication Station and Artificial Insemination Centre for pigs. So, Sir, this nucleus of eggs and piglings, piglets and sucklings we hope will now form the nucleus of the faculty of the proposed University / University College in Penang. Sir, this raises a very interesting point and which we will refer to later on because obviously the memorandum is not certain whether it is going to be a University College or University. And certainly, in recent Press comments, we have heard of a Science and an Art Faculty, but we have not heard of a veterinary faculty.

Sir, before I go on — I am trying to go on the speech, bit by bit as it came from the Chief Minister — I would like to pay a compliment to the Honourable the Chief Minister that in the course of one week, he has listened not only to the Opposition but also to his own back-benchers.

And in the question of the straightening of Chain Ferry Road and the provision of the extension of Chain Ferry Road, he is making sure that the people living in the area who are affected by the widening of the road will be given more than the normal ex-gratia payment. Sir, they will be given priority consideration if they wish to apply for the purchase of a plot in the future complex which the State Government intends to build along the same road. That, I think, is a wise and good provision, and a provision which we hope the Government will always bear in mind in its development projects. I myself have raised the question of Government's low-cost housing projects along Weld Quay foreshore, and I have asked the Government in similar type of assurance that when these present squatters and T.O.L. dwellers along

the foreshore have to give way to Government's development housing schemes, they will be given more than the normal ex-gratia payment and, be given also the same terms that the people on the Chain Ferry Road have been given and that the priority consideration, if they apply for the purchase of a plot. Sir, I hope this will become a future principle wherever Government makes development in areas which are already squattered upon.

Sir, the question of the Chain Ferry Road and the development of Chain Ferry Road takes us on to the question of the development of the North East/West Highway. In actual fact, Sir, the reference made by the Honourable the Chief Minister comes in at about this place. Sir, I would like to again stress and will go in stressing this on many occasions that we have to find the Board to do this. As the Opposition, we sometimes do not have the chance in the proper occasion in the Supply Bill to do it, but I have referred to the thing now for the establishment of a State Economic Development Planning Board.

Further, Sir, we have accepted the Government's focus of development along the Prai/Butterworth complex, around the future deep-water wharfs along that area and also on the industrial estates potentially arising in that area and I urge the Government, that the Chain Ferry Road is not the only road that will give us a lot of trouble in the future from the point of view of congestion and from the point of view of a clear thoroughfare of traffic on goods because the Government will have, I think, to provide for the development immediately on three satellite areas which could possibly be incorporated into one huge development area in Province Wellesley — an area which will com-

pete against George Town itself in the next fifty years, and that is there must be proper control and proper planning, zoning by the Town Planner for the development of Butterworth, Prai and Permatang Pauh Road up to Bukit Mertajam. Sir, the provision not only of the roads in that area. I notice that some visiting British Parliamentarian say only for the roads, not yet provided for the complex are coming up around the roads. But the Town Planner of the Economic Development Unit must be thinking in terms of future development in this area. And it is interesting, Sir, that there are two factors which arise out of this. One is the question of Mak Mandin as an industrial site and the other is the question of the east/west highway. To a question that was asked in the first day of this meeting, the Honourable the Chief Minister replied that in view of the fact that we do not know whether the east/west highway is going to go through Bukit Mertajam or otherwise, we cannot plan for the ancillary roads. Today, I think, he mentioned that the road will come from Kota Bahru to Butterworth. Whether it is going to skirt to Bukit Mertajam and come from Kulim to Butterworth, or whether it is going to come from Bukit Mertajam or opposite Bukit Mertajam, apparently it is not known.

Sir, however, we would like to know in this question for acquisition of land, head (1), and also for the provisions of State roads in the development, what is the purpose then of the by-pass provision which is called the Kampong Bahru By-pass in Bukit Mertajam. Is the Kampong Bahru By-pass meant eventually to link this east-west road skirting around Bukit Mertajam with the Chain Ferry Road leading on to Prai and Butterworth? Sir, at this stage,

I would like some clarification before I make further comments on this issue when we come on to a discussion of heads.

Sir, I am a little taken aback. I do not understand exactly what the Honourable the Chief Minister referred to when he talked about the industrial site at Mak Mandin — Sir, I will again use the official English translation — because he says "it was recommended by a committee comprising officials of both the Central Government and the State Government which examined the matter very thoroughly, I presume, before arriving at this recommendation." I presume is my word because the spelling here is not right. Then he goes on to say, "I am not trying to blame them, or cast aspersions on their judgment." Sir, this is quite an important point, because these are the actual words used in the hand-out — "Saya bukan-lah menchuba hendak menyalahkan mereka atau pun menyingkirkan pendapat mereka."

I do not understand why at this stage of the development of the Mak Mandin project, the Honourable the Chief Minister should begin to allow the general public to feel that something is wrong because I am not trying to blame them or cast aspersions on their judgment. These were the words used by the Honourable the Chief Minister. It makes us suspect that all is not well; that there is something wrong with Mak Mandin. Of course a lot of people have a lot of complaints. I am sure that a great number of complaints have been raised and the Honourable Members from the back-benchers have always wanted to find out what is the number of workers in this new project; how many workers are there; how the Mak Mandin industrial project affect

the Malay workers and people living in Butterworth and so. But it seems that the Honourable the Chief Minister is suggesting that the rate of development at Mak Mandin is not as rapid as the State anticipated, because he goes on further to ask the question 'why the slow progress?' And in answering his own question, he gives three reasons. One reason is that the filling of the Mak Mandin site takes time. This is a confession by the State Government — a very salutary confession—because the Alliance State Government normally goes on bluffing and saying 'Oh! we are very good'. For the first time they make a confession; so after all the Opposition by probing them do not bluff. At least, they are getting to be a little bit more nice. Here, the Honourable the Chief Minister says that we are of the view that although the soil conditions were not so favourable yet in the long term Mak Mandin would become a thriving industrial centre. Sir, that again is a statement which I do not quite understand. Because if Mak Mandin were an agricultural centre and the soil conditions are not good then we can understand it. But obviously he is not referring to the fertility or the quality of the productivity of the soil. It meant that Mak Mandin, I am told, is the name of a woman, actually Mak Mandin, as we have suggested before you put your foot in the mud; you can mug in, and the soil conditions are no good. It meant that of all the possible sites in the whole of Province Wellesley and in Penang the State Government must choose one which is full of mud; soil conditions are no good, which requires a lot of filling. The first reason the Honourable the Chief Minister gives for the slow progress is that the filling takes time to consolidate. After "tambah tanah" it takes time to harden, and after

sinking you put in more. Perhaps go to see Mak Mandin 'I want to put a million dollars factory, I have to put piles — will cost more, better go to Taiping, to Ipoh, to Petaling Jaya, to Batu Tiga.' The other reason which the Honourable the Chief Minister gives is an even more vague one. He says 'Another reason which I consider to be more important than the question of filling and soil conditions is financial considerations.' And from that I can only gather that what he means is what he says later on. "The investor is very cautious. He must be sure of an adequate return from his capital, besides being anxious that there should be no loss of his capital. So he needs time to make a decision." So this question of financial consideration is also a big issue. I do not know what exactly the Honourable the Chief Minister means by 'financial consideration' because we have some money on Mak Mandin project, for better or for worse, you better make it successful. So if the Honourable the Chief Minister in his reply would give us further clarification of what he means by financial consideration being the factor for holding back Mak Mandin progress, it will help us to understand the situation better. For example, the Government has spent \$30,000 last year. It intends to spend another \$30,000 for another tour to encourage people to invest in industries in Penang. I do not know what the results of the last tour were. But there seems to be a difference of opinion between the Honourable the Chief Minister and the Honourable Member for Kelawei what the purpose of this \$30,000 was. The Honourable the Chief Minister said that it was meant to help enlighten the views of the Members who went on the tour. The Honourable Member for Kelawei thought it was meant for tourism. But the actual expendi-

ture of the terms for the delegation were meant to visit for the enlightenment of the Assembly as well as to encourage foreign investors to come to Penang. So, I presume, Sir, is the actual point. And if the Government requires more money for more teams to go and I suggest that they should not send such a big team to go and enjoy themselves in Seoul or Tokyo, but they should send similar teams to more places so that they can have a wider scan of potential industry in Malaysia. And that is the financial consideration that Government needs we, on this side of the House feel that we require more advertisement for our project, especially if the soil is poor.

The third reason which the Honourable the Chief Minister gave is confrontation. That I do not understand at all. Anyway confrontation is used for everything; for anything which the Alliance Government cannot solve, they put on confrontation.

Sir, I suggest there are other reasons and I put forward only two reasons for the consideration of the Honourable the Chief Minister. One is a matter which we have already brought up before: it is in relation to the question of proper planning, proper zoning of the areas in the Butterworth/Prai complex. For example, Sir, it has become a very highly debatable issue from the point of view of the future development of this area, particularly in view of the development of the Malayawata Steel Mill over at Prai side of the river, and in view of the fact that Government has already spent a lot of money to build the bridge across Prai River, and the new road leads at one end to Chain Ferry Road and run, I think, straight to Prai; so the links are quite clear. We are already making

provision for a railway bridge from Prai to Butterworth. It is a very moot point whether in the development of this area, Government should not consider proper zoning and planning to allow for industrial siting where better soil conditions prevail on the Prai side, and develop the Butterworth and Permatang Pauh side more for commerce, industry and housing to support the industrial siting of this area. It is a moot point. For all these provision of industrial siting, zoning for commercial areas, zoning for housing, I think the most important point is the control of the prices of land. Sir, because of the natural instinct to make profit which prevail amongst one sector of the people in the world and in spite of the new blood of the socialist which the Honourable Member for Sungei Pinang has now introduced to the Alliance front-benchers, the Alliance's attitude towards the capitalism and cost of land and the exploitation of the cost of land in Butterworth and in Prai has gone up so much that land in certain parts of Butterworth has become comparable to and even higher than in parts of George Town itself. That means, Sir, that development projects and, much worse, redevelopment schemes in Butterworth and Prai will cost the State Government more and more.

Sir, I feel that in providing for industrial development and development in this area, the Government must provide for plans, and Government must be hold enough to exercise control of land of land prices in this area or else that Government must be prepared to raise assessment rates and the cost of land rents in these areas.

Another factor, Sir, which I think has led to the slower development of Mak Mandin than elsewhere is the question of the an-

ancillary development. Ancillary development, Sir, is one, I think, touched upon is the question of the east-west highway. And the other is the question of the port facilities. Sir, I think the Government is a little bit ambivalent. The Honourable Member from Sungei Pinang tried to psychoanalyse me a few days ago. Sir, this ambivalence is what he said about me. There seems to be ambivalence in the Government's attitude towards Government's Development Project. Because, what are these factories in Butterworth to serve? I think Government has not made up its mind whether the factories are there to produce material for export along these wharfs, deep-water wharfs which they are going to build, or the factories are there to produce goods for export into the Common Market or in Malaysia. Sir, most people have gone over to Butterworth and gone over to the Common Market area of Penang largely in order to develop industrial processing so that they can compete with the products manufactured in the rest of the Common Market in Malaysia. The idea of having a project close to the Port deserves two considerations: only when this kind of industrial development requires import of foreign material. For example, Sir, one of the very unhappy things was to see this flour go to Lumut. I feel the State Government, in view of the soil conditions and confrontation, should have made very great efforts to persuade the people to establish the flour mill in the industrial area in Penang and not allow such a big project escape our hands and go to the Lumut area, because such a scheme depends upon the import of raw materials. So, Sir, the Sugar Refinery is an instance of development where it requires close proximity to a Port, or close proximity to wharfs where the goods can come in, the raw materials can come in; and the

factories process, and the goods are then sent over to the Mainland and to the rest of the Common Market. The idea, Sir, that the east-west coast road is going to help our industrialisation, I think is a little bit tenuous. The east-west coast road will in fact augment the entrepot trade of the Port of Penang; but is not likely to increase our rate of industrialisation.

Sir, this is a point which I think we can take with a certain amount of careful measure because the Honourable the Chief Minister has provided us with certain figures made by a Survey Team of the University of Malaya. He says that out of a total number of industrial establishments, 986 industrial establishments are on Penang Island and 639 in Province Wellesley. Sir, so the greater proportion of industrial development is still on Penang Island. So in spite of the fact that the Government has yet to make provision for industrial siting on the Island, people, the capitalists, who are very careful about their money and in spite of confrontation and other reasons still put their capital in small industries in Penang Island because they can have a market and they can survive. Whereas the people in Mak Mandin or the industries that are growing up in Mak Mandin and Province Wellesley find it difficult to survive in terms of the cost of transport of their products from Mak Mandin into the rest of the Mainland. Sir, this question of provision of ancillary development is a very important factor, I hope the State Government when it has the new Assistant State Secretary (Economic) will establish a Board or Committee, of Alliance Members if necessary, so we can attack it to help this Assistant State Secretary (Economic) to look into the question of the ancillary roads.

I am sure, Sir, for example, if we put industrialisation on Province Wellesley after we have decided definitely whether Prai is a better place or not, if we had zoned the area carefully, if we had provided better water wharf facilities, if we can tell them definitely that the road is coming from Baling to Prai and so on. These ancillary facilities will help the growth of industries. Without these ancillary facilities, it is very difficult to see industries grow.

One of the ancillary facilities I would like to talk about is the question of provision of the low-cost housing which the State Government has made in the State Development Plan along Chain Ferry Road. I hope that these low-cost houses will be specifically earmarked for the low income group and for the workers in this area. Sir, there is a great shortage of houses in this area and unless this ancillary scheme of providing low-cost housing is properly controlled, what will happen is that low-cost houses meant for people from low income group will, without control, pass naturally into the hands of entrepreneurs, that is people who do not come into that group will buy over and take over these low-cost houses. So you defeat your own project and development schemes in the long run.

Sir, whatever it is, the report made by the Honourable the Chief Minister with regard to Mak Mandin only makes it clear that the free port status of Penang is still a very important issue because of industrialisation which the Members from Province Wellesley so strongly talk about. We are in the Common Market. We have improved. We have industrialisation. Industrialisation is still very slow and in actual fact we still depend very much upon a sound consultation or re-consultation of the

entrepot trade with places like Indonesia now that confrontation has ended.

Sir, on the question of provision for industrialisation, I cannot end up without again stressing the need for the State Government to press for industrial siting in Penang Island. At last, Sir, the Honourable the Chief Minister has made a little bit of concession and said that numerous (interruption.)

Mr. Speaker: Somewhere in Sungei Pinang?

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): Somewhere in Penang, but there is no proper zoning. This is very important, Sir, because we have a lot of brushes over the question of the free port of Penang. And our point of view is that until the Central Government can assist us to see our way through it is better for us to have economic development and the economic development has already taken place, and the future standard of living of the people of Penang Island is assured, we should not give away the free port status. The Honourable the Chief Minister in his reply gave a very guarded, clever, political statement — not statesmanship but political — high-class politicking, because he says that 'we assure the people that we will not give up the free port status of Penang.' If we stop there, people will say the Alliance Government is very good. But he goes on to say 'so long as we are of the opinion that it is of benefit to the people of Penang'. But what we are trying to tell you, Sir, is that by agreeing to the Amended Customs Ordinance, by taking away our free-from-tax tyres later on other items, you will make it into a position where it becomes of no benefit to have the free port status. On the one hand you tell

the people you want to defend the free port status: on the other hand you do things which make it useless to continue to have the free port status. So, Sir, in this very wonderful political way of speaking, the Alliance Government hopes to go on bluffing the people — fighting with right hand, left hand, right lunge, left lock, right ear, left ear and so on.

So I hope from the very statement made by the Honourable the Chief Minister about the slow progress of development of Mak Mandin, industrialisation of the State of Penang, our experience in the Province and our experience in Penang Island which hitherto was zero, apart from those established by private factories, indicates that although we all wish, as in the words of the Honourable the Chief Minister 'ultimately' — 'ultimately' means 'I do not know when' or eventually after we are dead, and our grand children, after our great grand children go: it can mean that ultimately it can be a success. And this is the same as the question of the Tanjong Tokong scheme and the projects of this land which we provided for land acquisition. With no completion. Ultimately, 10 years later, still nothing.

So, Sir, until we are very sure, I hope that the Government will make it clear that it will not only retain the free port status but it will help to make the free port status meaningful. Because it is clear that until industrialisation catches up we depend still a lot on the entrepot trade of Penang Island and the question of industrialisation of Penang. This provision of land in Sungei Pinang area: why Sungei Pinang, I do not really know. It may be because I presume, the reference is to the hinterland and the road to Jalan Aziz Ibrahim so that they can take the products and sell to the people

of Pulau Jerejak. But for industrial siting to go from Sungei Pinang through the congested area of Jelutong to the Port area is worse than the position you have in the Chain Ferry, unless you are telling me it is Sungei Pinang in George Town. Because if it is Sungei Pinang in George Town then you have soil problems, worse than Mak Mandin. Or are you talking about Sungei Pinang on the other side of the Island so that you can export it to Indonesia? Sir, exactly why do you choose a site for industrialisation? We are tolerant. We are patient. The Government says 'we await expert advice from the World Bank'. Sir we await this advice and, we want to find out what the Government's project is in the long run.

Sir, the last two points I would like to touch on from the actual speech of the Honourable the Chief Minister is the question on tourism. This is an addendum slip:

"The State Government is fully conscious of the desirability of promoting tourism. Every year we do spend some money on this. We cannot afford to spend large sums of State money on matters or projects such as acceleration of the Penang Hill Road, the construction of Dewan Sri Pinang etc."

Sir, the total amount of provision for Dewan Sri Pinang on the Development Estimates is \$10/- provision for 1967 for Penang Hill Road is \$50,000. It is a question of some money, you are providing nothing.

Sir, the other factor is that the Government says..... (interrupted.)

Chief Minister: On a point of clarification. I think the Honourable Member for Kota knows what the amount of \$10.00 means. It is

a token vote. I hope the Honourable Member will be more realistic in his comments. Out of a good gesture I allowed the Honourable Member to have a copy of my speech, otherwise I would refuse to give it to him. He should have listened to my speech. But do not mutilate my speech and take advantage of my generosity.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): Mr. Speaker, I would like to assure the Honourable the Chief Minister I have no reason whatsoever to mutilate his speech. As a matter of fact, we, on this side of the House is just as concerned as he is over the development of his State.

Mr. Speaker: Do you agree to correct that? \$10.00 is a token vote.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): Still it is \$10.00. If the provision for next year is \$60,000, we will praise Government. Everybody knows in this House that \$10.00 is a token vote. The point is the question of tourism: and the Honourable Members from Glugor and Tanjong Bungah who are interested in tourism should realise that State Government is now beginning to put responsibility on bigger shoulders because the promotion of tourism cannot be a matter of State concern, it must be a matter of co-operation and co-ordination with other States. Sir, I agree that the Federal Government has now come on to the idea that it is so short of money that it must also begin to promote tourism. I mean, it must at least try to promote tourism for the G.I.'s coming in from Vietnam so that G.I.'s do not spend all their money in Bangkok. They can come over to Malaysia,

some actually will come to Penang. But Sir, I feel that the State must make and continue to make stronger efforts in tourism because we'll have to compete with other States. Sir, if in actual fact there is co-operation and co-ordination tourists will come to Malaysia, land in Penang first and spend the money in Penang before they go elsewhere. This, I think, is the first principle in making tourism of any benefit. If the people land first in Singapore and spend all the money, by the time they come to Penang they have enough money for one "kueh teow" and may be drink one toddy. So, Sir, whilst I agree that the promotion of tourism is a matter of co-ordination, the very fact that the Central Government has got a tourists' scheme—this is a very sad thing—and the Head of the Tourist Centre, a man from Penang, visits the rest of the Federation more often than he visits Penang. This is a very sad thing. And I hope that great pressure will be made by the State Government to ensure that we not only generate our own tourist projects, but whatever the Central Government may have in terms of tourism, Penang would put in its finger in the pie first and get its cut first. Be sure, for example, that if any provision is made for greyhound-racing or dog-racing as so mentioned by the Honourable Minister of Commerce and Industry, it does not go to Lumut or Taiping or Cameron Highlands, but it comes to Penang. Sir, I think, that is a matter of importance, and tourism has been stated again and again as a matter of importance for the State of Penang. But whilst providing the large sums of money we are not making any real effort in promoting tourism. And most of the people who have come here and talked about the potentialities of Penang as a tourist centre have always talked about the beauties of Penang. But

always their statement carries a little word of pity and a little word of regret: 'It is a pity you have not done more.' Sir, these are words not made by the Opposition alone but by friends of Alliance Government who get gifts from the Honourable the Chief Minister when they visit us. I think we should do more.

Sir, one point, I would like to seek further clarification on is this question of a sum of \$2,500,000. A revote? The statement is that it is a revote. And we have to make this revote, if I am correct, not because the Government has got any real project for this money. This is being included in both the Supplementary Development Estimates and the Development Estimates because it is not possible to say with certainty, exactly, when the sum of money will be required to be paid out. Sir, I presume the projects are on hand, but you do not know when the projects will be finished. But I was under the impression that certain projects when they are put on, there are certain periods specified. You are not able to tell us so — this year or next year. By 1967 there will be no provision for a revote. Sir, this is very quick on the uptake for us to preserve \$2,500,000 which would otherwise disappear from the revote on the Development Estimates, and I hope the Government will make this the last of this type of revote. And certainly we will not come in before January to ask for more money for revote because our money is not expended: money not expended or not certain to be expended indicates what we in the Opposition mean by a lack of vitality and lack of dynamism on the part of the State Government because, Sir, it is all very well to tell the people we are spending over \$16,000,000 for development but

in actual fact you are not doing that much, nor are you capable of doing that much. Sir, it is better for us to move very slowly.

Sir, before I finish I would like to refer specifically to items to justify what I have said: namely over the question of tourism. We think the provisions of \$30,000 for tourism development is not big enough a sum for such an important project. Sir, on the question of Industrial Development, we have already stated that we wish to see a definite provision for industrial development in Penang.

Sir, on the question of our University: I hope this will spark off a little bit of a debate because we would like to know more of the future. The Government has told us and announced in the Press that by May of next year we are going to have a University College. But now the Chief Minister says University/University College, so I must presume University or University College in Penang. Sir, this is a very commendable thing. The sooner we get started the better. We have been talking about that University for a long time now during the course of the Supply Bill we have been told it depends upon how money is forthcoming from the Central Government. Sir, whatever it is, this University has become a matter of very great importance to us this year because last year when the Honourable the Prime Minister visited us and the Free Port Status of Penang was thrown to him he gave us as an alternative, a Causeway which costs about \$40,000,000. Now he gives us the University College. So I think if the Causeway is worth \$40,000,000 the Members of the Committee should be bold enough to plan a University worth about \$40,000,000 in terms of the University College balancing the loss of the free port status with-

out a Causeway. But whatever it is we would like to know more about this question of the University. This is an important point because it is quite clear that the number of children leaving Sixth Form, in Penang State alone, will be over a thousand each year. I think it will reach something like 1,500 by next year. The avenues for them for university training in Singapore will become less. In the University of Malaya, I think the position will remain very much the same. But we are striving to provide higher education and higher secondary education for our children, and there must be scope for them to move on. So I think it is commendable that the Government has already spend the full sum of money, originally allocated for the projects of land for the site of the University. I believe from hearsay, which I like to be confirmed by the Honourable Members of the Committee, that there will be a system of "pinjam?" with the Teachers' Training College for the use of the new wing of the Teachers' Training College for the University College to be sought.

Sir, however, I would like to caution the State Government that there are certain matters which we have to be very careful about; and much as I like the idea of the the University College being established as soon as possible, I think the provision for the final development of the University College should provide. I think, for what the Honourable the Chief Minister has guessed — that we should provide for the ultimate development of this University College into an independent University of our own. We should try to ensure that whilst the beginners of the nucleus of the University College shall be dependent upon the aid of the Central Government and dependent upon academic aid and administrative aid from the Uni-

versity of Malaya, nevertheless, this nucleus will be able to grow up to be an independent and autonomous unit in Penang itself. And for that reason, I feel there is every good wish on our part to commend the work that has been carried out by the Committee and to hope that this University Nucleus will be established as early as possible.

I would like to recall that before the war, when Raffles College was faced with an acute shortage of staff, staff with qualification, particularly in Arts and certain faculties of the Science were recruited even from the teaching staff and the Normal Secondary School staff of the Education Department; and they were seconded as lectures into the University College. I presume that some system of that type is being adopted by the Committee. But I hope, however, that the Committee does not fall into a trap which has occurred elsewhere; and that is the appointment of protem or part-time lecturers, of lecturers or academic staff should not be decided to such an extent that they become permanent. There are certain Universities and University Colleges in other parts of the Commonwealth who after the war war employ staff which were immediately available to them — not the best possible staff they could get, but one which was needed to help them start off — but once they were appointed you couldn't dismiss them and change them later on. And when the University Nucleus develops into the University College you might find the control of this staff difficult.

Sir, I would like to refer also to item 32 on page 7.

Mr. Speaker: Ahli yang berhor-mat, jam sekarang sudah pukul satu. Ada-lah banyak lagi yang hendak di-chakapkan?

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): No Sir. Just one or two things. I'll touch on it when we come to Committee.

Mr. Speaker: This is not going to Committee. This is a motion. I presume you have much more to say.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): Four or five items.

Sir, on the question of survey of economic development of Penang State provision of \$30,000: Sir, this sum of money from what I discussed earlier is too trifling for the future and I hope that the Government will provide for more.

I noticed that the revised estimate has increased from the original estimate from \$30,000 to \$60,000. This is one area on which we support the Government on upward revision. And I hope that upward revision is made realistic because if it is raised from \$30,000 to \$60,000 it is still not enough. It is not worth it at \$60,000. You may just as well make it a little more. Sir, when you think in terms of projects which the Honourable the Prime Minister mentioned — University, Causeway and development of Penang Island all costing millions and millions, the provision of \$30,000 for the Economic Development Survey is not enough.

Sir, on the question of di-silting of rivers, I would like to touch on the question of the rivers in Telok Bahang where there have been many places over the water of the rivers being muddied because of works that are carried out by some contract to take sand and to take red earth, in consequence making it more difficult for the people living lower down to use the water in this area.

Sir, the Honourable the Chief minister has talked about the question of the Tasek Irrigation Scheme, and I only hope that the whole scheme — the provision of \$100,000 — will mean that the Government will hasten and complete this scheme because this, as he, himself said, is a scheme which is two-fold and which must be combined and completed as soon as possible.

The last point, Sir, is this question on item 41, page 13 — \$300,000 provided for as a first instalment for the project of drainage and reclamation of Sungei Prai. We would like to hear more from the Government as to what this provision will lead to, and whether in the reclamation of Sungei Prai, there is any land reclaimed in that area at all. And in terms of reclamation in general, I hope, Sir, that the Government will make more strenuous effort in providing for reclamation of land, not only of land around the river but also land on the foreshore of the island, particularly in view of the development projects that lie ahead.

Sir, in conclusion, we would say that the Government's proposals for development are encouraging, but not enough. And we feel that there is an air of unrealism and there is an air of pessimism in the presentation of these Estimates, and we hope that the Government will really carry out the development projects on a systematic, strategic scheme, providing benefit for the State of Penang and not scatter so many eggs in so many baskets; but have single eggs in single baskets just like at a "kenduri" after a wedding.

The Assembly adjourns
at 1.02 p.m.

The Assembly resumes
at 2.45 pm.

Member for Tanjong Utara (Mr. Khoo Kay Por): Mr. Speaker Sir, with regard to the allocation of land for the university of Penang there is a fact which the Government should pay great attention also after passing the legislation for the Government to purchase land. There are students also from the Chinese Secondary Schools who have after passing their studies also need to receive higher education. We strongly urge the State Government to take this into consideration and should be able to provide a site in the near future in order for the students of Penang to be able to receive the further education. Thank you.

Member for Bayan Lepas (Enche Ismail bin Hashim): Tuan Speaker, saya bangun menyokong usul yang telah di-bawa oleh Y.A.B. Ketua Menteri ia-itu berkenaan dengan perbelanjaan pembangunan tahun 1967. Dalam ucapan Y.A.B. Ketua Menteri dalam membentangkan usul ini ada beberapa perkara saya rasa sangat menarek dan saya rasa patut kita memberi ucapan terima kaseh kepada Kerajaan Negeri yang telah dapat mengadakan beberapa ranchangan pembangunan bagi Negeri Pulau Pinang.

Tuan Speaker, dalam ucapan Y.A.B. Ketua Menteri pagi ini ia-itu di-muka 3 ada menyebut berkenaan dengan bantuan baja kepada petani2 kita ia-itu sebanyak lebih kurang \$24,000 yang mana 30% yang di-beri oleh Kerajaan sechara bantuan. Jadi saya mengambil peluang di-sini bagi mengucapkan terima kaseh banyak kepada Kerajaan atas bantuan yang sangat berharga ini. Lagi satu perkara yang saya suka hendak menventoh ia-itu berkenaan dengan Kepala 107 Pechahan Kepala 15 muka 8. Tuan Speaker,

kelmarin saya telah berucap dalam masa menyokong undang2 perbekalan tahun 1967 dalam mana saya telah mendapat jawapan daripada salah sa-orang daripada Ahli Kerajaan meminta supaya jalan raya yang saya percayai jalan ini ada-lah jalan Kerajaan Negeri ia-itu jalan di-antara Bayan Lepas ka-Batu Maung yang melalui Permatang Damar Laut dalam mana jalan tersebut ada satu selekoh yang sangat merbahaya dan dalam tahun ini sahaja lebih kurang tiga kali berlaku kemalangan dan perkara ini telah juga saya bawa dalam Jawatan Kuasa Pembangunan Daerah Pehak Jawatan Kuasa Daerah telah bersetuju serta pula telah mendapat jawapan dari pehak Jurutera Negeri supaya dapat membuat atau pun memperbaikinya dalam tahun 1967 ini. Jadi saya berharap dengan anggaran pembangunan dalam Pechahan Kepala 107 dan Pechahan 15 itu dapat-lah kerajaan menguntokkan perbelanjaan yang tersebut dan dapat membaiki selekoh yang saya sebutkan tadi itu.

Tuan Speaker, Kerajaan Negeri menchadangkan hendak mendirikan Universiti College, ia-itu di-kawasan Bayan Lepas saya percayai manakala Universiti College ini di-dirikan jalan raya daripada Bayan Lepas ka-Gelugor atau pun Jelutong akan bertambah sibok. Jadi saya berharap supaya dapat pehak yang berkenaan menyusun atau membuat ranchangan dari sekarang supaya jalan tersebut jangan-lah jadi macham mana jalan yang di-sebelah Utara Pulau Pinang. Pada fikiran saya jalan ini dapat di-jadikan sebagai satu jalan highway.

Tuan Speaker, lagi satu perkara, ia-itu Kepala 108 muka 21 Pechahan Kepala 10 — dalam ucapan Y.A.B. Ketua Menteri ada menyebutkan Kerajaan telah pun menyediakan peruntokan sebanyak \$270,000 kerana perbekalan ayer

bagi beberapa tempat yang saya rasa sa-hingga hari ini pehak penduduk2 di-situ berasa ketinggalan kerana masa'alah perbekalan ayer ini. Jadi saya rasa sangat-lah molek bagi saya pada masa ini meng-uchapkan setinggi2 terima kaseh kapada Kerajaan yang telah mengadakan peruntukan dan akan mengadakan perbekalan tersebut dalam Tahun 1967 ini.

Tuan Speaker, saya rasa ini ada-lah satu perkara yang baik dengan sebab Kerajaan Negeri telah mengambil alih City Council dan dengan ada-nya pemerentahan City Council dalam tangan Kerajaan Negeri hari ini dapat menyelesaikan masa'alah dan kerumitan bagi penduduk2 yang teraniaya tempoh hari. Tuan Speaker, akhir-nya saya suka-lah juga mengambil peluang di-sini meng-uchapkan terima kaseh kapada Kerajaan kerana dapat menguntokkan dalam ranchangan kema-juan tahun 1967 ini sebanyak \$165,000 untuk menggantikan rumah2 robek bagi orang2 atau buroh2 yang tidak ada kemampuan untuk membuat-nya dan memberi bantuan kapada mereka bagi mendirikan rumah2 mereka sendiri.

Member for Tanjong Bungah (Mr. Cheah Seng Khim): Mr. Speaker, Sir, in supporting the motion of the Honourable the Chief Minister, I thank him and the State Government for giving such a big speech on the Development Estimates. He has explained to us clearly about the low-cost housing, about the water, and about the University College of Penang.

The Opposition Leader, Dr. Lim Chong Eu, who was at one time the leader is not very happy about the speech. That, of course, is up to him. He is never happy about this. He is in the Opposition. He must say something because he is in the Opposition.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very happy about the speech. I do not like the contents.

Member for Tanjong Bungah (Mr. Cheah Seng Khim): What I want to say is the subject of tourism. The second but last paragraph of the speech of the Honourable the Chief Minister is about tourism. I think little has been done about tourism all these years. Only a few years back, even His Excellency in his speech also said, in his last paragraph, about tourism. At that time I did not see what a solitary voice in this House could do.

A few years ago when I was Chairman of the Tourist Association, I wrote to the State Government about the Titi Karawan, the bridge next to Sungei Pinang River. There was a swimming pool. We asked to spend a few thousand dollars to make it into a proper swimming pool, to have the boulders removed and paths cleared. But this was not done. The State Government just wrote to us thanking us for the suggestion. That's all, we also wrote to the State Government asking them to have a few posts for the tourists to stop and have a good view of the sea and have a good watch from the beach. This was not agreed to by the State Government because of low finance or something of that sort.

Now the Bill for the free port. There was a Bill recently passed by the Senate, and I was assured by the Finance Minister to Senator P. H. Tan that he would consult the Government when we want to implement in new taxes. I hope that this is a chance for the Government to bargain for some more money to build the Dewan Sri Pinang and the Hill Road.

The Economic Secretary is going to be in office in a few months time. I hope that he will go into the matter of these things about tourism and give his advice to the Government as to what to do when the time comes instead of waiting for the report of the Advisory Committee to the Ministry. Instead of waiting for the report I hope the State Government will go ahead first and do what is to be done in Penang.

That's all, thank you.

Member for Glugor (Enche Aziz Ibrahim): Mr. Speaker Sir, I would like to speak on the Development Estimates — the motion put before the Assembly by the Honourable the Chief Minister.

Now looking at the Development Estimates preparations, let me recollect the Member for Kota that since Merdeka, since Independence, I am sure we all cannot deny, I am sure the people of Penang, I am sure the country as a whole and even the Opposition Members today cannot deny that achievements since Independence, which is only a period of ten years compared to the former British rule of about 170 years, the development has been tremendous. Now, Mr. Speaker, Sir, and Gentlemen we are not going to say this ourselves. We'll ask some of our friends who revisited Penang — those who have left Penang for about a period of 10 years, those who revisited us from their return from Australia, New Zealand, India, the United Kingdom and many other parts of the world or those who have served the country, the State of Penang, those officials, the Government officers, who have gone and came back and our friends here who travelled out and came back; our students who went away and came back, when they pass Penang or when they stop at Penang to go to their

other States or when they come here for a visit. "What is your comment on Penang?" and they answer, "My God! Completely changed. You all have changed!" And some say "I did not see this when I was here six years ago. I did not see this, this, this, 10 years ago" and so on. Now these are the actual comments, and many have said that Penang has changed, especially in the development and progress of the people, the economy of the people, the movement of the people, the transport system and our many other spheres of development in the many sections. I say these are commendable remarks.

Now the Budget here shows, whatever we have put in the Development Estimates; and as it progresses we revise and then amounts of money are put back and the former votes and revised votes are split up into many years. We can see that very clearly: some are put in more; some are taken out, some are split so much so that in these few years all these development have taken place. I am sure the Member for Kota and my colleagues on the opposite side realise that.

Now I would like to mention two subjects, may be three or four but I'll mention only two big new ones which we cannot deny are great achievements. Take for instance, irrigation, which is an irrigation policy under Government now and which with the help of the Federal Government and ourselves, we have put in hundreds and thousands and millions of dollars, as we have heard from the speech of the Honourable the Chief Minister this morning, have now been completed. These irrigation schemes are mostly completed now except in one or two areas. There is only one area in the State of Penang where we cannot have this scheme yet. This is the Sungei Nibong,

Relau, Sungei Nibong Kechil, Kampong Java, Bayan Lepas and Telok Kumbar area. These are where the rice fields are. The padi planters and farmers here do not have these facilities yet but requests have been made and Government is looking into the possibility of providing proper irrigation system for them. In the rest of the State of Penang, in comparison, about 30 or 40% of these schemes have been completed and I am sure by the First Malaysia Plan of 1969 all these will have been completed.

The results of these irrigation schemes have been the cause of higher rice yields for the padi planters. Since this implementation, farmers who have been getting about 300 gantangs of rice are now reaping from 500 to 1,200 gantangs. This is because it was possible to have two croppings of padi. These padi planters are also being encouraged to have off-season crop. Because of these improvements we are able to have these statistics in black and white in front of all Members in this House. In addition, oral and written questions on this subject have been answered and distributed.

Now we come to other crops besides padi. These are nutmegs and cloves. These two crops are commendable because we have not only won a name for ourselves in India, Africa and many other parts of the world, but also have brought in economy to our country. These crops are not widely grown yet, but we have about a few hundreds of acres here and there on Penang Island. This is due to the encouragement of Government subsidy given by the Agricultural Department through the Ministry, and through the State Government. At this stage I am sure Members on

the opposite side will agree that the Budget we are presenting today is a correct and true picture.

When the Member for Tanjong Selatan stood up to speak this morning, he started his speech by saying that Government "menipu orang2 ramai", that is to say cheating the public of Penang, being dishonest to the public of Penang — this is not true. From what I have said and from what the Honourable the Chief Minister has said this morning I would like to ask him to think again and to inform him that I am willing to counter him for that statement and so are my colleagues willing to do so because we cannot welcome such a statement.

With regard to tourism — this is the subject the Honourable Member for Kota said is my pet subject and also that of the Member for Tanjong Bungah. This is because we have served on the Tourist Board Association in Penang. The Board and other Members too sympathise with tourism development. I am sure the Honourable the Chief Minister too. Now what happens is this: the Federal Government too have come in to plan a nation wide tourism activity on a nation-wide basis where large sums of money have been voted. Penang is also included in this big scheme. In addition, to that progress, the Penang Government has provided votes for a number of years and this is on a diminishing scale. Next year we have quite a balance and what we are going to do in 1957 is for the Tourist Association to have a Board. And with these grants we can do a lot of publicity campaign, printing booklets and other publicity materials to send to all parts of the world. Other tourism development are road building — the Penang Hill Road and the organising of the

Dewan Sri Pinang. Other important projects which come under these estimates is part of tourism. So there is no need to worry.

I suppose the Airport comes under the Ministry of Transport which is responsible for airport facilities, the airport facilities. Because of Penang Government's recommendation five years we have what we see today at the present airport.

Another extension for airport facilities is the introduction of heavier aircrafts like the Dakota and Fokker Friendship and the latest, the international Caravelle. I regret to say that the 707 Boeing type will not be able to land in our airport. But the Penang Government has made appeals for this and by 1968/69 I think the Boeing 707 will be introduced then. Other projects which come under tourism will soon be stepped up, especially now that we have the backing of the Federal Government. I agree that these will not come now but we have been promised that it will come one day.

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

Member for Glugor (Enche Aziz Ibrahim): It will not come during our time.

Then we have the Mak Mandin Estate which comes under tourism. The Muda Irrigation Scheme is tourism. The canals along there may be improved to rear freshwater fish. There could be a Dam there, too. Then we have the University project. That is another part of tourism. And the Hill too. We should not worry about tourism development vote. Some Opposition Members said that the

vote for tourism is too little but whatever projects we are having is tourism. It is not too little then.

Mr. Speaker: I hope the Assembly will not be included for tourism.

Member for Glugor (Enche Aziz Ibrahim): The Assembly Chamber is part of tourism. People come round and see this historical building. These historical buildings are kept back by Government. They are renovated and painted and they form part of tourism. That is clear. So, therefore, the efforts of these, and what we are doing and the development estimates and the country as a whole, I think benefit tourism and for visitors to see.

Now, what is happening from 3rd December to 17th December, — the Malayan Scouts Jamboree, the Pesta Pulau Pinang in the Esplanade, the Procession, the Floats and the Chingay—all these come under this vote and I can see the whole in a nut-shell when we bring it out one by one. Penang is doing a lot and as far as tourism is concerned hundreds and hundreds of people are going to jam this place in December.

The Tourist Association has checked the hotels today. We want to find out the response of the people all around us, especially in Thailand where the Asian Games are going on. And the result is, all the hotels are booked up, especially when we have the school holidays.

Now regarding the money side of it — yes, \$30,000 is nothing but money comes in other directions under the Development Estimates.

Regarding the speech by the the Members for Tanjong Selatan on the subject of agricultural

station which Government has announced and have not yet implemented in the Reliau/Paya Terubong area. That is in my Constituency and I would like to comment on this. The agricultural stations that are going to be built here are going to be the best possible but we must remember that we cannot do it yet because of the difficulties of the squatters and the farmers whom Government has requested to move. In fact, these difficulties are being looked into and are being settled now and I can assure the Member for Tanjong Selatan and the Member for Jelutong that the construction of these stations will soon be implemented, most probably by 1967. All these stations will provide wonderful and big development under agriculture. Now, this is along the main highway and this is set up also as part of tourism because all these are for visitors to see. It is planned by Government in such a way that the highway by-pass from one road to the other and across to the Airport so that people can stop and see the type of fruits we grown, the type of poultry we have. All these are part of tourism.

Now, we come to the aquarium. This is costing our State Government \$80,000 and now that the Federal Government has come in it is going to be one of the finest fish research centre and aquarium in the country. It is being built now and it is going to be ready soon. With this and plus the Malayan Teachers' College and the proposed University of Malaya College which I hope in the near future we can try to get it started off.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): I am getting a bit lost. Is this the Tourism Estimate or the Development Estimate?

Member for Glugor (Enche Aziz

Ibrahim): Development Estimates. As a whole under development of the State.

Mr. Speaker Sir, the last comment I have to make is this: Sometimes we are surprised that on the island of Penang you will be asked the question: 'Where are your factories and industries of the Island?' According to the Chief Minister's speech there are 986 factories — nearly 1,000 on the Island of Penang and on the Province Wellesley side there are about 639. And I found out that one factory has just shot up — just two or three months ago. There are six factories of that type in Province Wellesley. It is the plastic factory and all these began within a year. If this is the case there might be some hidden which Members of the opposite side do not know.

Mr. Speaker: Opposite side of off side?

Member for Glugor (Enche Aziz Ibrahim): Opposite side.

So **Mr. Speaker Sir,** these are the progress, these are the encouragement which the Government has been making all the time, so that industries of this type have sprung up.

Talking about Industrial Estate of Mak Mandin, it is still going up. Now others scatter around. It is quite a surprise to me from the figures. I am sure Members of the other side are also surprised. Therefore, there is no need to worry about the economic position of the State. In fact, I am not in the least worried, neither am I going to worry what is going to happen in the future because it is still springing. Instead of dying it is still coming up. All these industries, factories, development and progress and people's income has been increasing.

Member for Permatang Pauh (Enche Ariffin bin Shariff): Tuan Speaker, saya tidak-lah hendak membahaskan apa2 di atas ucapan Yang Berhormat Ahli daripada kawasan Kota, tetapi suka-lah juga saya mengatakan sedikit bahawa jika apa Rang Undang2 sekali pun di-kemukakan kita boleh-lah memberi jaminan bahawa Ahli kawasan Kota tidak-lah akan menerima-nya. Jika keistimewaan-nya satu kegiatan-nya memberi ucapan mengeritik Kerajaan didalam Dewan ini, kritik-lah banyak2 dan berchakap-lah panjang2 — lagi panjang lagi bagus.

Dalam ucapan-nya membangkang pagi tadi, hanya satu sahaja-lah nasehat-nya sebagai pembangkang kepada Kerajaan yang mana susah hendak di-terima, ia-itu perkara mengisi telor dalam bakul. Banyak telor isi dalam satu bakul itu perkara senang tetapi satu telah di-isi banyak bakul banyak susah. Kebiasaan satu telor satu bakul sudah chukup.

Kapada Ahli kawasan Jelutong yang mengatakan bahawa Rang Undang2 itu ia-lah sebagai memainkan angka2 untuk menipu ra'ayat, sa-benar-nya kami tidak memainkan angka2 dan juga tidak menipu ra'ayat. Tuntutan-nya itu ada-lah terbit dari anggaran sekian banyak sedangkan perbelanjaan-nya kurang dari itu, lantas kami di-tudoh mempermain2kan angka2. Jangan fikir kami tidak pandai membelanjakan wang. Sau dara harus perhatikan kita selalu di-dalam Dewan ini mengadakan Rang Undang Tambahan, Rang Undang2 Tambahan Perbelanjaan tetapi bila datang Rang Undang2 Tambahan sahaja, kita tidak chukup perbelanjaan sahaja, ahli kawasan Jelutong juga mengatakan bahawa kita tidak bijak pula dalam menunjokkan angka2, jadi kalau ada kelebihan di-katakan-nya pula kita tidak pandai main

angka2 pula. Ini harus-lah saudara Ahli kawasan Jelutong mengetahui bahawa itu bukan-lah perbelanjaan biasa yang mesti di-habiskan serta merta. Perbelanjaan biasa ini ada-lah anggaran pembangunan Negeri. Pembangunan berlainan daripada perbelanjaan biasa, kalau wang habis di-belanjakan atau lebeh di-belanjakan maka apa itu erti anggaran perbelanjaan yang terbelengkalai.

Ahli kawasan Jelutong juga tidak senang perasaan mengatakan lebeh hebat dari itu lagi. Mula2 di-sentuh-nya tentang letrik di-luar bandar. Untuk pengetahuan Ahli kawasan Jelutong suka-lah saya menerangkan bahawa kita tidak pernah mengabaikan kawasan luar bandar, permohonan apa sahaja yang datang terutama sekali tentang lampu letrik kita akan memberi dan menunaikan, tetapi mengikut giliran kerana kita tidak mempunyai apa2 tongkat hikmat untuk melaksanakan dengan serta merta malah di-adakan dengan chara satu demi satu. Sekarang sila-lah sediakan kertas saya hendak bagi angka2 berkenaan dengan ranchangan2 letrik luar bandar dalam tahun 1966:-

Yang telah di-luluskan dan sekarang ini Kerajaan telah berbelanja tetapi belum siap —

1. Titi Mukim/Lahar Tabit	—
perbelanjaan kesemua	\$14,476
bantuan Kerajaan Negeri ia-lah	\$8,176
2. Telok Wang/Ara Kuda	—
Jumlah berbelanjaan	\$41,874
bantuan Kerajaan Negeri ia-lah	\$28,887
3. Transkrian/Krian Estate	—
Jumlah Perbelanjaan	\$20,000
bantuan Kerajaan Negeri	\$12,300

4. Ptg. Pak Maras	—
Jumlah Perbelanjaan	\$9,071
bantuan Kerajaan Negeri	\$5,800
5. Tanah Liat Hujung	—
Jumlah perbelanjaan	\$6,559
bantuan Kerajaan Negeri	\$1,995
6. Kampong Mengkuang Titi	—
Jumlah Perbelanjaan	\$25,500
bantuan Kerajaan Negeri	\$22,000
7. Sungei Buaya	—
Jumlah Perbelanjaan	\$16,500
bantuan Kerajaan Negeri	\$14,400
8. Kg. Manggins (Tasek Gelugor)	—
Jumlah Perbelanjaan	\$9,880
bantuan Kerajaan Negeri	\$4,800
9. Ptg. Berangan 'A'	—
Jumlah Perbelanjaan	\$9,760
bantuan Kerajaan Negeri	\$7,100
10. Ptg. Berangan 'B'	—
Jumlah Perbelanjaan	\$6,264
bantuan Kerajaan Negeri	\$4,670

Itu-lah pehak Kerajaan Negeri ini telah pun mengeluarkan belanja berkenaan dengan letrik dalam kawasan luar bandar yang telah di-tudoh mengatakan tidak memperdulikan nasib ra'ayat di-desa2 yang di-dalam gelap gelita. Berkenaan dengan pelanchongan saya dengan panjang-nya Ahli Yang Berhormat dari kawasan Gelugor telah pun memberi keterangan yang paling hebat sekali.

Ahli kawasan Tanjong Selatan juga telah mengatakan sama sahaja-lah tentang banjir, chara tuntutan itu sama tetapi masa'-alah banjir. Yang Berhormat itu menudoh bahawa Kerajaan ini

tidak mengambil endah tentang perkara2 banjir yang berlaku dalam Negeri ini. Fikiran itu ada-lah salah sama sekali kerana baru2 ini apa yang kita ketahui bila berlaku satu banjir di-kawasan Seberang Perai Utara, Kerajaan Negeri telah pun menguntokkan wang begitu banyak dan juga Kerajaan Pusat telah memberi bantuan yang banyak juga pada masa itu. Pehak2 Kerajaan, wakil2 ra'ayat dan badan2 sukarela telah pun membantu dan memberi pertolongan yang sewajar-nya. Kita harus memberi terima kaseh kepada pehak2 yang berkenaan itu. Tetapi di-sini barang kali belum ada banjir apa2. Soal bendong itu soal lain kerana membendong sesuatu lebeh susah daripada membaiki lain2 perkara. Perkara membendong ada-lah satu perkara yang susah.

Kemudian beraleh kapada University. Entah bagaimana di-ungkit2-nya perkara konon-nya sa-orang murid Sekolah Han Chiang yang tidak dapat peluang masuk ka-tingkatan enam. Saya rasa itu soal lain. Jabatan Pelajaran Negeri ini harus tidak membezakan dari mana datang-nya penuntut Sekolah itu, tetapi barang kali boleh jadi ada sesuatu kesilapan yang menyebabkan tidak membolehkan ia masuk ka-tingkatan enam — itu lain perkara. Kalau nak mengatakan Sekolah Han Chiang tidak berpeluang masuk form enam tidak-lah pula, tetapi boleh jadi bukan sahaja dalam sekolah itu malah sekolah lain juga perkara yang demikian barangkali ada satu kesilapan yang tidak membenarkan ia memasoki tingkatan enam. Saya rasa ada lebeh baik Ahli dari Tanjong Selatan itu menyeniat terlebih dahulu supaya dapat di-ketahui-nya siapa-kah yang sebenar-nya bersalah dan jangan-lah membabitkan perkara Universiti College Pulau Pinang dengan mengatakan kalau begitu

ra'ayat tidak akan mahu menyokong kapada Universiti College. Saya rasa kedudukan Universiti College sekarang maseh di-dalam kandungan ibu belum lahir lagi kenapa dia mesti di-ungkit2 atau pun mengatakan (interrupted.)

Member for Tanjong Selatan (Enche Khor Peng Seah): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, satu penjelasan— saya mengatakan sa-orang murid dari Sekolah Han Chiang yang mempunyai kelayakan Sijil Sekolah.

Member for Permatang Pauh (Enche Ariffin bin Shariff): Terima kaseh. Itu perkara baru — tentang perkara itu saya rasa macham saya menasehatkan tadi-lah. Kemudian berhubung dengan Kampong Baharu, ia-itu perkampungan yang dahulu-nya orang2 itu di-paksa oleh pehak penjahat atau komunis merompak di-kampung2 baru. Tetapi kemajuan perkampungan Baru dengan apa yang terdapat di-zaman dharurat dahulu tidak-lah sama. Kampong2 Baharu sekarang tidak-lah boleh di-katakan sebuah kampung yang penoh dengan ketakutan dan mempunyai pagar berduri dan sebagai-nya malah ada setengah kampung baru itu telah menjadi sebuah bandar yang kechil. Kalau saya mengatakan perkampungan baru telah di-gemari tinggal mungkin keterlaluan, tetapi boleh-lah juga saya katakan bahawa dalam kampung baru itu sekarang telah menjadi tumpuan manusia—manakala Kerajaan mengadakan ranchangan perumahan murah di-situ rumah hanya ada beberapa puluh buah sahaja sedangkan permohonan-nya beribu2. Begitu juga sekira-nya ada kekosongan tanah di-dalam kawasan perkampungan baru sedikit sahaja tanah tetapi bilangan yang meminta-nya ba-

nyak. Perkampungan Baru juga ada-lah satu tempat yang sesuai untuk tempat tinggal negeri kita ini. Kerajaan ada-lah memberi peruntukan yang khas kapada perkampungan baru ini, bahkan shor-nya sudah ada meminta di-adakan kilang2 itu pun telah pun ada sedikit2 misal-nya di-Permatang Tinggi berhampiran dengan-nya ada sa-buah factory yang membuat alat2 untuk perkakas rumah. Begitu juga di-Machang Bubok ada sa-buah kilang kain yang terbesar di-dalam tanah ayer kita ini.

Berkenaan dengan perkara ternakan, perkara Haiwan, Pegawai2 Pejabat Haiwan ada-lah sentiasa melawat dari sa-tempat ka-satempat. Saya rasa sekarang ini pun sering kali kita dapati ada ranchangan yang di-keluarkan dalam siaran2 surat khabar mengatakan Pegawai Haiwan akan melawat dari tempat ka-tempat mengikut apa yang di-jadualkan tetapi kalau hendak melawat dari rumah ka-rumah, dari desa dan ka-cherok2 itu payah sedikit. Wakil Tanjong Selatan juga saya rasa payah sangat sampai nak melawat dari rumah ka-rumah tentu-lah ini satu perkara yang payah. Jika ada perkara bersangkutan dengan Haiwan sila-lah berhubung dengan pehak yang berkenaan yang ada hubungan-nya.

Berkenaan dengan padi dan baja padi sebenar-nya Kerajaan tidak-lah pernah menurunkan harga padi, menaikkan ada tetapi menurunkan-nya tidak ada. Sekarang ini harga-nya \$16.00 satu pikul jadi tidak-lah betul di-katakan turun. Ranchangan baja padi yang sekarang ini ia-lah memberi subsidy, pada keseluruhannya boleh-lah di-katakan memuaskan kerana ranchangan ini telah juga mendapat sokongan dengan sepenoh-

nya daripada Persatuan Penanam padi Negeri Seberang Perai dan Pulau Pinang. Persatuan ini telah memberi sokongan yang penoh terhadap rancangan baru ia-itu rancangan baja padi yang telah di-kemukakan kepada mereka dan sekarang ini rancangan ini sudah berjalan dengan pesat tidak-lah boleh kita mengatakan sedikit kemajuan yang di-dapati kerana rancangan ini baru di-mulakan di-musin ini sahaja. Terima kaseh.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker Sir, I notice, as I am sure, the House has noticed that at least on the Opposition bench on the right there has been today a certain amount of sobriety and restrain in their comments and remarks on the Development Estimates. Earlier, when we were discussing the Supply Bill they were full of fire and brimstone, hurling words such as "bluffing", "blundering" and "boasting" and so forth. Sir, it is with pleasure that I personally saw that they were more restrained and more parliamentary in their manner. I fail to notice a similar change of sentiment in the Opposition sitting, Mr. Speaker Sir, on your extreme left. Probably the subject of a parliamentary type of Opposition is a closed book to them.

The Leader of the Opposition on the right had, however, several criticisms to make, but they appear to me to be very mild ones. For example, he started to say that he would like to see more grants than loans. Well, who wouldn't? All of us would like to have grants rather than loans. But the point is this: the Centre too must balance its budgets. And therefore for them to be asked by all the States to be given outright grants is something that no Federal type of Government can

really either adopt or follow. But I notice that as he spoke, there were sometimes an occasional inconsistency in what he was saying. At one place he asked for a more unified Federation. At other times he seemed to be a staunch fighter for States' rights, especially the rights of our own State. Now, this seems to me to involve an inconsistency because if he wants a more unified, a stronger Central Government, then it is inevitable that the States should have less of the power.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification. This is important. I think the Honourable Member for Sungei Pinang is not interpreting this correct. I stated that we wanted a united Federation. But the rate of developments that are going on seems to appear that the Federation is split apart. Singapore is going out. So one of the ways to maintain this unity is to review this question of a State and Central power.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): I thank the Member for Kota for his clarification. But still the point I am trying to make is this: when last time I spoke on his suggestions about amending clause 109 and 110 of the Constitution, it was not the fact that he suggested the change that I objected to. It was the terms in which he put his proposal. If I remember correctly, he used the words "Let us stand firm". I think he used the word "fight".

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): No, never.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): I don't think he means it in the literal sense. He means it in the figurative sense and that it is why I took exception to the way in which he put his

proposal to change clause 109 and 110 of the constitution to provide for more revenue for the State. Actually, I suppose, everybody in Penang would like to see more revenue for the State. But the point is, the approach must be correct and that is where, I think, the Honourable Member for Kota went wrong.

Then there were some criticisms on the actual Development Estimates, and he adopted a tone of gloom. He claimed that our economy was slowly grinding to a halt. He also said that if this deceleration went on, then nothing will save Penang, or words to that effect. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am afraid this charge of his is a mere exaggeration without any foundation in fact. Admittedly, the basis of any industrialisation are two main factors: steel and power. I am sure none of the Members of the Opposition side can deny the fact that we in the State of Penang are very fortunate to have what I think is the largest steel factory. Well, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that is the trouble with the Opposition. They expect the State Government to be like Aladdin to wave a magic wand "Hey presto!" and tomorrow there is a factory processing at its fullest capacity. This seems to me to indicate a certain romantic and, if I may say so, puerile streak, in them. They want everything in a hurry like a little boy who asked his father for a piece of chocolate, and if he did not get it, he bursts out crying.

Mr. Speaker: Sometimes he breaks the jug also.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): As I say, Sir, here are two of the factors which makes for industrialisation and power which we could process — steel and power. Steel we have. Power: we are having built in

across the channel, a very large power station which will provide ample sources of power at least for the next decade, if not more.

I notice the Honourable Member for Kota has interjected the word "labour". I have not noticed that there was any shortage of labour. If he means by that word technical or skilled labour, that is another thing. That kind of labour is short not only in Penang and Malaya but everywhere. And that is why in Penang if he had followed earlier development estimates he would have noticed that in education, implied provision has been made for technical type of training to provide at least the technicians if not the engineers. That is why I cannot agree with his claim that our economy is grinding to a halt and that whatever development has taken place in Penang is a mere facade. It is more than a facade. It is happening. Perhaps it is not happening as fast as we all would like it. But the Honourable the Chief Minister has explained some of the reasons why in this particular Mak Mandin industrial estate development has not been rapid as some would wish. That is why I cannot agree with his claim that our development is a mere facade.

And then he went on to say there is no leap-forward. Mr. Speaker Sir, here I must point out that I am generally suspicious of leaps-forward, whether they are ordinary leaps-forward or leaps around, because those who leap like this often tend to fall on their face. We like to look before we leap, and therefore even if progress were slow, it is steady and uniform.

He went on to speak in very perfervide terms of the future of Penang and I can inform the Honourable Member and his colleagues

that we, on this side are keenly interested and we are careful and concerned about the future of Penang. But—and this is where again in his own subtle way he confuses the issue — if he says that the future of Penang is something to be look after, we will agree. But if he says that the future of Penang is something to be looked after at the expense of the country or the unity of the National then I am afraid we cannot agree, because we are no longer a mere welter of States. We are now a Federation.

Earlier, he had asked for a united Federation; and if he were sincere in his request for a unified Federation then it is also incumbent on our part in our desire to make Penang as prosperous and wealthy as possible to have some concern for the general prosperity and happiness and unity of the Nation as a whole. That is a factor which we must not forget.

On the point which was made by him as well as by some others that development monies are not fully spent, I think my colleague from Permatang Pauh has already expressed his views.

However, the Member for Kota went on to criticise us, in that he thought that the State Government was not fully adhering to the austerity drive announced by the Finance Minister, and he took as an example the fact that on page 3 it shows that there is a certain amount of increase. Here again, actually, if I am not mistaken — and if I am mistaken, I would like to be corrected — I believe the Finance Minister's austerity drive was in administrative expenses, and in not wasting money on non-productive items, because it would appear to me that there is a way in which money could be spent to earn more money for the country. And that is what is being done for these Develop-

ment Estimates. Money is being spent, yes. But it is to see that there is more productivity; that there is greater employment, and that there is more opportunity for everybody in the State.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): Mr. Speaker Sir, on a point of information. The Honourable the Minister of Finance did in actual fact cover that aspect of the austerity drive. But the point I took up was that this question of upward revision meant that certain amounts of money were allocated for certain projects. Later on, it is then revised upwards, that is more money is put in. A building is originally estimated at \$100,000 and later on it goes on to \$150,000, and something like that—examples of that sort. It is upward revision.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): I thank the Member for Kota for his explanation, but I am sure that as an experienced administrator he will realise that sometimes such increases are inevitable because of unforeseen circumstances.

He went on then to speak about rural poverty and he said that there had been no break-through in it. I think there, he has made a serious mistake, because if there has been one development within the last few years which has struck Malaysians as a whole, and even outside visitors to Malaysia, it is this fact of rural development. And independent, impartial observers have seen these various phases of rural development and have commended on them. Here again, if he argues that the per capita income has not increased to a certain level, he might well be right. I am not questioning him on that. But I do question him on this: that there has been no increase in prosperity and welfare

for the rural dwellers. There, I think, he is definitely wrong, because we have done a great deal and a great deal is going to be done. In this connection, perhaps, some of his lack of understanding of this particular point is due to the fact that he does not obviously have any knowledge of this new padi ria. Not raya.

I happen to read about padi ria in a magazine — not a Malaysian magazine; somewhere else; some magazine; I cannot recollect the name. And it is actually a new specie of padi which is almost a miracle type of padi. First of all, it is much more hardy. Secondly, it seems, in Manila where they develop this it gives four times—400% of the normal crop given by the average type of padi. If this be correct — and whether soil conditions in Malaya would bring about the same result of 400% increase in crop is still unsettled, I think — and if it comes anywhere near that figure we are going to have a tremendously improved rural population, especially in Penang which, as this House knows, was the premier State to develop this double cropping, and is generally more, proportionately speaking, than other State. If this new type of padi is therefore generally grown in Penang, then our rural population is really going to have a very high rate of improvement in their per capita income.

Other points about Mak Mandin and so on, I think have been actually, very adequately deal with in the Honourable the Chief Minister's speech. But there was one point about the free port that I would like to draw to the attention of the Opposition. It is true that in Penang, we have had this free port status for a long time. I have, on previous occasions, in this House spoken about it. But I have always pointed out that it

was a question of history, and that to simply say because we had it, we must continue to have it for ever and ever, is really more a wish than a fact.

Now, the usefulness of a free port depends on one vital factor, and that is there must be a country or some countries or a hinterland which is willing to accept the free port as the entrepot centre. If, however, the nearby countries say "No, we do not want all these goods to come from this free port, so we'll put up our tariff walls." Then what happens to your free port? The free port becomes entirely useless. A free port is only useful if the neighbourhood says "Alright, we will use this centre." For the past hundred years, for example, what was the development on the mainland of Malaysia? Penang therefore was welcomed as a free port. It was used as a free port, but now the situation has changed, and always let us remember that when we say "Penang" we mean Penang Island. Anyway, half of the State of Penang is always in a free port area. That is a fact we must remember. And therefore, to argue that because we had it before we must have it in the future is to make a mistake, and sometimes I think it is going to be a tragedy. I am sure you all have seen in the newspapers that the Prime Minister of England, only recently, announced that he is going to make another effort to get into the European Common Market. This was actually two or three days ago. When the opportunity came at the time of the signing of the Treaty of Rome for the United Kingdom to join the European Common Market, the English were not ready for it. They said "We will keep aloof. Let them do what they like." And they organised the European free trade area. And in 1965, I think, when they tried to get into

the European Common Market France vetoed it. And now they are trying very hard to get into the Common Market. Let us not, in Penang, fall into a tragedy like that, because it will be the livelihood of our people who will be affected. And they will stand to lose more than they gain by this so-called free port status.

There was one question that the Honourable Member for Kota asked, as to why an industrial site at Sungei Pinang. I believe this is because this area is a very small area. This is because it happens that the City Council has zoned this area for industrial development and that is why there is a piece of land there which the State Government considers suitable for siting some industries. This does not refer to the Sungei Pinang in the Balik Pulau area.

Member for Kota (Dr. Lim Chong Eu): You will have soil difficulties.

Member for Sungei Pinang (Mr. D. S. Ramanathan): Mr. Speaker Sir, I have only a little bit more to add. The Member for Kota made some very useful suggestions about the University College. His remarks were generally helpful. As a matter of fact the University Project Committee has gone into this matter in very great detail and many of the points that he raised have already been the subject of consideration in the Committee. We shall, however, remember that particular point that he said about engaging too many part-time or temporary lecturers and having a problem on our hands at some future dates.

In conclusion, the Member for Kota went on to say that the Development Estimates were encouraging but not enough. Mr. Speaker Sir, may I ask, in this world who

ever thinks he or she has enough. Everybody wants more. So what we have tried to do is to plan as much as our means permit. I do not think any planning which forgets the financial realities is a sound plan and that is why I mean he has every right to say that it is encouraging but not enough. But the facts are as I said. But I cannot understand why it has an air of unrealism and pessimism. I think we are making steady progress and we certainly are keeping the wheels of industry and development moving.

Member for Kelawei (Mr. Tan Khim Hoe): Tuan Speaker, I rise to support the motion but only to clarify on a point raised by the Member for Kota. He is greatly concerned about the flour mill going away from Butterworth. I would like to confirm that there is now a flour mill in Butterworth and will commence production in 1967. And with this good news I hope that the Member for Kota will sleep peacefully tonight.

Member for Muda (Tuan Haji Ismail bin Che Chik): Tuan Speaker, saya bangun menyokong usul yang di-bawa oleh Yang Amat Berhormat Ketua Menteri. Saya mendengar di-dalam ucapan Yang Berhormat Ahli kawasan Jelutong tadi telah menudoh ada-lah Anggaran Perbelanjaan Pembangunan yang di-kemukakan oleh Kerajaan Negeri Pulau Pinang ini sebagai satu helah menipu ra'ayat, kerana semua wang² yang telah di-untukkan pada tahun lalu tidak di-belanjakan. Tetapi saya suka menarek perhatian Ahli Yang Berhormat itu apa maana-nya 'estimate'. Mengikut dalam kamus di-dalam bahasa Inggeris, satu daripada maana-nya ia-lah 'rough calculation'. Oleh itu bagi pihak Kerajaan Perikatan di-dalam negeri ini kita kemukakan kepada ra'ayat 'estimate'

untuk pembangunan pada tiap² tahun itu yang mana menyesuaikan keperluan² serta memberi tahu ra'ayat apa-kah yang kita buat. Dengan sebab itu-lah kita kemukakan-nya. Dan saya juga mengambil kesempatan ini memberikan penjelasan kepada rakan seperjuangan saya Ahli kawasan Bayan Lepas mengatakan ia-itu peruntukan wang yang di-untukkan dalam bahagian 3, di-bawah Kepala 107 pechahan 15 membaiki jalan yang liku di-Jalan Permatang Damar Laut itu telah di-untukkan sebanyak \$25,000.

Mr. Speaker Sir, there have been general comments and criticisms about why we do not spend the money. It should be remembered that we have been in a state of emergency for the last few years, due to Indonesian confrontation which only ended last August. I think the House will join me in paying a warm tribute to all members of the Public Service of all ranks who have been working under pressure, without which I am sure we could not have achieved what we have achieved. And due to their devotion to duty, we have achieved what success we have made in our development programme.

Implementation of projects depend on working capacity, Mr. Speaker Sir, so that is why I should like, all Honourable Members in this House to remember that if there is any delay in implementation for any project, it is not due to the fault of the officers concerned but due to pressure of work.

Chief Minister: Tuan Speaker, saya ucapkan berbanyak terima kasih kepada rakan² saya di-sa-belah sini yang telah membawa keterangan yang penoh kepada perkara² yang di-bangkit oleh

parti pembangkang. Saya tidak-lah berkenan membawa itu sekali lagi, tetapi saya suka hendak membawa perhatian terlebih² kepada Ahli Tanjong Selatan, Jelutong dan begitu juga Tanjong Barat menyatakan wang² di-dalam Anggaran Pembangunan Tambahan ini ada-lah ma'ana-nya Kerajaan hendak belanja. Saya suka tarek perhatian Ahli² Yang Berhormat itu, sila-lah baca laporan penoh Jawatan-kuasa Kira² Awam, Kira² Negeri Pulau Pinang bagi Tahun 1964, Risalat 14 Bil. 14 tahun ini. Di-dalam sini ada-lah keterangan² yang penoh. Ada-lah Ahli Yang Berhormat itu baca ini? Jika tidak, tolong-lah baca sedikit kalau tidak mahu banyak pun sedikit pun chukup-lah. Jangan-lah kerumitan ini mahu bohong, ra'ayat kita nanti pening-lah — bukan sahaja ra'ayat pening, di-sebelah sini pun sudah pening.

Member for Tanjong Selatan (Mr. Khor Peng Seah): Mengikut itu-lah.

Chief Minister: Mengikut mana risalat?

Member for Tanjong Selatan (Mr. Khor Peng Seah): Yang 17.

Chief Minister: 17 apa? Umur 17-kah? Apa satu pun di-kata, chuba-lah dengan realistik, nanti sa-buah parti pening sebab kepala-nya cramp, jadi besi pun susah-lah. Ada yang satu saya suka mengambil perhatian juga, Tuan Speaker, ya'itu perkara yang di-bawa oleh Ahli Tanjong Barat — ia tidak ada di-sini, tidak apa-lah.

With regard to the de-silting of rivers, I would like to inform the Honourable Member for Tanjong Barat that de-silting of rivers is

a very expensive work, and only rivers considered absolutely necessary, and within our means to de-silt will be de-silted. For the year 1967 these are the rivers which will be de-silted:

Sungei Pulau Betong in Balik Pulau;

Sungei Titi Serdang in Province Wellesley North;

Sungei Selarong Gajah in Province Wellesley North;

Sungei Kubang Semang in Province Central.

Tuan Speaker, the Honourable Member for Kota has again displayed his eloquence in the field of debating. He spent the better half of this morning digging up various points on the development estimates to prove that the Government lacked vitality and the drive to carry out a comprehensive development programme. Now, to substantiate his statement he referred to the Auditor-General's comments on the fact that various provisions under different sub-heads have not been completely utilised. This is again a tactic resorted to by the Honourable Member when he finds difficulty in criticising the Government constructively. The under-expenditure in certain provisions can be explained if one examines paragraph 4(12) — that is on page 4 — of the Report of the Public Accounts Committee on the Accounts of the State of Penang for 1964. The factors mentioned in that paragraph are also applicable to the provisions in respect of 1965. In the main the reasons for this under-expenditure were attributed to the following. With your permission, Sir, may I read the Report of the Public Accounts Committee for the benefit of Members who either did not care to read the Report,

or have been too lazy to do so. The reasons for not being able to spend all the provisions are:—

- (1) Reimbursements from the Central Government fell short of expectations.
- (2) The State Government received direct allocations from the Central Government for a number of projects which came under some sub-heads in the State Estimates. These direct allocations could not be foreseen when the Development Estimates were prepared. On account of the direct allocations, the sums in the State Estimates were saved.
- (3) Some sub-heads in the Development Estimates were meant for providing loans to local authorities which, however, did not take advantage of the sums appropriated.
- (4) In the case of certain projects, particularly drainage and irrigation schemes, land acquisition sometimes took a long time to complete. It was the policy of the State Government that people displaced by State Government projects should not suffer in any way, most of all economically. In keeping with this policy it provided these people with alternative sites. In some cases squatters took a long time before they moved to the new sites offered to them.
- (5) In some cases the request for payment for technical equipment or plant or machinery ordered from overseas was received from the Crown Agents well after the Accounts for the year were closed.
- (6) Weather sometimes delayed completion of a project.

Tuan Speaker, the Auditor-General must have appreciated the factors mentioned in paragraph 4(12) of the Report of the Public Accounts Committee, as in his Report on the 1965 Accounts he did not use the term "unrealistic" when commenting on the Development Estimates. Therefore, Tuan Speaker, it is our contention that under-expenditure in respect of these provisions can only be attributed to the reasons stated by me earlier. To criticise the Government for lacking vitality or drive is certainly not a fair comment under the circumstances.

The Honourable Member has also made further references to the general revenue balances. In reply to him during the debate on the Supply Bill, I clearly explained that the utilisation of reserves is to facilitate the commencement of more development projects. We have always emphasised the need and preparedness on the part of the State Government to use its resources, which includes the general revenue balances to finance the implementation of development projects. Where the Government is satisfied there is a need to spend more money on development projects for the benefit of the people we will continue to do so.

The Honourable Member for Kota referred to the low position of general balances at the end of 1962; and further stated that we might conceivably reach this low level again if we carry on at this rate. I am quite prepared to grant the Honourable Member this point. But he must also appreciate the need for further development — a point which has been emphasised over and over again by the same Honourable Member. The fact that we built up our reserves from 1962 clearly must again demonstrate to the people that we are a responsible Government cap-

able of looking after the welfare and progress of the people in the State of Penang. In this connection the Honourable Member also made reference to the upward revision in our Estimates. Is it the intention of the Honourable Member that this figure should be maintained irrespective of the needs of the people? If this is so, then the Honourable Member is certainly suggesting that we should be stagnant — a situation which will only demonstrate that we are doing nothing for the people. Therefore there must be an upward revision in our Estimates. We all realise that no matter what we do these things will always appear wrong in the eyes of the Opposition. It is within their province to criticise the proposals submitted by the State. But if these criticisms are not constructive it will not be in keeping with the traditions and practices of a constructive Opposition.

Another point, Sir, which the Honourable Member spoke about was the evaluation of productivity of rural development projects. The Honourable Member himself is aware that the benefits derived from any development projects cannot always be attributed to monetary ones. Many of the projects undertaken are uneconomical; and the benefits derived from them are in the form of employment opportunities, better health, better transportation facilities, and better amenities. Therefore it is not possible to evaluate the productivity or the utility of such projects in terms of money. The Ministry of National and Rural Development has, however, set up a Research and Evaluation Unit which will undertake such studies throughout the country for purposes of future guidance in the implementation of new development projects, particularly in the rural areas.

Tuan Speaker, the Honourable Member spoke at length on the comments made by me with regard to the Industrial Estate at Mak Mandin. I have spoken on this subject on several occasions because members of the Opposition and certain newspaper columns have often criticised us on the slow rate of progress. The Honourable Member himself gave the same reasons quoted by certain of our critics. The site was established after very careful consideration; and it is therefore incorrect to say that there was no proper planning. We have always emphasised that this is a pilot industrial project; and based on its results other schemes may be undertaken. So long as ambiguity remains in the minds of our critics the Government will continue to talk about Mak Mandin and its related development. The Honourable Member, I believe, was not quite clear as to what was meant by financial consideration. Here reference was made to the care taken by any investor before he commits his capital. An industrialist would have to be clearly and fairly certain that he would get an adequate return on his capital before he undertakes any project. The Honourable Member also argued that the Alliance, when confronted with difficulties always attributed such to confrontation. Surely he cannot deny that confrontation brought about a certain measure of uncertainty; which certainly must have slowed down investment in the State. Therefore our argument that confrontation did in some way slow down industrial growth within the State of Penang holds water.

When speaking about industrialisation the Honourable Member spoke about and emphasised the need for the development of ancillary services. In this connection he made particular reference

to the proposed East-West Highway and the by-pass at Kampong Bharu. Sir, the latter is one of the many new service roads, or relief roads being provided in the State to reduce traffic congestion. I have not and will not make any claim that this road will be linked to the East-West Highway. In fact this position was made quite clear when I replied to one of the questions earlier, in which it was stated that the State Government was not aware of the actual route of the East-West Highway. Therefore we are unable to give any further details to this House on this project, that is, the East-West Highway. Sir, I do not intend to go into details on ancillary services which are being undertaken by the Government or quasi-Government bodies; but just for the information of the House I would like to mention a few of the major ones, for example the deep-water berths, the permanent bridge across the Prai River, the new Electrical Power Station at Prai, the railway extension services to Butterworth and various other projects which cost millions of dollars.

Sir, with regard to the proposed University or the University College, it is intended that this institution should initially be in the form of a University College affiliated to the University of Malaya in Kuala Lumpur. This is simply because the legal, academic and administrative problems would make it almost impossible to consider the immediate establishment of a fully-autonomous University. However, we are glad to know of the Honourable Member's support for this project; and we would like to assure him that it is the hope and wish of the State Government that this Institution should eventually become a fully-fledged and autonomous University. The University Project Com-

mittee as set up by the State Government has submitted a second memorandum to the Central Government for consideration. This matter is therefore under review by the authorities concerned. I wish to add that it is our hope, and also that of the Central Government, that this institution should be set up as soon as possible — if circumstances permit by next year. The State Government will soon be appointing a further Committee to raise funds and assist in the setting up of the institution; and it is our hope that the people will contribute generously when approached.

The Honourable Member, I think, also wanted an assurance from the Government that we would not seek revotes in the future. Is the Honourable Member implying that we should not come to this House for additional funds or revotes even if the project is half finished or unfinished?

Tuan Speaker, the last point that I would like to touch on before concluding is the drainage and reclamation on Sungei Prai. This Scheme is to gate the Sungei Prai at Permatang Pauh, with a causeway incorporated with multiple water gates. The river is now crossed by a steel pontoon bridge. The scheme will provide the following benefits:—

- (1) Reclaim 3,700 acres of agricultural land on both banks of Sungei Prai. Of the 3,700 acres, 1,800 acres are now

poorly protected by private bunds. The remaining 1,900 acres are swamp-land. In a State suffering from acute shortage of land for development this additional land made available by reclamation is of considerable importance.

- (2) Tidal water now goes up the Sungei Prai and causes flooding to part of the Sungei Kulim Irrigation Scheme and the Muda River Irrigation Scheme. The proposed causeway will help to regulate flooding in these two areas.
- (3) There will be a large reservoir of fresh water from upstream of the water gates. This is essential for the development and expansion of industries in one State.
- (4) The causeway will replace the existing pontoon bridge, and provide another permanent access to Butterworth in addition to the bridge at Chain Ferry at Prai.

The provision in the Estimates of \$300,000 is for land acquisition for preliminary work.

Terima kaseh.

Question put and agreed to.

The Assembly adjourns at 4.32 p.m. to 23rd November, 1966, at 10.00 a.m.

