

18
Jilid III
Bil. 6



Hari Isnin
28hb Mei, 1973

LAPURAN PERSIDANGAN OFFICIAL REPORT

DEWAN UNDANGAN NEGERI PULAU PINANG
YANG KETIGA
THIRD LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY PENANG

PENGGAL YANG KETIGA
Third Session

MESYUARAT YANG PERTAMA
First Meeting

Jilid III
Bil. 6



Hari Isnin
28hb Mei, 1973

LAPURAN PERSIDANGAN
OFFICIAL REPORT

DEWAN UNDANGAN NEGERI PULAU PINANG
YANG KETIGA
THIRD LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY PENANG

PENGGAL YANG KETIGA
Third Session

MESYUARAT YANG PERTAMA
First Meeting

KANDUNGANNYA

USUL DI BAWAH PERATURAN 30 (1) [362]

(1) RANG UNDANG-UNDANG PERBEKALAN TAMBAHAN (1973) (No.1), 1973
[365]

(2) RANG UNDANG-UNDANG ORDINAN PERBANDARAN (PINDAAN)
(PULAU PINANG), 1973 [384]

USUL-USUL [385]

PULAU PINANG

DEWAN UNDANGAN NEGERI YANG KETIGA

Laporan Persidangan

PENGGAL YANG KETIGA
MESYUARAT YANG PERTAMA

Hari Isnin, 28hb Mei, 1973

HAZIR :

Yang Berhormat Ahli Yang Mampengerusikan (Encik Ooh Chooi Cheng, J.P.,
Timbalan Ketua Menteri)

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, J.P.) |
| „ | „ | Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Encik Ismail bin Hashim, J.P.) |
| „ | „ | Kawasan Kepala Batas (Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Haji
Abdullah, A.M.N., J.P.) |
| „ | „ | Kawasan Butterworth (Encik Ooi Ah Bee) |
| „ | „ | 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 <i>alias</i>
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 Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan) |
| „ | „ | Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap) |
| „ | „ | Kawasan Jelutong (Encik Koay Boon Seng) |
| „ | „ | Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin) |
| „ | „ | Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik Veerappen a/k Veerathan) |
| „ | „ | Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How) |
| „ | „ | Kawasan Balik Pulau (Encik Abdul Rahman bin Haji
Yunus) |
| „ | „ | Kawasan Tasek Glugor (Encik Mustapha bin Hussain) |

TIDAK HAZIR :

Yang Berhormat Tuan Speaker (Dato' Harun bin Sirat, D.M.P.N.)

Dewan bersidang semula pada jam 9.49 pagi

DOA

USUL DI BAWAH PERATURAN 30 (1).

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

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I like to ask leave of the House to move an adjournment of the House under Standing Order 30 for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, as laid down in Order 30 (1) of the Standing Orders. The matter in question is the call by the Honourable the Member for Bagan Ajam for an independent Commission of Inquiry to hold a public inquiry into the circumstances under which State land in Chain Ferry Road, Butterworth, was sold to a private developer without calling for tenders and to determine whether there was corruption and/or malpractices and/or maladministration and the decision of the Honourable the Chief Minister to reject this call but instead to refer this matter to the Anti-Corruption Agency.

Honourable Members will appreciate that as this is a subject of public importance the matter should more rightly be resolved by a public inquiry comprising of a Commission headed by a High Court Judge. No one in this House, including the Honourable the Chief Minister, can deny that this is a definite matter of urgent public importance. This is so because the reputation of the State Government is at stake.

Earlier in this session the Honourable the Chief Minister moved the suspension of Standing Orders to enable this House to discuss a matter of urgency—the no-confidence Motion on the Speaker because, according to the Chief Minister, it was urgent because the reputation of the Speaker was at stake.

The urgency and public importance of this State matter lies not so much on the call for a Public Inquiry by the Honourable Member for Bagan Ajam but on the decision of the Honourable

the Chief Minister in rejecting his call, and instead referring this public matter for disposal privately by the Anti-Corruption Agency. As the Honourable the Chief Minister must fully appreciate, the Anti-Corruption Agency is only concerned with investigations to determine whether a *prima facie* case can be made out for prosecution in a Court of law. As corruption is a criminal matter the evidence available must be such as to support the charge beyond reasonable doubt.

As I pointed out on a previous occasion, we are concerned here not with a code of conduct of ordinary people but of politicians, and of politicians holding high office. Politicians holding high office, like Caesar's wife, must be above suspicion. All their actions must not only be right, but be seen to be right.

The complaint is not one of corruption alone, but also of malpractice and maladministration. The Anti-Corruption Agency is only competent to deal with matters pertaining to corruption.

The Honourable the Chief Minister's explanation as to why no tenders were called, and why the land was sold to a nominee of the contractor was unconvincing, and has aroused suspicion that all is not well in the State of Penang. Only a Public Inquiry will give the Government an opportunity to vindicate itself. And I see no reason why the Honourable the Chief Minister should be afraid to avail himself of this opportunity. So I hope Honourable Members in this House will be convinced on the importance and urgency of this move, and will support me to move a Motion in that—

“..... this House resolves that this matter should be a subject for a public inquiry and that a Commission headed by a High Court Judge be appointed forthwith.”

Tuan Speaker: It would appear to me that, first, under Standing Order No. 30 the Speaker must satisfy himself that this matter is a matter of public importance, and urgent; and if so ask the Member to go on with the Motion which he intends to move. The Honourable Member for Ayer Itam

spoke at length to try and convince the Speaker, I suppose, and Members of the House as to the urgency of the matter. This matter of Chain Ferry Road property was the subject of a question—wasn't it?—and also the subject of a speech in the course of debate made by the Member for Bagan Ajam. And the Honourable the Chief Minister in his reply gave reasons for the sale which do not appear to convince certain Members of the House—hence this motion.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Mr Speaker, Sir, may I interrupt you for a moment? Standing Order No. 30 (2) says:

"A Member who wishes so to ask leave to move the adjournment of the House shall before the commencement of the sitting hand to the Speaker a written notification of the matter which he wishes to discuss. The Speaker shall refuse to allow the claim unless he is satisfied that the matter is definite, urgent and of public importance."

In this respect, no doubt, I have expressed my views on this. And I do not know whether you, as Speaker of the House, would like to listen to other Members of this House on this particular point as to whether this particular Motion of mine is of urgency or of no public importance, because you have only heard myself; and perhaps other Members may have ideas on this subject, either against it or for it. Perhaps you would like to hear them before you come to a conclusion.

Tuan Speaker: I think I should be able to make up my mind. Even if I am satisfied that it is of public importance, Subsection (3) of Order No. 30 says:

"If the Speaker is so satisfied and either:

- (a) leave of the House is given, no Member objecting; or
- (b) if it is not so given, at least ten Members rise in their places to support the request;

he shall call on the Member to make the motion forthwith."

Now, even if I am satisfied that it is definite, urgent and of public importance, we still have got the provisions of subsection 3 (a) and 3

(f) to fulfil. Now, as we are going through the subject to assess whether it is of public importance, in a borderline case like this apparently the "public importance," as far as I can see, lies in whether all Members of this House disagree with the explanations given by the Honourable the Chief Minister on the circumstances or the method of the sale of the Chain Ferry Road land. If all the Members are dissatisfied with the answers then this Motion may be allowed. But because it has been very cleverly put that this Motion is not only on corruption but also on the answers given by the Honourable the Chief Minister I will rule that on the surface of it, because there are Members who are dissatisfied with the explanation given by the Honourable the Chief Minister, this request therefore becomes one which I allow. But it still must comply with Standing Order 30 (3) (a) and (b) which read:

"If the Speaker is so satisfied and either:

- (a) leave of the House is given, no Member objecting; or
- (b) if it is not so given, at least ten Members rise in their places to support the request;"

I would go on to Standing Order 30 (3) (a). Can this House give leave without any Member objecting?

Ketua Menteri: Mr Speaker, Sir, I would object. Dengan izin: The reason for my objection is straightforward. This is a matter which was discussed and brought up in debate. The charges that were made Government had indicated Government held with seriousness. And in consequence in this House I gave a full statement with regard to the facts leading up to the sale of the land in Chain Ferry Road. Apart from that, Sir, I on behalf of Government, took a decision that there was no necessity for a Public Inquiry; instead of which, if there were evidence of corruption involving the Political Secretary to the Chief Minister it was the bounden duty of the Honourable Member for Bagan Ajam, both as a citizen and as a Member of this House, to bring it up to the proper authorities. I stated also that I would direct the

attention of the Anti-Corruption Agency to see both the Honourable Member from Bagan Ajam as well as the Honourable Member from Butterworth.

Sir, you will remember that in the course of that very long debate over His Excellency's speech the House had plenty of time to discuss this matter. I think the House will also recall that when the time came for voting the House voted in favour of the Motion. And in so doing also, Sir, you will remember that you yourself asked whether it could be taken that the voice vote therefore indicated a unanimous voice vote in support of the Motion before the House. Under the circumstances, Sir, I say that this House had adequate opportunity to discuss this matter, weigh it thoroughly, and to take a decision in public. This House is the representative Assembly of the people of this State. It is here that we act in public. We have not strayed away from a favourite term of the Honourable Member of Ayer Itam that we should be seen to act accordingly. We have come to the public in public assembly, and acted accordingly. And the House had acted accordingly only before we adjourned to take a unanimous vote. That being so, Sir, I think it is only a further attempt, No. 1, to waste the time of the House to move a Motion at this stage. No. 2, it is an indication of the manner whereby the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam and his colleagues hold decisions—take a decision one day; and less than 72 hours later change their minds. Therefore, Sir, I do not consider that there is any merit at this present time to try to move a Motion which obviously only seeks to show the insincerity of the way in which the Members of the Opposition of the House had acted on the debate on the previous Motion.

Tuan Speaker: There being an objection (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Mr Speaker, Sir, you must give me an opportunity to reply.

Tuan Speaker: We are taking it under 30 (3) (a)—leave of the House being given, no Member objecting. Now there is a Member objecting. Therefore we go on to . . . (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): In the course of giving his reasons for objecting the Honourable the Chief Minister is misleading the House. There was no substantive Motion on the decision.

Tuan Speaker: May I ask the Ahli dari Ayer Itam to sit down when I speak? You were given a chance to talk; to give the reasons why this Motion of yours was urgent and definite and of public importance. Now there is objection; therefore we now go to 30 (3) (b)—‘if it is not so given, at least ten Members rise in their places to support the request;’

Will those who support the request rise in their places? (Ahli Kawasan Kelawei—Encik Yeap Ghim Guan, Ahli Kawasan Jelutong—Encik Koay Boon Seng, Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam—Encik Tan Phock Kin, Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap—Encik V. Veerappen dan Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam—Encik Ong Yi How, berdiri di tempat masing-masing.)

Tuan Speaker: Only five.

Setiausaha Dewan: Lima orang sokong.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, with your permission: We on this side of the House need explanation, especially we on this side, as to why we are standing. We are not going to just stand up and merely be counted. The Chief Minister has been given the privilege of explaining his objection.

Tuan Speaker: Will the Honourable Member please sit down and let me explain. We are acting strictly according to Standing Order 30 (3) (b).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, if that is so true the Chief Minister should have been allowed only to say, ‘I object’; and he should have sat down. And it is for us to say something now.

Tuan Speaker: I gave the Honourable mover the opportunity to speak.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): I agree. But we on this side should also be allowed to say why we stood up.

Tuan Speaker: No. Please sit down when I speak. This request is denied.

Usul tidak dibenarkan.

Tuan Speaker: We carry on with the business of the House.

5. RANG UNDANG-UNDANG.

(1) Rang Undang-Undang Perbekalan Tambahan (1973) (No. 1), 1973.

Bacaan Yang Pertama

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua saya memohon mencadangkan supaya Rang Undang-undang bernama "Suatu Enakmen bagi menggunakan wang daripada kumpulan wang disatukan untuk perbelanjaan tambahan bagi perkhidmatan tahun 1973 dan bagi memperuntukan wang itu bagi maksud-maksud yang tertentu" dibacakan bagi kali yang pertama.

Ahli Kawasan Glugor (Encik D. C. Stewart): Tuan Speaker saya mohon menyokong.

Rang Undang-undang dibacakan bagi kali yang pertama.

Tuan Speaker: Bacaan kali yang kedua hari apa?

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua sekarang juga.

Tuan Speaker: Baiklah.

Bacaan Yang Kedua

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya mohon mengusul supaya suatu Rang Undang-Undang yang bertajuk "Suatu Enakmen bagi menggunakan wang daripada kumpulan wang yang disatukan untuk perbelanjaan tambahan bagi perkhidmatan tahun 1973 dan bagi memperuntukan wang itu bagi maksud-maksud yang tertentu" dibacakan bagi kali yang kedua.

Tuan Yang Dipertua tujuan Rang Undang-Undang ini ialah untuk memberi kuasa berkanun kepada Kerajaan Negeri untuk mengadakan perbelanjaan tambahan sebanyak \$7,744,961. bagi perkhidmatan tahun 1973. Butir-butir lanjut mengenai perbelanjaan ini bersama-sama dengan keterangannya adalah dibentangkan di dalam Dewan ini sebagai risalah Bil. 1 tahun 1973.

Tuan Yang Dipertua Rang Undang-Undang ini mengadakan 5 Kepala-Kepala Kecil mengenai perbelanjaan luar jangka yang mana peruntukan-peruntukan telah tidak termasuk di dalam Enakmen Perbekalan tahun 1973. Perkara-perkara ini ialah seperti berikut:

- (1) Pecahan Kepala 1,200 di bawah Parit dan Taliair. Pecahan Kepala ini dengan peruntukan tender sebanyak \$10 sahaja diadakan untuk membolehkan pegawai yang mengawal untuk memindahkan peruntukan daripada Pecahan Kepala yang lain bagi menemui bayaran elaun-elaun dobi bagi kakitangan yang berpakaian seragam.
- (2) Pecahan Kepala ialah 1,200 di bawah Bomba. Peruntukan Tambahan sebanyak \$17,200 adalah diperlukan untuk menemui bayaran-bayaran Tunggakan dan Elaun-Elaun Perumahan sekarang untuk Ahli Bomba yang tidak dicadangkan dengan rumah-rumah kediaman.
- (3) Pecahan 11, 1,100 dan 1,300 di bawah Hal Ehwal Ugama dan Mahkamah-Mahkamah—
 - (a) Peruntukan Tambahan sebanyak \$757,873. ini adalah diperlukan untuk membayar Tunggakan-Tunggakan dan Gaji-Gaji yang telah disemak semula kepada 144 Guru-Guru Sekolah Ugama di bawah Lapuran Aziz; dan
 - (b) Bayaran bahagian Kerajaan terhadap Carum

Kumpulan Wang Simpanan Pekerja sejumlah \$39,878 hasil daripada tambahan di dalam gaji-gaji Guru-Guru Sekolah Agama; dan

- (4) Pecahan Kepala 5,500 di bawah Perbendaharaan perkara-perkara perbelanjaan yang terbesar di bawah Pecahan Kepala ini terdiri daripada—

(a) Bantuan tambahan sebanyak \$1,700,000 kepada pihak berkuasa air untuk menemui kekurangan yang dijangkakan tahun ini selepas mengambil pertimbangan mengenai bayaran-bayaran balik pinjaman yang akan dibuat kepada Kerajaan Pusat hasil daripada Projek Bekalan Air Sungai Muda;

(b) Bantuan sebanyak \$180,000 kepada pihak Berkuasa Air bagi pembangunan dan perkhidmatan-perkhidmatan bekalan air Kawasan Perusahaan Mak Mandin yang diperlukan dengan adanya pertubuhan industri-industri yang terbesar di dalam kawasan ini; dan

(c) Bantuan sebanyak \$50,000 kepada Perbadanan Perpustakaan Umum Negeri. Bagi Perpustakaan Negeri Tuan Yang Dipertua, Rang Undang-Undang ini dengan itu meminta kuasa berkanun bagi perkara-perkara perbelanjaan untuk menambah pada peruntukan-peruntukan dengan dibuat di bawah Enakmen Perbekalan 1973.

Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya mohon mencadang.

Ahli Kawasan Glugor (Encik D. C. Stewart): Tuan Speaker, saya mohon menyokong.

Tuan Speaker: Masaalah yang kita hadapi sekarang ialah Rang Undang-Undang yang dibawa oleh Yang Amat Berhormat Ketua Menteri dan disokong.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, dengan izin: Mr Speaker, Sir, this First Supplementary Estimates presented by the Government is totally without any merits, and displays once again the shoddy presentation of Annual Estimates in this House by the Coalition Government. And it also shows that after 4 years of government the Members of the front benches are unable to forecast accurately the Estimates of the State; and shows a total lack of confidence on the part of the Government; and a total lack of experience in spite of having the opportunity to present at least three previous Budgets.

Sir, supplementary budgets have now become a device and a method under which the Government appears to present annually fairly balances budgets; but it then comes subsequently to this House and attempts to slip in further budgetary provisions which they should have foreseen in presenting the original Budget.

Sir, one cannot say that the majority of the Votes sought today by the Government are not capable of projection in the original Estimates. In fact I would say that the majority of the provisions as presented by the Government today should have been easily foreseen. I would like to refer for instance to the \$10 vote for Parit and Taliair which the Chief Minister says is for the purpose of Dhoby Allowance which was provided under a different object. I see no reason why, in fact if this is an admission of a mistake, this should have been done. And this indicates and substantiates my point that Members of the Government are not that experienced, and not exercising sufficient control over the Budget of the State when they do present an original Budget.

Sir, this particular Bill that is presented carries a provision for

\$2,744,961, bringing the total budgetary deficit to \$2,848,462. And, Sir, this is by no means the last Supplementary Budget for 1973 that we will have to deal with in this House. And I think we must brace ourselves for further Supplementary Budgets.

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Members, I wish that all Honourable Members will participate in the debate today. But I also hope that Honourable Members will confine themselves to the subject under debate—that is, the Bill, and to the subject that comes under the Bill—Fire Brigade. They should confine themselves strictly to the Bill as presented.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): I hope, Mr Speaker, Sir, you are not implying that I have strayed.

Tuan Speaker: No. But just now you went out a little bit.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Yes, I am just giving the principle involved here.

Sir, I believe that before the end of the year there will at least be another Supplementary Budget. And in fact, Sir, if we look at the provision that had been applied for in another allocation of \$3,200 for Bomba it clearly indicates in sufficient comprehension at the time of estimating for the 1973 Budget, so that this provision could have been taken into account.

Another provision, Sir, which we find may indicate that the Honourable the Chief Minister's Government approaches the annual Budget carelessly is this provision of \$757,873 under Pejabat Ugama—Hal Ehwal Ugama and Mahkamah. I do not see why these Estimates could not have been forecast, again in view of the fact that Government obviously has made up its mind to accept the Aziz Report. And the consequential additional estimates in the sum of \$39,000 for E.P.F. could also have been foreseen. Why were these not presented and included in the Estimates? Was it in order that the 1973 Estimates would look better, more

balanced; would not look so distorted or so unbalanced as we see now, so that the Government could have in 1973 passed a Budget without debate, and claimed that it has done that with only a deficit of one hundred . . . (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member for Kelawei, I think that is irrelevant. The substance of your argument so far has been that you are against the conduct of the preparation of the Budget as a whole. But you do not appear to be against the provision.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): We are going towards that.

Tuan Speaker: Please go straight on.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Yes. And in doing so I would just draw the House's attention to the fact that when the Budget was originally passed it had only \$103,000 deficit; but today we find that it is now going to a \$2,848,462 deficit. So I say that this in fact is the manner in which the Government seeks to conceal. If this is deliberate then they had in fact presented a deficit Budget for 1973; a highly unbalanced Budget. And if not then they have not had sufficient understanding of the Estimates which they presented to this House, and just glossed over the Estimates, presented them to this House, and subsequently come, as they do now; and will come subsequently within the next six months—at least by December—and present another Supplementary Budget.

Sir, the provision of \$1.7 million for the Water Authority. And here, according to the Chief Minister, to meet its expected deficit this year after taking into consideration the loan repayments to be made to the Federal Government arising out of the Muda River Water Supply Project. Now, these are his own words—'expected deficits'. Now, if these deficits have been expected, why were they not forecast at the beginning? Or are his words incidentally slips? If they were expected then they should have been included—\$1.7 million; not \$1,700. And we presume, Sir, that there were prior agreements. We are

bound by agreement to pay these amounts by way of loan repayments to the Federal Government. These are agreements which have not been entered into last month only. And why were these things not included in the 1973 Budget? It is inexcusable, Sir, for the Government to come to this House now to ask for this Vote; and this should have been included in the 1973 Budget.

Sir, we can at least appreciate and be sympathetic perhaps to the \$180,000 for extension to water supply to Mak Mandin. This may add to something. And perhaps the \$50,000 for the Library Project. But on this, of course, we are giving the benefit of the doubt to the Government because even then those things should have been looked into. They should have studied—allocations for these particular requirements. But even then at least there is something. But, as I said, all the other provisions should have been anticipated, definitely. Compare that miserable grant of \$50,000 for the State Library Corporation for improvement of the State Library with better facilities when it moves into its new premises at Dewan Sri Pinang, which is supposed to help towards the education of our population, particularly the younger ones, to a similar allocation of \$50,000—Of course, the Member for Tanjong Barat will say that that \$50,000 may be recovered. We do not know—to the Grand Prix for two days' racing. Sir, we spend \$50,000 for one year's Library facilities; or for more than one year perhaps. At least for one year's allocation the Members of the Government think that \$50,000 is enough. Sir, I really doubt whether the Members of the Government understand their priorities, and appreciate what are the things that are of importance to this State, and what are the things that are not important. I think they are not aware of their responsibility when they pass and make allocations like this in this House.

Sir, just in passing, to touch on a few of these Heads that have been raised in this House. I hope, Sir, that the Library, which we have had the chance to deal with but briefly, in the previous debate

will definitely be forthcoming. I hope that at least some priority will be given to this. If the State can go out of its way to remove a traffic island, to spend a lot of money, and cause inconvenience to the general public over a Grand Prix, I see no reason why some priority cannot be given to this Library Project. And I am sure that this is a project which the people of Penang really look forward to. They do not look forward to a Grand Prix. They look forward to a simple premises to house a Library. We have in this House passed a Bill to benefit the public. And I hope that by the next Sitting, if and when we have it, we in this House will not have to again stand up here and say that the Library is not in existence at the new premises. We also hope that provisions of this nature will have priorities. And I say 'provisions of this nature' in view of what we learnt about the difficulties experienced by another Library over on the mainland which it has been said may have to close down. I do not want to deviate too much. But here is also an indication on the sense of priorities, which comes first to the Government.

Sir, it is very clear that at the half-way point of this year the Government is not able to balance its Budget; and it is already in the red by \$2.8 million. We condemn this lack of budgetary control, and the continued reliance on deficit spending in this State. We want to ask how long Penang can continue to eat into its reserves, and how long we can continue to present these 'red' Accounts to this House. We would ask the Honourable the Chief Minister and his colleagues to exercise greater control over the finances of this State. And if at all there is a need to have Supplementary Budgets these must be Supplementary Budgets arising in the course of policy changes and innovations which had not been foreseen when the Budgets were being prepared. Not something that they clearly had the capacity—or should have the capacity if they are people in whom we can have confidence—to have forecast. I hope that in the future we do not have to deal with matters of this nature; and we have something of greater value to spend our time on.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Tuan Speaker, saya minta kebenaran bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise to comment on the Supplementary Supply, 1973, No. 1, Bill of 1973; and in so doing to merely confine myself to comments on two Heads, namely Head S. 11 which relates to Religious Affairs and Courts, and Head S. 14 with regard to the Treasury.

Under Head S. 11 a sum of \$797,751 is required for purposes of paying arrears of salaries, and revised salaries of 144 Religious School Teachers in Penang and Province Wellesley under the Aziz Report, as well as increased Government share of the E.P.F. contributions. While this is merely a matter of implementing the Aziz Report, it is important that the State Government should look more closely into the administration of the Religious Council in the light of the Report of the Auditor-General, so that appropriate action can be taken to assist the Religious Council to conform with the requirements of the Auditor-General and the law. In paragraph 73 of the Auditor-General's Report on the non-submission of Accounts by the Religious Affairs Council, Penang, it is stated—and I quote—"There continues to be delays in submission of Accounts by the Religious Affairs Council. The Accounts for 1969, 1970 and 1971 have not yet been submitted for audit". I am sure Honourable Members will agree that this is a serious state of affairs which must be rectified at the earliest possibility. If accounting staff is needed by the Religious Affairs Department, I think the State Government should see to it that they are supplied with adequate staff as substantial public funds are involved.

Under Head S. 14 a sum of \$1,930,000 is required by the Treasury for the following purposes: An additional grant of \$1.7 million to the Water Authority to meet expected deficit this year; a grant of \$180,000 to the Water Authority for development and extension of water supply to Mak Mandin industrial area; and a grant

of \$50,000 to the State Library Corporation when it moves to the Dewan Sri Pinang. As I shall be moving a Motion on the increased water tariff I shall only confine myself to the question of valuation of City Council assets by the Water Authority. As the deficit only takes into consideration the loan repayments to be made to the Federal Government, apparently no provisions is made with regard to the payment to the City Council for assets taken over. The ratepayers of George Town would therefore like to know on what valuation the assets of the Water Department are taken over. Are they paid for in cash? If not, is interest paid? And if so, at what rates? As no provisions have so far been made to pay for the assets or interest thereon, one can only conclude that the take-over is done in the usual haphazard manner, without any provisions made for any repayment. I must remind the Honourable the Chief Minister that though he may have the ultimate say in both the City Council and the State Water Authority these two organisations are two distinct legal entities. And in this respect Section 13 (2) of the Penang Water Authority Enactment, 1972, provides for the Authority to pay the City Council as compensation for the transfer of the water undertakings such sum as may be agreed between them by negotiation. So we are entitled to know. Has there been any negotiation? And if so, what is the conclusion reached in this negotiation? What was the price agreed upon? So, even if negotiation is being conducted we have this anomalous position whereby the same person is concerned with both organisations; or perhaps the same person has the ultimate say in the two organisations. Even on the question of the Chief Administrative Officer we have the same person. The present General Manager of the Water Authority was the former Municipal Water Engineer. And he is the one who is most concerned with valuation. And there you have the anomalous position of the same person holding two positions. And when it comes to the other Authority, the ultimate Authority, it lies in the

Chief Minister himself. The Chief Minister is responsible for determining the policy of the Water Authority. He is responsible for nominating people to the Water Authority. And he will see to it that people nominated to the Water Authority will conform to Government policy. And one of the crucial issues is the question of valuation. And in that respect the people of George Town have a stake in the Water Authority.

And there was one provision in the Water Authority Enactment which says that assets taken over shall be valued at book value, whereas this particular section 13 (2) says it shall be done by negotiations. So it appears to me that there is an underlying intention to take over the assets at as cheap as possible a price, and at its book value. And in this respect I would like to remind the Honourable the Chief Minister that Article 13 (2) of the Federal Constitution provides that no law shall provide for the compulsory acquisition or use of property without adequate compensation. This is the safeguarding of fundamental property rights of the individual. And here again acquisition of the assets of the City Council, in my view, comes under this category of acquisition. The City Council is entirely a different entity. It is the property of none other than the ratepayers of George Town. And as such they must be adequately compensated. And in that respect I would like to know what the valuation is. Has any conclusion been reached on the valuation?

We know today that the Water Authority is already in existence. They have taken over the City Council Water Department. In fact the staff of the City Council are most concerned. They belonged to the Municipal Services Union before. And they were told quite abruptly by the Government that they can no longer be members of the Municipal Services Union. This, to my mind, is very blatantly ignoring the trade union policy of the Federal Government with whom the Honourable the Chief Minister claims to be working in very close conformity. And here the staff of the Water Department are most

concerned. Now they are put in a position in which they have no union to make representations with regard to their conditions of employment. This is a very sorry state of affairs. I think that the authorities concerned should remedy this defect at the earliest possible opportunity. So, I like to end this very brief comment on the Water Department by telling the Chief Minister that if he should choose to ignore the law he shall be doing so at his own peril.

Now I come to the \$50,000 grant to the Penang Library Corporation. As pointed out by the Honourable Member for Kelawei, it is a small sum indeed. And in this respect I like to ask the Honourable the Chief Minister whether the State is really serious about running a free Public Library as envisaged by the Penang Library Corporation Enactment, 1972; and by members of the Corporation. If that is so the \$50,000 is a mere drop in the ocean, and can hardly provide for the facilities of a free public library worthy of its name.

And in this respect if we turn to the Public Library Corporation Enactment, and look at the objectives of the Corporation we will appreciate that as far as the Government is concerned, and more particularly where the members of the Corporation are concerned, they are envisaging big things by the Corporation. And I will read to the House, to refresh the memory of the Honourable the Chief Minister, that the functions of the Corporation shall be to establish, manage and maintain the Penang Public Library in George Town; to promote and encourage reading, particularly in the National Language. And here I must point out that the Penang Library, which is the Library taken over by the Public Library Corporation, was a Library predominantly in the English language. And if it is going to fulfil its second objective of encouraging reading in the National Language obviously it must require the money—first of all, a capital grant to buy various books in Bahasa Malaysia; secondly, the staff and the equipment in the form of recurrent expenditure to maintain this particular department;

and, thirdly, to do all such matters and things as are reasonably necessary for the exercise and performance of all of the purposes of the Enactment.

And here the ambitious plan lies in the powers. And if we look at the powers it is stated here among the powers of the Library Corporation—"to establish, manage and maintain branches of the Public Library in any part of the State" So you find here an extension of the activities of the old Penang Library which is just a single library in Penang. The authors of the Enactment envisaged that we would have to expand. So, as a State Library worthy of its name it must provide facilities not only in George Town but throughout the State. And as a result of this it provides for the maintenance of mobile libraries. So, in other words, they are thinking of the people in the kampungs and in the outskirts. We must have vehicles to transport books to the people; and not expect the people to come to the Library. And the third power is to purchase, exchange, borrow and receive books and other movable properties incidental to the establishment and management of the Public Library and other branches thereof; purchase, exchange, lease and hold land and other buildings and other immovable property; take over any existing libraries in the State with the consent of such library. And here, I think, with regard to the Butterworth Library it is the intention that this particular library shall eventually be taken over by the State Library Corporation. And these are just a few of its objectives. And surely the Chief Minister is not serious to think that the Penang Library can run with a \$50,000 grant from the State Government and yet do all the things that are provided for in the Enactment. If the State is expecting that the State Library Corporation is to run a Library on the same basis as the old Penang Library, providing the same facilities, then I think it is misleading the people in passing an Enactment of this nature. The State Government must be serious. If it is going to do a thing it must do it properly. And you can't run a Library with a mere \$50,000. The running and maintenance

costs of the Library in Dewan Sri Pinang alone will absorb the \$50,000, leaving nothing for the purchase of books or for additional facilities. Even the Honourable the Chief Minister in the course of answering questions the other day mentioned that according to the Budget for this year the Penang Library requires more than \$50,000. So, where is the balance of the money to come from? This I submit is a very serious matter. And it is no wonder that the members of the Library Corporation took such a long time to decide to move from their present building to the Dewan Sri Pinang.

And there we have in the Dewan Sri Pinang valuable space unutilised for nearly two years. So this is the state of affairs we have. Where is the planning? The Honourable the Chief Minister cannot tell us that he did not know that the Library is to move into the Dewan Sri Pinang as soon as it is completed. He cannot tell us that he is ignorant of all these facts. In fact he has been told about this by the Committee of the former Penang Library. In fact the Committee of the former Penang Library made great efforts to get the State Government even to pass the Public Library Corporation Enactment. And it was only after pursuing the matter for quite some time that it was eventually passed. And even after the passage the next thing is the money. And if the Chief Minister is going to take this particular attitude he should not have passed the Enactment. And he should not mislead the people into believing that he is serious in wanting to have a Public Library for the State. So, I earnestly urge the Chief Minister to give second thoughts to this matter. And unless an assurance comes from the State Government of increased subsidy for recurrent expenditure I am afraid the people of Penang—and perhaps most of all members of the Library Corporation—will be very sadly disappointed.

It is a pity that the Honourable Member for Dhoby Ghaut, who is the Chairman of the Library Corporation, is not here to tell us more about the requirements and the needs of the Library,

because this is an occasion, more than any other occasion, where a Supplementary Budget is passed for the Library Corporation. And being the Chairman I feel that it is incumbent on him to be here to tell the Honourable the Chief Minister what are his needs. I am sure that the present provision is far from being adequate. And it is my earnest hope that the Honourable the Chief Minister will give very serious consideration to this point; and perhaps come to this House subsequently for an increased supplementary grant to the Library Corporation.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Tuan Speaker, saya minta izin supaya bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise to participate in the debate on this Supplementary Supply Bill by making a few comments. Firstly, as was pointed out by the Honourable Member for Kelawei, this Supplementary Supply Bill showing a total amount of 2.744 million dollars shows that the way the Government prepared the 1973 Budget has been a blunder; and also very unrealistic. I believe that when the Government prepared the 1973 Budget they knew very well that the Water Authority would need this money—1.7 million dollars. And also they should have had full knowledge that the Library is moving into the Dewan Sri Pinang. And therefore that amount of 1.93 million dollars should have been included in this year's Budget when they prepared it last year.

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member for Bagan Ajam, all the points you mention now have already been mentioned by you yourself. So let's not mention what has been mentioned two or three times before. Let's follow Standing Orders. I see that you have certain notes. I will let you go on. I do not want to throw you off your balance. But get back to the right track.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): I believe the reason why the Honourable the Chief Minister and his Government did not want

to include this large deficit in the last year's Budget is that they are afraid that people will know that there is going to be a big deficit for 1973.

Mr Speaker, Sir, another comment I would like to make is that out of 2.744 million dollars the sum of 1.93 million dollars was made as grants to the Water Authority and the Library Corporation. That leaves something like \$814,000 for salaries only. And this is a very big amount. Well, when we go through the whole Budget for 1973 we also note that a large amount of money has been provided for salaries and 'gaji-gaji' of the Penang State Government. Here I must call upon the Government to mobilise its machinery so as to provide courteous, efficient and honest services to our people in Penang. For all these years I have kept reminding the Government that it will be a complete failure on the part of Government if Government cannot discipline its officers to give people services with courtesy and efficiency. So long as the people in our State feel a sense of fear and hesitation to go and see our Government officers the Government will be failing in its duty. On many occasions I have been asked by the people of my constituency to accompany them to see Government officers for the paying of land rent, and other things. I have asked them: Why don't you go by yourself? You can talk to them, just the same as I do. You should go to see them yourselves. The answer was (gangguan).

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member, strictly for record purposes, we are on the Supplementary Budget. I don't think it covers anything in the Land Office.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): I am talking about Departments such as the Land Office.

Tuan Speaker: I would rather that you confine yourself to the Departments that are now the subjects of the Supplementary Bill.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Yes, Sir. Well, I have asked them: Why don't you go to see officers alone? And the answer they

have given is that they cannot face the ordeal of having to be examined by the officers of Government Departments. Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not really agree with the kind of general talk about Government officers, because many of them are doing their job with sincerity and honesty. But I would like the Members of this House to make a very close watch on the Government machinery so that they can provide our people with efficient and honest work.

Mr Speaker, Sir, another item on this Supplementary Bill is the Token Vote of \$10 for dhoby allowance for the Department of Parit dan Taliair. Sir, it is most disappointing because the Butterworth people are always made to suffer during the heavy raining season. For example, in my constituency there is a river running parallel to Raja Uda Road and Bagan Jermal Road. And that river has never been well looked after. During the rainy season the river usually overflows.

Mr Speaker, Sir, again, the culvert for the river at Telaga Ayer Road has been very much too small to allow the bodies of dead pigs and dead cows to go through. And when the culvert is jammed the whole place is flooded. Mr Speaker, Sir, similarly with a case in Bagan Ajam where there are no proper drains. During the rainy season the whole of Bagan Ajam in front of the Golden Sands Night Club is always flooded. And the same things also happen in Sungei Puyu where also there are no proper drains.

Well, the Honourable the Chief Minister himself was aware how much the people had to suffer in the year 1970 when places near Tasek Glugor and Bumbong Lima were flooded, and so many people were made homeless. But here I can see that the Honourable the Chief Minister has been sitting tight, and doing nothing about that at all.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the next item on this Supplementary Supply Bill is the additional allowance for the staff of Bomba Department. Here I wish also to make a little comment on the Department of Bomba in Butterworth. I would like to cite one incident that happened two years ago, when the

store of a factory of Chinese joser paper manufacturers caught fire. Mr Speaker, Sir, when I received a telephone call I immediately called '999', and got in touch with the Fire Brigade and the Police Department. Then after the telephone calls I rushed to the scene of the fire. With much regret, the fire engine was not there yet. Here I must say that I fully realise that the work of the Fire Brigade Department is very tedious. All the members of the Fire Brigade have to keep themselves alert every hour of the year. And I hope their services are not required by the public. But when their services are required they should rush there sooner than anybody else.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the next item in the Supplementary Supply Bill is \$1.7 million to the Water Authority to help to make loan repayments for its capital investments. Mr Speaker, Sir, here again I would like to urge, firstly, the Honourable the Chief Minister to approach the Federal Government for the grant for this Authority so that we in our State do not have to bear all the responsibilities to finance this Water Authority. Secondly, I also wish to urge the Honourable the Chief Minister to approach the Federal Government for deferred repayment for the loan we have taken from them.

Also, there is an item for providing as a grant \$180,000 to the Water Authority for the development and extension of water supply services to the Mak Mandin Industrial Estate, necessitated by the establishment of major industries in this area. Mr Speaker, Sir, here I feel that we can do something by asking these big industrialists to make advance payment to the Water Authority for the projects of laying the pipes to supply water to their factories.

Mr Speaker, Sir, again I would like to comment on the appointments to the Board of the Water Authority. It is observed that the Honourable the Chief Minister, as the Chairman of the Board, has adopted a great deal of favouritism attitude. Mr Speaker, Sir, if you look through the list of the appointments to the Board of the Water Authority we

see that many of his good friends are appointed to the Board. And I regret (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: Mr Honourable Member, I think this is very irrelevant to the Budget itself. There have been questions asked, and questions answered. I don't see how the appointment of members has anything to do with the giving of the grant.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Mr Speaker, Sir, surely we can comment on the Water Authority Board as a whole.

Tuan Speaker: Oh, yes. We are talking about the grant; but not on the Board as a whole.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Yes. I will take your ruling, Sir.

Tuan Speaker, Sir, this type of favouritism attitude should not exist in our State because it will destroy the whole Government Machinery one day.

Mr Speaker, Sir, now coming to the \$50,000 grant for the State Library Corporation. Well, a lot of comments have come from this side from the previous speakers, so I would not like to comment how small and how much delayed is the provision of this money for the State Library Corporation. Here I must urge the State Library Corporation to take immediate steps to take over the Butterworth Library, as we have seen in the newspaper that the Library is running into great difficulty. And if nothing has been done, and nothing will be done for this Library it has to close down next month.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to take this opportunity just to bring to the attention of the House how this Butterworth Library was formed. When the Alliance Government was in power in Butterworth Council—and I must congratulate the Alliance people because (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: I think this is also very irrelevant. (*ketawa*) You said just now that you accept my ruling; but you

go on being irrelevant. I think from now, if you accept my ruling, please act accordingly.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): I do, Mr Speaker, Sir.

Now, what I wanted to say is a little bit of history of the library.

Tuan Speaker: No. We all know the history of the library. (*ketawa*) You have brought us to the point where you say they are going bankrupt, and they may have to stop next month. You have gone on to urge the Penang Library Corporation to help them. So what else have you got to say about that library in connection with the Penang Library Corporation? Have you any further points connected with the Corporation?

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Mr Speaker, Sir, I feel that if no step is taken by the State Library Corporation to take over this library it has to close down.

Tuan Speaker: You have said that before.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): The library is the way to supply food for the brains of our people in Butterworth. And if it is to close down I am holding the Honourable the Chief Minister responsible for the closing down of that library. The Alliance Government started it. The Coalition Government (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member, please sit down. Don't talk about who started it, and this and that. You said you accepted my ruling.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): So I am hoping that the State Library Corporation will take immediate steps to help the Butterworth Library to get out of trouble.

Mr Speaker, Sir, finally I do urge the Government to examine again the working machinery of each of the Departments when they make provisions for that Department, and to see that the working machinery of that Department is really standing up to the expectations of all the people in Penang.

Thank you very much.

Dewan ditangguhkan pada jam 11.10 pagi.

Dewan bersidang semula pada jam 11.40 pagi.

Ahli Kawasan Dhoby Ghaut (Encik Khoo Teng Chye): Tuan Speaker, saya minta izin bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

Tuan Yang Dipertua, everybody seems to be very interested that I should speak, although I thought that silence is golden. I am very pleased indeed to rise and speak on this Supplementary Bill because in this Bill there is a provision of \$50,000 as an initial grant for the Penang Library Corporation; and I must thank the Government for providing this sum. This \$50,000 is to assist the Library Corporation as an initial grant on a dollar-to-dollar basis of the \$50,000 from the Federal Government. And I am of the view that the Government cannot provide a single cent more than what the Federal Government provides, in this Bill, because, as I have stated, this is a dollar-to-dollar basis.

I would like to inform this House, and particularly Honourable Members of the Opposition, that so far we have received a capital grant of \$50,000 from the Federal Government as part of the Second Malaysia Development Plan; and we shall be receiving this \$50,000 initial grant from the State Government. In addition to that we are also receiving another \$50,000 from the State Government—although by instalments—making a total of \$150,000 for 1973.

Mr Speaker, Sir, \$150,000 as a kick-off to move over to Dewan Sri Pinang, in my view, is just sufficient, but not really good enough to start a Public Library where we can improve on the lending service of the Library when it was a Library but not a Corporation. As I said, I think it would be enough for 1973 because our operation expenditure for 1973 will be around \$70,000 to \$80,000; but now we have \$150,000. Therefore, I think it will be quite sufficient for 1973. But I do not know about 1974 because in 1974 we

shall not, I think, be receiving the capital grant from the Federal Government and the \$50,000 initial grant from the State Government, leaving only \$50,000 if the State Government continues to give only \$50,000 as operational grant. Therefore I urge the Government to consider seriously increasing the operational grant of \$50,000 to perhaps a minimum of \$100,000 in order that the Library Corporation can function efficiently in Dewan Sri Pinang. When I ask for \$100,000 I don't think it is excessive because other libraries like the Ipoh Library are running with a budget of about \$200,000; and in Sarawak the Library is being run with a budget of about \$500,000. Therefore, as we always say that Penang leads, I hope that the State Government will not lag behind as compared to other States

I would like to speak a little about the Butterworth Library. The Butterworth Library is really in a mess. They have invited members of the Corporation to be present at one of their Meetings; and we had a lengthy discussion.

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member from Dhoby Ghaut, could you confine your talk on the Butterworth Library to its relationship to the Corporation, because that part has been brought up by the Member for Bagan Ajam. He may want to know about it only as far as that.

Ahli Kawasan Dhoby Ghaut (Encik Khoo Teng Chye): We have been approached by the Butterworth Library to take over. But the Corporation has considered very seriously this matter of taking over, and we have come to the conclusion that until and unless the Butterworth Library is prepared to be taken over by the Library Corporation on a clean slate it will be very difficult for us to take it over. As I mentioned earlier, we have just sufficient for 1973. And until and unless we have been promised by the Government that there will be an additional operational grant given to us it will be very difficult for us to take over the Butterworth Library,

particularly when we are now in the stage of consolidating our position in Penang.

I think a lot of Members on the opposite side would be interested to know that the Library will be moved over to the Dewan Sri Pinang by July this year. We have not been able to move earlier because minor works have to be carried out by the J.K.R. I understand that they have called for tenders, and these additional and minor works will be completed in due course. Until such time we are not able to move over.

Although I have asked for an increased operational grant from \$50,000 to \$100,000, I think I am duty bound to make suggestions as to the way in which the Government can increase the State's revenue. If I am allowed to give a few suggestions on how to improve on the State's revenue, I would mention that the big single item in the State's revenue consists of Capitation Grant and Road Grants from the Federal Government. Mr Speaker Sir, I refer to Article 109 of the Federal Constitution, under State Grants, which states:

- “(a) a grant, to be known as a capitation grant which shall be calculated in accordance with the provisions of Part I of the Tenth Schedule;
- (b) a grant for the maintenance of State roads, to be known as the State road grant, which shall be calculated in accordance with the provisions of Part II of that Schedule.”

These two Parts give us a total of something like 7½ million dollars—the single biggest item in the State Revenue. And the first part, this Capitation Grant, is derived from a per capita basis. It is worked out on the first 50,000 at \$15 per person, the next 200,000 persons at the rate of \$10 per person, and the remainder at \$4 per person. Mr Speaker, Sir, this Article was written in 1957, which is about 15 years ago. Since then the gross national product of this country has increased, say at an average of 6 per cent, which will give us an increase of about 100 per cent. Therefore today the State Government has every right to make a request to have this amended.

Instead of \$15 per person for the first 50,000 persons we could easily ask for \$30. And that rate goes on—instead of \$10 we can ask for \$20. I would urge the Government to form an Action Committee immediately, consisting of Members of the Government and the State Financial Officer, to discuss and study seriously the G.N.P. of Penang; and then make a strong request to increase or to amend these multiplier indices. The multiplier index of 14, 10 is really not applicable to the G.N.P. of the whole country or, for that matter, the State of Penang.

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member from Dhoby Ghaut, can you reconcile all that you have said with the subject under discussion?

Ahli Kawasan Dhoby Ghaut (Encik Khoo Teng Chye): Yes, because in the subject I asked for an increase. I said that it is not correct to simply ask; but I must make suggestions. That is why I think that this is very important. I am giving a constructive suggestion. I would not like Members on the opposite side always to make a lot of noise.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, I think that is an imputation. I think you are right in asking the Member to be relevant. We like to encourage them. But not (gangguan).

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Members, will you please sit down. We are discussing the Supplementary Budget involving certain particular items, and the subject of the Corporation. Let's confine ourselves to the business before this House.

Ahli Kawasan Dhoby Ghaut (Encik Khoo Teng Chye): This Supplementary Budget is connected with our State Budget. And the matter which I have just brought up is connected with the State Budget.

Tuan Speaker: No. Is the Supplementary Budget connected with the State Budget in so far as this particular item of expenditure is concerned?

Ahli Kawasan Dhoby Ghaut (Encik Khoo Teng Chye): If you rule that I am not allowed to speak on this subject then I won't. But I think that I am merely making a suggestion to help the State in asking for more revenue.

I think I have covered almost all that I wanted to say.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya mengucapkan terima kasih kepada semua Ahli yang mengambil bahagian dalam perbahasan Usul saya itu. Saya mintalah kebenaran menjawab dalam Bahasa Inggeris pada beberapa perkara yang perlu dibangkitkan.

Mr Speaker, Sir, in actual fact I should be very brief because the Honourable Members haven't brought up very many points that are of any intrinsic value.

My Honourable friend from Dhoby Ghaut began with the quotation that 'silence is golden'. Perhaps in consideration of what he had spoken he probably would wish he had followed his own injunction. However, because of his special knowledge of the functions of the Penang Library Corporation I thank him for his bringing to the notice of this House certain points which the Library Corporation are involved in. And I hope the Honourable Members of this House will appreciate that the Library Corporation has been working very cautiously. And if I may make a personal observation, perhaps a bit too cautiously. But, for the first time when you are dealing with public funds I think it is best to move with that caution. Unfortunately, I think, in anticipating what will happen in 1974 he allowed himself to be carried away. I can assure him that the policy of the Government will be to encourage the development of a Penang State Library through the Library Corporation. And it was because of that policy that we have not really found it possible to interfere with the problems of the Butterworth Library, unless and until the two organisations have come to some form of mutual agreement on how to operate. The State Government, however, is prepared to resolve the financial problems of the Butterworth Library provided that the

Penang Library Corporation will accept that the resolution of those financial problems will lead to the Library Corporation undertaking an operation in Butterworth; and, at the same time, if the Butterworth Library itself would hold an Annual General Meeting to wind up its affairs, and agree to become part of the Penang State Library Corporation.

As Honourable Members were aware, one of the reasons why the Library Corporation has not been able to move out of the old premises to the new one is that at the very last moment the Penang Library itself had second thoughts as to whether or not it should wind up its affairs and join the Library Corporation.

I would take this occasion, Sir, to enjoin all the Members of the House to appreciate that the powers of the Penang Library Corporation give it sufficient latitude to seek funds not only from the State and Federal Governments, but also funds that are engendered by its own enterprise, funds that are given to it by way of donations, and funds that it could operate in other ways under the provisions provided under the incorporating Bill. Under the circumstances, much as I would like the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam's comments about the Penang Library Corporation, I am sure he could start the ball rolling somewhat—when he shows so much concern—if he started a public donation to upkeep the Penang Library, because after all I think a good library is to the interests of the people of the State. And the people of the State should begin to appreciate that public corporations and public institutions have to be founded; and that these funds do not come from thin air. And if the public feel that they require the services of such an institution then they must be willing to contribute to this institution generously where possible in order that an institution can go on and become permanently established within the structure and the life of the State.

The Honourable Member from Dhoby Ghaut referred to Article 109. And I would like to assure this House, because

Ahli Kawasan Dhoby Ghaut (Encik Khoo Teng Chye): If you rule that I am not allowed to speak on this subject then I won't. But I think that I am merely making a suggestion to help the State in asking for more revenue.

I think I have covered almost all that I wanted to say.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya mengucapkan terima kasih kepada semua Ahli yang mengambil bahagian dalam perbahasan Usul saya itu. Saya mintalah kebenaran menjawab dalam Bahasa Inggeris pada beberapa perkara yang perlu dibangkitkan.

Mr Speaker, Sir, in actual fact I should be very brief because the Honourable Members haven't brought up very many points that are of any intrinsic value.

My Honourable friend from Dhoby Ghaut began with the quotation that 'silence is golden'. Perhaps in consideration of what he had spoken he probably would wish he had followed his own injunction. However, because of his special knowledge of the functions of the Penang Library Corporation I thank him for his bringing to the notice of this House certain points which the Library Corporation are involved in. And I hope the Honourable Members of this House will appreciate that the Library Corporation has been working very cautiously. And if I may make a personal observation, perhaps a bit too cautiously. But, for the first time when you are dealing with public funds I think it is best to move with that caution. Unfortunately, I think, in anticipating what will happen in 1974 he allowed himself to be carried away. I can assure him that the policy of the Government will be to encourage the development of a Penang State Library through the Library Corporation. And it was because of that policy that we have not really found it possible to interfere with the problems of the Butterworth Library, unless and until the two organisations have come to some form of mutual agreement on how to operate. The State Government, however, is prepared to resolve the financial problems of the Butterworth Library provided that the

Penang Library Corporation will accept that the resolution of those financial problems will lead to the Library Corporation undertaking an operation in Butterworth; and, at the same time, if the Butterworth Library itself would hold an Annual General Meeting to wind up its affairs, and agree to become part of the Penang State Library Corporation.

As Honourable Members were aware, one of the reasons why the Library Corporation has not been able to move out of the old premises to the new one is that at the very last moment the Penang Library itself had second thoughts as to whether or not it should wind up its affairs and join the Library Corporation.

I would take this occasion, Sir, to enjoin all the Members of the House to appreciate that the powers of the Penang Library Corporation give it sufficient latitude to seek funds not only from the State and Federal Governments, but also funds that are engendered by its own enterprise, funds that are given to it by way of donations, and funds that it could operate in other ways under the provisions provided under the incorporating Bill. Under the circumstances, much as I would like the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam's comments about the Penang Library Corporation, I am sure he could start the ball rolling somewhat—when he shows so much concern—if he started a public donation to upkeep the Penang Library, because after all I think a good library is to the interests of the people of the State. And the people of the State should begin to appreciate that public corporations and public institutions have to be founded; and that these funds do not come from thin air. And if the public feel that they require the services of such an institution then they must be willing to contribute to this institution generously where possible in order that an institution can go on and become permanently established within the structure and the life of the State.

The Honourable Member from Dhoby Ghaut referred to Article 109. And I would like to assure this House, because

this has been brought up in a previous debate in a Sitting of this House that we do not require any Special Action Committee because the National Financial Council meets regularly on these matters; and the increase of Per Capita and Road Grants has been taken up. And if my good friend, the Honourable Member for Dhoby Ghaut, had looked carefully at the provisions of the Budget, particularly in sources of revenue, he would have seen that in actual fact the Federal Government's contribution by way of grant for roads and road maintenance had been increased in so far as it referred to the previous years. And this type of increases are constantly under review by the National Finance Council. And I can assure the Members of this House that the whole trend of this debate in this House has been to indicate that the State Government persistently and constantly refers to the Federal Government on the need for more funding for immediate development projects. Sir, the Federal Government in looking at the provisions as to whether it should help the State Government is always very careful as to whether the State manages its Budget and its funds in a proper manner.

Now, I am afraid the Honourable Member for Kelawei on this particular occasion has not made one of his best speeches. I think he has not really given very much thought to the whole issue. And if I may refer back to the instance which the Honourable Member for Kelawei quoted earlier in the sitting of this House where, with regard to his suspension under 51 (1) of the Standing Orders, he said that in actual fact there was a period when the Members of the Opposition could in actual fact remain in the House because the suspension was only operational on the following day; but that they chose not to remain in the House is a different matter. Now, what the Honourable Member from Kelawei did we can appreciate. But what the other Honourable Members of Kelawei did we do not quite understand.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): There is only one Member from Kelawei. Not 'other Members of Kelawei'.

Ketua Menteri: All the other Members of the Opposition did in relation to the Member for Kelawei, to be precise, is a matter of whether the dog wags the tail or the tail wags the dog (*ketawa*). But they all decided to leave; Mr Speaker, Sir; and therefore abandoned their responsibilities to the electorate, and did not participate in the Budget proper debate. Even if they did so, and did not then have a chance to listen to the Budget presentation, if they were really interested in coming back to the Supplementary Budget, or at least if they were preparing a speech for the Supplementary Budget, they could have referred to the original Budget session and they would then have found that perhaps the allegations made are totally false and incorrect. And this is a very good opportunity for us in this House to measure the degree of the quality of the Opposition; because at first sight it would appear as though the Honourable Member from Kelawei's statement that the State presented a shoddy budget is true. This is the terminology. It is a kind of catch phrase that could hit the headlines. And in actual fact I would say that the speech by the Honourable Member for Kelawei is a completely shoddy preparation of a speech on a Supplementary Budget. Sir, let us take it point by point to prove whether it is so or not so. For example, the first point that was taken up was this question of a \$10 Token Vote to the Drainage and Irrigation Department. Sir, the particular \$10 Token Vote is, as I stated in the course of my speech, in order to allow the Department to vire sums of money for uniforms that are to be given to the staff of this Drainage and Irrigation Department. Sir, the money is already there, although the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam who is really a wise man on Token Votes had brought up that too much presentation of \$10 Token Votes in a Budget indicates that the State has not done its work well—I mean on previous occasions. The Honourable Member for Kelawei should not be too quick to jump at this kind of little things. He is just like a small fish jumping in a small bay. In actual fact the money is there. All

that was required was an accounting system whereby we had to provide a token \$10 Vote so that the money can be vired from even the own particular Head, which is 1,200 to be used for this purpose. But that is not bad enough. The Honourable Member from Bagan Ajam immediately referred to the question that this particular Vote had pertinence with the Drainage and Irrigation Department. And he started talking about drains in his constituency in Telok Ayer Tawar, particularly drains near the Golden Gate Night Club. Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member must have gone to Golden Gate. I do not know exactly what he does there (*ketawa*), but surely the question of sullage drains has got nothing to do with the Drainage and Irrigation Department. So you see, Sir, it is very difficult for the Government to treat seriously points that are raised by the Honourable Members of the Opposition.

The next point is the question of the provision for expenditure by the Majlis Ugama with regard to the payment of increased allowances and back payment of their salaries in relation to the Aziz Report. Sir, the Honourable Member for Kelawei said that here, is an instance of Government not knowing what it is doing; and allowing for this type of provision. The Honourable Member for Ayer Itam I think made a stronger point when he referred to the Auditor-General's Report on the fact that the Majlis Ugama had not been able to present the accounts for several years. But that Report referred in particular to the situation prior to 1972. I would like to inform Members of this House that Encik Basha bin Talib has now been appointed as Yang Dipertua by the Jabatan Hal Ehwal Ugama, Pulau Pinang. And this we hope will lead—and the Government thinks will lead—to a thorough re-organisation, and the setting up of a much more efficient Majlis Ugama in the State of Penang under the leadership of Encik Basha bin Talib. So it shows that Government was fully aware of this problem. However, even though Honourable Members themselves did not attend the Budget

Meeting the Honourable Member for Kelawei for example—and I had commended it many times—refers to previous documents, and so on, of this House. He even has his copy here. But he would have seen that in actual fact the State had provided for \$350,000 for this particular item under “4100 Pembinaan Subsidi dan Charum-carum”. However, Sir, the State could not come to a complete figure because negotiations were still being carried on between the teachers and the Federal authorities as to what exactly should be the degree of the allowances. And it was only when the official figures were presented to the State that the State had to make adjustments accordingly. And hence that leads to the supplementary provision.

Sir, before I come down to generalisations, there is one other point I would like to refer to now; and that is this question of the provision for a \$1.7 million State Grant to the State Water Authority. Sir, the Member for Bagan Ajam also brought this matter up and indicated that we should ask the Federal Government for its support also of the contribution in a way to a repayment of the loan from the Asian Development Bank. In actual fact the Federal Government's repayment to this loan will be in the region of \$2.2 million; and the Federal Government has taken steps to reimburse the State to that extent. However, in the course of presenting the Budget, and also in the course of the debate on His Excellency's gracious speech earlier on in this House I had indicated that the credibility of Government, particularly with regard to its handling of finances and its promises on loans, must at all times be upheld. And when I presented the Budget I had indicated that the State had provided an initial grant of \$1 million to the State Authority. However, the State would be determined at all times to uphold its obligations to the Asian Development Bank. And if any monies were required then the State will further pay up these sums of money in order that the commitments that have been undertaken by the State Water Authority would be met to the fullest.

Mr Speaker, Sir, although the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam wishes to delay the discussions until his Motion arises, however, he has brought up certain points with regard to the State Water Authority where I would ask your indulgence that I take the matter up at this stage. Sir, this provision of \$1.7 million grant to the State Water Authority by the State Government is an act not only of carrying out to the full the State's obligations to the loaning authorities, namely the Asian Development Bank, through the assistance of the Federal Government, but is also an act whereby the State has shown its determination to keep the water charges at a reasonable level throughout the State because it is obvious that if the State Water Authority could not find this \$1.7 million in deficit on its calculations of revenue versus expenditure then it must find this \$1.7 million from the consumers, that is to say the public; which means that the State by undertaking and carrying the burden of \$1.7 million has already undertaken to redress many of the imbalances in the State. Sir, firstly, Honourable Members should be aware that under the Asian Development Bank Agreement which was made in August 1968 the original surveys and the proposals that were made had indicated that one of the conditions whereby the Bank would initiate the loan for the Sungei Muda scheme would be that in order to raise the revenue of the water fund a new tariff of charges would be put into effect from mid 1970. The average price per 1,000 gallons of water would be Malaysian \$1.10 for water delivered on the mainland. For the water sold under the bulk sale agreement by the State and the City Council of George Town a bulk sale price of not less than 93.5 cents per 1,000 gallons would be adopted. Mr Speaker, Sir, in view of the current charges that have been established by the State Water Authority, as the fairest charges that could be levied through the State of 60 cents based on a gradient scale of 60 cents per 1,000 gallons for the first 5,000 gallons of water, that formula has assured, firstly, that there would be no increase of

charges to anyone living in the rural areas. They would be paying precisely what they had been paying before. In the meantime all those living in the City Council area would be paying slightly more than what they had been paying; and it had been calculated on an average not more than perhaps \$1.50 per month, particularly within this 5,000 to 6,000 gallons per month group; but that the ratepayers in the City Council in actual fact will be paying less than what is proposed by the Asian Development Bank. And this could only be calculated out, firstly, when the State Water Authority had been established. And after the State Water Authority had been established the scale of water charges to be imposed on the people of the State had to be published by the State Water Authority. So, at the time of the Budget, although the State Government had given \$1 million to the State Water Authority as an initial grant the State Government had also assured the State Water Authority that it will back up its policies and its decision in so far as it had to meet the commitments to the Asian Development Bank. It is a separate organisation, I agree. As I said, it has fallen upon my lot to become also the Chairman of the State Water Authority. And I stated in this House that I wish the day will come when the functions of the Chief Minister will be very much more normalised; and one doesn't have to do very much more than one is expected to do. But the duty having fallen on a separate authority, an authority established by a law which the Honourable Members of this House passed, that particular authority worked out the scale of charges and felt that the most equitable scale of charges causing the minimum hardship to anyone in the State, to create uniformity within the State, would be the one that we published. On that calculation they found that they had to face a deficit of \$1.7 million; and the State Government was forced to come in to put this money with the State Water Authority, and therefore assist the people of our State, and help them to carry the burden of having to repay the cost of the water supply system.

Sir, the Honourable Member for Kelawei then I think very mischievously—to some extent, personally I think, largely due to lack of experience—brought up this question that the State had budgeted for an initial deficit of over \$100,000. And therefore with this new Supplementary Budget provision we will then budget for an even greater deficit. Sir, this is a difference between a Budget session and a Supplementary Budget, because in the presentation of a Supplementary Budget the question of revenue and the question of inputs into the State Revenue are not considered; and the questions of adjustments, shortfalls, and so on, are not taken into account. I am fairly certain, Mr Speaker, Sir, that when we come to the presentation of the next Budget whatever the Honourable Member for Kelawei has said earlier on will be completely untrue because even without my balancing the Budget offhand—and that is just to indicate the matter is under constant surveillance by the State Financial Officer, and therefore directed directly to the State Authority which is the State Ex. Co.—we know roughly our position every quarter and every month. And I will assure the Honourable Member for Kelawei that the performance of the State will be very sound indeed. The Honourable Member for Bagan Ajam also did raise it on this occasion. I can assure him that there will be no question of the State going bankrupt. As a matter of fact I think the presentation of the State's Budget shows a very strong budgetary situation in the State. So, for the Honourable Member immediately to jump to the conclusion—as I said, the usual technique of bringing up one point, making a speculation with no basis at all, and then come to the question of a certain increase in deficit—Sir, I think, is part of the growth and development of Honourable Members of the Opposition in this House. And, if the Honourable Member from Kelawei will take it from me I hope that he will look through his own budget much more carefully, and he should study the matter much more carefully. We expected, actually, a much better presentation from the

Opposition than what we received today. Today's performance was very bad. (*Ketawa*). You know, he makes quite a good contribution; but I think today he was really below the mark. But someday some people are off beat, and so on. It would be a good thing if the Honourable Member will really study the Budget, and bring up his points on the supplementary provisions because this Supplementary Budget is a very straightforward and simple one. Actually nothing in it at all. As a matter of fact the only new thing that was brought up was the one that was not mentioned by any one except the Honourable Member from Bagan Ajam. So in all his wooliness he does hit a right point sometimes. That is the provision of \$180,000 for water extension in the Mak Mandin and Prai Industrial Estate areas. His suggestion as to what the State Government should do in actual fact should be referred to the State Water Authority. However, the matter has been brought up here; and the State Government will transmit his views to the State Water Authority. The State Water Authority will possibly charge the large volume of consumers for the preliminary laying of the pipes, and ask them to pay in advance. That, Sir, is a matter of policy. And, as far as I understand it, it is good corporation practice for the corporation to build up a budgetary provision for its expansion and development programmes in order to be able to meet its servicing responsibilities to big consumers. And these are consumers who will be coming in to utilise water at the rate of over a million gallons a month. In this particular case the considerations in relation to the initial capital outlay are such that I think the Honourable Member from Bagan Ajam does not quite understand this balancing of capital outlay in relation to revenue return. However, the matter will be brought up. But it is an indication of the strength of the State Water Authority that even at this very early stage of its formation it should have provided for expansion, particularly for the types of industries which, in the

course of the debate on His Excellency's speech, I have indicated that the State must now begin to service—industries of a special type requiring special servicing, and requiring very much greater efforts by us to meet the initial infrastructure costs.

Sir, the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam brought up two things—one was the question of delays in submission of Accounts by the Religious Affairs Department, to which I have answered; and the other, the question of assets of the Water Authority—and tried to frighten Honourable Members of this House about the possible future consequence. And he referred with his usual pomp to Article 13 (2) of the Federal Constitution on the question that Authorities, statutory or otherwise, would have to pay adequate compensation. Sir, I would like to say to the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam, and in fact all the Honourable Members of the Opposition, that when they read one Article they should know the Constitution well, because under the Ninth and Tenth Schedules of the Constitution it is clearly indicated that subject to the Federal List water will be a State matter. As a matter of fact it was on the basis of this that the Asian Development Bank made the loan to the State through the Federal Government. It was a loan direct to the State on the support of the Federal Government. Furthermore, in the Tenth Schedule the revenues of Town Boards, Town Councils, Rural Boards, Local Councils, and so on, also come under the State. So we appreciate the problem that the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam has brought up. As a matter of fact the legal advisers that we have on our side have constantly looked into this issue. But basically the issue is one that has gone through this State for the last 30 years—why is it that water that is taken from State land in the rural areas should come into the city area, and the people in the city area pay less whereas the people in the rural areas pay more? This question has been going on in the State for many, many years. And what the State has done is

to equalise the whole situation and make it uniform—that water should be a problem concerning the whole State, and should bring benefit to all the people of the State; and that all the people in the State should equally meet the burdens that are implied through the cost of production of a good water system. That is the general, simple attitude. The Honourable Member for Ayer Itam, I know, is trying very hard now to build up a case for his speech. And I am prepared to delay my reply to that aspect of it because when the time comes we will show him up as what he is.

Sir, the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam also referred to the question of the poor workers having no trade union. The Honourable Member for Ayer Itam, I know, has to say this kind of words. After all, presumably the loyal and sincere member of PEKEMAS, fighting for social justice, and also having something to do with the workers, has to say something about workers and trade unions. But in actual fact the members of the Penang Municipal Services Union had approached the State Water Authority with regard to the position of those workers who were in the Municipal Services, and had now become members of the State Water Authority, and what their position would be in regard to the Union. Sir, in that respect the State Water Authority's position was very clear, in the sense that it could not interfere with the position of the workers who had already become members of the State Water Authority. And therefore the General Manager of the State Water Authority informed the workers that if they chose to remain with the Penang Municipal Services Union they could; but there was no way whereby the State Authority could enjoin them specifically to continue to remain in the Penang Municipal Services Union. However, the points of view that were raised by the Penang Municipal Services Union were taken up and considered very carefully. And so, in accordance with Section 27 (3) (a) of the Trade Unions Ordinance, and also in consequence of Section 27

(4) (b) of the same Ordinance the State Government wrote to the Minister of Labour; and he gave the decision that those members of the State Water Authority who had been members of the City Water Department, and who were members of the P.M.S.U., could continue with the P.M.S.U. And at the same time both the P.M.S.U. workers of the State Water Authority had asked the Labour Department and the Ministry of Labour to assist in the formation of a new union under the State Water Authority. And until the Union is formed the decision of the Minister would be such that he would allow the members who had previously been members of the City Water Department to remain as members of the P.M.S.U. This I think has been resolved very satisfactorily. And in recent meetings we have had with the representatives and leaders of the Penang Municipal Services Union they have indicated their appreciation of the stand that was taken both by the State Water Authority and the State Government on this subject. So I think it is unnecessary for the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam to come here and try to beat and stir up trouble where there is absolutely no trouble.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for Bagan Ajam brought up one point; and that is the question of members of the general public fearing to see officials. Sir, I would like to take this opportunity in this House to assure Members of this House that instructions were given to all officials—and perpetually to all officials—that they should serve the interests of the public as well as they could. And no one in the State should have any fear at any time to see any of the officials connected with the State Government or the Administration of this State. Perhaps if the members of the general public go with the Honourable Member for Bagan Ajam they may have some things to be frightened about. But in general there should be absolutely nothing for the people to fear. As a matter of fact the policy of the State has been repeated time and

time again—that we seek to promote the fullest co-operation between the people and the Government. And in that respect the Administration and the officials concerned in the Administration will do their very best to meet the interests of the people. However, if the people do meet instances where officials at any time tried to frighten them beyond what is the normal nervousness then I think there is the avenue for them to lodge complaints. And I would assure Members of this House that the Government is at all times ready to entertain honest and genuine complaints where officials have been too officious. But the general public need not fear meeting any officials.

Ahli Kawasan Tasek Glugor (Encik Mustapha bin Hussain): Untuk penjelasan, Tuan Speaker. Ini adalah termasuk dengan pegawai-pegawai politik seperti Yang Amat Berhormat Ketua Menteri, “Saya boleh jumpa”, katanya.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya fikir ini satu fikiran dari Yang Berhormat Ahli dari Kawasan Tasek Glugor, yang hendak sahaja perli. Bila-bila sahaja Yang Berhormat Ahli dari Kawasan Tasek Glugor hendak jumpa dengan Yang Amat Berhormat Ketua Menteri, saya ingat senang sekali. Kalau ada rakyat-rakyat hendak jumpa dengan Ketua Menteri atau pegawai-pegawai yang bersangkutan dengan politik, saya fikir itupun tidak susah.

Tetapi jangan bawa perkara bercakap jika satu kelapa jatuh, jangan ingat ini satu dunia sudah pecah dan cepat-cepat selesai perkara itu. Itu, kalau bila-bila ada perkara yang sungguh berlaku, saya berjanji semua ahli-ahli politik dan pegawai-pegawai yang bersangkutan dengan Kerajaan mestilah berjumpa dengan rakyat atau wakil-wakil rakyat. Saya harapkan keterangan itu dapat dijelaskan.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not wish at this stage, as I said, to elaborate on what the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam has gone on talking about on the accounting system of the State

Water Authority, and its relationship with the City Council assets because he himself had said he would like to discuss it at a different stage. I wish only to end up by saying that the points that were raised by the Honourable Members from the Opposition, when you consider them fundamentally, have got no virtue at all, and are completely invalid. And I hope the Honourable Member from Kelawei will take it that this is not an attempt to derogate on his particular performance today; but really an injunction and a wish that he would really study the system of budgeting, because I know his sharpness of mind just keeps us on our toes. And we like sharpness of mind. But we cannot be kept on the toes when he talks about rubbish.

Soalan dikemukakan dan dipersetujui dengan sebulat suara.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tuan Speaker, saya ingat tidak boleh. Bila division diminta baru boleh halau (gangguan).

Tuan Speaker: Sebab-sebab tidak ada division—saya tidak dengar 'tidak'.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Orang lain pun tidak ada di dalam.

Tuan Speaker: Sebab itulah saya tanya. Saya tidak boleh minta division.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Ada orang di sana boleh minta.

Tuan Speaker: Di sana pun boleh. Tetapi tidak ada sesiapa minta division. Saya anggap sebulat suaralah. Sebab apa yang saya boleh tanya 'ya' dengan 'tidak' sahaja.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Boleh banyak.

Tuan Speaker: Saya tidak bolehlah berkata dengan tidak langsung. Jika sesiapa pun tidak minta division dan saya tidak dengar perkataan 'tidak', saya anggap persetujuan dengan sebulat suara.

Rang Undang-Undang dibacakan bagi kali yang kedua.

RANG UNDANG-UNDANG DALAM JAWATANKUASA PER- BEKALAN

Wang sebanyak \$10.00 untuk Kepala B. 4, \$17,200.00 untuk Kepala B. 5, \$797,751.00 untuk Kepala B. 11 dan \$1,930,000.00 untuk Kepala B. 14 menjadi sebahagian daripada Jadual.

Jadual menjadi sebahagian daripada Rang Undang-Undang.

Jadual, Fasal 1, dan Fasal 2, dan tajuk penuh dan fasal yang mengundangkan menjadi sebahagian daripada Rang Undang-Undang.

Dewan bersidang semula.

Bacaan Yang Ketiga.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya mohon melaporkan bahawa 'Rang Undang-Undang Perbekalan Tambahan (1973) (No. 1), 1973,' telah pun dipertimbangkan sefasal demi sefasal dalam Jawatankuasa dan dipersetujui tanpa pindaan. Oleh itu saya mencadangkan supaya Rang Undang-Undang ini sekarang dibacakan bagi kali yang ketiga serta diluluskan.

*Soalan dikemukakan dan diperse-
tujui dengan sebulat suara.*

*Rang Undang-Undang dibacakan
bagi kali yang ketiga dan diluluskan.*

(2) RANG UNDANG-UNDANG OR- DINAN PERBANDARAN (PIN- DAAN) (PULAU PINANG), 1973

Bacaan Yang Pertama.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya mohon mencadangkan supaya 'Rang Undang-Undang bernama suatu Enakmen bagi meminda Ordinan Perbandaran (Bab 133) dibacakan bagi kali yang pertama.

Ahli Kawasan Glugor (Encik D. C. Stewart): Tuan Speaker, saya mohon menyokong.

RANG UNDANG-UNDANG DIBA- CAKAN BAGI KALI YANG PER- TAMA

Tuan Speaker: Bacaan kali yang kedua hari apa?

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, bacaan kali yang kedua akan diadakan pada satu mesyuarat yang akan datang.

Tuan Speaker: Baiklah.

6. USUL-USUL.

(B). USUL OLEH YANG BERHORMAT ENCIK WONG CHOONG WOH.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Selatan (Encik Wong Choong Woh): Tuan Yang Dipertua, Usul di atas nama saya bertujuan untuk melantik sebuah Jawatankuasa Peraturan-Peraturan Mesyuarat bagi Penggal Ketiga Dewan Undangan mengikut Peraturan Mesyuarat 109 (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tuan Speaker, dengan izin. With your permission, Mr Speaker, Sir. I think the Government owes an explanation to the House why it is, if I am not mistaken, not proceeding with the Municipal Enactment Bill in all stages. If I am not mistaken, the Chief Minister says: 'at a coming meeting'.

Tuan Speaker: At a subsequent meeting.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Yes. So explanation should be given to this House why, although listed in the Order Paper 'at all stages,' it is not followed. It should be explained. You cannot come to this House and suddenly say that you are not going to proceed in all stages. We have prepared our work. The Chief Minister owes an explanation to this House and the Chair why all three stages should not be carried on with the Bill.

Tuan Speaker: The Order Paper says so, but what do our Standing Orders say?

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): I agree that the Standing Orders do allow the Government to decide at the time, but I think it is a matter of courtesy to the Chair to explain why the Government (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: No, the Chair does not take offence because the Chair has even gone on to the next part of the (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Yes, I know that because it has gone on rather like the steam roller and the train.

Tuan Speaker: No. I do not think so, Honourable Member from Kelawei. It has not been like the steam roller. It has been like (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): I mean from the Government side, the information just (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: We have even gone on to Mr Wong Choong Woh's Motion.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Yes, I agree. But when Government announced it we had no chance (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: It was not announced. When I asked the Chief Minister when the Second Reading was he said 'at a subsequent meeting'—so well provided for by the Standing Orders. So, therefore there is no Second Reading.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): I think an explanation should be forthcoming as to why they withdrew the subsequent reading.

Tuan Speaker: Not necessary.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Selatan (Encik Wong Choong Woh): Tuan Yang Dipertua, Peraturan Mesyuarat 109 adalah dicadangkan supaya Ahli-Ahli yang sama seperti bagi Penggal Kedua dilantik semula selama satu tahun lagi. Tuan Speaker dengan ini saya mencadangkan "Bahawa Dewan ini membuat ketetapan bahawa Ahli-Ahli yang berikut dilantik semula sebagai Ahli-Ahli Jawatankuasa Peraturan-Peraturan Mesyuarat Dewan Undangan Negeri Pulau Pinang:

1. Yang Berhormat Datuk Speaker (*Pengerusi*)
2. Yang Berhormat Encik Teh Ewe Lim
3. Yang Berhormat Encik S. P. Chelliah, J.P.
4. Yang Berhormat Encik Ismail bin Hashim, J.P.
5. Yang Berhormat Encik Teoh Kooi Sneh

6. Yang Berhormat Encik Yeap Ghim Guan
7. Yang Berhormat Encik Mustapha bin Hussain

dan Pengerusi serta empat orang Ahli-Ahli yang lain akan membentuk satu korum. Jawatankuasa tidak akan berkuasa mendapatkan orang-orang, dokumen-dokumen ataupun risalah-risalah kecuali jika Dewan memutuskan sebaliknya."

Tuan Speaker, seperti yang diperuntukkan di bawah Peraturan Mesyuarat 109 (1) Jawatankuasa tahun ini telah dipilih untuk menentukan setakat mana yang boleh terdapatnya pertimbangan di antara pihak Kerajaan dan pihak Pembangkang di dalam Dewan ini. Kedua-dua Jawatankuasa yang lampau telah menjalankan tugas-tugasnya dan tanggungjawab mereka dengan baik dan cekapnya. Adalah diharapkan bahawa Jawatankuasa baru ini akan mengikut contoh kedua-dua Jawatankuasa yang lepas serta meluluskan (gangguan).

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap): Tuan Speaker, under Standing Order 46 (v) "A Member shall not read his speech, but he may read extracts from written or printed papers in support of his argument and he may refresh his memory by reference to notes."

Tuan Speaker: Yes.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap): I think the Honourable Member for Tanjong Selatan is reading his speech from a text or prepared speech.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Selatan (Encik Wong Choong Woh): Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya ingat perkara ini bukanlah satu perkara yang penting di bawah Peraturan 46 (v). Jadi saya ingat pihak Pembangkang di depan kamipun ada juga membaca. Saya tidak sangka perkara ini menjadi satu perkara yang berlaku di bawah Peraturan (gangguan).

Tuan Speaker: Ya. Tetapi dia sudah (gangguan).

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Selatan (Encik Wong Choong Woh):

sebab saya mempunyai Usul. Saya ada perkara yang mustahak sepatutnya saya sebut dengan jelas kepada Dewan ini. Jika seseorang Ahli Wakil Rakyat memang berdiri di sini bercakap tanpa menyediakan ucapan, saya ingat mereka semua ada di sini. Saya bukanlah seorang professional. Maka orang yang professionalpun bawa kertas untuk bercakap dalam Dewan Undangan Negeri, Pulau Pinang. (Ketawa).

Tuan Speaker: Ahli dari Tanjong Selatan janganlah begitu panas. Di atas Peraturan 46 (v), Ahli ada kuasa. Macam manapun bagi pandangan kepada Tuan Speaker. Kalau Ahli-Ahli semua hendak beri ucapan-ucapan, saya harap janganlah baca tetapi jikalau hendak melihat note bolehlah dibenar.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Selatan (Encik Wong Choong Woh): Terima kasih Tuan Speaker. Ini secara cabutan saya baca.

Tuan Speaker: Secara cabutan.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Selatan (Encik Wong Choong Woh): Tuan Speaker, kedua-dua Jawatankuasa yang lepas sudah meneruskan perkhidmatan baik mereka itu dan jika boleh dengan lebih cakap lagi.

Sekian terima kasih.

Ahli Kawasan Glugor (Encik D. C. Stewart): Tuan Speaker, saya mohon menyokong.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, (gangguan).

Tuan Speaker: Ahli Yang Berhormat minta izin bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris?

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Yes. Saya minta izin.

Tuan Speaker: Tetapi mula dalam Bahasa Inggeris (Ketawa).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Minta izin.

Tuan Speaker: No, you started with "Mr Speaker." (Ketawa).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya ingat dalam Bahasapun kalau saya baca Utusan Malaysia sebagai contoh, ianya menggunakan Speaker. Sekarang sudah jadi satu perkataan dalam Bahasa Malaysia. Ya, sudah diterima.

Tuan Speaker: "Mr" itu tidak.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mana boleh jadi.

Tuan Speaker: Belum lagi.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): "Mr" itu barangkali belum lagi. Tetapi kita sendiripun boleh buat sedikit di Penang.

Tuan Speaker: Sebelum diterima janganlah.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Apa yang tidak dibuat hari ini barangkali hari lain baru diterima. Tidak mengapa. Dengan izin.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we on this side of the House support this Motion (gangguan).

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Selatan (Encik Wong Choong Woh): Tuan Speaker, di atas Peraturan 46 (v) (gangguan).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, if the Member would look at what I am reading he can read it. This is the Order Paper. I am looking at the Order Paper. If the Member would like to come over to this side of the House and look at my desk he is also entitled to do it. I am not reading.

Tuan Speaker: Carry on, Honourable Member from Kelawei.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): I mean, Mr Speaker, Sir, we are moving a Motion.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Selatan (Encik Wong Choong Woh): Don't lah. (Ketawa).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): I am looking at the Standing Orders. If the Chair would

like to look, this is the Order Paper. Maybe I should stand 5 feet away from my desk. I am not looking at any notes, or looking at any text. I am entitled to, so long as I do not read.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, mengikut Peraturan 46 (vi) saya minta maaf saya tidak mahu campurpun. Tuan Yang Dipertua, sekarangpun sudah ada keadaan baik di dalam Dewan ini. Tetapi saya tidak ingat Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Kawasan Kelawei minta izin bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tuan Speaker, saya tidak tahu berapa kali saya mesti minta izin. Tetapi jikalau Tuan Speaker atau Ketua Menteri tidak dengar saya minta izin, barangkali saya tidak tahu. Saya minta izin. Cukup?

Tuan Speaker: Ya, saya ingat sekarang kita jalankanlah.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Ya.

Tuan Speaker: Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Kelawei sokong Usul ini?

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Saya mesti bagi tahu sebab apa saya sokong. Kita di sini bukan sahaja sokong sama banyak Ahli di belakang Ketua Menteri. Kita sokong kerana ada sebab.

Tuan Speaker: Sepenuhnya?

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Sepenuhpun tidak mengapa. Tidak mengapa—reservation.

Mr Speaker, dengan izin, sekali lagi.

We support this Motion because we think that it is very important that the Standing Orders Committee should be appointed. Although year in and year out you have appointed a Standing Orders Committee this Committee has never met in the last few years. I think there is a need for this Committee to meet, and perhaps carry out its work. And perhaps even to the extent of holding sessions to enable Members of the Government especially,

even Ex-co. Members, to understand the Standing Orders to the extent they know what they can object or cannot object to. And I think Members of the Government need not, after all these years, take umbrage just because we now and then—in the words of the Chief Minister—in the ‘cut and thrust’, you know, bring up Standing Orders. But that is part and parcel of the Parliamentary process. And we hope that in establishing this new Committee something will be done, Sir, by this House. At least, if we cannot do anything else we could replace this word ‘bodoh’ in the Standing Orders with the word ‘frivolous’ so that the Honourable the Chief Minister—and this is the main fear I have—cannot use it again in this House, ever. So I move to support this also.

Tuan Speaker: Jika tidak perbahasan (gangguan).

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, sungguhpun saya tidak ingin hendak mengambil bahagian di dalam perbahasan di sini tetapi saya haraplah Jawatankuasa yang sekarang ini kita hendak luluskan dalam Dewan ini bukan sahaja hendak menimbangkan perkara mengenai satu perkataan ‘bodoh’ di dalam Seksyen 66 (2), saya haraplah banyak kerja-kerja lagi bukan sahaja Yang Berhormat Ahli dari Kawasan Kelawai seorang yang pandai atau bodoh tetapi bukan sahaja (gangguan).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Saya tidak pandai.

Ketua Menteri: satu kesilapan yang hendak dijaga. Tidak usah lagi pakai perkataan ‘bodoh’ di sini. Saya jelaskan kalau saya hendak kata dengan terang bagaimana ucapan-ucapan dari Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Kelawei.

Usul dikemukakan dan dipersetujui dengan sebulat suara.

Dewan ditangguhkan pada jam 12.59 tengahari.

Dewan bersidang semula pada jam 2.42 petang.

(C). USUL OLEH YANG BERTHORMAT ENCIK S. P. CHELLIAH.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S.P. Chelliah): Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya mohon mencadangkan—

“Bahawa Dewan ini membuat ketetapan bahawa Ahli-Ahli yang berikut dilantik sebagai Ahli-Ahli Jawatankuasa Hak dan Kebebasan Dewan Undangan Negeri, Pulau Pinang:

1. Yang Berhormat Datuk Speaker (Pengerusi)
2. Yang Berhormat Encik Wong Choong Woh
3. Yang Berhormat Encik Ooi Ah Bee
4. Yang Berhormat Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Haji Abdullah, A.M.N., J.P.
5. Yang Berhormat Encik D. C. Stewart
6. Yang Berhormat Encik Khoo Soo Giap
7. Yang Berhormat Encik V. Vee-rappen

dan Pengerusi serta tiga orang Ahli-ahli yang lain akan membentuk satu korum. Jawatankuasa akan berkuasa mendapatkan orang-orang, dokumen-dokumen dan risalah-risalah dan melapurkan kepada Dewan dari semasa ke semasa.”

Tuan Yang Dipertua, dalam membawa Usul ini saya tidaklah suka untuk mengulangkan tugas-tugas Jawatankuasa ini, oleh sebab telahpun diterangkan dengan sejelas-jelasnya oleh Timbalan Ketua Menteri pada bulan April, 1971, manakala beliau membawa Usul yang serupa ini.

Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya mohon mencadang.

Ahli Kawasan Permatang Pauh (Tuan Haji Mohamad Nor bin Haji Bakar): Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya mohon menyokong.

Tuan Speaker: Usul dibuka untuk dibahaskan.

Soalan dikemukakan dan dipersetujui dengan sebulat suara.

(D). USUL OLEH YANG BERTHORMAT ENCIK TAN GIM HWA.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Tengah (Encik Tan Gim Hwa): Tuan Speaker,

saya mohon mencadangkan—

“Bahawa Dewan ini membuat ketetapan bahawa Ahli-ahli yang berikut dilantik semula sebagai Ahli-ahli Jawatankuasa Dewan bagi Dewan Undangan Negeri, Pulau Pinang:

1. Yang Berhormat Datuk Speaker (Pengerusi)
2. Yang Berhormat Encik Khoo Teng Chye
3. Yang Berhormat Encik Ooi Ah Bee
4. Yang Berhormat Tuan Haji Mohamad Nor bin Haji Bakar, J.P.
5. Yang Berhormat Tuan Haji Abdul Kadir bin Haji Hassan, J.P., P.J.K.
6. Yang Berhormat Encik Yeap Ghim Guan
7. Yang Berhormat Encik Tan Phock Kin

dan Pengerusi serta tiga orang Ahli-ahli yang lain akan membentuk satu korum. Jawatankuasa tidak akan berkuasa mendapatkan orang-orang, dokumen-dokumen ataupun risalah-risalah kecuali jika Dewan memutuskan sebaliknya.”

Sebagai sebuah Jawatankuasa mengikut penggal adalah perlu bagi mencadangkan satu Usul baru untuk melantik atau melantik semula Jawatankuasa bagi penggal ini.

Tuan Speaker, saya mohon mencadangkan.

Ahli Kawasan Nibong Tebal (Encik Teoh Kooi Sneah): Tuan Speaker, saya mohon menyokong.

Tuan Speaker: Usul dibuka untuk dibahaskan.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tuan Speaker, dengan izin bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we on this side of the House support this Motion. And in so doing, Sir, we would like to draw the attention of the House to the requirements of Members of this House. I presume, if I am not mistaken, the Chief Minister himself is one of those who originated the idea of establishing a House Committee. From what had transpired in the last Session in connection with this establishment, I am sorry to say that from

my experience as a member of the Committee the deliberations fell far short of what we were told in this House. And although the Member for Tanjong Tengah has been very brief—probably carrying out the injunction of the Honourable the Chief Minister that ‘silence is golden’, and that he should say very little—judging from the experience of the Member for Dhoby Ghaut it is perhaps so. But I must say that ‘all that glitters is not gold’. And I think the Member for Tanjong Tengah in moving the Motion owes a duty to this House to at least set out a bit as to what the Government expects of this House Committee. By merely saying that he is moving for the establishment of this Committee is not sufficient, especially in the light of what we have experienced in the Committee itself, because from what I understand this Committee is not allowed to discuss matters pertaining to hours of meeting, and pre-arrangements between the Speaker and Members of the House. I see here that in this particular Motion almost everybody is represented in this Committee. Yes, all the major factions are represented.

Tuan Speaker: Except the Independent.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): The Member for Party Rakyat is not represented; but I do not know whether he doesn’t want to sit. Anyway at least the major factions are represented; and it is a good forum for discussing matters. And I would like to know, as a Member of that Committee-to-be, what is actually the mandate of this Committee; whether it is restricted to merely discharging its duties as regards whether the lavatories are working; whether there are rules where the members of the public are allowed to smoke within or without the Chambers; whether a telephone should be installed in a particular room. Or has it got other duties? I think we should be guided by this Assembly; and particularly be guided by the wisdom of the Ketua Menteri in respect of its powers, because if the Ketua Menteri vetoes any particular

suggestion—although he is not a member of the Committee—I know very well that it cannot carry out its function. I think that the functions should be a bit wider than merely taking care of providing lockers, which I am very glad to note have been provided. But there are other things I think Members of this Assembly require. I have time and again stressed in this House—and I would like again without fear of repetition to stress—that facilities should be provided. One which I have already stated earlier is to instal a photostat machine for Members to use in the course of the Assembly proceedings and Sittings. Whenever it is required to make copies of documents they must be able to do so. The question of providing staff to do some typing on behalf of Members also is something that should be looked into. I have just seen the hard-working Member for Nibong Tebal trying to type out his speech rather slowly because I happened to require the use of a typewriter at the same time. So, therefore, this kind of things should be provided for in the Dewan.

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member from Kelawei, that would be a very good argument for this Committee.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Precisely, Mr Speaker, Sir, it would be a very good argument. But it would appear that in spite of the deliberations of the Committee very little has been carried out. Apparently the Chairman of the Committee has doubts as to the actual mandate. Unfortunately he is not here today. He has doubts as to what he can do. But I am trying to draw the attention of the House to the fact that we require certain things here. I say it is very good to supply lockers which we had suggested is a good idea. I think we can go further than lockers, which is not the only thing we require.

Tuan Speaker: We are talking about the setting-up of the House Committee. Maybe, the Honourable Member would like to know what would be the terms of reference.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): We should be better able to decide the duties if some outline of the terms of reference could be given by the Honourable Member for Tanjong Tengah. But, sad to say, he has merely read out a speech in Malay which we do not particularly comprehend. And I do not think that he has set out the terms of reference.

Tuan Speaker: I agree with you that he has not set it out.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Similarly he has not set out the provisions, because this was, Mr Speaker, Sir, an innovation for the first time last year. And we have gone through the experience of it; so at least in this House we should clarify the situation.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya mohon izin menjawab dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I think the Motion does provide for a Committee. And this Motion just says what the Committee cannot do. As far as I understand, the Committee has got very wide powers of looking into and making recommendations for the benefit of the sitting of the House. The Honourable Member from Kelawei asked for several things. He got a locker; but he has not got a photostat machine. Well, part and parcel of the experience of Committee work is that any Member in Committee need not necessarily have to agree with the majority. In fact, if he thinks that he has got things better than what the majority thinks he has always got the right to put in a minority report. But I think to attribute to me that I control the Chairman of the Committee doing this or doing that is utter bunkum. As a matter of fact I have all times respected the Committees of the House. I have never interposed the functions of the Chief Minister on any of the Committees of the House. However, I can assure the Honourable Member that recommendations of the Committee when they come up in report form are sent to the proper channels for evaluation; and expenditures like

providing for lockers still obviously have to go through the State Executive Council before they are approved. But at no point do we interfere with it. And I really hope that the Committee will function well. I am not trying to make a gesture because for many years we have talked about improving facilities in this House—how we are going to do it in the light of the funds available to us in the light of the provision of the expenditure item. For example, we did seriously take into consideration how we could have a separate Assembly Vote for the Speaker, outside the Vote as it now stands under the Chief Minister and the Secretariat. But there are problems which have to be resolved before these things can be undertaken. I can only assure the Honourable Member from Kelawei that if he enters into this Committee in the full spirit of what it is designed to be he will find that things that are reasonable, which can be implemented, will be implemented. But I do not think it is fair for him to thrust everything at the Chief Minister—‘The Chief Minister vetoes this’, or ‘the Chief Minister vetoes that’. My participation in this debate is only to assure him that I do no such thing. If there is any failure of this Committee that has been set up, part of the failure of Committee must be accepted by the members of the Committee themselves. That is why I did laughingly mention to my good friend from Dhoby Ghaut that whenever you come to the Assembly like this you have to be very sure about the principle of silence being golden. Of course, you must be very sure of the facts when you say that this golden silence is not broken for nothing. But certainly to accuse the Chief Minister for controlling the Committee is I think untrue; and particularly when the Honourable Member, being a member of the Committee which fails to achieve something, has to bear part of the responsibility of the fact that the Committee does not work. But I do wish that we have Committees; and that the Committees do function. As I said, the very least that the Honourable Members

can be sure of is that they always have the right to insist that their views on the Report to be put up be put into the Minutes. But I think the Honourable Member will agree that when he puts up the proposal of lockers and the proposal for a photostat machine I think the Committee that wanted to make such a proposal should look into the cost of maintaining such a machine, and work out whether there is sufficient utility for putting up such a machine. All these things I think have to be brought into bearing. But I only stand to refute the allegation that the Chief Minister vetoes whatever the Committee itself proposes. I am sure that the Honourable Member, once he is a member of the Committee, can ask for a Meeting to put forward his points to be discussed in the agenda.

Soalan dikemukakan dan dipersetujui dengan sebulat suara.

(E) USUL OLEH YANG BERTHORMAT ENCIK ISMAIL BIN HASHIM.

Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Encik Ismail bin Hashim): Tuan Speaker, mengikut Peraturan Mesyuarat 109A (1) Dewan Undangan Negeri, dengan ini saya mencadangkan “Bahawa Dewan ini membuat ketetapan supaya Ahli-ahli yang berikut dilantik sebagai Ahli-ahli Jawatankuasa Kira-kira Awam bagi Penggal Ketiga Dewan Undangan Negeri, Pulau Pinang, Yang Ketiga, untuk mengkaji kira-kira dan laporan-laporan seperti yang ditetapkan di bawah Peraturan Mesyuarat 109A (1) dan untuk membuat segala laporan-laporan mengenainya kepada Majlis sepertimana yang diwajibkan perlu oleh Jawatankuasa tersebut. Jawatankuasa tersebut mengandungi—

1. Yang Berhormat Encik Khoo Teng Chye (*Pengerusi*)
2. Yang Berhormat Tuan Haji Mohamad Nor bin Haji Bakar, J.P.
3. Yang Berhormat Encik Teoh Kooi Sneah
4. Yang Berhormat Encik Koay Boon Seng

dan Pengerusi serta dua orang Ahli akan membentuk satu korum.”

Tuan Speaker, saya, dalam membawa Usul ini, tidaklah suka hendak memberitahu ulasan-ulasan yang panjang sebab saya percaya tiap-tiap Ahli yang ada dalam Dewan ini telah faham dengan Peraturan Mesyuarat 109A (1) dan perkara ini ialah satu perkara yang biasa kita buat bagi tiap-tiap Penggal Persidangan Dewan ini. Dan, saya rasa tugas-tugas Jawatankuasa ini juga telahpun termaklum dan jadi dengan sebab itu, Tuan Speaker, saya mohon mencadangkan.

Ahli Kawasan Glugor (Encik D. C. Stewart): Tuan Speaker, saya mohon menyokong.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Tuan Speaker, saya mohon izin mengambil bahagian dalam bahasa Inggeris.

Mr Speaker, it seems to me that the appointment of the Honourable Member for Dhoby Ghaut as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee is contrary to the principle which has already been accepted by this House last year where it was agreed that the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee should be a Member of the Opposition. The acceptance of this principle is because the House has taken into consideration the practice in other Parliaments, in particular the British Parliament, whereby the Public Accounts Committee is considered to be the watchdog of the House on the Accounts of the State. And it is because of that that no Member of the Government should be a Member of the Public Accounts Committee. And above all the Chairman should be a Member from the Opposition. I do not understand why there should be a departure from a practice which has already been accepted by the Government last year. Well, I could move an amendment to it; but I don't think it will serve any purpose. What is of more importance is for the Government, if they have overlooked the fact, to make the necessary amendment at this stage. I would like to know why it is that the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee this year is not a Member of the Opposition, as it was practised last year, because

unless a suitable reason is given it may be a reflection on the outgoing Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. Is it because a Member of the Opposition has given a lot of trouble? Is it because he is inept and incompetent? It is only fair that reasons must be given. Otherwise Members of this House, and in particular the general public, will hazard a guess, and may think of all sorts of reasons. I think that it is important because of the principle that has already been accepted. So I would be very grateful if Members on the opposite side of the House can enlighten this House on this departure.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya mohon izin bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I agree with the suggestions made by the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam. And I understand that the Honourable Member from Tasek Glugor who was the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee has declined to serve on the Committee. Be it as it may, I am sure the Government could find somebody on the opposite benches who could serve as Chairman very well in accordance with Parliamentary practice. If the Government has no confidence in the Members of the Opposition there is no excuse because Members of the Opposition also have been elected by the people. And, as has been said, this is a very important Committee which goes through the Auditor-General's comments on the Public Accounts audited by him, and makes its comments and recommendations so that the Accounts of the Government can be properly maintained.

Secondly, I notice that there is a preponderance in Members also in the composition of the Committee itself. It is the normal practice in all Committees of the House, Mr Speaker, that the composition of the Committee should reflect the position of Parties in the House. Although there are 8 Members in the Opposition, out of our at least two must be from the Opposition;

particularly in this Committee because you cannot have the Government itself studying its own Accounts and saying everything is alright, and the House should be happy about it. From the Report of the Public Accounts Committee that has been laid on this table I can point out that the Report and recommendations and conclusions which have been drawn by the Committee are no reflection on the Member. Perhaps this is due to the fact that numerically the Government side is over-represented. I could give you an example where the Chairman has said that there is a matter that is very fishy; but yet the Report itself does not say so. For example, on page 43 the Chairman says, 'Even without knowing anything about technical or engineering or contracting it looks fishy. A class 'C' contractor eligible for not over \$250,000 has been given three times that contract.' This refers to Mak Mandin. And if the Committee had come out with some recommendations perhaps we could have avoided this unpleasantness of having to refer to the A.C.A. And, besides, the Member for Dhoby Ghaut has mentioned that the land was bought for \$1.8 million—3,000 square feet; round about \$1.8 million. That is on page 5. This is the record. The calculation may be wrong.

Tuan Speaker: I was thinking that we were talking more in terms of the conclusions.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Yes. What I am to say is that while we appoint this Committee we want this Committee to be brave enough to state its recommendations. And it can only state its views. Although it may think something it does not say so. The record shows one thing, but the conclusions are not in line with the Report. And therefore that is why I am coming to the point, which is that the Committee should be better balanced. The Government with its majority is in a position to defeat any amendment or suggestion. Therefore I hope it will appreciate the point, and itself revise the composition of the Committee. And

also take into consideration the very important aspect that the Chairman should be a Member from the Opposition.

Tuan Speaker: I see that you go to the point by the other way.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya minta kebenaran bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I only wish to make one straightforward comment; and that is that the actual experience and precedence of this House is that we have appointed as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee both Members from the Party which is in power as well as Members from the Opposition side. That is the experience of the House. And the precedence in our House is such. But for us to conclude therefore that we should do this, or we should do that is, of course, a matter of opinion which the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam and the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap are entitled to. It is true when they say that in some other countries—not all other countries—the practice is to put an Opposition Member as the Chairman; but that is not always the case. Certainly the practice in the Dewan Rakyat in Malaysia is not so. So they are entitled to their opinion. But I must say that the experience of this House, and the precedence, that has been in this House is that the House nominates a Member whom it has confidence in to be the Chairman. And it could come from this side or the other side. That is the actual position. It is not a question of now having come this side it cannot go the other side. I think it is a much bigger experience, and a bigger machine.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tuan Speaker, dengan izin bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris:

Mr Speaker, Sir, I rise to participate in this debate also because we do not wish our silence to be interpreted as absolute consent to what is going on in this House as regards this Motion. We are glad that our friends on the left have raised this matter about representation, and about the non-appointment of a

Member of the Opposition as Chairman. I think the matter is not so much a matter of opinion, but a matter of fair play, and being above board. I regret to say that the appointment of Yang Berhormat Koay Boon Seng is only what I would call a tiny concession on the part of the Honourable the Chief Minister. In this case I say 'the Honourable the Chief Minister' although he does not want me to lumber everything on his lap, because we on this side of the House have time and again pressed that we be represented. If I am not mistaken, we did say so the First Session, and we did say at the Second Session. In the First Session the Member for Bayan Lepas, on behalf of the Alliance UMNO, was appointed; and he was also appointed Chairman. In the Second Session, in lieu of appointing a Member of the greater faction of the Opposition they appointed the Independent Member. And that was done also on the basis of appointing him the Chairman. Now, at that time we asked to be represented, but did not question the position of Chairmanship because it was satisfactory at least that Chairmanship was in the hands of a Member of the Opposition. But I say this is only a very tiny concession to our appeal time and again to the Honourable the Chief Minister because perhaps he feels that in this concession he cannot keep the tide back so long as all that, although he would like to command the tide to recede. And he makes this tiny concession in fact in the letter only; not in the spirit, Sir, of this Committee.

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member for Kelawei, I think the appointment of this Committee is up to the House. So, if the Honourable Member would refrain from blaming the Chief Minister for the appointment, we proceed to discuss and decide on the appointment of this Committee.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Yes, I agree, Mr Speaker, Sir, it is for the House. But we know that these recommendations come down from Ex-co. because I myself had written a letter to the Honourable the Chief Minister, if he would not shake

his head, once before in this connection. And he wrote me a reply saying that this matter had been considered by Ex-co., and it does not feel justified; and thanking me for my views in the matter. I have the letter. In any event, the point we are trying to make is that this is a very tiny concession in letter only. The Government, in all fairness, should appoint a Member of the Opposition as the Chairman if it wants the appearance of impartiality. It would appear, Sir, that even this tiny concession of appointing a Member from the Opposition, particularly from the D.A.P., is something in which the Chief Minister feels that he has gone far enough—that would cause, it would appear, sufficient damage to the Government; and that the appointment of a Chairman would make things even worse.

Tuan Speaker: May I interrupt the Honourable Member?

I find a few Members either asleep or concentrating very hard. Oh, they are concentrating! Please carry on.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): So, Mr Speaker, Sir, the failure to appoint a Member of the Opposition to the Chairmanship, as quite rightly stated by previous speakers on this side, has to be explained by the Honourable the Chief Minister. And that explanation, Sir, is not to say that we are not bound by precedence. We have tried one 'going' and tried another; and now we have decided to do something else. That, Sir, is no explanation. And if I might say (*gangguan*).

Ketua Menteris: Tuan Yang Dipertua, on a point of clarification. Saya minta kebenaran.

So that the records are straight, I think the Honourable Member for Kelawei will agree with me that when he wrote to me his letter the Orders of the Day had already been sent to the State Ex-co. for consideration; and my reply to his letter was therefore in accordance. So I do not wish the House to think that this had happened at some previous time, and I had pre-judged the actions that led to the Order Paper being what it is.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): So, Mr Speaker, Sir, I think that the Honourable the Chief Minister and Members of the Government do owe this House an explanation because this Committee is not like the previous Committee which we had appointed. This Committee, Sir, is under a specific Standing Order of the House, and also under the provisions of the Constitution. This is a Constitutional Committee, required by the Federal Constitution. Article 107 of the Federal Constitution requires such a Committee to be set up. And that Committee is a watch-dog Committee to supervise over the financial affairs of the State. And its powers, Mr Speaker, Sir, you will see are quite different from the powers of the previous Committee. This Committee has powers to direct papers to be produced, and various persons to attend before this Committee. So I would have thought, Sir, that having been in the seat of Government for the last four years, granted there was some degree previously of, shall we say, uneasiness on the part of the Government, by today, Sir, we should have that degree of confidence on the part of the Government to say, 'We have carried things out above board; and we need not refer again to the A.C.A.'. And we want an impartial Committee—a Committee under the Constitution to be headed by Members of the Opposition. And that is because the Committee must be seen to be above suspicion, above bias. Now, can we expect the Member for Dhoby Ghaut, having been told that silence is golden, to go into the financial affairs of this State? I wonder! And he is a Party man. So, therefore, I regret that the Honourable the Chief Minister and his Government have failed. If they feel sincerely and honestly in their hearts of hearts that this is a correct innovation in the proceedings of this House then they should justify it to this House and explain to us why, apart from the fact that he is prepared to break precedence. We are well aware of that. But, aside from that, to justify and explain to this House why the Member of the Opposition who is appointed is

not appointed at the same time as Chairman of the Committee. It is a reflection on the previous Member, as he said? Or is it a reflection on the particular Member being appointed? Is it being said that he is not capable of being a Chairman? So I think that Chief Minister has left doors half-opened. He should either open them completely, or he should close them. But to carry on like this we on this side of the House, although in the spirit, Sir, of service to the State and to the people, we accept the appointment. We do not object immediately. But we do so with tremendous reservations because we believe that this is a travesty of justice; and we do not wish that our silence and our acceptance of the appointment be read as support for the stand of the Honourable the Chief Minister and what he says. It is certainly not. But we do accept it because we feel that even with that limited mandate that we have, and in spite of the manner in which the Honourable the Chief Minister has prejudiced the Committee through the appointment of his own Member as Chairman, although, according to the composition of the Committee as it stands, the Government clearly has a majority. But if the Honourable the Chief Minister does not wish to be above suspicion, as the Member for Ayer Itam likes to say, like Caesar's wife, we can understand because he wants to be Caesar (*Ketawa*).

Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Encik Ismail bin Hashim): Tuan Speaker, saya dalam mengulung Usul saya yang dibawa sebentar tadi, saya rasa, saya nampak Pembangkang hanya hendak mengambil masa Dewan ini dengan tidak membawa sesuatu usul samaada bersetuju dengan cadangan yang saya membawa Ahli-ahli yang terdiri daripada empat orang itu atau tidak ada langsung, tetapi pindaan kepada Usul yang saya bawa. Jadi cuma yang saya nampak daripada apa yang diucapkan daripada Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Ayer Itam dan juga Sungei Bakap dan Kelawei merasa tidak puas hati tentang

lantikan Pengerusi Jawatankuasa ini. Saya rasa dalam Standing Order kita, tidak ada menunjukkan samada pihak Pembangkang atau pihak Kerajaan mesti menjadi Pengerusi, tetapi saya rasa dengan sebab itu apa yang saya cadangkan ini adalah mengenai dengan Peraturan 109 (1).

Terimakasih.

Soalan dikemukakan dan diperseutujui dengan sebulat suara.

(F). USUL OLEH YANG BERHORMAT KETUA MENTERI.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya mohon mengusul 'Bahawa Dewan ini meluluskan perbelanjaan sebanyak Ringgit Lima Puluh Ribu' sahaja (\$50,000) seperti yang ditunjukkan di dalam Anggaran Tambahan Pembangunan Yang Pertama tahun 1973 dan yang dibentangkan sebagai Risalat Dewan Undangan Negeri Bilangan Kedua tahun 1973 dan membuat ketetapan bahawa jumlah wang yang tersebut hendaklah dipergunakan bagi tujuan-tujuan yang ditetapkan di dalam Anggaran Tambahan Pembangunan Yang Pertama tahun 1973'.

Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya minta maaf kepada Ahli-ahli Dewan ini di atas pindaan ini yang disebabkan oleh kesilapan kekeranian. Usul ini melibatkan khususnya \$50,000 sahaja yang tidak diperuntukkan untuk tujuan-tujuan pembangunan yang dalam kes ini berkenaan dengan bantuan kepada Perbadanan Perpustakaan Umum Pulau Pinang. Anggaran \$50,000 ini pada asalnya telah dimasukkan di dalam jumlah \$1,930,000 tetapi setelah dipertimbangkan oleh Kerajaan, jumlah \$1,880,000 patut ditunjukkan di dalam anggaran perbelanjaan biasa.

Anggaran Tambahan Yang Pertama yang telah dibahaskan oleh Dewan tadi meliputi anggaran tambahan perbelanjaan biasa dan juga anggaran tambahan pembangunan. Dengan itu adalah mustahak perkara perbelanjaan yang beberapa pembangunan diuruskan berasingan sebagai Usul Dewan ini iaitu mengikut Seksyen 4 (ii) Development Funds Act, tahun 1966 seperti

yang berkaitan dengan Kerajaan Negeri di bawah Seksyen 9 di dalam Akta yang tersebut. Berikutan dari itu jumlah \$50,000 yang dimasukkan khususnya sebagai bantuan kepada Perbadanan Perpustakaan Umum Pulau Pinang untuk menemui bantuan \$1.00 untuk \$1.00 yang diberi oleh Perbadanan Perpustakaan Negara adalah kini dibahaskan di bawah Usul ini.

Tuan Yang Dipertua saya mohon mengusul.

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

Tuan Speaker: Usul dibuka untuk dibahaskan.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Tuan Speaker, saya mohon izin bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Chief Minister in moving this Motion explained that this part of \$50,000 for the State Development Corporation has been taken up from the '\$1130' as it applies for improvement of the State Public Library, and not as a separate grant to meet the transfer or the running expenses of the Library. It is for capital expenses of the Library. What struck me most was indeed this contribution on a dollar-for-dollar basis. I would like to take up this matter. I do not know how the Government arrived at this basis of a dollar-for-dollar contribution. From what I can see in the Federal Constitution, Libraries come under the Federal List—Item 13 (b) under 'Education' which is 'Libraries;'. And therefore I tried to look at the State List or the Concurrent List. But even then I was not able to find anything where Libraries are mentioned under the Concurrent or State List. Therefore one would suppose that Libraries are under the exclusive purview and responsibility of the Federal Government. My attention was drawn to the fact that under certain clauses in the Federal Constitution the Federal Government has delegated its power to the State Government to

enable it to set up bodies. If I were to look up that particular provision, Mr Speaker, Sir, I would find that this provision is merely to enable State Governments, as the long title of Act No. 15 of 1962 says, ' . . . to make laws with respect to the incorporation of certain persons and bodies within State'. Therefore, Mr Speaker, Sir, let me explain here that I am not claiming to be an expert of law. Neither would the Legal Adviser claim to be an expert of law. As we know, interpretation of the law is not a prerogative of anybody. Even the courts and Judges have made rulings which are reversed on appeal to the Federal Court. And the Federal Court may make a ruling which is reversed on appeal to the Privy Council. Therefore nobody can claim to be an expert. In this respect I am saying this because just now, on the point raised by the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam, the Chief Minister wangled his way round, and said he is aware of it. There is nothing wrong. But that is his method of interpretation. And we will leave it at that because I know he would like to take me to task for whatever interpretation that I made in this House. I am asking that because I feel this power is merely for the purpose of incorporation. In other words, the power is given to the State to set up bodies which are enumerated in the Schedule—that is, with regard to State Scholarships, State Educational Endowments, Museums and Public Libraries, etc. etc. But that doesn't take it out of the Ninth Schedule, which is the responsibility of the Federal Government. And where I am coming to, Mr Speaker, Sir, is that if it comes under the Ninth Schedule therefore the financing of this project must come out of Federal funds. As such, I do agree also that where the Federal Government has not taken steps to set up bodies like this it is a good thing that the State thinks of setting up these bodies. But the State should make representations and agitate for the funds to come from the Federal Government. It is a Federal responsibility. We cannot use State funds

for these purposes. Or rather, shall I say, we should try and conserve State funds for other purposes for which the State has direct responsibility. We should not finance from our own funds projects which are the sole responsibility of the Federal Government. And therefore, on the question of this dollar-for-dollar contribution, the State should agitate for and request, and try and get the whole of the contribution for the running of public Libraries from the Federal Government. Thank you very much.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya minta izin menjawab dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the matter is a straightforward one. The Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap has brought up, I think, a valid point. But I feel that he was just making this point as as legal exercise. I mean he very nicely began by saying that although being a member of the learned profession he would not claim to be an expert. So, how then? I was not even a member of the learned profession replying. Therefore, how could I? I do not claim to be even a starter. However, Sir, it is entirely his opinion as to what we should do. But I honestly urge the Members of this House to appreciate that if we went on waiting until the Federal Government gave an initiating grant to the Library Corporation it may take us a long, long time to get anything started. I think Honourable Members will agree also that we have to do something to move ahead. And through our representation the Federal Government had agreed to give a grant of \$50,000. I think for the State to match it dollar-for-dollar is not outside the interest of the State. The Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap and his colleagues all agree—and I am sure Members of the Opposition, and other Members of the House agree—that it is to the interests of Penang to have a State Library. And if so I think we should get on with it.

My friend, the Honourable Member from Dhoby Ghaut, has already indicated (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Mr Speaker, Sir, on a point of clarification, I think, if my memory is correct I did congratulate the Government for taking the initiative. But what I am trying to say is that having taken the initiative we should try and recover the money from the Federal Government.

Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Encik Ismail bin Hashim): In due course.

Ketua Menteri: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member from Dhoby Ghaut had indicated that in actual fact if we did not manage to get more money from the Federal Government, or from public sources, or from the own enterprise of the Penang Library Corporation, the State Government may have to consider giving an even greater operational grant. But that is a separate matter—anticipating the future. We hope that the Library Corporation will function well; and the Government will consider the matter as it arises. However, I had indicated that the Government will do whatever it can to establish the Penang State Library and to implement the Library Corporation Enactment to the fullest.

I refer now to the clarification that the State Government should ask the Federal Government for more, and recover our grant. Sir, the grant that the Government has given is not an attempt to start off the Library *per se*. It is only an equivalent measure of what the State can do in relation to what the Federal Government can do. We can only hope that the Federal Government will give even more. But, similarly, I think the Honourable Member will not object if the State, without having to wait for the Federal Government, also gives more by way of an initial grant. The colleagues of the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam will tell him that it is perhaps a very, very small sum, compared to what will be a total requirement to establish a fully-functioning library. So, from that point of view, what the State has started is virtually almost a token of support. And I hope that the members of Corporation will take it up and

meet the challenge, and find the resources. But if we were to take realistically the demands and needs of the Library—particularly of a good library—I think the \$50,000 that the State has contributed by way of an initiating grant is only a very small sum. That we understand. And I had already earlier on this morning expressed the hope anyway that Honourable Members who feel very strongly about the public institution of a State Library could perhaps lead the way by giving a donation to the Library. Similarly, I hope that the Honourable Member from Sungai Bakap would not imply that the State Government should not do anything because this is a Federal matter. I think he was just bringing a point. The point is noted. But I hope I get the support of the House in total to giving this grant to the Penang Library Corporation.

Soalan dikemukakan dan dipersetujui dengan sebulat suara.

(G). USUL OLEH YANG BERHORMAT ENCIK TAN PHOCK KIN.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to move a small amendment to my own Motion; and that is to amend my Motion by adding the words “the State Government and” after the words “shared by” and before the words “all consumers” in the 5th line of the text. So the Motion as amended will read:

“That this Assembly considers the increase in water tariffs by the newly constituted State Water Authority to be contrary to the principles of the Rukunegara of creating a just society, in that the burden of the increase is not equitably shared by the State Government and all consumers in accordance with their ability to pay.

This Assembly therefore calls upon the State Government to take appropriate steps to get the State Water Authority to review the increased tariffs so as to render the water rates more equitable.”

Tuan Speaker: I do not see it is relevant to add “the State Government and” after the words “shared by” . . . (gagguan).

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): And before the words "all consumers". So it will read:

" the burden of the increase is not equitably shared by the State Government and all consumers in accordance with their ability to pay."

Tuan Speaker: Under what Standing Order are you moving this?

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): The usual Standing Order for amendment—34 (i):

"The following motions may be proposed without notice—

- (i) A Motion by way of amendment to any motion being debated in the Assembly;"

Tuan Speaker: No, I do not see that it is relevant. Order 34 says:

"The following motions may be proposed without notice—

- (i) A motion by way of amendment to any motion being debated in Assembly;"

"being debated": You say it comes under 34 (i)?

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Order 33:

"If a Member desires to vary the terms of a motion standing in his name, he may do so by giving at the Table an amended notice of motion, provided that such amendment does not, in the opinion of the Speaker materially alter any principle embodied in the original notice of motion was given."

Tuan Speaker: That would be whether it materially alters the principle embodied in the original Motion. I have to read the thing very carefully.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): I am only adding four words.

Tuan Speaker: Your original Motion is:

"That this Assembly considers the increase in water tariffs by the newly constituted State Water Authority to be contrary to the principles of the Rukunegara of creating a just society, in that the burden of the increase is not equitably shared by all consumers in accordance with their ability to pay"

Now you are amending it by adding the words "the State Government and". Your amended Motion would read:

"That this Assembly considers the increase in water tariffs by the newly constituted State Water Authority to be contrary to the principles of the Rukunegara of creating a just society, in that the burden of the increase is not equitably shared by the State Government and all consumers in accordance with their ability to pay"

I think there is a big material difference. The original Motion is ". not equitably shared by all consumers . . .", without "the State Government and". Now you have thrown in this thing. I am sorry I cannot allow this amendment.

Pindaan tidak dibenarkan.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Mr Speaker, Sir, on your ruling, with due respect, the body of the Motion is the same. It is only adding four words. So it is a question of sharing the burden. Anyway, I will move the Motion as it stands.

It is important first of all to look at the rationale that promoted the Water Authority to increase water rates. According to the Press Statement issued by the General Manager—and I quote—'the new rates will help to maintain a self-sustaining waterworks of the highest quality to meet the growing needs of the community. And to enable the Authority to achieve this domestic consumers will be charged a subsidised rate of 60 cents per thousand gallons for the first 5,000 gallons of consumption'. Then the General Manager went on to say in his statement that this means that the average group with a monthly consumption varying from 5,000 to 6,000 gallons will pay the same monthly bills as before.

I like to ask the Honourable the Chief Minister whether it is the policy of his Government that essential services like water supply must be self-sustaining. I think this is the crux of a policy matter. The whole idea of increasing water rates, as explained by the General Manager, is to keep the water supply self-sustaining; so that is the most crucial question. Is it the

policy? If this is so then I would like to ask the Honourable the Chief Minister: How are we to establish a just society in accordance with the principles of the Rukunegara? Then in the question of water rates it is particularly difficult because we have at the same time to maintain water rates at a sufficiently low level in order not to deter the industrialists from having their factories in the State of Penang. So, on the one hand we feel that the poor consumers must be subsidised. But the main subsidy that we can give is also limited by the amount of increase that we are prepared to impose as far as consumers are concerned. Here the policy of the Government again to encourage industrialists to come here will control the upper limit.

As a medical man the Honourable the Chief Minister is fully aware that the free use of water is essential.

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member from Ayer Itam, can I say that we are now debating these water tariffs which the Honourable Member himself knows comes under the State Water Authority?

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): What I am trying to do is to ask the Government to use its influence (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: I see.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): to make this change of policy. And that is the full crux of the matter. I fully appreciate that the Water Authority is entirely a different body; and the Chief Minister is only the Chairman of the Water Authority. But now I am asking—the Assembly is asking—the State Government to do its utmost, in view of the policy of the Government in adhering to the Rukunegara. I was saying that as a medical man the Honourable the Chief Minister is fully aware that the free use of water is essential towards maintaining a healthy community. Our water charges must therefore be low enough so that the poorest member of the community will not have to consider every gallon he uses in terms of

the price which he has to pay for it. It is indeed a sad day for the State of Penang as water charges are such that after using the toilet a poor consumer is hesitating whether to flush or not to flush. Even of more important it is that rates must be low enough to enable poor rural people to instal piped water in their homes. These are the two very fundamental problems. And particularly the Chief Minister gave a great deal of play on the theory of equalisation of water rates, thereby trying to help the rural people. I have no quarrel with him on this. I am saying that the water rates must be low enough in the urban areas to enable people to use it without worrying about the money which they have to pay. And in the rural areas it must be low enough to enable Ali in the Kampong to instal piped water.

Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Encik Ismail bin Hashim): How much do you think it will cost?

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): That is your job. I am giving you the whole argument—destroy the policy of the Government that water rates must be self-sustaining, because if that is the case it is all wrong. The question of a just society doesn't come in at all because if you are doing that then poor Ali will never have piped water in his house because he cannot afford to have water at the present water rates. And even Ramasamy and Ah Kow in Cintra Street will have great difficulties.

Ketua Menteri: Suppiah (*ketawa*).

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S.P. Chelliah): Yeap Ghim Guan.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): The argument of the General Manager—and he argues very clearly—is on the presumption that the average consumer of the lower-income group with monthly consumption varying from 5,000 to 6,000 gallons will pay the same monthly bill as before. This presumption is by no means correct. And I shall go on to prove it. To start with, average consumers of the lower-income group do not live in

houses all by themselves and utilise one meter. On the contrary, they live in cubicles, with 5, 6, 10 or sometimes 15 families utilising one meter for the purposes of water consumption. Their consumption of water is therefore based on rates charged on the common meter. And because of this rates payable by them are rates based on consumption in the region of 20,000 or 30,000 gallons, depending on the number of families living in that particular house. They will therefore not be paying the same rates as before, but at rates which show increases varying from 20 per cent for 5,000 gallons to 64.3 per cent for 20,000 gallons, and 67.2 per cent for 30,000 gallons. Thereafter the percentage increase starts to increase, but at a decreasing percentage. And in this respect, just to give Honourable Members an idea of the increase, for 5,000 gallons the increase is 20 per cent of the former price which they had to pay. And the Honourable the Chief Minister will always try to hide the percentage increase because that figure does not suit him at all. So he will say that the increase is only 50 cents; or it is 50 cents out of \$2.50—a percentage of 20 per cent. And it goes up to 55 per cent for 10,000 gallons; 61.3 per cent for 15,000 gallons and 64.3 per cent for 20,000 gallons, reaching a peak at 30,000 gallons—67.2 per cent; and from then onwards reducing—for 40,000 gallons at 58.5 per cent; and for 60,000 gallons going down to 44.7 per cent. So this is the position, because the increase is quite fantastic. And this is particularly so when we look at the budget of a poor family. It is difficult enough to pay water rates as it was before the increase. But to be asked to pay 20% to 60% more on water is a bit beyond. This is the crux of the problem. So it will be seen from the figures given by me that what the General Manager says—that there is no increase whatsoever even for people consuming 5,000 to 6,000 gallons—is not correct because my figure shows that for 5,000 the increase is 20%, and for 6,000 it is 31.7%. And my figure is based on rates in the City Council area, to be fair to the General Manager because the General Manager in his

statement says there is no increase, and he did not say he was referring solely to rural areas. That may be so. But in the City Council area, even for consumers of between 5,000 and 6,000 there is an increase—20% to 31.7%.

So I must tell the Honourable the Chief Minister here quite categorically that I am not quarreling with him over the equalisation of water rates throughout the State. But what we are advocating is that the rates must be such that the poor will not be restrained from using water because of the price. So this is the position. People who have already had water installed in their homes may be restrained from using more water, even to the extent of 'contrary to health' reasons. And yet people who have not had the opportunity of having piped water in their homes will be deprived of this opportunity because the price is such that they cannot possibly do it. So I agree that to do so, if the consumers are not going to pay for it themselves, somebody must pay.

The principles of the Rukunegara and the policy of the State to attract industrialists are not consistent with the idea of a self-sustaining waterworks. So if you want to have a self-sustaining waterworks then somebody among the consumers must pay for it. And if the poor are going to be sufficiently subsidised the industrialists and the rich must pay for the subsidy. And here again the policy of the State Government is that we are not going to deter industrialists from coming to the State of Penang. We must encourage them to come. And to do so our water rates must not be so high as to deter them from coming. And here you have this conflict.

And, as I stated before, the only answer must be to subsidise more, and share the burden of increased cost with the consumers. I appreciate fully that the State Government that this subsidy of \$1.7 million, as stated by the Honourable the Chief Minister, is a step in the right direction. But this subsidy need not be recurrent because as the years go by in the production of water there is a great element of what is called fixed cost'. However much water

you consume the fixed cost will remain constant. Because of this very factor cost of production will not increase in the same proportion as the increase in consumption. So as a result you will have your margin as consumption of water increased. And your subsidy need not be in the region of \$1.7 million as the years go by. So what I am saying now is that if the State Government is serious about building a just society then the subsidy must be more. It is as simple as all that.

And the Honourable the Chief Minister will ask me: 'Where is the money going to come from?' And I think he himself should know. He has increased quit rent to quite a great extent. And according to the Auditor-General's Report it is thirteen-fold. And surely he can find ways and means of diverting funds from quit rent and other avenues to assist the poor water consumers. And this is actually the whole crux of the matter.

It is my earnest hope that the Honourable the Chief Minister will take my comments on the increase in water rates seriously. What I am asking him to do is not so much not to increase water rates at all. But what I am asking him to do is to look into the question of State subsidy in greater detail, and to review the present rates. I think there is a great deal to say for reduction in the water rates for domestic consumers below even the 20,000 gallons limit because, as I have pointed out, one must take into consideration the peculiarities of the people living in this particular State. And this sort of thing is not only applicable to the urban area. Even in the rural areas we do also have many families living in one house, and using one water meter. So one cannot simply quote that most houses are one-family houses; and therefore the consumption is from 5,000 to 6,000 gallons a month. In most cases, and particularly in George Town area—in none other than the constituency of the Chief Minister, and even the constituencies of Tanjong Barat and Tanjong Tengah and Tanjong Selatan—most of the town dwellers do not live in one house. They share the house. The

house is divided into various cubicles—small, little cubicles; and the number of families varies from 5 to 10, 15 or even 20 in bigger houses. And we must, if we are really sincere about alleviating the living conditions of the poor, and if we are serious about bridging the gaps between the 'haves' and the 'have-nots', this is the sort of thing we have to do. So, Mr Speaker, Sir, in view of that I would like to move the Motion standing in my name.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Tuan Speaker, saya mohon menyokong Usul itu.

Dewan ditangguhkan pada jam 4.10 petang.

Dewan bersidang semula pada 4.45 petang.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Tuan Speaker, saya minta izin supaya bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

Tuan Speaker, it is an admitted fact that water is a basic necessity for all men. One can do without electricity; one can do without many things; but certainly no one can do without water, whether they be rich or they be poor.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I second the Motion by my colleague the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam, particularly because I feel that this is the wrong time to bring up the price of water, and to increase the water rate. This is the time that the prices of all other commodities are increasing; and people in our State are very hard hit by the rising prices of all the necessary commodities in our State. And I regret very much that the Water Authority should think that this is the time they join in the race with the increased prices of all other commodities. I thought the least the Honourable the Chief Minister, as Chairman of the Water Authority would recommend to the Board would be that we wait a couple of years, instead of increasing the water rate at this particular moment.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I think the House could still remember that at the time when the Water Authority Bill was introduced in this House I particularly

asked, and I pressed for the answer to the question: 'What is going to be the new rate? Is it going to be like the land rent that increased 100 per cent, 200 per cent, 1,000 per cent? And here the Honourable the Chief Minister gave a pledge in the Assembly that there would be no rise in the water rates. And this is reported in the 'Straits Echo'. Sorry. It is reported in the 'Star'.

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member for Bagan Ajam, 'Star' or 'Echo'?

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): 'Star'. I apologise.

Mr Speaker, Sir, it is less than one year since then; and I regret that the Honourable the Chief Minister cannot even remember what he said less than one year ago; and has introduced a new water rate at this time of the year. Mr Speaker, Sir, what is the result today because of the increase of the water rate? The result is very simple: If we have 5 children at home, instead of having them bathe twice a day we can have them bathe once a day because

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah Encik Khoo Soo Giap): Once a week.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): or probably once every other day; or probably once a week. And this concerns the health of our children. How much does the Honourable the Chief Minister think of the children of the people of our State?

Mr Speaker, Sir, another result that would arise from this increase in water rate is this: When we wash our backyard our drains now instead of washing it once a day or once a week we would have to delay it because many people cannot afford the new water rates. Mr Speaker, Sir, we should especially think of the people of the constituency of the Chief Minister himself—the people in Malay Street where the houses are very large, and 5 or 6 families stay in one house. They share one meter and when they

have to use something like 10,000 gallons of water a month they have to pay 55 per cent more.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I personally noticed the increase of the water bill when I received the bill from the Council. Instead of using something like \$12 a month it is coming up to nearly \$20 a month. So I have to restrain myself from washing my backyard, drains, and so on. Mr Speaker, Sir, this concerns the people in our kampungs and rural districts. When they think of the new water rate, instead of installing a meter and getting the piped water they would rather resort to getting well water which is not very healthy for the children and for the people there.

Mr Speaker, Sir, when the new water rate was announced I observed from some Press reports, especially the Chinese Press report, that even the Gerakan members came up objecting to the new rate. I hope that the Honourable the Chief Minister will listen to his own members before putting this new water rate into use.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I have heard a great deal from the Honourable the Chief Minister himself—that what he is doing for the State is to bring about the well-being of the people; to think of the welfare of the people. Now I am asking the Honourable the Chief Minister; Do you think that it is going to help to bring about the well-being of the people by increasing the water rate, especially at this time when the people are hard hit by the increasing prices of the necessary commodities in the market? Is this the way the Honourable the Chief Minister thinks of the welfare of the poor people in our State? I submit here, Mr Speaker, Sir, that the Honourable the Chief Minister should reconsider the new water rate. I hope he will announce it later that there is no rise in water rate. And I will say, 'Congratulations to you.' Thank you very much.

Ahli Kawasan Butterworth (Encik Ooi Ah Bee): Tuan Speaker, saya bangun bukan untuk menyokong Usul

yang dikemukakan oleh Ahli daripada Kawasan Ayer Itam, tetapi menentangna.

Tuan Speaker, dalam hujah-hujah yang telah diterangkan oleh Ahli daripada Ayer Itam mengenai kesusahan yang telah diberi kepada penduduk-penduduk seperti menggunakan air khasnya kepada pengguna-pengguna air yang datang daripada satu kampung, dan juga datang daripada sebuah rumah untuk mengadakan banyak penduduk-penduduk ataupun satu rumah yang dikatakan dalam Bahasa Inggeris—common lodging house. Jadi, Tuan Speaker, dalam menentang Usul yang telah dikemukakan oleh Ahli daripada Ayer Itam itu, suka juga saya menerangkan di sini kenapa kita naikan harga air pada masa sekarang iaitu ada 2 faktor yang saya boleh ingat. Satu daripadanya ialah kerana kita telah meminjam wang daripada Asian Development Bank dan sebab itu kita terpaksa membayar kepada Bank tersebut. Dan yang kedua, walaupun pembayaran wang itu bebannya bukan terletak kepada Kerajaan Negeri sahaja, tetapi sebagai satu masyarakat yang adil saya ingat adillah juga kalau kita sama-ratakan pembayaran dengan pembayaran itu diberikan kepada semua rakyat yang menggunakan air tersebut. Di sini juga, dalam ucapan Yang Berhormat Ahli dari Kawasan Ayer Itam, beliau telah menyatakan beberapa kali iaitu biasanya dalam common lodging house ada banyak keluarga yang tinggal di sana (*gangguan*)

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Bolehkah saya beri keterangan? Saya tidak sebut common lodging house. Saya sebut satu rumah banyak keluarga yang duduk di situ bukan common lodging house.

Ahli Kawasan Butterworth (Encik Ooi Ah Bee): Tuan Speaker, maksud dia keluarga yang banyak. Tetapi kalau keluarga banyak saya ingat itupun common lodging house—banyak orang duduk (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Tidak fahamlah.

Ahli Kawasan Butterworth (Encik Ooi Ah Bee): Faham itu—saya mengikut maksud Ahli Yang Berhormat (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Ini tidak payah lesen.

Ahli Kawasan Butterworth (Encik Ooi Ah Bee): Tidak payah lesen. Saya tahu tidak payah lesen. Tetapi ada banyak keluarga yang tinggal dalam common lodging house.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Lodging house ada lesen.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): You better refer to encyclopedia. (*Ketawa*).

Ahli Kawasan Butterworth (Encik Ooi Ah Bee): Ahli Yang Berhormat kalau hendak cakap berdirilah cakap.

Tuan Speaker, saya ingat dalam kebanyakan rumah-rumah yang banyak keluarga di sini saya ingat kalau betul-betul Ahli daripada Kawasan Ayer Itam dan juga Ahli daripada Kawasan Bagan Ajam siasat, kebanyakan daripada mereka itu menggunakan air dalam region 4,800 gelen atau 5,800 gelen sebulan. Dan, juga barangkali kalau ada festival-festival ataupun keramaian, kahwin dan sebagainya, saya ingat mungkin consumption itu melebihi. Jadi, Tuan Speaker, saya ingat dalam argument saya di sini perlu juga kalau saya membawa Ahli Yang Berhormat—jangan pergi ke tempat lain, kita pergi ke kawasan Ahli Yang Berhormat sendiri iaitu di Rifle Range. Kalau kita meninjau ke Rifle Range, kita bandingkan air yang digunakan oleh Blok B, saya ingat mereka itu tidak menggunakan air lebih daripada 3,700 gelen sebulan pada tiap-tiap penghuni. Jadi ini saya berani terangkan di sini bahawa tidak kira penghuni-penghuni yang di ground floor—yang bawah sekali oleh kerana mereka adalah generous dan ada juga kedai-kedai kopi dan gerai-gerai. Dan juga dalam masaalah ini kalaulah kita tidak mahu bandingkan Rifle Range iaitu satu kawasan yang luas benar, kita boleh juga banding dengan flat Noordin Street, dan kawasan

perumahan yang lain seperti Trengganu Road dan sebagainya. Saya boleh katakan di sini iaitu kalau kita menyiasat betul-betul dalam tiap-tiap satu penghuni mereka itu tidak gunakan air lebih daripada 5,000 gelen pada tiap-tiap bulan. Jadi, di sini sudah menunjukkan iaitu kenaikan itu tidak dikenakan kepada mereka yang menggunakan air yang kurang daripada 5,000 gelen sebulan. Saya ingat perkara kenaikan air kepada orang-orang yang menggunakan air yang lebih daripada 5,000 gelen itu dikenakan sahaja kepada penghuni-penghuni ataupun orang-orang, keluarga-keluarga yang menggunakan air bukan untuk kegunaan keperluan mereka tetapi menggunakan air seperti yang diterangkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Bagan Ajam iaitu mencuci kereta, mencuci kebun dan sebagainya.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): On a point of clarification, I did not mention that cuci kereta at all. I say backyard and drains.

Ahli Kawasan Butterworth (Encik Ooi Ah Bee): Bagaimanapun saya ingat cuci kebun atau cuci drain (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Cuci kereta is for rich man.

Ahli Kawasan Butterworth (Encik Ooi Ah Bee): dan sebagainya. saya ingat kalau mereka itu menggunakan untuk berkebun dan mereka yang mengadakan kolam mandi di bilik air—kalau dalam weather yang panas mereka adakan cold bath dan yang dalam masa sejuk ada hot bath. Itu saya ingat bolehlah melebihi dan taraf mereka di situ bukanlah satu taraf orang miskin.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Don't distort the fact.

Ahli Kawasan Butterworth (Encik Ooi Ah Bee): Saya ingat kalau kita pakai hot water bath dan cold water bath itu adalah satu taraf yang lebih kepada orang-orang miskin. Jadi, itu saya ingat (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): You are distorting all the facts.

Ahli Kawasan Butterworth (Encik Ooi Ah Bee): yang telah disebutkan oleh Ahli daripada Bagan Ajam bukanlah satu taraf hidup orang miskin. Tuan Speaker, dalam perbahasan ini saya percaya kita hendak mengsaimbangkan kedudukan rakyat di luar bandar dan juga dalam bandar. Jadi kita kena ingat, kalaulah kita ambil air daripada kawasan-kawasan pekeliling luar bandar itu dan juga kita naikkan harga air di luar bandar, saya ingat itu tidaklah mengikut sepertimana yang dikatakan oleh Ahli daripada Kawasan Ayer Itam—satu masyarakat yang adil. Jadi, saya ingat betul juga kalau kita hendak mengsaimbangkan rate air ataupun kenaikan harga air, kita menaiki harga air dalam pekan-pekan atau bandar-bandar setaraf dengan harga air yang ada dalam luar bandar oleh kerana keperluan air itu selalu datangnya daripada kawasan luar bandar.

Tuan Speaker, sepertimana yang saya sebutkan iaitu perlu juga kita naikkan harga air oleh kerana kita terpaksa membayar wang pinjaman. Dalam perkara ini, Tuan Speaker, saya tidak hendak memanjangkan perbahasan saya tetapi nampaknya selalu dalam perbahasan usul-usul daripada Ahli-Ahli Yang Berhormat khasnya daripada Pembangkang, mereka selalu menghebah-hebahkan ataupun mengikut rekod-rekod yang lama. Jadi, kalaulah mereka boleh mengikut rekod-rekod yang lama saya ingat sebelah sini pun boleh mengikut rekod-rekod yang lama yang telah digunakan oleh Ahli-Ahli pihak Pembangkang. Jadi, saya, Tuan Speaker, berfikir bahawa boleh jadi ataupun barangkali kenaikan harga air ini mengikut fikiran Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Ayer Itam ini tidak mencukupi. Boleh jadi beliau hendak naik lagi harga air ini. Jadi, perkara ini bolehlah saya memberikan satu contoh dan menyebutkan dan saya minta maaf, Tuan Speaker, di sini iaitu saya hendak membaca satu daripada butir-butir mesyuarat yang

telah lalu pada 1hb Julai, 1960, di bawah City Council atau Majlis Bandaraya yang mana Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Ayer Itam sendiri—13 tahun yang dahulu, Ahli Yang Berhormat sebagai seorang ahli dalam Health and Water Committee.

Saya minta kebenaran, Tuan Speaker, membaca dalam Bahasa Inggeris. I would like to refer this Assembly to Minutes of Meeting of the Health and Water Committee in 1957 when we had an Alliance President, and a Water Department controlled by the Alliance. Going through the Minutes we will find our discussion on the question of water rates. It was pointed out then, in 1957, that so long as there adequate resources there was no extreme hurry to increase water rates. At that time the President, according to the Minutes, expressed the view that the Water Department should not be run at a loss. He expressed the views in very clear terms; and they are recorded in the Minutes before me here. If these were their views then they too are exactly the views held by the socialist Councillors here today. In fact, even though the increase in water rates is made we still hear the argument of so and so that it should not be run at a loss.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): What are you calling yourself.

Ahli Kawasan Butterworth (Encik Ooi Ah Bee): Nama Pengerusi, saya tak mahu sebut. We still hear that it should not be run at a loss; that perhaps it should be higher still. Jadi, kemungkinan, Tuan Speaker, di sini boleh jadi kenaikan harga ini tidak mencukupi sepertimana Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Ayer Itam mencadangkan. Jadi, dengan itu, Tuan Speaker, saya dan rakan-rakan saya memang menentang Usul yang dikesulkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Ayer Itam.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah Encik Khoo Soo Giap): Tuan Speaker, dengan izin: Sir, I rise actually to express my regret over the statement issued by the Ketua Menteri not so long

ago, as already repeated by the Member for Bagan Ajam, which had a very short life—the promise or almost guarantee by the Ketua Menteri that the water rate would not increase in Penang. Sir, this is one of the usual promises in giving false hope to the people of Penang. The people of Penang have been taking for granted for about a year that the water rate in the State of Penang would not increase. But right at this moment, in the midst of the spiralling cost of living, the Ketua Menteri has chosen to ignore this very promise of non-increase in water rate, and to impose a high percentage of increase in water rates. Sir, this increase in water rates, as I said earlier—in the midst of the spiralling cost of living in the State of Penang never experienced before—is in fact aimed at bringing about additional difficulties to the wage-earners and the lower-income group of people who form the majority of the people who use water in the State of Penang; Water which, I may include, is one of the necessities of the people. Sir, this increase in water rate would definitely bring added difficulty to the poor people, the lower-income group of people.

I would show an example of how the poor people, particularly those living in the rural areas, are finding it difficult even to pay for water they consume at the previous rate, prior to the increased rate. Take for instance the people in the rural areas. They live on piped water provided by the Government, with no piped water being connected in their premises for the simple reason that, firstly, they cannot afford to pay for the installation; and, secondly, they cannot afford to pay for the amount of water which they consume. And for that reason they have got to—in spite of the amount of inconvenience, like recently the residents of Batu Ferringhi had to line up; hundreds of them—to secure a pail of water from the public stand-pipe. This alone will demonstrate to the Government in power in the State of Penang the amount of difficulties that the poor who are living in the

rural district areas are finding. And with the increase in water rates, coupled with the increase in the cost of living, I think the financial situation of this lower-income group of people, the wage-earners, will be even worse. We are not helping them actually to make their financial ends meet. We are in fact aggravating their already precarious financial position. It is in this light that we would urge the Government to consider reviewing the increased water rate with a view to decreasing the increased rate for domestic use. It was wrong, Sir, for the Ketua Menteri's Political Secretary, who has just participated in the debate to say that the majority of the people, the wage-earners and lower-income group of people, consume an average of 5,000 gallons per month.

Sir, if we take into account the average quantity of water that the people of Penang use, the majority of whom are wage-earners and the lower-income group of people, I would think that the more appropriate average would be in the region of 15,000 gallons; perhaps 20,000 gallons. That would mean, Sir, that the rate of increase would be substantial. Well, it may be argued that we can use 5,000 gallons of water per month instead of 15,000 or 20,000 gallons. True. But, Sir, I would like to refer to what the Honourable Member for Bagan Ajam said earlier. His children may have to bathe once a week. If his children have to bathe once a week—I presume the Honourable Member for Bagan Ajam cannot afford—I think the children of the people in the rural areas will have to bathe only once in two weeks. That may be a bit exaggerated. But the fact still remains that the people may have to use less water. And this poses some health hazards. It was commented earlier by the Member for Butterworth that people in the State of Penang wash drains, etc. True. If the people of Penang try to save the amount they have to pay for the use of water then there must be obvious health hazards. So if we in this State face health hazards then we must obviously blame the increased in water rate. We are hoping that this situation will not

arise. We are here to tell the Government that the present rate of increase is definitely not in keeping with the wages the wage-earners are receiving, particularly when you find people underpaid in the State of Penang like in the electronic factories, etc. With the ever increasing cost of living, plus the increase in the water rate, they will never be able to make financial ends meet.

Sir, I would like to refer again to the Batu Ferringhi case. The people in Batu Ferringhi, in order to be able to get piped water into their premises, can only afford it through payment by instalment—installation fees paid by monthly instalments spread over a period of not less than 12/24 months at a rate of not more than \$5 per month. Now, if they can only afford to pay for installation at the rate of only \$5 per month then we can assume that their income is such that they cannot afford the increase in water rate.

True, the Government will argue that there is a balance now of water rate between the city area and the rural district area. We are not disputing the fact. We are not suggesting that the State Government or the Water Authority should maintain a rate in the rural areas which is higher than the rate in the city. In fact we are happy that the State of Penang has eventually been able to supply water to the people in the State of Penang at rates which are uniform.

Sir, if we are thinking in terms of revenue through water supply, in view of the vast amount of money being borrowed and which has got to be repaid, surely revenue through water supply can be sought from the industrial and commercial areas—commercial rates, industrial rates. We could best look at that angle. Look the other side, instead of squeezing money from the wage-earners or the lower-income group; or, I may say, trying to squeeze blood out of stone. What increase in rate the industrial and commercial areas can afford to pay perhaps the wage-earners and the rural people in the State of Penang will find difficult to pay for the domestic use. So it is

important that the Government, instead of looking to the ordinary people for revenue, should in fact look towards the industrial and commercial areas.

Sir, this Bank loan which has been sought for the Muda Scheme is in fact what has been done by the previous Government; and apparently the baby has got to be carried by this present Government. But, even then, what the previous Government may have done, and which is found to be incorrect, we perhaps today could correct. If in fact the loan is found to be excessive we may perhaps look towards the Federal Government in an attempt to sort this matter out. And with the present good relations between the present Coalition State Government and the Federal Government, this discussion, I assume, will not be difficult for the Ketua Menteri to undertake.

I would not like to deal at length with this Motion. But before I end I would like in this House to once again appeal to the Government and to the State Water Authority to really sit back and to study the rate of increase in water rate for domestic use, and to really consider whether what we have said is correct, with a view to decreasing the already-increasing rates for water. Thank you.

Tuan Speaker: Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat, I have noticed in this debate that there is a lot of repetition—one speaker repeating somebody else. I think it is time we grow up to a stage where we should learn to go to Chapter 2; we do not repeat what previous speakers have said; we bring new points in to the debate. I am very happy that the debate during the last few days has been held in a friendly atmosphere. So let us progress to Chapter 2. Let us please delete irrelevancy; and do not repeat yourself or any other previous speaker.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Terima kasih, Tuan Speaker. Saya bangun menyokong.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I shall try not to repeat what other speakers have said.

Tuan Speaker: Please don't, because I will pull you up.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): I hope you will pull me up if I stray.

Mr Speaker, Sir, to my mind the rise in water rate was yet another shock to the people of Penang when it was announced. A former speaker said we on this side of the House play very old records. And he brought up records of 1957 to substantiate that we are playing old records. At least I would say this: This is the first opportunity that we have of discussing water rates since the announcement by the Water Authority; therefore there could not be any records made. But, nevertheless, from what we see of Government's record that is played one notes that the sound itself has become distorted, and has become meaningless. For example, as was pointed out by the Honourable Member for Bagan Ajam, the Chief Minister pledged in this House—"pledged"; that is the report—that there would be no rise in water rates. But from there onwards you will see that the Chief Minister later went on to say that water rates may be increased—"Warning by Dr Lim that Penang water rates need adjustment." I am just quoting. No distress in this respect. Then comes the last one—"No alternative," says Dr Lim. That is how the record has gone complete rounds. Sir, this is just beside the point, just to show that the records have gone complete rounds.

Now, the Member for Butterworth is talking about this common lodging house, or something like that. I would take Honourable Members a little further away, to the little estates that we have, where ten or fifteen workers share one communal pipe. You see, in that case, where these pipes ought normally to be provided—shall we say, small-holdings.

Tuan Speaker: What pipe?

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Water pipes. You have the water. (*Ketawa*). I was talking of water pipes where they have to share

one communal tap; where in such circumstances the price has increased quite a lot, and the burden of the workers has gone up quite tremendously. I have written to the Manager of the State Water Authority; and he has replied that this is unavoidable. Perhaps they should fix individual pipes. Now, in other words, he accepts the principle that the piped-water rate has gone up, and it is a little burden on them; and therefore he suggests having individual pipes. But, Mr Speaker, Sir, having individual pipes in these places would be a bigger burden, although the State, of course, agree to give an interest-free loan of \$125. I wonder whether \$125 in some cases would be sufficient. And even if it is sufficient, as you are already aware, Mr Speaker, Sir, in Trans-Krian, a kampung which for two years has been waiting for water, they do not have the mains. How can they have the individual pipes? So, unless you give them the mains they cannot have the individual pipes. Apart from this, the fact that the people themselves got together and had a communal pipe is saving the Government and the Water Authority from incurring expenditure on providing a stand-pipe for the common use of other people. And not only the expenditure in providing a stand-pipe. They also save the Government the expenditure of having to give free water through the stand-pipe. Therefore this sort of people should be relieved. But unfortunately the State Water Authority says they do not have the power under the law to give any form of relief at all.

Now, although it has been said that the burden is not heavy, I can at least point out one other instance where the rate has been increased at least 100 times. This is particularly so in the case of minimum charges. The minimum charges are fixed for a consumer who has to pay. Whether he consumes one gallon or not he has to pay the minimum in the case where this minimum has been raised. And in the case of stalls, and small shops, in the rural areas where they do not consume that amount of water, the water rate has been raised to as much as \$5. Now that is 100%.

Well, Mr Speaker, Sir, we cannot equate stalls in the town that are charged, even though there are stalls here. I understand some hotels do not make \$300 a day. But then can we find any stalls in the kampung areas where they make \$30 or \$3 a day? It will be very difficult to find. Therefore the hardship is there.

And the second point which I want to make is this: The method of calculation. And I think in the method of calculation the Water Authority has become cock-eyed. Now, previously, Mr Speaker, Sir, the amount that was charged was at the rate of a certain amount at 50 cents or 60 cents per thousand gallons. Therefore the hundred and smaller units were ignored; whereas now the Water Authority has decided to charge them for every hundred gallons. Now, this would be really cumbersome, for the person has to read even the units. It is very inconvenient; and I would say unnecessary. But apart from that it will entail more persons doing the same job. In other words, you are increasing the cost of the water by having to provide more people to calculate even the fractions. I think that is totally unnecessary.

And finally, as you would not like us to go on, I would say that the Motion has had its effect already. From what I see, since the Motion was sent in we find that the Government is taking cognizance, even if the Motion may be defeated today. It has taken cognizance, and has considered the effect of the rise in water rate; and also has decided to give a grant, as we knew this morning, of another \$180,000 for the water supply. As I mentioned earlier on another occasion, it is my belief, Mr Speaker, Sir, that as water is the only vital requirement of a human being it is the duty of the State to try to provide it; and do so in such a way that every person in the State could have access to it. That is one of the principles why we give free water—special stand-pipes—so that people can have water. And therefore the Government should not push the burden of the cost of the loan repayment and charges on to the consumers. Thank you.

Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Encik Ismail bin Hashim): Tuan Speaker, saya bangun untuk mengambil bahagian dalam Usul yang dibawa oleh Ahli daripada Kawasan Ayer Itam yang bunyinya Usul itu ialah pada penghabisannya—

“Oleh itu Dewan ini merayu Kerajaan Negeri supaya mengambil langkah-langkah yang sewajarnya agar Pihak Berkuasa Air mengkaji semula cukai-cukai yang bertambah itu supaya cukai-cukai air dijadikan lebih saksama.”

Kemudian Tuan Speaker, dalam masa Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Kawasan Ayer Itam membawa Usul ini beliau telahpun menyentuh iaitu berkenaan dengan Rukunegara dan saya sukalah membaca dengan kebenaran Tuan Speaker, satu daripada prinsip Rukunegara yang ada dalam Negeri kita ini yang telahpun diterima oleh rakyat, iaitu (3) Masyarakat Adil yang telahpun ditunjuk-tunjukkan oleh Ahli daripada Ayer Itam—dengan kebenaran—

“Kami menyokong cita-cita hendak mencipta satu masyarakat yang adil di mana semua anggotanya mempunyai peluang yang sama untuk menikmati kekayaan negara. Sesuatu masyarakat yang adil ujud jika kekayaan negara dibahagikan dengan adil dan saksama. Untuk mencapai tujuan ini mustahaklah pihak-pihak yang lemah dan kekurangan diberi bantuan supaya mereka dapat menjadi setaraf dengan pihak-pihak yang lain. Masyarakat adil yang kita cita-citakan itu bebas daripada penindasan seorang terhadap yang lain ataupun penindasan sesuatu golongan terhadap yang lain.”

Jadi saya rasa Tuan Speaker, dalam kita bercakap masaalah Rukunegara ini saya rasa kita janganlah selalu menyalahgunakan Rukunegara itu cuba membalikkan maksud apa yang dicatitkan dalam Rukunegara yang ada di dalam Negara kita. Jadi sebab yang saya kata begitu kerana kalau memandang balik kepada Usul yang dibawa oleh Ahli daripada Kawasan Ayer Itam yang saya sendiri tidak bersetuju adalah kerana sekarang ini dengan keadaan penubuhan Badan Berkuasa Air yang ada di Pulau Pinang sekarang apa yang kita hadapi? Saya nampak, Tuan Speaker, ada tiga masaalah. Masaalah yang pertama iaitu setelah dibuat kajian di atas penggunaan—rakyat-rakyat

yang mengguna air dalam Negeri kita ini, kita dapati hampir 60% daripada rakyat menggunakan air 5,000 gelen air ke bawah. Sebagaimana yang telahpun diterangkan oleh Ahli daripada Kawasan Butterworth tadi, 60% rakyat dalam Negeri ini menggunakan air pada tiap-tiap famili di bawah 5,000 gelen pada tiap-tiap bulan. Itu satu. Yang kedua yang timbul, iaitu masaalah di mana keluarga yang banyak atau keluarga yang ramai yang duduk satu rumah atau banyak rumah, tetapi menggunakan satu meter air. Itu yang kedua. Dan yang ketiga, dalam Negeri kita selain daripada beberapa peratus yang saya sebut tadi walaupun air dalam Negeri ini digunakan lebih daripada 5,000 gelen, tetapi ini saya rasa bukanlah terdiri daripada orang-orang yang miskin. Jadi saya rasa kita kalau bercakap dari segi itu inilah Rukunegara. Dalam masaalah kita bercakap berkenaan dengan penggunaan air yang 60% orang ini yang mengguna air yang kurang daripada 5,000 gelen sebulan saya rasa tidak ada kenaikan yang dibuat. Hanya dalam soal di mana kawasan Majlis Bandaraya sahaja dinaikkan daripada 5% ke 6%, lain tidak naik. Itu kenyataan. Saya tidak faham bagaimana Ahli daripada Ayer Itam membawa masaalah-masaalah yang hari ini satu masaalah yang tidak betul ditimbulkan dalam Dewan ini, telah membangkitkan satu perasaan bahawa Kerajaan Pulau Pinang ini sengaja menaikkan cukai air dengan tidak tentu fasal dan membawa kesusahan kepada rakyat. Sebagaimana yang telahpun diterangkan oleh Ahli daripada Bagan Ajam tadi bahawa ada di antara rakyat dalam Negeri ini yang tidak mandi seminggu kerana cukai air ini naik. Di mana kawasan itu saya tidak tahulah. Saya sungguh rasa dukacita dan Ahli daripada Bagan Ajam sendiri tidak menyebut di mana dan kita tahulah sebab Ahli Bagan Ajam itu selalu dia menuduh dan bercakap perkara-perkara yang bukan-bukan. Jadi saya rasa biarlah perkara itu dengan tidak payah dijawab sebab masaalah itu tidak betul, iaitu masaalah yang timbul tidak mandi seminggu kerana cukai air naik itu tidak betul. Jadi apa yang saya kata

Tuan Speaker, 5,000 gelen yang digunakan oleh pengguna-pengguna air kita ke bawah daripada 5,000 gelen yang ada 60% rakyat dalam Negeri ini, tidak dinaikkan cukai. Yang naik hanya dalam kawasan Majlis Bandaraya sahaja. Dan saya tidak faham, Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam mengapa pada masa kita membawa keadaan-keadaan yang berkehendakkan Rukunegara yang semua rakyat biasa mendapat sama dan menikmati sama hasil negeri. Baru pada masa ini Yang Berhormat Ahli dari Kawasan Ayer Itam membawa Usul ini, padahal yang di belakang tidak. Pada masa itu daerah luar bandar membayar air 5,000 gelen—1,000 gelen 60 sen, tetapi orang dalam bandar membayar air 1,000 gelen 50 sen sehari. Padahal, pada masa itu, beliau tidak membawa. Ini menunjukkan satu daripada Usul yang jahat kerana kita tahu Usul ini dibawa ialah hendak mengambil hati orang-orang yang ada dalam bandar. Itu sahalalah tujuannya supaya discredit Kerajaan yang ada sekarang ini tidak membuat sesuatu dan membebankan keadaan kehidupan orang-orang yang ada dalam bandar tidak kira orang luar bandar. Pada masa dahulu tidak ada dibawa Usul. Fasal apa sekarang baru dibawa? Ini satu Usul yang jahat.

Saya dapat tahu Tuan Speaker, pihak Ahli-ahli Berkuasa Air ini telahpun membuat satu pertimbangan kepada pengguna-pengguna air kita yang ada dalam Negeri ini yang banyak keluarga menggunakannya satu paip. Mereka ini akan memberi pertimbangan kepada pengguna-pengguna air macam ini, dan saya tahu telahpun dilantik sebuah jawatankuasa untuk menimbang rayuan-rayuan kalau sekiranya ada perkara-perkara semacam itu berlaku. Dan saya rasa patut kita menerangkan kepada rakyat kalaulah sekiranya ada perkara kesusahan yang berlaku yang timbul daripada banyak pengguna-pengguna kita dalam Negeri ini yang menggunakan air memakai satu paip sahaja, satu meter sahaja, haruslah mereka-mereka itu menulis kepada Pihak Berkuasa Air supaya dapat Pihak Berkuasa Air meminda atas cukai-cukai air itu.

Perkara yang ketiga, saya sebut tadi ialah berkenaan dengan pengguna-pengguna kita yang menggunakan air lebih daripada 5,000 gelen pada sebulan. Ini bagaimana yang telahpun diterangkan banyak kali bukan sahaja dalam masa kita membahaskan Usul ini tetapi di lain-lain perbahasan dibuat dalam Dewan masa kita bersidang ini. Kalau sekiranya seseorang rakyat yang menggunakan air cukup untuk makan-minum dan kegunaan-kegunaan keperluan hari-hari, satu famili itu hanya tidak akan lebih daripada 5,000 gelen tetapi kalau mereka-mereka ini menggunakan lebih daripada 5,000 gelen bermaknalah mereka telahpun menggunakan kepada tujuan-tujuan yang lain. Boleh jadi jugalah bagaimana yang disebutkan oleh Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam tadi, mereka ini membasuh parit-parit mereka di belakang rumah, menyiram pokok-pokok bunga dan menyiram halaman rumahnya dan menyiram lain-lain lagi. Jadi, orang-orang macam ini atau pengguna-pengguna macam ini bolehlah kita biar sama dengan pengguna-pengguna yang betul-betul menggunakan air untuk keperluan yang mustahak pada mereka hari-hari. Pengguna-pengguna macam ini patutlah kita naikkan atau kita kenakan tambahan, sebab orang-orang ini atau pengguna-pengguna macam ini ialah orang-orang yang mempunyai, yang mampu. Jadi Rukunegara timbul balik. Rukunegara timbul balik kepada orang yang ada di sini yang menggunakan keadaan yang ada, yang diberikan oleh Kerajaan tetapi oleh sebab mampu menggunakan lebih, kita ambil cukai yang lebih sedikit untuk menampung kepada orang-orang yang miskin yang menggunakan air untuk keperluan mereka sahaja.

Ahli Yang Berhormat Ayer Itam, masa beliau membawa Usul ini bercakap, bahawa dengan sebab naiknya harga atau cukai air ini tidak memberi peluang kepada Ali yang ada di luar bandar, Ramasammy yang ada di luar bandar dan Ah Tan daripada bandar dan yang meminta air, bagaimana yang saya terangkan tadi yang sebenarnya perkara ini tidak timbul. Saya telahpun menerangkan tadi kalau sekiranya

pengguna-pengguna air kita menggunakan 5,000 gelen ke bawah tidak ada cukai dinaikkan. Pendiknya, dalam masaalah cukai air yang ada dalam Negeri kita sekarang ini tidaklah melibatkan langsung kepada orang-orang miskin—tidaklah melibatkan langsung kepada orang-orang miskin. Orang-orang miskin tidak payah takut, tidak payah susah hati dengan cukai air yang ada pada hari ini kerana mereka tidak kena.

Lagi satu masaalah, saya rasa masaalah ini telahpun diketahui oleh semua rakyat kita yang ada dalam Negeri ini sekarang ini dengan keadaan yang ada pada penyelarasan yang kita buat berkenaan cukai air samada dalam bandar dan juga di luar bandar. Kita dan rakyat patut berterimakasih kepada Kerajaan Negeri yang tidak menaikkan air mengikut cukai air yang ada dalam lain-lain negeri di Negara kita. Saya rasa Pulau Pinanglah satu daripada negeri yang paling murah sekali—yang paling murah sekali dari seluruh Negara kita yang mempunyai cukai air. Jadi dengan keadaan macam ini, itulah sebab Tuan Speaker, saya kata Usul ini tidak ada lain hanya jahat dan boleh jadi dengan sebab deman politik atau deman pilihanraya ini dekat, Usul-usul macam ini yang dibawa dengan tujuan hendak memburukkan pihak Kerajaan.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya bangun untuk mengambil bahagian dalam perbahasan Usul ini dan saya juga minta kebenaran bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

Tuan Speaker, Sir, the supply of water is a necessity to life. To be without water for washing, cleaning, breeding is already a tragedy. But then to be without water for drinking to quench the thirst, and for cooking is going to be a tragedy. Tuan Speakeer, Sir, therefore no sane and responsible Government in the world could ignore this very palpable necessity.

Tuan Speaker, Sir, our population in the early forties was around a figure of something like 300,000—correct me if I am wrong—but by now it has gone up to almost 800,000; and it is an

increase of half a million, which amounts to nearly 160%. Tuan Speaker, Sir, with this constant increase in the population of our people the City Council which at that time was the Authority for water on the island of Penang then planned ahead for the sixties and seventies when the population would be anticipated to reach a higher level. And as a result, Sir, the Ayer Itam Dam was envisaged, and construction proceeded accordingly. Tuan Speaker, Sir, the Dam itself cost the City Council about \$2 million which came as a loan.

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member from Tanjong Barat, how would you reconcile all your statements with the Motion that we have before us today? (*Ketawa*).

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): Tuan Speaker, Sir, I am bringing up a case. You see, this is how I build up the case. And that is why it warrants all this re-adjustment in our rates. You see, I like to bring up the old rates to enable this House to be aware of the number of increases that have been going on.

Tuan Speaker: Yes, if you talk about the rates fair enough. But you are talking about the Dam.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): You see, you have to depend on the revised rates.

Arising out of this loan of \$15 million the City Council is committed to an annual loan charge of \$1.3 million which would be paid annually until 1970. That is why I am bringing up these figures. Let us not be afraid of figures, because all this will be added on. And hence the revision of rates.

Tuan Speaker, Sir, the mover of this Motion is the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam. He was none other than, at one time, the Deputy Mayor of the City Council. Also, he was the Chairman of the Water Committee. Surely he is aware of this loan commitment; and also the annual charge of \$1.3 million.

Tuan Speaker, Sir, between the years 1949 and 1960 the water rate on the Island had been subjected to six increases; and this was due mainly to large capital projects built to meet the growing demands, in a manner similar to the Muda River Waterworks Scheme. In order to give the House some idea of these increases I am obliged to list the following, which is the price increase per 1,000 gallons on the basis of 10,000 gallons of domestic supply. In 1949, January—we deal with the municipal area because at that time the City Council was still the Municipality of George Town—it was 13½ cents; and outside it was 20 cents at least. In other words, the rural areas had to pay 100% more than the municipal area. Then in 1950, January, which was exactly one year later, it went up from 13½ cents to 15 cents—an increase of 1½ cents; and outside the municipal area it went up to 30 cents—another 100% increased; and in areas outside the municipal area the increase was 2 cents. In 1950 again—and this time March, only three months later—from 15 cents it went up to 20 cents, an increase of 5 cents; and outside the municipal area it went up from 30 cents to 40 cents—an increase of 10 cents. Then by 1952, August, which was 1 year 4 months after the increase in March, in the municipal area, it went up from 20 cents to 25 cents—another increase of 5 cents; and outside the municipal area the increase was from 40 cents to 50 cents—an increase of 10 cents. Tuan Speaker, Sir, you will find that during this period the people in the rural areas have been absorbing an increase twice as much as that borne by city-dwellers. And in 1956, December—now it is known differently. It is known as urban and rural in the urban areas—it went up by 5 cents to 30 cents; and in the rural areas there has been some adjustment from 50 cents downwards to 38 cents. In 1957, December—and here again after one year—it went up again from 30 cents to 35 cents—an increase of 5 cents; and in the rural areas it went up from 38 cents to 43

cents—also an increase of 5 cents. In 1960, December, after three years—and I believe this is the time when the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam was the Chairman of the Water Committee of the City Council—it went up from 35 cents to 50 cents—an increase of 15 cents. That was in the urban area. In the rural areas it went up from 43 cents to 60 cents—an increase of 17 cents.

Tuan Speaker, Sir, from the figures of comparison submitted by me we will at once realise that all along there had in fact been an inequity in sharing the burden; that the rural folks with their much-lower earning power and their lower standard of living were made to pay more. And this was already mentioned. Water is tapped in the rural areas.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Tuan Speaker, di bawah Peraturan 46 (vi), the Honourable Member is irrelevant. The question of equalization of water rates is not a matter under dispute. We are not debating that at all. In fact I told the Honourable the Chief Minister that I have no quarrel with him on that. I said that we are not quarreling over the equalization of water rates throughout the State. But what we are advocating is that the rates must be such that the poor will not be restrained from using water because they are poor. There is no point wasting the time of this House arguing on this fact because we have agreed with the Honourable the Chief Minister on the principle of equalization. There is no dispute there whatsoever. So let us not waste time arguing on a thing which is not the subject of dispute.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): Tuan Speaker, it is not a question of dispute that I am bringing to this House.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): You are debating.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): We are debating, exactly.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): However, it is about the policy of a self-sustaining waterworks. That is the relevant point. Why don't you tell us about it?

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): I have got my own way of participating in this debate. (*Ke-tawa*). The Honourable Member for Ayer Itam can teach some of his own Members the way of debate. The proximity from the source of supply of the areas of consumption, especially in the rural areas, could be very much closer in some parts of the State, like Ayer Itam, the constituency of the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam. The people there had to pay more under the old tariff imposed from time to time, with the increases, although they are in an area very much closer to the source of supply. I know. And this is the sort (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member for Tanjong Barat, the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam who is the proposer of this Motion has said that he agrees with this uniformity of rate. In other words, if my understanding is right, that these rates in the City Council area and in the Rural District Council area should be equal. He concedes that point.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): Tuan Speaker, Sir, in this Motion he did mention about the inequity. And that is why I am touching on this point.

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member, he has just conceded that point.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): Tuan Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam, being a very experienced and shrewd politician has been very careful to lump all together as consumers in accordance with their ability to pay. This is what I like to touch upon, Sir, because, instead of differentiating between City dwellers and rural folks, or people with different strata of income, in which case, it would be very difficult to segregate, how are you going to tell which person has the ability to

pay? Tuan Speaker, Sir, I do not think it is possible for the Water Authority to carry out an exercise to differentiate. Therefore, from what I can see this shrewdly-worded Motion carries a very heavy sting of politics in it as it is intended to be a vote-catching gimmick in any coming election. However, Tuan Speaker, Sir, what is far more important is that the new tariff will remove an anomaly which had been left to exist for a long, long time.

Now, what we are actually doing is that those with the money, and can afford to waste water indiscriminately, will be made to pay more; but not the poor. Tuan Speaker, Sir, I do not think any one of us here will tolerate to see the big fellows and the rich people getting away to enjoy low tariff rates on the same basis as the poor.

Tuan Speaker, Sir, the new water tariff is being brought about as a result of the Muda River Waterworks Scheme which cost \$40 million, and came as a loan from the A.D.B., and carries with it an annual loan repayment of \$4 million a year. This large amount of \$4 million, together with the \$1.5 million incurred on the Ayer Itam Dam make up a total loan repayment of some \$5½ million a year. And with the total expenditure of \$11.5 million worth of expenditure for 1973 for the Water Authority the loan-servicing charges will represent about 45% of the recurring cost. Tuan Speaker, Sir, if the old tariff rate of water charges is retained it is inevitable that a very large deficit of \$4.5 million will be brought about, as the estimated revenue for 1973 will fetch only \$7 million. The large deficit of \$4.5 million represents about 20% of the State Budget. And, as already mentioned earlier by Honourable Members on this side of the House, the State Government is giving the Water Authority a grant of \$1.7 million. And this also received the support of Honourable Members on the opposite side of this House.

Tuan Speaker, Sir, incidentally last year we had a very long drought; and as a result water rationing was put into effect in order to save water. And this was carried out in order to make

sure that the people will not go without water. Tuan Speaker, Sir, I am quite sure we do not like to have any recurrence of this lesson of water rationing. Therefore we disagree that the Muda River Waterworks Scheme is a 'must'. And I am very glad to say here that with its completion recently we have been able to have water in spite of the long drought that we had early this year.

Tuan Speaker, Sir, while the Muda River Waterworks Scheme helped us to solve our water problem, the loan commitment incurred in the Scheme, and lending to an annual deficit, has got to be met one way or the other. Therefore the Water Authority has a duty to work out a tariff in which the rich and the big fellows are made to pay more for making use of more water because as already mentioned, in consumption of water below 5,000 gallons the rate remains the same. It is only when you are above. And the following is the tariff: Domestic—first 5,000 at 60 cents per 1,000 gallons.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Wasting time. We have got it here.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): Above 5,000 gallons at 95 cents per 1,000 gallons.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): We are fully aware of that.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Anxiety to forget.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): I cannot understand why you people are so jittery when I mention all these figures. (*Ketawa*) It is nothing to be jittery about. Let me carry on. Don't interrupt.

And the minimum is at \$2 per month. For Trade and Commercial the first 5 million gallons is at \$1.30 for 1,000 gallons: 5,000, 100 gallons to 10,000,000 gallons it is one-tenth of 1,000 gallons. Contracting services, manufacture ice, mineral waters, etc., at \$2 per 1,000 gallons. Steamers and shipping at \$3 for 1,000 gallons. Minimum charges for all trade users \$5 per month. So from here, Sir, at the

figures I have just submitted, I do not think Honourable Members across this House could blame the State Water Authority for knocking out a tariff which would benefit the commercial sector. In fact, from these figures we find that domestic people are benefiting. It is for people who are using a lot of water, especially in case of Trade and Commercial, that they have to pay more.

And, Tuan Speaker, Sir, the State Water Authority also carried out a survey recently and ascertained that the average consumption—that is where we improve, unlike Honourable Member on the other side of the House. At the best they could only conjure, speculate, whereas in the case of the State Water Authority a survey was carried out, and it was discovered—is 45 gallons per head per day—between 25 gallons per head per day for the lower-income group and 100 gallons per head per day for the higher-income families. People like Honourable Member for Bagan Ajam: higher-income benefiter. And allowing the difference in family size, a lower-income family of 10 therefore would consume something like 7,000 gallons per month. A higher-income family of 5 will consume 15,000 gallons per month. And this is the way we prove it to you. The rich, those who can afford, consume more; and they are made to pay more. Not the poor people. Therefore, Tuan Speaker, Sir, basing on this it has become a justification for a sliding scale of water charges. It therefore gives a lighter load on the lower per capita consumer.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): What is the sliding scale?

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): Tuan Speaker, the cost of production for 1,000 gallons is \$1.10, so that only Trade and Commercial consumers pay \$1.30 per 1,000 gallons, unsubsidised. I think that figure is very important, Sir. And the people should know about it because at the lower rate water is being subsidised. It is only for Trade and Commercial that it is not subsidised. They are made to pay more.

Much more important, Tuan Speaker, Sir, is the fact that in spite of this new tariff our water rate is still the lowest in Malaysia as compared to the flat rate of \$1 for 'domestic' in many other States. Therefore you can observe that we are still enjoying the lowest rate in the country. And unless it is the intention of the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam to ask for higher water rate to be more equitable with the other States (gangguan).

Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Encik Ismail bin Hashim): As he did during the past time. (Ketawa).

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): Tuan Speaker, Sir, oddly enough the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam has already forgotten that as the ex Deputy Mayor, and the Chairman of the Water Authority (gangguan).

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): I was never Chairman of any Water Authority.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): I am sorry. A slip of the tongue is no fault of the mind. In the Council Meeting of July 11th, 1960—that was the year the City Council brought an increase—he urged for the support in water rates.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): May I know the year?

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): 1960.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): I was not on the City Council in 1960. Check your records.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): You were not there? Are you sure? You were the Deputy Chairman. (Ketawa).

I must with your permission, Sir, quote. That was only one quotation. This is another quotation:

'As the population increases in the Island of Penang the consumption of water will increase. And in order to prevent what is happening in other States like Perak where shortage of

water is causing a great deal of hardship to the people, and business people as well, Council has put forward a very plausible policy in gradually increasing water rates. Even with these increases Council is still providing water at below cost. I feel that as Members of this Council we should give the proposed increases all our support.'

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): There you are—against the principle.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): These were the very words uttered by the Member for Ayer Itam. He has forgotten.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): We were selling below cost, you know.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): Tuan Speaker, Sir, in earlier proceedings of this Assembly the Member for Kelawei attempted to link the present price of water to the other prices.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, I have not spoken. (Ketawa).

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): Listen. Please listen.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Yes, I am going to listen. Go on.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): In the earlier proceeding of a Sitting of the Assembly. Earlier! Not tonight. Not in the debate on this particular Motion.

It must be pointed out, Tuan Speaker, Sir, that the domestic tariff of all other States in West Malaysia have been fixed at \$1 or above \$1 per 1,000 gallons in the 1960's, long before the current trend of price increases. However, Tuan Speaker, Sir, the Consultants of the Muda River Waterworks Scheme in presenting their Reports in 1967 recommended that water charges should be \$1 per 1,000 gallons. This was the recommendation made by the Consultants in 1967.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): The Consultants don't have to pay the water rates.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): And, Tuan Speaker, Sir, this was long before the surtax or imported inflation raised costs. As has been pointed out, Sir, in the extreme case the average charge to a consumer using 30,000 gallons per month is 89 cents. And out of 48,000 consumers only 1,500, or about 3%, consumed more than 30,000 gallons per month. These figures were for large institutions, barracks, factories, etc. So we can safely conclude that few, if any, domestic consumers pay more than 89 cents per 1,000 gallons of water. Even in this extreme case the cost of domestic water fixed by the Water Authority has been lower than the cost of water recommended by the Consultants in 1967, or the 93.5 cents bulk sales. That is the price at which the City Council had undertaken to purchase the water from the Muda River Scheme. And this despite the present inflationary trend. Rather than passing on costs indiscriminately to consumers the Water Authority has by combining its resources and using them efficiently enabled the flow of water to its consumers at a price below that recommended by its Consultants more than 5 years ago. Certainly, Sir, this is a cause for congratulations rather than for condemnation.

Tuan Speaker, Sir, unless Members on the opposite side of the House want a repetition of water rationing in our State, and do not consider the loan commitments incurred to help the overcome future water shortage, it will be more sensible not to involve themselves in such a Motion. Therefore, Mr Speaker, Sir, can this house entertain the hypocritical Motion of the Member of Ayer Itam? Thank you.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya minta izin bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

Mr Speaker, Sir, my colleagues have spoken at great length in reply to this debate. In actual fact, if we were to examine the Motion as it stands—and

I refer, Sir, to the Motion in English—I think the House can stand a re-reading:

"That this Assembly considers the increase in water tariff by the newly constituted State Water Authority to be contrary to the principles of the Rukunegara of creating a just society, in that the burden of the increase is not equitably shared by all consumers in accordance with their ability to pay.

This Assembly therefore calls upon the State Government to take appropriate steps to get the State Water Authority to review the increased tariffs so as to render the Water rates more equitable."

Sir, the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam had tried to make an amendment to his Motion as it stood in the Order Paper. But I would like immediately to say that I accept in good faith that the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam in actual fact is referring to the water charges, because in actual fact the water tariff is equated with the water charge, and not the water rate. And I hope that the Member for Bagan Ajam will take note of this because in actual fact, because of the establishment of the State Water Authority and the establishment of the new water tariffs, the water rates have actually been abolished; and in so far as the Councils are concerned, where water rates of 2% had to be paid they have all been abolished. So I accept that he means water charges. And I think the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam accepts it. Otherwise we cannot proceed on this debate. It would be meaningless.

Now, the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam has indicated that the gist of the first part of the Motion should be read in relation to what he quoted from the statement made by the General Manager of the State Water Authority, namely that the State Water Authority should be self-sustaining. And he says that in a self-sustaining Authority, such as the Water Authority, if the burden of increase in the tariffs is not equitably shared by all consumers in accordance with their ability to pay then this is not the Rukunegara. I mean that is roughly how I would have to read the Motion. Otherwise, what the Honourable Member spoke has got nothing to do with what his Motion

stands for. So, either we have to debate what he said, and forget the Motion, or we have to correlate what he said in relation to the Motion, because if we are to take the Motion as it stands then there is nothing else to talk about. However, Sir, we accept that the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam defined himself quite specifically—that what he meant by all these words in the Motion is this question of a self-sustaining Authority. That, Sir, I assume in good faith because if he had not done so he would have, in order to prove the point earlier in the debate concerning the Bill on the Supplementary Budget—I think it is natural—asked that the State Government should not only give a subsidy of 1.7 million dollars, but more because if the State should give more subsidy then, of course, the people would have to pay less. But the idea of subsidy is not quite clear also. It does not fit in because the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam in interjecting to a point made by my honourable friend from Tanjong Barat—Sir, if I may be allowed the latitude of diverting a bit—accused me of not listening to people. But in actual fact the Honourable Member for Tanjong Barat is a very old friend of mine; and I listened to him with very great care. I understand that he has to develop his ideas much slower than I do; but I listen to him. And I listen very carefully because I find a lot of truth in what he says; and I find a lot of good, sound sense in what he says. So I was very much surprised at how much he understood, and how much he appreciated the position, because the Water Authority's problems are not within his compass at all. And as I listened to him I began to understand that his consultation with his electorate and the people of Penang really indicated that the people of Penang think very much in the way he does, because he is only reflecting their view. And they really do not have that much objection to the new tariffs as the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam seems to suggest. But, whatever it is, the question

is that the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam obviously was caught also in a different position because in a statement which he was supposed to have made on July 11th, 1960—just to refresh his memory. He was then in the City Council—he said that in order to ensure that the City Council Water Department should not incur any loss then they must increase the water rates. Therefore, in order to have a self-sustaining Authority of that nature there must be increase in water rates. So therefore, Sir, the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam—I am not trying to play havoc with the Motion—I think, has a point to raise. The Honourable Member was trying to say, 'Well, we agree that water charges have to be increased because we have to meet commitments. I think that he appreciates that. He also says, 'I have to assume that there should be uniformity in the sharing of the burden; that is, equal sharing out of the rates'. But what apparently the Honourable Member does not agree with is this question of "equitably shared by all consumers in accordance with their ability to pay". So it is obvious that there are some who are not able to pay as much as others. Now, Sir, this is one of the catch phrases of Socialist presentation. But it also happens to be one of the most difficult things to interpret and implement. The concept of the means test—to work on a person's ability to pay—has proved a failure. And most devices of trying to meet the ability to pay of consumers in an equitable manner naturally leads to controversy.

Now, what actually has happened in the State Water Authority? As far as I am aware, Sir, the State Water Authority actually imposed a two-part tariff. The two-part tariff deals with domestic charges as against trade and industrial charges. Sir, I presume that the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam has got no real quarrel with the question of the trade and the industrial charges. The only balance that he made, in reference to his speech, is that perhaps we should load the charges on the trade and industrial sector a little

bit higher so that the domestic volume of payment should be less. That is, I hope, a correct interpretation of his approach. The point, however, is this: that although only 18 per cent of the consumers in our State can be classified as trade and industrial consumers, and they bear 30 per cent of the burden; that is, they contribute 30 per cent of the total revenue of the State Water Authority. So the question therefore in its very fine shade means: whether or not to make 18 per cent of the people—those who are involved in trade and industry—pay 30 per cent is equitable or not. Should these 18 per cent of the consumers pay more than 30 per cent? 'How much more?' is, I think, a matter of controversy. But, whatever it is, it is quite clear that the State Water Authority has made an attempt to lower the weightage of the burden of payment on the trade and industrial sector as opposed to the domestic sector. Whatever or not the Honourable Member thinks it should be 30 per cent, 31 per cent or 35 per cent is a separate issue. The Board honestly took this into consideration, and felt that at this present stage to expect 18 per cent of our consumers to pay more than 30 per cent of the revenues would be a little bit harsh. That is the situation. Furthermore, this is only a budget. What the Board further anticipated was that with this type of tariff what will happen will be that it will be very much more in accord with the present situation in the State, where we need to bring in more and more development in the trade and industrial sector. And with this increased development in the trade and industrial sector the contribution from this sector may possibly be more than 30 per cent. And, in terms of budgeting, in actual fact, when the estimates are closed and the budgets reviewed at the end of the 12-month period we confidently hope that perhaps the actual revenue contribution made by this 18 per cent of the consumers may turn out to be more than 30 per cent. And, furthermore, what the General Manager had indicated in his statement of a self-sustaining Authority is that this kind

of tariff gives opportunities of attracting very large consumers who may consume more than a million gallons, and even more than 5 million gallons per unit, one single consumer contributing virtually something like about 3 million dollars in revenue to the State Water Authority. This tariff would help the development of further industrialisation programmes along these lines. And Honourable Members will remember that in the debate over His Excellency's speech I indicated that we should attract the type of industries which require a very much more different type of infrastructure servicing. But, whatever it is, at the present moment, on budget, 18 per cent contribute 30 per cent, with a possibility that when the total final budget is accounted for it may in actual fact contribute more than 30 per cent. That I hope the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam will agree.

Now, regarding what the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam in actual fact went on to elaborate when he referred to me as a medical man, and therefore having a little bit more understanding of the use of water, I do not think it requires a man trained in the medical disciplines to understand that every human being knows that he cannot go without water for too long. However, Sir, when he referred to this, and particularly when he referred to people having to sit down virtually on the pot and wondering whether they should pull the ring, because not to flush will save one cent, Sir, I think that is going a bit too far. Even the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam appreciates that that is a popular kind of statement; but not one that really merits a case which he is trying to make up. What he wanted was to prompt a fairly sound debate on these water tariffs. And at the same time—when he went on to these two examples, anyway—he went on to talk about, I think, consumers from houses within the city area, referring in particular to Kota, Tanjong Barat and Tanjong Tengah constituencies. These happen to be the

constituencies where I and my colleagues are involved. He brought this matter up. He referred particularly to those types of housing where more than one family live in an area, and they have to share one single meter. Sir, this was also repeated by the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap when he referred to similar circumstances of this nature which he has found in the Sungei Bakap area, presumably. Sir, that I think was the problem that he raised. So what is in actual fact this domestic tariff? The domestic tariff was shaded off; and it is a gradient scale that is based on a cut-off by 60 cents per 1,000 gallons for those who consume 5,000 gallons, and a graduated scale above that which goes on—And here I must refer to my notes. I am sorry, Honourable Member for Kelawei, I have to read—based on a graduated scale where after the first 5,000 gallons those who consume more than 6,000 gallons a month will begin to pay a charge calculated on an average of 65 cents; and for those who consume 8,000 gallons it is 73 cents; 10,000 gallons—78 cents; 20,000 gallons—86 cents; and 30,000 gallons—89 cents. That is the graduating scale.

Sir, I think the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam has introduced a very much more serious aspect of this tariff by using the general term “all consumers”, and also this general statement of ‘ability to pay’ because, unlike what the Water Authority attempted to put across or to establish, it is quite clear that even people who are consuming 30,000 gallons of water a month—let us say that they belong to that income bracket which the Honourable Member from Tanjong Bungah refers to as 20,000 and above, which is a totally different income group—may perhaps complain because they are paying a slight differential as compared to what they used to pay before; and they pay a little higher. But to these people who are paying maybe \$4 or \$5 more per month as compared to what they used to pay before I think the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam will be very hard put to

try and say that in these cases there is a real inability to pay. Sir, I think therefore that when he was referring to this question of inability to pay he was in this particular case not thinking of those in the higher-income group, but he was thinking in particular of the lower-income group, as in actual fact suggested by him when he specifically referred to that group of people who live in congested circumstances. And I know a very great difficulty exists for people living within the City area and within my own constituency in Kota, who live together—several families in one house—with only one water meter. Not water pipe; just meter. So in that respect the members of the Board of the Water Authority were very greatly concerned as to how to avoid this problem of difficulty to pay, and how to ensure that this burden of water charges could be as equitably borne by the people as possible. Hence there was a series of studies and checks. For example, against a series of statistical checks it was found that the average lower-income family in Province Wellesley South consumed about 5,900 gallons per month; in Province Wellesley Central they consumed about 7,000 gallons per month; and in Province Wellesley North they consumed 8,600 gallons per month. I do not know whether in the case of the Honourable Member for Bagan Ajam, who has just left, he is washing his drains three times a day; (*ketawa*) but I am sure this is not the general habit of the people living in Province Wellesley North. In Penang Island, outside City limits the average consumption was about 7,200 gallons, and in the City itself it was 12,500 gallons. Sir, these are not taken on the basis of whether the average amount that was consumed was based on a person of a higher per capita income or a lower per capita income. This was just an average that was obtained against actual values and actual monthly consumption area by area. These were the figures on which the State Water Authority had to take a judgment. Whether they took a judgment rightly or wrongly, they did take a judgment that would to the best of their ability

be beneficial to the people, and help to make the burden of payment as equitable as possible.

Sir, when we went further to study specific instances what happened was that people living in the Jesselton Road area had an average monthly consumption of about 15,700 gallons, whereas the people in Telok Kumbang had an average of 6,200 gallons a month, and the people in the Weld Quay squatter areas—this is where I am involved—had an average of 6,500 gallons of water per month.

So we can say that there is a relative index, and a relative correlation that wherever there were areas where the lower-income citizens stay the average consumption of water was lower, whereas where the income levels were higher the average monthly consumption of water was higher. On this basis the graded scale was put. But I accept the fact that it could possibly be that somebody might find it very difficult to make ends meet even when he can't find \$5. But that is not a question that one would attribute in this general discussion on a question of ability to pay, Sir, because in this particular kind of case, if the actual domestic budget was such, they could reduce their water consumption considerably. And we did find this a fact because when the Island faced water rationing the general average consumption of water fell. And the response in actual fact was better demonstrated by those with the higher-income levels than those from the lower-income levels because those in the lower-income levels were already using the minimum amount of water that they could possibly use. They knew how to economise. But the higher-income groups could very easily stop washing their cars; not their children. Instead of putting a stop to washing their children, what they should do is that instead of washing the car twice a day they should wash the car once a week. Instead of washing their drains three times a day they should wash the drains, say, once every day. Even that amount of water may be saved

considerably. And that kind of saving could make them reduce their actual payment to within the limits of their ability to pay. That is to say, the ability to conserve water in relation to the cost factor at the higher-income levels was much greater. And because of this I think the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam will agree with me that the problem of the question of ability to pay would occur very, very much less at the higher-income level. I hope you agree on that.

So the real problem comes down finally to this group of people who are consumers at 5,000—6,000 gallons. Maybe 5,000, 6,000, or 7,000 may mean a difference. What is the differential that we are trying to solve? What is the real differential that exists between the people who are finding it difficult to pay? I would have liked to have heard some calculations from the Honourable Members of the Opposition, because if they were in possession of other facts then it would have contributed greatly to the assessment of the situation. What do we think in actual fact is the differential? Sir, the differential is that when we took samplings of people who were living in Carnarvon Street, for example, and people who were living within the Argyll Road, the Campbell Street area, it was discovered that out of a total sampling of 98 houses, some of which have a larger number of families living in them, 4 of these 98 on rough calculation slightly more than 5%—consumed more than 30,000 gallons of water. 56 of these houses consumed less than 15,000 gallons; and 38 houses had consumptions of between 30,000 and 15,000 gallons. Sir, the calculations were very important because what the Honourable Member had suggested was in actual fact that in this type of houses where many families live and are served by one meter they are not paying at the special charge of domestic tariff of 60 cents per thousand gallons; but they were actually paying a slightly higher tariff. I think that is what the Honourable Member was trying to elaborate when he used these words "inability to pay".

Sir, in actual fact, when we calculate the situation out to a question of a multi-family house—as we say, a house with more families living in, sharing one single water meter—the differential would be such that a family would be paying a price different to what they would normally pay of \$1.40 per month more than a single family, say, of the same income level which has its own one family in the Rifle Range Flats. Any unit with one meter would have to pay an increase of \$1.90 more. This is on the assumption that the case studies were made of this kind of situation where families have to pay obviously at a higher level. And it was discovered that about 6% of the total water population is affected by this catch in the application of a sliding scale. However, to imply that just because 6% of the people are involved the whole system is inequitable, I think, is not fair. I think the Honourable Member may suggest that we should do something about this 6%. And in actual fact the State Water Authority had taken steps in these studies. And having taken these studies was actually beginning to identify these areas. After all, the first receipts of the State Water Authority as the State Water Authority under its own organisational structure, were returned to the State Water Authority only at the end of April. And until we have two or three of this returns of bills we will not be able to assess what the early predictions would actually turn out to be. Sir, the State Water Authority therefore set up a Committee whereby those cases of genuine hardship can be referred to the Public Relations and Complaints Committee of the Water Authority which would look into this kind of cases where it could be further resolved in the particular, because if there were genuine hardship I think the Water Authority should act. And that is how the Water Authority has taken the action. And I think the Honourable Members will agree that unless the Authority is given the opportunity of experience to work out how we can resolve these implementational problem it would not be fair, so early in

the life of the Water Authority, to charge on inequity, and not following the Rukunegara, and all that, because Sir, for example, if we had a case where there were two families living in the same house, and one is the father's family, and the other is the son's family, the father will say, "This is my big family; so you will have to count us as one family." Therefore this is inequitable. But actually there are two families living within one house.

Then the problem arises also that, as the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap indicated, even though the Water Authority had provided facilities of loans for those who wish to instal meters and pipes, and so on, to obtain water the charge returns are too high to compensate for this differential. It is therefore installing a water meter at a loan from the Water Authority at \$125. And the repayment of it may not be commensurate with having to pay just \$1.40 more per month. And this question of increase of \$1.40 in the water bill, as compared to previously, is referred not to one person, not to one house, but maybe 50 persons living in one house. The actual charge burden would be something in the region—assuming it to be \$1.50, to make it into round figures; and the month to be one of 30 days—of approximately 5 cents per day, divided by 50. And so it come to the region of 1/10th of a cent per capita.

So, Sir, I urge Honourable Members from the Opposition, and in particular the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam, to give the Water Authority a chance to establish their operational restructuring. I urge this because I know that the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam when he was in the City Council before had the courage to insist that in a self-sustaining Authority no losses should be incurred; and therefore increases of water should be put.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): We didn't increase. The Honourable Member from Tanjong Barat says we charged water rates. Even the increase is less than the cost

of production. The Honourable Member from Tanjong Barat himself says so.

Ketua Menteri: Sir, I always love these interjections, particularly when they are planned, and people fall into my tender trap.

Sir, the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam in actual fact in his speech says that we have been very grossly unfair because the increase of those paying for 5,000 is 20%; 10,000—55%; 20,000—64.3%; 30,000—67.2%. I do not know how he came by these figures. But those were the figures he gave to this House. Sir, I indicated in actual fact that the total number of people who are affected by the implementation of this two-part tariff, and particularly of the sliding scale in the domestic tariff, was in the region of 6% of the total number of consumers.

Sir, in actual fact, when the Honourable Member urged the increase of the rates of the Water Department of the City in 1960 he increased it from 35 cents to 50 cents—an increase of over 45%. So you see, at the level of the cut-off the largest percentage of domestic consumers stand at 6,000 gallons per month. The actual rate increase is, as the Honourable Member said, round about 20%—very much less than the increase one would have to take under normal loan-servicing conditions.

Sir, one of the problems that would arise in the City also is the question of those people who trade and live in small shops—small traders who actually have a situation where they work and bath; and their workers also bath and eat in the shop. The State Water Authority has taken the decision that in cases of this nature, where the shophouses are actually residences of the owners of those shophouses they would be given domestic rate. It is only in those cases where the owners of the shops in actual fact reside in some other places, in areas like Pulau Tikus or Ayer Itam or Fettes Park or Island Glades, and who run the shops purely as shopping—and therefore the place is treated purely as a place of business and of trade—that the trade charges would apply. But in

those cases where they actually reside in the houses in which they work the domestic tariff would apply.

Sir, we agree that the present system of water charges is new. And being new it is not perfect. But I think, from saying that they are not perfect, to say that they are unjust—and, more than that, to virtually imply that they were wilfully unjust—I think is unfair. I think the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam should realise that all of us have a responsibility to bear. The Water Authority, given the time, will meet up with this responsibility. And I am confident personally that with the already-known commitment of development, particularly in the industrial trading sector—particularly of the very heavy industries requiring large consumptions of water—the problem of resolving the balance between the trade charge and the domestic charge will be even better served. Within the domestic charge I am certain that the people of Penang—they naturally being democratic—must grouse. It is part of life to grouse. And one hears of these grouses. And one has to listen to these grouses. But the people of Penang are not unreasonable. The people of Penang, just as the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam, accept this fact that it is only after we have made a uniform adjustment of our charges, and made an equitable levy of the sharing of the burden of the repayment of this water charges, that we can begin to look at the situation from a different point of view. And here, Sir, I urge the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam not to exploit this concept of the town and the rural areas, because one of the main reasons why the Sungei Muda Scheme was introduced was because the very scheme which he himself was involved with 13 and more years ago had already worked itself out.

That is to say the potential rate of consumption of water by the increased population within the Island of Penang had made the sources of water supply on the Island shrink in relation to the growth of population. And this was evidenced by the fact that in drought years, and particularly like last year,

rationing had to be applied. Furthermore, Sir, it was also found in a study by the City Water Authorities that in order to find more sources of water, and for building reservoirs of water, one of the schemes which I think the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam will recall had been worked out before was to provide a dam for the whole of the Telok Bahang valley. And that project at that time—15 years ago—would have cost about \$18 million, as against that to bring the Muda River water by submarine pipes. And therefore for the water available in Penang to be reinforced by water from the Muda River Scheme was only a natural development, and a natural implication. And by this connection the problems of the urban and rural areas were more closely brought together; and therefore they must be definitely equalised. Sir, that I think the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam has very graciously accepted and agreed upon. But the Honourable Member can I think stand to listen to a repeat of a statement that when the Asian Development Bank made its first projections on cost accounting and the returns they insisted that the water charges should be at the level of \$1.10 per thousand gallons for the mainland, and at 95.3 cents for the city. Sir, in the equalising factor, if we took these two figures and divided them by two—we assume that the total population is about half—it would come out at the level just about \$1, or approximately \$1.08. What in actual fact the Water Authority has established is a rate charge which is lower than that proposed by the Asian Development Bank, namely a cut-off at 60 cents, and a graduation up to 95 cents. Sir, that is the position. And this gradient or sliding scale was a very serious attempt to have the citizens in the State of Penang share the burden of payment of our commitment on water loans and loan charges in as equitable a manner as possible. The decisions taken by the Water Authority may not meet fully the views of the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam. They may not meet what he may require. But whatever it is I think the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam will agree that they were

made with the best of intentions, in the best spirit of the Rukunegara, and in terms of trying to provide a just and equitable social solution to a social problem. And that, Sir, is the basis of a just and equitable society. Sir, under the circumstances I feel that this Motion which was introduced rather lamely by the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam at this hour of the day does not merit our support.

Tuan Speaker: The House stands adjourned for five minutes, and will resume till a vote on this Motion is taken.

Dewan ditangguhkan pada jam 7.04 malam.

Dewan bersidang semula pada jam 7.10 malam.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Tuan Speaker, Tuan, saya minta kebenaran bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris. I must first of all refer to the speech of the Honourable the Chief Minister in which he took great pains to explain to this House the difficulties of the Water Authority in determining the rate which they consider fair and equitable. But the issue raised by me in the course of my speech is quite clear. I fully appreciate the difficulties. In fact I told the Honourable the Chief Minister that if he is going to work within the policy that the State Water Authority must be self-sustaining he is bound by two difficulties: Firstly, the difficulty in trying to have a water tariff as far as the trade side is concerned, in which, as he informed us, 18% of the consumers constitute that particular section. He can't possibly increase the rate beyond what he is doing now. And we fully conceded; and in fact we fully appreciate that. And it is because of that that we on this side of the House put forward the view that if the water tariff is to be guided by these two principals of not deterring industrialists, and at the same time to help the under-privileged we will have this difficulty of really doing sufficiently for the under-privileged. And it is on those lines that

I suggest that there should be a subsidy. The Honourable the Chief Minister tried to inform the House that according to him it is 6%. But here again it is the matter of statistics. He may have taken 86 households. And somebody else may take a similar sample of 100 households, and reach an entirely different conclusion. So here again it is a matter (*gangguan*).

Ketua Menteri: On a point of clarification, Tuan Yang Dipertua, I think the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam appreciated that that was just one example of sampling. It need not necessarily (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): That is exactly what I am pointing out. Samples may be wrong. Anyway the important fact is this—that he promised this business of trying to alleviate the position of this section of the consumers who are facing difficulties. He says he is going to review their cases. But I can't see any provision in the Water Enactment that gives the Water Authority this power of review. Once the water tariff is fixed at a certain price there is no provision. So any review by him will be contrary to the provision of the law. And here again we have this position. And I think it will be more proper if the Honourable the Chief Minister had told us that he promised us that he will amend the Water Enactment to give power for the Water Authority to help cases of hardship just as the one we refer to. And here again there is one difficulty. It is very well to say that he wants to amend the law to consider cases of special hardship. But here again there won't be equality before the law. And here again there will be cases of administrative difficulties; cases of favouritism perhaps whereby rightly or wrongly people may accuse the Water Authority and the Chief Minister that he is favouring Ah Kow or Ah Chong because they happen to be members of the Gerakan. And these are the sort of things that we do not like to see. We want the law to be specific. We want the law to be clear. Any law that gives discretionary power

to anybody, be the person the Chief Minister or anybody else, is likely to give rise to abuse. Or even if the person himself acted quite correctly there is bound to be allegation of malpractices; there is bound to be allegation of favouritism. So this is the sort of thing which to my mind is unsatisfactory. So, in spite of what has been said I agree that there are difficulties. I appreciate the difficulty. And we are bringing this up with the view that a solution to these difficulties lies not so much in considering cases of hardship; but it lies in giving the benefit of the doubt to more people. So in other words we must treat the lower-income group as a whole. And if confining it to consumers of 6,000 and less may be unsatisfactory we should consider increasing the rate of consumption to consumers of 10,000 or even 15,000. There a certain section may get away with it, or may benefit from it. People who can really afford may benefit; but we can't help it. We must have a uniform system. And I would urge the Honourable the Chief Minister to give serious consideration to this question.

And coming now to the other Members who spoke on this Motion, in particular I like to first of all deal with the Honourable Member for Bayan Lepas. The Honourable Member from Bayan Lepas in the course of his speech appears to me to use only one word whenever he opposes any Motion. Perkataan yang dipakai oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bayan Lepas ialah satu perkataan sahaja. Perkataan itu perkataan jahat. Apa-apa pendapat yang diberi oleh pihak ini dia selalu kata itu ucapan jahat. Apakah ucapan jahat? Dalam pihak Pembangkang kita bawa satu tujuan. Tujuan itu berkenaan prinsip-prinsip Rukunegara. Mengikut ucapan Ahli dari Kawasan Bayan Lepas dia berkata apa sebab kita, dalam pihak Pembangkang, tidak bawa Usul untuk equalise water tariffs dalam rural dan bandaraya. Soalan itu elok saya bertanya Ahli Yang Berhormat sendiri.

Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Encik Ismail bin Hashim): Orangnya elok, tidak jahat, tetapi usul jahat.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Jika Ahli Yang Berhormat itu sendiri bawa usul ini dahulu, tidak payah tunggu sekarang baru hendak dijalankan. Pada masa dahulupun bukan Kerajaan lain, Kerajaan Perikatan juga dan pada masa itu Ketua Menteri juga menjadi administrator—administrator City Council yang mempunyai kuasa dalam perkara ini tetapi apa sebab tidak dijalankan?

Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Encik Ismail bin Hashim): Kita jalankan dalam Coalition Government.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Pada masa itu saya bukan seorang Ahli Dewan ini. Ini satu prinsip Rukunegara yang bersangkutan dengan penduduk-penduduk bandaraya dan penduduk-penduduk luar bandar. Saya telahpun berkata di dalam ucapan saya bahawa saya tidak bangkang tentang soal mahu equalise water charges di kedua-dua tempat itu, tetapi apa yang saya bangkang ialah berkenaan dengan orang-orang susah, orang-orang miskin, nelayan-nelayan, penduduk-penduduk di kampung-kampung di luar bandar dan juga keluarga-keluarga yang ramai yang menduduki satu rumah di bandaraya. Maka Usul saya ini adalah satu usul yang memberi faedah kepada orang-orang yang seperti itu dan saya fikir bagi orang-orang di kampung sangat merasa susah hati kerana kena bayar water charges yang tinggi. Mereka tidak payah lagi gunakan stand-pipe dan mengangkut air ke kampung sebab sudah pasang water pipe di rumah sendiri. Saya harap Ahli dari Bayan Lepas dalam masa yang akan datang tidak akan menggunakan lagi perkataan "jahat".

Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Encik Ismail bin Hashim): Nakal—gunakan perkataan nakal.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Kalau cakap banyak kali sangat, tidak lakulah.

Now, coming back to the Honourable Member for Tanjong Barat, I like to refer to one point; and that is this

question of water charges—the differential rate as stated by both the Member for Tanjong Barat and the Ketua Menteri. According to the Press Statement, water rates for consumers for the first 5,000 gallons will be 60 cents.

Ketua Menteri: Water charges.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Water charges. And after that it will be a flat rate of 95 cents for every additional 1,000. The Honourable Chief Minister in his usual skill in dealing with figures deliberately refused to mention that, but instead, just like the Honourable Member for Tanjong Barat, tried to average the price per 1,000 gallons. And as a result you have a standard rate ranging from 60 cents to a maximum of 95 cents. So I submit that it is this type of idea that is contrary to the whole principle of ability to pay, because if we look at water rates on that basis, and as I have mentioned just now, you have a maximum increase on the 30,000-gallon mark; and after that you have a decrease. So on that basis it appears, and it is so, that the people who are consuming water more than 30,000 gallons are paying an increased rate much lower than people who consume at 30,000, because that is the maximum, even granting the analysis of the Ketua Menteri that the rich will consume more water. At the same time one must agree that \$10 to the rich is nothing; but \$10 to a poor person is a lot of money. So even on that basis the rate of charges, if it is related more with consumption itself—in other words, you have a graduating rate instead of a flat rate of 95 cents—that will make it more equitable. I agree this is by no means perfect. But it will be more equitable than the rate that is imposed at the present moment. So from my point of view, and from the point of view of my Party, we feel that there are grounds for a review. The Honourable the Chief Minister may say that he wants a few months, or perhaps half a year or so. But whatever it is, however long he feels the Authority

should be given time, I on this side of this House feel that a review is necessary. And I am quite prepared to leave it to him. If he wants six months or a year to do so we are quite happy.

Soalan dikemukakan dan Usul tidak dipersetujui.

Tuan Speaker: Oleh kerana kita terlewat pada malam ini Dewan ditangguhkan pada pukul 10 pagi esok.

Dewan ditangguhkan pada jam 7.29 malam hingga 29hb Mei, 1973, jam 10 pagi.