

Jilid III
Bil. 7



Hari Selasa
29hb 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. 7

Hari Selasa
29hb 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

(H) USUL OLEH YANG BERHORMAT ENCIK V. VEERAPPEN [430]

(J) USUL OLEH YANG BERHORMAT ENCIK YEAP GHIM GUAN [466]

7. PENANGGUHAN [511]

PULAU PINANG

DEWAN UNDANGAN NEGERI YANG KETIGA

Lapuran Persidangan

PENGGAL YANG KETIGA

MESYUARAT YANG PERTAMA

Hari Selasa 29hb 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 *alias* Teoh
Kooi Sneah)

„ „ Kawasan Muda (Tuan Haji Abdul Kadir bin Haji Hassan,
P.J.K., J.P.)

„ „ 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 (Datuk Harun bin Sirat, D.M.P.N.)

Dewan bersidang semula pada jam 10.06 pagi.

DOA

(H) USUL OLEH YANG BERHORMAT ENCIK V. VEERAPPEN.

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

Mr Speaker, Sir, I wish to move the Motion standing in my name, that is—

“That this House deplores the failure of the Government to provide basic amenities in new villages, kampungs, slums and particularly fragmented estates in Province Wellesley where such services as sanitation, scavenging, night-soil removal, water supply, maintenance of access roads and drainage have completely broken down for the last 17 years or more, and urges the Government to take immediate steps to provide these amenities in order to safeguard the health and well-being of the residents of these places”.

Mr Speaker, Sir, although the Chief Minister claims that he has attracted large amounts of capital, and that he has created over 50,000 jobs, yet the people who live in our urban slums, the new villages and kampungs, and fragmented estates have seen no improvements in their living conditions. In fact, Mr Speaker, Sir, their position has become worse. From the answers given to my questions it is clear that the State Government has completely neglected these areas.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I refer to the answer to my question No. 17 in May, 1971, where I asked the amount of roads, the amount of drains, how many taps, etc., had been provided in the estates, in the new villages, and in the kampungs in Province Wellesley South. To take this as an example, the answer was jalan-jalan dan Parit—Kampung Baru Val Dor—tidak ada jalan-jalan, pemetong-pemetong disediakan sejak bulan Januari tahun 1970. Kampung Baru Jawi tidak ada jalan, pemetong-pemetong 20 kaki dengan garis pusat 36 inchi dan Parit 211 kaki telah dibena \$24.00. Kampung Baru Wellesley—tidak ada jalan dan pemetong-pemetong dibena tahun 1970. Kampung Baru Sungai Kecil—tidak

ada jalan dan pemetong dibena sejak tahun 1970. Saluran paip air dan pili tetapi jalan—tidak ada saluran paip air dan pili dibena di empat perkampungan baru sejak tahun 1970. Ada satu peruntukan bagi sebuah pili tepi jalan di perkampungan Jawi bagi tahun 1972 tetapi itu belum lagi dipasang sebab alat-alat yang dipesan belum lagi diterima.

Berkenaan dengan soalan Nombor 18—Perkhidmatan pembersihan dan pembuangan sampah dijalankan oleh Majlis Daerah Selatan, Seberang Perai—hanya di kawasan-kawasan yang diwartakan, that is gazetted villages and gazetted areas only—that is the towns and villages. Ladang-ladang yang dimaksudkan oleh Yang Amat Berhormat Ketua Menteri adalah di luar kawasan yang diwartakan. Oleh itu tidak ada perkhidmatan—tidak ada perkhidmatan pembersehan dan pembuangan sampah dibuat di tempat-tempat tersebut.

Mr Speaker, Sir, from these answer it is evident that since 1970 nothing has been done. In fact, the little provision of the one culvert and 211 feet of drains in Jawi was as a result of the fact that that culvert and the drain had been washed away. Apart from that, little or almost nothing has been done.

Now, if this is the situation in Province Wellesley South then what can be the situation in the rest of the State? Almost all low-cost housing schemes have no service roads. They only have foot-paths. Some of these do not have cleansing and scavenging services. There is—I must correct myself—I think, one low-cost scheme in Tasek Glugor which has got a service road. And that is due to the efforts of the Member for Tasek Glugor while he was Acting Chief Minister. Apart from that no other schemes have got these services or service roads.

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap, as I see here in your Motion, you mention ‘new villages, kampungs, slums and particularly fragmented estates’. Do these places you talk about come under this?

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Yes, Mr Speaker, Sir. As I was saying, Mr Speaker, the Government has done little or nothing by way of amenities such as roads, drains and stand-pipes for the people in the Kampung, new villages and fragmented estates since it was elected into power. It cannot complain, Mr Speaker, Sir, that it has no money. You know, Mr Speaker, Sir, the State's reserves have been reduced. It has also increased revenue by more than \$4,000,000 from quit rents. And it should be getting an additional \$3,000,000 to \$4,000,000 from the per-capita grant owing to our increased population. As such it has no excuse. If it has no money, Mr Speaker, Sir, to spend on this it has no excuse to rebuild not only the Chief Minister's house but also the Chief Minister's office, as the answer given shows that a sum of \$144,000 was spent on the office and over \$41,000 on the house, making a total of \$185,000—this is not to mention, of course, the new car—when the Chief Minister has not built a single inch of road, or a single inch of drain, or a single stand-pipe for the new villages in Province Wellesley South.

Mr Speaker, Sir, there is a long-standing request from Batu Kawan, which is a kampung with a large population, for a water supply. I understand that the scheme would cost about \$65,000. Way back in the Budget Session of 1971 the Chief Minister in reply to a question answered:

'Adalah dicadangkan bahawa sambungan bekalan air ke Batu Kawan akan dijalankan seberapa segera yang boleh selepas masalah mengambilalih kemudahan-kemudahan dari ladang getah dan kelapa Batu Kawan Sendirian Berhad dapat diselesaikan.'

Mr Speaker, Sir, it is now over two years; and it looks as if the project has been abandoned. Now, compared with the amount spent on the things that I mentioned, regarding this request of people in an island, which is an island actually blocked out from the mainland by a river, it is shocking that the Government cannot provide these facilities.

Sir, a visit to the new villages or the fragmented estates and the urban slums will show the abject squalor and filth in which the people have been forced to live. It is true, Mr Speaker, Sir, that the previous Government extended roads to some fragmented estates like Byram and Changkat, and provided a stand-pipe at least in each of these estates. But since then nothing further has been done in the estates. Now the situation is particularly revolting as there are no scavenging or cleansing facilities, as admitted in the answer given by the Chief Minister when he said that the District Councils are not responsible. Grass and weed have grown, rubbish has piled up everywhere, and drains and latrines are clogged-up and becoming breeding grounds for mosquitoes and disease.

Sir, I would like to take this opportunity to explain what happens when an estate is fragmented. The land is sold in small plots of anything from 2 to 50 acres to Asian buyers. The labour lines, on the other hand, and the factory are, however, not saleable as these will not produce income to the owner as most, if not all, of this subdivision is done without prior approval. There is no person or authority to look after the labour lines or the sanitation, or the maintenance of the roads and drains, as a result of which all these services which were provided by the owners of the estates become neglected. And the estate itself has become a group of small holdings. You cannot call it an estate any more, although the name has stuck to such places. Juru is another clear example.

We have in Province Wellesley South 13 large estates, out of which 12 have already been fragmented and have become small holdings which are nobody's baby. You see, when finally the subdivision is approved the fragmenter or speculator surrenders certain parts of his land for the purpose of access roads and drains and drainage reserves for the whole of the estate. But in the settlements themselves—in the concentrated area where the population is—the whole of the area is neglected.

As far as the drains are concerned a Drainage Board is set up, as in Nibong Tebal drainage area. That is for the sake of the land—to prevent it from being flooded—in drainage areas like Nibong Tebal; and the Drainage Board for Bukit Tambun. But so far as the labourers' lines are concerned these are left out. They are left to rot. And sometimes the labourers are forced out, as in Krian Estate. More often the labourers buy and stay in the rotting labour lines, and work as casual workers in the smallholdings.

Mr Speaker, Sir, at one time—when an estate was an estate and not a smallholding—the Ministry of Labour used to check on the living conditions, and ensured that basic amenities were provided by the estate-owner. When it becomes a smallholding the Ministry cannot check, and does not check on this. Now, as there is no-one after whom the Ministry of Labour can go, there is a complete break-down in the services in these settlements.

It is my contention, Mr Speaker, that the State Government, which is responsible for lands and local authorities, must provide these services either by itself or through local authorities. Mr Speaker, Sir, under Schedule 9 of the Federal Constitution the responsibility for the maintenance of health and sanitation is with the State Government; and therefore it is the duty of the State, either by itself or through local authorities, to see that these are maintained, and to provide for this. Sir, the local authorities collect assessment and taxes from the workers and others who own labour lines and quarters; and also from the rubber and coconut lands in the form of land assessment. But they failed to provide these services.

Further, in our State at least the responsibility for all local authorities rests with the State Government through the Chief Minister as Officer Administering the Councils. As such, Mr Speaker, Sir I repeat again (gangguan).

Tuan Speaker: Do not repeat too many times.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): I repeat that he has no excuse to neglect these areas. The State also gets a per-capita grant from the Federal Government. And as the grant is also for the people in local authority areas it is the responsibility of the State to see that part of this grant is used for providing these services. In fact, Mr Speaker, our local authorities, as I had pointed out sometime earlier, are not in the same position as local authorities in other States. Penang and Malacca are the exceptions in the sense that the local authority area covers a whole District. It is not confined to the towns and Town Boards, or to the villages where there are local councils apart from local authorities. Usually the failures in the local councils are attributed to local authorities. But in this context the figure covers the whole area of the District. As such all the people, be they labourers in fragmented estates or be they dwellers in kampungs, all have to pay assessment once the estate becomes a small holding or a group of small holdings. The position is the same in New Villages, although these villages have better facilities than estates, being creations of the Government, although estates maybe in the early days were creations of the East India Company, or private entrepreneurs, and so forth. But these New Villages were creations of the Government during the Emergency. As such they have better facilities than estates. But there are also villages which are just as bad; for example, Wellesley Estate in Sungei Bakap. Even these little amenities that have been provided in these New Villages have deteriorated; and no improvements have been made since the last elections in 1969, as the answers show.

In the case of kampungs, all attempts to provide facilities and amenities seem to have stopped, since the elections also. Instead there is an over-concentration in the urban and semi-suburban areas, and on glammers events. For example, more than \$5,000,000 has been given to the State Development Corporation which concentrates on the urban and suburban

areas which are to form the greater metropolitan area of George Town. But nothing is done to the rural areas. Further, thousands of acres of valuable lands have been alienated to the State Development Corporation. These lands would be worth at least \$100,000,000 if we take the infrastructure facilities and other services provided by the J.K.R., the D.I.D. and other Departments like the Water Authority, and the Lembaga Letrik Negara at State expense—that is, the ratepayers' expense. Yesterday we had an example of \$180,000 being approved for the provision of water mains to Mak Mandin industrial area. Besides, there are these glamorous events like motor racing, Pesta and Exhibitions which have cost large sums to the taxpayers' account. The Pesta cost about \$100,000, I think; the Exhibition about \$82,000, and the racing \$50,000. Of what benefit are these events to our citizens, let alone our rural citizens? But the things that the people in the rural areas want are little things. They wouldn't cost as much as this. The Pesta, to my mind, does not attract international tourism, but our rural folks who are encouraged to spend the little that they have to travel over to see the Pesta. Motor racing only benefits the speed hogs who want to let off steam. An exhibition, to my mind, is a mere propaganda stunt to project the declining image of the Government, if it has any image at all.

Furthermore, Mr Speaker, the Government has been planning a long time to develop the Penang Urban Centre in the city. I understand that this project will cost about \$200 million. I do not know how much has already been spent in the planning, in consultation fees and incidental expenses. I am sure that this must be a formidable sum as the planning has gone on for years. But how is this project to benefit our rural people, if it is to benefit anyone at all? I know it will be a monument to the Chief Minister if it comes off the launching pad at all. Otherwise the expenditure would be negatory and useless waste. It appears that both the Urban Development Authority and the Federal Government Authority are not

interested in this multi-million-dollar venture as it is said to be non-viable. Perhaps (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap, your Motion is on lack of services, and all those things; and all those places that you mention in your Motion. If you speak of all these other projects as being projects which should not be carried on in relation to your Motion it would be all right. But I don't think you should elaborate on the project itself.

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

I had to compare the amount of attention that is given to rural areas with the amount that is given to the town areas; and therefore I have to bring things up to support my argument. To my mind, Mr Speaker, this would be a wonderful catchword for the next elections, just like the free port, the surtax, the bridge, and even the ambulances the Gerakan plans to give to the people of Penang, but which has been quietly forgotten by the Government, particularly the Chief Minister. But, as you said, Mr Speaker, I agree with you that this is beside the point. The point, Mr Speaker, is that these examples go to show that the Government in the person of the Chief Minister has been interested in only its pet projects. But the rural areas have been forgotten and neglected, perhaps because the Government does not expect the rural population to vote for them again in the next elections. But the backing of the people of George Town, and the political developments in our country are such that they will not get half the support they got in the last election.

The rural areas are not only forgotten; but they have been heavily burdened with increased quit rents, increased assessments, and with new costs for building by having proper plans for their rural homes. Penang is the only State, apart from Malacca, where the homeowners or landowners have got to pay house and land assessment, apart from quit rents, on

their kampung lands and houses. In effect buildings in estates never attracted house assessment as no services were provided. But now, since these estates have been fragmented, all buildings, including labourers' lines and quarters, have to pay assessment which has been increased manifold. But no services are provided in return.

Sir, the Government, now, with UMNO in the Coalition, must wake up and reject the warped and capitalistic ideas of the Chief Minister, and do something for the people in the kampungs, in the new villages, and the urban slums and the fragmented estates which are now the responsibility of the State. The Chief Minister by himself has no heart, mind or sympathy for the poor. He is a man who believes that slums cannot be prevented, and that nothing can be done to people who live on private property. He once gave me an example of how slums cannot be prevented. He said that the London Council houses which were built to clear slums had now become slums again because the people who live there made it so. Such is the thinking of the Chief Minister. Also, in a written answer to a written question (gangguan).

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member for Sungai Bakap, may I interrupt you again? I thought you were going to present the merits of your Motion. You are urging the Government here to (gangguan).

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): I said earlier, if you heard me rightly, 'the Government in the person of the Chief Minister.' The Chief Minister, Mr Speaker, Sir, is responsible for the acts of the Government in this House. As far as I know it is the Chief Minister who answers all queries. It is the Chief Minister who stands up to defend the Government. And therefore I cannot but speak about the Chief Minister.

Tuan Speaker: Well, you put here in your motion 'the failure of the Government to provide'. So please

confine it to the Government, and not to personalities.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): It is not his personality, Tuan, I am talking about. But I will skip that.

Mr Speaker, Sir, you can see it from this answer which I quote. The answer to my Question No. 3 is: 'Wellesley New Village is located on private land. As such it is not possible to spend public funds on its improvement or development'. Mr Speaker, Sir, I say that if that is the philosophy of the Government, if not the Chief Minister, will that make you happy? If that is the philosophy then may I ask: How did George Town get its roads, drains, electricity, street lights, water supply, Town Hall, Esplanade, and the Dewan Sri Pinang? How did it get those? Take MacAlister Road for example: Was it originally State land? Was MacAlister Road originally State land? And how did the houses that are in MacAlister Road come there? Did whoever built the houses in MacAlister Road build the road also, as you require now? Was it so?

Tuan Speaker: I do not know. Do you know? (ketawa).

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Surely not, Mr Speaker.

Almost the whole of the City of George Town is still today private land, except for the roads and the little places we have here and there. The State Government may own the hills of Penang, but not the City of George Town. And therefore that is still private land. And we provide all these services. Why can't these places in the rural areas also have this same treatment?

Mr Speaker, Sir, there is no excuse for the Government to refuse to provide these amenities in all built-up areas in the State be they urban slums like Kampung Makam, Kampung Dodol, Kampung Besar, Kampung Bengali, or New Villages like Wellesley, Jawi, Val D'or, Machang Budoh, or fragmented estates like Changkat, Sungei Kecil,

Caledonia, Trans-Krian, Byram, Juru, and so forth. What I am trying to convince this House and the Chief Minister and the Government is that the whole philosophy is wrong. Wherever there is a concentration of population it is the bounden duty of Government to see that the people in those areas have these facilities and amenities. I therefore ask the new Coalition partner to urge the Government. The partner to urge the Government because the Chief Minister is a stubborn man. And it is well known that his colleagues call him *kepala keras*.

Tuan Speaker: I think that is irrelevant. (*ketawa*).

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Mr Speaker, Sir, you will appreciate that I was called a coward; and it is on record. Well, I am not going to call people cowards, or anything. What I am saying is a fact, which is a literal translation of being stubborn. If you want me to withdraw, well, I withdraw. But you have not asked me to withdraw, so I will say it is o.k. (*ketawa*).

Tuan Speaker: I was saying that the whole reference to the Chief Minister is irrelevant to your argument.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Why I ask the Coalition partners is because they are in a stronger bargaining position. And as most, if not all, of them come from rural constituencies they ought to know the plight of the people in the rural areas. But if they do not want to use their position then they must abide by their early decision to sink or swim with the Government, if not the Chief Minister.

Finally, Mr Speaker, Sir, as my Motion requires immediate steps I would like to suggest that the following steps be taken immediately to ensure that greater financial assistance is given to schools in rural areas by way of textbooks as well as exercise books, which is the duty of the State as the State is responsible for welfare.

Secondly, more allocations should be made to provide roads, drains, standpipes, communal baths, latrines and playing fields in all built-up areas, even if they are on private land, as indeed they must be, by acquiring such lands as are needed for the purposes of providing these facilities.

Tuan Speaker: Among the communal baths, as you said?

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Yes, communal baths. Mr Speaker, I am glad you asked that question. Is it a pleasing sight when we travel, when we pass the *kampung*s, to see people bathing on our roadsides? Ladies have to wait until the sun sets before they can come out to bathe—*ini guna-tak-guna?* Benarkah?—especially if you go on Thursday nights. Have a moonlight drive if you want to (*ketawa*) along the rural roads. You will see the people who have to come to the standpipes to bathe. Can we not do a little bit to see that our women folks do not expose themselves on the roadsides?

Tuan Speaker: I thought there would be communal bathing.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Ya, communal baths. If you want them to be open you can make them Roman baths or Turkish baths. (*ketawa*).

And I also urge that a task force be set up to sweep the drains, to remove the rubbish, and to clean communal latrines. Mr Speaker, Sir, these three things which I have mentioned: how much do they cost? I would like the Chief Minister, to let us know.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I am sure the Chief Minister is going to come up with fantastic facts and figures of how much money the State Government has spent on the rural areas. But I hope, even if he takes 17 years as the figure and adds up the total he will also give the 17 years' expenditure in the urban and semi-urban areas. But my question is this: From your reply, since the elections in 1970. And I want to see whether your answer contradicts your own answer that you have given in

1970. In other words, what I would like to know is: What have you done since 1970—since the last answer was given? So don't try to mislead the House with fantastic figures on what you have spent on this and that. And particularly I know some money has been spent on road improvements, which is paid for from the Road Maintenance Grant which the Honourable Member for Dhoby Ghaut mentioned. And that amount also has been increased. And therefore what are you going to do with the money? You have to spend it. So you spend it.

I urge that the above steps be taken immediately because the people themselves cannot provide these communal services which are essential to society. If the rural people are denied these services their overall health and education will suffer, and they will not be able to contribute to the economic development of the State, and indeed the country.

In conclusion, Mr Speaker, I hope I have convinced the House of the necessity for the Government to give urgent attention to the crying needs of the rural areas, and trust that the Motion before the House will receive the full support of Honourable Members.

Sir, I beg to move the Motion standing in my name.

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

Tuan Speaker, I rise to second the Motion standing in the name of my colleague, the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap, because I have discovered all these years with no uncertainty that the Honourable the Chief Minister and his Government—I hope you don't object to that phrase—have completely and miserably failed all the people living in kampungs and villages by their deplorable failure to provide basic amenities for the people there.

Mr Speaker, Sir, for all these 4 years of Gerakan rule in Penang, and then coming to the Coalition rule in

Penang, the State Government has totally failed in its duty to bring about the welfare and the well-being of our people living in kampungs and villages. And in actual fact the Government had neglected them altogether. And here I wish to put a very, very simple question; and a very, very straightforward question to the Government: Who put them there today? And the answer is also very simple: The people of Penang. And these people included the people staying in villages and kampungs. Therefore it is with great dismay and deep regret that the State Government, through the Honourable the Chief Minister and Members of the Government, should neglect these people altogether.

Tuan Speaker: I think, Honourable Member from Bagan Ajam, all those things were already said by the mover of the Motion. We said yesterday, I think, we should not repeat what has been said. If you have got new points please go on with your speech.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Mr Speaker, Sir, it is the same Motion; and I am looking at the other angle of it. (*ketawa*).

Tuan Speaker: If it is another angle of the same point I think it is also the same point.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): I am coming to that point, but from the other way. (*ketawa*)

Tuan Speaker: Don't go from the back or try the side. Let us go to a different point. There are different points.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Mr Speaker, Sir, since I became elected in 1969 I had on many occasions liked to talk to the Honourable the Chief Minister and the Members of the Government on how to improve the living conditions for kampung folks in my constituency. And always I found it very difficult to talk to him about the problems.

Tuan Speaker: I don't think that is relevant to this Motion.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): I am talking about the problems in the kampung in my place.

Tuan Speaker: Yes. But you are talking about how difficult it was to talk to the Chief Minister.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): I was saying it is very difficult to talk to him about these problems in kampung areas.

Tuan Speaker: If you talk about the problems themselves it is all right. Not how difficult it is to talk to the Chief Minister. Please carry on with the problems.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable the Chief Minister is the Head of the Government; and therefore I have to talk to him. And also I have to talk to many Members of the Government. I believe, Tuan Speaker, you yourself I have also talked to on many occasions about these problems. (*ketawa*)

Tuan Speaker: But I was saying that what we talked about has nothing to do with this Motion.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Well, Mr Speaker, Sir, one day I remember we were going to have a gotong-royong to clean up Butterworth town. Then one afternoon I came down to see the Honourable the Chief Minister, and to discuss how to do the work properly, and to inquire whether the Government could provide some funds for scavenging contracts, and so on, in Butterworth.

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member I am afraid that is highly irrelevant because the Motion says, "deplores the failure of the Government to provide basic amenities in new villages, kampungs, slums and particularly fragmented estates in Province Wellesley?". Here you are talking about towns.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Mr Speaker, Sir, the gotong-royong is not only for the towns. It is also for the kampungs. And we did go into the kampungs and villages to clean up the places there.

Tuan Speaker: So confine yourself to that.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Yes. Then, Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Chief Minister gave me a big lecture on how they can clean up the London town; and what kind of money they have to spend for scavenging in London, and so on. And he made me speechless.

Mr Speaker, Sir, on many occasions also when I talked to the Honourable the Chief Minister and his Government about the welfare and well-being of the kampung folks, and how to provide the amenities for them, I was always turned down as these were very small things—"We have multi-million-dollar concerns in hand. I have got to concentrate on these things". It shows how much the State Government has neglected this work in the kampungs.

Mr Speaker, Sir, from the answer the Honourable the Chief Minister gave to me about community development, the amount of money spent from 1969 to 1973 for community development in the whole District of Province Wellesley North—the amount given to me—was more than \$109,000. And this is worked out to be \$25,000 a year; \$2,000 a month for 300,000 people. On the other hand he has spent something like—if I total up all the figures—\$400,000 in these four years for travelling overseas; for the Government officers, and for his own office; for his own cars, and for renovation of his own residence. I have made comparison.

Tuan Speaker: Mr Ong Yi How, this comparison has been made. I think from now on we must begin to be very sure of ourselves. If Members have got new points to be made in support of a motion, new arguments to put forward, please do so. But if Members wish to go on tediously repeating, and being irrelevant I may have to apply Standing Orders accordingly. Please proceed.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Well, Mr Speaker, Sir, does the Government ever hear the cry of our people in kampungs and

villages? Do they know how much people are suffering when they have to live in places where no basic amenities are provided? Do they know how the kampung people eat, what they drink, and what kind of houses they stay in? One day when I was talking to people in my constituency they complained so much about the State Government's attitude towards the kampung folk. And I have told them what the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap has said—the Honourable the Chief Minister and his Government have no heart for the poor. And an old man remarked that the heart has been swallowed by the international giants. Ross International came here, and pocketed in four months \$400,000.

Tuan Speaker: I think that is highly irrelevant. If the Honourable Member wishes to proceed along that way I may have to apply Standing Order 51 (4).

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Mr Speaker, Sir, I was going to (gangguan).

Tuan Speaker: Yes, if you make that point.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): relate that one with the community development expenses. Now, if this \$400,000 (gangguan).

Tuan Speaker: The Motion before the House, Honourable Member is that this House deplores the failure of the Government to provide basic amenities in new villages, kampungs, slums, etc., etc., and urges the Government to take immediate steps to provide these amenities in order to safeguard the health, etc., etc. So let us confine ourselves exactly to what the Motion says.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Yes.

Tuan Speaker: And no more, and no less.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Mr Speaker, Sir, I am going to relate this \$400,000, if spent on community development, according to the way the Honourable the Chief

Minister has spent in the last four years. This \$400,000 could go for 16 years in the District of Province Wellesley North. This is the way I am going to put it.

Well, Mr Speaker, Sir, I am going to cite an example—the village called Kampung Simpah, where some 20,000 people are staying. All these years this place had no proper road to go in or to get out. The present path they use now is full of pot-holes here and there. And this path is still with red earth, and full of wild plants. During the rainy season it is so muddy that the villagers find it impossible to use the path. This path starts from the Mak Mandin low-cost housing site, running through the heart of the kampung, then going into Sungei Puyu village, and coming out into Sungei Puyu Road. The whole length is about three miles. If only the Government can spend some \$20,000—that is, 5% of what Ross has taken—then 20,000 people in that village will be benefited. For all these four years the Government has done nothing except providing a few lorry loads of red earth costing not even \$500. This made the situation worse. When lorries come in they mess up with the red earth. In fact, in 1969 and 1970 the villages inside that village contributed amongst themselves something like \$4,000 to buy granite and stones to level-up the road. The Government did not contribute even a single cent at that time. It is again like what it was before because many cars and cycles go in and come out; and the place is just as bad as before.

Mr Speaker, Sir, in that village there is no proper drain. And therefore when one goes to visit the village one can find a lot of small pools here and there full of filthy water. During the rainy season we can see a number of children bathing in these small pools. And this is very damaging to their health. There is no water supply pipes there; and they use mostly water from wells. For the whole village with 20,000 people there are only four stand-pipes. And therefore, if they have to rely on stand-pipes for water supply, some 5,000 people have to share one pipe.

For all these four years the Gerakan, and then the Coalition Government did not instal even one stand-pipe for that area. And from the answer I have here I was told that for all these four years the Government only installed two stand-pipes in the District of Province Wellesley North, and each one costing \$764.

Also, Mr Speaker, Sir, there are no proper street lights in the village, and no public utilities like lavatory, telephone booth, community hall, children's playground, and many other things like that. But, like all good citizens, these people staying in the village pay their house assessments, land rents, and other dues and taxes to the Government. But the Government totally, miserably, completely neglected them.

Mr Speaker, Sir, another example is the people staying in the slum along the beach in Kampung Gajah where no basic amenities are provided at all. The Government may come out and argue that these people are squatting on Government land, and therefore the Government cannot do anything for them. But I would argue the other way round. They are squatting there solely because of the fact that the Government is not capable of providing houses to resettle them. And therefore the Government has a duty to provide basic amenities so that they can live there like decent citizens, like everybody else. Most of the people staying there are hawkers and petty traders. And if the Government did not abandon the low-cost housing scheme for Bagan Ajam or Chain Ferry Road these two schemes could be used to resettle these squatters there. There are some 200 families staying there. And again, this place is much worse than what I have said about the village of Kampung Simpah. There is no proper path to go in; no proper stand-pipe at all; no electricity; no drains; no street lights. And I would say that they are the most neglected group in our State. Some two years back the Government tried to take action to demolish their homes. And I took great pains to explain, I think to yourself, Mr Speaker, how these people have to suffer, and

how the Government can help them. And I am very grateful to you, especially yourself (gangguan).

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member, I am afraid that part is also very irrelevant to this Motion. The Motion is a very general one. It deplores the failure of Government to provide all these things. Let us get ourselves completely clear first.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Yes.

Tuan Speaker: And then the Honourable proposer cited various examples.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): I am citing.

Tuan Speaker: And you are citing examples of neglect. That would be alright. But let us not go into details. It all amounts to the same thing. No stand-pipe, no drains, no roads. And possibly later on you come out with no lights. I mean, the basic things are all there. Let us mention them generally, and not go into details. Otherwise there will be total irrelevancy in this business.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Now that the Honourable the Chief Minister has answered my question—that is, these squatters will not be cleared for the time being—I am urging the Honourable the Chief Minister and his Government to provide at least six stand-pipes so that they do not have to go miles away for their drinking water. And the place really needs something like 129 lamps, so that their children and women can feel a little safer to travel there. There must be at least some drains to give the outlet for waste water. There must also be some small hall or little garden for the people there, so that they can go and have a walk when they are not in the small houses. Mr Speaker, Sir, it is the duty of the Government to provide them with all these basic amenities because indirectly and directly they pay taxes and dues to Government, like every good citizen. They are also the people who have played their part to put the Government in power.

Mr Speaker, Sir, as you have said just now, if I were to stand here quoting examples, like many other Members, I could stand here for the whole day quoting these examples. There are many villages in my constituency. But here I quote only these two examples just to illustrate how much the Government neglected the people: (a) in kampungs or villages; (b) in slums where no basic amenities are provided for them. Mr Speaker, Sir, for all these ten years under the Alliance rule before the Gerakan came into power in Penang they have suffered a lot. No-one has really cared for them; and no-one gave them a chance to air their hardships and their difficulties. So in 1969 they thought that the Gerakan, when it comes into power, can help them. And today they are greatly disappointed that the Gerakan came into power for four years; and—like the Alliance Government also—nothing has been done to help them. And in fact they found that the Gerakan is not better than the Alliance at all. In fact it is worse as far as their welfare and well-being are concerned. They put all their hopes in the Gerakan in 1969. And now they find themselves broken-hearted when the Gerakan came into power. This is one of the greatest disappointments one can have.

Mr Speaker, Sir, now I come to the suggestions that I would like to make to the Government on how to improve the life and the welfare of the people in those villages and in slums. Mr Speaker, Sir, I would urge the Government to introduce another Supplementary Development Budget for 1973 into this House, giving a bigger provision for community developments in the State. Here again the Honourable the Chief Minister may turn round and say: 'Now, you say the State is bankrupt; and you want more money'. But I urge the other way. I say that if money is spent on the people to bring about the welfare and well-being of the people I am all out for it, even if we have to borrow some more money from the Federal Government.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S. P. Chelliah): And go bankrupt also.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): (b) I would like to suggest that the State Government should set up a Committee for Community Developments at all District levels, with the District Officer as Chairman, and all Assemblymen of the District as members. This Committee must be assured of sufficient funds to carry out the projects in the District. And also they must be given unvetoes power to do the job. They do not want to submit their suggestions today; and tomorrow somebody comes out and vetoes that—no money. This Committee will consider how to allocate funds that are given to them for all small projects under their consideration. And these projects are to improve the welfare of the people in kampungs and slums.

(c) I would like to suggest that the Government sets up a Committee for Community Development at State level, with the State Secretary as Chairman, and at least one Assemblyman from each District as its members. This Committee will consider overall plans on how to utilise funds for the development of the plans, and how to utilise funds for all the community developments in every District. Mr Speaker, Sir, the Committee should also look into the question of providing more community halls, children's playing fields, improvement of village roads, and other facilities to promote sports and recreation for all Districts in Penang where most kampung people are staying.

Mr Speaker, Sir, after all these four years' spending by Government in many other ways I hope, and I strongly urge, that the Government considers allocating some funds to be spent for the welfare and well-being of our kampung folks in villages and in slums. Terima kasih.

Dewan ditangguhkan pada jam 11.10 pagi.

Dewan bersidang semula pada jam 11.35 pagi.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, dengan izin bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris. Mr Speaker, Sir, we on this side of the

House would like to take part in this debate. But in so doing we would like to move an amendment to the Motion. The amendment, Mr Speaker, reads as follows (gangguan).

Tuan Speaker: What standing Order please?

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Standing Orders 34 (i) and 40: "34. The following motions may be move without notice—(i) A motion by way of amendment to any motion being debated in the Assembly"; and "40 (1) An amendment must be relevant to the question to which it is proposed." My amendment reads as follows:

"That this House calls upon the Government to provide amenities for new villages and kampungs, and immediately introduce a crash programme to give a new deal to these people who have been neglected for the last 15 years."

Now, I would like to explain the main reason why I move this amendment, Mr Speaker. It is because I rather find that regarding the Motion as it stands—"That this House deplores the failure of the Government to provide basic amenities in new villages"—whether it is a statement of fact that the Government has failed, and whether this House should deplore that is one thing by itself. But I think we on this side of the House would not like to create an unnecessarily antagonistic situation between the Government and the Members of the Opposition if we do indeed wish to bring about changes that would improve the livelihood of these people. And we believe that there is a great need, as indicated by this Motion, for the lot of the people in new villages and kampungs to be improved. To our minds there is no necessity to inject any elements that would damage the Motion rather than assist the people, which is in fact the primary motive. Therefore we move that the Motion should read as we have amended it, to reduce any prospect of the Members of the Government being antagonised unnecessarily, especially the Honourable the Chief Minister who may take umbrage at language deploring him in his failures. Mr Speaker, Sir, I think that

the people in the new villages,—particularly those in kampungs, have been neglected.

Tuan Speaker: May I inform the Honourable Member for Kelawei that under Standing Order 42 I shall be the sole judge as to the admissibility of any amendment. I notice that your amendment is very much similar, though not completely, in essence to the second part of the Motion—"and urges the Government to take immediate steps to provide these amenities". In other words (gangguan).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): In other words, I submit this, Mr Speaker, is a more constructive approach to the issue, rather than to seek mere condemnation of the Government

Tuan Speaker: That is true. But this Motion is in two parts: one is the deploring part, and the other is the urging part. Yours is more the urging part.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Rather than the deploring part.

Tuan Speaker: So I do not think there should be any amendment allowed. But I hope you support the urging part.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Well, as I said, Mr Speaker, Sir, we would be most happy if you would enlighten us as to why the amendment is rejected, because it is not in conflict as such with that issue.

Tuan Speaker: But it is in conflict because it is not in conflict with the second part. That is to say, it is couched in different words.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): We are entitled to move this amendment.

Tuan Speaker: I am entitled to be the sole judge, and I disallow it.

Usul pindaan tidak dibenarkan.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Can we know under which particular Standing Orders it is disallowed?

Tuan Speaker: 42—The Speaker shall be the sole judge of the admissibility of any Amendment."

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Be that as it may, Mr Speaker, Sir, I think that we in this House are well aware that the Federal Government, in fact, is particularly concerned with this issue of a better deal for the people living in new villages. And as a result of agitation on the part of the Democratic Action Party last year a Minister for New Villages was appointed. But, sad to say, that response has only been superficial. And although a Ministry was actually created the only budget provision for that Ministry was for the salary of the Minister and the members of his staff. And I feel from the experience we have had with that particular Ministry the Federal Government does not take seriously its obligations to these new villages, particularly these new villages which have been dislocated as a result of the Emergency, and which have for the last 15 over years been thoroughly neglected by the State as well as the Federal Governments.

This term 'New Villages' is in fact a misnomer. They are no more new than you can say Butterworth is new, or Sungei Bakap can really be considered new. They are in fact old new villages. They are villages that have been set up well over 15 years ago. And, in fact, a new generation of people have come into being since the formation of these new villages. And we are sad to note that after all these years no facilities have been provided for them. I do not know whether it has been pointed out. Definitely, drainage facilities, proper roads, bridges, electricity supply and other amenities which would be expected of communities are not provided for these people. In fact it can be said that these are the neglected segment of Malaysia. And they constitute, Mr Speaker, Sir, if I am not mistaken, at least one million

in Malaysia. In Penang they are also a problem which is not noted. And people are not aware that Penang also has got these new villages arising from the Emergency days. And it is really very sad that Government after Government, be it Alliance or Gerakan or Coalition have failed in their duty towards these people.

And this also applies to a great extent to the neglect of the kampungs. I do not wish to revert back to what I had said in connection with Kampong Meriam Timbul and other parts of Bagan Jermal which I had referred to earlier on which, unfortunately, the Chief Minister, in his own peculiar wisdom, has preferred not even to reply to us in the Motion on the vote of thanks to His Excellency the Governor. These are serious problems which an enlightened Government would consider necessary to deal with. But a Government which is entirely careless to the needs of the down-trodden, would merely ignore the cry for justice and fair play, and to correct the economic social imbalances between these people and the better-off and more-fortunate people in the urban communities particularly. And it is a matter of regret that, as defined by Members on the left here—colleagues of the Honourable the Chief Minister under the same platform and Manifesto—although they had promised a lot in terms of social amenities and social services, community development and so forth, none of these things has been given any priority.

We would not like to harp on what we had related earlier, or 'correlated' earlier—to use the very favourite word of the Honourable the Chief Minister. But giving a drain to a village, or repairing a bridge for a new village is not a matter of priority. And action is only taken when members of the Press bring these things up, glaringly exposed to the nation: that Zoo Road bridge has collapsed or is not in a condition to service people—a danger to the children; or that Jalan Dua in Ayer Itam is flooded; or other roads adjacent to Jelutong Road leading to the sea-front are not tarred, and so on. Only on

these occasions—rarely even then—does the Government respond. That is why we on this side of the House hope to urge. But, unfortunately, as you have seen fit to reject our amendment, let the Government take a more enlightened attitude towards this problem; and perhaps in a sense launch a crash programme—a sort of Penang Marshal Plan—for these people who have been neglected; a Lim-Chong-Eu Plan, perhaps, to help these people who have very poor representation in these Chambers, particularly because they, by virtue of the neglect do not have the advantages of better education, and perhaps even consciousness of their rights, and allow themselves to be neglected by Administration after Administration after Administration. If at all the Chief Minister wishes to look back on his records in this House, and in this State as administrator, let it be that he has given a new deal to these people. And we on this side can only urge that action be taken, and taken speedily, because the Chief Minister and his colleagues rightly should have only one more year to go. And up to date it is not even one more year; just a few hundred odd days. But if they wish to neglect their responsibilities to the people, and forget their Manifesto, then there is nothing that we can do. Although I started by saying I do not deplore, if that attitude is taken not only I will deplore, but the people of Penang will deplore the manner in which the Government has failed to live up to its responsibilities.

Ahli Kawasan Balik Pulau (Encik Abdul Rahman bin Haji Yunus): Tuan Speaker, saya ingin juga mengambil bahagian berucap dalam Usul yang dibawa oleh Ahli dari kawasan Sungei Bakap itu. Kadang-kadang saya rasa Kerajaan terlupa langsung dengan keadaan hidup rakyat di luar-bandar. Apa yang saya suka bangkit dan apa yang saya perkatakan begitu ialah kerana segala kehendak-kehendak rakyat yang banyak dipandang dari segi begitu saja. Seperti mana yang saya katakan dahulu di Balik Pulau ada sebuah kampung bernama Kampung Genting dan penduduk-penduduknya

terdiri dari lebih kurang 40 buah rumah, telah memohon bekalan api. Tetapi sehingga hari ini belum ada apa-apa pertanda yang permohonan mereka itu akan dilayan. Dengan sebab itu saya menyokong Usul daripada Wakil Sungei Bakap tadi. Saya pernah ingat kadang-kadang kita menganggap bahawa Kerajaan mensifatkan rakyat di luar bandar itu sebagai satu rakyat yang terasing daripada rakyat dalam bandar. Demikian juga bekalan-bekalan air di daerah kampung-kampung.

Tuan Speaker, satu lagi perkara yang saya suka timbul dalam Dewan ini ialah mengenai penumpang-penumpang tanah T.O.L. Ini menjadi satu masalah kepada penumpang-penumpang di tanah T.O.L.

Saya hendak memberi satu contoh yang boleh dikatakan satu bukti juga dalam masalah ini. Seorang pemohon daripada orang kampung yang diberi kebenaran menduduki tanah Kerajaan yang sudah diluluskan untuk kawasan tapak rumah yang seluas 40 kaki dan 60 kaki, sesudah berlaku permohonan ini dan pembayaran T.O.L. selama 2 tahun maka tibalah masanya untuk pemohon itu mendirikan sebuah rumah. Apalah malangnya Tuan Speaker, sesudah ia membuat permohonan dan mengikuti syarat-syarat Majlis Daerah Luar Bandar iaitu (1) daripada surat permohonan untuk membangunkan sebuah rumah sementara dan (2) menyediakan 7 keping pelan untuk diberikan kepada Majlis Daerah Luar Bandar yang mana di dalam pelan itu menyatakan membuat satu pembinaan dan sekiranya Kerajaan menghendaki tanah ini kembali maka Kerajaan tidak perlu membayar segala kerugian. Dan ini menunjukkan keiklasan rakyat yang mana jikalau binaan mereka itu di-robohkan maka robohlah.

Syarat-syarat Majlis Daerah Luar Bandar iaitu sebelum pelan-pelan ini dibawa ke pejabat mereka, mestilah ditandatangani oleh pihak tuan tanah yang mana Pegawai Daerah sebagai mewakili tuannya tanah mesti menandatangani di atas pelan ini dan pelan ini mesti dibawa kepada Pegawai Daerah. Pegawai Daerah memberi

jawapan bahawa beliau bukanlah seorang yang mewakili tuanpunya tanah. Dengan masalah ini saya rasa pihak Majlis ini dapat mencari satu jalan keluar supaya menambah kesenangan kepada rakyat luar bandar.

Jadi Tuan Speaker, pembayaran T.O.L. bagi setahun sebanyak \$10.00 kita terima untuk membangunkan tapak rumah. Tetapi sesudah beliau membuat rancangan untuk mendirikan tapak rumah maka tidak mahu pula ditandatangani oleh Pegawai Daerah. Inilah yang menghairankan saya. Walau bagaimanapun saya rasa pihak yang berkenaan dapat mengatasi masalah ini dengan secepat mungkin supaya jangan berlaku ini di hari depan. Dan saya rasa sekianlah.

Terima kasih.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Tuan Speaker, saya minta kebenaran bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris. Mr Speaker, Sir, I like to rise to support the Motion moved by the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap. And in doing so I like to congratulate him for bringing up this issue before the House. In moving the Motion he has drawn the attention of this House to the failure of the Government to provide basic amenities not only to the new villages but also to the kampungs, to the slums, and to the fragmented estates. This, in short, covers all the under-privileged sections of the community. It cuts through race barriers. And I like to congratulate particularly because, unlike the Honourable Member for Kelawei, I feel that his motion is constructive. It is not merely a Motion of condemnation, or deploring the Government, because if we come lower down to the text of the Motion we will see that he did ask the Government to take action—and immediate action—to provide these amenities in order to safeguard the health and well-being of the residents of these places. So this is not merely a Motion deploring the Government. It is a Motion which calls on our Government to take immediate action. No doubt the Honourable Member for

Sungei Bakap did not mention a crash programme. But I don't think that made any difference because the fact that he did not mention a crash programme will give the Government a better opportunity of remedying whatever defects there are. Honourable Members must appreciate—and I think the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap appreciates this point—that the solution of some of the problems facing the kampungs are not solutions that can be arrived at by crash programmes. For example, the solution for flooding in the kampungs is not a situation that can be reached by any crashed programme. It is a problem that must be solved right from the source. One has to make a study of let's say, a flooding area like Kampung Sungei Pinang. One must appreciate that the flooding is due to quite a number of problems. And crash programmes cannot solve problems. And as such Government will have to go deeper into that, and find a long-term solution. It may involve the spending of millions of dollars; but nevertheless it must be spent. So we in the PEKEMAS believe that a resolution of this type must be a resolution that strikes at the very core of the problem. A resolution of this type must not be a resolution made for purely political motives. We must have the welfare of the people at heart. It is in this respect that we in this part of the House would like to note—it is an open fact—that very little has been done to alleviate the hardships of these under-privileged sections of the population. It is an open fact that it is the policy of the Government to alleviate the hardships of the under-privileged. And in this respect we like to know: Are there any plans to assist the under-privileged? So, it is important that Members of the Government in particular should inform this House what steps they have taken as representatives of the people. And I think that not only we in this part of the House but the constituents of Bayan Lepas would like to know what plans the Member for Bayan Lepas has with regard to this particular problem. Any plans for Teluk Kumbar, for example? Any

plans for any other areas of his Constituency?

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member from Ayer Itam, I think that is not relevant to the Motion. The Motion merely deplores the Government for certain things; and then calls on the Government to take steps. I think any talk on wanting to know about Government plans is irrelevant to this Motion.

Ah'i Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): So this is actually an attempt to find out whether there are any specific plans. The Government as such may not have any plans as yet, because otherwise we would have known about it. But in this respect I think it is important that individual Members of the Government, or individual Members of this Assembly should on this occasion put forward any constructive ideas they may have with regard to their constituency.

Tuan Speaker: That I think is irrelevant to the Motion itself.

Ah'i Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): But it pertains to the Motion, because if we are concerned with the alleviation of poverty, with improving the conditions of this underprivileged section of the community, I feel that if our knowledge of our constituency is made known to the Government it will assist the Government to formulate their plans.

Tuan Speaker: That is true.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): And it is in that respect that I like to urge Honourable Members to put forward their views.

Tuan Speaker: I agree. That was why when the Honourable Member urged the Members to air their views I did not stop him. It is quite correct that all Members be urged to air their views. But let us go on to the merits or demerits of the Motion itself. I do not think we should be here giving sermons and talking philosophy, and making all sorts of theories. But we should be here to debate the merit or the demerit of each particular Motion. The

Honourable Member made a point in urging Members of this House, on both sides, to bring out their views in relation to this Motion. That was all right. But when you begin to emphasize on that I think it is incorrect.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Thank you, Mr Speaker.

So in this respect I for one feel that it is important that we should highlight the inadequacies of development in various rural areas as well as in the various urban areas where there are slums. Take, for example, the constituency of the Chief Minister himself. I am aware of the fact that slums exist in the constituency of Tanjong. We heard of various plans to have a new Town Centre. We heard of various plans to improve various other places. But the question is the question of priorities. Has the Chief Minister got his priorities correct? Here the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap pointed out to expenditure utilized on the residence of the Chief Minister, and for improvement of offices, provision of cars, and all that. I do appreciate the necessity for adequate facilities. I do appreciate that the Honourable the Chief Minister should travel comfortably. But I like to urge the Honourable the Chief Minister at the same time to also provide adequate funds for alleviating of hardships of the underprivileged section of the community. And in that respect the blueprint for improvement of slums to my mind has not proceeded fast enough. To my mind this should be a matter of first priority. The people of urban areas in particular are living in crowded accommodation. We have heard of various schemes to improve the slums—to use the word of the Honourable the Chief Minister, “urban renewal”—but these are only talks. We like to see action being taken on this more promptly. And in this respect, as the Honourable the Member for Sungei Bakap has pointed out, grandiose plans were made for various projects which may not see fulfilment. So it appears to us that there has been an over-concentration of big projects without being sure that such projects will ever see the light of day.

And here I would like to urge the Government to give very serious consideration to the matters that being raised. It is only by so doing that you can have your priorities correct. Otherwise you will merely be paying lip-service to the principles as put forward in the Rukunegara.

Many problems have arisen, both in the rural and the city areas as a result of projects, whether it be to industrialise the rural area, or whether it be a matter of constructing new buildings at various places. And the crux of it all lies in this inability of the Government to really appreciate the plight of the underprivileged. In theory it may sound all right—that we will rehabilitate the various people; maybe people employed in pig-rearing, or vegetable gardeners, and the like. But one of the most important considerations is the fact that these people were there for ages. They have been pursuing that type of employment for generations. And one cannot uproot their way of life just overnight. One must have first of all studied the whole problem in depth before any steps are taken to proceed with any ventures. But this is the sort of thing which I would like to say the Government is lacking. There is a tendency to do things in a hurry, without proper planning. And this shortcoming I hope will be remedied in the near future.

So I therefore like to urge this House to look at this particular Motion of the Honourable the Member for Sungei Bakap objectively. And if we look at it in that light I see no reason why any Member of this House, be they in the Government or in the Opposition, should not support this Motion. So I therefore urge Members of this House to give the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap their support.

Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Encik Ismail bin Hashim): Tuan Speaker, saya bangun untuk mengambil bahagian bersama-sama dalam Dewan ini iaitu atas masaalah Usul yang dibawa oleh Ahli daripada Kawasan Sungei Bakap.

Tuan Speaker, dalam mengikuti perbahasan-perbahasan yang berlaku dalam Dewan ini sepanjang pagi ini, saya dapat mengikuti bahawa di antara

Ahli-ahli Pembangkang sendiri ada berlainan pendapat tentang Usul ini sendiri. Jadi saya rasa dalam masaalah ini biarlah rakyat yang ada di dalam Negeri ini dapat mengukur setakat manakah masaalah yang telahpun dibangkitkan oleh Ahli daripada Sungei Bakap ini telahpun ataupun telah diambil perhatian oleh Kerajaan sendiri. Saya sendiri dapat memberi pendapat saya, kalaulah ditanya pendapat saya di dalam masaalah ini saya rasa ada juga perkara-perkara yang saya bersetuju dengan pendapat yang di bawa oleh Ahli daripada Sungei Bakap. Tetapi Tuan Speaker, kalaulah semua perkara-perkara yang dibangkitkan oleh Ahli-ahli Pembangkang hendak dibuat oleh Kerajaan dengan sertamerta, saya fikir beberapa ratus juta ringgitlah wang yang akan digunakan untuk masaalah-masaalah ini semua. Jadi, dengan sebab itu Kerajaan ini membuat rancangan-rancangan untuk menolong khasnya kepada penduduk-penduduk kita yang dalam kawasan-kawasan perkampungan baru dan juga tempat-tempat yang sesak. Saya rasa mempunyai projek-projek yang tertentu dan mengikuti keadaan masa dan kewangan Kerajaan sendiri.

Jadi Tuan Speaker, saya sungguh tertarik hati dengan hujah-hujah yang dibawa oleh Ahli daripada Kawasan Ayer Itam; sebab saya nampak Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam ini selain daripada beliau menuju atau membawa hujah-hujah memburukkan Kerajaan di mana concentrationnya kepada Ketua Menteri. Tetapi hari ini dia cuba lighter sedikit kepada Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas. Jadi ini semua orang faham, iaitu motif yang ada di dalam Dewan ini untuk menunjukkan bahawa Ahli daripada pihak pembangkang Yang Amat Berhormat Ketua Menteri dan juga Ahli daripada Kawasan Bayan Lepas inilah mempunyai keadaan Kerajaan Campuran sekarang. Jadi kedua-dua ini kalau diattack ertinya habislah Kerajaan ini dan discreditleh Kerajaan yang ada sekarang. Jadi motif itu kita samakan dan kalau saya hendak ulas lagi masaalah ini, saya tidaklah menggunakan perkataan jahat sebab beliau itu terlampau marah kalau saya gunakan perkataan jahat; tetapi saya

hendak ubah sedikit, bolehlah kita kata sebagai nakal-nakal. Jadi sebab itu satu usaha yang betul-betul untuk hendak menunjukkan kepada orang ramai bahawa diantara Ahli-Ahli yang ada di dalam Kerajaan hari ini tidak membuat kerja terutama sekali di dalam kawasan masing-masing.

Saya berpendapat Tuan Speaker, kami di sebelah sini tidak payah hendak menunggu bila datangnya Dewan ini baru hendak bawa apa-apa perkara yang dihadapi oleh rakyat di dalam kawasan kami sendiri. Sebab kami daripada Kerajaan, boleh bawa bila-bila masa untuk perhatian Kerajaan dan mengambil tindakan bila-bila masa juga. Jadi walaubagaimanapun, dalam masa kami membawa perkara-perkara yang memberi kebajikan kepada rakyat khususnya dalam kawasan masing-masing adalah juga perkara-perkara seperti yang saya katakan tadi—satu benda itu kita tidak dapat buat dengan sertamerta, tetapi kalau ini hendak diambil bandingan saya rasa Tuan Speaker, ada juga banyak perkara-perkara yang boleh dibuat oleh Ahli kawasan masing-masing. Tidak payah lagi minta pertolongan Kerajaan yang Ahli daripada kawasan itu tidak buat, mithalnya saya hendak keluar sedikit daripada perbincangan kita yang ada sekarang ini. Saya tahu ada rakyat atau penduduk-penduduk dalam Kawasan Ayer Itam sendiri, di Kebun Thean Teik berlaku satu masalah di antara tuan tanah dengan penduduk-penduduk di atas tanah itu. Mereka hendak berjumpa dengan Ahli wakil itu sendiri tetapi Ahli wakil itu telah menolak atas rayuan penduduk-penduduk itu sehingga orang yang daripada kawasan lain, saya sendiri mengambil bahagian membetulkan keadaan masalah itu. Tetapi, saya tidaklah membawa ke dalam Dewan ini saya telah bekerja menolong Ahli yang ada di dalam kawasan Ayer Itam pada hal Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam sendiri tidak buat kerja di dalam kawasan dia. Saya tidaklah hendak bercakap banyak di dalam perkara-perkara ini Tuan Speaker (gangguan).

Tuan Speaker: Soal itu tidak berbangkit di dalam perkara ini.

Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Encik Ismail bin Hashim): Ya, saya faham. Tidak bersangkut, kita faham; tetapi kalau cuba hendak membawa masalah-masalah kecil, detail yang ada di dalam kawasan masing-masing, hendak memburukkan Ahli dalam kawasan itu di dalam Dewan ini, saya rasa ini bukanlah tempatnya, bukan tempat, Biarlah kita bercakap kepada Usul yang ada hari ini dan saya seperti saya kata tadi Kerajaan kita sedar, sungguh sedar di atas masalah kesusahan-kesusahan yang berlaku terutama sekali di dalam kawasan-kawasan luar bandar. Tetapi kita tidak dapat membuat itu semua, kalau kita berkehendakkan perkara itu semua dibetulkan dengan masa yang singkat, ini bergantung kepada kewangan dan sebagainya.

Jadi saya rasa Tuan Speaker, dalam kita membahaskan Usul ini, saya fikir samada Kerajaan Negeri dan juga Kerajaan Pusat mempunyai rancangan-rancangan untuk menolong orang-orang, misalnya masalah-masalah yang ada di dalam kawasan-kawasan tersebut. Saya tidaklah mahu bercakap panjang di dalam masalah ini sebab semua orang tahu dari satu rancangan ke satu rancangan samada Kerajaan Pusat atau Kerajaan Negeri untuk menolong orang kita yang ada di dalam kawasan tersebut.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S. P. Che'lliah): Tuan Yang Dipertua, dengan izin bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to take part in this debate on the Motion moved by the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap. Mr Speaker, Sir, I am not going to say that the Motion itself is jahat because I do not think it is jahat. But it is politically motivated, though the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam said that Motions should not have any political motivation. I think that advice should have been directed by the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam to the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap in the first instance.

We agree, Mr Speaker, Sir, that we could not have done much for these people, fully realising the fact that the

Member himself said the Government has done little or nothing for these people. No amenities provided by the Government; no service roads, drains, jobs in the estates, new villages and kampungs; nothing has been done by the Government. I do not think this Motion itself, as it appears to be is meant to fight for the under dogs or down-trodden in these slums, kampungs, and particularly fragmented estates. I feel the inward intention of the Honourable Member is to safeguard the interests of the huge landlords who are in actual fact threatening the very life of these people in the slums, fragmented estates and kampungs, etc.

The Honourable Member for Ayer Itam said the Government must study in depth; must not do things in a hurry. On the other hand, the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap has stated very clearly in this Motion itself that the Government must immediately attend to the needs of these people. Government fully realises the hardships that will be caused if at all millions of public funds are spent towards providing these amenities which will help in the ultimate the big landlords. Then I think the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap will come back again to this House and say this Government is a capitalistic Government. Now here, Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not think that by the very fact that the Government is studying in depth the problems of preventing any hardships, while the Government is thinking that adequate facilities and amenities should be directed to these people, we want to promote or enrich the capitalists who own major shares of this land where these people live. So here I think it is the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap who has capitalistic ideas in moving this Motion. But he belongs to a very peculiar party—the Socialist Justice Party. I would like to ask him whether this is social justice which he intends to do to these people, or for that matter the under dogs or down-trodden. So the whole thing boils down to only one factor. Mr Speaker, Sir, this Motion itself deplored the Government for ignoring or neglecting the people. This is untrue. If the

Government has done a little, as accepted by the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam and the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap, then the word “neglect” does not necessitate mention in this House.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): How about Government land?

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S. P. Chelliah): Government does not intend to neglect any sector of the community.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): He spoke about Government land.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S. P. Chelliah): Well, you are talking about new villages. Mr Speaker, Sir, the interpretation of the word “squatters” has been mentioned very clearly in this House. I think the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap is there as a member of the legal profession to advise the Honourable Member for Bagan Ajam what the meaning of “squatters” is. So Mr Speaker, Sir, I would not like to take the time of this House on this issue any further. As this Motion does not merit the support of this House because it is politically motivated to help the landlords, we on this side of the House do not support the Motion.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya bangun dan langsung bangkang usul daripada Yang Berhormat Ahli dari Sungei Bakap sebab saya fikir usul ini tidak laku dan perkara-perkara yang disebutkan di dalam usul ini menunjukkan dengan terang Yang Berhormat Ahli dari Sungai Bakap tidak faham masaalah-masaalah yang beliau sendiri telah bangkitkan di dalam Dewan ini. Tetapi sungguhpun jawapan-jawapan atau ucapan saya hanya pendek sebab Ahli Yang Berhormat dalam Parti-parti Pembangkang juga ingin ambil peluang di sini untuk membahaskan lagi, saya ingin menyentuh balek perkara yang sudah dan telah dibangkitkan di dalam Dewan ini dalam membahaskan Titah Ucapan Tuan Yang Terutama Gabnor.

Saya mengambil peluang di sini menjawab perkara-perkara yang dibangkitkan oleh Yang Berhormat Ahli dari Balik Pulau. Keadaan penduduk-penduduk Kampung Genting itu saya fikir satu perkara yang mustahak yang telahpun beberapa kali kita telah berunding. Saya mengambil peluang di sini berjanji yang bukan sahaja Kerajaan ambil perhatian, tetapi akan mengambil tindakan atas perkara ini. Berkenaan dengan bekalan air, saya ingat Yang Berhormat Ahli dari Balik Pulau tahu, faham bahawa di dalam undang-undang atau Akta Bekalan Air, kuasa itu adalah terletak kepada Kerajaan Negeri untuk menyelesaikan perkara-perkara dan masaalah-masaalah seperti ini. Tetapi berkenaan dengan perkara T.O.L. saya fikir Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Balik Pulau mestilah terima Kerajaan Negeri dalam menjalankan dasar-dasar atau arahan-arahan Kerajaan, Pegawai-pegawai di dalam Kerajaan mestilah mengikut dengan undang-undang, sebab penduduk-penduduk di atas tanah Kerajaan adalah diminta T.O.L. satu agreement atau satu lesen untuk masa setahun, maka mestilah tiap-tiap tahun Pegawai Daerah bagi pihak Kerajaan Negeri menandatangani terlebih dahulu. Itu hanyalah mengikut peraturan undang-undang.

Beberapa kali di dalam Dewan ini perkara Rukunegara dibangkitkan. Tetapi di dalam Rukunegara ada terdapat satu prinsip—Kedaulatan Undang-undang Negara kita. Oleh itu saya, Tuan Yang Dipertua, dapati Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Kelawei pun ingat dia mesti ambil bahagian dalam usul itu, tetapi nampaknya beliau tidak sungguh-sungguh bersetuju dengan usul itu bila beliau memberi pandangan di dalam Dewan ini tetapi walau bagaimanapun dia mestilah juga bercakap sedikit sebab sebagai leader of the opposition kalau tidak cakap, dan lain-lain orang cakap banyak, tidak boleh. Saya ingat apa-apa yang membangkit dari Yang Berhormat Ahli dari Kelawei itu langsung tidak ada apa-apa perkara, hanya ada dua tiga perkara yang sudah dibangkitkan dalam Dewan ini beberapa kali, seperti perkara

Kampung Meriam Timbul, Zoo Road dan seterusnya.

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

Mr Speaker, Sir, this Motion, as I said, is absolutely of no worth, particularly in view of the fact that this House has spent several days debating His Excellency's gracious speech where the policy of Government has been clearly stated. And Honourable Members of this House, particularly the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap who is in the Opposition, had attempted to abuse the Motion. But towards the end of the debate I think they took a very generous step when on the voice vote, when you, yourself Mr Speaker, asked whether the voice vote could be taken as a voice with unanimous consent, everybody agreed.

Sir, I think the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap never reads important documents seriously because if he has actually given attention to the speech made by His Excellency the Governor he would have realised that all the major principles that are involved in the numerous points that he has brought up have been dealt with by the speech.

Sir, Honourable Members from the Opposition and the expert of it, of course—the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap—tried to throw confusion in the House, hoping that the Government will, like their own tendency, miss the wood for the trees. So they felled a whole lot of trees, including the leaves, roots, branches, anything that they could get hold of, hoping that they would try to catch at it. But, Sir, the Government has clearly indicated that Government is motivated by very strong concern for the people of Penang; and not just for people of Penang in the urban area, but the people of Penang in the whole State, urban as well as rural. Sir, Government's policy, as stated by His Excellency—the Government's programme of rural industrialisation and rural urbanisation, and of parallel agro-horticultural extension and development, with an integrated development

programme including urban renewal—puts in a nutshell everything the Government intends to do. Now that the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap cannot understand this, and persists not to understand this, I hope he does not mean that he will never be able to understand it. That shows the fundamental differences between ourselves. Perhaps it may not be ideological here, because I think it is the question of ability to grasp at things. Sir, he referred to me as being *kepala keras*. And I accept it because he says '*kepala keras*' means hard-headed, and therefore stubborn. I never asked him to withdraw that. But when I referred to him as—I hope you do not mind this. I am just using this word as an illustration. But as you know the term is—*kaki lembut*—and *kaki lembut* is weak-knee-ed; and 'weak-knee-ed' is coward—he asked me to withdraw, which I did to make him happy. But, Sir, in the cut and thrust of the debate the Honourable Member referred to me as *kepala keras*. I accepted it if it means stubborn, because, Sir, Government has stubbornly persisted in the pursuit of its implementation of policies that will bring benefit to the people of Penang.

Honourable Members will remember, I hope, that not just 72 hours ago—perhaps if you add a few more days during the course of the debate on His Excellency's speech—it was so clearly appreciated that the first task that Government had to do in this State was to meet the problem of poverty. And that poverty as is defined concerns those in the State who were unemployed and who do not own any property or any land. And as I said in passing through, when the Honourable Members were sitting over here with us, and they thought there were only 8,000 jobs to be created they thought it was possible. But when we told them that the dimension of the job creation was 50,000 they ran across to the other side.

Similarly, Sir, the Honourable Members of Ayer Itam and Sungei Bakap not only were on this side. They at that time had the privilege of being my

colleagues in Government. They were Chairmen of important Committees in Government which initiated studies into the problems involving land utilisation, and problems of the rural areas. But they discovered that these problems were enormous, and that priorities had to be taken in such a way that they also ran across to the other side. And now having gone to the other side they begin to attack the Government for not having set their priorities correctly. Sir, without any doubt I say that the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap has not followed the speech of His Excellency the Governor because if he had done so he will appreciate that His Excellency did say, dengan izin, I quote:

"Kebajikan rakyat kita mestilah dijaga dan dari mula lagi adalah penting untuk menumpukan aktiviti-aktiviti kita untuk menyelesaikan masalah-masalah kemiskinan. Kerajaan Negeri telah menentukan bahawa sektor kemiskinan ada perhubungan secara khas dengan Negeri-Negeri yang tidak mempunyai tanah dan mereka yang menganggur dan juga mereka-mereka yang tidak mempunyai tanah-tanah yang mencukupi untuk mencari penghidupan, ataupun mereka-mereka yang mempunyai pekerjaan yang menghasilkan pendapatan yang terlalu rendah untuk keperluan sara hidup. Kita pada hari ini telah mencapai satu peringkat apabila kita mesti memenuhi keperluan-keperluan sektor-sektor yang kurang bernasib baik di dalam masyarakat kita. Untuk berbuat demikian kita mestilah menentukan supaya keamanan dan kesetabilan ujud, di samping itu kadar pembangunan diteruskan".

Sir, I am sure that the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap can go back and refer to this because if he had followed the speech of His Excellency the Governor—and the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap's remarks says 'verbiage', which I asked him to withdraw—I think it is very ungracious.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Is it unparliamentary to use the word verbiage? If the Speaker rules it as unparliamentary I shall withdraw.

Tuan Speaker: It is His Excellency's speech. If you want to refer to His Excellency's speech as verbiage, you

should withdraw it in deference to His Excellency the Governor.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): I shall withdraw it; and come back to it when I have the time.

Ketua Menteri: Sir, I therefore have to accept the fact that the Honourable Member did read through this speech. But the fact that having read through it he still persists means that he has very little understanding of the problems, having accepted that the first priority was to resolve this problem of unemployment in relation to poverty, and that the next step would be to take care of other problems.

The Honourable Member, if he referred to the speech in general, would have appreciated that the Government has set about to establish a State Planning Development Control Department in relation to the integration of Local Authorities in order to resolve these very many problems. So, to say that the Government has done nothing—admitted, it is a little, but not entirely nothing—I think is incorrect.

Sir, if we examine the Motion itself—"That this House deplores the failure"—the important word is 'deplore'—"to provide basic amenities in new villages, kampongs, slums and particularly fragmented estates in Province Wellesley where such services as sanitation, scavenging, nightsoil removal, water supply, maintenance of access roads and drainage have completely broken down", is it true? Have they completely broken down? Are the health situations referred to by the Member for Sungei Bakap—pods where mosquitoes breed—proved? What in actual fact is the incidence of Malaria or any other diseases carried by mosquitoes in these areas referred to by the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap? Have there been any changes for the worst? Or has the actual health situation been taken by objective analysis, and objective facts improved? Sir, have they really completely broken down?

Sir, as I have remarked, if we really wanted to debate this particular Motion *per se*—by itself—then there is no merit in debating this Motion. Even the way it is framed does not allow any merit in it because of this exaggeration of words and terms. But I know the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap does not entirely mean this. He means to do something good for his people there. So, in that light I will try to answer some of his questions; some of his problems.

Sir, I ask that we read this carefully, because we must appreciate that the provision of nightsoil removal must obviously be carried out by a totally different level of government on a different level of administration. From the very next words, the provision of water supply has got to be carried out by a different Authority; and at a different level of Government for the maintenance of access roads and drainage. The Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap, in spite of my explanation to his colleague, the Honourable Member for Bagan Ajam, has even overnight forgotten to make sure that when he refers to drains, namely, sullage drains, he should not mix it up with drainage and irrigation provisions which are controlled by the Drainage Board because drains are maintained by the Local Authorities as a responsibility of the Local Authorities, whereas the Drainage Board deals with the overall irrigation and drainage system. Whilst I expect that of the Honourable Member for Bagan Ajam who is a relatively inexperienced Member, and who is also known for making statements without very much backing, I did not expect that kind of failure to discriminate between what is right and proper by the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap who is a very experienced Member of this Assembly. Sir, it is this overlap of Authorities that has created the situation often of administrative delays, and frequently of administrative failure to implement a problem. And it is for this reason that the Government has been examining all the various problems arising, and its determination to move to the next step of our development, where

we have to look at the problems of those who are not completely without hope, and those who are unemployed but do not earn enough, or those who have land and properties, but are not able to get enough from the land utilisation, that the State Government has decided to establish a State Planning Control Department, and that the principle of control has got to be obtained. This principle of control and discipline is an extremely important one. And the Members of this House can see the distinction between the wild wooliness of the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap, running all over the place, as against the stubborn, hard-headed, persistent implementation on the part of Government of a problem. We have to look at the root cause of a problem. The Honourable Member for Ayer Itam and his team indicated to us that we had to look and study the problem, find the root cause of the problem, assess it, find its feasibility, and then implement it.

Sir, one of the problems raised is the question of slums. The Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap referred to a private conversation I had with him about slums in London, and the experiences of slums in London. But I do not think he went to the full context, because we were discussing slums in general; and there are many causes of slums. And in that particular discussion we had I did refer in particular to the psychological attitudes of the people who live in slums. And I thought that was the particular instance. I do not think the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap would wish to make a point of that, and imply that, whereas I worry about people in London, I do not worry about people of Sungei Bakap. But at the same time, Sir, the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap, I think, will appreciate that the problem of slums, as we are discussing it, was very large; and one part of it was this question of London, and the experiences in London.

Similarly, the Honourable Member for Bagan Ajam, much more vicious in his implications, did not have the time

to elaborate on our private discussions. The Honourable Member said that he found it very difficult to see me. It is not true, because I have seen him many times. He has been to see me many times. But, unfortunately, Sir, very nearly 99 per cent of the times he has been to see me it has been about his own personal matters which I do not think I should reveal in this House. On one occasion he referred to me about starting 'gotong royong', particularly for Kampong Simpah. There was a programme that had already been established by the Government and it was being carried out under the auspices of the District Officer concerned. The Honourable Member came to see me as an Assembly man in that area, and I had to see him. But what he wanted was more kudos than the District Officer who was in charge of the whole problem. So, I told him that this problem was being dealt with at District level; and for whatever requirements he may have, and whatever other accessory tools and implements he may require, he should see the District Officer; and the District Officer would transmit it through the proper channels, and it would be dealt with. But I saw him; and then I told him this indirectly. We had a discussion; so I told him of this very important problem which I had brought to the notice of this House—what I referred to as the unit cost of local government services. Sir, in London and in other places, I was telling him, in fact this is a basic problem, because of the cost of providing social services, such as keeping the place clean, scavenging, just keeping the streets, and sustaining the streets. These are very, very expensive matters concerning society; and laws are made in other parts of the world. And I referred in this particular context to the fact that in London they were receiving the local authorities application.

Sir, in other parts of the world there is insistence that for this kind of basic amenities nowadays the common urbanisation terms that are used by people involved in development planning, and the provision of such

basic social infrastructure services are such that they might have to legislate for the house-owners actually to come out and clean the portion of their frontage in regard to the public street. Sir, one of the problems in the world today, not only just here, is that in our experiences of 'gotong royong', our experiences of 'jaya diri', of 'maju kampung', our experiences where the inhabitants in the area had to come out voluntarily to give their services to keep the area clean the cost otherwise would be too high. In countries like the Republic of China, if you read the newspapers, when rain or snow falls what happens is that everybody comes out, and they clean it all up. Sir, that is, in actual fact, an explanation of the problem of our experience of "gotong royong", "maju kampung" and "jaya diri".

Sir, unfortunately, in kampungs and new villages there are two different types of experience. There are those who have established patterns of living, and those who have come into the kampung without having acquired the basic way of living in a kampung. Sir, that is why Government very nearly two years ago launched this anti-litter and beautification campaign; not so much to convince the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap or the Member for Bagan Ajam, but really to educate our younger generation of citizens to become more responsible in their environment. And, Sir, in actual fact, in his Excellency's speech there is also reference to the need at all times to preserve the environment of the city, Sir, when it comes to a situation that the environmental preservation—or in simple terms 'scavenging'—has got to be borne by the Local Authority, and eventually by the Government.

Honourable Members from Sungei Bakap and Ayer Itam, in the course of their attack, both on the Motion of Thanks for his Excellency's speech as well as on the Supplementary Budget, have referred to the fact that the District Councils had amassed large sums of arrears in collection, and were running in deficit. Therefore, Sir, that involves the problem that these local government organisations have to be restructured. The problem in Province Wellesley

South is such that an area of over 130 square miles was being administered by an Authority with less than 90 employees, officers and staff. And under the circumstances, Sir, the maintenance of all these services which the Honourable Member referred to was being carried out to the best of the ability of the staff; but was one which obviously must lead to deficiencies. Therefore the immediate task was to restructure and re-organise the Local Authority in such a manner that it can become more efficient to meet the needs of the people. So, to say that the Government has done nothing is incorrect, because what the Honourable Members would like to say to us today is to immediately go ahead and provide an allocation for roads. Sir, the State Government can make the allocation for roads; but if there is no organisation to maintain these roads then what comes first?

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): The chicken or the egg?

Ketua Menteri: No, the question of priority. A question of . . . (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): On a point of clarification: Does the Chief Minister mean that the District Councils make the roads?

Ketua Menteri: The Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap took this as a climax of his speech, because he said that in the City Council area the people own the land; how is it that MacAlister road is there? He asked a question; but he did not take the trouble to find out how to answer that question. Have you got an answer to that question? Sir, honestly, when we started together, and we asked ourselves these questions we were taken aback because we did not know how to answer these questions. But in the process of administration we now know how to answer these questions. And we not only know how to answer those questions; we know how to proceed to solve these questions. That is why I said earlier, on another occasion, that a lot of things have happened since you went across to the other side.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Let us know what has happened.

Ketua Menteri: Yes, Sir, because it is clear that in the presentation and attitude of the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap there is confusion. And here I think that the points that were raised are usual, because I think that if the House begins to appreciate the problem in its proper perspective our debates will be very much more constructive.

The Honourable Member referred to this question of fragmentation of estates. As I said, we have had to read these words very carefully, Sir. And whose responsibility is the after effects of fragmentation of estates? Whose responsibility is it to look after all the things that have been left behind in a disastrous manner by irresponsible capitalists—some of them well-known to the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap; some of them his friends; some of them seeking his advice? Sir, if irresponsible people take action in order to enrich themselves, and leave behind them a mass of problems, it obviously takes a long time to resolve these problems. Some of these fragmented estates leave problems which entail that the very titles of the fragmentation of the estates have not been completed legally.

Dewan ditangguhkan pada jam 1.00 tengahari.

Dewan bersidang semula pada jam 2.39 petang.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, dengan izin bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris. Mr Speaker, Sir, when the House adjourned I had said that some of the fragmented estates which left many of the problems that have been brought up by the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap still present the basic problems. The many Titles caused by the subdivision of these estates have in many cases not been completed. Sir, I would like to take this occasion to appeal to Honourable Members of the House to let the public know in as clear-cut a manner as possible where they may purchase any property, particularly before they go into any land purchase,

particularly land which has only recently been subdivided. They should carefully examine the Title pertaining to the land before they enter into that purchase. The Government understood this problem right from the very outset of its term of office, and have taken steps to re-organise the administration of land through the provision of Land Officers. Their functions will be distinct from those of the District Officer. That is to say, the District Officer who at one time had to deal with many problems, including the very essential problem of land, will now be able to entrust the functions of land administration to Land Officers who are attached to the District Office. And the Land Officers will be directly responsible to the Commissioner for Lands. Thus there will be a centralisation of decisions with regard to land matters; and the administration will be carried out through the proper channels; and the decisions will be carried out by the Land Committee of the Executive Council.

Sir, many of the problems are real problems that we do not deny exist. They arise from the simple fact that many people rush into capitalist ventures. And I am not really referring to capitalists in an evil manner or in a political manner, nor referring to capitalists as such in the manner in which the Honourable Member for Bagan Ajam says, "Big capitalists have stolen away my heart from the people of Penang" (ganguan).

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Swallowed.

Ketua Menteri: or swallowed away my heart; but really, I think, in a much advanced manner, which the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap with his long association with the principles of socialism—his particular colour of it—appreciates: that the basic difference between Government administration and Government development as against development of private entrepreneurs on a capitalist basis is that his colleague, the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam, used to say that the profit motive—and bigger and bigger profits—is the main motive that

drives many of the capitalists and private entrepreneurs to carry out the deals that they do. And this to a very large extent still applies with those who venture into speculation on land, whereas Government in development of land has got to provide the maximum value for the money that is spent—value in terms of social services; value in terms of social development. Therefore there is a very great difference in a motivation which leads only to the biggest possible profit for the money spent as against the social concept of good Government in obtaining the maximum value for the money spent. So, what happens frequently, Sir, with subdivision is that subdivisions of lots are made. And frequently even before the subdivisions have been finally approved, as Honourable Members should be aware, subdivisions are submitted to the Local Authorities for the purpose that subdivision having been carried out they would lead to further development. But for the subdivision to be completely approved it must be sent up to the State Planning Office, and to the Land Office; and then to the Land Committee; and then to the State Executive Council or the State Authority for this approval to be made. And the perniciousness of fragmentation of estates is that many of these subdivisions of very large estates were carried out without the complete procedure being finalised. And to make matters worse, what has been subdivided on paper—not yet legal, but subdivided to all intents and purposes by Agreements drawn up by the Solicitors representing the two parties—are then transacted, and they are sold to a buyer; and then resold to another buyer. What happens then? You get a big estate entailing 500 acres being subdivided, say, into 5 lots, each with 100 acres; and then the 100 acres are further subdivided into smaller lots of, say, 10 acres; and these 10-acre lots are then further subdivided into 20 lots or 40 lots or 50 lots for housing purposes. So by the time the Local Authorities have to handle the small lots for housing purposes there is a back-log of legal implications of this subdivision which have not been taken care of.

Now, the question of drainage. The question of provision of estate labour housing comes under the problem of the first subdivision; the problem of drainage, and whose problem it is to maintain the drains. I am not now talking about the drainage involved in sillage; but drainage in terms of actual irrigation of the land. And the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap knows that the whole of South Province, particularly in the area around Nibong Tebal, has been an area developed through development of the land by the formation of bunds against the Sungei Krian. And so the drainage problems of areas from Nibong Tebal right down to Ipil, and right down to Sungei Udang, all the way up north to Pulau Buyong and the hinterland, coming back to Changkat, and from Changkat to Jawi are enormous following subdivision because there was no one single Authority and no one single person who would be responsible for the maintenance of the drainage which at one time the big estates found themselves responsible for. So the question now arose as to whether this responsibility of maintaining the drainage should or should not be the responsibility of the State Government; or the responsibility of the Local Authority, or the responsibility in fact of the very owners of this land. The problem becomes very, very acute when on subsequent subdivisions following the fragmentation the very, very small owner who owns now a piece of land on agreement very far away from the drainage canals says: Why should I pay for the maintenance of these drainage canals? Why should I pay for this drainage system to which I myself and my property have got no immediate direct connection? And this I think the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap appreciates has been a problem that has been existing for quite some time, particularly in the years immediately prior to and after Independence, when the British entrepreneurs who held these large estates began to evacuate from Malaysia—or Malaya then. And in their desire to move out and to obtain as much money as they possible could they sold the property to local people who, being equally greedy to make more

profits, bought them and fragmented them without looking into the problems of how to solve the social problems. And these social problems are therefore left in abeyance for what the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap says the State Government must bear the responsibility; and because the State Government has not been able to resolve them the State Government has been a failure. Sir, these problems have been looked into so thoroughly, and they involve such an enormous amount of deliberation and preparation for action that we require Federal legislation to control further fragmentation of estates. And we hope that it will not be long before the new laws that are being prepared to enable Local Authorities, when they are restructured, to meet this problem also enable them to resolve problems of this nature. So, therefore, it is clear that for many years the Government has been looking into this problem, and has been taking steps, and taking proper action to resolve these problems. But these problems have got to be resolved step by step.

For example, the Honourable Member, after a tremendous speech, ends up with three recommendations. One: more financial assistance to schools, especially for the provision of textbooks. Sir, this is one of his conclusions to support his Motion. I say the Government has been providing a lot of aid to the schools; and the textbook scheme has been in operation for several years. And, therefore, for him to say that the Government has not done anything in this particular instance is not correct. However, he did ask for more. But I assure the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap—as I assured the public when presenting the State's contribution for textbooks to those students who were needy and poor—that all the schools who submit the requirements of the students who are needy and poor—receive the fullest attention from the Government. And, as a matter of fact, the Government will be prepared to meet all those cases for requests of textbooks where and when possible, although I do not wish the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap

to say that the Government is just using the term here 'where and when possible' because Government is just trying to run away from its responsibility. As a matter of fact, every single request by needy students for aid of textbooks in the schools that has been submitted through the proper channels has been met by aid from the Government. So the Government has obviously taken a step; and that obviously makes the Motion not true; and the Motion should be rejected.

The second important conclusion: more allocations for roads, playing fields and so on. Sir, I would like to take this opportunity to correct a statement which I made earlier because I did not have notes with me. But I would like to give exact figures where I mentioned the size and dimensions of the problems in South Province Wellesley. In actual fact the District of Province Wellesley South is a total area of 93 square miles; and the number of people living in this District is estimated at 65,000. Sir, the revenue returns which Province Wellesley South has been able to contribute to the Local Authority in the area was in 1970 in the region of \$372,000; 1971: \$402,000; 1972: \$474,000. And in 1973 it is estimated at \$493,000. Sir, these increases compare with the figures of \$327,000 in 1968, and \$322,000 in 1969, which shows that the Auditor-General's Reports have been very well taken note of by the Government, and a better system of collection of revenue has entailed the higher returns. But what would be in actual fact the expenditure of the Council? Sir, in the case of Province Wellesley South, in the year 1971—as against the revenues which I mentioned earlier—\$333,000 and more. And I am not giving the exact figures that will be expended. In 1972 a sum of \$375,000 was expended; and in 1973 the estimated budget is an expenditure of \$594,129. Sir, which means that Province Wellesley is budgeting for a deficit. Now, a large percentage of this increased expenditure undertaken in the South is to provide for more staff, more facilities, and more amenities for provision of medical and health requirements in the area. So, Sir,

these steps have been taken by the Government a long time ago. Admittedly, Sir, the Government cannot satisfy the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap because the roads that the Government plans do not come within his own door-step.

Sir, one of the problems that Government has to study in Province Wellesley—and this entails North, Central and South—is the question of the actual drainage system in terms of urbanization. And here I am not referring to drainage and irrigation canals, but to actual drains and roads, and the problem of flooding, Sir, the questions particularly cogent to the South, and pertaining to the South are: Why is the present road structure what it is? Why did the Administration previously design the road structure in the way that it did? Sir, the only general conclusion that one can come to is that it was designed specifically to meet the requirements of the area when that area served the interests of the very large estates. And the road structure was meant only for the development of large estates which were involved originally in sugar cane planting, and then later on in rubber; and later on changing into palm oil. Now, whether or not this road system can be correlated into new development of the South to inject a new vigour in the South is got to be taken in relation to many other problems. For example, what are the plans of the Perak Government with regard to the development of Parit Buntar? What are the plans of the Federal Government and the Perak Government with regard to establishment of a barrage at the Krian River? What are the plans of the Kedah State Government with regard to the development, industrial and otherwise, of Kulim and Bandar Bahru, and of Serdang; and in the North of places like Gua Chempedak? So obviously these considerations will have to be taken into account and evaluated before an actual planning and implementation of development can take place in the areas mentioned by the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap. For example, Sir, the economy

of the whole of Province Wellesley had previously been dominated by the fact that there was a North/South road running through Province Wellesley; and the North connecting us with Alor Star in the State of Kedah, and the South connecting us eventually with Kuala Lumpur and thereafter.

Today, Sir, everybody knows of the development of the East-West Highway. And everybody knows of the determination of the Federal Government to implement the building of the bridge. Under the circumstances, to what direction can the provision of basic amenities for the people in Province Wellesley be correlated to these very primary provisions of development? Can indeed a population of 65,000 in the South in an area of 98 square miles sustain any degree of particular requirements which the Government would like to implement in the area?

Sir, finally in its essence we have to ask ourselves whether in fact these people living in the areas can meet the cost of providing these infrastructure services. Sir, the Honourable Member from Bagan Ajam, strangely enough, provided the best example.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): That is what I am afraid of.

Ketua Menteri: Strange'y because he did not realise that he was providing an example when he referred to the area in Kampong Simpah. And the question now comes upon an examination of this so-called 20,000 population living in that area. How many of these people are landowners? How many of them actually own houses on land belonging to themselves? How many of these houses are on temporary building permits? And how many houses have actually been approved for planning, and are on a permanent basis? Sir, the differentials are quite great because in so far as maintenance of basic amenities—which I hope you will agree is equivalent to the provision of basic social infrastructure—are concerned the contribution in rates to the Local Authorities who will have to maintain

the roads and the drains, and the provision of all these other sanitary and scavenging units that the Honourable Members ask for, will have to be equated with the capability of the local rate-payers to sustain the Local Council in the area. So the person paying for a Building Permit will pay in the region of about \$5 in a year, whereas, Sir, in the course of my speech in winding up the debate on His Excellency's speech I had indicated that even on a unit cost of a \$10,000 house, based on a 15-year repayment return, and based on a 10% assessment rate, the return from such a low-cost housing in the State would be in the region of \$84 a year. And even at that rate of \$84 assessment per year—let us say, per unit of dwelling within a year contributing to rates—it was very difficult to make the ends meet with regard to local administration. So what more if the situation arrived at and actually pertaining is where the large percentage of the people living in an area are paying even below what would be that unit cost return of contribution? So, under the circumstances there has got to be a very deep review of the whole situation. And in the course of the Budget debate, which unfortunately Honourable Members not only failed to participate in but apparently didn't even bother to read about and follow, the State Government had indicated two important schemes to be implemented: (1) was the complete restructuring of the Land Offices; and (2) was the establishment of the State Planning Development Control Department, with special reference to the restructuring of Local Authorities. It is clear therefore that the Government, far from being unaware of the problems of the people, and far from not taking into consideration, but being in great sympathy with the people who live under these circumstances, has in actual fact taken a very deep, careful, hardheaded look, and made its assessments of the problems concerning the people in these areas. And Government has initiated the steps to implement the solution of the problems that are referred to.

Sir, the final conclusion by the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap—his third major suggestion—was that Government should immediately set up a task force to sweep the drains. Sir, I do not understand the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap's (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): This is the minimum you can ever do.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Gh'm Guan): Drain sweeper.

Ketua Menteri: Mr Speaker, if in the words or quotations of aspersion the Honourable Member has gone down the drain I hope he is not swept down by this trend. Sir, the question of establishing task forces as a rural equivalent of the parking attendant system has long been looked into by the Government. But whether or not they should be specifically directed to sweeping drains is a separate matter. The Government had many, many programmes of gotong-royong; and had specifically looked into the question of cleaning up the drains leading into rivers and streams that would clog up and cause floods. Many of these programmes have been undertaken. And the fact that the Honourable Member of Sungei Bakap has not found it fit for himself to join such activities, whereas ordinary Members with far greater sense of public responsibility than he have participated in, does not mean that these things have not been done. They have been done. That he is unaware of that is no problem of the State.

Sir, in the final analysis we know (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): There is something wrong in the State if nobody is aware of what you are doing.

Ketua Menteri: that the problem confronting us has always been the problem of what is termed a rural drift into the towns. And this rural drift has been a contributory factor to the establishment of slums in urbanised areas. The programming

of the Government, and the implementation of Government's programmes has been such that there will no longer be this drift into the towns in a hopeless search for better employment. Sir, this drift is a fact. Even the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap would represent such a drift because, although he comes from Nibong Tebal, he has to come to George Town to search for his livelihood. I am not assuming that the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap, now that he has acquired all the appurtenances for setting up a legal practice, should have a legal practice in Sungei Bakap or Nibong Tebal, which I am sure he has partly. But why drift into the town? Sir, the tendency had always been for this drift towards the town. And because of this the Federal Government's new economic policy is orientated towards rural urbanisation—the development of the rural areas. In the State of Penang the implementation of that policy has been translated in the development of the Prai/Bagan Serai/Mak Mandin areas in Province Wellesley, and the Bayan Lepas area in Penang.

The Honourable Member from Ayer Itam in an aside said, "The people do not know what is happening in the State's programme." Sir, the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam will find out and realise that the people know, and the people understand what is happening. Sir, on behalf of Government I would assure Members of this House that for me to be able to participate in this debate on this Motion by the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap extemporaneously has been due to the fact that my colleagues in Government have worked very hard in the various fields of development in the interests of the people of Penang in all parts of the State of Penang. And all my friends and colleagues, having done their work, submit their ideas. Their ideas are processed into reports; and the reports are submitted to me. Thus I am kept briefed of the problems.

Sir, the very least that the Honourable Members of the Opposition should accept is this: that whereas the

Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap has spent his time, as I said, chasing the leaves, the branches and the trees, and forgetting the principal matters that concern the Government, Government has examined the situation very carefully, and come to an orderly decision as to what should be done first to resolve the problems of the people in our State—in the urban areas, in the rural areas, for the poor, for the rich, for those who are unemployed, for those who are employed. All sectors of the people of Penang add up to the total interest of the people in the State. The Government has steadfastly—and if the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap still insists on using the word "stubborn" I accept it—and stubbornly held on to this decision to implement what is best to the interests of the people of Penang.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Government embarks upon schemes of development not in order to win elections, not in order to catch votes, not in order to satisfy individual voters, but in order that the entire State can be taken out from the problems that it faced in 1969, when there was an economic doldrum in this State, into the present stage where the Government and the State and the people in Penang are ready to move ahead into a new phase of the development of the State. We are confident that the people of Penang who elected us, and who voted for us understood that they did not vote for us to do things that they want individually; but the people voted for us so that we can make Penang a better place, for the people living in the towns as well as the people living in the rural areas. And the people in Penang accepted that the programming of the Government is such that it is to their best interests.

Sir, there is no need for the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap to bring a Motion at this very late stage of the House in order to take up points which he could have contributed in the debate on His Excellency's speech; and in actual fact, having participated in the debate on His Excellency's speech, now to take up other points to raise

what are I would say his own fetishes. They have referred to my pet subjects. As long as I have known the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap he has always been talking to me about the drains in Nibong Tebal. But he has never been able to tell me why those drains don't drain into the proper places. Sir, if he had done his work, and suggested what the Government should do, Government can better understand this problem. If the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap were honestly trying to help these people whom he failed to help—but now hopes to assuage by making a Motion in this House—in a proper way, instead of writing letters to the District Officer and to the District Council: I guarantee that these things will be done, payments will be made, and so on; and not carrying them out because in actual fact they cannot be carried out—subdivision and ownership problems, I think he will contribute a lot more (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Could you produce the letter in which I say I guarantee?

Ketua Menteri: to the well-being of the people in the area.

Sir, the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap has brought up valuable points with regard to the position existing in the various areas he mentioned. And the Government appreciates this because Government is determined to look after the welfare of the people in these areas. And His Excellency's speech had indicated that we have now reached a stage where we shall go on to improve this level of the society in our State.

Sir, that aspect of the work of the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap, I think, is understandable. For him to conclude in the manner he did, and for him to present it in the manner he did—and deplored the failure of Government, and asked for an immediate implementation—I think virtually characterises what I began my speech with, namely that the Motion as it stands is not really worth debating.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): You spend a great deal of time debating it. (*Ketawa*).

Ketua Menteri: Sir, I was going to end up by saying that if the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap and the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam stick their neck out we will chop it off. (*Ketawa*). Mr Speaker, Sir, there is an old saying on how to kill a snake. You knock at the head. So, when the snake sticks its head out you must knock at the head. Sir, if they had remained quietly in their hole the position would have been different. (*Ketawa*).

The Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap's Motion, I think, has got points that are implied, which Government has looked into. However, the Motion as it stands, as I said, is not worth while debating *per se*. And it is in the pursuit of the points that he has raised—not by virtue of the merit of the Motion—that it has taken me some time to elaborate on what I said right from the very beginning. Sir, we find that there is little merit in the Motion; that the Motion is mischievous, misleading, particularly in the light of what has happened in this House. We will reject it. And I hope that this House will reject it rapidly so that we can go on to the next Motion by the Honourable Member for Kelawei.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Tuan Yang Dipertua, dengan izin bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris. Mr Speaker, Sir, I must thank Honourable Members who have taken part in this debate. And I notice that the Chief Minister took the greater part of the time on this Motion. We had in all about seven speakers. I am indeed grateful to them for having taken part, and for having supported it. Apart from the Chief Minister, the Member for Bayan Lepas and the Member for Sungei Pinang did agree with me. And even the Chief Minister has said that there was virtue. I do know—as the history of the House shows—that any Motion however good will not be acceptable to the Chief Minister. Even, if I may add, the suggestions of his colleagues have been

often rejected offhand. He just now said, "Oh, we study the whole thing in depth in Committees;" in this and that. We also know that when these Committees finalise their reports and go up to him it is rejected.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang (Encik S. P. Chelliah): Not true.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Perhaps that is one of the reasons why the road behind the Chettiar Temple at Waterfall Road is still not paved. (*Ketawa*).

The Member for Bayan Lepas mentioned that there is a difference in points of view in the Opposition. Mr Speaker, Sir, if I come here as a Member for Sungei Bakap, although I belong to a Party, my first duty is to the electorate; second to my Party; and third to the Opposition. So each person has his own views. And the Honourable Member from Kelawei had his own views. After all I must thank him for having participated and supported this Motion.

The Member for Sungei Pinang agrees that the Government could have done much more, but says that what I was saying was quite untrue. I cannot see how he says that what I said in moving the Motion was untrue when he could agree with these things. And he questioned my intention in moving this Motion which he said was to safeguard the interests of the huge landowners, the peculiar landlords, and so forth. Mr Speaker, Sir, I know the Honourable Member has visited some of the places of which I am talking about. I know for certain he has visited Trans-Krian, and he knows the conditions of the people; and he has also made promises to them, particularly when he was, I think, a Member of the triumvirate which controlled the Councils at one stage. As such he should know the places where the people actually live. The Chief Minister, of course, twisted the whole story. He is a clever man at that. And, of course, the Speaker gave him the courtesy, and gave him the opportunity of straying away from Penang to Parit Buntar, then to Gua Chempedak. Perhaps we

will have a fly-over to Gua Chempedak one day because it is the planning. But apart from that (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: No, no, no. Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap, he was talking about planning for the State; and therefore his contention was that one should know what those industrial areas were. So he was at liberty to (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Yes. Mr Speaker, Sir, my subject was "basic amenities for the people in these areas". And Gua Chempedak is I think quite some distance away.

But coming back to the Honourable Member from Sungei Pinang, he does know that in these fragmented estates where he went, the original owner, as understood by the Chief Minister himself, is no more there—where the Chief Minister had said it is a question providing the facilities which have been neglected. As he said there was no one single Authority and no one single person to maintain the drainage areas. Now, if this applies to the drainage area, how much more it applies to the resettlement area or community area where the people live; where they have a little school, and so forth. That is it. And, Mr Speaker, Sir, these facilities are not going to help the landlords. The landlords are not there. And besides, let us take the slums. Why do people go into slums to build houses on other people's land? It is because the State Government cannot provide the land, like in the case of New Villages where land was provided for the people to build houses. It was never provided by the State. People have to fend for themselves, buy the land, and build the house. Those who have the means buy the land and build the house on their own land. But the vast majority of people who did not have the money to buy the land naturally went and lived on other people's land, paying a small rent. That is how our slums have come about. This also applies to the people in kampungs. In the kampungs it is different, as the Member for Bayan Lepas who sits

opposite me is aware. In fact, in the kampung all the relatives, whoever one is, are allowed to come and live and shelter in one's own house. This is the way of life in the kampung. They do not chase him away. This is not open to people in the urban areas who have to squat on other places, or rent ground and build houses, and live on other people's land. In such circumstances it is the landlords there who come in. But the landlords do not provide for them. And therefore I ask: When these are not provided, should the State neglect them?

Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Encik Ismail bin Hashim): No.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): They should know because they are also human beings. The landlord collects his ground rent. We also collect our house assessments. It is not the question of landlords. Now when we collect these should we not provide these services? That is my contention. It is not, Mr Speaker, Sir, that by trying to provide facilities for them we are helping the landlords. Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, if we build a road, or lay a pipeline into a small owner's land we are improving his land, no doubt. And therefore I would suggest that if we improve the land then the value of the land must go up. If the land is to go up in value then I suggest we buy it up and improve it. Then it will benefit the people as well as the State; not the landlord himself. Not like what we did in Prai—to improve the thing for the benefit of the land owner. I have always been against it. So for me to be accused of trying to support the landlord is a bit far-fetched. Perhaps in the course of the debate when I say things I hope it is taken at its best. And it is said in that spirit.

This brings me to the vast amount of talk. Although the Chief Minister has said that I said nothing, sometimes he is really Quixotic, to my mind, because at one moment he admits that there were certain deficiencies, but this was due to administration. Then he says there were real problems which we do

not deny exist. As I said earlier, Sir, he says the Motion is not worth debating; there is nothing; the Member for Sungei Bakap does not understand the problems he has brought up. I would say the Chief Minister, having been a man born with a silver spoon and in the bright lights of Penang, will never understand what it is to be born poor and in the lower community. Mr. Speaker, Sir, there was insinuation saying that I wanted a road right in front of my house. Mr Speaker, Sir, I am sure the Chief Minister knows—and you have visited my house—that the road is right in front of my house. And what do I want a road for? Right behind again? (*Ketawa*).

Tuan Speaker: You don't have a road behind. You don't like one behind?

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Sir, for one thing, as I said, I do not expect the Government to accept this Motion which says "deplores the failure". There is failure. But the Chief Minister went all over, and tried to confine his observations mainly to the fragmented estates; and went on a dissertation which was irrelevant—on fragmentation, on land ownership, titles, bund, drainage in the sense of D.I.D., Sir. And the Chief Minister was entirely wrong. As you know, as far back as 1964, or even earlier, the Nibong Tebal Drainage Board was set up. And I know the Member for Bayan Lepas at that time came and opened up that one. And I admit that fragmentation in Nibong Tebal started in 1956; and there was tremendous agitation. And the fact was recognised that if the drainage area was not maintained, and if there was no authority, the whole of Province Wellesley South would have become flooded. And who would lose? Not only the owners. The Federal Government and the State Government would lose. They would lose their assessment. And the Federal Government would have lost everything in revenue from rubber, coconut, and all that. And the people would have been in a most miserable position.

Unlike the present Government, the former Government had the foresight as long ago as 1959 to introduce the Drainage Board for the drainage of the rubber lands. But my Motion is not asking for amenities for rubber trees or coconut trees. That is where a clever twister can twist. And he has not twisted well enough because these are amenities for the residents of these places to safeguard the health and well-being of the residents of these places. Rubber trees are not residents. I am not fighting for people with titles or no titles. Never.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Chief Minister then went on to say the policy of the Government has been clearly stated, and read out as was stated in His Excellency's Address to us. Mr Speaker, Sir, I did read the speech. And I will repeat that there is a tendency for the Chief Minister, although he has been trying to hide behind the sarong of the Speaker, now to want to use the sarong of the Governor. That I must say with no disrespect to His Excellency. Sir, let us not fool the people. Although it is the Governor's Address—it is a royal address—it is the customary Address given by the Ruler of any State to set out the policies of "my Government". That is what the Governor said—my Government. Not his policy—"My Government's policy". Therefore, do not try to bluff the people and say, "His Excellency had said that. Therefore it must be gospel truth. Accept it. Don't criticise it." No, Sir.

And there was much play on your asking us whether it was unanimous. Sir, it was out of courtesy to His Excellency that the Motion of Thanks to the Head of State is always supported fully. But, Sir, where the House shows its displeasure with the Government is by way of amendments and criticism. Therefore, if anyone were to impute, least of all the Chief Minister that the words that came out from the mouth of the Governor were his own I would say he is stretching things too far, because then all the criticism made in this House would equally apply to him. Therefore it should not be so. I

am sure this House will agree that we should not link the Head of State with the policy of the Government in power.

He also criticised us for attacking the Government when we crossed the floor. Mr Speaker, Sir, to this I must say, as I have said before, only the four walls of the Executive Council will know, and ought to know, what has happened. But the differences did not arise for nothing. The Chief Minister always likes to draw example to the fact that we on this side ran away without wanting to contribute. We knew, Mr Speaker, Sir, as many of the Members on the other side knew. The Member for Dhoby Ghaut had the unpleasant experience of knowing yesterday that it is impossible with this Chief Minister to suggest anything to him. And we have done that.

Sir, the Chief Minister, on behalf of the Government, has stated that the State Planning Unit will be the panacea for all the ills in the rural areas. Sir, what is the State Planning Board going to do? Let us not hide behind words. What is the State Planning Board going to do? Now, who are the people doing the planning in our State? If you look at the answers that have been given, there are so many Committees. There are the Industrial Planning Committee, and so forth. That is that. Who are doing the planning in this State? Mr Speaker, Sir, if I may say so, we have one authority for the City Council—the Planning Section of the City Council; the City Planning Officer. There is another authority for the rest of the States—the State Planning Officer. So, if you combine the two, do you mean you solve all the problems of planning? Or will the same people be there? Unless you change your policy, if you have combined the two authorities into one unit that is what the State Planning Unit be, if I understand, because no explanation was given, unless the Chief Minister were to accuse me by saying I did not read the Governor's Address again. But I know. And therefore this State Planning Unit is not going to solve all our problems. It may determine how planning should take place;

where the settlements should be; where people should be allowed to build and live. Not everywhere, of course. Perhaps certain areas should be developed for industrial purposes, certain areas for the settlements, so that the State can provide other facilities like schools, clinics, health centres and community halls for a unit of people, so that we keep the people together, as is done in other countries. I do agree, maybe that could be done. But, Sir, what is the State Planning Unit going to do, for example, in Trans-Krian or in Changkat or in the new villages? Are you going to uproot the new villagers? Are you going to expand the new villages into bigger townships? Perhaps yes. But how are you going to do this with the scattered fragmented estates? There you cannot do that. You cannot uproot. They are settlements all right. Therefore do not try to mislead the House. Then he went on to challenge. He challenged. I did not want to stand up, you know. He is a very patient man. He listened to us, so I also listened to him. (*Ketawa*). He challenged: "Have the services completely broken down?" Sir, if you read my Motion carefully I said "particularly in fragmented estates where these services have broken down". And I still maintain that these services have broken down. And if the Chief Minister is not satisfied then let him set up a Committee from this House. We will go and see whether these services have broken down or not. What better proof than "seeing is believing"? Let's go. I invite the Chief Minister and his Committee. Or, never mind, if he is too busy a man let us have the Committee. Let us go and see whether these things have broken down or not. They have definitely broken down.

And he says that there are different Authorities for this purpose. Mr Speaker, Sir, as I said earlier, the Federal Constitution, in the Ninth Schedule, sets out the responsibility of the Federal Government and the State Government. And there is a Federal List, a State List, and then a Concurrent List. Now, the Authority responsible for public health, sanita-

tion and the prevention of diseases is in the Concurrent List, Item 7. Therefore the State is equally responsible. But, Sir, no doubt, as I said earlier in moving the Motion, we have a peculiar position in the State in that the whole of the Districts—not merely the towns or the cities. The towns are developed already. Except the City of George Town. The whole area—comes within the jurisdiction of the Local Authority. But, Sir, the Constitution did not set up Local Authorities. It is the State which set up the Local Authorities. And what the State has done is that it has delegated its responsibility to the Local Authorities. And therefore if a person has delegated his authority to the Local Authorities, and the Local Authorities don't carry the responsibility, the person responsible is still responsible. And therefore he cannot say, "Now the Local Authorities are the Authorities which should do it. And because it is a very big area, and they do not have enough staff there are deficiencies." Mr Speaker, Sir, the Chief Minister went on to the revenue from this aspect of it. And particularly where he answered the points raised by the Member for Bagan Ajam—Kampung Simpah: 20,000 people having to spend \$20,000—there the real thinking of the Government now crystallizes in that point. It crystallizes in that when he said: "Can the people in that area contribute for these services?" Sir, if we apply that yardstick then we are bluffing the people. We are not only bluffing; we are not living up to the Rukunegara also. And no man who believes in that can subscribe to the new economic policy because he will be a traitor to that policy if he says so, because if you believe that the people in that area must contribute for the services of that area then you do not believe that in the equitable redistribution of income those who can afford to pay more should provide for those who cannot. And if this policy is taken to its logical conclusion the poor people in this country will never get any assistance at all for them to improve themselves. That is why, Mr Speaker, Sir, (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Encik Ismail bin Hashim): Itu different fasal, contrary to the Usul, tengah-tengah—air—kelmarin.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Itu kelmarin punya perkara.

..... in other countries the Local Authorities—it is very clear, Mr Speaker, Sir—will never ever be able to find the money to provide the services for the community which they represent, except, for example, in the cities because the wealth of the country is more often than not—and is always in fact—concentrated in the cities. And therefore it is the urban areas which can get better revenue, and provide better facilities for their people. But the people in the rural areas and the areas in the Rural District Councils will not be able to collect that amount of revenue; and therefore they cannot provide the services. And that is why, Mr Speaker, Sir, during the time—pardon my drawing you in—when you were in the Council you will remember that the State Government made a grant to the Local Authorities. There was a grant. But this grant was reduced and reduced until today there is no contribution from the State Government or the Federal Government to Local Authorities.

Tuan Speaker: You remember that?

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Ya. It was mentioned in Parliament.

Tuan Speaker: There is no need for that one. My job today is to preside. Members on the left and right are like my children. I love my children. I see that they do not fight and quarrel unnecessarily. That is my job today.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Sometimes a tribute is due to you, so it is given to you.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): By virtue of the fact, Mr Speaker, that we always address the Chairman or the Speaker you have to be the person who receives the sedative, because we have to refer to you

as the Speaker, as Honourable Members may know. If you do not want to be addressed then I will forget the Speaker and address Honourable Members. (*Ketawa*). It is not that we want to refer to you directly, Mr Speaker, Sir.

As Honourable Members know, the State makes a contribution to the Local Authorities to see that these Authorities have sufficient funds to maintain at least the basic minimum services for the people for whom they have to provide. Now, this is also true in England where, of course, these institutions which we talk of—Federal Government, State Government, Parliamentary Democracy—all originated. There is a thing called the Exchequer Balancing Grant. And this balancing grant is given just like the Federal Government gives the grants to the schools also. The difference between the income and expenditure is approved and is paid. But this is the balancing grant. Even the Royal Commission on Local Authorities has recommended this for the Local Authorities to improve their services. And for their very existence these balancing grants must be given. Unless and until these grants are given we cannot expect the Local Authorities to do all that can be done. And therefore it is the responsibility of both the State and Federal Governments.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I would once again thank all those who have participated in the debate; and the Chief Minister also who has given me this opportunity to refute all the allegations made by him, and also which gave me food for thought. One fact remains clear; and that is the fact that although my Motion as such may be obnoxious, as it must to the Government, yet the facts that I produced are facts that are obtained from his own answers, and therefore incontrovertible. It was proved that the Chief Minister never went and tackled the facts, but went round all over. I hope that Honourable Members will listen to both sides, and will feel able to support this Motion. Thank you very much.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): I support it in principle. Thank you.

Ahli Kawasan Sungai Pinang (Encik S. P. Chelliah): You have no principle.

Soalan dikemukakan dan Usul tidak dipersetujui.

(J) USUL OLEH YANG BERTHORMAT ENCIK YEAP GHIM GUAN.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Dengan kebenaran bercakap dalam bahasa Inggeris.

Tuan Speaker, we on this side of this House, in moving this Motion standing in my name, would like to stress the seriousness of this particular Motion because it involves the question of faith; the question of living up to the stand taken by the present Government; and involves the question of fulfilling pledges that have been made to the people of this State. Mr Speaker, Sir, Penang has one of the longest traditions of democracy or representative Government; and it had its beginnings in the local level of our administration. And that is the greatest contact between the people and the administrators. These traditions have meant that we have, together with other colonial territories in Malaysia, had a better and more efficient Local Authority to deal with the day-to-day matters concerning the people. It is therefore one of the early developments of democratic traditions; one of the earliest concessions of our colonial masters of the concept of "one man one vote". It is therefore ironical that the concept of "one man one vote" was the first casualty of Merdeka that was achieved in 1957; and that the Local Councils and grass-root democracy itself were the first casualties of Independence.

Sir, the Alliance intolerance for grass-root democracy was basically motivated by the fear of the rapid take-over by Parties opposed to the Alliance in the political spectrum which in the late 50's and the early 60's saw the Alliance losing in the major urban centres. This disenchantment with the

application of the democratic process to the local level cannot be attributed to any other factor because the Alliance in fact control the majority of the 380 Local Councils in West Malaysia; and any charges of maladministration and corruption must fall largely on to the laps of the self-same Alliance-controlled Councils rather than on the Opposition.

Sir, in Penang the darkest chapter of the history of the Local Authorities must have been made on the day the State Legislative Assembly controlled by the Alliance, on the 23rd March, 1966 in this very House passed the Enactment 1/66 to amend the Municipal Ordinance by adding Section 398B, whose effect was to give arbitrary powers to the State Authority to take over the functions of the Council for reasons therein provided, which in fact amounted to a pretext, as experience has shown us today. Sir, this marks the take-over of the City Council from the then Socialist Front control on the pretext of malpractices, and the appointment of the Abdul Aziz Commission to inquire into malpractices. Sir, it is a matter of regret that the Members of the Opposition at that time—and I would like to refer the House to the records of this House which I think are pertinent to this debate—did not avail themselves—of the opportunity, particularly those of the present Government. The Member from Tanjong Barat, I understand, was present; but unfortunately the leader of the present Government, none other than the Ketua Menteri, Sir, was absent from the proceedings on the very day these amendments to the Municipal Council were passed. But, Sir, although the leader of the present Government was absent from that crucial meeting, the undemocratic amendment was passed. And it did not prevent him later from crying over spilt milk; and ever since then from trying to exploit the issue.

Sir, in spite of the fact that the Commission of Inquiry had sat, and had made these recommendations, the then Chief Minister, Wong Pow Nee,

insisted on holding on to power; holding on to the reins of the administration, and absolute power over the City Council. And on the further pretext that the country was facing *Confrontasi* the Alliance Government suspended further Local Council elections because of the so-called national emergency, and the necessity to conserve resources; not to waste money on elections—to save the buck so to speak. And democracy and free elections were the first casualties again.

Sir, with the end of Confrontation another excuse had to be advanced as to why no elections would be held. And that excuse now, Sir, was the establishment of the so-called Athi Nahapan Royal Commission of Enquiry into the Local Authorities. And so the people were taken on a merry ride; and grass-roots democracy was a mere catchphrase which the Alliance year in and year out churned. And they promised the people that elections would be held. And in the meantime Councillors whose mandate had expired in the Local Authorities continued to run the Local Councils indifferent to the ratepayers. And in fact Penang Rural Councillors voted themselves study tours; and voted at the same time deficit budgets for their respective Councils. The fact that Local Councils were left in the *status quo*, as it is still in many other States, was bad enough. But it has become a major political issue on which political fortunes were to be made; and in fact were made by Members of the Government who are here today. These are the bold promises that, for example, the Gerakan will restore elections to the City Council. These are bold promises in view of the fact that Local Government elections have been suspended by the Federal Government. And this is in fact one of the answers given by the Honourable the Chief Minister in answers to the questions which we have put in this House. And we are surprised that an experienced politician like none other than the Ketua Menteri didn't understand the full consequences of his promise to the electorate, and didn't

fully appreciate his capacity to fulfil the same or otherwise. Today he has the chance to come to this House and explain to the people his stand, and his continued administration of the City Council of George Town. And in fact, to worsen the situation, his take-over of four other Local Authorities in this State.

Sir, the Gerakan in the Manifesto says 'Shall restore elections to the City Council of George Town.' I hope Members of the Government will remember these exact and very simple words. Four years, Sir, after coming into power the elections promise, among others, remains unfulfilled, both by the then Gerakan Government and the present Coalition Government. The excuse has been given that Local Government elections have been suspended by the Federal Government—an argument that is highly contentious, to say the least. And even if correct for a moment, in the spirit of that declaration in the Manifesto is it not up to the present Government to honour its pledge to restore constitutionality and democracy over the affairs of the Local Councils, particularly the City Council of which a specific promise has been made?

The Democratic Action Party in moving this Motion to debate the City Council budget and that of the other four Councils does so because we have given the Government of the Ketua Menteri, Sir, and his Gerakan Members four years to take action; and we have given them ample opportunity, not only to make good his personal stand but to make good a Party pledge. But that is something, Sir, that we have waited for in vain. And far from restoring any semblance of democracy, in this House itself we can see that there is a steady erosion of democratic control over the Local Authorities. Sir, it will be interesting to reflect on the past in order to understand the present. In 1967, in this very House itself, it was none other than the Chief Minister, Sir, and his colleague, the Member for Tanjong Barat. And I would like to read, with

your permission, the words of the Honourable the Chief Minister—the relevant parts of it. And I would like to read the opening paragraph of what he said in this House before he staged—and I say ‘staged’—that walk-out, unlike we in this part of the House. We protest, and we walk-out. We don’t stage a walk-out.

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member from Kelawei, I am not trying to stop you. But do you think that passage has any relevance to your Motion as it stands on the tabling of the Accounts for debate?

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, it has great relevance because we have to indicate to this House the reasons for our stand that the Budgets of the Local Authorities must be debated; and because we will demonstrate in this House, and disclose quite conclusively that the same stand has been taken by the Honourable the Chief Minister. That is the relevance.

Tuan Speaker: I ask that because you will notice, Honourable Member from Kelawei, that since we started to talk by way of introduction to the subject I have allowed a lot of latitude. That is the case of introduction to the matter. Go on.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Yes, thank you.

Sir, I will read the words of the Honourable the Chief Minister uttered on that day. He said,

“Mr Speaker, Sir, our Party believes firmly on the basis that one of the motivations of democratic representation is that there should be no taxation without representation.

Those were his words.

“Under those circumstances, whenever this House discussed our budget we on this side of the House have gone through the budget quite extensively and in minute detail. On this occasion, Sir, we have also done the same. As a matter of fact we could point out several spelling mistakes and typing errors in the sheets that have been presented to us. However, Sir, the point is this: We are happy to see that the Alliance Party

is responsive to strong opposition. We had noticed this in the past because last year I said the Alliance Government was responding somewhat to our proddings in the previous years.”

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): Tuan Yang Dipertua, dengan kebenaran: Standing Order 8 (1)—“No business except that of adjournment shall be transacted by the Assembly if objection . . . (gangguan)

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): I think the Member is wasting our time because one quarter is six. There are six here, Honourable Member. Don’t waste our time. And it is even seven now. If you wish to object do so constructively.

Mr Speaker, Sir, as I was saying, before I was interrupted, the Chief Minister went on to say—unless these words are very unpleasant to the Member who should recall them very well because he followed the Chief Minister like an attentive and very respectful sheep at that time—

“We are happy to see that the Alliance Party is responsive to strong opposition. We had noticed this in the past because last year I said that the Alliance Government was responding somewhat to our proddings in the previous years. And I repeat again what I said last year.”

And he goes on about the budget a bit. Anyway that is not relevant. to what I am trying to say. Then it comes to the relevant point, Sir:

“However, it is not our function today to go into this long exercise of going into the budget in detail. What we want to do is to express our very general attitude towards the whole exercise of budgeting, the whole exercise of provision of the Supply Bill, and the whole principle of democracy.”

Those are very lofty ideals, Sir, which we hope we on this side of the House could follow.

“Sir, we feel very strongly that our having to spend hours here today to debate a Supply Bill of over fifteen million dollars has become rather a mockery and a sham, by virtue of the fact that the Alliance Party insists on continuing its control and suspension of the City Council, and passing a City Council budget which is in the order of thirty-three million dollars—twice the sum of the budget which we have to

discuss—without having to go through the democratic procedure of debate. Under those circumstances, to demonstrate our strong protest against the attitude of the Government towards the control of the City Council we on this side of the House will not participate further in this debate.”

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Bravo for that.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): And on that note, Sir, and it is written here—Members of the United Democratic (now defunct) Party leave the Chamber.

Sir, that was, if I may add, an admirable stand; a stand which I, though not being a member of the United Democratic and defunct Party would have followed irrespective of whether I was a member of the Party, although I must say that rather—I do not know whether justified or otherwise—cruelly perhaps the then Chief Minister said, ‘It is obvious that the Members of the U.D.P. have come to this House unprepared.’ This is by way of an aside. I do not wish the Member to jump up. But that may be so. But what took place, Sir, on that day must demonstrate a determination, Sir, that no Local Authorities should pass budgets—the funds of the people—without due process of debate. But I wonder, Sir, whether those same sentiments that were expressed on this side which precipitated a staged walk-out are similarly the sentiments held by the Members of the Government who today hold the reins of power, and who today can carry out every single word that they uttered in this House. It is sad that the Honourable the Chief Minister does not wish to be confronted with his own words, and has therefore made a very unceremonious retreat. But we have, Sir, here the eminent words, further to enhance my argument, of the Member for Tanjong Barat who came back. He was congratulated by the then Chief Minister for having come back. At least he came back. He said,

“Tuan Speaker, we on this side of the House were the centre of attack from the front bench as well as from the back-benchers on the opposite side of the

House with allegations that we were irresponsible in walking out on the debate on the Penang Estimates. Sir, we have a principle.”

the Member said.

“We have a principle. We believe in democracy. We are being asked to discuss a budget involving \$16 million, whereas the budget of the City Council is more than twice the amount of the Penang State Budget, involving some \$33 million. And yet such a big budget could be decided upon by an individual.”

I hope the House will remember these words: ‘could be decided upon by an individual.’ And who was that individual at that time? Tan Sri Wong Pow Nee. We see who that individual is today.

“For this reason we find that there is no point in discussing this budget if a bigger budget could be decided upon by an individual. In taking over the City Council we were given to understand that as soon as the Aziz Report is out after the Commission of Enquiry the City Council would be returned to the elected Councillors. And yet, in spite of the completion of the Commission of Enquiry, and the issue of the Aziz Report, we still find that the Chief Minister clings on to the administration of the City Council.”

We firmly believe, Sir, that here again is a repetition of this concept. It may have come from the American Revolution. It is a concept which we subscribe to.

“We firmly believe that there should be no taxation without representation. It is because of our firm principle that we are not prepared to participate in such a mockery of democracy.”

Sir, again it is a principle; it was a stand taken; and it was a desire, Sir. And I must accept that it was an expression of sincerity. The Member for Tanjong Barat and his colleague the Honourable the Chief Minister who was then leading him, also on this side, were expressing their determination, Sir, that democracy shall not be struck asunder by the Alliance. But unfortunately, Sir, today we shall see after this adjournment who now betrays the democratic principles of the State.

Dewan ditangguhkan pada jam 4.16 petang.

Dewan bersidang semula pada jam 4.38 petang.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, as I was saying before the adjournment, in 1967 the Ketua Menteri, when a Member of the Opposition as he then was, protested against the take-over of the City Council by Tan Sri Wong Pow Nee as this was against the principles of democracy, and against the concept of non-taxation without representation. In fact, he called for the return of the City Council to the people. However, after coming into office on the 10th May, 1969, none other than the Ketua Menteri and his colleagues themselves, instead of restoring the City Council to the people (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member for Kelawei, just before the adjournment I mentioned that all these matters brought into the House by you on the Motion, about the take-over of the Councils, and this sort of thing, would be under discussion. I mean, wide latitude was given. Therefore let us go on to the merit of your Motion, which is as mentioned—namely that accounts be tabled for debate; not the Budget of the Council.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, it says the Budget; not estimated accounts.

Tuan Speaker: Annual Budget; that is right. So please confine yourself to it.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Budget means the policy; the reason for bringing forward the Budget to this Council. That is the basis.

Tuan Speaker: Just give the merits of this case.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Yes. I will have to give the merits in connection with what has transpired in this House today. Mr Speaker, Sir, I appreciate that from the absence of the Government Members this topic in fact is the one Motion that the Members of the Gerakan are most afraid to debate, because, Sir, this is a

topic that will expose the Members of the Government as political bankrupts and people who deceived the electorate on no less than the issue pertaining to the democratic institutions of this State, because, as I had mentioned earlier, not only did the Chief Minister on assuming power in this State assume the role of Officer—so-called—Administering the City Council; he went on to grab four other Local Councils in this State.

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member, I must again ask you to confine yourself to the merit of your Motion. The fact that the Chief Minister took over and became O.A.C. for the Councils is known; and that is not the subject of your Motion.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, unless the history of the take-over of the Councils is traced—and it is because of the take-over that budgets in the Council are now no longer debated—I cannot present my case. It is very difficult to just come to this House and say: 'Where are the budgets?'

Tuan Speaker: I agree with you, but (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Assuming the House has knowledge—and that is the assumption we have to take as to the background of the history of the proceedings of the Local Councils—we have to present our case in accordance with the background that has taken place.

Tuan Speaker: The House has knowledge, I believe, that the Councils have all been taken over by the . . . (*gangguan*)

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): And we have to draw attention of the House to the reasons why the Councils have been taken over.

Tuan Speaker: No, I do not think that is relevant to your Motion because your Motion only says that the annual budgets of the Councils should be submitted for debate.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, if we do not trace the history as to how the budgets are no longer debated, how can we bring a Motion to say that they should be debated? It is going to be rather difficult. And I am surprised that we are not allowed to introduce our case. I have only gone on for less than 15 minutes, and yet (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: About 25 minutes introduction.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): For about 25 minutes; and yet (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: So I told you we should treat this as an introduction. And after that we shall confine ourselves to the business of the Motion.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Selatan (Encik Wong Choong Woh): Tuan Yang Dipertua, Peraturan 48. Apabila Tuan Yang Dipertua cakap Ahli Yang Berhormat tidak duduk.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): We already have one Speaker, Tuan Speaker.

Tuan Speaker: That is correct. When the Speaker speaks on a point of Order (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): He should be sitting also.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Selatan (Encik Wong Choong Woh): Saya tidak cakap.

Tuan Speaker: Both Honourable Members, please sit down. Let us have good sense here. I think we are carrying on quite nicely.

As I was saying, we had this 25 minute introduction. Honourable Members all must admit there was an unfettered sort of performance. And after that I did say that we shall confine ourselves to the merit or demerit of this particular Motion—I shall now read—

“That until such time as the Councillors of the City Council of Georgetown, Rural District Council, District Council North Butterworth, District Council

Central Bukit Mertajam and District Council South Nibong Tebal are elected by the people the Chief Minister must table the annual budget of the Councils for debate.”

Now, that is the Motion. And it is a fact known by everybody in the House, and everybody else, that the Councils have been taken over. Therefore anything to do with the taking over I consider and rule as irrelevant to the Motion.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, certain Members of this House may be well aware of the take-over. Perhaps you, as Member for Bukit Mertajam, are more aware than anybody else. But I think that we have to trace the circumstances of the take-over because we are not debating one Council; we are debating all the 5 Councils in the State of Penang. I hope you will appreciate that point. And I have to trace the circumstances of this take-over—as to whether this take-over has involved loss of representation. If I am not allowed to do that I think it will be rather difficult to proceed in this House.

Tuan Speaker: I do not think it is difficult to proceed in this House, Honourable Member.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Am I allowed to aver the fact that four other Councils have been taken over?

Tuan Speaker: Yes, because that is a known fact, and it is accepted.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, if we go by known facts it is very hard to determine whether the known facts that are known to you and the known facts that are known to me are common. I think we should be allowed to have some degree of latitude in pressing our case and establishing even the known facts, so that Members who dispute these facts may dispute them in the debate, because from what we see the Government benchers are so afraid of this Motion that they refuse to be in this House. We are not in the least

perturbed; and we will see whether Members who are here today will be here again in the future days to come.

Tuan Speaker: That is an aside.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Can I continue with this debate; or are we going to continue like this?

Tuan Speaker: You can continue with the debate; but please keep within the Standing Orders.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Precisely. I am within the Standing Orders. I feel that if I present my case as to how these Councils were taken over, and whether this take-over has affected the quality of representation, that could be common ground.

Tuan Speaker: Well, you could go on; and I could give my views on the relevancy.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, the take-over of the four remaining Local Councils by the Honourable the Chief Minister has met with a considerable outcry from the public and, incidentally, Sir, from the Members of the Alliance because it was the Alliance Councillors who dominated most of the Local Councils in this State. And in fact there were appeals made to the Prime Minister. But unfortunately, Sir, when the Coalition Government was formed an opportunity was given to the Alliance, particularly the UMNO, to be represented in the Government, and to make its voice heard as to representation and as to the control over the affairs of the Council by the State, and its democratic nature; but nothing has been done. The members of the Coalition today are quite happy to continue with the situation where there is no representation in the Local Councils, and the views of the Rakyat are being left unattended. Sir, whether it is the Aziz Commission, or whether it is the Athi Nahappan Commission, these recommendations have now been put on the political shelf. And the public are asking when (gangguan).

Tuan Speaker: That I consider very irrelevant to your Motion.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Can I go on? I am afraid, Sir, at the rate we are going on you may have to suspend Members here because I certainly intend to carry on my duties to the electorate. And this control over the affairs of the Local Councils, and particularly the City Council, has now been completely vested in the hands of none other than the Honourable the Chief Minister. And in this respect I would like to trace again, Sir, the history of this control.

When the Chief Minister assumed office he took over control of the City Council. In 1971, Sir, if I may refer to the Government *Gazette* Notification, the Chief Minister one fine morning gazetted the take-over of all the Local Councils without as much as notice to the Councillors by *Gazette* Notification. The interesting history, Sir, by P.U 28 of 1970 is that because the Chief Minister was going on a world tour these powers were handed to a Committee—an authority, Sir, comprising of the Member for Tanjong Barat, the Member for Tanjong Utara, I think, and the State Financial Officer. That was in respect of the City Council. The Chief Minister returned and took over this function; and by a Notification—if I am not mistaken, sometime in 1971—the Chief Minister took over all the four Councils in addition to the City Council which he had taken over. And the interesting issue of that, Sir, is that in 1972 you yourself were involved in this further change of hands; in this so-called—as referred to by my friend on the left previously at times—‘three Ex. Co. members’. And earlier this year again, Sir, the powers reverted back to the Chief Minister by *Gazette* Notification. And I like to refer to this interesting *Gazette* Notification No. 54 of 1972, December, where all these functions were again transferred back to the Chief Minister ‘until the said Council shall meet on an appointed day after the General Election of the said Council itself.’

Sir, one wonders how the affairs of these Councils can be conducted when year after year they are shifted to some Ex. Co. members plus the Financial Officers; then back to the Chief Minister; then back to the appointment of three members; and then back to the Chief Minister, without so much as an explanation to this House or to the people as to what is going on in the Councils. And mind you, Sir, all this has been done in the name of efficiency; in the name of economy; in the name of bring about a greater control over the affairs and the finances of these Councils. I would refer, Sir, to other instances which give rise to doubts as to whether this kind of changing of hands really brings about any control over the affairs of the Councils, particularly as regards budgeting. With your permission, Sir, I would like to read a very interesting remark contained in the *Khidmat Kemajuan, Majlis Daerah Tengah, Seberang Perai, Bukit Mertajam*. This is only one instance dated the 16th October, 1972. Sir, the take-over of this Council is on the basis that we were to bring about efficiency. The Chief Minister was the first person to take over the Local Councils, aside from the City Council referred to. And I give an illustration of one particular Council; and that is the Bukit Mertajam Council which was taken over. And this, if I am not mistaken, is the budget presented by this Council. I would like to read the words of the Chairman of the Authority which was constituted to take over. And I will just read the relevant paragraph:

"Kerajaan Negeri merasa untuk kepentingan orangramai pentadbiran Majlis perlu diambilalih bagi menyediakan perkhidmatan-perkhidmatan yang lebih cekap dan baik kepada orangramai. Sejak diambilalih—sejak diambilalih—beberapa perubahan telah diadakan di bahagian pentadbiran bagi mengurangkan kelengahan dan sebagai buktinya ke atas pelan-pelan dan lesen-lesen telah dapat disegerakan."

If I am not mistaken, Sir, what this statement actually states is that before the take-over there had been delays, Sir, in the processing of plans, licences and matters of importance. And, Sir, these

were the words of Yang Berhormat Member for Bukit Mertajam, the Member for Tanjong Barat and Yang Berhormat Wong Choong Woh, the Member for Tanjong Selatan. What were the delays that they were referring to? The statement did not refer to the delays five years ago. They referred to the delays prior to the take-over by the three Members. And I say that those delays were the delays by the Honourable the Chief Minister—delays in respect of control over these Councils. And that is why we bring this Motion here—because we feel there is not sufficient control over the affairs of the Councils; particularly and symbolically the budget, because it is through the budget that the Councils run. And if there is no control, as now, if we take what is stated here to be true and I have no doubt that the statement of fact by none other than the Member for Bukit Mertajam in his capacity as Chairman should be true—then the reversion to the Chief Minister of these powers again will give rise to the very complaint that is said to be in this particular statement: that there will be delays in all matters pertaining to the financial affairs of the Council. Sir, can we allow this to continue? Can we, the Penang Legislative Assembly, Sir, which has responsibilities under Schedule 9 over Local Government, allow this to be perpetrated in this State. Knowing too well, Sir, that it is the established policy set out by the Government that they are to restore democracy to these Local Councils. And, Sir, I might say that in order to forestall our debate in this House we have the words of the Honourable the Chief Minister speaking through the Governor:

"The State Government will be restructuring the local Authorities with the overall objective of creating a more viable and more efficient organisation of the Local Authorities which can better serve the needs of the people at this level of Government."

It is true that Local Councils will contend that their combined resources, and the personnel from one Council to the other will be able to function better, and in a manner that is consistent with

the overall State strategy of social economic development. Through this exercise the Local Councils in Province Wellesley will be merged into a single Local Authority, and the City Council and the Rural District Council in the Island will be merged to form another Local Authority. The task of restructuring the Local Authorities has already been initiated in close consultation with other States through the National Council for Local Government, and the concurrence of the Minister concerned. Sir, I submit this is only a mere falsity. We are no closer to having a control over the budgets and the affairs of the Councils by elected representatives because not a single word here mentions elected representation. But, Sir, I would further say that these are mere platitudes, because we had in fact in the 1st Session of the Third Legislative Assembly in 1971, in the Address of His Excellency the Governor—and I like to quote again with your permission—

“I am also happy with the Government officers.”

His Excellency said,

“For their loyalty and the way they have admirably met the challenges of the last 21 months. No effort has been spared to streamline and improve upon the efficiency of the administration, and a study of the integration of functions falling under the State and Local Authorities has been undertaken. The transfer of functions of Local Councils to the Chief Minister, is, therefore, a step towards integrating common functions.

It is the objective of the Government to eventually restore elections to the Local Authorities. However, this objective will have to be reviewed in the light of Article 95A of the Federal Constitution and the Report of the Royal Commission. With this in mind, the Government will plan to establish the Local Authorities into more efficient and financially viable entities.”

Sir, it is still promised that there will be integration. Unfortunately, Sir, we on this side of the House expect this to go on. If the Honourable the Chief Minister and the Members of the Government really believe sincerely—and I doubt their sincerity quite honestly—that they wish to carry out their promises to the electorate I would say: show some

semblance of democracy even before elections are held. Restore this democracy. And you can do so, Sir, by bringing the Budget to this House, because there are no conflicting provisions under the Federal Constitution that will disallow us to do so. It will be an act of good faith on the part of the Government if they were to act accordingly. But sad to say the Chief Minister clings to power, and goes against the thread of everything that he has stood for; everything that he has said in this House itself; and refuses, Sir, to account to the elected representatives of the people as to the affairs of the Councils. Sir, if the Councils are mere honorary posts and positions that they carry no weight; that the finances of the State are not concerned, like for example the Goodwill Committee—we would be prepared to overlook these things. But this is not the State Goodwill Council, or anything of that sort. This is handling the finances of the State. And the Chief Minister himself has said in 1967: \$33 million; that is the single Budget of the City Council. If I may just refer today, the estimated revenue in 1972 was \$41,909,208; and the expenditure, Sir, \$36,633,778. And what are we dealing with in this State? We spent probably—of course the last time we did not have the privilege of spending that time—two to three days debating a State Budget of a mere \$24 million. And here is a Budget twice the size, if we take the City Council. But if we take the R.D.C. which is, I understand—correct me if I am wrong—about \$2 million, and the Majlis Seberang Perai Utara which is roughly \$2 million also, the combined Budget of the Councils could well come to about \$45 million. And yet, Sir, as the Honourable the Chief Minister himself says—today he doesn't wish to face his own words—that one individual passes this Budget. And true, one individual, Sir, now. Previously at least we had the luxury of having three persons, rightly or wrongly, passing the Budget; but right now one man passes the Budget. The Chief Minister says, Sir, in this House: ‘I do not like the added

responsibilities of the Chief Minister. It is the circumstances of the case.' Sir, is it true that it is the circumstances of the case that the Chief Minister today assumes the role of Superman? He is in fact the Mayor of the City Council, and the Chairman of the Local Councils in the State of Penang; he is the Chairman of the P.D.C.; he is the Chairman of the Water Authority. He is everything.

Sir, at one debate in this House, under the previous Government, the present Chief Minister rightly asked the question: How many times did the Honourable the Chief Minister at that time visit the City Council? He asked that question; and the answer that was forthcoming was very unfortunate. The Chief Minister said he asked the then Chief Minister: Are you satisfied that you are doing duty to the Councils? And today I ask the Chief Minister the same question, although he is not here to answer it. I ask him the same question. His Members can relate that question to him. Is he satisfied? Is he capable of doing justice to the affairs of the Council for which annually he passes \$4,000,000 (?) worth of Budget? What control has he over this? We have seen, Sir, in this House that he hasn't got sufficient control over the affairs of this House by itself. Judging from the number of mistakes, for example, in the Water Enactment, it is impossible for one man to take all the functions, although in principle we object to the delegation of these powers under the Municipal Ordinance to this Committee because we feel that under this Section 398 the Authority referred to must be a duly-constituted statutory authority. That is our interpretation. Even the Legal Adviser is not here today; but it doesn't matter. But why is that? Even though we regret the interpretation, surely we can see that no matter how intelligent one man is, how superhuman he is, he cannot do the job that was formerly delegated to virtually three men in one Council. He cannot do it. And why, when the Chief Minister himself has taken on a stand that he doesn't believe in one man passing the Budget, does he continue like this, Sir? The

reasons for the take-over particularly of the Local Councils, apart from the City Council which the Chief Minister in fact inherited, to be fair with him, were that they were inefficient; there were delays; and that the ratepayers were not able to get satisfactory settlement of their problems. But, Sir, I would like to refer to the words of none other than a retired member of the City administration, Mr Sonni Pillai, when he left. And what were his words? I like to quote. He was referring to the usefulness of the City Council. Even the most ineffective one can be a source of valuable information on the needs of the citizens. Giving his opinion on the difference between the City Council with and without politicians, Mr Pillai said: "Councillors have been of immense help. In other words, you will get a more accurate gauge of public opinion in formulating policies". He has always taken the view that in a Malaysian society people will always make representations to Councillors rather than to officers. Mr Speaker, Sir, you in fact have had tremendous experience in the Council; and you will substantiate these words. He said there had been some reluctance on their part to approach an officer direct. So when a Councillor was approached by the citizens it was his duty to bring the matter to the attention of the officer concerned. It is up to the officer to convince the Councillor and the citizen concerned if the request cannot be complied with. Sir, a man—if I am not mistaken, here it says—had started as an Assistant Secretary in 1956, and left in 1970—14 years of experience in a Local Council. These are the views of people who have yearly dealt with the Budgets and the affairs of the Council. And are these views to be discarded? We ask nothing more, Sir, than the principle, if it is honestly felt on the part of the Government that in view of the present laws the elections cannot be held. And we wonder, Sir, as to the sincerity of the Honourable the Chief Minister, because he made an election pledge. And he is, in his own words, an experienced politician. Surely he must know the provisions of the Constitution. He must know the

law as it stands. He made a promise to restore elections to the City Council; and he has taken the reverse step of abolishing the elected members of the Council. But having done that, whether there are a menace to that Act or not, we would expect at the very least, Sir, that the Honourable the Chief Minister would restore some semblance of democracy; and that, in our humble opinion, is to bring the Budget of these Councils to this House. There are no Constitutional impediments to debating these Budgets. And the fact, Sir, that the Honourable the Chief Minister is afraid to participate in this debate, and afraid to be present while this debate is taking place, indicates that he is trying to run away from his responsibility as the Honourable the Chief Minister, and as the Officer Administering the five Councils. And this, Sir, indicates the total lack of responsibility on the part of the Chief Minister who has taken over all the five Councils. And yet, Sir, no matter what his views as to the merits or otherwise of this Motion *per se*, to use his own words, he is duty bound as the Chief Minister, and as one who has taken over the functions of the five Councils, to come here and listen to the views of Honourable Members. And I say that his failure to come here cannot be taken as a very clever political manoeuvre; but it must be taken, Sir, by Members of this House and the people of this State that he is irresponsible.

Tuan Speaker: Let us not go into opinion. Let us stick to the merits of the case. He may be listening to your arguments outside.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Thank you, Mr Speaker, Sir. I hope he is listening somewhere. But, Mr Speaker, Sir, these things cannot be taken lightly because while we in this House may be jovial about how we handle the affairs of this State, and even the affairs of the Councils in the meantime, Sir, the people's affairs are neglected. I think neglected because there are ample illustrations, Sir, of

how there is no control over the Council; there is no control over the finances; there is no control over the functions. I give an illustration, Sir.

Mr Speaker, Sir, you will recall that—I do not know because you were not the Speaker at that time—we in this House asked several questions about the Councils. And mind you, Sir, these same questions, and the type of questions that we asked were also asked by Members of the present Government who were on this side of the House at that time. And these answers were graciously given by the then Chief Minister. But one thing that has made this debate more important still, Sir, is the fact that the absent Speaker has taken upon himself to reject all questions pertaining to the Local Councils. And this is why I say it has made this debate more important, because now that we bring a Motion to debate the Budgets of the Councils we have been prevented. The debate is allowed; but the questions that had been previously allowed by the self same Speaker and previous Speakers of this Legislative Assembly have now been disallowed. So the question arises: Who is going to supervise the affairs of the Local Councils? I ask that because we have now been disallowed. It is as clear as that. The questions that have been asked have been totally rejected. And it can be seen, Sir, that all the questions that have been rejected are questions pertaining to the Local Councils. A pertinent question that was asked of the Chief Minister as Officer Administering the Council . . . (gangguan).

Tuan Speaker: But if the Speaker has disallowed, I do not think it should be queried here.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, I am not criticising his decision. But what I am saying is that these are matters which we in this House would like to know. As the Officer Administering the Local Authorities, how many times did the Chief Minister visit these Authorities in 1970? Give us a breakdown. That is fair information that the

Chief Minister should give this House, so that we can be assured that all the affairs of the Council are being properly run. That is why we want to know. We are not trying to grab his powers. We want to be assured. But, Sir, by not giving this information doubts are being created. And how do we fill these doubts? Sir, we fill these doubts by the rumours that prevail among the public as to whether the Chief Minister ever visits these Councils.

Tuan Speaker: I think we will confine ourselves to the Budget, and the visits.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Yes, Sir. And an important question was asked: Is the exercise to revalue the City Council property completed? And will the Chief Minister assure the House that rates payable will not be increased? And when will these new values be implemented? You will agree with me, Sir, that this is in connection with that function. And I would like to refer, Sir, to your own words in the matter. And that is why we find it very difficult to follow what goes on in this State and in the Local Councils. If I am not mistaken, Sir, you had said in connection with presenting the 1972 Budget—and I quote the relevant part in connection with what I have just cited: “The primary objective of revaluation is to achieve more equitable distribution of rate charges, and not to increase revenue, although the latter might come as a coincidence”.—This is in respect of the City Council Budget.—“It follows that when higher and more realistic values are eventually introduced there will be substantial reduction in the present rate of 34%. When revaluation takes place I have every confidence that it will be possible to reduce the rate from 34% to 17%, if not lower”. And it goes on: “Mr Ooh said that the expected economic uptake in the next few years may make it possible to revise the licence fees and taxes, and Council’s other resources of revenue which have not been revised for many years”. Sir, here is a

question of revenue; a question of revaluation of City property. Now, fortunately or unfortunately—I do not know; depending on where one is sitting, and the outlook of the Government. We do not know because things are done without even a public explanation—the take-over of the Local Councils from their elected representatives was done overnight. A member of the R.D.C., Sir, who has since departed from us—a friend of mine who was a member of the U.D.P. at that time—was irate because he was an elected member of the Local Council. He woke up one morning to read in the newspapers that he had been dismissed by the Chief Minister. That was all. And I wonder if the same shoddy treatment was meted out to the members who constituted the Authority. That is what we are interested in.

We find here, Sir, that there is reference to revaluation; and that certain steps have been taken. And we feel that as elected representatives of the people—now that the elected representatives at the local level have been dismissed, similarly as the Chief Minister has got added responsibility, which he himself has stated—we have got added responsibilities which we have not on our own taken on. And these responsibilities are now that we have to deal even with Local Council matters in which probably, Sir, you have had experience. We have to deal with Local Council matters too. And is it not within our democratic right, and within our privileges as elected representatives of the people to ask the Honourable the Chief Minister to let us know whether the statement that you made on that particular day, which was reported on the 6th November, 1971, is valid today; and what has happened; and what is going to happen? And yet, as I said, not only are we not allowed to ask the question—it doesn’t matter, because we can raise it in the debate—the Chief Minister is not even here to listen. He is not bothered. He can spend hours filibustering; but he is not prepared, Sir, to participate in this debate. He has the direct responsibility. And it is

no point saying, Sir—if it is going to be said later—that the Political Secretary is here, because the Chief Minister has time and again said, “I am personally responsible to the Local Authorities”. Therefore he cannot choose to be one thing on one day, and another thing on another day. So we really regret that the Chief Minister is not here to debate, and to listen, because the name in the *Gazette* Notification is not the Ex. Co., Sir, I regret to say. I would be happier if it had been the Ex. Co. The name in the *Gazette* Notification is “The Chief Minister of Penang”.

Tuan Speaker: You have made that point very clear. Please go on.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Sir, we have asked, in connection with the questions in this House, whether matters in connection with provisions in the Budget have been carried out, or whether the Chief Minister will carry out certain improvements in the respective Authorities of which he is in charge. Here again we have asked whether steps will be taken to prevent tidal flooding in the Bridge Street area in the City of George Town. No answer is forthcoming. Sir, we are not asking this for our own information and our own interest. We are asking this on behalf of the people of Penang.

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member, if these questions have been disallowed by the substantive Speaker I do not think it is fair that we talk about these matters now, or expect answers to questions.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, we are concerned with the failure on the part of the Government and on the part of the Chief Minister. Here in this case I have to say “Chief Minister” because I do not know whether we should say it is the Ex. Co., because the Ex. Co., as you will agree, is not the Authority now as regards matters pertaining to parking provisions, parking fees, and sale of land which belonged to the City Council. Sir, to indicate how the present situation is very unsatisfactory, and

that the debate over the Budget must be brought here, even at the time when the Chief Minister—or, if we wish to give him latitude, the Speaker—allowed these questions of the Chief Minister the answers were highly unsatisfactory. And it showed, Sir, rather a disregard for public opinion.

I would like to refer to a matter which I raised in this House pertaining to provisions for parking, and the collection of dues therefrom. What was the reply of the Chief Minister? Sir, this matter is not a political issue. It is not a matter on which the Democratic Action Party can take a stand and say that we insist, and champion this and that. But this is a matter which common sense must dictate that people who administer the City Council rightly and in an enlightened manner, democratically, will accede to. And, it was, Sir, a request on my part. I repeat the question that was put to the Chief Minister: Will the Chief Minister or the Government direct the City Council to amend the Parking Places Regulations, 1969, to allow parking fees to be paid within 48 hours, instead of the present requirement—before 12 o'clock the next afternoon? Sir, I think you will agree with me, with your experience, that no matter how you look at it, from what angle, it cannot be a political question. Now, what was the answer the Honourable Chief Minister gave?

Tuan Speaker: I would agree with you, Honourable Member from Kelawei, that it was not a political question. But I would go on to say that the payment of parking fees before 12 o'clock would have nothing to do with Budget itself, or the merit of bringing the Budget to this House for debate.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, thank you very much. Precisely, that is the point I would like to explain. If we had the Budget of the City Council debated here then we would have had the opportunity to reply to the Chief Minister, and explain to him why his answer is not right. But because we

don't have that opportunity we play cat and mouse. We ask him a question; there is not sufficient time during question time; and he gives it to us three months later. And then we cannot take it up again. That is the point. If we had the Budget here then we can tell the Chief Minister that this is nothing political. And this is the answer he gave: "No. Extending the time allowed for payment of parking fees will not help careless motorists, as the longer the time allowed the easier it is to forget. The parking fees can be paid to any parking attendant."

Tuan Speaker: I fail to see, Honourable Member, how this, which to my mind is an administrative matter, can be something which has to do with your Motion on the merit of bringing the Budgets of these Councils for debate here. I agree that these are all administrative matters of Council. As to whether the answers are right or wrong that is a different question. I think we should keep ourselves to the subject of the matter under debate.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Yes, Mr Speaker, Sir. As I was explaining, if we had these Budgets before us then this House can represent the citizens and the public. You will agree with me that this is not a political issue; and that we need not impose this regulation right now that motorists must immediately report before 12 o'clock and pay their parking fees. They should be allowed 48 hours, because a person who parks at 9 o'clock in the morning has got a longer number of hours to pay than a person who parks at 10 o'clock at night. And perhaps a person going outstation cannot pay; and he has got to pay a \$2 fine. And that adds on to the Budget of the City Council. But I do not think it is the intention to obtain financing of Budgets through fines. If that is the case I think that will be a very sorry state that we would be in. But the point I am trying to raise here is that on a simple thing like that the public are asking for it. But the Chief Minister, being the Administrator by

himself, and having by himself no debate over the Budget, will never know. And I say that if we want to be particular about it we will leave this alone, and let the accumulated hatred, Sir, and accumulated discontent build up. But that is not in the interests of the State. What we must have is a fair Administration, and a Government which is responsive to the people. And the Government cannot be responsive to the people if one man takes it all into his hands, and passes a Budget of \$45 million by himself. That is impossible, because one man can only meet that number of people. And the Chief Minister, according to his own admission, is too busy.

Sir, whether a Budget provision such as \$9,000 to give a green look to the Esplanade, as set out in the statement made by the Council on 6th February, 1972, is proper expenditure is again questionable. And we have time and again in this House tried to impress upon the Government that expenditure of that sort is not really a necessary expenditure; that the City Council should find another venue for the Pesta. And yet this is not done. And every year these amounts are recurring. For example, in 1972 there was a deficit, I understand, of \$179,000 on the part of the Majlis Seberang Perai Utara. Sir, whether these deficits are justifiable or otherwise, here again nobody knows. Nobody is there to supervise it. We can only look at the figures in abstract. We do not know whether things are going on well or otherwise. And we must just venture a guess whether the whole idea of having Councillors in the first case had any meaning. Or is it just to waste everybody's time, and allow them to sit around and do nothing; and one man can do all the jobs?

Mr Speaker, Sir, in this regard I like to refer to the comments made by the Auditor-General in respect of the handling of City Council's finances and the Local Councils' finances. Sir, now that we have a Government Member as Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, to make things worse—and now again, as I said, the Chief

Minister is the sole arbiter of the Budget of the Local Authorities—how are the complaints and the recommendations by the Auditors going to be resolved?

Sir, I refer now to the Report of the Auditor-General, 1971. It says here: "Accounts of District Councils. I have neither received any Accounts in respect of the four District Councils for the year 1971, nor the 1970 Account of the Rural District Council, Penang Island, for audit. I am not satisfied that every effort has been made by the respective Authorities concerned to render the Accounts as early as possible."

Sir, in 1971 these Councils had been taken over by the Honourable the Chief Minister. And have the financial situations improved in these Councils? Have they improved? If they have improved there is no necessity for the Auditor-General to make this restricted complaint. It is confidential. And it goes on, Sir. And this is in respect of every Council. "Financial position of District Councils."—This is not a politician making a statement. This is the Auditor—"No significant improvement can be reported on the financial position of the District Council South, Nibong Tebal, since my last Report. As at 31st December, 1971, the cash balance of the Council, according to available record, was \$133,859.21, against current liabilities totalling \$387,392.50. Of the local current liabilities \$206,355.98 is due to the State Government as reimbursement for various services rendered to the Council. The Council's liability to the Federal Government by way of education rate amounted to \$166,402.77. Though the Council had a balance of \$51,950.69 to its account in respect of education rate collection, only \$8,335.95 had been remitted to the Federal Government. The weak financial position of the Council can be attributed to the failure by the Council to enforce the laws to collect dues promptly, and to revise valuation of properties."

Sir, we do not have a full debate here about the Budgets of the Councils. Therefore in passing, in the Budget

debate, we may in our general address; and not trying to take up too much time of the House, or we may be accused of a lot of things by Members of the Government. And they do accuse us of being long-winded. But can we, Sir, in fairness say that we can conduct ourselves in half-an-hour presentations if we are to deal with all the matters that are relevant to the State? Because these matters are now abandoned to our laps, we are the people who have to look into it. And that is the peculiarity, Sir. Although the Auditor-General submits his Report to us for our examination and consideration, the Budgets are not here for us to consider. We must be superhuman if we can make an objective assessment of these things without proper presentation of complete Budgets. Sir, I know that these Budgets are published in the *Government Gazette* for the State of Penang. But so are the State Budgets. Now, why do we need the Chief Minister to stand up here and give us a two-hour lecture when he presents his Budget? Why? It is where the Chief Minister explains to us which item is meant by which particular Head, and what are the provisions. This is not a waste of time. But can we say the same about these Council Budgets? Can we just merely take the *Government Gazette* and look through, and understand what is going on? Sir, there is a need to bring this to this House because the Auditor-General has himself stated. And he is an impartial person.

And now we go on to the District Council Central, Bukit Mertajam.

"In previous Audit Reports, I drew attention to the unsatisfactory financial position of the District Council Central, Bukit Mertajam. The financial position of the Council has further deteriorated in 1971."

Further deteriorated! The take-over, Sir, was supposed to improve the situation. The Auditor-General again says it has further deteriorated.

"At the end of 1971 the cash balance of the Council, according to available records, was \$209,000."

I won't go into the minor pieces "against current liabilities totalling \$734,000" and again in round figures.

"The current liabilities include outstanding loan instalments due to the State Government totalling \$170,000 (plus) during the period 1967 to 1971, and a further \$300,000 (plus) due to the State as reimbursement for various services rendered to the Council during the years 1964 to 1971. As in the past, the Education Rate of \$73,000 (plus) collected in 1971 was again utilised to meet current expenditure bringing the total amount due to the Federal Government of \$262,000 (plus) for the period 1967 to 1971 inclusive. The financial position of the Council should be viewed with concern."

Of course, the Auditor-General has the powers and the privileges and the opportunities which we in this House do not have. The Auditor and his staff have got a little card which entitles them to demand vouchers and receipts from every Government Department where the officers go and audit. We have no such opportunity in this House. We are the elected representatives of the people; but we are not allowed to look at the Budgets of the Local Councils—40 million compared to our 20 million. And this is what the Auditor-General has discovered. Now, why is it the Chief Minister is prepared to allow this situation to go on, if he earnestly believes in democracy, and talks about not having one man passing the Budget?

"There are many outstanding matters affecting the financial position of the Council which have been repeatedly mentioned in my Observations on the Council's account for the past few years."

Sir, this is in connection with Bukit Mertajam.

Now we come, Sir, to the Rural District Council, Penang Island. Again,

"No improvement in the financial position of the Rural District Council, Penang Island, can be reported."

It would appear, Sir, that the Auditor is getting sick of every time giving adverse reports. He would like to give a positive report. Even that he cannot.

"The Council has continued to suffer yearly deficits since 1964, and the total

deficit at the end of 1969, the period the accounts have been certified is \$777,000" to give round figures.

"As at 31st December, 1971 the Council, according to available records, had a cash balance of \$469,000" again round figures "including fixed deposits totalling \$375,000 against current liabilities totalling \$671,000 (plus). Of the total current liabilities, \$118,000 (plus) is due to the State Government as reimbursement for various services rendered to the Council and the balance of \$552,000" again giving round figures "represents Education Rate collected and retained by the Council and is due to the Federal Government. The deterioration of the financial position of the council should be viewed with serious concern."

Sir, this is a recurring phrase. In every report on the Council it is indicated that the situation is deteriorating. Sir, the Chief Minister was supposed to take over and improve the situation. And how come the situation is deteriorating?

And the most beautiful part of this Report is:

"In order to improve the financial and administrative structure of the Councils, I have been informed," he says, "that the State Government is at present giving serious consideration for the integration of the Councils and the City Council of George Town into two local authorities—one authority to administer the Province and the other to administer the Island."

That is all, Sir, that the Honourable the Chief Minister can say to the Auditor.

I have referred to the Report of the Auditor-General. But even the Public Accounts Committee has made certain recommendations. And I must say I take off my hat to the Public Accounts Committee because, not having had the opportunity in this House to debate the Budgets of the Councils, how they can really go into enquiring into the state of affairs and the Councils' Budgets is something admirable. But I think that perhaps they could better do their duties if a proper debate were forthcoming. But this is at least what they say, Sir:

"The Committee recommends that the State Government draw the attention of the District Councils to forward Accounts not later than 30th June of the following year."

This is in connection with the recommendations. I am glad the Honourable the Chief Minister has mustered some courage to be back here.

"The Committee notes the unsatisfactory financial position of the District Council South. It also notes that the arrears of revenue of those Councils had increased, and recommends that the various Councils make concerted efforts to recover arrears, and to write off arrears which are irrecoverable."

Sir, these Reports by the Public Accounts Committee and by the Auditor-General should not be taken lightly just because one man has the privilege of passing the Budget by himself. It doesn't mean that we in this Assembly are so engaged in so many of the matters pertaining to legislation of this State, and to provision for the State itself that we should overlook the affairs of the Councils which, in the words of the Honourable the Chief Minister, can budget double the size of the State of Penang. And I am sure that in spite of the great capacity of the Honourable the Chief Minister to know that he is a man of substantial capacity he cannot do justice to all the matters that have been raised. And even if he could there must be somebody to whom he must account. Sir, it is interesting to note that when the Chief Minister himself took up this point, as I take up now, the then Chief Minister said, 'Don't you worry.' And even the then Legal Adviser said that the Chief Minister is responsible to Exco; and Exco is responsible to the Legislative Assembly. But is that situation even pertaining now, in view of what we have learnt? The recommendations and the appeal to the Chief Minister have fallen on deaf ears, because none of these things have been taken up; and he is not prepared to take these matters up.

For instance, the question of loan instalments overdue. Now, if we allow this situation to go on in the next five years God help the next Government which takes over the State Government, because everything is in a mess. They wouldn't know what was going on in this State. 'The Committee notes'—and this is in respect of the

Public Accounts Committee recommendations—"that two of the three loans made to the District Council Central are still outstanding, and recommends that the State Government exercise greater control over the Council's expenditure." Sir, all these matters of accounts and Auditor's Reports cannot be properly studied unless and until Members of the Government accept the concept that these Budgets cannot be continually passed, year in, year out, without the mandate of the elected representatives. And I would like to ask Members of the Government in what way, Sir, it is offensive to have the Budgets of the Local Councils debated in this House. In what way would it infringe the Constitution? In what way, Sir, would it abuse the democratic principle? I do not think there is an answer to this. The Chief Minister necessarily gives the impression that all is well in the State of Penang pertaining to Local Councils. I say, Sir, that when the affairs of the State are run by one man, and the manner in which funds of this State are utilised are not accounted for properly, all is not well.

I note, Sir, that the Honourable the Chief Minister in the December session of Parliament did say that:

"With the sense of responsibility that the present Government took over the question of administering the Local Councils the State Government is co-operating fully with the Federal Government in the restructuring and streamlining of the present Local Councils. The problems confronting the Government are enormous. But to have said that no action has been taken I think must be to deceive the House, because in the State of Penang certainly a Water Authority has been established."

Sir, I do not know how the Honourable the Chief Minister relates the establishment of a water Authority to the restructuring of the Councils that he talks about, because the first restructuring that we require here is to revert to a state of democratic representation. Unless we have that, Sir, the democratic traditions of this State will have been destroyed by the present Government.

Sir, I would like to deal with the matter pertaining to the properties of the City Council. Sir, I do not know the

reason for selling City Council properties. Perhaps it is to increase the revenue of the particular Council concerned. But I do not think that is a wise way of doing things. I think the Chief Minister must account to this Assembly as to how he disposes of the property of the Local Councils. And I am shocked to have read in the newspapers that City property had been sold with a tender notice stating that the sale is not necessarily to the highest tenderer. Sir, I think that is very strange. If the City Council disposes of its property, and it goes on to the finances of the City Council surely we want to improve on, shall we say, the revenue. And improving the revenue cannot be by selling it to the lowest tenderer. Can it be? This is not a question of public works where you may well say that you reserve the right not to give to the lowest tenderer because his job may be very poor, and he may have a record of delay. I appreciate that. But can this apply to a case of selling City property where we wish to add on to the revenue of the City Authority? Surely it must be to the highest tenderer. Because we have zoning laws and planning laws we are not afraid. Whoever buys the property he has to conform with the City provisions. So surely there is no necessity to say that we are not bound to sell the highest tendered. In fact the City should bind itself to sell to the highest tenderer. As I said earlier, controls are very patent, there is no doubt about it. So how does the Honourable the Chief Minister justify his control over the revenue when he says that he can allow people to buy property belonging to the City although the price may be lower than other people's price? That is very strange. And that is something that the Chief Minister should explain. And that is something that can be explained if there is debate over the Local Council Budgets. But if there is none this will be a matter left to conjecture and 101 rumours. And there will be allegations in this House about corruption; and the A.C.A. will be called in again; and all things will go on again and again. Does the Government not think that it is adding on to this problem?

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member for Kelawei, I do not know how you equate budget debate with budget control.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, unless we have budget debate how can we control the Budget of the Government? For example, we have budget debate over the State Budget. And in that debate we will tell the Government why a certain scheme is not right, and why tenders should have been called. That is what I am trying to get at. It is a dangerous precedent. And I think it is not healthy for the revenue of the State if we do not adopt, shall we say, common administrative practice; and a very prudent practice. Could not we (gangguan).

Tuan Speaker: I agree with you that it is a prudent administrative action. But your Motion is to argue that the Budgets of these Councils should be debated here. I assume, of course, that the Annual Budgets will be debated. And once the Budget is debated and passed there is no question here over the budgeting control.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, you see, as I said, when we debate the Budget then we can make criticisms to the Government. That is where we can tell the Government where it has failed to provide for matters, or failed to control the proper budgeting provision. And this is where we in this House are very astonished. I do not know about the other Rural Councils. As I say, this Motion in fact is a very tall order. And we have to make it that wide because all the Councils are now affected. But the point is that there is a tendency, not only in this State but in the Local Authorities, to sell public property without tender. And how does one account for that to the people of Penang? How does one account for that to the ratepayers who are paying increasing rates? And you as Government sell this property to people without tender! And I refer, Sir, to the incident over the Balai Rakyat at Hamilton Road. I would like to

believe the Chief Minister when he says, 'Oh, when we consider that it is in the interests of the public.' So what is 'in the interests of the public?' This is his answer: "It was deemed to be in the public interest to do so. And the State will continue to act in the public interest in future." Sir, disposing of public property should be by way of tender. That would be in the interests of the public—to be seen to be above board. When the Chief Minister says it is in the interests of the public not to have a public tender I cannot understand that. The public will ask: Could we not have shown that it is a property for \$50,000, \$100,000; and next year you tax us less? You may well reconsider whether you wish to increase your assessment, revaluation, and so forth. But here is a case where the Honourable the Chief Minister, himself administering the Council, is not prepared to abide by what is called procedure.

Tuan Speaker: That is administrative procedure. I only mentioned budgeting procedure. So I think . . . (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tuan Speaker, Sir, you will appreciate that, of course, they are based on all their fine distinctions; and we are bound to stray over one side or the other. I am grateful to you for pointing out when we have strayed over a bit.

Mr Speaker, Sir, if the budgets were to be presented in this House then very much of the manner in which Members of this House sometimes stray over from State issues to Local Council issues, and back and forth, and reach conclusion as to whether the Chief Minister is directly responsible, or somebody else is responsible would not arise at all. But because the Chief Minister just refuses—and I use the word 'stubbornly.' He likes the word now—stubbornly refuses to account to this State. This gives rise to suspicion. Why is it the Chief Minister is unprepared to account in this State over the manner in which he

administers these Local Authorities? We come back to this question in the word 'Why?'. Why does he run it like his personal, private estate, which it is not. If the Chief Minister has a clean record—and when I say 'clean record' I do not mean that he has a black record. And he has already advised one of his Members that silence is golden—he may well have considered that he should have been silent when he was over here, because today we are telling him that he himself knew that all these procedures were highly irregular. And in fact, Sir, the Honourable the Chief Minister himself made an Adjournment speech. I am only moving a Motion. But the Chief Minister himself in fact made a full Adjournment speech on this issue.

Tuan Speaker: On the Budget?

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Yes, pertaining to the Budget. And I am reading this carefully. But I have been misled by him actually. As I said, we learn from the mistakes of the Chief Minister. He thinks we learn from him. But we learn from his mistakes. Well, he says here—according to him this is by way of an aside—that on the 28th of April, 1966, this House passed an amendment—No.1 of 1966. And the Amendment he refers to is the very amendment that gave the powers to the State to take over the Council. He said 'on the 28th April;' but according to my records and the records of this House—but perhaps the Chief Minister has a better record—it was the 23rd of March, 1966. Anyway we do not take it very seriously. But the Chief Minister here, Sir, has stressed the point whether the then Chief Minister was accountable to Ex. Co. or accountable to this House. And he had a very heated argument with the Legal Adviser at that time. He had a hard time too. And here is the point. I would like to read with your permission.

Tuan Speaker: If it pertains to the Budget.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Yes, it pertains to the

Budget estimates:

"I will defer to the views of the Legal Adviser in Court, but as far as the Legislative Assembly is concerned I believe that we are a body responsible for legislation. My opinion may not carry the weight of the Honourable the Legal Adviser, but I am here perfectly at full liberty and within constitutional rights to express my opinion about the legislation in this State. So I wish, Sir, that without further interruption I be allowed to carry my point to its logical conclusion.

Sir, if we look at the Municipal Ordinance of the City Council, there are references within; for example, under Section 57, Statistics—The Governor-in-Council must be informed. Estimates of revenue of the City Council should be submitted to the Governor-in-Council."

These are his own words

"which means the State Ex. Co.—changed now to the State Ex. Co."

I don't understand; but this is the record.

"But, Sir, there are large sections of the Municipal Ordinance under which the authority in charge of the Municipality or the City Council has no need to refer to the Ex. Co. It is because of this that I contend that it is invidious for a matter which is under the authority of the Chief Minister; and, Sir, our own Assembly had considered this possibility because it doesn't say that the Chief Minister should automatically be the authority of the City Council. It provides for the fact that other persons—such person or persons apart from the Chief Minister—may also be appointed to be the authority of the City Council. It is invidious, I say, Sir, for the Chief Minister, who is the head of the State Ex. Co. to come to us and say that he is directly answerable to the State Ex. Co. of which he is in command. Sir, I maintain that it is desirable for us to look into the possibility whereby amendments could be made to enable the Chief Minister or persons responsible for the running of the City Council during its suspended State to be responsible directly to the State Legislative Assembly."

That is precisely what I am asking for. But I am not going to the extent of asking for everything, Sir. I am a bit more reasonable. I am only asking for the budget. And he says,

"I notice the Honourable the Legal Adviser is shaking his head, but that is our view."

And he says a lot of things, Sir, which I would not like to quote because the

Chief Minister may not be happy. And this is in fact the last debate. We would like to end it on a happy note.

Tuan Speaker: Have you finished quoting?

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Well, yes.

Dewan ditangguhkan pada jam 6.00 petang.

Dewan bersidang semula pada jam 6.15 petang.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable the Chief Minister himself, when he was at this side of the House, even questioned the legality of the then Chief Minister for carrying on as he did. Therefore we on this side of the House cannot but also be guided by the views that he presented at that time because of his vast experience. We cannot allow a thing to go wrong also. Mr Speaker, Sir, if I were to refer to every single one of these budgets of the other Local Councils, including the one I referred to earlier of the Majlis Daerah Tengah I could be accused of not knowing. But I use this as an example. Anyone would see, Sir, that the provisions of the City Council Budgets are more intricate—the estimates are more enormous than even that of the State—because these items are in minute detail: provisions of all sorts of facilities—and every conceivable aspect pertaining to the City. Surely there are things that must be brought up before they are adopted. This is the only democratic way. But unfortunately that is not done. Although we are Legislative Assemblymen of this State, most of us represent the population of the City itself. When most of us utilise the facilities of the City then what happens to this City by and large affects the State because of the vast majority of the people living in the City itself. For example, for an item like Urban Development—although the Honourable the Chief Minister talks about it in the Governor's speech—it is under the City Council. And here it is stated: The estimated expenditure for 1973 is \$500,000. I do

not know what this particular urban reference leads to—whether it is urban development in the sense of urban renewal or otherwise. Without a debate in this House nobody is going to query the Chief Minister as to how he is going to develop urban areas with \$500,000, which is not even enough to construct a building. And we hear of this multi-million-dollar Urban Renewal Programme for Penang Road/Prangin Road/Maxwell Road/Magazine Road announced sometime ago by experts. These things directly reflect on the State and the City. But what do we know about it? I say that what the Chief Minister said when he was here is right. We are wasting our time on the State Budget if this kind of things which in fact go to millions are not even allowed to be debated in this House. And it is a shame that it has to be a Member of the Opposition to bring this to the House. And I will be the first to admit that we cannot do justice to this Budget. We cannot because we do not have the facilities; neither do we really have the personnel to go into it. Then we must be guided by the Government in the State as to what it intends to do, and so forth. But here again it clearly indicates a state of mind that the Government is quite unprepared to conduct the affairs of the City in a democratic manner.

For example, Sir, allocations in connection with extensions of roads under the City Engineer's Department. These are all very important matters. How are we going to determine, I ask the Chief Minister, whether these allocations are sufficient; whether such and such a road should be or should not be extended, or re-metalled or lighted, or so on and so forth. Previously, when the Standing Orders were drafted our question time was intended for a debate of the State Legislative Assembly, where the Members would be querying the Government basically about State matters, in view of the Constitution, some aspects pertaining to the Council. But today it can be seen from the type of questions that have been sent in from all Members here right down to the other end that there are a lot

of questions pertaining to the Local Authorities. And in three hours 'How can you do justice to this type of thing?' we would like to ask. And Members are fighting against each other to ask questions, and to see who is the first to submit the questions, and get away with the questions. But this is not the way, Sir. To ask question about the City Council alone, I think, will take more, than three hours; not to say asking questions about the whole State, plus the City Council and the other Local Authorities.

Sir, the affairs of the City Council in its collection of revenue, in its expenditure, affect almost everybody who utilises the City as the centre of all activity. As I've said, this is only by way of an example, because if I were to refer to the other budgets we would take quite a long time. But the point is that all these activities affect all of us here. For example, the City and the people of Penang would like to know what is going on with the City Transport Department on which a lot of talk has been had in the past. Is it making ends meet? Is it improving? We do not see improvements in the facilities. Is it balancing its budget? Is it now pulling its own weight since the Chief Minister took over? That is something we do not know. And I accuse the Chief Minister quite happily for not allowing the people of Penang to know. This is not, I emphasise, his private estate. There are other matters pertaining to maintenance of road as provided under the budget. We do not see and do not understand why year by year the City Council is quite happy collecting assessments into its general revenue, and on the other hand quite prepared to neglect all the roads that have been surrendered to the Local Authorities. The problem—and this applies to all the Local Authorities—is that these roads are ready for surrender, but the State Government and the Local Authorities under the Chief Minister are not prepared to take over these roads. It is as simple as that. There is no point coming to this House and say that this is the responsibility of private developers. This is the responsibility of the

Local Council which collects house assessments. What are these house assessments which we collect in Fettes Park and in various places in the City for, if not to be utilised and to be given back to the owners of these houses by providing them with proper lighting and road signs, and repairing their roads in Glugor and Fettes Park? How can you allow this, Sir, when you collect revenue, and allow these pot-holes to be there? I would invite the Chief Minister to take a ride to Fettes Park and to Tanjong Bungah, and see the pot-holes for himself—big pot-holes right in the middle of the road. And this is advertisement to the world, especially in Fettes Park where foreigners are staying, that that is how we run our City and our Local Councils. That is a shame. And yearly you collect revenue! You have the cheek to collect house assessments; and yet you do not provide the facilities. I say that it is high time the State Authority under the Chief Minister administering the Local Councils set up a committee to look into this: as to whether it is high time. Sir, after four years of Government, that the State Authority and the Local Councils take up the responsibility for all these roads that are surrendered to them. It is a question of whether or not you are prepared to take it up. Don't say that it is private property. And I say that we should take it up. And it is only in the Budget debates that we can continually come to this House and ask the Government whether it has done all this. We cannot do it unless there is a Budget debate. And I say that if this is the pattern of things I am afraid that we will have to move Budget debates in this House. And I think it is a shame. This is nothing political. This is moved solely in the interest of the State of Penang; And I hope that the Honourable the Chief Minister will see it in that light. I had a suspicion that if I'm kind to him—and I'm trying to be kind—perhaps he himself may feel the way we feel. I do not know whether these sentiments expressed in 1967 were sincere sentiments of a sincere man, speaking for what he believed in when

he was over here. But was it just politicking? I don't think I should say that it must be, because he had no anticipation that he would be a Chief Minister today unless he is a sorcerer. But if that were so these were expressions of belief, Sir. And perhaps, to be fair with him, he may be restrained by office today because of coalition. The Alliance is not very happy about the Local Councils. But I say we are prepared to take the initiative. And we are prepared to take the brickbats from the Alliance for moving this kind of thing. And if it need be we will yearly move for Budget debates in this House if that is the only way. If we do so now as a token, I think the Government should take the initiative. And I think there is relatively no harm in having a debate over the Budget because this is the chance for the Government to explain its policies. I know there is a tendency to hold the cards close to the chest. But let us administer this State in a manner that the people had elected us to do. And the people did elect the Gerakan Government for a just and democratic Government; to do away with all the usurpation of power in this State. And the best way to do it, in view of the fact that, o.k., the elections are suspended, is to bring the Budgets to this House. It is gazetted, Sir. Every Member who is entitled to the Government *Gazettes* receives these things. But, Sir, don't you think that it is prudent for the Government to have some degree of scrutiny over its budgetary provisions, plus other administrative matters pertaining to the State. I would like to have your permission to give an example. I would like to invite the Legal Advisor to correct me if I'm wrong. I'm not learned in administrative matters. Sir, I would like to learn. Sometimes we learn. I may not be the first son of the first son of the first son. It would be interesting to know whether it is the first son of the first daughter of the first daughter too. But then that does not matter. We also learn. On the other hand we hope we learn from people who deserve to be learnt from; not from people who make mistakes.

We are not going to learn from their mistakes.

Sir, I refer to this matter of public interest—I think you will bear with me—in connection with the Majlis Daerah Tengah, Seberang Perai. Correct me if I'm wrong. I am always open to correction by the Chief Minister or whoever else in the Government benches. This *Gazette* Notification, Sir, is dated the 24th May, 1973. That is why we are ignorant about budgetary provisions; and we are ignorant of the administration of the City Council, although we have these local councils under our administration under the 9th Schedule of the Federal Constitution. Let the Legal Advisor correct me if I'm wrong. I feel that something is wrong here. I read here: The District Council Central, Province Wellesley, Itinerant Hawkers Amendment By-Laws of 1972. This is an exercise of the By-Laws in connection with licences. It says here: In exercise of the powers conferred by section 195 of the Municipal Ordinance the following By-Laws have been passed by the District Council at a Special Meeting of the Council held on the 31st October, 1972, and are published under section 58 (4) of the said Ordinance prior to confirmation and sanction by the State Authority. These By-Laws may be cited as the District Council Itinerant Hawkers (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: Just a moment. How do you relate these By-Laws with the Budget?

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): This is under the licensing, Sir. I am trying to bring this to the attention of the Legal Advisor—whether there is anything pertinent thereto. The point I am trying to make is this: According to this Legal Notification dated the 10th of May, 1973, Sir, I think this is an exercise of powers by the Pihak Berkuasa Majlis Daerah Tengah dated the 10th of May, 1973. Note the point I'm trying to make. I am open to correction here. But here again, Sir, I refer back to the previous reference I made in connection with the Majlis Daerah Tengah too. And we

see, Sir, that this Order reverting all the functions back to the Chief Minister shall take effect from the 1st of January, 1973. This is dated the 27th December, 1972; and this is signed under the Clerk of the Executive Council, Penang. Under this with effect from 1st January, 1973—correct me if I'm wrong (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: I think, Honourable Member, you have made your point very nicely if your Motion had not stood as it stands.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): No, Mr Speaker, Sir. I am trying to explain why the affairs of the Administration would be better controlled.

Tuan Speaker: That is exactly what is stressed here. Your Motion is not referring to the Administration. You are trying to put forward arguments as to why the Budget of the Council should be debated in this Assembly. You have made your point very clear—that one man himself tends to be autocratic.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Nor, Sir, I think I have not used the word 'autocratic' yet. I may use it later.

Tuan Speaker: You have made yourself very clear.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): No, I think the word may not be 'autocratic.' Perhaps 'liable to mistakes,' Sir. The point I am trying to raise here is that I think there is a mistake—I stand to be corrected—because I see here that with effect from 1st January, 1973, the powers have been transferred to the Chief Minister. And yet, Sir, by this Notification you yourself as the Pengerusi of the Authority are here to exercise the powers.

Tuan Speaker: But that has nothing to do with the Budget.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): That I wonder, Sir. That is only in passing. I mean this cut and thrust of debate.

Tuan Speaker: That is right. You have made your point very clear in your talk so far—that the Budgets of all these Councils should not be in the hands of only one person. It should be debated more likely by more people. And you went so far as to say that at least three people were better than one.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Yes, yes, precisely. That is right. And I have illustrated.

Tuan Speaker: Many illustrations have been put forward. And all those points have been well delivered, and well taken. And I do hope you will go on to fresh points.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Thank you, Sir.

The point I am trying to make is—and I am departing from this—that this kind of errors do arise. I think it is an error; but I stand to be corrected by the Penasihat Undang-undang. Sir, this kind of things happen. And only God knows how many more of these things are happening. And if it happens to be administrative matters it is one thing. If it happens to be the Budget, Sir—\$45 million of money pertaining to the State—can we really have confidence that one man who is to sit here the whole day, perhaps uncomfortably, listening to the people can have in his mind all the five Councils of this State? I doubt it, Sir. Perhaps a super-human.

Tuan Speaker: You have made your point very clear.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Yes. So, Sir, we here on this side of the House hope that the matters which we have raised will find determination in a proper forum in this State until such time as elections are held. That is the point which we have to make in our Motion. We are not trying to usurp the powers of the Local Councils indefinitely. And it is, I say, not an obstruction. We want proper controls over the finances of this State. And we can't have proper control so long as one man—in the words of the Chief Minister—controls it without being accountable to the Assembly.

And I would like to sincerely ask the Chief Minister whether he really believes that what he is doing now is right; is at all satisfactory; is at all proper; is at all legal. I think there is a grave doubt, Sir, whether everything is proper in the State. Therefore, Sir, it is not surprising that yesterday, for instance—and this is by the side, if you will allow me because I had no chance to say it—that the Municipal Ordinance Amendment Bill was withdrawn unceremoniously; and there is no indication that a proper forum would have been able to deal with this matter. Why suddenly the Chief Minister withdrew the amendment? God only knows. He is not prepared to tell us. I am sure it is not 110 mistakes inside there. Some other reason. There you are.

So, Mr Speaker, Sir, even if the Ketua Menteri was honest for a moment in believing that the Councils cannot be restored to the people he would and he should in the spirit of the letter of his elections pledge, and the stand of several years of a man who has devoted the better half of his life to politics until this day, not only account to the Legislative Assembly, but allow the Legislative Assembly of Penang, the supreme body of the State, to deliberate over the financial policy and administrative affairs of the Local Authorities and the City Council. That is, I say, if he were sincere. But, in rounding up, Sir, we on this side of the House do really doubt that sincerity because although the Ketua Menteri has made a pledge to the people to restore democracy to the Local Councils he has acted to the contrary. Although it is within the powers of the State Government to restore democratic practice and control over the Councils he has refused. Although it is within the Constitutional powers of the State Legislative Assembly to question and investigate the running of the Local Councils the Chief Minister has seen fit to obstruct and even evade questioning in this House. And although the State Government could have on its own brought the respective Budgets to the Assembly for consideration the Chief Minister has failed; and preferred to

act in a dictatorial and, Sir, in your words, autocratic manner. In the light, Sir, of disturbing tendencies and administrative malpractices patent to the public, and the continued insistence on running the Councils as the, personal estates of the Chief Minister, we on this side of the House—the D.A.P.—now take the only logical step, Sir—and, I might add, the only constructive step—by bringing up this Motion in order that the Chief Minister can live up to his words. Only to allow the Chief Minister to live up to his words. Nothing else. And we feel, Sir, that this Motion should not only have the support of this side of the House, but of right-thinking and responsible and democratic Members of this House, irrespective of their affiliations, and the support of those who are concerned with the restoration and the perpetuation of the democratic controls over Local Government in this State. We, Sir, are here upholding none other than the concept as pronounced by the Chief Minister of “no taxation without representation.” And I hope, Sir, that as I had indicated earlier, what we hear as rumours outside will not become a fact in days to come—that is to say, the restructuring of the Councils; and that the vesting of their control, budgeting or otherwise, will not fall into undemocratic hands. In other words, we hope, Sir, that it will not be a nominated Council. That, we know, is the feeling of the Federal Government; and perhaps even the thinking of the Ketua Menteri. But I will draw, in conclusion, the Chief Minister’s attention, Sir, to a Motion of this House itself. Now, Sir, a Motion of this House cannot be lightly treated. And, I say, more so a Motion of this House as amended by the Chief Minister himself. The Chief Minister must amend a Motion in this House calling upon the Federal Government and the Minister of Technology, Research and Local Government to expedite, Sir, the holding of free elections for the Local Councils. And I say that the Chief Minister, not only having amended that Motion and having moved the amendment successfully, and that Motion having been carried in this House, is

bound, Sir, to carry out the mandate of this House. And it would be shocking, Sir, to the people of this State if we were to learn one fine morning that the administration of the Local Councils had been handed to Members of the Government, and when we hear of Mayors walking around this Assembly—Members of the Government without free elections.

Therefore, Sir, it is in the spirit of the Constitution itself, and in regard to our duties as Assemblymen that we on this side of the House do not believe in walking out for the sake of walking out. We will walk out to protest undemocratic and unjust suspension. But we do not walk out to evade our responsibilities to the House nor to the people. And here, Sir, is where we differ from Members of the Government. When they were in opposition they were only prepared to walk out. We are prepared to take one extra step to allow the Government in power to have the opportunity to prove that it is not undemocratic; that it is not dictatorial. And I extend this opportunity to none other than the Ketua Menteri himself who has taken this stand. And I ask him as a man of honour who hopes to be a representative of the people of Penang to support this Motion. And if he refuses to support this Motion to give, Sir, patent and weighty reasons why he cannot support his very own stand; what circumstances have changed in this country and in this State for him to change not only from the stand he took in this House in 1967 and 1968 but from his own Manifesto. and therefore, in that spirit, Sir, I hope that the majority of the Members of the Government who are absent here today will be able to account satisfactorily, especially those who have a record in this House as to their stand. And I hope the Ketua Menteri will avail himself of this opportunity. And let it not be said that by default and by sheer majority alone, before the argument, this Motion has been defeated. We are not afraid of being defeated in the Motion. What we are afraid of, Sir, is that the people of Penang will find it

a shame if the Government they elected, no matter how unpopular it has become, has not only become unpopular but seen to be unjust, and seen to be unable, Sir, to defend its policies.

Tuan Speaker: Any seconder?

Ahli Kawasan Jelutong (Encik Koay Boon Seng): Tuan Speaker, saya mohon menyokong.

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

Tuan Speaker, I support this Motion. And to be very brief I will just list out the points why I support the Motion. Mr Speaker, Sir, first point No. (1): We all have to consider the functions of Councils. The functions of all Councils, especially in the rural districts, concern and affect the life of everybody in the district. And therefore all the people in the district are very anxious to know what the Council would do for them, and what is going on in the Councils. And therefore, if the Budgets of these Councils could be brought into this Assembly for debate then we as the elected Members of the districts can tell the people what the Council can do for them; and what the Council will be doing for them in future. And we may be able to defend what the Council had done before.

Point No. (2), Tuan Speaker: The Administrator of the Councils, who is the Honourable the Chief Minister, now could be greatly benefited if he would bring the Budget into this House for debate because during the time of debate we the elected Members, who are always in contact with the people in our districts, would always like to bring criticisms and suggestions to the Honourable the Chief Minister as the Administrator of the Councils.

Mr Speaker, point No. (3): As elected Members we have a duty and responsibility to tell the people what is happening in the Councils, and what the Councils can do for them. And therefore it is helping the elected

Members of this House to discharge the duty and responsibility given to us, Sir, towards our electorate.

Point No. (4) (gangguan).

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member from Bagan Ajam, do you have many points?

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): I have 8 points. Because I go on very briefly it will not take very much time of the House.

Tuan Speaker: Let me ask you a question, if you have got very few points. It is the last day of our meeting, we hope. But all these points have been brought up by the Honourable Member from Kelawei; so you must blame him for bringing up all the points that had to be brought up (*ketawa*). I don't think anybody else should by then be able to speak, because all the points have been brought up. But if you have a few points let us carry on.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Yes, only a very few points. And I will try to be very brief. And, of course, Mr Speaker, you will appreciate that as an elected Member of that place I shall be failing in my duty if I do not have the views of the people in my Constituency. And although it may be a certain amount of repeating what the previous speaker has said, we are only doing our duty. So I hope you will appreciate that.

Point No. (4): We are aware, as well as the Honourable the Chief Minister himself is aware, that the City Transport Department is making losses every year. And the losses seem to mount up every year, Sir—to something like \$40,000 to \$120,000 nowadays. Mr Speaker, Sir, my point is this. If the Budget could be brought into this House for debate, we the elected Members who are also gaining experience from our own people in our Constituency may bring up certain suggestions, criticisms, or some ways to improve the efficiency of the Transport Department. And when the efficiency of the Transport Department is brought up then, of course, it will

follow that the losses will be reduced; or perhaps profit may come in which will create a historical event in the State Government.

Tuan Speaker: There may also be traffic congestion (*ketawa*).

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): This is a new point, I hope. Mr Speaker, Sir, now that the Honourable Chief Minister is thinking so much about the State Transport Consortium, and it is very important that the efficiency of the City Transport Department must be really shaken up, and until such time that the Honourable Chief Minister, as the Administrator of the City Council, can manage the City Transport Department under his direct charge—can manage it properly, and can increase its efficiency—I do not think the people of Penang can put any more trust in the State Government to run that kind of Transport Consortium. So in this respect I really feel that the Honourable the Chief Minister must bring in the City Council Budget for debate. And until such time we should forget the idea of State Transport Consortium because it will be messed up again like the City Transport Department.

Mr Speaker, Sir, point No. (5): This is a new point (*ketawa*); and it is about a scavenging contract in Province Wellesley North. Well, I have submitted a question asking about the details of scavenging contract terms and conditions, and tenders, and so on, and so forth. I asked the question because I have been confronted too many times by people in my constituency saying that there is a certain amount of favouritism in awarding this scavenging contract to the former Gerakan chief in Bagan. Of course, I cannot confirm whether it is true or not. But I promised them that I would ask the questions. And if I got the answers I would tell them whether it is true or not true. If the Budget is brought into this Assembly for debate then I can question this matter in this Assembly; and I can tell them with no uncertainty how this matter is done. And if this is not done I do not know how to give my

people the answer because I myself do not know anything about this scavenging contract. Is it true that this contract is being awarded to the former Gerakan Chairman of Bagan Division with a certain amount of favouritism?

Point No. (6): Tuan Speaker, Sir, this also concerns my district, the Province Wellesley North District Council. I heard from people in my constituency that a very, very active Gerakan member has been employed as an Administrative Assistant. I do not know how true it is. And rumours and complaints are also going around the town that this very active Gerakan member has discharged his duty with a certain amount of favouritism to Gerakan members. I do not know how true it is. But unless we have a Budget debated in this House (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: If there is a Budget debated in this House how do you think that would be solved?

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): In that case we can ask the Honourable the Chief Minister during the time of the Budget whether it is true or not; whether there is any special favouritism accorded to Gerakan members in Butterworth.

Tuan Speaker: I don't think we should delay Budget business with the behaviour of officers and gifts. If that's true complaints can easily be made through other channels.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Alright, Mr Speaker, Sir. I now go on to point (7).

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable the Chief Minister has elaborated this morning the services of the Council to the public, for example, maintenance of the drains. And I must thank the Honourable the Chief Minister for informing me that this is the job of the Council. I thought it was a job of Drainage and Irrigation Department. And I say, "Thank you very much for telling me that." If the Budget is debated in this House that kind of mistake would not have happened.

And again, services to the public in the respective districts. Mr Speaker, Sir, as I said in my point No. (1), the functions of the Council affect the life of everybody. And therefore when the Budget is brought into this House for debate we will have a chance to suggest to the Government or to the Administrator of the Council how best we can serve the people in our respective districts.

Tuan Speaker: I agree with you, Honourable Member.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): I hope that is very clear.

Tuan Speaker: That point has been repeated by you twice; and stressed many times and very vociferously by the mover of the Motion. So I think you can leave out that point.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker.

Now I come to the last point. I do not think that point has been mentioned by the previous speaker. It is about town planning.

Mr Speaker, Sir, there has been a long battle in Butterworth involving the people living in the housing estate. And I think you yourself are also aware of that fact. There is something going on between the people who stay in that housing estate and a factory over there. Mr Speaker, Sir, none of these people are to be blamed because the only person that can be blamed is the 'Council.' Why the Council allow that factory there; and at the same time allowed that housing estate to go in by the side of the factory?

Tuan Speaker: But if you debate the Budget here would that sort of thing have been stopped?

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Certainly we could make a suggestion that this Planning Department should be more careful, because this type of incident had already happened in Prai before. Long before this factory came

in they complained of the dust and the air pollution in Prai. So that should have been a lesson to the Council. But here, because the Council itself made another mistake, there is a quarrel between the factory on one side and the people who stay in that housing estate on the other side.

Tuan Speaker: When did that take place? When was the factory constructed; and when were the houses constructed? During the time of the O.A.C.?

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): That I do not know, unless we have the Budget debated in this House. (*Ketawa*). You are asking me a question. And only the Administrator of the Council would know. And it is my duty also to tell my electorate how this thing happen. Now, with the Budget debated in this House we can hear from the Honourable the Chief Minister how the thing happened. And then we can go back and tell our electorates. Our duty is to convey the ideas of the Government to the people, and bring the ideas of the people to the Government. This is our responsibility and our duty.

Tuan Speaker: That would be perfectly good for administration. But in the Budget debate you won't get all these things.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): In the Budget debate we can find out more facts and figures; and the date, and so on. And then maybe the Administrator would be (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member for Bagan Ajam, you do not have to wait for the Budget debate to get the dates. You can easily walk into the Council office and get the date when it was constructed. It is as simple as that.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Mr Speaker, Sir, during the course of debate we may know a lot of facts and figures, and all the incidents that led to what had happened. And therefore it is quite important. If

the Tuan Speaker holds the view that if you want to know anything you go to the Council, or if you want to know anything about the State Government you just go into the Government offices and find out, then there is no need for us to meet here. Mr Speaker, Sir, with all due respect to you I am arguing my point.

Tuan Speaker: I am only referring to things like, when the building was constructed. Surely the Council can tell you that without waiting for the end of the year to come to have the Budget debate.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Tuan Speaker, Sir, in any case I have already concluded all the points. (*ketawa*)

Tuan Speaker: As I have told you, we are having a very nice session.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): And I hope that all the points I brought up would help the House to decide whether or not the projects of all the Councils should be brought up to this House for debate. And I sincerely hope that all Members would really, apart from partisanship, support this Motion. Thank you very much.

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

Mr Speaker, Sir, I have listened to this very long disposition by the Honourable Member from Kelawei on a Motion which is not moved. I had the opportunity, just to while away my time, just to look at a dictionary. And it so happened—honestly just happened. The Honourable Member for Kelawei does not believe me when things happen, because he will say that I am planning things. But his speech which is not a new and trendy one is one which we call a peripatetic speech which dalam Bahasa dictionary ini berkeliling dari satu tempat ke tempat lain. That is what the speech actually was. Just to show to you, I opened one page. It happened to be quite interesting because ada lagi satu perkataan

di dalam Bahasa Malaysia ialah kelakar. Ini pun serupa dalam Bahasa Inggeris 'peripatetic, dan 'persiflage', and happened to be all under 'p'. That is how I came to it.

I think the Honourable Member for Kelawei has taken a lot of the time of this House to bring out a matter which he has brought out, as I said, on several occasions. Let us examine his Motion in exact words, dalam bahasa, "Bahawa sehingga masa yang Ahli-ahli Majlis bagi Majlis Bandaraya George Town; Majlis Daerah Luar Bandar, Majlis Daerah Utara, Butterworth; Majlis Daerah Tengah, Bukit Mertajam; dan Majlis Daerah Selatan, Nibong Tebal; dipilih oleh orangramai kelak, Ketua Menteri mestilah membentangkan Belanjawan Tahunan Majlis-majlis itu untuk perbahasan."

And to make sure, with your permission we read the Motion as it stands in English: "That until such time as the Councillors of the City Council of Georgetown,"—that is correct. ". . . Rural District Council, District Council North Butterworth,"—that is not quite correct—" District Council Central Bukit Mertajam"—that also, I think, we'll allow. ". . . . and District Council South Nibong Tebal are elected by the people the Chief Minister must table the annual budget of the Councils for debate." So the relative word is 'must.' And then he went through 3½ hours to say why I must, because he asked me whether I thought or I considered what is happening today is proper, satisfactory or legal. Those were the words.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wouldn't wish to take much time of the House because quite honestly the transfer of power to the State Government follows the suspension of the Councils which is in accordance with the Emergency Suspension of Local Government Elections Regulations, 1965. And this is a law which has got to be debated in Parliament. As a matter of fact the Honourable Member referred to a speech I made fairly recently

which is in rebuttal of one of his colleagues, I note somewhere around here. Because the Honourable Member could not then reply to me satisfactorily he has asked his colleague, the Member for Kelawei, to take it up. But the question of election to the Council is a matter that should be debated at Parliament. And the question of suspension of the Councils or the Local Government Elections is a matter that should be debated in Parliament. That is the proper place, Sir. Because of the emergency suspension of the Local Government Elections Regulations, 1965, transfer of powers was effected under Section 398B of the Municipal Ordinance.

The Honourable Member in the course of his speech made one interesting point which I think Honourable Members of this House would like to know. He asked: How could this power be transferred first to the Chief Minister, then to several persons, to Members of the Exco., and then back to the Chief Minister? But towards the end of his speech when I came back to this House he said I was bold enough, or that I had taken courage to come to this House. Sir, I assure the Member for Kelawei that I am not afraid of him. That demonstrates two things: First, the application of this Federal Act fell upon the State Government, and the State Government acted accordingly to 398B. And 398B allowed this appointment of various members in the Government. That shows further that the Government in our State sekarang ada tunjuk chance—sekali adalah semangat tanggungjawab bersama atau to demonstrate the spirit of collective responsibility; and therefore matters can be handled by my colleagues in the Government. Earlier in another debate in this House I had already indicated that with this vast amount of work going on in the State, with this enormous push, I have never myself claimed absolute credit or absolute autocracy. Here we practise democracy; and we practice it fully. And the degree of sharing of responsibility, sharing of work, exchange of ideas constantly

goes on. The fact that we come here to debate this Motion is also a demonstration of parliamentary democracy in action. So the Honourable Member from Kelawei need not try to impose that we are not democratic. We are democratic enough to take this matter up because the Honourable Member for Kelawei, not having very much substance to go by to support his Motion, had to talk round and round sebab itulah peripatetic—dalam perkataan—in this dictionary by chance. And as usual, whenever he is short of points he reads back the Proceedings of this House, particularly things that I have said before in the course of years. And I would say that I like very much to see the Honourable Member for Kelawei reading things that I mentioned before; and I hope that he learns from them. And being a very ungenerous person at times he has told this House that he learns from my mistakes. Mr Speaker, Sir, that I hope too is a good thing because one sometimes does make mistakes. And when somebody younger learns from the mistakes that one makes, and makes an improvement on it, it is a good thing. But don't for heaven's sake make a mistake where no mistake occurs. You see, if you really want to learn, be it the first son or the first daughter, of the first daughter, or otherwise, do learn carefully. And where no mistakes occur do not try to make a mistake out of it.

Sir, in actual fact the manner whereby the present situation prevails is perfectly proper and perfectly legal. The annual Budgets of all the five Local Councils in the State are prepared in accordance with the provisions of Section 46 of the Municipal Ordinance.

Sir with your permission: 'The President—which of course now has got to be interpreted—shall in every year prepare a Budget containing an estimate of the available municipal revenue for the next ensuing year an estimate of all balances, if any, exclusive of moneys raised by loan which will be available for ordinary expenditure at the commencement of the next ensuing year, an estimate ' Sir, I think Section 46 of the Municipal

Ordinance stands. I needn't try to waste the time of the House as the Honourable Member for Kelawei does. It is prepared in accordance with the provisions of Section 46 of the Municipal Ordinance, and submitted to the State Authority for approval under Section 47. Sir, I do not think I have to read it. We must presume that Honourable Members are in possession of the *Gazettes* and do read. It is clear thus that the Budgets of all the Councils, including the City Council, are outside the control of this House. No useful purpose therefore would be achieved by tabling such Budgets in this House for debate. As the Honourable Member for Kelawei is aware, the Local Authorities in the State are administered in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Ordinance, Chapter 133: All Budgets of the Councils are passed in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Ordinance. To ask for the Budgets to be tabled in this House is in fact asking the Government to do what the law does not require the Government so to do. The Government is satisfied with the existing system with regard to preparation and submission of Annual Budgets by the Local Authorities. Furthermore, I would like to assure the Honourable Member for Kelawei that the Budgets of Councils are only approved after very careful consideration by the State Authority. It is the considered view of the Government that the present procedure of presentation of the Budgets by the Local Authorities shall therefore remain. Mr Speaker, Sir, very briefly I have answered. The present procedure is appropriate and legal.

Now, going to the question of whether it is satisfactory, Mr Speaker Sir, the Honourable Member for Kelawei has one of the liberties remaining with the Members of the Opposition—that he can come here and say precisely what he himself thinks. But taking into consideration the constraint of responsibilities, I do not wish therefore to imply that he is irresponsible. Mr Speaker, Sir, from my personal point of view, if I may be allowed to express

a personal point of view, the present situation as it stands today, leading to the method of presentation of the Budgets could perhaps be more satisfactorily made. But under the present provisions of the law it is a satisfactory method of tabling and preparing the Budgets. Sir, I say with all sincerity, as I have said before in this House that the Government would wish that the Federal Authorities at the Parliamentary level would as soon as possible carry out what has already been announced by the Minister for Local Government and Technology following meetings of the National Council of Local Government, and also in statements made in Parliament—that the restructuring of the Councils for the benefit of the people, and for the better functioning of these Councils will be carried out as soon as possible. The main reason, Sir, why one Bill which stood under my name did not go through after the First Reading is a normal procedure provided for under our Standing Orders. It was not withdrawn only except that the Government decided to take it up to First Reading; and the Second Reading is postponed to a subsequent Meeting. Sir, that is all. It is quite normal, and quite stable. And the Honourable Member for Kelawei need not try to insinuate all sorts of things. The reason really is that the Federal Authority intends to move two Bills in a Parliamentary Meeting not very long from now. Sir, I have to be very careful of this because I have been assured many times before that it could have been moved very much earlier, but other considerations have to be taken into mind. But to all intents and purposes these draft Bills are already in preparation; and that was the only reason. Sir may I therefore briefly re-summarise that the long speech of the Honourable Member for Kelawei and the taunted speech by the Honourable Member for Bagan Ajam did not bring any case whatsoever to support this Motion, or to make this Motion valid, because in every way it is proper, it is legal and it is in accordance with all the laws of our country to do precisely what the Government is doing now. But in

actual fact what the Honourable Member for Kelawei is asking us to do is not what he said—to be democratic and so on. What he is actually asking us to do is to act *ultra vires* to the law; to be beyond the law, because, Sir, by quotation he used the word “must.” So, how must? “Must” because the D.A.P. thinks so? Because the Honourable Member for Kelawei thinks so? Even though the law does not provide for it, we must do it because Mr Yeap Ghim Guan, Member for Kelawei, says so?

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): You forget your walk-out. You did walk out.

Ketua Menteri: Sir, that is why to the Honourable Member for Kelawei, after so many times in this House I have taught him to be very careful of my planned pauses for him to come forward and make a mistake, I have said, “Please do not make mistake when no mistake was implied.” Because at the time in 1967 I made my speech—I’m reminded by him—as an adjournment speech; I took my point where I knew that point could not be answered by the Chief Minister in the way that the present Chief Minister is answering to the Member for Kelawei.

Ahli Kawasan Jelutong (Encik Koay Boon Seng): Tuan Speaker, dengan izin bercakap dalam Bahasa Inggeris.

I rise to support the Motion put up by my colleague on my right, the Honourable Member for Kelawei. The Government in 1969 promised the electorate the restoration of the City Council of George Town to the people in its Election Manifesto. In fact (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member for Jelutong, we are debating this question that until the elections are restored to these Councils the annual Budgets be debated in this Assembly; so please do not go on to the Manifesto which has been spoken about so many times before.

Ahli Kawasan Jelutong (Encik Koay Boon Seng): Yes, Sir.

Sir, in every State in the Federation the right of the people to make representations at the local level remains a lip service. Sir, the present Government imitated the previous Chief Minister, taking a leaf out of the book of Wong Pow Nee in an egotistic image, and swallowed the four remaining Local Councils in the State without the courtesy of due notice to the public.

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member for Jelutong, that has been very amply put forward by the mover of the Motion himself. We should keep ourselves to fresh points. We don’t want to repeat the same things.

Ahli Kawasan Jelutong (Encik Koay Boon Seng): Sir, I would like to deal with a few items as an example of how all is not necessarily well in the City Council, and which need explanation from those who run the City Council. Sir, under the Budget of the City Council, Parks and Open Spaces, Dato Kramat Grounds maintenance is set out as \$9,000 in the 1973 Budget; and \$18,248 for the Esplanade Grounds. Sir, everyone will agree that Dato Kramat Grounds is more extensive; yet the Esplanade costs twice as much to maintain. Sir, what does this imply? One implication is that what is claimed by the Honourable the Chief Minister regarding the returfing of the Esplanade Grounds after each Pesta is either misleading or inadequate. So actually the cost to the ratepayers in the City in allowing the continual use of the grounds for the Pesta, it would appear, comes to more than \$8,000. We also know that after six months the grounds are not fit for strolling or for games as the turf has still not been restored. Why this waste of money, and waste of amenities? Administrators will realise the pollution of our City, and deterioration of our flora. It is important to keep public grounds free and healthy. Thousands of children are deprived of the facility of a seaside playground because of the failure of the City or State Authority to decide

on a permanent site for the Annual Pesta, and of a responsible approach to the utility of the ratepayers.

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member for Jelutong, very sorrowfully I have to interrupt you at this stage. We are debating a Motion to bring the Budget here for debate. We are not debating with the Budget itself. If we are debating the Budget itself you will be perfectly correct. We are not debating on the merits of the Budget, but why this Budget should be passed here.

Ahli Kawasan Jelutong (Encik Koay Boon Seng): I'm trying to illustrate.

Tuan Speaker: I do not think the House here so lacks the capacity to understand the point that we need possibly 20 illustrations to illustrate one point. I am sure at least 24 illustrations have been given by the mover of the Motion. There has been a lot of latitude, a lot of repetitions, and a lot of irrelevancies. Let us keep on confining ourselves to certain points. Please carry on.

Ahli Kawasan Jelutong (Encik Koay Boon Seng): Sir, I am going on to a new point—on the City Budget.

Tuan Speaker: Do not debate the Budget itself, please—illustration of how the Budget was this and that. Go on to new points which you think are relevant. We do not need further illustrations.

Ahli Kawasan Jelutong (Encik Koay Boon Seng): Sir, regarding the Motion put up by my colleague, it is clear that this debate will determine for the people who is against consultation with the people. The developments in this House and the Councils themselves prove beyond any doubt that this state of affairs, mistakes of one man, cannot go on. We may be an island State in many ways; but we have no room for dictators. To those who vote against this Motion, let them bid the people's condemnation in the years to come. In taking a stand against this Motion, the Gerakan—Alliance

Government is showing its true colours. In this debate, Sir, the people will see once and for all the insincerity and the total lack of principle in the utterances of Members of the present Government, beginning with the Chief Minister who had sat at this side of the House and frowned about his concern over the Alliance taking over the City Council.

Tuan Speaker saya menyokong Usul ini.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap): Tuan Speaker, dengan izin:

The Honourable the Chief Minister earlier spoke on the Motion to table the Councils' Accounts in this House. The participation by the Honourable the Chief Minister, as expected, was short. The question is, Mr Speaker, Sir, why the Ketua Menteri took only a few minutes to participate in the debate on this Motion? Simply because what the Honourable the Chief Minister referred to as mistakes were in fact mistakes made during the days of Wong Pow Nee; and in fact mistakes which were continually being made till this present day under the administration of the present Ketua Menteri. Sir, the Chief Minister, as usual, prefers to keep the debate on this Motion to a few words rather than to labour in it. The very words which in the earlier debates he used to advise the Member for Dhoby Ghaut should in fact be applied to him now—Silence is golden. The Honourable the Ketua Menteri is keeping his golden silence.

Sir, the Ketua Menteri went on to say it is very legal; and therefore it is unnecessary to present the Budgets of the Councils in this House. But if at all it is legal, if at all it is unnecessary, why did the Honourable Member for Kota, right over here in this House, on this very seat, decide to challenge the previous administration under Wong Pow Nee?

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member from Tanjong Bungah, I must say that that matter was already brought up.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap): It is true, Tuan Speaker, that this matter has already been brought up; but it was brought up in a different angle. What I am bringing up is from a different angle.

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member from Tanjong Bungah, may I say that no matter from which angle you approach a problem it is not the point. Let us arm ourselves with Standing Orders, and let us desist (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap): I was saying earlier that the Ketua Menteri, as a Member of the Opposition, insisted on Council Budgets being tabled in this House. And now he goes on to say (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: Exactly the same point was made by the mover of the Motion.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap): Tuan Speaker, with due respect to you I don't think the Honourable Member for Kelawei had said what I am going to say now.

Tuan Speaker: What you have said was actually said. If you have something new to say, please carry on.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap): This is new; so I would like to ask you to interrupt me less often. (*ketawa*).

Tuan Speaker: I will not only interrupt you Honourable Member from Tanjong Bungah. I will stop you from speaking if you go on with irrelevancies and repetitions, under Standing Orders.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap): Sir, I think I am well covered by the Standing Order.

Sir, the Honourable Ketua Menteri said, when he participated in the debate, that there was no necessity to bring the Budget into this House; that what the Honourable Member for

Kelawei was merely asking the present Administration to do was what was supposed to be illegal. Those were the words of the Honourable the Chief Minister. But I would like to ask the Honourable the Chief Minister where the money for the 5 Councils—4 District Councils and one City Council—come from? Does the money come from the estate of the Ketua Menteri? In fact, the money comes from the people of this State. Sir, the money got for the Budgets of the 4 District Councils and the City Council in the State of Penang, belong to rate-payers in Penang. All of them . . . (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: Even that point, Honourable Member from Tanjong Bungah, has been made by the mover.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap): The Ketua Menteri says it is not necessary. I am telling the Ketua Menteri that (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: If a point has been made, and the Ketua Menteri in his rebuttal of the Motion said something, it does not mean that any Member on this other side can repeat what he said.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Selatan (Encik Wong Choong Woh): Peraturan 47 (1). Apabila Tuan Speaker bercakap, Ahli Yang Berhormat sila duduk.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): That is all you can say.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Selatan (Encik Wong Choong Woh): Saya harap Tuan Speaker ambil ruling dengan sekeras begitunya.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): We will elect you as the new Speaker next month.

Tuan Speaker: Let us keep ourselves cool; and let us keep ourselves within Standing Orders. We are coming to the end.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tuan Speaker, Sir, the air-conditioning has failed. I am not sure; but the temperature is rising. I

think perhaps it is the air-conditioning. We may have to ask the P.W.D. to look at it.

Tuan Speaker: I don't think the air-conditioning has failed.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): I feel rather warm.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap): The behavior of Government Members is expected. We have always expected this Motion to be sensitive to Members of the present Government, particularly to the front—benchers—so sensitive that they have refused throughout the whole afternoon to be present to listen to the argument of the Member for Kelawei during the debate on the Motion. Sensitive particularly for the Member for Tanjong Barat and the Ketua Menteri.

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

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker Sir, I demand that the Member for Tanjong Barat withdraw the word "fools". He has no respect for the Chair. I ask you to make a ruling.

Tuan Speaker: If you used the word "fools" please withdraw.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Encik Teh Ewe Lim): I beg to withdraw.

Tuan Speaker: I think Members should keep their cool. We are about to come to the last Motion. It will be a great pity if Members cannot keep their cool at this stage.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap): We are quite prepared to be called by any name. We know the quality of most of the Members of the front bench. In fact the Member for Tanjong Barat should not behave as he had earlier done for the simple reason that he was the very Member of this House who got himself involved when he was sitting right here. I see no reason why he should get so sensitive about it now when he fought for what we are asking now.

Tuan Speaker: I think that has nothing to do with the Motion itself, Honourable Member from Tanjong Bungah.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap): Sir, agreed. It may not have any bearing; but it is in reply to the kind of behavior that we witnessed just a few moments ago.

Sir, as I said, regarding the Budgets of the Councils, far from it being unnecessary to bring them to this House, we on this side of the House, the duly elected Members of the D.A.P. representing at least 3 constituencies of the State of Penang involving hundreds of thousands of citizens in the State of Penang, because of their desire to seek supervision over the Budgets of the Councils in the State of Penang, are here debating this Motion. Who else should supervise the budgets if not by duly elected members of this House? Public opinion is that these Budgets must be scrutinised and supervised. They are interested to know what the present Administration is going to do with their money. They are ratepayers. They pay the money. They have the right to know. If we do not move a motion in this House for Budgets to be tabled in this House then alternatively we have to urge the Government in power to have speedy local elections for the proper and duly elected Councillors to look after the finances of the Councils; to look into the Budgets of the Councils in the interests of the people; in the interests of the ratepayers whose money the Councils are spending, and how they are spending the money—rightly, wrongly or otherwise. But with all the powers and duties vested in the hands of the Ketua Menteri who is the Officer Administering the 4 District Councils and the City Council, and who has got all the duties that only a superman can perform efficiently, we are of the opinion that unless we assist in looking into the Budgets, the Ketua Menteri alone will not be able, though he may wish to, to efficiently look into and study the various accounts and budgets of the 5 Councils in the State of Penang. And that is why we are

concerned. And that is why the people in the State of Penang are concerned. It is not because we think that the Ketua Menteri is not efficient; but because we feel the Ketua Menteri has assumed duties beyond what a normal person can assume or can shoulder. This is what we are arguing about. For the Ketua Menteri to tell this House that we are asking for something that is illegal, then the Ketua Menteri when he was asking the previous Administration to do something that was illegal! It is surprising, Sir, for the Ketua Menteri who is a very experienced politician of 20 years or 30 years—while he was here he had had political experience for 20 years—to do something which he considers to be a mistake now when he is sitting on the Government side. The question is whether he finds it correct here, or finds it incorrect there after he has become the Chief Minister and assumed all the responsibilities, or whether he was really politiking while he was here? This is the question. For the Ketua Menteri to demonstrate his sense of hypocrisy while he is opposite us now is something we least expect. We sincerely hope that with all his political experience, and with all his ability to tongue-twist, he will not forget . . . (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member from Tanjong Bungah, I think this is absolutely irrelevant.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap): I am ending, Sir. I am winding up. We hope that the Ketua Menteri will (*gangguan*).

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, on point of clarification, Sir. I had in my reply to the Honourable Member for Kelawei stated precisely what it meant. If Honourable Members were to read very carefully what was expressed previously in 1967—he said they wanted to find out whether the Government was fully aware under what powers they acted—because the debate terminated the adjournment speech on that day I was able to get on and press my point. And now the

Honourable Member from Kelawai asked how I raised this thing. Sir, I have indicated precisely and exactly that the point demonstrates two different issues.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap): Tuan Speaker, dengan izin: This is yet another common twist of the Ketua Menteri who apparently has got two tongues, or more tongues. We have for 4 years been admiring the manner in which he twists. We never hoped and will not hope to learn from the manner in which he twists because that is the fastest way to twist all his political career into the drain. Sir, I sincerely hope that with all the abilities and capabilities of the Ketua Menteri he will look into this; and study this Motion today carefully with a view to presenting the Budgets of the 4 District Councils and the City Council when we meet again in this House. Thank you.

Tuan Speaker: Would you like to reply?

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Yes, of course, Mr Speaker, if there are no other speakers.

Tuan Speaker: I think we will keep within Standing Orders. You should speak only on observations that have arisen.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Yes, precisely, the observations that have arisen during the course of the debate. I am well aware that we will be keeping in accordance with the Standing Orders.

I am very glad—before I go on, I am summing up—that I have had this opportunity to speak before you in a substantial debate, and had the opportunity to partake in part in other debates. I must say that I appreciate that you are carrying out a difficult task; and I hope that our absent Speaker will not be absent too long because he is well missed; and I hope that his ailment will very soon disappear; and I hope it is not psycho-somatic.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we in this House had intended this debate to be moved in a previous Sitting of the House. And Honourable Members will recall that this was in fact on the Order Paper. But unlike Members of the Government, what we put in the Order Paper we intend to carry out. And if we do not carry them out it is because of, shall we say, unforeseen circumstances—circumstances that are unforeseen on our part; but certainly, Sir, not unforeseen on the part of the Government Members. It is quite plain, as a result of my suspension from this House, that we could not move this debate earlier than we had intended to. But for the Chief Minister to say that he had known about this and that, we have nothing to say. It is new, Sir. This is the first time that we move it.

Sir, we on this side of the House would like to have the impression whether this will be the last session; whether indeed the Alliance Government will have the guts, and the courage particularly—the controlling element of the UMNO—to hold early elections. We do not know. But this may well be—I do not know—the last Meeting. And we had hoped that we would leave with memories that at least the Ketua Menteri is a man who is vested with some degree of sincerity, honesty, integrity and a personal charm, in that he will not attempt to distort from the first day of the Assembly to the last day of the Assembly. We hope that there will be some redeeming features. The word 'Ketua' is not defined in Bahasa. I do not have to look up under 'p' and find interesting words and make a mockery of the debate. I am not very well versed in attempting to belittle people here. No, Sir, we from the D.A.P. put our points sincerely. And if we fail to put them forward in as beautiful a manner, and as engaging a manner as the Ketua Menteri with his vast experience, we say we beg to be corrected. But the Ketua Menteri, Sir, does not behave like a person who should be old and distinguished. Mr Speaker, Sir, from the charges that he levels against us

we can only conclude that he is in fact egoistical and immature, because we had expected the Head of a Government to give substantial replies. No matter how he sees the Motion as irrelevant, he should give us a reply in a manner becoming the office and the dignity of that office. But I am afraid that from the notes that I have been able to jot down there is in fact nothing new in reply, and the manner of reply. And that indeed is very sad because this debate, Sir, is not a debate which we from the D.A.P. particularly are attempting to gain any point politically. In fact, we had moved in an earlier debate which failed to achieve any reply from the Government. But that is a matter of the past. That is a matter of regret. But we had hope that a matter of this nature which should be entirely non-partisan would be received in a manner becoming of the Chief Minister of the State. Sir, we hope that the newspapers will have a lot of reports in connection with the debates from the various States. And you will see, Sir, that other Menteri Besars and Ketua Menteris do not indulge in this matter of attempting to belittle Members of the Opposition who dare—I say 'dare'—to bring Motions. And we will bring Motions if need be to stress the issues that pertain to this State. And we will not be in the very least deterred by any intimidation on the part of the Chief Minister, by his method of belittling Members in this House, or by abstaining from this Chamber, attempting to create the impression that this is a stupid Motion not worthy of consideration. Sir, I would say respectfully, in connection with the absent Speaker, that if this is an erratic and irrelevant Motion then we would have been the first person to have excluded it as frivolous. But no, Sir; that was not done. And the Ketua Menteri, as the Head of the Local Authority, hasn't got the sense of responsibility, Sir, to come to this House and debate in a decent and civilized manner. That is to be regretted. That is apparently a contagious disease on the opposite benches—for the confronted Member to use unparliamentary language in this

House; and he says there is no point indulging in this thing; and then apologizing for it. It is not out of sincerity. And that is the basic lack among the Members of the Government—lack of sincerity.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we are well aware that the Ketua Menteri has attempted to duplicate me in this House. He has tried to filibuster the whole of this morning. That's why we were well aware; and we did not object. And he went from Nibong Tebal to Perak, and back again; and talked a lot of nonsense—Gua Chempedak, and all that. I saw he was quite unrestrained. And we appreciate your position. But we were not aware that this was an attempt to filibuster, and inadequately, Sir. I would expect that filibustering by a Ketua Menteri would be of a higher standard. But unfortunately it was very tiring; and we sustained it. We have learned to take the cut and thrust. And the cut is below the belt sometimes. But we can take the cut and thrust. But, Sir, we are well aware of this practice by the Ketua Menteri of avoiding issues. That was why the Motion of No-Confidence had to be debated, into the late hours of the night. And that is why again, Sir, an issue of such importance as the Local Councils of this State has to be debated after four o'clock; and debated into the late of night. As one Member from the Opposition said, "The Ketua Menteri does the dirty bit at night." In the dark at night he does all these things. If it is a stand that he can be proud about, by all means, Sir, speak from the roof top of this State. But when he does this we are not beaten. We are prepared to speak at midnight if need be. We are not here to seek publicity. We are here to do our duty as we honestly see it. And whether it is reported in the Hansard, or whether it is reported in tomorrow's newspaper is entirely, Sir, irrelevant. So let not the Ketua Menteri think that his method of filibustering has achieved anything. He has not achieved anything. What he has achieved, if at all, is to lower his estimation in our eyes.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I say that if at all anything is pathetic it is the reply of the Ketua Menteri—a wholly inadequate reply. A reply, Sir, that falls short of the standard that we have grown to expect from him at least. Perhaps it is due to the hours that we are in. And it has also lost its thrust; and it has lost its sharpness. It in fact apologizes to this House as to why he cannot accept this Motion, and why he has to turn tail and, like a ship, show no trail. It leaves no path. The water will cover up its trail. Sir, unfortunately the Ketua Menteri may be anything; but he is certainly not a ship. He may be on the Alliance boat; but he himself is not a ship. The Alliance ship may take him to many places.

Tuan Speaker: That is completely irrelevant.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Sir, there are a lot of things that are irrelevant. And I think I have a right—the cut and thrust—to reply.

Tuan Speaker: You have got some points.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Yes, Mr Speaker, Sir. That is why we are very unhappy that in spite of all that we have heard none of the points we have raised have been dealt with in substance. And we are glad that the Ketua Menteri tells us not to take too seriously what he has spoken in this House. Precisely, it would appear, Sir, that we cannot take what he says too seriously because for one thing I was embarking on—with your permission, Sir, if I may in the cut and thrust of the House refer to the example that if one were to look at the records of this House, the topic about whether we cope with the National Language or not—if one were to look at the records of this House for one thing, in spite of the fact that he has tried to play the National Language line the Ketua Menteri himself has never made a substantial speech in Malay. But now that he is the Ketua Menteri there he is trying to teach us a few

things. But we at least have made substantial address in this House in Malay. That shows, Sir, the insincerity of the man. Mr Speaker, Sir, he has said that I have made mistakes. And I think I have the right to refute what he says. He says that I do not know what is right or not right; and I make the mistakes, not him. That is the manner in which he likes to twist things. And it is a concrete sign of immaturity and old age. (*Ketawa*). Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to reply to this particularly interesting entry. He said I made a mistake, Sir. Sir, I did not print this particular, what you may call, 'Hansard of this House. But I would like the Ketua Menteri to see for himself. It is the Third Sitting of the Fourth Session, Wednesday, 27th March, 1968, if the Clerk of the Council could give him a copy if he is not too busy dreaming away, or trying to appear to dream. Sir, these are his own words in this House. If he has any respect for himself he would withdraw his words.

Tuan Speaker: Honourable Member, this is enough of irrelevancy.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): It is relevant because he has raised the matter that I have made a mistake. I haven't made a mistake, Sir; so I think I am entitled in fairness and equity to reply to this point.

Tuan Speaker: Please reply direct to the point.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Yes, Sir. Now, he says here—these are his own words—'Sir, I would like with great deference to the Honourable the Legal Advisor try to answer your question.' This is the Member for Kota. He is still the Member for Kota. He may be the Ketua Menteri. What actually happened was that on the 28th April, 1966, this House, the State Legislative Assembly, made an amendment; and this amendment is called the Penang Enactment No. 1 of 1966. What I am trying to stress is: Here is a mistake. I am just trying to show him that to err is human. But he thinks he is superhuman. On the 28th of April he says the Enactment

was passed. As I said, I do not take what he says word for word. I have to countercheck with officers of this House, and with my records. And I have checked that actually the Enactment was passed in the Sitting of this House . . . (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: On the 23rd June, or something like that.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Sir, I have to verify it. You cannot take my word for it because the Ketua Menteri says I made a mistake. On the 23rd of March, 1966. There you are. That is your mistake. Have the guts and the mandate to stand and admit it is a mistake; and admit yourself and damn the thing. But don't . . . (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: Please withdraw the word 'damn.'

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Alright, I withdraw. And let us forget about it. (*Ketawa*). But let us not behave in this immature manner. I would like to have some respect for the Ketua Menteri; but I cannot respect somebody who twists and turns on things that are so patent, Sir. So patent! One cannot deny that grass is green; but he would insist that it is black. Mr Speaker, Sir, he likes to say that we take a small point, and beat a big thing out of it. And his gesturing: sometimes it is interesting to watch him because he has been called a Bob Hope. (*Ketawa*). Mr Speaker, Sir, this is why I say it is a method of contortions. The Chief Minister is not only a politician; he is a contortionist. He says that—God only knows!—this transfer back and forth of power is a sign of responsibility. I hope that it is not an unparliamentary explanation. But I think God only knows whether if you transfer from yourself to the Committee of the great Member for Tanjong Barat who uses this kind of language, and the Member—I think, if I am not mistaken. He is not here—for Tanjong Utara, and the Financial Officer; and then to come back you transfer to yourself; and then you transfer, Mr Speaker,

Sir, to yourself and Exco Members; and back to yourself, can we have any confidence in what you are doing. And you say that it is responsibility? This playing around on his musical chairs: that is no responsibility, Sir. Mr Speaker, Sir, if he says that the responsibility as imposed by the Federal Government has fallen on him. I think that is rather out of question for the simple reason that it is only the State of Penang that has seen fit to grab all the five Local Councils. Let us look at the State of Perak. Ipoh has not been taken over by the State Government. So, how do you lay this responsibility on the Federal Government? Let us call a spade a spade. And you have grabbed the Local Councils. Grab it and say, "I, Lim Chong Eu, grab it," and don't say, "I acted on instructions of the Federal Government," just as you said, "I acted on the instructions of the Federal Government when I increased the quit rent," which is not true.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we would like to have here in this House very coherent arguments. An that is what we anticipate. But this kind of blurred and garbled reasoning comes from Members on the right of the Chief Minister, excluding the Penasihat—with due respect to him, he hasn't been drawn in he quite wisely abstains—because some of the stands taken by the Chief Minister absolutely cannot be taken by any sensible person. And I would come to it very soon because he says it is *ultra vires*, and the rest of it. We would like to know whether it is *ultra vires*. Indeed we would like to know. I regret that although it is eight o'clock the affairs of the State are more important than our stomachs. Mr Speaker, Sir, he says that he—this is very interesting, and these are his words—does not claim absolute autocracy. I did not say that the Ketua Menteri claimed absolute autocracy. Maybe you may have used the word; I did not hear. But I might claim, after having heard what he said, that he is claiming 99% autocracy. Not absolute; 99%. And power we know will corrupt—99%. And that is what is happening in this State. And

that is why the A.C.A. has to come. It is a shame for a Government to invite the A.C.A. Mr Speaker, Sir, the Ketua Menteri, we know, with some of his experience could play around with words. And that is something that we look forward to because that adds to the colour of the debate. Because if we have the Member for Tanjong Barat just saying "fools," and all that, it is not going to contribute (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: I think we are repeating many times over, Honourable Member.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, we hope that Members of the Government will contribute constructively to this debate. It is an eternal hope, Sir. And it is perhaps as hopeless. Perhaps that is the word—hopeless; tidak ada harapan.

Mr Speaker, we are astonished that the Members of the UMNO have no stand in this matter. Perhaps it is the saying that they abstained in the debate of No-Confidence. They also have no stand in that. But we could have expected the Coalition partners to have supported each other in this debate. It appears that there is a difference of views.

Tuan Speaker: What is the relevancy to your closing remarks?

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): It is relevant, Sir, in summing up, that the Government is divided on the Motion. Sir, it is relevant. It is my conclusion. It may not be the conclusion of the House. Saya tidak ada (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: You yourself admitted that on closing this Motion—please sit down—you would be speaking on points raised in observation by the opposite side. But I allowed you (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, with due respect, one can obtain observations from what is uttered, and what

is not uttered in this House. I think you will accept that silence does indicate certain things. So I am entitled to my conclusions.

Tuan Speaker: When no observation is made . . . (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): I can criticize the failure to make an observation, I think.

Tuan Speaker: I don't think so.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Be that as it may, Sir. As I say, their Coalition may not be working very well. But I have made my point. The point is that it appears, Sir, that there is an inability on the part, at best, of the Government to reply. At most there is a division of views. Sir, if the Ketua Menteri would like to look at the Standing Orders I would read for him.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I definitely say here that what the Honourable the Chief Minister claims of the Budget being outside the control of this House, is utter—and I like to use the word which I hope is not unparliamentary—bunkum, which are the words used in fact in this House earlier, because the State List, Sir, under the Federal Constitution is very clear. And I read, with your permission again: 'List No. 4—Local Government, etc., Federal capital including local administration, municipal corporations, Local, Town and Rural Boards, and other local authorities, local government service, local rates, local elections.' Could that be made any clearer, Sir, Could those who drafted the Constitution make it any clearer? Would they have to write here that it also allows a Motion to debate the Budgets of the Local Councils in this House? Would they have to? I know that even the previous Legal Advisor was at pains, Sir, to explain to the Chief Minister that one can imply the law. That was in this great adjournment speech. And there again Sir, the Chief Minister is only capable of making adjournment speeches; but he does not bring substantial Motions. But, Sir, here is clearly a mandate for us to take in this House. And

the Chief Minister tries to distort the facts and the Constitution by saying, 'Oh, this is outside the control of this House.' How is it outside the control of this House, Sir? We can abolish, Sir, the Local Councils. That is how outside it is. We can call it the Budget of the Local Councils if we choose to, and we have the majority. But how outside the control of this House is that? We expect a man of the Honourable Chief Minister's—I won't use the word 'experience,' but—length of participation in politics to have a great regard for the words that he uses in this House because these are recorded. But when he comes and tells this House that I, Sir, have no right to move this Motion, and that it is outside the jurisdiction of this House, I say again that it is utter bunkum. And I have no respect for somebody who does that.

Sir, we are not asking the Government to do anything outside the law, We are asking the Government to do something that is entirely *intra vires*. And the fact that the Chief Minister has to bear the brunt of legal opinion on his own indicates that he is on a limb by himself, and is not on all fours with anybody except his team mates.

Mr Speaker, Sir, it is very clear that the provisions of the Municipal Ordinance do not preclude us from debating the Budget in this House, although the Chief Minister, in his show of kindness, tells us, 'Oh, I don't like to burden the House. I would like to read only a bit of it.' And this is where he himself does not take his own injunction. And I say that he should read everything: and read properly, and understand it because I can tell the House that there is nothing in Sections 46 or 47 that says that the Budget cannot be presented here, and that it is *ultra vires*. I challenge the Chief Minister to say that it is *ultra vires*, and substantiate it with legal argument. If he can't then better shut up.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the law is very clear. We do not come here and introduce *ultra vires* Motions. We do what we know is right; and we carry it out to the best of our ability. The same

cannot be said about Members of the Government who hide behind the sarong of the Ketua Menteri, and who hide behind other sarongs as well.

Sir, how can the Chief Minister say that the situation is entirely satisfactory? How? He himself posed the question, although he would like to distort it. We are, of course, not vested with the advantages of this House to be able to read everything that he says in this House—every word without rejection. Therefore we cannot, it would appear. But, Sir, should the Ketua Menteri take advantage of the situation and try to distort what he did in this House? It is highly immoral. The point is very clear. He himself said that it is highly unsatisfactory. He asked the question; and he said it was highly unsatisfactory. I know that in his egoistical mania he would like to say, 'Oh, we planned everything. This was a trap,' and all that. Sir, tell that to the marines. Tell it to the school children—'This little thing that I anticipated, I did this'—and leave it to the school children who play this kind of things. This is assembly of your elders. Whether you like it or not it is your assembly of your elders. And we are in no way going to be bluffed and huffed by you just because you have the advantage of the House.

Sir, I like to repeat this part of it—and I will go on. There are other matters, Sir—where he says that everything is entirely above board. I don't like to take too much of the time of the House; but I feel that the records must be set straight, if you have any respect for what we are doing here. He says here, with your permission:

"Whilst I appreciate the State Authority under the Ordinance has the power to further extend the period, it would have been salutary to the purposes of the State, in order to preserve the State's rights"

So at this time he was really concerned about the State's rights and the State's powers of control. These are his words:

". . . . State's powers of control over matters pertaining to local government"

And what are matters pertaining to local government if it is not the Budget?

May I know that? Without the Budget how do the Local Councils function? Without the Budget how do you pay yourself in this State, and vote yourself in places of profit?

" pertaining to local government and the control of Town Councils and the City Council of George Town particularly, if the Government had thought it fit at least to come back to this House "

And here he says, 'come back to this House with the full knowledge that it has the power to act arbitrarily.' So, with the full knowledge! I know—with the full knowledge that it has the power to act arbitrarily. But all the same show your diplomacy. Show your being above board. Come back to the House with the full knowledge that he has the powers to act arbitrarily within the State. Sir, I apologise. I withdraw the word 'arbitrarily.' It is not very polite.

" . . . has the full power to act within the provisions of the Enactment by virtue of the fact that the State Assembly gave its assent to the amendment on the understanding that the main reason why the City Council should be suspended and be taken over by the Chief Minister or such other persons in authority was because of the inquiry into the affairs of the City Council. Therefore, Sir, it would have been, I think, a matter of courtesy "

He says it is a matter of courtesy. That is where we defer. But it would appear he is not courteous in this house in any event. In his own words:

" . . . the Legislative Assembly of this State if the Government had deemed it fit to come back and explain its reasons why it wished to carry on."

Here are the words of the Honourable the Chief Minister. Do they sound sincere now, Honourable Members of the House? Take away your Party Whip, and take away your Party affiliation. It may sound rather hollow at this late hour of the night.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Chief Minister goes on to accuse the Government of being dictatorial. I have read earlier the part about Estimates of Revenue of the State Government being presented to the Governor in Council, and I need not go over that again. Of course, we

cannot account for the lapse of memory of the Ketua Menteri. But how satisfactory is it, Sir, to present the Budget of the five Councils? And how do we get it? Does the Chief Minister, as the Officer Administering the Local Councils, present his Budget to his Exco of which he is the Head? How wonderful! I would like to sit for examinations where I set the Paper and I mark the Paper. I am sure I will pass the Bahasa easily. Therefore, Sir, even a child can see through the puerile arguments of the Ketua Menteri. And now he goes on, Sir, from this point to the fact that there is restructuring. Sir, I accept. But there is no restructuring of the Local Councils at all. And he refers to the Minister for Research and Local Government. But, Sir, if we really looked into what was said by the Minister, he has said that whatever restructuring would be done in consultation with the State Government. But what I had mentioned, and what the Chief Minister now prefers to ignore, is that in the course of a debate in this House a Motion was passed stressing the point that elected representation must be the crucial principle of any Local Government restructuring. And he had entirely forgotten that. And he has left, Sir, a big question mark on the question that I posed—whether in fact a nominated Local Council body will be set up ultimately. And I had also asked whether the Member for Tanjong Barat will be the mayor. We would like to know. And we would like to be the first to congratulate him by sending him a wreath. And this is a passing remark, if you would allow me. All I said was that it was set out in the Order Paper—and if I am mistaken—correct me—very clearly. Obviously I do not control the Speaker. I do not refer to you, Sir. There is some degree of control of the Speaker by the Government. But anybody can read, Sir. This is where again an insincerity arises. And this is where it gives us great doubts, Sir, as to the mental balance of the Honourable the Chief Minister—whether it is the level of a three-year-old kid or that of a man that should be the age that he is at. And I hope he grows older. But at the rate we are going

he may not. Maybe he is in his second childhood. Mr Speaker, Sir, it is clearly stated here, if I may read with your permission—No. 5 of the Order Paper, page 10, Bills: Supplementary Supply (1973) (No. 1) Bill, 1973. (All stages); and we would carry through all stages. And No. (2): Municipal Ordinance (Amendment) (Penang) Bill, 1973. (All stages).

Now, I was just correlating the whole issue as to how the Councils are being run—where there is obviously evidence that all is not well even in the manner in which they conduct their affairs in respect to the Councils in this House. And there you are, Sir. I am not blind, Sir. You can read through from here with your eyesight. It says “All stages.” Therefore, although you may not feel offended, I feel that as Members of the Opposition we are entitled to know, if you are not going to carry on in all stages in the next stage, why you don’t. He says it is within the Standing Orders. We know it is within the Standing Orders. I know that if the Speaker sustains the Standing Orders he would have noted that we have not been within the Standing Orders. And that is a highly irrelevant statement if ever there was one. But there you are. And he has even got the audacity to ignore the amendment to say, “Well, we have after—thoughts.” Of course, I must say—and this I concede to him—I haven’t raised this thing yet. You know, he has condescended to explain to us that it was because of two Bills that may be introduced in Parliament. Then say so. Say so. And I had used the words ‘and be damned’ you know. I withdraw them. Say so, and let us forget about it. But there you are. It is the Ketua Menteri again with his usual tricks. And I think we are sick of these comic acts. But the point is this, Sir: On one hand, Sir, we hear from the Ketua Menteri that there is rapport. He uses this word ‘rapport.’ He likes to use high-saluting words, whether it is Malay or English. He likes to use ‘rapport.’ What happened to the rapport? Where is the rapport if you don’t even know, until you have presented your Bill in this House, that the Federal Government is going to

pass two Bills that will affect your amendment? So, what is your rapport? I don't think there is any rapport, if at all, if that is any proof of anything.

Sir, I have said, if at all anything, that we are trying to impress upon this House that a control of the Budget of this House is essential to confidence in this State. I am sure no electors like to hear that the Ketua Menteri is a dictator. And these were his words, you know—dictator who grabs all the power. Tan Sri Wong Pow Nee was a dictator when he grabs the City Council. And now our Tan Sri—Oh, not 'Tan Sri'—Lim Chong Eu grabs all the Local Councils in this State. What would you call that? Dictator to the fifth power? And I say that anybody would lose confidence in a State where in fact the Ketua Menteri is conducting himself in fact as a dictator. And the fact, Sir, that the reaction of the Ketua Menteri has been so hostile to this Motion indicates that we have hit a very sore point. Maybe we have hit the spinal cord.

Mr Speaker, Sir, what we are afraid of in this House, and what we are trying to prevent in this House, and what we are trying to allow the public to have an impression of in this House is that the Budgets of the Local Councils are above board; and so that there are no accusations of corruption. That is the basic point because now I have dealt with the points raised by the Ketua Menteri. But I must give him that respect. And whether he takes it or not I give him that respect. But the Member for Bagan Ajam in his way of presenting it has raised the fact that, well, appointment of Party members and officials to the Local Councils in various respects is a sign of nepotism and political corruption. I say that in this House. And he can call the A.C.A. And perhaps it would be wise to call the A.C.A. because we are interested in some members of the Gerakan who are abusing the position of the Government in power by using the Local Councils as, I would say, a happy hunting ground. And I say here that there are members of the Gerakan who are using

the Local Councils as a happy hunting ground. And the example indicated by the Member for Bagan Ajam is an example, although it may not have been put very nicely; and helped along—that is all—by the laughter that we had by Gerakan Members who were here earlier, and who have now disappeared when I started to speak. But the point is very clear, Sir.

The crux to our Motion, Sir, is to prevent corruption in this State. Sir, if we in this House can talk about corruption when we pass a Bill of \$24 million a year, and when we talk about Housing Trust corruption, and the Chief Minister volunteers to call the A.C.A., I thought another step he should have taken to facilitate the investigation at the moment would be to ask the Political Secretary to step down for the time being. But put it aside.

Tuan Speaker: I think there has been too much rambling, Mr Honourable Member. If you have nothing more to add then we may have to close. But if you have got something new to talk about please carry on.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, as I was saying, it comes to the crux of our problem. I deviate a bit by way of illustration. If you have given me an injunction not to do so I will abide by it. But the point I would like to make very clear here is that the people of Penang are highly suspicious of Budgets of \$45 million passed by none other than the Ketua Menteri alone, when this House has to debate \$24 million Budgets. Now, if \$24 million Budgets can give rise to corruption, if at all—I use the word 'if'—what about \$45 million Budgets? And it is a known fact, Sir, that the members of the Gerakan, as the Member for Bagan Ajam has said, are infecting—I use the word 'infecting,—the Local Councils. I have asked questions of the Chief Minister; and he answered that the Publicity Secretary is in most of the Local Councils; and that Members of the Government—and, I say here, even the Member for Sungei Pinang—have

been on the Local Councils for no reason when they no more have any responsibility in this local government. What, Sir, is going on? That is the crucial point—corruption. That is the point we are going at. And let not the Chief Minister belittle this debate and say, “Oh, *ultra vires*,” and so on, and so forth; and take a side snap at the Member for Bagan Ajam. He is doing the best that he can in raising this point. And, Sir, whether you like it or not; whether you silent debate in this House or you may not; whether you pretend to look at the Malay/English dictionary or not; whether you prefer to speak half words or not; and whether you succeed in bluffing us on this side or not, Sir, don’t forget you can bluff some of the people some of the time, but not all the people all the time. And tonight, Sir, is not the night that the Chief Minister is going to succeed in bluffing anybody; even himself.

Therefore, Sir, on this side of the House, I like to thank the Members who took part in this debate. But I cannot say that because the Members of the Government did not take part in the debate. In fact the Officer Administering the Local Councils took part in the debate; nobody else. The Members on this side: The Member for Bagan Ajam tried to take part in the debate with considerable difficulty; but he did try. The Member for Tanjong Bungah did try with considerable difficulty; and the Member for Jelutong did try. But, Sir, it is not the Member for Kelawei who is speaking. It is not the Member for Tanjong Bungah or the Member for Jelutong or Bagan Ajam. No, Sir. Let the Government consider that, even in their own estimation, if at all we represent one voice from our electorate that is one voice, Sir, that has the guts. And the big question mark in the manner in which the Honourable the Chief Minister is conducting the affairs of the Local Councils: I say here that it is a matter, Sir, of deep regret. It is a matter that reflects rather poorly on the Honourable the Chief Minister that he has failed to give answers to this House. He has failed to explain the stand he took formerly.

We can only conclude—as we begin to conclude in this House as each Sitting progresses—that there is no sincerity on the part of the Members of the Government. There is even no sense of responsibility on the part of the Members of the Government. And they are hoping, Sir, by the grace of the God to live through these five years. And hopefully, with the help of the Central Government, another two years may be added as a bonus so that they can—I would not like to use the word—happily retire. But I think, Sir, that there are greater things in this State than seeking self-interest. And if at all this Motion is for any purpose it is to allow the people of Penang to have the opportunity to have some control and some deliberations over \$45 million that are passed every year. And if the Ketua Menteri, in his great wisdom, and as a man of honesty and integrity and sincerity, thinks that he alone is above all suspicion, that he alone like God can make and destroy, then I say God alone can help him when the right time comes.

Soalan dikemukakan.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap): Tuan Speaker, dengan kebenaran, saya minta division.

YA

Encik Yeap Ghim Guan
Encik Khoo Soo Giap
Encik Koay Boon Seng
Encik Tan Phock Kin
Encik V. Veerappen
Encik Ong Yi How

TIDAK

Ketua Menteri
Encik Teh Ewe Lim
Encik Tan Gim Hwa
Encik Wong Choong Woh
Encik S.P. Chelliah
Encik Ismail bin Hashim
Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Haji Abdullah
Encik Ooi Ah Bee
Encik D.C. Stewart

Tuan Haji Mohamad Nor bin Haji Bakar

Encik Khoo Teng Chye

Tuan Haji Abdul Kadir bin Haji Hassan

TIDAK HADIR

Encik Abdul Rahman bin Haji Yunus

Encik Mustapha bin Hussain

Encik Teoh Kooi Sneah

Encik Khoo Kay Por

Tuan Speaker: Keputusan pembahagian: 'Ya'—6, 'Tidak'—12, 'Tidak Hadir'—4.

Usul tidak dipersetujui.

Usul tidak dipersetujui.

7. PENANGGUHAN.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya cadang Dewan ini tangguhkan sekarang.

Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Encik Ismail bin Hashim): Tuan Speaker, saya menyokong.

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

Sir, I hope you will bear with me for a few minutes to allow me to finish my Adjournment speech. The subject of my Adjournment speech today is 'How the State Government can help the students in Butterworth.' This is a problem that all the 300,000 people in Butterworth and near the town are gravely concerned with.

Every morning, before dawn, thousands of Butterworth students have to catch the ferry to come to Penang for study. Most of these students come from very, very poor families who have to spend more in coming to Penang for studies. Therefore, I am hoping that the State Government can do something to help them. I do understand that education is in the hands of the Federal Government; but I only hope that through the good relationship and the rapport between the State Government and the Federal Government the State

Government can do something to help. I believe there are two things that the State Government can do:

(a) The State Government already has a State Scholarship Board. And I also understand from the Chief Minister that the State Exco provide certain funds for needy student to buy books. I hope that part of the funds can be extended to the students in primary schools, especially those students in the Butterworth primary schools. Most of them come from very, very poor families.

(b) I would like to bring the attention of the House to the fact that places in the secondary schools in Butterworth are not adequate to cater for students graduating from primary schools, especially from the 3 main Chinese primary schools where some 1,350 students are graduating. Mr Speaker, Sir, the Butterworth secondary schools are no longer adequate to take them all. Therefore, most of them have to come to Penang for their studies. There is a great need for a large national-type secondary school in Penang; and this need is very great indeed for a national type secondary school like Chung Ling High School, Han Chiang School or Free School in Butterworth, so that the Butterworth students can study in Butterworth schools.

As I say, the schools are in the hands of the Federal Government. But I sincerely hope that the State Government, through their very good relationship with the Federal Government, can help to bring about this large type of secondary school in Butterworth.

I suggest two things that the State Government can do:

(a) The Honourable the Chief Minister can discuss with the Ministry concerned about the setting up of this school; and maybe report to this House as regards the result of the discussion in the next Meeting.

(b) From the many thousands of acres of lands the State Government owns in Butterworth, I hope that the State Government may consider giving something like 10 acres of land to build this large type of secondary school in Butterworth.

I know there are some lands which have not been filled up yet; and I believe that many Butterworth people would come out to help and fill up the land. I had an offer from some lorry companies to fill up the land free of charge. And as regards the building funds I believe that if the Honourable the Chief Minister will initiate it and discuss with the Federal Government then these Butterworth people will happily get together and try to form a Committee to raise building funds. And I believe that with the boundless enthusiasm that the Butterworth people have for this large type of secondary school in Butterworth there will not be very big problems in raising the building funds. And also we may apply to the Federal Government for a dollar-for-dollar grant.

Therefore, I am taking this last opportunity in the House to urge—please, just for this one thing—that the Honourable the Chief Minister try to do his little bit to help the Butterworth school children who have to travel early in the morning to Penang, even before dawn. And I sincerely and wholeheartedly hope that the State Government through the Honourable the Chief

Minister, will do just this little bit to help the Butterworth students. Thank you very much.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya fikir tidak ada banyak yang saya hendak jawab, sebabnya perkara yang Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam sendiripun sudah kata, perkara-perkara yang bersangkutan dengan Kementerian Pelajaran, dan dengan sebab itu, apa-apa perkara yang disebut olehnya, Kerajaan Negeri boleh merujuk kepada Kementerian Pelajaran menggunakan Kerajaan Negeri bolehlah dijalankan Berkenaan dengan perkara murid-murid, macam mana Kerajaan Negeri boleh menolong dengan kesusahan murid-murid itu, Kerajaan Negeri akan ambil timbangan.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, with your permission, may I just ask something? This is a matter concerning the House—whether members of the public are allowed to sit in the tape-recording room. I find that certain members of the public—unauthorised personnel—are sitting in the tape-recording room. I think that is wrong. I hope that you will look into this matter that members of the public who are not personnel of this Assembly should not sit in the tape-recording room. They may be tampering with the tapes. I think that is wrong.

Tuan Speaker: I will look into this matter. Dewan ditangguhkan.

Dewan ditangguhkan pada jam 8.41 malam.