



# PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

DEWAN RA'AYAT  
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

OFFICIAL REPORT

## CONTENTS

### **BILLS—**

**The Notaries Public (Amendment) Bill [Col. 827]**

**The Supplementary Supply (1960) Bill [Col. 828]**

**The Loans (Central Bank of Malaya) Bill [Col. 874]**

### **MOTIONS—**

**Government Statement on Auditor-General's Report on the  
Accounts of the Federation for 1958 [Col. 877]**

FEDERATION OF MALAYA  
**DEWAN RA'AYAT**  
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

*Official Report*

---

Second Session of the First Dewan Ra'ayat

---

*Thursday, 28th April, 1960*

*The House met at Ten o'clock a.m.*

PRESENT:

- The Honourable Mr. Speaker, DATO' HAJI MOHAMED NOAH BIN OMAR,  
S.P.M.J., P.I.S., J.P.
- „ the Prime Minister, Y.T.M. TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN PUTRA  
AL-HAJ, K.O.M. (Kuala Kedah).
- „ the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Defence, TUN  
ABDUL RAZAK BIN DATO' HUSSAIN, S.M.N. (Pekan).
- „ the Minister of External Affairs, DATO' DR. ISMAIL BIN  
DATO' ABDUL RAHMAN, P.M.N. (Johore Timor).
- „ the Minister of Finance, ENCHE' TAN SIEW SIN, J.P.  
(Malacca Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications,  
DATO' V.T. SAMBANTHAN, P.M.N. (Sungei Siput).
- „ the Minister of the Interior, DATO' SULEIMAN BIN DATO'  
ABDUL RAHMAN, P.M.N. (Muar Selatan).
- „ the Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives, ENCHE'  
ABDUL AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Kuala Langat).
- „ the Minister of Transport, ENCHE' SARDON BIN HAJI JUBIR  
(Pontian Utara).
- „ the Minister of Health and Social Welfare, DATO' ONG  
YOKE LIN, P.M.N. (Ulu Selangor).
- „ the Minister of Commerce and Industry, ENCHE' MOHAMED  
KHIR BIN JOHARI (Kedah Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Labour, ENCHE' BAHAMAN BIN SAMSUDIN  
(Kuala Pilah).
- „ the Minister of Education, ENCHE' ABDUL RAHMAN BIN  
HAJI TALIB (Kuantan).
- „ TUAN SYED JA'AFAR BIN HASAN ALBAR, J.M.N., Assistant  
Minister (Johore Tenggara).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL HAMID KHAN BIN HAJI SAKHAWAT ALI KHAN,  
J.M.N., J.P. Assistant Minister (Batang Padang).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDUL KHALID BIN AWANG OSMAN, Assistant  
Minister (Kota Star Utara).
- „ ENCHE' CHEAH THEAM SWEE, Assistant Minister (Bukit  
Bintang).

- The Honourable ENCHE' V. MANICKAVASAGAM, J.M.N., P.J.K., Assistant Minister (Klang).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED ISMAIL BIN MOHAMED YUSOF, Assistant Minister (Jerai).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL GHANI BIN ISHAK, A.M.N. (Malacca Utara).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL RAUF BIN A. RAHMAN (Krian Laut).
- „ ENCHE' ABDUL SAMAD BIN OSMAN (Sungei Patani).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI ABDUL RAOF (Kuala Kangsar).
- „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN ABDULLAH (Kota Bharu Hilir).
- „ ENCHE' AHMAD BIN ARSHAD, A.M.N. (Muar Utara).
- „ ENCHE' AHMAD BOESTAMAM (Setapak).
- „ ENCHE' AHMAD BIN MOHAMED SHAH, S.M.J. (Johore Bharu Barat).
- „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN SAAID (Seberang Utara).
- „ ENCHE' AHMAD BIN HAJI YUSOF (Krian Darat).
- „ TUAN HAJI AZAHARI BIN HAJI IBRAHIM (Kubang Pasu Barat).
- „ ENCHE' AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Muar Dalam).
- „ DR. BURHANUDDIN BIN MOHD. NOOR (Besut).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN CHONG WEN (Kluang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN SIANG SUN (Bentong).
- „ ENCHE' CHAN SWEE HO (Ulu Kinta).
- „ ENCHE' CHIN SEE YIN (Seremban Timor).
- „ ENCHE' V. DAVID (Bungsar).
- „ DATIN FATIMAH BINTI HAJI HASHIM, P.M.N. (Jitra-Padang Terap).
- „ ENCHE' GEH CHONG KEAT (Penang Utara).
- „ ENCHE' HAMZAH BIN ALANG, A.M.N. (Kapar).
- „ ENCHE' HANAFI BIN MOHD. YUNUS, A.M.N. (Kulim Utara).
- „ ENCHE' HARUN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N. (Baling).
- „ ENCHE' HARUN BIN PILUS (Trengganu Tengah).
- „ TUAN HAJI HASAN ADLI BIN HAJI ARSHAD (Kuala Trengganu Utara).
- „ TUAN HAJI HASSAN BIN HAJI AHMAD (Tumpat).
- „ ENCHE' HASSAN BIN MANSOR (Malacca Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN TO' MUDA HASSAN (Raub).
- „ TUAN HAJI HUSSAIN RAHIMI BIN HAJI SAMAN (Kota Bharu Hulu).
- „ ENCHE' IBRAHIM BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Seberang Tengah).
- „ ENCHE' ISMAIL BIN IDRIS (Penang Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' KANG KOCK SENG (Batu Pahat).
- „ ENCHE' K. KARAM SINGH (Damansara).
- „ CHE' KHADIJAH BINTI MOHD. SIDIK (Dungun).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SECK FUN (Tanjong Malim).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SIOK YEW (Sepang).
- „ ENCHE' LIM JOO KONG (Alor Star).

- The Honourable ENCHE' LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).
- „ ENCHE' LIU YOONG PENG (Rawang).
- „ ENCHE' T. MAHIMA SINGH (Port Dickson).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED BIN UJANG (Jelebu-Jempol).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED ABBAS BIN AHMAD (Hilir Perak).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED ASRI BIN HAJI MUDA (Pasir Puteh).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED DAHARI BIN HAJI MOHD. ALI (Kuala Selangor).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED NOR BIN MOHD. DAHAN (Ulu Perak).
- „ DATO' MOHAMED HANIFAH BIN HAJI ABDUL GHANI, P.J.K. (Pasir Mas Hulu).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED SULONG BIN MOHD. ALI, J.M.N. (Lipis).
- „ ENCHE' MOHAMED YUSOF BIN MAHMUD, A.M.N. (Temerloh).
- „ TUAN HAJI MOKHTAR BIN HAJI ISMAIL (Perlis Selatan).
- „ NIK MAN BIN NIK MOHAMED (Pasir Mas Hilir).
- „ ENCHE' NG ANN TECK (Batu).
- „ DATO' ONN BIN JA'AFAR, D.K., D.P.M.J. (Kuala Trengganu Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Tanah Merah).
- „ ENCHE' OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH (Perlis Utara).
- „ ENCHE' QUEK KAI DONG (Seremban Barat).
- „ TUAN HAJI REDZA BIN HAJI MOHD. SAID (Rambau-Tampin).
- „ ENCHE' SEAH TENG NGIAB (Muar Pantai).
- „ ENCHE' D. R. SEENIVASAGAM (Ipoh).
- „ TUAN SYED ESA BIN ALWEE, S.M.J., P.I.S. (Batu Pahat Dalam).
- „ TUAN SYED HASHIM BIN SYED AJAM, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Sabak Bernam).
- „ ENCHE' TAJUDIN BIN ALI (Larut Utara).
- „ ENCHE' TAN CHENG BEE, J.P. (Bagan).
- „ ENCHE' TAN KEE GAK (Bandar Malacca).
- „ ENCHE' TAN PHOCK KIN (Tanjong).
- „ ENCHE' TAN TYE CHEK (Kulim-Bandar Bharu).
- „ TENGKU INDRA PETRA IBNI SULTAN IBRAHIM, J.M.N. (Ulu Kelantan).
- „ DATO' TEOH CHZE CHONG, D.P.M.J., J.P. (Segamat Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' V. VEERAPPEN (Seberang Selatan).
- „ WAN SULAIMAN BIN WAN TAM (Kota Star Selatan).
- „ WAN YAHYA BIN HAJI WAN MOHAMED (Kemaman).
- „ ENCHE' WOO SAIK HONG (Telok Anson).
- „ ENCHE' YAHYA BIN HAJI AHMAD (Bagan Datoh).
- „ ENCHE' YEOH TAT BENG (Bruas).
- „ ENCHE' YONG WOO MING (Sitiawan).
- „ HAJJAH ZAIN BINTI SULAIMAN, J.M.N., P.I.S. (Pontian Selatan).
- „ TUAN HAJI ZAKARIA BIN HAJI MOHD. TAIB (Langat).
- „ ENCHE' ZULKIFLEE BIN MUHAMMAD (Bachok).

## ABSENT:

The Honourable TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI MOHD. SALLEH, A.M.N., P.I.S.  
(Segamat Utara).

- „ ENCHE' HUSSEIN BIN MOHD. NOORDIN, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Parit).
- „ ENCHE' KHONG KOK YAT (Batu Gajah).
- „ ENCHE' LEE SAN CHOON (Kluang Utara).
- „ DR. LIM SWEE AUN, J.P. (Larut Selatan).
- „ ENCHE' S. P. SEENIVASAGAM (Menglembu).
- „ WAN MUSTAPHA BIN HAJI ALI (Kelantan Hilir).

## IN ATTENDANCE:

The Honourable the Minister of Justice, TUN LEONG YEW KOH, S.M.N.

## PRAYERS

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

## EARLIER RESUMPTION

## (Motion)

**The Prime Minister:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move,

That the House at its rising this day shall resume at 9.30 a.m. to-morrow instead of 10 a.m. as provided under Standing Order No. 12.

**The Deputy Prime Minister (Tun Abdul Razak):** Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That the House at its rising this day shall resume at 9.30 a.m. to-morrow instead of 10 a.m. as provided under Standing Order No. 12.

## BILLS

THE NOTARIES PUBLIC  
(AMENDMENT) BILL

## Second Reading

**The Minister of the Interior (Dato' Suleiman):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to amend the Notaries Public Ordinance, 1959" be read a second time.

The Honourable the Minister of Justice will explain the Bill.

**The Minister of Transport (Enche' Sardon):** Sir, I beg to second the motion.

**The Minister of Justice (Tun Leong Yew Koh):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is

a very simple Bill. I have no doubt that Honourable Members would have read the explanatory statement to the Bill. Before 1959, pleaders in Trengganu were qualified to be appointed notaries public and one such pleader was so appointed. However, the 1959 Ordinance inadvertently omitted to save his appointment, and the purpose of this Bill is to reinstate his right. It is personal to him as it is not intended to appoint further pleaders in Trengganu as notaries public. I am sure Honourable Members will wish to restore to this gentleman concerned the small source from which he could earn his bread and butter.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

*Clauses 1 to 3* inclusive ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported without amendment: read the third time and passed.

THE SUPPLEMENTARY SUPPLY  
(1960) (No. 1) BILL

## Second Reading

**The Minister of Finance (Enche' Tan Siew Sin):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to apply a sum out of the Consolidated Fund for additional expenditure for

the service of the year 1960, to appropriate such a sum for certain purposes and to provide for the replacement of amounts advanced from the Contingencies Fund" be read a second time.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Supplementary Supply (1960) Bill, 1960 seeks legislative authority for the appropriation of approximately \$2 million for purposes which were not included in the Supply (1960) Act, 1959. As none of the purposes for which provision is made in the Bill represents any major new Government policy or a departure from existing policy, I do not propose to comment on it in detail at this stage, as the opportunity for informal detailed explanations will be available when the House resolves itself into Committee of Supply.

I should like to mention, however, that this is the First Supplementary Supply Bill to be presented to this House under the amended procedure of Standing Order 67 (1). Honourable Members will notice that, for instance, under Head 27 of the Supplementary Estimates a token vote of \$10 only is requested. This means that savings under the same Head of Expenditure have been diverted for this new purpose. Although the Treasury has powers, under Sub-section (4) of Section 15 of the Financial Procedure Ordinance, 1957, to alter the proportion of the financial provision as between subheads of the same Head as the exigencies of the public service may require, there are certain occasions when the Treasury considers that this House should be kept informed of the manner in which these powers are exercised so that the actions of the Treasury can be debated. I feel sure that Honourable Members will agree that this system is fair and sensible.

Sir, I beg to move.

**Tun Abdul Razak:** Sir, I beg to second the motion.

**Enche' Tan Phock Kin (Tanjong):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, in looking through the First Supplementary Estimates for this year we note that a sum of \$2,092,431 is put in the estimates for our approval. It is important as far as the Opposition is concerned that

the estimates should in no way depart from the principle enunciated by the Government. It was only last year when the Honourable Minister of Finance, in introducing the Supply Bill, had stated that "there is considerable room for economy in Government expenditure and it is therefore my intention to start a campaign against waste and inefficiency in the coming year" Honourable Members will note that this is the first supplementary budget and if we compare this supplementary budget with that of last year, we may get a rough idea of the trend on the side of the Government in asking for supplementary expenditure. Last year the Government started with a supplementary budget of \$642,000 as compared with the \$2,092,431 now. It was followed by a second supplementary budget for \$6,900,000 and this was followed by a third supplementary budget of \$10,000,000 and finally a fourth supplementary budget of \$16,000,000. Assuming that we judge the Government on their performance in the previous years, Honourable Members of this House can well imagine what the figure will be at the end of this year when they ask us to approve the fourth supplementary budget.

It was also pointed out by the Honourable Minister of Finance—and also embodied in the Speech of His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong—that the Government policy was to build up reserves to ensure that its economic and social plans would continue in good times and in bad, and that to this end the Government would not fritter away its resources in increased expenditure on non-essential projects, but on the contrary would curb unnecessary and wasteful expenditure in order to conserve its financial strength for the main challenge, that is of improving the material and sociological prospects of the people.

Let us now have a look at the estimates in general. In the estimates we cannot help noticing a lot of expenditure that cannot be considered as expenditure for the improving of the material and sociological prospects of the people. The following should give Honourable Members of this

House an example of what I mean. We are asked here to approve an expenditure of \$18,000 under the Head, Ministry of External Affairs and it is stated here in the notes from the Treasury that it is for the cost of a new official car for His Majesty's Ambassador to Indonesia. It further says that the present official car is beyond economic repair and a sum of \$18,000 was advanced from the Contingencies Fund. Well, if it is the policy of the Government to economise, is there the necessity to purchase a car that costs \$18,000?

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** On a point of order. I would remind the Honourable Member that this debate is on the second reading and I think this debate should be confined to the general principles of the Bill. But he is going into details of the Bill. I suggest that he will have ample time to elaborate on the details of the Bill when the House goes to the Committee stage.

**Enche' Tan Phock Kin:** If I may explain, Sir, I stated before I drew the attention of the House to this item that I was giving it as an example.

**Mr. Speaker:** For the information of the Honourable Member I shall quote Standing Order 67 (5)—

"The debate on a Supplementary Supply Bill in Committee of Supply shall be limited to the particulars contained in the estimates on which the supplementary appropriations are sought . . ."

So, you will have a chance to debate again when that particular item comes up in the Committee.

**Enche' Tan Phock Kin:** If it is your ruling, Sir, that I shall not refer to the item specifically, then I shall refer to it generally. So, I would just take an example of unnecessary expenditure, expenditure, which is contrary to the Government policy as enunciated. For instance, if it is proposed to purchase a car, there are various types of cars that can be purchased and we in this country have seen that even Ambassadors in this country do not go about in \$18,000 cars. The prestige of our foreign representatives is judged by the policy which those representatives put forward and not by the size of their

motor cars. So, Sir, this is just one example to illustrate my point as to the supplementary estimates not conforming to the declared policy.

The Honourable the Minister of Finance has stated in no uncertain terms about having room for economy and this House will be very glad if he can tell us to what extent economies have been exercised in the various departments. We in this House will certainly go into the estimates as they come up and criticise them where necessary. But the main point is this: if the overall policy is to economise, we must not budget for more just because we have an increased income. It is a well-known fact, and it was announced by Government, that in the course of the first three months of this year income from various sources in the Federation of Malaya have increased beyond expectations; and we on this side of the House would not like to see any increase in income being frittered away—as we have seen last year. It would be remembered that last year the financial position improved towards the end of the year and in view of this fact, the Government had seen it fit to increase its expenditure in the form of supplementary estimates. I am speaking to-day in the hope that the same trend will not happen again this year, and I hope the Honourable Minister of Finance will consider this issue very seriously.

**Enche' Liu Yoong Peng (Rawang):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, before this Supplementary Budget is being approved—and we know that it will go through the House—I support the view of my Honourable colleague that there should be no unnecessary expenditure for the Government. We note that under this Supplementary Budget the Ministry of Works, Posts and Telecommunications is spending the most money. I have my doubts whether the money spent by this Ministry has been carefully spent. We note that quite a good number of buildings are being constructed under this Ministry and there will be more constructions in the future. I think that some of the buildings, may be through the fault of the contractors, are not actually up to the requirement

that are befitting of Government buildings. For instance, in the case of the building of the Federal Government departmental headquarters in Petaling Jaya, we find that, not even after one year of its completion, its roof is falling down, and if this state of affairs is allowed, I wonder how much more Supplementary Budgets will be required by this Ministry!

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order, may I know to what item is the Honourable Member referring? I cannot find out what item he is speaking on.

**Mr. Speaker:** We are not debating on the Development (Supplementary) Estimates. We are debating on the Supplementary Estimates.

**Enche' Liu Yoong Peng:** I am only pointing out the situation. The money supplied to this Ministry should be only on the basis of necessity, and the principle of it is that we should not spend money when certain buildings are built simply on the basis that the contractors say that they want so much money and then we simply give them the whole sum they asked for.

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** Sir, on a point of order, I think the Honourable Member is referring to the Development (Supplementary) Estimates.

**Mr. Speaker:** Command Paper No. 12 of 1960 is the one we are debating—not the Development (Supplementary) Estimates. I do not see anything that has been asked for by the Public Works Department.

**Enche' Liu Yoong Peng:** If that is the case, I shall speak on it when we come to it.

**Enche' K. Karam Singh (Damansara):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish to speak on the Ministry of Labour and Industrial Relations. We have a point to illustrate as to what is happening in this field in the recent strike of about two hundred rubber tappers on Seremban Estate. These two hundred rubber tappers went on strike on the 25th of March against the dismissal of eighteen of their colleagues.

**The Minister of Labour (Enche' Bahaman bin Samsudin):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order, there is nothing provided here about strikes. He is barking up the wrong tree.

**Enche' K. Karam Singh:** I am talking on the policy of this Ministry, Sir.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Minister is only asking for a sum of \$900.

**Enche' K. Karam Singh:** Even if he asks for 10 cents that is going for implementing the policy of that Department, I have got the right to speak on it. I hope I will not be interrupted—I lose my trend of thoughts by being interrupted. (*Laughter*).

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, may I have your ruling on this point? If to-day the Honourable Member is going to go over the whole range of Government policies in the debate on the Supplementary Estimates, the debate on this paper will go on for months.

**Mr. Speaker:** We have already debated on the principles of the policies of the Government. Now what we have before the House are some supplementary provisions asked for by some Ministries to be approved by this House. Will you kindly confine your remarks to this particular item and in doing so do not go back to the general policy, because we have already debated that during the time when we had the Supply Bill before us last year?

**Enche' K. Karam Singh:** Sir, after we had debated the Supply Bill last year, certain developments had taken place in this country, and I feel that I have the right to speak on those developments that had taken place since. Sir, before I was interrupted, I was talking of this strike in Seremban Estate. These people went on strike so that their colleagues could be reinstated. Now we find that the Police have been called in and even troops have been called in, as I have been reliably informed, to break the spirit of these workers.

**Enche' Bahaman:** Sir, I wonder how it is relevant to the matter before us.



**Mr. Speaker:** It is not relevant. (To Enche' Karam Singh) You better touch on another point.

**Enche' K. Karam Singh:** But, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am speaking on the policy of the Labour Ministry.

**Mr. Speaker:** We had already discussed that when the Supply Bill was debated in this House by us. Now we are seeking only for supplementary votes to be approved by this House. Will you confine yourself to that?

**Enche' K. Karam Singh:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, this money given here is under the Head of the Ministry, so I have the right to speak on that. They have not mentioned it is for what purpose.

**Mr. Speaker:** Yes. But do not go into details.

**Enche' K. Karam Singh:** I will not go into details. What do we find? We find that troops and Police have been called to break the strike and allow black-legs to work on the Estate.

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order, would it be proper for Members of the Opposition to flout your ruling deliberately and flagrantly?

**Mr. Speaker:** (to Enche' K. Karam Singh) I think you better not continue on that. I have already said that you should not go into details on that strike. We are not considering that. That is not the point in issue.

**Enche' K. Karam Singh:** But the strike apart, Sir, I say I am not talking on strike now. (*Laughter*). What I say is that we find a very evil policy coming into this of allowing black-legging to go on in this country—and that is very bad for the Ministry of Labour. Otherwise we find that the Ministry of Labour would be allowing sides to be taken in an industrial dispute by the Police.

Another point in this case is the share of the National Union of Plantation Workers in this industrial action.

**Enche' Bahaman:** Again on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is irrelevant. The whole speech is irrelevant.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there any provision asked for? Which one are you referring to?

**Enche' K. Karam Singh:** Labour and Industrial Relations, Sir.

**Mr. Speaker:** I am afraid that is not relevant. I have before me under Head 55 an additional provision required for the purchase of furniture for the office of the Assistant Minister of Labour. An advance of \$700 has already been made. That is on page 9; and under Head 56, Labour and Industrial Relations, another supplement is required to meet expenses in 1960 of the Commission of Enquiry on terms and conditions of service of Government Daily-Rated Employees. You can talk on these things if you like—Head 27 and Head 29. You have the chance to speak again when these are proposed by me to stand part of the Schedule.

**Enche' K. Karam Singh:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, as regards this expenditure for the particular purpose of the Ministry, could I not speak on the policy as affecting it?

**Mr. Speaker:** It is not before the House to-day. I cannot allow that.

**Enche' K. Karam Singh:** So we can only discuss the particular items?

**Mr. Speaker:** Yes.

**Enche' K. Karam Singh:** So, Mr. Speaker, Sir, we find that certain things are being done for the comfort of the Assistant Minister of Labour (*Laughter*) and we will demand of this Assistant Minister of Labour that the comfort that he gets at the expense of this nation is not allowed to be misused for the benefit of the capitalist class, but that it is used for the benefit of the working class and that the working class and especially the rubber tappers of our country are not allowed to be intimidated by Police or troops or by managers or anyone else in the just prosecution of their industrial claims.

**Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam (Ipoh):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, on the Supplementary Estimates I notice one thing—that items which generally come under attack from the Opposition are items

which have already been performed and for which funds have already been advanced from the Contingencies Fund. If I remember correctly, the Honourable Member for Tanjong suggested previously, under the general debate, that these things should not be accomplished and then to come to this House and say, "Now give us formal approval for what we have done." I note that this practice is still being carried on. Things are done, thousands of dollars are spent, and then as a formality the Ministry concerned comes to this House for approval so that it can be said in later years that the people of this country have given us approval for what we have done.

I now refer to Head 7 where a sum of \$4,000 is asked for for a very strange affair—*ex-gratia* payments amounting to \$4,000 for two former Mentri<sup>2</sup> Besar to rehabilitate and resettle themselves under Head 7, Prime Minister. This provision is for the purpose of rehabilitating the two former Mentri<sup>2</sup> Besar. I do not know what this is, but as a matter of policy I think it is not a good policy to start rehabilitating Mentri<sup>2</sup> Besar. As Mentri<sup>2</sup> Besar start changing and if we are going to rehabilitate them, then a lot of money will be going for the rehabilitation of the Mentri<sup>2</sup> Besar.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, during the last Federal Assembly of Parliament the Government side came under attack on the question of salaries—extravagant salaries—not only at Federal level but also at State level and from time to time the answer in justification had been, "Well, they have to put away something for the rainy day." I think those are almost the exact words of the Leader of this House—"They have to put away something for the rainy day." If they have not put away something for the rainy day, when they cease to be Mentri<sup>2</sup> Besar, I do not understand why this Government should provide for them, to give them a large salary for the rainy day if they do not save it. Now we have to rehabilitate for them to live and yet when a Government servant asks for a dollar rise in wages it takes years for a decision to be arrived at. Here we are asked to approve \$4,000 to rehabilitate two

former Mentri<sup>2</sup> Besar, so that they may be set up in life. Can there be any more glaring example of an attempt to waste public money? Mr. Speaker, Sir, perhaps some of the Assistant Ministers may want to rehabilitate themselves when they cease to be Assistant Ministers and they may therefore support this, but we on the Opposition do not require to be rehabilitated at any time of our lives.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, now I refer to an item under the Ministry of External affairs with regard to the purchase of a motor car under Head 29. It says this: the provision asked for is for the "cost of a new official car for His Majesty's Ambassador to Indonesia. The present official car is beyond economical repair. A sum of \$18,000 was advanced from the Contingencies Fund." This together with the previous provision makes a total \$34,600 for the purchase of a motor car. Mr. Speaker, Sir, as has already been indicated by the Honourable Member for Tanjong, the standing of a country, the standing of a representative of a country, does not depend on the size of the car he uses. It depends on his conduct, his attitude, his behaviour and his moving about with the people of other countries. I cannot understand what is the meaning of "beyond economical repair". What is the cost of the economical repair, may we be told that? What is the make of the car which has been in use; what is the make of the car which it is proposed to purchase for this Ambassador in Indonesia? If we are going to keep to the policy of economy or to save money to spend on the people, then I think this spree should stop, this spree of large limousines for Ambassadors, in foreign countries. If it is with their own money, of course, they can even buy palaces on wheels and nobody will stop that, but if it is public money, we strongly oppose it as a matter of principle. Again on that item I wish the House to note that it has already been done, the money has already been given and now we are just asked to approve it or to put our dhobi mark on it.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, Sir, I ask your direction as to whether I am entitled

to speak on this—Postal Services dealing with Post Office Savings Banks, the advertisement or propaganda for that purpose.

**Mr. Speaker:** Under which Head?

**Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam:** Page 10, Postal Services, Head 71, National Savings Movement—an attempt to propagate it, to advertise it, so that the people will join the National Savings Movement. Mr. Speaker, Sir, on the previous days in this House there was a general debate, there was a specific debate, which took almost one day or half a day on the question of Radio Malaya. National Savings is an important thing and here I ask you for direction before I go further. Since the debate on the Radio Malaya, I have got certain other information of victimisation or attempted victimisation in the Radio Malaya by the Assistant Minister of Broadcasting. May I say that he is trying to victimise them? *(Mr. Speaker indicates dissent)*. With this I stop.

**The Assistant Minister of Labour (Enche' V. Manickavasagam):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I feel duty-bound to reply to certain allegations or remarks made by the Honourable Member for Damansara. Sir, he referred to the Seremban Estate Strike. We cannot stop anybody from staging a strike. The Police was called to maintain law and order and not to crush trade union activities. The Police was called to see that there is peace amongst the workers themselves and not to help employers. The Police has to maintain law and order throughout the country whether it is on the estates or in tin mines or in the urban areas or in the kampongs. He also mentioned about black-legs. Sir, I wish to inform the Honourable Member and this House that the National Union of Plantation Workers is dealing with the issue and my Ministry is giving all the help.

**Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order. If you have ruled that this specific point is out of order then I ask that this Member be ruled out of order, otherwise I would like to get up and say

something on that point. I ask for your ruling.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have ruled this out of order and it is irrelevant to the motion before the House. You need not reply to that.

**Enche' V. Manickavasagam:** Thank you.

**The Minister of External Affairs (Dato' Dr. Ismail):** Mr. Speaker, both the Members for Tanjong and for Ipoh have quoted one of the supplementary provisions of External Affairs as an example of Government extravagance, and of a contradiction in the Government policy of trying to economise as enunciated by the Prime Minister or as contained in the Royal Address. I think that what this Government means by economy is that it does not mean that this Government should be a miser. There is a great difference between being economical and being a miser. If the Members to whom I address these remarks should think that the words "miser" and "economical" are synonymous, then we on this side of the House will accept that as their interpretation for their benefit, and not for us.

Sir, it is true that our foreign policy is not based on adherence to any bloc, but strictly based on merits. But, Sir, our Ambassadors abroad are representatives not only of the country, but they represent His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong; so, they have a dual function of trying to upkeep the dignity of His Majesty and also trying to publicize this country to the world. Sir, even Ambassadors from the Iron Curtain countries—from which some Members of the Opposition draw their inspiration—even they try to keep up the dignity of their countries by appearing appropriate according to accepted international diplomatic practice all over the world.

Sir, I am really grateful that the Alliance Government commands a big majority in this House because by having this the External Affairs Service at least is able to upkeep the the dignity of His Majesty and also to publicize to the world this country in keeping with its status in the world.

We in the External Affairs Service do not try to emulate the opulence of some countries, but what we try to do is to give dignity and proper standing of this country in the international world. Sir, God forbid that any of the Opposition Parties come into power, for they would ask our Ambassadors to travel in bullock carts or in other ways that would make this country a laughing stock to the world.

Now, Sir, the Honourable Member for Ipoh—I am surprised at this young man, because he is such a fluent speaker, and I am sure he has a very great command of the Queen's English, and yet he does not understand the meaning of the words "beyond economical repair". However, Sir, we have to take him at his word, that he doesn't know what "beyond economical repair" means: it means that the car is in such a bad state that it has to be repaired so often that it has become uneconomical to maintain it any longer.

**Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad (Bachok):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berasa ada berlainan sedikit berkenaan dengan Supplementary Estimates ini. Pada fikiran saya, bagi satu Estimates yang \$888 juta menghendaki Supplementary Estimates bukan-lah satu perkara yang menghairankan. Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, yang saya mengharap supaya Menteri Kewangan mengisi perchakapan<sup>2</sup>-nya untuk menjalankan ekonomi yang lebeh didalam hal pentadbiran negeri ini. Apa yang kita lihat daripada Supplementary Estimates yang ada di-sini, ia-lah perkara<sup>2</sup> yang di-buat boleh dikatakan dahulu-nya di-keluarkan anggaran biasa. Tetapi kita, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada-lah menghadapi beberapa bulan lagi di-masa yang akan datang. Jadi, di-minta 2 million Supplementary Estimates atas perkara<sup>2</sup> yang dahulu-nya ta' dapat kita agakkan seperti Minggu Bahasa dan seperti perkara<sup>2</sup> yang di-sebutkan di-sini.

Saya perchaya, ini perkara kechil sahaja sebab 2 juta daripada \$888 juta. Di-harap di-dalam membelanjakan \$888 juta yang akan datang itu, ekonomi hendak-lah dijalankan dengan kuat supaya tidak-lah

mustahak lagi memberikan Supplementary Estimate bagi masa yang akan datang. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berasa walau pun Menteri Luar Negeri, dan dia telah menyebutkan berkenaan perbelanjaan motor-car di-sini sa-banyak \$18,000 dan menerangkan ma'ana di-dalam economical repair dan amat besar ma'ana-nya, itu di-fahamkan bersama. Tetapi yang menjadi soal, ia-lah ada-kah sampai pehak-nya di-dalam membeli motor-car yang baharu itu, motor-car yang lama itu tidak boleh di-jualkan dan kalau di-jualkan motor-car lama itu boleh-lah lagi kita mengurangkan belanja yang ada pada kita.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tidak perchaya bahawa kalau-lah pehak pembangkang di-sini memerintah mereka akan menghantarkan Duta<sup>2</sup>-nya berjalan dengan kereta lembu. Ini ada-lah satu pandangan yang saya rasa tidak sa-suai dengan fikiran yang waras. Yang kita kehendaki di-sini, ia-lah berjimat bukan-nya berbakhil. Hal ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, harap-lah mendapat pandangan juga. Saya suka menarek perhatian dalam Supplementary Estimates ini di-dalam bahagian Kementerian Pertanian dan Kerja sama. Di-sini ada financial Assistance sa-banyak \$90,000. Saya rasa kejadian ini di-tempohkan di-dalam Supplementary yang ada ini kerana kemarau yang telah berlaku pada tahun yang lalu dan telah di-beri bantuan kepada petani<sup>2</sup> dalam hal ini. Dasar membantu petani<sup>2</sup> itu amat-lah baik-nya chuma saya harap-lah jangan dalam negeri Kedah sahaja hal ini dijalankan sebab di-Kelantan pun ada bah baharu<sup>2</sup> ini dan saya berharap Kementerian yang bersangkutan mengambil perhatian dalam hal ini.

**Enche' Ahmad Boestamam (Setapak):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya sungguh merasa dukachita sekali apabila mendengar ucapan Yang Berhormat Menteri Luar kita mengatakan yang kami dari pehak pembangkang di-sini menghendaki Duta<sup>2</sup> kita di-luar negeri menggunakan kereta lembu. Kalau kami mengemukakan pendapat kami maka bukan-lah berdasarkan bahawa Kerajaan Persekutuan Tanah Melayu ini akan selama<sup>2</sup>-nya sampai kiamat

di-pegang oleh Perikatan, bukan. Tetapi, kami memandang hidup di-dunia ini sa-bagai roda, ia berpusing. Kami juga di-satu masa, bukan chakap besar, tidak (*Ketawa*)—mungkin duduk di-sini. Menteri Luar Negeri tadi menyebutkan soal jimat—economical dengan miser—kedekut, barangkali Menteri Luar itu lupa juga perbedzaan di-antara economical—jimati dengan waste—membadzir. Kami mengemukakan soal membeli kereta tadi ia-lah dari segi ini, soal apa-kah satu waste atau tidak? Baharu<sup>2</sup> ini saya telah pergi ka-Indonesia, dan dengan segala hormat saya minta bertemu dengan Duta kita di-sana, maka dengan baik-nya beliau menjemput ka-rumah-nya dengan menaiki kereta bersama<sup>2</sup> dengan dia. Saya duduk di-belakang bersama<sup>2</sup> dengan Duta kita, dan waktu saya duduk di-dalam-nya saya merasa saolah<sup>2</sup> saya ini kalau pun tak Duta, separoh Duta. (*Ketawa*). Kenapa saya berkata begitu, kerana motor-car itu maseh chantek lagi, entah-lah motor-car ini motor-car yang baharu itu saya tak tahu, tetapi kalau motor-car yang itu yang di-katakan beyond economical repairs itu saya sungoh tak mengerti sebab motor-car ini chantek sakali sampai tak berbunyi waktu berjalan. (*Ketawa*). Tahu<sup>2</sup> sahaja saya sampai di-rumah Duta. (*Ketawa*).

**Dato' Dr. Ismail:** Saya menompang bertanya, apa-kah buatan motor-car itu?

**Enche' Ahmad Boestamam:** Sampai saya tak tahu buatan motor-car itu. (*Ketawa*).

**Mr. Speaker:** Sampai berjalan tak ada bunyi. (*Ketawa*).

**Enche' Ahmad Boestamam:** Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order! Order!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Berapa roda?

**Enche' Ahmad Boestamam:** Empat. (*Ketawa*).

**Mr. Speaker:** Jangan di-jawab pertanyaan itu.

**Enche' Ahmad Boestamam:** Tetapi, saya mengulas kerana saya di-ganggu.

**Mr. Speaker:** Jangan tuan jawab pertanyaan itu, kalau hendak, jawab kemari. Ya.

**Enche' Ahmad Boestamam:** Jadi, soal-nya jangan kita menimbulkan soal jimat dan kedekut, tetapi timbulkan soal jimat dengan soal membadzir. Satu lagi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau kita pandang di-Head 29—Special Expenditure—the Deputy Prime Minister and Party propose visit to Japan and Formosa, saya tak mahu membachakan detail-nya, dan saya tak tahu apakah ini sudah di-tarek balek? Tetapi, pertanyaan mulut saya tempoh hari berkenaan dengan lawatan Timbalan Perdana Menteri kita ini Perdana Menteri menjawab mengatakan bahawa lawatan Timbalan Perdana Menteri kita itu atas nama diri-nya sendiri, tetapi di-sini ada di-sebutkan propose visit to Japan and Formosa.

**Mr. Speaker:** Muka nombor berapa?

**Enche' Ahmad Boestamam:** Muka 9—Head 29 di-bawah sa-kali, jadi saya ingin mahu tahu apa-kah sudah terkeluar atau bagaimana?

**Tuan Haji Azahari bin Haji Ibrahim (Kubang Pasu Barat):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untok menyokong di-atas usul yang di-kemukakan oleh Kerajaan bagi penambahan perbelanjaan tahun 1960, maka saya suka-lah menarek perhatian Yang Berhormat itu ia-itu penambahan<sup>2</sup> belanja yang di-kemukakan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Kewangan ini ia-lah penambahan<sup>2</sup> yang munasabah, dan saya suka-lah menyatakan di-sini ia-itu ada-lah satu perkara yang bukan luar biasa bagi mana<sup>2</sup> negeri pun yang meminta penambahan bagi perbelanjaan tahun yang berkenaan. Sebab saya berkata begitu ia-itu ada-lah belanjawan<sup>2</sup> atau pun penambahan<sup>2</sup> kapada belanjawan bagi tahun mana sekali pun ada-lah tergantung kapada keadaan siasah, dan perkembangan perkhidmatan. Jadi, dalam Dewan ini juga kita dapati bahawa beberapa polisi yang baharu yang mana berkehendakkan pentadbiran yang berchorak berbagai<sup>2</sup> untok memperkembangkan dan mengikuti polisi Kerajaan yang di-tetapkan, maka

dengan kerana itu-lah pihak Kementerian Kewangan berkehendakkan kapada penambahan<sup>2</sup> belanja ini.

Dari itu, kalau sakira-nya kita kaji berkenaan dengan keadaan siasah umpama-nya, kita tahu ia-itu kita mempunyai satu chadangan atau pun kita sahkan beberapa usul yang di-kemukakan oleh Kementerian sabagi menamatkan atau menghapuskan pengkhianat<sup>2</sup> atau pun subversive, maka kita perchaya-lah jikalau kita hendak menjalankan polisi semacam itu maka terpaksa-lah pentadbiran atau pun Kerajaan meminta belanja yang sa-umpama itu pula pada masa yang kahadapan. Bagitu juga kalau sakira-nya kita berkehendakkan atau hendak melebihihan perolehan negara ini ia-itu dengan jalan kita hendak mengutip Income Tax daripada penduduk di-sini dengan di-kenakan Undang<sup>2</sup> Income Tax, maka terpaksa-lah di-kehendakkan beberapa banyak pegawai<sup>2</sup> lagi untuk menyelenggarakan perkara itu.

Maka dengan sebab itu, saya mengeshorkan ada-lah penambahan<sup>2</sup> di-beberapa Kementerian mengikut Kepala<sup>2</sup> yang ada di-sini, atau pun Kepala<sup>2</sup> Perbelanjaan di-sini, yang mana menjadi munasabah bagi pihak Kementerian Kewangan agar meminta penambahan Kementerian-nya bagi tahun ini di-persahkan.

**The Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives (Enche' Abdul Aziz bin Ishak):** Yang Berhormat Tuan Pengerusi, bagi menjawab Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bachok dengan wang bantuan kapada penanam padi dari Kedah. Memang di-mana<sup>2</sup> pun jikalau sa-suatu bahana tertimpa kapada penanam padi, kerana banjir atau pun kerana kemarau, jikalau bantuan itu melarat, baharu-lah kita buat langkah memberi bantuan. Saperti yang berlaku di-negeri Kedah di-mana 1,300 relong dalam satu kawasan itu yang tidak dapat satu biji padi sekali pun, dan oleh itu kira<sup>2</sup> 11 peratus daripada keluaran padi sudah menjadi kurang daripada tahun sudah di-Kedah dan Perlis.

Saya sa-bagai Menteri Pertanian apabila ada penyata<sup>2</sup> di-terima atas

bahana<sup>2</sup> di-kawasan<sup>2</sup> padi selain daripada pegawai<sup>2</sup> tempatan maka saya sendiri akan menyiasat perkara<sup>2</sup> itu. Tetapi setahu saya belum lagi mendapat penyata daripada negeri Kelantan kerana banjir atau lain<sup>2</sup>. Saya sa-bagai Menteri Pertanian, juga memang semua penanam<sup>2</sup> padi ada-lah saya sayang belaka.

**Enche' Lim Kean Siew (Dato Kramat):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to speak on Museums. Not many people, I know, are interested in Museums, but I rise to speak on Museums because I see under Head 12 that there is going to be \$15,200 to be spent on excavation work at Johore Lama. I understand that the repair work will be done by two qualified archaeologists, Mr. Mathew of the Museums Department and Professor Stolheim. Mr. Speaker, Sir, Johore Lama is a historic site to where, I understand, the King of Malacca retired in order to fight the Portuguese and should, of course, be kept like all relics. It is desirable that in excavations of our historical sites, properly qualified archaeologists ought to be in charge of such expeditions. But—I think it was on April the 5th—I was rather surprised to see a statement in one of our English newspapers that Professor Tregonning had been to the East Coast of Malaya with a certain other professor—I think it was Professor Fatimi—to excavate a certain site in order to find out if early inhabitants from China had come to live in that place. I think it was to seek proof as to whether or not Islam had also come from China. Not one of those people leading the excavation was properly qualified for excavation work. I understand that 150 young people from the Historical Society also went to assist in the excavation. Whilst we admire the courage and the persistence and the enthusiasm of those young people who should be encouraged, we must regret that there was no qualified man to direct the excavation especially as we are trying our best to preserve our past. These two professors were professors in history—probably amateurs in archaeology—and they went to dig up the site and, of course, they found nothing. Is that very surprising?

The last time when the Budget came up I spoke of the need for more funds for our Museums. I have since then been to the Taiping Museum again. Taiping Museum now appears to be completely empty. I understand that many of the things have been taken away or boxed, but we do not know exactly where they are kept. As for the Museum in Kuala Lumpur, all of us who go to the Lake Gardens will pass by a little shed, or what looks like a little shed, and that is our National Museum. And in the meantime we are able to spend \$8 million on a new Parliament, we are thinking of spending \$50 million on a new aerodrome and \$1½ million on a new indoor stadium. If we can spend so many millions to create what will become relics in 10 or perhaps in 50 or 100 years time, I do not see why we cannot spend some more money to preserve relics which we now have in Malaya today, instead of allowing all manner of inexperienced and untrained people to go about so freely to destroy so many things.

**Wan Sulaiman bin Wan Tam (Kota Star Selatan):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun berchakap berkenaan dengan financial Assistance to Padi Cultivators \$90,000. Ahli Yang Berhormat dari Bachok tadi telah merungut kata mengapa pertolongan semacam itu tiada di-beri kepada penanam<sup>2</sup> padi di-Pantai Timor sama. Di-sini saya suka menerangkan kepada ahli<sup>2</sup> Yang Berhormat, bahawa keadaan penanam<sup>2</sup> padi di-Kedah itu boleh kata berlainan sedikit daripada rakan<sup>2</sup> mereka di- sebelah Pantai Timor sana. Ada-lah penanam<sup>2</sup> padi di-Kedah itu telah dengan sa-sungguh<sup>2</sup>-nya menjalankan berbagai ikhtiar untuk meninggikan taraf kehidupan mereka sendiri. Mereka melebuhkan perusahaan<sup>2</sup> mereka dengan bermacam<sup>2</sup> chara, terutama sekali menerusi Pengerakan Kerjasama yang dasar utamanya ia-lah menolong diri sendiri untuk melebuhkan pendapatan padi mereka dengan menggunakan baja uria yang mashor itu yang asal-nya dari Jerman itu. Baja itu telah di-perolehi menerusi badan Kesatuan Sharikat Kerjasama<sup>2</sup>

Utara Kedah. Semenjak baja itu dibawa masuk ka-Malaya, maka penanam<sup>2</sup> padi di-Negeri Kedah-lah yang mengguna pertama kali-nya untuk padi. Mereka tidak-lah semata<sup>2</sup> bergantung kepada perusahaan padi sahaja, tetapi juga menjalankan lain<sup>2</sup> perusahaan<sup>2</sup> kecil termasuk menternak ayam itek . . . . .

**Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad:** On a point of explanation, Sir, bolehkah saya pinta penjelasan . . . .

**Wan Sulaiman Wan Tam:** . . . saya dukachita, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tiada dapat beri peluang. Saya ada bawa bersama<sup>2</sup> saya di-sini 30 biji telur ayam white-leghorn sebagai contoh, menchari pasaran menjual-nya, menerusi Sharikat Kerjasama dan telah pun lawati 2-3 tempat. Yang di-Pertua, ayam white-leghorn itu, dahulu tiada suka di-bela oleh orang<sup>2</sup> di-sini; tetapi sekarang sa-telah menerima nasihat<sup>2</sup> dan penerangan<sup>2</sup> dari Pejabat Pertanian, sudah menjadi sa-balek-nya. Maka sudah ada beberapa tempat belaan ayam itu di-kampong<sup>2</sup> sekarang ini. Demikian-lah, Yang di-Pertua. Jika sakira-nya penanam<sup>2</sup> padi di-Kedah itu meminta lebih daripada \$90,000 sekali pun, saya perchaya, Ahli<sup>2</sup> Yang Berhormat sakalian, sa-telah melihat keadaan-nya yang sa-benar, dengan tiada soal menyoal panjang lagi, akan benarkan permintaan mereka itu.

**Enche' Mohamed Yusof bin Mahmud (Temerloh):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menarek perhatian Majlis ini dalam bahagian Head 7 Prime Minister, \$27,500 telah di-belanjakan kerana menjayakan Pertandingan Membacha Kor'an di-seluruh Tanah Melayu. Maka saya dan seluruh ra'ayat Persekutuan Tanah Melayu yang beragama Islam ucapkan banyak<sup>2</sup> terima kaseh, di-samping itu saya suka memberi sedikit pandangan, supaya tahun hadapan belanja itu di-lebuhkan, supaya dapat memberi peluang yang lebih luas lagi kepada orang<sup>2</sup> yang hendak masuk pertandingan itu pada tahun hadapan. Dan bagitu juga saya suka menarek pandangan pada Head 28, \$24,960 telah di-belanjakan kerana menjayakan Minggu Bahasa Kebangsaan, di-sini saya perchaya ra'ayat yang chintakan

kapada bahasa tentu menguchapkan sa-tinggi<sup>2</sup> terima kaseh atas ranchangan ini. Tetapi saya berasa muskil, pehak Kerajaan telah bersusah payah mengadakan Minggu Bahasa Kebangsaan, dan sa-telah Minggu Bahasa Kebangsaan itu lenyap, ada di-sa-tengah<sup>2</sup> pejabat yang di-kelolakan oleh Expatriate Officer, chuba menahan semangat pegawai<sup>2</sup> yang menggunakan bahasa kebangsaan ini. Saya tidak-lah hendak menerangkan pejabat<sup>2</sup> itu, saya sendiri akan menulis kapada Kerajaan atas perkara ini. Saya suka juga memberi tahu ada satu pejabat yang Pegawai<sup>2</sup> Daerah-nya bersungguh<sup>2</sup> dalam perkara bahasa ini dan telah di-gunakan dengan sempurna-nya, tetapi Expatriate Officer ketua mereka pula menahan dan ia tidak membenarkan mereka<sup>2</sup> itu menggunakan bahasa kebangsaan ini. Jadi saya rasa perkara ini mustahak bagi pehak Kerajaan memberi tahu, terutama sa-kali kapada Expatriate Officers, tanggung-jawab-nya terhadap kemajuan bahasa kebangsaan ini.

Jadi, saya rasa bagi pehak Kerajaan, perkara sa-macam ini sa-patut-nya-lah kita memberi ingatan terutama sa-kali kapada mereka<sup>2</sup> yang daripada executive officers mengingatkan tanggung jawab-nya terhadap kemajuan bahasa kebangsaan ini. Pada ka-seluruhannya permintaan perbelanjaan ini saya rasa, sa-bagai Kerajaan Negeri yang baharu merdeka maka saya rasa, tidak hairanlah ia-itu berkenaan perbelanjaan<sup>2</sup> yang di-minta oleh Kerajaan memandangkan perkara<sup>2</sup> yang timbul dengan tidak semena<sup>2</sup>. Sa-bagai satu tuduhan daripada wakil Front Socialist, dia mengatakan Museum kita di-Kuala Lumpur ini satu tempat yang tidak sesuai, tetapi perchaya-lah kalau beliau itu betul<sup>2</sup> tahu apa yang di-chakap-nya, pergi-lah di-tempat itu di-mana ada tertulis di-depan-nya, "sementara". Jadi, kalau di-fahamkan "sementara", saya rasa, tentu-lah Kerajaan akan mengambil berat dalam hal ini untuk di-baiki.

**Enche' Othman bin Abdullah (Tanah Merah):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun di-dalam mengemukakan beberapa fikiran. Di-dalam Estimates minta di-benarkan ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tertarek kapada jawapan

yang dahulu-nya telah di-berikan oleh Perdana Menteri kita tentang perbelanjaan terhadap Timbalan Perdana Menteri ka-negeri Jepun dan Formosa. Saya di-sini tidak-lah hendak membangkitkan perkara<sup>2</sup> itu kerana telah pun di-jawab. Tetapi yang menjadi kemuskilan-nya dan saya minta pertanggung jawapan yang besar daripada Perdana Menteri, apa-kah jawapan-nya yang benar atau kertas ini yang salah di-chetak. Sebab, di-dalam jawapan Perdana Menteri bahawa perbelanjaan Timbalan Perdana Menteri ka-Jepun dan Formosa itu, tidak-lah berkait dengan urusan<sup>2</sup> Kerajaan tetapi hanyalah semata<sup>2</sup> berjalan dengan perbelanjaan-nya sendiri dan urusan-nya sendiri dan untok menengok sa-buah mesjid di-buka di-Formosa. Tahu<sup>2</sup>, di-dalam perbelanjaan yang di-minta ini, terdapat-lah sa-jumlah \$13,650 perbelanjaan kerana Timbalan Perdana Menteri ka-Jepun dan Formosa. Jadi, di-sini-lah yang menjadi kemuskilan saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Mana-kah dia yang sa-benar dan saya minta kapada Yang Teramat Mulia Perdana Menteri kita memberi pertanggung jawab di-atas jawapan-nya yang telah pun di-beri di-dalam Dewan ini beberapa hari yang lalu supaya perkara ini jelas dan tidak ada silap mata di-sa-balek jawapan itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, berbalek saya kapada perkara yang lain ia-itu dibawah Head 28—Ministry of Education. Berkenaan dengan Dewan Bahasa yang telah pun menjayakan Minggu Bahasa dan telah pun di-sebutkan oleh sa-orang sahabat saya daripada pehak di-sa-belah sana ia-itu bagi saya amatlah bershukor dan berterima kaseh kapada Kementerian ini dengan mengadakan Minggu Bahasa Kebangsaan yang telah pun di-jalankan di-dalam negeri ini beberapa bulan yang lalu. Apa yang kita harapkan ia-itu hasil dari Minggu Bahasa itu sekarang dan di-masa<sup>2</sup> yang akan datang. Minggu Bahasa itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tidaklah rasa-nya akan memadaï chuma sebutan yang sedap sahaja. Satu tanda kejayaan perkembangan bahasa Kebangsaan negeri ini ia-lah supaya dapat kita amalkan bahasa itu dengan sa-baik<sup>2</sup>-nya. Apa yang kita harapkan di-masa<sup>2</sup> yang akan datang ia-lah hasil



dari Minggu Bahasa yang telah dilancarkan itu, ia-lah penilaian-nya dan ia-lah harga-nya kepada perkembangan bahasa Kebangsaan di-dalam negeri ini. Minggu Bahasa Kebangsaan telah pun kita adakan bagi tahun ini tidak-lah akan sempurna kalau sa-kira-nya hanya sa-takat kita mengadakan Minggu Bahasa Kebangsaan itu sahaja, kemudian kita berhentikan. Tetapi apa yang perlu di-buat ia-itu di-lipat gandakan usaha<sup>2</sup> kerja<sup>2</sup> bagi menggalakkan Minggu Bahasa Kebangsaan ini dan hasil<sup>2</sup> yang dapat di-nikmati oleh ra'ayat negeri ini sendiri.

Berkait dengan bahasa Kebangsaan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menarek perhatian kepada Head 27, bahagian Polis. Bahagian Polis ini tentu-lah pembelian motor cycle ini akan di-keluarkan tetapi ada satu perkara yang berbangkit daripada Jabatan Polis ini ia-itu berkaitan dengan bahasa Kebangsaan. Di-dalam Jabatan Polis, kalau saya tidak salah, sa-orang mata<sup>2</sup> atau polis yang bukan daripada keturunan orang Melayu katakan-lah daripada orang . . .

**Tun Abdul Razak:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order, the Honourable Member is irrelevant.

**Mr. Speaker:** Saya hendak mengingatkan kepada Ahli Yang Berhormat di-bawah Standing Orders 67 ia-itu di-katakan di-sini:

" . . . . . the general principles of Government policy and administration as indicated by the supplementary appropriations included in the Bill . . . . ."

Kalau-lah hendak berchakap di-bawah satu<sup>2</sup> Head, kalau kita sudah datang ka-Committee nanti baharu-lah boleh berchakap. Jadi, tidak-lah hilang masa. Sebab dalam tahun 1959 dahulu kita telah bahathkan principle-nya dengan penoh ia-itu dalam meshuarat budget. Jadi, saya ingin jangan-lah hilangkan masa banyak.

**Enche' Othman bin Abdullah (Tanah Merah):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sedikit sangat, lagi pun saya ta' hendak berchakap dalam perkara itu.

**Mr. Speaker:** Jangan terkeluar daripada maudzu'-nya.

**Enche' Othman bin Abdullah (Tanah Merah):** Jadi, berkenaan dengan bahasa Kebangsaan yang telah di-sebutkan ia-itu berkait dengan Polis, satu

perkara yang patut saya kemukakan di-sini ia-itu bagi di-pertimbangkan. Ya'ani sa-orang polis yang bangsa-nya bukan Melayu mendapat allowance bahasa banyak daripada gaji pokok daripada sa-orang orang Melayu mithal-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau dia sa-orang corporal, dia mendapat gaji kata-lah \$110 . . . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** Itu, tidak ada dalam Supplementary Estimates yang di-minta di-sini.

**Enche' Othman bin Abdullah (Tanah Merah):** Tidak, ini berbangkit dengan Minggu Bahasa Kebangsaan. Yang kita telah jadikan Minggu Bahasa Kebangsaan.

**Mr. Speaker:** Minggu Bahasa Kebangsaan, macham mana pula berbangkit fasal gaji?

**Enche' Othman bin Abdullah (Tanah Merah):** Tidak, ini berkenaan bahasa sahaja.

**Mr. Speaker:** Di-sini, dia minta fasal provision kerana Minggu Bahasa dan tidak berbangkit berkenaan dengan Allowance.

**Enche' Othman bin Abdullah (Tanah Merah):** Jadi, kalau Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tidak benarkan saya berchakap begitu, ta' apa-lah. Tetapi saya menarek perhatian ia-itu Allowance bahasa Kebangsaan patut-lah di-beri kepada orang yang belajar bahasa Kebangsaan dalam semua pejabat yang bukan daripada orang Melayu.

Satu lagi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tertarek hati berkenaan dengan Statistics. Statistics ini nanti, kalau saya berchakap panjang sedikit agak-nya tentu ada Order-nya supaya saya dudok. Tetapi berkenaan perkara ini usaha<sup>2</sup> atau kerja<sup>2</sup> yang hendak di-buat oleh Statistic ini bukan hanya-lah hendak menchari jumlah orang mati dan hidup sahaja tetapi yang penting menambah kerja<sup>2</sup>-nya lagi ia-itu menengok keadaan di-luar<sup>2</sup> bandar, orang yang tidak bekerja, orang yang bekerja, orang yang tidak dapat kerja langsung dan yang dapat pekerjaan, orang<sup>2</sup> yang anak-nya terbiar dan orang<sup>2</sup> yang tidak dapat pelajaran maka usaha<sup>2</sup> Statistics dalam perkara ini penting-lah di-adakan oleh Jabatan<sup>2</sup> yang berkenaan.

Berkenaan dengan Museum yang telah di-kemukakan oleh beberapa orang sahabat saya, maka dapat-lah saya mengemukakan masa'alah ini di-sini bahawa Museum di-Kuala Lumpur memang-lah tak menarek perhatian; walau pun Kuala Lumpur ini ibu kota Persekutuan Tanah Melayu, dan satu lapangan terbang kerana menarek pelanchong<sup>2</sup> agar datang ka-Persekutuan Tanah Melayu akan di-buat, tetapi sayang-nya Museum Kuala Lumpur ini belum lagi di-katakan sempurna dan rasa saya bagi Museum yang akan di-buat itu, saya nampak, banyak bahan<sup>2</sup> yang akan di-masokkan ka-dalam Museum itu, terutama-nya beberapa buah patong yang sekarang ini berada di-hadapan Pejabat Kerajaan itu patut-lah di-masokkan ka-dalam Museum kita, dan banyak lagi perkara<sup>2</sup> yang boleh di-jadikan bahan dalam Museum kita itu bagi menarek pelanchong<sup>2</sup> datang ka-tanah ayer kita ini.

**Enche' Mohamed Asri bin Haji Muda (Pasir Puteh):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua . . . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** Saya suka mengingatkan bahawa perkara ini bukan budget, tetapi Supplementary Estimates.

**Enche' Mohamed Asri bin Haji Muda:** Ya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tak hendak berchakap banyak dalam perkara ini, chuma saya tertarek hati dengan kenyataan yang di-keluarkan oleh Menteri Pertanian tadi. Yang Berhormat Menteri, tadi dalam menyatakan jawapan-nya kapada Ahli Yang Berhormat, bahawa dia sayang kapada semua penanam<sup>2</sup> padi, ini-lah yang saya rasa sejok hati saya, yang saya hendak berdiri ini. Dalam menyatakan sayang-nya kapada semua penanam<sup>2</sup> padi itu, saya suka menarek perhatian Menteri yang berkenaan bahawa kedudukan penanam padi di-sa-belah pantai timur boleh di-katakan maseh jauh kebelakang jika di-bandingkan dengan penanam<sup>2</sup> padi di-sa-belah negeri Kedah umpama-nya, yang kita telah dengar dengan panjang lebar, bahawa wakil tadi mengatakan tentang kemajuan dalam menanam padi dan usaha<sup>2</sup> bagi menambah kehidupan mereka itu, saperti memelihara atau menternak ayam dari beneh

atau baka ayam yang baik, entah apa nama-nya saya kurang mendengar-nya. Saya rasa kalau Menteri Tanaman dapat menganjorkan besaran<sup>2</sup> supaya penternak ayam di-sabelah sana, di-pantai timur dapat di-sebarkan dengan saluas<sup>2</sup>-nya bukan sahaja merupakan nasehat<sup>2</sup> dari Pejabat<sup>2</sup> Pertanian tetapi juga memberi bantuan dengan tidak ada interest—bantuan yang di-bayar pada pokok sahaja.

Dalam soal menggunakan baja, memang ada kemajuan di-pantai timur sekarang, di-sana sangat gemar nampak-nya menggunakan-nya, oleh kerana jelas fa'edah penggunaan baja itu, tetapi satu perkara yang saya fikir tak dapat di-buat oleh penanam<sup>2</sup> padi di-pantai timur itu; walau pun hati-nya hendak maju, bukan sahaja di-pantai timur bahkan di-negeri Kedah sa-kali pun tak dapat di-buat, ia-itu Parit dan Tali Ayer. Parit dan Tali Ayer ini memang mustahak benar lebeh<sup>2</sup> lagi dasar kita sekarang ini hendak memajukan perusahaan menanam padi dua kali sa-tahun. Dalam memajukan menanam padi dua kali sa-tahun ini yang besar sa-kali—

**Mr. Speaker:** Di-bawah head mana yang di-chakapkan ini?

**Enche' Mohamed Asri bin Haji Muda:** Di-bawah Head 14—Agriculture. Dalam perkara memajukan penanaman padi dua kali sa-tahun, ini berkaitan dan bergantung benar dengan ada-nya kesempurnaan Parit dan Tali Ayer, saya rasa perkara Parit dan Tali Ayer di-pantai timur belum lagi begitu luas dan saya per-chaya bahawa Kementerian yang berkenaan akan memberi perhatian yang lebeh meluas.

Berkenaan dengan kenyataan sahabat saya wakil dari Bachok yang mengatakan bahawa di-sabelah Kelantan bahana kemarau tidak berlaku, tetapi apa yang berlaku ia-lah bahana kerana ayer bah. Penderitaan kerana bah ini, saya rasa tidak-lah besar berlaku saperti bahana di-negeri Kedah. Akan tetapi penanam<sup>2</sup> padi yang terkena bah itu memang menderita betul; sunggoh pun tak sampai beribu<sup>2</sup> ekar, tetapi bagi tiap<sup>2</sup> sa-orang yang kena bahana bah itu

memang betul menderita. Saya per-chaya, kalau pehak Menteri yang berkenaan dapat berhubung dengan Pejabat Tanaman, Kelantan, di-mana tempat<sup>2</sup>-nya yang berlaku, maka dapat-lah butir<sup>2</sup> yang lebih jelas berhubung dalam perkara bah itu. Saya rasa itu-lah sahaja perkara yang saya hendak berchakap dalam perkara ini.

**Enche' Lim Joo Kong (Alor Star):**

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wish to elaborate a little more on Head 40. The Honourable Member for Bachok and the previous speaker have shown some jealousy about Kedah for obtaining this \$90,000.

**Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad:**

Mr. Speaker, Sir, on a point of order, the Honourable Member is imputing improper motive to what I have said.

**Mr. Speaker:** (to Enche' Lim Joo Kong) He is not jealous of Kedah. He wants to get as much as Kedah gets. (*Laughter*).

**Enche' Lim Joo Kong:** I have said that they are not satisfied with the allocation given to them. I am quite sure the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture is not showing favouritism to Kedah just because our Prime Minister comes from Kedah. The fact is this. This small allocation is but a drop in the bucket. (*Laughter*). Kedah produces 5 million piculs of padi annually, if I am not mistaken, and then from the statistics of last year the total production was about 3 million piculs, so the loss incurred by these padi planters was not less than \$30 million and this \$90,000 is just a drop in the bucket—luckily my honourable colleague from Kota Star Selatan had already informed this House that the planters in Kedah do not depend solely on padi alone. As I have informed the House already, many are holding smallholdings which are uneconomic for planting padi alone and they have to depend on some other means of living, such as, rearing poultry, rearing buffaloes—not *seladang*—as I am sure *seladang* cannot be reared and they will go back to the jungle. Thus they have to find other means of living. If they have to depend on these smallholdings, I am sure all of them would have starved to death by this time.

That is why I say this is a very small amount given to Kedah. The extent of the drought was so heavy that it affected Kedah so very much. This is only a very meagre amount given to Kedah and I hope the Minister concerned will do more for Kedah. They are still recuperating from the effects of the drought which they suffered last year.

**The Prime Minister:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to take this opportunity to explain away the reasons for these two officials for whom \$4,000 has been asked. The reason is that these two officials were Government servants or Government officials who had been nominated to the posts of the Mentri Besars. It was considered that it would be only fair to them to give them some compensation when they had been asked to return to their special duties as Government servants. Therefore, this payment was made on compassionate grounds in order to enable them to buy some very necessary things for their new quarters and this includes cupboards and things like that.

With regard to the proposed visit of the Deputy Prime Minister to Formosa which has been brought up by two Honourable Members, I would like to say that there was a slight error in the entry here about Formosa. As I have explained lately, it was an incorrect one. The intention was that the Deputy Prime Minister should go to Japan on an official visit and on his return journey he should make a private visit to Formosa, in order to be present at the inauguration ceremony of a mosque there. Therefore it was entered here as visit to Formosa. Actually the official visit was only intended for Japan but that the return passage was by way of Formosa. That is why it is entered here.

As regards the question of unsightly museum we have now, I do not think Honourable Members appreciate the fact that the provision for a museum has been entered under Command Paper No. 13 of 1960 under Head 101 in which a provision of \$900,000 has been made for the building of a National Museum.

I think this is about all with which I am concerned. Of course, there has been a suggestion in regard to *Minggu Bahasa Kebangsaan*, that we should make it a more elaborate affair than it was last year. I can assure Honourable Members that we will do all we can be oblige.

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I shall now deal with the points raised in the debate which have not been dealt with by my Honourable colleagues. The Honourable Member for Bachok has asked the Government what would happen to the proceeds from the sale of the car now being used by the Ambassador to Indonesia when the new car has been bought. The answer, of course, is that such proceeds of sale will be credited to revenue, and in fact the net expenditure as a result will be very much less than the \$18,000 provided for the purchase of a new car.

The Honourable Member for Ipoh questions the propriety of the practice whereby expenditure is expended by means of advances from the Contingencies Fund before such expenditure is actually approved by this House. I should like to add that it is not possible in all cases, in many cases in fact, to secure prior approval of such expenditure, because as Honourable Members know, this House meets only once in two months and in the meantime there can be occasions when expenditure is urgently required and it obviously would not be possible to obtain prior approval before such expenditure is incurred. I can give one or two examples. For example, under Customs and Excise, Head 35, there is a provision asked for refund of import duty paid by States and the amount is \$400,000, and this practice arose as a result of the ruling which was adopted at the beginning of this year whereby Government Departments were required to pay import duty in the same way as private firms and private individuals; obviously this duty has to be paid even though the Legislature does not approve this sort of payment beforehand. In these circumstances the only course open to Government is to sanction an advance from the Contingencies Fund to provide for such expenditure. This

is nothing unconstitutional but is perfectly in order, and it is the practice in other legislatures as well.

The Honourable Member for Tanjong raised the question of economy in Government Departments. I have not forgotten the promise I made at the last Budget Session of this House. In fact, I have already taken steps to secure a firmer control of Government expenditure. A Committee of the Cabinet has been appointed for the purpose, but as Honourable Members will appreciate, this is a major operation and if to-day we are to do the job properly, we must prepare the ground beforehand carefully. It is, of course, possible to institute drastic and harsh measures, but they are both unpleasant and undesirable, and I do not think that the burden of such measures will be spread fairly and apply equally to all sections of the community and, as I have said already, this is a very major exercise which must be conducted very carefully and planned in advance carefully if it is to achieve the results which we all desire.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

*Schedule—*

*Head 4—*

**The Prime Minister:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to say a few words under Head 4—Elections Commission. As stated in the Treasury Memorandum, a supplement of \$29,500 is needed to amalgamate the Federal, State and Local Authority Electoral Rolls into a single list, and to enable us to set up the machinery, this money is required. First, it is necessary to have comprehensive roll of all the electorate; secondly, complete re-registration of the electorate for the Local Authority elections to be held in April, 1961. In view of these, 4,000,000 copies of Form "A", Applications to be Registered as an Elector, and 130,000 copies

of other forms will be required. The \$2,000 originally entered in the Estimates when they were prepared in the middle of 1959 is quite inadequate, and the Government has estimated that a further sum of \$29,500 will be required.

**Enche' Tan Phock Kin:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, on this question of Supplementary Estimates required for the Elections Commission, I would like here to get an assurance from the Government that there will be adequate supply of forms for registration. In the past we were faced, quite a number of times, with a shortage of forms. It must be appreciated that in this case, the registration period is only one month and there should be ample supply of forms to enable political parties and others to register all eligible voters. The whole register is to be re-written, and I would like an assurance from the Minister that ample forms will be supplied to all.

**The Prime Minister:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I will take note of what has been mentioned, and I will bring it to the notice of the Elections Commission.

Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$39,000 for Head 4 ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

*Head 7—*

**The Prime Minister:** Sir, this particular Head has been discussed at some length just now, and I don't think there is any further need for me to explain.

**Enche' Tan Phock Kin:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, the explanation given by the Prime Minister—"purely on compassionate grounds"—is to my mind not very satisfactory. We are here dealing with the terms of service of a civil servant, and in appointing a civil servant to any posts, he is guided by his terms of service. So, if there is nothing in the terms of service with regard to compassionate payments like this, as far as I can see, it will be a very undesirable precedent, because if the Prime Minister can see fit to grant arbitrarily compassionate payment of \$2,000 each to the two former Mentri-mentri Besar, then, similarly, he can make decisions to have compassionate payments for everybody in the Civil Service. So I would suggest that public funds should not be expended so liberally. If we are

spending our own money, and we think we are going to give our money to somebody on compassionate grounds, we are quite at liberty to do so, but if we are expending public funds, we must consider the repercussions and the precedent that may result from that.

**Mr. Speaker:** Under this Standing Order—67 (5)—again I have got to remind you that we have come to the Committee Stage now, and what you can do is to say that the money is insufficient, or more than enough, or should be reduced. You cannot touch the principle of that policy now, as that has already been debated. We now are on the particulars of that amount. In debate on the Supplementary Supply Bill, this is what Standing Order 67 says:

"The debate on a supplementary Supply Bill in Committee of Supply shall be limited to the particulars contained in the Estimates on which the supplementary appropriations are sought; such debate may not touch the policy . . . ."

The Standing Order is quite clear.

**Enche' Tan Phock Kin:** I quite appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, but my intention here is to move the deletion of this particular item, and to be able to convince the House on the wisdom of deleting this item . . .

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** On a point of Order, Sir—the Honourable Member is out of order because if to-day he wants to move a deletion, he must propose it under Standing Order 66 (7), which requires two clear days' notice. I do not believe the notice has been given.

**Mr. Speaker:** You cannot move any amendment on this unless you have given me two clear days' notice.

**Enche' Tan Phock Kin:** I quite appreciate that I am not in a position to delete it, but my intention is to ask the Prime Minister if he would consider deleting it in the light of my explanation.

**The Prime Minister:** With all due regard to the explanation of the Honourable Member opposite, I don't think I can agree to the deletion of this thing because, as I think I said before, it is done on compassionate

grounds and I can assure Honourable Members that it won't be a question of creating a precedent because there won't be any more civil servants appointed to the post of Menteri Besar, and the present elected Members will not be entitled at all to this money.

**Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad:** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau-lah Menteri Besar itu Civil Servant tentu-lah dia berkhidmat kepada negeri, maka mengapa-kah tidak di-minta \$4,000 compensation daripada negeri?

**The Prime Minister:** Di-pendekkan cerita, ini di-punya'i oleh Federal Civil Service bukan State Civil Service. Jadi, orang yang meminta menjadi Menteri Besar dalam State itu ia-lah di-pinjam daripada Federal dan kerana itu-lah apabila balek, dia kena di-tanggung oleh Federal.

Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$4,010 for Head 7 ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

*Head 12—*

**The Prime Minister:** Mr. Speaker, I might explain straightaway the reason for this supplement is the preservation of the old Malay Fortress at Johore Lama which was excavated in 1953, and where a number of interesting finds were made. Now, we have in February of this year the opportunity presented when the United States Government offered to make available the services of the well-known archaeologist Dr. W. Solheim, who has had experience of this work in South-East Asia, and in order to take advantage of this opportunity it was necessary to provide the supporting staff and labour to make the operation possible.

Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$15,200 for Head 12 ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

*Head 13—*

**The Prime Minister:** Mr. Speaker, a Manufacturing Census is of very great importance to this country, and I think all Honourable Members appreciate it. Also, having carried out a population census, with a survey of national income now still in progress and with a census of agriculture to be undertaken

shortly, the census of manufacturing industry will, so to speak, complete the picture available of basic economic information. The Census will be under the supervision of Miss D. A. Mercer, a Canadian Colombo Plan Expert who is a specialist on industrial statistics. This expert arrived in the Federation last October, and her initial appointment is for a period of two years.

Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$189,110 for Head 13 ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

*Head 14—*

**Enche' Abdul Aziz:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, on this supplementary provision I do not propose to elaborate on what I said earlier, that what is stated in Command Paper 12.

**Enche' Tan Phock Kin:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, arising from discussion on this particular point and to avoid further misunderstanding, I would suggest to the Ministry that a scheme be drawn up for assistance to farmers who happen to suffer from drought, because it appears to me that this particular sum of money is provided arbitrarily because there is a case in Kedah and the Minister decided to provide \$90,000. But there may also be cases elsewhere, and so I would suggest that the Ministry should have a scheme of assistance to people of this nature and anyone in any territory, whether in Kedah, Kelantan or Trengganu, can make application to the Minister for assistance if they fulfil the conditions.

**Enche' Abdul Aziz:** Sir, the drought cycle in this country is five years. The last drought was five years ago. Actually it does not happen every year and so I think it is quite unnecessary to have such a scheme. Wherever possible, Sir, we are very considerate. Apart from getting an allocation from the Treasury, we do get an allocation also from the Social and Welfare Lotteries Board. There is also another Fund, called the Prime Minister's Flood Relief Fund, from which we can draw small amounts from time to time for this purpose.

Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$90,000 for Head 14 ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

*Head 15—*

**Enche' Abdul Aziz:** Sir, likewise, I do not propose to elaborate further on this item.

**Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad:** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Menteri Yang Berhormat tadi rasa saya he didn't mention anything about this.

**Enche' Abdul Aziz:** Sir, it is in Command Paper 12.

**Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad:** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam Comd. Paper 12 of 1960—Agriculture \$8,640 itu tidak ada sekarang.

**Enche' Abdul Aziz:** Sir, I think I have to explain that. In order to make the Advisory Service of the Department of Agriculture more effective so that more farmers are informed and taught the new method in agriculture, the Ministry has launched a scheme to organise farmers into groups known as Farmers' Associations. These Associations enable Advisory Officers to deal with many people at a time rather than individually and facilitate projects of agricultural improvement to be undertaken by members of the Associations upon considering their immediate needs. The progress towards organising these Farmers' Associations, Sir, is dependent largely on the ability of the organisers—the Field Officers of the Department of Agriculture. It becomes obvious that the first need is to train these officers in organising rural people and an opportunity was provided by the Asia Foundation by making available a Filipino expert on Farmers' Associations who arrived in this country in October 1959. This expert, after his arrival, started a training scheme for Field Officers at State level. Up to now training has been given to officers in Negri Sembilan, Malacca, Johore and Perak and it is being conducted in other States. The amount of money requested for is to cover expenses incurred by this expert in his movement from State to State and his travels in each State for the purpose of training local officers and visiting people to organise these Associations.

The sum also cover expenditure on food and lodging for the expert, as he is given the same treatment as that given to officers recruited under the Colombo Plan.

Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$8,640 for Head 15 ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

*Head 21—*

**The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Enche' Mohamed Khir Johari):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, a token vote of \$10 has been provided in the 1960 Federal Estimates of Expenditure under Head 21, Sub-head 16—Cost of Administration of Anti-inflationary Cess Fund. It was not possible at the time when the Federal Estimates were prepared to provide the estimate of expenditure of the administration of this Fund, but in view of the price of rubber being maintained at above \$1 per pound level since 1st January, 1960, anti-inflationary cess is being collected, for which refunds will have to be made some time in the year if and when the price of rubber falls below \$1 per pound for eight successive weeks. The estimated expenditure for 1960 is \$16,000. The Secretaries and Treasurers fees and audit fees are fixed payments, but in respect of other items only actual expenditure incurred will be charged to the Fund.

Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$16,000 for Head 21 ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

*Head 27—*

**Tun Abdul Razak:** Sir, this expenditure has already been explained by my colleague the Minister of Finance, and it is also explained under Command Paper 12. The money is required for the purchase of motor cycles for use as outriders for Their Highnesses the Rulers and Governors.

**Enche' Tan Phock Kin:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, apparently this sum of money has already been expended from Contingencies but I do not know when it was expended; anyway, it cannot be before the beginning of this year, I take it. From my observations, Sir,

even last year everywhere His Excellency the Governor of Penang, or somebody else went there were already outriders accompanying and I was wondering as to the justification for this increased fleet of another 22 motor cycles. In the past the Police were in a position to supply outriders whenever necessary and I see no reason why there should be a special provision of 22 motor cycles for the specific purpose of giving outriders for the Governors and the Rulers. My point is this: if there is no difficulty of getting outriders from the Police, these 22 motor cycles if purchased should also go into the pool so that they can be fully utilised. I see no reason why 22 motor cycles should be supplied specifically for use as outriders. However, since the 22 motor cycles have been purchased, we could not do anything about it and I would suggest that they be included in the pool of the Police so that whenever outriders are required the Police can be informed about it and the necessary number of outriders can be supplied, rather than reserve 22 motor cycles specifically for use as outriders for Rulers and Governors.

**Tun Abdul Razak:** Sir, these motor cycles are required for outriders here in Kuala Lumpur and not in the States—in Penang or any other place. These motor cycles are subject to wear and tear and they have to be replaced from time to time. The Police have got motor cycles but they are used for other purposes; so we require these 22 motor cycles in order to meet our commitments for providing outriders for Their Highnesses the Rulers and the Governors. We have some motor cycles here but some of them have to be replaced.

Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$10 for Head 27 ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

*Head 28—*

**The Assistant Minister of Education (Enche' Abdul Hamid Khan):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, the sum of \$38,760 asked for is made up of \$24,960 for Minggu Bahasa Kebangsaan and \$13,800 for Malaya Hall, London. The sum

required for Malaya Hall is for emergency repairs—repairs to brick-work, floors, door frames, electrical wirings and re-plastering of the building. I have nothing to add other than that stated in Command Paper 12.

**Tuan Haji Azahari bin Haji Ibrahim:** Sir, may I know if this expenditure on Minggu Bahasa Kebangsaan is under the direct control of the Ministry or is it within the discretion of the person in charge of Minggu Bahasa?

**The Minister of Education (Enche' Abdul Rahman bin Haji Talib):** The Ministry is in charge of this vote, Sir, but the organisation of Minggu Bahasa was done by the Dewan Bahasa.

Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$38,760 for Head 28 ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

*Head 29—*

**Dato' Dr. Ismail:** I have nothing further to add, Sir, but will be prepared to answer any questions raised.

**Enche' Tan Phock Kin:** Sir, under item 16 a provision of \$33,243 is shown for the purchase of air-conditioners and furnishings for the residence of the Malayan Charge d'Affaires in the Philippines. Here again the full amount has been advanced from the Contingencies Fund. So it is no use for me now to suggest to the Minister to delete certain items because he has already purchased all the items. What I would like to do here is to ask for clarification. I notice here the purchase of air-conditioners. Well, I would say that if the weather there in Manila is very hot, I can see justification of the purchase of one air-conditioner for the office, because surely we do not expect our representative in Manila to work under very uncomfortable conditions. But as we all know, in the evenings, after office hours, it is quite cool and I see no justification whatsoever of purchasing more than one air-conditioner. Perhaps the Minister can inform us as to the reasons why the purchase of more than one air-conditioner was necessary.

Secondly, the overall value of \$33,000 for furnishings and air-conditioners



appears to me to be on the high side and perhaps the Minister can also give us some idea of the type of furniture that has been purchased for the Chancery.

**Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad:** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-dalam jawapan Menteri Kewangan dalam Meshuarat Anggaran Belanjawan pada tahun yang lalu ada menyebutkan bahawa Treasury akan mengambil perhatian tentang banyak-nya bilangan<sup>2</sup> orang yang hendak berjalan keluar negeri, sama ada pergi sa-bagai Conference atau sa-bagai-nya. Jadi, saya lihat di-sini, "Visit of the Deputy Prime Minister and Party to Japan, Visit of the Prime Minister and Party to New Zealand". Ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tentu-lah kita tidak memikirkan bahawa Perdana Menteri atau Timbalan Perdana Menteri ini pergi sa-orang sahaja, saya pun tidak juga memikirkan patut dia pergi sa-orang sampai ta' ada kawan. Tetapi saya suka bertanya kepada Menteri Luar Negeri, bagaimana-kah ka-edah parti atau kawan<sup>2</sup> kumpulan yang pergi itu dengan satu<sup>2</sup> Menteri, ada-kah di-perhatikan supaya bilangan itu jangan terlalu banyak. Sebab, pernah saya perhatikan ada sampai tiga, empat Menteri yang mengiringi-nya dan saya takut kalau banyak sangat, ternampak-lah kepada negeri luar bahawa kita ini sengaja hendak membanyakkan bilangan-nya.

**Dato' Dr. Ismail:** Sir, I would reply first to the Member from Tanjong. It is true that two air-conditioners were bought—one for the residence of the Charge d'Affaires and one for the Chancery. We consider that the climate in Manila is so extreme that it is one of the ways whereby this Government is trying to improve the standard of the workers working under it. We also provide four pedestal fans in the residence of the Charge d'Affaires—the air-conditioner is for the bedroom and the pedestal fans are for the family, for we feel that we must also look after the welfare of the families when they go abroad.

Berkenaan dengan lawatan Menteri Kewangan, yang pertama lawatan itu bukan-lah makan angin. Lawatan itu ialah di-gunakan kerana fa'edah negeri

ini. Jadi, dalam rombongan itu, yang pertama-nya mesti di-ikuti oleh pegawai daripada Kementerian saya. Ini memang lazim di-buat oleh mana<sup>2</sup> negeri yang merdeka. Ini juga, jika Menteri itu melawat negeri yang merdeka ia-itu supaya jangan kita menchebor adat negeri<sup>2</sup> itu dan pegawai<sup>2</sup> itu boleh menasehat Menteri itu di-atas perkara<sup>2</sup> itu. Lazim-nya kita menghantar, sa-orang daripada Kementerian Commerce and Industry supaya dapat berunding dengan negeri<sup>2</sup> itu untuk membesarkan perniagaan kita. Kita, kadang<sup>2</sup> membawa Press Officer supaya memberi keterangan berkenaan dengan negeri kita supaya menolong propaganda bagi rombongan itu. Maka inilah dasar yang selalu kita buat. Kadang<sup>2</sup> ada dua, tiga Menteri pergi ia-itu di-fikirkan oleh Perdana Menteri, Menteri yang di-bawa itu ada-lah akan memberi fa'edah kepada negeri ini supaya dapat bertukar fikiran dengan Menteri<sup>2</sup> dari negeri yang kita lawati itu.

**Che' Khadijah binti Mohamed Sidik (Dungun):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka hendak bertanya kepada Kementerian Luar Negeri, tadi di-terangkan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-itu tentang lawatan keluar negeri. Saya minta di-sini ia-itu kepada Kementerian yang berkenaan, kenapa-kah sudah beberapa banyak dan sudah berapa kali pelawat<sup>2</sup> dari negara kita ini keluar negeri tetapi belum ada lagi sa-orang wanita yang ikut bersama dengan lawatan itu. Kalau sakira-nya bagi Menteri yang berkenaan mengatakan perlu mithal-nya, sa-orang Press Officer atau Commerce and Industry ikut serta dan akan membawa keuntungan kepada negara kita ini. Maka saya merasa juga, kalau wanita-nya ikut keluar negeri, wanita juga akan memberi keuntungan kepada kemajuan di-dalam negeri ini. Satakat itu, Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

**Dato' Dr. Ismail:** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, yang pertama, saya telah terangkan tadi, rombongan ini bukan-lah pergi makan angin atau berbulan madu. (*Ketawa*). Dan yang kedua-nya, pegawai<sup>2</sup> yang di-ambil mengiringi Menteri<sup>2</sup> itu ada-lah daripada kaki tangan Kerajaan. Jadi, kalau wanita<sup>2</sup> yang bekerja dengan Kerajaan dan ada

pula bersangkutan dengan pekerjaan-nya tentu-lah dia juga akan di-bawa bersama untuk menjalankan kerja-nya.

Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$139,060 for Head 29 ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

#### *Head 32—*

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that expenditure shown under Head 32, Treasury, totalling \$250,000 be approved. Owing to the inadvertent cancellation of one Legal Notification by another Legal Notification, Schedule IV Replanting Cess, although included in the Penang annual Rubber Tree Tax collected from smallholders in Penang for the years 1957 and 1958, no payment was made to the Replanting Fund. The sum which is properly due to the Rubber Industry Replanting Fund from the proceeds of the annual Rubber Tree Tax in Penang for the years 1957 and 1958 is \$250,000, and is now to be paid to the Replanting Fund as an ex-gratia payment.

Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$250,000 for Head 32 ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

#### *Head 35—*

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that expenditure shown under Head 35 totalling \$400,000 be approved. In the course of my reply on the Second Reading of this Bill, I dealt at some length with this particular item, and I do not therefore propose to add anything to what I have said in view of the fact also that there is an explanation in the Treasury Memorandum itself.

Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$400,000 for Head 35 ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

#### *Head 37—*

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that expenditure shown under Head 37 totalling \$862,921 be approved. In my Budget speech in November last year I gave details as to the manner in which it was intended to increase the incidence of taxation on income. I also gave a clear indication that the Government intended to use all means in its power

to ensure the minimum illegal evasion of income tax. The legal measures that it is proposed to take to close the loopholes through which the evaders avoid paying their fair share towards the revenue of this country will be dealt with by the House subsequently. In this Supplementary Supply Bill I seek supplementary provision in order to give the Income Tax Authorities the staff and the means to ensure that evasion is reduced to a minimum and to enforce in due course the amending legislation that will be introduced. It may seem that the increased provision sought under Head 37, which amounts to about 30 per cent. of the total voted for that Head in the main Supply Bill, 1960, represents an unreasonable rate of increase. I do not agree with this view. In fact, I must warn this House that the Government is so intent on achieving success in its campaign against tax evasion that it will not hesitate to seek provision for still further increases in the staff, and I propose to do all in my power to have recruited the number and calibre of staff which is needed to succeed in this objective.

Honourable Members may wish to note in particular the increased provision under "Investigations" from \$5,000 to \$100,000. It is from this vote that rewards are paid for information on tax evasion, and I am confident that this measure, in conjunction with the increases of staff and other facilities which are proposed, will pay dividends in the form of increased yield from taxation. Not only will this increase the Government's revenue but equally important, those taxpayers who already paid their proper share of income tax will be comforted in the knowledge that Government is taking energetic steps to ensure that tax dodgers will be brought to heel.

**Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad:** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam ucapan-nya tadi Menteri Kewangan telah menyatakan dalam menjalankan semua daya upaya untuk menchegeh pelarian daripada membayar cukai dalam negeri ini, dan dalam ini dia tidak segan<sup>2</sup> akan meminta belanja yang lebih banyak daripada Kerajaan supaya menambahkan kemas yang akan

di-tambah belanja itu. Saya bersetuju Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dengan pandangan seperti ini, tetapi saya hendak bertanya dengan chara berterus terang bahawa apa-kah sebab maka di-tarek balek undang<sup>2</sup> yang di-kemukakan baharu<sup>2</sup> ini berkenaan tax evasion sedang dengan chepat-nya undang<sup>2</sup> yang seperti ini di-luluskan maka dapat-lah dasar itu kita jalankan.

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** In replying to the Honourable Member for Bachok, I should state that the Government has not withdrawn the Bill—I am of course referring to the amending Bill on Income Tax legislation. All that it has done is to withdraw or defer the Second Reading of the Bill and it is hoped to take the Second Reading at the next meeting of this House. The action has been taken in order to accord with the view of our back-benchers who wanted a bit more time in order to consider the provisions in that Bill.

Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$862,921 for Head 37 ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

*Head 43—*

**The Assistant Minister of the Interior (Enche' Mohamed Ismail bin Mohd. Yusof):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that Head 43 totalling a sum of \$4,000 be approved. Sir, it is a very straightforward matter. The amount required, as explained in the Command Paper No. 12 of 1960, is for the cost of Abel Flash Point equipment for the sampling and testing of petroleum imported into the Federation of Malaya.

Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$4,000 for Head 43 ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

*Head 55—*

**Enche' V. Manickavasagam:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a supplementary provision of \$1,570 be approved. The reason for this supplementary provision is already given in Command Paper No. 12 of 1960.

Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$1,570 for Head 55 ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

*Head 56—*

**Enche' V. Manickavasagam:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a

supplementary provision of \$1,000 be approved. The reason for this supplementary provision is given in Command Paper No. 12 of 1960. I have nothing further to add.

**Enche' V. David:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would seek clarification from the Honourable Minister. It is stated here that the supplement is required to meet expenses in 1960 of the Commission of Enquiry on terms and conditions of service of Government Daily-Rated Employees. May I know from the Honourable Minister, since the money will be passed by this House, when the report of the Commission of Enquiry is expected to be out?

**Enche' V. Manickavasagam:** I think the Honourable the Prime Minister has already replied to him in this very same House.

Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$1,000 for Head 56 ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

*Head 63—*

**Tun Abdul Razak:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that an expenditure totalling \$11,000 under Head 63, Survey, be approved. This amount is required for the payment of customs duty and freight charges on Process Camera Equipment for the Survey Department. Actually this is in accordance with the new ruling that every Government Department has to pay the actual customs duty and freight charges.

Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$11,000 for Head 63 ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

*Head 69—*

**Enche' Sardon:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that Head 69, Road Transport, totalling \$2,150 be approved. The funds for the Taximeter Testing Equipment and Accessories were provided in 1959 and the Equipment was duly ordered, but delivery could not be obtained by the end of the year. So the funds have to be revoted. The 31st of December, 1960, has now been fixed as the date for delivery and the postponement is to give more time for the careful breakdown of the present number of hackney carriages into hire cars and

taxi cabs to suit local needs. This matter is still under examination.

Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$2,150 for Head 69 ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

*Head 71—*

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that expenditure shown under Head 71 totalling \$20,000 be approved. As Honourable Members may be aware, I have from time to time expressed the view that there are more savings in this country than is perhaps generally realised. In accord with this view, the Post Office Savings Bank recently has launched a campaign not only to promote such savings but to channel those savings into the Bank itself, and the provision sought for under this item has I think been justified by the results to date.

**Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad:** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, "National Savings Movement" ini ada-lah satu perkara yang amat besar ma'ana-nya kepada kita, terutama sa-kali, bagi negeri kita yang pada masa ini menghadapi kesulitan<sup>2</sup> kekurangan kewangan. Saya nampak daripada Treasury Note yang di-hadapan mata saya ini "To meet the cost of newspaper advertisement charges in connection with the National Savings Movement . . . .", dalam perhatian saya i'lan<sup>2</sup> dalam surat<sup>2</sup> akhbar berkenaan dengan menyimpan wang dalam Post Office boleh-lah di-katakan di-bacha sambil lalu sahaja oleh orang<sup>2</sup> kita, terutama sa-kali, i'lan<sup>2</sup> yang di-lekatkan di-dinding<sup>2</sup>.

Pada fikiran saya patut-lah Kementerian ini memikirkan jalan<sup>2</sup> yang lebih active dan yang lebih berkesan kepada orang<sup>2</sup> ramai. Kalau dapat pada fikiran saya elok-lah di-adakan sharahan<sup>2</sup> di-kampung<sup>2</sup> berkenaan dengan hal ini, walau pun boleh jadi ada sharahan<sup>2</sup> di-buat sedikit sa-banyak oleh Pegawai Penerangan tetapi jalankan-lah dengan chara yang perbesar<sup>2</sup>an, kalau tidak di-jalankan perkara ini perbesar<sup>2</sup>an, wang tidak ada. Sekarang ini kita sudah adakan "Minggu Bahasa Kebangsaan" rasa bahasa itu telah timbul kepada mereka. Pada orang<sup>2</sup> kampung sekarang ini rasa menyimpan wang belum-lah

timbul, sebab mereka tidak tahu fa'edah yang besar menyimpan wang dalam Post Office. Sebab kita menyangka orang<sup>2</sup> kampung yang menyimpan wang dalam Post Office ini sa-mata<sup>2</sup> takut kena churi sahaja, pada hal ini ada-lah satu jalan yang kalau kita menyimpan wang dalam Post Office mendatangkan keuntungan pada negeri ini.

Maka saya berharap dalam perkhidmatan-nya (service) yang hendak di-belanjakan \$20,000 ini di-masokkan-lah langkah<sup>2</sup> bagi memperkenalkan perkhidmatan menyimpan wang dalam Post Office ini benar<sup>2</sup> kepada orang kampung dan memberi jalan kepada mereka supaya chara dari kampung datang ka-Post Office untuk menyimpan wang di-senang dan di-mudahkan.

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Government is aware that more than one method of encouraging savings is possible and that the method of publicity alone is not sufficient. The Honourable Member for Bachok can rest assured that every possible avenue will be explored.

Question put, and agreed to.

The sum of \$20,000 for Head 71 ordered to stand part of the Schedule.

*Clauses 1 and 2* ordered to stand part of the Bill.

*Preamble* ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported without amendment: read the third time and passed.

## THE LOANS (CENTRAL BANK OF MALAYA) BILL

### Second Reading

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "An Act to provide for the issue and management by the Central Bank of Malaya of loans raised under the provisions of certain laws" be read a second time.

The purpose of the Bill is clearly set out in the "Objects and Reasons," and I do not propose to elaborate thereon. If the Bill is approved by Parliament, its provisions will be brought into force at as early a date as possible, as the Governor of the Bank Negara Tanah

Melayu has confirmed that the Bank is now ready to take over the functions of the Public Debt Office with regard to Federation of Malaya Government Loans.

Finally, I would like to emphasise that this Act in no way affects the rights of stockholders.

Sir, I beg to move.

**Tun Abdul Razak:** Sir, I beg to second the motion.

**Enche' Tan Phock Kin:** Mr. Speaker, while welcoming this move to enable the Central Bank to take over the functions of loan authority, I would like here to stress on a few points with regard to the Central Bank. The objects of the Central Bank as set out in the Central Bank of Malaya Ordinance, 1958, are: firstly, to issue currency in the Federation and to keep reserves safeguarding the value of that currency; secondly, to act as banker and financial adviser to the Government; thirdly, promote monetary stability and sound financial structure; and lastly, to influence the credit situation to the advantage of the Federation.

The Central Bank has been established for nearly two years, and to-day we are told by the Minister of Finance that the Governor has announced that it is now in a position to take over the functions as a loan authority. I say here, Sir, that though the Central Bank Ordinance set out the functions of the Central Bank, we still find that to-day the Central Bank is not in a position to carry out many of those functions. The only function which the Central Bank at the moment is in a position to do is perhaps the second one—to act as banker and financial adviser to the Government. This, I submit, Sir, is a very unsatisfactory state of affairs. Large sums of money have been expended on the Central Bank, and the earlier the Central Bank is able to implement its other objectives, the better it is for this country. This is a matter of very great concern to the people of this country. We set up a Central Bank with specific objects, and the earlier the Honourable Minister sees to it that the Central Bank will be able to implement all these objects, the

better it is for the people of this country. So I will urge the Honourable Minister to do his utmost to see that the objectives as set out in the Central Bank Ordinance is being implemented as early as possible.

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** Sir, I do not think I need very much in reply. As is characteristic of the Honourable Member for Tanjong, he has misstated one fact, and that is the fact that the Central Bank has been in operation for nearly two years. The Central Bank in fact came into being in January, 1959, and that according to my arithmetic is only one year and three months—and that is rather slightly less than two years. The Honourable Member referred to the inability of the Central Bank to perform the functions entrusted to it under the Ordinance by which it was established. I have already earlier—I think it was about three or four days ago—told the House the reasons why it has not been possible for the Central Bank to assume its note-issuing functions, and I believe that was the function to which the Honourable Member for Tanjong referred. I do not think there is any other function which the Central Bank has not been able to perform to-date, and I therefore do not understand the purport of his remarks, because, as I tried to explain earlier, the Government could not for various reasons ask the Central Bank to undertake this particular function, but, unfortunately, the Honourable Member for Tanjong has got an uncanny knack of making the most simple things look difficult.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

House immediately resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill.

Bill considered in Committee.

(Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

*Clauses 1 to 5 inclusive* ordered to stand part of the Bill.

*Schedule* ordered to stand part of the Bill.

Bill reported without amendment: read the third time and passed.

*Sitting suspended at 12.40 p.m.*

*Sitting resumed at 2.30 p.m.*

*(Mr. Speaker in the Chair)*

## MOTIONS

### GOVERNMENT STATEMENT ON AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT ON THE ACCOUNTS OF THE FEDERATION FOR 1958

**The Deputy Prime Minister (Tun Abdul Razak):** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that this House having regard to the changed conditions prevailing immediately after Merdeka, accepts the Government statement, on the Auditor-General's Report, in Command Paper No. 14 of 1960. Since the Auditor-General's Report on the accounts of the Federation of Malaya for the year ending 31st December, 1958, was tabled at the last meeting of this House, a number of criticisms, indeed in some cases unwarranted allegations, were made against Government both in this House and outside and, to some extent, through the press. As a result of the criticisms and allegations made in this House at the last meeting, I asked members of this House to refrain from making unnecessary and unfounded allegations against Government until a full statement has been made by Government on the Report. I assured the House then that a full Government statement would be tabled at a meeting of this House. Following that assurance, the Government has at this meeting tabled a full statement on the various matters shown in the Auditor-General's Report. I hope Honourable Members have had time to make a careful study of that statement in order, as His Majesty said in His Gracious Speech, that any misunderstanding that Members might have had as a result of that Report has now been corrected.

Sir, the Auditor-General has a function to perform under the Constitution and the independent position of the Auditor-General as guaranteed in the Constitution is a safeguard which the Alliance Government had from the very start asked to be included in the Constitution. Therefore, it is not the wish of Government to prejudice in any way the independent position of

the Auditor-General or his functions in the Constitution, but what I would like to make quite clear to the House and to the country and what has been stated in the Government statement is that the Auditor-General's Report should be read in the context of the changed conditions prevailing in this country immediately after Merdeka and that those changed conditions should be taken into consideration before any judgment is passed for or against those responsible for the disbursement of Government funds. It is true that the Auditor-General has only to look at Government accounts and finances strictly from the angle of accounting and financial procedure, but there are other circumstances which should be borne in mind by this House and by the country at large. It is also unfortunate that certain parts of the Auditor-General's report are not as clearly worded as they might have been so that words and phrases taken out of their context would give a completely distorted version of the Report. Let us, for instance, take paragraph 146 of the Report which has been given so much publicity and which certain members of the opposition have deliberately taken out of its context and used to discredit this Government. This paragraph merely says that the Auditor-General has been unable to ascertain, as the Audit Ordinance requires him to do, whether payments up to a total sum of above one hundred and ten million dollars were made in accordance with proper authority and were properly chargeable. There is nothing said anywhere in the Report or in the paragraph that the money has been misappropriated or lost. The only thing is that the Auditor-General was unable to scrutinise all the audited accounts of Local Education Authorities and Secondary Schools. Now, as explained in the Government statement, payments to these agencies have in fact been checked by Audit to the extent that payments were actually made and recorded in the Cash Book at the Ministry or that charges have been debited by journal adjustments on the basis of advice notes from State Treasurers through the Accountant-General, and where payments have

been made, receipts have been seen by Audit which show that in fact payments were received by the various education authorities and schools. Final verification could be made when audited accounts were available. The only thing was that some of the audited accounts were not available at the time the Auditor-General made his Report and that made him write the paragraph as he did. Now, most of the necessary information required is available either in the Ministry or in the offices of Chief Education Officers, and the only omission, if at all it can be called an omission, on the part of the Ministry of Education is in the delay of obtaining the audited accounts. Now, Sir, with this explanation of facts before the House, is it fair to say that the money has been misappropriated or lost? Or, is it even fair to say there is a mystery about this amount of money? The money has been properly disbursed and the audited accounts are now available for verification, except those from the Perlis Local Education Authority and from some Secondary Schools where there has been some difficulty in arranging for the local audit.

Now, Sir, as the Ministry of Education was the one most heavily criticised in respect of this Report, I should now like to explain the special circumstances pertaining in this country immediately after independence which this House should be fully aware of and, in particular, the special circumstances pertaining in the Ministry of Education which was then undergoing great changes due to the adoption of the new policy in 1956. In August, 1957, this country achieved independence and as a result of that great event the whole Government machinery was subject to changes. The public service had to undergo a change. Instead of being responsible to a permanent official they had to be responsible to elected Minister, and a number of Ministries had to be reorganised and integrated, in particular the Ministry of Education. Also, at that time the effect of Government's Malayanisation policy was beginning to be felt. Senior expatriate officers were leaving and their places had to be taken over by local

officers. Although the change-over was done much more smoothly than in some other countries, nevertheless there was this change-over and there was this period of transition. There were also constant changes among officers holding various appointments. Under the circumstances there was bound to be a slight drop of efficiency and lack of continuity in some departments. Such a state of affairs was only natural and must be expected. Now, this Audit Report was made in respect of that year, 1958, the year immediately following independence. Now, by saying all these it is not my wish to discredit our public service in any way, but on the contrary, they had stood the change admirably, and local officers who assumed new responsibilities, discharged their responsibilities admirably. As I said, the change-over was carried out much more smoothly than in some other countries which had obtained independence. But we, members of this House and members of the public at large, should be aware of these circumstances and make allowance for them before we can pass any judgment against those responsible for the disbursement of Government funds at that time. It is also not my intention to disclaim responsibility for what had happened at that time. We, the Alliance Government, take full responsibility, but at the same time we take great pride in the way in which we were able to effect the change-over from a country under colonial rule to an independent country. (*Applause*).

Also, having achieved independence which was the first main aim of the Alliance Government, it was the Government's wish to achieve results in other fields of development—in social services, in health and in particular, in Education. In order to achieve quick results and to effect the necessary economic and social changes which the people had long desired, it was necessary in some instances to dispense with formalities and red-tapes and outdated procedures of colonial days. It may be, in this desire to achieve quick results, Government had overlooked certain procedures, accounting or financial. It may be these procedures should have been changed, but due to rush of work

there was no time to effect such a change. Also, in the rush of work and in the desire to achieve results there might have been delay in submitting audited accounts of monies spent. But I can assure the House that as far as possible the necessary procedures were followed and there was no instance of any intentional omission or misappropriation of funds.

Also, immediately after the achievement of independence, Government was seriously concentrating on ending the Emergency and of bringing peace to this country so that our young nation will progress and prosper without restriction and hindrance. In fighting a war, Government's main objective must be to kill the enemy and win the war at any price, and in doing so it might have been necessary to incur expenditure without first having to obtain prior approval. This had to be done in other instances and as time was the essence in any battle, in some instances money had to be spent without having to go through the usual procedure. Circumstances such as these do occur in the process in order to achieve results as in this case the Government had achieved results.

Indeed, as regards the Ministry of Education, this Ministry underwent greater changes and had to face a much more challenging task during the period than any other Ministry or department. I speak on this with some authority, with personal knowledge and experience as I was Minister of Education during the first two years of this transitional period. As the House is fully aware, one of the first tasks of the Alliance Government when it came into power in 1955 was to appoint a committee to examine the Education policy. The Report of that Committee was approved unanimously by the Federal Legislative Council on the 16th May, 1956. Soon after that the new Education Ordinance was drafted and was passed by the Federal Legislative Council on the 7th March, 1957 and brought into force on the 15th June of that year. Therefore, in that year the whole education field underwent great changes and the Ministry

and its staff had to set itself to the task of implementing the Government's new education policy. Also, prior to this new policy, Education was a State matter and the Federal Government was merely responsible to the extent of ensuring a common policy and a common system of administration.

With the new policy, education became completely Federal and this was confirmed under Articles 74 and 80 of the Constitution. Therefore, in 1957, the year of Merdeka, there were fundamental changes in the policy and fundamental changes in the Constitutional responsibility in the field of education. Now, the year 1958 was the first financial year during which these changes took effect. While the Auditor-General's Report for the 1958 financial year deals merely with accounting and financial matters, it is not enough, as I have said, to consider these in isolation of the political, policy and constitutional changes which had just taken place. As I have also said, the elected Government of independent Malaya, the Alliance Government, was determined that progress should surge through waters which had become somewhat stagnant in the colonial days, and in the field of education, above all, progress and reform were greatly needed. Since the Alliance Government first came into power in 1955, education facilities have considerably increased and enrolment in assisted primary schools has increased by 64 per cent and assisted secondary schools by no less than 112 per cent, and what is more, at the end of 1956 the Government undertook a census of all school-going children in an operation known as "Operation Torch" and at the beginning of 1957 the Government was able to find a place for every child of primary school age. (*Applause*). This was a great endeavour and a great achievement unparalleled in the history of any country. Thus, while the education policy was being changed, the education system was also being expanded. The Ministry had to face the responsibility of carrying out the education policy and the great expansion in the system. It was in 1958 that the full impact of these changes and of



this development became fully felt. In that year the Ministry of Education became self-accounting and responsibility for administering all the funds voted for education rested, for the first time, directly upon the Ministry. The Government felt that it would be out of tune with the hopes and the needs of the country to allow these great educational reforms to be delayed by reason merely of procedural difficulties. There is no denying that these procedural difficulties were formidable. Those affecting the accounts included the facts that within a matter of months local education authorities had to be set up throughout the country, that Boards of Managers or Governors were required for more than 5,000 schools, that all these schools had to maintain, for the first time, records and accounts to which they were not accustomed, and that Auditors had to be found to audit the accounts of all local authorities and schools.

The Auditor-General was properly performing his duty in pointing out that in 1958 statutory boards were not appointed for many schools, and that without them the full statutory system for payment of grants should not have been operated. Now, Sir, I ask the House to consider the magnitude of this operation. In all, about 75,000 public-spirited persons had to be found and appointed under formal instruments approved by the Minister. Furthermore, there were factors which, in the judgment of the Government, made it undesirable to force the appointment of boards too quickly. Education, as Honourable Members are aware, is a very controversial matter, and the new policy had to be carefully explained, and also most of the schools affected are Government-Aided schools, and Government should not forcibly rush these schools to accept the new procedure without giving them time to consult the owners of the school and to consult members of the committee of management. These were political considerations, outside the scope of the Auditor-General. However, there was sufficient weight for the Government to decide to amend subsidiary legislation so that grants could also be paid under suitable safeguards to schools without boards.

This was done after full consultation with the Auditor-General and the Government's legal advisers early in 1959. This solution is mentioned in the Command Paper, though not in the Auditor-General's Report. I submit, Sir, the country was better served by this realistic approach to the problem of the new policy than it would have been by the adoption in 1958 of the only alternative—which was closing the schools.

Now, in the Auditor-General's Report, it was stated that the accounts of the Ministry of Education were confused and obscure, and that he was unable himself to certify that certain payments were properly charged. Now, I ask this House to consider what I have said in the light of the statement made in the Command Paper, whether the charge was in all circumstances fair. The statement in the Command Paper revealed there was no such confusion or obscurity in the Ministry after all.

The second charge relates to delay in submitting audited accounts. I have explained the circumstances which led to this, and the audited accounts have since become available. I will not tire this House by explaining the difficult operation of appointing auditors under the Education Ordinance for various school boards and authorities. The audited accounts of primary and trade schools had to be submitted to Local Education Authorities, and the audited accounts of Local Education Authorities had to be submitted to the Ministry. In the process, there is bound to be delay, but I must say that at the time the Auditor-General conducted the audit of the Ministry's accounts, some of the audited accounts were available, and now most of them are available.

Now, after I have made this explanation, I am sure this House will agree with me that in all the circumstances of the case, in the light of the political, constitutional and policy changes that had taken place and not merely from the angle of accounting and financial procedure, any charge of omission or neglect of duty against this Ministry is hardly fair. But the point, Sir, I wish to emphasise in this House is this: There is no question at all that this money has been misappropriated or

wasted or improperly spent, as has been alleged by some quarters, and I am sorry to say by some Members of the Opposition. In any case, the Auditor-General himself does not say so in his Report.

I would, Sir, earnestly invite Honourable Members to study Command Paper No. 14 of 1960, in particular those parts relating to the Ministry of Education. It will be seen that many paragraphs of the Auditor-General's Report call for some qualification. As the Command Paper shows, there are a number of factual errors. For example, in paragraphs 49, 143, 144, 148, 152. And there are a number of other paragraphs, for example, paragraphs 47, 51, 52, part of 54, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 139, 140, 141, 142, 145, 146, 149, 151, 155, 156 and 157, which are incomplete and misleading in their implications. As a result, the Auditor-General has in these cases, no doubt for lack of space, presented a picture which omits material considerations. It is for this reason that the Government has felt itself impelled to publish this White Paper. It is necessary for the good name not merely of the Government, but of the nation, that Parliament and the public at home and abroad should have a fuller picture of the actual circumstances than the Auditor-General was able to find room for in his Report on the Accounts. It is also necessary that on behalf of the Government I should state categorically that the funds voted in 1958 for education were spent on education. There were, it is true, some errors and misallocations; for instance, paragraphs 53, 55, 61, 150 and 158, and it is quite correct that some of the apparatus of the education system, for instance, some boards of managers and governors, were not set up in 1958, but as I have said, alternative statutory arrangements were set up later. There are even one or two transactions, for instance those mentioned in paragraph 158, the propriety of which are open to consideration and are open to investigation. But the fundamental point was that there is no misappropriation and no gross misuse of Government funds. In the time available, it was not possible without closing schools

all over the country to perfect accounting arrangements. It was not possible in all cases to follow fully the requirements of the new legislation. What was the Ministry to do then? was it to slow down the rate of educational expansion? Was it to delay the implementation of the policy, which, when enunciated, had received the unanimous approval of the Legislative Council? Or was it to close the schools? The Ministry did none of these things. It endeavoured to carry out the Government's policy. It continued the phenomenal expansion of the education system. In spite of the most serious staff shortages, it endeavoured in 1958 to carry out the clearly expressed intention of the Legislature, that is, the implementation of the Government's educational policy. Now, in neither the Auditor-General's Report nor in the White Paper such as that before the House is perhaps the most appropriate place to pay tribute to any particular group of persons, but in view of all that has been said since the Auditor-General's Report was tabled at the last meeting of this House, I feel it is right for me to pay a tribute to my colleague the former Minister of Education and now Minister of Commerce and Industry, and to those Government officers who, in the face of practical difficulties that would have daunted many, carried out in good faith the full spirit of Government policy, and in so doing produced results in maintaining the expansion of our schools, of which we can all well feel proud (*Applause*). I say, Sir, all this about the Ministry of Education because I had the honour to be the Minister at the time when the changes were taking place, and the full effect of which were felt when my friend and colleague the present Minister of Commerce and Industry took over the Ministry of Education. I do strongly feel that we in this House should join together and pay our tribute to him and to those officers of the Ministry for the great work they did in the face of all the difficulties that I have mentioned (*Applause*). I ask the House to see all these matters in the true perspective, and not to indulge in criticism and allegation unless they are backed by hard facts.

The true facts are before the House. Our country is making steady progress in the fields of development and particularly in the field of education. The Ministry of Education has thus done well in the past, and it has a great and intelligent task ahead in providing the best education for our children in the years to come. Let us therefore, Sir, fortify the hand of our new Minister of Education and the officers of his Ministry in their great task by accepting the Government's statement and by approving this statement.

Sir, I beg to move.

**Enche' Abdul Rahman:** Sir, I beg to second the motion.

**Enche' Tan Phock Kin:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, we have heard a very long speech from the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister. His speech is nothing but an apology to the allegations in the Auditor-General's Report, of ineptitude and incompetence on the part of the Government. He has asked us today to approve this Statement which is prepared by the Government. This Statement contains nothing but excuses as to why certain things are not done and as to why certain things are done not in the proper manner.

First of all we must be clear as to the functions of the Auditor-General. As pointed out by the Honourable Minister, the Auditor-General is appointed by the Yang di-Pertuan Agong. His duties are set out very clearly, and the Constitution sees to it that Auditor-General would not be influenced by the Government in power, so much so that even on the question of the removal of the Auditor-General it must be done in the same manner as the removal of the Judges. So much so that politicians have no part in it.

So in the light of all that, we have a Report from the Auditor-General. A lot of criticisms have been made about that Report. There were excuses given as to delays and as to procedural difficulties. But I would like to point out one thing, and that is the Report of the Auditor-General is for the year ending 31st December, 1958, and the accounts and final statements were

received only on the 3rd of November, 1959—nearly one year had elapsed before the accounts were given to the Auditor-General. So the excuses given are by no means justified. The various departments have had a year to put in their explanations and it is quite obvious that during the course of audits the Auditor-General must have made demands for certain facts, certain documents and have waited very patiently for them and it was only through the absence of such facts and such proofs being presented that it is incorporated into the Report.

Secondly, there were talks of procedural defects. We must realise that the intention of the Auditor-General is to disclose facts as far as accounting is concerned. I do not agree for one moment with the Honourable Minister that in order to carry out certain policies the various departments are at liberty to ignore accounting procedure. We must realise here that one of the fundamental protection which this country has against misappropriation of funds, and against embezzlement is through a proper accounting system. Under no circumstances should the accounting standard be relaxed. The moment you allow that to be done I cannot imagine what is going to happen to this country. It is exactly in this light that the report of the Auditor-General is formulated. The Report sets out, as it should, very objectively the weaknesses of the Government accounting procedure. In the course of giving us such weaknesses, it is also obvious that not only the accounting procedure is vague but the administration is by no means satisfactory, because I can point out here to various instances in which the Auditor-General came across undesirable methods of accounting and I refer to one example here. In paragraph 140, on page 28 of the Report, the Auditor-General says—

"It seems that the accounting staff would in any case have been inadequate to carry out the essential checks. Secondly, the requirements of the Ordinance were widely disregarded and in consequence the controls were severely weakened or destroyed. Thirdly, when the intended arrangements broke down, there was no plan to deal with the accounting requirements of the new situation."

This I submit, Sir, is a very grave state of affairs. You have here a complete breakdown of accounting procedure and it is this sort of thing which the Minister is trying to tell us to condone. Surely there should be a plan, as suggested by the Auditor-General, to deal with the accounting requirements. As it is, we can see very clearly that as far as the Government is concerned something seems to be very wrong. It is very well to say that due to the changed political situation we must not be too strict about it. But this is a matter which concerns cash—which concerns money—and it is a matter, I submit, on which there cannot be relaxation.

Coming now to the statement of the Government, I am glad to read at the beginning of this particular statement that the Government is aware that there is a Public Accounts Committee and it would not like to prejudice the deliberations of the P.A.C. with this statement. But I notice here a very remarkable statement. It states here that the statement is brief; if the statement is lengthy it may prejudice. But surely the Honourable Minister should know that however brief the statement is, it is bound to prejudice the findings of the Public Accounts Committee. We have in this House a Public Accounts Committee whose functions according to our Standing Orders are to examine—

- (a) the accounts of the Federation of Malaya and the appropriation of the sums granted by Parliament to meet the public expenditure;
- (b) such accounts of public authorities and other bodies administering public funds as may be laid before the House; and
- (c) reports of the Auditor-General laid before the House in accordance with Article 107 of the Constitution.

So the logical procedure would be for the Government to submit any explanation which they may have to this Committee. The Public Accounts Committee is the Committee that will go

into the Report of the Auditor-General and even if the Government did not produce this Statement it will be the duty of the Public Accounts Committee to ask the Government for explanations on every point and every criticism that is brought up in this Report. And I think the Government here is trying to take over the functions of the Public Accounts Committee. This statement is just like the apologies of a guilty man. Many allegations have been made in the Report about certain procedures adopted by the Government and now we have a Statement from the Government trying to clarify their stand; and not satisfied with that they are asking this House to approve this statement. What in effect would be the result if this House were to approve this Statement? The Public Accounts Committee is merely a Committee of this House. If this House has already approved this Statement I see no value in this Report being referred to the Public Accounts Committee because the House has already agreed to the explanation given by the Government.

Now, let us all have a look at this Statement from the Government. It contains lots of opinions; and it contradicts certain statements made by the Auditor-General. Apparently if this House is to approve this, then this House must be in a position, like the Public Accounts Committee, to be able to call for documents and persons to give evidence. This House can only approve this Statement from the Government if this House is satisfied after listening to evidence from the Auditor-General, the officers of the Treasury and representatives of the Education Ministry. So, I submit, Sir, that the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister is wrongly advised in bringing this motion before this House. I can quite see the concern of the Government over public reaction over this Report of the Auditor-General. But the correct remedy will be for the Government to submit whatever statements they may have to the Public Accounts Committee and not to us in this House to approve this Statement. So I would like therefore, Sir, to move

an amendment to this motion of the Honourable the Deputy Prime Minister by deleting the word "accepts" in the second line and substituting it with the word "refers" and to remove the fullstop at the end of the sentence and add the following words "to the Public Accounts Committee."

**Mr. Speaker:** I must have that amendment in writing—what to delete, what to add and under what line. It is laid down in the Standing Orders. (Amendment handed over to Mr. Speaker). Do you mean to say "refers" this Command Paper to the Public Accounts Committee, and not the Auditor-General's Report?

**Enche' Tan Phock Kin:** Exactly, Sir. The Auditor-General's Report should normally have gone to the Public Accounts Committee.

**Mr. Speaker:** That I do not know. Honourable Members, the motion before the House is amended by deleting the word "accepts" in the second line and substituting it with the word "refers" and by adding the words "to the Public Accounts Committee" at the end of the sentence. Who seconds the amendment?

**Enche' V. Veerappen (Seberang Selatan):** Sir, I beg to second the motion. Mr. Speaker, Sir, I appreciate the anxiety of the Government to correct any misconceptions, if there are any, created by this Report. But it would be pertinent to ask: who is auditing whose accounts? Is the Auditor-General auditing the accounts of the Government or the Government auditing the Report of the Auditor-General? Because it appears that the comments made here are such that the Government is correcting the Auditor-General's Report. Not only that, Sir, the Government is commenting as well as giving judgement on the Auditor-General's Report. I would refer to the second paragraph in the Command Paper. It says: "The implication of mismanagement is not justified". Now, I take it in my own language that the Government is saying whether it is justified or not justified; and in several places, on page 3 for instance, it says: it is not correct; the Auditor-General

is not correct—here, there and everywhere it is the same. Why do we have an Auditor-General? His job is to see whether the Government accounts are in order or not and here we have the Government telling us that the Auditor-General is not correct. (*Laughter*).

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I therefore submit that it is not for the Government to judge whether the Auditor-General's remarks are correct or not, but it is for the Public Accounts Committee of this House, and this House alone. Therefore, the Government in submitting this Statement to this House is side-stepping the Public Accounts Committee. But even there I think they have nothing to fear as the Chairman himself is from the Government side—we fought for it but we could not get it. (*Laughter*).

One other thing I would like to mention is that if we accept this Statement as it is, it would amount, I think, to a censure on the Auditor-General because we are saying that he is not correct. Therefore, it amounts to a censure, and therefore it is an indirect method for this House to tell the Auditor-General to pack off and go off. (*Laughter*).

**Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, sometimes it is said that the best form of defence is attack. And to-day, having heard the Honourable the Deputy Prime Minister, it would appear that the Alliance Government is adopting the best form of defence in this case. In this case it attacks the Auditor-General, it attacks the Opposition parties, in defending itself. But let us see what are the facts.

The speech of the Honourable the Deputy Prime Minister is a pathetic attempt at moving emotion in this House by trying to say, "In 1958 we did this, we did that and, therefore, if there is anything wrong, forget about it." It is a pathetic attempt to try to defend where possibly there may be no defence. We have been told that we had a peaceful transition from colonialism to Merdeka. What has that got to do with these accounts set out by the Auditor-General as to whether they were properly done or not properly

done? "The education policy has changed, great credit does to the Ministry of Education; therefore, if there is something wrong with the accounts, please forget about it. We must be thankful for the great things done." What has that got to do with whether the Auditor-General's statement is a proper one or not? "Every child in this country has a place in school; and the people of this country have given the mandate to the Alliance." But they did not give the Alliance the mandate to misuse funds and to not properly look after the funds of the country—that is the point we are trying to draw attention to.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Auditor-General's Report, read as a whole, gives room for any reasonable human being to say that there possibly has been mismanagement; alternatively, there possibly may have been misappropriation or there may have been wholesale, downright cheating. These are possibilities which this Report has disclosed and that, I think, is agreed to almost by this House, as otherwise there is no need to bring in this White Paper.

We heard just now from the Honourable the Deputy Prime Minister that even outside this House some Members of the Opposition had made allegations which should not have been made. There is a law in this country known as the Criminal Law and if any Member of the House outside this House were to say something which should not have been said, the Criminal Law could have been applied, and I am sure that the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister would not hesitate to use that Criminal Law.

Let us take the White Paper given to us—Command Paper No. 14 of 1960. What does it do, what does it attempt to do? It attempts to pull wool over the eyes of the public of this country. It attempts by this Report to draw a red herring across the people of this country, to evade the point in issue in the Report of the Auditor-General. I am supporting the amendment of the Honourable Member for Tanjong, because if this Command Paper is to be made use of, the proper place is the

Public Accounts Committee, where it can be discussed and considered in the light of the Report of the Auditor-General—that is the special Committee to deal with these matters—and also where explanation should be given. But what are we being asked to do? The Government side says, "We stand charged, we stand accused, we want to defend ourselves by Command Paper No. 14." But if you look at it, it is no defence at all: it is not even, to use a legal phrase, a reasonable probability of what is sufficient explanation of the serious statements made in the Auditor-General's Report.

Let us take a few. Paragraph 16 of the Report—The White Paper says:

"The implication of mismanagement is not justified by a technical imperfection of this kind. However, the method of operation of these Accounts has since been completely revised."

What is the technical imperfection referred to? Paragraph 16 of the Report of the Auditor-General has made it clear—

"If the Self-accounting Departments' Clearance Account were properly managed, there would be no nett disbursements at the end of the year and no nett receipts except the initial appropriation to the Fund. In fact, there are debit balances totalling \$4.2 million and credit balances totalling \$6.4 million and this is clearly indicative of accounting defects which have been mentioned repeatedly in recent Audit Reports."

Is that a technical imperfection on which mismanagement is not to be inferred? Who is the Government to tell us, "Do not infer this", when the Auditor-General clearly makes it a possible inference to be drawn? The Government stands accused, and the Government now says, "Do not listen to the Auditor-General. We are the Judge, we are the Jury, we find ourselves not guilty." That is the attitude of the Government side. If an inference can be properly drawn, then whether the inference is proper or not it is for a select committee, a special committee, or the Public Accounts Committee to deal with it—not for this House or this Government to say, "We want to absolve ourselves from this implication." That is not playing cricket!

Now we go to paragraph 22 of the Auditor-General's Report—it says:

"The individual balances of conveyance advances controlled by the Medical Department have not, so far as I am aware, been reconciled with the Treasury Account."

There is no reference to paragraph 22 in this White Paper. What is the explanation of the Government on paragraph 22 of the Report? Two accounts do not balance, they do not tally—there is no reference in this White Paper. Are we going to accept it? Are we to close our eyes to paragraph 22 of the Auditor-General's Report? What should we see in that? What is the hurry to get rid of the Auditor-General's Report from the eyes of the people?

Then we go on to paragraph 30:

"Survey fees accrue to Federal Revenue but are assessed and collected by State Governments. The revenues appear to fall short of the costs of the service (which are borne by the Federal Government) by approximately \$2 million annually and it is understood that a revised procedure is under consideration."

What does the White Paper say on that? It says:

"This matter is still receiving consideration. The position is as stated by the Auditor-General but any revision of the present practice needs careful consideration in order not to cause hardship."

That is no explanation of paragraph 30. What is the implication of paragraph 30? The implication is that you have over-spent \$2 million for that service. Now, in a good Government, you do not spend for a service more than you collect for it in normal cases. Therefore, one inference which you can draw is that the \$2 million which should have gone into the Treasury has not gone into that Treasury, because no good Government will do a service by paying more than what that service will bring in—that is the rule of Government. Why should the Auditor-General mention that? He has mentioned that because he has a suspicion that \$2 million has not been properly accounted for. This is one of the inferences which this Report lends itself to. Otherwise, there is no reason to mention the \$2 million shortfall. Therefore, I say there is possible inference and who is the Government who stands charged to say, "Do not

bother about that; take this explanation; it is still under consideration."

Coming to paragraph 49 of the Report—I am picking them at random—it says here:

"Subhead 18 has been charged incorrectly with amounts totalling \$111,459 for transport expenses connected with the training of teachers. Provision for these transport expenses was specifically made at subhead 21."

In other words, it says from one sub-head a sum of money was taken when actually that provision was to be taken from another sub-head. What is the explanation on that in the White Paper? It says:

"It is incorrect to say that provision for these particular transport expenses was made under subhead 21. The provision was made, with Treasury agreement, under subhead 18 and the expenses were so charged."

In other words, it says that paragraph 49 is completely wrong. Who says it? Who dare to say it? The same people who stand charged with it? How can you say that the Auditor-General was wrong? He is not just a nobody. He is Mr. H. M. Watson, C.B.E., whatever it may mean. He is the Auditor-General appointed by this country. How are we going to accept a blank statement from the Government—"He is wrong!" If the Government is going to be allowed to violate a report of the Auditor-General, what is the use of an Auditor-General in this country? A blank statement, "He is wrong, we are right." I take it that the Auditor-General is a qualified person who will hesitate to make a mistake—it could be a mistake, but we are not the persons to say it; the Public Accounts Committee or a Select Committee is the proper body to do so.

Then we come to paragraph 50:

"Of the sum of approximately \$19 million charged to subhead 37: Statutory Grants to Secondary Schools, all but \$2 million was disbursed by Chief Education Officers through one or other State Treasury . . . . ."

but as yet only those in Malacca and Penang have complied and the statements produced by them fail to agree either in total with the amounts charged through the State Treasuries or individually with the amounts appearing in the Schools' audited accounts. I have therefore been unable to satisfy myself that the charges against the vote record disbursements properly made."

"I have been unable to satisfy myself"—it means that he has tried to satisfy himself but he has been unable to do so. What does the White Paper say? It says:

"Owing to the considerable delay in producing audited accounts the Auditor-General was prevented from completing his audit on subhead 37. Audited accounts from schools are still being received and checked in the Ministry."

What is that? There is no explanation. It is just a statement that the Auditor-General could not satisfy himself because such a thing has not yet been completed. It does not explain paragraph 50. It does not say whether the implication in paragraph 50 can be properly drawn or not properly drawn. It is just a blank statement, not an explanation but a statement by itself which is absolutely no vindication.

Paragraph 51—The White Paper says:

"The establishment of Statutory Boards of Governors for secondary schools was a huge and delicate task, and in the meantime some financial provision had to be made for the schools or they would have to close. The implication that the action taken by the Ministry in order to keep the schools functioning led to payments greater than the schools were entitled to is not correct."

Again, this paragraph says that it is not correct. Who says—is it the Minister of Education, or the former Minister of Education, is it the Department, or is it somebody on the Government Bench? If so, what further information they have which the Auditor-General did not have. If they have that information, why are they reluctant to take it to the Public Accounts Committee—the proper place for such a matter?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, then we come to that important paragraph—paragraph 58 of the Report which reads:

"Subhead 41, Secondary Vocational Schools and Classes has been charged with the cost of equipment bought in 1957 and 1958 for the Rural Trade School at Temerloh. The Trade School was never built but I have not yet been able to ascertain how the equipment was used and am therefore unable to confirm that the allocation is correct."

As stated by the Honourable Member for Tanjong in 1959, the Auditor-General has been unable to ascertain how the equipment was used. What is

the comment in the White Paper on paragraph 58? In the White Paper it is stated:

"The construction of the Rural Trade School at Temerloh was postponed as a result of Treasury policy that all works in respect of which contractual commitments had not been entered into should cease. However, equipment for the school had already been ordered and, in agreement with the Treasury, the equipment was issued to appropriate vocational schools and classes which were in need of the equipment. This action was taken in order to avoid deterioration from prolonged storage."

How does the Government get the information when the Auditor-General could not get it? The Auditor-General was allowed to draw an inference as even though he tried he could not get information. How is it only now, after the flow of events, after the *Straits Times* did a service to this country by publishing "\$110 million—something wrong", that the information has started to come out. Sir, that is not the way, although the Government may have a two-third majority, that a Government should try to vindicate its name.

There is another important matter—the school at Temerloh, under Treasury policy, was not to be built where no contractual commitment has been entered into. But let us look at the Report with regard to the school at Temerloh. What happened to it? Paragraph 157, page 31, of the Report reads:

"A Rural Trade School was to have been built at Temerloh and the estimated cost of the building was \$332,179. Plans were apparently prepared but it is understood that the project was abandoned before building started."

The architect was paid a fee which was calculated on a notional building contract and amounted, with other charges, to \$21,541."

Plans were made up, furniture had been bought, or rather ordered. Then the Treasury says, "Don't build" and \$21,541 went into the pocket of the architect without the school having been built. We are asked to accept this explanation which appears in paragraph 157 of the White Paper:

"The Rural Trade School in Temerloh was one of many projects which fell under the Government 'axe' at the beginning of 1958. Building could not start because no contractual commitments had actually been



entered into. The private architect had to be paid a fee for the work he has already done and this was reduced by negotiation to as low a figure as possible. *See* also comment on paragraph 58."

What I cannot understand is why the Auditor-General was prepared to bow down; why should that money be paid to the architect? Was there a contract? If there was a contract, how can you say that there were no contractual obligations—and the Treasury says, "Don't build."? Was \$21,541 actually paid to the architect? Are there receipts, are there vouchers? Perhaps there are. We do not know. How are we going to approve the White Paper? What indications are there that it only state facts? It only shows that \$21,541 was wasted. Then we come to the Deputy Prime Minister's statement that it is wrong to allege misappropriation, waste and such other things. Surely the \$21,541 which you paid to the architect is waste. I understand now that the school has been built. If a new school had been built now and the Report came out in 1959, why did not the Auditor-General know of it? Why could he not put it in the Report?

Then we come to another paragraph. I am going to read it out because it clearly shows that we have no basis to accept this White Paper as justification on the part of Government for what happened.

**Mr. Speaker:** You are supporting the amendment?

**Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam:** I am supporting the amendment and these are my reasons why it should be referred to the Public Accounts Committee. We come now to paragraph 153 of the Report—it reads:

"The purposes of the Fund are not entirely clear but it is being used largely to make interest-free loans and advances to students. A number of these loans appear to have been outstanding for a considerable period."

This is for students in England. What does the White Paper say? It says:

"Instructions have been issued to make no further loans until new instructions are issued by the Ministry and details of the outstanding loans have been requested from London."

What is the explanation? It only says "Yes, we have done something wrong.

We are now instructing them not to do so in future." What we want to know is why was nothing done, why give interest-free loans from Malayan people's money, why were interest-free loans given to people in England which they should not have done—not the fact that it was done or not done. The White Paper merely says, "We did so, next time we will not do it." What we are interested in and what we want to know is why should this be done, why there was no proper supervision, why such negligence in a Government Department?

Then we come to paragraph 154: Malayan Student Centre—a body quite separate from the Malayan Students' Department:

"Little else appears to be known about it except that it operates a bank account in London and that the account contains \$4,644 which should be refunded to the Federal Government."

That was in 1959, when this Report was made. The Auditor-General says \$4,644 should have been refunded to the Federation Government; therefore, in 1959, when this Report was made, that money was not refunded to the Federal Government. What is in the Government's White Paper:

"The 'Malayan Students' Centre' in London is not the responsibility of the Ministry of Education. The amount referred to has been refunded to the Federation Government."

Again, what we want to know is: Why was a thing which should have been refunded not been refunded? What is the explanation? Then, surely, the Auditor-General's Report is correct. There is nothing wrong in it. It was not done—the White Paper says: We agree it was not done, but we and the people of this country want to know why it was not done, and only the Public Accounts Committee perhaps can be able to tell us, or perhaps a special Committee.

Now, paragraph 155 of the Report:

"An amount of \$13,466 was provided in 1958 for maintaining a centre in Dublin. The amounts charged to the vote totalled \$16,030 and I have seen no authority for the excess."

In 1959 the Auditor-General says a sum of \$13,466 was spent, there was

no authority for spending that money. What does the White Paper say:

"The excess is more than covered by under-expenditure on other items within the same sub-head and has been duly authorised."

Mr. Speaker, Sir, if there is excess money, should it be wasted or wrongly spent? Should it not be saved for a more useful purpose nearer home? Why is it necessary to explain it by saying: We have more than enough money to cover this; we have given it. So it is covered; therefore we are absolved from all responsibility. That is not the attitude a responsible Government should adopt. What we want to know is why was this wrong thing done.

Then we come to one more very significant part that is again on schools—with regard to paragraph 143, on page 29, which says:

"The Penang Statement shows payments totalling more than \$100,000 for purposes which the Chief Education Officer has not even attempted to describe."

\$100,000 spent, the Chief Education Officer did not even attempt to say what happened to it in 1959, when this Report was made.

"In Malacca the St. Francis Institution was given \$12,000 from Federal Funds in order to build two classrooms, but the classrooms were never built and the money was used in part to meet a deficit on the school account."

Now, the White Paper merely says this: it says that the Auditor-General is wrong, that the money was not spent to cover a deficit in school funds, it was spent for some other purpose. Mr. Speaker, Sir, who is giving the Report? As the Honourable Member for Seberang Selatan said, who is giving the Report—the Government or the Auditor-General? The Auditor-General says: I have studied the matter. This money was spent for a deficit in the school account, and wrongly so. Government says: Nothing doing! We didn't spend it on the school. Whom are we going to believe? Whose statement are we to accept? The Auditor-General, or the people who stand charged of these allegations? Who? Surely we must accept the Auditor-General's Report! If they wanted to vindicate themselves—and they possibly can, and quite rightly perhaps

vindicate themselves—vindicate themselves in the proper place.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, dealing with External Affairs—the state of External Affairs seems to have been a most terrible and sorry affair; a sorry affair because a clear, unmitigated admission of incompetence, inability to comprehend, inability to adapt themselves to changed circumstances in the matter of External Affairs. The Auditor-General's Report is very clear:

"The accounts of the Ministry of External Affairs have attracted an exceptional number of queries of which many are still unsettled. This unsatisfactory position is mainly due to inadequate control of votes, inadequate attention by Overseas Missions to accounting requirements, . . . ."

To-day we hear—how much—\$37,000 for a motor-car in Indonesia. Let us hope at least that that will go to a motor-car and not something else. Mr. Speaker:

"Vouchers have not yet been produced to support payments made by the London Office during December, 1957, and the accounts of that office for the month of October, 1958, are said to have been lost in transit."

The other day, we got an answer saying that it had now arrived, and was now available. What we want to know is how did it get lost in transit. Was it sent by registered cover? Is somebody telling a lie that it was put in the post. Is somebody suggesting: I put, oh, I don't know how many shillings for postage from England to here, and chucked it into the post office? If it was a registered cover, then somebody must be able to tell us what happened to the registered cover. Has any investigation been made from the Post Office? If not, why not? Are we going to accept a blank statement—a blank statement on a white piece of paper that everything is well, that the funds of the people of this country have been properly looked after? I don't think the Opposition will? I think only puppets will! Nobody else! Only puppets who will move with the pulling of strings—they may accept the White Paper. And the Opposition are not going to accept it. Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Deputy Prime Minister's address spoke of a number of things, and suggested that unwarranted allegations have been made. Allegations will be made by the

Opposition. We are prepared, as has been exemplified by the Honourable the Deputy Prime Minister, we make them not only under the cover of the privilege of this House, but we have made them outside this House, and I am glad the Honourable the Deputy Prime Minister seems to know about it. Therefore, nobody can say that under the cover of the privilege of this House we take advantage of them. Because we don't! We are not of that mettle! We were asked to refrain from making statements, we have been advised to refrain, but we don't take advice from the Government side. We do what the law allows us to do, and we will always do what the law allows us to do; we will not do anything which the law does not allow us to do. But we are not prepared to be advised by Members on that side of the House.

With regard to the White Paper being issued to clear any misunderstanding, I say that . . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** You seem to be going to the main motion.

**Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam:** That is why I say that this White Paper should be referred to the Committee. I must say why we can't accept, and the reasons why . . . .

**Mr. Speaker:** But you have got another opportunity when you go back to the motion.

**Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam:** Yes. I think I want to exercise my right now. We say this White Paper should be referred to that Committee because far from clearing any misunderstanding, this White Paper, unless referred to that Committee, throws a darker cloud, throws a darker suspicion more glaringly on the Government in the Federation to-day. With regard to the question of whether we should accept this Paper or refer it to the Committee, I say this: I support the reference to the Public Accounts Committee for this one very solid reason: As the Honourable the Deputy Prime Minister said, we should not indulge in speculation, we should have hard facts. The hard facts which are staring us in the face: the hard facts of insinuations, suspicion, circumstantial evidence, of

possible misappropriation, of possible thievery, of possible mismanagement, stare us in the face in this green book. We want hard facts to rebut it. We want hard facts, and only a Committee can give us those hard facts to rebut this Report. If we consider this now, we don't have even semi-fluid ones to take away those hard facts.

**Dr. Burhanuddin bin Mohamed Noor**

**(Besut):** Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pandangan saya berkenaan dengan perbahathan ini ada-lah berchampur berkenaan dengan keindahan yang menyebabkan ini saya menyokong pindaan ini. Semuga keterangan yang dikemukakan oleh Timbalan Perdana Menteri tadi walau pun sechara perubahan negeri ini bekerja daripada kemerdekaan negeri ini tentu-lah hujah<sup>2</sup> yang di-berikan-nya itu dapat kita terima, tetapi masa'alah ini ada-lah masa'alah laporan Auditor-General yang timbul dahulu yang mana kita ingat ada-lah masa'alah yang timbul berhubung dengan perkara belanja Kementerian Pelajaran.

Dalam menjawab Kementerian Pelajaran tadi, kita telah menerangkan jawapan yang panjang lebar yang kita menolak menerima beberapa perkara<sup>2</sup> yang telah di-terangkan itu, tetapi perkara yang timbul ia-lah Command Paper No. 14 of 1960 ini tujuan-nya ia-lah untuk menghilangkan keraguan atau kechaman<sup>2</sup> yang telah di-majukan oleh pihak pembangkang di-sini. Chadangan<sup>2</sup> saya dan juga chadangan rakan<sup>2</sup> di-sa-belah sini maka nyata-lah Command Paper No. 14 ini tidak dapat menghilangkan keraguan. Oleh itu, jalan yang paling chepat saya rasa bahawa bukan-lah Kerajaan membawa perkara ini supaya dengan di-bawa-nya perkara ini—kapada hal ini dan dapat-lah nanti di-bahathkan dengan di-undi nanti mengstemrolkan apa yang di-lakukan oleh pihak<sup>2</sup> pembangkang ini.

Sa-benar-nya kita ada Public Accounts Committee, oleh itu, sepatutnya atau sememang-nya perkara ini kembali-lah pada pemeriksa committee itu atau committee yang lain dan dengan jalan itu satu jalan yang tepat bagi menghilangkan keraguan<sup>2</sup> yang ada sekarang ini. Saya telah

mengikut juga laporan<sup>2</sup> daripada Command Paper No. 6 ia-itu Report of the Auditor-General ini yang telah di-kecham dan dengan ada-nya Command Paper No. 14 ini yang mana hendak menghilangkan keraguan<sup>2</sup> itu, saya tidak-lah hendak membawa chon-toh yang banyak, tetapi di-sini dalam Command Paper No. 14 ini ada menerangkan berkenaan dengan Fasal 3 dan para 5, tetapi para 6 yang maseh ada lagi keraguan-nya yang tidak di-masokkan ka-dalam Command Paper No. 14 ini, mithal-nya kalau kita tengok Command Paper No. 6 ini ada menyebutkan pembayaran sa-banyak \$78,057.58 kenapa-kah Bendahari Kerajaan Johor yang voucher-nya di-kembalikan dalam bulan March, 1959, tidak di-penohkan dan tidak di-serahkan kembali? Bagitu juga di-antara para 3 to 5 melompat ka-para 16. Dalam para 9 Command Paper No. 6 of 1960 di-sini kita dapat perselisihan pembayaran \$13,359 pada 31 December, 1958, di-mana perselisihan itu tidak di-jalankan dan tidak di-pandu dengan keterangan voucher, bagitu juga dalam cheraian 10 ini ada menerangkan perkara<sup>2</sup> berkenaan dengan investments. Kenapa-kah nilai investments atas harga pokok tidak di-nilaikan dengan harga pasaran? Kemudian di-sini masok kapada para 20 dan 21 hingga para 25 dan 26 di-mana para 23 tidak ada di-sini. Dalam para 23 ini juga ada keraguan<sup>2</sup> yang merupakan kelalaian kerja dalam menjalankan perbelanjaan kewangan itu, maka kelalaian ini maseh lagi menjadi keraguan, tetapi tidak di-jawab dalam para 23 ini.

Ini-lah, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-antara beberapa puluh yang menunjokkan bahawa apa yang telah di-terangkan oleh Auditor-General di-tolak atau di-berikan keterangan dengan surat Command Paper No. 14 ini yang mana maseh lagi keraguan<sup>2</sup> itu tidak dapat di-terangkan. Oleh kerana itu, jalan dan juga chara membawa kertas ini, saya rasa tidak-lah tepat menurut peratoran<sup>2</sup>. Jadi, setakat yang saya terangkan itu-lah saya berikan sokongan, pindaan ini supaya perkara ini berjalan menurut peratoran<sup>2</sup> yang membawa dan menghilangkan keraguan<sup>2</sup> yang lalu, dan dengan jalan ini dapat-lah segala keraguan<sup>2</sup> yang timbul dari

Report of the Auditor-General itu lepas daripada Parlimen ini menggunakan vote terbanyak ini dengan menenggelamkan yang maseh tidak dapat dihapuskan oleh Command Paper No. 14 ini.

**Dato' Dr. Ismail:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for Ipoh says that Government's tactic is "attack is the best form of defence". We are proud that he attributed that to us, but I would like to label him and some Members of the Opposition that their motto is just like a fly who sticks on you and when you try to flick at it, it runs away. Why do I say that? Well, I say that because, in spite of what the Government said at the last meeting that the Report of the Auditor-General would be debated in the Public Accounts Committee, they kept on discussing this Report at that time. So it is just like a small boy who sets fire to the house and later on going to his parents—I do not mean you, Sir—saying: "The house is on fire, what can I do about it?"

Now, Sir, this Government was challenged on the Auditor-General's Report. Now, the motion standing in the name of the Deputy Prime Minister is not a censure on the Auditor-General's Report, it is a statement putting forward the Government's point of view and this is in response to the challenge of the Members of the Opposition. Now, Sir, suddenly the Members of the Opposition seem to be paragons of virtue. This is just like—I do not know whether this is parliamentary or not—a virgin who suddenly finds herself not a virgin and protesting. Well, I ask yourself, Sir.

**Mr. Speaker:** I do not know what you want to say and you ask me first. (Laughter).

**Dato' Dr. Ismail:** Well, Sir, we are at a loss to understand their stand. They know very well that according to the Standing Orders of the Dewan Ra'ayat, the Auditor-General's Report will be sent to the Public Accounts Committee. We reminded them and yet they kept on challenging us and now when we have the Government's statement here they accused us of trying to

contravene Standing Orders. And I think this reminds me again when the Honourable Member for Ipoh said that politicians love publicity. But publicity, Sir, is in varying degrees. There is one described by Bacon—like a fly sitting on the axle of the wheel and then saying: “Look, what a dust I raised”. I think it is quite plain that the dust is not raised by the fly but by the wheel. So there are politicians and politicians, and to say that the Government is contravening Standing Orders when they themselves invited us, challenged us, and when we attack, now they withdraw and pretend to be virtuous. Well, I do not want to draw a simile again, Sir. I think this Government cannot accept this amendment. I do not want to delay this House by trying to be kept as close to the wind by making this amendment as an excuse for a debate on the general motion. But I would say that the Government rejects entirely this amendment by the Opposition because the Opposition challenged us, contravening Standing Orders, and we accept that because we are not going to debate that here. As my colleague the Minister of Finance said, it does not mean that once you accept this statement the Auditor-General's Report and the Government's statement are not going to be sent to the Public Accounts Committee. So, Sir, I say that if anyone is to be blamed for having contravened Standing Orders, it is the Opposition and not us.

**Enche' Zulkiflee bin Muhammad:**

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya menyokong bahawa Report ini di-rojokkan kepada Public Accounts Committee. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Menteri Luar Negeri baharu sa-bentar ini telah menjawab bahawa Comments yang di-keluarkan oleh Kerajaan ini ia-lah kerana menyambut chabaran daripada pembangkang—saya tidak ingat sahabat saya ada menchabar—boleh jadi orang lain. Walau bagaimana pun dalam chabar-menchabar ini patut-nya Kerajaan jangan-lah latah sangat sampai mengeluarkan Kertas Puteh ini kepada Parlimen. Ini saya minta supaya difikirkan. Soal merojokkan Kertas Puteh ini kepada Public Accounts Committee atas dua dasar. Dasar yang pertama,

supaya dapat-lah kenyataan yang di-kemukakan oleh Kerajaan berkenaan dengan Penyata Auditor-General ini di-halusi dengan baik-nya, sebab, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau tidak di-rojokkan kepada Jawatan-Kuasa yang tersebut, maka akan jadi-lah Majlis ini satu Majlis yang hendak membahath penyata kewangan dan ulasan<sup>2</sup> berkenaan dengan penyata itu. Sa-tahu saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soal kewangan terutama soal odit-mengodit ini ada-lah soal teknikal, dan membahath soal teknikal di-dalam kedudukan Parlimen yang saperti ini tidak-lah saya rasa tepat pada tempat dan keadaan-nya. Dalam soal teknikal maksud-nya besar, bukan-lah chakap<sup>2</sup> dan dasar, tetapi penghalusan dan pemerhatian yang dalam. Sa-kira-nya Majlis ini membincangkan juga dalam perkara ini, maka akan terjadi-lah per-chakapan<sup>2</sup> umum yang akhir-nya walau pun di-luluskan tidak akan memuaskan.

Dasar yang kedua, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-kira-nya kita bahathkan di-sini menurut apa yang tertulis dalam Comments yang ada di-sini, perkara ini akan di-bincangkan pula kemudiannya oleh Public Accounts Committee sa-bagaimana yang di-terangkan dimuka yang pertama. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ini-lah yang menyebabkan masa'alah ini menjadi rumit, satu kertas No. 14 di-terima oleh Parlimen, di-bawa kepada Committee yang di-bawah Parlimen, dan akan di-bawa samula pandangan Public Accounts Committee itu kepada Parlimen memberi pandangan-nya atas perkara yang di-putuskan dan di-terima oleh Public Accounts Committee.

Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya rasa tidak-lah berapa tepat kerja yang di-buat sa-chara yang demikian. Maka oleh sebab hal ini akan berpanjangan chara-nya, saya menyokong bahawa perkara ini di-kemukakan kepada Public Accounts Committee. Hal ini tidak-lah susah bagi Kerajaan, sebab Kerajaan telah juga menyebutkan: “. . . . . as this would prejudice the deliberations and findings of the Public Accounts Committee which examine the Report later.” Jadi nyata-lah, walau bagaimana pun, Report ini Kerajaan bersedia mengemukakan

kapada Public Accounts Committee, sebab Report ini walau bagaimana pun menurut Peraturan akan di-pereksa oleh Jawatan-Kuasa itu. Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya faham bahawa Kerajaan amat mengambil berat supaya kedudukan kewangan-nya di-pandang berseih dari beberapa segi. Saya perchaya sa-kira-nya Kerajaan berkeras di-dalam hal ini dan memaksa juga supaya di-bahath penyata ini di-sini, maka akan timbul-lah lagi rasa ta' puas hati yang mengatakan ini sa-mata<sup>2</sup> kerana menyelesaikan perkara ini dengan chara procedure, perkara<sup>2</sup> yang tidak puas hati tidak di-bukakan, sa-mata<sup>2</sup> di-buat dengan chara procedure biar-lah asas-nya dapat membawa kapada penjer-

nihan apa yang di-sangkakan ada ke-kerohan di-dalam-nya.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, atas dua dasar ini saya kemukakan sokongan itu.

## ADJOURNMENT

(Motion)

**Tun Abdul Razak:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that the House do now adjourn.

**Enche' Tan Siew Sin:** Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

*Adjourned at 4.15 o'clock p.m.*