

Jilid II
Bil. 2



Hari Selasa
5hb Dis., 1972

LAPURAN PERSIDANGAN
OFFICIAL REPORT

DEWAN UNDANGAN NEGERI PULAU PINANG
YANG KETIGA
THIRD LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY PENANG

PENGGAL YANG KEDUA
Second Session

MESYUARAT YANG KEDUA
Second Meeting

KANDUNGANNYA

Usul-usul [130]
Usul di bawah Peraturan Mesyuarat 51 (3) [146]
Penanguhan [169]

PULAU PINANG

DEWAN UNDANGAN NEGERI YANG KETIGA

Laporan Persidangan

PENGGAL YANG KEDUA

MESYUARAT YANG KEDUA

Hari Selasa, 5hb Disember, 1972

HADIR :

- Yang Berhormat Tuan Speaker (Datuk Harun bin Sirat, D.M.P.N.)
Yang Amat Berhormat Ketua Menteri (Dr Lim Chong Eu)
Yang Berhormat Penasihat Undang-Undang Negeri (Encik Abu Talib bin Othman)
Yang Berhormat Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim)
" " Kawasan Tanjong Tengah (Encik Tan Gim Hwa, J.M.N.)
" " Kawasan Tanjong Selatan (Encik Wong Choong Woh)
" " Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S. P. Chelliah)
" " Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Encik Ismail bin Hashim, J.P.)
" " Kawasan Butterworth (Encik Ooi Ah Bee)
" " Kawasan Kepala Batas (Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Haji Abdullah, A.M.N.)
" " Kawasan Glugor (Encik D. C. Stewart)
" " Kawasan Permatang Pauh (Tuan Haji Mohamad Nor bin Haji Bakar, J.P.)
" " Kawasan Dhoby Ghaut (Encik Khoo Teng Chye)
" " Kawasan Nibong Tebal (Encik Teoh Chung Hor *alias* Teoh Kooi Sneah)
" " Kawasan Muda (Tuan Haji Abdul Kadir bin Haji Hassan, J.P., P.J.K.)
" " Kawasan Tanjong Utara (Encik Khoo Kay Por)
" " Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik Veerappen a/k Veerathan)
" " Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin)
" " Ahli Kawasan Balik Pulau (Encik Abdul Rahman bin Haji Yunus)
" " Kawasan Tasek Glugor (Encik Mustapha bin Hussain)

TIDAK HADIR :

- Yang Berhormat Timbalan Ketua Menteri (Encik Ooh Chooi Cheng, J.P.)
Yang Berhormat Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan)
" " Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap)
" " Kawasan Jelutong (Encik Koay Boon Seng)
" " Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How)

Dewan bersidang semula pada jam 9.35 pagi.

DOA

PENGUMUMAN TUAN SPEAKER

Tuan Speaker: Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat, saya ingin memaklumkan kepada Dewan bahawa Yang Berhormat Encik Ooh Chooi Cheng, Timbalan Ketua Menteri telah uzur dan telah dimasukkan di Hospital Besar. Satu sijil perubatan yang telah ditandatangani oleh Pakar Perubatan Perunding telah diterima oleh saya. Oleh hal yang demikian, saya telah membenarkan Yang Berhormat Encik Ooh Chooi Cheng tidak menghadiri mesyuarat ini.

5. USUL-USUL.

(A) USUL YANG AMAT BERHORMAT KETUA MENTERI

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Speaker, saya mohon mencadangkan bahawa Dewan ini meluluskan perbelanjaan sebanyak ringgit tiga puluh tiga juta dua ratus empat puluh tiga ribu enam ratus sahaja (\$33,243,600) seperti yang tertunjuk di dalam Anggaran Pembangunan Tambahan Kedua, 1972 yang dibentangkan sebagai Kertas Dewan Undangan No. 12, 1972 dan bahawa jumlah tersebut akan dikenakan kepada tujuan yang ditetapkan di dalam Anggaran Pembangunan Tambahan Kedua, 1972.

Datuk Speaker, Usul ini adalah untuk mengikut keperluan seksyen 4 (2) Akta Tabung Pembangunan, 1966, seperti yang dikenakan kepada Negeri ini mengikut seksyen 9 Akta yang sama.

Tuan Speaker, tujuan Usul ini adalah untuk mendapatkan kelulusan daripada Dewan ini bagi membelanjakan sejumlah \$33,243,600 untuk membiayai perbelanjaan tambahan terhadap berbagai projek pembangunan, butir-butir yang mana adalah terdapat di dalam Anggaran Pembangunan Tambahan Kedua yang dibentangkan di dalam Dewan ini sebagai Kertas No. 12, 1972. Seperti yang dimaklumkan oleh Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat,

nota-nota penjelasan mengenai perkara-perkara perbelanjaan itu adalah dilampirkan kepada Kertas tersebut.

Anggaran Pembangunan Tambahan kedua bagi perbelanjaan tambahan ialah untuk Ketua Menteri dan Pejabat Setiausaha Kerajaan. Sebab-sebab bagi perbelanjaan tambahan ialah seperti berikut:

(i) Pengambilan Tanah—\$43,370

Diperlukan bagi pembayaran pengambilan tanah bagi tapak khemah Belia di Teluk Bahang.

(ii) Pelancungan—\$143,000.

Peruntukan permulaan sebanyak \$100,000 tidaklah mencukupi untuk membiayai perbelanjaan sehingga 31hb Disember, 1972.

(iii) Rancangan-Rancangan Perumahan Murah—\$22,009,230 (Pinjaman).

Kerajaan Negeri pada 31hb Mac, 1972 telah bersetuju untuk mengambil alih Rancangan Perumahan Rifle Range daripada Kerajaan Pusat dan menanggung segala hutangnya.

(iv) Sumbangan dan Pinjaman Kepada Perbadanan Pembangunan Pulau Pinang—\$10,848,000 (Pinjaman).

Ini adalah satu pinjaman daripada Kerajaan Pusat kepada Perbadanan Pembangunan Pulau Pinang melalui Kerajaan Negeri bagi membeli dan memajukan tapak-tapak perusahan di Kawasan Perdagangan Bebas di Bayan Lepas dan Perai bagi penubuhan Kawasan-kawasan Perdagangan Bebas.

(v) Penempatan Semula Setingan—\$200,000.

Jumlah ini diperlukan kerana peruntukan permulaan sebanyak \$850,760 tidak mencukupi untuk membiayai perbelanjaan tersebut setakat 31-12-72.

Datuk Speaker, saya mohon mengusul.

Ahli Kawasan Permatang Pauh (Tuan Haji Mohammad Nor bin Haji Bakar): Tuan Yang Di Pertua, saya mohon menyokong.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Tuan Speaker, dengan izin, saya mahu cakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

The Honourable the Chief Minister, in introducing the Motion to approve an expenditure of 33 million dollars in the Second Supplementary Development Estimates, has very briefly informed us as to the purpose of these Supplementary Estimates. It has come up very late in the day—near the end of the year for Supplementary Estimates for this particular year. And quite a few of the items are by no means items which cannot be forecast at the beginning of the year. And we see no reason why this very undesirable practice should be repeated again and again. It is understandable if an item comes up because of a flood, because of a civil commotion, where the Government cannot anticipate that it has to come to this House for Supplementary Estimate. But on issues like this, where the facts are all known to the Government, surely a Government with any imagination should have planned right at the beginning of the year as to how much they require for development of the tourist industry. Surely these are matters that should be part of an overall plan. They should not come to the House in the middle or at the end of the year and say, "We are short of \$143,000 for tourism". This demonstrates that the Government has no plan whatsoever, and that Government expenditure is dependent on the whims and fancies of the Government. There is no plan whatsoever. There is no scrutiny as to the benefits—any type of expenditure will accrue to the Government. So at the moment, as a result of that, we have this very sorry state of affairs.

We take for example the additional expenditure of \$143,000 for tourism. The original estimate shows \$100,000. And here again is just a very rough guess—"we want \$100,000"—without even knowing what the \$100,000 is for.

And here, if the Honourable the Chief Minister wants this House to approve the sum of \$43,370, it is not enough merely to come and tell us that you require this money. This is not sufficient. He should spell out what this expenditure is going to be for. After all, this is an Assembly that is going to approve Development Estimates. And I am afraid the Honourable the Chief Minister will have to treat this House with greater respect. He should tell us exactly what this sum of money is for; how this sum of money is going to be utilised. Or has it already been utilised? And also tell us the reasons why he should come to us now for these Supplementary Estimates.

So on this question of tourism I would like to urge the Honourable the Chief Minister to plan for it in a very business-like manner. After all, tourism is an industry. And if the State is to utilise State funds for tourism we must see to it that every cent is worth the expenditure; that every expenditure is worth the value.

For example, we have the very sorry state of affairs in which we engaged a public relations firm for a sum of \$30,000 a year. And it is part of the Agreement that part of the job of this public relations firm is to publicise Penang overseas. And it is part of the Arrangement also that in order to enable this public relations firm to fully benefit Penang we must have somebody here who will be able to feed this public relations firm with information; and it was suggested that a Press Officer would serve the purpose admirably well. So, strange as it may seem, the Government only lately, after my submission of a question as to whether the services have been fruitfully and fully utilised, made the announcement that they are appointing a Press Officer as from the 1st of January, 1973. But this firm of public relations has been appointed for more than a year. So this is a very glaring example of public funds being utilised without considering other aspects of it; without seeing to it that it will fully benefit us. As a result that

\$30,000 is like \$30,000 thrown in the drain. So this is but one of the aspects with regard to tourism.

Another more important aspect about tourism is not so much the question of spending money on promotion. Even if we are going to promote any particular project we must see to it that this particular promotion will bring in benefits to us. They must, as far as the Tourist Department is concerned, be fully equipped as to be in a position to tell us that as a result of a certain amount of expenditure we have benefited so much and so much. It is very well to say that there are the fringe benefits—the multiplying effect of this sort of thing. But, nevertheless, any efficient business organisation will have or must have facilities to demonstrate to their Board of Directors—and in this case to this Assembly—that every particular cent spent is benefiting this country.

We have heard, in the course of a Press Release, that a team of Government officials will be travelling overseas to promote Penang. Surely, before any money is spent on that, the Government should think very carefully whether this sort of promotion will benefit tourism in Penang, or whether it will only benefit the people who are making such visits, because in 9 out of 10 cases these so-called promotional tours of Government officials, or even of the Members of the Government itself, failed to demonstrate to us to any degree that they are bringing in benefits. In most of these cases the people who go on such tours, on returning back, do not even furnish a single report to show the work done by them in the course of their travels. I have yet to see a report tabled to this House, or embodied in the report of the P.D.C., to demonstrate this. And I think this is very important. If any one Member of the Government is going away on so-called promotional tours he must come back with a report to tell us exactly what he did; and also perhaps to give us an account of the money spent by him. We don't want the sorry state in which officials go on tours, and even come back with expenditures which are

not supported by vouchers. These are the sort of things that have happened. And, as representatives of the people, it is our duty to see that every cent that is expended is fully accounted for.

And on tourism again, perhaps more important than promotion is the fact that we must have an Airport that is able to take in at least 707, because the whole problem with tourism in Penang is not so much that we cannot get people to come, but because we haven't got the communication to bring people into this country. And, perhaps, what is even worse is the fact that in its endeavour to promote its own national needs Government have seen fit to prohibit other airlines from landing in Penang. And this is very important. And I think that as a Government for the State of Penang it is incumbent on them—I think it is their duty—to see to it that S.I.A. are allowed landing rights in Penang. It can be a pool system whereby M.A.S. and S.I.A. can operate direct from Singapore to Penang, and vice versa. As it is, they have to go to Subang before they can come to Penang. From the point of view of tourism this is definitely detrimental to the tourist industry. And it is, I think, the duty of the State Government to point out to the Federal Government that though it is important to promote the national airline the promotion of the national airline should not work to the detriment of the tourist industry in Penang. It is common knowledge today that in Penang the hoteliers are very concerned over the fact of the lack of communication. This sort of arrangement will not be detrimental to the national airline. And I think the State Government should be more articulate, and not merely accept everything that is being put down to them by the Federal Government. We owe a responsibility to the hoteliers.

At the moment, in spite of the boasts that we have a lot of tourists in Penang, if we make a study of the hotels in town today we will still see that most of the hotels are not fully occupied. Some of them have only about 30 or 40 per cent occupational rate, which is nothing to speak of, particularly for the Tourist

Committee, or the P.D.C. which is taking charge of tourism today. In spite of the money spent on tourism, in spite of the PATA Conference, and in spite of the expenditure put forward for the PATA Conference we still have this sorry state of affairs. And some of the promotional work is actually being done by the Airways themselves. And in fact some of the most effective promotional work is not done by the State Government; neither is it done by the Development Corporation. But it is done by the Airways, and by other tour operators who are anxious to promote their business.

Then I like to come to this question of promotion for our tourist projects like the Conference Centre in the Dewan Sri Pinang. We have just heard from the Honourable the Chief Minister that they have just published some pamphlets about Dewan Sri Pinang—one year after its completion. The Honourable the Chief Minister should have appreciated that even in any new hotel promotional work will start years before the hotel is completed. And here we have a few-million-dollars project in the Dewan Sri Penang being neglected. And only from next year will we be doing some promotional work. This is a very sorry state of affairs. In spite of the claim by the Honourable the Chief Minister of having a dynamic Government and in spite of his claim of having a State Development Corporation whereby he can carry out promotional activities and other activities without being tied down to the strict rules of General Orders, he has failed to do so. I will come to the State Development Corporation later on. For the time being I will be content in restricting myself to discuss the State Development Corporation in conjunction with its work on tourism.

As far as the promotion of tourism is concerned, though it is the declared objective to try to get everybody involved, as far as we can see the private sector is not given very much opportunity to participate fully in this very important work of tourist promotion. I would suggest that if the State Development Corporation were to start

fully on promotional work they should at least have a few representatives from the private sector to take a very active part in this work of promotion, and to correlate the work of the private sector with that of the public sector. Joint promotional efforts should be encouraged. At the moment the participation merely involves the presence of some of them in the Committee. And in most cases suggestions which come from them are ignored; And the Government merely carries on according to its own whims and fancies. So, as a result, you have this very sorry state of affairs.

Coming now to the question of housing, the State Government have decided now to take over the Rifle Range flats. And what is important to the people of Penang is not so much whether the Rifle Range flats are taken over by the State Government, or whether they are run by the Housing Trust. What is of most importance to the flat-dwellers is this: This is what we call the low-cost houses. And "low-cost housing" means that it is specially built to assist the people in the lower-income group who may not be able to pay an economic rental for houses elsewhere. Or perhaps for houses elsewhere they may be charged even more than economic rental.

However, it is my view that to charge what is considered to be an economic rental for flat-dwellers in the low-cost housing area will not help them at all. In doing so the Government is not doing anything to assist the underprivileged section of the community. It has been the policy all over the world in most progressive countries that low-cost housing is being subsidised by the Government. It is a matter of degree—to what extent the Government can subsidise such low-cost housing. But in a country like Malaysia, with a declared policy of the Federal Government that it is their intention to bridge the gap between the have's and the have-not's it is incumbent on the State Government, which is part of the Federal Government today, to pursue its policy with subsidy, and not merely by charging an economic rental. A survey

of the income of the flat-dwellers in both Rifle Range and Kampong Melayu would disclose to the Government that most of these flat-dwellers are unable to pay even the rental of \$30 plus the \$8 for services, and most of them are in arrears for months, and some for years. If a person has an income of \$250, and with children to feed and a family to maintain, with the present rising cost of living—with deference to the Alliance Government and the Gerakan Alliance Coalition—how can we expect him to be able to pay this rent? It is all very well to say that we are going to have a property-owning democracy; we are going to allow these flat-dwellers to own their own flats.

And here again it is a matter of policy. And I submit that this policy of the Government is all wrong. The flat-dwellers cannot afford to pay this economic rental; least of all own the flats themselves. What is going to happen to the flats if eventually the flat-dwellers become the owners? Will they be able to continue to pay \$8 for the service charge? They find it difficult enough to pay \$30 rental. So, as a result the moment the houses are transferred to them their first job will be to try to reduce the costs. They cannot cut down the monthly payment. But surely they can cut down the service charge. So, if the service charge is to be reduced then who is going to see to it that the lifts are being maintained, that the house is to be painted regularly, and that the sweepers are going to sweep the corridors and the staircase. So, as a result of that you will have a slum growing up before our very eyes. So it is because of that that progressive Government throughout the world are of the view that low-cost housing must be subsidised. There is no question of ownership because all along the Government must subsidise to the best of its means so that the flats will be maintained in good condition or order, the lifts will be properly maintained, and the flat-dwellers will be asked to pay an economic rental—perhaps in this particular case a sum of \$15 to \$20 a month. That will be within the means of all the flat-dwellers. They will be quite happy to pay that

every year. Whether they own the flat or they don't own the flat doesn't matter to them. So long as they pay the \$20 everything will be done very nicely for them; and they can live there for as long as they like. This should be the sort of policy. Of course, the Government will say "Where are we going to get the money to subsidise all this". And in this respect I do not have to repeat myself again. We have pointed out to the Government that they can always do this if they had used their imagination and utilised all the land that is at their disposal at the moment, whether by the City Council or by the State Government—land which they have sold to developers at a very low price; land on which they have enabled developers to make very large profits. They could have used the money themselves. They could have used the Penang Development Corporation to build houses on a commercial basis, sold them off, realising the money, and using the money to subsidise low-cost housing. But here the Government simply refused to do this sort of work. Instead they have sold off big chunks of valuable land to developers; and as a result the developers have succeeded in making quite a great deal of profit. And you have this state of affairs in which you have no money to subsidise low-cost housing. The responsibility is on the Government. They have failed, in spite of the declared policy of both the Federal and the State Governments. They have failed to take advantage of a means which was within their control to play a little part towards bridging the gap between the rich and the poor. So much about housing.

Now I like to come to the question of loans to the Development Corporation. And the Development Corporation, I am happy to note, has at long last come out with a Report—Laporan Tahunan Kedua; a Report containing seven flimsy pages in Bahasa Malaysia, and six flimsy pages in Bahasa English. And this is a Report of their second year of activities. Sir, if we were to glance through this Report it contains practically nothing worth reading. And its main activities which run into two pages are concerned not with any particular

projects, or an Interim Report of any particular project that they have started, but with the world tours of its officers and its Chairman; world tours to all corners of the globe, and the reason given. These are the activities. And under the guise of promotion of Penang as an investment centre they proudly inform us of these trips by various members—so-called promotion tours. It would be more helpful if more details are given. However, it appears that the activities for Year Two of the Development Corporation are purely promotional. And even up to date we still have need to have a copy of the accounts of expenditure with regard to such promotional tours. But the Report failed to give us all these particulars.

And here again we have little references to Free Trade Zones without actually spelling out the details. Surely one would expect a Report to contain greater detail as to the activities of the Free Trade Zones. And I think the people of this Assembly would like to know in greater detail from the Honourable the Chief Minister with regard to the precise functions of the Free Trade Zones. We have quite large chunks of land being fenced away in Weld Quay. At the rate things are going we are of the view that he doesn't quite know exactly what is going to be done; what functions the Free Trade Zone is going to perform. Perhaps he is going to tell us he is going to do it by trial and error. He doesn't know precisely; but as time goes on he will utilise it.

The Government boasts greatly of its achievements, particularly in the field of electronics. So in this respect I would urge the Government to have a look at, particularly, this problem of unemployment, and this problem of the electronics industries coming to Penang. And in this respect it is not only coming to Penang; it is coming to all over Malaysia. Let us look at it more objectively. Let us not try to play politics and say, "Well, it is one of the greatest achievements of the Government". It is my view that the electronics industries come to Malaysia—not only to Penang—not by design on the part of the State Government; but they come here in their quest for cheap labour.

Everybody is aware that the electronics industries were first in Hong Kong and in Singapore. But as Singapore progresses, and as Hong Kong progresses, and where there is a labour shortage, and where labour demands more and more wages than mere subsistence wages that will enable them to have a decent living, the electronics industry will not hesitate to fly. It has been said that the electronics industry is an industry that can fly by night. It is not an industry which is machine-intensified; where it is difficult to move from one place to another. It has flown from Singapore to Penang. There is no reason why in the course of time, if Penang progresses—which I hope it will—it will not fly to somewhere else. Perhaps with a peace in Vietnam it will go to Vietnam. But our objective is not merely to provide cheap labour for the electronics industry which requires cheap labour. Our objective will be to provide employment for our people—employment at reasonable wages; not employment on the subsistence wages which they are actually getting now. But it appears to me, from the utterances of the Government, that they are not concerned with all this. In fact they pride themselves of the fact that they can supply cheap labour in whatever quantities to potential investors. This is not something which any Government can be proud of. As a result we have noticed that as far as the Government is concerned the Government is not lifting one finger to assist in the unemployment problem. As far as direct employment by the Government is concerned the Government has done very little. So much so that in the course of answers to questions they like to lump figures together. After all the objective of full employment is a means to an end. It is a means of achieving a higher standard of living for the people in this particular State. Employment is not merely an end by itself. It is a means to an end. And it seems to me, the Government is thinking of it purely in terms that employment is merely an end itself. So, however much you get, you get a subsistence level of living. So long as you are employed you can jolly well be happy. That is not the right

way of looking at things. And even from the point of view of policy you are not going to eliminate the gap between the rich and the poor. So I think that it is time that the Government sit up and think in these terms, in spite of the claim by the Government of 80,000 jobs, in spite of the claim by the Honourable the Chief Minister of the multiplier effect of recent job creation. At the moment you have to go to your neighbour's house and ask him. You can ask Hassan in Glugor or in Bayan Lepas, perhaps; and he will tell you that there are still two or three of his children still unemployed. Or even at the New Village, Ah Kow will tell you that he has a few children unemployed. And Ramasamy will tell you the same thing. So the unemployment situation is by no means solved. And the Government should do something about it. The Government should not be content to leave it to private investors to do the job.

So in the light of the P.P.P.P. we notice that there is very little joint ventures, with the exception of one or two. And it appears to me that the Government is quite contented to leave private enterprise to do all the work of job promotion.

Then we come to the question of the agro-based industries. And I expect that after nearly two years of research the P.D.C. should give us quite a comprehensive Report; not an Interim Report on the feasibility of the work done by the Mushroom Research Station. But as a result of it we do not have anything. We have two paragraphs of statements about agro-based industry:

"The Mushroom Research Station was completed in April, 1971."

It is now more than one and a half years.

"Intensive research was carried out at the Station. The results of the research indicated that a large-scale commercial farm and cannery was viable technically and commercially. As such the Corporation proceeded to promote the project for possible equity participation from interested private-sector groups, both local and overseas.

The Corporation sponsored the establishment of a company to undertake

the project, to be named 'Malaysia Food Sendirian Berhad'. The incorporation of the new company was expected to be completed in early 1972."

And here the Report seems to me a bit odd. This is a Report for the year ending 31st December, 1971, but the Report was dated 18th October, 1972—Secretariat, Penang Development Corporation, 18th October, 1972. And in the body of the Report itself it says:

"The incorporation of the new company was expected to be completed in early 1972."

So in October, 1972, he writes that the incorporation will be completed in early 1972. It doesn't make sense. He should have known by then whether it was incorporated or not. So here again we have a somewhat odd Report—a Report written on the 18th of October mentioning about something that is going to be done in early 1972. He could very well have told us whether it has been done, or has not been done.

Sir, the other matter is about Joint Ventures. It is said here:

"The Corporation received an offer from Intron Industries Incorporated, Manila, to enter into a joint venture to operate the Printed Circuit Board plant of the Penang Electronics Sendirian Berhad. A joint-venture Agreement with Intron, Hong Kong, was expected to be signed in early 1972."

Surely in October, 1972, you should have known whether it was officially signed or not. You cannot give a Report of this nature to the House. And here again, in spite of the boast about this Corporation, how can they give us a Report of this type? So it is obvious from this Report that there are a lot of paraphernalia to create the impression that the Corporation has been doing something. In fact a scrutiny of this thing will indicate very clearly that the Corporation has done practically nothing; and whatever benefits, whatever employment or whatever industries have been started are there because they have to be there anyway. They have to find a place somewhere. And it is by no means due solely to the promotional effort.

So it is my earnest hope that the Honourable Chief Minister in the course of his reply will clarify the various points which I have raised with regard to the three items, namely, tourism, housing and the P.D.C.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Speaker, saya minta izin cakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

Sir, for all that it is worth, I must thank the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam for bringing up his views which I shall reply to in great detail. At least the central piece of the Opposition has, after reflection over the night, found it fit to come back to some degree of responsibility.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): It was a deliberate protest.

Ketua Menteri: Sir, all through the course of the Honourable Member's speech, I think I never even interrupted him. But I think the Members of this House will realize that in frank exchange of views, even as the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam attempts to take us to task, we accept it in good faith in this House because I think the function of this House is for all Members to participate with responsibility, and bring out views which they consider, in their own opinion, to be what is best for the State of Penang. And having taken into consideration the views expressed by either side we can then direct our course of action for the benefit of the people of Penang. So I am interested to know that Honourable Members take deliberate action, because I had my suspicion yesterday that even at the very beginning of the Sitting of the House the Honourable Members opposite us had really come to this Meeting unprepared; and they were seeking all sorts of ways and means of getting away from participating over the main debate, which is the Supply Bill. First, they wanted to adjourn the House. Then they created all sorts of things, and walked out apparently in deliberate attempt to shirk their responsibility to represent the electorate on important issues.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): On a point of order, the Honourable Chief Minister is being irrelevant, Mr. Speaker, Sir.

Ketua Menteri: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am not, because I am coming to this point. I enjoy reactions, even if only by one Member on the otherside (*Ketawa*), especially one whom I know so well for all his niceties. Mr Speaker, Sir, I say this because yesterday afternoon I was not very sure about the reaction. But having thought over it I think myself they were totally irresponsible, and were unprepared. And, therefore, to try and beat the drum they needed a little bit more time to think out all sorts of things. And this is precisely what I mean about how the State has got to weigh the apparent cleverness, the apparent weight of opinion held by the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam has against the innuendos, the light political insinuations that make some of his points stand. I will take his arguments backwards because, although I make some notes, I remember his last statements.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam built up a course of attack and debate from tourism, housing and the Development Corporation. And the climax of his argument was that the Development Corporation presented six pages of flimsy report not worth reading. Mr Speaker, Sir, if the Honourable Members, first of all, do not take the trouble to read, and say it is not worth, well that is a matter of opinion—I don't read because it is not worth. They don't say first of all, "I don't read because I have no time to read. I am not carrying out my responsibility to the people to read." And, secondly, they don't say, "After reading it I don't understand it." They say, "It is flimsy," and throw it away. And how did the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam climax it? "What you see here is a report which referred to items like the formation of the General Foods Company, and the Intron Company which the Report

said will take place in the early part of 1972" and "had not written it properly."

Mr Speaker, Sir, the very front page of this Report shows "Untuk Tahun Yang Berakhir 31hb Disember, 1971." So this is the Report for 1971. So you see, even on the very front page the Honourable Member hasn't even read these very big words. And he goes on and says, "Oh, this is flimsy Not worth our reading."

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): There is the date here—October, 1972; the date when the Secretary signed it.

Ketua Menteri: Mr Speaker, Sir, that is the kind of interruptions we expect. And this is the kind of situation the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam perpetually finds himself in because when you come in unprepared for debate, and you go through the thing, and it so happens that it strikes your eyes, you will immediately jump to conclusions. Mr Speaker, Sir, this is the Report of 1971. Even that the Honourable Member was correct when he stated (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): It was written in October, 1972.

Ketua Menteri: Mr Speaker, Sir, this is precisely the kind of thinking that we have to eschew. And I would like now to go back, having shown the characteristic of the argument.

Sir, on tourism: Here I must admit very frankly—and I have admitted many times—that the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam is probably more knowledgeable about certain aspects of tourism than I am. And he cannot deny the fact that certainly he is not one of those people who through Government funds visited other places, went abroad, half way around the world and wasted it (*Ketawa*), because he obviously has learnt a great deal. He met Mr Marvin Plake, and participated in PATA. Now we talk about hoteliers, airline charges—terms which I have learnt through him, admittedly. Mr Speaker, Sir, there was no written

Reports tabled in this House. But somehow or other the message managed to get through.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): It was tabled to you.

Ketua Menteri: So, Mr Speaker, Sir, there are reports which sometimes do get tabled, but do not necessarily come to this House. There you are, Mr Speaker, Sir, on admission direct, although I am making my own arguments without any further abetment by the Honourable Member. And he says, "Every particular cent to this Assembly"; "we must think very carefully"; "should benefit the people;" "sad piece." Mr Speaker, Sir, the State Government accepts this kind of reminders because we are very, very aware of the fact that the limitations of our State revenues are so grave that we have to spend our money wisely and carefully. And although, with the development taking place, sometimes we do have to take a certain amount of venture risks nevertheless every single cent that is spent by the Government is spent after careful deliberation. The Government cannot tolerate the wasteful expenditure of our funds.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the theme brought up by the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam—"sorry state of affairs." It is repeated several times. Everything ends up "sory state of affairs." Mr Speaker, Sir, I sympathize with the sorry state of affairs on the other side (*Ketawa*). But that apparently seem to be the theme. Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member says, "In spite of our promotional efforts in tourism" Admittedly, as I said, we are not as clever in this particular field as the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam. But I do believe that amongst my colleagues there are those who have given as much attention to the problem of tourism. They themselves were not born tourism officers. They themselves knew nothing about tourism; but they took up the responsibility, and they met that responsibility. They have to learn the business of how to promote tourism.

Mr Speaker, Sir, it is very well for the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam to come and tell us now it is good business practice to promote the Dewan Sri Pinang as a Conference Hall. Everybody knows that even before the building is laid down we should promote the building, and ask it for a Conference Hall. Mr Speaker, Sir, that is a statement certainly in his private report to me, amongst other things, I should have been informed a long time ago. I only hear it today.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): You were informed very early, but you didn't do anything about it.

Ketua Menteri: Mr Speaker, Sir, there are other things, apart from just building the Conference Hall. There are many other things. We have to know the capability of our own people to meet and service the problems of a large Conference. It gave us a great deal of encouragement to understand that, with the new Conference Hall, with practically no resources at the time we were able to meet the high standards of requirement by the PATA Workshop which was held earlier this year. This was a matter of very great encouragement to us. It showed that we were tested in our ability to meet a Conference of about 1,000 people. Now, currently there are other people who have been asking us whether or not the State Government, in its course on tourist promotion, will assist in the holding of Conferences such as Rotary International and Lions International, and so on, which would involve holding conferences up to 3,000 people, and even more. Now, are we in that stage when we are able to promote this type of Conference? Have we got the personnel? Have we got the capability? We have to learn from mistakes. We are proud of the fact that we did meet some of the objectives. Now, until we are very certain of this kind of things we can't just go blithely around, writing to people saying, "There is a Conference Hall. Come in. Just walk inside and do what you like." Mr Speaker, Sir,

the Government is aware that there are also defects—after every single Conference, the amount of cleaning; the amount of re-organization that has to take place. And the costing of the holding of such a Conference has also got to be sustained.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member also insinuates that we don't want people going all around the world, and coming back by Accounts not supported by vouchers. Mr Speaker, Sir, in this House we have debated this issue before. We have indicated that there are many different ways whereby expenditure may be incurred; and these are specified. Among these ways of incurring of expenditure is that the expenditure must accounted for by vouchers. And there are certain other procedures which satisfy the Auditor-General and the Accountant-General. So this is not the only way.

The Honourable Member is very clever at this kind of issue because this is the kind of pernicious criticism which, if allow to go to the general public, is the way whereby the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam with his new PEKEMAS attitude—gold colour on top of him; or baggage, I don't know which—comes to put forward an idea to the people that if the Accounts are not supported by vouchers something illegal, something naughty, something bad has been done. Mr Speaker, Sir, the Government takes care of its expenditure very carefully, as has been indicated even in the very disrupted process of the Sitting; and Government takes note and acts upon the observations made by the Auditor-General. Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member knows very well that particularly in tourist promotion there can be no absolute, strict accounting by vouchers. Wherever possible every single responsible person involved in the promotion of tourism will naturally provide vouchers. Now, he knows this himself. As a matter of fact, from his own lips and I learned that it was not possible to account strictly by vouchers because in the course of promotion

there are a lot of little things that one has to do. And now, in attempt to subtly constrain the activities of Government he builds up this question: "We must be very careful about how we spend;" "accounts that are not supported by vouchers;" and so on, to bluff the public to suit his own ends.

Sir, I understand that the Honourable Member is now seated on the other side. But I think that if we have the interest of the State at heart, and we want to promote tourism, we should not try to establish double standards in our arguments.

Mr Speaker, Sir, over the question of the Airport, which should be big enough at least for 707, that I accept as part of the debate. But what we are really dealing with is the question of both an airstrip as well as an Airport. And the main thing is that we do not really want a magnificent Airport; but we want an airstrip at least long enough to bring in the 707, or planes of that calibre. But in the process of the argument, here again the Honourable Member passed the bounds of criticism when he said that it is the duty of the State Government; and the State Government is failing in its duty unless it provides the Airport; unless it allows S.I.A. to have landing rights. Mr Speaker, Sir, from any other Member of the Opposition I would accept this kind of criticism due to lack of experience; but certainly not from the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam with his known experience in the political arena and in the service of Government. He fully understands that the whole question of the Airport, the question of landing rights, and the question of the landing strip are all Federal matters, and should be dealt with by the Minister for Communications. This is not a State matter. And he knows also how much the State Government has been pressing for the extension of the airstrip to be long enough for the 707.

But I think it is irrelevant Mr Speaker, Sir, although you have allowed it in the course of debate to be brought up, that Federal matters that should be

dealt with properly by the Federal authorities be discussed in this House; and again be used as a debating point to say that the State Government is failing in its duty not to build an Airport, and not to allow S.I.A. landing rights. Mr Speaker, Sir, this is the characteristic type of criticism that, as I say, gives the right texture. From the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam I would have accepted such criticism if it were my responsibility. But here was something which had nothing to do with this House, and nothing to do directly with the State Government, which he also knows the State Government is anxious to have. And it is brought up as a matter whereby "the State Government is failing in its duty". Mr Speaker, Sir, over-accentuation of situations like this do not add to the credibility of arguments that are raised by the Honourable Member.

Mr Speaker, Sir, "the sorry state of affairs" began to appear; and the Honourable Member referred to the poor; helpless condition of the hotels; there is only 30% or 40% occupancy; there is nothing to boast about. Mr Speaker, Sir, we realise that when hotels are built, particularly if they are built after consultation with the State Government or the State Development Corporation with regard to future promotion of tourism, and they only have 30% or 40% occupancy, then this is a very sad state of affairs. As a matter of fact, the State Government had to assist, wherever possible, the hotels going through a difficult period. But I am sure that the members of the Hoteliers' Association themselves will tell us without very much further ado that occupancy at the present time in the State of Penang is certainly much higher than double the 30% or 40% occupancy. There are hotels now serving particularly international tourism which are not only booked 100 per cent occupancy; but there are hotels which are pre-book 100 per cent for the next few years, right up to 1975. Mr Speaker, Sir, that is the other side of the point. On the other hand we accept the fact that certain inter-State and perhaps regional hotels do not often have the same opportunities as certain other hotels.

Mr Speaker, Sir, Government will do everything it can to ensure that the benefit of tourism will reach all the hoteliers and all those connected with the hotel industry, and also with the promotion of the tourist industry, which, in the course of my presentation of the Supply Bill, was something which we never took into account with regard to the promotion of jobs. We left that aside. We hope that the tourist industry will become one of the major offsetting situations to the question of the economic stagnation related to the erosion of the free-port status. That is why Government is building up its provision towards more and more expenditure for the promotion of tourism. That is why, Sir, last year when we presented the Budget we asked for a figure of \$100,000 to be released. I admit that this figure was a small sum; and that the figure was a guess. However, we had to base our estimates on some known figure. And the requirements of the Penang Tourist Association and other tourist bodies indicated that the sum of \$100,000 was something very much bigger than what has been previously provided, and a sum which was credible enough to boost the tourist industry. We also indicated that we will provide more funds when necessary to encourage the development of the tourist industry.

Now, in the case of promotion it is not just like straightforward accounting or a matter of business routine. In promotion you catch your opportunity when you can. Certain things develop. And when they develop, if you do not have the capacity and the determination, the awareness and the willingness to meet that situation, to grasp that opportunity and translate it into facts, you are not able to go ahead. In consequence, unless we provide for a very, very large unrealistic figure for tourism, I think Honourable Members from the Opposition should realise that the figures that we are asking for are baseline figures. And if they are sincere—and I know the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam is sincere in the promotion of tourism—then they should not

come back and carp, "The Government doesn't know, doesn't think". Now, we are asking just for an additional provision of \$143,000. Now, he says, "The Government doesn't know"; The Government spends willy-nilly"; "has no effect"; "leads to a sorry state of affairs". Mr Speaker, Sir, if the Honourable Member can now suggest to us that Government should spend \$500,000 to buy a new ship to do the big tours, to permit tourism, or something like that, even that the State Government could consider. That is a positive figure, although it might be too big a sum for the State to promote by itself. The State will certainly put the suggestion to the Development Corporation so that it could be promoted. But to carp on little things! He states, "Oh, this shows the State is spending on things willy-nilly".

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member went further: the private sector is not given the opportunity to participate in the promotional work. Mr Speaker, Sir, I think most responsible persons involved in the tourist operations, in airlines, in the hotels, and even in the direct tour operation itself will tell you that in the State of Penang all those persons in the private sector who are involved in the promotion of tourism are given every opportunity by the State Government to carry out their work.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member goes further to say that in many cases the views and suggestions of the private sector are ignored. This I must refute most completely. It may be true that some of the suggestions made by the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam may or may not—I do not know—have received the kind of approval desired. But to say that in most cases their suggestions are ignored again is accentuating the argument for the sake of publicity in this House, and not contributing responsibly to the debate that can lead constructively to the promotion of tourism for the benefit of our people. In the course of his statement also he said: we have spent, for example \$30,000 on Eric White

Associates—unnecessary, useless expenditure. In fact the Honourable Member, when he was responsible for his particular portfolio, agreed that Eric White Associates should be used as Consultants.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I had already explained yesterday, in the course of the reply to the question, that the choice of a Public Relations Officer involved other considerations; considerations—which I like to repeat—as to whether tourist promotion should be done by the State, or whether it should be done by the Development Corporation. And, if carried out by the Development Corporation, whether or not that development would interfere with the at-that-time proposed establishment of a National Tourist Corporation; and if, on the other hand, it was to remain in the State Government, whether the appointment of the Public Relations Officer would involve problems with the Public Services Commission. All these problems had to be met with. The charges incidentally that are now asked for are largely caused by the provision for the salary of the Press Officer; and the other expenditure are for translation of the “Mutiaru Timor”, which most Members have now seen, into the Japanese language. Incidentally, work on the film “Pearl of the Orient”, which also will promote tourism in Penang, started long before the Dewan was completed. The other charges are for printing of posters, and for circulation to further promote Penang, and for leaflets and newsletters, and a write-up on the historical and economic background of the State. These are the details which the Honourable Member asked for.

Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, coming to the question of housing, the Rifle Range flats in particular are brought up. Mr Speaker, Sir, the matter of the Rifle Range flats is a long-standing argument. I think Members of the House are fully aware of the fact that the State Government took a very long time to consider the pros and cons of taking over the Rifle Range flats which were built by the Housing Trust. And as they were developed by the Housing Trust

the programmes and the policies involved in the development of Rifle Range were directly the responsibility of the Federal Government. The subsidies that are involved in these areas involve the question of land being provided at a nominal sum. And this cost of land, which would otherwise have been added on to the cost of the building of the flats, had not been taken into account because these are hidden subsidies not easily accounted for. In fact the difficulty of the question of the system of sale of flats by agreement to cover the period of the loan recovery carries with it, first of all, a hidden subsidy in the sense that the interest rate that is accounted for the loan is very, very much lower than that provided for by general bank rates for purposes of construction. Even at those rates the Rifle Range flats cost large sums of money to build; and the recovery rates in 15 years would have made it very difficult for the flats to have been sold, as they were intended to be sold, under the terms of two years on the agreement where the title is not conveyed to the person who had been allocated a flat; and subsequently the payments would have been made in 15 years’ instalments. However, the State Government negotiated with the Federal Government, and asked that the period of the loan be extended for a further two years, from 15 to 17 years, in order to low the actual amount of the instalments of payment.

Furthermore, as was stated in the course of the reply to an unfinished oral question, the Rifle Range flats will now be given further amenities such as a Community Centre, a market, and shopping in the area, including a Surau and facilities for a funeral parlour in the place in order to assist and to give the community a better integrated livelihood. These are subsidies which the Government give to the people living in the low-cost flats at Rifle Range.

Now, for the Honourable Member to talk about subsidised housing, and the Government not having done anything, here again we lift from the air that the Government was selling land to private developers. It goes for the

benefit of the private developers, because once you start making a statement there is no way of going out. So it must be that the Government sells it cheap, and developers make a lot of money, in order to prove the Government is wrong. On the other hand, the Honourable Member says that the Government itself should exploit the situation: make use of the land—build houses and sell them—I suppose to other people. I do not know who; but not to our own people—make large profits out of them and give it to the people in Rifle Range.

Mr Speaker, Sir, even on that kind of argument on subsidies I think the Honourable Member has failed on two points to realise that these flats were not meant to be flats for rental. If in actual fact they could be converted for rent it might solve part of the problem. The flats were designed to be sold to people of the lower-income group, and the payment was to be made in monthly instalments.

I admit and I think that the Federal authorities concerned now realise that there has got to be a complete revision of the whole system of provision of housing for the lower-income groups. At the present time the standard of application is that the applicants for housing of this nature should come from families whose incomes do not exceed \$300 per month. And for applicants whose total family incomes exceed \$300 a month there is a sliding scale for the number of persons dependent upon the applicants. Mr Speaker, Sir, these are the rules, and this was the commitment that was made long before the present Government came into office. The Government had to weigh the pros and cons as to whether or not the Government should undertake to do whatever it can for the people who are now committed to live in Rifle Range; to make life better for them; to ease their financial problems; to ease their economic problems; and not to run away and break away from the responsibility, and jump across over to the other side, and now be in a position merrily, irresponsibly to lay charges which are completely unfounded, and to make

suggestions which do not really advance any further argument as to how best we can meet the problems of housing.

Essentially the problems of housing are double-edged.

The first question is: If we are to provide for subsidised housing, how best can this be done? By means of rental, or by means of sale of actual low-cost housing? The question of how much this subsidy is to be—not on international figures, but on our own experience in Penang as well as in Malaysia as a whole—should be taken into consideration. The other factor is: If the charges are to rental, or if the housing is to be sold, what should be the rent, and what should be the cost of the sale? And the second edge of this problem touches upon this \$8 maintenance charge. Now this is a question which involves the problem of the Local Authorities because, depending upon how much a unit of low-cost building costs, and depending upon its rental, we get a situation where the annual valuation of the property is taken into account; and that is the reply for assessment. Now, from that point of view there is a further hidden subsidy to all those living in flats—not only in Rifle Range but elsewhere—that arrangements have been made with the Local Authorities that annual assessments for these particular flats be reduced to a minimum in order that the problem of servicing these flats, the question of cleaning the corridors, keeping the steps clean, and so on, which the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam has brought up, can be considered as a community project. When we go on to high-rise development the decision is that we are no longer involved with valuation and building problems whereby we have to clean the streets, and provide removal of refuse of one level; but we have to think of the project on a vertical level as well. Hence this maintenance cost which is talked about by the Honourable Member as being too much—\$8 is too much for the people—is, I think, not quite clear and not quite honest because the Honourable Member should have taken into cognizance that

when all these persons applied for allocation of the flats they knew fully well what they had to pay. They knew fully well their commitment to the terms of the Agreement which were necessary before going into the Rifle Range flats.

I consider, Mr Speaker, Sir, that the whole question of housing, particularly with reference to Rifle Range, is just an attempt by the Honourable Member to try and make up lost ground in his own constituency, and not really contributing to a general discussion on the question of housing, or contributing data which can lead to a constructive assessment of how best we can proceed with the problem of new housing for our new workers; and in particular for those who are less privileged than others.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I have already begun my reply on this debate by taking the Honourable Member up on the question of the Penang Development Corporation. I have indicated too the flimsy manner, the whimsical manner whereby the Honourable Member takes up a brief without looking at it carefully. And thinking that this is not a proper Court-house, but a case of open debate, he merely tries to bamboozle us with his legal expertise. Mr Speaker, Sir, we are not taken in by this line of action.

And he refers to the question of the Free Trade Zones. And then he also refers to the Free Trade Zone at Weld Quay. Mr Speaker, Sir, here again is a simple matter. It could be a slip in the tongue. But we are dealing with a serious matter. The Honourable Member realises that, whereas in Prai, at Pulau Jerejak and Bayan Lepas the State has set up Free Trade Zones, at Weld Quay we have set up a Free Trade Area. There are two different propositions altogether. The essential difference between the two areas is that the manufacturing process will not be permitted to take place in the Free Trade Area. The Free Trade Area, however, is specifically designed to try and revive the entrepot trade that has

been a traditional thing between Indonesia and ourselves, whereas the Honourable Member, I am sure, can refer to the *Gazette* Notification which spells out in full the activities that are permitted within the Free Trade Zones. Mr Speaker, Sir, I wouldn't waste my time. The Honourable Member can do a little bit of his homework. Mr Speaker, Sir, not having done his homework, and not willing to admit that all these activities are being spelt out—It appears actually in one of the popular newspapers, in a full page, as to what the functions of the Free Trade Zones are. It has appeared even in several other newspapers, and in other journals, about what the Free Trade Zones are—if the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam says he doesn't know, well I suggest that he does a little bit more homework. However, he comes down to the point on which he charges us. He builds all these up to try and reduce the credibility of the Government. Now, we have proven that the arguments brought forward by the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam are in actual fact flimsy—not creditable, and probably mischievous—because I am sure he does his homework. He knows what he wants to say. But it is only for the benefit of this House that he tries actually to belittle us. And that is understandable.

Now, he says, "It is my view that the foreign investors who have come to the Free Trade Zones have not come here by design, but in their quest for cheap labour". He goes on further. The whole of the theme is the question of our selling our labour cheap. Mr Speaker, Sir, we who are responsible understand fully the difficulties of our people in the State. We understand that in 1969 we were faced with an enormous problem where we were told that there were anything between 39,000 and 41,000 people unemployed in this State. We have carried on to meet those responsibilities, and not run away from them. Mr Speaker, Sir, in the course of our attempt to resolve this problem of unemployment in the State the State Government has to have an

overall strategic policy. And the strategic policy, as I have stated many a time, has been to boost industrialisation in the State, and to couple this industrialisation in the State with rural urbanisation programme; and further to accentuate this industrial flow through export-orientated industries. And the kind of industry that meets this particular problem of being export-orientated,—and—also the producing of labour contents, was and is the electronic industry. And the kind of situation that will meet the requirements for promotion of this type of industry is the establishment of Free Trade Zones. Now, the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam says the State Government has done nothing; this thing has just come by chance; they are thrown in like Aladdin's lamp. Now, we have Free Trade Zones, and we have electronics; but now they are no good. Why? Because the lamp was not rubbed by the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam. That is about all.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member has made one statement which again attempted to sap the spirit of our people when he tries to frighten us. I have told the Honourable Members of this House that we have to be very careful about factories, such as electronic factories, which are fly-by-night industries. But the electronic industry is a wide-range industry; and there are those electronic industries which can fly by night, and those which cannot fly by night. And it was to assess precisely what were those which can fly by night and those which are not "fly by night" that we undertook the promotional tours in order to find out exactly what were the kind of industries which we should eschew, and what are the kind of industries we should attract.

The Development Corporation in particular has promoted the flow of the proper electronic industries that will meet our requirements, whereby our population and our people, particularly those who seek employment, can go in with the new industry, and grow with the new industry in the years to come. And I must say that the Government

is not boasting about its problems. But we are very proud of the way in which we have solved these problems, and the way whereby new problems have now arisen. There is no question about it that we have to meet the problem whereby there will be a shortage of skilled labour. We may have to meet the problem of increasing cost of labour. And we have to resolve this problem. As I said in the course of my speech on the Supply Bill, we must at times attempt to preserve the standard of life of our people.

Now, the Development Corporation, as I said also yesterday, has begun to look into the problem whereby the total requirements for jobs that are created by the private sectors and by the various industries may be such that we may have to prepare ourselves to welcome workers even from other States because—if I can repeat it, and I think it best repeated—every one in the State who is willing and capable to work, and every one, in particular, who is willing to be trained for the specific industrial work that the new industries will create should be able to obtain a job. Mr Speaker, Sir, this is one of the situations which the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam has been very clever to exploit, because he talks about unemployment: "The unemployment situation is by no means solved. Ask Hassan. Ask Ramasamy. His children haven't got jobs". Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to quote from one of the foremost thinkers on problems of the current day, H. Kahma and A.I. Wiener, that "the creation of new jobs is a subtle and undramatic process, and it is difficult to chart how and to what extent increases in productivity cause investment which leads to new jobs, whereas the direct elimination of jobs is both noticeable and dramatic".

The Honourable Member from Ayer Itam quite characteristically stressed on this question of unemployment. We realise that if we had not taken the steps which we took in late 1969 and early 1970 we would never have been able to break the back of the unemployment problem. Today we are really

faced with another situation—that within the next two years the question of unemployment in the State will no longer be the major problem. The major problem will be how we can best provide for the better livelihood of the new workers in the new factories and in the service sectors of economy in our State. Our problem will be how to integrate our people into a truly united Malaysian society. Mr Speaker, Sir, these were the things which the Honourable Member hinted at yesterday. At the beginning he said “the things that do not appear in the Budget”. Mr Speaker, the things that do not appear in the words of the Budget are that we are harnessing the spirit of the people. We are building the spirit of the people towards higher efforts of endeavour.

And, Mr Speaker, Sir, much as I thank the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam for those suggestions that he has brought, I hope that our reply to him will be accepted by him in good faith. And I thank him for reaching out to specific points because I think this is the only way whereby this House can function responsively to carry out our duties. We may have differences over argument. But I think most of the criticism should be labelled with some sense; and not just to carp on small things. And I am sure that every Member of this House will agree with me that the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam has done his very best, although there wasn't very much time—not even enough time to read the first page of the Report of the Penang Development Corporation.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Very sarcastic.

Soalan dikemukakan dan diperseutujui.

Dewan ditangguhkan pada jam 11.16 pagi.

Dewan bersidang semula pada jam 11.37 pagi.

USUL DI BAWAH PERATORAN MESYUARAT 51 (3).

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Tuan Speaker, under Standing Order 51 (3) I like to move

that the suspension of the Honourable Member for Kelawei be determined. I am moving this under Standing Order 51 (3)—

“If a Member be suspended under the provisions of this Order, his suspension shall last until determined by the Assembly”

In doing so I like to clarify to the House the mitigating circumstances under which the Honourable Member was suspended. Honourable Members will remember that when the Honourable Member for Kelawei was suspended he was on the verge of asking a supplementary question. Though you, Mr Speaker, ruled that the 3 hours was up he was of the opinion that he could continue asking supplementary questions. In fact Standing Order 26 (7) provides that—

“Oral questions shall be limited to a maximum of three hours for each sitting and no oral questions, other than any supplementary questions arising out of a question already asked”

So in other words the Honourable Member for Kelawei was under the impression—and in fact he was going on this particular Standing Order—that he could still ask supplementary questions, while you, Mr Speaker, were of the view that he could not do so after three hours. There is a misunderstanding, so to speak, on this particular issue. So as a result we have the unfortunate happening of the Honourable Member for Kelawei being suspended.

And here again I would like to point out that suspension is a very serious matter, and it is provided for in Section 51 (1). However, Section 51 (4) provides that if the Speaker, after having called the attention of the Assembly or of a Committee of the whole Assembly to the conduct of a Member who persists in irrelevance or tedious repetition of his own arguments or of the arguments used by other Members in debate, may direct the Member to discontinue his speech.

“(5) The Speaker may order Members whose conduct is grossly disorderly to withdrawn immediately from the Assembly Chamber during the remainder of the day's sitting.”

And (6) provides that—

“If a direction to withdraw under paragraph (5) of this Order be not complied with at once or if on any occasion the Speaker deems that his powers under that paragraph are inadequate, he may name such Member or Members in pursuance of paragraph (1) of this Order.”

So, in other words, (4), (5) and (6) provide an alternative that only when he disobeys then suspension will come in. So it may be that the Order to suspend him that day may have made quite abruptly, without consideration of other Standing Orders. So I feel that these are the mitigating circumstances. And in view of the fact that it will not make much difference also, because in all probability the Assembly may be over today, as a gesture of goodwill I would urge the House to support my Motion that the suspension of the Honourable Member for Kelawei may be determined forthwith. And in Malay: “Pergantungan Ahli daripada Kawasan Kelawei hendaklah ditamatkan”.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya menyokong Usul ini, dan minta izin bercakap sepatah dua dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I support this Motion because I think the action taken yesterday, although within the powers of the Speaker—these are residual powers which are used in the ultimate—is an unprecedented action. I do not think it has ever happened in Parliament; neither in any of the State legislatures in our country. Although I agree that yesterday the House was charged with emotion, and it was a little bit heated up, today we are more sober. And I would like to urge the Government to be gracious enough to concede to this request, so that the person who has been elected by the people should be given an opportunity to be in this House. I hope that the Government would consider it in that light.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Speaker, sebelum kita berbincang perkara ini, saya hendak tahu dari Yang Berhormat

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam iaitu daripada peraturan yang mana sekarang hendak dicadangkan.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): 51 (3).

Ketua Menteri: Tetapi 51 (3) tidak ada perlu pada masa sekarang. Under what order are you moving this particular motion.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): 51 (3).

Ketua Menteri: On what Standing Rules can you move it now?

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): 51 ialah atas peraturan berkenaan dengan suspension. Berkenaan dengan suspension tidak payahlah bagi apa-apa notis. Juga, Ahli dari Kawasan Sungei Pinang ada ambil satu motion yang tidak bagi apa-apa notis juga, itu peraturan iaitu Peraturan 51. Ini 51 juga 51 (3). Jikalau 51 boleh diambil dalam mesyuarat ini yang tidak bagi notis, saya ingat 51 (3) pun serupa lah kata satu Standing Order tidak boleh ada dua macam boleh buat, boleh suspend yang tidak payah bagi notis, mahu berhenti pun tidak payah bagi notis. Itu tidak boleh masuk dua interpretation di dalam satu Standing Order.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Speaker, apa yang saya faham kelmarin, bila kita ambil keputusan untuk cadangan, Tuan Speaker sendiri sudah tetap masa yang suspensionnya ialah dua hari. Ini bukan saja (gangguan).

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Betul-betul, betul, itu saya faham. Saya tahu juga di dalam Dewan ini saya pun ada bercakap, tetapi saya bagi mitigative circumstances fasal mitigative circumstances bukan cakap Ahli dari Kawasan Kelawei tidak betul sekali, saya pun tidak mahu cakap Tuan Speaker yang tidak betul sekali. Ada sedikit silap faham, ada sedikit gangguan; sebab itu saya ambil usul ini. Saya harap ahli-ahli dari parti lain bolehlah sokong usul ini, yang important ialah spirit. Itu sebab saya harap kita boleh sokong ini bagi keputusan motion saya.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S.P. Chelliah): Tuan Speaker dengan izin. Under Standing Order 51 (3) the Assembly yesterday determined the period of suspension by you and the Motion of mine was moved under the direction of your goodself under Standing Order 51 (1). There is no Standing Order in this book for a member to raise and move a Motion for the removal of the suspension. So I feel that the Motion should be refused.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Tuan Speaker, ini saya ingat Tuan Speaker menjadi satu Tuan Speaker di sini, Tuan Speaker sahaja yang boleh bagi ruling. Ini orang tepi jalan semua mahu cakap ini ruling, mahu bagi tahu, ini tidak betul.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S.P. Chelliah): Tuan Speaker, I want the words to be withdrawn by the Honourable Member, you know.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Sebab itu saya harap ini cadangan (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S.P. Chelliah): Tuan Speaker (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Tepi jalan itu tidak betul (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: Ahli Yang Berhormat, saya harap tolong tarik balik huruf kaki lima itu kurang sedap sedikit.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Saya tidak cakap kaki lima Tuan Speaker, saya kata tepi jalan.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S.P. Chelliah): Kalau tidak ada orang tepi jalan, dia orang apa? Kaki lima-kah?

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang bukan tepi jalan. Ahli daripada Kawasan Sungei Pinang (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S.P. Chelliah): Apa cakap macam itu, mata dia butakah?

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Banyak kasar dia cakap Tuan Speaker. Sebab itu saya ambil cadangan ini, satu spirit muhibbah (*ketawa*). Sebab itu Assembly ini bolehlah bila jam boleh determine. Suspension ini bukan suspension ada masanya, bila jam kita mahu determine kita boleh determine. Kalau ada ini spirit mahu buat boleh, tidak mahu buat pun tidak apa, kita saja bawa perkara ini. Kalau mahu jadi "Robert Grudge" selalu mahu lawan pun boleh juga, tetapi saya saja bawa fact ini harap boleh dipersetujui.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S.P. Chelliah): Muhibbah tidak usah lawan.

Ahli Kawasan Tasek Glugor (Encik Mustapha bin Hussain): Saya tidak faham Tuan Speaker.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Shall I make a photostat? Tuan Speaker sendiri boleh beri keputusan.

Tuan Speaker: Dibenarkan Motion diberi persetujuan untuk dibahaskan.

Usul daripada Yang Berhormat dari Ayer Itam ialah penggantungan Ahli daripada kawasan Kelawei hendaklah ditamatkan.

Ahli Kawasan Tasek Glugor (Encik Mustapha bin Hussain): Tuan Speaker, boleh berbahaskah Usul ini?

Tuan Speaker: Ya.

Ahli Kawasan Tasek Glugor (Encik Mustapha bin Hussain): Datuk Yang di Pertua, walaupun saya tidak mahu masuk pihak sesiapa atas keputusan yang Datuk Yang di Pertua buat kelmarin, tetapi saya fikir adalah suasana muhibbah yang kita selalu bergiat. Juga, Yang Amat Berhormat Ketua Menteri sebagai Pengerusi Majlis Muhibbah Negeri dan juga sebagai satu ahli selama hidup, Parliamentary Commonwealth/Parliamentary Association yang fikir Yang Amat Berhormat Ketua Menteri mestilah bertolakansur sedikit, beri sokongan kepada cadangan yang dikemukakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Ayer Itam dalam semangat muhibbah. Saya rayu kepada

ahli-ahli di hadapan supaya mereka sokong Usul ini. Terima kasih Datuk Yang di Pertua.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Speaker, saya minta izin bercakap di dalam Bahasa Inggeris. Tetapi sebelum saya bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris, saya fikir Yang Berhormat Ahli dari Kawasan Tasek Glugor sungguh pun faham semangat muhibbah, sungguh pun mesti bangun dari satu semangat bertolakansur; tetapi jika sesiapa yang selalu mahu kacau dan berpecah harmoni atau muhibbah yang kita ada dalam Negeri ini, Kerajaan mestilah menjaga dan kuatkuasa. Kalau tidak Kerajaan tidak tanggungjawab bersungguh-sungguh dan buat betul-betul begitu juga menjalankan harmoni. Tetapi itu bukanlah satu perkara yang sekarang ada bersangkutan dengan apa yang mesti kita rundingkan di sini. Apa yang mesti kita berbincang di sini ialah "Peraturan Dewan Majlis" ini.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I feel that, as I have said before—and I hope the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam doesn't try and deviate from it further—there is always a degree of merit. Certainly I stated earlier that after one night of thinking they come back offering a kind of peace branch. I think, earlier on, he did say it was a very deliberate walk-out yesterday. However, Mr Speaker, I do not think there is any debating point. This is a question of the authority of the House. When the incident took place yesterday, quite honestly, I myself was taken a little aback because my mind was engaged on other matters. As far as I myself am concerned, I wouldn't mind any cut and thrust from this House; and to any degree that the Honourable Speaker, you yourself, would allow. But I think the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam was not quite correct when he indicated that the Honourable Member from Kelawei was at that time attempting to draw your attention to Clause 26 (7) of the Standing Orders. What he was doing in actual fact, now that I have time to reflect upon it, was to challenge the very authority of yourself.

Mr Speaker, Sir, if I can recollect the time sequence, you had yourself already turned round to the Assembly and indicated that the proceedings should now go to questions for written reply. Now, the Honourable Member admittedly was referring to 26 (7); but in the course of so doing I attempted myself at that time to bring attention to Clause 15 of the Standing Orders, namely that under "Order of Business" there was no further action to be taken in view of the fact that the questions had gone on to the stage of questions for written reply. Then the Honourable Member from Kelawei started having a private argument between you and himself, and appealed to the Legal Adviser to even judge you and overrule your views.

Mr Speaker, Sir, in this House we abide by the Standing Orders. We have agreed also in this House that these Standing Orders need certain amendments to make them more up to date for the present circumstances of debate. But in this House, Sir, you are paramount. You run the authority of this House. It was you yourself, Sir, who drew the attention of the House to 51 (1); and under 51 (2) and (6) referred it in particular to the Honourable Member from Kelawei.

Sir, I personally agree with the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam that to take such an action is a serious matter. But I think we in this House also appreciate that you have never taken any action, Mr Speaker, Sir, without careful consideration. And you must have been pushed to your uttermost because of your patience. Also pushed to the uttermost of your own judgment as to how this House should be conducted in a proper manner when you invoked 51 (1). I agree, Mr Speaker, Sir, that it was not one specific instance alone yesterday, but a series of instances which must have built up to what the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap said, you know "a little uneasiness and temper in the House". We all admit that particularly in a closed House like this, which is small, this kind of thing can take place. But I feel Honourable Members must agree that

the main thing that we are faced with in the proposition made by the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam is whether or not Members of this House should subscribe to the idea that Parliamentary democracy as practised in the State should be conducted in the House according to Standing Orders; and that in so doing we must at all times respect the Honourable Speaker for his position, and not attempt to carry out private conversation and private argument in debate. These matters could have been done properly in the House Committee. And, therefore, Mr Speaker, Sir, I feel that what this House has to decide is whether, when the Speaker calls attention to 51 (1), which is a very serious Clause in this House, the House should not support the Speaker. Now, I think the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam also agrees that we should support it. Mr Speaker, Sir, the only thing was to mitigate; that is to say, that the period of suspension should not have been longer. Quite honestly that is a matter I think for Honourable Members to decide. Personally, with the events of the House having gone on, and I think having taken a serious Motion, and taken a decision on it, and having had our votes actually counted on that occasion, I think the following day to come back and change it is too early even for mitigation, because the position of the Speaker, and the decorum of the House, as maintained by the Speaker, have got to be sustained. I think this is the one thing; Much as we should like to have mitigation—and I certainly subscribe to the concept of Muhibbah—I think the three members of the learned profession opposite me appreciate that justice must come from heaven; but your require a Police Force to enforce that justice as promulgated by law. I think also that the functions of this House must be determined by the Standing Orders as they are today. As I said, we accept the cut and thrust. For that reason also I feel I am in a better position to make my views. An appeal has been made by the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam. I myself at that time abstained from voting but I was not very sure of the position. I feel,

however, today that the point is not a question of the spirit of Muhibbah; but the point is whether this House considers that the status of the Speaker in conducting the affairs of this House in a proper manner according to Standing Orders should be sustained.

Under those circumstances, I felt that the Resolution that was taken yesterday was perhaps a little bit harsh. But having been taken in support of the real meaning and spirit of all those Orders, I think there really is not much point in further changing what we resolved yesterday.

Saya fikir Tuan Speaker ta'gunalah kita lagi bahas perkara ini.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Tuan Speaker, bolehkah saya bercakap sepatutnya? After hearing what has been said by the Honourable the Chief Minister I would like to clarify that it is not so much here that there is a difference of opinion. The basis of the statement by the Honourable the Chief Minister is due to the fact that in his opinion he feels that there is a deliberate defiance on the Speaker; whereas I believe that Members of the Opposition who voted against the Motion believed that there was no deliberate defiance. On the contrary, there was a misunderstanding by the Speaker as to the actual intention of the Honourable Member for Kelawei. This is the basis difference. And even the Honourable the Chief Minister agrees that the measure taken is too drastic. So what I am doing today is to remedy the drasticness, because after all he has been suspended until now. And even if we were to move a Motion to determine the suspension he would have been suspended already. What purpose does it serve, unless it is to deprive him of participating further in the debates that are before this House. And I am sure that even the Honourable the Chief Minister felt a bit lonely today because of the lack of speakers from the Opposition, as he said. The whole issue is whether we want matters to be discussed by all sections of the

community, by all representatives of the people. So it is because of that that I moved this Motion. And if it is agreeable he could support my Motion. But from what I have heard apparently he is not in favour. However, it is only an attempt on my part to bring the facts to this House; to draw the attention of this House to the various Rules and Standing Orders over which there was quite a great deal of misunderstanding. There is a great deal of difference over interpretation; and I leave it entirely to the House to decide.

Soalan dikemukakan dan Usul tidak dipersetujui.

(B) USUL OLEH YANG AMAT BERHORMAT KETUA MENTERI

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Speaker, saya mohon mencadangkan—

“Bahawa Dewan ini meluluskan Perbelanjaan bagi tahun 1973 sebanyak \$21,739,347 seperti yang ditunjukkan di dalam Anggaran Pembangunan Pulau Pinang Tahun 1973 yang dibentangkan sebagai Kertas Dewan Undangan Negeri Pulau Pinang No. 11 Tahun 1972 dan meluluskan bahawa jumlah yang tersebut akan dikenakan bagi tujuan-tujuan seperti yang ditetapkan di dalam Anggaran Pembangunan Negeri Tahun 1973.”

Tuan Speaker, Usul ini memohon kuasa dari Dewan Undangan Negeri bagi mengenakan perbelanjaan berjumlah \$21,739,347 bagi projek-projek pembangunan dan perkhidmatan dalam tahun 1973. Butir-butir lanjut mengenai anggaran ini adalah terdapat di dalam Kertas No. 11 Tahun 1972. Usul ini adalah dikehendaki di bawah seksyen 4 (1) Akta Kumpulan Wang Pembangunan Tahun 1966 seperti yang dikenakan kepada Negeri, melalui seksyen 9 Akta yang sama, yang memerlukan kebenaran dari Pihak Berkuasa Undangan untuk mengenakan perbelanjaan dari Kumpulan Wang Pembangunan.

Tuan Speaker, Enakmen Perbekalan tahun 1973 yang telah diluluskan oleh Dewan ini kelmarin telah menguntukkan satu jumlah sebanyak \$3,163,906 untuk dicarumkan dari Kumpulan Wang Yang Disatukan kepada Kumpulan Wang Berkanun. Dari caruman ini satu jumlah sebanyak \$1,878,906

akan disalurkan kepada Kumpulan Wang Pembangunan Negeri seperti yang terdapat dalam muka surat 101 Kertas 11 dan di muka surat 45 dari Kertas No. 9. Lain-lain sumbangan dari Enakmen Perbekalan termasuk \$1,000,000 kepada Pihak Berkuasa Air Negeri lagi, \$250,000 kepada Tabung Amanah Pinjaman Penuntut-penuntut dan \$35,000 kepada Tabung Amanah Majlis Muhibbah Negeri.

Tuan Speaker, pada tarikh 1hb Januari, tahun depan, Kumpulan Wang Pembangunan Negeri akan menunjukkan kan perangkaan sebanyak \$2,940,866 dan Anggaran Perbelanjaan Pembangunan bagi tahun 1973 ialah \$21,739,347 yang termasuk \$500,000 di bawah Wang Simpanan Mengejut yang terdapat di bawah Kepala 115. Jumlah ini tidaklah termasuk Perbelanjaan bagi pembangunan bekalan air yang akan dijalankan oleh Pihak Berkuasa Air Negeri. Tuan Speaker, jika Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat boleh lihat di dalam 1hb Januari, tahun 1973 baki yang dianggarkan ialah \$2,940,866.

Tuan Speaker, Perbelanjaan Pembangunan sebanyak \$4,651,341 ialah anggaran yang lebih banyak daripada anggaran permulaan pada tahun 1972. Anggaran yang dikaji semula untuk tahun 1972 ialah \$42,233,685. Ini adalah disebabkan bahawa anggaran perbelanjaan untuk perumahan yang pada mulanya dianggarkan sebanyak \$4,386,000 dalam tahun 1972, perlu disemak semula dan ditambah kepada \$22,109,230 berikutan dari pengambilan oleh Kerajaan Negeri Rancangan Perumahan Rifle Range. Ini menunjukkan keazaman Kerajaan Negeri untuk menjalankan usaha bagi menyediakan kemudahan-kemudahan perumahan yang banyak dan lebih baik bagi rakyat Negeri ini.

Di bawah Kepala 101, Ketua Menteri dan Pejabat Setiausaha Kerajaan, perbelanjaan untuk tahun 1973 adalah dianggarkan sebanyak \$14,994,344 dari jumlah yang mana perkara-perkara perbelanjaan yang terbesar adalah seperti berikut:

(i) Perumahan Murah \$4,129,010

- (ii) Sumbangan dan \$9,308,800
Pinjaman kepada
Perbadanan Pem-
bangunan Pulau
Pinang

Tahun 1973 merupakan tahun yang ketiga bagi Rancangan Malaysia Kedua dan kebanyakan daripada projek-projek pembangunan yang disediakan untuk perlaksanaan di dalam kedua-dua tahun yang kebelakangan ini telahpun selesai. Satu sumbangan sebanyak \$1,878,906 adalah diperlukan untuk melaksanakan projek-projek pembangunan tahun depan. Peruntukan bagi pembangunan dalam tahun depan akan meneruskan dan mempercepatkan kadar pembangunan di dalam Negeri. Dengan bertambahnya pembangunan infrastruktur dalam bidang sosio ekonomi, bentuk luas kemajuan akan bertambah dengan banyaknya. Secara ringkas, Kerajaan akan mempergiatkan kemajuan ekonomi yang telahpun diperolehi melalui perindustrian dengan Rancangan-rancangan Perbandaran dan Pembaharuan Kawasan-kawasan Perbandaran.

Tuan Speaker, Perbadanan Pembangunan Pulau Pinang telah membuktikan bahawa penubuhannya sejak bulan November, tahun 1969 adalah berfaedah, walaupun kita menimbangkan peranannya di dalam usaha kemajuan perindustrian sahaja. Di penghujung bulan September, tahun ini telah terdapat 3 kawasan-kawasan perusahaan, iaitu Mak Mandin, Perai dan Bagan Serai dan 3 kawasan-kawasan Perdagangan Bebas di Bayan Lepas, Perai dan di Pulau Jerejak.

Di dalam erti kata perlaksanaan di antara akhir tahun 1959 hingga Mei, 1969 telah terdapat 15 buah kilang-kilang yang bergerak di dalam hanya satu kawasan-kawasan perusahaan yang ada di Mak Mandin yang menduduki kawasan seluas 54.5 ekar dan dengan mengadakan peluang pekerjaan sebanyak 2,407. Akan tetapi di antara Jun, 1969 dan September, tahun ini telah terdapat tambahan yang ternyata di dalam bilangan kawasan-kawasan perusahaan, termasuk Mak Mandin, Perai dan Bagan Serai dan juga kawasan-kawasan Perdagangan Bebas di

Dermaga Perai, Bayan Lepas dan Pulau Jerejak. Dalam tempoh ini sejumlah 35 kilang telahpun mula menjalankan perusahaan dan berkemampuan menyediakan 7,960 pekerjaan, sebanyak 61 kilang lagi di dalam peringkat pembinaan atau pun diluluskan untuk pembinaan di dalam kawasan-kawasan perusahaan ini yang menduduki 467 ekar dan mampu menyediakan pekerjaan bagi 16,350 orang. Oleh itu pada keseluruhannya rancangan perindustrian di dalam tempoh 24 bulan yang datang akan menyediakan peluang-peluang pekerjaan untuk lebih dari 26,000 pekerja.

Kebanyakan daripada kilang-kilang ini adalah terletak di kawasan-kawasan luar bandar dan ini telah membolehkan perindustrian dan perbandaran di kawasan-kawasan luar bandar disamping mempercepatkan kemajuan ekonomi di kawasan-kawasan tersebut. Dengan demikian, ahli-ahli kumpulan tenaga buruh yang berasal dari kawasan luar bandar, di antara mereka masih banyak yang bekerja tak penuh dan berpendapatan rendah, akan berpeluang untuk mendapat pekerjaan yang lebih menguntungkan di dalam kilang-kilang baru di dalam Kawasan-kawasan Perusahaan Negeri. Bagi kebanyakan pekerja-pekerja ini, pekerjaan di dalam kawasan perusahaan akan membolehkan mereka memilih samada untuk tinggal terus-menerus di dalam kawasan-kawasan yang tidak begitu sesak, disamping mendapat keuntungan dari pekerjaan yang tetap dan pendapatan yang tinggi dari apa yang dijangkakan dari usaha-usaha pertanian.

Kerajaan dan Perbadanan Pembangunan Pulau Pinang telah menubuhkan dan mengadakan hubungan yang rapat dengan sektor swasta, yang menyebabkan aliran modal asing dan tempatan ke dalam Negeri Pulau Pinang. Di dalam usaha menubuhkan kilang-kilang di dalam kawasan-kawasan perusahaan, Perbadanan Pembangunan Pulau Pinang telah mempercepatkan permohonan bagi pelaburan perindustrian ke peringkat yang tinggi sehinggakan kemajuan perindustrian telah bergerak pada kadar yang cepat dalam 2 tahun yang kebelakangan ini.

Tuan Speaker, ada 3 kawasan Perdagangan Bebas yang telahpun ditubuhkan iaitu Bayan Lepas, Pulau Jerejak dan Perai. Di akhir tahun 1972 akan terdapat 9 kilang di kawasan Perdagangan Bebas Bayan Lepas yang akan memberikan pekerjaan terus sebanyak 4,000. Ini menunjukkan kemajuan yang cepat di dalam kawasan tersebut kerana dalam tahun 1971 terdapat hanya 2 buah kilang yang sedang dijalankan. Masa itu Penang Electronics ada 60 pekerja sahaja. Kawasan Perdagangan Bebas Perai juga telah menunjukkan kemajuan yang pesat. Di akhir tahun ini, 7 lagi kilang sedang di dalam pembinaan dan akan mula menjalankan perusahaan pada awal tahun 1973 dan dengan itu membekalkan tambahan pekerjaan kepada 1,177 orang. Sebanyak 23 lain kilang telahpun diluluskan untuk pembinaan. Apabila semua kilang ini telah didirikan, sebanyak 2645 orang akan mendapat pekerjaan.

Tuan Speaker, Kawasan Perdagangan Bebas Pulau Jerejak, juga telah dikhaskan bagi pembangunan perusahaan membina kapal, memperbaiki, dan memberi perkhidmatan dan lain-lain tujuan-tujuan tertentu.

Selain daripada ketiga-ketiga kawasan Perdagangan Bebas ini, satu keputusan dasar telah pun dibuat untuk menubuhkan sebuah kawasan perdagangan bebas di Pengkalan Weld. Ini satu Free Trade Area. Tujuan-tujuan projek ini ialah untuk menghidupkan semula dan menggalakkan perdagangan entrepot Pulau Pinang. Adalah diharapkan semoga kawasan perdagangan bebas ini akan memenuhi atas ekonomi yang tidak berkembang dari kehilangan taraf pelabuhan bebas Pulau ini. Kawasan Perdagangan Bebas Pengkalan Weld dijangka menyediakan banyak pekerjaan terutama sekali untuk pekerja-pekerja pelabuhan, pemungkah-pemungkah barang dan pekerja-pekerja jeti. Adalah difikir bahawa pembangunan perindustrian akan menghidupkan kembali dengan pesatnya ekonomi dikalangan suwasta di Negeri ini.

Tuan Speaker, Kerajaan Negeri adalah sedar sepenuhnya mengenai kemungkinan industri pelancungan

menyumbangkan kepada pekerjaan terutama sekali di sektor suwasta dan sambil itu merupakan satu punca hasil kepada sektor perdagangan Negeri ini. Sejak Jun, tahun ini, Perbadanan Pembangunan Pulau Pinang telah mengambil alih tugas-tugas menggalakkan pelancungan dan memajukan kemungkinan pelancungan Negeri ini. Perbadanan Pembangunan Pulau Pinang telahpun menyediakan satu rancangan pembangunan yang terbesar yang pada masa ini sedang dilaksanakan. Banyak kerja-kerja sambungan telah dijalankan selepas Bengkel PATA dan usaha-usaha yang tertentu untuk menggalakannya melalui perhubungan dengan badan-badan pelancungan dan penulis-penulis mengenai pelancungan terutama sekali Eric White & Associates. Dengan adanya usaha Kerajaan Negeri bersama-sama dengan minat ditunjukkan oleh sektor suwasta di dalam industri pelancungan, jumlah pelancung yang akan melawat Negeri ini dijangkakan bertambah dengan banyaknya dalam tahun hadapan.

Tuan Speaker, satu perkara yang terpenting di dalam kawasan Pembangunan 1972 ialah titik-berat yang diberikan di atas perlaksanaan rancangan-rancangan mengatasi banjir di dalam Negeri ini. Kerajaan Negeri adalah sedar dengan sepenuhnya mengenai kerugian dan kesusahan yang disebabkan oleh banjir. Dalam tahun ini, tahun 1972 \$1,000,000 telah di-untukkan bagi perlaksanaan berbagai-bagai rancangan mengatasi banjir di dalam Negeri ini. Dalam tahun 1973, sebanyak \$800,000 lagi akan diuntukkan dan di penghujung tahun 1973, kebanyakan daripada rancangan-rancangan permulaan bagi mengatasi banjir yang akan dijalankan bersama oleh Jabatan Parit dan Taliair dan Majlis Bandaraya akan selesai. Perbekalan sebanyak \$800,000 merupakan rancangan yang akan dibayar balik di dalam projek yang mana Majlis Bandaraya akan menyumbangkan \$400,000 kepada Kumpulan Wang Pembangunan Negeri. Dengan tersiapnya rancangan ini, kita adalah yakin bahawa kesusahan yang dialami oleh mereka-mereka yang tinggal di kawasan yang mudah dilanda banjir akan hapus sebahagian besarnya.

Tuan Speaker, walaupun Negeri ini sedang terlibat secara aktif di dalam perindustrian, ianya juga sedang mengambil berat tentang usaha memajukan pembangunan pertanian, oleh kerana pertanian masih mempunyai peranan yang terpenting untuk dimainkan di dalam ekonomi Negeri. Sudahpun ada rancangan-rancangan kemajuan bagi mempelbagaikan bidang agro-horticulture secara intensif dengan titik-beratnya di atas penanaman pelbagai tanaman seperti buah-buahan, cendawan dan orkid berdasarkan perdagangan.

Tuan Speaker, Perbadanan Pembangunan Pulau Pinang telah menubuhkan satu pusat penyelidikan cendawan di Sungai Ara bagi memajukan satu industri cendawan yang berkesan di Negeri ini. Projek cendawan ini dijangka mula bergerak penuh di akhir tahun hadapan dan satu syarikat telahpun ditubuhkan sebagai usaha bersama di antara Perbadanan Pembangunan Pulau Pinang dan sektor swasta. Lain-lain projek yang dirancang termasuklah penyelidikan dan penanaman orkid di mana terdapat pasaran yang baik sama ada di dalam ataupun di luar Negeri untuk bahan ini.

Tuan Speaker, untuk menambahkan dengan lebih banyak lagi pendapatan mereka yang bergantung kepada pertanian bagi penghidupan, maka usaha telah dijalankan untuk memperolehi sokongan dari sains dan teknologi dan latihan di dalam kemahiran-kemahiran baru. Ampangan Perai (Prai Barrage) yang bercorak pelbagai guna akan membolehkan pengambilan kawasan seluas 1,670 ekar tanah paya di kedua-dua belah tebing Sungai Perai bagi tujuan pembangunan pertanian dan lain-lainnya. Ianya juga akan mengeringkan dan memperbaiki 1,290 ekar kebun-kebun yang ditanam dengan kelapa. Projek ini akan juga membolehkan kerja-kerja menyiapkan kemudahan parit dan tali-air bagi 4,700 ekar tanah padi yang sedia ada untuk tujuan tanaman 2 musim dan memulakan kerja-kerja terbesar bagi kemungkinan mengadakan tanaman 3 musim.

Perkhidmatan penyambungan pertanian yang dijalankan pada masa lampau akan juga diteruskan. Dalam tahun hadapan lebih banyak lagi Persatuan-persatuan Peladang akan ditubuhkan. Persatuan-persatuan ini akan memberikan sokongan kewangan dan pasaran kepada petani-petani untuk membolehkan kebun-kebun dijalankan secara unit-unit perdagangan. Persatuan Peladang-peladang meliputi 60% dari jumlah kawasan pertanian dan dengan permodalan yang berjumlah \$120,000. Persatuan-persatuan ini telah mendapat keuntungan sebanyak \$70,000 di dalam tempoh 2 hingga 3 tahun yang lepas.

Tuan Speaker, bagi tahun hadapan Jabatan Haiwan akan terus memperbaiki mutu ternakan melalui rancangan-rancangan membiak dan dengan itu memperbaiki keadaan penghidupan peladang-peladang dan penternak-penternak ayam di dalam Negeri ini melalui tambahan di dalam pengeluaran dan eksport binatang-binatang tersebut. Bersama-sama dengan Perbadanan Pembangunan Pulau Pinang jabatan tersebut akan menubuhkan pusat utama bagi ladang babi atau "Centralised Hog Rearing" yang disatukan dan dengan itu memberi pandangan yang baru bagi sektor ini di dalam ekonomi Negeri kita.

Satu Pejabat Haiwan yang baru untuk memberi khidmat kepada Seberang Perai Utara dan Seberang Perai Tengah akan didirikan di Bukit Tengah di Seberang Perai.

Tuan Speaker, sistem jalan raya di dalam Negeri ini adalah antara yang terbaik, akan tetapi Jabatan Kerja Raya di bawah Kepala 107 Anggaran Pembangunan akan terus memperbaiki keadaan sistem jalan raya yang ada di dalam Negeri ini supaya memudahkan usaha perindustrian dan perbandaran. Dalam tahun hadapan sejumlah 15.7 batu lagi jalan raya akan dibina.

Perhubungan di kawasan-kawasan luar bandar telah bertambah secara banyaknya dan ini akan memudahkan pengangkutan barang-barang pengeluaran dari luar bandar ke pasaran. Sistem jalan raya yang ada akan diperbaiki untuk memenuhi kehendak aktiviti pembangunan seterusnya di kawasan-kawasan luar bandar.

Tuan Speaker, Kerajaan adalah memberi perhatian yang terbesar kepada perumahan rakyat, terutama sekali dalam kawasan bandar dan kawasan-kawasan perbandaran di mana keperluan bagi rumah rakyat adalah sungguh mendesak. Negeri ini telahpun menyediakan 6,680 yunit untuk kegunaan kumpulan-kumpulan yang berpendapatan rendah sejak 1961. Dalam tahun hadapan, sejumlah 916 yunit perumahan lagi akan dibina oleh Negeri.

Tanah telahpun diadakan di kawasan-kawasan perusahaan Bayan Lepas dan Bagan Serai bagi projek-projek perumahan. Projek perumahan yang pertama di dalam kawasan-kawasan perusahaan akan dimulakan awal tahun hadapan. Kedua-dua kawasan perumahan tersebut akan menjadi sebahagian daripada bandar-bandar baru yang dirancangan di situ.

Tuan Speaker, Anggaran Perbelanjaan Pembangunan tahun 1973 menyediakan satu Kepala Kecil di bawah Kepala 101 bagi Pembangunan Masyarakat. Peruntukan ini bertujuan bagi projek-projek yang memerlukan rakyat Negeri ini mengambil bahagian di dalamnya. Melalui rancangan Gerakan Pembaharuan, titik-berat telahpun diberi kepada masyarakat luar bandar supaya tampil kehadapan agar usaha mereka dapat disatukan dengan usaha-usaha Pihak Berkuasa Kerajaan untuk memperbaiki keadaan ekonomi dan sosial masyarakat-masyarakat itu. Projek-projek tersebut dirancang dan dijalankan melalui Jawatankuasa-jawatankuasa Kemajuan Kampung yang bertanggungjawab bagi menyelaraskan pelaksanaan projek-projek tersebut. Tuan Speaker, Jawatankuasa ini akan juga memberi bantuan dan bimbingan kepada rakyat untuk memainkan peranan yang semakin besar di dalam memperbaiki keadaan hidup mereka. Ini pada hakikatnya ditunjukkan terhadap menggalakkan usaha berdiri di atas diri sendiri dan usaha gotong-royong terutama sekali di dalam pelaksanaan kemudahan-kemudahan sosial yang penting seperti jalan raya kampung, padang permainan, jeti,

balai rakyat, jambatan kecil dan lain-lain kemudahan kehidupan yang diperlukan oleh mereka yang tinggal di kawasan-kawasan luar bandar.

Dalam dua tahun pertama Rancangan Malaysia Kedua Kerajaan Negeri telah membelanjakan \$217,980 bagi 215 projek-projek. Untuk tahun hadapan Kerajaan Negeri telahpun menyediakan peruntukan sebanyak \$120,000 bagi 140 projek, untuk dijalankan di dalam lima daerah. Projek-projek ini termasuklah pembinaan jalan-jalan kampung, jeti, tempat main badminton dan sepak-raga dan juga saluran-saluran air.

Tuan Speaker, peruntukan yang lain seperti yang disebutkan di dalam Anggaran Pembangunan bagi tahun 1973 ialah untuk bekalan letrik di kawasan-kawasan luar bandar. Peruntukan ini ialah bagi menyediakan subsidi untuk menyambung bekalan letrik ke kawasan-kawasan luar bandar. Di bawah rancangan ini Kerajaan telah meneruskan secara beransor-ansor membawa letrik ke semua bahagian Negeri ini terutama sekali ke kampung-kampung di kawasan-kawasan luar bandar.

Di permulaan Rancangan Malaysia Kedua, Kerajaan Negeri telah membelanjakan \$211,540 untuk menyampaikan bekalan letrik ke 18 buah kampung di Seberang Perai dan di Pulau Pinang bagi faedah 572 orang. Dalam tahun hadapan peruntukan sebanyak \$73,501 telah pun disediakan bagi pelaksanaan 8 buah projek yang lain. Projek-projek ini akan menguntungkan 315 orang dalam 8 buah kampung-kampung.

Tuan Speaker, dalam tahun 1972 Negeri ini telah mengalami kemajuan yang pesat di seluruh sektor, terutama sekali di dalam sektor industri hasil dari perancangan yang baik. Anggaran Pembangunan tahun 1973 telah dirancang di dalam corak yang tertentu supaya dapat mengatasi masalah yang dihadapi oleh Negeri ini dari semua bidang. Dalam proses mencapai objektif terakhir bagi menghapuskan kemiskinan, Kerajaan telah berusaha untuk memperbetulkan keadaan ekonomi yang tidak seimbang melalui usaha perindustrian dan perbandaran di kawasan luar bandar.

Rancangan perindustrian telah mempercepatkan kemajuan ekonomi di dalam Negeri ini. Ianya bergerak lebih jauh daripada menyediakan pekerjaan oleh berbagai kilang semata-mata. Keperluan oleh kilang-kilang baru bagi bahan dan perkhidmatan tempatan telah membawa kepada kemajuan di dalam lain-lain sektor ekonomi seperti di dalam industri pembinaan dan sektor perkhidmatan. Oleh yang demikian kita akan dapati bahawa kesan-kesan selanjutnya pembangunan industri di dalam Negeri ini telah membolehkan satu pembahagian pendapatan yang lebih saksama bagi semua sektor penduduk dan dengan itu menubuhkan asas yang kukuh bagi pembentukan satu masyarakat Malaysia yang adil.

Satu lagi pertanda mengenai kejayaan di dalam rancangan perindustrian adalah ditunjukkan oleh sambutan yang begitu baik dari pengusaha-pengusaha asing kepada usaha Kerajaan untuk menggalakkan industri-industri yang bercurak usaha-bersama.

Anggaran Perbelanjaan 1973 adalah sebahagian daripada keseluruhan strateji pembangunan yang terbesar untuk Negeri ini bagi mengatasi masalah pengangguran. Kerajaan telah mengenalkan beberapa kawasan sebagai pusat untuk kemajuan ekonomi "active centres of development". Sektor industri dianggap sebagai yang terpenting dan mempunyai kebolehan yang terbesar sekali bagi pengambilan pekerja-pekerja. Ini adalah benar oleh sebab terdapat keadaan saling bergantung di antara sektor. Dengan adanya kemungkinan mengadakan pekerjaan tambahan sebanyak lebih 26,718 dan dengan kesan pengganda sebanyak 2.5, sebanyak 68,000 pekerjaan tambahan dapat dianggarkan secara realistik sebagai matlamat kita yang harus dicapai dalam tahun 1973.

Tuan Speaker, dengan adanya kemudahan infra-structure yang baik dan kualiti pekerja-pekerja kita yang terbukti, Kerajaan Negeri adalah yakin bahawa Negeri ini mempunyai kebolehan untuk meneruskan kemajuan ekonomi yang lebih pesat lagi di dalam tahun-tahun yang akan datang. Dengan adanya sokongan terus-menerus dari

rakyat, dan dengan rancangan yang elok dan kewangan yang sesuai dilaksanakan oleh sebuah pentadbiran Kerajaan yang cekap, kita mempunyai keyakinan bahawa Pulau Pinang akan menjadi sebuah pusat perindustrian yang terpenting.

Datuk Speaker, saya mohon mengusul.

Ahli Kawasan Dhoby Ghaut (Encik Khoo Teng Chye): Tuan Speaker, saya mohon menyokong Usul ini.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Tuan Yang Di Pertua, saya mohon izin chakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris. Mr Speaker, Sir, we heard the Chief Minister covering a very wide ground this time on most of the aspects. He has not forgotten Agriculture. And almost a little bit is in the Development Estimates. And we also have heard that again he is repeating the "employment opportunities" and "job potentials" that he and his Administration have created in Penang.

I understand—or at least the figures say—that the unemployment figure for West Malaysia is about 9.7 per cent, whereas the Penang average is 14 per cent, and could be more. But, if that is so, how can the Chief Minister say that he has broken the back of unemployment? I may agree that with the establishment of the electronics industry, and so forth, there is a need for labour skilled in that particular industry. That is different from creating employment for the vast number of people who are unemployed. I know that when I take him to task on this I incur his wrath, as is usual. He, as you know, can go down very low to personal levels, which this House is quite familiar with. But if he wants to maintain the dignity and decorum of this House, as I have said, I think that he, as Chief Minister, must be above others. He must set the tone and the example for debate in this House. Well, that is an aside. But, as I was saying on this unemployment, the Annual Report on Bank Negara, for example, in 1971 states that 150 projects with 520 million dollars capital would have employed only about 30,000 persons;

and a further 22 other projects with a called-up capital of \$109 million would have a "job potential"—these are the exact words used there in the Report—of 9,200 persons. If this is the average, say about 200 jobs per project, how can we reconcile the figures given by the Chief Minister with the figures given in the Annual Report, when the Chief Minister claims he has created about 22,000 jobs, and his yardstick has always been "job potential" and "job opportunities". Well, to my mind this has a special meaning in his dictionary, because the job potential to my mind and as also stated in the Bank Negara Report, is the full capacity of the factory which is established to employ a certain number of people when in full production. That is the potential of the factory. But the fantastic, inflated figure of 88,000 is simply baffling, even if we take it as the jobs that have been created. And if you take his own figure—those were the answers he has given in 1969, according to the Nathan Report which he is privileged to quote, but which we are not privileged to use. Whether by his quoting he has broken the privilege or not, I do not know. Anyway, he is privileged to quote, and we are not privileged to quote—there were 39,000 persons unemployed in Penang. And if the figures that he claims are correct there should not be a single person in the State of Penang who should be unemployed today. As I said, he will take me to task; it doesn't matter. But his reply will, of course, enable thousands and thousands who are still unemployed to know who is telling the truth. But he keeps repeating, perhaps in the hope that by repeating the same things over and over again people will believe what he says.

He also said that very much progress is in store for the year 1973. But if you look at the Estimates you will see that the actual provision for 1973 is only 21 million dollars; that is, 12 million as direct expenditure, and 9 million as loans, making a total of 21 million dollars. This I think is a little bit more realistic. But this compared with last year's total of \$42 million is actually

half. And, even though I say it is realistic, the targets set by the Government are never ever fulfilled; never ever achieved. And this has been pointed out by the Auditor-General. In fact, if we look at the figure for 1971, it says that—I do not know how much was estimated. Usually very-highly-inflated figures. Maybe \$41 million. Well, I must admit I could have looked it up. I think I have it somewhere. I can look it up. The 1971 Budget, I do have. But here it says—we were only able to spend \$9 million in 1971, the first year of the thrust forward; and then we estimated for \$42 million in 1972. I do not know how much we spent out of that. Maybe we have to wait until the end of 1973 to know how much was spent out of the \$42 million we had budgeted. But when we come to 1973 we have come down to \$21 million. And therefore we have gone down by 50%. Even the contribution by the State for development has gone down. I think this year it is 1.8 million; and it is lower than what (*gangguan*).

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Speaker, dengan izin: Just a point of information.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Yes.

Ketua Menteri: Sir, we will benefit greatly from the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap, for I think he is trying to criticise the figures I put forward in a constructive manner. I think you have got the picture wrong. Actually the Development Estimates for 1973 will be \$4,651,341 more than was provided last year. The figure of \$42,233,000 which you referred to, in actual fact, is largely due to the fact that the original provisions that were made last year have now had to be increased by supplementary provision which was made yesterday, unfortunately in your absence. It provided for \$22 million for the sum of money for Rifle Range. So we are actually providing for estimates of about \$1 million. This is just to get our figures straight. But I appreciate that you haven't got your references with you.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): I thank the Honourable the Chief Minister. But the thing is that I was also saying that for this year it is \$21 million. But the heading says "Anggaran Perbelanjaan untuk tahun 1972". It doesn't say "Revised Estimate", which is a better word—"Revised". They would normally say "Revised Estimate". Then I am justified in assuming that was the estimate for 1972.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Speaker, I have explained in the course of my speech. The Honourable Member—I was just explaining to him—had not probably followed it.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): In other words, in 1972 the estimated expenditure was also \$21 million. That is what I think the Chief Minister is trying to say. And it became \$42 million by this extra amount which was merely book accounting of taking from this side and putting to the other side. In the case of Rifle Range it created nothing new. As far as Rifle Range is concerned it started, as everybody in Penang knows, even before the General Elections of 1969. And therefore it is just an entry from one side to the other side. And that has increased it to \$42 million. If that is so, then the provisions in 1972 and 1973 remain the same. That is what the Chief Minister wanted to clarify. But I was going on further to say that the contribution by the State is less.

Ketua Menteri: It goes up 4 million.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Goes up 4 million? I do not know where they get their arithmetic right. Now, in the case of Agriculture, the actual provision is much lower than that for 1972—Pertanian, Head 102, \$349,000. This year it will be \$235,000. Although the figures elaborated and set out the projects for which this money is to be spent, \$349,000 to \$235,000 is less by \$114,000 for Agriculture. Well, he himself stressed the importance agriculture plays in the economy of the country. And, Mr Speaker, if that is important—

and in fact agriculture gives employment to a greater proportion of people than any of the other industries put together—then in fact there should be an increase, not a reduction. By the way, although I must profess that my comprehension of Malay is not that much good, I heard about mushrooms, and so forth. But I wonder what has happened to the ginger project. I understand that the ginger project which was started in Bagan Serai went gingerly, in the sense that nothing came out of the project, and all the ginger had disappeared. In other words, it had just rotted away. Or perhaps the Chief Minister would let us know how much was spent on it, and what is happening to it today.

Coming now to the question of the Drainage and Irrigation Department, I see that there is an increase. But I would like here to bring to the attention of the Chief Minister a big problem that arose in Province Wellesley South. Actually it is not in my Constituency. It is in the State Constituency of Ahli Nibong Tebal. This is regarding this place called Trans-Krian. I must beg the indulgence of the Government if I were to refer to Trans-Krian. The thing is that this area was sold and fragmented several years ago; and this area is a low-lying area which has a bund to prevent the sea water from coming in. And this bund has all along been maintained by individual whose lands bordered the river. The maintenance by individuals is not that efficient. And there will be individuals who will not be able to maintain these bunds because of the high cost. And, therefore, I would like to appeal to the Government to consider setting up a Drainage Board for that area. It is not a small area. This is a large estate. I think it is more than two thousand acres. And if this area should be flooded the bund could break. I think the damage to the crops, trees, poultry, and all that, would be considerable. And therefore in the same way that a Drainage Board has been set up for Caledonia, Byram, Changkat, or for Juru and Bukit Minyak—the Nibong Tebal Drainage Board and the Bukit Tambun

Drainage Board—I do hope that the Government will take immediate action to see that a Drainage Board would be set up for the Trans-Krian area in order to forestall any likely damage that may be caused to that area. In making this request I also would like to urge the Government to see to it, and to find every possible means of trying to reduce the drainage rate that is imposed on these people—the farmers, the landowners, tenant farmers, and so forth, who are smallholders. Most of them—in fact almost the whole of Province Wellesley South in Penang—are smallholders. Now they have great difficulty in paying these high drainage rates. I know that the drainage rate is calculated in such a way that it will offset the expenditure that will be incurred by the D.I.D. in providing the drainage facilities for that area. But as farmers, as smallholders, they have to pay quit rents which we have increased, and the other rate which is, as the Chief Minister knows, peculiar to Nibong Tebal. The peculiarity of it is that it was once a “hasil pokok” on the number of trees, but has now been converted by the Government into land assessment, which is different from quit rent. Quit rent is rent for the land. The assessment goes to the District Council. Now, this is an added burden to the people in Province Wellesley South. And this rate also—as it can be seen from the answers given by them—has been raised quite high as far as Nibong Tebal is concerned. I do not want to appear parochial. But it is a very high figure—24 percent is gazetted areas, and ungazetted areas 20 percent—which almost reaches the City Council level of assessment. So it is an additional burden which the people in Province Wellesley South have to bear. And coupled with drainage rates there are three rates the landowners have to pay, although I do know that the State does not directly benefit from the farmers. In other words it doesn't get any cent from the smallholders, apart from the quit rent. In the same way it doesn't get one cent from the promotion of tourism, or from industries. These are all Federal concerns. There is a

separate Federal Minister probably for farmers, for tourism, for industry, and so forth. Yet we must see to it that the drainage rates are reduced, which the Government has the capacity to do, particularly in view of the fact—I do not know whether the Chief Minister told us in his Budget speech yesterday—that we have got an additional per capita grant from the Federal Government. The accumulated sum for last year was quite substantial; and this year it is an increased amount. And this will go on. And further, the increase in quit rent which gives, of course, the Chief Minister a lot of funds to play with. So I think he should honestly—and seriously, I suggest—consider reducing these drainage rates. And it should be subsidised. The people who work these smallholdings should be subsidised as far as drainage of the area is concerned because if it is flooded it would be useless for anybody.

Now, he also talked about pig farming.

Dewan ditangguhkan pada jam 1.06 petang.

Dewan bersidang semula pada jam 2.34 petang.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Tuan Yang Di Pertua, before we adjourned for the lunch break I was talking on agriculture, and I was going to make a few comments on this pig farming. The Government, as stated by the Chief Minister, and as shown in the Estimates, has been spending money to improve the quality of pigs that are reared in our State. But all these efforts were nullified by the failure of the Government to anticipate the epidemic of swine fever, as a result of which so many of our farmers lost heavily. Most of our farmers are small farmers, and the loss is very big to them. Besides, as I said, the vast amounts of money that have been spent in giving under the Pawah system; in giving a better breed of pigs—We have heard about the Honourable Member for Tanjong Barat

distributing pigs. All these went over board—we have the answer from the Chief Minister to the question, where he said it was only when the epidemic started that the Government gave free vaccines. But inoculation against swine fever, just like inoculation against smallpox and other diseases, is a preventive measure which ought to have been taken long before the epidemic comes. And therefore the Government should have given free vaccinations, just as in similar cases like smallpox where vaccination is given free, and ought to be given free.

It is human nature not to try and spend money. It is not a crime, neither is it a folly, because one can never tell when a epidemic will come. But the Government cannot afford to let the people become victims or become prey to these diseases which act without warning although the Chief Minister tried to tell us that the disease was confined to the Island of Penang. But the announcement that Penang is a swine fever area had a tremendous effect on Province Wellesley where according to his own statement, at that time there was no swine fever; as a result of which the pigs from Province Wellesley could not be exported, and there was a glut, and farmers lost heavily. Once these pigs grew big they were not wanted in the market. And I also understand that if the pigs had got the fever they cannot be cured. And therefore they just have to be killed or allowed to die. But there seems to be—I have not, I must admit verified this from any authorities—a serum, or anti-serum, or something which when given to these pigs which have got the fever they can be cured. I am sure the Chief Minister will be able, with the expert officers in the Government, to tell us—even if it merely means to remove a fallacy—if this is a fallacy. And I do hope that the Government would be able to give free vaccines in the future. I do know that this is not only the fault of the State Government, because this is also the policy of the Federal Government. And vaccines are, I understand, supplied by the Federal Government; and they are charged.

And therefore the State Government also charges. But it is up to us, as we have a large pig population, to make representations, and to see that these vaccines are supplied free of charge.

Let's come to the subject of the J.K.R. We notice that the provision for the J.K.R. is almost double. And that is excluding the Water Department which is to be under the Water Board. Now, what strikes me is that the J.K.R. is very short of staff, particularly in the supervisory section. The position has remained almost static; that is, the staff position in the J.K.R. In 1969, if my arithmetic is correct, there were about 251 posts. Today, after five years of dynamic government in power, the position has hardly improved. It has now 259 posts—an increase of 8 posts in the supervisory section; not including what we call the workers—the I.M.G. staff. An increase of 8 posts is hardly worth mentioning. And I am informed that many of the posts are not filled. Since persons retire and go to other jobs, some of these posts are not filled. Therefore the J.K.R. must be understaffed. And the work load of this Department has greatly increased, with the provision of new roads and developments here and there. And I know that the Chief Minister, once he decides he wants the job done, he wants it done immediately.

Well, Bayan Lepas is a clear example of the push and the stress to which the J.K.R. has been subjected to, as a result of which the routine work of the Public Works Department suffers. And, sad to say, the supervision of workers is poor. I have heard that the technical officers who are supposed to go for roll-call early in the morning don't turn up. And the work is not allocated; and so workers have to sit by the roadside and idle away, waiting for the supervisory staff to come, if they come at all, after their breakfast, and so forth. As such the Public Works Department is often at the butt-end of attacks, not necessarily from me alone; and therefore I would like to urge the government to be more considerate, and to ensure that this Department is strengthened in order that it may do its work efficiently and well.

Talking of the J.K.R., I cannot forget about the action taken by the J.K.R. or the Government in respect of one person, who was a meter reader in Province Wellesley South, and whose action caused a great deal of loss to the Government, and suffering to the people. And because of this man, the whole group of meter readers have been subjected to periodical change. Now, not only in the J.K.R. but also in other Departments there are people who handle funds. But because of one man have you to subject the whole group to periodical change of six months? Every six months the meter readers have to be changed, irrespective of whether they have homes in the places, whether they have commitments in the place, and so forth. This is like cutting the nose to spite the face. And I think it is a very stupid decision, whoever was responsible for the recommendation. I understand there was a Committee. Supposing the members of the Committee were in that position, would they be happy to accept a decision of that kind. Just because of your fault in not being able to control and supervise one man, you make everybody else suffer. It is like Templer punishing the whole village, just because of one bandit who had shot somebody. This is mass punishment.

Coming now to this small Department, Kebun Bunga Kerajaan—that is, Gardens. This Department has got a small increase of \$5,000. But, as I have said earlier, for the P.W.D. there has never been an increase in staff. In fact, the staff has remained static for the last three years. In fact, one cannot see what this Department is doing, or has done. From what I see there has been no improvement in the Botanical Gardens or in the gardens that are outside of its perimeter, or the tree-planting schemes and so forth outside, and the gardens in Penang Hill. As we are trying to promote Penang into a tourist centre, I am sure that we must pay greater attention to this. And this Department must also be strengthened.

Now, talking of gardens reminds me of playing fields. If I heard the Chief Minister correctly, he was telling us of how much he has spent in the rural

areas to promote badminton courts, basket-ball courts, and so forth. But in an answer to a question as to whether any playing fields have been constructed since the Government took over there was none. There was something done in Penang. With a growing population, there is definitely a greater need for playing fields in other areas, particularly in the rural areas. And although some schools do have facilities while others don't have the school fields cannot be used. And therefore the Government should actively consider providing these facilities.

On the question of low-cost housing, which the Chief Minister had dealt with quite extensively on the Supplementary Development Estimates, and also mentioned in the moving of this Motion before the House, he said that since 1969, 6,100 houses have been constructed.

Ketua Menteri: Since 1961.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): 1961. So the figures cover a period even before you came into power. And next year 960 units will be constructed. But in an answer last year—in July or early January; the last Session—the answer given by the Chief Minister was that 300 units would be constructed this year, that is, 1972. But it is a fact that not even a single unit was constructed. And even the 6,100 houses were all planned previously, and perhaps carried forward and completed. As was told during Question Time, the Chain Ferry flats which were intended for people have now been completed for different uses; and therefore there must be a replacement at least.

The Chief Minister has said that he is planning to put up houses in the new industrial estates in Bayan Lepas and Bagan Serai. But, if the cost of the houses or the flats is going to be what it is, can you really tell me that your workers who go to work in the electronic factories in Bayan Lepas will be able to afford to stay there? It is my humble opinion that they will not be able to stay there. The workers, with the salary they get, will not be able to

stay there. It may be for the higher-income group; but not for the ordinary workers who are paid \$2 or \$2.50, or the most \$3. They will not be able. If they work daily they may get at the maximum \$3. And many don't get that. It is a well-known fact. At the most, if they work everyday in the month, \$90. And, if they were to pay over \$30 for a flat, what is left for them? And therefore the cost of construction must be drastically reduced or, as the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam suggested, must be heavily subsidised. Well, you don't like the word "subsidised". You try and twist it around—very ably no doubt—to say you subsidise in other ways. Yes, even with 4% interest rate it is a subsidy. I agree it is a subsidy. But even with that you cannot bring down the cost. Therefore there must be some other way. Maybe you might have to subsidise much more than that. For example, in Kuala Lumpur they even allow the first 3 years free of rent, and subsequent years at a graduated rate.

Well, on Development, Mr Speaker, I must express my regret. Or shall I say I am really disgusted to know that after all the hullabaloo, after years of talk, that the Government has now decided not to do anything about the miserable condition of roads in some of the former housing areas. But to an answer to a written question the Chief Minister has stated that until the developers of these areas have brought these roads up to the standard required by the J.K.R. the Government will not be able to take over these roads. Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, these developments in the former housing estates have been approved by the former Government before the change in policy. They were in some cases outside rural areas to which there was no control; and it was not the fault of anyone that these people bought the houses. And now you cannot expect the purchasers of those houses to go and find the developer now, and ask him to come and make the road. It is an impossible thing. You cannot find him. But the people are living there. They pay quit rents. They pay assessments. They pay all the fees that are

required by the State. Therefore it is the duty of the State to take over and maintain these roads, even if, I would say, the roads don't qualify for Federal Grants. The Federal Grants, I know, are only given if a road is not up to a certain standard. But it is our responsibility to take over these roads and bring them up to the standard because it is not the fault of the purchasers. But it is the fault of Government—not necessarily this Government or the former Government. It is the fault of Government. And you succeeded to that Government. So if that Government has done wrong are you going to allow that wrong to remain? Surely you should not. As a Government which claims to have the interests of the people at heart it should tackle this problem without brushing it aside.

I would not like to labour this House. But my last point is with regard to the Report which has been submitted by the State Development Corporation.

Tuan Speaker: Ahli Yang Berhormat, saya ingat tak masuk dalam ini.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Mr Speaker, we are giving money which goes to the State Development Corporation; and therefore it is only right that we should discuss how the money is spent. It is no use giving money. Even if you give money to your boy to go and buy school books you would ask him "How did you spend it? What are the books you bought". It is public money; therefore we should be able to. And if it is not to be discussed it should not have been tabled at all. And therefore, with your indulgence, Mr Speaker, I just like to say that although the law that created the State Development Corporation only requires that a Report shall be submitted, Mr Speaker, what is the use of a Report if it does not show the Accounts? It will say, "I did this, I did that. I went there. I went here." Then habis. Bolehkah? Would you accept that explanation from your son? Or even if you give money to your wife to go marketing? Would you accept? You may not.

Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Encik Ismail bin Hashim): Did you ask every day?

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): I do know it is not necessary that a law should state that it must have the statement of Accounts. But, even the law does not state so, this money is not just given to the State Development Corporation to go and makan angin. No, it was given for a specific purpose and therefore it must be accountable to the fellow who gives it. And in this case it is the State that gives the money. Mr Speaker, therefore, even without the law requiring it, it still must account for it, because if it doesn't account for it then we can propose that the whole amount be cut. Therefore it won't get any money.

Tuan Speaker: Soalan itu kelmarin sudah berbincang.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Ini development. Ini ada sangkut dengan development.

Tuan Speaker: Soalan itu sudah berbincang kelmarin. Saya tidak benarkan sebut panjang perkara itu.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Therefore I think that where a law lays down that a Report must be submitted it is implicit that the Report must have a financial statement. If it does not, it is no Report at all. It is a mere humbug. That's all.

Terima kasih.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya minta izin berchakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

Tuan Speaker, Sir, I take this opportunity of replying to some of the comments and criticism made by the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap. He touched on the question of Agriculture—Pertanian—Head 102 when he expressed that there has been a reduction in the allocation for 1973 as against the allocation for 1972. If he only had taken the trouble to read under this Head 102 on page 105 then

he would note that \$44,800 was provided in 1972; and this amount was to be spent within this year. However, no work was carried out because under Suffian the staff have got to bear 10% of the monthly salary. And because of this the Junior Agricultural Assistants were reluctant to stay in quarters meant for them. However, a token sum of \$10 is being provided. And if the nature of the work necessitates the provision of quarters the Government will certainly consider the building of these quarters for them. And as such only \$10 is provided.

And there is another item, that is under Subhead 8, Pembinaan Pusat Pertanian Baru. This is in connection with the Agricultural Complex in Sungei Nibong.

And another point which the Honourable Member touched upon was Haiwan, concerning the swine fever. I think the Opposition are duly unfair to level this accusation on the Government because as soon as the swine fever was confirmed, after being sent to Ipoh for analysis, the Government immediately declared Penang Island a swine-fever-infested area. And simultaneously the Government embarked upon giving free vaccination to the farmers. And in the same way I am very proud to say that out of all the affected States in West Malaysia Penang is the only State, right up to this date, to provide free vaccination for the pig-rearers. In the past the Veterinary Department charged 40 cents for each vaccination, which in fact is now being carried out in the other States. But with the declaration of Penang as a swine-fever-infested area we waived this charge. And in fact when it was confirmed that Penang Island had this epidemic the supply of vaccine was enough at that time. And because of the far-sightedness of the Government we drew supplies from Ipoh. And we even went to the extent of acquiring more supplies from Singapore.

Tuan Speaker: Ahli Yang Berhormat, saya ingat panjang lebar berkenaan swine fever. Kalau tidak ada lain point sila duduk.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): Tuan Speaker, these are the two points I would like to reply to the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap. Thank you.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Speaker, saya mahu chakap banyak terima kasih kepada Yang Berhormat dari Kawasan Sungei Bakap pada berapa perkara yang berbangkit dalam bahasan cadangan Usul yang saya bawa.

Tuan Speaker, dengan izin, I would like to speak very briefly in reply, in view of the fact that the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap has seen it fit also to do a disappearing act. (*Ketawa*) This is, of course, good Parliamentary procedure, in spite of the fact that his colleague from Ayer Itam also is not here. It is like a twin barrel. Obviously it has been prepared for today that one should put up this question of a flimsy attack. Ah! (*Ketawa*).

Now, if the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam had earlier on today, like his colleague, put up a flimsy, see-through kind of attack (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Batik.

Ketua Menteri: See-through.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap, his very much—vaunted colleague, has now presented us with a really topless, bottomless situation. (*Ketawa*).

Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Encik Ismail bin Hashim): For the tourists.

Ketua Menteri: Topless and bottomless because I cannot see head or tail of what he is trying to say all through an hour and a half, except probably to take up a little bit more time. But the Honourable Member must make his presence felt. And I thank him. (Kepada Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap:) In your absence I had already thanked you. (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): I have my gaji.

Ketua Menteri: for having made your peregrinations in and out of this House.

But, Mr Speaker, Sir, there are one or two points which I think have to be taken fairly seriously. Of course, this is all in an aside. The Honourable Member is an expert Parliamentarian. And he asked me to maintain the tone of the House; and not to go too low down. I would wish that this were the case. But in order to reach down sometimes you must almost have really to go bottomless. (*Ketawa*) But I feel, Mr Speaker, Sir, that there are one or two points which, as I said, require a reply. And I would take them, in this particular case, in the order that they were brought up.

The Honourable Member referred to this question of job potentials in the State; and he quoted the Bank Negara statistics. None of us are really perfect in our home work and cross references. But I presume that the Honourable Member really was putting forward the kind of index which was put up by the Bank Negara—that is to say, the statistics apply on general observation—whereas the statistics that we apply in our calculations are for Labour-intensive industries. To put the picture in its proper perspective, whereas the unemployment rates in West Malaysia were 7% in 1969, for the State of Penang it was 14%, which was virtually very nearly double that of the rest of West Malaysia. Hence our very deep concern, and continuing concern, over the question of unemployment. However, unlike the position in June, 1969, when the position looked hopeless, and the question of unemployment was almost like a nightmare, today, with the strategy of industrial development focused particularly on labour-intensive, export-orientated industries, our expectation for job potentials is such that in actual fact we now have to prepare the programme for the problems that will arise in the future. And all our calculations, as I have said before, are more likely to be conservative than over-optimistic.

The problem of housing, and the problem of maintaining our standard of living at a cost which is comparatively cheaper than anywhere else are tremendous problems. And hence in my speech earlier I had indicated that the Development Estimates are strategically-projected developments that will take place in order to consolidate all the work that had been done in the past two or three years, and to make sure that our advance forward from 1973 will be able to meet problems which are not yet even understood or appreciated by the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap.

Now, this is not an attempt to boast. This is not an attempt to continually repeat the achievements that have been established. Already factories that have been established have gone on from one shift to two shifts. And there are factories working three shifts. Now, all along the State Government had presented the problem of unemployment, and the achievement of a job-potential creation by a definite process, namely those factories that are already in operation, factories that are being built, and factories that will be built. And I have stated that in the next two years the requirements for jobs will be enormous. And I have stated quite categorically that the Government will have to face the people on this—whether we are bluffing them or not. But I do not think the Government will be fully responsible if the Government did not carefully look into this problem to ensure that our new workers will get the best out of the present situation; that whatever problems may arise should be anticipated, and if possible obviated. Mr Speaker, Sir, it is in this situation where we have presented a strategic outlook that there appears to be a slight degree of difference of opinion. And the Honourable Member immediately takes up a tactical position in an area well known to himself like Trans-Krian which he has repeated many times before. Therefore all through this debate there are the tactical references to Trans-Krian, to pig-rearing, to roads, to housing. But they all have one common factor which is very interesting to us.

Let us take housing backwards. The Honourable Member is just like his colleague also—this ambience. They like to pull our legs a bit, and hit us on the head whenever they can. And when we try to hit them on the thing we find there is no head there; so it is very difficult. I won't elaborate further. I must maintain the tone of the House. (Ketawa) Mr Speaker, Sir, what is this which is interesting to us? It is interesting because on the question of housing we wasted two years of our time in planning, and the preparation of implementation of housing. The Honourable Member himself was responsible. And they were completely wasted. Quite honestly, utterly and absolutely wasted. And when we get the come-back today I think I must say that, unlike the case of tourism, in the case of housing we have been left a little bit stranded, even on this issue of the fact that from 1961 till 1972 the State built 6,680 units of housing which as an average for say 10 years, is 600 units per year. What the State proposed to do in 1973 is therefore to build 916 units; that is, to increase the rate of building construction in this State. Furthermore, the position is that in Bagan Serai and in Bayan Lepas the Development Corporation on its part will also be undertaking further development and housing. So the work of the Development Corporation will be complementing that of the State. But the State *per se* is attempting to reach a target of 916.

Now, we appreciate all these problems of whether a house should cost within the means of the new workers. I won't go into debating points because the Honourable Member began his statement with "If the houses cost the same then there must be a subsidy". Mr Speaker, Sir, we can put it the other way: If the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap were to donate one million dollars then it would be solved.

There is no point putting up hypotheses of that type in a debate of this serious nature. Obviously, as I said in reply to his colleague earlier on today, the State Government has got to look into this problem of whether houses

should be built for rent, or built for sale; and whether the cost of these houses can be brought down to a level whereby it would fulfil two aspects of the problem; One, namely the aspect of the cost of living which the worker can afford; and, the other, the aspect whereby the worker as a citizen will have to pay rates to the local authorities concerned. And here again the distinction between the Government and local authorities has not been made clear by the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap. And I thank him for giving me this opportunity to elaborate this, because he brought it up when he mentioned the fact that there are roads; and the Government gets quit rent, assessment, other fees, and so on, and therefore the Government must do this. Otherwise the Government is failing in its duty.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the State Government admittedly does obtain Federal grants for certain categories of roads. Now, until these roads are approved and accepted, these roads which are built up by private entrepreneurs will not of themselves come under the jurisdiction of the J.K.R., or even of the local authority to which assessment is paid. Now, the problem of assessment has got no relationship with State funds because assessment rates accrue to local government. And therefore to lump all this round, and say, "The Chief Minister and the Government have failed in their duty", again is an unnecessary blurring of facts because at this time of our development in the State it is very necessary for established, responsible politicians—and certainly politicians of the long record and long standing as the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap—to tell the public precisely what is the nature of the problem, so that we can arrive at a proper conclusion, and not go bluffing around and saying the Government is wrong.

Mr Speaker, Sir with the best of intentions, there are problems that have been raised. As I said, there is an interconnecting basic issue brought out in the various points. That is to say, should or should not the Government

subsidise in some way or other the efforts of the private sector which bring profit to the private sector? For example, should Government go in to rebuild the roads which the developer should have built up to proper standards in the first place? Should the Government subsidise something which is for the profit of a small section of the State—an irresponsible section—which couldn't care less what kind of roads it builds, so long as it could sell and make money? Should the Government now go in and, because of this, make up the quality of the road?

Now, this is the same kind of thing which applies when it comes down to this question of the problem of free vaccination to pigs. This is a matter which the Government obviously will take into serious consideration; and if our finances permit it we shall certainly try to implement it. I had already given the House some indication of the dimension of the funds that will be expended if we were to vaccinate every pig free. Now, if the Members of the House feel that this is a good thing—it is true now the Opposition says, "Go ahead!"—should the Government immediately go ahead and give everything free? Mr Speaker, Sir, I would say that the Honourable Member has got to be aware of the fact that there are a lot of people who make money out of this pig industry, and who contribute nothing directly to the State funds, whereas the provision of the cost of free vaccine and free vaccination of pigs will have to come directly out of State funds. Now, this is the problem. So do not try to bring out the plight of the poor farmer because on our side, and my honourable friend has earlier said, at the height of the swine fever we certainly worked very hard, and we have met a lot of them.

The farmers in Province Wellesley asked the Government to try to obtain permission for them to send the pigs through Perak and Selangor, so that they could go to the destination market; and this the Government complied with. And the members of the Pig-rearing Association were quite happy with what was done. To say that the Government

did absolutely nothing, I think, is stretching the point a bit too much. The principle is this: Are we just going to put the Government effort in without at the same time a come-back? And here I would draw the attention of the Honourable Member to the Gerakan Pembaharuan, or the Operation Renewal Programme, which I referred to at great length when introducing this particular Motion, because if the people will work with the Government the Government will do everything it can to work with the people.

To say that we did not anticipate swine fever is not true; otherwise we would never have stocks of vaccine available, and so on. As a matter of fact the Government has been trying very hard over the last three years to begin to implement a better system of pig-rearing which would create less contention, and remove the sensitivities of an undue development of pig-rearing, particularly in kampung areas where the sensitivities of our Muslim brothers have got to be taken into consideration. However, the pig farmers are responding very slowly. And the Government's intention has never been to force the issue onto anyone. If, on the other hand, any pig-rearers wish to participate and co-operate with the Government on the basis of the centralised hog-rearing scheme then the Government will certainly assist in any way possible to make their livelihood better.

I would say that in other countries, if an epidemic such as swine fever were to take place, what happens is that the Government fairly ruthlessly burns up all the sites in the area, and destroys the whole pig population to see that the disease is eradicated. So the control of the disease is not a simple one. It takes quite some time; and full measures in certain instances. So I think, therefore, the Government on this occasion has displayed considerable constraint and considerable care to implement the work that it has undertaken to eradicate swine fever, and to help promote the general welfare of the pig-rearers. Now, if the pig-rearers will co-operate then I think we can move forward very much more rapidly. Hence the reference in this development fund.

Similarly, Sir, the Honourable Member had stated that we were like Templer punishing a whole village—it is strange, but this is just a question of language style—because of some bandits having shot somebody, or something like that.

Mr Speaker, Sir, this question of meter readers which led to a lot of difficulty in the Honourable Member's constituency has been resolved; and resolved fairly satisfactorily. Now the meter readers are being moved about; not because the Government wants to punish them, not because the Government likes to impugn them, but because the former system which led to the failure of administration obviously had to be corrected. And the system of rotation is a system whereby each of the meter readers will be able to familiarise himself with the job as a whole; and not just that one little unit under his immediate care.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member referred to the question of J.K.R. And in his usual nice style he said that in 1969 there was 251 jobs for senior posts, including supervisory posts, whereas now there are only 259—“this shows how dynamic the Government is”. Of course, we accept the fact the Government is dynamic because we are able to streamline the Administration and carry out the same amount of work, and even double that amount of work, with the same amount of work force. I think I should indicate to the Honourable Member that for every single cent that we spend we get more value out of that. Mr Speaker, Sir, however we wouldn't like to claim so extravagantly, nor should the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap jump to a conclusion, that we are understaffed. (Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap menepuk tangannya) I wish he would applaud a little bit more loudly than to go through this gesture of just clapping your hands (*Ketawa*). He knows how. That's usually the trouble—all the gestures but no effect. At least there is an effect (menepuk tangannya). There is a sound. But you did all that. There is no effect. That is precisely the kind of thing. We at least dare to do that (menepuk tangannya).

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Mr Speaker, Sir, loud enough for you to hear?

Ketua Menteri: Mr Speaker, Sir, the position is that the Honourable Members must realise, of course, the difficulty and the strain under which the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap was debating the situation. He did not quite know exactly what the figures implied were. But the most important point is that a great proportion of the development that will be taking place in the State will now to some extent be undertaken. Where it was previously undertaken by the J.K.R. itself it will now be undertaken by the Water Authority, and also by the Development Corporation. It is very unfortunate that Honourable Members were absent from the House on the presentation of the Supply Bill. The provision in the Supply Bill for a State Planning and Development Control Department precisely meets the kind of situation which the Honourable Member is driving at and had gone into at great length. Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not wish to repeat this matter as the Honourable Member can read it from the Hansard. The job that was undertaken by the J.K.R. in previous years, as I said, not only will be undertaken by the State Water Authority and the Development Corporation; but because of the co-ordination of the functions of the local (gangguan).

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): On a point of clarification. I gave way. I hope the Honourable Chief Minister is honourable enough to give way. I gave way just now. (Ketawa).

Ketua Menteri: On what Order?

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Clarification.

Well, my figure, Mr Speaker, Sir, was exclusive of the Water Department. As the Chief Minister very well knows, the Water Department is a different Head, and the J.K.R. is a different Head. Although they are in the same Department, if you look at your Budget you will know that the Water Section is

under a different Head and the Public Works Department is separate. My figures were taken from the Public Works section, excluding the water-works. That is just a clarification.

Ketua Menteri: Sir, I understood that because that appears in the Paper itself. What I was saying is that in future the total volume of work load that is going to be undertaken will be done by the State Water Authority which will not only carry out the functions of the J.K.R., but also the kind of functions that used to be carried out by the City Water Department, as well as the new functions which the Water Authority will generate by itself, and together with the functions that were undertaken by the local authority. With better co-ordination the work of providing what we call the physical infrastructure for development of the State will be better organized to allow us to begin on the next phase of our development. And as I said, everything doing well, if we are to maintain political stability and social stability then what will happen is that the job potentials that have been created will be fulfilled or implemented as a fact in the next 24 months. As a matter of fact, we have problems arising out of that. Therefore, even now we must begin to prepare for a new restructuring of society whereby our people can live together more harmoniously; whereby they can learn to be more independent, and be more self-reliant under Gerakan Pembaharuan. This is all that the Development Estimates are stressed at. And I do not think that the matters that have been raised by the Honourable Member are particularly meant for this debate. I mean, he has to say something. That we understand. And he has got to say it very quickly.

On the question of the Trans-Krian, and the setting up of a separate Drainage Board for the Trans-Krian, the problem, I think the Honourable Member also appreciates involves this question here of the big land-owners of the past fragmenting the estates. Some middleman comes in and makes a big profit, and leaves the poor, helpless people in the area with the problem of

maintaining a common bund. Here again is a problem of how money should be directed. And in this particular instance the Government will look into the problem as to whether or not it is reasonable to set up such a Drainage Board. And I think the matter will receive proper consideration although the implementation of this involves the principle of what comes first.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to inform the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap that there are other countries which place development such as communications and roads on a very low key. Even a very advanced nation like Japan, which everybody accepts as one of the major industrial societies that we have in the world today, had left a lot of their major roads unrepaired ever since the last war because they had to go ahead with priorities of building up the economy which has put the nation where it is today. So sometimes we have to temper our tactical position against our strategic requirements. Our strategy is, as I have said, to exercise through rural industrialization and urbanisation. And now, augmented by a programme of rural organization and urban renewal, to lead towards an integrated urban development. And we must target ourselves to be able to build up a new Malaysian society which is integrated. It would not be meaningful if we spend all our efforts today eventually only to have it disintegrated. But certainly, Sir with the amount of funds available to us, with the resources available to us, we have always to consider whether the opening up of new roads, even without bringing it up to the standards that are required by the J.K.R.—but to just open up so that communications in the rural areas can be obtained so that the rural bodies can reach the market—should have priority over the question of repairing roads. Now, for this reason again I have stated in my speech earlier that Gerakan Pembaharuan is not just for the village people. It is for society as a whole. So if the people come out in the spirit of gotong-royong and work together the Government can give them every assistance to meet their requirements if and when it arises. On the

other hand, on the question of priorities we must be firmly fixed in our objectives of correcting the imbalances through this process of rural industrialization and rural urbanisation. Mr Speaker, Sir, I think that answers most of the questions raised by the Honourable Member. And again I take the opportunity to thank him for participating, at least in rotation.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Not alone like you. With so many people, you alone talk all the time.

Ketua Menteri: Mr Speaker, Sir, I hope that the Honourable Member does not represent a multiplicity of things; what is called "*multum in unum*"—so many in one. So, Mr Speaker, Sir, I take it that that was just meant to be just a nice way of ending up a fairly nice debate. (*Ketawa*).

Soalan dikemukakan dan dipersetujui.

(C) USUL OLEH YANG BERHORMAT ENCIK YEAP GHIM GUAN.

Tuan Speaker: Di bawah Peraturan 35, apabila satu Usul berada di dalam Susunan Urusan Mesyuarat tidak dicadangkan oleh ahli itu pada masa yang ditetapkan, maka tidaklah dapat dibahaskan dan disifatkan bahawa Usul itu sebagai ditarik balik.

Usul ditarik balik.

6. PENANGGUHAN.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Speaker, saya mohon mencadangkan supaya Dewan ini ditangguhkan sekarang.

Ahli Kawasan Kepala Batas (Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Haji Abdullah): Tuan Speaker, saya mohon menyokong.

Ahli Kawasan Balik Pulau (Encik Abdul Rahman bin Haji Yunus): Tuan Speaker, dalam ucapan penangguhan di Dewan sidang kali ini, ingin saya mengembalikan keluhan-keluhan rakyat di luar bandar khususnya di daerah Balik Pulau kepada Ahli-ahli Dewan ini sekarang. Keluhan-keluhan ini telah saya lahirkan disidang yang telah lalu.

Apa yang dimaksudkan ialah undang-undang bangunan sementara di luar bandar.

Tuan Speaker, keadaan memaksa juga bagi saya memberi gambaran-gambaran hidup mereka. Datuk Speaker, keadaan rakyat di luar bandar boleh dikatakan 98% bergantung hidup mereka menjadi petani upahan dan nelayan-nelayan kecil. Hanya dua sumber ini sahaja yang menjadi punca hidup mereka. Sekiranya mahu dikaji dari punca-punca ini tidak memberi jaminan yang tetap pendapatan mereka, malahan selalunya hidup mereka menanggung beban hutang yang tidak habis-habis.

Ini, mereka menghadapi pula satu masaalah lagi iaitu apa yang dimaksudkan ialah dengan rumah-rumah buruk mereka yang tidak sebagaimana sangat. Saya tidak menentang keseluruhan apa yang diwajibkan oleh Majlis Daerah kepada mereka. Dengan kesulitan ini saya menyeru pihak yang berkenaan membuat kajian yang mendalam dalam masaalah ini, terhadap undang-undang bangunan sementara di luar bandar di seluruh Pulau Pinang dan Seberang Perai. Umpamanya di dalam kawasan-kawasan pekan kecil-kecil, di jalan-jalan besar atau main road; ini memanglah logik dengan undang-undang yang dikenakan oleh Majlis Daerah.

Sekiranya keluhan-keluhan ini tidak diindahkan oleh pihak-pihak yang berkenaan dengan masaalah-masaalah ini,

saya dan rakyat di luar bandar menganggap ini bukanlah sebagai nikmat yang diberikan oleh Kerajaan Negeri kepada penduduk-penduduk di luar bandar, bahkan inilah satu beban yang diberi oleh Kerajaan ataupun bala yang diberi oleh Kerajaan Pulau Pinang terhadap rakyat yang ada di luar bandar

Tuan Speaker, terima kasih.

Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Encik Ismail bin Hashim): Datuk Speaker, untuk menjawabkan perkara yang telah pun dibangkitkan oleh Yang Berhormat Ahli dari Kawasan Balik Pulau, saya rasa pihak Kerajaan Negeri sentiasa sedar atas kesusahan yang ditanggungkan oleh rakyat yang ada di dalam Negeri ini; tetapi pihak Kerajaan kita tidaklah berdiam diri dan sentiasa bekerja untuk menyelesaikan masaalah-masaalah yang dihadapi itu.

Berhubung dengan perkara pelan ataupun perkara yang telahpun dibangkitkan oleh Yang Berhormat dari Kawasan Balik Pulau tadi, saya rasa perkara ini telahpun diambil perhatian oleh Majlis Tempatan. Saya rasa perkara yang diragukan oleh Yang Berhormat itu sendiri pada masa ini telahpun selesai.

Dewan ditangguhkan pada jam 3.45 petang.