

32
Jilid IV
Bil. 5



33
Hari Jumaat
12hb April, 1974

LAPURAN PERSIDANGAN
OFFICIAL REPORT

DEWAN UNDANGAN NEGERI PULAU PINANG
YANG KETIGA
THIRD LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY PENANG

PENGGAL YANG KEEMPAT
Fourth Session

MESYUARAT YANG PERTAMA
First Meeting

Jilid IV
Bil. 5

Hari Jumaat
12hb April, 1974



LAPURAN PERSIDANGAN
OFFICIAL REPORT

DEWAN UNDANGAN NEGERI PULAU PINANG
YANG KETIGA
THIRD LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY PENANG

PENGGAL YANG KEEMPAT
Fourth Session

MESYUARAT YANG PERTAMA
First Meeting

KANDUNGANNYA

PENGUMUMAN TUAN SPEAKER [322]

(F) USUL OLEH Y.B. ENCIK TAN PHOCK KIM (SAMB.) [322]

(G) USUL OLEH Y.B. ENCIK ONG YI HOW [343]

(H) USUL OLEH Y.B. ENCIK YEAP GHIM GUAN [350] DAN [363]

PULAU PINANG

DEWAN UNDANGAN NEGERI YANG KETIGA

Laporan Persidangan

PENGGAL YANG KEEMPAT

MESYUARAT YANG PERTAMA

Hari Jumaat, 12hb April, 1974

HAZIR :

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

Yang Amat Berhormat Ketua Menteri (Dr Lim Chong Eu)

Yang Berhormat Penasihat Undang-undang Negeri (Encik Abu Talib bin Othman)

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

Yang Berhormat Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Barat (Datuk Teh Ewe Lim, D.M.P.N.)

” ” 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, J.P.)

” ” Kawasan Permatang Pauh (Tuan Haji Mohamad Nor bin Haji Bakar, J.P.)

” ” Kawasan Dhoby Ghaut (Encik Khoo Teng Chye, J.P.)

” ” 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)

Dewan bersidang semula pada jam 9.32 pagi.

DOA

PENGUMUMAN TUAN SPEAKER.

Tuan Speaker: Ahli Yang Berhormat, sebelum kita sambungkan perbahasan, saya mahu maklumkan bahawa saya harap kita akan habiskan mesyuarat kita pada hari ini. Oleh itu saya harap Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat bila berucap hendaklah pendek sedikit kerana banyak saya percaya Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat yang hendak berucap, Jika panjang-panjang barangkali kita terpaksa adakan *night session*, macam mana yang saya katakan hari itu kita mesti habiskan juga pada hari ini, kerana kita hendak beri peluang kepada Ahli-ahli Dewan Rakyat hazir di Dewan Rakyat pada hari Isnin. Dan lagi pula, pada hari ini adalah hari Jumaat, kita hendaklah tangguhkan pada pukul 12.00 tengahari dan mulakan pada pukul 2.00 petang.

(F) Usul oleh Yang Berhormat Encik Tan Phock Kin (*Sambungan*)

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Saya punya selalu pendek sahaja.

Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Encik Ismail bin Hashim): Bukan pendek tetapi ringkas.

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

Mr Speaker, Sir, a Motion of this nature is a very serious one. And judging from the performance of the Chief Minister during the session one can see the effect of its usefulness. Mr Speaker, Sir, it is no surprise to this House that the Chief Minister has become more restrained, and has appeared to be more reasonable, and shows a sense of humour. We can see him smiling away. And I must add that at least at this session we have for once followed, shall I say, the best Parliamentary traditions. But, Sir, the Chief Minister is a very well-known figure who has had a long tradition in the political life of this nation, not only

in this State; and he will leave, no doubt, an indelible mark in our Malaysian history. As we know, his name is already mentioned in many books connected with the political life of our country. But, Sir, we also know, because of historical facts, that although today he is as gentle as a lamb he can be as ferocious as a tiger. Of course, when he is down, like at this moment when the standing of the Chief Minister is at the lowest ebb of his political career, he must look like a lamb. But once he has confidence he will be, as we know, as ferocious as a tiger. Mr Speaker, Sir, to talk of ditching, I think there is no greater figure who has ditched. In 1959 he ditched the M.C.A. and made it a very weak and feeble Party by drawing away so many of its able leaders, and ran away to seek refuge in the cool climate of England; and later in the Himalayas where he got inspiration to come back to this country and enter the political arena once again. And, of course, at that time, Mr Speaker, Sir, in 1959 he was the hero and the hope of thousands upon thousands of people. But today I am sad to say that it is the other way round. I think, Mr Speaker, Sir, that if you walk round the streets of Penang, even in the Constituency of Tanjong, which is being perpetuated, and which will be known for years and years to come, the Chief Minister is but a mere shadow of what he was.

Mr Speaker, Sir, some time ago, when I seconded a similar Motion of no confidence moved by the Honourable Member from Kelawei, I stated my reasons first for seconding the Motion of no confidence. Recent events, Mr Speaker, Sir, have not only tended to confirm my conviction of no confidence but had also revealed that the Chief Minister is one who indulges in favouritism and nepotism, half-truths and untruths; one who is a squanderer of the funds of the State; one who indulges in wasteful projects; one who has not exercised sufficient control over the finances of the State; and one who has abused his power, and has neglected his duty. I need not go into

the question of favouritism and nepotism as my colleagues, the Member for Ayer Itam and the Member for Bagan Ajam, have already pointed these out quite clearly. And however much the Honourable the Chief Minister might try to whitewash to reduce the effect of his actions that is being felt throughout the length and breadth of Malaya he cannot remove it. He cannot erase it because it is a fact. And however you twist a fact it will always remain a fact. I will go into the question of how lands have been sold without tender; how contracts have been given without tender; and how friends and relatives have been rewarded. But, Mr Speaker, Sir, there are other matters. For example, he is the person responsible for the inflation in land prices through the abuse of the powers under the Land Acquisition Act. He, with the Penang Development Corporation, has become the greatest speculator in land. It is a fact, Mr Speaker, that once a piece of land is put under Section 4 the prices of land in the surrounding areas sky-rocket. And if you put a bigger area the areas that will be surrounding it will be larger. In 1972 alone there were 13 notices under Section 4, involving more than a thousand lots of land, but only five were put under Section 8. And perhaps one wonders how much of this was acquired. But I know that in Province Wellesley South two whole mukims, Mukims 7 and 11, were put under Section 4. And out of these what came out? The Government acquired 30 acres, and Mr Speaker, Sir,—two whole mukims—as a result of which the prices of lands in that area went up.

Many people tried to speculate. There was one big landowner who thought a certain area is going to become an industrial area, and bought up large chunks of land from land-owners in Penang. Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to show what effect this has on ordinary people. Now, we know that although land is put under Section 4, as the Honourable Member for Ayer

Itam pointed out, people are allowed to build; and not one inch has been acquired. Take for example the Batu Ferringhi area. Mr Speaker, Sir, before the land was put under Section 4 I think it was about a dollar or two a square foot. It was then put under Section 4. But some people, as everybody can see could put up hotels. How come? Can the powers of the State be utilised for a private purpose? How was this? There are specific reasons under which land can be acquired by the State. Is one of the reasons the preserving of the area for private development? Is that one of the reasons? We have hotels which have come up in the Batu Ferringhi area. How did it happen? Again, the price of land in that area has sky-rocketed to about \$30, I am told. I am not a dealer in land, but I am told. I may be wrong in that figure; but it is no more \$2 or \$3. So can, Sir, any ordinary people—take our class, the middle class, the small businessmen, the wage-earners—buy land to put up a house for themselves in such areas? Where are they going to be pushed to, Sir? The same thing, Sir, in Teluk Kumbar and Gertak Sanggul. Is there an intention in the mind of the Government to put up anything in that area? If not, why do you put it under Section 4? And what is the effect, Sir, where land was sold last year or the year before last for \$2,000 an acre? That is about 5 cents, I think, a square foot. Is my calculation wrong? It may be; but today it is more than a dollar. In fact, a man refused to sell his 8 acres of land for even \$50,000 an acre. Sir, it may benefit those people who own the land. But will it benefit the thousands and thousands and thousands who have no land space? Suppose, Sir, you were to buy a piece of land in Telok Kumbar to put up a house. Would you be able to do it, Sir? The answer, as I pointed out, and as has been pointed out, is this: People in the know can take the risk. They can buy land at a higher price. Ignorant persons who are frightened, who are so anxious, who are so worried that the Government may buy

up their land, and whose houses or land may be affected sell to these speculators. And these speculators are prepared to take the risk, Sir. Supposing there is a speculator here who has got the money to buy up all the land in the Glugor/Green Lane area—786 acres, Sir. Supposing only. He buys up all these lands today, or just before it was gazetted, or on the day of gazetting. There is a great deal of anxiety in the minds of the people affected—they are worried. They may even suffer financial loss. These people, thinking they will be affected, sell the land as soon as they can. But how much of these 786 acres will the State require for the approach road? 6 acres? 16 acres? Surely not. Or 36 acres? Surely not. What are you going to do with the remaining 750 acres? Sir, if I could buy 786 acres I could jolly well give 36 acres to the State, and still make money out of the rest. Therefore, Sir, that is why I say that contrary to the protestations of the Chief Minister land prices have been artificially hiked up by the State, giving false hopes to people, and hopes of development coming on, when in reality no development comes in. And this has raised prices of land in our place. In fact, Mr Speaker, Sir, our land prices are very artificial because when you compare prices of houses even in Kuala Lumpur or Ipoh they are not that high. And so what will happen? Very soon I don't know where the poorer people will have to go and live. The Honourable Member from Bukit Mertajam, the Deputy Chief Minister, mentioned "a growing crowd of squatters." Is not that a direct consequence of your actions? If you are going to use your powers to indirectly help private developers then you should ensure that these people who are pushed out or forced out of their little sheds get alternative accommodation. In other words, build first, keep it ready, and burn later if you want. So if we want to control squatting we must ensure that our citizens—they are our citizens, they are our people—have homes which they can go to, so that they don't run away; squat here, and then run to

another piece of land; squat there, and then run to another piece of land, and squat there if they are harrassed. Perhaps when the bridge is ready they will sleep under the bridge, like under the bridges of Paris. But the bridge is not ready; and they will have no place to sleep. We know that in some countries a lot of people live under the bridges.

Mr Speaker, Sir, then there is the other abuse we had in answer to a question. Of course, when I asked the question the Chief Minister did not want to answer. He says, "You can look at the Gazettes". Although I know that in the Commissioner's office there are complete records of land acquisition he does not want to help us. He wants us to look through the Gazette. He wants us to know when he gazetted under Section 4, and when he gazetted under Section 8. And then when, if at all, he acquires he wants us to find out. But to someone else he has given an answer that in 1972 alone, as I said, there are 12 notices under Section 4. Five were placed under Section 8, and subsequently acquired in 1973. And he gives a break-down.

Sir, first of all, this question of allowing the lapse. How long does it take the Government to decide on which particular portion of land it is going to acquire? Take that 786 acres once again. Does it require one year to do it; and then you tell the people of Glugor and Green Lane, "Don't worry. We will allow it to lapse."? When? One year later? So, will it take you one year to make up your minds on anything you want to do? If so, what sort of plan are you showing? You can start one year, when the date of Gazette will be next year—1975. How are you going to start work on the project this year, even if you should decide within one month which land you want? You have got all your experts working very hard, I know, doing their best, when you only show us sketch plans. I have also got a sketch plan here. You see my sketch plan? I also drew a sketch yesterday. Somebody described it as a school-boy's sketch. Anybody can sketch. I don't have my glasses. I can't see that far. Sir, did you see whether they are engineering designs?

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): With no dimensions?

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Were there any dimensions, or were they only sketches?

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): How many?

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Keep the answer to yourself. I think they were only sketches. (*ketawa*).

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): My boys can do better than that.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Of course, the Chief Minister was trying to—you know, in our school days there used to be magic shows—buat silap mata. (*ketawa*) Sir, he might have pulled out some eggs from his hand. But that is one thing. I am sure that the State can devise means by which the moment it is decided which area it is going to use it must gazette. Don't wait for it to lapse. Don't let people suffer anxiety, and live in suspense for one year for the thing to lapse.

The other more serious thing is this: I have noticed even—in 1972, of course—that the Honourable Member from Tanjong Barat said that at one time half of Penang was under Section 4. What they were doing, I don't know. Trying to find pelandok or what in the jungles if there are any? I am concerned with 1972 alone. There were at least two instances of renotification. Now, is it legal? Even if it is legal, and you have the powers, there is nothing behind the law. It says you are given only one year to decide whether you want the land or not. Then after that one year has lapsed the land is no more under Section 4, and you have no right to go on to the land. Should you then go back after one day and say you are putting it back under Section 4 again? Is this Land Acquisition Act to enable you to make it a plaything? I am sure that even if the law is silent the intention is that once it lapses it lapses. But putting the land under re-notification! I don't know how many such lands

have been re-notified under Section 4. So if you say that that is not the intention, and you have the power, how often are you going to do it? Are you going to do it year in and year out until you decide what to do?

Tuan Speaker: Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Sungei Bakap, sila *address* kepada saya.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Minta maaf.

Sure enough, Mr Speaker, Sir, I think this is a glaring example of the abuse of powers under the Land Acquisition Act.

Now, I also said, Mr Speaker, Sir, that he has failed in his duty to exercise control over the finances of the State. We know, Sir, and it is in the Auditor-General's Report, that there was an instance—I don't know how many instances there have been since that day because the P.D.C. Accounts have still not been shown to us—of an officer going on tour to America, all expenses paid, Sir; and coming back and getting over \$15,000 without receipts for his expenditure. He merely certified that he had spent \$15,000. Sir, we have had so many officers going. It is a well-known fact, Sir, that if you go overseas, and if you want to visit factories, and you want to see people, the people there also entertain you. When you live in a hotel you get a bill. If you go and eat in a restaurant you get a bill. Perhaps train fares; but you get tickets. Don't tell me, Mr Speaker, that our State dignitaries go overseas and eat at "nasi kandar" stalls or roadside stalls where they don't get receipts for their expenditure. And I am sure that much of the expenditure incurred is paid for. Then how in the world can one man spend \$15,000 out of pocket? On tips? You can say tips. Therefore, how can you authorise payments?

Secondly, Sir, the State Hospitality Fund—how it has been abused. Even the Hospitality—\$45,000 per year—is over and above the Chief Minister's entertainment allowance which has been increased. Sir, that was initiated to entertain foreign dignitaries, perhaps like the Prime Minister of a foreign

country, or people from other places, and for State dinners. But I don't think you can use it for the private dinners of the Chief Minister. Therefore he has his own entertainment fund. But, Sir, to spend \$6.50 from the State Hospitality Fund is a disgrace; is a "*malulah*". Anybody could have paid that out of his own pocket, and saved the State from this ignominy. You can see that \$1 and \$2 also have been saved. State Hospitality Fund! *Malu saja*. That is enough.

Then we know of projects being carried out—where I think you mentioned once that the P.W.D. is the greatest culprit in paying up—at highly-inflated costs; and then accepting the lowest of tenders, and getting the worst product. The Chain Ferry Road block of flats is a living monument to this efficiency of the P.W.D. But, Sir, we know. Anybody can see. I have got a picture of a forest stacking station in Nibong Tebal. It is a wooden building, Sir, with a car porch. It is raised about one foot. The estimated cost, I think, in the Budget is \$41,000. Sir, what is the cost of constructing a modern brick building? The most a building of that size would cost is \$12,000; and land in that area—say one acre for this station—would cost \$6,000. How much was actually spent? This is an example of waste, and of neglect. This is an example of the failure of the Chief Minister to exercise control. Sir, he has the State Financial Officer; and he has so many other officers. He has the P.W.D., the D.I.D., and all the others. But, unfortunately, heavy must be the head that wears the crown and the responsibility. And I don't know what sort of building this tower block will be, or how high the Urban Centre will go up. Not only has one eminent son of Penang who must be a '*chin ang*' of the Chief Minister written in the "*Straits Times*" a bit about the Urban Centre in the usual style of the Chief Minister, but the brother also—the architect—has tried to defend the Government, hiding behind words and phrases. So we can see what it will turn out to be. And I am sure the people of Penang will be eagerly waiting to see how the 45-storey tower block will be

built, how much of it will be occupied, and whether it will be a white elephant. As I see in some places, people like huge buildings, competing, you know, to have the highest building in the world. And perhaps Penang is trying to have at least the highest building in this part of Northern Malaya. But how many floors will be occupied? As I said, I have seen in a 15-storey building where only 5 storeys have been occupied in some places. Perhaps by the time it is completed the Chief Minister will ensure that all buildings are occupied, to make sure he will have a penthouse on top of the 46th floor which he will be occupying. Thank you very much.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap): Dengan izin, Sir: I would like to move an amendment to the Motion under debate. And it reads, Sir "That this Assembly resolves that it has no confidence in the Honourable the Chief Minister and his Coalition Government and the Speaker of the House."

I move this amendment, Mr Speaker, Sir, because I believe that the conduct of the Speaker in the last few days gives us very little . . . (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: Sebelum saya memberi keputusan saya dahulu, sila duduk. Biar saya baca dahulu.

Pindaan berbunyi demikian:

"That this Assembly resolves that it has no confidence in the Honourable the Chief Minister and his Coalition Government and the Speaker of the House."

Nampaknya, pindaan ini tidaklah kena-mengena dengan Usul yang mula oleh kerana Usul yang pertama ialah berkenaan dengan Chief Minister and his Coalition Government. Bila bersangkutan dengan Speaker of the House ini tidak ada kena-mengena dengan perkara itu. Usul ini saya tolak.

Usul pindaan tidak dibenarkan.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap): Alright, thank you.

Tuan Speaker, dengan izin: Sir, it is clearly a matter of regret that the Chief Minister faced two no-confidence Motions in the short life of his Go-

vernment. And that there were only two no-confidence Motions is due to the fact, Sir, that this Government has come to the end of its life. If it dares to stay in power longer than the 5 years voted by the people, Sir, I am confident that there will be another Motion of no-confidence in him. Sir, not only has this House the distinction of having had two no-confidence Motions against the Chief Minister, but also a no-confidence Motion against the Speaker. It is not only we on this side of the House who have no confidence in the Chief Minister, Sir, but people outside also. That is why the Chief Minister moves around, Sir, nowadays with a bodyguard in his car, and with all the windows of his car wound up. And we also know, Sir, that the wind-screens and the windows of his car are bullet-proof, and the doors behind are armour-plated. That is how popular the Chief Minister is. He feels that he is popular; and that is how popular he feels himself to be.

Sir, there have been many allegations made against the Chief Minister, not only of malpractices, maladministration and corruption but also of a character defect of political blackmailing by the Member for Bagan Ajam. I produce here another statutory declaration, Sir, by the Member for Glugor stating that "On or about the last week of August, 1971, I was forced by the Chief Minister, Dr Lim Chong Eu, to write and sign two sets of letters of resignation, one hand-written in my own hand and one typewritten, from my seat as Assemblyman for Glugor, and addressed to the Speaker. Both letters were undated. I was forced to write and sign the letters of resignation under threat and duress from Dr Lim himself that he would take action or use his influence to have action taken against me."

Tuan Speaker: Ahli Yang Berhormat, kelmarin kita dengar Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bagan Ajam sudah cerita fasal itu, jadi saya tidak benarkan sebut lagi dengan panjang lebar perkara itu.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap): Tuan Speaker, "I have personally requested the Chief Minister to return the letters to me, and

have revoked any authority for use by him of the letters under any circumstances."

Tuan Speaker: Ahli Yang Berhormat, saya sudah sebut yang kita sudah dengar dengan panjang lebar itu semua. Ahli Yang Berhormat kelmarin pun sudah sebut dalam Dewan ini dan kita sudah dengar itu.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Itu yang lain. Itu substantiate.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap): Ya, Tuan Speaker, betul juga. But this is only to substantiate the allegation that was made by the Member for Bagan Ajam, although this is also a separate issue as against what was raised by the Member for Bagan Ajam. Sir, even the Ketua Menteri's own back-bencher has no confidence in him. How can we, Sir, on this side of the House, and the people outside this House living in the State of Penang have any confidence in the Chief Minister who could go so low to that level as to even threaten his own elected Members in this manner?

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

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap): It is a malpractice for the Chief Minister in a State, Sir, to descend to that level. It is very dirty and unexpected by the people of the State of Penang. And, Sir, for all that he has done in his position as Chief Minister—the level that he has stooped to—he should, Sir, by right tender his resignation, if he has any principles, or the pride and dignity of a person holding such an office. Sir, if the Ketua Menteri wishes to deny that such a thing has taken place with regard to his Members on the back-benches then I, Sir, request that a Commission of Inquiry be held to investigate into the truth or falsity of the whole matter. Thank you.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Refer to the Privileges Committee.

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

Tuan Speaker: Ahli Yang Berhormat hendak bahas perkara ini?

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Ketua Menteri mahu jawab—beri peluang.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Dia tahulah jawab.

Ahli Kawasan Tasek Glugor (Encik Mustapha bin Hussain): Tuan Speaker, sebenarnya saya tidak mahu masuk campur atas Usul ini tetapi saya berasa ganjil sedikit bila saya dengar Ahli-ahli bercakap. Datuk Speaker, saya datang di sini hendak dengar apa *issue* atau sebab-sebab yang boleh menyokong Usul tidak kepercayaan ini. Ahli Yang Berhormat yang mencadang Usul tidak kepercayaan berpeluang mengeluarkan dua *issue* sahaja iaitu—satu *issue* berkenaan dengan Pasukan Tiga iaitu *Team Three* yang menjadi akitek kepada *Urban City Centre*. *Issue* yang kedua ialah notis-notis yang dikeluarkan mengenai dengan pembinaan jambatan daripada Pulau Pinang ke Tanah Besar. Itulah dua *issue* sahaja Ahli Yang Berhormat bercadang mengeluarkan untuk menyokong Usulnya, Usul yang amat penting sekali. Tetapi saya suka menarik perhatian Tuan Speaker iaitu dalam ucapan Tuan Yang Terutama, iaitu ucapan dasar, Kerajaan untuk penggal yang akan datang apa yang dikatakan dalam bahasa Inggeris “The programme of the Government in power for the next Session”. Dalam ucapan Tuan Yang Terutama kita ada dalam perenggan 32 perkara jambatan yang menghubungkan Pulau Pinang dengan Tanah Besar Semenanjung dan juga notis-notis di bawah Seksyen 4 Akta Pengambilan Tanah dibuat di kawasan Green Lane, Glugor dan Jelutong.

Dalam ucapan Tuan Yang Terutama juga dalam perenggan 34 kita dapati rancangan Kerajaan mengenai dengan Pusat Bandaraya yang telah dilancarkan oleh Perdana Menteri. Kelmarin dalam pukul 1.30 kalau saya tidak silap Tuan Speaker, Ahli Yang Berhormat yang mencadang Usul yang tidak menaruh kepercayaan kepada Kerajaan dan rakan-rakannya iaitu Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Sungei Bakap dan

Bagan Ajam menyokong Usul terima kasih kepada Tuan Yang Terutama. Ini bermakna Tuan Speaker, si pencadang dan rakan-rakannya menyokong sebulat-bulat bila beliau dan rakan-rakan beliau mengatakan ‘Ya’ kepada Usul ucapan Tuan Yang Terutama itu bermakna pencadang Usul dan rakan-rakannya sokong rancangan Kerajaan iaitu sokong Pusat Bandaraya dan jambatan daripada Pulau Pinang ke Seberang Perai dan Seksyen 4 notis-notis itu. Mereka sokong, mereka kata ‘Ya’. Saya berasa ganjil Tuan Speaker, pukul 1.30 mereka semua sokong kepada perkara-perkara atau *issues* yang dibangkitkan dan pada pukul 5.30 ini beliau pula bawa keluar perkara itu yang menjadi asas kepada Usul tidak kepercayaan itu sahaja yang saya berasa ganjil sedikit Tuan Speaker, walaupun saya berasa bersimpati penuh kepada Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Ayer Itam, Sungei Bakap dan Bagan Ajam. Saya bersimpati . . . (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Encik Ismail bin Hashim): Ya.

Ahli Kawasan Tasek Glugor (Encik Mustapha bin Hussain): dan kalau boleh hendak cari jalan untuk beri undi kepada mereka, tetapi saya rasa ganjil dalam masa lima jam mereka boleh tukar haluan. Jadi, saya harap Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Ayer Itam jawab sedikit bagi terang.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Mesti saya jawablah, fasal (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Tasek Glugor (Encik Mustapha bin Hussain): Fasal apa? Saya bukanlah Ahli yang berpengalaman politik yang panjang dan lebar tetapi saya boleh dapat peluang beri macam-macam hendak saya ikut.

Tuan Speaker, itulah keganjilan yang saya dapati. Saya harap Ahli Yang Berhormat, si pencadang, boleh terang sedikit kepada saya. Sayapun bukanlah orang pandai.

Tuan Speaker, sebelum saya duduk suka saya sokong sedikit apa yang dikatakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bagan Ajam. Beliau kelmarin menyebutkan tentang apa yang dikatakan dalam bahasa Nasional kita—keper-

cayaan (*trust*). Kita mesti ada *trust*. Merekapun sebut "lawyer tolong sama" pun mesti ada *trust*. Barulah kita boleh hidup dengan harmoni antara satu syarikat perdagangan dengan satu syarikat perdagangan lain—antara semua manusia dalam dunia mesti ada sedikit kepercayaan. Minta izin saya bercakap dalam bahasa Inggeris. I agree with what the Honourable Member from Bagan Ajam said—that we must have trust, otherwise we cannot live in this world. That is a very good thing, Mr Speaker, because without trust I do not think the world would be a happy place. However, as the Honourable Member from Bagan Ajam should know himself, among the professions we can have that trust we place in each other; but among politicians we cannot have trust. (*ketawa*). That is my advice to him. A politician under any form—whether in his own Party or outside—can never, never, be trusted.

Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Encik Ismail bin Hashim): Your experience?

Ahli Kawasan Tasek Glugor (Encik Mustapha bin Hussain): That is my experience.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): You are not a politician? Don't trust you also?

Ahli Kawasan Tasek Glugor (Encik Mustapha bin Hussain): Never have trust in any politician.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Here is, I think, a point for clarification.

Ahli Kawasan Tasek Glugor (Encik Mustapha bin Hussain): Yes.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Tuan Speaker, dengan izin: I think I have said that a politician must exercise more care as regards trust because of what you are telling people who vote you into power. If finally you destroy the trust that would be a great tragedy, as you are betraying, cheating and lying to the people. And that is what I actually said. I think I disagree entirely with what he says. Politicians never trust one another: that I might agree. I clarify that I didn't say politicians (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bagan Ajam, cuma minta *clarification* sahaja. Ini satu ucapan, saya tidak benarkan.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Ini bukan satu ucapan. It is not an *ucapan*, Sir. He is saying that politicians should not trust one another.

Tuan Speaker: Ya, cukup.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): But I say politicians should be trusted by the people. I didn't say politicians should trust one another.

Ahli Kawasan Tasek Glugor (Encik Mustapha bin Hussain): Terimakasih, Tuan Speaker, kepada Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Bagan Ajam, tetapi apa nasihat saya kepada beliau ialah datang daripada hati saya, betul-betul dan benar-benar daripada hati. Bukan saya hendak sentuhnya tentang mana-mana, cuma saya hendak beri nasihat. Trust everybody but not a politician. Itu nasihat saya bukan kepada Ahli daripada Bagan Ajam (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Minta keterangan sedikit Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Tasek Glugor. Adakah kepercayaan ataupun *trust* kepada *allies*-nya dalam KITA? Adakah *trust* kepadanya?

Ahli Kawasan Tasek Glugor (Encik Mustapha bin Hussain): Adapun sedikit kepada rakan-rakan saya dalam KITA. Saya ada kepercayaan sedikit atau *trust* sedikit tetapi lain tidak langsung, Tuan Speaker.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Tetapi tidak banyak, tidak penuh.

Ahli Kawasan Tasek Glugor (Encik Mustapha bin Hussain): Penuh tidak ada langsung. Susah hendak sokong parti semacam ini. Fasal apa itu Yang Dipertua, *slowly* Yang Berhormat sendiri daripada Bagan Ajam sendiri tahu. Dia mesti tahu bagaimana dia boleh *trust*—sudah *trust* dari belakang.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Tengah (Encik Tan Gim Hwa): Betul.

Ahli Kawasan Tasek Glugor (Encik Mustapha bin Hussain): Tuan Speaker, sebelum saya duduk saya suka juga membuat dan memberi pandangan sedikit. Walaupun dalam perbahasan Usul lain ataupun Rang Undang-Undang lain Ahli-ahli daripada Pembangkang ada mengemukakan banyak penderitaan rakyat atau kesusahan rakyat, itu tidaklah benar Tuan Speaker. Oleh kerana, di mana-mana rakyat di dalam mana-mana negeripun bukan sahaja Kerajaan Campuran atau Kerajaan lain walaupun satu hari Pekemas boleh pegang tampuk Kerajaan, atau DAP pegang tampuk Kerajaan mesti ada kelemahan, macam pepatah Melayu: 'Gading mana yang tidak retak'. There is nothing perfect in this world. Jadi, Tuan Speaker, ada kelemahan bagi pihak Kerajaan atau tindak laku parti-parti yang memerintah. Kalau Tuan Speaker berganding dekat dengan rakyat jelata di kampung-kampung, kita boleh dapat sungutan-sungutan dan ragu-ragu rakyat. Jadi, rakyatpun, pada masa sekarang, ragu-ragu tentang kepercayaan mereka kepada parti-parti yang memerintah. Ini benar. Macam-macam perkara yang dihadapi oleh rakyat seperti inflasi, pengambilan tanah, barang mahal, dan gaji serupa juga sedikit. Itu rakyat cukup sudah. Itu benar. Jadi, rakyatpun bila pandang kepada parti-parti Pembangkang, rakyatpun merasai bimbang, kalaulah rakyat melantik parti-parti Pembangkang macam-macam boleh jadi. Jadi rasa bimbang, payah. Jadi rakyat masa ini Tuan Speaker, mencari jalan tengah, satu *alternative* antara parti-parti yang memilih sebelah sana dan Pembangkang sebelah sini—rakyat cari *alternative*. Di sinilah saya kata: We are here to offer the people an *alternative*—between the two.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Ini bukan political platform—an *alternative* to the people?

Ahli Kawasan Tasek Glugor (Encik Mustapha bin Hussain): Dalam sebutir pasir ada unsur-unsur politik—even in a grain of salt there is politics. Jadi lebih-lebih lagi kita di sini bermain politik. Datuk Speaker, saya berasa ganjil. Jadi, saya tidak mahu ambil lagi dalam division yang akan . . . (*ganguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Selalu macam itu, bukan baru.

Ahli Kawasan Tasek Glugor (Encik Mustapha bin Hussain): Untuk penjelasan sedikit kepada Ahli yang menca-dang. Saya ambil jalan tengah—an *alternative to the people*. Terimakasih.

Ketua Menteri: Datuk Yang Dipertua, saya minta izin bercakap dalam bahasa Inggeris untuk berbahas Usul yang dibawa dalam Dewan ini sekarang. Sudahlah saya dengar ucapan dari Yang Berhormat Ahli Kawasan Tasek Glugor sekarang seorang pemimpin dalam parti KITA. Nampaknya, saya berasa, barangkali harapan yang lama yang kita amalkan di sini ada harapan satu hari Dewan ini boleh bekerja mengikut semangat Dewan Rakyat atau Parlimen dan tetapi, bagaimana pilihanraya yang akan datang untuk hari depan rakyat menimbangkan *alternative* atau tidak ada *alternative*. Itupun saya fikir yang Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Kawasan Tasek Glugor terimalah. Ini di dalam kuasa beliau sendiri tetapi beliau pertunjuklah satu *style* perbahasan yang berapa lama kita harap kita boleh dapat di dalam Dewan ini.

Mr Speaker, Sir, this I express with very deep sincerity because ever since the convening of this House after the Emergency, from the very 1st Meeting of the House, the character and the standard of the Opposition that have been established, especially by Members of the D.A.P., and subsequently by the Members of the Gerakan who now call themselves Pekemas have been below general expectations. Although the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap began this morning, I think, in a conciliatory mood while he was holding the fort for some time for this colleague the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam, there isn't really very much for the Government to reply to—too-often-used gimmicks in this House. The Honourable Members of the Opposition have stated quite clearly that it is very unusual in this House for a Government, and in particular the Chief Minister or the leader of the Government, to have had two previous Motions of censure against

him, and be now facing the third. And, according to the Honourable Member for Tanjong Bungah, he even tried to make fourth one in the form of an amendment, and promised to have further ones in future if the present Government continues. So it is quite clear to Members of this House that this is a gimmick—a method whereby Members of the Opposition feel they can stir up the emotions of this House. And that is precisely because this gimmick has been used time and again to try and ‘close-up’ emotions. On the Motions of censure moved by the Honourable Members from the D.A.P.—one Motion moved by the Honourable Member for Kelawei—we had a clear distinction of the Honourable Members from Ayer Itam, Sungei Bakap and Bagan Ajam on this side of the House. And we took that seriously, and put it . . . (gang-guan).

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): When you answer, try and get your facts straight.

Ketua Menteri: When this method of moving Motions of censure as a means to get some kind of publicity, and some kind of cheap debate in this House became a matter of common usage we felt that this particular Motion did not deserve the kind of prominence that it was meant to get because it was just a gimmick—one of the characteristics of the present style of debate from the Opposition. In any case, as the Honourable Member for Tasek Glugor had clearly indicated, it is a strange thing that when the two main issues contained in the speech by the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam on his Motion of censure had actually been debated at great length only 4 hours earlier—and he himself had voted for Government policy on this issue—he should then, 4 hours later, move another Motion all the same. That I think the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam can take up from the remarks by the Honourable Member for Tasek Glugor.

I would like, Mr Speaker, Sir, to tell the Honourable Member from Kelawei that if the D.A.P. opposition, as led by the Honourable Member for Kelawei, uses vicious and contemptible forms of

debate we shall hit them sky-high. And whatever way they go we shall attack them word-for-word. And we shall have no hesitation whatsoever to attack them in exactly the same manner that they use. We realise, and we have urged the Honourable Member for Kelawei and the Members from the D.A.P., right from the very first Meeting in this House, to try and grow up with the years, and improve, and uphold the general traditions of this House that have prevailed before. For example, I am quite sure that much as I personally had opposed Tan Sri Wong Pow Nee when the positions we held were in reverse—and we opposed one another through the years—one of the reasons why Tan Sri Wong Pow Nee was able to conduct this House in a manner which the Honourable Member from Kelawei himself says was very good was due to the fact that as a responsible Opposition we never stooped so low. We never used methods and terminology as dirty and low and vicious and contemptible as those used by the Honourable Members from the D.A.P. Mr Speaker, Sir, since those days the conduct in this House has decayed. That is why we say that there has been a tradition that has been established; and right from the very first Meeting we urged the Honourable Members of the Opposition to try and live up to that position. But what we heard yesterday from the Honourable Member from Kelawei is no different from what we heard from him on the very first day when he came to this House. I would like to remind him that when I used the words ‘naked power’ it was in response to him when he said that he would use all the naked power. He said in reply: ‘If you are going to demonstrate everything within your power then we also on this side of the House will use naked power against you’.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Where is the record? When did we use ‘naked power’? You created the term ‘naked power’.

Tuan Speaker: Ahli Yang Berhormat, saya harap jangan ganggu. Saya beri amaran yang pertama.

Ketua Menteri: Mr Speaker, Sir, I repeat here again also that I did tell him on one occasion—he says 2 occasions. I will accept it—quite categorically in this House that I would have no hesitation to have him arrested. Now, you make a statement like that and declare it gives a false impression. And this is precisely the technique of the Honourable Member from Kelawei and his ilk from the D.A.P. because they talk shop half way. As I said, they read things half way, and they twist things. They don't make true statements.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): On a point of clarification, do you want me to quote your statement? I have the gist.

Ketua Menteri: I would like to repeat here for the third time that as a person responsibly holding the office of the Chief Minister I shall have no hesitation in asking the relevant authorities to arrest the Honourable Member for Kelawei if he carries out anything that is anti-national, or anything that is anti-government by way of law, or anything subversive against the nation. Mr Speaker, Sir, that is the way whereby we hold our responsibility. We don't like arresting people. But if people want . . . (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): You have no power.

Ketua Menteri: If people want to behave illegally, against the interests of the nation; or in a subversive manner—and I would now also include the Member for Bagan Ajam—to test whether I have the power or not—they can behave like that. And if anything that you do is against the law of the land, with regard to the peace and security of the land, I shall certainly take those steps to have you arrested also. (*ketawa*).

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Do what you can. Happily I will go. (*ketawa*).

Ketua Menteri: So you see, Sir, this is not a threat.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): It is a threat.

Ketua Menteri: This is only a demonstration . . . (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap): Democracy!

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mockery of democracy.

Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Encik Ismail bin Hashim): Democracy D.A.P.

Tuan Speaker: Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bayan Lepas, saya harap janganlah ganggu.

Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Encik Ismail bin Hashim): Minta maaf.

Ketua Menteri: That is why we on this side of the House hold this great responsibility. The very fact that all through the years none of these Members have actually really become heroes in the way that they expected is clearly established. And Government has not found them—'kue-thnee-loh'—doing what they pretend to the people they will do: even go against the law of the nation to fight for them. That is why they have not been arrested. And that is why Government has got this terrific latitude of democratic practice, and understands that the Honourable Member for Kelawei and his colleagues in the D.A.P. need time to grow and to mature. Certainly at this present moment, in terms of that type of development, they must be in this sour stage of mellowing of the vine.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I would only like to say one thing to the Honourable Member for Kelawei. Throughout his long speech he really made no statement that was new to us. And that is typical of the Honourable Member for Kelawei. He said my history of political record started off from the K.M.T., and so on, and right down. Mr Speaker, Sir, I will inform Members of this House that during the time of the Second World War, when the theatre of war shifted towards China, and the battle against the then Japanese Imperial Army took place, I was at that theatre of war. But I would like the Honourable Member for Kelawei to substantiate, with any proof whatsoever that he can get, at

what time and when I was a member of the K.M.T. On this unsubstantiated statement he goes on and builds a terrific story.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Then why were you not allowed to go to Peking when you went to . . . (*ketawa*).

Tuan Speaker: Ahli Yang Berhormat, saya harap jangan ganggu.

Ketua Menteri: By the way, I would like to remain on this island. And he now asks me why I didn't go to Peking.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Not allowed to go.

Ketua Menteri: Not allowed to go.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for Kelawei behaves as if he has got recent authority to speak on behalf of Peking (*ketawa*). I don't mind telling the Honourable Member for Kelawei that if and when he gets the opportunity to visit China, and particularly to visit and have the chance to exchange views with those responsible members in the Government in Peking, he will find that he has no standard whatsoever (*ketawa*).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Not allowed to go in. No entry.

Ketua Menteri: We are not people who try . . . (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Begging to go.

Ketua Menteri: We are not people who try to put on airs.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): But there are no airs.

Ketua Menteri: But I can assure the Honourable Members of this House that if and when our nation has diplomatic relations with the Government of the Peoples' Republic of China we will know exactly what is the measure of the D.A.P., what kind of Party they are; what kind of people they pretend to be. Then and only then will the Honourable Member for Kelawei realise what it means by the word 'honour', and

what it means by the word 'vicious'. Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member from Kelawei has these usual tactics of referring to one small thing which is not true, and building up terrific stories. And for that reason he, has made this debate unimportant and of low priority because, as I have said, it has become apparent that the Pekemas is also using the same kind of gimmick as the D.A.P. The debate carried out by the Honourable Member for Kelawei is no different from that at the very first Meeting. As we have seen all these years in this House, he has shown no improvement; and it is still the same.

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

Ketua Menteri: I don't claim to be Headmaster. But the Honourable Member for Kelawei consistently reads from my old statements; and he tries to study my speeches at great length in the past, and he quotes them. And there I think I have a right to tell him that he tried to emulate me by reading my speeches here for me to listen. I say to him: I don't think boleh *pass-lah* (*ketawa*).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Doctors, teachers and even professors were not able to pass.

Ketua Menteri: Mr Speaker, Sir, even as we debate the Honourable Member for Kelawei had his chance to snipe at me when he was speaking; and I kept quiet. And here I haven't stood for three minutes to hit at him, and he must snipe back. He must sit back and take it in a proper way. And if you can't do it, leave the house and sit outside.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for Kelawei has put up a very small case. In actual fact, what he was trying to do was to demonstrate and reveal to this House, after careful thought—they always say they can act very quickly; they think very quickly; they are very good. They must have gone back last night and tried to work it out—how the D.A.P. can outshine the Pekemas, and all that. So the Honourable Member for Tanjong

Bungah, his colleague in the D.A.P., came out today with an amendment to the Motion to show that they are better than the Pekemas. Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member from Tanjong Bungah, I think, has improved somewhat.

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap): This is a mid-term review. Is it?

Ketua Menteri: And he tries to use the tactics and methods which are set up by the D.A.P. Now, Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not wish them to go and test it, and try and shoot a bullet at the car which I am sitting in. To equate my popularity as though I move around in fear, and to say that PG. 1 has got bullet-proof windscreens and armour-plated back screens, and all sorts of things is a kind of hypothetical exaggeration. Now, if No. 2 wants to outshine No. 1 in exaggeration that is well within the backing order of the D.A.P. But the Honourable Member from Tanjong Bungah has really not contributed anything at all to this particular debate.

Now, with regard to the matters raised by the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap, I personally think he took it very nicely. But I must accept it for a fact that the Motion of censure which was moved by the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam didn't just contain the two particular items. It must contain a sum total of situations because in holding the fort in this House for the time being, for the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam to turn up, he took the House to the question of issue whereby a former State Secretary of the State, as a member of the P.D.C., visited Malacca to assess and to evaluate the need and the financial potential of the setting up of an electronic capability with electronic facilities for the State. And he took up this old story again of bills being put up without any support, although it has been adopted many times in this House before, in Motions of censure and outside Motions of censure, that it is well within their competency for officers to record their expenditure in the manner that it was recorded.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap also referred to the State Hospitality Fund. Mr Speaker, Sir, I assure the Honourable Members of this House that I myself, in my own personal capacity and as Chief Minister, also do entertain as the Chief Minister. And I do spend money, not only from the entertainment funds provided to the Chief Minister but also out of my own pocket. But it is only proper that in accounting for expenditure that is relevant to the State Hospitality Fund, where many of the expenses are incurred within the Budget provisions coming under my name, the expenses are taken by various organisations and for various purposes; and sometimes I myself don't attend a function. So there is a definite division between what is a private matter and what is a State matter.

Now, the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap also took up this question of squatters. And I would like to assure him that I hope he realises that it is Government's duty to be responsible for the problem of squatters on Government land. And that is why the Government, acting fully in the interests of the people of Penang, tries its very best to ensure that no new attempts to establish squatter settlements on Government land takes place on State land. This, I think, is only a proper action of Government to resolve a problem that has gone on for a long, long time. As a matter of fact the problem is a tremendous one, and has been carefully studied to show the size and dimensions whereby the problem can be solved. In His Excellency's gracious Address it was clearly indicated that in the design of the new township and urban renewal rehabilitation the resiting of squatters will be taken into account. The total number of squatters and T.O.L. holders, as a matter of fact, presents an enormous issue because over the years Penang has become plagued with squatter problems, amounting to well over thousands on the Island, and even more on the Mainland side. The studies are still going on as to how to accommodate and resolve these problems.

Now, with regard to squatters on private lands, I think the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap will be the first to agree that this is a matter for private owners to deal with, and Government's position is clearly laid down in terms of the law.

Mr Speaker, Sir, regarding the Honourable Member from Bagan Ajam, I think there is not very much that I need to bring up because he made a beautiful speech. And from the point of view of delivery in this House he has improved considerably.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): I start shivering, you know, when you try to say that (*ketawa*) because there must be a trick somewhere.

Ketua Menteri: He has improved considerably. But I think myself that he should not think that he is the perfect example of all those who have been to Chinese-medium schools. And I think all those who have had no opportunity of receiving education through Chinese-medium schools will not all of them accept the Honourable Member from Bagan Ajam as the shining example of the best products coming from those schools. (*ketawa*) So, Mr Speaker, Sir, when I hit at the Member for Bagan Ajam—I was hitting at him—if he takes what I said in this House to be an insult to him, he should not try and pass it on to the other Members as though I am insulting the other people who have undergone Chinese education. Sir, I have very great respect for Chinese education. My knowledge is very limited. But, little as it is with reference to 'Yeh Fei' and 'Ch'n Koi' and all that, I would like to say that Malaysians as a whole have this wonderful right to live and develop with their own culture and their own language background. This is provided for in our Constitution. If the product of Chinese civilisation and cultural education is to end up in a manner like the Honourable Member from Bagan Ajam then it must be a waste.

Mr Speaker, Sir, what this side of the House stands for with regard to the formation of the National Front, and with regard to the aims that we wish

for and will work for with every effort that we can make as a Malaysian society—and with regard to that society we accept that the present Malaysian society has got many different communities with different racial, ethnic, cultural and lingual backgrounds—we would like to weave and mould the different communities into a Malaysian society with an identity of our own. That is why by showing respect to every community, with its different cultural and linguistic background, the Coalition Government, and now the National Front can proceed to guarantee and assure the people of Malaysia, and particularly the people of Penang, that in so far as their educational and linguistic backgrounds are concerned, if they are of benefit to the Malaysia that we want to have, and the Malaysian society that we wish to create from the present into the future, each and every community shall be ensured a proper place. Mr Speaker, Sir, that is the stand.

Now, if the Honourable Member from Bagan Ajam thinks that it is necessary for us now to indicate clearly that at this time of history every Malaysian, no matter what his racial origin, his cultural background or his linguistic background may be, having a right, just and proper place, can contribute towards the development of a Malaysian nation then I think the Honourable Member from Bagan Ajam should not really turn and twist around, as has been observed by the Honourable Member from Tasek Glugor, to stab people in the back, or try to say that I am a betrayer, I am a traitor, at one time I was a champion of Chinese education, and so on. Mr Speaker, Sir, these statements were never made by me. They were made by the public, and by the Honourable Member from Bagan Ajam. All I know is that throughout my public life I have steadfastly worked for the development of a Malaysian nation through peaceful, modern, democratic means. And we shall continue to do so with all the experience we have, and all the efforts that we can make.

Mr Speaker, here again we find the quality of debate. The Honourable Member takes up the issue in one way, and twists it into a rather piddling kind of argument. Mr Speaker, Sir, he referred, for example, to this question of a bank loan. And he even insinuated that I had influence to ask the banks to stop credit to him. Mr Speaker, Sir, I think that this is too personal a matter between the Honourable Member from Bagan Ajam and myself to be discussed in this House.

All that I ask you is to search your own conscience, and answer for yourself whether at a time of very great personal difficulty you did not really receive some help from me.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Search your own conscience. (*ketawa*).

Ketua Menteri: I searched my own conscience; and I did help you. But if you can't fulfil the terms and conditions of your own bank loan, or your own bank guarantee then the banks must act accordingly.

Mr Speaker, Sir, as I said, this is too personal a matter; and I would not like to bring it up in this House. But search your own conscience (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Search your own conscience.

Ketua Menteri: and find out whether or not you were in actual fact indebted by gratitude to me for having helped you at a time of need.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I did not anticipate any positive reply by my colleague, the Honourable Member from Bukit Mertajam, as I had indicated that we on this side of the House know who are the people who have any understanding of gratitude, and who know in actual fact the meaning of the word 'responsibility'. We understand it, and we know our position.

Mr Speaker, Sir, now coming back to the original mover of the Motion, there is really no priority in this Motion. And, as has been observed even by a man he tried to move very hard to join him—the Honourable Member from

Tasek Glugor—fortunately he failed. I would like to say that it is really strange that on a matter that was brought up in His Excellency's gracious Address—debated in full and statements given in full—on which through some lapse of normal parliamentary procedure the Honourable Members of the D.A.P. insisted on a division to be held in the voting on the Motion of Thanks, the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam had indicated that he supported the Motion. And now he moves something which is a 180-degrees turnabout in the situation. Now we realise that the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam is always capable of turning 180-degrees somersaults. But regarding the points that he raised I have no need to reply because they have been replied in full.

I only want to state here that, as an illustration, he asked me why it was that I replied "no" to him on a question that he asked for a written reply. This is the question: "What firm was appointed to assist the City Council and the State in Town Planning work?" Mr Speaker, Sir, it is very important for us to seriously take the written words as they stand. And the answer was "no" because there has been no firm appointed for the purpose of assisting the City Council and the State in town planning work. Mr Speaker, Sir, what was stated very clearly was that Architects Team Three had been appointed as consultants to the Town Planning and Building Department of the City Council. So you see here that because of the way the questions are phrased they deserve serious answers. If you ask, as I say, stupid questions you will get stupid answers—just as the Honourable Member from Kelawei asked what expenses were incurred by the State Government with regard to the visit of a Minister from Victoria, and our answer was that there was no such visit by a Minister from Victoria. (*ketawa*). So if you don't ask proper questions how do you expect to get proper answers. So, you see on that issue alone they show the great responsibility they have for the people. Look back to the way you phrase your questions in black and white. I repeat again:

"What firm was appointed to assist the City Council and the State in Town Planning work?" Does not that question deserve the answer "no"? On that kind of issue he says we more or less run away from all sorts of things. Mr Speaker, Sir, I don't want to go back to issues which I have dealt with in full already in participating in the debate on His Excellency's speech.

Now, on the question of land acquisition, the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam says that because the State Government puts land under acquisition we help the rich to become richer. Mr Speaker, Sir, I fail to understand his argument. He says I have said that the State Government does put under Section 4 larger areas than what is eventually needed. That is true because, supposing you have to look at an area for purposes of development, and we put an area under study, it may be that you put the road, Mr Speaker, Sir, through the centre; and you may acquire the right-hand side of the land after studying the soil and the condition of the land. On the other hand you may take the road, and acquire the land on the left-hand-side of it. So eventually the actual amount of land that is taken by the State would be less than the amount that was gazetted under Section 4. Mr Speaker, Sir, that is a simple, straight-forward example which I am sure even you can appreciate.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): That is an insult to the Speaker. How can you refer to the Speaker as "even you", as if his standard of English is lower than that of the other people? (*ketawa*). What an insult!

Ketua Menteri: Mr Speaker, I don't think I have ever shown disrespect for the office of the Speaker. And far be it for me to even try and insult him. What I was saying is that it is typical (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Will you please withdraw that remark. For the dignity of the House, I appeal to you to withdraw that remark.

Mr Speaker, you ask him to withdraw that remark. It is a most insulting remark.

Ketua Menteri: It is typical for the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam to jump up like this. And, as I said, if the public in actual fact had an opportunity to see his behaviour and his decorum and display in this House they will know what kind of man he is. Mr Speaker, Sir, what I seriously meant is that you are not a member of the learned profession, and you have not studied law. But the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam is a member of the learned profession, so he should understand all the implications of the Land Acquisition Act as an ordinary layman like yourself, Sir, would have understood. Even you would understand, as a layman, these implications of the law. And here he is standing up and saying I am insulting you when I am making a straight-forward statement. Sir, this is how and why in parliamentary debate the characters of personalities are brought up in the cut and thrust of debate. This is why (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): That is how your character is brought up. (*ketawa*).

Ketua Menteri: That is why in parliamentary debates we really know what exactly to put up.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Very true; very true.

Ketua Menteri: Mr Speaker, Sir, this is a trying thing for the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam. He has certainly learned that it is true. Mr Speaker, Sir, it has taken him a long period of his life to learn what is true. Mr Speaker, Sir, I like to end up by just saying that the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam has repeated, at least on several occasions that the responsibility of being a Chief Minister is one that should be above reproach, like Caesar's wife. I do want to take him up on this. We had nice little exchanges on this question of Caesar's wife before.

But, Mr Speaker, Sir, on this question of interest I would like to refer the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam first to the State Constitution—Article 7 (9) and (10):

“(9) The Chief Minister shall not hold any office of profit and shall not actively engage in any commercial enterprise.

(10) A member of the Executive Council shall not engage in any trade, business or profession connected with any subject or department for which he is responsible and shall not, so long as he is engaged in any trade, business or profession, take part in any decision of the Executive Council relating to that trade, business of profession or in any decision likely to affect his pecuniary interest therein.”

Mr Speaker, Sir, is the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam trying to imply that just because by God's will I happen to share the same parentage as a partner of Jurubina Bertiga I have contravened the provisions of the State Constitution? Mr Speaker, Sir, I refer to the Municipal Ordinance—Cap. 133, Section 43:

“(1) A Commissioner shall not vote or be present at the discussion of any matter before the Commissioners or a committee in which he has directly or indirectly by himself or by his partner any pecuniary interest.”

Can the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam say that I have any pecuniary interest in Jurubina Bertiga?

“(2) A Commissioner shall not be deemed to have a pecuniary interest in any matter in which he is interested merely by reason of being a shareholder in a joint stock company which is interested in such matter.”

These are the laws of the land.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I refer to the provisions of Penang Enactment No. 10 of 1971:

“9. Save as it is otherwise provided in the instances under section 15 below, any member who has or acquires, directly or indirectly by himself, his partner or agent:

(a) in respect of any contract or arrangement proposed to be entered into by the Corporation in which he or any company, of which he is a director or manager or any firm in which he is a partner, an interest; or

(b) any beneficial interest in land proposed to be acquired, purchased, leased or otherwise dealt with by the Corporation”

and so forth, and so on. Mr Speaker, Sir, these are the laws. And I did state that in spite of different and successive Motions of censure against the method whereby the Chief Minister and his colleagues in Government have administered the affairs of the State, I maintain that the Chief Minister and Members of the Coalition Government have done so in strict accordance with the provisions of the law. And they have, as I have said on several occasions before, shown an order of responsibility much greater than I have had the opportunity to experience in the long course of my public service. Mr Speaker, Sir, I wind up by just saying this because the Honourable Members for Ayer Itam, Sungei Bakap and Bagan Ajam will jump up immediately and state so. But the Member for Bagan Ajam, of course, can be excluded from the issue.

Mr Speaker, Sir, in the course of my reply I indicated that the appointment of Jurubina Bertiga as Consultants to the City Council took place over a period of time; and some of the relevant dates I gave were November of 1969, and onwards. At that time the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam and the Honourable Member for Sungei Bakap were Members of Government. I do not remember, at any time when they served under me, that they gave me any other advice. And what they are doing now concerning what they considered to be correct when they were here is what is commonly called ‘red eye’. They have not necessarily got the cold. Don’t be red-eyed. Take the matter up. Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap postulated a bit, and mentioned ‘blue eyes’. If the Honourable Member from Sungei Bakap will realise, he could be referred to as “The Kissing” of the Pekemas. But there is a term ‘blue eye’; there is a term ‘red eye’; there is a term ‘black eye’. But don’t—Mr Speaker, I urge the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam—with your wealth of experience, and with the hope that you carry for your Party in the future, descend to the

level of the D.A.P. Don't descend to their level; and at least you may have some hope in the future. But it has taken the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam a long time to rise up. And I say quite categorically that his charges are unfounded, and motivated not because of a sense of responsibility to the people but simply because he has to naturally take the somersault. That he must do, and vote for a Motion 5 hours later than the Motion of thanks.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Mr Speaker, Sir, dengan izin bercakap dalam bahasa English:

It is by no means surprising to hear what the Honourable the Chief Minister has to say on this Motion. And before I come to him I would first of all like to deal with the Honourable Member for Tasek Glugor. And the point is the allegation that the Pekemas has turned a somersault by voting for the Motion, and moving this censure Motion. So, before we go further let us see what the Motion is. Is this a Motion of supporting Government policy, or is it a mere courtesy Motion expressing thanks to His Excellency the Governor? As was pointed out earlier, a Motion of thanks is a non-controversial Motion. And a Motion of thanks is merely a courtesy Motion to express thanks to His Excellency the Governor, just like expressing thanks to His Majesty the Yang Di-pertuan Agong. When a Motion of this nature is brought up it will give opportunity for the House to discuss Government policy in general. And even if anybody were to make an amendment to the Motion the whole body of the Motion is usually left intact, normally adding a little sentence: "but regrets that no discussion is made on 'this', no discussion is made on 'that'." So on the whole the Motion of thanks is accepted, as the Chief Minister rightly pointed out, as a non-controversial Motion. And no division is expected on a Motion of this type. Everybody is expected to support the Motion because, if you look at the Motion, there is no controversy in it at all—

"That we, the Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly, Penang, beg to thank His Excellency for the gracious Address given to this Assembly at the First Meeting of the Fourth Session on 8th April, 1974."

There is no controversy whatsoever. There is no expression of support or opposition to the speech. It is merely thanking His Excellency for delivering a speech in this House. I see no reason for the Honourable Member for Tasek Glugor to be confused over an issue like that. It is self-explanatory. But for the Honourable the Ketua Menteri to deliberately twist the whole issue, and try to make political capital out of it is to my mind deplorable.

The Member for Tasek Glugor took great pains asking me to justify our stand on this particular issue. I think there is practically nothing to explain about it because the Motion speaks for itself. The Honourable the Chief Minister made great play of the fact that the Member for Tasek Glugor was speaking against the Opposition, or that his views were different from those of the Opposition. Well, I don't intend to call the Member for Tasek Glugor names, just like the Honourable the Ketua Menteri has been calling the Members of the Opposition names in his endeavour to belittle them. But I would like this House to consider and to judge the Member for Tasek Glugor purely on his utterances, and purely on the stand which he takes in this House. We have the Member telling this House that all politicians cannot be trusted; and yet he is a member of a political Party. When asked whether he trusted his own political colleagues he said 'Just a little'. So if you want an example of a person who does not know what he is doing, or who doesn't know what he is talking about, this is a very clear example. And he went further on to say that we need in this country something new. No longer should have a Party in power, or a Party in Opposition. But he says there must be a Party in between that neither supports the Government nor supports the Opposition. Can you ever have a more fantastic idea than this from none other than the Honourable Member from Tasek Glugor? His performance in this House

is testimony of his person as a whole. We have seen him many a-time in this House making speeches on various issues, some crucial, some not so crucial; and the ultimate conclusions he reached. And I merely would like to refer to his performance as a guide for judging whether what he says will carry any weight, or has any credibility. So much for the Honourable Member for Tasek Glugor.

Now, more seriously, I will come back to the Honourable the Chief Minister. True to his form or his performance in the past, he is a very shrewd Chief Minister. He is very shrewd in the sense that he knows what to say. He knows how to divert attention from the really crucial issues that face this country. So, in the course of this debate he very conveniently refused to answer very crucial issues that were raised by me on this particular Motion of no confidence; and instead tried to divert attention by calling the Opposition names, and by going into issues that are not quite so relevant to the Motion that is before us. He also made great play of the fact that what he has done is all very legal. He went to great pains to show us the Municipal Ordinance and the Constitution of the State of Penang to justify to this House that what he is doing is above the law. Well, I must tell the Honourable the Chief Minister that I never challenged him by saying that he is acting contrary to the law. I never challenged him at any moment by saying that what he has done so far is not in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution, or in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Ordinance. If he had done that, other Authorities would have got him before I had the opportunity of doing so. So, to bring the legal issues before the House is to evade the issue that is before us. When I introduced my Motion I stated very clearly that politicians are unlike ordinary people. Ordinary people are bound by the law; and if they acted contrary to the law they would be arrested, or civil action would be taken against them. But if we ourselves are to be politicians we have to behave quite differently from

ordinary people because we have a great responsibility entrusted upon us. And, as I pointed out before, the standard expected of politicians, and particularly of politicians holding high office, must be very high. They are not bound only by the legal requirements of the law. They also are bound by the moral requirements which society expect them to conform with. And this is the whole issue which I brought before this House.

Tuan Speaker: Ahli Yang Berhormat saya ingat Ahli Yang Berhormat terkeluar daripada *Motion* ini. *Stick* kepada *Motion*. Saya harap *stick*-lah to your *Motion* itu.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): This is in reply to the Honourable the Chief Minister bringing up the legalistic issues. And I am telling him that as politicians we are not so much bound by the legal aspect of it but by the moral aspect. And I say that morally all our actions must not only be right but seen to be right. Justice must not only be done but seen to be done. So if what we do may be perfectly alright, but in the eyes of the public it appears that there may be suspicious circumstances, then we should as far as possible refrain from taking that action. And this is exactly what I am trying to put before the Honourable the Chief Minister. He may think that his brother is the best of all architects. He may think that it is proper to appoint his brother to that appointment; but in the eyes of the public it is not seen to be correct. So this is exactly the issue that is before us. And in the course of my (*gangguan*).

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, minta izin: Peraturan 46. Mr Speaker, Sir, I think the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam should not try to be too Caesarian. It may be, I may think, or what I may do. Say exactly what is done.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Well, that is exactly what I am doing.

Ketua Menteri: Do not say what I mean. Say it exactly.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): I am just giving an example of moral conduct—the standard that is expected of a person holding a high office. And in due course I may mention a good number of issues which are still left unanswered.

Well, the Honourable the Chief Minister chose to refer to an earlier statement by him; but the argument of his earlier statement was destroyed by me in the course of my Motion. I demonstrated very clearly, and referred to the Minutes that were read before this House saying that Architect Co-partnership was the name of his brother's firm before. At that time they were merely appointed to look into the feasibility of a hawkers' paradise over the Prangin Road ditch. And the Minutes itself show very clearly the area bounded by Maxwell Road and Prangin Road. There is no mention about the triangle. And the Honourable the Chief Minister subsequently had the audacity to come and tell us that the earlier reference was to this triangle. And I say that there was a deliberate untruth being stated; and that was one of the reasons why I accused him of trying to deceive this House. I accused him of deception; and this is one example. And the other example which he took great pains to tell us about was because of my question—I added the word 'State'. So if the Honourable the Chief Minister has nothing to hide he would have stated very clearly that so-and-so was appointed by the City Council, and not by the State. A genuine, responsible Government would have done that, and not try to evade the issue, or try to say that nobody is appointed, and no fees are paid. So I don't have to answer. It is this very action which I am criticising—the attempt at deception. As I pointed out earlier in my Motion, deception is a very serious offence—particularly deceiving an Assembly like this which is equivalent to Parliament and the nation. And I pointed out that Cabinet Ministers in other countries have had to tender their resignation because they deceived Parliament. It seems that our Chief Minister can do this with impunity. His standard of behaviour here is en-

tirely different. And he pointed out to us that in the course of debate the character of a person is shown very clearly. So I would ask this House or anybody to look up the record of Parliamentary proceedings, both in the Dewan Rakyat and in this particular Assembly, to judge the characters of the Chief Minister and myself, as the Chief Minister really believed that a scrutiny of the records would show our true characteristics. I never called people names. I never stooped to the level adopted by the Chief Minister of black-mailing and belittling others. But there is no point of myself trying to tell this House what I have said. I think everyone in this House does know. A scrutiny of the record will show exactly the characteristics of the Chief Minister and myself. There is no necessity for me to take up the time of this House by going into this matter. So here again characteristics in debate play a very important part. But what is of more importance than that, and what pains me here is the fact that people use their position to threaten other people; and that is a very bad thing. And for that to come from none other than the Chief Minister, to my mind, is most deplorable. What does he think other people are? As for me, I say that it is unbecoming of the Chief Minister of our State to stoop to the level of using threats, particularly on Members of the Assembly. We know very well that he has no powers; but he is trying to boast to us that he can use this power by perhaps influencing, though he does not like me to use the word. By whatever means he chose to do it, he must do so through the Minister for Internal Security. But is he suggesting that the Minister for Internal Security will have to rely on him to perform his duty? I think the Honourable the Minister for Internal Security has a very efficient department, and is quite capable of carrying out his duties himself without the Honourable the Chief Minister of Penang interfering in his work. But I think that it is deplorable; and I think the Honourable the Chief Minister has descended to a very low level by using his position for purposes of this nature.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, Standing Order 46.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I think the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam, with his characteristics, will accept the fact that what I did exactly say was that I considered it responsible for the Chief Minister of this State, should any Member do anything that is anti-national, to take those steps to have him arrested. This is a statement of information. There was no threat implied.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): The innuendoes are there. If the Honourable the Chief Minister does not understand what an innuendo is, there it is. He is doing it. He is insinuating. But the point is that there is no necessity for you to do this. And even if there is a necessity for you to do this there is no necessity for you to openly say that you are going to do because it will only . . . (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: Yang Berhormat dari Ayer Itam, bila berucap sila *address* kepada saya.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): It will only give the indication as if the Federal Department is so inefficient that you have to do it. But in actual fact I believe that if there is any commission of such offence, and there is something inherently wrong with the Federal Department, so much so that it has to take the Honourable the Chief Minister to do the work, then I think the organisation of our security system in this country is in a very bad state. So I can take it that there is no other reason. The mere statement of this fact is really to threaten people. It is not an expression of genuine belief. There is no sincerity whatsoever in that particular statement. So I say this: that as far as the Pekemas is concerned we are not introducing this particular Motion as a gimmick. We are introducing it because there are very serious charges—charges that are left unanswered; charges of irregular conduct, of malpractices, of nepotism, and of deception. And one of the most important points which I raised here, and which is still left unanswered by the Honourable the Chief Minister, is the appointment

of Architects Team Three to prepare the Master Plan for the City Council. This puts Architects Team Three in a special position of determining what is to be the future zoning for the City Council area. And our objection to that is that Architects Team Three are also practising architects in the State of Penang; and here the questions of professional ethics and professional etiquette are involved. It is our view that Architects Team Three will have to choose between either becoming planning consultants to the City Council or being practising architects in the State of Penang. They cannot be both. To be both will put the other firms of practising architects in a disadvantageous position. Here you have a firm of architects in the know. The others are all in the dark. And especially at the present stage when there is just an Interim Plan. That is what they say—just an interim plan. It is obvious that the other architects in the State of Penang are feeling very concerned over this very important issue. And here we receive no answer whatsoever. No answer! At least he should have the courtesy to tell us that he is unable to answer. We will accept. So it is clear that the Motion which is put forward by us is by no means a frivolous one. It is a very serious Motion. It is a Motion not so much on the policy as put forward in the speech of His Excellency. We are not concerned here with the desirability or otherwise of the Urban Centre. We are not concerned in debating whether there should be an Urban Centre, or there should not be an Urban Centre. We are arguing here, as far as the Motion is concerned, on whether the appointment made in connection with the Urban Centre and in connection with town planning are correct appointments; whether those appointments are properly made; whether there are malpractices as far as the appointments are concerned; whether there is nepotism as far as the appointments are concerned. Those are the issues. Also, whether there is deception as far as the Chief Minister is concerned in his conduct in this House. These are the crucial issues. And we come to the conclusion in the course of this debate.

And after this debate we are even more convinced because our allegation was not refuted—that there is nepotism, there are malpractices and, above all, there is deception. So I urge Honourable Members of this House to support this Motion.

Soalan dikemukakan. Usul tidak dipersetujui.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Saya minta division, Tuan Speaker.

YA

Encik Tan Phock Kin
Encik V. Veerappen
Encik Ong Yi How
Encik Yeap Ghim Guan
Encik Khoo Soo Giap
Encik Koay Boon Seng
Encik Abdul Rahman bin Haji Yunus

TIDAK

Ketua Menteri
Timbalan Ketua Menteri
Datuk 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
Encik Teoh Kooi Sneah
Tuan Haji Abdul Kadir bin Haji Hassan
Encik Khoo Kay Por

TIDAK HAZIR

Encik Mustapha bin Hussain

Tuan Speaker: Mengikut keputusan bahagian adalah seperti berikut:

Ya—7; Tidak—15; Tidak hadir—1.

'Tidak' lebih banyak. Usul tidak dipersetujui.

Dewan ditangguhkan pada jam 11.45 pagi.

Dewan bersidang semula pada jam 2.04 petang.

(G). Usul oleh Yang Berhormat Encik Ong Yi How.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Tuan Speaker, saya mohon mencadangkan Usul di atas nama saya, dan saya minta izin membaca Usul saya dalam bahasa Inggeris.

"That this House views with grave concern the difficulties and hardships suffered by Butterworth Secondary School students who have to come to Penang for their further education due to the lack of a large type secondary school in Butterworth and therefore urges the State Government to make representation to the Ministry of Education for an early establishment of a large National type Secondary School in Butterworth so as to cater for the future graduates of all Primary Schools in Butterworth".

Mr Speaker, Sir, I do realise that this Motion concerns only part of the State of Penang. It concerns only Butterworth people: and the Motion in this way should not have come to this House for debate, but should be included in an Adjournment speech. But I have done so before—several times in this House to bring up this subject. And I have not really seen anything done when I brought up this subject.

Mr Speaker, Sir, this is a simple, straightforward Motion which I beg to move now. And I would say that this is perhaps the only Motion that has been moved in this House without any political motive behind it. And therefore it is my earnest and sincere hope that this Motion will have the support of this House. And in particular I would like to invite the Honourable Member from Butterworth to second my Motion.

Sir, before I go into the details of my argument, may I quote the following figures which could then be used to support my arguments later. The number of Butterworth students travelling daily to Penang Island for their further studies is quoted as 2,081 in February, 1974 and 2,076 in March, 1974. Mr Speaker, Sir, I am trying to get figures from other schools, but have not been

very successful. But I have got these figures from six Chinese primary schools only. And I have tried to get figures from other schools, which I have not been given. In 1973 there were 1,030 students who graduated from six primary schools in Butterworth. Sir, also, according to the 1970 Census the population in the Penang North-East District is 373,086; and in Province Wellesley North it is 161,608. Mr Speaker, Sir, from the above figures we can see that there were about 2,000 students travelling daily to Penang from Butterworth for their secondary education. Also, we can see that each year there will be an addition of at least 1,030 students looking for places to study when they want to go to the secondary schools.

Mr Speaker, Sir, here we would like to compare the population of Province Wellesley North and the Penang North-East District. Sir, here we worked out that the ratio between these two places is 1 to 2.3. Mr Speaker, Sir, I have written to the Department of Education asking for details of the names of the schools, including secondary schools, in Butterworth, and for all types of schools and secondary schools in Penang; but unfortunately I have not got a reply from them. This is what I can only use: my own guess-work. And I do not think it is very far away.

We know that in Penang we have many, many secondary schools big schools like Free School, Convent, Chung Ling, Penang Girls' High School, Chung Hwa, Heng Ee, Methodist, St. George's. And I guess that the number of places available for students in these schools approximately comes up to 20,000. On the other hand, in Butterworth we only have St. Marks School, Convent Secondary School, Kampung Kastam Secondary School, Datuk Onn Secondary School and Assumption School. So the total number of places available for secondary schools in Butterworth is not more than 4,000, and the ratio is one to five.

Mr Speaker, Sir, as I have said just now, we will have 2,000 students coming daily to Penang to study. At least, there will be an additional number of about 1,000 coming to look for places in

Penang for their secondary education. So where do they go? We don't have the large type of secondary school in Butterworth, so they do not have anywhere to go. Therefore I strongly feel that Butterworth needs a large national-type secondary school very, very urgently—a school like Chung Ling, Free School, Penang Girls' High School, or that type of school.

Sir, I am really concerned with about 1,000 graduates from 6 primary schools who originally studied Chinese. Of course, I do not mean that a secondary school should be aimed for all the Chinese-school students. I do not really mean that. It should be for students of all races. I must make myself very, very clear. But I mention these 6 Chinese primary schools because it is these 6 schools which gave me figures. Sir, the five secondary schools I have mentioned in Butterworth only take 4,000 to 4,500 students altogether; so each year they may only take a few hundred. And there are many graduates from primary schools who cannot find their place in a school.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I do know that the Federal Government plans to build one school in Mak Mandin, and one school in Prai. And I also know, from the reply to my question, that the Honourable the Chief Minister has earmarked 30 acres of land in Bagan Serai Estate. Sir, I would like to ask whether these would be secondary schools or primary schools. And would they be large-type schools like the national-type schools, or would they be only little primary schools, or several small schools?

Mr Speaker, Sir, my Motion begins by saying:

"That this House views with grave concern the difficulties and hardship suffered by Butterworth Secondary School students who have to come to Penang for their further education"

I say so because all these 2,000 students who have to come to Penang for their further studies come from the lower-income groups. Sir, there is also a large number of students who come from the upper-income group, and also from the middle-income group. These students are fortunate enough. They don't have to travel to

Penang for studies. They can stay in Penang with their relatives or friends. Some even can afford to buy houses in Penang where they can stay to study. So only those who have to travel from Butterworth to Penang for their education are those who come from the lower-income group. They cannot afford to find a place in Penang to stay for their studies.

Mr Speaker, Sir, if students stay, say, in Kampong Simpah, Sungei Puyu, Prai or Bagan Ajam, and they want to go to a school like Free School or Chung Ling or Methodist they have to get up very, very early in the morning. They would have to get up at about 4.00 a.m. or 4.30 a.m. in order that they may catch the six o'clock morning ferry. Mr Speaker, Sir, if we care to walk along Bagan Luar Road at five o'clock in the morning we can see many of those poor students who have to walk all the way to the ferry terminus in order to catch the ferry. And if we care to watch this scene I believe we will all be greatly touched by what they are suffering. We will be very greatly touched by their earnestness to study.

Sir, as regards their parents, they would have to get up earlier than the students in order to prepare their children for school. Mr Speaker, Sir, as I said just now, these students come from the lower-income group. And their parents are mainly hawkers and petty traders and workers. And many of their parents would have to sell their goods early in the morning in the market. And sometimes many of them have to do their business till very late at night. Sometimes they don't go home until 1.00 a.m. So, day after day, month after month, year after year, these parents have to go to bed at perhaps 1.00 a.m., and get up 3 hours later at 4.00 a.m. to prepare their children for school. So, Mr Speaker, Sir, if we have a large national-type secondary school built in Butterworth—for example, like Free School, Chung Ling or Penang Girls' High School—if this school can provide accommodation for 3,000 students then the suffering and hardship of the students and their parents will be altogether relieved.

Mr Speaker, Sir, in passing I would just mention that for the purpose of catering for students of all races it must be a school which is something like Chung Ling or Free School because some of these students who graduate from primary schools in Butterworth come from Chinese primary schools, and some come from Tamil primary schools. They can all go together to the same school.

Mr Speaker, Sir, in the past 5 years I have suggested many times to the Honourable the Chief Minister ways and means of starting this secondary school in Butterworth; but unfortunately each time he was very busy talking to the international giants. And very often he turned down what I wanted to speak to him.

Sir, I would like to suggest a few things that the State Government can do as regards the promotion of this school:

- (a) The State Government can announce a donation of a piece of land, say about 10 acres. I think 30 acres have been earmarked in Bagan Serai; and 10 acres could be specially earmarked for building a large national-type secondary school. This would start the ball rolling.
- (b) The State Government can officially approach the Federal Government of the Ministry of Education for permission to build this type of school. If the State Government would make a representation to the Ministry of Education I think it will carry a lot of weight. If anyone in Butterworth, even an elected member, does anything like that it would not carry as much weight as action by the State Government.
- (c) The State Government should initially take steps to call a meeting of all those people in Butterworth who are interested in the building of this school and form a Fund-raising Committee to raise funds for this project. I have said that I move this Motion at the request of many, many Butterworth people. And if the Government would take

that initiative I believe many Butterworth people will come forward to help with the fund-raising work.

- (d) The State Government can approach the Ministry of Education for grants on a dollar-to-dollar basis to build the school. In other words, if the Fund-raising Committee can raise \$1 million then the Federal Government should make a grant of the same amount.
- (e) I would like to suggest that the State Government moves a Supplementary Supply Bill in this House making provision for a special grant to the school.

Mr Speaker, Sir, although this Motion is concerned with a secondary school it is also a Motion to help the poor people in the lower-income group. Mr Speaker, Sir, the Government's New Economic Policy is to help the 'have-nots', and to eradicate poverty. This is the time that the Government can do something.

Mr Speaker, Sir, these students coming from Butterworth to Penang not only waste a lot of time but they also waste a lot of money because they have to have their lunch in school. If they were studying in Butterworth they could go home for their lunch. So, just imagine a worker working in a factory for \$2.80 or \$3 a day having to send a boy to school, with a lunch of 20 cents, or even about 50 or 60 cents. It means that it is one fifth of the total income he gets. So this is the way, Mr Speaker, Sir, the Government can really and truly help these people.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I appeal to the Government to sympathise with the poor people, and try to find ways and means to help promote a school like that. That will help thousands and thousands of people in the lower-income group in Butterworth. So, Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to say that this is a good opportunity for the Government to do something for the people. Thank you.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Datuk Yang Dipertua, di bawah Peraturan Majlis 46 (xii) saya menyokong Usul ini.

Ahli Kawasan Butterworth (Encik Ooi Ah Bee): Datuk Yang Dipertua, saya ingin membuat satu Usul iaitu untuk meminda Usul asal yang dikemukakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Bagan Ajam yang berbunyi seperti berikut:

'Bahawa Dewan ini sedar di atas kesulitan dan kerumitan yang dialami oleh murid-murid sekolah menengah Butterworth yang kena datang ke Pulau Pinang untuk melanjutkan pelajaran mereka sebab tidak ada sebuah sekolah menengah besar di Butterworth dan oleh itu mendesak Kerajaan Negeri membuat permohonan kepada Kementerian supaya membina dengan secepat mungkin sebuah Sekolah Menengah Jenis Kebangsaan besar di Butterworth untuk memuatkan semua murid-murid yang lulus Sekolah Rendah di Butterworth kelak.'

Ahli Kawasan Permatang Pauh (Tuan Haji Mohamad Nor bin Haji Bakar): Saya bangun untuk menyokong Usul itu.

Tuan Speaker: Pindaan Usul adalah berbunyi seperti berikut:

'Bahawa Dewan ini sedar di atas kesulitan dan kerumitan yang dialami oleh murid-murid sekolah menengah Butterworth yang kena datang ke Pulau Pinang untuk melanjutkan pelajaran mereka sebab tidak ada sebuah sekolah menengah besar di Butterworth dan oleh itu mendesak Kerajaan Negeri membuat permohonan kepada Kementerian supaya membina dengan secepat mungkin sebuah Sekolah Menengah Jenis Kebangsaan besar di Butterworth untuk memuatkan semua murid-murid yang lulus Sekolah Rendah di Butterworth kelak.'

Pindaan dibenarkan.

Ahli Kawasan Butterworth (Encik Ooi Ah Bee): Datuk Speaker, saya memindakan Usul yang asal itu oleh kerana nampaknya Usul asal itu yang berbunyi: 'Bahawa Dewan ini mengambil berat atas kesulitan dan . . .', dan sebagainya oleh kerana saya percaya Tuan Speaker, ini adalah satu Usul yang boleh dikatakan yang menyatakan satu motif. Walaupun, Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Kawasan Bagan Ajam kata tadi ini adalah satu Usul yang *straightforward*—satu Usul yang tidak ada kemungkinan buruk, tetapi saya fikir, saya di sini percaya, dan yakin bahawa Usul yang dibentangkan itu adalah satu Usul yang menyatakan satu motif dan juga berbelit-belit.

Tuan Speaker, dalam ucapan Usul Yang Berhormat dari Kawasan Bagan Ajam tadi beliau telah menyebutkan satu angka yang saya ingin terangkan di sini iaitu beliau kata tiap-tiap pagi dan tiap-tiap petang ada kanak-kanak sebanyak 2,000 lebih yang datang dan balik dengan feri. Tetapi saya percaya kalau kita mengikuti dengan telitinya soalan-soalan yang telah dijawabkan oleh Yang Amat Berhormat pada awal penggal tadi, saya percaya jumlah murid-murid yang datang dan balik daripada Butterworth ke Pulau Pinang itu bukanlah 2,000 tetapi hanya hampir-hampir 100 sahaja.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): May I clarify that? I got this figure from the P.P.C.

Ahli Kawasan Butterworth (Encik Ooi Ah Bee): You don't have to. You sit down.

Datuk Speaker, saya ingin juga memberitahu kepada Ahli Yang Berhormat dan juga semua Ahli-ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Pembangkang dan juga perkara ini telah juga disebutkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat sendiri bahawa Kerajaan Pusat melalui Kementerian Pelajaran sudah menyediakan satu pelan untuk mengadakan satu sekolah menengah di kawasan Butterworth iaitu di Mak Mandin dan juga di Perai dan saya percaya sekolah menengah di Mak Mandin ini akan dibina tidak lama lagi dan juga saya percaya tidak lama lagi boleh jadi awal tahun ini ataupun awal tahun depan kita akan mengadakan satu sekolah menengah untuk kanak-kanak di Butterworth.

Datuk Speaker, saya tidak ingin hendak membuang masa Dewan ini oleh kerana saya percaya banyak lagi Ahli-ahli yang hendak bercakap. Tetapi saya cuma ada satu perkara sahaja yang saya hendak bangkitkan iaitu di dalam peraturan kami kepada Kementerian Pelajaran, Kerajaan Campuran di Negeri Pulau Pinang akan cuba menitikberatkan keperluan penuntut-penuntut di Butterworth khasnya dan di Seberang Perai amnya supaya kemudahan-kemudahan yang mencukupi disediakan untuk memenuhi keperluan pelajaran di peringkat sekolah menengah. Walaubagaimanapun, Datuk Speaker,

sekiranya keperluan itu disediakan untuk murid-murid di Butterworth memilih untuk pergi ke sekolah-sekolah di luar daripada Butterworth atas sebab-sebab sendiri itu maka ini adalah satu perkara yang Kerajaan Negeri tidak dapat berbuat apa-apa. Namun demikian Datuk Speaker, saya ingin mengulangi dan menyuarakan bahawa penuntut-penuntut pada masa ini mendapat kemudahan sekolah yang cukup di Butterworth dan dengan itu semua kecaman-kecaman dan tuduhan-tuduhan yang baru sahaja kita dengar, yang telah dikeluarkan oleh Ahli daripada Bagan Ajam itu tidak benar. Saya ingin, Datuk Speaker, sekali lagi mengusul.

Tuan Speaker: Dewan dibuka untuk dibahas atas pindaan yang dibuat oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Butterworth.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Tuan Speaker, bolehkah beritahu *amendment* dibenarkan atau tidak? Jika tidak . . . (*gangguan*).

Tuan Speaker: Ya dibenarkan. Ada sokongan?

Ahli Kawasan Permatang Pauh (Tuan Haji Mohamad Nor bin Haji Bakar): Ya, tadi saya sudahpun membuat sokongan.

Tuan Speaker: Saya benarkan pindaan ini.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Mengikut bahasa Inggeris bolehkah saya bertanya sebab dia pun tidak beri saya langsung sepuccuk *amendment*.

Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Encik Ismail bin Hashim): Serupa.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Saya dengar *amendment* dalam bahasa Kebangsaan berbunyi seperti ini dalam bahasa Inggeris. Perkataan '*views with grave concern*' dipotong sudah ditambah '*is aware of*'.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): 'Being aware of'.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): 'Being aware of'. Betul atau tidak bunyi macam itu?

Tuan Speaker: Sedar.

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

Tuan Speaker tuan, saya juga sukacita mendengar pihak Kerajaan terima Usul ini, prinsip Usul ini sepenuhnya; tetapi ada satu perkataan yang Kerajaan—apa sebab saya tidak tahu mahu pinda, tetapi pindaan itu bukan *material*. Pindaan itu sahaja saya ingat mahu tutup dan apa sebab Kerajaan tidak buat pekerjaan ini dahulu? Apa sebab hingga hari ini, Yang Berhormat Ahli daripada Butterworth, membawa perkara ini, baru Kerajaan tahu perkara ini? Sebab Ahli dari Bagan Ajam berkata dalam tiap-tiap Majlis ini, mesyuarat ini, dia membawa perkara ini; tetapi Kerajaan menunggu hingga sekarang barulah bersetuju perkara ini. Murid-murid yang susah dalam Butterworth ialah satu perkara bukan diadakan pada hari ini. Masa dahulu, dua, tiga atau empat tahun dahulu begitu juga, tetapi Kerajaan tidak ambil berat atas perkara ini.

Sungguhpun Ahli dari Bagan Ajam berjumpa Ketua Menteri banyak kali berkenaan perkara ini tetapi apa tindakan pun tidak diambil. Sebab itu kita harap masa sekarang, masa pilihanraya, ada juga banyak pihak mahu main, mahu dapat sokongan, dan sebab itu boleh beri jaminan. Saya harap jaminan yang diberi hari ini satu jaminan yang betul, yang sungguh-sungguh bukan sahaja satu jaminan mahu beritahu kepada rakyat. Cakap kata bersetuju perkara ini sebab jikalau kita tidak bersetuju sudah tentu rakyat tidak boleh beri sokongan kepada wakil kita atau kepada calon kita dalam pilihanraya akan datang. Tetapi perkara ini bukan perkara pilihanraya, perkara ini bersangkutlah kehidupan orangramai—penduduk-penduduk di Seberang Perai, Butterworth dan Perai. Sebab itu, saya harap Kerajaan Negeri Pulau Pinang dan Ketua Menteri kita mesti mahu ambil berat atas perkara ini. Jadi saya harap dalam satu masa yang akan datang dalam bulan atau dalam setahun kita boleh lihat sebuah sekolah menengah didirikan di Butterworth.

Sekianlah terimakasih.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya bangun menyokong Usul pindaan yang dibuat oleh saudara saya, Yang Berhormat Ahli Kawasan Butterworth. Sebab ini bila saya mendengar ucapan daripada Yang Berhormat Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam, Usul beliau dibawa di dalam Dewan ini, nampaklah yang terus-terang. Tetapi saya fikir Yang Berhormat Ahli dari Kawasan Bagan Ajam tidak berapa faham bagaimana dia sendiri pun terima perkara ini dengan Kementerian Pelajaran sebablah di dalam ucapan beliau, beliau berkata diharaplah tanah-tanah yang kita ada di dalam Kerajaan Negeri Pulau Pinang mestilah kita sekarang beri tanah-tanah kepada Kementerian Pelajaran. Di sini saya ingat saya mestilah beri terang perkara ini. Jika Kementerian Pelajaran berpendapat bahawa ada guna sebuah sekolah menengah di Butterworth didirikan, Kementerian tersebut selalu mengikuti peraturan yang kita gunakan. Kementerian Pelajaran akan meminta Kerajaan Negeri memberi tanah untuk sekolah itu. Dan yang saya tahu, bila-bila pun jika Kementerian Pelajaran hendak minta Kerajaan Negeri Pulau Pinang hendak cari, beli atau hendak beri tanah Kerajaan Negeri selalupun sokong penuh dengan Kementerian Pelajaran. Sebab itulah saya ingat menimbangkan perkara ini terang atau guna atau ringan atau tidak perlu, itu adalah satu kuasa Kementerian Pelajaran. Tetapi Kerajaan Negeri Pulau Pinang sedar perkara-perkara yang disebutkan oleh Yang Berhormat Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam. Berikutan dengan kesusahan murid-murid—selalu apa yang kita dapat tahu daripada Pejabat Pelajaran—di dalam Negeri ialah setahun barulah lebihkurang 100 murid-murid masuk sekolah di Pulau Pinang dan tahun ini adalah 96 murid-murid sahaja yang masuk sekolah menengah.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): May I clarify?

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, ini saya tahu Yang Berhormat Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam, apa yang diucapkan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat Kawasan Bagan Ajam sungguh betul. Sebab beberapa tahun yang lalu ada

beberapa banyak murid-murid yang selalu mestilah menaiki feri pergi ke sekolah di Pulau Pinang. Itu saya terima. Tetapi saya haraplah menerima Usul ini dan bukanlah Kerajaan tidak ambil perhatian atau tidak ambil tindakan atau semacamana Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap kata inilah sahaja satu perkara yang kita ambil sebab pilihanraya. Saya sekali lagi tegaskan sebab kuasa ini dalam Perlembagaan Negeri ialah tanggungjawab Kementerian Pelajaran dan kita tahu Kementerian Pelajaran selalu mengambil berat apa-apa yang berguna untuk pelajar-pelajar yang mahu di sini, murid-murid yang duduk di Seberang Perai atau Butterworth.

Tuan Speaker: Masalah yang kita hadapi sekarang . . . (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Tuan Speaker, boleh saya, hari ini, sokong Usul yang asal. Bolehkah saya cakap di atas pindaan yang dibuat ini?

Tuan Speaker: Ya di atas pindaan itu.

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

The fact that the Government has almost completely accepted the resolution as it stands, with only a very minor and inconsequential amendment, shows the importance of the matter that has been brought up by the Honourable Member from Butterworth. And I am happy that the Government has shown some sense, and has acted, I believe, in this case wisely. Although the Honourable mover of the amendment said that there is politics I hope he is not playing politics. Because the Honourable Member from Bagan Ajam brings a thing the Honourable Member from Butterworth, his counterpart, has to bring an amendment. (*ketawa*) Anyway, it serves the people in both those constituencies.

Mr Speaker, Sir, unfortunately the sense and the purpose of the acceptance has been marred a little because our Chief Minister must have a dig at all costs, even on a straightforward Motion

like this. The Honourable Member admittedly started by saying, "Well, perhaps I should not bring this Motion as it is here." You have said that even in Chinese he is not a great scholar; and he won't be very happy about it. Then why go and dig at it?

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Speaker, mengikut Peraturan 46 (iii).

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Mr Speaker, I am not giving way. He has never given way. He has never behaved like a Chief Minister.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Sit down.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Sit down.

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

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

Orang tidak tahu Standing Orders.

Ketua Menteri: Saya . . . (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Tidak apa. You cannot give way. I give way. Never mind. Okay, carry on. (*ketawa*).

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, sekarang yang saya hendak bercakap adalah perkara lain. Yang Berhormat Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap kalau dia tidak dengar apa yang saya cakap, sayapun terima. Sebab apa, saya tidak pandai seperti semua . . . (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Lagi mahu kasi juga. Ini dia. He was born like that. (*ketawa*).

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Is he coming out with all these things?

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, saya tidak selalupun kata . . . (*gangguan*).

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Bodohlah ini. (*ketawa*).

Tuan Speaker: Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bagan Ajam, sila tarik balik percakapan 'bodoh' itu.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Saya tarik balik.

Ketua Menteri: . . . tidak guna dengan Cina-cina atau apa-apa. Saya tidak tahu apa dia kata betul-betul, tetapi ini kuatkuasa Jawatankuasa Kementerian Pelajaran.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Dia tahu juga, dia kata *make representation*. Dia faham.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Bakap (Encik V. Veerappen): Dia tahu. Datuk Yang Dipertua, saya ada ertilah. Tetapi saya juga dengar dalam ucapan Yang Amat Berhormat Ketua Menteri tadi dia akan menolong beri tanah atau ikut rayuan ini dan akan *make representation*. Pindaan itu buat permohonan kepada Kerajaan Persekutuan oleh kerana Kerajaan Persekutuanlah ada hak buat kuatkuasa, saya ingat. Ada hak atas Perlembagaan dalam Perlembagaan kita. Kerajaan Persekutuanlah ada hak membuat keputusan atas perkara ini. Tetapi saya suka berkata di sini Kerajaan Pulau Pinang dalam titah ucapan yang diberi tidak lama dahulu bukan cakap mahu menolong ataupun mahu buat rayuan. Tidak. Apa dia kata? Minta izin: "At the same time, however, the State will embark upon an intense programme of providing housing;" *et cetera, et cetera*. And, Mr Speaker, providing "other civic amenities such as schools, hospitals". Sir, how do you interpret these words: "providing schools, hospitals"? That means the State is going to provide; not make representation. And you come and ridicule a man like him. It is a shame on the Chief Minister of Penang. Minta maaf. (*ketawa*).

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Tuan Speaker, dengan izin: Since the amendment is only changing a few words—from 'views with grave concern' to 'is aware of' it does not change the contents of my Motion; so I would like to accept the amendment. (*ketawa*).

Pindaan Usul dikemukakan dan dipersetujui.

(H) Usul oleh Yang Berhormat Encik Yeap Ghim Guan.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, dengan izin: This Motion before the House is in accordance with the Federal Constitution. I would like to refer to the Constitution on this point. The provision under Articles 113, 116 and 117, by virtue of the Thirteenth Schedule to the Constitution—Part II thereof—provides that where the Election Commission proposes to make provision relating to the delineation of constituencies these proposals may be opposed or objected to, or representations may be made against these recommendations by either the State Government or any local authority whose area is wholly or partly comprised in the constituencies affected by the recommendation; or a body of one hundred or more persons whose names are shown on the current electoral rolls of the constituencies in question. Mr Speaker, Sir, in view of the manner in which the Election Commission is actually conducting this particular review—

No. 1: In respect to the State of Penang they have caused to be published two notices in connection with this review—one published in the Utusan Malaysia of the 14th March, 1975, and one subsequently published, I believe, one week later in the Straits Times—that the Constitution provides that objections or representations can only be made within a period of one month from the date of publication in a local paper. In fact, this publication in two newspapers on two different dates has caused a degree of confusion as to when the period of limitation arises.

No. 2: In view of the fact that the Election Commission bases its recommendations on the revised electoral rolls for 1974, we assume that, although the Constitution here again is silent, 'the current electoral rolls' must mean the rolls upon which the Election Commission has based its recommendations. In view of the fact that these rolls have not been made public, how are the people of Penang going to make representations through a hundred or more people? We do not know who are on the new rolls, and who are excluded from the new rolls. And therefore an

exercise to obtain 100 signatures or more is a very risky one, and a very difficult one—made difficult by the Election Commission.

We on our part, in the Democratic Action Party, certainly view with the greatest suspicion the manner in which the Election Commission has conducted this review. To begin with, for the first time in the history of the Election Commission, in 1973 they refused to allow political Parties to assist them in registering voters. Why? One of the reasons given was that there would arise duplication of registration. Sir, the answer to that is very simple: (1) It is a criminal offence; and (2) the Election Commission now has got a computer, I understand, so they can feed these names into the computer. The computer is programmed to reject double names, treble names. Obviously, the answer given by the Election Commission is false, to say the least. Why then do they refuse? We have approached the Election Commission. One of the reasons they have given also is that they cannot afford because the pieces of forms given to political Parties end up in the *kacang puteh* sellers' stalls. That, I think, is false again. Therefore, to begin with I believe that the whole approach of the Election Commission towards this exercise was in fact, in the year 1973, deliberately to exclude a lot of our citizens from the right to vote, and from being registered as voters. Sir, this is not one of the things in this country where we can take it or leave it. This electoral-roll revision is very fundamental to us, especially on this side of the House. Marking around with election constituencies is a favourite pastime of the Alliance Government. Drawing constituencies to suit their own purpose is something that the Alliance does without a pinch of salt. And we in the Democratic Action Party take the strongest objection to it. In fact, playing around with electoral rolls and electoral constituencies have in the course of history been major problems and issues. I recall the time when the Chief Minister was expelled from the M.C.A. because he took a strong stand on this question of election and constituencies, because we know that in this country

Constitutions are amended by the day. From year to year constitutional safeguards are amended. The civil liberties of the citizens are curbed, in spite of protection and safeguards, because the Government feels that it has a sufficient majority in Parliament, and also in the States, to amend State Constituencies, and does as it likes. And it is very important that a Government, particularly like the National Front Government, and the Alliance Government in particular which only commands about 50% of the actual votes cast in the 1969 Elections—in actual fact a minority Government to a great extent—should not be allowed to do as they like with the Constitution. And this is where the seeds are planted—the marking around with the constituencies.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I have to draw the attention of the House, No. 1, to the reply given by the Honourable Chief Minister who chooses to avoid this debate because he hasn't got the gumption to face up to the facts, and to take a stand on an issue over which the people of Penang feel very strongly. I like to refer to the written reply he gave to the Member for Ayer Itam when the Member for Ayer Itam, in anticipation of this debate, asked the Chief Minister a certain question about the policy of the Government on the recommendations. The Chief Minister in the course of this Sitting's debating I think, if I am not mistaken, ticked-off the Member for Ayer Itam also, and said that he showed ignorance of the Constitution; and that the Constitution had been amended. He said certain provisions had been amended to do away with the necessity or the ruling that certain rural constituencies would have only a weightage of as little as one half of the electors of any urban constituency. He said that this displayed ignorance on the part of the Opposition. Sir, we in the Opposition do not claim that we know everything. And certainly on this point we are not ignorant. But we do not have the benefit of the Legal Adviser. The Chief Minister is one of those men who, I have already said, has the Legal Adviser, but does not accept his legal advice. In fact he does not accept any advice, legal or illegal.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I have to draw the attention of the House to the answer given by the Chief Minister which shows that the Chief Minister himself was ignorant when he gave the reply to the Honourable Member in answer to the question, 'What is the stand of the State Government in the proposal of delineation of constituencies for the State of Penang by the Election Commission' in a very long-winded answer which in fact was intended to cloud the actual stand of the Gerakan Party, which is not a stand. They dare not take a stand because their life and death depend on the National Front. Among a lot of what I would term as gibberish he said—this is the part where he is wrong—that in the matter of revision of electoral constituencies, both Federal and State, the provisions of the Thirteenth Schedule of the Federal Constitution will be complied with; but distinction will be made between urban constituencies and rural constituencies because according to the new principle—he says it is the new principle—laid down in the said Schedule the number of electors in an urban constituency may contain more than half the electors of any rural constituency. During the course of this Sitting the Member for Ayer Itam said this very same thing—and he said that he was wrong: that this particular provision had been done away with. At that time he had the benefit of the Legal Adviser's advice. But when he gave this reply he himself did not know. How can the Chief Minister mislead this House? What he said in this House, and what he gave in his written reply is obviously wrong. I agree with the Chief Minister that that provision has been deleted by Parliament, and that there are now no provisions preventing the Election Commission from doing as they like. They can put 80,000 voters in an urban constituency, and 2,000 voters in a rural constituency. They can do as they like. This is the state of democracy in Malaysia; and particularly in the State of Penang which is one of the urban States of this nation.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we on this side of the House certainly cannot accept and allow these recommendations to be

passed without the strongest objections, unlike the Honourable the Chief Minister when faced with great issues of the nation. Way back in the 50's he had the privilege of running away from Malaysia on a mere issue of a medical certificate. We on this side of the House intend to face this issue. We say that future generations shall not be condemned forever to political inequality by virtue of the acceptance of this travesty of justice.

Sir, the UMNO particularly, and the members of the so-called National Front talk about correcting the economic imbalances in Malaysia; but they dare not touch the 60% control by the foreign capitalists. They are only interested in the small percentages held by our own people. But they talk about eradicating the economic imbalances. Sir, what about the political imbalances? Why is it that non-Bumiputras in this country, who also contain and make up a majority, do not even have representation politically in accordance with the electoral recommendations? The way that the constituencies are being delineated, the people of this country are being deprived of the right of one man to one vote. What is happening is that in certain constituencies one man's vote is equal to three men's vote in the urban areas. Is that fair?

Mr Speaker, Sir, before you want to stop me: I am aware that this will be our last Sitting. This, Sir, is the new recommendation (*pelan ditunjukkan*) by the Election Commission. Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the House, for example, to this constituency known as Kota Pengkalan or Pengkalan Kota—call it whichever way you like—which is a Federal constituency of Parliament. I am referring to Pengkalan Kota, State. Mind you, the number of people who are registered to vote, and the number of people who are entitled to vote are a vast difference. The number of registered voters is 15,077. That makes up a State constituency. But let us look at a rural area like Sungai Dua. For Sungai Dua the number of registered electors is 6,748. Sir, is that a fair distribution of electors in this country? Is it fair that 15,000 people are allowed one State

seat, but 6,000 people are allowed also one State seat? Is this political equality? If you want economic equality I say I support you. But the people of this country are also entitled to political equality. And I am not afraid of being charged under the Sedition Act. The Constitution provides for economic privileges. I do not see anything in the Constitution providing for political privileges. We are citizens of this country. We are entitled to the right to vote, and entitled to equal representation. Where is this equal representation when 15,000 people are allowed one State seat, but 6,000 people are also allowed one State seat? Where is the equality? I am not drawing an extreme example, or one example alone. No, Sir. In fact, I can name a whole host of constituencies in the rural areas which are so provided; and I will begin to name them if you will allow me: Bertam 7,138; Tassek Glugor 7,359; Sungai Dua 6,748; Kubang Semang 7,375; Penanti 7,819; Bukit Tengah 7,748; Machang Bubuk 7,866; Sungei Bukit Tambun 7,000. That works out, if I am not mistaken, to nearly ten constituencies. And is Pengkalan Kota the only example of this glaring imbalance of constituents or registered voters? No. Sungei Pinang also has 15,000 over voters; Datuk Keramat—14,000 over voters; Kampong Kolam—15,556 voters; Padang Kota—15,086 voters. This is the inequality. Gentlemen, you want economic equality. I say, 'By all means'. What about political equality? What has happened to the principle of one man one vote?

Mr Speaker, Sir, I know the Chief Minister of Penang, if he dares at all, will find excuses. The people know that even way back in 1969 there was in existence a recommendation to give the Island of Penang an extra Parliamentary seat. But what has happened as a result of these new recommendations? Not only did Penang fail to get an extra Parliamentary seat—it had four; it still has four—but the Island lost two State seats, and the Province was given an extra Parliamentary seat. So today Province Wellesley which is a predominantly rural area has got five Parliamentary seats; but the Island of Penang

which has a greater population than Province has only got four Parliamentary seats. What sort of delineation? What sort of justice? What sort of Rukunegara? What sort of fair play and justice is this?

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Chief Minister, if he could reply—and he may reply to one of his henchmen—would say that this is in accordance with the Federal Constitution. Now I have pointed out to him that he has given a wrong reply. We in this House, Sir, have to approach the Chief Minister's reply in a precarious situation because we never know whether he ever knows what he is talking about. But he would say, 'Oh, this is provided for in the Constitution, you know—a weightage'. I will read the Constitution in this particular reference. It is contained in Part I (Thirteenth Schedule), paragraph 2 (c), as amended. I will read it the way it was before it was amended; and I will read it after it was amended.

"the number of electors within each constituency"—

and this was before it was amended—

"ought to be approximately equal throughout the unit of review except that, having regard to the greater difficulty of reaching electors in the country districts and the other disadvantages facing rural constituencies, a measure of weightage for area ought to be given to such constituencies, to the extent that in some cases a rural constituency may contain as little as one half of the electors of any urban constituency;"

It says, 'as little as one half'. In other words, rightly—as the Chief Minister gave a wrong answer—the urban constituency can contain more than a half of the electorate of a rural constituency. Fair enough. That was before it was amended. And let us look at the rationale of this law as it stands. This was provided—as stated here at that time—because of the disadvantages facing rural constituencies, and the greater difficulty of reaching electors in the country districts. That is the reason given. That is why the proportion—what we call weightage—was given. But that has been amended too. It has been amended to read now:

"the number of electors within each constituency in a State"—
the words 'in a State' have been put in—

"ought to be approximately equal"—
the principle is there—

"except that, having regard to the greater difficulty of reaching electors in the country districts and the other disadvantages facing rural constituencies,"—
again the conditions and the reasons are there—

"a measure of weightage for area ought to be given to such constituencies."

It now eliminates 'to the extent that in some cases a rural constituency may contain as little as one half of the electors of any urban constituency;' in fact, in other words, that ratio has been eliminated. The hand of the Election Commission has been freed. They can do what the hell they want. And today this is the 'hell' they are going to do.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to point out to the great representatives of the National Front, and the great representatives of the Alliance that the rationale of this particular provision was that in an area voters have greater difficulty by virtue of the disadvantages facing rural constituencies. They face the difficulty, therefore you give them a weightage. In other words, you are saying that because of conditions of backwardness, and because of the communication rural areas are given a greater weightage. That is what you are saying. Sir, this Constitution—if I am not mistaken—was introduced in 1957 on *Merdeka*. Are you gentlemen of the National Front admitting that since 1957 you haven't improved the rural conditions, you haven't built roads, you haven't improved communications, and that thereby the situation still exists? I say that was the standard in 1957. The situation must have improved; and therefore there has been greater urbanisation in the rural areas. Isn't that what you are talking about? To use the words of the Member for Tanjong Barat, that is what the silly Alliance old cock crows about everyday. I am just quoting him, so don't look at the Speaker. You crow about urbanisation of the rural areas. All right. If there

has been urbanisation from a period when you had to give this weightage, surely there must be continual improvements; and this weightage, if at all, should be maintained but not improved upon. But judging from the kind of electoral constituencies you are giving now, where rural areas have 6,000, and urban areas carry 16,000—three times the number of voters for one constituency—what have you done to this principle? But the Chief Minister in his hope—and I say futile hope—to get into national politics at any cost, and even at the cost of mortgaging the interests of the people of Penang, is prepared to accept this wholesale. This is why he gives an irrelevant answer, and repeats the Thirteenth Schedule as an answer. The Thirteenth Schedule is not an answer to your stand. I say that the delineation of constituencies, as far as the State of Penang is concerned—and we are not here to talk about other States—is racially biased, Sir. You want to build a united nation—one identity. You talk about economic imbalance, but you are prepared to maintain the political imbalance.

Tuan Speaker: Ahli Yang Berhormat, gunakan perkataan 'you' untuk siapa? Saya faham Ahli Yang Berhormat mesti *address* kepada saya. (*Ketawa*).

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, 'you' is the terminology meaning the people whom we oppose. I do not mean you. 'You' could possibly be the Election Commission, Sir. (*ketawa*).

Mr Speaker, Sir, the people also must know that, if we really look through this revision carefully, the seats that have been allowed to accumulate voters are the seats which particularly the Alliance Government lost in 1969. The seats where they lost they very cleverly left, and increased the number of voters less the voters remaining. The areas where they are very strong they have multiplied, subdivided, and created more constituencies. That is what they have done.

Mr Speaker, Sir, even when we compare the allocation of voters in other States we find that there is a glaring imbalance. If we take for granted that

Province is actually here (*menunjukkan di atas pelan*), and Kedah is surrounding Province, I have to enlighten the House that there are Kedah constituencies which are in the rural areas, and which are neighbouring our Tasek Glugor and our Penanti. These Kedah State constituencies carry more voters than our own rural constituencies. Neighbouring constituencies which are State constituencies in Kedah have more than 7,000 voters. And yet we make this special allocation along racial lines.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the Motion is in fact a Motion to give the Government—the Gerakan particularly—an opportunity to state its stand. The stand of the Democratic Action Party in this State and throughout Malaysia is very clear. We oppose this proposal. And therefore it is my duty and my pleasure to move this Motion:

“That the Government of Penang appeals to the Commissioner of Elections in accordance with Article 116 and 117 of the Federal Constitution against the present proposals for the delineation of constituencies and proposes that—

- (1) Penang Island be given one more Parliamentary Constituency;
- (2) Penang Island as the area with the most population be given constituencies reflecting the population ratio in the State;
- (3) The imbalance between constituencies is too great, for example 46,719 voters for Tanjong and”

Here, Mr Speaker, I would like to make a slight amendment if you will bear with me. The number of voters for Permatang Pauh, Mr Speaker, Sir, should read 21,942 instead of 21,077. That is a typing error. I don't think that needs a Motion of amendment. The figure for Permatang Pauh is actually 21,942, not 21,077, if you follow me.

“ 21,942 voters for Permatang Pauh for Parliament and 16,077 for Pengkalan Kota and 6,748 for Sungai Dua for the State;

- (4) Delineation be considered on the basis of one man one Vote.”

Mr Speaker, Sir, the concept of ‘one man one vote’ is universal. And any Government which departs from that concept must prove to the hilt and justify it. The onus is on the Govern-

ment. And since the Ketua Menteri is a member of the so-called National Front, I think he is aptly in a position to explain and establish in this House the stand of his Party and the National Front. We on our part are taking the pulse of this country—of the people who strongly object to this delineation; and we object because this delineation will condemn future generations to political inequality. And if Members of the Government claim to do anything for the people—and in that even failed—at least they could do one thing: at least have the backbone to stand up on this issue and say that the delineation as published and as proposed is unjust and unfair, and will deprive all the people of Penang of the right of ‘one man one vote’.

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

Tuan Speaker: Dewan dibuka untuk dibahas.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Tuan Speaker, saya, bagi pihak Parti Pekemas, sukacita . . . (*gangguan*)

Tuan Speaker: Tolong cakap kuat sedikit.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): mengambil bahagian dalam perbincangan perkara ini.

Dengan izin bercakap dalam bahasa Inggeris:

Mr Speaker, Sir, I like the House to consider this particular Motion objectively without even bringing in Party political considerations or any racial considerations because elections and delineation of constituencies are matters that should be above politics. And I think that it will be a very sorry day for this country if Members of the Government or the Opposition or any Party consider delineation purely from the point of view of Party political ends. It is obvious that it takes somebody to start the riot. And once it is started there won't be any end because once we allow political considerations to come in then I feel that there is very little future for democracy in this country.

So it is in that light that an Election Commission was appointed. The Election Commission is supposed to free itself from Party political considerations. Whether the present Election Commission does conduct itself within the code of conduct expected, I leave it entirely to the people to judge because I wouldn't like to make any judgement. But as far as delineation is concerned a procedure is laid down. The Election Commission is quite at liberty to make any recommendations they please. The people can make representations, and so can the State Government. It is provided in the Thirteenth Schedule that the State Government or any local authority whose area is wholly or partly comprised in the constituencies affected by the recommendation can make representation. And in fact it was advertised in the *Government Gazette* that the State Government or any public body of 100 persons who are registered in the register can make representations. So what is this particular recommendation? Is this recommendation a very ordinary recommendation without really making any great departure from known practice? This is the important thing. The Thirteenth Schedule has been amended way back in 1962. But this is the first time that the Commission is utilising its rights under the amended Constitution to make recommendations. And they have seen fit to make recommendation that gives a difference between rural and urban constituencies to a range of over 50 per cent. Quite rightly, the Honourable the Chief Minister says that the Commission is at liberty to make such recommendations. But I must tell the Chief Minister that the Thirteenth Schedule merely lays down the principles. They may be free to do so; but in doing so they must consider the principles that are laid down in the Thirteenth Schedule as, though there is no limit being placed this time, originally when the Constitution was first promulgated there was a difference of 15 per cent either way—either 15 per cent more or 15 per cent less. So there could be a difference of as little as 30 per cent between rural and urban constituencies. The 1962 amendment

allowed them to be as little as 50 per cent; and the subsequent amendment gives no limit. But, whatever it may be, the principle is still there. The principle is that the Commission should take into consideration the size of the constituency, communications within the constituency, and all that. Particularly in the State of Penang the discrepancy in the means of communication between the urban areas and rural areas is not as marked as, say, in places like Trengganu or Kelantan. So even the difference in places like the State of Penang cannot be compared with the difference in numbers as between State and Federal constituencies, say, in the State of Trengganu or the State of Kelantan. And yet in those States we do not see the difference as marked as we see it in this particular State. So under the circumstances it is but natural that a body like the State should utilise its rights under the Thirteenth Schedule of the Constitution to make representations. But for the Honourable the Chief Minister to come before this House and say that it is not necessary because the Election Commission has acted within their rights! Quite true, within their legal rights they can do it. But even the Thirteenth Schedule provides that they can hear representations from the State. Is the Honourable the Chief Minister trying to tell this House that he agrees entirely with the recommendation of the Election Commission? If he does not then I say it is incumbent upon him and upon the Government to make representations. But in coming to this House and saying that it is not necessary I feel the Chief Minister is not fulfilling his duty as the Chief Minister of the State because I think that as the Chief Minister of this State it is incumbent upon him to represent the views of the people of the State. And on this question of delineation of constituencies I believe that the people of this State are not happy about this very great discrepancy between rural and urban constituencies. And I think that the Honourable the Chief Minister, in adopting this stand, is carrying his enthusiasm in supporting the National Front or the Federal Government a bit too far because here we must divorce the Elec-

tion Commission from the Federal Government, unless he holds the view that the Election Commission is but a machinery of the Federal Government. This is exactly what we are afraid of. Is he going to lend credence to the prevailing belief that nowadays the Election Commission is but a machinery of the Government in power, and that was what was envisaged in our Constitution, that the Election Commission should be an independent body, is no longer true? So, Mr Speaker, Sir, I for one would like to see the day when—on the recommendations of the Election Commission, whenever they are published—representations are made not only by the Opposition but also by the Government in power. That should logically be the case. If the Election Commission is really impartial, one would expect that whatever the recommendations may be they cannot be perfect recommendations with which anyone would entirely agree. That is an impossible position, unless the Election Commission is merely a machinery of one group or another. So the group which is given satisfaction will just keep quiet and not object, and will not raise any representation even to suggest a little change of name here and there. Is it possible that the Election Commission which is an independent body can have one mind with a ruling Party, either in the Federal Government or in the State? It looks that way. Whether we like to believe it or not, it seems to us rather odd that the Election Commission which is an independent body can make recommendations, and yet neither the Federal Government nor any State Government even see the necessity of objecting to the recommendations. These are very important issues. And I say that by agreeing to make representation, I think, at least the Chief Minister can make a little contribution to the Federal Government, or to the people whom he would like to be given support, saying that at least the Penang State Government is making representation. If not on crucial issues, perhaps object to the change of name of the constituency of Datuk Keramat into Jelutong. At least he should give some symbol of opposi-

tion, or give some symbol of the fact that the recommendations do not have the unanimous support of the State Government. So this is the situation which we have before us today. And I say it is a very serious situation. It has been said by quite an eminent research worker in the University when he made an analysis of constituencies in the country. This very eminent writer mentioned that in Indonesia at that time they had guided democracy. But, with this amendment to the Constitution, Malaysia will have what is called a manipulated democracy in which democracy could be manipulated by delineation of constituencies. And this is the situation which we have today. And I appeal to the Ketua Menteri who is the champion of the rights of the common people—at one time he was the champion of Chinese rights—to play a little part in this particular issue because to me delineation of constituencies is not a political issue, and I do not see it as a Chinese issue or as a Malay issue. It is an issue between rural and urban constituencies. And at least my Party does not equate 'rural constituency' to a racial group, or 'urban constituency' to a racial group because as a political Party we find that we can overcome all racial barriers, and we are not afraid of weightage to one side or the other. But we like to see a fair distribution—adhering to the principle of equal representation the principle of one man one vote, with little adjustment to be made within very small limits. It doesn't matter if it contains the predominance of any racial group in one constituency or the other. We feel that delineation, to be fair, must not be as it is at the present moment—very heavily weighted in favour of rural constituencies; for example, Permatang Pauh and Tanjong. So this is the situation we have today. And I feel that the principle of making representations embodied in this Constitution is worthy of support. It is worthy of support because of the fact that we as a State must demonstrate that we are not subserviently agreeing to recommendations made by the Election Commission, because to make representations will contribute, and will also be evidence that

the Election Commission is not actually an instrument of either the State Government or the Federal Government. And I think this is very important. So I would like to urge the Honourable the Chief Minister to agree to make representations, even if he does not agree with the terms as put forward by the Honourable Member from Kelawei. He can agree on his own terms. And I would urge him to make whatever necessary amendments he feels fit to this particular Motion because I feel that the principle of making representations is very important. And I am sure the Member from Kelawei will concede even if he is prepared to make reasonable amendments to this particular Motion.

Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Encik Ismail bin Hashim): Datuk Speaker, saya berdiri bagi pihak rakan-rakan saya dalam Kerajaan iaitu membahaskan Usul yang dibuat oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Kawasan Kelawei. Datuk Speaker, masalah yang kita bahas sekarang ini, saya rasa ada dua masaalah.

Masaalah yang pertama ialah Usul yang dibawa oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Kawasan Kelawei ialah meminta Kerajaan Negeri atau Dewan ini membuat rayuan untuk membahaskan cadangan kawasan-kawasan yang baru yang telahpun dibuat oleh Suruhanjaya pilihanraya. Itu masaalah yang pertama.

Masaalah yang kedua. Apa yang telahpun diucapkan oleh Yang Berhormat Ahli daripada Kawasan Kelawei ini tadi seolah-olah menuduh Kerajaan Negeri Pulau Pinang ini telahpun bersubahat. Itulah motif ucapan yang dibuat oleh Yang Berhormat Ahli daripada Kawasan Kelawei ini seolah-olahnya Kerajaan Negeri ini telahpun bersubahat dengan Suruhanjaya Pilihanraya, iaitu meminta Suruhanjaya Pilihanraya mengadakan kawasan-kawasan baru mengikut cadangan yang dibuat sekarang ini kerana hendak *suit* kemudahan-kemudahan, kesenangan-kesenangan dan faedah-faedah kepada Kerajaan yang ada sekarang. Saya fikir ini silap. Saya fikir ini salah. Sebab saya kata begitu kerana, Datuk Speaker, saya bersetuju dengan apa yang

diucapkan oleh Ahli daripada Kawasan Ayer Itam iaitu masaalah kawasan Kerajaan ataupun masaalah Suruhanjaya Pilihanraya. Ini ialah bukan masaalah yang boleh kita bahas, yang boleh kita bertanggungjawabkan kepada Ahli-ahli Dewan ini sebab Suruhanjaya Pilihanraya ini dilantik oleh Yang Dipertuan Agung mengikut Perlembagaan. Jadi, bukan pula masaalah, meminta kawasan ini ialah masaalah bangsa bagaimana yang diucapkan oleh Ahli daripada Kawasan Ayer Itam—masaalah bangsa iaitu masaalah orang Cina, masaalah orang Melayu, masaalah orang India yang ada di Negeri kita ini. Saya dengar dengan apa yang diucapkan oleh Ahli daripada Kawasan Kelawei seolah-olah, saya berasa takut hari ini, apa akan jadi kepada Negeri ini apabila kita keluar daripada Dewan ini. Dia timbul perasaan. Saya rasa sungguh takut dengan apa yang diucapkan oleh Ahli daripada Kawasan Kelawei.

Saya fikir marilah kita bertenang dan kita membincangkan masaalah itu dengan fikiran yang saksama, dengan fikiran yang waras supaya jangan kita membangkitkan masaalah-masaalah yang bukan kerja kita ini menjadi pertelagahan di antara kita sesama kita. Saya berkata begini Datuk, kerana Kerajaan Negeri ialah yang pertama sekali mendukung kesucian Perlembagaan Persekutuan antara lain Suruhanjaya Pilihanraya hendaklah mengulangkaji pembahagian-pembahagian pilihanraya bagi Persekutuan dan Negeri-negeri dan serta mengesyorkan apa-apa perubahan yang difikirkan perlu untuk mematuhi peruntukan Perkara 113 yang terkandung di dalam Jadual Ketigabelas.

Juga yang kedua pula, kami, Kerajaan Negeri, menghormati kedudukan daripada segi Perlembagaan, dari segi Perlembagaan macam saya kata tadi, bagi Suruhanjaya Pilihanraya yang mana adalah sebuah badan pertubuhan bebas yang dilantik oleh Duli Yang Maha Mulia Seri Paduka Baginda Yang Dipertuan Agung iaitu setelah berunding dengan Majlis Raja-Raja.

Dan yang ketiga, kami, Kerajaan Negeri, menerima prinsip-prinsip mengenai memperkawasankan kawasan

pilihanraya seperti yang dikemukakan kepada kami oleh Suruhanjaya Pilihanraya dalam sepucuk surat yang bertarikh 1hb Oktober, 1973 daripada Setiausaha, Suruhanjaya Pilihanraya itu. Dalam surat itu, saya bolehlah terangkan kepada Dewan ini apa yang telah dicadangkan setelah pindaan Perlembagaan dibuat, iaitu, Suruhanjaya Pilihanraya telah mencadangkan, ada empat bentuk kawasan pilihanraya yang akan dipertimbangkan untuk dikemukakan kepada rakyat Negeri ini untuk menjadi bahagian-bahagian atau kawasan-kawasan pilihanraya yang akan datang iaitu:

- (i) Kawasan metropolis yang mengandungi penduduk-penduduk 75,000 ke atas, iaitu satu kawasan;
- (ii) Bandar besar yang mengandungi penduduk-penduduk antara 10,000 hingga 74,999 orang;
- (iii) Bandar kecil yang mengandungi penduduk-penduduk antara 1,000 hingga 9,999 orang; dan
- (iv) Luar bandar yang mengandungi penduduk-penduduk kurang daripada 1,000 orang.

Inilah kawasan-kawasan yang akan dibuat mengikut surat yang dihantarkan oleh Setiausaha, Suruhanjaya Pilihanraya kepada Kerajaan Negeri yang bertarikh 1hb Oktober, 1973. Jadi manakala Kerajaan Negeri menerima asas-asas pembentukan kawasan berdasarkan kepada empat perkara atau empat kawasan ini maka inilah pada hari ini kami menerima apa yang telah dibuat oleh Suruhanjaya Pilihanraya ke atas kawasan-kawasan dalam Negeri ini.

Jadi Datuk, saya rasa tidaklah mahu bercakap banyak dan mengulas akan ucapan yang dibuat oleh Ahli Kawasan Kelawei kerana saya sifatkan kalau saya buat ucapan itu yang boleh mengeruhkan lagi keadaan ketenteraman Negara kita pada masa akan datang.

Terimakasih.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, I do not wish to add very much more to what my colleague has already said. He has in fact repeated almost precisely the reply which I had to give to the Honourable Member from Kelawei.

The only thing I would like to say to the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam who asked, "Will the Chief Minister do this? Will the Chief Minister do that?"—he asked me whether I have any objections—is this: Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to inform the House, as an individual and the Chief Minister, that when I saw the Report of the Election Commission it surprised me as much as it, I am sure, surprised other people because I certainly did not expect such a radical change. But I consider it is well within their power to do what they did. And there was no question any more under the provisions of the Constitution as it stands today for any further argument about rural weightage. So I myself as an individual consider that the decision taken by the State Government was one which was sound. And we have to meet new challenges.

The Honourable Member from Ayer Itam mentioned some unnamed Professor in an unnamed University—an expert on elections. I can also refer to people who remain unnamed who are also experts on elections, but whose views are totally different from that expressed by this unnamed expert referred to by the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam. With all these changes in constituencies, will we have what he called manipulated democracy? In actual fact the new constituency delineations really take Malaysia into a new era because no longer are we faced with the problem of minorities, but we are really faced with the problem of Malaysian issues. In actual fact, following the new delineation, my own personal opinion is that the only way whereby one can approach elections through constituencies that are now delineated is by virtue of taking up the election problems or issues in the light of Malaysia, as Malaysians dealing with Malaysian problems. From that point of view I must say that the Honourable Member from Kelawei was forthright in using the privilege of the House. He, on his own view and his Party's view, said that these delineations were made maliciously. I say that this is not true. Why do I say this? Because Article 116 and other relevant Articles of the Constitu-

tion had been amended once in 1962. And in a consequential amendment in 1973, vide Act A206, Section 2 (c) of the Thirteenth Schedule had certain words eliminated, so that at the present moment, Section 2 (c) of the Thirteenth Schedule now reads:

"the number of electors within each constituency in a State ought to be approximately equal except that, having regard to the greater difficulty of reaching electors in the country districts and the other disadvantages facing rural constituencies, a measure of weightage for area ought to be given to such constituencies;"

So it is a matter of argument with the Election Commission of how one gives this weightage. The old clause as it stood was:

"the number of electors within each constituency"—no reference to the State—"ought to be approximately equal throughout the unit of review"—those words have been taken out—"except that, having regard to the greater difficulty of reaching electors", and so on, "weightage for area ought to be given to such constituencies,"—it goes on to say in the old clause: "to the extent that in some cases a rural constituency may contain as little as one half of the electors of any urban constituency".

So you see where we have a specific definition of what weightage could mean with regard to 'rural' or 'urban'. And if we go back even to the original Article 116 of the Federation of Malaya Constitution, the whole of Article 116(3) and (4) now have been taken out. But in those days it was considered that each State should be divided into constituencies in such a manner that each constituency contains a number of electors as nearly equal to the electoral quota of the State as may be after making the allowance for the distribution of the different communities, and for differences in density of population and the means of communication; but the allowance so made shall not increase or reduce the number of electors in any constituency to a number differing from the electoral quota by more than 15 percent. So you see Clause 116 as it stood in 1957 had undergone change by 1962 to the extent that there were no further references to communities. And

it had also changed in quota. Now the 1973 amendment had taken a pace further and eliminated these differences in weightage between 'urban' and 'rural'. So the word 'weightage' was left specifically to the Election Commission to uphold.

Now here, of course, in this House the State Government takes very serious note of the Motion here. And if in fact the Honourable Member for Kelawei can get anyone to support his Motion after his brashy statements then the State Government will seriously have to consider making those representations. But if the Honourable Member from Kelawei and his Party, the D.A.P., and the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam and his Party, the Pekemas, really feel so strongly—although I think the Honourable Member from Ayer Itam just wanted to say something. But in the case of the Honourable Member from Kelawei I think he does feel very strongly about this kind of thing. I also know that he has a great capacity to go about collecting the people's signatures, and so on,—then, you see, the Thirteenth Schedule of the Constitution also provides under 5 (b) that a body of 100 or more persons whose names are shown on the current electoral roles of the constituencies in question have in actual fact the power to make representations and recommendations. So, recourse is not just to the Assembly here. And the decision should properly not be taken by the Assembly.

With regard to the State Government's stand, the State Government's stand has already been properly enunciated, and has already been repeated by my colleague, the Member for Bayan Lepas. Now that it is brought to the Assembly, the Honourable Member from Kelawei, I think, should take cognizance of all these Constitutional provisions, and act accordingly in the light of the Constitution. And I hope also in the light of the new challenges, because what lies ahead of us with the new Federal constituencies will be an era when every single person now must think in terms of Malaysian politics, and act and fight on Malaysian issues as Malaysians.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, dengan izin: I thank the Members who decided to participate in this debate. Of course, it comes as no surprise: The stand of certain Members in this House, particularly the Ketua Menteri. As I said, we already have his reply to the question of the Member for Ayer Itam in this connection. And we know particularly that not only are he and his Party members in full agreement with these proposals, but in effect, in answer to the question, in paragraph 3, he says that the State Government accepts the principles relating to the delineation of the constituencies as communicated to the State by the Election Commission in a letter dated 1st October, 1973, from the Secretary of the Election Commission. Since the recommendations were actually published on 14th March, 1974, in the *Utusan Malaysia*, if the Chief Minister and his Government knew about it on the 1st October, 1973, it must mean that not only did they know about it, but (*gangguan*).

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, on point of clarification, my exact reply with regard to that particular letter of 1973 was in reference to the communication from the Election Commission to the State Government with regard to the principles relating to the delineation of constituencies, and not to the constituencies as delineated.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, I think that unless we have production of that particular letter and the communications that took place between the Ketua Menteri and the Election Commission we have to accept his answer as it stands, and the implications of that answer. The implications are obviously that the State Government and the Ketua Menteri were consulted. And if it were not for consultations then why they write a letter to the Government in connection with this proposal? And not only were they consulted, but they accepted the provisions. And let him not later say that these provisions were not accepted by his Government. Mr Speaker, Sir, as the Member for Ayer Itam says, in fact (*gangguan*).

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Yang Dipertua, on a point of clarification, it was principles, and not provision.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, as the Member for Ayer Itam says, perhaps the term is 'subservient to the Federal Government'. And in his subservience he is so afraid that even the slightest tinge of objection to what the Member for Ayer Itam says is supposed to be an independent body will damage his prospects with the Federal Government.

There is no point, Sir, for the Member for Bayan Lepas to try and herald the Constitution to us. We know that the Election Commission is set up by the Agong. We know that. We know the provisions whereby the Commission was set up with powers, *et cetera*. There is no need to read this back to us. And in fact, as the Chief Minister quite rightly says—and I agree with him on that—the Member for Bayan Lepas only managed to read the Chief Minister's answer in his speech, which is not much of a contribution because we are already aware of what the Chief Minister said. But, Mr Speaker, Sir, even the Chief Minister himself in his speech admits that there has been an erosion. And that is all he needs to say, instead of going in this roundabout way, leading us down the garden path. He need only say that starting from a 15% weightage it became a 50% weightage; and from a 50% weightage it became an unlimited weightage. The doors are wide open for the Election Commission to do as they think. This is precisely what I say. But the fact that the Thirteenth Schedule provides it does not mean that we, the people's representatives, must sit quietly aside and say, 'Go ahead'. Just as the Constitution was amended to do this it can be amended to do anything. But let us not accept that we have no powers here. What we are saying is in keeping with the Constitution also. This is where the Chief Minister wishes to pass the buck; and this is highly irresponsible. The people of Penang elected him to lead us. Even at this eleventh hour we hope that he will lead us. Not into the drain; across the bridge. There is no bri-

dge; but we hope he will lead us. And here he is trying to *tolak* the responsibility away from himself to the people. He chose to read paragraph 4 of Part II of the Thirteenth Schedule and say (gangguan).

Ketua Menteri: Five.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Paragraph 5, yes—you are not sleeping—“(b) a body of one hundred or more persons whose names are shown on the current electoral rolls of the constituencies in question.’ If he had taken the trouble to read the whole, and not part of it, he would have given the reason why this should be very difficult, apart from the fact that he is trying to pass the buck, because even the Constitution provides that it is the State which has the first move. And then a body of 100 persons can do it. Why does he push the responsibility to the people when he has the leadership capacity? He is the leader. He is the Ketua Menteri. He should take the role. From his answer it would appear that he is certain. He says that he was taken by surprise. Well, I can gather that—of course, he did not say that he outright supports it—personally he was not too happy about it. Then why don’t you translate it into policy? But, as I said, they wish to have their cake and eat it at the same time. But the fact simply remains, Sir, that it is the responsibility of the State. And we in moving this Motion are giving the State the opportunity to uphold the responsibility as provided by the Constitution. We are aware that the Election Commission is fully empowered under the Constitution to make this proposal, or even worse proposals. That we do not object to, deny or question. But we say that similarly under the Thirteenth Schedule the State Government equally has the power, in being faced with such a proposal, to object to it for all it is worth. But at least you have a duty to the people to object to it and say, ‘This is wrong. This is a travesty of justice’ and make fair representations for the better. I agree to a weightage; but I do not agree to this kind of

weightage. That is all we are asking the State to do. But the State Government, as usual would rather deal with personal matters, and say that the D.A.P. has a great capacity in collecting signatures. Sir, that is beside the point—whether we have the capacity or otherwise. And you may be mistaken. That capacity may be bigger than you think. But in saying that you are trying to brush issues aside, and drawing irrelevant arguments. The fact remains, and will be proven here that the opportunity was given to the Chief Minister to make proper representations. If he dare not by himself or through the volition of his own Government, then through the State Assembly make representations to the Election Commission. If he does not wish to then let him be so condemned by history, because we are aware, Sir, frankly, that whether Motions are accepted in this House or otherwise they mean very little to the Ketua Menteri. I recall a Motion in this House that was moved by the Opposition at one time to call for free elections to the Local Councils. It was taken over by the Chief Minister through amendment and carried. And up to today there is no progress. In fact they have gone backwards. Now they are going to have a nominated Council. This is the respect they show for a resolution of the House. Whatever resolution is put up on this side has very little bearing on what they chose to do on the other side. Therefore, Mr Speaker, Sir, it is a matter of regret that the Government, and particularly the Coalition Government, cannot support this Motion which is also supported by a member of the National Front. The M.C.A. has been clamouring outside this House that these proposals are unjust. We are, of course, to await events and developments in the National Front. But we cannot, in taking this step, be accused of being anti-national, unless the M.C.A. also is anti-national.

Soalan dikemukakan dan Usul tidak dipersetujui.

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

YA

Encik Yeap Ghim Guan
Encik Khoo Soo Giap
Encik Koay Boon Seng
Encik Tan Phock Kin.

TIDAK

Ketua Menteri
Datuk Teh Ewe Lim
Encik Tan Gim Hwa
Encik Wong Choong Woh
Encik S. P. Chelliah
Encik Ismail bin Hashim
Tuan Haji Ahmal bin Haji Abdul-
lah
Encik Ooi Ah Bee
Encik D. C. Stewart
Tuan Haji Mohamad Nor bin Haji
Bakar
Encik Khoo Teng Chye
Encik Teoh Kooi Sneah
Tuan Haji Abdul Kadir bin Haji
Hassan
Encik Khoo Kay Por.

TIDAK HAZIR

Encik V. Veerappen
Encik Ong Yi How
Encik Abdul Rahman bin Haji
Yunus
Encik Mustapha bin Hussain
Timbalan Ketua Menteri.

Tuan Speaker: Keputusan bahagian di atas Usul ini ialah seperti berikut:

"Ya"—4; "Tidak"—14; "Tidak
Hazir"—5.

Usul tidak dipersetujui.

Dewan ditangguhkan pada jam 4.10 petang.

Dewan bersidang semula pada jam 4.39 petang.

(I) Usul oleh Yang Berhormat Encik Yeap Ghim Guan.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, dengan izin:

It is my pleasure and duty to move this Motion before this House—the last Motion of this Sitting. Dan nampaknya Ketua Menteri fikir Usul ini tidak

ada asas dan tidak ada khas atau keutamaan. Sebab itu dia tidak ada sini langsung. Kalau dia mahu main begini bolehlah semua orang tengok.

Tuan Speaker: Ahli Yang, Berhormat, tolonglah baca Usul ini.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, the Motion is:

"That the Appeal of the residents of the site of the proposed Urban Centre Project be accepted and a Commission of Inquiry be established to investigate into the project, especially the circumstances surrounding the award of the contract to "Team Three" without a tender being called".

In the course of this Sitting many things have been said in anticipation of this debate. This is a substantive Motion on the Urban Centre Project which should aptly be called the Urban Central Problem because it has become the major social and economic threat to the livelihood of thousands of our Penang citizens. This Motion seeks to call upon the Chief Minister's Government—the Coalition Government of the Gerakan and the UMNO—to accept the appeal of the people affected by the proposed Urban Centre Project; and seeks at the same time for a Commission of Inquiry to look into the whole project, and also into the malpractices in connection with the award of the contract to Architects Team Three, the senior partner of whom is the Chief Minister's own brother, due, of course, according to him, to an act of God. I can anticipate that the Chief Minister and his Government will attempt to side-step the issues of this Motion; and even ignore the issues that are raised by the Opposition. But this does not and will not deter us, on this side of the House, from carrying out our clear duty. Our responsibility is here. We will carry out our responsibility. The Chief Minister has privilege to abandon his responsibility, and even refuses to sit in this Assembly for this particular important topic—one of the biggest, if not the biggest, project in the history of Penang; a \$200,000,000 project. He is not prepared to be here. But inability on the part of the Govern-

ment to effectively answer the charges raised so far in the course of the sitting of this Assembly against this project is not so much due to a sense of doing what is right, but because they are plainly unable to answer the charges.

Mr Speaker, Sir, this Motion has raised considerable interest, to the extent that the people from the area affected by the Urban Centre Project have, in the course of this Sitting attended this Assembly in the gallery. And I would like to place on record that it has been a matter of experience that they have not been assisted in gaining admission to this Assembly. In fact, they have been hindered. All sorts of obstacles have been placed in their way. There have been identity-card checks. All of a sudden policemen are appointed to check identity cards. People carrying umbrellas—normally the womenfolk—are also told that they are not allowed to go in with their umbrellas. I think that the Chief Minister's life is quite safe with us here. We will protect him if anybody were to attack him. But, Sir, this is a democratic country. Democratic principles must prevail. If our people take an interest in politics to the extent that they come here to witness the proceedings on matters pertaining to them—they have every right they should receive every courtesy when they come and sit and watch the proceedings. But sad to say, obstacles have been placed in their way. And I think that is very, very unfair. You are merely discouraging democratic Parliamentary practice. You are telling them, "Representations from your elected representatives are futile. Don't come," when you should in fact accord them every facility to come. As a result of statements made in the newspapers, precautions have been taken well in advance in anticipation of a mass attendance. As I say, the people who put their signatures to this petition to the Chief Minister are law-abiding citizens. They don't carry bayonets or the gun (*ketawa*). They don't speak through the barrel of the gun yet. But they are law-abiding citizens of our country. They have every right to make representations to you, gentlemen. And if you take offence then I say you will have to reap the holocaust. That is why

you find that you are confronted with situations which you are in no position to control. Just as the Chief Minister was unable to answer my charges of Gerakan land speculation, with the result that this was commented upon by a local paper, he is similarly unable to accept our call for a Commission of Inquiry. That much I can anticipate. Never in the history of the State of Penang have people so united together to collect signatures for a petition to the Chief Minister. And they should be congratulated for their law-abidingness and respect for our democratic process. When people collected signatures of appeal constitutionally to the Chief Minister he makes all sorts of insinuations. And they even say that the people were deceived into signing the petition. The Member for Tanjong Barat said that the people who signed this petition were ignorant of its contents. I would like to make one thing very clear to him. There was a Chinese translation also which accompanied the petition. If he would like to have a copy of the Chinese translation I will give him one. But don't make allegations because you may find that allegations are rather too serious to substantiate. If he wishes to prove that any one signature was obtained under false pretences he could have obtained the original copy from the Chief Minister, and the necessary action could have been taken. Mr Speaker, Sir, there are two causes for this attitude of the Government:

- (1) Fear for the people; and
- (2) Disrespect for the masses and their capacity to organise.

However, when people demonstrate against the Chief Minister he threatens to hit back, and calls in the Police. Because the D.A.P. is a democratic and constitutional Party, we go by constitutional methods. We are therefore proud to be associated with this mass-signature campaign of appeal to the Chief Minister. This is only an appeal, Sir. This is not a threat. We are not like the Chief Minister. We don't come to this Assembly and threaten to get the Minister of Home Affairs to arrest people. We don't do that. We appeal. We make our appeals through what

you call the proper channels. But don't be mistaken, Sir. The people of the Urban Centre area in actual fact deserve all the credit for this. I have said this in the papers; and this can be repeated. We only claim credit for being the vehicle of the people's objection. And if you claim that the signatures were obtained under false pretences you are not accusing the D.A.P. alone. You are accusing the people of Magazine Road, Gladstone Road, Cross Road, Tek Soon Street, Maxwell Road and Jalan Ria, and all other residents of the area because they collected the signatures together with us. We did not collect the signatures on our own. Even the muted Straits Times carried the petition; and it is clearly stated there, 'Shopmen send petition to Chong Eu.' If I may read: Shopkeepers and residents affected by the State Government's \$200 million Urban Centre scheme in the heart of the city have sent a petition to the Chief Minister to stop the project.' Don't say it is the D.A.P. alone. Therefore, if you are brave enough to make this allegation in this House, please go to these places on your own and repeat this statement, without your bodyguards. To begin with, it is an untruth and a gross distortion of fact to say that the appointment of Malayan Architects was for the purpose of the Urban Centre. I say it is an untruth that Team Three succeeded Malayan Architects for the construction or planning of the Urban Centre. They were engaged to cover up the monsoon drains at Maxwell Road, and to build a hawkers' and shopping arcade, with a bus terminal. That is all. This is where the Chief Minister has made, I would say, an Urban Centre out of a mole-hill. That was the original project; and that was the basis upon which the City Council spent, according to the Chief Minister's answer, \$57,700. The City Council spent that money for what purpose? To engage those consultants. But this has nothing to do with that. The Chief Minister now wishes to assign blame to the City Council; or even push further to the Labour Government of the City Council.

Mr Speaker, Sir, in fact, now the so-called Consortium, or even Team Three, Head of the Consortium, are employed

by the P.D.C. That is the answer of the Chief Minister. He cannot deny it now. So, was the P.D.C. in existence in 1963? Are you saying that now? Let us draw the line of distinction. The City Council employed Malayan Architects. And perhaps in succession Team Three came in; but not for the Urban Centre Project. So do not try and bluff. The fact is that, although the City Council appointed the Consultants to cover a ditch, Team Three was appointed not by the City Council but by the Chief Minister to do the Urban Centre Project. And this is a clear-cut case of political nepotism, shamelessly practised. He now tells us a ridiculous story that his brother is one amongst hundreds in Team Three. But the question is not that Team Three has a lot of employees. We agree that Team Three may be a big organisation. It probably has one hundred people working for it—draftsmen, clerks, typists, stenos, and all sorts of people. But the point is that his brother is a senior partner, and the employer; not an employee of Team Three. That is the difference. In judging whether there has been nepotism we cannot, admittedly, look only at the appointment. And the appointment, I might stress here, is without tender for Team Three. I know the Chief Minister says: 'Oh, I can give you plenty of examples. The Universiti Sains have got projects where they never extended . . . , you know.' Well, I can give the Chief Minister further examples if he wants examples. Goh Hock Guan was appointed to do the work of Subang Jaya. I don't think there was a tender. But we know who he is, and who he was acting for. So there is political favouritism. We know it exists among the Alliance. Don't quote Alliance examples. The Alliance is one of the most politically-corrupted Parties that practises nepotism right through their nose. Don't tell us examples from the Alliance Party. Tell us examples from other countries. How was the Sydney Opera House designed and built? Was there a competition? Ah, tell us that. Don't tell us about Alliance practice. They are two of a kind.

Sir, if we just confine ourselves to the Urban Centre we would be unfair because one swallow does not make a spring. We cannot base on the Urban Centre and accuse the Chief Minister of practising nepotism. We would be doing him an injustice; and I would not permit it. But we must look at the sum total of the methods of the Chief Minister. Has he practised nepotism in other instances? Well, for example, the appointment of a Party member—would you like the name? I mentioned it the last time. It can stand repetition—Rajasingham to the Water Authority. The appointment of this same person and his brother and other relatives to the Rent Tribunal Board of Penang. It is a fact, if the Chief Minister wants it to be mentioned, I mention it.

Tuan Speaker: Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Kelawei tolonglah *confine* kepada *subject under discussion*. Janganlah pergi luar dari situ. Saya tidak benarkan, Ahli Yang Berhormat.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, saya tidak apa bagi saudara-saudara dan kawan-kawan kerja dan juga dalam Kerajaan. Sebab itu saya bagi contoh.

Tuan Speaker: Saya faham. Tetapi saya mahu *confine subject under discussion*. Saya tidak mahu pergi lain-lain keluar. Itu kita sudah dengar banyak. Confine to this alone.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, even on appointments to Local Councils allegations have been made in this House—Gerakan Secretaries and members being appointed, and being promoted. In that kind of background, are we entitled then to question the appointment without tender of the Chief Minister's brother's firm? That is the question. But on some of these appointments which I have mentioned, which you are so worried about, I think you need not worry very much because this is the last Sitting of this Legislative Assembly.

Tuan Speaker: Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Kelawei, saya bukan worry. Saya mahu confine to the subject under discussion. Saya tidak ada worry apa-apa.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Okay, okay, baik. Then you want me to confine only to this subject?

Tuan Speaker: Ya.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): This is not the only instance. And as I said, in some of the other appointments there has been justification. I do not attack a person just because he is a Gerakan member. He may get the P.J.K. before he joins, or after. That does not matter. If the merits are there, let him have it. But we object when we have seen nepotism systematically being practised. Mr Speaker, Sir, this is not a \$20,000 project; and that is why we have raised the matter so many times. When we raise matters here they say it is petty. We raised the question of the Hamilton Road Balai Rakyat being sold without tender. We raised the question of land in front of the City Stadium being sold to a Petrol Station without tender. They say, 'Petty', you know. Petty? Well, that was a few hundred thousand dollars. But here it is \$200 million. And where do you draw the line? If we allow you to go on with this kind of selling of land, and doing all sorts of things without tender, we will end up with a \$200 million problem.

Mr Speaker, Sir, this project of \$200 million or even \$300 million we have to scrutinise properly. How many professional people can claim the making of one million on one transaction, not to mention 10% of 200 million, or even 5%? The Chief Minister today says it is 9.5%. Mr Speaker, Sir, he himself said it was about 10%. That was his answer in a written question. And he now chooses to say '9.5%'. He said it was Team Three who got the 10%. Now he wants to say it is somebody else. It is his answer. He is entitled to change it as many times as he likes. But we know that definitely Team Three is in for millions. And, Mr Speaker, Sir, I dare say that we in the Opposition can claim the credit. If it was 10% at the last Sitting, and it has become 9.5% today, that .5% reduction was obtained by the Opposition. Because this issue was raised in this Assembly, Team Three

and their friends have been under public pressure to reduce by .5%. But I say that even .5% is not enough. Normal architectural fees of this nature are about 7%, Sir. And the bigger the project the lesser the percentage. I ask the Chief Minister: Is it due solely to an act of God that Team Three has got this project, or is it the act of the Chief Minister? I dare say that without the Chief Minister there would be no Urban Centre Project and no 9.5% commission.

There are more pressing problems facing the people of Penang, the least of which are inflation and land speculation. The Chief Minister announced in 1972 that it would be a year of housing. In 1972 he did not build a single house for the people of Penang. That was called, 'The year of housing.' It should be more appropriately called 'The year of no housing'. In fact, the record of the Government as far as low-cost housing for the people of Penang in the last 4 years and 11 months is concerned is a zero. Housing is a grave problem in Penang. By tearing down the houses of these people at the Urban Centre site you will create a new housing requirement. If your houses are not built, and with a project of \$200 million, where are we going to find the funds to build housing for our people again? Mortgage the people of Penang? Mortgage the land? Go and borrow more money from the Federal Government? Follow Alliance policy? Go around begging for money? Is that what you want us to do?

The Chief Minister and his so-called Deputy both say that there has been a growth of squatters in this State. It is in today's newspapers. Quoting what the Deputy said: 'A growth of squatters in this State by the thousand'. The Chief Minister himself said that on the mainland it is even worse—squatters all over the place. In these last five years there has been a growth of squatters. I say this is testimony of their housing failure because the population of Penang has hardly increased, yet more and more people are turning to squatting as a livelihood. By turning the people of the Urban Centre area out of their homes, and out of their shops, and out of their

businesses you are driving multitudes to become squatters. You at least owe them accommodation. But the fact is that you have no accommodation to offer in the Urban Centre or elsewhere. By slapping your acquisition notices on their property you are going to pay them for their land at pre-speculation prices. And by the time you complete your acquisition process the money you compensate them ten years from now will not enable them to buy a hut in the rural area. You, as a responsible Government, want to buy the property of the people at the Urban Centre site valued at the cost before the price of the land went up. And speculation in land was caused by your Government. That is not imported inflation, you know. We didn't import the land. The land was already in Penang. How did the land prices in Penang go up if it had not been for you people? Don't talk about imported inflation in this respect. And if you pay them at pre-inflation prices, how do you expect them to buy land at post-inflation prices? The price of land, I will tell the people of Penang, will keep on going up. So long as the Gerakan Government and Coalition Government are in power it will keep on going up. And if you are very clever, and take the people's land, and pay them the price that they could have got one year ago three years from now, do you expect them to go and find an alternative site? I say you cannot give them an alternative site. Sir, you are destroying the livelihood, the savings, hard-earned accumulation of capital, and the roof over the heads of our people, our kith and kin, our fellow citizens. For what? For profit to achieve your political ambition, so that you can claim that although the Alliance Government in other States cannot implement the New Economic Policy you will do so in the State of Penang.

The Chief Minister, in the Governor's speech, makes a vague reference to the New Economic Policy. And in his speech he talks about a 30% participation in finance and development. What do you mean? Spell it out. What is this 30%? Tell us. Why hide behind vague phrases, and say 30% participation?

Tell us what it is. If you are so proud that you are the first State to do it—even UMNO States find difficulty—tell us what it is all about.

The cost of housing in Penang, Sir, is rising. You cannot buy a semi-detached house in the city for less than \$90,000. That is a fact, Mr Speaker, Sir, try and buy a shophouse at \$150,000 in a business centre. And the prices are rising. When you compensate our people at pre-speculation prices, what can they do with the money? Is it fair, when you yourself are instrumental in raising the price of the land and housing and business premises? You are driving our people back into the slums, into poverty, into ruin. That is your achievement. What is going to happen to the dependants of motor-mechanic firms, furniture shops, retail shops, sundry shops, hawkers, coffee mills, coffee shops and others? When you close them down will you be able to offer them accommodation? The answer is "No". The Chief Minister and his bully boys have gone about the town, outside this Assembly, promising a lot of things. We give the Chief Minister now an opportunity to prove his words here. Tell us in what way you propose to allocate to these people places in the project. Where will the coffee-sellers go? Where will the sundry shops go? Can they open supermarkets? Have they got the money to open supermarkets or air-conditioned shopping arcades, with the miserable \$20,000, \$30,000 or \$40,000 you gave them? What sort of rents will you be charging? You claim that you will have a return of 12% of capital, and that Assessment from \$3 000 will go up to a million dollars in any particular phase. The Chief Minister himself has said that at this Sitting.

Sir, what sort of rents will you be charging? We know that Assessment is but a percentage of the annual value; and the annual value is based on the economical rent that you can obtain. Now, if people are just paying a few thousand dollars of Assessment today, and you are going to charge them \$1 million of Assessment, what sort of rents will you be charging? And what sort of values are these? How expensive are

these places? Maybe a tycoon from New York, Hong Kong or Singapore can invest in your Urban Centre project; but not the ordinary shopkeepers, sundry shopkeepers, coffee shop men. They have no places here. You are going to drive them into the slums.

Mr Speaker, Sir, in a city like Hong Kong which is notorious for its land value you can buy a square foot of land for \$1,000. You know that. And at this moment, while I am speaking, it probably has gone up to \$2,000. And do you know how much the biggest Urban Centre development project in Hong Kong is worth? Three hundred million Malaysian dollars. That is the biggest Hong Kong has got. Skyrocketing land value. And tiny. Sleepy-Hollow Penang—\$200 million.

Mr Speaker, Sir, where is the urgency of this project? I do not see the urgency. In fact, our people cannot afford this type of building. But, as I said, we have to assume that the Chief Minister has got a pre-feasibility survey for the Urban Centre. But he says: 'Oh no, I cannot show you. This is secret. The appropriate time will come when I show you.' When is the appropriate time? This is the appropriate time.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to show the House what I have traced as a map. It is not a very good map, but it tells the story of the Urban Centre—a map of the Urban Centre (*menunjukkan pelan*). If you can see the plan, it is bounded by Maxwell Road, Penang Road, Magazine Road and Bridge Street, I think. Sir, why is it a coincidence that Su Beng Dispensary which is sited on the boundary of the Urban Centre project is not affected by the acquisition notice under the project. Is it because the owner is Dr Lim Chong Eu? (*ketawa*). According to the Chief Minister—I am glad that he is back. I hope he has taken a glass of cool water—in connection with acquisition in Glugor and Green Lane for the so-called bridge project of his, which is another election stunt, acquisition notices were imposed—and I quote his words—'upon an area usually larger than the intended acquisition.' That is what he said. So he told us in this

House, 'Tell the people of Glugor and Green Lane not to worry. This is just a formality. We just impose legal acquisition notice.' Well, Sir, how is it that you imposed acquisition precisely on this area, and Su Beng Dispensary was left out? Huh, that is a coincidence, Sir. And it is also a coincidence, Sir, that Central Hotel, which was formerly called International Hotel, was recently taken over by the Central Securities group; and it has been turned into Central Hotel. And one of the Directors is a very close supporter of the Chief Minister. It is a coincidence how people can time everything so well. And it is also a coincidence, Sir, that according to the Chief Minister who brought this matter on Central Towers is going to be sited here also (*sambil menunjukkannya di atas pelan*) just a stone's throw from the Urban Centre. Quite a coincidence!

Mr Speaker, Sir, is the Chief Minister so insensitive to the people? Does he not realise that people will feel that your own premises which adjoins their land does not suffer from acquisition. You can sell at your price. We who own the pieces of land adjoining you will have to sell at a price post-inflation. Is it fair? Is it Rukunegara—fair play? Sad to say, Sir, I do not think it is.

Mr Speaker, Sir, in answer to our question the Chief Minister says, 'Oh, everything is affected by this acquisition.' When I asked him whether this was planned in advance he said, 'Oh, it has been planned in advance, with the 'CAPU' and the 'SAPU'. It is more like 'SAPU' had everything planned. When I asked him if the Post Office which was built recently is going to be torn down he said 'Oh, that is a Federal matter.' That is a very good answer. There is no co-ordination. Where is this rapport?

The Chief Minister must also answer why Oriental Emporium and Shaw Brothers' Capitol have, as I understand, been excluded? Why? Because Shaw Brothers are bigger fellows than the Chief Minister, and he can't take them on? If they can be excluded, why can't Ah Chong, Ah Kow be excluded? They are not so influential.

Of course,

Mr Speaker, Sir, we feel that perhaps at the rate things are going, and at the rate certain people happen to know where to buy land suddenly, perhaps the next Gerakan elections slogan will not be 'Vote Gerakan. We can do more for Penang,' but 'Vote Gerakan. We can do more for ourselves.' That would be a more appropriate elections slogan. But, Mr Speaker, Sir, let us not have 5 years of Government, and 10 years of suffering. If you have failed to carry out your promises don't erect a tombstone in the heart of our city. Don't erect a tombstone. There are many examples of white elephants in Malaysia. Go to Malacca. The Alliance Government also built a helluva big building in Malacca which is standing there half empty. They also think in terms of height. Perhaps the higher it is the easier it would be for the Chief Minister to jump down.

But let us look at the merits of the project also. Let us not say that we just went through the thing. What are we providing? Are there car parks? Are there theatres, concert halls? What facilities do you have? Are you going to spend \$200,000,000 just to make a bus terminal? That is what you told us. Is that what you are doing? What are these great facilities that require this much investment, measured against unemployment, under-employment, housing problems, settlement? What relevance has this—what you call—futuristic building? It is a word he likes to use. It captures the imagination of schoolboys. Futuristic! Mr Speaker, Sir, I would tell the Chief Minister that this building is no more futuristic because in America they talk in terms of 'machine city'. You are out-of-date. They do not talk about this kind of things any more. And what is an octagonal building doing inside the Urban Centre? I understand architects abhor this kind of building because it wastes a lot of space. But it looks nice on model paper, you know. You can show people a funny shape, you know—a five-sided building. I understand this from my friends who are architects, but are not in Team Three. No act of God gives them a Chief Minister (*ketawa*), so they don't have the opportunity.

But, Mr Speaker, Sir, what is this? We know of instances when UMNO leaders built a huge palace in the centre of a padi field. That is how they use elections to gather our votes. And that is what you are doing. You are building this so-called futuristic building around a scenery of squalor. Improve the housing conditions for these people. What about investments on bringing in infrastructure facilities? How much will it cost us? I believe, Sir, that this Urban Centre project of \$200,000,000 will become, by the time it is completed in three years' time, and at the rate inflation is going, helped by the Alliance Government and the National Front, a \$300,000,000 white elephant.

Mr Speaker, Sir, we really appeal to the Government and to the Chief Minister to heed the call of the people. And in ending I would like to put on record the appeal of the people addressed to the Honourable the Chief Minister. And I say we do not approach this Motion with hostility. Alright, with the characteristic dynamism of the D.A.P. we do put our points through a bit more forcibly. He is not accustomed to it; but he will be in time to come. But the people, Sir, are getting more and more impatient with a Government which does not care, and a Government which is indifferent.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to read the petition. It reads:

"We, the people of Penang, appeal to the Penang State Government to reconsider the City Centre project, or so-called Urban Centre project because the proposed project does not meet with the urgent needs of the City of George Town. And we call upon the Government to immediately suspend its plans to commence construction scheduled for the 1st January, 1974, as *inter alia*—

- (1) The Civic Centre will cause irreparable economic hardship to the people directly affected by the construction.
- (2) Business carried on for generations will be closed; and great financial loss will be suffered by the people.
- (3) Large numbers of families will be found to be turned out of their homes in which they have lived for 30 to 50 years—before the Chief Minister himself was born also.
- (4) Large numbers of families will be made homeless, and be thrown into inferior housing conditions.
- (5) Many houses affected by this project are still very good structurally, and fit for habitation for tens of years to come.
- (6) The proposed Civic Centre does not meet with the basic essentials of an urban renewal programme.
- (7) The people who are tenants stand to lose large sums of money paid as premium to obtain tenancies of choice business sites.
- (8) The use of acquisition legislation to forcibly obtain premises for what is basically a private development project is not in accordance with the principles of the Rukunegara, of justice and fair play.
- (9) Business premises recently renovated stand to lose thousands of dollars by this acquisition.
- (10) The Government should purchase properties by private treaty, or seek vacant sites for such projects."

Here I would like to pause, Sir, to note that there is precedence of this. The Bagan Serai land was bought by private treaty. The Chief Minister will confirm this.

- "(11) No adequate compensation is being made which takes into consideration economic dislocation, loss of goodwill, and extreme hardships to the people.
- (12) The City Council has more urgent problems which are not resolved, such as low-cost housing, sewerage schemes, drainage, flood alleviation, road-widening and traffic control.
- (13) The urban renewal should be at private level, with incentives given by the Government so that the poorer sections of the community will not be made to suffer by the use of special legislation which circumscribes the protection normally available to the citizen.
- (14) The use of the Acquisition Act ousts the provisions of the Control of Rent Act, and other principles or equity for just and fair compensation on a project without urgent or public necessity.
- (15) The project will cause increases in rent, thereby pricing the average small business-man out of a living.

- (16) There is a greater demand for other State projects like the Penang Island-Butterworth bridge which will bring greater income and benefit to the people, and cost a quarter of the cost of the Urban Centre.
- (17) The project has not been fully explained to the people; and no proper city utilization stand has been made. And hasty implementation will cause sufferings to the people.
- (18) More time should be given for the views and aspirations of the people of Penang to be ascertained, especially those in the City who are affected."

And it concludes:

"We therefore call upon the Chief Minister, as the Officer Administering the City Council of George Town, and the Chief Minister of the State of Penang to appreciate our difficulties, and to understand our hardships, and call a stop to the projects as a demonstration of a just and equitable and responsive Government. The Coalition Government as a democratically-elected Government of the people, should consult and respect the wishes of the majority. We pray that the Chief Minister, as the highest Authority of the State, will have sympathy for our fight, and preserve our rice bowls, and accept our appeal as humanitarian, and in the spirit of the Rukunegara."

Mr Speaker, Sir, in the light of that petition, what more is there for me to say?

Ahli Kawasan Tanjong Bungah (Encik Khoo Soo Giap): Tuan Speaker, dengan izin: I rise to support the Motion.

Tuan Speaker: Dewan dibuka untuk dibahas.

Ahli Kawasan Bayan Lepas (Encik Ismail bin Hashim): Datuk Speaker, saya bagi pihak rakan-rakan saya dari Kerajaan membangkang Usul ini. Usul ini dibawa oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Kelawei adalah sebenarnya berdasarkan kepada rayuan-rayuan yang dibuat oleh penduduk-penduduk di mana Projek Rancangan Perbandaran yang baru akan dibuat iaitu dengan sebab penduduk-penduduk itu sendiri tidak mendapat ataupun telah dipupuk oleh fahaman-fahaman yang salah, ataupun dengan sebab parti-parti politik ataupun parti-parti Pembangkang

telahpun menakut-nakutkan penduduk-penduduk di situ dengan projek yang akan dibuat oleh Kerajaan ini. Rancangan ini adalah satu rancangan yang besar yang difikirkan oleh Kerajaan, iaitu setelah dibuat kajian beberapa lama, yang kita dapati satu rancangan yang paling baik bukan sahaja bagi penduduk-penduduk yang terlibat di situ tetapi adalah juga bagi rakyat yang ada dalam Negeri ini. Jadi masalah kita sekarang, setelah Kerajaan membuat kajian-kajian itu, kita akan cuba dan kita akan jalankan rancangan ini. Dan kita percaya dalam masa kita hendak menjalankan projek-projek ini tentulah ada orang-orang ataupun penduduk-penduduk di situ yang akan terlibat dan sebab itu rancangan ini dijalankan dalam beberapa peringkat. Jadi sebab-sebab yang kita buat beberapa peringkat ini adalah kerana kita hendak menyenangkan atau memudahkan lagi perjalanan rancangan ini dan tidak melibatkan banyak penduduk yang ada dalam kawasan itu dengan sebab adanya rancangan ini.

Saya, Datuk Speaker, tidaklah hendak pergi kepada masalah teknikal dalam rancangan projek ini kerana perkara ini telahpun diterangkan dalam Dewan ini beberapa hari yang lepas. Perkara ini telah dibawa bukan sahaja pada kali ini berdasarkan kepada Usul ini tetapi juga dalam pertanyaan dalam perbahasan ucapan terimakasih kepada Tuan Yang Terutama Gabenor. Yang Amat Berhormat Ketua Menteri telahpun menjawab dengan se jelas-jelasnya. Saya sendiri mengikuti apa yang telahpun diucapkan oleh Yang Berhormat Ahli dari Kawasan Kelawei sebentar tadi bahawa beliau sendiri tidak mendengar sepenuhnya atas jawapan-jawapan yang dibuat oleh Yang Amat Berhormat Ketua Menteri sebab beliau ada bertanya adakah dalam rancangan atau projek ini *cinema*, atau *civic centre* dan sebagainya, pada hal Yang Amat Berhormat Ketua Menteri telahpun menjawab dan perkara-perkara itu telahpun dapat dimasukkan dalam rancangan ini dan akan dibina untuk penduduk-penduduk kita di dalam kawasan itu. Jadi, saya rasa kalau kita hendak bercakap pergi kepada masalah-masalah *detail* yang dibawa oleh

Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Kelawei saya fikir tidak ada gunanya sebab kita tahu beliau dalam bercakap itu—semua orang boleh bercakap—bahan-bahan yang dicakapkan itu ada guna dan ada yang tidak guna tetapi saya sifatkan cakapannya macam mulut jalang. Sekian, terimakasih.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Tuan Speaker, saya minta izin bercakap sedikit sahaja, bukan banyak. Mr Speaker, Sir, dengan izin: I rise to support the Motion, and to support the part brought up by the Honourable Member from Kelawei as regards those who subscribed their signatures on that petition.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the House will be aware that I was the first one to bring up the subject in this House in connection with nepotism. And the next day when I happened to have a chance to go to Penang Road to repair my watch I met a host of people coming out and saying, 'Congratulations for bringing up the subject; otherwise nobody knows about that nepotism'. And they wanted to sign a petition voluntarily. But unfortunately at that time I was engaged in certain other things. I was not able to help because my constituency is in Butterworth.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I fully support what the Honourable Member for Kelawei has said. These people are not forced to sign. They willingly, happily come and beg you, 'Please do this for me; and I sign it,'—no force. For example, this land acquisition thing which came out created confusion. The Honourable the Chief Minister comes out with a certain statement: 'Those empty, bad elements,' and so on, and so forth. These are not bad elements. They are genuine people who want to safeguard their livelihood in those areas.

I happened also, after repairing my watch, to go for my dinner at 'Seah Boey.' (*ketawa*) That's at the end of Maxwell Road and Prangin Road. That is a *pasar*. That day I must say I was quite lucky. I got a free meal, free coffee and free drinks (*ketawa*) because they all came to congratulate me, and brought some coffee, and said, 'Very good for you to bring this matter up.

You must *hantam* Chong Eu.' (*ketawa*) That's what they actually told me. You can come with me tonight to hear what they say. That is nepotism—a clear-cut case—no matter how much explanation is given to this House. That fact is very clear. Team Three would not get the contract because they have got 160 people working there—the largest number. Team Three would, not get the contract because it is the successor to Malaysia Architects. Team Three got the contract solely and entirely because Lim Chong Keat is the senior partner. This is a fact. All the people of Penang are clear about it.

Tuan Speaker: Perlahan sedikit, terlampau kuat sangat.

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

I say Team Three could get this contract solely because the brother of the Honourable the Chief Minister is the senior partner. If it were not for Lim Chong Keat and Lim Chong Eu, both brothers, getting together and discussing about these things they could never get the contract. I can say that for sure. They could never have got the contract if the brother of the Honourable the Chief Minister is not in that firm, Team Three. No matter how big it may be—it may be the biggest in the world—they wouldn't get the contract. I tell you this is a fact. And all the people of Penang will acknowledge that this is a fact. No matter how much explanation you are going to give in this House, it is of no use. People know. You come with me to 'Seah Boey'. I can tell you how much people talk about it.

Tuan Speaker: Where is 'Seah Boey'?

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): 'Seah Boey' is the Maxwell Road market. It is better known as 'Seah Boey'.

Mr Speaker, Sir, this is a very, very serious charge. We, the Pekemas, had the privilege of bringing it up at the last Sitting. And I heard too much explanation, which is all nonsense—absolute nonsense not even worth listening to. It is a clear case of nepotism. If the brother of the Chief Minis-

ter is not the senior partner of that firm he would never have got the contract. This is all I submit, Sir, Thank you.

Timbalan Ketua Menteri: Tuan Speaker, boleh saya bercakap dalam bahasa Inggeris?

Tuan Speaker, the Motion as it stands is very interesting. Actually, I break it into two parts—very distinct, and bearing no relationship to one another at all. This Motion as it stands belies and betrays the real intention of the Motion. There is this question of accepting the appeal of the residents of the area not to continue with the project. And suddenly you come to the question of an inquiry into the circumstances leading to the appointment of Team Three without tender.

Well, Tuan Speaker, Sir, the second part of the Motion does not even warrant any more answers. So much has been spoken so often. And even written answers have been given to questions on this matter. The matter is so very clear and so very grave, especially to the mover of the Motion who is himself a professional man because professional ethics should be understood better by professional men than by a layman like me.

Now, coming to the first part of the Motion, Tuan Speaker, the residents seemed, through their appeal, not to understand the purpose of the Urban Centre, or the benefits that the Urban Centre will bring to them. How they misunderstand or do not understand, I do not understand. It could be that the residents have been misled by certain people who do not understand it. It could be that they refuse to understand. But I think it is more than that. They were persuaded not to understand the true objectives of the setting up of this Urban Centre.

The mover of the Motion, the Honourable Member for Kelawei asks: Will there be a theatre? Will there be cinemas? Will there be community halls, and so many other amenities? Well, the answer had previously been given, and many other things, in reply to questions, and in speeches made by

various other Members. So there will be cinemas. There will be bus stations. There will be community halls. There will be so many other things to serve the people living there, and to serve the community.

What complaints do we generally get from the people of Penang today? Probably some of those who signed the letter of appeal had often complained that the various Government Departments—the Federal Departments, the State Departments and the Local Government Departments—are spread. So they have to go to Batu Uban for road transport matters. They have to go to the Bangunan to visit Government Departments. They have to go to certain other areas to do certain other things. Well, with this Urban Centre, one of the objectives is to centralize all Departments—Federal, State, Local and quasi-Government—in one area. This is also in the interests of the residents in Penang. And we are trying, Mr Speaker, Sir, with the implementation of this project, to move physically instead of just talking about things. And this is a policy of having people of various social strata, and people of various racial origins, living together in one area, because this Urban Centre will provide housing facilities of various categories to suit various types of people. Not only types in terms of racial origin, but also types in terms of income. And then we also want to demonstrate through this particular project our policy to integrate and to give opportunities for Bumiputras and non-Bumiputras to trade and to live together. And then also—and this is one of the main points—through this Urban Centre project to be able to provide better and improve, subsidize social amenities in the area, and also in other parts of Penang Island.

Well, these, Mr Speaker, Sir, are a few of the points that would benefit the people who live in and around the Urban Centre. The main problem with the people who signed that appeal appears to be: 'What is our lot?' Mr Ah Kow, the coffee-shop keeper, seems to ask the question: "Where do I sell my coffee?" Mr Ah Chong, the tailor, seems to ask the question: "Where do

I sew my clothes?" That is, if I get the mover right. Well, the answer is a simple, straightforward: "You sell your coffee, and you sew your clothes in the Urban Centre Project." So, Mr Speaker, Sir, it is the fear of being displaced. Yes, I will grant that it will not be exactly on the particular portion of land which you now occupy. Very likely it will not be so. But it will be within that area. But, of course, before he goes into that phase of being within the Urban Centre, if anything at all, there might be a temporary dislocation. And the authorities who deal with this project will see to it that the dislocation will be as slight and as short as possible.

You cannot deny, Tuan Speaker, Sir, that to have anything there must be some pain, some difficulty before you can do it. Even to get a child you must first get the birth pains. Surely, Tuan Speaker, Sir, it is not suggested here in this Assembly today that Penang City should remain as it is today, and does not make any plans to improve. We let the houses remain as they are until they fall. And then the charge will come: "What have you done to clear the slum? What have you done to improve the City?" When something has been done to improve we also get this particular charge.

And then, as I said, the Motion as it stands is very clear cut. The appeals of the residents have been brought in. And here I would like to say that although the appeals of the residents were addressed to the Honourable the Chief Minister, although I am not the Honourable the Chief Minister, I can say on his behalf categorically that the appeals will be considered, and definitely considered, because all appeals that go to the Chief Minister, or go to the Government are considered, although it does not necessarily mean that all requests are granted. But due consideration, Mr Speaker, Sir, is always given. And having made the appeal to the Honourable the Chief Minister, I see no reason why the question of the appeal itself has again been brought up in this Assembly for debate. I think this Motion does not deserve any support at all.

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

Mr Speaker, Sir, we on this side of the House totally reject this Motion because we understand the basic objectives that have prompted the Honourable Member for Kelawei to move the Motion, and those who so support him. I think there has been enough said in this House on this subject. And it is true, as the Honourable Member for Bagan Ajam would have it, that nothing that I can say will make it any more true that Lim Chong Keat and I both have the same father and the same mother. (*Ketawa*) That is a fact. But the fact as presented even by the Honourable Member for Bagan Ajam as his swan song, that the project was awarded solely because of that fact, is not true. Now, this is something which I am sure the people of Penang will have to weigh and consider carefully. And the people of Penang will, I am sure, when the time comes, judge accordingly. But I and my colleagues here understand the people of Penang. We have always consulted; and we never bluff you. I only stand up here, Mr Speaker, to add just a few words to what has been said by my honourable friend, the Member for Bayan Lepas, and my honourable friend the Member for Bukit Mertajam. And that is with regard to the residents in this area who have sent in this petition of inquiry. I give them every assurance, as indeed has already been given by the Honourable Member for Bukit Mertajam, that the Government will at all times view the project from the point of view of their petition. In actual fact the provision of the development of this Urban Centre, as was stated very clearly in His Excellency's gracious speech, is so designed that it will cause minimum dislocation to the people. That is why the project has been put up in five phases. And the first phase which will create space—and a fair amount of space compared to what is exactly the present space—will give the people in the area an opportunity to move and settle into this Centre even as this Centre grows. And the Government—and I

hope succeeding Governments—will proceed carefully to make sure that the objectives of this Centre will make it into a living Centre whereby Malaysians from all walks of life, from different income groups, and from different racial backgrounds can live together, and make this project into a viable project. It is a challenge. It is a challenge not only to the Government but to the people in our Island and our State, whether or not both Government and people can proceed at a pace where people and Government are in constant consultation, and people and Government build together a new Malaysian environment for every Malaysian to enjoy in the future. That is why there have been five phases. That is why the very first phase was the phase that affected the least number of people. And in multiplying that space into hundreds and thousands of square feet of building space and building area the Government confidently hopes that the people who have lived in this area for a long time before will be able to continue to live in this area; and that generations of their families will continue to live in this area in an environment which the Honourable Member from Kelawei sneeringly called futuristic. Now he talks about machine development and architectural development. I am sure he has got many friends; and I am sure his friends are happy that they are not related to him.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): They won't get favouritism.

Ketua Menteri: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am afraid the Honourable Member's left hand did not get favouritism from his right hand.

Mr Speaker, Sir, the position is a position of careful deliberation and of careful implementation so that the people in the area can understand what is being done, and so that Government can assess, and assure them that what is being done will be to their benefit. That is why even now we also meet the people of this area. And we talk with them; and we explain to them. And we realise that with a project of this magnitude, and

a project that will take us many years ahead the people living in the area naturally have their doubts, their fears, and their uncertainties. But Government will never proceed any faster than what the people can understand and accept. And the Government will make it certain that its activities and the implementation of this project will not only meet the requirements of the people living in the area at the present time because the project will give increased space and increased opportunities for more people to live in the Urban Centre than those who are at present living in that area. Government will make it certain that those who come to live within this area can live together in peace and harmony with the people living in the area. My honourable friend, the Member for Bukit Mertajam, is not a man who often speaks very much. But I think what he says simply is the truth—namely that the residents on the site involved will eventually be living within the new Urban Centre itself.

Mr Speaker, Sir, my honourable friend from Bayan Lepas, who is also not accustomed to talking over much about the Urban Centre, has put it clearly, and has said that the benefits that have been calculated will accrue not only to the people who are now living in the site, not only to their children, and not only to their children's children if they continue to live within the Urban Centre; but the development of the Urban Centre will allow people who at the present moment do not have the privilege of living within what the Honourable Member for Kelawei has himself called 'the choicest part of town' to share in its benefits, and allow people even from rural areas to come to this urban area. So the choicest part of town is being developed into a bigger cake so that more people of Penang—more people from all walks of life, from the rural areas, and from other urban areas, or other less important areas of the city—can come to this choicest site of the city and share.

Now, how do you solve this problem? You cannot put thousands of people to crowd into the same area. The only way is to build; and plan to build bigger and bigger areas; bigger and bigger

space to allow for more and more people to come to live within what has been called the choicest part of our city. Is there anything wrong with this principle that more and more people from different income groups, and people from different communities should all be given this chance to share a bigger development? Mr Speaker, Sir, what the people who are now living in the area enjoy they will continue to enjoy, with probably some changes. But they will also have the privilege, by meeting the difficulties of these changes, to share what they enjoy with more people in Penang.

Mr Speaker, Sir, with regard to the appeal by the residents, we shall continue to meet the people, to discuss with them, and to make it clear to them that whatever rights they have, and whatever they have enjoyed will not be taken away from them. As a matter of fact the Government's policy, and the policy of the National Front will be to make it possible for them to enjoy even greater benefits. But the policy of the Government will be to make it also possible for even more people—for others who have not had the chance—to live in this choicest part of the town; to come in to have the opportunity to live, to work and to earn a livelihood in this choicest part of the city. This is a challenge. And I am certain that my colleagues in Government, with all their experience of proceeding in consultation with the people at all times, will be able steadily throughout the years—because the project will take a period of 10 years—to implement the project step by step so that the people can see for themselves what the Government will do for the benefit of the people.

Mr Speaker, Sir, there are those, I know, who run around for cheap victories; who run around to frighten people. They are—if I may borrow a bit of the feather from the Honourable Member from Bagan Ajam who is a Chinese scholar—the '*Ah Kiew*'s'.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Tuan Speaker, you allow it? If you allow it, alright. But you must be fair where you allow it.

Ahli Kawasan Ayer Itam (Encik Tan Phock Kin): Minta *ruling*, Tuan Speaker berkenaan dengan itu. Minta *ruling*, Tuan Speaker.

Tuan Speaker: Boleh tarik balik.

Ketua Menteri: Tuan Speaker suruh saya tarik balik, saya tarik balik. Tetapi '*Ah Kiew*' (*gangguan*).'

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Sudah tarik balik jangan cakap banyak.

Ketua Menteri: Saya tarik balik '*Ah Kiew*'s'. They are the people who go around causing confusion. They are the people who are there at Sungei Kluang, telling the people in Sungei Kluang that everything is disastrous. They are the people who go around to Sungei Ara, Sungei Tiram, and say, 'Be careful. Electronics is useless. This is a humbug, bluff'. But when the things are built, and people begin to get more work, and the squatters there are properly settled and they are happy they do not go there any more. Mr Speaker, these are the people who go round agitating because they exploit the fear of people, and they exploit the anxiety of people. But I am sure, and I am very confident that the people of Penang have grown to realise that this Government is able to explain to them that projects taken by Government are for their benefit, and therefore allay their anxiety. And having implemented the projects Government will be able to quench and allay their fear because the Government will have brought benefit to them. This is precisely the same thing on a bigger dimension, on a longer time span, and is the same as in the case of what has already happened in Bagan Serai, in Prai, and in Bayan Lepas. At Prai the Honourable Members from the Opposition shouted, 'What about these squatters? Government has done nothing about it'. Mr Speaker, Sir, at Sungei Ara they also went round saying, 'What is happening to Government, with all these squatters?' Just like now they are running around shouting, 'What is Government doing about all these squatters under the new gazetted areas for the proposed new bridge entry.'

Mr Speaker, Sir, what has Government done? Government has made it possible for the people in Sungei Ara who were squatters squatting on land now to be properly settled in a new area not far away. And they are able to live and make a better livelihood in this new area. They have better shelter. They can look and plan forward further ahead. They can understand now that these so-called electronics factories which the Honourable Member from Kelawei used to say was 'humbug and imagination' are there. Because they are not living far away their children are able to go to these factories and get work, and be paid.

Ahli Kawasan Bagan Ajam (Encik Ong Yi How): Tuan Speaker, Standing Order 46 (vi). We are on the Urban Centre; not on this Bayan Lepas electronics, or humbug, or anything like that. If he is going to draw examples like that it would take the whole night.

Tuan Speaker: Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bagan Ajam, saya faham. Saya *rule out of order* kerana dia beri *instances* semacam itu.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Tidak apa beri dia peluang.

Ahli Kawasan Sungei Pinang (S. P. Chelliah): So you know which.

Ketua Menteri: So, Datuk Speaker, at this present time the Government understands and realises that the people living in the area in particular, and the people in Penang Island in the overall picture, and in the State as a whole are a little bit anxious, and a little bit worried. But here I take the opportunity to reply to the Honourable Member from Kelawei that the Government treats and deals with the petition and the appeal of the residents with very great care, and with deep concern and consideration. And I also repeat what I have stated—that the Government will proceed with this project, having taken into account what the people living in the area have said in their appeal. The Honourable Member from Kelawei read the appeal in full. And I am sure he will be the first to acknowledge that not all the items of the appeal deserve the same consideration.

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

The Honourable Chief Minister, as usual, brings us on a merry-go-round, replying to lots of irrelevant points, and evading the various issues which have been raised by the Honourable the mover of this Motion. He talks about the challenge. What is the challenge? It is not a challenge to build prestige buildings. It is not a challenge to give architects the opportunity of building buildings of international class or of international standards. It is not a challenge to expend the very limited funds of the State on prestige projects which will not benefit the people of the State as a whole. When this particular matter was discussed we brought up the question of priorities. We have stated quite categorically that this runs very low in priority. And today we had the occasion to read a letter in the Straits Times written by a very eminent son of Penang in which he supports the contention that in spite of the very eloquent talk given by none other than the brother of the Ketua Menteri on this particular subject, using a lot of architectural terms which very few people understand, the fact remains that as long as there are slums in Penang—and to quote the writer of this letter 'as long as there are roads in Jelutong which are not even metalled'—how can we ever think of building a 45-storey block in the centre of George Town? This is the crucial issue. And why the choice of this particular area which the Honourable Chief Minister has described as the choicest. The Honourable Member from Kelawei questioned whether it is because its boundary is very near the Su Beng Dispensary. No answer was given to the Honourable Member from Kelawei. So the important issue before us is this: What is the net benefit to the people of Penang. As we have pointed out time and again, there are slums in the Hutton Lane area, in Kedah Road, Kampong Malabar, Jelutong and everywhere else. If you are going to find a choicest area you must pick a place where the people are living in dire poverty; a place that

will cause as little disruption as possible. But as far as this particular area is concerned it is by no means a slum. Some of the buildings have actually recently been constructed. And you do not even have an idea as to how the buildings when completed are to be occupied. You have very fanciful ideas about 30% Bumiputra participation. Up to today you do not know whether the whole 45-storey building will be occupied. But what I do know is this: that you are trying to stifle development outside the area. Plans submitted for development on areas outside the town centre are being sabotaged. I have had the occasion to read in the papers that plans submitted by a Bank for the construction of a new building in the Beach Street area have still not been approved. And I have had occasion to read that the Honourable the Ketua Menteri gave a little hint to the Manager of this Bank discouraging him from constructing a new Bank building in this area. Well, this is but one little example. It is clear that the Honourable the Chief Minister, in his capacity as officer administering the City Council, and in his capacity as officer administering the Rural District Council, has been exerting quite a great deal of influence to stifle development outside the town centre. So you are not allowing the free market of private enterprise to develop where it thinks fit. You are in fact compelling them to come into the town centre—'I am not going to approve plans for houses above a certain number of storeys because it is only in the town centre that we can build 45 storeys. Other than in the town centre we will limit the height of your building.' So this is another instance of exploiting property-owners outside the area. This is an example of compelling people to go into the town centre. If the project is as good as the Chief Minister would like us to believe, what is the necessity for all these threats, and all these hints to developers not to develop? So I must say that I am very disappointed with the reply. And, in fact, throughout the course of debate in this House, whether it was on the no-confidence Motion or on this Motion, or on the question of elections, no specific reply was given

to arguments put forward by Members from the Opposition. The Honourable the Chief Minister very cleverly, in the arguments and in the debate on no confidence, evaded the question of nepotism, and evaded the question of deception. Similarly, during the course of this debate he did the same; and instead took us on a merry ride to the electronic factories in Bayan Lepas and elsewhere. I must point out to him that as far as the facilities are concerned it can be done in the town area, the present urban centre, just as well as in other areas—the Beach Street area, for example. The same concept can also be implemented in an area other than the town centre. So the argument has no force whatsoever. So in this respect I feel very strongly that there is some substance in the fear of the residents there, particularly with regard to the benefits that will accrue to the people of this State as a whole. I am afraid the Honourable the Chief Minister, in his enthusiasm to develop the town centre for reasons best known to himself, has taken a very extraordinary step by making a very, very hasty start on this project. Never in the history of development in this country have we seen such a move being made by a Chief Minister. If it is made for the benefit of the people, I would be the first to support him. But I must say that as far as his actions are concerned they raise very grave doubts as to the genuine intention—whether to benefit the people of Penang, or to benefit a small group who will really benefit from this particular project. So I therefore have very great pleasure in supporting this Motion.

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, dengan izin: I must thank all the Members who took the trouble to participate in the debate on this Motion which must be the last Motion in this Third Legislative Assembly, although it is a matter of regret that there are those who still do not contribute anything constructive to the debates, but only repeat what others intend them to say. The Member for Bayan Lepas does no better than read the answers of the Chief Minister. It is better that the UMNO contributes

because the Timbalan is already taking part. And we hear the Timbalan talk, no doubt, very rarely. And none of the Members of the Government ever really participate. As I have always said, we must have sympathy for the Ketua Menteri. Try as he might to delegate some responsibilities they don't seem to come up the right way. Although he commences all his speeches with 'I had no intention of taking part; and I only want to say a few words', he manages to say nearly 20 minutes of 'a few words'.

Mr Speaker, Sir, this Motion is rightly in two parts. One is that we feel that the Motion should be accepted; and the other is that if the House thought it fit to appoint a Commission of Inquiry there are also two aims of the Commission of Inquiry. One is to go into the whole feasibility of and necessity for the project. There is obviously nothing offensive there. And if the Chief Minister says he already has a Feasibility Report he could have saved us all the trouble by tabling the Report. But since he did not have that for a project of such magnitude—\$200,000,000; and therefore, I think, affecting thousands and thousands of people—there should be a Commission of Inquiry. And also, on the second limb, they should look into whether there were malpractices in the actual granting of the contract to Team Three. I regret to say that in the course of debate neither the Chief Minister nor any of his friends has managed to convince us. It is not that we are not receptive. And this is where he tries to twist the words of the Member for Bagan Ajam who does perhaps get a bit excited. But perhaps, as the Honourable Member for Ayer Itam has said, the answers are meant to mislead rather than to assist. And, therefore, how can we accept these answers when a man comes to this House on a \$200,000,000 project and says, 'Look, I have the Feasibility Report here. I have got 5 copies.' And then he says, 'I won't show it to you. I will show it to you at the appropriate time.' Is this playing the fool with the Assembly? I say that if you are sincere there is no secret about the Feasibility Report. Obviously your plans are al-

ready set. The Feasibility Report only deals with demands and the type of facilities that are to be provided, costs, and such factors. There is no secret involved. And if the Honourable the Chief Minister wanted to really assist us, and assist himself, he would have said, 'Here, gentlemen, I table these papers. You go through it.' Then when we, having read the Feasibility Report, still come back with all sorts of funny,—as he terms it—ridiculous and unfair accusations then he can say so. But here is a man who has the Report and says, 'I refuse to show it to you'. Appropriate time! What is the appropriate time? The first pile, Sir, has already been driven in, as the Chief Minister calls it, on the 1st January, 1974, by Tun Razak. But, Sir, look at the priority of the project. The first pile was driven in on the 1st January, 1974. We are now in April, Sir; and that first pile is standing there like a tombstone.

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

Ahli Kawasan Kelawei (Encik Yeap Ghim Guan): Mr Speaker, Sir, I remember another Prime Minister—sad to say, ex-Prime Minister Tunku Abdul Rahman who came to Penang, you know, and also laid a foundation stone urgently. You know, this was one of those election periods. He laid the foundation stone of the so-called Penang University. And that stone lay there for how many years; and only came into reality after he stepped down. That is the kind of foundation stone that is laid. And this is another foundation stone. I do not know how long it is going to stand there.

Mr Speaker, Sir, this is very much a politically-motivated project. But we on this side of the House don't wish to approach this question politically. That is why the Motion was carefully worded. As quite rightly said by the so-called Timbalan Ketua Menteri, quite carefully worded so as not to offend anybody. It was not meant to be, as I said earlier, an offensive, antagonistic Motion. And in that I would like to answer certain points that were raised by the Timbalan—this question of professional ethics. I think the question of profes-

sional ethics is very simple here. If one has special knowledge of a project by virtue of being a special consultant one should in fact be disqualified from carrying out that project. You yourself recommended this project, and you yourself took over the project. That is most unethical. I think professional people don't do that. They make it a point that if they have special knowledge about a project they disqualify themselves, and let other people take it up. That is professional ethics, if he likes to know.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I didn't say that the Ketua Menteri gave certain hints about facilities. I said that these are only hints. We want specific information. What are the facilities available? I say you are duty-bound to give them. But even if you do so that has to be related to the needs of the people. Do you think the people need another cinema there? Do you think they need another shopping arcade? Is that what you say? So don't mislead the House, and say that I was not listening. I may not have been here the day the Chief Minister was talking on the Governor's speech, but I certainly was listening.

And this question of alternative accommodation: Is the Timbalan really saying that they are providing the alternative accommodation in the site itself? That I don't think is a truthful statement. I don't think they can.

And this question of spread of Government Departments: Mr Speaker, Sir, I think that if you try to concentrate everybody into the Urban Centre you are going to create a traffic problem. In other countries people are trying to spread out so that there is no concentration of traffic. And here the Chief Minister is trying to do the reverse—trying to create a concentration of traffic in the Urban Centre. What sort of town planning is this? As I said, perhaps it is 'SAPU' in the first case. Don't try to pull the wool over our eyes, and say that you are going to help people find the Government Departments. Sir, Government Departments will keep on expanding. We know. We can see around us that many Government Departments have been spread

out. But if you want to pick an area to establish Government Departments you have plenty of areas. You need not go to the choicest place in the city.

And if you talk about giving people of various races an opportunity to live together the D.A.P. endorses that. We endorse that. We want integration. But, Sir, let us weigh that empty talk about integration against the reality of segregation. We need not go very far to see the Alliance policy of segregation. Go to Kampong Melayu flats. It is called 'Kampong Melayu flats' because about 90 per cent. are Malays. That is where integration could have taken place. But you are not bothered. You could have integrated. Why is it that at Rifle Range it is also predominantly one race? You could have integrated them. But is that really their policy? That is the question. So now you talk about integration here; and you don't practise it over there. Some integration!

Mr Speaker, Sir, this talk about better and improved and subsidised social amenities, I think, also is in the category of empty promises.

And the Timbalan says, 'Oh your trade will not be disrupted. You will be given exactly the spot where you are.' And then he suddenly qualifies this and says, 'Of course, there will be some degree of disruption.' Mr Speaker, Sir, How long? What is this 'some degree'? One year? One month? One week? Or is it years? Now, how does the sundry-shop man get back his customers whom he has lost for one year or two years? Can he move from the Urban Centre, go to Glugor, and then in 5 years' time come back and open a sundry shop there? You must be kidding. It is impossible. And how about other trades—furniture-makers, motor mechanics? You say, 'not exactly on the spot where you were'. So how is he going to repair a motor-car on the 5th floor? (*ketawa*). So, what sort of promise are you making? How does a coffee grinder grind his coffee and go by lift? Now, how is that done? How does he keep all the bags of coffee nuts? How is that done? On the 45th floor? Sir, let us be very frank. You have got licensing powers—the Municipal Ord-

nance—through which I say you will prohibit these trades in the area because you will call them offensive trades.

Mr Speaker, Sir, there is no question of temporary dislocation. It is going to be a wholesale dislocation. And the Member likes to talk about 'giving birth to a child you must have pain.' Sir, don't cause more than the necessary pain. Haven't you heard of painless childbirth? This kind of example that he gives is just a red herring (*ketawa*). Mr Speaker, Sir, of course, it is a privilege to listen to the Timbalan whom we do not hear very often. But it is a fact that when the Timbalan starts to speak there must be something going on. Maybe in actual fact the support is not really there, but is only for show.

Mr Speaker, Sir, some of the questions we have asked have not been replied to. For instance, how does the Government justify buying people's property at values at 1972, and then making a huge profit when selling it at market value in two or three years to come? You are making that huge profit. And do you think that our people who come from these areas can afford to take it at market price—sell to you at \$4 a square foot, and buy from you at \$50 a square foot? Where are they going to get the money when their livelihood is already threatened and destroyed? How can they sell to you at \$4, and buy from you at \$40. Can they do that? And would they be able to maintain the running costs? I assume some of these facilities will be air-conditioning, and so forth; escalators; and maintenance of services. So you think they can afford it? Do you think that our people come from America? They are the people who have saved from day to day—5 cents, 10 cents. That is their profit. Not the multinational Companies that the Ketua Menteri has been used to; He's seen in New York, London, Tokyo, Hong Kong. No, Sir, these people cannot.

We in this debate have tried to give the Ketua Menteri and the Government a chance to explain their policies; a chance to discharge the onus that is on their hands. But, sad to say, they

haven't done so. As one Member has said, it is a question of priorities also. They haven't justified the priorities. I have already said that they are not able to even build houses during their year of housing. These are the priorities; and they can't do it.

And this talk about correlating this development in Bagan Serai and Bayan Lepas. This is just for the birds, Sir. This kind of argument is really for the birds. Bayan Lepas is how many miles from the Urban Centre? Bagan Serai is how many miles from the Urban Centre, right across the sea? How is that correlated? If you want to build a township in Bagan Serai or Bayan Lepas I take my hat off to you. I support you. In fact this was the thing they used to talk about in the first Governor's speech. But we haven't seen the Bagan Serai township. We haven't seen the Bayan Lepas township. That is the place to build because it is empty space, and you cause the minimum hardship. But you must come here where there is a concentration of thousands.

And he talks about consultation, Sir. The Ketua Menteri talks about consultation with the people. I do not know his meaning of the word 'consultation.' The last time some groups of people who had grievances wanted to consult with him about five people ended up in Court. That's the kind of consultation—one-way consultation. He gives the instruction, and they end up in the jail. That is what he means by 'consultation.' Nobody gets a chance to chip in with the Ketua Menteri.

And here also, in trying to beguile the House, he says, 'Oh, we will be putting in people of all income groups.' That is clearly a game for the birds. How can all income groups afford the facilities that you are giving by virtue of the cost? He himself has said that the return in one phase alone is one million in assessment. I would ask him, 'How can people pay that one million?' So, how can he say 'all income groups'? I don't think the income groups belong to the people who live in Penang even. As I said, probably people from Hong Kong, Singapore,

Kuala Lumpur can afford it; but not our local people. They cannot afford this kind of things.

Mr Speaker, Sir, he talks about enjoying the challenge. Here the Chief Minister is very good when he comes to this kind of things. He used a very nice phrase—'enjoying the challenges of development.' To those who are suffering under the acquisition he says, 'enjoying the challenges.' (*ketawa*) Why doesn't the Chief Minister himself also join in the enjoyment? Su Beng is next door. Acquire Su Beng, and enjoy the challenges. (*ketawa*) He doesn't want to enjoy.

In ending, Sir, we regret that having given the Government the opportunity they prefer to brush aside this Motion, not wishing to have the chance to explain vigorously forthwith without rancour one of the most important issues. And I call upon the Government to heed the appeal of the people, and not to proceed with the project. If they find offensive that part of the Motion calling for a Commission of Inquiry they could have moved an amendment. But on this alone I would like to point out that this is nothing new—Commission of Inquiry. The Alliance Government held a Commission of Inquiry into the Labour Government of the City Council. It was held; but they never prosecuted anyone found guilty of malpractices. So there is a gap between a criminal offence and administrative political malpractice. And that is where this thing comes in.

Mr Speaker, Sir, if the Government takes the attitude that it does we on this side of the House have no alternative. They hold the majority. If that were not so we would be the Government. But this is where we appeal to their reason—the last chance for reason to prevail. And if the Government is really confident of itself then I challenge them to freeze the project, and await the greater verdict of the people; not the verdict of this House. If you have the gumption, it will be a matter of months. Let the people decide in the next election. Freeze this project. If you really have confidence in what you say, and in what

your Ketua Menteri says, freeze this project—I do not say scrap it; I say freeze it—and wait for the elections. Go back to the people for the elections. Mr Speaker, Sir, I hope the Chief Minister will not treat this too lightly. Go back to the people, and see whether they will vote for you on this issue. Go back to the Urban Centre people on this issue. If they vote for you the D.A.P. will not say any more. If you are so confident of your stand I challenge the Ketua Menteri himself to go to the people of the Urban Centre and get a mandate; and then proceed with the Urban Centre project. That's all I ask. Freeze the project for the time being. Don't confront the people with your *fait accompli*.

Soalan dikemukakan dan Usul tidak dipersetujui.

Ahli Kawasan Jelutong (Encik Koay Boon Seng): Tuan Speaker, 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
Timbalan Ketua Menteri
Datuk 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
Encik Teoh Kooi Sneah
Tuan Haji Abdul Kadir bin Haji Hassan
Encik Khoo Kay Por.

TIDAK HAZIR

Encik Abdul Rahman bin Haji
Yunus

Encik Mustapha bin Hussain.

Tuan Speaker: Keputusan bahagian ialah seperti berikut: 'Ya' 6; 'Tidak' 15; 'Tidak Hazir' 2. 'Tidak' lebih banyak. Usul tidak dipersetujui.

7. PENANGGUHAN.

Ketua Menteri: Datuk Yang Dipertua, saya mohon mencadangkan supaya Dewan ditangguhkan sekarang.

Ahli Kawasan Butterworth (Encik Ooi Ah Bee): Tuan Speaker, saya mohon menyokong.

Dewan ditangguhkan pada jam 6.40 petang.