

Volume III
No. 11



Saturday
27th August, 1966

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

OFFICIAL REPORT

THIRD SESSION OF THE SECOND HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES

CONTENTS

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR SPEAKER:

The Constitution (Amendment) Bill (Postponement of Second and Third Readings)
[Col. 1977]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS [Col. 1978]

ADJOURNMENT *SINE DIE* (Motion) [Col. 1993]

BILLS:

The Tin Industry (Research and Development) Fund (Amendment) Bill [Col. 1994]

The Rubber Industry (Replanting) Fund (Amendment) Bill [Col. 1996]

The Local Government Elections (Amendment) (No. 2) Bill [Col. 2005]

MOTIONS:

The Customs Ordinance, 1952—the Customs Duties (Amendment) (No. 5) Order,
1966 [Col. 2019]

The Sabah Customs Ordinance (Cap. 33)—the Customs Duties (Sabah) (Amend-
ment) (No. 3) Order, 1966 [Col. 2021]

The Sarawak Customs Ordinance (Cap. 26—the Customs (Import and Export)
Duties (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1966 [Col. 2021]

The Customs Ordinance, 1952—the Customs Duties (Amendment) (No. 6) Order,
1966 [Col. 2022]

The Sabah Customs Ordinance (Cap. 33)—the Customs Duties (Sabah) (Amend-
ment) (No. 4) Order, 1966 [Col. 2031]

The Sarawak Customs Ordinance (Cap. 26)—the Customs (Import and Export)
Duties (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1966 [Col. 2033]

The First Report of the Standing Orders Committee (Third Session) of the Second
House of Representatives (Paper No. DR 4 of 1966) [Col. 2034]

MALAYSIA
DEWAN RA'AYAT
(HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES)

Official Report

Third Session of the Second Dewan Ra'ayat

Saturday, 27th August, 1966

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

PRESENT:

- The Honourable Mr Speaker, DATO' CHIK MOHAMED YUSUF BIN SHEIKH ABDUL RAHMAN, S.P.M.P., J.P., Dato' Bendahara, Perak.
- „ the Prime Minister, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Minister of Culture, Youth and Sports, Y.T.M. TUNKU ABDUL RAHMAN PUTRA AL-HAJ, K.O.M. (Kuala Kedah).
- „ the Minister of Finance, TUAN TAN SIEW SIN, J.P. (Melaka Tengah).
- „ the Minister of Transport, TAN SRI HAJI SARDON BIN HAJI JUBIR, P.M.N. (Pontian Utara).
- „ the Minister of Health, TUAN BAHAMAN BIN SAMSUDIN (Kuala Pilah).
- „ the Minister of Commerce and Industry, DR LIM SWEE AUN, J.P. (Larut Selatan).
- „ the Minister for Local Government and Housing, TUAN KHAW KAI-BOH, P.J.K. (Ulu Selangor).
- „ the Minister of Labour, TUAN V. MANICKAVASAGAM, J.M.N., P.J.K. (Klang).
- „ the Minister of Information and Broadcasting, TUAN SENU BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Kubang Pasu Barat).
- „ the Minister of Lands and Mines, TUAN ABDUL-RAHMAN BIN YA'KUB (Sarawak).
- „ the Assistant Minister without Portfolio, TUAN HAJI ABDUL KHALID BIN AWANG OSMAN (Kota Star Utara).
- „ the Assistant Minister of National and Rural Development, TUAN SULAIMAN BIN BULON (Bagan Datoh).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Culture, Youth and Sports, DATO' ENSKU MUHSEIN BIN ABDUL KADIR, J.M.N., S.M.T., P.J.K. (Trengganu Tengah).
- „ the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, TUAN IBRAHIM BIN ABDUL RAHMAN (Seberang Tengah).
- „ the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour, TUAN LEE SAN CHOON, K.M.N. (Segamat Selatan).
- „ the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, TUAN ALI BIN HAJI AHMAD (Pontian Selatan).

The Honourable the Parliamentary Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister,
TUAN CHEN WING SUM (Damansara).

- „ TUAN ABDUL GHANI BIN ISHAK, A.M.N. (Melaka Utara).
- „ TUAN ABDUL KARIM BIN ABU, A.M.N. (Melaka Selatan).
- „ WAN ABDUL KADIR BIN ISMAIL, P.P.T.
(Kuala Trengganu Utara).
- „ TUAN ABDUL RAZAK BIN HAJI HUSAIN (Lipis).
- „ TUAN ABDUL SAMAD BIN GUL AHMAD MIANJI
(Pasir Mas Hulu).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABU BAKAR BIN HAMZAH, J.P. (Bachok).
- „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN ABDULLAH, S.M.K. (Kelantan Hilir).
- „ TUAN AHMAD BIN ARSHAD, A.M.N. (Muar Utara).
- „ TUAN HAJI AHMAD BIN SAAID, J.P. (Seberang Utara).
- „ PUAN AJIBAH BINTI ABOL (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN AZIZ BIN ISHAK (Muar Dalam).
- „ TUAN CHAN CHONG WEN, A.M.N. (Kluang Selatan).
- „ TUAN CHAN SEONG YOON (Setapak).
- „ TUAN CHAN SIANG SUN, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Bentong).
- „ TUAN CHIA CHIN SHIN, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN CHIN FOON (Ulu Kinta).
- „ TUAN C. V. DEVAN NAIR (Bungsar).
- „ TUAN SYED ESA BIN ALWEE, J.M.N., S.M.J., P.I.S.
(Batu Pahat Dalam).
- „ TAN SRI FATIMAH BINTI HAJI HASHIM, P.M.N.
(Jitra-Padang Terap).
- „ TUAN HANAFI BIN MOHD. YUNUS, A.M.N., J.P. (Kulim Utara).
- „ TUAN HARUN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N., J.P. (Baling).
- „ TUAN HUSSEIN BIN To' MUDA HASSAN, A.M.N. (Raub).
- „ DATO' HAJI HUSSEIN BIN MOHD. NOORDIN, D.P.M.P., A.M.N.,
P.J.K. (Parit).
- „ TUAN HUSSEIN BIN SULAIMAN (Ulu Kelantan).
- „ TUAN HAJI HUSSAIN RAHIMI BIN HAJI SAMAN, S.M.K.
(Kota Bharu Hulu).
- „ TUAN ISMAIL BIN IDRIS (Penang Selatan).
- „ TAN SRI SYED JA'AFAR BIN HASAN ALBAR, P.M.N.
(Johor Tenggara).
- „ TUAN LEE SECK FUN, K.M.N. (Tanjong Malim).
- „ DR LIM CHONG EU (Tanjong).
- „ TUAN LIM PEE HUNG, P.J.K. (Alor Star).
- „ DR MAHATHIR BIN MOHAMAD (Kota Star Selatan).
- „ TUAN T. MAHIMA SINGH, J.P. (Port Dickson).
- „ TUAN MOHD. ARIF SALLEH, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ DATO' HAJI MOHAMED ASRI BIN HAJI MUDA, S.P.M.K.
(Pasir Puteh).
- „ TUAN MOHD. DAUD BIN ABDUL SAMAD (Besut).

- The Honourable **TUAN MOHD. TAHIR BIN ABDUL MAJID, S.M.S., P.J.K.**
(Kuala Langat).
- „ **TUAN MOHAMED YUSOF BIN MAHMUD, A.M.N.** (Temerloh).
- „ **TUAN MOHD. ZAHIR BIN HAJI ISMAIL, J.M.N.** (Sungai Patani).
- „ **WAN MOKHTAR BIN AHMAD** (Kemaman).
- „ **TUAN HAJI MOKHTAR BIN HAJI ISMAIL** (Perlis Selatan).
- „ **TUAN MUHAMMAD FAKHRUDDIN BIN HAJI ABDULLAH**
(Pasir Mas Hilir).
- „ **TUAN HAJI MUHAMMAD SU'AUT BIN HAJI MUHD. TAHIR,**
A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ **DATO' HAJI MUSTAPHA BIN HAJI ABDUL JABAR, D.P.M.S.,**
A.M.N., J.P. (Sabak Bernam).
- „ **TUAN NG FAH YAM** (Batu Gajah).
- „ **TUAN HAJI OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH** (Hilir Perak).
- „ **TUAN OTHMAN BIN ABDULLAH, A.M.N.** (Perlis Utara).
- „ **TUAN QUEK KAI DONG, J.P.** (Seremban Timor).
- „ **TUAN HAJI REDZA BIN HAJI MOHD. SAID, P.J.K., J.P.**
(Rembau-Tampin).
- „ **RAJA ROME BIN RAJA MA'AMOR, P.J.K., J.P.** (Kuala Selangor).
- „ **TUAN SEAH TENG NGIAB, P.I.S.** (Muar Pantai).
- „ **TUAN SENAWI BIN ISMAIL, P.J.K.** (Seberang Selatan).
- „ **TUAN SOH AH TECK** (Batu Pahat).
- „ **TUAN SULAIMAN BIN ALI** (Dungun).
- „ **PENGIRAN TAHIR PETRA** (Sabah).
- „ **TUAN TAI KUAN YANG** (Kulim-Bandar Bharu).
- „ **DR TAN CHEE KHOON** (Batu).
- „ **TUAN TAN TOH HONG** (Bukit Bintang).
- „ **TUAN HAJI ZAKARIA BIN HAJI MOHD. TAIB, P.J.K.** (Langat).

ABSENT:

- The Honourable **the Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Defence and Minister of National and Rural Development, TUN HAJI ABDUL RAZAK BIN DATO' HUSSAIN, S.M.N.** (Pekan).
- „ **the Minister of Home Affairs and Minister of Justice, TUN DR ISMAIL BIN DATO' HAJI ABDUL RAHMAN, S.S.M., P.M.N.** (Johor Timor).
- „ **the Minister of Works, Posts and Telecommunications, TAN SRI V. T. SAMBANTHAN, P.M.N.** (Sungei Siput).
- „ **the Minister of Education, TUAN MOHAMED KHIR JOHARI** (Kedah Tengah).
- „ **the Minister for Welfare Services, TUAN HAJI ABDUL HAMID KHAN BIN HAJI SAKHAWAT ALI KHAN, J.M.N., J.P.** (Batang Padang).
- „ **the Minister for Sarawak Affairs, TAN SRI TEMENGGONG JUGAH ANAK BARIENG, P.M.N., P.D.K.** (Sarawak).
- „ **the Minister of Agriculture and Co-operatives, TUAN HAJI MOHD. GHAZALI BIN HAJI JAWI** (Ulu Perak).

- The Honourable the Minister for Sabah Affairs, TUN DATU MUSTAPHA BIN DATU HARUN, S.M.N., P.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Education, TUAN LEE SIOK YEW, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Sepang).
- „ the Assistant Minister of Finance, DR NG KAM POH, J.P. (Telok Anson).
- „ TUAN ABDUL RAHMAN BIN HAJI TALIB, P.J.K. (Kuantan).
- „ WAN ABDUL RAHMAN BIN DATU TUANKU BUJANG, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDUL RASHID BIN HAJI JAIS (Sabah).
- „ DATO' ABDULLAH BIN ABDULRAHMAN, S.M.T., Dato' Bijaya di-Raja (Kuala Trengganu Selatan).
- „ Y.A.M. TUNKU ABDULLAH IBNI ALMARHUM TUANKU ABDUL RAHMAN, P.P.T. (Rawang).
- „ TUAN HAJI ABDULLAH BIN HAJI MOHD. SALLEH, A.M.N., S.M.J., P.I.S. (Segamat Utara).
- „ O.K.K. DATU ALIUDDIN BIN DATU HARUN, P.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ DR AWANG BIN HASSAN, S.M.J. (Muar Selatan).
- „ TUAN JONATHAN BANGAU ANAK RENANG, A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ PENGARAH BANYANG ANAK JANTING, P.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN CHEW BIOW CHUON, J.P. (Bruas).
- „ TUAN FRANCIS CHIA NYUK TONG (Sabah).
- „ TUAN D. A. DAGO ANAK RANDAN *alias* DAGOK ANAK RANDEN (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN EDWIN ANAK TANGKUN (Sarawak).
- „ DATIN HAJJAH FATIMAH BINTI HAJI ABDUL MAJID (Johor Bahru Timor).
- „ TUAN S. FAZUL RAHMAN, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ DATO' GANIE GILONG, P.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).
- „ TUAN GANING BIN JANGKAT (Sabah).
- „ TUAN GEH CHONG KEAT, K.M.N. (Penang Utara).
- „ TUAN HAJI HAMZAH BIN ALANG, A.M.N., P.J.K. (Kapar).
- „ TUAN HANAFIAH BIN HUSSAIN, A.M.N. (Jerai).
- „ WAN HASSAN BIN WAN DAUD (Tumpat).
- „ TUAN STANLEY HO NYUN KHIU, A.D.K. (Sabah).
- „ TUAN IKHWAN ZAINI (Sarawak).
- „ PENGHULU JINGGUT ANAK ATTAN, Q.M.C., A.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN KADAM ANAK KIAI (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN KAM WOON WAH, J.P. (Sitiawan).
- „ TUAN THOMAS KANA (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN KHOO PENG LOONG (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN EDMUND LANGGU ANAK SAGA (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN AMADEUS MATHEW LEONG, A.D.K., J.P. (Sabah).
- „ DATO' LING BENG SIEW, P.N.B.S. (Sarawak).
- „ TUAN LIM KEAN SIEW (Dato Kramat).
- „ TUAN PETER LO SU YIN (Sabah).

The Honourable **TUAN C. JOHN ONDU MAJAKIL** (Sabah).

„ **TUAN JOSEPH DAVID MANJAJI** (Sabah).

„ **DATO' DR HAJI MEGAT KHAS, D.P.M.P., J.P., P.J.K.**
(Kuala Kangsar).

„ **ORANG TUA MOHAMMAD DARA BIN LANGPAD** (Sabah).

„ **TUAN MOHAMED IDRIS BIN MATSIL, J.M.N., P.J.K., J.P.**
(Jelebu-Jempol).

„ **TUAN MUSTAPHA BIN AHMAD** (Tanah Merah).

„ **TAN SRI NIK AHMAD KAMIL, D.K., S.P.M.K., S.J.M.K.,**
P.M.N., P.Y.G.P., Dato' Sri Setia Raja (Kota Bahru Hilir).

„ **TUAN ONG KEE HUI** (Sarawak).

„ **TUAN HAJI RAHMAT BIN HAJI DAUD, A.M.N.**
(Johor Bahru Barat).

„ **TUAN RAMLI BIN OMAR** (Krian Darat).

„ **TUAN SANDOM ANAK NYUAK, A.M.N.** (Sarawak).

„ **TUAN D. R. SEENIVASAGAM** (Ipoh).

„ **DATO' S. P. SEENIVASAGAM, D.P.M.P., P.M.P., J.P.** (Menglembu).

„ **TUAN SIM BOON LIANG, A.B.S.** (Sarawak).

„ **TUAN SIOW LOONG HIN, P.J.K.** (Seremban Barat).

„ **TUAN SNG CHIN JOO** (Sarawak).

„ **TUAN SULAIMAN BIN HAJI TAIB** (Krian Laut).

„ **TUAN TAJUDDIN BIN ALI, P.J.K.** (Larut Utara).

„ **TUAN TAMA WENG TINGGANG WAN** (Sarawak).

„ **TUAN TAN CHENG BEE, J.P.** (Bagan).

„ **TUAN TAN KEE GAK** (Bandar Melaka).

„ **TUAN TAN TSAK YU** (Sarawak).

„ **TUAN TIAH ENG BEE** (Kluang Utara).

„ **TUAN TOH THEAM HOCK** (Kampar).

„ **TUAN YEH PAO TZE, A.M.N.** (Sabah).

„ **TUAN STEPHEN YONG KUET TZE** (Sarawak).

PRAYERS

(Mr Speaker *in the Chair*)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR SPEAKER

THE CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL

(Postponement of Second and Third
Readings)

Mr Speaker: Honourable Members, I wish to inform this House that item No. 11, standing in the name of Member for Tanjong, in the Order Paper for today, i.e. the Constitution Amendment Bill (Second and Third Readings)

is postponed at the request of the Honourable Member to the next sitting of the House. I wish to find out if that is also the wish of the House. (*House indicates assent*) Thank you.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

HUBONGAN DIPLOMATIK ANTARA MALAYSIA DENGAN PAKISTAN

1. Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah (Bachok) bertanya kepada Menteri Luar Negeri sa-jauh mana-kah usaha² yang telah di-jalankan bagi memuleh sa-mula hubungan diplomatik di-antara Malaysia Pakistan.

Perdana Menteri: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-takat yang saya boleh ceritakan di-sini ia-lah perhubungan antara kita dengan Pakistan belum lagi di-'itirafkan. Tetapi usaha Yang Maha Mulia Baginda Shah Iran ada-lah menunjukkan bahawa baginda telah berikhtiar hendak membaharukan perhubungan baik antara kita dengan Pakistan, ia-itu perhubungan diplomatik. Dan saya pun telah ma'alumkan kapada Shah Iran, bahawa bagi pihak Malaysia ini, kita memang bersedia hendak menghubungkan perhubungan diplomatik dengan Pakistan bila² masa di-kehendaki. Sa-takat itu-lah yang saya boleh cerita sekarang.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah:

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soalan tambahan. Dapat-kah Yang Teramat Mulia Perdana Menteri kita menceritakan sa-takat yang boleh di-cheritakan, ia-itu sa-jauh mana kebenaran sa-orang bekas pegawai kita yang pernah kita memberi khidmat kapada-nya di-Malaysia ini—nama-nya Mohammad Ma'aruf yang menjadi Pengarah Pelabohan Port Swettenham—pernah membuat perhubungan dengan Tunku sendiri dalam masaalah hendak memulehkan hubungan Pakistan dengan Malaysia. Tetapi, sa-hingga ini, tidak ada apa² tindakan yang di-ambil beralaskan kapada surat itu—surat antara kawan dengan kawan—pada hal yang di-maksudkan ia-lah sa-bagai initiative daripada Pakistan. Jadi, sa-jauh mana-kah kebenaran ini berlaku? Kalau sa-kira-nya Perdana Menteri kita dapat menceritakan.

Perdana Menteri: Yang sa-benar-nya, saya belum terima apa² surat daripada Enche' Ma'aruf yang dahulu bekerja dengan kita itu. Jadi, tidak dapat-lah saya hendak cerita. Chuma, yang saya tahu, perhubungan yang diadakan dengan saya chuma Baginda Shah Iran sahaja—lain daripada itu tidak ada. Memang-lah ada banyak kawan² daripada Pakistan yang menunjukkan dukachita di-atas apa yang telah berlaku, dan masing² semua-nya berdo'a supaya dapat di-hubungkan samula persahabatan sa-chara diplomatik dengan Pakistan. Sa-takat itu sahaja-lah. Tetapi semua-nya terpulang ka-

pada Pakistan—sa-takat kita sendiri itu, sedia menerima peng'itirafan itu bila² masa di-kehendaki oleh Pakistan.

LANGKAH UNTUK MENG'ITIRAF NEGARA FORMOSA DAN MENGAADAKAN HUBONGAN DIPLOMATIK DENGAN NEGERI CHINA KOMINIS

2. Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah bertanya kapada Menteri Luar Negeri sama ada benar atau tidak bahawa Kerajaan Malaysia sedang mengambil langkah² untuk meng'itiraf negara Formosa di-samping berusaha juga hendak mengadakan hubungan diplomatik dengan China Kominis.

Perdana Menteri: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ini tidak benar bahawa kita ini hendak 'itirafkan mana satu negeri China, baik pun negeri China—Chinese Republic atau Chinese People Republic. Chuma-nya yang kita ada perhubungan perniagaan dengan kedua² negeri itu. Jadi, bagi pihak kita dengan Republic of China, ia-itu Formosa, dia ada menaruh satu Consul di-sini untuk meniaga dan untuk mengeluarkan Visa dan sa-bagai-nya. Dan kita ada-lah berchadang hendak adakan satu Consul juga di-sana, kerana banyak-lah orang² di-sini melawat ka-Formosa itu. Tetapi, itu bukan-lah berma'ana peng'itirafan, sa-bagaimana di-maksudkan dalam soal ini. Chuma-nya ada perhubungan sahaja—perhubungan perniagaan dan kelulusan lalu-lalang antara orang² ini dengan orang² di-sana.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah:

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, soalan tambahan. Saya menerima kaseh di-atas jawapan itu kerana perkara yang kabor² itu sudah jelas. Tetapi, saya suka hendak menambah lagi soalan tambahan, ia-itu ada-kah Perdana Menteri kita atau Kerajaan kita sedar bahawa ada majalah² luar negeri yang sampai di-negeri kita ini, menyiarkan bahawa Kerajaan Malaysia membuat initiative untuk meng'itirafkan kedua² buah negara itu dengan alasan, kata-nya, Malaysia perchaya kapada falsafah dual citizenship yang di-pakai oleh negeri China—Tanah China Besar itu. Jadi, ada-kah

Kerajaan kita sedar bahawa siaran² itu maju sangat dalam majallah luar yang masuk ka-dalam negeri kita, dan jika ada, apa-kah tindakan yang telah dibuat terhadap-nya.

Perdana Menteri: Saya ta' berapa faham tentang mana majallah mana itu, saya ta' berapa dengar baik. Apa kata-nya majallah itu?

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Ada majallah² dari luar negeri, tetapi sampai di-negeri ini mengatakan benar bahawa Malaysia ini akan meng'itirafkan dua buah negara China itu, ia-itu Formosa dan China Kominis. Alasan yang di-beri-nya ia-lah, Malaysia ini perchaya kepada falsafah dual citizenship. Jadi, oleh kerana Malaysia ini perchaya kepada hak kera'ayatan bagi negeri China itu ada dua, maka Malaysia ini di-atas asas itu-lah hendak meng'itiraf kedua buah negara ini. Jadi . . .

Mr Speaker: Boleh-kah Ahli Yang Berhormat itu bagi chontoh majallah itu?

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, itu sebab saya tanya sa-jauh mana benda itu benar—sebab saya ta' bawa. Kalau saya bawa saya tunjukkan pada hari ini juga.

Perdana Menteri: Kita, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tetap tidak 'itiraf mana² satu negeri China, kerana dua² buah di-katakan negeri China. Jadi, melainkan mereka boleh terangkan yang mana sa-benar-nya negeri China, ta' dapat-lah kita hendak 'itirafkan.

DATA² MUHIBBAH

3. Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah bertanya kepada Menteri Luar Negeri bila-kah Kerajaan akan menghantar "Duta² Muhibbah" terdiri daripada rombongan kebudayaan, pergi ka-negeri² Timor Tengah. Jika Kerajaan akan mengirim, ada-kah Kerajaan akan menimbang memasokkan juga ahli² pihak Pembangkang dalam rombongan tersebut.

Perdana Menteri: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, menurut soal Ahli Yang Berhormat ia-itu kita berchadang hendak hantar Duta² muhibbah ter-

diri daripada rombongan kebudayaan pergi ka-negara Timor Tengah. Jadi, soal-nya ada-kah jikalau sa-benar-nya Kerajaan hendak hantarkan. Kerajaan akan menimbangkan, memasokkan juga ahli² pihak Pembangkang dalam rombongan kebudayaan, ini saya tidak faham. Kalau kita hantar kebudayaan kita tidak kira pihak Pembangkang-kah, sa-belah kita-kah, chuma-nya ahli kebudayaan untuk hendak menunjukkan permainan kita di-negeri luar, apa yang hendak masuk Pembangkang dalam itu pun saya tidak tahu (*Ketawa*).

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Soalan tambahan, oleh kerana gu-longan kebudayaan ini banyak di-Pantai Timor dan khusus-nya yang saya maksudkan ia-lah di-kawasan saya sendiri, tetapi tentu-lah orang itu semua-nya terdiri daripada orang² PAS. Walau bagaimana pun, mereka itu mempunyai kebolehan di-dalam lapangan kebudayaan ini. Jadi, biasanya tidak di-beri peluang kepada orang² itu, dan saya menjamin-lah bahawa saya boleh mengadakan orang² yang istimewa di-dalam ini, saya boleh kemukakan.

Perdana Menteri: Saya tidak kira siapa yang pandai itu yang saya hendak hantar (*Ketawa*). PAS-kah, UMNO-kah, asal pandai main untuk menghiburkan hati orang² di-Timor Tengah itu.

Tuan Wan Abdul Kadir bin Ismail (Kuala Trengganu Utara): Boleh-kah Perdana Menteri menganggap Ahli dari Bachok itu sa-orang ahli kebudayaan? (*Ketawa*).

Perdana Menteri: Menurut yang di-kata dia satu daripada pakar juga. (*Ketawa*).

PLACES IN UPPER SECONDARY TECHNICAL AND VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS IN 1968

4. Tuan C. V. Devan Nair (Bungsar) asks the Minister of Education how many school places in upper secondary technical and vocational education will be available in 1968 for the first batch of students from the comprehensive system.

The Minister of Lands and Mines (Tuan Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub):

Mr Speaker, Sir, there are already three secondary technical schools and four secondary trade schools in operation in addition to the present programme of expanding and converting three of the former rural extension schools into full secondary trade schools and also of providing extensions to existing trade schools to cater for higher enrolments. It is not possible, Mr Speaker, Sir, at present to state how many school places in upper secondary and vocational education will be available in 1968, but every effort is being made to provide places for students for such technical and vocational education from the beginning of 1968.

**PEMANDU KERETA SAKIT
DI-MELAKA**

5. Dr Tan Chee Khoon (Batu) bertanya kepada Menteri Kesihatan sama ada beliau sedar atau tidak bahawa di-Melaka, Pemandu Kereta Sakit, Rumah Sakit Umum, selalu-nya pergi sa-orang diri, dengan tidak di-sertai oleh sa-orang jururawat atau atendan, bagi menyahut panggilan² sakit mengejut; jika sedar, sama ada perbuatan yang sangat merbahaya ini akan dihentikan segera.

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health (Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, di-Rumah Sakit Umum Melaka ada dua jenis perkhidmatan ambulance. Satu di-gunakan untuk mengambil orang² kechemasan beranak, emergency maternity cases, dan yang satu lagi untuk orang² yang kechemasan yang lain². Untuk perkara² kechemasan beranak sa-orang doktor dan sa-orang bidan pergi bersama² dengan ambulance itu, tetapi oleh sebab kekurangan kakitangan maka perkhidmatan ambulance satu lagi itu telah beberapa kali dan tidak selalu, sa-bagaimana tuduhan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat, hanya beberapa kali sahaja menjalankan tugas dengan tidak ada Pembantu Rumah Sakit atau atendan, tetapi sekarang telah di-atorkan bahawa sa-orang Pembantu Rumah Sakit atau jururawat

akan pergi bersama dengan perkhidmatan ambulance itu tiap² kali.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, is the Honourable Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health aware that what has happened in Malacca—that has, I think, brought the censure of the Coroner down there—also is prevalent in other hospitals as well? Can he also give us an assurance that *tiap² kali* every other ambulance from other hospitals also will have a *jururawat* that he talked of?

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-telah Kementerian mendapat tahu berkenaan dengan kejadian di-Rumah Sakit Umum di-Melaka, maka tiga orang telah pun di-hantar oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Kesihatan untuk menyiasat perkara itu. Dan pada hari ini pehak Kementerian Kesihatan memberi jaminan yang penoh kepada Yang Berhormat Ahli dari Batu ia-itu tidak lagi akan berlaku; dan pada tiap² kali ambulance keluar mesti ada sa-orang pengikut-nya, atendan atau sa-orang Pembantu Rumah Sakit atau pun jururawat.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Soalan tambahan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, barangkali apa yang di-katakan dalam bahasa Inggeris tidak di-faham oleh Setia-usaha Parlimen Kementerian Kesihatan. Apa yang di-tanya oleh saya tadi ada-kah Setia-usaha Parlimen sedar di-lain Rumah Sakit Umum di-seluruh, di-antara lain Rumah Sakit Umum di-seluruh Malaya, maka ada ambulance keluar dari Rumah Sakit Umum tersebut yang tidak ada atendan? Dan boleh-kah Setia-usaha Parlimen menjamin kalau sa-kira-nya ambulance keluar daripada Rumah Sakit tiap² kali di-dalam ambulance itu ada jururawat?

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman: I understand fully what the Honourable Member spoke just now in English. The Ministry is not aware.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: It looks to me that the Ministry is unaware of lots of sins of omissions until they are brought up to the coroner's court.

SAMBUTAN DOKTOR² PEREBET TERHADAP SEKIM KERAJAAN MENGADAKAN PERKHIDMATAN SAMBILAN

6. Tuan C. V. Devan Nair bertanya kepada Menteri Kesihatan bagaimana-kah sambutan doktor² perebet terhadap sekim Kerajaan mengadakan perkhidmatan sambilan sejak di-mulakan sekim itu pada 1hb Julai, 1966.

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sambutan daripada doktor² perebet terhadap sekim Kerajaan ini ada-lah tidak memuaskan oleh sebab daripada 864 orang doktor² perebet yang berdaftar cuma 13 orang sahaja menawarkan diri.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, is the Honourable Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health aware that perhaps the poor response from 800 over doctors that the Honourable Parliamentary Secretary mentioned is due to the inflexibility of the scheme? For example, there are lots of private practitioners who are well versed in certain specialities, and they may well want to contribute to this part-time scheme. But to ask a chap who is doing private practice in ear, nose and throat, for example, to go and do out-patient work, is a wanton waste of time both to the private practitioner and to the Government. If the scheme were made a little more flexible, where we can use the skills of these chaps—many of them have long years of service in surgery, in ophthalmology, in obstetrics and gynaecology, Government can tap these resources, these talents, if they make the scheme a little less flexible.

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, Kerajaan akan berikhtiar, tetapi ada juga banyak doktor² perebet yang meminta supaya berkhidmat di-masa luar pekerjaan ia-itu lepas daripada pukul empat setengah tetapi pihak Kementerian sangat-lah perlu supaya doktor² perebet itu bekerja waktu pagi ia-itu di-antara pukul 8 sampai pukul 11 kerana masa itu-lah banyak orang² sakit yang datang ka-rumah² sakit. Jadi, pihak Kementerian tidak menerima oleh sebab

lepas 4.30 tidak payah-lah ada pertolongan atau bantuan daripada doktor² perebet.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Is the Honourable Parliamentary Secretary aware—perhaps, I think the Ministry is not aware of all these things—that there is a grave need for doctors in the Out-patient Department between the hours of 4 o'clock when the Outpatient Department closes at 7 o'clock? This is a fact—I see the Minister of Health shaking his head—and I do know this because when I send cases for admission to the hospital, they have to wait two to three hours before the cases can be attended to by the doctor. I do know this, I am a practitioner in Kuala Lumpur, and I can speak from experience, Mr Speaker, Sir. I think this is so throughout the country that after 4 o'clock in the evening and perhaps until as late as 7 or 8 p.m., sometimes there are no doctors in the hospitals to look after emergency cases that are sent there. Consequently, there is a need for assistance of private practitioners at such hours. If so, if the scheme were made a little more flexible, the Government will be less subject to cases landing up in Coroner's Court.

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, apa yang dikatakan oleh Yang Berhormat daripada Batu itu tidak-lah benar. Sa-kira-nya doktor² perebet itu berkhidmat masa pekerjaan ia-itu hingga pukul 4.30 maka tidak-lah ada orang² yang sakit yang menunggu sa-lepas 4.30.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Soalan tambahan, dapat-kah pihak Kerajaan kita menceritakan sa-jauh mana kebenaran tuduhan² yang mengatakan bahawa salah satu daripada sebab-nya kekurangan doktor² berkhidmat dengan Kerajaan dengan penoh dan juga dengan yang sa-paroh masa ini ia-lah oleh kerana Parti Perikatan sendiri menjalankan recruiting doktor² itu di-dalam Parti. Maka orang itu tidak dapat berkhidmat. Sa-jauh mana kebenaran dalam tuduhan itu?

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman: Tidak, Tuan Yang di-Pertua (*Ketawa*).

Dr Mahathir bin Mohamad (Kota Star Selatan): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya ingin tahu kalau-lah sa-lepas satu masa yang patut scheme yang di-buat oleh Kerajaan ini tidak menarik sokongan daripada doktor² private, bolehkah saya tahu ada-kah Kerajaan akan mengkaji sa-mula sharat² yang di-letak dalam scheme ini.

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pehak Kementerian Kesihatan maseh lagi menunggu pandangan dan pendapat daripada doktor² private untuk mengatasi masalah² ini.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, perhaps, before I ask a supplementary question, I wish to make it quite clear that in my practice, there is one obstetrician and gynaecologist, who will be very willing to help out in this scheme, if given a chance to do so. But he is an obstetrician and gynaecologist, and it is a wanton waste of his talents and time to ask to do outpatient work. Mr Speaker, Sir, just now, the Parliamentary Secretary mentioned that the hours of between 12 noon and 2 p.m. are the times that most private practitioners wanted to work and that the Government has found it not available. Sir, at least I can speak from experience in the General Hospital, Kuala Lumpur, that during such hours, there is also a big crowd of patients waiting to be treated and the paltry number of Government doctors that are in attendance there, or that are intended at attendance there, is not enough to cope with the patients there. If so, will he not make this scheme a little more flexible, so that if doctors go there between the hours of twelve and two, perhaps the Government doctors can have the much needed rest during these hours?

Tan Sri Syed Ja'afar bin Hasan Albar (Johor Tenggara): Sir, he is making a speech!

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya telah mengatakan dan saya perchaya Ahli Yang Berhormat daripada Batu itu sedar sa-kira-nya banyak doktor² private itu menumpukan tenaga daripada pukul 9 pagi, dua jam, maka dapat-lah

doktor² private ini melihat banyak orang² sakit. Jadi tak payah-lah orang² sakit itu menunggu sa-hingga pukul 2 atau 12 kerana pada hari ini Ahli² dalam Dewan ini sedar ia-itu sa-orang orang sakit terpaksa menunggu dua atau tiga jam.

THE RUBBER REPLANTING FUND—SIPHONING OF FUNDS TO HELP FINANCE F.L.D.A. SCHEMES

7. Dr Tan Chee Khoon asks the Minister of Commerce and Industry if it is true that money from the Rubber Replanting Fund has been siphoned off to help finance F.L.D.A. Schemes, and if so, to state:

- (a) how much has been spent on F.L.D.A. Schemes from the Rubber Replanting Fund;
- (b) whether the money is recoverable;
- (c) whether this is the reason for the decision to restrict replanting by rubber holders to 45,000 acres a year beginning 1967.

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Dr Lim Swee Aun): Mr Speaker, Sir, the Rubber Industry Replanting Fund was established in 1952 and it empowers the Government to collect cess on exports of rubber for replanting. Money due from small-holders, i.e., those who own rubber land of less than 100 acres, has been paid into Fund "B". No money so collected and paid into the Fund "B" has been spent on F.L.D.A. schemes.

Honourable Members also know that Government has given two grants to assist the whole rubber industry to replant and new-plant. Out of the first grant (which was given in 1955), \$112 million was set aside for assisting small-holders to replant and new-plant. Under the Rubber Industry Smallholders New-Planting Scheme, 1957, gazetted as L.N. 9 of 1958, a sum of \$30 out of the \$112 million was allocated for new-planting at the rate of \$400 per acre. Each State Government was given an allocation on a certain formula by the Board when the scheme was brought into effect in 1958. Various

State Governments appointed the F.L.D.A. to supervise the new-planting of eighteen schemes, and the sum of \$11,143,986 was spent on these schemes. As these moneys are from the Government grant, they are not recoverable.

Sir, the reason for deciding to restrict replanting rubber for smallholders to 45,000 acres, beginning from 1st January next year, is because of the sudden increase in the demand for replanting in the last few years. In 1953 the replanting rate of smallholdings was only 27,612 acres, and this steadily increased till in last 1965 when the amount replanted was 112,343 acres. As a result of this replanting 47.3% of the total acreage of smallholdings as on 1952 have now been replanted. Now, if there was no restriction on the rate of replanting for smallholders, then the total amount of Government funds, \$84 million from the second grant plus the balance of the first grant of \$3 million, together with the cess collected every year, which averages about \$37 million, would not be able to finance the replanting at the rate of 120,000 acres per year. Therefore, it was necessary to revise the financing, so that if we limited it to 45,000 acres a year as from 1967, it would be possible to finance it almost on an indefinite basis.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, in my question, I hope the Minister will have noticed it, I did not refer either to Fund "A" or Fund "B". The Minister has concentrated mainly on Fund "B". Can he enlighten this House whether the cess collected for Fund "A" has been diverted to F.L.D.A. schemes?

Dr Lim Swee Aun: No, Sir.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, is it true that some of the funds from Fund "B" have been diverted to replanting in Sarawak?

Dr Lim Swee Aun: No.

CENTRALISATION OF KUALA LUMPUR'S HAWKERS BY THE PESUROHAN JAYA IBU KOTA

8. Dr Tan Chee Khoon asks the Minister for Local Government and

Housing to give details of the Scheme drawn up by the Pesurohan Jaya Ibu Kota to centralise Kuala Lumpur's illegal hawkers—Hong Kong style.

The Minister for Local Government and Housing (Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh):

Mr Speaker, Sir, I do not know what the Honourable Member meant by "Hong Kong style". Probably, he was referring to certain proposals made by the Federal Commissioner with regard to control of hawkers, which were referred to in newspaper reports some time in the middle of July. Certain proposals have, in fact, been submitted to my Ministry for consideration and as such proposals involve financial implications, apart from a section of it, which I have already previously stated in this House a few days ago, the remaining part of the proposals is still under consideration by my Ministry. The Federal Commissioner is planning to construct two Hawkers Emporia at Jalan Sekolah and Jalan Haji Hussein as Pilot Projects at an estimated cost of \$1,280,000. The object of these projects is to accommodate as many hawkers as possible who are causing obstructions in congested areas. If these projects prove successful, the Federal Commissioner will consider the construction of more such Emporia in the Federal Capital. I have already stated in the House that members of the public must be protected against illegal hawkers for various reasons too well known to the Honourable Member. But, as I said earlier, the remaining part of the proposal is still under consideration by my Ministry. I am not in a position to say whether we are in fact going to implement the remaining part of the proposal until this question of Emporia is first settled, because we must first find ways and means to accommodate the hawkers before we can decide on what other action to be taken.

Tuan Tan Toh Hong (Bukit Bintang): Will the Honourable Minister kindly confirm that, whether the scheme is implemented or not, the legitimate rights and opportunities of the hawkers to trade and to seek a livelihood will not be suppressed?

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Sir, I do not know whether the Honourable Member was referring to the legitimate rights and opportunities of the licensed hawkers or to the illegal hawkers. If he is referring to the licensed hawkers, I think, as far as I know, the licensed hawkers have been duly protected and have been allowed to trade as they are entitled to; but, as far as the illegal hawkers are concerned, I do not think there is any question of legitimate rights—they have no rights at all. I mean they merely operate by the tolerance of the Federal Commissioner and, as I said, the Government has tried its best or, in fact, the Federal Commissioner has tried his best, to accommodate these illegal hawkers, as it is also a social problem, and for that reason the Federal Commissioner has put up this proposal to construct emporia to accommodate such hawkers, and in fact in other markets too the Federal Commissioner too has tried his best to accommodate such illegal hawkers. I must categorically say here that there is no question of any legitimate rights and opportunities of the illegal hawkers because they have no rights at all.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, when I asked the question to centralise Kuala Lumpur's illegal hawkers "Hong Kong style", I was hoping that the Minister would give us a clarification of what is "Hong Kong style" because, as he pointed out, these were words used by the Commissioner of the Federal Capital, taken from the newspaper cuttings. Sir, I merely wanted to seek an elucidation. I did not coin these words. It was his Commissioner. Who coined it? This House, I am sure, will be very grateful if the Minister can give us a clarification on this "Hong Kong style" of trading.

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I think the Honourable Member must be referring to this news report, a cutting of which I have here. Nowhere can I find any mention of the Federal Commissioner going to adopt anything "Hong Kong style". He visited Hong Kong and then after that

he submitted certain proposals. If anything at all, it will be one of "K. L. style", and not "Hong Kong style".

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, I can produce cuttings, but I unfortunately did not think that it would be in question. I can produce those cuttings to the Minister later. The question I wish to ask is this. He talked about the two emporia that are to be built, will be built, or are being built, at Jalan Sekolah and Jalan Haji Hussein. Can he give us a little more clarification of these two schemes? For example, when will these two schemes be completed, how many hawkers will each scheme accommodate, and from where will these hawkers be drawn to each particular scheme.

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, what has been asked by the Honourable Member is a separate question but, nevertheless, as I have some of the details here, I will certainly answer the question. In fact, I have already answered part of the question—and the Honourable Member would have known if he had remained in this House long enough—I think that was about two days ago. It involves the construction of two emporia, one at Jalan Sekolah and one at the Jalan Haji Hussein. The one at Jalan Sekolah will have altogether eight tiers, and I have the details here. The size of the building—four storeys with roof garden; ground floor will be used for a bus terminal for 24 to 30 buses; first floor, first tier, will have space for 40 hawkers; first floor, second tier, parking for 40 cars; second floor, third tier, parking for 48 cars; second floor, fourth tier, space for 48 hawkers; third floor fifth tier, space for 12 eating stalls; third floor, sixth tier, space for 14 eating stalls; roof garden, seventh tier, space for twelve eating stalls; roof garden, eighth tier, 14 eating stalls. Total cost \$900,000.

Then for the hawker emporium at Jalan Haji Hussein, the height of the building is three storeys. Basement—parking 45 cars; ground floor—space

for 90 stalls, first floor—space for 56 stalls; second floor—space for 56 stalls. Estimated cost \$380,000.

I must stress that these are proposals, with the exception of one for which tender has been called; the plan for the other one is under finalisation; and of course the allocation of space for all these stalls is subject to further alterations, if necessary, because there is the matter of whether certain floors are suitable for such purposes. The scheme is still under consideration by the Ministry.

SHORTAGE OF TECHNICAL INSTRUCTORS AT THE CENTRAL APPRENTICESHIP BOARD

9. Dr Lim Chong Eu (Tanjong) *under Standing Order 24 (2)* asks the Minister of Labour if it is true that the reason for the shortage of technical instructors at the Central Apprenticeship Board is because of the unattractive salary scales; if so, what steps the Minister proposes to take to remedy the situation.

The Minister of Labour (Tuan V. Manickavasagam): Mr Speaker, Sir, there is a general shortage of suitable technically trained instructors in the country and the problem is not one affecting the Central Apprenticeship Board alone. The Salary Scales in themselves are not therefore responsible for the shortage of instructors in the apprenticeship scheme. My Ministry is now working out, in conjunction with the other Ministries concerned, a "Crash Programme" for the training of instructors with United Nations assistance. The salary scales are also being studied to ensure that once these instructors are trained they can be retained by the Government.

(Mr Deputy Speaker *in the Chair*)

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE (Motion)

The Minister of Finance (Tuan Tan Siew Sin): Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

That at its rising today the House shall stand adjourned *sine die*.

Tuan V. Manickavasagam: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That at its rising today the House shall stand adjourned *sine die*.

BILLS

THE TIN INDUSTRY (RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT) FUND (AMENDMENT) BILL

Dr Lim Swee Aun: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to amend the Tin Industry (Research and Development) Fund Ordinance, 1953" be now read a second time.

This Ordinance provides for the establishment of the Tin Research and Development Fund, into which are paid the proceeds of cess collected on tin exports.

The Fund is administered by a statutory body called the Tin Industry (Research and Development) Board which consists of six members nominated by recognised associations of the tin industry and three Government officials.

The Fund is used to meet expenditure on research, development and publicity to stimulate the consumption of tin and also to popularise and extend the uses of tin. It also provides for Malaysia's contribution to the International Tin Research Institute, which is financed by major producers of tin, and those work is to conduct research in uses of tin and to extend technical advisory services to tin users. The Institute, with branches in eight main consuming countries, has been successful in conducting research projects designed to develop new uses of tin, improve existing tin products and the processes by which they are made, and to regain the field that has been lost to substitutes.

The Fund also finances the Malayan Tin Bureau in Washington, which performs an important function of keeping in touch with tin consumers in the United States and dissemination of

information and maintaining interest in the uses of Malayan tin and enabling the local industry to be kept informed of developments in America, both industrial and political, which may have a bearing on future demand for our metal.

The Ordinance, when first enforced, provided that it would be in force until 31st December, 1957 and may be extended for further periods by resolution of the Dewan Ra'ayat. Since its coming into force in 1953, the Ordinance has been extended three times and will now expire on 31st December, 1966. In view of the continuing nature of research activities in the field of utilisation and the need to popularise and extend the uses of tin and considering the vital importance of research, technical advisory service, and publicity for tin, the provision for periodic extension of the legislation would seem to be an unsatisfactory arrangement. It is, therefore, proposed that the Tin Industry Research and Development Ordinance, 1953 be suitably amended by repealing the present Section 14, so that the Ordinance will operate continuously without having to require periodic extension.

The Tin Industry Research and Development Board has been consulted on this proposal and it has unanimously agreed that the Ordinance be suitably amended to remove the need for periodic extension. A new section 14 has been included to deal with power of the Board to make rules, subject to the approval of the Minister.

The Bill also seeks to amend Section 2 of the Tin Industry Research and Development Fund Ordinance, 1953 by substituting, for the existing definition of "Minister" a new definition so as to place the administration of the Ordinance under the appropriate authority.

Sir, I beg to move.

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

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 Deputy 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 RUBBER INDUSTRY (REPLANTING) FUND (AMEND- MENT) BILL

Second Reading

Dr Lim Swee Aun: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled "an Act to amend the Rubber Industry (Replanting) Fund Ordinance, 1952" be now read a second time.

The Bill seeks to affect several amendments to the provisions of the Rubber Industry (Replanting) Fund Ordinance, 1952.

The purposes of these amendments are clearly set out in the Explanatory Statement to the Bill.

I, therefore, beg to move that the Bill be now read a second time.

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Tuan Tai Kuan Yang (Kulim-Bandar Bharu): Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to make a few comments on this Bill intituled "an Act to amend the Rubber Industry (Replanting) Fund Ordinance, 1952."

On the whole, I would like to support the Bill which, I think, will give further improvement to the planting industry, especially the smallholders. We realise how important a part the smallholders are playing in the development and progress of Malaysia. They contribute substantial improvement to our economy and for this reason, because of their lack of capital to replant, any subsidy and help by the Government will be a very good gesture.

According to my information, only 46% of all the smallholdings in rubber have been replanted over the years.

since the replanting scheme was launched. Mr Speaker, Sir, although this is a satisfactory and progressive thing, it is not altogether a very bright and happy picture. What we must try to achieve is to ensure that 100% of the smallholdings in this country are replanted. This will help in the long run to generate greater economic activities in the rural area. The people will have more money to spend and purchase whatever requirements they need.

It is not true that smallholders do not wish to replant, but it is a question of how soon and how much assistance they can get from the Government. These people deserve the attention and help of the Government.

Mr Speaker, Sir, it is my hope that the Government will NOT stop short of doing a great service to the people of this country, especially this section of the population. What they are able to produce and produce more will certainly be a great thing for this country.

I would like to congratulate the Honourable Minister of Commerce and Industry for allowing himself some powers to extend the replanting scheme as he thought fit. This indeed is a flexible thing and knowing the Honourable Minister by his performance, in this House and outside, we can all expect him to do the needful for the smallholders. It is a sensible and logical approach towards a delicate but vitally important scheme. As we all know, the Honourable Minister is a man of action and in words, and we can all expect him to do justice to all.

Lastly, it is my earnest desire that the replanting scheme will be continued for many years to come especially for the smallholdings. To neglect the smallholders will be a very grievous mistake, and I know the Honourable Minister will steer clear of the danger. Thank you, Mr Speaker, Sir.

Tuan Ahmad bin Arshad (Muar Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun mengalu²kan Undang² Kum-

pulan Wang Menanam Getah sa-Mula ini. Rang Undang² ini ada-lah sangat di-tunggu² oleh peladang² getah dalam negeri kita terutama sa-kali pekebun² kechil. Dengan di-luluskan pindaan ini maka bertukar-lah kegem-biraan dan menambahkan ekonomi bagi negara kita ini.

Saya chuma hendak menyentoh satu perkara sahaja, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ia-itu pada usaha menaikkan taraf pengeluaran getah pekebun² kechil kita yang menjadikan rendah harga getah kita ia-lah berpuncha dari getah yang di-keluarkan oleh pekebun² kechil itu sangat kurang mutu-nya. Ada hingga menyebabkan mutu pasaran getah—harga getah kita—di-antara bangsa² menjadi rendah, malah mendatangkan pula kerugian kepada pekebun² kechil. Mereka di-permain²kan oleh pembeli² tempatan bukan sahaja dengan harga yang murah tetapi di-tolak susut ayer pada getah² pekebun² kechil ini. Walau usaha ini sedang di-jalankan oleh Kementerian ini untuk mengatasi perkara yang tersebut, tetapi menurut hemat saya, tidak memadai dan tidak meliputi. Usaha ini pada permulaan-nya di-usahakan oleh MARA dengan mengadakan Pusat Membeku Getah atau memprocess getah chara bera-mai². 10% daripada modal process itu di-minta daripada pekebun² kechil yang lain itu wang ini di-ongkosi oleh MARA. Dengan ada-nya wang ini di-minta daripada MARA, beberapa kesulitan di-dapati, kadang² project² kechil ini lambat dapat di-laksanakan.

Menurut hemat saya tidak menasabah ranchangan ini di-kelolakan oleh MARA sebab MARA ada satu tugas yang maha hebat, tugas yang lain, berhubung dengan membangunkan ekonomi bumiputra. Jadi oleh itu saya nampak bahawa memprocess getah ini hendak-lah Lembaga Menanam Getah sa-Mula ini mengambil alih daripada MARA dan tiap² pekebun kechil sa-ramai 20 orang, supaya Lembaga ini mengadakan process itu dengan membuat rumah asap bagi pekebun² kechil. Dua² project yang saya sebutkan, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, menurut apa yang saya di-fahamkan oleh pekebun² kechil, hanya menelan

belanja \$3,000 lebih kurang. Jadi dengan ada-nya process getah, dengan ada-nya rumah asap pekebun² kechil yang di-kelolai, yang di-keluarkan oleh Lembaga ini, maka mutu getah pekebun² kechil itu akan baik pada negeri dan pada pasaran dunia.

Sekian sahaja, Dato' Yang di-Pertua, terima kasih.

Tuan Mohd. Zahir bin Ismail (Sungai Petani): Yang Berhormat Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya mengalu²kan Rang Undang² ini terutama-nya pindaan yang telah pun di-chadangkan kepada Sekshen 10. Pada fahaman saya, Sekshen 10 ini ia-lah akan menolong kepada pekebun² yang di-bawah daripada 100 ekar, dan tanah² yang di-bawah daripada 100 ekar ini dahulu-nya telah pun menjadi atau pun tanah² yang di-keliling-nya itu di-kumpulkan di-bawah satu estate yang besar dan estate ini telah pun di-pechah²kan (fragmentation) dan sa-lepas daripada fragmentation itu maka estate yang besar yang lebih daripada 100 ekar tadi yang dahulu-nya telah pun mendapat pertolongan daripada Fund "A" maka tanah² yang sekarang ini telah di-kechil²kan yang di-bawah daripada 100 ekar akan mendapat pertolongan terus di-bawah Fund "B" pula.

Tetapi dalam perkara ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya suka-lah hendak bertanya sedikit satu benda yang menjadi keraguan kepada saya ia-itu sa-tengah² pekebun² besar ini yang mendapat pertolongan daripada Fund "A" telah pun menanam sa-bahagian daripada tanah²-nya, kata-lah sa-tahun atau dua tahun dengan pokok² getah, kemudian di-jual-nya tanah-nya yang besar itu dan orang² yang membeli telah pun membuat fragmentation. Kemudian mengikut undang² yang dahulu, maka pekebun getah yang besar—estate yang besar itu—boleh memindahkan Fund "A"-nya itu kepada tempat lain. Jika sa-kira-nya demikian, maka jika sa-kira-nya orang² yang membeli tanah² yang kechil² di-dalam tanah yang dahulu-nya itu di-pechah²kan dan apabila dia membeli tanah dalam 10 ekar atau 15 ekar dan sa-telah pun di-tanam sa-tahun atau dua

tahun atau pun belum di-tanam lagi, oleh sebab wang yang telah di-untokkan kepada estate itu di-bawah Fund "A" telah pun di-pindahkan ka-lain estate, maka tidak-lah boleh orang² yang membeli tanah² yang telah pun di-pechah²kan ini mendapat pertolongan untuk hendak menanam samula. Ini saya rasa saya minta-lah pihak Kementerian memberitahu adakah dengan ada-nya pindaan ini maka wang yang di-hadkan di-bawah Fund "A" kepada estate yang dahulu itu boleh di-pindahkan ka-lain² estate.

Tuan Sulaiman bin Ali (Dungun): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya juga mengalu²kan Rang Undang² yang di-hadapan kita ini dan saya memberikan sokongan saya yang penoh tetapi saya juga suka menyentuh satu dua perkara berhubung dengan replanting. Saya tahu dan saya faham bahawa sanya pihak Kerajaan kita, pihak Lembaga, telah membuat ketetapan ia-itu hanya sa-kadar 45,000 ekar akan di-untokkan supaya di-tanam semula dalam tahun ini dan tahun hadapan.

Jadi saya rasa, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dengan bilangan 45,000 ekar bagi seluroh Tanah Melayu dengan tidak di-tentukan quota² bagi tiap² buah negeri, saya perchaya barangkali keadaan ini akan menghampakan pekebun² kechil dalam tiap² negeri. Kerana bilangan 45,000 ekar ini adalah satu bilangan yang terlampau kechil kalau di-bandingkan dengan pekebun² kechil yang ada di-dalam seluroh Tanah Melayu kita. Dan dengan chara ini juga barangkali, boleh jadi, pihak Pejabat Tanam Sa-mula di-tiap² negeri akan berlumba² menchari atau merebut peluang supaya pekebun² kechil dalam masing² negeri membuat permohonan untuk bantuan tanam samula. Dengan perlumbaan ini boleh jadi bilangan permohonan² untuk bantuan tanam sa-mula dalam negeri² ini akan melebihi bilangan 45 ribu ekar yang di-hadkan itu. Maka ini akan menimbulkan satu kesulitan, saya rasa, dan juga satu kerumitan bagi pihak Lembaga untuk menentu atau menapis mana-kah permohonan² yang patut diberi dan mana permohonan² yang patut di-tolak manakala bilangan itu lebih.

Pada pendapat saya sendiri, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-chara quota ini juga barangkali akan menimbulkan satu kesulitan lagi. Kalau pun pehak Kementerian atau pehak Lembaga mengadakan quota, ini pun juga akan menimbulkan satu kesulitan dan boleh menggalakkan barangkali permainan² rasuah, permainan² churang barangkali, permainan sunglap, dengan sebab kalau ada pemohon² barangkali yang lebeh daripada 45 ribu ekar yang di-hadkan, maka ini boleh menggalakkan pehak pegawai² yang berkenaan barangkali akan memberi pileh kaseh, dan sa-bagai lagi untuk menghadkan supaya tidak lebeh daripada bilangan itu.

Jadi, pada pendapat saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untuk mengelakkan segala kesulitan ini patut dan mustahak benar pehak Kementerian dan pehak Lembaga mengadakan satu pendaftaran terlebih dahulu—membuat pendaftaran berapa-kah bilangan, berapa ekar-kah tanah² dalam tiap² buah negeri yang sudah di-tanam dengan chara bantuan tanam sa-mula, dan berapa-kah lagi tanah² yang ada yang patut mendapat bantuan tanaman sa-mula. Maka dengan chara ada pendaftaran saperti ini dapat-lah pehak Kementerian atau pehak Lembaga mengadakan quota berasaskan kepada bilangan² yang berhak dalam tiap² negeri.

Perkara yang kedua menurut faham saya dan pendapat saya, Ranchangan Menanam Sa-mula ini ada mempunyai dua tujuan yang terbesar. Satu tujuan-nya ia-lah kerana meninggikan atau menegapkan ekonomi negara. Yang kedua, kerana meninggikan taraf hidup pekebun² kecil khas-nya ra'ayat² kita di-luar bandar.

Kapada orang² kampong atau kapada pekebun² kecil soal meninggikan ekonomi negara itu tidak timbul, tidak berbangkit. Tetapi soal meninggikan taraf hidup mereka itu-lah yang mereka pandang lebeh mulia, lebeh hampir kapada mereka. Dan dengan sebab keseluruhan pekebun² kecil, pekebun² getah ini berada dalam kawasan di-luar bandar, maka saya rasa pehak Kementerian ini atau pehak Lembaga sa-patut-nya memberi

keutamaan dari segi meninggikan taraf hidup ra'ayat di-kampong² dengan chara tanaman sa-mula bukan kerana ekonomi negara, dan dengan sebab itu chara dan atoran yang lebeh bersesuaian, chara dan peratoran yang lebeh berkesan, saya rasa penanaman sa-mula ini patut di-arah atau pun di-bawah pengawasan Kementerian Pembangunan Negara dan Luar Bandar, dengan sebab kebun² getah itu banyak merupakan dalam kawasan luar bandar. Jadi saya rasa, kalau boleh saya suka juga-lah mengshorkan kapada pehak Kerajaan kita supaya Lembaga Tanam Sa-mula ini dapat di-pindahkan daripada di-bawah Kementerian Perusahaan dan Perdagangan kapada Kementerian Pembangunan Negara dan Luar bandar.

Dr Lim Swee Aun: Mr Speaker, Sir, the Honourable Member for Kulim Bandar Bahru has expressed the hope that 100 per cent of all smallholdings will be replanted and that the speed could be increased, if we could give greater assistance. Sir, it is also the Government's intention that we should aim at 100 per cent replanting of all smallholdings, but I would like to bring to the attention of the House that, when this replanting scheme started in 1953, the grants given in instalments over a period of five years totalled \$400 per acre for every smallholding. This did not get much response. So, in 1956 the amount was increased to \$500 per acre, in 1960 to \$600 per acre, and in 1962 to \$750 per acre, with an addition of \$50, making it \$800 per acre for those who own less than five acres. As a result of this increased subsidy, there has been this tremendous response, so much so that, if there is no proper control as I said just now, the Government's grant of \$84 million (second grant) plus the cess of about \$37 million per year, would not be sufficient to pay for the total planting per annum beyond 45,000 acres per annum. We certainly would like to see this replanting go on as a continuing process and hence the necessity to limit it to 45,000 acres.

I am very grateful to the Honourable Member for Muar Utara who, perhaps, is the first M.P. in this House,

who has suggested that certain responsibility from another Ministry should be transferred to mine, whereas it has been the general tone here that many of the work done in my Ministry should be transferred to somebody else's—as suggested by the Honourable Member for Dungun, the replanting of rubber should be taken out from my Ministry and put in the hands of the Ministry of National and Rural Development

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: On a point of clarification, Mr Speaker, Sir, is the Honourable Minister afraid that, if all the work in his Ministry is transferred to other Ministries, he will be done out of a job? (*Laughter*).

Dr Lim Swee Aun: It is not necessarily that, Sir. I am, therefore, grateful to him (the Honourable Member for Muar Utara). He has suggested that we should improve the standard of production of rubber from smallholders, as under MARA, when group processing and factories were done on a co-operative basis, it was not actually successful. Sir, I would like to report to the House that the R.R.I. has now taken over this aspect of improving the production of smallholders' rubber through its Small Estate Advisory Service. It has taken over quite a number of these factories, which once were run under MARA, and I am glad to report that the standard of production has improved and factories themselves are now making profits.

Sir, the Honourable Member for Sungai Patani wanted to know about section 10 and its amendment. Now, the purpose of amending section 10 is because the Board Members in Fund "B" have been very concerned over the definition of Fund "B". Under the old definition, the Board cannot legally exclude owners of land totalling 100 acres and above from participation in Fund "B", where as it was not the intention to permit such owners to participate in Fund "B". Hence, it is necessary to make the definition more specific, but I can assure the Honourable Members here that owners of estates over 100 acres have not been included in Fund "B".

Sir, on this question of the subdivision of larger estates and people, who have bought the smaller estates, joining Fund "B", before they can join Fund "B", they have to refund or they do not get that portion of Fund "A" subsidies that have already been paid to the estates—there is a deduction. As Fund "A" and Fund "B" are two separate Boards, funds from one are not transferable to the other, so that it means that, although there is subdivision of a larger estate, subsequently, the buyer of a small portion of the estate, although entitled to join Fund "B" cannot have the advantages of both Fund "A" and Fund "B"; to join Fund "B" he would have to give up or refund what has been taken out of Fund "A".

The Honourable Member for Dungun has suggested that the restriction on replanting in future would create problem and chaos; and he has, therefore, suggested that there should be registration of estate owners. Sir, that is exactly what we have anticipated and this Bill includes provisions and gives us power to have registration of not only Fund "B" but also Fund "A" members. I can assure this House that Fund "B" Replanting Board has looked into this question of restriction, and it has worked out a scheme called Scheme No. 4, where there will be a system of priorities and guidelines as to how to approve applications for replanting under Fund "B" and all estates of all smallholders who own land under five acres with original titles, not sub-divided titles, would get top priority, the idea being to give the smallmen every assistance and the higher priority, whereas members who join Fund "B" as a result of subdivision, although they are entitled to join Fund "B", would have a lower priority than the others. Thank you, Sir.

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 Deputy Speaker *in the Chair*)

Clauses 1 and 2 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.

THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS (AMENDMENT) (No. 2) BILL

Second Reading

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move that a Bill intituled “an Act to amend the Local Government Elections Act, 1960”, be now read a second time.

Sir, the Bill is a simple and straightforward one and seeks to provide in the Local Government Elections Act, 1960, that notwithstanding that the Municipal Affairs of a Municipality shall be administered by a Council pursuant to section (3) (1) of the Act, the States may provide in the Municipal Ordinance for the transfer of any of the functions of the Council to any person, officer or authority for such period as the State Authority may deem necessary or desirable in the public interest. This is necessary because, although the Municipal Ordinance has a provision which provides for the administration of municipal affairs by an Authority other than a Council, this is made void by virtue of Article 75 of the Malaysian Constitution, which states that where there is a conflict between a Federal Law and a State Law, the Federal law—in this case the Local Government Elections Act—prevails. This Bill seeks primarily to effect an amendment to that Act to remove this irregularity.

Following the power of the Legislature of the State to provide for the administration of a municipality to any other person, officer or authority for such period as may be deemed necessary in the public interest, there should also be power for the Legislature of a State to suspend the Constitution or any provisions thereof of the Municipality. Thus, the opportunity is also

being taken to provide for the suspension of Constitution of a Municipality during the period the Municipality is administered by an Authority other than a Council.

It will be noted that the commencement of this Bill shall take effect from 26th of January, 1961, being the date of the commencement of section 398A of the Municipal Ordinance, which provides that the State Authority may require the Council to carry out certain instructions.

I might also add that as required under Article 95A of the Malaysian Constitution, the Bill has been agreed to by the National Council for Local Government at a meeting held recently.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move.

Dr Lim Swee Aun: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: Mr Speaker, Sir, the amendment that the Minister for Local Government and Housing seeks to make is not as simple and straightforward as he would like this House to believe.

It is designed with the sole purpose of hiding a whole heap of sins of omission, and it is designed primarily to cover the sins of omission in connection with the takeover by a certain State of the functions of a certain Local Council. Mr Speaker, Sir, as such, it is a travesty of justice, particularly when the action of the takeover is now the subject of Court proceedings.

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Sir, is the Honourable Member suggesting that the matter is *sub judice*?

Dr Tan Chee Khoon: No, I am not saying that it is *sub judice*, but that it is designed primarily for these two functions. May I also say, Mr Speaker, Sir, since the Minister has asked me about that case, that what happened in that enquiry has been, as Shakespeare would have put it, “much ado about nothing.”

Dr Lim Chong Eu: Mr Speaker, Sir, this Bill, which is a complete amendment to an Act on Local Government

Elections, is a complete travesty of meaning, because the Bill we are asked to debate in actual fact does away with all the provisions that anybody understands by elections.

Quite apart from that, Sir, I am rising not to debate the merits of the Bill, but to strongly object to Clause 1 of the Bill, because this retrospective application of the Bill is pernicious. And under the circumstances, I wonder whether the Honourable Minister would consider withdrawing the Bill, because of the obnoxious implications of a retrospective Bill. Otherwise, Sir, I shall have to speak on behalf of the Members of the P.P.P., the Members of the D.A.P., the Members of the S.U.P.P., and the Members of the Labour Party, some of whom, because of the peculiar procedure of Standing Orders and Orders of the Day, have had to go back early this evening and late last night.

Sir, we the undersigned Members of this House—the names are: Enche' C. V. Devan Nair (Member for Bungsar), the Members from Sarawak, Enche' Ong Kee Hui, Enche' Stephen Yong, Tama Weng Tinggang Wan, the Member for Batu, Dr Tan Chee Khoon, the Member for Ipoh, Enche' D. R. Seenivasagam—think it our duty to bring to the attention of this House and to the public at large the sinister content and purport of the Local Government Elections (Amendment) (No. 2) Bill.

The Bill seeks to provide powers to the State Governments to suspend or take over functions of Municipal and Local Councils, and to make these powers to have retrospective effect as from January 1961. Sir, retrospective legislation is passed only in the most exceptional cases, and never to defeat the course and the ends of justice.

This clearly implies a belated recognition by the Government that all the measures taken up to date by the State Governments concerned against Local and Municipal Councils have had no legal basis. There is currently a court action taken by the Penang City

Council against the State Government of Penang. It would appear that the intention of this Bill is to defeat the course of justice in Penang and to give retrospective sanction for acts which were clearly *ultra vires* when they were committed.

The public will not fail to see that this is a case of the most brazen political chicanery. This House was elected by the people to legislate in their interests, and to legislate for the future. What this Bill seeks to do is to convert this Legislature into an Alliance rubber stamp for underwriting possible illegalities committed by the State Governments. We are, in fact, asked to pass a Bill into law, which will have retrospective effect from a time in 1961, when another House was responsible for legislation.

We consider this Bill an insult to the intelligence and the dignity of Parliament, and we decline to be associated in any way with the passage of this thoroughly disreputable piece of legislation, which will drive yet another nail into the coffin of Malaysian democracy under the Alliance Government.

We also call on all Members of this House, whatever party affiliations they may have, to refuse in like manner to give their sanction to a most shameful measure motivated by sinister considerations. Those Members of this House, who find it in themselves to associate their names with the passage of this Bill into law, must necessarily draw upon themselves the odium of justifying what must be condemned as inimical to the canons of parliamentary propriety and to the cause of justice.

In order to record our strong feelings on this matter, we the undersigned will now walk out of this Chamber.

Tuan C. V. Devan Nair: Disgraceful!

(*The Honourable Dr Lim Chong Eu, Tuan C. V. Devan Nair, Tuan Ong Kee Hui, Tuan Stephen Yong Kuet Tze, Tama Weng Tinggang Wan, Dr Tan Chee Khoon, and Tuan D. R. Seenivasagam leave the Chamber.*)

Tuan Haji Ahmad bin Saaid (Seberang Utara): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun untuk mengalu²-kan Rang Undang² Pindaan Pilihan Raya Majlis² Tempatan dan saya sokong penuh di atas langkah Kerajaan untuk meminda Rang Undang² Pilihan Raya bagi Majlis² Tempatan. Bagaimana kita ma'alum, bahawa beberapa Majlis Perbandaran telah melakukan beberapa kesalahan di atas pentadbiran bagi Majlis² itu khasnya Majlis Perbandaran Seremban, Melaka, juga Majlis Bandaraya Pulau Pinang bagaimana pada masa sekarang ini sa-buah Surohanjaya sedang menyiasat di atas perjalanan pentadbiran Majlis yang tersebut.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untuk menjaga kepentingan penduduk² dalam Majlis² Perbandaran ini, maka sangat-lah patut bagi Kerajaan mengadakan satu pindaan yang membolehkan Kerajaan Negeri mengambil tindakan, mengambil alih kuasa pentadbiran bagi Majlis² Perbandaran ini untuk hendak menjauhi daripada kejadian² yang kita sedia ma'alum.

Saya, sa-orang daripada ahli di-Pulau Pinang, tahu sangat-lah chara² pentadbiran Majlis Bandaraya Pulau Pinang yang di-tadbirkan oleh Socialist Front. Mereka enggan bekerjasama dengan Kerajaan Negeri dan Kerajaan Pusat, mereka engkar daripada patoh kepada arahan dan perintah daripada Kerajaan Pusat atau Kerajaan Negeri. Dalil-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada tahun 1960 Kerajaan Pusat dan Kerajaan Negeri telah mengarahkan supaya tiap² Majlis Tempatan mengadakan perayaan tamat dzarurat, tetapi pehak pentadbir Bandaraya Pulau Pinang engkar mengikut-nya. Juga pada tahun 1963 waktu kita menyambut pengishti-haran Malaysia, mereka juga engkar mengikut arahan dan perintah daripada Kerajaan Pusat dan Kerajaan Negeri, mereka tidak sama sa-kali mahu mengambil bahagian menyambut perayaan pengishti-haran Malaysia.

Dengan yang ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, ada lagi perkara² yang berlaku di-dalam pentadbiran majlis itu. Satu chara yang di-laksanakan oleh Front Socialist waktu itu, mereka memilih pekerja² daripada ahli parti-nya sahaja,

juga kemudahan² di-beri chuma kepada ahli² parti sahaja tidak kepada ahli² parti yang lain. Ini ada-lah satu chara dzalim yang tidak menitek-beratkan ke'adilan kepada orang² atau penduduk² dalam kawasan itu, dalam daerah itu, atau pun dalam kawasan yang di-tadbir oleh Majlis Bandaran ini.

Saya sangat-lah sukachita-nya dan mengalu²kan supaya Rang Pindaan ini di-luluskan dan dengan ini dapat-lah Majlis² Perbandaran yang ada dalam negara kita ini berjalan lebeh lichin lagi dan lebeh sempurna lagi dan memuaskan hati semua penduduk² dalam kawasan yang di-tadbirkan oleh Majlis² yang tersebut. Jikalau sa-kira-nya tidak ada satu kuasa untuk mengambil alih atau mengambil tindakan, maka ahli² yang mentadbir Majlis itu, sa-kira-nya dapat kepada tangan orang² yang tidak bertanggung-jawab, maka jahanam Majlis atau pentadbiran Majlis² yang tersebut.

Dan sa-kali lagi saya mengucapkan tahniah kepada Kerajaan kerana meng-ambil satu langkah yang sangat sesuai.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Koram tidak chukup, Tuan Yang di-Pertua.

(Divisional bell rung: House counted: 26 Members present).

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Mr Speaker, Sir, I thought the Opposition has always claimed to practise parliamentary democracy, yet in an important debate of this nature they have chosen the negative attitude of walking out of this Chamber instead of participating in the debate and putting forward their points both in law and in fact as to why they oppose this Bill. They have no basis for any argument against this Bill, so they have chosen the negative attitude of just walking out of this Chamber. Nevertheless I hope that they are still within listening distance, near one of the speakers within the precincts of this Honourable House, so that at least they have the benefit of hearing my explanation of only a few, I repeat, a few points raised by them.

I will summarise their objections. The objections of, I think, both the

Honourable Member for Batu and the Honourable Member for Tanjong are based roughly on:

- (i) that the matter is *sub judice*;
- (ii) that the Bill intends to validate an illegal act of the State Government;
- (iii) it departs from the spirit and intention of the Local Government Elections Act; and, finally,
- (iv) it is retrospective.

Sir, before I reply to these points, I would like to congratulate the Opposition for their apparent "Grand Alliance" on this issue—and it was because of such a type of alliance that we saw in Seremban Town Council that prompted the moving of this Bill. What did we see in the Seremban Town Council? There we offered the first available opportunity to the Opposition coalition headed by the Socialist Front, now defunct, of course, and known as the Labour Party—to administer the Town Council. No sooner were they given the first opportunity to do so, what did they do? They resorted to maladministration and malpractices, as a result of which we have this Report of the Royal Commission of Enquiry which substantiated the allegations of malpractices and maladministration, including corrupt practices. I will later, Sir, quote the Report to show why it is necessary for this Honourable House to take this measure in this House.

In running this Government, Sir, the most important issue that the Alliance Party must always bear in mind is public interest. Public interest must prevail against all other considerations, or all other considerations must be subjugated to public interest. Let us look at it in law and in spirit whether it is wrong to bring such a Bill and whether such a Bill should have retrospective effect.

Now, let us look at the spirit of the whole thing. We are practising parliamentary democracy, and through general elections we have been entrusted with the destiny of the people at all levels—from Central level, Federal level, State level, District level, right down to the Local Council level. Surely, Sir, it must be

the responsibility of the Federal Government to ensure that the public interest is protected at all times and, as such, the Central Government, for that matter the Alliance Party, is the watchdog for members of the public, and it must ensure that prompt action is taken where necessary to see that the public interest is duly safeguarded and protected, and particularly in cases where the trust of the public in returning the Opposition is not being abused. And does the Opposition suggest that we should sit back and do nothing, especially when we have clear instances of maladministration and malpractices in Local Authorities—especially the one that has been proved beyond all doubt in Seremban Town Council? Yet, the Opposition has the cheek to say that this Bill should not have been introduced and that it has sinister intent and what not.

Now, the Constitution certainly envisaged such an exigency and it was because of an oversight of drafting that this provision was omitted—it is admitted as an omission in this legislation. However, as I said earlier, it is most important that we must bear in mind at all times that the public interest must prevail against all other considerations. Furthermore, it is beyond any doubt that the Parliament is the highest legislative tribunal of the land and, as such, there is no question of the justifiability and the legal right of this Honourable House to legislate against the situation that I have stated just now.

First, I will deal with the question of whether this matter before the House is, in fact, *sub judice*, because the Honourable House has been informed about court proceedings elsewhere, although not specifically, both by the Honourable Member for Batu and the Honourable Member for Tanjong. Now, Standing Order 36 of the House deals with contents of the speeches in this House and in subsection (2) thereof it is provided that reference shall not be made to any matter which is *sub judice* in such a way as might, in the opinion of the Chair, prejudice the interests of parties

thereto. Nowhere else in the Standing Orders of the House is there any reference made to bills *sub judice*. In Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, Sixteenth Edition, at page 400, a relevant passage reads as follows:

"Matters pending judicial decisions: A matter"—I repeat the word "matter"—"while under adjudication by a court of law should not be brought before the House by a motion or otherwise. This rule does not apply to Bills."

This rule only applies to matters and not to Bills.

In regard to the second point that this Bill intends to validate the illegal act of the State Government, raised by the Honourable Member for Tanjong who referred to certain action taken by a certain State Government, although not specifically again, this is not quite the case. Local Government is a State matter and, therefore, it is absolutely within the power of the Legislature of a State to legislate on matters relating to Local Government. The powers of the Federal Government with regard to matters relating to Local Government are limited to the provisions of Article 76 of the Constitution. It is absolutely within the power of the State of Penang to enact the provisions contained in section 398A and 398B of the Municipal Ordinance. However, when the Federal Government passed the Local Government Elections Act, 1960, it was not foreseen that a State might enact provisions in their laws for the transfer of functions of the Municipality for any reason necessary, or desirable, in the public interest. As such, a Federal law, was enacted for the purpose of uniformity of law and policy, provided that the administration of a Municipality shall always be carried out by a Council. By virtue of Article 75 of the Constitution, the law enacted by the State, which is inconsistent with the Federal law, shall be void although the Enactment was made absolutely within the power of the Legislature of the State. Therefore, the amendment today to our Federal law is merely to enable the State to effectively exercise the legislative powers with regard to Local Government. There is no legal or

constitutional objection to the proposed Amendment Bill.

In regard to the third contention that the amendment departs from the spirit and the intention of the Local Government Elections Act of 1960, here again, this contention is not true. The 1960 Act was enacted by the Federal Government for the purpose of uniformity of law and policy with regard to Local Government's elections. The scope of this Act is described in its long title. In section 31, therefore, it is provided that the municipal affairs of every municipality shall be administered by a Council and this is notwithstanding any provision of the Municipal Ordinance to the contrary. The principle of this is still maintained although an exception is allowed for the State to enact provisions for a temporary transfer of functions of a Municipality for any reason necessary, or desirable, in the public interest. As I have said just now, Sir, it is an indisputable principle that all other considerations must be subjugated to public interest.

Now, the Parliament is a Court superior to any Court of Law with sovereign power which can make and unmake the laws. As I said earlier, Sir, the Alliance Party must and shall always amend any law—in fact it is duty-bound to do so—if in its opinion, such action is necessary, as long as there are people such as the leaders of the Opposition, the Socialist Front, the U.D.P., etc., who would seize the first available opportunity to enrich themselves when given the opportunity to run an administration: I refer to no other than such leaders of the until recently Opposition-controlled Seremban Town Council in respect of which allegations of maladministration and malpractices were proved.

With your leave, Sir, I would like to read some of the extracts from the Report of the Royal Commission of Enquiry. In page 29 of this Report, Sir, it is stated, and I quote:

" . . . there can be little doubt that on the evidence the allegations of maladministration in the Seremban Town Council since 1959 have been established . . . there are evidences which, if believed, would justify

the finding of allegations of malpractices against certain councillors in the said Council since 1963"—

that was the time when the Socialist Front and other Opposition coalition group took over the Town Council of Seremban.

"Having the advantage of seeing and hearing all the witnesses and studying the numerous documents I am satisfied that substantially the allegations of malpractices against those councillors in the said Council since 1963 have been established."

Again, Sir, in page 28, it is stated, and I quote:

"I, therefore, find the following allegations to have been established:

- (i) that C. Rajaratnam, a former Vice-President of the Seremban Town Council had accepted a cheque for \$2,000 from the first witness in consideration of having the latter's layout plans approved and that Gurnam Singh Gill and Lai Pong Yuen wanted more money before such plans would be approved by the Plans Committee;
- (ii) that Gurnam Singh Gill accepted \$5,000 from the third witness in consideration of the issue of a certificate of fitness in respect of Ruby Theatre;
- (iii) that Gurnam Singh Gill accepted various sums of money from the fourth witness, namely, \$300 and \$200 in consideration of issuing certificates of fitness and \$1,500 and \$500 in consideration of having certain plans approved;
- (iv) that Toh Fook Seng, Councillor of Seremban Town Council, approached Ng Low and wanted the latter to pay \$300 in consideration of having the licence of Ng Low's wife renewed;
- (v) that both Gurnam Singh Gill and Lai Pong Yuen, Councillor and President of the Seremban Town Council respectively, wanted the fifth witness to pay \$6,000 to be shared among controlling councillors in consideration of having his layout plans approved by the Plans Committee;
- (vi) that both Gurnam Singh Gill and Lai Pong Yuen, Councillor and President of the Seremban Town Council respectively, were interested in the payment of the sum of \$10,000 to be shared among controlling councillors from the sixth witness who had promised to make such payment in consideration of having his building plans approved by the Council; that Gurnam Singh Gill was in addition personally interested in obtaining \$2,000 from the sixth witness in the same matter."

Here you are, Sir, those words are quoted from the Report of the Royal

Commission of Enquiry. Are we, the watchdogs of the interest of the public—the Central Government—are we to sit back and do nothing and let such type of coalition government of the Opposition to go and continue with their maladministration and malpractices? Certainly not, Sir. Therefore, this Parliament, which has all the unlimited rights of legislative powers and sovereignty, must legislate and enable the State Government to take over the functions of the local authorities, particularly throughout the whole period of investigation or enquiry. As I have stated, Sir, under constitutional law, the Parliament has legally unlimited legislative powers of sovereignty, and in fact rights previously established could even be taken away by an Act, even a private Act—and furthermore even to the extent of which due notice was not given to the party meant to be injured.

Sir, I beg your leave to make all these explanations, Sir, because no doubt publicity would be given to the walkout of the Opposition Members. I hope the Press will give equal publicity to the submissions I am giving here. Sir, I would like to refer to one of the leading cases of constitutional law, *Edinburgh and Dalkeith Railway Company vs. Wauchope (1842)* in which Wauchope was entitled to certain payments from the Railway Company under a private Act, and the Company subsequently obtained the passing of even a private Act which modified his rights. I am not suggesting that it is the intention of this Government to modify private rights, but here I am illustrating a point that even to this extent this Parliament, this Honourable House, has the power to do so, and more so when we are doing it in protection of public interest. In this case, the Court went further to say that "No Court of Justice can enquire into the mode in which the Act was introduced into the Parliament, nor into what was done previous to its introduction"—this is most important, Sir—"nor into what was done previous to its introduction". Now, this is the answer to the point raised by one of the Honourable

Members of the Opposition that because certain events have happened somewhere that it is obnoxious to introduce this Bill.

In another classical case on constitutional law, *Stockdale vs Hansard*, it is stated that the Commons of England, which is equivalent to our Parliament here, Sir, are not invested with more of power and dignity by their legislative character than by that which they bear as the Grand Inquest of the nation—I repeat the words, Sir, “Grand Inquest of the nation”. Therefore, if we have local authorities which are maladministered and corrupt, the Parliament has no alternative but to resort to its power to the fullest extent in order that public interest may be fully safeguarded, and this includes legislating retrospectively, if it is necessary to do so.

With regard to the question of retrospective legislation, there is no rule against retrospective laws. There are certain principles, however, governing retrospective laws, which I would briefly mention here. Firstly, no law shall be given retrospective effect so as to take away any accrued rights—and this is not the case here, Sir; secondly, no law shall be given retrospective effect to make an offence that was not unlawful—and again this is not the case, otherwise there is no other sanction against the power of Parliament to make retrospective laws. I repeat again, Sir, that there can be no proposition that the Parliament cannot legislate retrospectively. In this respect, I would like to quote Odgers on the *Construction of Deeds and Statutes*, although I am having a very old edition (third edition) and it is said here on page 209:

“Retrospective effect may be supplied either by expressed enactment or even by implication and that this latter is the much more frequent method; the presumption is against such operation where it would affect vested or acquired rights.”

In this case we are not dealing with vested and acquired rights. In this case, we are concerned with public interest.

I can quote a case, Sir, which is quite similar to the present Bill. The

Town and Country Planning (Amendment) Act, 1951 in England, Section 1, sub-section (3), provides that, “the Principal Act of 1947 shall have effect and shall be deemed for all purposes to have had effect as if it had originally been enacted as amended by the preceding sub-section.” Here is a case where an amending Act was made retrospective—amending Act in 1951 was made retrospective to its original Act of 1947. Here again, to strengthen the argument of the unlimited power of the Parliament, not only can the Parliament legislate retrospectively in this case, but it may even do so in what may appear to be unreasonable or against natural justice. During the 17th century, it was at one time thought that an Act of Parliament against reason or natural justice would be adjudged void, but today such theory is of merely antiquarian interest.

Summing up, Sir, what I tried to submit in this House is that this action was taken—I beg your leave to repeat this—in order that the public interest may be safeguarded in the light of the maladministration and malpractices in the local authorities, and particularly so, when we have proof—the Report of the Royal Commission of Enquiry of the Seremban Town Council headed by the Opposition Coalition—that there have been, in fact, cases of maladministration and malpractice.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, untuk penjelasan. Di-dalam keterangan yang di-beri oleh Menteri tadi ada tersebut satu perkataan sa-chara umum—in general—kata-nya kesemua Local Council Authorities—dia menggunakan *plural*. Jadi, ada-kah termasuk juga Municipalities, termasuk juga Town Council dalam perkataan Local Authorities itu?

Tuan Khaw Kai-Boh: Sir, this Bill concerns only the Municipalities.

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 Deputy 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.

MOTIONS

THE CUSTOMS ORDINANCE, 1952

The Customs Duties (Amendment) (No. 5) Order, 1966

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Tuan Ali bin Haji Ahmad): Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of sub-section (2) of section 10 of the Customs Ordinance, 1952, the Customs Duties (Amendment) (No. 5) Order, 1966, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 62 of 1966 be confirmed.

The Order before the House serves to correct the anomalous provision in the tariff structure. Formerly, unset pearls and precious and semi-precious stones were dutiable at 25 per cent, whereas the duty of articles incorporating them was at 10 per cent. In order that the work of setting such pearls, precious and semi-precious stones may be carried out in Malaysia rather than in other countries, and also in order to discourage smuggling of these articles, it was found necessary to bring the level of duty of such unset pearls, precious and semi-precious stones to the same level as that on articles incorporating them.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move.

Tuan Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bersetuju dengan Kerajaan mengemukakan motion ini dengan niat hendak mengurangkan penyeludupan, tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya rasa dukachita terhadap Kerajaan sebab di-dalam keterangan-nya dengan tegas mengatakan bahawa dengan meluluskan usul ini dapat-lah kita mengurangkan penyeludupan yang membawa barang² itu, tetapi apa-kah dengan chara menurun-

kan peratus chukai itu jalan yang sa-benar untuk mengurangkan penyeludupan atau pun usaha² menchegeh penyeludupan itu kalau itu lebeh berkesan.

Ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bimbang bagini: apabila kita menyokong usul ini, maka kedua² tujuan itu tidak akan dapat—yang pertama chukai kemasokan kita pun kurang daripada 25% kita turunkan kepada 10%. Jadi kita sudah rugi 15% dengan harapan konon-nya hendak mengurangkan penyeludupan, sedang penyakit penyeludupan itu tidak di-ubat. Jadi, penyeludupan itu menjadi² juga sa-bagaimana biasa dan chukai masuk pun kurang. Bagi saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, usaha yang sa-macam ini tidak bijak dan saya rasa patut-lah penyeludupan itu di-ubati, bukan lain tempat yang sakit, lain tempat yang kita buboh ubat.

Tuan Ali bin Haji Ahmad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, langkah yang di-buat ini dengan menurunkan chukai daripada 25% kepada 10% ia-lah sa-bagai satu daripada langkah² untuk mengurangkan kechenderongan pada penyeludupan. Jadi dengan mengemukakan ini tidak-lah di-maksudkan bahawa ini-lah sahaja langkah yang di-jalankan oleh Kerajaan untuk mengurangkan kechenderongan pada penyeludupan. Langkah² yang lain itu memang-lah sudah berjalan dan pehak Kerajaan memang-lah sentiasa mengambil langkah dan sentiasa memikirkan dan membaiki langkah² untuk mengurangkan penyeludupan. Ini hanya-lah sa-bagai salah satu chara yang lain untuk mengurangkan kechenderongan atau mengurangkan *incentive* untuk menyeludupkan barang².

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau di-dalam kenyataan yang di-kemukakan pada kali pertama tadi begitu-lah tertib, erti-nya chermat-nya, saya tidak bangkit, tetapi chara memberi penerangan tadi itu patut di-perelokkan lagi, sebab Ahli itu selalu *represents* Menteri Kewangan, jadi wording-nya itu patut di-gunakan elok².

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of sub-section (2) of section 10 of the Customs Ordinance, 1952, the Customs Duties (Amendment) (No. 5) Order, 1966, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 62 of 1966 be confirmed.

THE SABAH CUSTOMS ORDINANCE (CAP. 33)

The Customs Duties (Sabah) (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1966

Tuan Ali bin Haji Ahmad: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move,

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of sub-section (3) of section 8 of the Sabah Customs Ordinance (Cap. 33), the Customs Duties (Sabah) (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1966, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 63 of 1966 be confirmed.

This Order applies to Sabah in the same way that Customs Duties (Amendment) (No. 5) Order, 1966, applies to Western Malaysia.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move.

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of sub-section (3) of section 8 of the Sabah Customs Ordinance (Cap. 33), the Customs Duties (Sabah) (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1966, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 63 of 1966 be confirmed.

THE SARAWAK CUSTOMS ORDINANCE (CAP. 26)

The Customs (Import and Export) Duties (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1966

Tuan Ali bin Haji Ahmad: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move,

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of sub-section (3) of section 8 of the Sarawak Customs Ordinance (Cap. 26), the Customs (Import and Export) Duties (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1966, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 64 of 1966 be confirmed.

This Order applies to Sarawak in the same way that Customs Duties (Amendment) (No. 5) Order, 1966, applies to Western Malaysia.

Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move.

Tuan Ibrahim bin Abdul Rahman: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya hendak mengemukakan sedikit ia-itu saya tidak ada kertas ini, boleh jadi saya tidak dapat Statute Paper No. 64 ini.

Mr Speaker: Tidak ada apa?

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Tidak ada Statute Paper No. 64/1966.

Mr Speaker: Jadi tidak menjadi soal-lah!

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of sub-section (3) of section 8 of the Sarawak Customs Ordinance (Cap. 26), the Customs (Import and Export) Duties (Amendment) (No. 2) Order, 1966, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 64 of 1966 be confirmed.

THE CUSTOMS ORDINANCE, 1952

The Customs Duties (Amendment) (No. 6) Order, 1966

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move the motion standing in my name which has been put down in the Order Paper as Item No. 7 and which reads as follows:

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of sub-section (2) of section 10 of the Customs Ordinance, 1952, the Customs Duties (Amendment) (No. 6) Order, 1966, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 65 of 1966 be confirmed.

The Order before the House abolishes Commonwealth preference in respect of import duties on several categories of goods, viz. sugar, textiles and wearing apparel, alcoholic beverages, tobacco, cosmetics and perfumery, television and wireless sets, musical instruments, and tyres and tubes. Henceforth, the import duties on these goods will be uniformly fixed at the old non-Commonwealth rates. I expect this measure to yield \$17 million of additional revenue in a full year. I might add that in a simultaneous exercise to remove the preferential rates of *ad valorem* registration fee on motor vehicles, a further

\$10 million per annum is expected to be collected.

I have explained publicly that the decision to remove Commonwealth preference has been made with a view to strengthening the financial position of the Government which, in the current fiscal year, is facing a deficit on current account. This is a trend which clearly had to be reversed, if we are to remain financially viable and credit worthy, a paramount consideration for attracting foreign aid on the scale envisaged in order to implement the First Malaysia Plan. New sources of revenue had, therefore, to be found.

In this connection, I would like to emphasise again that, under the financial circumstances in which we were placed, we really had no choice, except to act in the way we did. This was the only possible course open to us in mid-year. Something had, therefore, to be done, and done quickly, to cover the deficit on current account. I, of course, agree that our financial position is by no means desperate, but if we regard ourselves as a responsible Government that has achieved an international reputation in this respect, we clearly should not delay taking remedial action until it was too late. The time we chose was by no means too early, if we are in earnest about maintaining the strength and stability of our currency, a matter which gains added importance in view of the fact that by the middle of next year Bank Negara will be issuing its own currency.

When that event takes place, it is absolutely vital that our foreign exchange reserves should be more than enough and our financial position should be strong. Anything less than this might lead to a dangerous erosion of confidence in our currency, and this would be a poor start for us, and would justify the strictures of our critics and opponents, who insist that we are not fit to manage our own currency unless we are tied to the apron strings of a currency board system with all its rigidities and colonial pattern of operation. We therefore, cannot afford to take chances at this stage, and we must do everything

we can to ensure that on 12th June, 1967, the day Bank Negara issues its own currency, we get off to the best possible start. Under these circumstances, I hope that Commonwealth Governments whose exports have been affected by our action will view the reasons which dictated it with sympathy and with understanding.

I have also stated that the action taken by the Government in no way reflects any change in its trade policy. Malaysia still accords a substantial number of preferences in favour of goods of Commonwealth origin. In the aggregate, the value of the remaining goods accorded such preference is approximately equal to the value of Malaysian goods accorded preference in other Commonwealth countries. I should also add that preferences contracted under trade agreements entered into by Malaysia with individual countries remain unaltered.

Sir, I beg to move.

Tuan Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub:

Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah:

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-bagai kebiasaan, saya dalam sa-barang usaha yang di-kemukakan oleh Kerajaan, saya menyokong pada asas-nya, dan di-sini saya suka-lah mengambil peluang memberi pendapat saya tentang pindaan Undang² terhadap chukai ini ia-itu dengan kita berhajat atau pun berniat supaya dengan pindaan ini kita dapat menolong lagi menegohkan kedudukan kewangan kita dengan kita mengadakan pindaan bagi *import duty* yang preferential.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, memang-lah satu daripada usaha kita ia-itu memansokhkan chukai² yang sa-macam itu supaya kita dapat chukai kemasokan banyak. Tetapi dari segi ekonomi yang saya faham selalu yang di-sarankan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri Perusahaan dan Perdagangan yang selalu-nya lebih banyak daripada Menteri Finance sendiri ia-itu hubungan ekonomi. External Economy, tidak-lah dapat kita menyukat dengan ekonomi dari dalam. Jadi saya bimbang kalau² apabila kita mansokhkan chukai preferential ini dengan harapan kita hendak

dapat chukai masok lebih, tetapi reaction daripada negara² yang berkenaan itu akan menerbitkan pula tindakan² terhadap kita.

Jadi kalau sa-kira-nya dahulu kita memberi keistimewaan itu dan hujah kita memberi keistimewaan chukai yang rendah itu tidak menyentoh kedudukan kewangan kita, maka elok pula kita buat begitu supaya orang menimbang pula hubungan kita dengan mereka itu. Maka sekarang ini mengapa pula yang kita sedar bahawa kita mesti memansokhkan preferential duty itu? Jadi kalau dahulu-nya kita mengharapkan simpati orang² itu kepada kita, maka sekarang ini dengan lojik-nya, dengan mudah-nya, bila kita mansokhkan preferential duty itu, orang pun akan bertindak terhadap kita, dan saya bimbang reaction daripada memansokhkan preferential duty ini akan menambahkan lagi kesulitan di-dalam masaalah ekonomi kita—in contact with the external economy.

Dr Mahathir bin Mohamad: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bangun untuk menyokong penoh usul Kerajaan yang terkandung di-dalam-nya policy baru berkenaan dengan keistimewaan sa-tengah² impot² daripada negara² Commonwealth.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita yang berumur lebih daripada 40 tahun di-negeri ini telah di-dided dalam sekolah² kolonial di-mana kita belajar tentang kelakuan gentleman. Dalam didekan ini kita di-fahamkan ia-itu apa juga yang di-lakukan oleh orang British ia-lah chara yang di-buat oleh gentleman. Mereka tidak boleh buat salah. Mereka selalu menimbangkan sa-chara adil. Kalau penimbangan ini selalu menguntongkan mereka sendiri, ini bukan-lah apa, ini terpaksa jadi, kerana keadilan.

Kita juga di-ajar tentang *word of honour* ia-itu kita mesti patoh kepada janji², walau pun janji² itu di-pulas daripada kita dengan chara yang kejam. Akhir-nya kita di-ajar supaya menjadi good loser ia-itu mesti *sporting* selalu. Kalau kita dapati orang Inggeris tipu, kita kata itu chara gentleman sungguh pun kita tidak nampak (*Ketawa*). Kalau kita terikat

dengan tipu daya-nya kita mesti *honour our words*. Dan kalau kita rugi kerana di-tipu, kita mesti senyum dan tunjok yang kita ini ia-lah good loser dan real gentleman (*Ketawa*).

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita tahu bahawa Commonwealth preference ini di-buat di-masa penjajah. Saya tidak perchaya yang siapa² pun berani kata chara ini yang di-bentok pada zaman penjajah bermaharaja-lela di-sini ia-lah dengan kerana kasehan kapada jajahan² ta'alok-nya. Atau pun mereka ini telah nampak ia-itu pada satu hari jajahan² ini akan menjadi negara² merdeka dan berdaulat. Saya perchaya mereka membuat Commonwealth preference ini sa-mata² untuk menjaga market untuk keluaran industry² British dan supaya mereka dapat mengawal bahan² yang penting yang ada di-jajahan² ta'alok.

Tetapi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, pada masa kita menuntut kemerdekaan, Honourable British Gentleman telah menegas penting-nya memegang kuat kapada Commonwealth preference, sa-olah² ini di-bentok khas-nya untuk memelihara Malaya yang merdeka. Sunggoh pun kita tidak nampak macham mana ini akan menguntongkan kita, tetapi supaya kita tidak dikatakan bukan gentleman kita telah terima alasan² yang di-buat.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-lama kita merdeka, kita telah chuba jadi gentleman dengan British, tetapi sa-makin lama sa-makin terang yang gentleman—orang yang mengajar kita supaya menjadi gentleman—mereka sendiri bukan gentleman. Mereka chuma menggunakan tayangan ini untuk kepentingan mereka sahaja.

Pada Ogos, 1965 kita telah nampak dengan jelas betapa bad loser mereka boleh jadi. Daripada Ogos, 1965 sahingga sekarang, British telah tunjok bertalu² yang mereka akan membuat apa sahaja untuk menjujuk apa yang boleh jadi kapada kita jikalau kita tidak bekerjasama dengan mereka. Saya tidak akan sebutkan satu persatu, tetapi sa-telah kita kenal baik gentleman kita, gentleman friend, maka tidak dapat tidak kita mesti tukar

sikap kita terhadap mereka. Jadi saya mengalu²kan langkah Kerajaan merentikan Commonwealth preference bagi sa-tengah² impot pada masa yang akan datang.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya fikir ada lagi perkara² yang patut di-kaji samula berkenaan dengan ikatan² yang di-buat sa-belum merdeka. Kita tahu sa-belum merdeka, Kerajaan Negeri² Melayu mesti menerima nasehat² yang di-berikan oleh British Advisers. Mereka ini telah menggunakan kuasa nasehat mereka untuk perniagaan company² British. Umpama-nya, berkenaan dengan tanah ladang getah. Saya di-beri tahu ia-itu tanah² yang luas yang di-beri kepada company² British dikenakan hasil yang rendah, kadang²-nya sa-banyak 10% sahaja daripada hasil² yang di-kenakan kepada peladang² kecil. Apabila di-soal, sa-tengah² daripada pegawai kita berkata, kita tidak boleh ubah hasil oleh kerana kita telah janji dengan company² ini masa British, kita tidak boleh pechah janji² ini. Jadi tentu-lah terang, sungoh pun pada masa di-buatkan janji² itu British telah berkelakuan kurang sedikit daripada gentleman dengan menggunakan kuasa British Adviser untuk kepentingan bangsa mereka, kita pula sekarang ini hendak gentleman sangat dan tidak mahu memecah janji yang merugikan kita.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, yang lebeh burok lagi ia-lah kejadian di-Pulau Pinang. Apabila Captain Light telah, dengan pandai-nya, mengambil Pulau Pinang dia telah beri kepada keluarganya dengan tiada di-kenakan apa² pun, atau pun chuma dengan nominal charge sahaja tanah² yang ada di-Pulau Pinang. Tanah² ini telah ada orang² yang memileki-nya dengan chara usaha, tetapi ini tidak dipedulikan oleh Kerajaan Pulau Pinang. Satu daripada tanah² yang di-beri kepada keluarga Captain Light ini ia-lah Brown Estate di-Glugor. Dengan murah hati-nya, Mr Brown telah berkata kepada orang² yang pada masa itu menduduki di-dalam tanah ini ia-itu mereka boleh tinggal di-situ dengan tidak di-kenakan apa² bayaran. Ini sama-lah juga, sa-orang yang meny-

mun duit daripada saya dan sa-lepas itu memberi wang balek kepada saya, dan berlagak saperti dermawan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, akibat ram-pasan ini ia-lah, sekarang penduduk² di-Brown Estate terpaksa di-keluarkan oleh keturunan Brown yang telah menjualkan tanah ini kepada orang² lain. Ini membawa kepada kesusahan yang menyedehkan. Tetapi, Kerajaan tidak-lah boleh membuat apa². Kita maseh patoh kepada Undang², dan Undang² berkata Brown Estate ini ia-lah hak keturunan Brown, dan mereka boleh menjualkan tanah itu atau pun membuat apa². Kerajaan tidak akan champor tangan, sungoh pun chara Brown mendapat Estate ini bukan-lah bagitu tertib.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berharap supaya perjanjian² saperti ini dapat di-kaji balek. Kita ta' boleh pegang kuat sangat dengan chara gentleman. Kita merdeka dan kita mesti berusaha untuk kebaikan diri kita. Di-dalam soal Commonwealth preference, kita telah ambil tindakan. Sekarang saya berharap supaya bila juga kita dapati, ia-itu kelakuan dan kerja yang di-jalankan oleh penjajah British dahulu, ke-kurangan dalam segi ajaran, patut-lah kita ambil tindakan untuk menjaga kepentingan kita.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dari itu saya menyokong penoh usul Kerajaan untuk meminda chukai² yang di-kenakan kepada sa-tengah² daripada import² daripada negara² Commonwealth. Terima kaseh.

Tuan Mohamed Yusof bin Mahmud (Temerloh): Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya juga bangun mengalu²kan Rang Undang² yang di-bentangkan di-Dewan pada hari ini, ia-itu mengaleh atau pun meminda Undang² Khas berkenaan chukai² barang² yang datang daripada Commonwealth. Ini satu langkah yang berani, rasa saya, kerana apa, saya perchaya negeri² Commonwealth yang tertentu akan pula mengambil peluang, mengambil sikap yang lain terhadap Undang² yang kita timbulkan di-negeri kita ini. Dan daripada ini, kita akan menghadap satu perkara yang sangat² penting. Jadi, dalam perkara ini, rasa

saya, patut juga-lah Kementerian Perdagangan dan Perusahaan mengalahkannya usaha-nya supaya ketetapan wang kita di-luar negeri tetap, ia-itu mencari pasaran² yang luas di-dunia ini.

Sebab, saya kata bagitu, pasaran² barang kita belum lagi cukup laris di-luar daripada Commonwealth, bagaimana yang telah saya lihat pada masa lawatan saya di-negeri Eropah, di-Timor Tengah dan juga di-Tenggara Asia. Jadi, rasa saya kita mesti menghadapi keadaan itu. Dan, kalau kita dapat menyalurkan pengeluaran² barang² kita ka-negeri² lain daripada Commonwealth ini, mungkin mereka² akan menimbang tindakan² yang akan di-ambil oleh sa-paroh² negeri dalam Commonwealth ini.

Yang kedua, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, usul ini juga akan memberi peluang yang baik kepada kita, ia-itu terutama sa-kali ra'ayat Malaysia menggunakan Perusahaan²-nya sendiri. Jadi, apa sebab saya kata bagitu, pada masa yang lampau, boleh di-katakan perusahaan² kita belum lagi mendapat layanan atau pun penerimaan daripada ra'ayat kita sendiri. Masih banyak lagi ra'ayat kita yang menggunakan barang² yang datang daripada luar negeri. Jadi, dengan ada-nya Undang² yang macam ini, maka kegiatan yang di-jalankan oleh perusahaan² kita di-dalam negeri ini, lebih mendapat satu perasaan yang gembira dan peluang yang baik pada masa hadapan.

Jadi, dalam perkara ini, saya percaya-lah banyak lagi perkara yang mengenai kepentingan negara kita di-antara Malaysia dan Commonwealth ini, dapat juga di-semak balek sa-mula sa-bagaimana ucapan sahabat saya yang baharu berchakap tadi. Banyak lagi perkara², bukan-lah berkenaan tanah sahaja, tetapi banyak lagi perkara² yang kita fikir patut boleh kita pinda dan ini akan meninggikan kedaulatan negara kita daripada negara² lain.

Jadi, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam usul ini, saya sa-kali lagi memberi tahniat-lah kepada Menteri Kewangan yang telah berani membentangkan usul ini di-hadapan kita. Kerana, pada masa

ini, pada masa yang lampau, kita ini masih lagi berhaluan kepada Britain, dan ini-lah, rasa saya, satu langkah yang sangat baik, ia-itu kita menuju kepada kedaulatan kita sendiri dan kita tidak berharap kepada negeri² lain.

Sungguh pun ada baik-nya—banyak perkara² yang di-fikirkan baik pada masa kita hendak merdeka dahulu, ia-itu kita masuk dalam Commonwealth, tetapi sa-telah pada masa yang lampau ini, kita dapati banyak perkara² di-dalam Commonwealth itu telah mengakibatkan keadaan negara kita kucar-kacir. Jadi, rasa saya, ini lagi langkah yang baik menuju arah kepada negara yang berdaulat dan merdeka. Terima kasih.

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, I am grateful to my Honourable friends on the Government benches for supporting these measures so fully and so ably.

In reply to the Honourable Member for Bachok, I might add—in fact, I had referred to this aspect of the matter in my speech when proposing this motion—that we had no choice and we had to do what we did. In spite of this, we still accord to Commonwealth imports into Malaysia approximately the same value of preferences which are being accorded to Malaysian exports to Commonwealth countries. As I have said previously, this matter before this exercise was a rather one sided affair in the sense that what we gave was far more than what we received. In spite of this exercise, I think the balance is about right now. I also agree with my Honourable friends on the Government benches that this measure has got a protective element, in that apart from the revenue aspects the measure we propose will give very much needed encouragement and assistance to our own domestic industries.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of sub-section (2) of section 10 of the Customs Ordinance, 1952, the Customs Duties (Amendment) (No. 6) Order, 1966, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 65 of 1966 be confirmed.

THE SABAH CUSTOMS ORDINANCE (CAP. 33)

The Customs Duties (Sabah) (Amendment) (No. 4) Order, 1966

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move the following motion standing in my name, which has been put down on the Order Paper for today as item No. 3:

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of sub-section (3) of section 8 of the Sabah Customs Ordinance (Cap. 33), the Customs Duties (Sabah) (Amendment) (No. 4) Order, 1966, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 66 of 1966 be confirmed.

This Order repeats most of what appears in the Customs Duties (Amendment) (No. 6) Order, 1966, which has been confirmed by the House, and which applies to the Principal Customs Area of West Malaysia only.

I wish, however, to draw the attention of Honourable Members to the fact that in West Malaysia no import duty is collected on motor vehicles, but instead an *ad valorem* registration fee is levied. In the States of East Malaysia, on the other hand, an import duty is collected with no *ad valorem* registration fee levied. In effect, the import duty in East Malaysia replaces the *ad valorem* registration fee in West Malaysia. The basis for collecting both these levies has now been made uniform.

Sir, I beg to move.

Tuan Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, motion ini atau usul ini tidak-lah begitu berbeza pada dasar-nya dengan motion yang baru lalu tadi. Jadi, untuk menambahkan lagi pendapat saya berasaskan kepada apa² yang saya telah katakan dalam motion yang lalu itu, saya suka-lah hendak mendapat keterangan lagi yang lebih lanjut dan sehat lagi daripada Menteri Kewangan kita ia-itu di-dalam argument yang di-kemukakan oleh Menteri kita ini bahawa walau pun kita memansokhkan preferential duty itu, kedudukan ekonomi kita pada masa ini kita jamin elok lagi ia-itu perkara² itu

tidak menyentoh ketegohan balance of payment kita dengan negeri² yang berkenaan—itu yang di-sebutkan oleh Menteri kita baharu sa-kejap tadi, ia-itu untuk menguatkan hujah Menteri, Menteri kita berkata walau pun memansokhkan preferential duty itu di atas tindakan negeri Commonwealth terhadap exporter² kita tidak tersentuh. Jadi erti-nya mereka itu tidak-lah pula di-kenakan preferential duty dari segi negeri² sana. Jadi, itu-lah menjadi hujah kepada Menteri kita bahawa perkara itu tidak menyentoh balance of payment di-negeri kita.

Kalau pendapat saya ini tidak silap, saya faham daripada Menteri kita maka saya amat-lah berasa dukachita di atas hujah² itu, kerana kalau pada masa ini negeri itu tidak memansokhkan preferential duty terhadap kita sebagaimana kita melakukan, boleh jadi besok atau pun lusa harus di-mansokhkan, maka hilang-lah hujah yang di-kemukakan oleh Yang Berhormat Menteri kita tadi.

Yang kedua, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, apa yang di-sebut oleh Ahli daripada Kota Star Selatan tadi ia-itu memuji Kerajaan kita, khusus-nya Menteri kita ini, tentang berani-nya mengemukakan usul² yang sa-macam ini dan beliau menarek perhatian satu peristiwa yang berlaku di-Estate Glugor yang di-punya² oleh sa-orang yang di-katakan nama-nya Brown, dan Dewan ini tentu-lah bersetuju dengan apa yang di-suarakan oleh Ahli Yang Berhormat itu dan kita harap di-Sabah pun akan di-perhatikan juga perkara² ini.

Apa yang saya suka hendak memberitahu kepada Dewan ini yang saya tahu ia-itu tanah² yang di-punya² atau yang di-mileki atau di-katakan di-mileki oleh Brown dan keluarga-nya di-Pulau Pinang itu tidak-lah boleh, dari segi undang², kita hendak mengatakan orang itu menipu kita atau begitu bagini, sebab yang saya tahu dalam sejarah—kalau saya tidak betul boleh di-perbetulkan—ia-itu orang ini membuat perjanjian dengan Raja² Melayu bukan dengan policy Kerajaan, Jadi, mithalnya dia hendak buka kebun getah dia membeli tanah itu daripada Raja itu, jadi, erti-nya dia tidak beli daripada

Kerajaan negeri itu. Jadi, Kerajaan tidak ada berkuasa di atas tanah itu, jadi menunjukkan, kalau-lah ada Raja² itu menjual, maka Kerajaan tidak boleh berkata apa² dan ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau-lah sejarah yang saya baccha itu benar, saya bimbang takut di-negeri² yang lain lagi di-dalam Malaysia kita ini ada tanah² yang dijual begitu dan kalau-lah perkara ini ada terbau atau pun ada terdengar angin² ada di-Sabah dan di-Sarawak, patut-lah kita membuat daripada awal lagi, kita membuat lagi penyiasaan² yang sa-macam itu.

Ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya bawakan kerana Ahli Yang Berhormat tadi memansokhkan pada hal usul yang di-hadapan kita ini sa-mata² kena mengena dengan duty dan saya harap-lah Menteri kita ini memberi penerangan di atas kebimbangan saya tadi.

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Sir, in reply to the Honourable Member for Bachok, I should add that I do not think that this measure will significantly affect our balance of payments. If there is any effect at all, it should be favourable, because it is just possible, but I obviously cannot forecast in this matter, that the removal of the preferential margins would decrease the imports of Commonwealth goods which are affected, and if that were to happen, there would, in fact, be a favourable effect on our balance of payments.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of sub-section (3) of section 8 of the Sabah Customs Ordinance (Cap. 33), the Customs Duties (Sabah) (Amendment) (No. 4) Order, 1966, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 66 of 1966 be confirmed.

THE SARAWAK CUSTOMS ORDINANCE (CAP. 26)

The Customs (Import and Export) Duties (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1966

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move the following motion standing in my name which has been put down on the Order Paper as item No. 9:

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of

sub-section (3) of section 8 of the Sarawak Customs Ordinance (Cap. 26), the Customs (Import and Export) Duties (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1966, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 67 of 1966 be confirmed.

In essence, this Order is identical with the Customs Duties (Sabah) (Amendment) (No. 4) Order, 1966 and applies to Sarawak in the same way as the latter Order applies to Sabah.

Sir, I beg to move.

Tuan Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That this House resolves that in accordance with the powers vested in it by virtue of sub-section (3) of section 8 of the Sarawak Customs Ordinance (Cap. 26), the Customs (Import and Export) Duties (Amendment) (No. 3) Order, 1966, which has been laid before the House as Statute Paper No. 67 of 1966 be confirmed.

THE FIRST REPORT OF THE STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE (THIRD SESSION) OF THE SECOND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES (Paper No. DR. 4 of 1966)

Tuan Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub: Mr Speaker, Sir, I beg to move the motion standing in the name of the Minister of Home Affairs, which has been put down as item No. 10 in the Order Paper, namely:

That the first Report of the Standing Orders Committee (Third Session) of the Second House of Representatives, which has been presented to the House as Paper No. DR. 4 of 1966, be adopted with effect from the end of this meeting.

Tuan Tan Siew Sin: Sir, I beg to second the motion.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dengan izin Tuan, saya ingin memberi pendapat sedikit berkenaan dengan peratoran² yang telah di-kemukakan oleh Jawatankuasa Standing Order ini.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya lebih suka kalau sa-kira-nya perjalanan persidangan Dewan Ra'ayat kita ini berjalan mengikut waktu² pejabat ia-itu office hours betul, tidak sa-bagaimana yang ada sekarang ini. Sebab-nya

bagini, Tuan di-Pertua, kita telah mengalami di-dalam Dewan ini berbagai² keadaan, terkadang² itu menyedehkan, terkadang² itu memarahkan dan terkadang² meluchukan, ia-itu kita pernah meshuarat sampai pukul satu, sampai pukul dua dan terkadang² dahulu-nya kita meshuarat sampai pukul lapan. Ini menyebabkan contact kita dengan hidup sa-hari² tidak sama, jadi kita bermeshuarat sampai pukul enam, office tutup sampai 4.30, mithal-nya, habis! Jadi, erti-nya program kechergasan kita itu tidak sama dengan apa yang berlaku. Jadi, sa-patut-nya masa kita bekerja ini sama, kalau office habis 4.30, kita pun habis 4.30.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, apabila kita samakan itu senang-lah kalau kita ada berjanji dengan orang 4.30 mithal-nya, lima minit lagi kita pun keluar e'ok sahaja pergi ambil dia. Ini dia tunggu kadang² kita bersidang sampai pukul enam, berapa banyak pula janji² yang di-buat oleh Ahli Parlimen ini yang tidak dapat di-tunaikan dan orang itu mengatakan Ahli Parlimen ini tipu janji kita, dan melukakan hati² orang yang berjanji itu pula.

Yang kedua-nya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita sudah ada pengalaman di-dalam waktu bermeshuarat ini.

Tuan Ahmad bin Arshad: Saya hendak bertanya Ahli Yang Berhormat—janji apa yang di-katakan-nya itu, dan kepada siapa?

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Pada satu hari, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya berjanji dengan isteri saya sendiri (*Ketawa*) ia-itu lepas office saya hendak ambil dia—jadi dia memahami bahawa lepas office itu erti-nya 4.30. Saya tersilap rupa-nya kita ini bersidang sampai pukul lapan, maka dia dudok menunggu di-situ dan balek, Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Tuan Yang di-Pertua dapat menggambarkan dan dapat meramalkan bagaimana hebat-nya confrontation pada hari itu (*Ketawa*). Jadi, ini kalau berlaku pada saya, tidak mustahil-lah berlaku-nya kepada Member² yang lain juga, chuma Member² lain itu dia sembunyikan keburokan-nya lebeh daripada dia mencheritakan kebaikan.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sa-lain daripada itu persidangan kita terkadang² lama, panjang dan kita berhajat juga hendak membacha, hendak refer, ka-sana ka-mari. Kalau kita masok meshuarat, mithal-nya, berlain daripada Office Hours kita tentu-lah berasa leteh dan banyak-lah member² yang tidak ingin berchakap langsung terutama berkenaan dengan Rang Undang².

Saya perhatikan dalam Dewan ini ia-lah banyak orang termasuk-lah saya, bukan orang lain sahaja—kita ada beringin (*interested*) di-dalam benda² yang berchorak political dan yang dalam polisi speech, yang boleh berchakap mengikut pendapat masing², tetapi Rang Undang² sendiri yang menjadi tugas bagi Parlimen ini membentok Rang Undang² itu siapa pun tidak ada berchakap, di-antara 100 lebeh back-benchers Kerajaan. Yang saya tahu sa-orang dua sahaja berchakap atas Rang Undang², yang lain itu dia menggunakan masa-nya untuk memberi fikiran biasa sahaja. Rang Undang² tidak di-tempoh langsung, padahal, ma'af Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam back-benchers Kerajaan ini ada loyar, ada orang yang berpengalaman begitu bagini.

Jadi kita mengharapkan orang itu memberi fikiran dan saya sendiri sebagai Ahli yang muda di-dalam Dewan ini, saya rasa kalau orang itu bekerja menunai begitu, dapat juga pengalaman² saya tetapi kalau dia orang itu lebeh malas lagi daripada saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, malas champor malas maka Dewan kita ini

Tuan Abdul Razak bin Haji Hussin: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, tidak-lah Yang Berhormat tahu kami ada-lah bagi pehak Kerajaan dan apa yang di-buat oleh Kerajaan itu kami telah rundingkan lebeh dahulu, sebab itu kami ta' berchakap.

Tuan Haji Abu Bakar bin Hamzah: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya tahu-lah kalau back-benchers itu tentu-lah menyokong Kerajaan tetapi di-dalam masaalah Rang Undang² ini, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, saya sendiri sudah melihat bahawa di-waktu hendak membentok Rang Undang² itu Ahli²

back-benchers yang boleh berfikir selalu-nya tidak begitu sama sangat dengan Kerajaan—ada contribution dia dan begitu juga saya pernah masuk di-dalam Select Committee, di-dalam Selection Committee. Jadi erti-nya perbezaan orang² itu berfikir. Jadi saya sayang sangat fikiran² itu yang baik itu hanya di-tenggelamkan dengan satu kata ia-itu kami back-benchers ini menyokong Kerajaan sa-mata², dalam polisi kita menyokong tetapi dalam membentok rang undang² apa salah-nya kalau kita memberi contribution di-dalam itu.

Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sebab itu-lah Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kita dapati Dewan kita ini selalu tidak chukup koram dan saya, Tuan Yang di-Pertua, kalau Tuan Yang di-Pertua izinkan kapada saya, saya terpaksa meminta elaun lebeh kapada Tuan Yang di-Pertua, sebab saya selalu menolong supaya koram itu chukup (*Ketawa*).

Jadi sudah dua tanggung-jawab saya dalam Dewan ini yang pertama sa-bagai ahli Dewan Ra'ayat dan yang kedua sa-bagai orang tolong jaga koram (*Ketawa*). Jadi lepas konfrantasi ini saya berasa duit pun banyak, patut tuan hendak bagi tahu kapada Kerajaan supaya menambahkan elaun ahli² Parlimen ini kalau tidak pada orang lain pun kapada satu ahli yang chergas yang menolong tuan menjalankan Dewan ini. Terima kaseh. (*Tepok*).

Tuan Abdul-Rahman bin Ya'kub: Tuan Yang di-Pertua, dalam Dewan ini kita ada bukan sahaja ahli² Yang Berhormat biasa, tetapi juga Menteri²

termasuk-lah Yang Teramat Mulia Perdana Menteri kita dan Yang Amat Berhormat Timbalan Perdana Menteri kita. Maka jika meshuarat ini diadakan mengikut jam seperti pejabat², ini akan mengganggu atau pun tidak membenarkan Menteri² menjalankan kerja² di-Kementerian yang mesti juga di-jalankan walau pun Parlimen bersidang. Itu-lah sebab-nya maka perkara ini, dalam masa meshuarat ini, kita adakan seperti yang ada pada masa ini.

Masalah Ahli Yang Berhormat itu meminta elaun, saya pun ta' tahu sama ada PAS ada berkuasa dalam Dewan ini hendak melantek dia membantu Tuan Yang di-Pertua. Jadi oleh kerana dia itu sudah bengkerap sangat jadi dia minta-lah elaun pada kita. Agak-nya kita pun kasehan juga dengan dia itu, boleh jadi juga hendak minum kopi, hendak minum teh, hendak apa, waktu ada persidangan ini. Boleh jadi kita boleh "pass-round" topi kita keluarkan 5 sen atau pun 10 sen (*Ketawa*) sa-orang kita boleh "contribute" kapada Fund Yang Berhormat dari Bachok itu. Terima kaseh.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved,

That the first Report of the Standing Orders Committee (Third Session) of the Second House of Representatives, which has been presented to the House as Paper No. DR. 4 of 1966, be adopted with effect from the end of this meeting.

Mr (Deputy) Speaker: Meshuarat ini di-tanggohkan *sine die*.

Adjourned at 1.00 p.m.